Political Science in Canada and the Americanization Issue*

ALAN C. CAIRNS *University of British Columbia*

This paper is a contribution to the controversy over the appropriate relationship between political science in Canada and in the United States. Thus far the discussion has lacked a clear focus on issues of specific concern to political science as a discipline, partly because they are not easily extricated from the welter of contextually related considerations pertaining to the employment prospects for Canadian graduates, to the social role of the man of knowledge in a time of crisis, and to more general aspects of Canadian-American relations. The paper's objective is to clarify the nature of the disciplinary issues involved.

The paper is divided into four parts. Part one deals with the development of political science in Canada from its nineteenth-century beginnings to the present. Part two outlines the diffuse Americanization controversy of recent years. Part three stresses several crucial factors which that controversy has failed to consider. The paper concludes in part four with a general approach to the study of Canadian politics which summarizes the main conclusions and notes factors relevant to a research strategy for this subfield.

The discussion is restricted to political science in English Canada. Although brief mention is made in part one of the development of a francophone political science community, it is excluded from the subsequent discussion on the grounds that an analysis of its distinct position would require individualized treatment beyond the author's competence. A further important limitation is evident in parts three and four which examine the Americanization issue with particular reference to the study of Canadian politics, the subfield to which the controversy has been primarily directed. The relevance of this examination to other subfields of political science in Canada is an open question. The extent to which the Plato industry, fed by contributors from every country and clime, can be usefully discussed with reference to particular national communities of political scientists is a problem left to others for exploration.

A preliminary observation may forestall misunderstanding: it is taken for granted that the social science enterprise includes a scholarly capacity to explain and interpret realities other than those personally experienced by the scholar. White contributions to Black studies, male professors of Women's studies, and American contributions to Canadian studies are presupposed by the very nature

*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the IXth World Congress of the International Political Science Association in Canada, Montreal, 1973, under the title "Continentalism and/or Nationalism in Canadian Political Science. Is there a Problem?" I am grateful to Donald V. Smiley for showing me a draft version of his paper "Must Canadian political science be a miniature replica?" *Journal of Canadian Studies* IX, 1 (Feb. 1974) and to many colleagues for their helpful comments.

Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique, VIII, no. 2 (June/juin 1975). Printed in Canada/Imprimé au Canada.

of a social science, namely a capacity to transcend experience as a basis of understanding.[1]

Part one: development of political science in Canada[2]

Academic disciplines develop differently in different societies. The following sketch relates the development of political science in Canada to the particular Canadian circumstances in which it grew and provides historical background for the Americanization controversy of more recent years.

English Canadian society was intellectually colonial from confederation to the First World War. The universities applied themselves "chiefly to the transmission of a European cultural heritage,"[3] so that "education seemed somewhat exotic, European rather than native."[4] The social sciences commenced by importing the major disciplines "as mature and well established techniques from Britain and the United States,"[5] especially the former, and by importing the professors to teach

[1]See Robert K. Merton, "Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge," *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (1972).

