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Abstract

The constitutional division of powers in Canada assigns no authority to the federal state in the area of education. In spite of this, the Canadian state has used its constitutional authority to act in the national interest to justify substantial activity in public education at all levels. One area of particular interest to the state is the education of Canadian citizens. This thesis examines state policy in citizenship education between 1947 and 1982. It focuses on the Department of the Secretary of State, particularly the Canadian Citizenship Branch, and addresses three questions: 1) What conception of citizenship formed the basis for state policy in citizenship education? 2) How did the state formulate citizenship education policy? and 3) What means did the federal state use to implement citizenship education policy given that education is an area of provincial jurisdiction?

Throughout this period the state was preoccupied with questions of national unity and therefore the focus of its policy in citizenship education was the construction and propagation of a national ideal in which all Canadians could find their identity as citizens. The policy was consistent with an elitist conception of citizenship in that it excluded most Canadians from the process of constructing the national identity and relegated citizen participation to largely apolitical voluntary activities.

Although the Department of the Secretary of State was
rhetorically committed to scientific policy making, the process was driven not by social science research but by attempts to secure and extend bureaucratic territory in relation to both other government departments and voluntary organizations working in the citizenship sector. In the complex interplay among the interested parties the Department was sometimes a leader and sometimes a follower in the policy making process.

State citizenship education policy was implemented through official agreements with the provinces as well as more direct means which bypassed provincial authorities. Bilingualism in Education programs are the best example of the former, while training programs for teachers, the production and dissemination of materials, and attempts to use voluntary organizations as surrogates for the state are examples of the latter.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The nineteenth century saw the birth of many modern nation states. For the rulers of those states the creation of a territorial and political entity was not the end of nation building; citizens of the new state had to be created as well. As an Italian nationalist of the period put it, "We have made Italy; now we must make Italians." Education in general and public schooling in particular were essential tools for states in creating among often diverse groups of people a sense of national identity or "a feeling of being one people different from all other people." In Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871, Curtis examines this process of "public construction" which he argues was concerned with the overlapping functions of institution building and "political characterization of the population" (emphasis in the original). He documents the long and often contested process of centralizing state control over schools, curriculum and teachers, contending that this disciplining of "the educational market" was a deliberate effort to take control of education away from parents and local communities so the state could be more effective in using education for political socialization. According to Curtis, the elites who pushed for, and achieved, universal public schooling in Canada West at this time were concerned about "the
creation in the population of new habits, orientations, [and] desires" that were consistent with "the bourgeois social order" including "respect for legitimate authority and for standards of a 'collective' morality."\(^5\)

In Canada, the process of state formation is a continuous process. In geographic and political terms this can be seen in Newfoundland joining Confederation in 1949, the patriation of the constitution in 1982, recent agreements to establish a new political entity, Nunavut, in the Eastern Arctic, and several attempts to amend the constitution. Alongside these structural changes have been ongoing efforts by the national state to create a Canadian citizenry with appropriate "habits, orientations, and desires."

During the years 1947-1982 the policy of the Canadian state was to use public education to construct and propagate a Canadian citizenship that included: a universally shared national identity; a set of appropriate values and attitudes for citizens; and a model for citizen participation. Consistent with the traditionally elitist nature of state building in Canada, this policy was conceived and implemented without significant input from the citizens it was designed to shape. In general the policy defined "good citizenship as deferent and supportive behaviour towards the government in office."\(^6\)

Although in Canada the federal state has no constitutional authority in the area of education, Grant argues that it is becoming
increasingly obvious that the national government is currently acting on the perception not of three justifications for federal involvement in education, [traditionally: education and employment; education and culture; and education and language] but four. The fourth is overriding, has existed for some time, and has been basic to many federal actions. This justification, ever increasingly present, is education for national unity, for "Canadianization", for developing a national consciousness, and is in fact citizenship education, or the socialization of citizens, especially young people, to the national as opposed to the provincial state.  

Indeed, as Grant points out, the federal state has been interested in citizenship education a long time but because of the constitutional constraints placed upon its direct involvement in public education it has had "to work indirectly to use the schools as the agents of the nation-state and to employ the tactics of pressure groups, interest groups, or lobbies to advance the interest of the state." Such tactics include attempts to convince ministers of education to adopt particular policies or practices, as well as efforts "to directly affect the materials of instruction and/or the vehicles of instruction - the teachers."  

One way to influence ministers of education to go along with federal policies in any area of education is to offer financial inducements to adopt particular programs. As we shall see later in this work, the explosion of French immersion programs across the country, for example, largely occurred because large sums of federal money were made available to provinces and school districts who implemented them. Recently the federal government, through The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), has influenced school programs in
almost all the provinces by its funding of provincial global education projects.⁹

For some time the federal government has been heavily involved in the production of educational materials. In 1983 Anderson wrote that "some 66 departments and agencies of the federal government produce educational materials that could be used in social studies instruction" where citizenship education, at least in the overt sense, usually takes place.¹⁰ More recently the Department of the Secretary of State acted as coordinator for an Interdepartmental Working Group on Educational Materials consisting of representatives from "50 federal departments and agencies which produce materials for primary and secondary school students and teachers."¹¹ Many of these departments are explicitly involved in the production of materials related to citizenship education. Despite direction that these developers ought to work with provincial educational authorities, in many cases these materials are directly available free of charge to teachers. These resources thereby enter classrooms without the provincial scrutiny that textbooks and other approved materials usually undergo.

In addition to producing materials, these departments and agencies are often very involved in the in-service training of teachers. Curtis argues that control of teacher training was a key aspect of state intervention in education in the nineteenth century and, as Grant points out, it continues as an important
aspect of federal attempts to influence educational policy in the area of citizenship.\textsuperscript{12}

Beyond direct involvement in citizenship education, the federal state has had considerable indirect involvement through its funding of "private" organizations, what I call surrogates, that have influence in the field. The Canadian Citizenship Council, an organization promoting citizenship education across the country, maintained close ties with the state throughout its existence from the early 1940s to the late 1960s. A more recent example is The Canada Studies Foundation (CSF), which was involved in curriculum and teacher development between 1970 and 1986. Current examples include: The Association for Canadian Studies, Forum for Young Canadians, and The Terry Fox Centre.

Grant concludes that recent federal involvement in citizenship education "has grown in some proportion to match the destructive forces attacking Canadian unity."\textsuperscript{13} It has also grown in an uncoordinated and unexamined fashion. Possibly because of a desire not to appear to be treading on an area of provincial responsibility, the federal state has not been explicit about its policy with regard to the objectives and means of citizenship education in and outside of public schools. This lack of a clear policy and the scattered nature of work in the area among the various departments and agencies of the state, as well as the private initiatives that receive federal funding, make it very difficult to begin to understand the complex nature of state involvement in citizenship education.
This Study

This study seeks to clarify the state's involvement in citizenship education between 1947 and 1982 by addressing three related questions: What conception of citizenship formed the basis for state policy in citizenship education? How did the state formulate citizenship education policy? and What means did the federal state use to implement citizenship education policy given that education is an area of provincial jurisdiction?

Resnick points out the disagreement in the literature over what constitutes the state but it is generally held to be a more inclusive term than government. The latter is often taken to mean the elected government of the day, while the former includes that but also would take in the bureaucracy, state institutions, and in some cases private groups working with the state. For the purposes of this study I will use Dale's definition. He argues that the state consists of the government and "state apparatuses" - specifically publicly financed institutions." By publicly financed he means wholly paid for from the public purse and "accountable officially to government." Therefore the federal bureaucracy and the CBC are included as "state apparatuses" but the CSF, which received both public and private funding and was ostensibly a private organization not accountable to government, would be excluded. As we shall see later, the state often attempted to coopt organizations like the CSF as surrogates to carry out state
policy in citizenship education precisely because these organizations were viewed as autonomous by the provinces.

As a window into state policy in citizenship education this study will examine in detail the Department of the Secretary of State between 1947, the year the first Canadian Citizenship Act was proclaimed into law, and 1982 the year the Constitution was repatriated from Britain and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms was added to it. As Grant points out, the passage of the Citizenship Act "mark[ed] both a new beginning and a reason for the growing involvement of the federal government in citizenship education." Similarly, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is seen by many, including state officials responsible for citizenship policy, as a turning point in the evolution of Canadian Citizenship and therefore provides a suitable marker for ending this study.

Although many parts of the Canadian state have been involved in education generally, and in citizenship education in particular, the Secretary of State's Department is extensively acknowledged as the most active. Hodgson contends, for example, that "in some respects the Secretary of State is Canada's unofficial federal Minister of Education." Of particular interest is the Citizenship Branch, which one senior official described "as the only federal agency of government directly concerned with the subject of citizenship in other than its legal aspects." Between 1950 and 1966 the Citizenship Branch was located in the Department of Citizenship and
Immigration so for that period the scope of the study extends beyond the Department of the Secretary of State.\textsuperscript{21}

The data for this study are largely made up of documentary evidence from the files of the Department of the Secretary of State located in the National Archives. In addition to these files, the public record of the Department including annual reports and departmental publications was examined in detail. The National Archives also contain the records of several organizations which were key surrogates of the Department. The most valuable of these were the files of the CSF which was active between 1970 and 1986. This was a particularly valuable source because the Department's own documentary record is sparse after the early 1970s and the Foundation papers included a substantial record of its dealings with the state.

Although there has been an increasing interest in examining the role of states in shaping society in general and in the Canadian state in particular, the role of the national state in education in Canada has not been examined very thoroughly.\textsuperscript{22} In the preface to their 1981 book \textit{Federal-Provincial Relations: Education Canada} Ivany and Manley-Casimir lament the lack of study of federal involvement in education. For the authors the "fundamental questions regarding educational goals in the context of a federal state, and the attendant administrative procedures and fiscal arrangements appropriate to their achievement remain unanswered. Indeed, they remain unasked."\textsuperscript{23} Some useful work has been done since that time, particularly
Hodgson's update of his 1976 book *Federal Intervention in Public Education* that appeared in 1988 under the revised title *Federal Involvement in Public Education*. These important books provide an overall description of the federal state's growing role in public education but they do not provide much insight into the ideas that shape state policy, how that policy is made or the details of how it is implemented. This study provides a more detailed look at one small part of the state in an attempt to provide such insight.

This work is set in the context of both the literature on citizenship education and the literature on the state. In reviewing the literature in these areas, particular attention is given to that dealing with the relationship of citizens to the state and how that relationship is worked out over time.

**Citizenship Education**

Training for citizenship has always been a function, albeit sometimes unstated, of schools. Conley writes, "public education is and has been inevitably political. Its mandate is to train citizens, in the widest sense of the term."²⁴ Pratte makes the point that in order to survive, nation-states have always had to ensure new citizens had certain competencies.²⁵ As well, some would argue public schooling has been used by emerging nations, especially during periods of significant immigration, to create in their citizens "a feeling of being one-people different from all other people."²⁶
During this century in North America the school’s role in educating for citizenship, at least in the overt sense, has been primarily assigned to the subject of social studies.\(^\text{27}\) Social studies is most often defined as being fundamentally concerned with preparing students for citizenship.\(^\text{28}\) Jenness, in his historical analysis of the social studies in the United States over the past 100 years, makes the point that, although educating for citizenship is often touted as being an important role for the school as a whole, an explicit focus on citizenship in academic literature and curriculum materials shows up principally in social studies, and there it is central.\(^\text{29}\) Tomkins expressed much the same sentiment about the field in Canada when he wrote that "the goal of `citizenship' probably comes closer than any other to identifying the purposes that Canadians have usually believed that the social studies should serve, even though they might not agree on what a `good' citizen (or a good Canadian) is."\(^\text{30}\) More recent surveys of department of education documents from across Canada confirm that citizenship education remains, rhetorically at least, an important goal for public education generally and the primary focus of social studies in particular.\(^\text{31}\)

In social studies, however, as Marker and Mehlinger point out,

the apparent consensus on behalf of citizenship education is almost meaningless. Behind that totem to which nearly all social studies researchers pay homage lies continuous and rancorous debate about the purposes of social studies.\(^\text{32}\)
This debate continues, in part at least, because citizenship, as it is used in the field, is an essentially contested concept.

The idea of essentially contested concepts is rooted in the premise that there are some "concepts the proper use of which inevitably involves endless disputes about their proper uses on the part of their users". These disputes do not arise because the people involved are arguing about different concepts to which they have mistakenly given the same name, but because the internal complexity of the concept makes for disputes that "are perfectly genuine: which, although not resolvable by argument of any kind, are nevertheless sustained by perfectly respectable arguments and evidence". Most writers define citizenship using the same elements, "knowledge, skills, values, and participation", yet wide disagreement exists about the role and relative importance of each element. As Kaplan points out, citizenship "means something different to everyone, and to some people it means nothing at all".

Disputes about citizenship arise not only because it is an internally complex concept, but also because it is a normative one. Normative concepts defy precise definition because of their complexity and because they "describe from a moral point of view." They are appraisive because they involve making judgements about what is better and best. When we speak of educating for citizenship we are not so much concerned with the narrow legal definition of citizenship as with some normative sense of good citizenship. Citizenship in the vital sense is
far more than a person's legal status in a country; it reflects rather that person's relationship to the state and the other citizens in it. For Woyach, this relationship involves both give and take:

Within democratic political systems citizenship involves a complex combination of claims against the state and the community (including protection, political rights and respect) and assumed responsibilities to the community (including loyalty, obedience to laws, respect for officials, self control in public matters, and participation in the community). 39

Misunderstandings often arise in discussions of citizenship education because the same language means different things to different people. Phrases such as "the educated citizen," or "responsible citizenship," often touted as the desired outcomes of citizenship education, operate as educational slogans in that they are "systematically ambiguous" 40 and often represent particular political and social interests. 41 Komisar and McClellan describe such slogans as "meaningless" 42 until they are given an interpretation; that is until someone delimits or restricts their "application to some limited set of proposals within the larger amorphous class." 43 A central purpose of this work is to "delimit" the range of conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education and to show which conceptions formed the basis for state policy in the area.

The State
In recent years the state has increasingly become the focus for scholarly examination particularly in the field of historical sociology. At the simplest level "historical sociology is the study of the past to find out how societies work and change." A major focus for historical sociology is how societies experience significant transformation, for example, the transformation to industrialism and capitalism has been a major concern in the work of scholars in this field. Contemporary scholars have largely rejected both liberal notions of the state as a neutral arbiter of economic disputes and neo-Marxist notions that the state has no life of its own but simply reflects class struggles in civil society, and have come to see the state as a key actor in social transformation. This recognition has led researchers to study the complex ways in which states act to influence society and further their own cause.

The period of this study provides an opportunity to study the Canadian state as it experiences transformation in several areas. The first is the ongoing transformation from a colony to an independent state that was begun in 1867. The decline of the British Empire after World War Two, for example, saw Canada begin to "shift to the United States from the British sphere" and that this precipitated changes in our approach to government and citizenship. Over this period state policy in citizenship education was greatly influenced by efforts to create a Canadian identity that was neither British nor American.
Another area of significant transformation for Canada, as with other Western nations, was the "enormous expansion in the role of the state" particularly in its relationship to the economy and the stabilization of capitalism.\(^4\) Resnick argues that this move to "organized capitalism" has been accomplished in part through efforts to bring about social cohesion for this "is as much of a prerequisite for the stabilization of capitalism as is the intelligent management of monetary or fiscal policy."\(^4\) As Skocpol points out "statemaking, and capitalistic development" have been key areas of examination for historical sociology. This work examines how citizenship policy and practice was used by one part of the Canadian state to both establish its own bureaucratic turf (statemaking) and the social conditions favourable to a liberal democratic market economy.\(^5\) It also explores the nature of resistance to that policy both within the state itself and from outside.

Modern manifestations of historical sociology have moved beyond Marxist determinism in exploring the relationship between the state and its citizens.\(^6\) As Dale points out in his study of education in Britain under Thatcherism, the state in capitalist democracies is often faced with contradictory demands.\(^7\) On the one hand it is under pressure to create a climate which supports the capitalist mode of production and the accumulation of capital, and on the other hand it is under pressure to live up to liberal democratic notions of citizenship which "are often at odds with capitalist rationality."\(^8\) Carnoy
and Levin refer to this as the "social conflict theory of the state." They see the structures of capitalism and the middle class having a large influence on educational policy but argue that "the educational system is not an instrument of the capitalist class. It is the product of conflict between the dominant and the dominated." This conflict is described by some as the dialectic between structure and agency which "recognizes simultaneously and in equal measure that history and society are made by constant and more or less purposeful individual action and that individual action, however purposeful, is made by history and society" (emphasis in the original). This work examines both conflicts within the state over turf and policy as well as the complex and dialectical relationship between the state and the surrogate organizations used to carry out its policy objectives. It also examines resistance on the part of citizens to aspects of state policy.

Overview

The study is divided into two parts: chapters 2 and 3 which set a context from the literature for discussions of citizenship and citizenship education policy in Canada and chapters 4 to 6 which provide an empirical investigation of state policy in citizenship education as reflected in the work of Department of the Secretary of State between 1947 and 1982.

Chapter 2 begins by tracing the development of modern conceptions of democratic citizenship, particularly the
evolution of various types of citizen rights: civil, political, and social. As part of this background, the contested nature of citizenship is discussed, particularly the ongoing struggles by various groups of people to attain full rights of citizenship. Drawing on the literature, I then develop a typology of contemporary conceptions of citizenship and corresponding conceptions of citizenship education. I argue that different conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education derive from conflicting beliefs about the appropriate role of citizens in a democracy ranging from an elitist view which would see that role as a very limited one, to an activist view which advocates a substantial role for ordinary citizens. Finally, I discuss what the research tells us about past practice in citizenship education in Canada arguing that it has largely been consistent with more conservative and elitist conceptions of citizenship.

Chapter 3 begins with a brief discussion of the common features of democratic citizenship across modern states as well as some of the common challenges to citizenship. I then outline what I argue are some of the unique features which have influenced the evolution of Canadian citizenship including: the historical and international context; the persistent search for a distinctive national identity; and the unique institutional structure of the Canadian state. All of these factors provide important insight into understanding later discussions of state policy in citizenship education. For example, the federal nature of the Canadian state, and particularly the
constitutional designation of education as an area of provincial responsibility, greatly affects the ways in which the federal state attempts to implement educational policy.

Chapter 4 begins the empirical work by examining the conception of citizenship that informed state policy in citizenship education. I argue that the foremost concerns for the state were to create an overarching national identity and maintain social cohesion, or, in other words, to use citizenship education "to serve the formation of political nationality and the preservation of political order." In the case of the former the state saw the biggest threat to its legitimacy in the lack of a widely accepted national identity which, in the view of those making policy, put the continued existence of the nation at risk. To counter this threat policy makers constructed and attempted to promulgate a series of three national ideals which they hoped would be adopted by all Canadians and form the basis for a lasting national unity. Each of these characterizations was a response to particular communities within the nation and particular historical contexts. For example, the first ideal: Canada: the land of conquering pioneers, was developed to better assimilate the flood of immigrants coming to Canada following World War Two.

Further, I show that the concern to maintain social cohesion led state officials to develop a policy of assimilation and accommodation as a way of ensuring social stability. State programs were designed to get those who were not part of the
majority culture to take their place in the main stream as quickly as possible (assimilate), while encouraging those already in the main stream to be patient and help in the process (accommodate). The principle mechanisms to foster this policy were contact and intercession. That is, the state sought to bring people from different groups together in carefully controlled circumstances or to act as interpreter, explaining the accomplishments and aspirations of one group to another.

Another policy outcome of the concern to maintain social stability was state support for a very limited notion of citizen involvement. Although state rhetoric called for all citizens to be active participants in public affairs, state programs were designed to steer people into volunteer community activities and away from any direct political action. Where political action was endorsed it was always at the local or, less often, provincial levels and never at the national level. Indeed, there is evidence that state politicians and policy makers regraded citizen opposition to state initiatives to be inappropriate. I contend that the upshot of these policies is a conservative and elitist conception of citizenship and citizenship education.

In chapter 5 I examine the policy making process within the state arguing that in spite of a rhetorical commitment to scientific policy making the process was largely one of political expediency. The driving force for the Department of the Secretary of State generally, and the Citizenship Branch in
particular, was to secure and extend control over particular areas of bureaucratic turf. The Branch struggled early on with low visibility and esteem within the state but was particularly effective in attaching itself to emerging trends within state policy as a whole and reaping the resulting benefits of new areas of responsibility and control. Citizenship policy making was driven more by the need to develop relationships with key organizations, like the Centennial Commission and the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, than by the insights of social science.

Another key component of the policy making process explored in this chapter is the complex interplay between the state and the private organizations which it attempted to coopt to implement state policy. Although state policy makers attempted to structure these relationships so that policy was being set by the state and implemented by the surrogates, these organizations through both active resistance and political savvy were able to have considerable influence on state policy directions. This was particularly the case when the organization was out ahead of the state in an area of emerging public concern as the CSF was in its early years.

Chapter 6 looks at the means the state used during these years to implement its policy in citizenship education, ostensibly an area of provincial jurisdiction. I use the concept of policy instruments to show that the state used both official (financial inducements and bilateral agreements) and
unofficial (surrogates and direct programs) means to implement policy. Drawing on other research on federal involvement in education, I argue that the state was able to use the argument of overriding national interest to virtually override constitutional niceties and transform various aspects of Canadian education.

Finally, in chapter 7 I summarize my findings about state policy in citizenship education and set them in the context of other work in the field. As well, I explore the implications that these findings might have for policy makers and make some suggestions for further research in the area.

Conclusion

Many policy researchers have become concerned that the reification of specialized social science knowledge for the purposes of social problem solving will lead to a process of deliberation on public policy issues that excludes non-experts. Nelkin in particular worries about the abuse of "scientific expertise" which she notes "is a critical political resource." She argues that "democratic principles require that individuals be involved in the formation and determination of policies affecting them." Her concern is that the rise in the reliance on scientific knowledge to inform policy decisions may be a threat to such democratic principles. In light of these concerns, this work is focused on "addressing a democratic polity" by opening up for wider public discussion a largely
hidden area of government policy and one that ought to be of significant concern to all citizens.⁶¹

Notes to Chapter 1


4. Ibid., 55.

5. Ibid., 366.


8. Ibid.: 5-6.

9. CIDA funding for these projects ended in 1985.


11. S. Swanson, *Getting Our Message Across: A Guide for Federal Departments and Agencies Developing Educational Materials For Use in the Classroom* (Ottawa: Canadian Studies and Special Projects Directorate, Education Support Branch, Department of the Secretary of State, no date), 16.

12. Curtis, *Building*; Grant, "Citizenship Education".

13. Whether or not these "destructive forces" are real or have in fact grown is open to debate. What is clear is that the
critical need for citizenship education to address the problem of a lack of unity in Canada has been a persistent theme over many years. It was addressed by James Kidd in his outlining of a plan for the post World War II work of the Canadian Citizenship Council. It was also central to the work of the Canada Studies Foundation and appears in recent background documents prepared for Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada. See, for example, J.R. Kidd, "A Study to Formulate a Plan for the Work of the Canadian Citizenship Council (Ed.D. diss. Columbia University, 1947); A.B. Hodgetts & P. Gallagher, Teaching Canada for the Eighties (Toronto: OISE Press, 1978); and Will Kymlicka, "Recent Work in Citizenship Theory," (Ottawa: Corporate Policy and Research, Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada, 1992).


16. Grant, "Citizenship Education": 18. See also, G. Lewe, "The Department of Secretary of State: An Historical Overview" (Ottawa: Department of the Secretary of State, 1984).

17. See, particularly, Lewe, "The Department of Secretary of State." The evolution of Canadian citizenship will be discussed in detail in chapters two and three.


21. When I refer to state policy in citizenship education in this thesis I essentially mean the policy of the Department of the Secretary of State and related agencies such as the National Film Board and the CBC. I recognize that the Canadian State is far more diffuse than this and exists at several levels, federal and provincial, for example. As I point out in this chapter and elsewhere, other state
agencies were involved in education generally and citizenship education in particular and sometimes there was competition within the state itself for bureaucratic control of policy initiatives and programs. The Department of the Secretary of State as the agency charged with the responsibility for citizenship education does provide a starting point for understanding the policies of the federal state in citizenship education, however, and that is why this study focuses on that department.


27. Not all provinces use the term social studies the same way. I intend it to refer to the school subjects of history, geography, civics, and social studies.


34. Ibid., 158.

35. Marker & Mehlinger, "Social Studies," 835. For a more complex model of citizenship that contains these elements but adds several other dimensions see Heater, *Citizenship*, chapter 9.


43. Ibid., 201.


49. Ibid., 170.


51. Skocpol, "Bringing the State Back In."

52. Dale, *The State*.


55. Ibid., 50.


60. Ibid., 108.

Chapter 2
"Something Different to Everyone":
Conceptions of Citizenship and Citizenship Education
In Canada

The Roots of Modern Democratic Citizenship

Most writers argue that modern ideas about citizenship began with the Greeks "where the notion of the city-state and cultural membership become clearly identified in an articulate political philosophy - that is in the works of Plato and Aristotle." Clarke contends the Athenian principle of "sharing in the operation of common affairs, and the sense of belonging which such sharing can engender, still underlies richer views of citizenship." Although the idea of citizenship had its origins with Greek philosophers, today "the concept of citizen is essentially modern" and its development "seems inextricably bound up with the development of modern social conditions." A key event in the development of modern conceptions of citizenship was the French Revolution. The Revolution, and especially the Declaration of the Rights of Man, according to Turner, established three of the underlying principles of modern conceptions of citizenship:

1. It linked the notion of citizen rights with human equality and "allied citizenship with the notion of community in the principle of social fraternity."
2. It enhanced the idea of national citizenship as sovereignty was located in the nation.

3. It "joined citizenship to the quest for political liberation."\(^5\)

While other writers do not tie the emergence of modern ideas about citizenship so closely to one historical event, they do recognize the modern age has given rise to new understandings of individuals, their relationship to each other and the state. Clarke, for example, argues

"the individual, understood as an autonomous being having an inherent value, emerged as a consequence of, on the one hand, the breakdown of the great chain of being, the feudal order, and, on the other hand, the rise of protestant thinking with its direct appeal to God."\(^6\)

Similarly, Taylor contends "the fall of social hierarchy"\(^7\) is one modern phenomenon that has played a key role in contemporary conceptions of citizenship. He argues there has been a move away from honour in the "ancien regime sense in which it is intrinsically linked to inequalities,"\(^6\) and a corresponding move toward the notion of dignity used in a universalist or egalitarian way so that all humans - or all citizens - in the political world have intrinsic or equal dignity. He goes on to contend that "with the move to dignity has come a politics of universalism, emphasizing the equal dignity of all citizens, and the content of this politics has been the equalization of rights and entitlements."\(^9\)

British theorist T.H. Marshall, whose ideas have been very influential in modern conceptions of citizenship,\(^10\) argues the
central principle separating the modern era from feudalism is the equality of individuals. This equality, he asserts, did not arise overnight, nor for that matter has it been fully achieved, but it has evolved through distinct stages. Marshall divides the rights associated with modern democratic citizenship into three classes which, he contends, have gradually been extended to citizens in Western democracies over the past several centuries. Those classes are: civil rights, "composed of the rights necessary for individual freedom—liberty of the person, freedom of speech, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts"; political rights, including "the right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body"; and social rights, consisting of "the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society." For Marshall, basic civil rights as we know them today were largely in place for all citizens by the end of the eighteenth century, political rights were gradually extended to the whole adult population through the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and "the modern drive to social equality [social rights] is ... the latest phase of an evolution of citizenship which has been in continuous progress for some 250 years." While acknowledging some states have gone further than others in
recognizing and granting social rights, Kymlicka points out "the principle that full citizenship requires some sort of welfare entitlement has become the orthodox view in most Western democracies."  

The Contested Nature of Citizenship

The extension of the rights of citizenship to a wider range of people in western democracies has by no means been an easy or uncontested process. The civil and political rights Marshall identifies as being largely in place by early in the twentieth century were won only after long and often violent struggle. The French Revolution is certainly an example of this. Even Marshall who wrote of the "continuous progress" of the granting of full rights of citizenship over the past 250 years, was not implying uncontested progress. He acknowledges that political rights were extended "cautiously....down the scale" by nineteenth century political and economic elites and, in regard to the extension of social rights, argues that "in the twentieth century, citizenship and the capitalist class system have been at war." The history of citizenship has been one of rights being gradually extended to people on the basis of necessity not principle. Clarke concludes an essay reviewing the history of citizenship by noting, "again and again it emerges with some clarity that it is not because people are equal that they are granted citizen rights; it is because people demand and obtain citizen rights that they become equal persons."
The contest to determine the rights and obligations of citizenship and how widely these are shared is ongoing. Bottomore, while concurring with much of Marshall's analysis, argues Marshall was overly optimistic about the expansion of social rights in the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{19} Bottomore contends that "in 1949 in Britain, it was possible to take a fairly optimistic view of the gradual extension of citizens' rights in a democratic society that was becoming more socialist in its structure."\textsuperscript{20} But, he continues, the revival of capitalism during the boom years from the fifties through the mid seventies along with the development of a welfare system concerned with "providing welfare services in specific areas, rather than with any radical reconstruction of the economic and social system" has largely derailed progress in the extension of social rights.\textsuperscript{21} The failure of proposals to add a so called Social Charter to Canada's constitution and ongoing attempts by organized labour to have collective rights, such as the right to bargain and strike, recognized as constitutionally equivalent with individual rights are examples of this continuing struggle.\textsuperscript{22}

While civil and political rights and, in a more limited sense social rights, have long been established for adult, white males in most western democracies, full access to those rights continue to elude women and minorities. Scholars of citizenship have only relatively recently begun to recognize this. Bottomore, for example, points out that Marshall
neglected to consider gender or race in his analysis of the rights of citizenship in Britain and concludes that "some of those rights are still quite unequally distributed."  

While full rights of citizenship for women as well as racial or ethnic minorities are currently enshrined in law in most western democracies, there is often a difference between legally having a right and practically being able to exercise it - what has been called the difference between right and remedy. For example, a worker who has been unfairly discriminated against might have the right to take the employer to court to seek justice but if the worker is ignorant of his or her legal rights in the matter, or if the financial resources needed for a legal challenge are prohibitively high, the worker has no way to exercise the right. As Marshall writes, "the right was there, but the remedy might frequently prove to be out of reach." Some would argue that rights in effect do not exist where there is no effective remedy.

For Marshall, "the barriers between rights and remedies were of two kinds: the first arose from class prejudice and partiality, the second from the automatic effects of the unequal distribution of wealth, working through the price system." On further analysis, many would add gender and ethnicity as other barriers between rights and remedies.

O'Neil, for example, outlines the ongoing struggle of Canadian women to obtain civil, political and social rights. Until well into this century women in Canada were denied the
most fundamental of civil rights - the right to be recognized as persons under the law, and the most basic of political rights - the right to vote. What many see as social rights such as employment equity and equal pay for work of equal value are very much contested issues at this time. In terms of full participation in the public realm, O'Neil argues that women are still largely relegated to the private sphere as they generally have less leisure time than men do and often do not get partner, family or social support when they want to move away from some family responsibilities to become active in public affairs. As a consequence, she writes, "women are still petitioners, not lawmakers."

Similarly, Simms identifies "racism as a barrier to Canadian citizenship" and uses well known examples of the denial of rights on the basis of race such as the botched investigation of the murder of Helen Betty Osborne, the wrongful imprisonment of Donald Marshall and the destruction of the community of Africville in Halifax as illustrations. Canadians have generally prided themselves on having built a tolerant and inclusive society often referred to as a "mosaic". There is considerable evidence, however, of persistent political and economic dominance of those of British ancestry in English Canada and, in a more limited sense, those of French ancestry in Quebec as well as of the essentially exclusionary nature of that dominance. Regenstreif argues the publication of The Vertical Mosaic by Porter in 1965 exposed the mythical mosaic as
"a facade for systematic exclusion of non charter groups from elite positions." Although the rights of citizenship in democratic societies have expanded greatly both in kind and scope over the past several centuries, it is clear significant areas of inequality and struggle persist.

Modern Conceptions of Citizenship and Citizenship Education

The similar expansion of rights and entitlements in modern democratic states does not imply the existence of a single conception of the democratic citizen, for citizenship involves more than simply being accorded certain rights. Citizenship is also defined by the extent citizens are expected, and enabled, to participate in the affairs of the state. Woyach argues that different conceptions of democratic citizenship exist along "a complex continuum of opinion" ranging from "elitist" to "populist." Similarly, for Ichilov "citizenship orientations can be arranged along a continuum from a narrow to a broad definition of the citizen role." These different views of the role of a citizen are not new but, as several writers have shown, have developed out of long philosophical traditions.

Resnick discusses five theories of the state, aspects of which he argues are present in modern Western democracies. He labels these "(1) aristocratic, (2) republican, (3) the philosophy of order, (4) liberal, and (5) democratic." Each of these theories includes a view of the citizen's place and role within the state. Resnick points out his constructions are
"ideal types" and that there is considerable overlap across the borders between them. Indeed, as he develops his theories he refers to theorists who combine aspects of more than one type.

Abrams describes the long history of using such constructions as analytical tools in the social sciences and particularly sociology. He writes that "just as the moralist can judge the actual world by comparing it to utopia so the social scientist can apprehend the actual world by relating it to the 'ideal type', a unified analytical construct." Abrams argues that "ideal types are neither typical nor ideal. They are not constructed to represent what actually exists or what should exist. Rather they are logically and formally precise statements of possible relationships." Drawing on the work of Resnick and others, I have constructed a typology of citizenship along a continuum from elitist to activist (see table 1).

The elitist conception of citizenship "is one that assumes that there is a small group of people that, by reason of birth or training, is especially fit for the business of rule." For elitists, participation in public affairs by ordinary citizens beyond voting is not only undesirable, it is dangerous and "could lead to 'mobocracy' not democracy." As Heater puts it, "the natural Conservative has a low and gloomy opinion of the average human being." Barber argues the popular book The Closing of the American Mind by Allan Bloom is a recent
expression of this political philosophy and is "astonished at a
democratic society that receives these aristocratic strictures
without a murmur of protest."  

TABLE 1
Conceptions of Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Citizenship</th>
<th>Elitist Conception</th>
<th>Activist Conception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sovereignty</td>
<td>• resides in parliament. • made up of elected individuals with appropriate backgrounds and training. • are loyal to the national state and its institutions. • have a common body of knowledge about the history and political structures of the country. • participate in a common national culture and set of traditions. • obey the law. • inform themselves about the policies of the various political parties. • vote.</td>
<td>• resides in the people • made up of free and equal citizens (equality is emphasized in three areas - before the law, in the opportunity and ability to participate, and in relative access to material resources) who exercise power in more direct ways than voting. • are committed to participating in free and equal discourse where all voices are heard and power is relatively equally distributed. • are knowledgeable about the ways in which institutions and structures privilege some people and groups while discriminating against others and are skilled at challenging them. • are open to multiple understandings of national citizenship (e.g. it is possible to consider oneself a citizen of an Aboriginal nation as well as Canada). • are committed to wide citizen participation in both the &quot;public&quot; sphere of politics and the &quot;private&quot; sphere of community, home, and family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The good citizen in the elitist conception of citizenship is knowledgable about mainstream versions of national history as well as the technical details of how public institutions function. He or she is loyal to the state, defers to authority, and knows (and believes in) patriotic symbols and ceremonies as well as the national myths, what Hirsch refers to as the "civil
religion." The highest duty of citizenship in this view is to become as informed as possible about public issues and, based on this information, to vote for appropriate representatives at election time.

At the other end of the continuum is the activist conception of citizenship which assumes a significant level of participation by all citizens. Theorists of this conception would posit a state containing three essential elements:

First it recognizes the equality of legal rights of citizenship, disdaining special privileges or powers for some, whether based on heredity, wealth, and social and political position. Second, it recognizes further the need for citizens to be able to participate in some ongoing manner in political affairs. That such a condition can be fully satisfied through the casting of a ballot in elections every four or five years, when competing political parties present their programs to a largely atomized electorate is highly dubious. "The right to speak in the assembly" suggests the need for some more active exercise of citizenship than voting alone allows. Third, and no less important, it sees equality of condition (or something approaching this) as the prerequisite for the practice of democratic citizenship."

Recognizing "the inevitability of representation, given the size and scale of modern nation states," Resnick still believes that it is possible to construct "a democratic public sphere, i.e. an open, communicative society, characterized by face to face structures and significant economic and political democracy." While he has seen no evidence of these kinds of structures at the level of the state he argues this conception of democracy can be seen in "radical movements such as the student revolts of the 1960s, or in new phenomena like feminism,
the Greens, or the anti-nuclear movement." Similarly, Taylor argues that the "politics of the ecological left" demonstrates this kind of significant citizen participation.

In this conception, good citizens participate actively in community or national affairs. They have a deep commitment to democratic values including the equal participation of all citizens in discourse where all voices can be heard and power (political, economic and social) is relatively equally distributed. These citizens are knowledgeable about how institutions and structures privilege some people and groups while discriminating against others and are skilled at uncovering and challenging them.

As I pointed out in chapter one, citizenship is a complex concept with several interconnecting dimensions that can vary considerably. Because of this complexity, between the extremes of elitist and activist conceptions are numerous possible manifestations of democratic citizenship. In later chapters I will use this continuum as a way of illustrating the conception of citizenship which informed state policy in citizenship education.

Different understandings of the nature of good citizenship have given rise to different conceptions of citizenship education. The need for clear explanation of the concepts we use in regard to citizenship and citizenship education is well illustrated in the work of a committee of the Australian Senate.
In a follow up to a study of citizenship education the committee found it was essential to clarify where on the continuum between elitist and activist (their terms were protectionist and participatory) they stood for their recommendations to be understood and implemented appropriately.54

A review of the literature in the field presents several different models of citizenship education. Barr, Barth and Shermis in their influential books Defining the Social Studies and The Nature Of the Social Studies identify three models, Dynneson and Gross twelve, and Heater five.55 For the purposes of this study I have constructed two conceptions of citizenship education (see table 2) which correspond to the conceptions of citizenship in table one. Each illustrates a view of the knowledge, values, and skills students need to learn in order to be good citizens from the perspective of the parallel conception of citizenship.

Consistent with a passive, conservative understanding of citizenship, an elitist model of citizenship education seeks to homogenize, to make all citizens the same by ensuring they have not only the same body of knowledge, but also get the same message from that knowledge. If schools can accomplish this the country will be preserved and society will be stable. As Lawton writes about the British experience, "In the U.K. when civics or civic education is mentioned, we tend to associate it with a discredited kind of socialization for conformity and obedience
rather than political, economic, and social awareness going far beyond national consciousness."

**TABLE 2**

Conceptions of Citizenship Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Citizenship Education</th>
<th>Elitist Conception</th>
<th>Activist Conception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Knowledge                      | • students are taught a common body of knowledge about the history and political structures of the nation.  
• political/military history is emphasized and is presented as a narrative of continuous progress.  
• political institutions are presented as operating in a lock step fashion (e.g. how a bill is passed).  
• teaching styles and techniques may vary but are focused on students arriving at common answers on matters of fact and/or value. | • students are taught how to uncover the ways in which institutions and structures support certain, potentially oppressive, forms of social organization (e.g. capitalism and patriarchy).  
• curricula and school structures are examined to find the ways in which they have discriminated against certain groups and changed to be more democratic and inclusive. |
| Values                         | • students are taught a particular set of national values and norms (e.g. that current political structures are the best ones possible). | • students are taught to develop a commitment to the equal participation of all individuals and groups in society as well as a commitment to participate on this basis and to challenge any manifestations of privilege and inequality. |
| Skills/Participation            | • informed voting is presented as the general level of participation in government by the average citizen; students therefore need information gathering skills to allow them to vote in an informed manner. | • students develop critical/reflective problem solving skills and cross cultural skills so that they can participate with a wide variety of people in making the world more just and human activity more environmentally sustainable. |

This approach to citizenship education is perhaps best exemplified in E.D. Hirsch's 1988 book, *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*, which garnered significant attention in both the United States and Canada. Hirsch claims
the fund of shared knowledge among Americans is shrinking quickly because of the diversity of school curricula and the fuzziness of modern teaching methods. This shrinking fund of shared knowledge is making it more and more difficult for Americans to communicate with each other and threatens the very fabric of American society. He advocates the return to a highly centralized curriculum emphasizing a core of low level (factual and superficial) knowledge. He has identified what that core material ought to be in a list of 5000 items literate Americans ought to know something about. Hirsch advocates teaching the mythological aspects of American history to students in an uncritical fashion, what was referred to earlier as the "civil religion." The book sold well in the United States and Canada and the term "cultural literacy" has become part of the educational jargon in both countries.

The sense that Canadians need to have the same kind of common historical memory can be seen in a 1992 article in The Globe and Mail which lamented, "the problem remains the same, Canadians do not know their country, and are learning different versions of their past." The article goes on to quote several prominent historians who lay a substantial part of the blame for Canada's ongoing unity crisis at the feet of social history and social studies in Canadian schools. At about the same time University of Toronto Historian Michael Bliss made a speech in
which he lamented his own part in the "sundering of Canadian history" and the consequent "sundering of Canada."  

At the other end of the continuum, advocates of a more activist conception of citizenship education argue that schools are "mechanisms of cultural distribution in society" that act to reproduce unequal social relationships and support an elitist social structure. Schools legitimate the dominant ideology in school knowledge and structures. The knowledge and the relationships that schools present as natural and objective, are in fact, middle class constructions of knowledge and the relationships of the capitalist mode of production.

Proponents of this conception criticize other citizenship educators for having a "technical ahistorical view of schooling." In other words they have failed to see how social studies along with the other school subjects has been an ideological instrument for cultural reproduction. Wexler and his colleagues contend that historically citizenship education in the United States has been an instrument used in support of the dominant ideology, not to critique it. Proponents of the activist conception of citizenship education are committed to empowering students so they can participate in challenging and changing oppressive social structures.

It is important in this conception to open up all social relationships and institutions as well as all accepted forms of knowledge to interrogation in order to discover the inherent
values they promote. Feminist writers like Vickers and Noddings would have us consider the idea, for example, that citizenship as a concept (either elitist or activist) has been a way of privileging forms of social organization that have oppressed women. For Vickers, "patriarchal modes of maintaining group cohesion are so deeply based as to be nearly invisible." Included here are nation states and the institutions that sustain them, the very institutions that more traditional conceptions of citizenship education would train students to work within. Noddings calls for a rethinking of the whole emphasis of social studies and citizenship education to highlight "what we once called 'private' life as contrasted with 'public' life." The knowledge and skills of the private sphere, of "family membership and homemaking," she argues, are as important to citizenship as skills of political organization or large scale social action.

A variety of labels are used to describe this approach to citizenship education including: "critical pedagogy;" "feminist approach to pedagogy;" "pedagogy of possibility;" and "democratic socialist pedagogy." Some common themes overlap these approaches, for example: including content previously not covered such as "discussions of women's suffrage, women's participation in the fur trade, and the changing organization of family life;" teaching students "to question everything, and in particular, that which all of us have learned
to think of as normal and natural practices;" and, reorganizing the structures of schools and classrooms to make them more democratic by doing such things as involving parents and students in the management of schools, integrating intellectual and practical activities, providing a common curriculum accessible to all students, and employing dialogical teaching methods. 

The practice of citizenship education in Canada and the United States over time and in particular jurisdictions includes examples which fall along the continuum from elitist to activist. In subsequent chapters I will use this continuum as a way of framing state practice in citizenship education between 1947 and 1982. In the remainder of this chapter I will examine the policy and practice of citizenship education in Canada in the context of the continuum.

Citizenship Education in Canada

Many scholars have argued that, traditionally, citizenship in Canada has been constructed in more elitist and passive terms than in many other democracies, particularly the United States. Regenstreif argues that "instead of liberty, individualism, achievement, and optimism," that were the founding ideas of the American state, "Canada institutionalized authority, order, ascription and a certain pessimism."
Resnick supports this view and points out that the so-called Fathers of Confederation clearly did not support any notions of wide participation and contends that their model of "constitution-making from above" has been a persistent feature of Canadian politics. "The upshot," he continues, "has been the exclusion of popular sovereignty as an operating construct or ideal for the large part of Canadian history." 81

There is considerable evidence to indicate that in the past citizenship education in Canada has, for the most part, reinforced this elitist conception of democratic citizenship. Curtis points out that from the earliest years of public schooling in Canada West (Ontario) "education was centrally concerned with the making of political subjects, with subjectification. But these political subjects were not seen as self-creating. They were to be made by their governors after the image of an easily governed population." (emphasis in the original) 82

Studies of more recent times have also described practice in citizenship education that is largely consistent with an elitist conception. In his landmark study of civic education in Canada, Hodgetts wrote about the "bland consensus version of history" 83 that dominated Canadian social studies classrooms. History teaching of this type focused almost exclusively on political and military matters, avoided matters of controversy,
did not make any connection to the present, and emphasized the memorization of, among other things, "nice, neat little acts of parliament." As Osborne writes, "the combination of curricula, examinations, textbooks, and pedagogy that prevailed before 1968, even when it was successful, served to produce a particularly conservative kind of citizenship." Other studies have lent support to the argument that an elitist conception of citizenship education has dominated Canadian social studies and several make the case that citizenship education in Canada has often been used to attempt to impose a narrow view of national culture on all students.

Although citizenship education in Canada has generally been consistent with the elitist conception, in recent years there has been a move along the continuum to a more activist conception at least in terms of official policy and mandated curricula. In recent documents from across the country the adjectives used to describe citizens include "informed" and "responsible" which could be consistent with more conservative and passive notions of citizenship, but also include far more activist terms such as: "adaptive, enterprising, [and] inventive;" "effective;" and "self-motivated, self-directed problem solvers."

In her 1987 study, Masemann found that "the main ideology of citizenship education is the importance of citizen action and participation." From coast to coast to coast in recent years,
this emphasis has permeated policy. In some cases the shift in emphasis from knowledge to participation can be seen by comparing older documents with newer ones. A 1982 course description from Newfoundland refers to "an informed citizenry . . . willing and able to participate" but the emphasis clearly lies with being "informed" and the participation skills identified are those of group learning and decision making. A newer document clearly implies that information is only useful in so far as it serves the needs of participation. It states:

Competencies rest on a knowledge base (understandings) and are considered essential to the participation of the learner in society. [There is a] need for a shift in emphasis from passively learning knowledge in favour of an active acquisition and utilization of knowledge. These are learnings that are viewed as having "instrumental worth" and enhance the individual's capacity to participate meaningfully in the affairs of society.

Consistent with the example from Newfoundland, in most jurisdictions the acquisition of knowledge is not seen as an end in itself but as a vehicle through which to involve students in past and current issues. One of the documents from Manitoba contains a very explicit list of ten "basic features" of Canada that students are expected to understand before leaving high school including:

Canada:
• is a country in which national unity cannot be taken for granted. It is multicultural, with many of its various cultural groups experiencing a new sense of identity. It is geographically diverse, officially
bilingual, and often subject to severe divergent forces.

- has a political system described as a parliamentary democracy within the framework of a constitutional monarchy. It is federally organized and is characterized by federal-provincial tensions.
- is an economically developed middle power with various international aims and responsibilities.⁹⁵

The document argues that "these features essentially describe the reality of Canada"⁹⁶ and that students need not only to have knowledge about them but to understand the issues involved and be able to "frame defensible viewpoints on them and be aware of possible courses of citizen action."⁹⁷.

The skills emphasized for citizenship education are those that would enable students to become effective decision makers able to participate in society. One document from Alberta states that "the concept of learners as receivers of information should be replaced with a view of learners as self-motivated, self-directed problem solvers and decision makers who are developing the skills necessary for learning."⁹⁶ Skill areas specifically identified in other Alberta documents include: "skills that acquire, evaluate and use information and ideas,"⁹⁹ "good communication and decision making skills,"¹⁰⁰ as well as skills "to resolve difference and conflicts constructively."¹⁰¹ A document from Ontario breaks some of these down further into an "inquiry model" that requires the ability to: "focus,
organize, locate, record, evaluate/assess, synthesize/conclude, apply and communicate.\textsuperscript{102}

Citizenship education aimed at fostering both the ability to participate and the inclination to do so has recently found expression in the growth of community service programs.\textsuperscript{103} The \textit{Common Curriculum} in Ontario calls for students to develop participation skills from the primary grades up as they do such things as: "identify and perform a service in the school community or at home and evaluate the experience;" and "develop and participate in an activity related to a global and/or environmental issue and evaluate its impact."\textsuperscript{104} In Manitoba as well this active involvement in community service is seen as moving from a classroom level (eg. "helping and working with other students") to participating actively in society, ie., participation in volunteer work that helps young children, the elderly, ill, handicapped; participating in (or observing) efforts directed toward solving some community problems; criticizing society constructively and working to improve it where necessary; participating in a political campaign of a candidate of the student's own choice, writing letters to elected officials, etc."\textsuperscript{105}

Although recent developments concerning citizenship education in Canada appear to emphasize an "informed action," there has also been an emerging interest in the realm of citizenship values or dispositions. A recent study documents a general consensus among a group of Canadians that their ideal of good citizenship is characterized by dispositions (what I have
called values) such as "open-mindedness, civic mindedness, respect, willingness to compromise, tolerance, compassion, generosity of spirit, and loyalty." The author points out that "many of these ideals would seem to be characterized by a willingness to set aside private interests and concerns for the sake of the common good." These kinds of dispositions or values and the importance of altruistic commitment to community at a number of levels appear consistently in the documents from across the country. They are seen to be key in a country where "cultural pluralism" is viewed as "a positive force in society" and citizenship education seems to be largely focused on attaining the "multicultural ideal." That ideal would best be described by the principle that:

all students regardless of race, colour, gender, language, cultural heritage, religion, ethnicity, physical capabilities or intellectual potential have a right to equal and meaningful roles in Canadian society. Education must, therefore, enable all students to develop those abilities and competencies which will promote effective social participation and equal status for themselves and their ethnocultural groups.

Several documents from Ontario emphasize the rapidly changing nature of Canadian society "in the structure of families, in the composition of the population, and in the nature of the economy." Part of the role of citizenship education is seen as equipping students to understand and manage change, particularly in regard to understanding and appreciating the "role that diverse cultures have played and continue to play..."
within our country." The contention is made that in the past school knowledge has focused on "the values, experiences, achievements, and perspectives of white-European members of society" and has excluded or distorted "those of other groups in Canada and throughout the world." Although students are expected to acquire traditional knowledge "about the structure and functions of government," the documents consistently make the case that students should also be exposed to materials and experiences from a wide variety of cultural, gender, and class perspectives. Among other things, a good citizen is seen to be one who "[knows] about and [values] the contributions of people from a variety of cultures, races, religions, socio-economic backgrounds, and abilities, in the school, community, Canada, and the world."

To support the development of these values of respect and appreciation for diversity, programs in Human Rights and Multicultural Education have been developed and implemented across Canada. The principles of a proposed Intermediate Program in British Columbia, for example, emphasize that there should be

- system-wide adoption of practices that
  - promote gender equity
  - promote positive multicultural and race relations
  - respond to the particular requirements of First Nations learners
  - meet the needs of learners for whom English is a second language
  - serve young people with special needs.
Although almost all of the jurisdictions have moved in these or similar directions, the most interesting example is provided by two textbooks currently being used in high schools in The Yukon: Our Land Too: Women of Canada and the Northwest 1860-1914 by Carolyn Moore and Dan Dha Ts'edenintth'e: Reading Voices: Oral and Written Interpretations of the Yukon's Past by Julie Cruikshank. These books are premised on the idea that women and Aboriginal peoples have largely been left out of the historical record studied in schools. Both books overtly challenge the view that history is an objective version of the past and actively present it as constructed accounts which differ depending on the perspective and/or biases of the historian. Carolyn Moore, for example, writes that "history is most often told from the perspective of men" and this, she argues, "explains, in part why women have customarily been absent from the historical record." Julie Cruikshank juxtaposes two versions of the history of the Yukon for students and tells them that:

science and oral tradition present us with different, but equally valuable ways of understanding relationships between environment, animals, and humans. These ways of understanding can't easily be compared, because they have different objectives. Both traditions provide stimulating ideas as well as precise information. The issue is not which one is "better" but rather that knowing something about each may broaden our understanding of human history.

Consistently both books remind students that any version of history is a constructed account reflecting particular cultural
values and relying on certain types of evidence while rejecting others. From these materials it could be inferred that in the view of the Yukon Department of Education, there are particular characteristics that good citizens ought to possess, such as:

- An understanding that various peoples have substantially different ways of viewing the world and of representing or presenting their views;

- Knowledge about and respect for the ways in which various groups, particularly women and aboriginal peoples, have experienced and continue to experience the world;

- An understanding that human knowledge, particularly historical knowledge, is socially constructed and contingent;

- Knowledge about the ways in which different kinds of historical accounts are constructed including: an understanding of the role culture and perspective play in shaping the inquiry as well as the account; and the kinds of evidence regarded as important or relevant.

These characteristics are consistent with those of the activist conception of citizenship outlined in table one.

Studies of education in Canada have shown that, despite the fact education is administered provincially, there has been "a fair degree of similarity across the different systems."\textsuperscript{118} Evidence from policy and curricular documents makes it clear
that this commonality of perspective persists in citizenship education. There are certainly different nuances in various jurisdictions, but universally the conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education that currently form the basis for citizenship education in English Canadian public school curricula fall toward the activist end of the continuum. Officially at least, good Canadian citizens are seen as people who are: knowledgable about contemporary society and the issues it faces; disposed to work toward the common good and be supportive of pluralism; and skilled at taking action at a number of levels to make their communities, nation, and world a better place for all people to live.

While considerable attention today is directed toward a more activist conception of citizenship and citizenship education in the officially prescribed curricula across Canada, it does not necessarily follow that this interest is borne out in actual classroom practice. Numerous examples exist which show the analysis of policy documents does not determine the extent to which the programs described actually guide classroom practice.

In a study of political education in Canada conducted just over a decade ago, Conley and Osborne found that most high school courses in political science took what they called a "traditional civics" approach to political education in that emphasis was put on the rote learning of political systems and
debates about issues were avoided. They did find one course in Manitoba which "appears to be one of the few political science courses available which makes an active attempt at developing 'political skills'." On further investigation, however, they found that "no students are actually taking this course, which is an elective offered by no school in the province."\textsuperscript{120}

The availability of programs is not the only factor that might inhibit the practice of more activist forms of citizenship education. Considerable evidence exists that in spite of educational reform at the policy level, the "transmission view of education" has continued to dominate Canadian classrooms. This approach to education assigns "one particular role to teachers -- active, dominant, powerful -- and another to students -- subordinate, docile, powerless." It does not see the curriculum as the study of issues but rather as "that which the students have to learn, with no ifs or buts."\textsuperscript{121} As an approach to education it is far more consistent with passive, elitist notions of citizenship than with the activist ones advocated in official policy and prescribed curricula.

Social studies, the area of education where citizenship receives the most explicit attention, has not been immune to this discrepancy between the curriculum as intended and the curriculum as practised. While modern social studies theory and curriculum development for more than 70 years have tended to emphasize an issues centred, critical thinking approach to
citizenship education, Tomkins points out that "the formalism of Canadian classrooms and the rote learning of traditional content have attenuated such an approach." In his national study of civic education, Hodgetts found considerable differences between the intent and practice of citizenship education. For example, he found that "no prescribed course of study in Canada and no textbook (and very few of the classes we observed) make any attempt to relate the events of the past to the problems and concerns of today." This, he wrote, is "diametrically opposed to the advice of all Departments of Education. Every one of them, without exception, emphasizes the need to make 'constant references to the present'." In a more localized study, Sutherland documents in detail the persistence of formalistic and traditional teaching and learning in Vancouver schools for most of this century, until at least the 1960s. This was at a time when progressive student centred theories of learning dominated curriculum theory and the curricular documents of the province. Research indicates that many new teachers faced with the "reality shock" of the classroom retreat from the progressive methods they became committed to in university to very conservative and custodial ones and many of them stick with these traditional methods.

One particular area where classroom practice may not be consistent with policy is the discussion of public issues. Documents in all of the jurisdictions advocate involving
students in the analysis of issues and several propose that students be encouraged to take public action based on their analysis. Research would indicate, however, that teachers are often reluctant to deal with potentially controversial issues in class particularly when they are contemporary and local. A survey of Manitoba teachers who had been working with curriculum materials for upper elementary teachers designed to develop in students "a sense of political efficacy and a disposition to participate"\textsuperscript{127} showed that while teachers liked studying issues in the abstract (e.g., based on fictional stories and moral dilemmas), they did not follow suggestions in the material to involve students in studying a local issue. The teachers cited lack of time as one reason for this but they "also voiced concerns about the possibility of negative community reaction."\textsuperscript{128} A more recent American study of high school social studies teachers found them reluctant to deal with issues unless they were far removed in time or space.\textsuperscript{129}

To support the teaching of issues, Alberta Education has issued a policy document that states:

\begin{quote}
Alberta Education believes that studying controversial issues is important in preparing students to participate responsibly in a democratic and pluralistic society. Such study provides opportunities to develop students' capacities to think clearly, to reason logically, to open-mindedly and respectfully examine different points of view, and to reach sound judgements.\textsuperscript{130}
\end{quote}

The document goes on to outline appropriate procedures for dealing with issues in the classroom. Similarly, Ontario has
produced a policy document on teaching about religion (a potentially controversial topic) which first of all establishes it as an important aspect of education and then outlines appropriate ways to deal with it.\textsuperscript{131} Policy statements like these might help teachers overcome some of their reluctance to deal with issues by assuring them of official support for the practice and providing them with a framework for planning and instruction but there is no way of knowing this without further research.

Another domain of the curriculum where research demonstrates that practice often does not mirror rhetoric is in the areas of multiculturalism, human rights and equality of opportunity. Masemann found a shift in curricular focus over the past 20 years away from the mechanics of government to more emphasis on multiculturalism, bilingualism, regional accommodation, human rights, and global awareness.\textsuperscript{132} Most of these trends continue but some research has called into question the degree to which education systems are truly committed to ideals such as multiculturalism and gender equity. A 1977 study by Werner et al. attempted to uncover the hidden curriculum with regard to the treatment of ethnic groups in social studies, and the authors concluded in most programs "the underlying value system is that of the dominant white (and even middle class) culture."\textsuperscript{133} They argued mainstream British and French cultural perspectives dominated most curricula and where other cultures
were present they "are interpreted in terms of one or both of these dominant groups."  

Studies by Troper and Cummins and Danesi examine the new emphasis on multiculturalism in the curriculum and conclude that it does not substantially improve the situation described by Werner and his colleagues. Troper's study seeks to situate the emphasis on a British imperial identity in early Canadian social studies programs and the recent emphasis on multiculturalism in an ideological context. He contends that as the Empire waned after World War II, Canadian educators looked for a new icon around which to construct a national identity and that this new icon is multiculturalism. He writes: "If multiculturalism is not a permanent solution to this classic Canadian dilemma, it may at least afford a temporary respite." For Troper, therefore, "the history curriculum remains less a reflection of root changes in Canadian society than an instrument for political socialization."  

Cummins and Danesi examine the public response to government-sponsored heritage language programs (both in and out of schools) and argue that "the current rhetoric of multiculturalism . . . is frequently at variance with the continuing underground reality of Anglo-conformity." They cite research to show that Canadians of English and French background are supportive of "`celebratory multiculturalism'" that is manifest in things like "ethnic festivals, community
centres, etc." but that they were not supportive of more substantial cultural initiatives such as teaching heritage languages in regular school programs. The work of Aoki and Ijaz and Ijaz demonstrates that multicultural programs in schools have often been of the "celebratory" type focusing on food, dress, and music rather than on more substantial inter-cultural issues. Cummins and Danesi contend that this is evidence of a deep rooted, and largely unexamined, racism in Canadian society and write:

while a superficial notion of multiculturalism has come to be associated with Canadian identity (at least outside of Quebec) as a value that sets us apart from our American neighbours, a more grounded notion of multiculturalism involving equal access to power and resources for all cultural groups has yet to take root in the Canadian psyche.

A similar theme is taken up in the work of Gaskell, McLaren and Novogrodsky and Brookes with respect to the gendered nature of the school curriculum. They argue that women's experience and knowledge have not been adequately represented and call for a reexamination of "the entire curriculum" which is more than "just asking that women be added to parts of the curriculum from which they have been excluded."

Adding to the concerns about curricula that are overly ethnocentric and gendered, some authors have expressed concern about evidence that the structure of schooling supports the division of society along class lines. Osborne writes that "research has established quite conclusively that middle-class
and working-class students do not receive the same education."\textsuperscript{145} Curtis, Livingstone, and Smaller examine the process of streaming students by ability level in Ontario schools since the rise of public education in the mid nineteenth century and argue that this process "is a systemic political problem"\textsuperscript{146} (emphasis in the original) that does violence to many students, especially those from working-class, single parent, and minority backgrounds by limiting rather than equalizing their opportunities. The authors describe both the overt streaming of secondary students into one of three streams which ended any hope of the high school providing equality but instead made it "an agency of social selection"\textsuperscript{147} and the more subtle, and unofficial, streaming of students in elementary schools through things such as French immersion programs. Curricular tracking continues to exist at the high school level in some jurisdictions and this raises the question whether substantially different citizenship education is provided to students in different tracks.

As discussed above, some of these issues are now being addressed at a policy level. For example, Werner and his colleagues reported in 1977 that

Some social studies programs neither have explicitly stated rationales on multiculturalism (whether for integration, diversity, or awareness) nor display much evidence in the prescribed content and goals of even an implicit rationale. In such cases, the notion of multiculturalism does not
appear to be an important organizing idea for the study of Canadian society.\textsuperscript{148}

Today, multiculturalism is seen as an important organizing idea for the study of Canadian society and detailed programs with explicit rationales have been developed and implemented. Many of the programs, particularly in Native Studies, include substantial material from the perspective of different ethnic and cultural groups. As well, several provinces have developed consultative structures for involving representatives from different ethnic and cultural communities in designing and assessing curricula and other aspects of school programs and at least one province, Manitoba, has expressed support for heritage language programs. Gender equity also explicitly appears as an important goal for citizenship education in several jurisdictions, although it does not seem to have reached the same level as multiculturalism in terms of the development of specific courses or materials. The Yukon text book dealing with women's history is one example of curricular movement in this direction. Several jurisdictions have also developed policies to ensure gender equity in hiring and promotion of staff.

A study by Tarrow comparing human rights education programs in Canada and the U.S. supports the contention that, at the policy level, progress is being made in this area. She argues that Canada is further ahead in laying the groundwork for
programs in human rights education than the United States. She writes:

It is clear that Canada's acceptance of the legal obligations that accompany ratification of international covenants have [sic] put in place an administrative structure more conducive to the institutionalization of human rights education than the structure operative in the United States. 149

Her study includes no analysis of actual school practice. It is useful for comparison at the policy level but should not be taken as an indication of the level of human rights education in classrooms in either Canada or the United States.

With their own particular emphases, educational jurisdictions across Canada are officially committed to conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education that incline well toward the activist end of the continuum discussed earlier. In all cases some specific programs have been developed and put into place to support this commitment. It must be remembered however that this represents the curriculum as intended which is often quite different from the curriculum as taught. Very little is known about the actual practice of citizenship education in Canadian classrooms but such evidence as exists suggests that more elitist and conservative conceptions have been quite persistent. 150

Conclusion
In this chapter I have argued a range of conceptions of democratic citizenship underpin modern discussion and debates about the nature of good citizenship. While in all cases proponents of the various conceptions would agree full citizenship ought to be extended to almost all native born or naturalized adults, they differ significantly in their view of the nature of the citizen, the degree to which the citizen ought to participate in the affairs of state, and the conditions necessary to make that level of participation possible. Advocates of more elitist conceptions, for example, have a dim view of the capacity of individual citizens to be aware of, and competent to make judgements about, public issues. They wish to limit the direct involvement of ordinary citizens in decision making. They see politics as a realm for well educated "experts" and, every four or five years, accord other citizens the opportunity to choose the experts they want to represent them. Activists, on the other hand, reject this view of citizenship and are firmly committed to wide public participation in the political process. They argue "individual citizens are the best judges of their own interests" and reject what they see as a departure from classical notions of citizenship where the citizen's highest obligation was to participate in public life. Within this range many variations exist.
Corresponding to the conceptions of citizenship discussed above are models of citizenship education representing ideal types on a continuum ranging from elitist to activist approaches. In order to begin a productive dialogue on citizenship education it is essential to move beyond the rhetoric of educational slogans to a better understanding of what we mean when we talk about citizenship and citizenship education.

In Canada the practice of citizenship education has generally been consistent with elitist conceptions. Recent evidence from policy documents and curricula suggest a shift toward the activist end of the curriculum but without further studies of classrooms it is impossible to judge to what degree this shift is manifest in practice. Research suggests that elements of conservative and elitist approaches to pedagogy persist in many classrooms.

In the next chapter I will consider the unique historical aspects of citizenship in Canada which raise particular challenges for citizenship education. In chapter four I will examine materials produced and programs supported by the federal government to determine what conception of citizenship formed the basis for federal policy in citizenship education and how that was manifest in federal initiatives.
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Chapter 3
"In Canada Even History Divides": Unique Challenges for Citizenship in Canada

The Common Features of Democratic Citizenship

In modern democratic states citizenship has many common features. These similarities exist at the practical level of laws and institutions as well as at the level of creeds. In the case of the latter, the conception of freedom that emerged in the seventeenth century is "one of the key notions" that undergirds modern societies. "In this view the free subject becomes someone who follows an internal purpose and who owes no a priori allegiance to a pre existing order but gives it only to structures that were created by his or her own consent."^2 Several features of modern democracies flow from this including the equality of individuals, the guarantee of certain rights, and popular sovereignty. These principles are widely accepted as forming the bases of modern democratic societies and at the institutional and legal level have been actualized in similar ways in most democracies where civil, political and social rights have gradually been extended to citizens over the past several centuries accompanied by the institutions that support them such as courts of law, legislatures, and social service agencies.\textsuperscript{3}

As well as having developed similar creedal, legal and institutional frameworks for citizenship, modern democratic states face a host of similar issues with regard to the ongoing
evolution of citizenship. For example, changing immigration patterns (including the world wide movement of refugees) have raised challenges with regard to citizenship that all democratic states have to face. One of the most obvious and pressing issues is how immigrants, refugees and "guest workers" are to be included in the society. As Kaplan points out,

Important questions must be addressed by virtually every nation state: Who should that state admit and on what terms? And this question leads to the next. What rights do resident non-citizens enjoy? Should there be distinctions in status between citizens and resident aliens, and if so on what basis can these distinctions be justified?

Studies of citizenship legislation in Canada as well as other democracies make it clear these issues are pressing ones all over the world.

Another challenge faced by modern democracies, who are all committed to some idea of popular sovereignty, is growing alienation from the political process. Three contemporary manifestations of political alienation in Western democracies are low voter participation, the rise of single issue politics, and the appeal of "political demagogues who promise fulfilment and belonging but promote antidemocratic politics." A society in which the public feels substantially cut off from "participatory self-rule", Taylor argues, "incurs the risk of a 'legitimation crisis'." The growing evidence of political alienation in Canada and other Western Democracies is a problem that will have to be faced and dealt with if such a crisis is to be avoided.
Although modern democratic states share the basic features and challenges discussed above, each has particular aspects that make citizenship in them unique. A broad distinction is made, for example, between immigrant societies such as Canada, the United States and Australia, where the legal status of citizenship is relatively easy to obtain through naturalization and non-immigrant societies such as France and Germany where citizenship through naturalization is very difficult to obtain. In the case of the former, citizens come from a great diversity of religious, ethnic and racial backgrounds and national identity is rooted in something other than common ethnic culture and heritage. Citizens in the latter tend to be much more ethnically and culturally homogenous and national identity, particularly in the case of Germany, is rooted in "ethnic and cultural unity."\textsuperscript{8}

Within these broad categories, distinctions create unique features of, and challenges to, citizenship in each state. Even between Canada and the United States which "resemble each other more than either resembles any other nation",\textsuperscript{9} considerable historical, cultural and structural differences exist which have implications for citizenship in each country. In order to understand citizenship and citizenship education in Canada, it is necessary to identify and explore some of the distinctive aspects of, and challenges to, Canadian citizenship.

Unique Aspects of Canadian Citizenship
Even though "citizenship has always been central to the debates about who Canadians were and what they should become," \(^1\) "Canadian citizenship is not a highly researched field." \(^2\) A review of the literature reveals considerable consensus about key aspects that make citizenship in Canada unique. I will examine three of these: the context of Canadian citizenship, the preoccupation with national identity, and the unique institutional structure of the Canadian state.

The Context of Canadian Citizenship

Contemporary understandings of Canadian citizenship emerge from a unique context. Many factors, social, political and environmental, shape and have shaped this context and, by extension, Canadian citizenship. I will focus on two closely related elements: history and international relationships.

Historian Cornelius Jaenen argues that certain conditions of Canada's historical development have uniquely suited it for pluralism. He posits four conditions: the English-French Dualism, which has been "a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society" since the Loyalist migration at the end of the eighteenth century; the more diverse British, rather than exclusively English, nature of early anglophone Canada; the separation of church and state and relative religious liberty that has always existed in Canada; and the fact that control over education was made a provincial, rather than a federal, responsibility. \(^3\) One of the ongoing results of this persistent
diversity underlying Canadian society is that Canada has been "a country of many allegiances" and any common sense of national identity has been notoriously illusive.

The history of state formation in Canada has also been critical in shaping the development of citizenship. As Lipset points out the American Revolution was a key event for both the United States and Canada. He argues that "the United States is the country of the revolution, Canada of the counter revolution." While the Americans built a new country, and the institutions to sustain it, based on "doctrines that emphasize[d] distrust of the state, egalitarianism, and populism," Canadian leaders shaped their country in much more conservative ways "accepting the need for a strong state, for respect for authority, [and] for deference."

The Canadian state has been constructed on much different principles than the American and these principles are reflected in political and social institutions as well as in values and dispositions. Regenstreif argues "liberty, individualism, achievement, and optimism," were the founding ideas of the American state, while Canada, in contrast, "institutionalized authority, order, ascription and a certain pessimism." Resnick echoes this view and points out that the so called Fathers of Confederation clearly did not support any notions of wide participation and their model of "constitution-making from above" has been a persistent feature of Canadian politics. "The upshot," he continues, "has been the exclusion of popular
sovereignty as an operating construct or ideal for the large part of Canadian history."\(^{17}\)

Along with these themes of diversity and conservatism in Canadian history particular events have shaped notions of nation and of citizenship. The two world wars of this century were key in this regard. Popular historian Pierre Berton, for example, argues that World War One had a significant affect on Canadians' attitudes about themselves and their nation, particularly in relation to Britain. Canadians who fought along side the British "had no further reason to believe the British were their superiors" and after the war it was clear that "Canada no longer considered herself a colonial vassal of Great Britain."\(^{18}\) Similarly, a visit to a Normandy cemetery after World War Two served to transform Secretary of State Paul Martin's desire to introduce legislation to establish a separate Canadian citizenship "into a crusade."\(^{19}\) The resulting Citizenship Act became palatable to a majority of the population largely because "Canadians emerged from the Second World War with a heightened sense of national identity."\(^{20}\)

Closely related to historical context is the context of relationships. By this I mean Canada's relationships to the rest of the world, particularly the two nations who have been most influential in its modern development, Britain and the United States. Canada is not British or American but features of these two nations can be clearly seen in Canadian institutions and values.
Always with a relatively small population, and weak, in
terms of geopolitics, Canada has been significantly shaped by
its close relationships to the most powerful nations on earth in
both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Britain, the
nineteenth century political and economic powerhouse, gave birth
to Canada very much in its own image. Resnick and others
describe the essentially British, or "tory," nature of Canada's
early ruling elites and political institutions. Contrary to
American faith in the individual, the founders of Canada held a
"pessimistic view of human nature [which] led [them] to posit a
state with notably hierarchic features," a strong state, ruled
by elites "to shepherd the people to a virtuous conduct that
they could never achieve by themselves."\(^{21}\) The B.N.A. Act,
Resnick contends, was carefully crafted to leave Canada
subordinate to the British parliament and crown. This
subordination could be seen in many ways, not the least of which
was in terms of citizenship. For more than half of its
existence as an independent nation Canada had no citizenship of
its own; Canadians were British subjects not citizens of Canada.

This attachment to Britain and the empire was not only
legal but emotional as well. In Canada's early years patriotic
ceremonies and symbols were not directed toward the new nation
but toward the growing empire.

"English speaking children were raised with the historical
myths of British nationalism, as conveyed by adapted
editions of the Irish National Reader and authors as
diverse as MacCauly and G.A. Hently. What mere Canadian
citizenship could compete with the claims of an empire that
spanned the known universe?"\(^{22}\)
Over the past century Canada has been moving slowly away from the British sphere of influence. A number of factors have influenced this, including Canada's coming of age on the international stage with its independent participation in the great conflicts of the century, as well as its membership in international organizations. This, coupled with the decline of the British Empire, has contributed to Canada's cutting many of its legal, symbolic and emotional ties with Britain.

One important element in this move toward independence was the passing of the Canadian Citizenship Act in 1946 and its subsequent proclamation into law in 1947. Prior to 1947 Canadian citizenship did not exist, those born in Canada or naturalized immigrants were subjects of the British Crown. In 1946, partly as a result of a new sense of Canadian nationalism emerging after World War Two and partly to continue a long time Liberal "vision of a separate Canadian nation," Paul Martin guided the Citizenship Act through the House of Commons.

The British hold on much of the Canadian psyche was tenacious however, and Martin writes of opposition to the act from within the upper echelons of his department as well as throughout the country. While the Citizenship Act created Canadian citizens it also stated that Canadians would remain British subjects. Martin was personally opposed to this provision because "it left Canada with a mark of inferiority" but he allowed the compromise because he "recognized that if Canadians' status as British subjects had been done away with in
[the] bill, it would not have passed.\textsuperscript{24} This provision was not eliminated from the Act until it was revised in 1976.

The move away from British influence can be seen in other symbolic changes. Resnick, for example, documents the way the term "Dominion" was used by the government to refer to Canada prior to 1945 and how that term was replaced by the phrase "government of Canada." He argues that the term "Dominion" was meant to explicitly link Canada with Britain and "its disappearance can be seen as a newly stirring Canadian nationalism."\textsuperscript{25} Another symbolic gesture in this transition to a fully independent state was the adoption of a new Canadian flag in 1965.

In a recent delphi study on Canadian citizenship\textsuperscript{26} conducted with thirty Canadians with special interest and expertise in citizenship, participants were asked to develop a profile of a good Canadian citizen. The coordinator noted after three rounds of correspondence in which the participants developed their own profiles and had the opportunity to comment on the ideas of others "not a single mention was made of the monarchy."\textsuperscript{27} Even when the principal investigator raised the issue with participants very few responded and some of those indicated that "consideration of the monarchy was not something that had influenced their thinking. Most did not comment on the matter of monarchy at all."\textsuperscript{28}

As Canada has moved out from under the shadow of Britain some would argue it has moved into the American sphere, a trend
which Resnick refers to as "the period of American tutelage." The United States has always had a powerful influence on Canada. From the influx of Loyalist refugees in the 1780s to the Free Trade Agreement of the 1990s Canadians have had an ambivalent relationship with the United States. One of our Prime Ministers mused about the association being similar to a mouse sleeping next to an elephant. Like the mouse, Canadians are often glad of the protection of their huge neighbour, while at the same time being worried about getting crushed if it should roll over.