[2]The major articles helpful in tracing the development of Canadian political science are as follows: W.J. Ashley, *What is Political Science? An Inaugural Lecture* (Toronto 1888); John George Bourinot, "The Study of Political Science in Canadian Universities," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada for the Year 1889* VII (Montreal 1890); O.D. Skelton, "Fifty Years of Political and Economic Science in Canada," in The Royal Society of Canada, *Fifty Years Retrospect, Anniversary Volume 1882–1932* (no place, no date); C.B. Macpherson, "On the Study of Politics in Canada," in *Essays in Political Economy*, ed. H.A. Innis (Toronto 1938); R.M. Dawson, "Political Science," in "Research in the Social Sciences in Canada," mimeo, 1939, archives of the Social Science Research Council of Canada; A.R.M. Lower, "The Social Sciences in Canada," *Culture* III (1942); H.McD. Clokie, "Canadian Contributions to Political Science," *Culture* III (1942); C.B. Macpherson, "The Position of Political Science," *Culture* III (1942); H.F. Quinn, "Political Science Instruction in Canadian Universities," *Culture* IX (1948); R.M. Dawson, "Political Science Teaching in Canada," a report to the Social Science Research Council, 1950, reprinted in *Newsletter: Canadian Political Science Association* II, 4 (March 1973); B.S. Keirstead and Frederick M. Watkins, "Political Science in Canada," in UNESCO, *Contemporary Political Science: A Survey of Methods, Research and Teaching* (Paris 1950); B.S. Keirstead and S.D. Clark, "Social Sciences," in *Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences* (Ottawa 1951); J.E. Hodgetts, "Dives and Lazarus: Three Reports on the Teaching of Political Science," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* XVIII, 1 (Feb. 1952); C.B. Macpherson, "L'Enseignement de la Science politique au Canada," *Revue Française de Science Politique* IV, 2 (Avril-Juin 1954); C.B. Macpherson, "The Social Sciences," in *The Culture of Contemporary Canada*, ed. Julian Park (Toronto 1957); Henry B. Mayo, "Writing in the Social Sciences," in *Literary History of Canada*, ed. Karl F. Klinck (Toronto 1965); R.R. March and R.J. Jackson, "Aspects of the State of Political Science in Canada," *Midwest Journal of Political Science* XI, 4 (Nov. 1967); D.V. Smiley, "Contributions to Canadian Political Science Since the Second World War," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* XXXIII, 4 (Nov. 1967); J.E. Hodgetts, "Canadian Political Science: A Hybrid with a Future?" in *Scholarship in Canada, 1967: Achievement and Outlook*, ed. R.H. Hubbard (Toronto 1968); James MacKinnon and David Brown, "Political Science in the Canadian University, 1969," in *The Struggle for Canadian Universities*, ed. Robin Mathews and James Steele (Toronto 1969); A.R. Kear, "Canadian Political Science – One Man's Fancy," mimeo, presented to the 1971 annual meeting of the CPSA. The works by Macpherson are particularly useful.

[3]Clokie, "Canadian Contributions," 470

[4]Lower, "Social Sciences," 437

[5]Macpherson, "The Social Sciences," 185. The harmful effects of British influences in political science are discussed in Macpherson, "Study of Politics in Canada," 156–61. See Robin Neill, *A New Theory of Value: The Canadian Economics of H.A. Innis* (Toronto 1972), 13, 15, 70, 89 for analogous problems in economics.

Le problème de l'américanisation de la science politique au Canada

Cet essai a pour objectif d'analyser les principales composantes de la controverse actuelle concernant l'influence américaine sur le développement de la science politique au Canada, tout particulièrement au Canada anglais. Après avoir rappelé les grandes lignes de l'histoire de la science politique au Canada depuis le dix-neuvième siècle jusqu'à nos jours, l'auteur circonscrit les arguments fondamentaux sur lesquels le débat de l'américanisation repose en accordant une attention toute particulière à trois facteurs cruciaux qui n'ont pas, selon lui, été suffisamment considérés jusqu'à présent. L'énoncé d'une approche générale pour l'étude des phénomènes politiques canadiens permet à l'auteur de tirer certaines conclusions pertinentes au problème de l'américanisation et de poser certains jalons stratégiques pour la recherche politique au Canada.

them. The extensive recruitment of British faculty contributed to an emphasis on undergraduate teaching characteristic of British higher education, at the expense of research and graduate programs.[6]

These colonial circumstances in the universities combined with prevalent attitudes in Canadian society to discourage domestic social science scholarship. Academics and intellectuals were not accorded high status in a community which blended a frontier mentality with the narrowly utilitarian values of a business oriented society. Business and the professions offered more attractive inducements for the aggressive and the intellectually able in a period of developing capitalism. There was neither an aristocratic nor a leisured class to sustain a scholarly tradition in a hostile environment, nor large, stimulating, heterogeneous, metropolitan centres to allow escape from the confines of a small, parochial North American society. There was, however, a diffuse group of public officials, lawyers, journalists, and policy advocates who wrote for the small educated public. Their work was essentially legal and historical in orientation. It supplemented the limited output of the small university faculties with their heavy teaching loads and negligible incentives or opportunities for research and publication.

The successful transplanting of the social sciences to Canada required a reduction of these obstacles to scholarship, the emergence of Canadian scholars whose roots and affections were not in Europe, the overcoming of the imitative mentality of colonialism, a research focus on Canadian society, and the development of an infrastructure of journals, professional associations, and university departments. In the two decades between the world wars universities were strengthened, more Canadian-born academics were appointed, and research interest in the social sciences shifted to Canadian issues and problems. The University of Toronto Department of Political Economy, for long the strongest department in Canada, which had been consistently headed by British academics from the appointment of Ashley in 1888, selected Harold Innis as the first Canadian head in 1937. Concurrent with these interwar changes "it was no longer considered entirely the proper thing to rush off from college to Europe in the spring, presumably to renew the depleted stock of culture originally acquired there, returning on the last boat in the fall to ladle out the precious commodity during the ensuing winter."[7]

In political science there was a steady progression after the First World War towards an autonomous, indigenous, university-based professional discipline. The

[6]L.-P. Bonneau and J.A. Corry, *Quest for the Optimum*, Vol. 1 (Ottawa 1972), 18
[7]Lower, "Social Sciences," 437

developing system of universities recruited a nucleus of capable political scientists, of whom the most prominent were H.F. Angus, A.R. Brady, H.McD. Clokie, J.A. Corry, R.M. Dawson, E. Forsey, R.A. MacKay, C.B. Macpherson, Escott Reid, and N.McL. Rogers. In a manner analogous to simultaneous American developments in the discipline they broke away from the formal, legalistic approach widely employed in pre-First-World-War interpretations of the Canadian political system. They analysed the polity in which they lived as a series of interrelated institutions of British and American origin operating in a North American setting. In the mid-forties they produced four comprehensive works – H.McD. Clokie, *Canadian Government and Politics*,[8] J.A. Corry, *Democratic Government and Politics*,[9] R.M. Dawson, *The Government of Canada*,[10] and A. Brady, *Democracy in the Dominions: A Comparative Study in Institutions*[11] – which provided clear overviews of the political system, and indicated that political science, in a small but striking way, had established itself in Canada.

These and other impressive works were encouraged by the new disciplinary infrastructure created with the establishment of a professional association, the Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA), in 1929–30[12] and a professional journal, the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* (*CJEPS*), which commenced publishing in 1935, both of which were joint ventures with economists. The president of the CPSA noted in the foreword to the first issue that Canadian scholars frequently published in the journals of the United States and Britain, but, he continued, in a practical nationalist vein, "Canada has many distinct problems of her own. Canadian scholars could scarcely expect to find a medium for their discussion in either of the above countries. The proper place to examine and discuss them is in a Canadian journal."[13] The new journal and association helped break down the isolation of a dispersed academic community thinly scattered across a large sprawling country. They gave an immense boost to Canadian scholarship in political science. They stimulated the study of Canada, and they fostered a Canadian professional identity by bringing together scholars whose graduate education usually had taken place in Britain or the United States, who employed texts written by the faculty of other countries for the students of other countries, and whose previous disciplinary memberships had been with foreign, primarily American, professional associations.[14]

From a practical perspective the collaborative creation with economists of the CPSA and *CJEPS* constituted a recognition that the world was carved up into

[8]Toronto 1944 [9]Toronto 1946 [10]Toronto 1947
[11]Toronto 1947

[12]See K.W. Taylor, "The Foundation of the Canadian Political Science Association," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* XXXIII, 4 (Nov. 1967). Technically the CPSA was a revival, rather than a new creation, as an earlier annual meeting had been held in 1913. Further meetings were disrupted by the war and the association lapsed.

[13]D.A. MacGibbon, "Foreword," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* I, 1 (Feb. 1935), 1

[14]The founding of the American Political Science Association in 1903 is described as an event of tremendous significance for the development of American political science by Somit and Tanenhaus. They also note that the *Political Science Quarterly* was founded in 1886 as a distinctively American outlet in political science because of a dissatisfaction with dependence on foreign journals. Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus, *The Development of American Political Science: From Burgess to Behavioralism* (Boston 1967), 49–50, 36

nation states, the analysis of which could be aided or impeded by the presence or absence of the appropriate national institutional arrangements. This was especially true for political science, although possibly no less so for policy-oriented economic analysis, which employed the nation state as its major unit of analysis. The creation of the CPSA and *CJEPS* helped Canadian political scientists to meet the most obvious obligation of any national community of political scientists to the international political science community, an obligation which reflects a commonsense interpretation of an international division of academic labour, and the principle of comparative advantage in research choice, namely the provision of an analysis of the domestic political system for their colleagues elsewhere.