Many Canadians have long regarded the United States as a potential threat, not so much militarily, but culturally. A historian of the Loyalists points out, for example, that these refugees were essentially American in many of their sentiments and that one of the reasons for creating new settlements for them in what is today Southern Ontario was to keep them and their American ideas away from the French population of Quebec. Similarly, there were those who blamed the rebellions of 1837 on republican ideas promulgated in schools by American teachers and textbooks. This was one of the reasons why the Irish Readers became widely adopted in Canadian schools of the nineteenth century and initiatives were undertaken to train and certify Canadian teachers.

This kind of concern continues into this century. Canada has acted at various times to limit foreign, largely American, ownership of Canadian business, American influences on Canadian curricula and American dominance of popular culture. Canadian
actions have included regulations to limit American access to Canadian markets and airways, such as Canadian content requirements for licensed radio and television stations, as well as institutions and incentives to encourage Canadian activity in contested fields of endeavour. The CBC, National Film Board, and Canada Council are examples of the latter.

Although Canadians have persistently tried to differentiate themselves from Americans, Canada, in important ways, has moved towards the United States. The most profound example of this is the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms that was included in the repatriated Canadian constitution of 1982. While the Charter is much more limited than the American Bill of Rights, it "has moved Canada a long way in the direction of American due process" and "has drastically changed, although not completely eliminated, the difference between Canadian and American legal cultures." Canada, along with much of the rest of the world, has been influenced by this American notion of a "rights society." Journalist Richard Gwyn argues that in similar fashion the free trade agreements of the past several years have eliminated many of the economic distinctions between Canada and the United States.

The Search for an Elusive National Identity

A key component of citizenship in any country is the people's identification with the nation, in other words, their sense of national identity. A persistent issue for Canadian
citizenship has been the search to discover, or create, some sense of shared national identity. An American observer writes that "national identity is the quintessential Canadian issue." He goes on to argue that "almost alone among modern developed countries Canada has continued to debate its self-conception to the present day." In 1947 Kidd wrote, "Canada is legally a nation, but the Canadians are scarcely yet a people." Similarly, several more recent writers have made the point that, while Canada exists as a state, it is not a nation in the sense of Canadians sharing a profound sense of "group affinity and shared values." The fear of deep differences and lack of understanding among Canada's disparate peoples and regions has been a dominant theme in the literature in the fields of citizenship and citizenship education in English Canada.

Like the United States, Canada is an "immigrant society." Unlike the United States, however, Canada has been unable to develop the kinds of sustaining ideologies and myths that make up American "civic religion" and provide Americans with a more coherent and unified national identity than Canadians have. As Morton points out, "by dint of a substantial effort, largely begun in the wake of the Civil war, the United States forged from incredibly heterogeneous peoples a remarkably homogeneous sense of civic identity." At the same time, he argues, "Canadian citizenship has had to coexist with loyalties to old homelands, newer provinces, or nations within and protected by
the federal state, specifically la nation canadienne francaise.\textsuperscript{41}

In the United States, the "Founding Fathers realized that only through a widely shared political ideology could the foundations for the new nation be built."\textsuperscript{42} This ideology was constructed around particular understandings of the defining events of American history such as the Revolution and the Civil War; the holy texts of civic religion such as the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution; and patriotic rituals such as swearing allegiance to the flag or singing nationalistic songs. The central component of this shared ideology is a commitment to liberalism and particularly individual freedom. In the United States "everyone from the hippy to the Bircher argues his case from the premise of the individual's freedom to pursue happiness in his own way."\textsuperscript{43} While recent public debates about education in the United States have exposed some fractures in this ideological unity this has been relatively mild and short term compared to discussions about identity in Canada.

For many reasons "Canada never developed its own universalistic ideology."\textsuperscript{44} Factors that unify most countries are often sources of division in Canada.\textsuperscript{45} Fulford illustrates this when he observes that

the key event in our past, the battle on the Plains of Abraham, was not a subject to be explored mythically, because there was no pan-Canadian way of calling it either a victory or a defeat; to this minute it remains a sensitive issue, perhaps the only eighteenth century battle anywhere, that cannot be discussed without anxiety.\textsuperscript{46}
Taylor sums it up succinctly: "In Canada even history divides."\textsuperscript{47}

One of the chief impediments to a pan-Canadian identity is the existence of more than one nation within the Canadian state. While Canada and the United States are both culturally and ethnically diverse societies, in the United States, no particular ethnic or cultural group has been granted its own territory, political and legal institutions and, official language. From the eighteenth century in Canada at least two nations have coexisted and shared power within the boundaries of the state; "Canada outside Quebec" and "la nation canadienne-française."\textsuperscript{48}

Although Quebec is not an independent state, for most francophone Québécois it is a nation in the sense that it commands the allegiance of the people. Resnick argues that this "sense of nationhood preceded 1867"\textsuperscript{49} and has persisted, making it very difficult for French Quebecers to feel close association with the institutions of the federal state. While "French Canada has...no problem of identity,"\textsuperscript{50} English Canada has struggled to find its centre and, in lieu of the linguistic and cultural unity found in French Quebec, has focused its nationalism around the structures of the federal state.

This different sense of the nation has led to profoundly different understandings of citizenship. Taylor posits two models of citizenship. The first model was pioneered by two nations that sprang from democratic revolutions, France and the
United States. In this model to be "a citizen of a democratic state is to be an individual with certain rights and duties along with other individuals equally endowed." Any collective associations are a matter for the private sphere "the state only deals with individuals." Taylor argues that most Canadians understand their citizenship in this way.

The second model of citizenship is coming to the fore largely because of the interest in defining a new European citizenship. In this understanding "citizens would belong to the larger entity via their membership in constituent societies" and "the superstate here would not deal with individuals as such but would recognize subcommunities." Taylor contends that some Canadians, francophone Quebecers and aboriginal peoples in particular, understand their citizenship in this way and "see themselves as fitting into the larger society ... through their membership in their historical communities." This model provides the basis for the "two nations" understanding of Canada that is popular in Quebec.

For most, if not all, of Canada's existence this "basic Canadian misunderstanding" has led to social and political conflict. The problem is not so much that there are two different understandings of citizenship but that both sides see their understanding as having universal application. Each Canadian believes that all Canadians should be citizens in the same way - their way. For Taylor "the ways that the two groups envisage their predicament, their problems, and their common
country are so different that it is hard to find a common language." Resnick describes them as resembling "two ships sailing off in opposite directions on a northern sea."

While the most significant obstacle to the creation of a single Canadian identity has been the Quebec/Canada question, it certainly has not been the only one. In recent years an emerging aboriginal nationalism has been added to that of English and French Canada.

Although early public education outside of Quebec was decidedly assimilationist, with the goal of "Anglo conformity" around the ideal of the British Empire it was largely unsuccessful in unifying the population. Non-British newcomers to Canada did not identify with the Empire and clung doggedly to their ethnic communities and loyalty to distant homelands. Granatstein points out that public school education, while compulsory, did little to crack such ethnic exclusiveness. The singing of "God save the King," "Rule Britannia," and "The Maple Leaf Forever," and the reciting of patriotic poetry, could do little in and of themselves to teach the values of the wider Canadian community.

Ethnic identities have not been the only things that have divided Canadians who have always had strong community and regional identities as well and, as a former prime minister notes, "the connections that draw together the members of our local communities don't extend farther, to reach to the whole country. Instead, more Canadians are focusing narrowly - as Quebecers, as Albertans, as aboriginals."
Canadians are and always have been a people of divided loyalties with multiple understandings of the country and their relationship to it. Robert Fulford argues we live in "a post modern dominion" where

we all have our own Canadas, which many of us clearly find satisfying, and in which many of us take great pride, but making these multifarious personal Canadas cohere into a collectivity appears so far to be beyond our intellectual range.\textsuperscript{51}

The Unique Institutional Structure of the Canadian State

Almost all democratic states hold elections, have legislatures to which representatives of the people are elected, divide the powers of the state between legislative, executive and judicial bodies, and maintain some division of powers between national governments and more local authorities at the municipal and/or regional level. While these commonalities exist, each state has developed its own way to institutionalize and operationalize them. For example, Britain and France concentrate state power in national institutions, while Switzerland and Belgium are more decentralized and allow municipal, provincial or regional institutions more autonomy. The United States centres executive power in an elected head of state and an appointed cabinet, while in Australia executive power is exercised by a prime minister and cabinet who are elected members of the national legislature. Canada has developed its own peculiar state institutional structure which
does much to shape the way citizens relate to the state and each other.

Like its neighbour to the south, Canada is a federal state. Power is shared between national and provincial institutions. Unlike the United States, however, Canada has adopted the structures of the British parliamentary system rather than those of a presidential republic as the organizing framework for the state. Canada also has a somewhat different legal system from the United States. For example, Canada allows for a different system of civil law in one province, Quebec, and accords parliament and provincial legislatures supremacy over the Charter of Rights through the so called "not withstanding clause".

Perhaps the most striking feature of the structure of the Canadian State is the degree to which it is decentralized. Lipset writes that

political scientists agree that Canada is already more decentralized that any other industrialized country and that, especially since the early 1960s, decentralization measured by such indices as spending and taxing shares has proceeded apace.62

Canada has a long tradition of accommodating regional and provincial differences partly through the constitutional division of the powers between federal and provincial governments and partly through bilateral agreements between particular provinces and the federal government. In regard to the latter, Taylor writes, "in a diverse federation such as ours, with such very different conditions prevailing in the
regions, we have always accepted that the role of the federal government may be different in relation to different regions." The Civil Code in Quebec, constitutional guarantees for Newfoundland's religious schools, ferry service guarantees for Prince Edward Island and unique accommodations for Manitoba regarding language in the legislature and the courts are examples of these differences.

Although the "Fathers of Confederation" intended a much more centralized state the growing importance of constitutional areas of provincial jurisdiction such as control over education and natural resources and the pressure from the provinces, particularly Quebec, for more autonomy moved Canada in the direction of decentralization. Although Quebec has been the province that has pushed most forcefully for more powers, it has not been alone. All provinces have a long history of jealously guarding and trying to extend the breadth of provincial jurisdiction viz-a-viz each other and the federal state. In the talks to bring Newfoundland into confederation in 1949, for example, the federal government "always had to negotiate with an eye to dominion-provincial relations and had to be careful not to give Newfoundland any advantages that might arouse the jealousy of existing provinces, especially the Maritimes." In similar fashion other provinces have often used Quebec's demands for more power to further their own ends. In the present post referendum climate it seems clear the demand for more decentralized federalism will increase. The decentralized
nature of the Canadian state is a major factor in Canadians developing and maintaining strong regional identities and it means that the public exercise of citizenship - particularly in the political realm of voting, lobbying, party work and holding public office - goes on at several levels.

Another feature of the institutional structure of the Canadian state that is important for understanding Canadian citizenship is the tradition of elitism in Canadian public life. Resnick argues that the framers of the Canadian state had no faith in popular sovereignty and designed a constitutional framework that included models of British aristocratic structures, such as an appointed Senate in place of the British House of Lords. He documents the closed and elitist nature of Canadian constitution making from the discussions leading up to Confederation through the repatriation of the constitution in 1982 to Meech Lake, and argues that throughout "the advocates of a differential passive notion of the citizen's role carried the day in Canada." These advocates have come from all parts of the political spectrum.

Few are the politicians, Conservative, Liberal, or for that matter CCF/NDP, who have questioned the hegemony of parliamentary sovereignty, or who have been prepared to accord to the people more than an auxiliary role in the operation of government and the state.

Former Prime Minister Joe Clark contends that public backlash against recent attempts at constitutional change were largely expressions of public dissatisfaction with so called executive federalism and a call for more public involvement in
the processes of constitution building. Similarly, Taylor points out that the stereotype of the deferential Canadian may no longer hold much validity. "The Canadians of today," he writes, "are not excessively deferential people." These impressions may or may not be accurate, only time will tell if average citizens in Canada will have a more substantial role in public life. It is evident, however, that for much of its history the Canadian state has not encouraged or welcomed the wide participation of citizens.

In dealing with economic and social issues, the Canadian state has carved out a role for itself that is more interventionist than the American model but less so than many European states. Largely because of history and geography, particularly the "smaller population relative to land mass," Canadian governments have been very involved in developing the infrastructure of the country in areas such as transportation, communications, and power production. This has been done both by public initiatives, as has largely been the case with power development, and through public support of private initiatives as was the case with the building of the railroads. Many Canadian citizens, particularly in English Canada, have seen threats to national institutions like railroads or public broadcasting as direct threats to any sense of national identity that does exist.

Another area where the Canadian state is more interventionist than the American is in the realm of providing
social services. This too is closely tied with Canadians' sense of who they are as a people. According to Taylor, "Canadians see their society as more committed to collective provision, over against an American society that gives greater weight to individual initiative." The Canadian state has been dedicated in recent decades to "the equalization of life conditions and life chances between the regions" and has thus instituted "the practices of large-scale redistribution of resources through equalization payments, and attempts have been made at regional development." These transfer payments have ensured that social programs like education, health care, and unemployment insurance are universally accessible in all parts of the country regardless of regional wealth.

The Canadian state has unique aspects which impact greatly on Canadian citizenship. These features, including the form of political and legal institutions, the decentralized nature of the state, the history of elitism in Canadian public life, and the degree the state intervenes in the economic and social affairs of the nation need to be taken into consideration in any comprehensive examination of Canadian citizenship.

Conclusion

One of the persistent issues in a recent delphi study on Canadian citizenship was whether there was any difference between a good Canadian citizen and a good global citizen or for that matter a decent human being. In other words, is
citizenship best understood in the specific or the generic sense. "Initially a majority of the [delphi] panel seemed to equate good Canadian citizenship with good global citizenship."
As the study went on, though, "there began to develop a sense of the need to put a Canadian stamp on the idea of Canadian citizenship." Modern democratic nations do share many ideological and institutional features that create significant similarities in citizenship across states, the generic, or global, features of democratic citizenship. But, as important as these similarities are, nation states differ from one another in significant ways and these differences impact on the ideology and practice of citizenship and create nuances of citizenship specific to that context.

Several writers have identified specific attributes of Canadian citizens. In comparison to Americans, for example, Canadians are described as being less individualistic, less confrontational, more deferential to authority, more willing to compromise and less overtly patriotic. These categorisations are difficult to document and often the subject of debate and therefore I have avoided using them as the basis for my argument that Canadian citizenship has unique aspects. Instead, I have argued that Canada is most different from other states in its historical and relational context, its persistent search for a pan-Canadian national identity and the institutional structure of the state. Obviously these phenomena do not exist separately in any real sense but weave together in complex interplay of
cause and effect. For example, it is clear that historical and relational context has been a significant factor in shaping the contemporary structure of the Canadian state, our adoption of the parliamentary system from the colonizing power being a case in point. At the same time, state structures have also had an impact on the history of Canada. An example of the latter would be the degree to which a decentralized federal system has made constitutional reform a difficult and divisive issue in Canada. I have developed these themes separately in order to illustrate my argument that Canada is unique in the family of democratic states and that uniqueness has given rise to particular ways of understanding and operationalizing citizenship as well as particular challenges to it.

Citizenship education in Canada has attempted to respond to these unique challenges to Canadian citizenship. A key part of the mandate of the Canada Studies Foundation, for example, was to develop in Canadian students a sense of pan-Canadian understanding as a basis for citizenship. Even though constitutionally education falls within provincial jurisdiction in Canada, the federal state has not been reluctant to intervene, particularly to address what it saw as challenges to Canadian unity and therefore Canadian citizenship. In the early years of the nation "education was clearly a matter of local concern" and, "until the 1950s, the federal role was largely 'at the margin'." Since that time the reports of several royal commissions, for example, the Royal Commission on National
Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (The Massey Commission) in 1949 and the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (The B and B Commission) in 1968, have raised serious concerns about national sovereignty, identity and unity. These have spurred the federal state to become involved in almost all areas of public education. Although the national state often claims that its activities in education are essentially confined to the post secondary sector, substantial involvement in both school and community based educational initiatives for school aged children has been well documented. As Doerr points out, we ought not to expect any significant degree of withdrawal from this involvement in the future.

National objectives in the areas of employment, immigration, broadcasting, bilingualism, cultural identity and so on will always overlap to a degree with provincial responsibility and control of education.

In the next three chapters I will take a detailed look at the nature of the federal state's intervention in citizenship education between 1947 and 1982.
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Chapter 4

Creating Canadians
The State's Vision of Citizenship

In 1961 then Secretary of State the Honourable Ellen Fairclough received a letter from a Reverend A.E. Baker from Ontario suggesting that a good project for the upcoming centennial year would be to draft "a definition of a Canadian ideal," in other words a description of the exemplary Canadian citizen.¹ The minister seemed to take this request seriously as she passed it on to senior departmental officials and requested a reply. The Director of the Citizenship Branch began his internal response to the letter by writing to the Deputy Minister that "the well engrained tradition of the Citizenship Branch has always been to steer clear of attempts to set norms of behaviour. The reasoning is," he continued, "that it would not be appropriate for a government agency to moralize."² While the director's words reflect the official policy of the Branch and the Department of the Secretary of State for the period under study, the evidence demonstrates that the federal state through the policies and programs of the Department in general, and the Citizenship Branch in particular, was not only involved in setting norms of behaviour and attitude consistent with its conception of Canadian identity but also expended considerable resources to see that Canadians adopted and adhered to them. Echoing Curtis' findings about policy in the nineteenth century, the central educational concern of the Canadian state in the
third quarter of this century "was the reconstruction of popular character and culture"\(^3\) for the preservation of state legitimacy and social cohesion. In order to achieve this objective, state policy in citizenship education was focused on three overlapping priorities: the formation of a national identity; fostering the disposition to get along with others; and, channelling the participation of citizens into community service through "non-political" voluntary organizations.

"A Nation-in-the Making": Constructing a National Identity

Essential to the survival of any state is maintaining legitimacy with its population. It needs "to be seen by its citizens as a credible normative and political authority"\(^4\) or, according to Taylor, the people have to "so understand and value [the state] that they are willing to assume the disciplines and burdens which membership entails."\(^5\) Over the years the Canadian state has perceived the lack of a national identity on the part of large numbers of Canadians as a direct threat to its own legitimacy and hence the survival of the Canadian nation. The Nationalities Branch, from which the Citizenship Branch was later formed, was created during World War Two in response to the lack of support for the war effort among many immigrant groups.\(^6\) For these groups the Canadian state had little or no legitimacy and therefore they could see no point in going to war for it.\(^7\)
Canadian political scientists and philosophers like Philip Resnick of the University of British Columbia and Charles Taylor of McGill University argue that the Canadian state has always had difficulty capturing the hearts and minds of Canadians. Both assert that English Canada has had no organic sense of identity, rather "it must be inculcated, often artificially, from above" and the strong sense of identity in French Canada has not been focused on the Canadian state. This persistent lack of national legitimacy in Canada is inextricably bound up with concerns over national unity. As Conservative E. D. Fulton pointed out during the debate over the Citizenship Act in 1946:

The first and perhaps still the greatest Canadian was the man who united Canada in Confederation in 1867. The next great Canadian will be the man who truly unites Canada at any time in the future.

The Canadian state attacked the problem of creating unity at both a social and symbolic level. In the next section I will discuss the policy of creating social unity and harmony by promoting acceptance of the "other", but before that I will deal with the attempts to construct an overarching national vision or ideal with which all Canadians could identify.

The lack of a national identity was a key theme in Canada at the end of the Second World War and was one of the central factors leading to creation of the Citizenship Branch in 1945 and the passage of the Citizenship Act in 1946. As I argued in chapter three, the decline of the British Empire had eliminated that ideal as a focus for identity in English Canada and a new sense of national maturity partly brought about by the
country's contribution to the war set the stage for renewed efforts to construct a distinct Canadian identity. This was clearly expressed in an editorial appearing in Saturday Night magazine in June 1944.

It is high time that Canadians woke up to the importance of having a clearly defined and universally recognized Canadian citizenship, a civic quality which one either possesses or does not possess, and which confers equally clearly defined and well understood (and generally accepted) privileges and responsibilities. If the Process of getting this defined citizenship involves separating Canadian citizenship from British citizenship, then that necessity must be faced.12

It was in this spirit of post war nationalism and growing international maturity that Paul Martin Senior, then Secretary of State, introduced Canada's first Citizenship Act. Martin saw this as an important step in Canada's evolution to nationhood and, more particularly, the continuation of Wilfrid Laurier's project of creating "a separate Canadian nation."13 Martin and his parliamentary colleagues on both sides of the house unquestionably felt the lack of a Canadian identity, perceived it as a threat to the country and hoped the Act would play a major role in solving the problem. When he first introduced the Bill in 1945 Martin said,

For the national unity of Canada and for the future greatness of this country it is felt to be of utmost importance that all of us, new Canadians or old, have a consciousness of a common purpose and common interests as Canadians; that all of us be able to say with pride and say with meaning: I AM A CANADIAN. (emphasis in the original).14

Members on all sides of the House concurred with Mr. Martin and encouraged the government not only to pass the Bill but to
ensure that the Department of the Secretary of State be given the resources to develop programs in citizenship education in order to, in the words of opposition leader John Diefenbaker, "fuse [the] clashing differences, and to build for that unity which, beginning with the dreams of the Father (sic) of Confederation, has been cemented by common sacrifice in two wars."¹⁵ Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (C.C.F.) Member, Alistar Stewart, referred specifically to the Citizenship Branch hoping that it would unite with other federal agencies like the National Film Board in "going through all the country telling Canadians just what Canadianism really is."¹⁶

Stewart's comment is typical of the pervasive belief among politicians and bureaucrats of the day, that Canadians were largely ignorant about what their country, and therefore their citizenship, was all about. Good citizenship education designed to address ignorance and counter the obstacles to a national identity would, they believed, result in peace, prosperity and, most importantly, unity.¹⁷

In this political context the Department and Branch began work in citizenship education. Throughout the succeeding three decades bureaucrats accepted the assumptions of their political masters and saw their job as defining "Canadianism" for Canadians or as Frank Foulds, the first director of the Citizenship Branch put it, "the building up of a Canadian point of view."¹⁸ Hundreds of programs run directly by the department or supported by the department and run by non-governmental
organizations, what I call surrogates, had the creation of national identity and unity as a central theme. From the radio program "In Search of Citizens" developed with the CBC in the early 1950s, through the Travel and Exchange programs in the 1960s and 1970s, described by one Branch official as "An Instrument of National Unity and a Tool for Learning," to the National Program of Support for Canadian Studies in the early 1980s which was designed to reflect "the social development priority of the federal government, i.e. the enhancement of national identity and the sense of belonging to Canada," this theme was consistently present. Yet, national identity and its assumed by-product, national unity, proved to be as elusive as ever. For those in the state responsible for developing policy in citizenship education, Canada was very much "a nation-in-the-making" and they were determined to make it right.

For Troper in the late 1970s the growing emphasis on multiculturalism in the history curriculum in Canada was one example of an attempt to make the nation in the sense of creating a widely accepted Canadian ideal. Multiculturalism, he contended, was not so much a recognition of the pluralist nature of the nation but rather an attempt to construct a Canadian ideal different from the so called "melting pot" of the United States. The evidence examined for this thesis offers support to Troper's argument. A perceived need to differentiate Canadians from Americans and British existed alongside a rejection of the American melting pot stereotype and a feeling
that "cultural diversity [was] a means of distinguishing Canada from the United States." Troper's work, however, offers only a partial view of both the perceived obstacles to creating a Canadian identity and the solutions developed to overcome those obstacles.

Between 1947 and 1982 the federal state responded to what it perceived to be various threats to national identity and national unity by constructing a series of national ideals it hoped would be widely accepted by Canadians and form the basis for a lasting national unity. These ideals roughly fit into the following time periods: the conquering pioneers from the late forties through the fifties and into the early sixties, the bilingual/bicultural fact from the early sixties to the mid seventies, and the pluralist ideal from mid seventies on. Policy change most often took place as a response to circumstances rather than as a result of ideology, research or planning. Policy therefore evolved in an erratic manner with many false starts and periods of overlap. For example, while bilingualism did not become a priority of the state until the 1960s, earlier efforts had been made to enhance English-French relations and to portray Canada as a bilingual and bicultural country. Conversely, well into the 1960s Branch publications, consistent with the ideal of Canada as a land of conquering pioneers, were portraying the early European settlers to this country as brave and virtuous examples who "in spite of hardships and difficulties... cleared the land and established
farms." Perhaps the best example of an overlap of ideals is seen in the view of Canada as "a multi-cultural country within a bilingual framework" which became popular Department jargon in the early 1970s.

Canada: The Land of Conquering Pioneers

In many ways the immediate post World War Two period in which the Citizenship Act was passed and the Citizenship Branch began its work promoting citizenship was a very exciting one for the country. As a Branch publication aimed at immigrants of the period put it, "Canada has emerged [from the war] as a great nation. Her vast resources, her agricultural and industrial capacity, exercise a profound influence on world affairs." The passage of the Citizenship Act was seen by Paul Martin and his parliamentary colleagues as the first step in that process and this was to be followed by a concerted effort of the state largely through the Citizenship Branch to forge Canadians into one people ready to move forward and realize their destiny as leaders in world affairs.

Despite the optimistic assessment in the 1947 edition of How to Become a Canadian Citizen which maintained that Canada's people drawn from every racial group in the world are welded into a mighty democratic force through their love of freedom, hatred of oppression, and the steadfast determination that the powers of government shall be exercised by and through the people for the benefit at all,
officials of the Branch were not convinced that Canadians were unified at all. The Branch grew out of an attempt to create a sense of national loyalty among immigrant groups during the war years and the assimilation of immigrants into Canadian society remained the main focus of the Branch into the 1960s. Branch officials sometimes expressed regret they could not focus on more general concerns of citizenship but the influx of immigrants following the war and ten years later after the Hungarian crisis drove the policy and programs of the day. Later I will discuss the Branch's attempts to create social harmony between immigrants and established Canadians, but first I will look at the image of Canada intended to provide a common identity for immigrants and Canadians alike, the portrait of Canada as a land of conquering pioneers.

One of the remarkable features of this period for someone looking back is what is missing. From an observation post in the shadow of the second Quebec referendum one is struck by the lack of concern in Branch policy and publications for English-French relations. The unique role played by the English and French in the development of the country is acknowledged, but issues of bilingualism and biculturalism, not to mention multiculturalism, are substantially absent and certainly do not concern policy makers in the department to any significant degree. A document describing the work of the Nationalities Branch, the precursor of the Citizenship Branch, includes the point that a primary task of the Branch in regards to immigrants
was "to train every individual for membership in the British or English-speaking nations and for the spirit of citizenship." In 1954 Eugene Bussiere, Director of the Citizenship Branch, wrote that though "the cultural and ethnic identities of all groups are recognized and respected. At the same time, all individuals are bound together in a common citizenship and participate in the development of a common cultural heritage." This certainly seems a long way from notions of one part of the country constituting a distinct society.

Bussiere's distinction between the ethnic identities of groups and the common citizenship of individuals is an important one, for the focus of the federal state during these years was to wean individuals away from allegiance to the ethnic group to become individual citizens of the nation. According to Ellen Fairclough, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, the "speed at which the immigrant is absorbed into the community" was critical both for the nation and the success of the individual. Later in the same speech she told the story of an immigrant who arrived in Canada with no education, began working as a labourer and "after six years of residence owned an enterprise employing 150 workers and had graduated to the highest income bracket of all." The Minister admitted that this was a rare accomplishment but argued

the story does prove that for those that have the ambition, the stamina, and the will-to-work even the most formidable obstacles can be conquered. It proves, too, that Canada is still a country in which everyone has his chance."
This view of rugged individuals relying on hard work, courage and perseverance to create both national and personal success against tremendous odds permeated the public materials produced by the Branch over these years.

Beginning in the 1940s one of the principal activities of the Branch was the publication of a series of materials designed to introduce Canada to immigrants. These publications included guides to the legal process of obtaining citizenship but also booklets on the history, geography, politics and economy of Canada. *The Canadian Citizenship Series* including *Our History, Our Land, Our Government, Our Resources*, and *The Canadian Scene* was very popular and went through several revisions over these years. In 1954-55 the Branch distributed over half a million copies of its publications reporting that "the Citizenship Branch, during the year, continued to act as a clearing house for information and to provide special services to voluntary organizations in all parts of Canada interested in citizenship."³⁴ These volunteer organizations involved not only those which worked exclusively with immigrants but groups like the Boy Scouts, Girl Guides and the YM-YWCA as well. With the assistance of the National Film Board (NFB) a series of film strips based on *The Canadian Citizenship Series* was produced and by 1955 almost 18,000 copies had been sold.³⁵ In 1951 an official of the Branch reported that "the distribution of these strips has been much greater than was expected. They are used not only in classes for immigrants, but in elementary and high
schools. In addition to these materials, in 1955 the Branch began the publication of a journal, Citizen, "to provide a service for voluntary organizations engaged in citizenship work" and by 1962 it was going out regularly to 6000 "citizenship and program conveners of voluntary organizations and church groups." It was mainly through these publications the state carried its vision of Canada as a land of rugged individuals to the people.

The 1953 edition of Our History illustrates the vision of Canada the state was promoting.

Throughout the efforts of the daring explorers, adventurers, and traders outlined in this study, the vast geographical extent of Canada became known to the world. To this day, the work of exploration has continued upon the foundations laid by the brave men who first penetrated the wilderness, lived and died amongst the native Indian tribes, and relentlessly pushed their way forward in search of knowledge. Their names will forever constitute a glorious page in this great country.

Two important ideas are conveyed in this quotation: first the men who opened up Canada were relentless and brave and, second, the same spirit of progress that drove their accomplishments is present in Canadians today.

In classic "history as progress" style Canadian pioneers were presented as people who began by establishing the barest foothold on a hostile continent and went on to turn it into a land of economic might and prosperity. "The early settlers," we are told, "established a wide variety of home industries for the manufacture of clothing, harnesses, boots, cheese, butter, and numerous other articles essential to survival in the rough
Canadian wilderness. They went on from there to build transportation systems to open up the continent and the modern industries that have contributed to Canada attaining its status as the third greatest trading nation in the world.

Canadians, blessed by nature and great wealth, have striven through the years to make use of such wealth for the betterment of the nation and the benefit of the world.

This progress is seen not only in Canada's economic development but also in its political evolution. A deliberate attempt was undertaken to show the peaceful evolution of the modern Canadian political system, as opposed to the more violent American example. A description of one of the filmstrips distributed by the department illustrates this.

This filmstrip tells how Canada was forged into a nation and shows how the vision of the Fathers of Confederation grew into actuality despite tremendous physical barriers and political opposition. Starting with British North America as it was in 1860, the film traces the development of the union of Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick in 1867, then describes how the other provinces entered confederation one by one, until the entry of Newfoundland in 1949 completed the union from 'sea to sea.'

In the vision of Canada presented by the Branch this spirit of determination and progress continued to drive Canada forward to greatness and was something that united all Canadians. An article in Citizen titled "Things Canadians Share in Common" argued that Canadians share pride not only in the accomplishments of the explorers and pioneers of history but also in the "contributions made to the welfare of mankind by such Canadian scientists and researchers as Doctors Banting and
Best who saved millions of lives through their discovery of insulin.⁴³

Recent immigrants are portrayed as being imbued with the same spirit as those who came earlier. Like their predecessors they left home and security and came to a strange land filled with the hope and expectation that the future would be better than the past; that Canada would provide opportunities which, by dint of hard work, courage and initiative, could lead to the fulfilment of dreams and the realization of happiness and security.⁴⁴

Each group of immigrants made a distinctive and profound contribution to the nation's progress. The minister in a 1959 speech praised the success in mining, shipping, and manufacturing of recent Dutch immigrants and went on to say,

What the Dutch have accomplished has been duplicated by the nationals of other countries, particularly since the end of the Second World War. The Italians, for example, are prominent in the construction industry, in wholesale fruit and grocery business; the Germans in a variety of occupations, including, real estate, retail furniture, nursery and landscaping, dressmaking and the restaurant business; the Jews in the clothing industry and the Greeks and Chinese in the restaurant trade.....The pioneers of bygone days who settled the plains of the West, who made fruitful the Niagara peninsula, the Annapolis and Okanagan valleys, who tapped the minerals of the Laurentian Shield, have been followed by other immigrants who made the Kitimat possible, who helped build the St. Lawrence Seaway, opened the riches of Elliot Lake and Knob Lake, who have established industries and tilled the farmlands from one end of the country to the other. They are worthy successors of the pioneers of former years.⁴⁵

The similarities between pioneers of earlier days and heroic immigrants of those days was portrayed beyond the economic arena. These recent arrivals did not only come because of the opportunity for material gain but, as well, "they [were] united with all Canadians in their love of freedom, their desire
to live under a democratic form of government and hopes of a
great future for Canada." 46

According to the Branch this view of Canada and Canadian
progress was nothing but an objective account of the history of
the nation and its people. A pamphlet produced to help schools
celebrate Dominion Day asserts that

it is not suggested that the schools embark on a program of
flag-waving patriotism. What is needed is an honest
understanding and appreciation of how Canada evolved from
colonial status to nationhood and the truly thrilling
accomplishments of our forefathers. 47

Similarly, in the conclusion of the 1970 edition of Our History
assurance is given that the book is reliable as ever.

Thus, in a free society "Our History" remains the objective
account of events in perspective, with faults openly
admitted but with pride in the constructive advances made
over the years since the confederation of Canada. 48

Despite these assurances the accounts described above and
others throughout the materials do sound suspiciously like
"flag-waving patriotism" with little evidence of "faults openly
admitted." A glorious history is presented that glosses over or
ignores anything that might spoil the story. Native people are
absent from the accounts except for their contact with the
pioneers with no discussion of conflict between Aboriginals and
Europeans. Little discussion of opposition to Confederation is
included either in 1867 or when any of the other provinces
joined. As will be discussed later, Louis Riel is forgotten
until he is conveniently remembered when bilingualism and
biculturalism becomes the ideal. English-French relations on
the whole are described as being almost completely harmonious
since the benevolent British passed the Quebec Act in 1774 as noted in the first edition of Our History.

By permitting the inclusion of French settlers on the council, the English gained the confidence of French leaders, who in turn were much respected and admired by the people as a whole.  

The booklet goes on to disclose the reaction of the French population to English magnanimity. "Impressed by the generous terms of the Quebec Act, the French population remained loyal to England." The Centennial Edition of Our History does mention the conscription crisis of the First World War but it is not explored in any depth and the repeat of this issue during the Second World War is ignored.

The description of working people in the materials reminds one of Osborne's study of Canadian public school history textbooks. Osborne found that working people were largely ignored in the books as was any hint of struggle between workers and industry or government. In similar fashion the materials produced by the Branch during these years overlook working people except to extol their hard work and diligence. No mention is made of the On to Ottawa Trek or the Winnipeg General Strike. One booklet claims that a fundamental characteristic of Canada is the lack of a hard and fast class structure.

Perhaps the most disingenuous aspect of this "objective account" is the description of the harmony between immigrants and established Canadians. The Branch better than perhaps any other part of the state knew it not to be true. The predecessor of the Branch was formed in order to deal with a perceived
serious lack of patriotism and participation among immigrant
groups during the Second World War and yet accounts of any
tensions over the war effort are missing from Branch materials.

The Branch was created in part as a response to perceived
problems between immigrant groups and Canadians. In 1944 Robert
England a special assistant in the Department of National War
Services travelled to Western Canada to discuss "the work of the
proposed Citizenship Division (the present Nationalities
Branch)." England found evidence of serious intergroup
tensions in the West including:

1. The growing anti-Semitism among all races and creeds.
2. The Doukhobor fanaticism - "sons of Freedom" methods
   in B.C. and to a limited degree in Verigin and N.E.
   Saskatchewan.
3. The Hutterites who engage in little Red Cross or
   relief campaign continue to isolate themselves and
   whose purchase of land are being objected to.
4. There are Ukrainian districts where Red Cross and war
   activities are not taken seriously enough. The
   Ukrainian Committee needs backing to push a greater
   consciousness of war effort to the forefront of all
   these communities.
5. The ideological warfare of the Communists in
   Ukrainian, Polish, Finnish and other non-Anglo-Saxon
   communities.

England concludes this section of his report with a call to
action; "There is much work for the new Division and not an
hour to lose." Subsequent histories of the Citizenship Branch confirm the
importance of England's report in establishing a focus for the
Branch and, as will be shown in detail below, concerns about
tensions between ethnic and cultural groups has consistently
been a driving force behind Branch policy. The accounts of
early settlers and recent immigrants building a nation in harmony are not in fact an objective view of Canada's history but a symbolic representation designed to be the basis for a shared "civil religion" in Canada. The concept of civil religion as developed by Hirsch includes widely shared societal values rooted in a shared belief in national myths. The conquering pioneers portrayed by the Branch during the forties, fifties and sixties were not so much representations of what was, as depictions of what should be.

Canada: The Bilingual/Bicultural Reality

In the early 1960s the federal state made an important discovery. All was not well between the English and French linguistic communities in Canada. Having grown to accept, or at least live with, the notion that Canada is made up of "two solitudes," it is hard to imagine a time when tension between the two official language groups did not command a lot of attention from the organs of the state concerned with citizenship and social affairs, but the late 1940s and the 1950s were such a time.

That is not to say that during this period the Citizenship Branch paid no attention to English-French relations. The idea that Canada was made up of two principal linguistic and cultural groups was one the Branch subscribed to from the beginning. Prior to the establishment of the Branch Robert England in his recommendations for hiring officers for the Branch recognized
the importance of the bilingual and bicultural nature of the country. He recommended that if "the Director is not bilingual in English and French the Assistant Director should be bilingual and should have lived and worked in Quebec." In 1949 Director Frank Foulds described the country's population as "composed chiefly of French and British stock." In the late summer of 1951 Dr. Louis Charbonneau, Assistant Director of the Branch, travelled to New Brunswick to attend the Fourth Annual Conference of the French Language Education Association organized around the theme of "Education and Unity." The conference was attended by delegates from across the country and Dr. Charbonneau states that its most interesting feature was that not only was national unity studied, but it was illustrated by the important participation of English-speaking Canadians in a French-speaking educational and cultural organization.

Similarly, the earliest travel and exchange programs sponsored by the Branch in the late 1950s and early 1960s were designed to respond to "the problem of French and English-speaking unity."

Yet despite this recognition of bilingualism and biculturalism, these issues were not a priority for the Branch until well into the 1960s. The Branch's preoccupation was twofold, "to create among Canadians of French and British origin a better understanding of Canadians of recent European origin, and to foster among the latter a wider knowledge of the best traditions of Canadian life." While the Branch was very concerned about developing good relations between Canadians and immigrants, it felt little pressure to work on relations between
English and French Canadians who had, presumably, established "the best traditions of Canadian life." Branch policy was almost exclusively focused on immigrant integration until the work of the Dunton-Laurendeau Commission, better known as the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (the B and B Commission), brought into focus the "crisis" in English-French relations in the mid 1960s.

This crisis was perceived as an extreme threat to the unity of the country. According to Laurendeau, one of the commissioners, "the Canadian government, in setting up the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, clearly indicated its belief that we are in a state of emergency that can jeopardize the very existence of Canada." In chapter five I will show how the Branch attached itself very closely to the Commission and used this relationship to establish itself as the heir of the Commission's work in promoting bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada. Here, I will argue that this perceived threat to Canadian unity, and thus the legitimacy of the national state, led the Branch to propose a new icon around which to rally Canadians.

Bilingualism and/or biculturalism is not mentioned in any annual report of the Citizenship Branch until 1963-64 and then it receives only passing mention in three brief sentences. Reference is made to several recent articles on the subject in Citizen and contact between the Branch and officers of the B and B Commission "to discuss ways in which it could be of assistance
to the Commission." As the work of the Commission got underway the focus of the Branch shifted more toward forming policy and developing programs in the area of bilingualism and biculturalism. In the fall of 1964 the Acting Chief of Liaison for the Branch, Miss J. Lynam, circulated a memo "suggesting possible ways of dealing with attitude change in Canada, with respect to the present crisis around Bilingualism and Biculturalism." The suggestions in the memo are described as preliminary and intended for informal discussion only but this signalled a growing interest in the area within the Branch. At the staff conference for all Liaison Officers from Eastern Canada held in early 1965 most of the discussion time focused on bilingualism and biculturalism as it related to national unity.

In the annual report of The Department of the Secretary of State for 1967 "bicultural relations" appears as one of nine program areas of the Branch. While this is the first time there is any indication of specific programming in this area, it does not seem to have had any priority among the program areas. In the next two annual reports the Branch identifies five and four program areas respectively and these do not include anything specifically related to bilingualism and biculturalism. Neither report mentions these terms at all. Work was going on behind the scenes, however, to increase the involvement of the Department and the Branch in the area. In a memorandum to Cabinet in June 1968 the Secretary of State outlined the close
connection between the work of the B and B Commission and the Citizenship Branch and requested approval for a seven fold increase in funding to the Branch's "bicultural relations programme" within two years.\textsuperscript{70} The Department's lobbying for more responsibility and resources in this area was highly successful. The annual report for 1970 announced that during the final quarter of the 1968-1969 fiscal year, the Cabinet entrusted the Department of the Secretary of State with the general responsibility of coordinating all government policies respecting the official languages within federal departments and agencies.\textsuperscript{71}

This responsibility was to be carried out under the general rubric of the Official Languages Program by four new Branches: Bilingualism Programs Branch, Social Action Branch, Language Administration Branch, and Research and Planning Branch.\textsuperscript{72} While the names under which the policy was developed and carried out changed throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s bilingualism and biculturalism remained a priority of the Department. One can get a sense of how quickly the Department's involvement in this domain grew by noting that $80,000 were originally allocated to programs in the area in 1968-69; By 1969-70 expenditures for Bilingualism Development (the new name to replace Official Languages) were reported as being $1,702,320 and by 1970-71 $53,352,080. This represents an increase over two years by a factor of more than 600.\textsuperscript{73} The transformation to the reality of bilingualism and biculturalism was largely complete by 1970 and the Minister responsible for citizenship policy could say confidently to his Cabinet colleagues, "It is
accepted today that Canada is a bilingual country with two main cultural streams.  

The discovery of bilingualism and biculturalism was evident in some changes in Departmental publications. *Citizen*, for example, began running more articles on bilingualism and biculturalism. These, like other sources, often included the theme that much of Canada's strength and uniqueness as a nation could be attributed to her dual heritage. As one article phrased it, "Canada, a nation enriched by two great cultural streams, has been endowed with a double heritage which it is making its very own." The accounts of Canadian history in the Centennial Edition of the booklet *Our History* published in 1966 contained new material related to this issue not included in the 1953 edition. Some discussion of the Riel Rebellion, for example, left out entirely in 1953, is included with the clear implication that the government had been mistaken to hang Riel. A new section on Canada in the twentieth century included a description of Sir Wilfrid Laurier as perhaps the quintessential bilingual Canadian.

Laurier had all the qualities necessary to be an outstanding leader. He had a striking personal appearance, while his eloquence in both French and English and a gift for oratory, made him a natural leader in Parliament. He was to devote much of his life to bringing about harmony between the English and French sections of Canada.

One of the most important programs implemented by the Department was Bilingualism in Education, which was designed to support public school initiatives in teaching a second official language. In a speech to a seminar sponsored by the Canadian
Teachers' Federation in January 1976 Secretary of State, J. Hugh Faulkner, made it clear the government's goals with regard to bilingual education programs extended far beyond the teaching of language skills. In summarizing the challenge of the B and B Commission for teachers he said,

the Commission called on all Canadians, and particularly on you Canadian teachers, to take up the enormous challenge of building a truly bilingual country. As teachers you play a crucial role. You do not only dispense learning and teach skills; you impart values; you instill ideals; you transmit attitudes. A climate of acceptance and understanding of Canada's linguistic realities cannot exist unless you help to create it. It seems to me that your interest in bilingualism in education cannot be only a professional concern. It is an issue which should touch us all deeply as Canadians, for it is the key to our history in the next 100 years. (emphasis mine) 79

Clearly, in the Minister's view bilingualism was an important organizing ideal for Canadian society. Lest there be doubt he went on to elaborate the specific goals of the government in this area.

We want to help Canadians to perceive the advantages of personal bilingualism in terms of the unity of the country; in terms of the effective operation of our national institutions at all levels; in terms of our national identity; and in terms of personal and cultural enrichment for the individual. (emphasis mine) 80

All this "to achieve our broad national objective of a bilingual country." 81

The fundamental tenent of this new creed, what the minister referred to as "sacred", "is the equality of the two official language groups" 82 and the Department was committed to convincing people from coast to coast to accept this belief. The original Cabinet Document requesting funding for programs in
bicultural relations indicated that the field officers of the Branch from across the country had already (without any substantial funding) been working for a number of years "to help the public understand the need for bridging the gap between the present situation and the stated goals of equality for the two official cultures." The memo went on to say that the requested funding would be used in part "to conduct programmes of public education so that the need for special measures to achieve equality is well understood and accepted by the majority culture in each province." In addition to regular funding provided for second language instruction under the Bilingualism in Education program, grant money was available every year "for areas that consider themselves in need of special attention." In 1974-75 the Department funded special projects in British Columbia, both Territories as well as in Alberta and Saskatchewan. While projects were also supported in other areas with larger official language minorities, Special Project funds were often used to create an infrastructure to support bilingualism in areas of the country where none existed before and where the Citizenship Branch had found hostility to bilingualism in the past. These projects will be examined in more detail in chapter six. Similarly, The Official Language Minority Groups Directorate begun in 1974 was charged with promoting the cultural and linguistic development of the official language communities where they existed as minorities; to foster a better understanding between the two official
language groups throughout the country; and to implement programs that stress co-operation between the two groups.  

In 1974-75 approximately $3,000,000 was spent on programs in this area; By 1978-79 the amount had risen to $9,000,000.

State programs were used to convince Canadians to accept and support the reality of Canada as a bilingual country. An often expressed purpose of programs in bilingualism and biculturalism, for example, was to provide "opportunities for the Canadian public to understand and accept the French-English fact and its implications for the different spheres of national activities." (emphasis mine) As one internal document put it bluntly, "immigrant and ethnic groups in Canada must realize Canada's bilingual nature and adapt themselves to it."

Just as resistance to public schooling in the nineteenth century was characterized by its proponents as "inherently irrational," opposition to the view that Canada was a bilingual country was portrayed by proponents of state policy as a denial of the facts or as evidence of ignorance. As one civil servant put it, 

A great many English speaking Canadians have come up against the fact, rather recently, that the French language does exist in Canada and that it is going to continue to exist and that it is one of our official languages - and that, that fact can't be changed and whatever they may have thought Canada was before, it in fact is, a bilingual country and not a unilingual English country.

Although sentiments similar to those above seem to have been widely held, there is no recognition that the Department only discovered bilingualism and biculturalism in the mid 1960s. The comments of Secretary of State Faulkner quoted earlier make
it clear that the ideal of a bilingual country is an ideal that teachers have a role in constructing for students, however, state officials did not acknowledge that to portray Canada as a bilingual and bicultural country was a deliberate policy choice. Rather, the impression is given that Canada's bilingual/bicultural identity is a self evident reality that the state has always recognized and only the ignorant or the stubborn would challenge it. It would not be long before the state discovered other "realities" that challenged the bilingual/bicultural fact.

Canada: The Pluralist Ideal

Despite its obvious basis in reality, at least for some, the Bilingual/Bicultural Fact never really enjoyed a period of uncontested dominance as a national ideal within state policy. It was challenged even as it was being formed by the Pluralist Ideal. This new conception of Canada grew partly out of a desire, as Troper has argued, to define this nation in terms different from the United States. There is certainly an overt rejection of the "melting pot," often associated with the United States, and considered by policy makers to be an unacceptable model for Canada. But the Pluralist Ideal was more than simply an attempt to distinguish Canada from its neighbour, certainly an identity centred around bilingualism and biculturalism would have done that, it was also a response to a perceived internal threat to national unity coming from what one
writer has called "opposition voices from below." These voices included people who were feeling alienated from the political process in general and from the ideal of Canada as a bilingual and bicultural nation in particular. Taylor has pointed out that this kind of alienation constitutes a significant threat to the legitimacy of modern states. That the Canadian state understood this is clearly demonstrated in the draft of a Cabinet Document which read in part "alienated and disadvantaged groups are always a threat to national unity and solidarity as well as a blemish in a just society." Policy makers responded in this instance by attempting to create an ideal to which those who felt excluded could relate.

Early in the work of the B and B Commission, state officials recognized the potential for conflict between those who would construct Canada as a bilingual and bicultural country and groups of Canadians from non-English and non-French backgrounds. At a meeting between senior officials of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration (where the Citizenship Branch was located at the time) and the B and B Commission held in October of 1965,

The Deputy Minister remarked that the Citizenship Branch faces the dilemma of spurring a national consciousness of the French-English fact in Canada, while maintaining a sound approach to ethnic groups on such questions as the retention of language and cultural traditions which they have brought here.

Book IV of the Commission's report which dealt specifically with non-English and non-French groups in Canada was, in part at least, an attempt to head off opposition to bilingualism and
biculturalism from those groups by developing some policy recommendations that would demonstrate that they had not been forgotten by government and their cultures were not going to be submerged by bilingualism and biculturalism. One such recommendation was "that members of non-British, non-French cultural groups should have opportunities to maintain their own languages and cultures within the educational system if they indicate sufficient interest in doing so."\(^9\)

Such recommendations, however, did not head off opposition to bilingualism and biculturalism primarily because they were not accompanied by resources. For example, while the Commission recommended that heritage language instruction go on in schools as shown above, it also recommended against government funding of such programs and this was a source of great consternation among certain ethnic communities.\(^1\)\(^0\) The force of the opposition to bilingualism and biculturalism by various ethnic groups eventually led Prime Minister Trudeau to announce "a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework"\(^1\)\(^1\) in 1971, just two years after the passing of the Official Languages Act.

As the seemingly complex and perhaps contradictory nature of the phrase multiculturalism within a bilingual context indicates, the transition from the icon of the Bilingual/Bicultural Reality to that of the Pluralist Ideal was not immediate or uncontested. Over the years between 1970 and 1983 bilingualism and biculturalism gradually gave way to
multiculturalism in the priority it was accorded in state policy. This can be illustrated in the changing names of one sector in the Department of the Secretary of State. In 1978 it was called the "Citizenship and Bilingualism Development Sector," in 1980 it was renamed "Citizenship and Official Languages" and by 1984 it was simply called "Citizenship and Culture." 102

When the multiculturalism policy was first proposed it seems to have been intended as a Trojan Horse which could be used to undermine opposition to bilingualism and biculturalism within the ethnic communities and build loyalty to the nation. As one internal document from 1970 put it,

if we permit the various ethnic groups to maintain their languages and cultures, and, in effect have the government support these, we believe that this would lead the ethnic groups to identify themselves more strongly with Canada. 103

A long memorandum to Cabinet in the spring of 1971 on how the government should respond to the recommendations in Book IV of the B and B Commission echoes these sentiments. While it recommends that the government support some of the demands of ethnic groups such as providing funding for heritage language teaching the ultimate goal is

the individual integration of these people into one or the other of Canada's two majority societies so that they and their children are able to share equally with all Canadians the full range of opportunities and advantages open to all citizens of this country. (emphasis in the original)

The memo goes on to say that these people

must be inculcated with a strong sense of personal identification with Canada without being given the
impression that they must hide or lose their ethnic cultural identity in order to be true Canadians.\textsuperscript{104}

One wonders how people who have been integrated into a majority society can retain much of their own ethnic identity. The answer lies partly in the state's view of culture as a private, group phenomenon and economic and civic activity as the realm of the individual.

The Trojan Horse worked in reverse, however, as the multiculturalism policy did not lead to the integration of ethnic groups into a bilingual/bicultural nation, but instead played a major role in undermining the Bilingual/Bicultural Fact as a national ideal. By 1972 a Minister of State for Multiculturalism had been appointed (there has never been a Minister for Bilingualism), through the 1970s annual reports of the Department of the Secretary of State show an increasing emphasis on multicultural programs, and by 1980 any discussion of ethnic groups integrating into either English or French culture has disappeared. The new language of citizenship was that of "belonging." As Secretary of State Francis Fox explained, "one of the main thrusts of the Department of the Secretary of State developed over the past year is the desire to enhance the sense of belonging to Canada."\textsuperscript{105} In a radical departure from the policy of weaning individuals away from their cultural group to become integrated in a majority culture the Department now promoted close identification with a distinct group as a way to foster this belonging. The 1981 annual report states that "the sense of belonging to a pluralistic
collectivity develops from an initial identification with a smaller group."\textsuperscript{106} Belonging represents the triumph of the Pluralist Ideal over the Bilingual/Bicultural Reality.

In a curious paradox, Canadians, according to this new policy direction, would find a national identity by affirming and maintaining their distinct cultural or ethnic identity. In the mid 1970s the Department introduced a new program area within the Multiculturalism Directorate with the plural designation "Canadian Identities."\textsuperscript{107} This program "endeavoured to help Canadians recognize and understand their cultural heritage and identity as part of the wide variety of cultures existent in our society."\textsuperscript{108} As part of this program of cultural retention and enhancement the Department sponsored many multicultural initiatives including multicultural centres, conferences, festivals and educational initiatives. In 1974-75 funding for these kinds of projects was reported at just over 2.5 million dollars\textsuperscript{109} and by 1981-82 funding for multiculturalism had risen to almost 6 million dollars.\textsuperscript{110}

"The voices from below" that spawned the development of the Pluralist Ideal as the organizing principle for a Canadian identity did not only include ethnic and cultural groups who were reacting to exclusion from the Bilingual/Bicultural Fact, but also other groups who were reacting to long term marginalization in society more generally. In line with this, the state's response went beyond developing policy and programs in multiculturalism to include work in areas concerning
aboriginal peoples, women, youth, the aged and the disabled.
In fact, the history of the state in this area is partly an
unfolding history of who counts as Canadian citizens. This was
recognized within the Citizenship Branch as early as 1963 when
an internal report summarized the unfolding work of that
department as follows.

When the Branch was established there was some feeling that
members of ethnic groups were not sufficiently included in
the dialogue [about the ideal Canadian society]. Since
then, Canadians have realized that Indians were excluded
too. Some French speaking Canadians indicate that they
have not been included enough either. In fact, there seems
to be a feeling among Canadians that they can not
participate effectively in the Canadian dialogue and no
wonder when you consider how difficult it is to trace an
individual's or group's participation and establish their
effectiveness. The Branch was established to harmonize
some voices into the Canadian theme but in the process
found more voices wanting a new harmony.ii

In the years up to 1982 the Branch and the Department of the
Secretary of State were to discover even more voices "wanting a
new harmony."

As the quote above illustrates, one of the first of the
excluded groups to be discovered by the Branch was native
peoples. Internally the Branch began to plan for native
citizenship programs in the late 1950s with a specific section
in an annual report on policy and programming in this area first
appearing in 1959-60.ii Since then separate programs focusing
on native citizenship were maintained by the Departments
concerned. These programs were always kept distinct from
multiculturalism as if aboriginal citizens were somehow set
apart and not part of the multicultural mix.
Throughout the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s the Department also developed specific citizenship programs for youth, women and disabled people. As will be shown in detail in the next chapter, more often than not these programs were in response to a perceived crisis or threat to state legitimacy. Taylor argues that one fundamental characteristic of the modern person is the need for efficacy which he describes as "the ability to effect one's purposes." This need is not only felt in the private realm of family, career and social life but in the public realm of government as well. As Taylor puts it "the fact that we govern ourselves is an extremely important part of our dignity as free subjects." Taylor contends that when modern citizens feel that they are unable to participate in their own governance to a significant degree the state loses legitimacy in their eyes.

In working to include previously excluded citizens in the public life of the nation, the Canadian state was attempting to head off deep alienation and the corresponding loss of legitimacy. The intent was to construct an ideal to which all Canadians could adhere. This effort led the Department of the Secretary of State to develop a double barrelled approach to citizenship policy in the 1970s: citizenship policy for the mainstream and special initiatives for the excluded. For example, five Directorates fall under the Citizenship Sector in the 1975 annual report of the Department and the report says of the first, "The Citizens' Participation Directorate addresses
itself to all Canadian citizens as opposed to the four other citizenship directorates which each focus on a specific target population. In this case the specific populations targeted were official language minorities, women, ethnic and cultural groups, and native citizens. By 1981 the Department had been assigned the responsibility of improving opportunities for people with disabilities to participate as citizens. Later in this chapter I will show that state programs to enhance participation, both for the general population and specific target groups, were designed to protect and enhance the status quo and channel any dissent in "appropriate" directions.

Like the Bilingual/Bicultural Reality before it, the Pluralist Ideal, particularly the aspects of it related to multiculturalism, was marketed aggressively by the state. "The Canadian Identities Program," reads the 1976 annual report from the Secretary of State,

is designed to make Canadian life, in all aspects, more reflective of the reality of multiculturalism in Canada. It is felt that if Canadians are better able to perceive multiculturalism as an integral part of their experience, they will more readily understand and accept it as such. (emphasis mine)

In other words, Canada is in fact a multicultural country but Canadians do not know it yet. If the state can show them just how pervasive "the reality of multiculturalism" is Canadians are certain to embrace it. Three years later the short lived Conservative government of Joe Clark held the line on the policy of convincing Canadians that multiculturalism was a fundamental part of Canada and ought to be held as a national ideal. In a
letter to Robert Anderson, Director of the Canada Studies Foundation, in June 1979, Secretary of State Steve Paproski wrote:

I want to affirm the fundamental commitment of myself and Mr. Clark's Government to multiculturalism. The entrenchment, promotion and further development of this policy is one of the most basic principles and goals of our Canadian Confederation. Your assistance and the direct participation of your community [i.e. teachers of Canadian studies in schools across the country] is most important to help me and my colleagues in those decisions that will make multiculturalism a practical and working reality for Canada and a goal for all Canadians. (emphasis mine)\textsuperscript{119}

Perhaps one of the most revealing sources is a letter from Edward J. Ratushny, executive assistant to Otto Lang, Minister of Agriculture, to Robert Stanbury, Minister without Portfolio responsible for citizenship.\textsuperscript{120} The letter was written in August of 1970 and is not necessarily indicative of state policy but is a personal communication of advice from one friend to another. It is, however, a reflection of the thinking of senior officials in the government who had the ear of the minister. Mr. Ratushny states his impression from media reports and the activities of Mr. Stanbury's department "that you [Stanbury] have some sympathy for the ideal of a mosaic cultural pattern for our country." (emphasis mine)\textsuperscript{121} Mr. Ratushny supports the Minister in this view and goes on to offer some advice as to how the construction of this ideal might be pursued.

In my opinion it would be a legitimate and desirable activity of a Federal Government, not only to protect its citizens from the "melting pot" but also positively to foster and encourage the maintenance of cultural diversity as an expression of the kind of country we would like to have. (emphasis mine)\textsuperscript{122}
This identity is to be constructed by the state in order to "protect" its citizens and provide them with an ideal. As for resistance to this policy, Mr. Ratushny writes, "I suspect that the main objectors would be traditional Tories who are beyond salvation anyway." As with bilingualism/biculturalism before it, resistance to pluralism is seen as the purview of the ignorant or the malevolent. Some resistance did exist, however, particularly from Quebec whose political leaders saw the policy as a way to reduce the status of Francophones in Canada to that of just another ethnic group. In the past few years resistance has become more public as reflected in the policies of the Reform Party of Canada and recent published works critical of state policy in this area.

Speaking in the House of Commons on the occasion of the first Citizenship Day in 1950, Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent said,

In these past fifty years Canada has become a great nation. We have at all times discharged our national obligations promptly and honourably, and no country which does that needs to try by artificial means to create patriotism.

I have argued so far in this chapter that since 1947 the Canadian state has responded to perceived threats to national unity and identity by trying in several ways "by artificial means to create patriotism." The threat of divided loyalties seen in large scale immigration particularly from Eastern Europe in the 1940s and 1950s spawned an attempt to create a national identity (patriotism by another name) around the ideal of Canadians as conquering pioneers; the threat of an English-
French split in the nation which became evident in the sixties gave rise to the bilingual/bicultural fact as the focal point for a second attempt to create such an identity; and the agitation of "voices from below" through the 1970s and the 1980s generated yet a third attempt to create and peddle a national identity around the pluralist ideal. The fact that the Secretary of State could say near the end of 1981 that "I am convinced of the need for greater knowledge of ourselves, our history and achievements, as well as for greater recognition of our potential as a nation" indicates that attempts to create a Canadian identity had been largely unsuccessful, at least from the state's perspective.  

Throughout this period the state was not only anxious to create national unity around a symbolic representation of "Canadianism" but it was also concerned with creating unity on a much more personal level among Canadians who were different from one another in some respect. Its goal in this process was to shape attitudes of citizenship which would ensure social cohesion and harmony.

Getting Along: Constructing Appropriate Attitudes for Citizenship

Recent scholars of the state have largely agreed that one of the prime functions of modern, Western states has been to create conditions that support the capitalist economy. While some of the more obvious of these include "support for the
capital accumulation process" and "the legitimation of the capitalist mode of production" part of this process is more obscure and includes creating a context in which capitalism can flourish. Social stability is a key component of that context. As Resnick argues, in a modern capitalist democracy like Canada "social cohesion is as much of a prerequisite for the stabilization of capitalism as is the intelligent management of monetary or fiscal policy." During the years under consideration here what Resnick refers to as "organized capitalism" was becoming established in Canada and during the same period Canadian state made social cohesion a centre piece of its citizenship policy.

In late 1969 Robert Stanbury, Minister without Portfolio responsible for citizenship, said,

We must recognize the people of Canada as the greatest of Canada's resources. For it is the attitudes of Canadians from many cultures, and the way they react to one another and work together that will determine Canada's future.

While the minister may have thought he was setting a new course by calling for a focus on the attitudes of Canadians and attention to how they manage to live and work together, this had been a central preoccupation of the state from much earlier times. In a paper written in 1966 to explain the work of the Citizenship Branch to the Department of the Secretary of State, where the Branch was returning after a 16 year sojourn in the Department of Immigration and Citizenship, the Chief of the Programs and Materials Division, W.H. Agnew, explained that the Branch was conceived principally as a vehicle of the state to
foster appropriate attitudes among the population. The predecessor of the Citizenship Branch, he contended, was created during the war because the government of the day recognized the need for an agency which would concentrate its efforts upon creating a favourable climate of opinion and attitude in which all residents of Canada could work in harmony and contribute to the maximum extent in a united war effort.

He went on to point out that the Nationalities Branch, later to become the Citizenship Branch, "was the only segment of the Department of National War Services which was considered to have a continuing role in the post-war period." This was because "it was recognized that national unity would continue to depend upon the development and retention of favourable attitudes between people and groups." In the paper, Agnew details the policies and programs of the Branch designed to foster the development of these "favourable attitudes" and predicts this will continue to be a major focus of state policy in the future.

The promotion of wholesome group relations in a diversified society such as Canada is a never-ending task and represents a field of endeavour which will occupy the staff and resources of the Branch in a substantial measure in the years that lie ahead.

An examination of the evidence confirms that this desire to shape attitudes and create social harmony saturated the work of the Branch throughout the years from 1947 to 1982. In a list of three primary functions of the Citizenship Branch in the annual report of 1950, the first is "to promote unity among all racial groups." Later that decade one of the "long range goals of the Canadian Citizenship Branch" was "to increase understanding
and co-operation between all ethnic groups comprising the Canadian population so as to realize a greater degree of national unity." A memorandum to Cabinet in the late sixties seeking confirmation of the Branch's role includes descriptions of seven program areas four of which, Immigrant and Ethnic Relations, Indian Integration, French-English Relations and Human Rights, are directly related to improving the relationships between individuals and groups. The mid 1970s saw the formation of the Policy Branch within the Department of the Secretary of State and "among its first areas of attention were new program proposals for Group Understanding and Human Rights, and research and planning in the area of relations among ethnic groups." In the early 1980s the Department of the Secretary of State introduced the National Program of Support for Canadian Studies the objective of which was "to promote and support activities designed to help Canadians from various regions and cultures to get to know and understand each other better as a people."

Mr. Agnew's point discussed previously is certainly true with regard to the federal state, promoting "wholesome intergroup relations...is a never ending-task."

In the view of state policy makers all of this effort to promote good relations was essential because of certain persistent threats to social harmony in Canada. Despite what one Citizenship Branch official described as "the latent desire of Canadians to help others," the state saw itself as faced with
negative social forces which "are disruptive and, when allowed
to flourish, promote suspicion and disunity." One of those
negative social forces was considered to be racism, which in the
early years was understood to include not only malice directed
toward those of other racial backgrounds but toward other ethnic
and cultural groups as well. In 1982 the Secretary of State's
Department established race relations as a priority "because of
increasing racial tensions in Canada." In fact, as we saw
above in relation to Robert England's report of 1944 which
formed the basis for the development of the Citizenship Branch,
racism had been a significant concern of the state well before
the 1980s. Similar concerns to those expressed by England in
1944 and in the annual report of 1983 are reflected in a Branch
submission to Cabinet in 1968 which argued that prejudice and
discrimination were inhibiting the integration of "Indians," "Eskimos" and some immigrants into Canadian society and that
hate literature was a growing problem that should be
countered.

While intolerance on the part of Canadians was one of the
key threats to social compatibility that the state worried about
over these years, it was also concerned that some groups, for
example immigrants and native peoples, were reluctant to
integrate fully into Canadian society. Although the Citizenship
Branch often described this problem as exaggerated, nevertheless programs of the Branch or those of its surrogates
were designed to get perceived outsiders "to learn about
Canadian methods and points of view so that they could more fully integrate into Canadian life.

The way in which social problems are defined or framed has a significant effect on how they are dealt with. By deciding that the lack of social cohesion was a significant national problem, and that the solution lay in overcoming the twin obstacles of intolerance and reluctance the state laid down the basis for the policy that was to follow. The substance of state policy in this area of citizenship was assimilation and accommodation and the mechanisms used to implement that policy were contact and intercession.

Assimilation and Accommodation: The Substance of Getting Along

The themes of assimilation and accommodation can be clearly seen in the work of the Citizenship Branch in its early years. The Director of the Branch, Frank Foulds, reflected this quite clearly in 1945 when he wrote,

If we are to assimilate people of recent European origin and any additional persons who may come to this country in post-war immigration, we must not only show some appreciation of their customs and cultures but we must build, and draw them into, a Canadian people.

Here are the twin functions of the state: get Canadians to "show some appreciation" (accommodate) and make the immigrants into "Canadian people" (assimilate). Foulds contended that assimilation would not be an easy or short process and Canadians needed to be patient. He argued full assimilation might not take place until the second generation. "Men and women born in
another land may become enthusiastic Canadians," Foulds wrote, "but will always think of their birth place as home. It is with the youngsters growing up that we can do our best assimilation job." He goes on to explain how surrogate organizations, such as Army and Navy Cadets, church groups, Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, and farm boys and girls clubs, can be useful tools in assimilating the children of immigrants. Foulds even held that helping immigrants assimilate into Canadian society was in accordance with their own wishes. In testimony before a Senate committee in 1949 he said that "the question that is coming to us from these European people who anticipate getting passage to Canada is 'How can I arrange to fit into Canadian life quickly so that I shall not appear queer, new or awkward?'"

A proposed series of radio broadcasts in the late 1940s illustrates the double barrelled focus of state policy. This series of programs was to centre "around a typical Canadian family in small town Ontario" and the three objectives for the series are completely consistent with assimilation and accommodation. They were:

1. To give Canadians a real understanding of the background of the immigrants now entering our country.

2. To define for Canadians "good citizenship" in terms which can and should be achieved by all men who live in Canada. Among other things, special emphasis to be laid on assisting newcomers to achieve this.

3. To give Canadians an appreciation of the fact that the assimilation process will be a long range project requiring their constant sympathetic aid.
By the early 1950s the language of "assimilation" was disappearing and being replaced by the preferred "integration" which itself was to be replaced in later years by terms like "orientation." While in the state's view this changing language represented a progressive development of policy, others have argued that assimilation remained the cornerstone of state activity in citizenship during this time. Using examples of state policy and practice with immigrants, native peoples, and ethnic and cultural groups, I will show that the twin pillars of assimilation and accommodation remained the substance of the policy for creating social stability into the 1980s.

Throughout the 1950s the question of the integration of immigrants into Canadian society commanded most of the state's attention. A statement on Citizenship Branch policy in 1955 noted that, although the Branch was concerned with issues of citizenship generally, 90 percent of its time and resources were being expended on programs to deal with "newcomers." As noted above, early in that decade the Branch moved explicitly away from a policy of assimilation, as one senior official put it,

> We, in Canada, prefer to endorse a theory of integration which permits the cultural and ethnic identities of all groups to be recognized and respected in our society, while at the same time, all individuals are bound together in a common political allegiance.

While this certainly sounds like a change from the assimilationist language described above, the underlying assumptions of the state's policy were that cultural and civic life are separate and cultural homogenization is inevitable.
State policy held that cultural life is essentially private and while it may be shared with others, it is not part of the process of constructing a common civil society. Indeed, as will be shown below, these same assumptions formed the basis of policy with regard to native citizenship and multiculturalism.

In other words, immigrants were going to be allowed, even encouraged, to keep some of the visible trappings of their cultures such as music, dance and even language while they were expected to assimilate fully into Canadian political and economic life as if those areas were acultural. As a Citizenship Branch policy document titled "The Integration of Immigrants in Canada" put it in 1956

Integration...is used in Canada to express a theory which combines unity and diversity. The unity is sought in common principles of political philosophy and in participation in common citizenship. The diversity is maintained by reciprocal appreciation of diverse cultural contributions.

Later these "diverse cultural contributions" are defined as "religious observances, and social and cultural customs."161

Although official policy on integration during this period sounded culturally tolerant the assimilationist agenda is present. At the staff conference of the Citizenship Branch in 1951 when the concept of integration, as opposed to assimilation, was first raised the Regional Liaison Officer from Vancouver in referring to young (under 25) Chinese immigrants is reported to have said, "They must be given aid in understanding western ways -- they must be 'oriented occidentally'."162

Echoing Frank Foulds' sentiments from two decades earlier about
the desire of newcomers to assimilate, a publication aimed at preparing people for citizenship first published in 1965 and reprinted in 1967 includes the claim that immigrants "want to see how quickly the children become indistinguishable from the native-born boys and girls." Finally, a paper prepared by the Department of the Secretary of State for external release in 1970, almost 20 years into the era of integration, in extolling the work done with ethnic groups in the West asserted that

It might be reasonably claimed that if the Doukhobors were finally persuaded to send their children to school and to avoid conflicts with the law, it was due in no small measure to the efforts of Citizenship Branch field officers working in Western Canada.

In other words, Doukhobors were largely assimilated thanks to state policies and programs and the state is quite pleased with this.

A speech on Canada's refugee policy delivered by Ellen Fairclough, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, in 1959 illustrates the state's commitment to assimilation. In discussing refugees displaced by the Arab-Israeli War she said that Canada had been very generous in sending relief but "has not found it possible to take large numbers of the refugees themselves." The Minister's reasons for this inability to accept some of these refugees make it clear the government wanted people to come to Canada who could assimilate easily. She said,

Most of these unfortunate people would find it very difficult to settle happily in Canada because of the great difference in climate, economy and other conditions. Canada, experiencing pressure to take people from the
surplus population countries of Europe as well as European refugees, felt that this country could do more to help solve the whole refugee problem by selecting those who could establish themselves successfully in a northern climate that by admitting those who would find conditions strange and difficult and who would have little chance of a happy life.\footnote{166}

The assimilative aspect of state policy can also be seen in its relationship with Native people. In 1949 the Prime Minister, arguing that Indian Affairs belonged in the same department as citizenship, said,

\begin{quote}
\textit{it is the policy of all members of the House to have the Indian Affairs Branch administered in such a way as to bring the original inhabitants of Canadian territory to citizenship as quickly as that can be reasonably accomplished.}\footnote{167}
\end{quote}

Although this indicates concern for Native citizenship very early in the work of the Citizenship Branch, in fact, similar to the situation with bilingualism and biculturalism, the Branch did not "discover" Aboriginal Canadians in terms of policy and programs until sometime later. In the late 1950s it began to devote some of the attention previously directed at immigrants toward Native peoples. A key impetus for the state moving in this direction was a seminar held in Minaki, Ontario in August of 1958. Partly as a result of that conference the Branch extended its objectives in immigrant integration to include Native peoples, particularly those living off reserves.\footnote{168}

Again, one of the clearest indications that the policy of integration, in this case applied to Natives, was essentially assimilative came from the Minister herself. In a speech delivered in 1959 the Honourable Mrs. Fairclough spelled out the
government's position with regard to Native integration and particularly the role of education in that process. In the talk she stated that the "fundamental aim of the government's policy towards Indians is the gradual integration of our country's fastest-growing ethnic group into the Canadian community." She then went on to detail what this integration involved and how it could be fostered. Schools were the key component of the state's policy in this regard. "Good schooling is essential," the Minister contended, "if the Indian wants to move off the reserve into a society where he must adapt himself to a different and more competitive set of values." Schools were important in the assimilation process not only for the knowledge and skills they taught but for their potential to introduce children to the dominant culture at an early age. As the Minister explained, government policy was "to foster Indian education" but "to build as few Indian schools as possible." She continued,

In this apparent paradox lies the real progress of Indian education in the last decade - the growth of integrated schooling. The Indian Affairs Branch encourages integrated education in full realization of the benefits the Indian child gains by close association at an impressionable age with non-Indian children. A great many serious and responsible Canadians, both within the Indian Affairs Branch and without, have given this problem of the Indian much thought and study. They have to
agree upon one thing, at least, and that is that there is little future for the Canadian Indian unless he can be given the same educational opportunities, and thereby the same vocational opportunities, as other Canadians. These "same educational opportunities" are designed to have Natives take their place in the dominant culture to, in the Minister's words, "permit them to take their places, in industry, business and the professions, on equal terms with other Canadians." "For our own good as well as theirs," she continued, "they cannot be left outside the mainstream of the Canadian community." Lest this be mistaken for assimilation the minister made it clear that Indians "are a free people. They cannot and must not be coerced. If they do not choose to accept a program of integration we cannot force them into it." The Minister's assurances aside, obviously Natives are not "a free people" in any meaningful sense when the dominant culture determines what is in their best interests, structures educational institutions to break their connections with Native communities and teaches them new values consistent with the capitalist economy. The policy as described by the minister was clearly one of assimilation.

In the latter part of the 1960s some misgivings about this policy were expressed within the Branch. In a background paper for the annual conference in 1967 one official wrote that though Indian integration had been a priority of the Branch and programs targeted key Native leaders, they "were too dumb (or was it too smart?) to come out smelling like us." The policy remained fairly consistent, however, until at least the mid
1970s. There seemed to be a change at that point when the Native Citizen's Directorate of the Secretary of State had as its "overriding objective...to assist native people to identify their needs and actively to enhance their own development as Canadians." Not only did the language of this time reflect a transfer of autonomy but the structure of programs did as well. Instead of directly implementing programs more of the money was being transferred to Native organizations who could then develop the specific programs themselves. The Department maintained considerable control, however, as they continued to set criteria for funding and controlled which Native groups were funded. As I will show in chapter six, the state often used this kind of arrangement to get surrogates to carry out its policy objectives and those surrogates were seldom as autonomous as they seemed or would have liked to be.