The political science which emerged from 1920 to 1950 was not dominated by any particular orientation to the discipline. The long textbook hegemony of Dawson's *Government of Canada*, first published in 1947, and the generally limited knowledge of the history of the discipline in Canada have given a historical-institutional approach such a high degree of visibility that the conventional wisdom erroneously tends to equate it with the political science of yesterday. An equally misleading historical interpretation springs from the contemporary revival of interest in Innis and a political economy approach. This elicits a tendency to view political economy as the traditional Canadian way of doing political science. However, with the distinguished exception of the Rowell Sirois Report,[15] two of whose commission members were political scientists, Henry Angus and R.A. MacKay, most of the significant work in political economy was done by economists, particularly by Innis himself and W.A. Mackintosh. Political scientists employed varying approaches, from the sociological orientation of Brady, the "nuts and bolts"[16] perspective of Dawson, to the Marxist class analysis of C.B. Macpherson. Political science in this period of development was plural, not monolithic. There is little evidence of a strong commitment of political scientists to political economy. Further, there was a pervasive rankling feeling of resentment over their inferior status in their relationships with the numerically stronger economists in the joint departments then common. Although the emerging Canadian variant of the discipline was eclectic in this period of growth, an increasing recognition developed of a common disciplinary identity distinct from economics, an identity later to seek institutional embodiment in separate departments and in its own professional association when numbers allowed.

In summary, the collaborative development with economists of the scholarly infrastructure of an association and a journal helped to domesticate political science and weaken the colonial mentality with its assumption that all worthwhile models of academic excellence were foreign, particularly British. This interaction of academic and nationalistic considerations indicates that the movement from colony to nation was clearly understood to have consequences for academic disciplines. The idea of making one's own contribution, and one's own decisions, required the reduction of British influence in academic life, as elsewhere, a related willingness to consider Canadian subjects important enough to merit investigation, and the development where necessary of models, theories, and approaches congru-

[15]*Report of the Royal Commision on Dominion-Provincial Relations* (Ottawa 1940).
[16]C.B. MacPherson, "After Strange Gods: Canadian Political Science 1973," in *Perspectives on the Social Sciences in Canada* ed. T.N. Guinsburg and G.L. Reuber (Toronto 1974), 65

ent with the Canadian phenomena they were designed to explain – a development best indicated by the staples approach in economic history.

Although the various steps undertaken to domesticate political science in Canada were not independent of nationalistic considerations, they were not moves to intellectual autarchy, or denials of the cosmopolitan aspects of academic existence. No primitive, nativistic reactions against foreign scholarship or scholars were involved. The objectives were prosaic and practical: the adaptation of political science to Canadian conditions, the development of Canadian scholarship, and explanations of the Canadian polity that did not do violence to reality.

By the 1940s and early 1950s political science was sufficiently developed and self-conscious to produce a spate of introspective analyses of its own condition and future prospects.[17] These articles concentrated less on relations with scholarly communities outside Canada – as that issue seemed of diminishing significance by this time – and more on the place of political science within the social sciences in Canada. They grappled with the questions of the boundaries of political science, its proper subject matter, its relation with other disciplines, and generally with the range of questions involved in the emergence of a separate discipline. The implicit, sometimes explicit, purpose of much of this introspective literature was the staking out of a claim for a distinct piece of social territory which it would be the responsibility of political scientists to analyse. Surprisingly, the impressive intellectual and organizational achievements of the thirties and forties evoked minimal optimism in these surveys. The mood they portrayed was characteristically gloomy.[18] Political scientists shared in the generally poor Canadian treatment of scholars, condemned by Harold Innis in 1946 as "a standing disgrace."[19] There was particular distress over the inordinately small size of the political science community, and over the dominant position of economics in the standard political economy departments of the time. By 1950 there were only 30 political scientists in the country, little more than a reasonably sized department 20 years later.

In the following quarter of a century an explosive increase of faculty transformed political science in Canada (see Table 1).

Growth engendered impersonality. It destroyed the cosy situation in which most political scientists knew each other. The heavy intake of young faculty fresh from graduate school stimulated professionalism. The dramatic increase in numbers facilitated the differentiation of political science from other social sciences and its isolation from society. Numbers allowed, and professional identity encouraged, the break with economics. Political scientists formed their own association, with the same title as its predecessor, CPSA, in 1967, and simultaneously established their own journal, the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* (*CJPS*). However, the possibility of a growing isolation from society was countered by two trends. The first was the growth of student and faculty demands for relevance, variously

[17]See the references in fn. 2.