On the face of it the announcement of the federal policy for multiculturalism in 1971 symbolized the end of assimilation. A close examination of the evidence, however, reveals that the practice of multiculturalism in the early years was consistent with the state's long practice of separating private and public life. Canadians were to be multicultural in their private lives but in the public, or civic realm all Canadians were to speak one of the two official languages, be good producers for the capitalist economy, and remain committed to public institutions as presently constituted.
In reality, Canadian multicultural policy was not new in 1971, its essence was expressed in 1957 in an issue of Citizen which contained a quote celebrating the contribution of immigrants to the arts and culture in Canada.

There is a greater variety of languages to be heard in the streets of our cities now than before the war. There are more varied tastes in food, literature, architecture, music, art and entertainment to be satisfied in Canada, and therefore an opportunity for a more varied and interesting collection of artists and craftsmen. I think this diversification brightens Canadian life, and I welcome it. I hope it will give many Canadians pleasure to live in this richer culture.

This emphasis on the "celebratory" aspects of multiculturalism which focus on drama, dance, art, music and food while largely ignoring more substantial cultural questions such as concerns about social and political structures dominated federal multicultural policy at least during the years under study here. For example, five areas are reported on under the Canadian Identities program in the 1975 annual report of the Secretary of State's Department and they are: Multicultural Festival; Theatre; Folklore; Literature; and Crafts. While there was growing state support for university programs in multicultural studies throughout the 1970s the most visible public programs in multiculturalism continued to be "folkloric" in nature.

A document on state programs in support of multicultural education published in 1983 seems to indicate a move away from this policy. "A folkloric, museum, group by group or one group approach to studying ethnicity should be avoided in favour of a more thematic study of ethnic groups, involving provocative and
challenging strategies for exploring social issues." It remains for others to determine the degree to which this rhetoric was realized in subsequent policy and programs, but certainly for the majority of the period under consideration here multiculturalism was relegated to the realm of private celebration while the state maintained a policy of the smooth and successful integration of people of various cultural groups into the civic and economic life of Canada.

As I have argued above, assimilation was only one half the state's plan for having Canadians get along, the other half was accommodation on the part of so called main stream Canadians. In the view of the state one aspect of this policy would not be effective without the other. As one Citizenship Branch officer wrote in 1947, 

Any plan for citizenship education can not separate these two groups [immigrants and Canadian-born] for no amount of work with the former will show positive results without the latter group being prepared to accept the newcomer into the community.

Exactly the same sentiment is expressed as Branch Policy in a 1970 document which reads, in part, "the Citizenship Branch recognizes that cultural and social integration of immigrants is impossible without the acceptance of the community." Again in 1976 this aspect of policy is reiterated in a Departmental discussion paper:

The Department of the Secretary of State besides having concerns with naturalization, and the preparation for it, also has certain more general responsibilities regarding the development of a receptive and tolerant Canadian society into which the immigrant may integrate smoothly and successfully.
Accommodation in this case does not mean substantial, permanent change but, rather, patience and participation. (Patience is required for the assimilation process takes time and participation by introducing immigrant neighbours to Canadian ways and organizations, would help speed the process up.) In the next section on the mechanisms used to implement this policy I will show that in addition to programs developed and set in motion to assimilate immigrants and Native Peoples, the state was active in programming designed to get Canadians to accommodate these people in the short term.

Any resistance to either aspect of the policy of assimilation and accommodation was portrayed as stubbornness or, more likely, ignorance. In addressing concerns about dissatisfied immigrants leaving Canada to return home the first director of the Citizenship Branch assured his minister that the problem was not large. "Ninety percent of them," he wrote, "are becoming assimilated so quickly to Canadian ways that approximately ten percent of the stiff necked and hard shelled ones are finding it hard to accept the actions of their fellows." Throughout these years ignorance was perceived by the state to be a far greater impediment to both assimilation and accommodation than was "stiff necked" hostility. The Honourable Ellen Fairclough illustrated this when she argued in 1959 that opposition from both the native and non-native communities to integrated schooling was the result of ignorance. In this case of the former she contended the opposition came
"from the Indian parents themselves who do not fully understand the objective of integrated schooling" (although it may have been that they understood far too well). Non-native parents, she went on to argue, opposed integration because of outdated fears about Native people as carriers of tuberculosis and as culturally backward. "Such misapprehension," she said, "ignores the advancement of the Indian in the past few years, his improved social conditions and his broadening horizons through newspapers, radio and television." In the view of the minister appropriate enlightenment would dispel the resistance of both groups. A key component of the citizenship education policies and programs of the state was to dispel the ignorance of those who resisted assimilation and accommodation through the mechanisms of contact and intercession.

Contact and Intercession: The Mechanisms of Getting Along

From the birth of the Citizenship Branch in the mid 1940s, through the subsequent four decades the state sought to shape attitudes consistent with creating social harmony and promoting the policy of assimilation and accommodation through the vehicles of contact and intercession. The essence of contact was "to encourage the intermingling of peoples and groups so that, out of such experiences, might come mutual respect and understanding," while the state's intercessory role was the dissemination "of objective information about cultural groups." The two most common vehicles for establishing
contact were travel and exchange programs of various sorts and conferences. Intercession was carried out primarily through a variety of publications and media presentations supported by the state. This combined effort of contact and intercession was described by one Branch Officer as "operation unity".  

In 1966 W.H. Agnew, the Chief of Programmes and Materials Division of the Citizenship Branch, described the centrality of travel and exchange programs to the state's policy of creating positive inter-group attitudes. In a section of his history of the Branch he wrote,

While the main theme of this section is, in reality, intergroup relations, the title Travel and Exchange is used, as the Branch regards this program area as, potentially, one of the most effective means now available for promoting better relations.

As early as 1947, Branch officials were proposing various forms of travel and exchange programs as vehicles to promote national unity and social harmony. During the 1950s these programs began in earnest "under the program heading of 'cultural tourism'" and later "Visites Interprovinciales." The stimulus that really caused travel and exchange programs to take off was planning for the centennial celebrations that began in the early 1960s. In 1961 the Chief of the Liaison Division of the Branch wrote a memo to all Liaison officers informing them that the Centennial Commission had already approved in principle the idea that the federal government would provide funding for travel and exchange programs that would see "as many as 50,000 young Canadians" visit other parts of the country.
between 1961 and 1967. After centennial year the Branch inherited the responsibility for travel and exchange from the Centennial Commission and it occupied an increasingly important part of Departmental programming. Annual reports of the Department of the Secretary of State show a growing commitment to these kinds of programs from 1969 when slightly over half a million dollars was reported spent to 1983 when over 14 million dollars was spent on exchange programs and almost 20 million dollars was allocated to Katimavik, a youth service and employment program that shared many of the strategies and goals of travel and exchange. Participation in travel and exchange doubled in those years from about 15,000 to 30,000 young people annually.¹⁹⁹

These programs took a variety of forms including camps or seminars where participants travelled from various parts of the country to a common location²⁰⁰ and various types of exchange visits which involved one group of participants travelling to the home of another group with a reciprocal visit taking place at a later time.²⁰¹ The focus of the exchanges varied from the very specific objective of Visites Interprovinciales to "promote better understanding between English and French-speaking Canadians"²⁰² to the more general goal of enabling "young people of various regions to know one another better" which was the intention of the Open House Canada program.²⁰³ Whatever the specific form or focus, all of the manifestations of travel and exchange sponsored by the state had the same overall purpose "to
strengthen national unity and promote a national identity."\textsuperscript{204} As examined in the next chapter, great claims of success, or at least potential success, were made for these programs even though they were not designed to take into account research findings on inter-group contact nor did the state conduct any substantial assessment of either the immediate or long term effects of any of these programs.

In his paper discussed above, W.H. Agnew makes it clear that conferences run directly by the Citizenship Branch or, more likely, sponsored through surrogate organizations were the second key aspect of the policy of promoting contact. "The Branch," he wrote, "has also sponsored numerous inter-ethnic conferences at local, regional and national levels which resulted in more positive and more productive relations between groups in Canada."\textsuperscript{205} Over the years the state sponsored hundreds of conferences designed to bring people from different cultural backgrounds together, teach them skills in "human relations" and thereby foster unity and tolerance. Citizen, for example, reports that the summer of 1955 was a busy time as a series of five conferences titled "Canadian Workshops in Human Relations" were held in various centres across the country.\textsuperscript{206} One of the Branch Liaison officers reported that the previous year had also been a busy one in this regard.

Working closely with leaders in the field of adult education, the Branch has assisted in organizing and conducting a number of regional conferences on citizenship and intercultural problems during the past year. These conferences were held at Mount Allison University, New
Brunswick; Camp Laquemac in Quebec; Lake Couchiching in Ontario and at the Banff School of Fine Arts in Alberta.

Emphasizing the value of contact the officer went on to write,

Typical of these seminars was the one held at Lake Couchiching where representatives of thirteen ethnic groups spent ten days living and working together on problems of interest to all. It is the opinion of the Branch that from such experiences will eventually come greater understanding between groups and wholesome respect for the traditions and culture of each group. 207

As this quote indicates adult educators, particularly those associated with the Canadian Association for Adult Education (CAAE), were key allies of the state in facilitating these conferences. Another key collaborator in terms of putting on conferences was the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews which through most of the 1950s and into the 1960s sponsored an annual citizenship conference for "young adult leaders" at the Banff School of Fine Arts. The purpose of these seminars was "to stimulate more effective citizenship in our cosmopolitan communities through a better understanding of our heritage." 208

The Citizenship Branch did more than provide funds to sponsor this conference. The pamphlet advertising the eighth annual conference in 1961 indicates that the keynote speaker was the minister, Ellen Fairclough, and that two of the conference resource leaders were liaison officers with the Branch. 209

Over the years literally dozens of ostensibly private organizations cooperated with the state in sponsoring both exchange programs and conferences. These included the YM-YWCA, service clubs, and the Canada Studies Foundation. In chapters five and six I will examine the role of surrogate organizations
in developing and implementing state policy and show that the state used its position both as financier and as provider of expertise to influence the form and agenda of both conferences and exchange programs run by surrogates. The state wanted to ensure the proper conception of citizenship was being inculcated in any of these fora.

In addition to direct contact as a vehicle for the state to promote its policy of assimilation and accommodation it adopted what might best be described as a priestly function of intercession. Part of the role of a priest is to act as an intermediary or an interpreter between people and God. In the hearing of confession, for example, the priest listens to the confessor's sins on behalf of God and then delivers God's requirement for penance to the sinner. In a similar manner the Citizenship Branch, and later the Department of the Secretary of State more generally, saw itself as the intermediary between various excluded groups (e.g. immigrants, Natives, minorities, and the disabled) and mainstream Canadians. This function was clear from the very beginning of work in this area. The original duties of the Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship established by the Ministry of National War Services in 1942 included the following:

(a) to maintain contact with Canadian citizens of non-British and non-French origin and to seek to interpret their points of view to the Government and to the Canadian public generally;

(b) to co-operate with the Director of the Bureau of Public Information in distributing news to the
foreign-language press in Canada and in explaining public policy as it develops;.....

(d) to encourage cultural activities which may promote mutual understanding and esteem between Canadian citizens of different origin;

(e) to interest itself in situations which appear to be producing misunderstandings, dissatisfaction or discord among groups of Canadian of European origin, non-French and non-British, or between these groups and other Canadian citizens and, if it is thought advisable to make representations with respect to such situations to the appropriate bodies or authorities.  

The Citizenship Branch inherited these duties from the committee and understood a central part of its ongoing mandate to be the interpretation of the needs and concerns of immigrants to Canadians and of Canadians to immigrants. Throughout the years the groups between which the state mediated changed somewhat but the spirit of the policy remained the same. For example, a proposed new Division in Inter-Community Relations in 1969 was to provide for "educating the public in relation to cultural differences between the two official language groups and to clarification of misunderstandings." The state used several means to accomplish its intermediary function. One of these was to develop close ties with ethnic organizations and particularly with the various ethnic presses across the country. The ethnic press was closely monitored and proved valuable "to Branch officers in interpreting the groups to the Canadian public" and conversely it was also a vehicle through which to communicate the concerns of Canadians or the state itself to immigrant groups. This monitoring was present from the beginning of the Branch's work and continued right
until the end of the period under study here. In 1980 the Secretary of State's Department reported that "the Ethnic Press Analysis Service monitored opinion trends and major events within Canadian ethnocultural communities through the analysis of more than 200 ethnic newspapers and periodicals in more than 30 languages."\(^{214}\)

In addition to the ethnic press the state used its own publications to get the message out. From its earliest days the Citizenship Branch sponsored a program of research and publication with regard to ethnic groups in Canada. In a section on publications at the first annual conference of the Branch in 1951 it was reported that "'The Chinese in Canada' and 'The Dutch in Canada' have been completed and 'The Italians in Canada' is practically completed. The next to be prepared will be on the Germans in Canada."\(^{215}\) This kind of work continued to be a significant part of Department policy. In 1980 it was reported that

As part of the on-going Ethnic Histories Project, the history of the Portuguese in Canada was published in French. Work proceed on the publication of Arab, Greek, and Norwegian histories. Manuscripts of the Chinese, Byelorussian, Hungarian, Welsh and Croatian histories were being evaluated and edited.\(^{216}\)

At a more popular level the Department, in cooperation with the Centennial Commission, published a booklet in 1967 called The Canadian Family Tree which contained short histories of many of the groups making up the population of Canada.\(^{217}\) For each culture the book covers background, early settlement, organizations, adjustments to life in Canada, contributions to
Canadian life, and religion, art and festivals. The journal Citizen was also used to communicate the experience of various groups in Canada as well as their contributions to the nation to a more general audience. Over the years the journal carried articles on the Belgians, Jews, Italians, Austrians, Finns, Hungarians, Japanese, Chinese, Germans, Ukrainians, Syrians, Poles, and others.

There was an abiding belief within the organs of the state "that most adverse attitudes owe their existence to myths about the 'other' cultural groups"\(^{218}\) and that "only through mutual understanding will all Canadians feel equally at home in Canada."\(^{219}\) If positive information could be disseminated about the various groups in the country social cohesion would be enhanced and inter-group problems would disappear. The depth of this faith is apparent in a story about a teacher's experience related by the regional liaison officer for Vancouver at the first annual conference of the Citizenship Branch. The teacher was teaching a class in which a small Italian boy was obviously strange and rather ashamed of his nationality. Mrs. Black [the teacher] took the opportunity to teach a lesson on the culture of Italy, and so improved the child's status amongst the other children by teaching them respect and admiration for Italy, that the changes in attitude were apparent the same day! \(^{220}\)

This almost naive belief in the power of positive information about various cultures to turn around negative attitudes is also evident in the publication The Canadian Family Tree and in the articles from Citizen discussed above. In both
these cases emphasis is placed particularly on what the various groups have contributed to Canadian history and contemporary life. The Swiss, for example, are credited with being hard working farmers, while the Métis are given credit for having acted as interpreters between Europeans and Natives during early settlement of the West.\textsuperscript{221}

Consistent with the state's focus on assimilation and accommodation many of the articles extol immigrants or other groups outside the mainstream who are acting like Canadians. For example an issue of \textit{Citizen} pointed out that

Among the many ethnic groups which comprise the population of Canada are the Negroes who, in an unobtrusive way, are contributing continually to the culture of the country. A few negroes have become celebrities but, for the most part, Negro citizens, like other Canadians, live quietly taking part in the community life in the areas in which they live.\textsuperscript{222}

Another issue of the journal celebrated the accomplishment of two Chinese Canadians in becoming part of mainstream Canada. One, Douglas Jung, became the first Canadian of Chinese origin to become a member of parliament and the other, Betty Chan, won the Gaelic Society's challenge trophy for Highland Dancing at the Winnipeg Highland games in 1956.\textsuperscript{223}

Sometimes members of ethnic communities are allowed to speak for themselves in these publications but it is almost always to celebrate some aspect of Canada or Canadian life as was the case with two Hungarians who wrote in \textit{Citizen} in 1957 and 1960. The first concluded that

while an immigrant has to work hard in Canada in order to establish himself in his new environment, he is certain to
obtain the reward for his efforts in being able to secure a pleasant and satisfied present, and a bright future for himself and his family.224

Three years later similar sentiments were expressed by the second writer.

Many Canadians like to think of New Canadians as contributing from their cultural heritage to Canada. But it seems to me that in order to make a true contribution the newcomer must work continually toward self-improvement, he must draw on spiritual resources instead of passively living on past glories and find a happy medium between enjoying material advantages and becoming a slave to material temptations. I also feel that the measure of truly being at home in Canada is when the newcomer ceases to take himself seriously and is able to criticize himself, with humour, rather than his surroundings.225

Articles like these seem to be directed both towards immigrants, to encourage assimilation, and towards Canadians to foster accommodation by assuring them that immigrants are trying their best.

When the Citizenship Branch returned to the Department of the Secretary of State in the mid 1960s the Department acknowledged that "the continuing role of the Branch is the development of inter-group and inter-regional understanding throughout Canada."226 This role was reconfirmed ten years later when "the Policy Branch was established with responsibilities for the Citizenship Sector. Among its first areas of attention were new program proposals for Group Understanding and Human Rights, and research and planning in the area of relations among ethnic groups."227 Indeed, the concern that Canadians get along was central to state citizenship policy from the 1940s to the 1980s. In order to develop attitudes consistent with the desire
to maintain social cohesion the state implemented a policy the substance of which was the assimilation of those outside the mainstream into middle class Canadian society and the accommodation of these newcomers by those already in. The principal mechanisms for implementing this policy were carefully controlled contact among groups and state intercession in order to interpret one to the other.

Voluntarism - Constructing an Approach to Citizen Action

Modern liberal democracies, of which Canada is one, "are based on the principles of political participation, self voted taxation burdens, the citizen army as the ultimate instrument of defence, and the like." Taylor points out that these principles sustain important elements of the modern identity, including "our status as citizens, in terms of which we collectively determine the course of social events." In other words, to maintain legitimacy a modern democracy has to involve its citizens in their own governance, or at least give the impression that it does.

Earlier, I argued that the Canadian state has been much less inclined throughout its history to foster wide citizen participation than its neighbour to the south. Former Prime Minister Joe Clark asserts that this has been the source of popular consternation (crises of legitimacy) about some initiatives in constitutional reform, including the defeat of the Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accords. The people, according
to Clark, felt excluded from the process and therefore they reacted with hostility.\textsuperscript{230}

The overt policy of the Canadian state throughout the period under study was to promote the widest possible citizen participation. In a paper given to a citizenship conference in 1961 Alex Sim, Chief of Liaison for the Citizenship Branch, wrote "In a democracy the citizen is the ultimate authority, an informed and active citizen is its promise of survival."\textsuperscript{231} Later that decade a director of the Branch wrote that

the Branch has the role of facilitating the full participation of all segments of Canadian society. In other words, to nurture social conditions which will make it possible for all Canadians to participate with some degree of equal opportunity, in the economic, political and social processes which are shaping the character of the Canadian nation.\textsuperscript{232}

Although rhetorically committed to wide citizen participation in "economic, political and social processes" the actual policies and programs of the state were designed to restrict the role of citizen more in line with the elitist conception of citizenship discussed in chapter two. The state's vision of participation was inherently conservative. It restricted the citizen's role to community service in the most orthodox sense of the term. This service was to be carried out through mainstream volunteer organizations which operated in a largely apolitical fashion. Attempts by citizens to agitate for political change or to operate outside of state sanctioned organizations were seen by the state as a threat and steps were taken to redirect the participation in appropriate ways.
Community Service: The Highest Order of Citizen Participation

Citizenship Branch Director Frank Foulds illustrated the central theme of state policy with regard to citizen participation when he wrote in 1945 about "the place of ethnic societies in the longer range Canadian picture." He argued that those societies are for recreational and cultural purposes and that their activities should not be political, either in a desire to settle the affairs of their homeland in Europe or to become pressure blocks on the Canadian government.233

In other words the participation of these citizens ought to be apolitical. Twenty five years later the Department remained committed to encouraging "immigrants and minority ethnic groups to take part in the social and cultural life of Canada"234 while leaving politics to the politicians.

This separation of the private (eg. recreation and culture) and the political along with the restriction of the role of citizens and their organizations to the former realm was a persistent aspect of state policy through the period being examined here and applied to all citizens not just those who were members of ethnic minorities. In a Citizenship Day address in 1956, the Hon. Roch Pinard, Secretary of State, said,

Every true citizen must realize that, in every sphere of his activity, he has his own responsibility towards the community and that it is his duty to carry out this responsibility at every level of action - personal, family, religious, social, educational, professional or labour. He must never forget that the greater freedom a man has, the greater is his responsibility.235

It is interesting that "every sphere of ... activity" for the minister did not include the political.
More than twenty years later the state's view that citizen participation ought to be largely apolitical had not changed. A publication of the Department of Secretary of State for those considering becoming Canadian citizens clearly spelled out a vision of citizen action consistent with this policy.

People in Canada choose many ways to change things for the better, like doing their jobs well and being devoted to their families, to name two of the most important ones. But there are many other things people do. They improve their school program by working as volunteers in the library; they improve recreation by teaching sports they know; they tell City Hall how to improve traffic; they serve as volunteer firemen in our smaller communities; and so on. It is important for each person to know what others want. They can do this by writing letters to the newspapers, or by joining organizations at their children's schools.²³⁶

While the booklet does go on to list five responsibilities and privileges of citizenship including voting and running for political office it concludes that section by stating

Nearly everyone agrees that the most important responsibilities of citizens are to do the jobs we have agreed to do, to respect the rights of others and to respect the law.²³⁷

Clearly a very conservative conception of the citizen's role.

This image of the citizen's role as one of community service within existing political and social institutional structures permeates state policy. In a submission to the British Columbia Royal Commission on Education (The Chant Commission) in 1959, Dr. W. G. Black, Regional Liaison Officer with the Citizenship Branch, presented a description of citizenship education that would emphasize, among other things, the development of self discipline, courtesy and a sense of
obligation to the community. In regard to the role of
citizenship education in fostering citizen action Dr. Black
wrote:

I believe then that it would be very important for teachers
to point out to their students that good citizenship is
partly shown by active participation in public service
projects, even if this only entails giving up one evening
once a month or even less frequently to such service
activities.\textsuperscript{238}

Even Alex Sim, the influential Chief of Liaison for the
Citizenship Branch, who was quoted above arguing that informed
active citizens were essential to the survival of democracy,
held a very narrow view of the citizen's role. Earlier in the
same speech in reflecting how the citizen's participation ought
to extend beyond what is required by law he wrote:

Doing what is compulsory is a small part of citizenship,
and the prevailing attitude seems to be that the good
citizen does what is compulsory, as if it were voluntary.
The other areas, which range from voting to keeping the
streets tidy, from being informed on public issues to
concern about the conservation of natural resources, are
largely untouched by the law.\textsuperscript{239}

Clearly the state's view of participation was consistent
with the elitist conception of citizenship which holds that
complex public issues are beyond the grasp of the average
citizen and therefore the chief obligation of citizenship is
informed voting for representatives who are better able to
understand the subtleties of the great questions of the day.
The booklet \textit{Human Rights} published by the Citizenship Branch in
1968 also illustrates this well. It calls for citizens to
inform themselves on public issues, but is rather cynical about
their ability to become knowledgeable enough to really understand possible solutions.

A citizen may not always know what is the wise decision for government leaders to make. Even the Members of Parliament lack the technical knowledge required for many of the decisions that have to be made today. But neither Parliament nor the people back home must ever lose the right to ask questions of government leaders and to investigate their decisions.240

This belief that most issues are beyond the ability of the average citizen is reinforced later when the pamphlet states, "We live in an age of specialization and it is beyond the power of the individual to make himself conversant with more than a few subjects or fields."241 The upshot of this is that participation is reduced to informed voting, or, at best, lobbying M.P.s.

Participating may mean voting at elections, expressing one's view on questions of community interest at meetings of voluntary organizations or community groups or perhaps through letters to the press or to one's member of Parliament.242

Consistent with this conviction that the most appropriate form of participation is in voluntary community service activities rather than in political action state policy was to stimulate wide public involvement in the volunteer sector.

Voluntarism: The Vehicle For Citizen Participation

In 1969-70 the Department of the Secretary of State received "a new and expanded Citizenship mandate" which included "the broad task of re-enforcing Canadian identity and unity and
improving citizenship participation." In regard to the latter part of that mandate the minister wrote,

The role of voluntary organizations in Canadian society is a crucial one in citizenship terms. It has been referred to recently in the sixth volume of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. We see such groups as major vehicles of citizens participation.

In affirming volunteer organizations as the primary vehicle for citizen participation, the minister was endorsing what had been state policy for years. In 1949 the Director of the Citizenship Branch described the close relationship between the Branch and a wide variety of volunteer organizations. He wrote that "There are many organizations in what might be called the general citizenship field, and they present a wide variety of programs." The Guide to Canadian Citizenship published in 1966 made it clear that participation through voluntary organizations was, in the eyes of the state, synonymous with democratic practice in Canada.

Voluntary action represents initiative and responsibility on the part of the individual citizen. A feeling of personal responsibility for our community and our country is at the heart of democracy. That is why voluntary organizations are closely related to the democratic way of life in Canada.

The state's continuing tie to voluntary organizations as an instrument of policy is clear in the close working relationship that developed in the late 1970s between the Department of the Secretary of State and the umbrella group "the Committee of National Volunteer Organizations whose members were elected from among nearly one hundred national volunteer agencies."
Volunteer organizations were convenient surrogates for implementing state policy in this area because they operated in a fashion consistent with the state's goal of defining participation in largely apolitical terms as service to the community. In describing the work of organizations connected with the Citizenship Branch in the forties, Frank Foulds wrote:

Some are concerned chiefly with adult education and by means of radio forums and regular meetings stimulate interest in the current important issues, thereby helping to keep democracy alive. Others are more interested in the service angle, the establishment of recreational facilities in the community, and so on. Still other organizations have been created to foster an interest in the Canadian arts.

While it must be acknowledged that the adult educators mentioned by Foulds were interested in stimulating citizen interest in civic and political issues, the emphasis was on producing informed citizens who would be able to vote intelligently and not on encouraging possible political action. The majority of the state's efforts over the years were focused on funnelling participation into the other areas of service and culture mentioned by Foulds. A major study of citizen participation carried out in the 1970s, for example, focused on participation in cultural activities outside of work time. The report stated that:

It is held to be a prerequisite to the proper functioning of a democracy that citizens participate freely and autonomously in discretionary activities and especially that they become actively involved in decisions affecting the quality of their lives.

Although this reads like a ringing endorsement of broad participation it is clear from the report that what is desired
is "wide participation in cultural expression" or, in other words, "cultural democratization."^{252}

In order to ensure participation remained on the relatively safe level of community service and cultural expression the state was careful to identify, support and work with mainstream, largely non-political organizations. In a 1956 letter Acting Citizenship Branch Director R. Alex Sim identified both "ethnic" and "non-ethnic" organizations with which the Branch had developed a close working relationship. Of the former he wrote "these organizations are usually of a religious, cultural or recreational nature," and similarly the latter included "religious organizations, service clubs, welfare and recreational organizations and official government organizations."^{253}

Citizenship Branch Director A.J. Cormier recognized in 1967 that the voluntary organizations with which the state worked represented mainstream, middle class values and that this often excluded some people from participating. He wrote,

It is necessary to continually face voluntary middle class organizations with the fact that they are living room, social, power, and prestige clubs so long as their efforts and programs do not result in bringing and ever increasing number of former non-participants into participation.^{254}

A report on travel and exchange programs published in 1971 was critical of both the government run Young Voyageurs program and those programs administer by voluntary organizations for favouring young people from a limited strata of society.^{255} The report contended that the Young Voyageurs had "a built-in bias
towards young persons who are supported by and sanctioned by traditional organizations” and in the grants to voluntary agencies "there was a bias towards long established organizations that are adept at lobbying for federal funds" including the Boy Scouts, YMCA, and the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews. There are many other examples of state supported programs for young people which focused on those who had already been identified as good citizens by the organizations involved.

The state recognized that voluntary organizations often catered to particular groups of people while excluding others, and regarded this as a problem. The solution adopted, however, was not to reach out beyond mainstream organizations to work with other groups and individuals but to push these organizations to include those who had previously been excluded. In doing this the state hoped not so much to widen and perhaps politicize the work of voluntary organizations as to equip them to reach out to excluded groups, bring them into the mainstream, and thereby channel participation in what it considered to be appropriate directions.

In the late 1960s, for example, there was growing concern within the state with youth alienation and lack of participation. A memo to Cabinet in 1969 expressed concern that disillusioned youth might resort to protest and perhaps violence. The proposed solution was not to consider youth demands, but to create and support programs "so that they can
constructively express themselves by facing the concrete challenges of real work of a socially useful nature." As one government official put it in a speech to the Social Development Commission of the United Nations, "we cannot be mere observers of uncontrolled outbursts of protest;" rather government has a responsibility "to give youth the opportunity for the health, education, and useful dignified employment, coupled with the opportunity for leisure time and recreational activity." Clearly social and political protest by young people was considered to be inappropriate participation by the state. This feeling was not limited to young people. A 1970 Cabinet Document, "Citizenship Policy and Legislation", included a section on participation and alienation:

The problem is that the level of alienation in the country is continuously rising and has already, in a number of instances, rendered the solutions of problems most difficult. The traditional formulas for citizen participation are no longer seen as adequate. What began as a movement of the dispossessed minority groups is spreading to other sections of the population including middle class citizens groups in opposition to urban renewal schemes, student, parent and teacher groups seeking greater control over the educational system. Tenants organizations and professional associations feeling alienated and oppressed by the rigid limitations of the present social order. Equally a source of concern is the fact that some of the new forms of citizen participation that are emerging place people against governmental agencies rather than with Government. (emphasis mine)

Appropriate citizen participation, it seems, did not include political action, protest, or opposition to government policies. This document goes on to propose that one solution to this growing alienation was to expand the number of social
development officers in the Department of the Secretary of State.

Their role would be to provide technical advice to voluntary action groups and associations and seek ways of promoting those methods of social action and community involvement most likely to yield the desired results and prove rewarding to both the citizen groups and the agencies expected to provide the services.262 (emphasis mine)

Consistent with past policy the solution was to use voluntary action groups to channel participation into forms acceptable to the state.

In his study of federal government involvement in public education Hodgson mentions the Challenge for Change program which was designed to involve citizens in political issues. He points out that while the civil servants involved were quick to encourage challenge to provincial programs or lack thereof, he reported "there is no evidence that any Challenge for Change group has ever challenged the policies of a single federal cabinet minister."263 The evidence examined for this study confirms that although state programs might encourage citizens to "think of any examples of shortcomings (a) in your community (b) in your province",264 or, to "keep in close touch with municipal affairs and to express [their] views on how such affairs are being conducted"265 they never encourage questioning of federal government policies or practices.

Although the Canadian state recognized in principle that democratic society is rooted in citizen participation, its policy was to limit that participation to various forms of community service within existing political and social
structures. Citizens were encouraged to participate in recreational, cultural and philanthropic activities but political participation beyond becoming informed about issues was actively discouraged by state policy and programs. The primary vehicle through which the state encouraged appropriate participation was mainstream voluntary organizations.

Conclusion

In 1965 John R. Nicholson, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, in a speech to the Canada Club Dominion Day Dinner in London, England said that in his lifetime he had seen Canadian identity "develop from the merest germ of an idea to an established fact." He spoke of the time when Canadian identity had a "British flavour" and, following that, the time "when, to be a Canadian was to be American more or less." "Those times," the minister assured his audience, "are past. Canadians today are neither British nor American." The minister went on to "say firmly and unequivocally that the Canadian union was never stronger, never more real, never more vital than it is today."

This minister's assurances notwithstanding, there has never been a time when the federal state in Canada has been convinced that the union is strong and unshakeable. The state has seen serious threats to national unity, social cohesion, and social stability, and therefore threats to its own legitimacy, in the
lack of sustaining and widely held national myths; in the
divisions among people of region, language, culture, race, class
and gender; and in the alienation of citizens from mainstream,
middle class society. In response to these perceived threats
the state developed and implemented a policy of citizenship
education designed to create national unity in both the
political and social realm.

Politically the state constructed and tried to impart three
successive national ideals: Canada as the land of conquering
pioneers; Canada as the bilingual and bicultural reality, and
Canada as the pluralist ideal. Each of these was a response to
particular social and political stimuli and each was promoted
not as a conscious policy choice but as a reflection of
objective reality. Consistent with the position that these
constructions represented the reality of Canada, resistance to
them was characterized as being the result of ignorance or
simply spite. It was expected that most Canadians, if properly
informed, would identify with the reality of the day.

State policy was designed to promote social cohesion and
harmony by helping Canadians to get along with each other and by
narrowly limiting citizen participation to community service.
The substance of the policy for getting along was to assimilate
marginalized groups, immigrants, natives, women, the disabled,
into mainstream society and to encourage mainstream society to
accommodate that assimilation by being both patient when it
seemed too slow and active in promoting it. Even policies such
as bilingualism and biculturalism and multiculturalism were essentially assimilationist in that they privatized culture and insisted that all citizens adopt a common political and economic identity as individual citizens of a capitalist economy. One writer has called this "ice cream cone pluralism." As with different flavours of ice cream, there are superficial differences like colour and taste, but beyond these superficial differences it is all ice cream. State policy has encouraged differences of dress, religion and even language but essentially it expects all citizens to be the same.

To promote its policy of assimilation and accommodation the state adopted the twin mechanisms of contact and intercession. It facilitated bringing people together in carefully controlled situations and disseminated so called objective information about various groups of Canadians to other groups. These two mechanisms were carefully designed to control contact and information so that it would always be positive and foster social stability while furthering the substance of the policy, assimilation and accommodation.

To further ensure social cohesion and the stability of the political and economic status quo, state policy supported a very narrow view of citizen participation. Individuals should be active in community service through a select group of mainstream voluntary organizations. Political action in the form of protest and opposition to government policy was construed as not only inappropriate but as dangerous and state policy actively
sought to channel such action into what it considered to be more appropriate forms of participation.

The policy described here is consistent with the very conservative notions of citizenship and citizenship education characterized as elitist in chapter two. It holds that all citizens ought to adhere to a single national identity which is undergirded with a common body of generally accepted information. This identity, at least in the public realm of politics and economics, ought to be adopted and adhered to by all citizens. Finally, it proposes a very limited role for the citizen, who is to have no real input into how political and economic institutions are structured. Citizens ought to participate in shaping their social world but leave the political and economic world to elected representatives and experts. Individual citizens need to be informed about political issues only to the degree that they need in order to vote intelligently.
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Chapter 5

Science and Survival
How the State Made Citizenship Policy

As we saw in the last chapter, between 1947 and 1982 the policy of the Canadian state in the area of citizenship and citizenship education was to unite all Canadians with a common national mythology; create social cohesion by having marginalized groups assimilate and mainstream groups accommodate; and foster citizen action in the voluntary, as opposed to the civic or political, sector. This policy construed citizenship in quite conservative and elitist terms and one might be tempted to see it as part of some grand design by a hegemonic state apparatus to limit the aspirations and opportunities of citizens in ways consistent with supporting the capitalist economy. Indeed, as I argued in the last chapter, capitalist economies depend, among other things, on the type of social unity and cohesion that the Canadian state sought to foster through its citizenship policy and economic stability and growth was an important factor driving state policy. To understand this policy only in terms of economics, however, would be to reduce it to a level of determinism that the evidence does not support. As Skocpol points out, modern scholarship on the state has advanced beyond Marxist and Neo-Marxist determinism to a more complex understanding of how states operate.¹ States, according to Skocpol, will often act to protect and extend their own bureaucratic interests quite
apart from economic concerns. "Autonomous state actions," she writes,

will regularly take forms that attempt to reinforce the authority, political longevity, and social control of the state organizations whose incumbents generated the relevant policies or policy ideas. We can hypothesize that one (hidden or overt) feature of all autonomous state actions will be the reinforcement of the prerogatives of collectivities of state officials.²

Consistent with this argument, a key aspect of policy making in the parts of the Canadian state concerned with citizenship was the maintenance and extension of bureaucratic territory. While officially the Citizenship Branch and the Department of the Secretary of State adopted a scientific approach to policy and presented the policy making process as detached and objective, most often the "science" involved was poor or nonexistent and policy was driven by the times, a need to carve out a niche within the federal bureaucracy, and the concerns of the surrogate groups which were instrumental in carrying out state policy. In other words, science was overtaken by survival.

Scientific Illusions: The Pretence of Policy Making

Scholars have written about the growing tendency of the state to subsume private interests in this century and thus play a greater role in the definition of, and the search for solutions to, social problems.³ Holzner and Marx, for example, trace the dominant conceptions of the State in the history of the United States. The state, they argue, began small providing
large amounts of private space for individuals to operate in and was seen largely as an adjudicator of disputes. With the increasing complexity of society that came with industrialization and urbanization the state began to play a greater role as a regulator of business excesses. The depression saw the beginning of the social welfare or "bureaucratic state." It is in this phase that Holzner and Marx, as well as Coleman, argue that the state became a prime mover in the area of policy research. As the state assumed more and more responsibility for the welfare of individuals on a national scale there was a need for it to have information upon which to operate. Furner and Lacey document the substantial growth of state research functions in both Britain and the United States during this period pointing out that by the late 1970s "Washington was spending about $2 billion annually on the acquisition and 'application' of research on social conditions." This growth occurred at a time when policy research was coming into its prime as positivist social science and the state turned to social scientists to provide answers to thorny social problems. State driven and funded research is largely responsible for the significant growth of the field of policy research.