[18]See Hodgetts, "Dives and Lazarus," for a summary of three of these reports.

[19]Harold Innis, *Political Economy in the Modern State* (Toronto 1946), 76. A year earlier J.B. Brebner had stated that "it must be said that the salaries paid to most Canadian scholars and teachers can be described as stupid, even by comparison with the modest remuneration paid elsewhere in the English-speaking world." *Scholarship for Canada: The Function of Graduate Studies* (Ottawa 1945), 45. This report indicates the generally undeveloped state of Canadian scholarship at the time, and specifically notes the low position of the social science faculties.

TABLE I

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF POLITICAL SCIENTISTS TEACHING IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES, 1950–1 TO 1973–4[20]

1950–1	30
1964–5	184–200
1966–7	over 250
1966–7	270
1968–9	425
1970–1	517
1972–3	664
1973–4	750

defined; the second, of great potential significance, was the increasing propensity of governments to ask questions about the use of the vast funds they disbursed. This generated utilitarian assessments of what universities should do.[21]

The massive increase of numbers included the emergence of a francophone community of political scientists. The study of history, and a tradition of sociological investigation, both introspectively concerned with the interpretation and survival of French Canada, have a respectable ancestry in Quebec. Political science, however, is almost entirely a contemporary phenomenon, largely a product of the past two decades.[22]

The political science of French Canada differs from that of English Canada. Language and graduate training provide stronger links with the political science of France, and more generally of continental Europe, than exist in English Canada. According to a recent study,[23] there is a pronounced generation gap in political science orientations. The older political scientists, most of whom came to political science from other disciplines, have a sense of professional affinity with their English colleagues. The younger generation has a more activist orientation, displays a minimal interest in pan-Canadian institutions, and has only a weak interest in a "science of politics." Francophone political scientists are "much

[20]Table compiled from data presented in Macpherson, "After Strange Gods," 56, supplemented by the following data. The second figure for 1966–7 of 270 is taken from A. Scott, "The Recruitment and Migration of Canadian Social Scientists," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* XXXIII, 4 (Nov. 1967), 496–8; 1968–9 figure of 425 from MacKinnon and Brown, "Political Science in the Canadian University, 1969," 153; 1973–4 figure of 750 is an estimate by John Trent, Secretary-Treasurer of CPSA.

[21]See René Hurtubise and Donald C. Rowat, *The University, Society and Government* (Ottawa 1970), plus the two volumes of supporting *Studies on the University, Society and Government* (Ottawa 1970).

[22]The development of the social sciences in French Canada is discussed in the following: Jean-Charles Falardeau, "Problems and First Experiments of Social Research in Quebec," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* X, 3 (Aug. 1944); Maurice Tremblay and Albert Faucher, "L'Enseignement des Sciences Sociales au Canada de Langue Française," in *Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences*; Jean-Charles Bonenfant, "Les Études Politiques," avec "Commentaire," par Vincent Lemieux, *Recherches Sociographiques* III, 1–2 (Jan.–Août 1962); Jean-Charles Falardeau, *L'essor des Sciences sociales au Canada Français* (Quebec 1964); Albert Faucher, "La recherche en sciences sociales au Québec: sa condition universitaire," in Mabel F. Timlin and Albert Faucher, *The Social Sciences in Canada: Two Studies* (Ottawa 1968); Vincent Lemieux, "L'état de la recherche en science politique et ses perspectives multidisciplinaires," Communication présenté au 37ème Congrès de l'ACFAS, à Montréal, le 8 novembre, 1969.

[23]Gilles Lalande, "Presidential Address," *CPSA Newsletter* I, 1 (Sept. 1971)

affected currently by the impact of our national crisis on Quebec,"[24] and research interest, particularly of younger scholars, focuses extensively on Quebec problems. The political science community of French Canada has its own identity, its own social system, and its own associational structures, although it is linked by elite ties, after the fashion of consociational democracy, with Anglophone political scientists in the CPSA and *CJPS*.[25]

Given these various forms of distinctiveness from political science in English Canada, particularly the greater degree of isolation from trends in American political science, and more pronounced European contacts, the francophone political science community of Quebec could not be included without constant qualification in the subsequent discussion of "Americanization," an issue which in any case lacks saliency in Quebec. Language differentiation between French- and English-speaking political scientists carries with it differences in the composition of the intellectual universes to which they belong. Accordingly, this paper excludes francophone political science from consideration. The influences of history, language, and the contemporary political situation in Quebec necessitate a distinct analysis of the relations of that scholarly community with variants of the discipline external to Quebec, including those of English Canada.