During the period 1947 to 1982 the Canadian state was a significant producer, funder, disseminator and consumer of research related to the many facets of citizenship and citizenship education including: Canadian history, particularly...
the history of immigrant and minority ethnic groups; immigrant adjustment to Canada; racism and race relations; multiculturalism; the effectiveness of various citizenship enhancement programs; and language teaching and acquisition. Amongst all of the parts of the state bureaucracy the Citizenship Branch saw itself as a leader in the production and use of "scientific" knowledge in the service of policy. The Chief of the Programmes and Materials Division of the Branch wrote in 1966 "that the manner in which the Branch chose, in its formative years, to discharge its responsibilities through the systematic application of social science theory has since been adopted by a number of agencies."

This commitment to research is seen in the bureaucratic structures of the Branch in the early 1950s when it began to appear as a separate heading in annual reports. A 1954 statement on the Research Division of the Branch noted that it had two functions; "(a) to provide information or knowledge on which policy may be based; and b) it may be expected to plan or undertake research designed to test or assess existing programs." Over the years the division responsible for research had various names including the "Strategic Planning Division" and "Policy, Planning and Priorities" but the dual purpose of using research to inform policy and assess programs remained essentially the same.

The bureaucratic structures mentioned above are reflective of one aspect of this scientific approach to policy making; the
separation of policy from program. In this view the sector of the Branch responsible for policy research is separate from the sectors responsible for programming and provides research information and policy advice as a service to them. The description of the Policy Branch in the 1975 annual report of the Department of the Secretary of State provides a good example of this. According to the report this Branch "provided the policy development, research, evaluation and related service required by the Citizenship Sector, and in particular by the Programs Branch."  

The Policy Branch was divided into three units "Policy Development, Policy and Priorities Planning (often referred to as 'Research'), and Policy and Program Analysis ('Evaluation')." This separation of policy research from program development and implementation, as well as the further division of the policy process into discrete, isolated segments (development, research, evaluation) is consistent with the scientific orientation to policy making, which holds that research can and should be objective and linear and policy can be made based on that research in a detached and disinterested manner.

Along with relying on its own capacity to scientifically make policy the state often consulted with outside experts to help in this process. For example, in 1970 Assistant Under Secretary of State, Bernard Ostry, asked the Rand Corporation for help in research on developing Department programs. He wrote,
As you know, the target groups for citizenship programs are ethnic minorities (Indians, Eskimo, Métis, etc.), disadvantaged youth, low-income families, the aged, the disabled, in other words, all those who, for economic, geographic social or personal reasons of age, sex, state of health, etc. have become alienated from the main stream. We have an opportunity now to develop a strategy for reaching, involving and eliciting feedback and responses from these sectors. We want to approach all of this systematically and so we are turning to the 'Systems Mecca'."\(^1\)

Clearly, Ostry's belief was that if the right systematic (read scientific) approach were adopted department programs were sure to be a success. This belief was not new. In a 1957 memo to the Director of the Citizenship Branch the Chief of the Research Division, Frank Vallee, wrote, "Experience in many government agencies has demonstrated that findings gathered in a systematic way contribute materially to planning and operations."\(^1\)

Along with research on specific issues and programs there was a belief within the state that its officials needed a strong background in social science generally in order to develop and implement sound programs. In a 1963 memo to the Deputy Minister, Branch Director Jean Legassé wrote that Branch staff is "chosen from graduates in one or more of the Humanities or Social Sciences and is expected to maintain its contacts with the professional literature and associations with others in Canada working in these fields."\(^1\) Mr Legassé reiterated his point three years later: "Branch management has always tried to draw its inspiration from the professional literature about the dynamics of social change."\(^1\)
This effort to keep staff abreast of current social science theory and practice was clear in the 1967 staff conference for the Citizenship Branch. The Branch arranged for well known Canadian sociologist Dr. John Porter to attend the conference as "a competent outside resource to help us achieve our goal of having the staff gain an understanding of the forces shaping Canadian society." In addition to inviting Dr. Porter, the organizers also distributed "copies of his most recent writings" to staff and suggested that all participants "acquire and read your own copies of the 'Vertical Mosaic'."

Along with Dr. Porter the Branch invited a professional evaluator to assess the conference. Dr. T.J. Mallinson, Chairman and Director of Communications Studies at Simon Fraser University, not only enjoyed the conference personally but provided a ringing endorsement of the Branch's goals when he wrote that it represented

a very important step towards the fusion of the skills and resources of the practitioner and the social scientist. This is a gap which badly needs bridging in toway's (sic) world; we may not have met all expectations but I believe you and your staff should be congratulated on both your courage to make the step and the extent to which you involved so many of your own resources in designing and implementing the program.

Bureaucrats familiar with the latest social science would, it was assumed, be able to take a systematic approach toward solving social problems. This approach is outline in a 1971 memo to the Director of Strategic Planning as the "negative orientation" to planning, which advocated rewriting state
goals in terms of problems and then adopting a problem solving approach to policy. The memo explains;

The negative approach begins with the transposition of the problem of policy implementation into terms that refer to our existing situation; therefore, the negative approach is action-oriented. It does not leave us speculating about a utopian society, out of touch with reality and, consequently, impotent and looking rather silly.\(^\text{23}\)

This linear approach was not new to the Citizenship Branch in 1971 and is clearly illustrated in a policy statement on ethnic participation written a year earlier which said that "the role of the Citizenship Branch is to identify those groups which, by reason of their ethnicity, are prevented from participating fully in our society and to devise programs that will assist their progress toward full participation."\(^\text{24}\) The document goes on to propose various research projects which will contribute to identifying problem areas, as well as to policy and program development. In general terms this approach can be summarized as a series of steps to which various forms of scientific knowledge can contribute: identify the problem; plan solutions; implement programs; assess progress.

The public pronouncements of the state indicate this was the preferred approach. Many statements claim evidence for the problems that citizenship policy was being designed to address and establishing a link from the identified problem to the programs which offered solutions. As was shown in the last chapter, for example, the state consistently claimed to have evidence that Canadians are deeply divided by region, ethnicity, race and language. This problem preoccupied the Citizenship
Branch and its successors from its beginnings. In 1983, for example, the Department of the Secretary of State reported that there were "indications of increasing racial tensions in Canada" and this was justification for making race relations a priority in the Department. The state not only identified division between and among groups as a central social problem in Canada, it also decided that a major contributing factor to this program was ignorance of others. Over the years programs like Travel and Exchange, Official Languages Education, and Canadian Ethnic Histories have been touted as vehicles to help Canadians get to know one another and, consequently, get along. As one document claims, "drawing from social science theory and practice, Branch officers seek to help resolve conflicts arising within ethnic communities and between them." 

Through the 1970s there was a growing interest within the state in the evaluation of programs. In addition to claiming scientific evidence for problem identification and policy development, the state also claimed, publicly at least, the evidence indicated that many of their programs were successful. The Department of the Secretary of State reported for example that elementary-level French immersion, has proved very successful and with regard to the Francophone-Anglophone Relations Program, "the impact of inter-group communication, created by these projects, resulted in a greater awareness within the majority of the aspirations of the minority group." No state program had more expansive claims made about it than
Travel and Exchange. Even before its heyday in the post centennial year period, one Citizenship Branch officer wrote, "There is a growing weight of evidence that the exchange of visits between persons from various regions of Canada is contributing substantially to greater understanding between groups and the development of a greater sense of unity."30

Despite over 20 years of officially taking a scientific approach to making policy as well as designing and assessing programs the Minister responsible for citizenship in a lament to his cabinet colleagues in 1970 wrote,

The problem is that we always attempt to tackle social problems when it is almost too late. We should be forewarned and prepared. When the problems have taken solid roots the cost of solving them is often prohibitive and the disruptive factor a nuisance and the accompanying human misery most unfortunate. Yet the social and behavioral sciences have made much progress in the last two decades. They have produced data and insights that could be of valuable assistance in analyzing the social health of a nation. Their potential has hardly been tapped.31

The Minister's comments indicate two things: a continuing belief that policy can and should be made in a scientific manner; and, an admission that, despite all of the claims and rhetoric, the state had not made or assessed policy in this manner.

The evidence bears out the latter point. Despite its commitment to scientific policy making the federal state was a poor practitioner. From problem identification through to program assessment little if any of the state's policy decisions were based on solid research. For example, although the state often claimed a crisis in relations among groups of people: immigrants and Canadians in the 1950s; French and English in the
1960s and 1970s; and various cultural groups in the 1970s and 1980s, these impressions are supported in the documents by anecdotal evidence alone. No serious research was undertaken to establish whether these problems existed, let alone to further delineate and specify them as to groups and regions.

Not only were problems not identified scientifically, there is acknowledgement at the highest levels of the state bureaucracy that, far from being carefully planned and fitted together "the work of the Citizenship Branch has grown up piecemeal over the years." 32 The youth policy of the late 1960s is a good example of this. The Citizenship Branch, with some fanfare, created a Youth Services Division on August 1, 1967, hired Ted Sexsmith away from the YMCA in Vancouver to run it, and then, in May of 1969, the Director of the Branch wrote in a memo to staff "I am sorry to inform you that effective April 1, the Youth Services Division was dissolved because of lack of authority and funds to implement a youth policy." 33

Shortly after the Division was terminated the government approved more than a quarter million dollars to conduct a study of the "aspirations, attitudes, and needs of youth, and of the government's present role in this area." 34 The Committee on Youth was formed to oversee the study and released its extensive report in 1971. 35 Although the report is probably one of the better examples of social science research conducted by the state, none of the recommendations were implemented. One of the goals of the study, for example, was to bring some coordination
to existing federal programs for youth (the study reported over 80 programs within 20 departments) but later studies documented the same diversity.  

The case of Travel and Exchange is also an interesting example. The background notes for a memorandum to cabinet on citizenship policy and legislation in 1970 claim, "One law in human relations is that when contacts between individuals are rewarding, the more extended or frequent they are, the more strongly they cement the relations between the individuals concerned." This "law in human relations" led the Minister to propose to his colleagues "a substantial expansion of the Travel and Exchange program" as one of a number of "special measures to unite the country and give each segment a sense of belonging to the whole."  

In fact, a substantial amount of social science research had been done at this time on the effects of various kinds of contact, particularly between people of different ethnic groups, and, rather than supporting the "law" that contact increases understanding, the results had been mixed. The Citizenship Branch seems to have ignored the research on contact and did not even follow its own criteria for success mentioned above. Travel and exchange programs did not allow for extended or frequent contact (most participants went once for no more than a week).  

In his 1988 study of Federal involvement in public education Hodgson argued that many government programs in
language, culture, social services and law "have an impact upon the schooling of children" but no studies have been done to assess their impact. Later in his report, Hodgson comments on assessment of federal programs more generally: "It is an extraordinary fact of our federal government's life that it spends billions through both unconditional and conditional grants—transferring moneys to governments, organizations, groups and individuals—but the amount of money spent studying the results of such fiscal transfers scarcely amounts to thousands." An example of questionable assessment practice is a report on the Young Voyageurs Program in 1972. One aspect of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of trips to Ottawa that were part of the program. In order to do this, the researchers gave participants a Likert-type questionnaire asking them to rate several facets of their experience. Students liked the trip and according to the report "the questionnaire comments clearly show that Parliament was the high point of the visit and it seems reasonable to suppose that other young Canadians 15 to 17 years of age do have this lively interest in the political system of the country." Over 70 percent of the students "agreed that the visit strengthened their identity as Canadians." The first claim is rather dubious at best (it is a large leap from several hundred students reporting that they enjoyed a visit to the Parliament Buildings to the supposition that most teenagers have "a lively interest in the political
system of our country") and the second, as it is reported with no elaboration on what is understood by identity, is meaningless. As was recognized by one Citizenship Branch official in 1967 any meaningful assessment of the real goals of travel and exchange (enhanced national identity and understanding) would require long term detailed follow up of participants.\textsuperscript{45} There is no evidence this work was done.

It is not surprising that state policy making in citizenship did not live up to its scientific billing. Academic literature is full of laments that policy research does not have much affect on policy making and much work has been done to try and explain this.\textsuperscript{46} Several analysts, for example, have explored the idea that researchers and policy makers do not communicate well because they operate from different world views, or, as one has written, they each have their own "disciplinary matrix."\textsuperscript{47} Gwiazda argues that these two groups work within different parameters and have different needs and expectations with regard to the results of policy research. Policy makers usually operate in a political context where quick, simple, and workable solutions are appreciated (as well as solutions which will fit their particular agenda). As Lacey and Furner point out, reflection on policy within the state is not "a quiet carefully focused intellectual exercise that follows rigid rules"; rather "necessary reflection takes place in a busy public setting, in a swelling, information rich environment fed continually by many interested parties, all
intending to have some bearing on the activities of government. Researchers, on the other hand, work in the more protected environment of the university and are, in theory at least, hoping to increase knowledge not necessarily to provide the quick, workable solutions that policy makers need. Webber suggests that the gap between the two groups has grown so wide that "the opportunity for interdisciplinary-matrix communication and exchange within the policy making process does not, of course, suggest that meaningful communication of ideas will take place nor that information provided by the other community will be considered." Without changes in interactions between researchers and policy makers, Webber suggests that "there is little reason to expect the use of policy research to increase in the future."

A related problem to the one discussed above is a significant lack of understanding by policy makers themselves about how policy is really made. Weiss illustrates this problem in her study of the way senior managers in the mental health professions made use of research in policy decisions. Weiss sums up the findings of her research in two main points. First, policy makers make almost no direct and instrumental use of research findings, rather "research knowledge usually affects the development and modification of policy in diffuse ways. It provides a background of empirical generalizations and ideas that creep into policy deliberations." (emphasis in the original) Second, policy decisions are rarely made "in brisk
and clear cut style." Almost none of the managers which were interviewed thought they made decisions. In most cases rather than a single, final decision

the onrushing flow of events shape an accommodation-and pattern of behaviour—that has widespread ramifications. It may in time be ratified by conscious policy action, but in the crucial formative stages, it just seems to happen. Without conscious deliberation the policy accretes. (emphasis in the original)

Policy makers within the parts of the Canadian State responsible for citizenship and citizenship education faced all of these issues. They worked in a very political environment where protecting and extending bureaucratic turf as well as responding to contemporary political conditions were seen to be essential considerations in policy making. Because of the nature of their work and the lack of human resources, they had to rely on surrogate organizations to help develop and implement policy and this often resulted in political struggle for control and credit as well. Finally, in Weiss' words, "the onrushing flow of events" often seemed to effectively take policy making out of the hands of those involved and leave it to chance.

Politics and Survival: The Reality of Policy Making

In 1970, a columnist for a Winnipeg newspaper wrote a sarcastic attack on federal policy with regard to increasing financial commitment to travel and exchange programs and particularly the evidence used to justify it. After considering the reasons given by federal officials, Maurice Western wrote,
It is difficult to see how anyone could take exception to these observations. The benefits of travel are well known. There is testimony on the subject from leading thinkers all the way back to Herodotus; so much so that Mr. Stanbury's [Minister without portfolio responsible for citizenship] workers have been able, with a minimum of research, to produce all sorts of persuasive quotations for use in departmental handouts.55

Western went on to poke fun at Mr. Stanbury's portfolio in general claiming he had nothing substantial to do, calling him "a minister of odds and ends", and arguing that travel and exchange programs were part of his attempt to build an "empire."56

Like the well known comedian Rodney Dangerfield, the Citizenship Branch did not seem to be able to get any respect either from newspaper columnists or other parts of the state bureaucracy. Citizenship and citizenship education, as I explained in chapter one, are elusive concepts and this made the Branch's work hard to explain to others. One external consultant to the Branch acknowledged this in 1970 when he wrote, "the nature and purpose of citizenship are so difficult to define."57 This, in his view, was responsible for some of the confusion about the Branch's role.

The role of the Citizenship Branch was not clear to other parts of the bureaucracy including other branches of the very ministry that contained the Branch. A memorandum to Cabinet in 1953, for example, takes pains to correct the false impression in the minds of "some high officials of the Government" that "the functions of the Branch did not extend beyond work with newcomers and so-called 'ethnic groups'."58 Frequently, the
Branch had to take pains to distinguish its work from that of other sectors of the bureaucracy including: the Departments of Labour, Immigration, and Indian Affairs as well as from its close cousin the Citizenship Registration Branch. It had overlapping responsibilities with each of these areas, for example, the Citizenship Branch had responsibility to provide citizenship education programs for immigrants to get them ready for the citizenship registration process which was the responsibility of the Citizenship Registration Branch. It was not always clear where one mandate ended and the other began. A series of meetings was held in 1964 between representatives of the Citizenship and Indian Affairs Branches to deal with misunderstandings and overlapping areas of responsibility. As part of that process Jean Lagassé, Director of the Citizenship Branch, wrote to his counterpart in Indian Affairs, "I feel it is important that the role of the Citizenship Branch be more clearly defined not only in relation to your Branch but in relation to Immigration and Citizenship Registration." That same year the Acting Director of the Immigration Branch wrote to Lagassé, "There is no doubt that many of our officers do not have a clear conception of the responsibilities of the Citizenship Branch or of your many activities which are closely related to this service."

Its tenuous place in the bureaucracy was confirmed when in the process of Government reorganization in the mid 1960s the Citizenship Branch did not know until virtually the last minute
where it would be going when the Department of Citizenship and Immigration folded. When it returned to the Department of the Secretary of State in 1966 the Branch took great pains to explain itself to its new colleagues, establish its importance, and stake out legitimate territory.

The Citizenship Branch inspired both external and internal confusion. Consistent with Weiss's analysis, Branch policy seemed to accrete in an unconscious or, as one internal document describes it, "topsy-turvy" fashion. From a tight focus on immigrant integration in its early years, the Branch listed nine separate program areas in its annual report of 1967 and continued to expand through the 1960s and 1970s. Most of this happened without any new government directive being given the Branch, it had moved out on its own and by the mid 1960s even its own staff was not sure what its mandate was and argued that:

Time has come for the government to give new direction, either by recognizing the new role which the Branch has espoused on its own initiative, by instructing that the Branch return to its initial mission, or by formulating some completely new instructions.

This impression of rather aimless wandering was confirmed by an outside evaluator who severely criticised the Branch in a 1969 memo to the Director. "Since its existence," the evaluator wrote, "the Branch appears to have operated without any firm government mandate." J. A. Morrison argued that the lack of a mandate has forced the Branch into a situation where it is groping for new programs and clutching at anything which will ensure it continues as an entity. Consequently, in recent years, we have seen the sudden appearance and demise of activities such as 'Youth' and 'French-English relations'.
Despite assurances in a 1984 Departmental history that the Department of the Secretary of State was not, as had been suggested, a "grab bag of disparate programs" but rather a key player in the systematic development of social policy, the evidence suggests this kind of ad hoc policy development continued. In addition to expanding to take on new responsibilities for bilingualism and biculturalism, multiculturalism, human rights, women, and the disabled, the Department, and specifically the citizenship sector, underwent several reviews and reorganizations from the late 1960s, through the early 1980s. New mandates included significant reorganization and new overall objectives in 1970-71 and 1980-81. Much of this was done on an ad hoc basis with the so-called new mandates simply recognizing areas of responsibility already adopted by the citizenship sector. In its policy making the Department and the Citizenship Branch had taken seriously the warning it received in 1969 that "without a mandate, the very existence of the Branch is in peril." The prime motivator in policy making in the citizenship sector was carving out secure territory within the state.

One strategy the Citizenship Branch used to try to establish a significant niche was to cast itself as coordinator of broad areas of the state's work. From the beginning the Branch sought to become the coordinating body for all citizenship work whether it be carried out by other government departments, provincial governments or private voluntary
organizations. Throughout these years, however, the Branch encountered much resistance to this from other sectors involved in citizenship work. The Canadian Citizenship Council (CCC), for example, which was "a federation of the nine Provincial Departments of Education and twelve national organizations concerned with education" saw itself in 1948 as the "national co-ordinating agency and 'clearing house'" for all governmental and non-governmental work in citizenship. Almost twenty years later the CCC reported that "the Council has been a useful co-ordinating agency for the various Canadian national organizations and community associations which are engaged in education and action for citizenship." The Citizenship Branch almost certainly would have described its role over the same period in precisely the same terms.

A specific example of the Branch's attempts to establish itself as co-ordinator of national activities in citizenship was its efforts to establish its leadership in the area of youth programs. From 1947 to the mid 1950s the Branch tried several times to convince the government to allocate funds to a youth centre or camp to be constructed near the national capital. Many private organizations involved in youth programming had expressed an interest in such a facility and the Branch saw it as "an excellent opportunity for co-ordination of all citizenship programmes for youth." As we shall see later, the Branch was often concerned with its lack of control over the surrogate organizations. Part of the reason for its support for
the proposed youth facility was to establish a mechanism to solidify Branch leadership in this area. As the Director put it in 1954, "the work of the Canadian Citizenship Branch [will be] strengthened if a national citizenship centre were established." The Branch failed in its efforts, however, as such a centre was never built.

In 1967 the Branch attempted to establish itself as the coordinator for youth policy and programs with the bureaucracy of the federal state. The impetus for this was the Report on Juvenile Delinquency released that year by the Solicitor General. The Citizenship Branch, through its new Director of the Youth Services Division, Ted Sexsmith, invited all of the other federal departments with an interest in youth to a conference organized by the Branch in January 1968 to determine the departments' reaction to the report. Writing to the Undersecretary of State the Branch Director outlined the real purpose of the conference. "This meeting," he wrote,
can assist the Branch in developing its leadership role in the area of social policy, particularly in light of the proposed demise of the Special Planning Secretariat. We hope the Youth Division will be seen as serving the role of coordinator for youth activities in the federal government to a much greater extent as a result of this conference."

While Mr. Sexsmith thought the conference was reasonably successful, some senior people within government service were not happy with the Branch's attempt to establish leadership in this area. The Privy Council Office was a source of particular resistance to the initiative because, in Sexsmith's view, officials there wanted to take the lead in the youth area."
follow up conference was organized for March 25-26, 1968 and
Sexsmith reported a general easing of tensions at that meeting.
He wrote,

I sensed most of the people present accepted the role of
the Secretary of State's Department even though Butler [of
the Privy Council Office] kept saying the co-ordinating
role had not yet been established by the 'Policy Makers'.80

Plans were made to continue with more meetings but it was
obvious by the summer there was little will to proceed and the
Youth Services Division itself was terminated the following
spring effectively ending the Branch's effort to establish its
leadership in this area of state policy.

Perhaps the most comprehensive attempt to establish itself
as the co-ordinator of a broad area of state policy and programs
was the Citizenship Branch's move to change its name in the mid
to late 1960s. The name change was first raised in 1965
ostensibly in an effort to clear up confusion. As one
preliminary document put it, "The designation of 'Citizenship'
should be abandoned as it leads to confusion with the
Citizenship Registration Branch of this Department."81 The same
document proposed possible new names including: "Community
Services Branch, Social and Cultural Affairs Branch, and
Community Planning Branch."82 Two years later the proposal was
formalized in a request to Treasury Board which spelled out 12
possible new names, with special emphasis given to two:
Community Services Branch; and Social Development Branch.83
Again, the principal reason given for the change was to avoid
confusion with the Citizenship Registration Branch as well as to
provide for a name that better described the nine program areas of the Citizenship Branch. The request for the change was denied largely because the suggested names were seen as too general and as applying to the work of other departments.

The Citizenship Branch was engaged in more than an exercise to clear up confusion. The Branch attempted to establish its "role as a social development agency" and become the recognized leader in this very broad area. When the attempt was repeated in 1968 with a suggestion the Branch "should be renamed Social Development Branch" and be given authority over eight specific program areas it was rejected. The Secretary of the Treasury Board portrayed the request as an attempted power grab by the Branch, a way to extend its territory in an indirect manner. He wrote,

If functions such as those referred to are going to be assigned to the Citizenship Branch, it seems to me that it should be as a result of a conscious policy decision of the government itself, and not result merely from a departmental, - or even a Treasury Board - decision to reorganize the structure and up-grade the positions of the Citizenship Branch.

When the request went to Cabinet a month or so later the name change was not approved and the attempt of the Branch to redefine itself in that way was thwarted.

Although these attempts to cast itself as the coordinator for large areas of state policy and programming were largely unsuccessful, they did not represent the only attempts by the Citizenship Branch to secure a prominent place in the bureaucracy. Throughout the 1940s and 1950s Branch staff
frequently expressed frustration that the bulk of their work was focused on immigrant integration and little time was left for more general citizenship concerns. The moves in the areas of social policy generally and youth policy in particular discussed above were largely unsuccessful attempts to broaden the Branch's work in this way. The Branch was, however, far more successful in another strategy for expanding its territory in citizenship policy and programming. In two pivotal cases the Branch quickly recognized an emerging area of significant state policy, attached itself to the area at the beginning of the process of policy formation, and positioned itself as the state agency most suited to inheriting long term responsibility for policy and programs in the area. The two cases were the work of the Centennial Commission and the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (B and B Commission) which carried out their mandates over the decade between 1959 and 1969, but which left the Citizenship Branch, and the Department of the Secretary of State more generally, an enduring legacy. This legacy had a determinant effect on policy and programs in the citizenship sector.

In neither of these cases was Citizenship Branch involvement secured without a struggle. As early as May 1959 the Director of the Branch was concerned about a rumour that responsibility for centennial planning would be assigned to the Hon. Alvin Hamilton, Minister of Northern Affairs. In a memo to his Deputy Minister Laval Fortier worried that the Branch would
be left out of the loop altogether, a possibility that he found unacceptable. "I cannot envision," he wrote, "the situation where the Citizenship Branch would not play a key role in the developments that are bound to come." Fortier went on to play the trump card that the Branch would use with both the Centennial Commission and the B and B Commission to ensure influence. "We alone have all the contacts [with non-governmental organizations] at our finger tips." Both of these commissions depended on wide participation by citizen groups and the Branch used its contacts with these groups as an enticement to gain influence.

Early that summer Fortier reported to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration that the Citizenship Branch had already begun to mobilize non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and asked the Minister to make the case for an interdepartmental committee within the bureaucracy to plan for the centennial. He argued that as "the advisory and liaison agency of the Government in the promotion of citizenship projects, including the observance of national holidays," the Branch ought to have an important role to play on such a committee. Several days later the Minister forwarded Fortier's suggestions to her cabinet colleague, Mr. Hamilton, and in December of that year the first Interdepartmental Meeting on Canada's Centennial was held, including representation from the Citizenship Branch.

Even then the Branch's position was not as secure as it might have thought. During the spring of 1960 Branch Director
Fortier received a memo from the Clerk of the Privy Council detailing four interdepartmental working groups established under different ministries to work on developing centennial projects. The four committees were: Historical Projects; Ceremonial Matters; Cultural Aspects; and Administrative. The Department of Citizenship and Immigration was invited to send representation to two, Ceremonial Matters and Cultural Aspects. Fortier responded to the Clerk by naming the proposed representatives from the Department to the two committees and by strongly making the case that the Department deserved representation on all four committees. He argued that the Citizenship Branch had produced historical materials in the past and because of this "could be of assistance if it were represented on this particular group." He went on to point out that other Departments had more representation and wrote, "like Northern Affairs and Natural Resources, we would be prepared to serve on all four groups." Very shortly after this Mr. Fortier received a reply from the Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet agreeing to Departmental representation on all four committees.

Two years later the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and the Citizenship Branch in particular had to fight this battle all over again. In August 1963 a new Interdepartmental Committee on 1967 Programme was formed and the original terms of reference included no representation from Citizenship and Immigration. This caused great consternation
within the Citizenship Branch with the Chief of the Liaison Division noting that the Department of Citizenship and Immigration was the only original member of the 1959 Interdepartmental Committee not reappointed to the new committee. She went on to write that "it is most urgent that the Department request membership on this new Interdepartmental Committee."  

During the two years preceding the formation of this new committee the Citizenship Branch had been actively encouraging the many voluntary organizations with which it worked to become involved in planning centennial projects and it did not hesitate to play the contact card again. In a memo requesting the Acting Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to intercede with the National Centennial Administration to secure Departmental representation on the new committee, Jean Boucher, Acting Director of the Citizenship Branch wrote,

"While the present membership of the Committee is not questioned, the absence of a Member from this Department would unquestionably be the subject of comment among the agencies and groups that look to us for leadership and guidance in planning programmes and projects in the field of citizenship and inhibit our effectiveness in sharing the governmental effort towards ensuring the success of the Centennial."

This concern about the lack of representation, along with the less than veiled threat of lack of cooperation from contact groups, was passed on to John Fisher, Centennial Commissioner, by the Acting Deputy Minister. By early 1964, a representative from the Citizenship Branch was named to the committee and from then on the Branch's status was secure.
The fight to remain close to the work of the Centennial Commission paid off for the Citizenship Branch in both the short and long term. In the short term the Branch carried out several centennial projects including an update of the Citizenship Series publications, a film in both English and French about the contribution of ethnic groups to Canada, the publication of The Canadian Family Tree in both languages along with the 45 monographs on ethnic groups, and a presentation booklet for new citizens.\footnote{101} The largest long term gain for the Branch was in the area of travel and exchange. The Branch had been involved in this in a small way since the mid 1950s but it became a major part of the work of the Centennial Commission and in 1965 the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration wrote to the Prime Minister to advise him that "it has been agreed that the Citizenship Branch would accept responsibility for the continuation of the Centennial Commission's Cultural Travel and Exchange Program after 1967."\footnote{102} As detailed in the last chapter the various manifestations of Travel and Exchange became a central part of the state's policy of promoting contact between groups of Canadians, and by the 1980s involved millions of dollars and tens of thousands of young people and their sponsors every year.\footnote{103}

In July 1963 the Federal Government set up the B and B Commission. The Citizenship Branch quickly recognized the potential benefit in terms of new territory and programs that might result from a close relationship with the Commission.
During the fall of 1963 the National Liaison Officer for the Branch invited a Commission Co-Secretary to participate in a Branch Staff conference and offered the services of the Liaison Division to the Commission. In a memo to the staff of several Branch Divisions a year later Jo Lynam, the Acting Chief of Liaison, wrote extensively of "a year of cooperation between the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism and the Canadian Citizenship Branch." This cooperation ranged from informal exchanges of information to the "formal establishment of cooperation between the Programs and Materials Division of the Citizenship Branch and the Research Division of the Commission, especially with respect to the ethnic sector of Canada." Lynam reported that, among other things, "contacts with practically every staff member from the Commission's Program Branch were established."

The most important aspect of the relationship as described by Lynam was not its growth in terms of number and extent of contacts but the way its nature was changing. According to Lynam:

It was further agreed that the relationship between the Commission and the Branch would now take on an added aspect, namely that of mutual cooperation. Previously it had been concerned mainly with assistance to the Commission during its initial year of operation. (emphasis in the original)

In other words the Branch was going to begin to reap some benefits from the help that it had provided, and was going to provide, to the Commission.
Over several years one can point to a number of examples of this "mutual cooperation" between the Branch and the Commission. As was the case with the Centennial Commission, the Branch asset that proved most valuable to the B and B Commission was its contacts with groups across the country. Liaison officers of the Branch were directed on numerous occasions to help the Commission by providing it with information about organizations that might participate in Commission activities, encouraging these organizations to participate, and setting up meetings between the Commission and various organizations across the country. For example, in the fall of 1964 Jo Lynam passed on a request from the Commission to all Liaison Officers for the names of local youth organizations that the Commission should contact.¹⁰⁹ Earlier that same year the Acting Director of the Branch had received a letter from a Commission Official to inform him that "Mr. Arni Arnason of your Staff gave us outstanding help in arranging and carrying out our Northern Saskatchewan Regional Meeting in Saskatoon on June 12th."¹¹⁰ The Branch continually provided this kind of logistical assistance to the Commission.

A key element in the Branch's effort to keep in touch with voluntary organizations in the citizenship field were its quarterly publications Citizen and Citoyen. In the fall of 1964 Acting Citizenship Branch Director Jean Lagassé wrote to the Deputy Minister to suggest that these publications might be used to further the work of the Commission. He wrote,
I have already shared with you the work which the Branch is doing in relation to the Commission's inquiry. A further suggestion has been that the fullest use be made of our periodicals "Citizen" and "Citoyen" which reach some 6,000 English and French community leaders across the country. He went on to suggest that "every issue of the two publications [have] an article on some aspect of French-English relations" and closed with the assurance "that we shall be working very closely with officers of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in the preparations of the articles."  

In return for these important connections to groups across the country the B and B Commission provided some services to the Citizenship Branch. In particular, Branch officials noted "the generosity of the Commission in releasing staff and commissioners for consultation and training purposes."  In fact, the Branch conducted a number of training sessions in which Commission officials brought Branch personnel up to speed on the latest concerns and opportunities in the area of bilingualism and biculturalism. Having a knowledgeable staff was in turn one of the arguments that the Branch used later in contending that programs established in response to the Commissions recommendations ought to be its responsibility. In addition to providing training and consultation, the Commission also made its research findings, particularly in regard to ethnic groups, available to the Branch.  

The most important thing that the Citizenship Branch gained from its relationship with the B and B Commission, however, was neither training nor research but strategic position. Very
early on in the process Branch Officials at the highest levels realized that the Branch needed to begin to tailor its programs in anticipation of the final report of the Commission. In 1965 the Deputy Minister wrote to André Laurendeau, a co-chairman of the Commission, to propose a meeting of senior officials of both organizations. "It would be my hope," wrote the Deputy Minister,

that these discussions could help us define the future role of the Citizenship Branch and identify those services which the Branch may need to intensify and those which it should be prepared to relinquish in favour of new administrative structures which may emerge as a result of your study.\textsuperscript{114}

Prior to the Deputy Minister's letter, Citizenship Branch staff was hard at work beginning to develop programs in bilingualism and biculturalism and link them to the work of the B and B Commission. The Annual Staff Conference of the Branch in 1964 was given over almost completely to discussions of the work of the Commission and Branch response to that work.\textsuperscript{115} Following that, regional staff meetings across the country focused on the issue. For example, one senior official noted that "the December [1964] meeting in the West was given over entirely to the B & B question."\textsuperscript{116} Staff were not only discussing the work of the Commission, they were also explicitly attempting to link current Branch programs to that work, develop new programs in anticipation of the directions the Commission's recommendations might take, and training staff to be ready to respond to those directions. A key question, in the mind of one senior official was, "How best can staff resources and Branch
resources in grants and materials be deployed to speed up the pace of change which the issue of bilingualism and biculturalism demands?"¹¹⁷

By the time the B and B Commission released its final report in 1968 the Citizenship Branch was well positioned to argue it was the logical institution for the state to utilize in implementing the Commission's recommendations. Two submissions to Cabinet in 1968 from the Branch outlined what it had already done in this regard. One document asserted that during the mandate of the Commission the Branch gave "as much importance to French-English relations and help to French minorities as it could afford to do within the limitations of its authorized budget and staff."¹¹⁸ The other document is more explicit about the effect of the Commission on the policy and work of the Branch.

The work of the Commission had a strong impact on the Citizenship Branch as the latter was already working on problems of intergroup relations and national unity. Throughout this five-year span, officers of the Branch in each of the fifteen field offices have conducted programs to help the public understand the need for bridging the gap between the present situation and the stated national goals of equality for the two official cultures. The Branch also helped, with grants and technical advice, to strengthen the social and cultural activities of both cultures where they exist in a state of minority.¹¹⁹

The influence exerted in the relationship between the Citizenship Branch and the Commission was not one sided. Although, as acknowledged above, the policies and programs of the Branch were greatly influenced by the Commission the Branch was not without influence itself. In a memo to the Chief
Liaison Officer in 1967, René Préfontaine, Chief of the Travel and Exchange Division of the Branch, reports on a meeting he had with an official of the Commission.

I have provided her with some material. She has volunteered to draft a paper on the place of Travel and Exchange as a dynamic method of strengthening Canadian unity for use in the Bi & Bi report and to consult with many as it develops.

I feel this is a most fortunate development as a result of which Travel and Exchange will probably receive the right emphasis and a good deal of support in the Bi & Bi report. (emphasis mine)\[120\]

The extent of Branch influence is also evident in the recommendations of the B and B Commission regarding non-English and non-French cultural minorities. In making the case to Cabinet that "The Department of the Secretary of State, with its overriding responsibility for citizenship, bilingualism, and cultural matters is a logical choice as the central coordinating agency of the federal government" in this area, Branch officials noted,

The Citizenship Development Branch of that Department has been recognized as the focal point of the federal activities in matters pertaining to the social integration of immigrants and to the cultural activities of ethnic groups. This is well documented in Book IV in as much as the Commission refers frequently to that Branch. (emphasis mine)\[121\]

Clearly, while the Branch adapted itself to the work of the Commission it had also positioned itself well to influence that work.

The connection to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was even more successful in securing and extending turf for the Citizenship Sector of the Department of the
Secretary of State than the connection with the Centennial Commission. The Department was made largely responsible for policy and programming in response to the Commission's recommendations both in the areas of bilingualism/biculturalism and multiculturalism and even a quick review of annual reports of the Department from the late 1960s through the early 1980s will demonstrate substantial growth in terms of personnel, budget and programs. Bilingualism in Education Programs alone accounted for over one billion dollars in spending during this period not to mention other programs in the bilingualism/biculturalism or multiculturalism areas that are discussed in detail in chapter four. As we saw in that chapter, both bilingualism/biculturalism and multiculturalism became central elements of Department policy and programming during this era.

The politics of policy making in the citizenship sector not only included struggles for territory within the state bureaucracy but between the state and the private surrogate organizations working in the citizenship area. Officially state policy labelled these surrogates as autonomous organizations who worked with the Branch and had significant influence on the state. As a 1960 document put it,

Because the aims of the Branch are largely implemented through programs of voluntary organizations, the Citizenship Branch is represented on a large number of voluntary bodies, such as planning and coordinating committees, where its role is however confined to that of observer and consultant. (emphasis mine)
An earlier document put it even more bluntly contending the Branch worked closely with these groups for years "with no attempt ever being made to direct the work of voluntary organizations."\(^{124}\)

Officially the Citizenship Branch was portrayed as "essentially a service agency for voluntary organizations whose role in developing good citizenship is fully recognized."\(^{125}\) These services included "a steady flow of information and materials for the use of organizations, ranging from a discussion guide on "Let's Take a Look at Prejudice and Discrimination" to "films on community participation and individual rights"\(^{126}\) as well as "consultative and technical advice" provided by "Branch officers, trained in the social sciences."\(^{127}\)

Throughout the period under study the state officially recognized "the essential role played by voluntary organizations in the formulation of new policies." (emphasis mine)\(^{128}\) In the mid 1950s, for example, a conference for groups involved in citizenship work was held in Scarborough and a senior Branch official claimed that "the Scarborough Conference established a method of consultation and that policies were developed at Scarborough which have been followed as closely as possible since."\(^{129}\)

As was the case with the state's commitment to making policy scientifically, the commitment of the state to neutrality and consultation in its relationship with voluntary
organizations fell somewhat short of the ideal. The state tried to manipulate these organizations into the role of surrogates for carrying out state policy and was often only really interested in consultation in as far as it fit a predetermined agenda. Yet the state did not always get its way. It was often influenced by the policy agenda of its surrogates. One Branch official described the relationship between the state and voluntary organizations as "a complex series of tenuous - and professionally intimate - partnerships with the Canadian community." As we shall see the relationships were certainly "tenuous and complex" as it was often unclear who was setting policy. The close connections between the people working for both the state and the private organizations often made for professional intimacy.

This series of complex relationships points to the dialectical nature of the relationship between the state and civil society. As Cornbleth and others point out, policy making and implementation is not a linear unmediated process but involves complex give and take among the several contexts in which any policy exists. This dialectical exchange goes on at both the personal and structural levels. It is in the former that the professional intimacy referred to above can be seen in the relationship between the Canadian state and its surrogates in the citizenship field.

Despite the size of the country, the community of those providing leadership in the areas of citizenship and citizenship
education has never been large. There has always been a high
degree of interchange between state policy makers and the
leaders of private organizations. Jean Lagassé, Director of the
Citizenship Branch, described this relationship in a 1965 letter
to an official in the Prime Minister's Office. Lagassé was
writing to outline the position of the Branch on providing
annual funding to two of its principal surrogates in the area of
citizenship education, the Canadian Association for Adult
Education (CAAE) and its Francophone counterpart the Institut
Canadien d'Éducation des Adultes (ICEA). In the letter he made
the point that "officers of these two organizations and those of
the Branch work in overlapping fields, sit on several planning
committees together, and meet frequently at national
conferences." This kind of close working relationship between
officers of the state and its surrogate organizations was a
common occurrence in the citizenship area and contributes to
making it difficult to determine where the state ends and civil
society begins in the policy making process.

Not only did state officials and representatives of private
organizations maintain close contact, sometimes they switched
roles or, as in at least one case, were in fact the same people.
The latter case is described by James Kidd in his doctoral
thesis on the Canadian Citizenship Council (CCC). Kidd devotes
most of a chapter of his work to the close working relationship
between the CCC and the federal bureaucracy. The CCC enjoyed
the confidence of government departments "largely through the
work of the its secretary, Dr. Robbins, who while giving half-
time to the direction of Council affairs, continued as Chief of
the Education Branch, Dominion Bureau of Statistics [Statistics
Canada today]." In other words Dr. Robbins was simultaneously
director of the CCC and head of a Branch within the federal
bureaucracy.

State officers often had either volunteer or professional
experience with some of the organizations with which the state
worked. For example, Dr. Black, the Citizenship Branch Liaison
Officer for Vancouver for most of the 1950s, was very involved
as a member of volunteer organizations which carried out
citizenship work along with the Branch\textsuperscript{134} and two Liaison
Officers in the early 1960s were alumni of the Annual Banff
Citizenship Seminar sponsored by the Canadian Council of
Christians and Jews and partly funded by the Branch.\textsuperscript{135} Ted
Sexsmith, Chief of the short lived Youth Services Division,\textsuperscript{136}
and Mike Andrassy, Chief of the Immigrant Integration Division,
were wooed to the Citizenship Branch in the late 1960s after
long professional service with a key surrogate organization, the
YMCA.\textsuperscript{137}

One of the most interesting examples of the crossover of
personnel, this time from the state to the private sector, is
the case of the Canada Studies Foundation (CSF). Established
in 1970 to further the teaching of Canadian Studies in schools
the CSF was ostensibly a private organization. The work of the
Foundation will be examined in more detail later but what is
particularly relevant to the discussion here is the close connection of some of the senior officers of the CSF to the citizenship sector in the state bureaucracy. The first Chairman of the Board for the CSF, for example, was Walter Gordon a former Liberal Finance Minister. Gordon was very active in this role and provided the CSF with access to the most senior levels of the state administration. In the files of the CSF there are numerous letters from Gordon to Ministers or Deputy Ministers seeking support for the Foundation's work or setting up meetings between senior state officials and Foundation staff.\(^\text{138}\) In his history of the CSF, Grant refers to the kind of access Gordon provided to both private and state organizations as indispensable to the work of the Foundation. Grant contends that, "While Walter Gordon's contacts were useful in a number of ways, undoubtedly they were most important in negotiations with the government and in fund raising."\(^\text{139}\)

If having a former cabinet minister as Chairman of the Board was not enough, the CSF also convinced Senator Muarice Lamontagne to join the organization as a Senior Policy Advisor. Senator Lamontagne was a former Secretary of State and, since that was the Department responsible for the citizenship area and which became almost the exclusive funding source for the CSF, he, like Gordon, proved to be a valuable asset.\(^\text{140}\) The kind of help these men were able to give is well illustrated in a short note from A.B. Hodgetts, Foundation Director, to Senator Lamontagne in 1972. In the note Hodgetts refers to
correspondence from Bernard Ostry, Assistant Undersecretary of State, about a recent grant application from the CSF and then continues,

Judging from the second paragraph, they may have forgotten that we were to meet personally with Departmental officials after they had a chance to read our materials. Walter Gordon thought it would be a good idea if sometime, on an informal, low-key basis, you might make sure with Jules Leger [Undersecretary of State] that we do have a personal follow up.\textsuperscript{141}

This kind of "informal, low-key" access to the highest echelons of state policy making in the citizenship area was a consistent feature of the early years of the CSF because of the close connection between Foundation officers and senior state officials.

Bureaucrats worked hard to ensure these organizations conformed to state directed policy. From the beginning of its work with surrogates the Citizenship Branch attempted to subtly move these organizations in directions consistent with Branch policy. At the first Branch staff conference in 1951, for example, one Liaison Officer spoke of the need to "encourage" both home and school associations and churches to further the work of the Branch.\textsuperscript{142} Later, speaking of surrogates more generally, the same official said, "the citizenship officer should know what people and organizations exist, and then establish a liaison with them all. The citizenship officers should act mainly as coordinators of the organizations doing citizenship work."(emphasis mine)\textsuperscript{143} The idea that the Branch should be the overseer and coordinator of all citizenship work,
including that ostensibly done by the private sector, was persistent within the state throughout this period. Two years after that first staff conference, for example, the Branch applied to cabinet for funds "to study means of coordinating programmes of various governmental and non-governmental agencies in the field of citizenship education." 144

Part of this overall coordination was the provision of both expertise and resources to surrogates. The former, in particular, was often seen as an opportunity to influence the policy and programmes of these organizations. In the letter discussed above requesting funding for the CAAE and the ICEA Citizenship Branch Director Jean Lagassé argues that the provision of sustaining funding might give the Branch more influence in the ongoing work of these organizations. He goes on to write,

The active participation of several staff members in the planning meetings of these two agencies already enables us to benefit from most of their activities and to influence, as much as is wise for a government agency to do, the orientation of their programs. (emphasis mine) 145

Later that same year, the Branch expressed similar sentiments to senior officials of the B and B Commission about programs run with government grant money by groups from the various ethnic communities. "Officers of the Branch," the officials were told, "attempt to steer developments" 146 within these programs.

A document on the role of liaison officers from 1955 recognizes the subtlety of this direction. "The liaison officer," it contends, "has no authority over any groups with
whom he works. He cannot dictate but only suggest concerning their programs."  

Even given these restrictions liaison officers attended the conferences of both local and national organizations "and assist[ed] in their programme planning." 

The document closes by emphasizing how intricate this work is.

The role of the liaison officer is of necessity unpretentious. His over-publicized prominence in community activities would stunt the development of indigenous leaders, whose participation in planning projects is as important to citizenship education as the completed projects themselves. Unobtrusively, he encourages and inspires local communities to develop themselves through inter-cultural and other citizenship projects. His relationship varies with respect to each community as it is ready and willing to accept and to act on broader suggestions, but always he is emphasizing and encouraging more positive attitudes.

Although this statement would indicate a commitment to the development of "indigenous leaders" in communities across Canada the Branch was not willing to leave this process open to chance. A major part of the service it offered was leadership training and it was very concerned that the right leaders be identified and trained appropriately. In a letter to a regional liaison officer in 1968, Mike Andrassy, Chief of the Immigrant Integration Division of the Branch, suggested that future leaders in the various immigrant communities be identified by Branch personnel and brought "together for a weekend sometime before the end of the year to discuss with them, their aspirations for a Canadian society and what they can do toward the achievement of these aspirations and how our Branch can be helpful."
Several years earlier, the Chief of Liaison for the Branch was far more blunt in arguing for closer Branch control over leadership training. In a memo discussing Branch funding to leadership training programs run by surrogate organizations he makes the point that as liaison officers "move about in their regions, they are dependent upon either effective leadership or potentially effective persons who demonstrate some leadership ability." In light of this he worries about the lack of Branch input into the selection process for the leadership training process and writes,

I question seriously whether we are giving assistance to those persons who indicate by their performance in their home-community that they are the best candidates, at least under our terms of reference. I question, too, whether it leaves us free to channel the training of the most promising persons in the direction most suitable to them and most applicable to their community needs." (emphasis mine)

The memo goes on to suggest a mechanism whereby the Branch can participate in the selection process to ensure that potential leaders consistent with its needs will be trained. This scheme was not implemented but it did represent the thinking of at least one senior Branch official.

Sometimes the Branch was even willing to consider more direct involvement in giving direction to the projects of surrogate organizations. Concerns about the lack of quality program leadership at the Annual Banff Citizenship Seminar run by the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews led one Branch official to write a memo to the Minister. The memo acknowledges "the extreme sensitivity" of the Council about the Branch taking
over and recognizes that in light of that "Branch staff must be careful that it not become a 'Branch project'." Even so, the Branch offered Mrs. Violet King of their staff to the Council as a Program Co-ordinator for the seminar with "responsibility for selecting and directing the staff responsible for the discussion or 'training' sessions." This suggestion was well received by the organization.

Even when it sought advice from surrogate organizations the state was careful to control the circumstances under which that advice was given. In the summer of 1970, 500 voluntary groups took part in a major consultation on citizenship policy. According to the Department of the Secretary of State which conducted the consultation the goal was "to decide a new policy on citizenship in the seventies." Before the survey was conducted, however, the Cabinet had already approved five new objectives for citizenship policy and the consultation, rather than asking whether these were appropriate or comprehensive, basically asked the groups to comment on what they already did in these five areas and what they thought ought to be done in each area. In other words, surrogates were to have input only after the broad framework of the policy was in place and input would be limited to suggesting how the policy could best be implemented.

In addition to those limitations, groups involved did not trust this consultation process and found it to be poorly organized and carried out. This resistance concerned Branch
headquarters staff but two employees of the Toronto office did not find it surprising. In a frank and angry memo to the Task Force on Consultation they wrote,

Can we possibly criticize any group when they are faced with a fifteen page questionnaire and are expected to produce within the framework of a totally unrealistic timetable? Can we reproach then for not meeting our schedules when they have previously experienced colossal government delays in turning out reports? Can we label their refusal to partake as simply 'political motivation'?\(^{158}\)

A particularly clear example of the state manipulating the consultation process was the Seminar on Citizenship held in Minaki, Ontario in the fall of 1958. The Minaki Seminar, as it was known, was a gathering of leaders from the citizenship field to advise the Citizenship Branch on future policy directions. It is interesting to note that the Branch carefully selected who would attend this seminar and made a point of inviting participants as individuals and not as representatives of the organizations with which they worked in hopes that this would make for less political posturing.\(^{159}\) A cynical memo between two planners of the conference further indicates that the Branch wanted to make sure that certain recommendations came out of the event. The memo reads, in part,

We might like certain recommendations to come from the Conference which would strengthen our position in arguing that the Branch should undertake certain kinds of activity, and at the same time there may be areas on which we genuinely need guidance and advice. (emphasis mine)\(^{160}\)

The memo goes on to identify grants policy as one area that should not be open to general discussion. The author writes,
I think that grants should be discussed by the staff at the staff meeting, and I would hope that if we do not wish to have it come into open session, or even into one of the small groups, that one or two members of our the staff should select for informal consultation, several people with whom we have worked with (sic) on grants.\textsuperscript{161}

Even with this careful planning, some of the recommendations of the conference were considered by state officials to be so controversial that the promised report of the conference was never publicly released.\textsuperscript{162} Clearly the state held a very limited view of consultation on policy for citizenship education.

Certainly these careful attempts to direct the work of private organizations were often successful and, as will be examined in detail in the next chapter, surrogates were an important policy instrument for the federal state in implementing its policies in citizenship education throughout the country. Yet, these organizations were not mere pawns of state policy. The close personal and institutional relationships between the state and surrogate organizations, as well as periods of policy confusion caused by the internal insecurity of the citizenship sector within the state bureaucracy, often meant that particular surrogates would take the lead for a time in an area of policy development and implementation. In a 1971 memo, for example, Assistant Under Secretary of State Bernard Ostry admits that recent changes in the Department left the Citizenship Branch without a clear grants policy. Because of this, he wrote, "present circumstances dictate the need for a flexible approach which
will allow us to respond to the needs of citizens' groups, while at the same time operating within the objectives of Cabinet priorities and recommendations." In other words, surrogate groups would not have to meet clearly defined state criteria for funds, because there were not any, but would have some flexibility in how money is spent. It is at times like these when close personal connections like those discussed above have a significant effect on who gets state funding and for what.

There were several examples of surrogate organizations using their leverage with state officials to influence policy and secure funding for their own programs. The CSF was formed largely in response to the huge public reaction to the publication in 1968 of *What Culture? What Heritage? A Study of Civic Education in Canada* which was the report of a massive study of Canadian public school social studies and particularly history. This study was a primary catalyst that led A.B. Hodgetts, its author, and others to form the CSF in 1970.

Between 1970-1975, the CSF received approximately 80 percent of its funding from the private sector. The rest was provided through grants from the Canada Council and The Secretary of State. Subsequently the Foundation was not successful in attracting private funding and relied more and more on the state. From 1975 to 1979 the Foundation was jointly funded by the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) and the Department of the Secretary of State. The CMEC withdrew its funding at the end of the 1970s and from then to its demise.
in 1986 the CSF was almost completely funded by the Department of the Secretary of State.\textsuperscript{166}

The beginnings of the CSF coincided with the period of confusion within the Department of Secretary of State described above by Bernard Ostry. The Department was surprised by the surge of interest generated by Hodgetts' book and the subsequent "crisis" generated by the publication of To Know Ourselves: The Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies, a damning indictment of the state of Canadian Studies in universities across the country.\textsuperscript{167} Both studies generated considerable public interest and were the subject of much media comment.\textsuperscript{168} Although both the CMEC and the Secretary of State had representatives on the Board of the CSF and expected annual reports and accounting for funds, the Foundation was largely free to determine policies and program directions. The funding it received was of a sustaining nature (i.e. not tied to grants for particular projects) and it seemed to operate largely without state interference. As Hodgetts put it in 1979, "the Canada Studies Foundation has worked with the Department since 1971. We have always received helpful suggestions and have never experienced any interference whatsoever in the substantive part of our work."\textsuperscript{169} While Hodgetts' assertion that there had been no interference might be somewhat exaggerated, the evidence does suggest that up to this time the Foundation had been relatively free to set the agenda for its work. This lack of interference was at least partly due to the influence key
officers of the Foundation had with the state but the main reason was the lack of state policy in this area.

The CSF was only too happy to help the state establish a Canadian Studies policy. The 1976-77 annual report of the Foundation makes this clear.

The experience of the Foundation also should be valuable to the Department of the Secretary of State. Considering the rather bewildering array of things presently labelled Canadian Studies - many of which are designed to fill specific provincial needs only - guidelines are obviously needed to identify and encourage programmes having pan-Canadian objectives. The Foundation is in a position to assist the Department in the development of criteria that could be applied to all funding requests and other matters associated with interprovincial cooperation in the area of Canadian Studies.¹⁷⁰

Not only was the Foundation willing to help the Department, there is considerable evidence that it had a very significant influence over state policy. In 1981, for example, the Department of the Secretary of State announced a three year $3.8 million dollar National Program of Support for Canadian Studies. In the published Guide to that program the Department acknowledged the leadership of both the CSF and the Association for Canadian Studies (the organization formed largely as a response to the report To Know Ourselves) in the area of Canadian Studies. More significantly the guide acknowledged that

the definition [of Canadian studies], as it relates to the National Program of Support for Canadian Studies, is based on the four components of Canadian Studies identified in Teaching Canada for the 80's by A.B. Hodgetts and Paul Gallagher of the Canada Studies Foundation.¹⁷¹
Clearly the CSF had a significant impact on state policy for citizenship education.

As the state became more involved in Canadian studies more control was exerted over the CSF. In 1979 Hodgetts spoke about the Foundation's autonomy from state control and influence but only two years later Robert Anderson, then Director of the Foundation, complained in a letter to his predecessor, Paul Gallagher, that the Foundation Secretariat was being "harassed" by Secretary of State personnel. According to Anderson, "the CSF Board [was] in danger of being made redundant by the Secretary of State dictates. And federal officials are now deciding how they think the CSF should be meeting federal objectives." (emphasis in the original)

The principal vehicle the state used to gain control over the CSF was a change in funding structure to program grants as opposed to sustaining funding. As Grant points out, because of the more precise criteria of the granting programs "the Foundation's activities had to be moulded to meet the Department of the Secretary of States objectives" in several areas.

Throughout this period, he argues, the CSF had to "struggle" to avoid becoming a pawn of the government and this was a key factor in the final decision to wind down and end the work of the Foundation in 1986.

The relationship between the CSF and the Department of the Secretary of State is a good illustration of the complex and dialectical nature of relationships between the state and
private organizations. As Grant contends, "clearly the CSF was influenced by the Department of the Secretary of State just as the Department was influenced by the Foundation."\(^{176}\) This is indicative of the policy interplay between the state and many of the surrogate organizations with which it worked. Joshee, for example, details the earlier association between the state and the Canadian Council for Citizenship and presents a similarly complex web of policy making interactions.\(^{177}\) The initiative in policy making ebbed and flowed between the state and surrogate organizations with many factors including the era, public opinion, personnel, and the relative internal stability of the institutions involved playing a role in determining who would have the lead role at any particular time.

**Conclusion**

State policy making on citizenship and citizenship education during the period between 1947 and 1982 was far more influenced by politics and the struggle for bureaucratic survival than it was by science. Although officially committed to the formal and professional creation and application of social science knowledge in policy making the citizenship sector within the state was not able to adhere to this commitment. Struggles for recognition and territory within the state consumed much energy and policy was often developed in response to perceived threats to bureaucratic territory or opportunities to expand that territory. The Citizenship Branch proved largely
unsuccessful in its attempts to gain influence through casting itself as the coordinator of broad areas of state policy and programs, but was far more successful at attaching itself to rising areas of public and state interest, such as the Centennial and bilingualism and biculturalism, and exploiting that position to enhance its status within the state.

The other significant influence on policy making in the citizenship sector was the interplay between the state and voluntary organizations. Again, the struggle for control over policy and programs was significant in determining state policy. Bureaucrats worked hard to subtly move surrogate organizations in the direction of state policy but at the same time these organizations were often ahead of the state in responding to emerging areas of public concern. When the state saw a surrogate organization taking the lead in a particular area in which it was unprepared, as was the case with the Canada Studies Foundation, it would often adopt the policies of the organization and then move to gain control over the area. Far from being a systematic and linear process, policy making within the citizenship sector of the Canadian state was complex, messy, and ill defined.
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Chapter 6
Instruments of Policy
How the National State Influences Education in Canada

In 1959 Dr. W. G. Black, Regional Liaison Officer in Vancouver for the Citizenship Branch, submitted a brief to the British Columbia Royal Commission on Education (The Chant Commission). In introducing the brief Dr. Black recognized provincial authority in education when he pointed out that "it would be inappropriate for an official of the Federal Government to criticize the educational programme of any provincial government, and I do not intend to do so." Even though he was careful to present his remarks as the reflections of someone who had worked for a long time in the citizenship field and not as a representative of the state, Dr. Black's superiors in Ottawa were not at all happy with what might be construed as federal intrusion onto provincial turf. Shortly after a copy of the brief arrived in Ottawa, Dr. Black received a blunt letter from R. Alex Sim, Chief of the Liaison Division, informing him that his brief had been reviewed by both Mr Sim and Branch Director Jean Boucher. Sim wrote, "It is our view that this [a federal civil servant making a submission on education] was inappropriate and that you should take steps at once to overtake your brief." Sim went on,

You have made your points and the Commission can use them as ideas, but they must not be quoted directly as a contribution of a federal civil servant, nor should they be published or used otherwise than as a personal and confidential document by the Commission.
Dr. Black was able to make contact with the Commissioner and secure agreement that his submission would only be used in ways consistent with the directive from Ottawa. 3

In the scope of Canadian education this was certainly a minor incident, but it is illustrative of the tension between the federal state and the provinces. In this case, it was federal officials who expressed concern about being perceived as interfering in an area constitutionally reserved for the provinces, but in other instances the provinces were quick to condemn what they saw as federal meddling. A headline in the March 1977 issue of University Affairs, for example, proclaimed "Ministers tell Federal Government to Stay out of Education." The accompanying article went on to say that in light of growing public concern about the state of Canadian studies in schools and universities all of the provincial ministers of education joined to warn "the federal government not to become involved in education." 4

Throughout the period 1947 to 1982 education for both levels of government was exclusively an area of provincial jurisdiction. Yet, the federal state, sometimes with provincial collusion, was very proactive in using both official and unofficial means to influence educational policy. A 1971 memorandum to the federal cabinet, "Long Term Federal Education Policy After 1974" illustrates these often contradictory agendas. The four "guiding principles" for federal policy were:
(a) Federal policies should respect the provision of the constitution leaving to the provinces the authority to operate their education systems.

(b) Policies should be developed in agreement with the provinces.

(c) Policies should be such that all provinces may participate.

(d) Policies should be designed so that federal purposes may be accomplished and the federal presence easily recognized. (emphasis in the original)

As Citizenship Branch Director Jean Lagassé wrote in 1966, "While it is often said that education is not a federal responsibility, there is no doubt that the federal government does spend an impressive sum of money each year for education." He went on, "it is hard to differentiate, for example between education in its more restricted sense and the function or role played by informational bulletins and press releases published by various government departments." Throughout this period, the federal state was to use several arguments to justify its involvement in education and develop various means to facilitate that involvement.

In the National Interest: Justifying State Intervention

Hodgson argues that the federal government has traditionally used three justifications for its involvement in education: the complexity of national and international life mandate a national focus for some areas of education; provinces are unequal in their ability to pay for needed programs; and Ottawa is able to recognize the need for, and fund, special
projects that may be beyond the scope of the provinces. "The general view behind the three parts of the federal argument," according to Hodgson, "is that Ottawa possesses 'superior wisdom' with respect to the provinces and territories." The view that the provinces hold too narrow a view of the purposes of education and that some national direction is needed was echoed by Secretary of State John Roberts in a 1978 address. In describing some of the criticisms of the Canadian educational system included in an O.E.C.D. report Mr Roberts said, in part, they observed that in Canada we have not had educational reform rooted in a conception of the future of the country as a whole. Put more simply, we have never conceived our educational system as a mechanism which can be used to achieve some desired goals for our country. We lack, in effect, an explicit, comprehensive conception of our country's objectives and purposes. As a consequence, we lack educational policies which take into account not only the individual parts but our whole society. Secretary of State Roberts, like other state officials before and after him, argued that "the constitution does not exclude the setting of national goals in education" and that the federal government has a responsibility to "play an active educational role, to fulfil real needs, to resolve national problems, to define and initiate activities in the national interest." As I pointed out in chapter four, from its earliest days the Citizenship Branch was concerned with creating an overarching national identity and convincing Canadians to adhere to it. With the growing threat to the unity of the country this became a central focus for the state. In the early 1980s, for example, Secretary of State Francis Fox wrote that developing
"a sense of belonging' [to Canada] underlies much of the federal interest in the field of education." Around the same time the Secretary of State addressed the Special Parliamentary Committee on the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and detailed a number of national objectives in education, one of which was the "citizenship, language and cultural identity, objective." Through this the state wished to promote, through the education system, a sense of Canadian citizenship and identity, with particular emphasis on the nation's bilingual nature and to increase access by members of the official language minorities to a full range of educational opportunities in their own language.  

Consistent with Hodgson's points discussed above, the state saw its role in citizenship education as "providing a national perspective" that by definition was beyond the scope of the provinces. This point is clear in a 1968 memo to cabinet which acknowledges that many of the Citizenship Branch's activities are in the realm of education and culture, constitutional areas of provincial concern, but makes the case that a national role is vital. "In relation to those activities," the document states, the Government of Canada cannot be replaced by an aggregate of the ten provinces. What is sought is not a mathematical addition but a social symbiosis in which new units (i.e. the nation, the national organization, the national goal or activity) have a life of their own that must find a point of reference and a unit of service in the Government of Canada if Canadian citizenship is to have any meaning.  

In the view of the federal government, Canadian citizenship could not be adequately fostered by provincial or regional
institutions and therefore it was vital for the national state to intervene.

Although the state did use the justification of fostering equality among individuals and provinces for its forays into citizenship education, the overriding rationale has been response to national crisis. In 1961, for example, Ellen Fairclough, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, used the national crisis argument to justify state intervention in technical and vocational education.

Many people wonder why the Federal Government should show such concern over the field of education, which until now Canadians have quite properly regarded as something of almost exclusively provincial and municipal interest. Let me emphasize that there is no suggestion, in anything that the Federal Government has done, of any intention of usurping, or interfering with, the provincial jurisdiction.

But this is an emergency, and a grave one. The nations of the Western world are today faced with a gigantic struggle, on many fronts, with the world of Communism. The events of the past few years have given us little cause for complacency, and there is nothing whatever to indicate that the challenge will diminish in the near future. Our best minds in the world of science and technology have not ceased to warn us that if we are to win the economic, scientific and intellectual struggle with Communism we must without delay apply ourselves to a sweeping new approach to education.

In similar fashion, state involvement in citizenship education has been justified in response to crises beginning with the lack of support of immigrant groups for the war effort in the 1940s, through massive post war immigration in the 1940s and 1950s, rising tensions between French and English Canadians in the sixties and seventies, to the awakening sense of exclusion of youth, women, cultural minorities and the disabled in the later years of the period under study here. Over time the sense that
Canada as an entity was threatened grew and with it the language of crisis within the citizenship sector of the state became more pronounced and the state's interest in education as a vehicle to promote national identity and unity became greater. As the Secretary of State put it in 1968, "The subject [federal interest in education] has become more important as the future of our country has become more uncertain." From the mid 1960s until the early 1980s officials of the federal state justified programs in support of bilingualism and biculturalism, youth employment and travel, Canadian studies, and multiculturalism on the basis of national crisis in these areas. A memo to cabinet in 1968, for example, outlines educational initiatives in response to "the French-English crisis of the last few years." Similarly, the substantial report on youth carried out in the early 1970s was conducted because of the perception of "an open breach of confidence ... between adults and youth" and federal support for Canadian studies in the late 1970s and early 1980s was explained as a reaction to "a crisis in education" to which the provinces had not responded adequately.

Federal involvement in education required implementation mechanisms to carry out state policies. The challenge to the federal state was implementation of its educational policy given the constitutional division of powers.

The Instruments of State Policy in Canadian Education
As Skocpol points out, in federal states where authority is dispersed over several levels of government, attempts by the national state to establish policy in areas outside of its jurisdiction is often hotly contested by other parts of the state. This has certainly been the case with regard to education in Canada. Skocpol goes on to assert that where the national state lacks official authority in an area it often develops alternative "policy instruments" in order to exercise influence. Some of the policy instruments developed by the Canadian state to influence educational policy and practice are well illustrated in a 1983 publication outlining federal programs in support of multicultural education. Although the document asserts that "a federal ministry cannot directly fund educational systems, it may provide assistance in other ways which can have a great impact on what in fact happens at the classroom level." The booklet goes on to illustrate some of these other forms of assistance, including: the development of educational materials; the dissemination of materials and information; providing professional development for teachers and other educators; and support for community based education programs. Over the years between 1947 and 1982 the state in Canada employed all of these as well as other means to carry out its purposes in regard to citizenship education.

Buying Favours: The Official Exercise of State Power
Cornbleth elaborates on the concept of policy instrument and sets it in the context of educational policy within a federal state where, as in Canada, the national government does not have primary constitutional control over education. She argues that such a state has several instruments it can use to influence educational policy, including: mandates, inducements, capacity-building, system-changing and exhortation. In a series of official agreements with the provinces in areas related to citizenship education, the Canadian state made particular use of two of these: inducements and capacity-building.

Inducements, according to Cornbleth, are "conditional transfers of money or technical assistance," in this case to provinces, "in return for desired products or services." These transfers are usually conditional as they include "regulations regarding how funds or assistance can be used." From the beginning the Citizenship Branch sought to develop official ties with the provinces in order to further its own educational agenda. In 1946 Branch Director Frank Foulds wrote to the Minister to propose that the Branch develop closer ties with the Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship, a body that included in its membership all nine provincial ministers of education. Foulds wrote that this body was of particular use to the Branch in providing "an avenue through which we can put forth our ideas of an educational nature without conflicting with the B.N.A. Act." Over the years the federal and
provincial governments entered into a number of agreements related to citizenship education in which the federal government agreed to provide conditional funding in order for the provinces to provide particular educational services. These included agreements in the areas of: citizenship and language training for immigrants; travel and exchange programs for youth; and second language programs for public schools.

Throughout the period the two levels of government maintained a series of agreements related to citizenship and language training for immigrants. Through these agreements the federal government provided partial funding for conducting language and citizenship classes for immigrants as well as providing text books for those classes. The Citizenship Branch saw these classes not only as a means to teach English or French to immigrants or to get them ready to meet the legal requirements of citizenship but also as a means to further its policy of assimilation of immigrant groups into Canadian society. This is evident in the testimony of Director Foulds before the Senate Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour in 1949 and was reiterated as late as 1976 when the Branch worried that the provinces were focused almost exclusively on language and "the elementary facts about Canadian institutions and ways of life' may not be receiving the attention that the federal Government feels is important." The 1976 paper suggests that changes need to be made in these agreements so
that these concerns of the Department of the Secretary of State can be dealt with.\textsuperscript{32}

Following the transfer of the Centennial Travel and Exchange Program to the Citizenship Branch after 1967, the Branch entered into agreement with the provinces to jointly run the program.\textsuperscript{33} As was shown in chapter four the various manifestations of travel and exchange were a key mechanism of state policy in creating a particular kind of citizen and were seen by state officials as "valuable and exciting extensions of the school system."\textsuperscript{34} Over the years these programs involved hundreds of thousands of students and thousands of their teachers from coast to coast. Although the provinces were willing participants in the programs, the educational agenda was set by the federal government. This is illustrated in a pamphlet outlining the division of federal and provincial responsibility for the Young Voyageurs Program. While the provinces had responsibility to select participants and make logistical arrangements for travel and billeting, the federal government, which provided almost all the funding, was responsible, among other things, for approving and planning all trips and itineraries.\textsuperscript{35} In other words where students went, who they met and what they saw was all in the purview of the federal government. In 1976 the Department of the Secretary of State ended the Young Voyageurs Program and replaced it in 1977 with the Open House Canada Program which did not include any direct provincial participation.\textsuperscript{36}
The most significant program, in terms of money and effect on school systems, in the area of citizenship education that was established and maintained through federal-provincial agreements was the Bilingualism in Education Program begun in 1970. The major emphasis of this initiative was establishing public school programs in second language instruction. Annual federal contributions for this grew every year from approximately $50 million in 1970 to over $190 million in 1983. As we saw previously, for the state this program was not only about promoting language acquisition but also about establishing "a sense of mutual understanding between the two main language groups" as well as reinforcing Canada's identity as a bilingual-bicultural nation. This citizenship aspect of the program was not lost on the provinces who recognized that the key objectives of second language teaching were that students "acquire knowledge of the second official language and an understanding of the bilingual nature of the country."

Although state officials insisted that with regard to this program "the Federal Government has always respected in principle and in practice the fact of provincial jurisdiction" and was therefore "a paying guest at the party" who provided funds but had no responsibility for programs, in fact the state did use conditions attached to its funding to dictate particular programs. Early on, for example, state officials decided that immersion programs were the only way for students "to become functionally bilingual through the school system." Therefore,
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state established funding formulas were far more generous to provinces with immersion programs than those without. As one official explained it, each province

receives a much greater formula payment for the student in immersion French compared with what it gets for the student in conventional French courses. The percentage payment is higher and it is paid in respect of the student's full day and not just a fraction. The difference works out to an amount thirty times greater for an immersion student than for the student on 20 minutes a day of French.43

Clearly it was in the provinces' interests to follow the federal lead and encourage immersion programs. In 1977 the Department of Secretary of State reported that "virtually all provinces were offering some form of immersion program."44 This was a rapid and dramatic change. In 1970 as the Bilingualism in Education Program was beginning virtually no immersion programs were in place. By 1976-77 two hundred forty one schools in nine provinces (statistics for Quebec are not available) were offering French immersion programs to 19,766 students and by 1984-85 over 1,000 schools were providing these programs for 140,111 students.45 Today, French immersion programs are a significant part of public school education and a manifestation of considerable state influence on the nature, form and purpose of public education.

In addition to providing these inducements to stimulate direct programs in citizenship education both inside (second language programs) and outside (citizenship training for immigrants, travel and exchange) of public schools the state also used its economic power to engage in "capacity-building."
Cornbleth describes this as "transfers of money or technical assistance to individuals or organizations as investments in material, knowledge, or human resources for anticipated future benefits." Some examples include the funding of basic research, the training of personnel, and the establishment of curriculum and research and development centres. The national state in Canada used all of these mechanisms to further its policy in citizenship education.

Chapter five outlined the state's heavy involvement in funding research. Through the 1950s, for example, every annual report of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration describes research in the area of immigrant adjustment and integration supported by the Citizenship Branch. Although the emphasis gradually shifted to French-English relations and later to race and gender relations the state remained heavily involved in funding research to support its policies. In addition to formula funding to the provinces to support the provision of second language instruction in schools, the Bilingualism in Education program throughout the 1970s and 1980s provided special grants to provinces to build both research knowledge and infrastructure in the area of second language teaching and learning. These grants supported teacher education programs in colleges and universities as well as research centres. The annual report of the Department of the Secretary of State for 1974, for example, details support for nine language centres across the country as well as grants of over $600,000 from the
Language Acquisition and Development Division for research into language learning and pedagogy. In 1980 the Department reported support for 249 special projects designed to develop and expand minority official language education and second official language instruction totalling almost $14 million.

A base of research knowledge was not the only capacity that the state sought to build in the area of citizenship education. Much of the special project money in the area of bilingualism development, for example, went to funding pre-service teacher training. Curtis argues that a key objective of those who brought education under state control in nineteenth century Canada West (Ontario) was to gain control of teacher education and thereby "transform teachers into a corps d'etat" or, in other words, agents of the state. (emphasis in the original)

While the federal state in Canada has no direct control over teacher training, it has worked over the years to create a cohort of teachers sympathetic to its citizenship goals and skilled at carrying them out. This intervention has taken various forms including formal programs jointly administered with the provinces, professional conferences run in conjunction with national and provincial teacher organizations, as well as direct federal support to individual teachers for professional upgrading. I will examine the first of these here and turn to the others later when I discuss the unofficial means through which the state sought to implement its policy in citizenship education.
Through the 1950s the federal government with the provinces jointly sponsored a number of initiatives to train teachers who were instructing the language and citizenship classes for immigrants. The 1958-59 annual report of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, for example, discusses such programs in Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. These teachers were, "in the majority of cases, professionals who [were] employed in the primary or secondary school system" and they were bound to take back with them into those milieux both pedagogical ideas and materials generated by the state.

As discussed above, the federal government spent millions of dollars during the 1970s and 1980s working with the provinces to establish and enhance training programs for second language teachers. In 1979, for example, the Department of Secretary of State reported that over the previous year it had "aided the provinces in establishing and financing minority language teacher training institutes." In 1979 federal support to such institutes totalled over one million dollars. Secretary of State, J. Hugh Faulkner's comments quoted in chapter four about the responsibility of language teachers to help construct and propagate the bilingual-bicultural nature of the country leaves little doubt that these programs were at least partly about creating state agents for promoting a particular vision of citizenship.
The Canada Studies Foundation (CSF), which, for at least part of its existence, was essentially a joint federal-provincial project was also active in the professional development of teachers. Indeed, Grant argues that one of the most significant contributions the CSF made to Canadian education was the training of thousands of teachers in the area of teaching Canadian Studies. According to Grant, the Foundation involved some 1,300 teachers directly in curriculum development projects and sponsored in-service programs for 30,000 others.54

Along with funding research and training teachers the state cooperated with the provinces in developing materials for citizenship education. In chapter four I pointed out that thousands of booklets and filmstrips designed to introduce immigrants to Canada were developed cooperatively and distributed through the language classes for immigrants as well as through volunteer organizations who used them with both immigrants and Canadian youth. Many of these materials also made their way into public school classrooms. The CSF in the 1970s and 1980s was also very active in developing curriculum materials producing over its life 150 publications along with scores of locally produced and used materials which were never published nationally.55 The combination of teacher training and curriculum development made the CSF, described in one document as "a project of the Secretary of State Department,"56 hugely influential in Canadian education. Tomkins describes the
Foundation as "the only national curriculum endeavour in Canada on a scale comparable to those in the United States and Great Britain" and elsewhere he argues that, largely due to the work of the CSF, Canadian Studies "has tended to dominate senior high school social studies."  

The state used its spending power to induce the provinces to offer programs consistent with its citizenship policy and to build the capacity to carry out that policy in public schools. Although the provinces often complained that the conditions attached to federal funding constituted undue interference by the federal government in a provincial area of responsibility, they did not refuse the money. One federal background paper admitted "the whole arrangement for federal support of language classes for immigrants ... is, at least, irregular, if not illegal." Yet, aside from Quebec, there were no complaints from the provinces and "the initial arrangement on teaching costs was initiated at the request of some provincial governments."

The provinces' ambivalence over federal funding of education is well illustrated in the funding arrangements of the Canada Studies Foundation. As the Foundation was establishing itself in 1970 Bernie Hodgetts, the Director at the time, broached the subject of possible federal support with the Curriculum Committee of the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) and some project teachers from Quebec. In a letter describing these conversations he wrote,

*the reaction, as we anticipated, was definitely antagonistic. The members of the Curriculum Committee were*
opposed to Federal participation mainly because of the arbitrary manner in which the Federal Government has cancelled out joint educational programmes, such as the one dealing with physical education. Our French-Canadian colleagues were opposed to any Federal participation (intervention) with education per se.61

Initially the CSF avoided taking money directly from the federal government, although it did accept grants from the Canada Council which the provinces found acceptable.62 By the time the second phase of the CSF began in 1975, however, most private funding had dried up and it was being largely supported by matching grants from the provinces and the Department of the Secretary of State. In a complete reversal of position from 1970, when the provinces decided to withdraw support from the Foundation in 1977 they intervened on its behalf "with a strong recommendation that the maximum federal financial support of $330,000 be granted to the Canada Studies Foundation for the year 1977-78."63 A federal official once said of Newfoundland in regard to education policy that it "is much more interested in acquiring the necessary funds for her development than in protecting her sovereign rights as a province."64 Clearly, this was true of more than Newfoundland and the federal government often turned this to its advantage in implementing its policy in citizenship education.

Ways Around: The Unofficial Exercise of State Power

As pointed out above, the state often took great pains to ensure that it did not over step its jurisdictional bounds when it ventured into the area of education. Even an arm's length
organization like the Canada Council was careful in this area. Before giving final approval for a 1970 grant to the CSF, for example, the Council requested written assurance from the CMEC that the provinces did not object to this funding from a national source. Although this gives the appearance of the national state acting in cooperation with the provinces to carry out its policy in citizenship education, this was not always the case. Official federal-provincial programs were not the only mechanism through which the state in Canada sought to influence policy and practice in citizenship education. The state was often dissatisfied with provincial efforts and therefore sought ways to have more direct influence. It did this by sponsoring educational efforts through surrogate organizations as well as through programs of its own.

In the last chapter, I explored the complex policy making interactions between the state and the many surrogate organizations which used state resources to carry out work in citizenship education. The state made extensive use of surrogates for two related reasons: they greatly extended the capabilities of a relatively small department to have national influence, and they could often go where the state could not. In other words, through surrogates the state could carry its citizenship education agenda to many Canadians it might not otherwise reach and it could do so in a way that would not disturb the provinces.
In 1947 James Kidd, later to become head of the Canadian Citizenship Council (CCC), illustrated this well. He wrote about the Council's efforts to generate patriotism among immigrant groups during the war and said that in effect "the CCC acted as an agent of the Wartime Information Board." (emphasis in the original) He went on, "the tasks performed were those that could be more effectively performed by a private, educational, 'neutral', body than by an arm of government." He did not see this as a thing of the past but contended that "a similar relationship is now being worked out with the Canadian Citizenship Branch." In testimony before a Senate Committee in 1949 Citizenship Branch Director Frank Foulds acknowledged that the CCC was a key player in carrying out state policy in citizenship education and Joshee has documented in detail how this relationship continued for two decades.

This use of surrogates to get around provincial concerns about federal involvement in education was not limited to the CCC but extended to many different volunteer and professional organizations. The Chief of the Liaison Division of the Citizenship Branch wrote in 1962 that "as federal officers we are skirting the field of education, perhaps because we encourage other persons, and through them, other agencies and groups to do that which a government cannot easily do, and I think ought not to do." Over the years these agencies and groups included volunteer and charitable organizations as well as teacher professional associations. In 1956 Acting Director
R. Alex Sim identified sixty religious, service, and educational organizations with which the Branch worked including: the Canadian Council of Churches, B'nai Brith, the Canadian Legion, and the YM-YWCA.\textsuperscript{70}

One of the things that surrogates could do for the state was to get it access to schools in ways it did not already have through federal-provincial programs. Kidd, for example, points out that during its first year of operation the CCC "gave almost all of its attention to aiding the schools in their work of education for citizenship."\textsuperscript{71} Similarly, a 1964 issue of Citizen reports on a program to involve five Ontario High Schools in Citizenship Week activities. The YMCA proved instrumental in obtaining the cooperation of school boards, principals and teachers and even arranged for regional officers of the Citizenship Branch to give a speech to each student assembly.\textsuperscript{72}

In later years the Department of the Secretary of State developed programs with several national and provincial teachers' organizations that both furthered citizenship goals in terms of developing teachers as proponents of those goals and bypassed provincial ministries in getting access to classrooms. At a 1976 seminar on second language education programs sponsored by the Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF) both the CTF president and the Secretary of State called for mutual cooperation in meeting national goals in education.\textsuperscript{73} The Department worked with the Manitoba Teachers' Society "to
conduct training sessions to develop non-sexist school material, as well as working through Multicultural Associations and other groups to sponsor professional conferences for teachers and other educators on various aspects of multicultural education.

These conferences were often seen as a way to push the provinces to action through the back door or, failing that, to generate action at the grass roots. An illustration of the former comes from Nova Scotia and the latter from Manitoba. A state supported effort in 1979 to bring together individuals in Nova Scotia interested in Acadian education with education officials resulted, according to the Department of the Secretary of State, in "the provincial Minister of Education plan[ning] to examine the possibilities of a French Language education system in Nova Scotia." In Manitoba a 1981 conference is said to have generated all kinds of local activity in multicultural education.

Approximately 700 teachers, pedagogical experts and school trustees attended the conference on 'Multiculturalism in Education held in Winnipeg in November. As a result regional committees are now involved in introducing multiculturalism into local education and the Multiculturalism Directorate [of Secretary of State] is providing assistance and encouragement for the development of curriculum materials."

It was not only access to public schools that made surrogates valuable to the state, however, they also opened up other avenues for reaching school aged youth. Early on the Citizenship Branch realized that citizenship "cannot be taught in schools alone but must be taught also in our churches, social
service clubs and service organizations." This recognition led the state to sponsor a wide variety of programs through an equally varied number of organizations. These included a number of different camping programs like the one at Camp Gold Eye in the early 1960s which brought together 16 to 20 year old students representing such organizations as Junior Farmers, 4-H clubs, and the YMCA. For a week these students attended sessions on "understanding ... the concept of community in a changing democratic system" guided by officers of the Citizenship Branch.

Literally dozens of similar projects were carried out with Branch support and under the auspices of various organizations. As was shown in chapter four, conferences were a favourite vehicle for the state to gather groups of young people for citizenship education. In addition to the Annual Banff Citizenship Seminar sponsored by the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews and discussed extensively elsewhere in this work, the Branch sponsored dozens of citizenship conferences run by the YMCA, the Canadian Association of Adult Education (CAAE) and many different ethnic organizations.

One of the earliest travel and exchange programs sponsored by the Citizenship Branch was called Adventures in Citizenship and was run by the Rotary Club. In May of 1959 the first of these projects was carried out and was described as follows:

Briefly, the 200 boys and girls spend four days in Ottawa learning at first hand how our parliamentary system of government functions and gaining a deeper insight into the
significance of, and the rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship. 80

Another example of a state supported project was "The Key to Canada, which was a two-year project in which the YMCA inaugurated citizenship training for young Canadians." 81

These represent only a few of the large number of citizenship education programs sponsored by the state and run by surrogate organizations. In addition to these kinds of special projects the Citizenship Branch provided long term sustaining funding over the years to several organizations involved in citizenship education. These included the Boys Club, Boy Scouts, Girl Guides, CCC, and the CAAE. 82

Although they proved a valuable policy instrument in addition to official agreements in implementing state citizenship policy, surrogates were not the only mechanism the state used to bypass the provinces. In 1981 Secretary of State Francis Fox wrote, "three issues concern us deeply whenever we talk about federal-provincial programs - accountability, visibility, and national goals." 83 State officials worried that funds they provided were not being spent properly and that the federal government was not receiving appropriate credit (visibility) for the money it provided. 84 As Hodgson points out, one solution to these kinds of concern was to offer direct programs over which state officials could exercise direct control. 85

The method of direct federal intervention most familiar to Canadians is the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) and the
National Film Board. From the very beginnings of its work the Citizenship Branch maintained close contact with CBC radio and television and with the NFB and developed many citizenship programs with both of these organizations. In a 1951 memo the deputy minister Branch Director Frank Foulds wrote that,

"two half days were spent with some six officials of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Their school broadcasts are outlined for the next year and were reviewed with them. Various members of their Talks Section discussed how their regular broadcasts, and especially Citizens' Forum and Radio farm Forum, could utilize topics which in essence were citizenship."

A decade and a half later in responding to a question about Citizenship Branch activity in citizenship education, another Director reemphasized the importance of the CBC and the NFB in the Branch's work. He wrote that the Branch enters into agreements with the National Film Board for the production of films designed to illustrate certain aspects of citizenship responsibilities. In a certain sense, it could be said that the entire budgets of the National Film Board and the C.B.C. are aimed at educational ends those being interpreting Canada to Canadians.

In more recent times the federal government has offered direct grants to teachers, students, and material developers in order to further its citizenship education policy. The best example of the former two were the bursaries available under the Bilingualism in Education Program for professional preparation to teach a second official language or for short term (usually summer) immersion opportunities for students. In addition to the substantial sums of money given to the provinces to support public school language programs and second language teacher education, the state invested heavily in individual teachers and
students. In 1979-80 alone $2,552,179 was given in bursaries to students for language study while a further $2,269,644 was provided to teachers to upgrade their pedagogical skills in second language teaching.

In terms of direct grants for the development of materials, multicultural and human rights education seem to have fared the best. Throughout the 1970s and early 1980s there were many programs to fund the development of materials in these areas. For example, the Department of Secretary of State reported in 1980 that,

The Multicultural Educational Resources Development Program assisted publishers to produce supplementary learning materials on multicultural topics for use both within and outside the education system.88

In addition to providing support to publishers, the Department funded some authors directly as well for both self initiated and commissioned works.

Works commissioned included a multicultural anthology of stories and poems for children aged 8-12; a collection of Canadian folk tales from many cultural groups; a series of studies to provide detailed information of the writers and on the literary activity of as many cultural groups as possible, as well as a list of publications funded over the last few years by the Multicultural Program.89

Whether as a direct result of these initiatives or not, as discussed in chapter three there is evidence that Canadian public schools are paying much more attention to multiculturalism and human rights than they were twenty years ago.
Conclusion

Research done on the federal state's involvement in education indicates that by the 1980s the notion that the constitution guaranteed provincial autonomy over education was clearly a "myth" which "effectively disguises that large and even determining role long played by Ottawa in education." Stevenson argues that federal officials, and indeed provincial ones when it suits them, have always managed "to address pressing social needs without allowing Section 93 to become too severe an impediment." Hodgson goes even further when he contends that the federal state has used its spending power to effectively amend the constitution as it applies to education.

This substantial federal involvement can clearly be seen in the area of citizenship education. Between 1947 and 1982 the federal state employed several policy instruments, including official agreements with the provinces, surrogates, and direct programs to implement its citizenship education policies. Substantial financial inducements were used to convince provinces to implement particular programs such as French immersion in public schools across the country. In addition to the direct sponsorship of particular programs, the state sought to build the capacity for carrying out its policies in the future by developing: a knowledge base, institutional infrastructure, pedagogical materials, and a cadre of trained teachers all designed to support state policies in citizenship education.
A direct link between cause and effect in social systems is almost impossible to establish. With that in mind, it is impossible to know for certain to what degree the explosion of second language programs, the rise to dominance of Canadian content in school social studies programs, and the increasing presence of multicultural topics and materials in public schools are the result of state policies and programs which have advocated all of these. Certainly, other forces have been at work, including continued threats to national unity, the desire of parents to have their children become bilingual, and the demands of cultural minorities for increased recognition and status in the nation and in the curriculum, that have contributed to moving Canadian education in these directions. What is clear, however, is that the national state invested considerable energy and money through bilateral agreements with the provinces, the sponsoring of surrogate organizations, and direct programs in all of these areas and all of them have shown movement in the direction desired by the state. There can be no doubt, that at least some of that movement, and probably a considerable amount, can be safely attributed to state policy and practice.
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Chapter 7
Conclusion

Summary

As in other Western democracies, the role of the state over the past century in Canada has undergone an enormous expansion. According to Hodgson, after accounting for inflation, spending by the federal government in 1986 was more than 28 times what it was in 1871, 22 times 1931 levels and three times the amount for 1971. The "evidence of increasing involvement [by the state] in many aspects of national life can be seen further in a burgeoning civil service, rising federal budgets, the lengthening sessions of Parliament, Parliament's inability to debate more than a small fraction of our national issues, the existence of over 800 federal-provincial consultative committees and of almost 315 agencies, departments, corporations and councils."¹

Even though constitutionally education falls within provincial jurisdiction in Canada, the expansion of the federal state's presence and control has been felt as strongly in that area as elsewhere. In the early years of the nation "education was clearly a matter of local concern" and, "until the 1950s, the federal role was largely 'at the margin'."² Since that time the reports of several royal commissions, for example, the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (The Massey Commission) in 1949 and the Royal
Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (The B and B Commission) in the late 1960s, have raised serious concerns about national sovereignty, identity and unity. These, coupled with ongoing concern for equal opportunity and economic competitiveness, have spurred the federal state to become involved in almost all areas of public education. Although the national state often claims that its activities in education are essentially confined to the post secondary sector, substantial involvement in both school and community based educational initiatives for school aged children has been well documented.

In this thesis I have shown that the period between 1947 and 1982 was one of active and expanding state involvement in the area of citizenship education. I have examined the conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education which informed state policy in citizenship education during the period, how the policy was developed, and the instruments through which the policy was implemented.

The Policy

In 1947, the year the first Canadian Citizenship Act became law, James Kidd reflecting on that legislation wrote, "Canada is legally a nation, but Canadians are scarcely yet a people." What Kidd meant was Canadians did not have a sense of national identity and collective purpose which sprang from a common culture and shared mythology or civil religion. This lack of a national identity has been widely perceived as the greatest
threat to the continued existence of the Canadian nation and is a persistent theme in the literature about citizenship and citizenship education in Canada. Between the years 1947-1982, the Canadian state regarded this deficiency as a significant threat to its legitimacy and therefore made the construction and propagation of a shared national ideal the central element of its policy in citizenship education.

It was the abiding belief of federal politicians and bureaucrats alike that Canadians were largely ignorant of who they were and if they only knew, problems of national unity would be solved. These officials saw it as their job to dispel the ignorance of Canadians in this regard and set out to create an ideal to which all Canadian citizens could adhere. Over the years the nature of this ideal changed in response to times and circumstances, moving from Canada: the land of conquering pioneers in the 1940s, and 1950s; through Canada: the bilingual/bicultural reality in the 1960s and early 1970s; to Canada: the pluralist ideal in the 1970s and 1980s. Although the ideal changed, what did not change was the state's view that the ideal of the day represented an accurate and objective image of the country and one that could and should unite all Canadians in a common vision of the nation and their relationship to it. What also did not change was that Canadians, by and large, did not participate in the construction of these ideals.

One of the major threats to a widely shared national identity in the eyes of state officials was the divisions that
existed between groups of Canadians. In the 1940s and 1950s this concern focused on the divisions between established Canadians and post-war immigrants and it grew in later years to include divisions between: Natives and non-Natives; French and English; various cultural groups; and so on. Simply said, the state wanted all Canadians to get along. The creation of a shared identity was one way to foster getting along, but this was not the only policy option the state employed. Policy and programs designed to foster assimilation and accommodation were also developed. The essence of this policy was that immigrants and Native Canadians were to be assimilated into the mainstream as soon as possible and established Canadians were to be patient and helpful as this process took place. Even seemingly more progressive and inclusive policies like multiculturalism were largely covers for assimilation. Resnick points out about Native integration into Canadian society that,

There would be little space for indigenous customs and institutions in this brave new world. Capitalism - Anglo Saxon or Latin - would put paid to group and collective forms of ownership common to most aboriginal societies.

As it was with Native peoples it was with all others, people were free to hang on to outward manifestations of cultural expression but when it came to civic and economic life they were to fit in as individual citizens of a capitalist liberal democracy.

The citizenship sector of the Canadian state adopted two mechanisms to further this policy of assimilation and accommodation. These were contact and intercession. Through
the former the state sought to bring representatives of various groups together for short periods in controlled circumstances for the purpose of enhancing mutual understanding and therefore unity. Programs to foster contact most often took the form of exchange programs like Young Voyageurs or conferences like the Banff Citizenship Seminars. In the case of intercession the state sought to act as the conduit of carefully controlled information among groups thought to be in conflict. It did this largely through the journal Citizen published in English and French by the Citizenship Branch as well as other Branch publications such as The Canadian Family Tree.

Finally, the state perceived a threat to a shared national identity in the alienation of Canadians from public participation. The state was not interested, however, in political participation of any significance by ordinary citizens, particularly if that participation might entail opposition to government policies or programs. Policy in citizenship education encouraged the participation of people in community based volunteer organizations. The state provided materials and human expertise to a wide variety of community groups to help them involve more people, particularly those from groups who were perceived to be marginalized. Many of these programs were developed to explicitly head off more overtly political activities by youth, ethnic organizations, women, and the disabled. The state's purpose in encouraging this kind of
participation had more to do with heading off political dissent than with fostering democratic participation.

In his book, Thinking English Canada, Philip Resnick argues that there is often a difference between state and nation. Although we have tended to use the terms interchangeably, he contends, they are not necessarily the same. States are political and territorial entities which have some form of international recognition, while nations are sociological entities which do not necessarily have political institutions and sovereign territory but do have "group affinity and shared values." Canada, according to Resnick, is clearly a state in that it is an internationally recognized entity with established institutions and territory but is not a sociological nation because it lacks group affinity and nationally shared values.

The focus of state policy in citizenship education for the years in question was to turn the Canadian state into a sociological nation and to maintain power elites. In the words of Ronald Manzer, "civic education [was] to serve the formation of political nationality and the preservation of public order."

This policy was largely congruous with elitist conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education outlined in chapter two. Consistent with those conceptions, the Canadian state desired to construct citizens who were loyal to national institutions and common ideals, had a common body of knowledge about the nation, obeyed the law, and largely left political participation to politicians. Although the state did consult
with some groups about the formation of its policies, in the main Canadians were left out of the process of actively constructing their own citizenship.

**The Process**

The period covered in this study largely coincides with the dominance of a positivist conception of social science in general and policy research in particular. Torgerson argues this orientation held a vision of society where policy research would lead to "putting an end to the strife and confusion of human society in favour of an orderly administration of things based on objective knowledge." The idea was that researchers' scientific "knowledge would replace politics." This orientation to policy making dominates the public and private statements of state officials throughout the period 1947 to 1982. As with most modern states during this period, the Canadian state greatly expanded its activities in the area of collecting social information and sponsoring social research of all types and officials in the citizenship sector claimed to be making policy based on the objective findings of this work.

As Manzer points out, however, in understanding what policy is and how it is made it is as important to pay attention to what is done as to what is said. What the state did in developing citizenship education policy in these years far more closely resembled the "ecology-of-games metaphor" described by Firestone than objective social science. Firestone contends
that the various players who have interest in and influence over educational policy engage in a kind of game. As with other games, the policy game is a structured competition in which the players involved seek advantage in order to win. Rewards in the policy game might include promotion, extended influence, or better working conditions. The ecology-of-games metaphor sees the educational policy process as an interaction between various games, including "the state legislative game, the state government administration game, the district and school administration game, and the teaching game." Each of these games includes an internal competition with winners and losers but is also influenced by the outcomes of the other games. A particular politician, or group of politicians, might win or lose the state legislative game, for example, because of a strong lobby from winners of the teaching game. On the other hand relative advantage in the teaching game or either version of the administration game is bound to be affected by particular outcomes of the legislative game. In order to understand policy making and implementation one must study the elements of individual games (e.g. rules, players, rewards) and the complex interaction between various games in a field of endeavour.

The policy making activities of the citizenship sector of the Canadian state between 1947 and 1982 fit Firestone's model very well. The principal force driving the evolution of policy was for the Citizenship Branch and its successors to win the game by extending the policy territory over which it had
control. The main opponents in this game were other sectors within the state itself which shared areas of responsibility with the Citizenship Branch and non-governmental voluntary organizations which worked in the citizenship field. In several instances the Citizenship Branch attempted to extend its influence within the state through becoming the coordinator for broad areas of state policy particularly in social policy and education. These attempts were largely unsuccessful. Far more successful were Branch efforts to extend bureaucratic territory through recognition of emerging areas of state interest and careful positioning so as to inherit responsibilities which accrued from those interests. As a result of this process the Branch, and the Department of the Secretary of State more generally, inherited significant areas of policy and programming responsibilities from both the Centennial Commission and the B and B Commission. These new areas of responsibility, including student exchange and bilingualism development programs, resulted in a great expansion of the Department of the Secretary of State in the 1960s and 1970s. Clearly a victory in the policy games.

Less clear was the outcome of the competition between the citizenship sector of the state and non-governmental organizations involved in citizenship promotion. Although the state consistently attempted to bring the work of these organizations into line with state policy, to make them in effect surrogates, it often found itself having to take the lead from one or more of them who were out in front in a particular
area of policy development. The best example of this is the relationship between the Department of the Secretary of State and the Canada Studies Foundation (CSF). The CSF clearly had the initiative in policy and program development for the area of Canadian studies in public education throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s. During this period the state framed most of its policy initiatives within parameters developed by the Foundation. In the early 1980s, however, as the state got up to speed in the field it used its funding power to reign in the CSF and usurp control over this area of policy. This loss of autonomy was a significant factor in the demise of the Foundation in 1986. This example is typical of the ebb and flow in the relationship between the state and private organizations in the citizenship field.

Far from the neat and clean application of social science knowledge, "educational politics and policy-making are rent by conflicting political, economic, and cultural interests." This was certainly the case for the making of citizenship education policy within the Canadian state between 1947 and 1982.

The Implementation

When it is convenient the federal state works through official agreements with the provinces to meet its policy objectives in education. For example, since World War II the federal government working through a series of agreements with
the provinces has provided substantial financial support for vocational education. One of the most significant areas of federal-provincial cooperation in public school education during the period under study here was with regard to second language programs. State officials saw these programs as integral to their attempts to construct a national identity around bilingualism and biculturalism. In response to some of the recommendations of the B and B Commission the federal government launched a substantial program of support for public school second language education in September 1970. Under these agreements provinces were reimbursed for part of the cost of instructional programs in the second official language (French for Anglophone students and English for Francophone students). Different formulae were used depending on whether students were enrolled in an immersion program or took the language as one class period each day.

The fact that these and other federal-provincial arrangements in public education were worked out by negotiations through official channels is not to imply that the provinces have been completely happy with the federal role. Hodgson points to "the start-stop problem," that is the tendency of federal officials to conceive of and announce programs before any negotiation with the provinces takes place and then to cancel them without notice. The Technical Vocational Training Agreement (TVTA), for example, was announced suddenly in 1960
and cancelled in 1966 "quite literally on the evening before a federal-provincial conference was about to begin."  

A much more serious problem from the provinces' point of view is the federal preference for conditional rather than unconditional grants for education. Federal conditions often have the effect of interfering with provincial priorities and thereby circumventing their authority over education. The federal view is that "Ottawa offers money upon certain conditions; no person, body or government has to accept the conditions and the moneys; therefore Ottawa is not interfering in any way with provincial autonomy as it is exercised under our Constitution." While federal authorities argue that as a granting agency the federal state retains an appropriate arm's length relationship with education, there is counter evidence. For Hodgson "the TVTA period represents a time in which federal authorities were in fact the curriculum directors for thousands of Canadian high school students." In similar fashion, during the 1970s and 1980s the federal state used funding formulae under the Bilingualism in Education Program to exercise direct and substantial control over schools and programs.

The federal state does not limit its involvement in public education to official federal-provincial initiatives but has also developed several ways to bypass the provinces. A study by the Canadian Teachers' Federation in 1973 outlined how the federal state provided educational programming directly to school age children including: the development of curricular
materials for elementary and secondary schools by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs; sponsorship by the National Arts Centre of both student projects and cross Canada school tours of professional companies; several travel and exchange programs; and school broadcasts by CBC radio and television which "carry some 4,000 primary and secondary school programs in a year." My study shows that the state used all of these direct means to implement its citizenship education policy in public education. Throughout the period 1947 to 1982, for example, various sectors in the Department of the Secretary of State produced, or funded the production of, curricular materials which found their way directly to public school teachers. In the 1940s and 1950s the department distributed thousands of booklets and filmstrips in the Canadian Citizenship Series to schools and by the early 1980s it was distributing materials to support teaching such things as multicultural and human rights education.

In addition to the development and dissemination of materials, the state was directly involved in the training and professional development of teachers. From courses for those teaching immigrant language classes in the 1950s to bursaries and scholarships for second language teachers in the 1970s and 1980s the state attempted to fashion a teaching force sympathetic to its goals in citizenship education. Heater argues states of all kinds have historically attempted to make
teachers their agents in citizenship education. The Canadian state was no exception in this. 23

Other ways that the federal state exercised influence in education over the period included: the funding of ostensibly private organizations in the area of education such as the Canada Studies Foundation (CSF) and the Canadian Council for Multicultural and Intercultural Education (CCMIE), support for community groups like 4-H Clubs to carry out educational programs and direct support to school boards for particular programs. 24 Many of the organizations which received federal support delivered citizenship education programs directly to school aged children and others had access to schools and teachers that the state could not get on its own. In many cases provinces were not even aware of initiatives affecting their own jurisdictions.

Implications

There are several implications for policy makers that flow from this study of state policy in citizenship education. First, the attempt to focus citizenship education on the construction of a single national identity has been unsuccessful and ought to be abandoned; second, the policy making process needs to be democratized with individual citizens as well as groups being included in substantial ways; third, the political and social context in which policy is made needs to be explicitly acknowledged and the role of various forms of
knowledge in that process clarified; finally, there needs to be an acknowledgement of the substantial role the federal state plays in Canadian public school education and an attempt to make that role as open as possible.

The Focus of Citizenship Education Policy

Historically the most common state objective for citizenship education "has been to sustain national pride" through the development of a sense of national identity. Attempts by the Canadian state to do this failed largely because of the depth and tenacity of the multinational character of Canada. Earlier in this work I argued that one of the unique aspects of Canadian citizenship was the existence within the state of at least two nations. In his essay, "The Nations of a State," Edward Spicer contends that Canada is not alone in this, he writes "that every state (the exceptions are too trivial to dwell on) is a plural entity. Every state contains within itself two or more nations." In his work, Spicer distinguishes between states and peoples in a similar fashion to the way Resnick distinguishes between states and nations. Part of the distinction is contained in the concept of "boundedness" which Spicer explains as follows:

A people is bounded in a quite different way from a state. A state maintains the privilege of defining a territorial boundary around itself, a boundary that can be marked as a relatively fixed line on a map to enclose the territory within which the legal citizens of a state reside. The boundary of a people is not that simple, because it depends on the sharing of meanings among individuals.
This shared system of meanings is very complex and can be a mystery even to peoples who live near each other and have much interaction. States have been able to establish domains of meaning for some common symbols, such as a flag, but a state "never has the rich array of symbols, ranging through all aspects of life, that characterize a people."\

Although most modern states contain more than one nation, in almost all cases, Spicer argues, one dominant people come to define official culture in each state. The other peoples he calls "hidden nations," their cultures and systems of meaning are submerged by the dominant culture. If Canada is not unique in being a multinational state, it is rare in that it has never established a single dominant national culture. While it is true that some peoples, Aboriginals being the most obvious example, have for most of Canadian history been engulfed by European culture, the presence of Québec within Canada with its own territory, legal system, and culture has prevented a single official culture from dominating the state. Because of the nature of the Canadian federation, what Spicer sees as the corner stones of a dominant state culture: one official language, a national education system, a common history, and a single body of law, have never existed in Canada. Certainly, state attempts to create a unifying ideal were attempts to construct an official culture, but these attempts failed, in part at least, because the very structure of Canada encouraged resistance to them.
At the end of an article tracing the many unsuccessful attempts by Canadian schools to create a national identity, historian Robert Stamp asks the question, "Should Canadian schools and universities even attempt to foster a sense of national identity?" Stamp leaves the question unanswered but I will not. If fostering a national identity means, as it did for the Canadian state between 1947 and 1982, constructing a single ideal in which all Canadians will find their identity as citizens, it should not be attempted. I argue this for two reasons. First, the history recorded here and elsewhere indicates that it can not be done, and second, current realities would make it even more likely to fail. Charles Taylor in his essay "Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition" points out that peoples who have been dominated by national culture are not willing to live that way any more and are stepping forward to demand recognition. This recognition, he argues elsewhere may include the right to understand their citizenship differently from the dominant culture. Likewise, Rosamond Spicer points out that Native Americans "like so many other nations within states today,...are strongly asserting their nationhood in no uncertain - though mostly peaceful - terms." Certainly the same statement could be made about Native Canadians. Even if it was desirable, and in my view it is not, the state would continue to meet overwhelming resistance if it attempted to impose a single national culture on all peoples within Canada.
Does this mean that the nation state, or at least the Canadian nation state, cannot continue to exist. I do not think so, but it does mean that the state may have to find its unity in ways other than a national mythology which springs from a commonly understood history. Taylor contends, for example, that Canada could find its identity and unity "based on a significant common future rather than a shared past." He suggests that this common future might include consensus around such things as: building a society in which "groups can learn from each other and be enriched by living side by side; the role Canada might play in the world (i.e. peace keeping and aid); and "the creation of a more egalitarian society." Resnick as well dismisses the idea of creating a single national identity to undergird Canadian citizenship. He suggests that the best hope for Canada's continued existence is the recognition of three nations within it, English Canada, Québec, and Aboriginals, and the creation of mechanisms "to bring these different nationalities together within the rubric of a single state." It is not clear what shape Canadian citizenship would take in any of these proposals, but it is clear is that Canadians need to be more involved in the construction of that citizenship and that citizenship education ought to prepare them for that process.

The Process of Making Citizenship Education Policy
State citizenship policy between 1947 and 1982 was not only elitist in nature, it was also formed and implemented in an elitist fashion. Consistent with Hodgson's view that Ottawa generally feels that it is alone in having the big picture (i.e. seeing things from a national perspective and looking out for the national interest), the state was careful to limit the participation of individuals, private organizations, and the provinces in the business of policy making and implementation. Although the Department of the Secretary of State, in particular the Citizenship Branch, held many consultations on citizenship policy and programs it usually had an idea of what outcomes it wanted before the meetings took place and set agendas accordingly. In regard to implementation, the state often used its control of funding to put conditions on how both surrogate organizations and the provinces spent money in the area of citizenship education.

Resnick contends that there has been a "democratic deficit" in the Western world in general and Canada in particular. By this he means that decisions are most often made by political elites and "do not reflect the aspirations of the population at large." He goes on to argue that "what our recent constitutional experience teaches us is the impossibility of arriving at workable alternatives without a large measure of grass-roots participation in the political process." A widely shared conception of Canadian citizenship can only be created if a wide spectrum of Canadians participate in the process.
Mechanisms must be found for much wider citizen participation in shaping the public life of this country. As Resnick argues, "we need institutions for direct participation at all levels of society, feeding into, but not swallowed up by the executive and legislative structures of the central state." In other words, we need to build what Taylor calls "the participatory society." A central element of this project would be citizenship education not focused on creating national identity but, rather, focused on developing broad and significant participation by all citizens, what Barber calls "strong democracy." At a meeting in Ottawa several years ago on the place of citizenship education in Canadian schools one participant, in responding to the question, "What is a Canadian?" said: "Canadians are people who are always arguing about what it means to be Canadian, and the purpose of citizenship education is to prepare students to participate in that debate in an intelligent way."

The Nature of Making Policy

Essential to democratizing the process of policy making in citizenship education is a move away from the "imperial" view of professional social inquiry which portrays the knowledge created by research as objective and the process of policy making as the rational application of that knowledge to pressing social issues. One of the features of modern states, according to Lacey and Furner, is they claim to exercise power based "on
the application of an appropriate body of knowledge and procedure."\textsuperscript{44} The reality demonstrated here and elsewhere is that the policy making process is a lot more complex and messy than that and "the knowledge base [for policy decisions] is not composed exclusively or even largely of expert information and theory."\textsuperscript{45}

Many policy researchers themselves are concerned that the reification of specialized social science knowledge for the purposes of social problem solving has lead to a process of deliberation on public policy issues that excludes non-expert.\textsuperscript{46} Nelkin, in particular, worries about the abuse of "\textit{scientific expertise}" which she notes "is a critical political resource."\textsuperscript{47} (emphasis in the original) She argues that "democratic principles require that individuals be involved in the formation and determination of policies affecting them."\textsuperscript{48} Her concern is that the rise in the reliance on scientific knowledge to inform policy decisions may be a threat to such democratic principles.

If the policy making process is going to be more democratic state policy makers need to both acknowledge the complex and political nature of their work and find ways to involve individuals and groups in meaningful dialogue around policy issues. Some of the mechanisms of the past, such as conferences and written submissions, could work well but the agenda and outcome can not be fixed ahead of time as so often was the case in the making of citizenship education policy.
Clarifying the State's Role

This study supports the findings of others which show that by the 1980s the notion that the constitution guaranteed provincial autonomy over education was clearly a "myth" which "effectively disguises the large and even determining role long played by Ottawa." Stevenson argues that federal officials, and indeed provincial ones when it suits them, have always managed "to address pressing social needs without allowing Section 93 to become too severe an impediment." According to Hodgson the federal state has used its spending power to effectively amend the constitution as it applies to education.

The national state in Canada has consistently used the language of crisis to justify its intrusions into education. Sometimes the perceived crises were economic, which was the case with the TVTA initiative, and sometimes they were political or social as with the Bilingualism in Education initiative. Whatever the nature of the crisis, the state has argued that its constitutional responsibility to protect the national interest justifies it intruding on provincial territory. Although the provinces are usually happy to receive federal money for programs, they often resist and resent federal influence. The net effect of this resistance is two levels of government which are frustrated, the provinces because they feel their territory has been violated and the federal government because it lacks the means to hold the provinces completely accountable for how
programs are implemented. It is time for the provinces to acknowledge that the national state does have an interest in public education as well as the means to exercise some measure of influence and that it is never going to butt out of the field altogether. On the other hand it is reasonable, given the constitutional division of powers, for the provinces to expect the federal government to be open and above board with its educational initiatives and to include the provinces early in the policy making process. This kind of agreement could lead to better conceived and implemented policies and programs.

Future Research

This work has examined in depth the kinds of policies in citizenship education developed and implemented by one portion of the Canadian state over the period 1947 to 1982. There are several areas where future research could verify, refine and extend the findings reported here. The effect of state downsizing on educational policy is one key area for study. The period covered by this study was one of almost constant economic growth coupled with substantial growth in the size and influence of the state. Huge amounts of money were available at various times to implement programs related to citizenship education. Those times have been swept away in the current wave of restructuring and cutting the size of government, including those departments responsible for citizenship and citizenship education. What this will mean for state activities in the
field is uncertain: will the state disappear as an important player? Will the initiative devolve to non-governmental organizations? or Will the state find a way to maintain influence with fewer dollars and personnel? These are all important questions for study.

Another area for further research would be the degree to which the policies and programs reported here actually permeated public schools. Cornbleth points out that in studying educational policy it is important to consider both the structural and sociocultural context in which the policy will operate. The state is part of the sociocultural context in which the education system exists and that system itself with its many layers beginning with the classroom and moving through the school and district to the department of education makes up the structural context. Within this structure are "established roles and relationships, including operating procedures, shared beliefs and norms (i.e., tradition and culture)." These things act to condition and shape any policy brought forward for implementation. It would be interesting to know the ways in which state policies and programs described here were mediated by the structural context of education and what, if any, form they took at the level of classroom practice.

Finally, Lacey and Furner suggest the influence of interest groups on state policy as an important but neglected area of inquiry. My study has touched on the role of some of these groups in the direct formation and implementation of citizenship
education policy largely from the perspective of one part of the state bureaucracy. There is need for work examining the influence these groups have in shaping policy at the political level as well as work that examines the policy making process from the perspectives of the groups themselves. Lacey and Furner point out that there is a lot of cross over between modern states and voluntary organizations in the shaping of public policy and argue that "the boundary separating the public from the private has functioned more like a membrane than a wall." This study has begun to uncover the delicate and complex process of policy osmosis in relation to interest groups and the Canadian state, there is certainly room for more work in the area.
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