The primary concentration on Canadian politics which characterized the much smaller English Canadian academic community of a quarter of a century ago is now much less evident. Geographical coverage has been greatly extended. Parts of the world hitherto untouched, such as sub-Saharan Africa, now attract sizeable concentrations of scholarship. More domestic political scientists are now studying Black Africa than were studying Canada in 1950–1. Methodological pluralism has produced for the first time serious intradisciplinary difficulties in communication and understanding. The large number of political scientists who continue to employ varying blends of historical and institutional perspectives – many of whom have been trained at the University of Toronto or in Britain – has been supplemented by others, usually American trained, who value numeracy as well as

[24]*Ibid.*, 5. See also Claude Gousse, "Reflexions sur l'Avenir de la Sociologie au Quebéc," and Guy Rocher, "L'Avenir de la Sociologie au Canada," in *The Future of Sociology in Canada*, ed. Jan J. Loubser (Montreal 1970), for the political role of sociology in Quebec.

[25]For the situation in sociology and anthropology see James E. Curtis, Desmond M. Connor, and John Harp, "An emergent professional community: French and English sociologists and anthropologists in Canada," *Social Science Information* IX, 4 (Aug. 1970). French-English differences in sociology are graphically described by Guy Rocher as follows: "la sociologie de langue française et la sociologie de langue anglaise ... sont presque étanches l'une à l'autre. Il s'agit en réalité de deux univers presque imperméables qui cohabitent dans une ignorance réciproque à peu près totale ...

"Entre ces deux univers, un bon nombre d'attitudes sont différentes; les auteurs auxquels on se rallie ou autour desquels on se bat ne sont pas tout à fait les mêmes; les problèmes auxquels on s'intéresse sont différents; de plus, chacun des univers a sa structure sociale, son échelle de prestige, ses sanctions et gratifications, ses contrôles et ses solidarités, ses canaux de communication, ses rites et ses cérémonies. Ce sont donc bien deux systèmes sociaux en même temps que deux cultures qui se partagent la sociologie canadienne.

"Et ce qui renforce encore davantage l'étanchéité de ces deux solitudes, c'est que chacune trouve un marché international auquel s'alimenter, et dans lequel elle se situe, de sorte qu'on ne sent pas un vif besoin d'abbatre les barrières. Si l'on regarde en effet l'état de la sociologie sur le plan international, on se rendra compte que la barrière linguistique à l'intérieur du Canada n'est en fait que la continuation du mur qui, dans le monde actuel, partage deux sociologies, la sociologie de langue anglaise et la sociologie de langue française." "L'Avenir de la Sociologie au Canada," 25–6.

literacy and apply themselves to rigorous empirical work in their devotion to the tasks of science.[26] The contemporary pluralism of political science in Canada also includes an emerging group, with supporters in other social sciences, which espouses a Marxist perspective, builds on the political economy tradition, and condemns "bourgeois scholarship" for its superficiality and support for a decadent social system.

Disciplinary pluralism is accompanied and supported by the new pluralism of good political science departments nurtured by university growth. The former hegemony of the University of Toronto, with Queen's and McGill as distant contenders, is now seriously attenuated, if not broken. Although the University of Toronto department remains the largest in the country, and is possessed of great strength in several areas, especially normative political theory, it is no longer unrivalled. The expansion of old and the creation and growth of new universities and political science departments of high calibre have ended the era when the University of Toronto was equivalent to the Mother country, and the other universities were cast in the role of colonies where faculty did their stint of duty while eagerly awaiting the mailman.[27]

The dispersal of political scientists across the country in a host of separate departments has significant academic consequences. In the same manner as federalism increases the opportunities for experimentation at the local level, the scattering of faculty in several dozen departments increases the opportunities, and incentives, for disciplinary diversity. It provides a plurality of mobilizing foci which can be employed to give special prominence to particular orientations in the discipline. Beyond the core subjects, departmental specializations develop. Each department establishes by design and accident its own special mix of subject matters and disciplinary trends. Disciplinary differences become entangled with institutional rivalries as, for example, some departments remain committed to more traditional ways, while others respond avidly to newer approaches.

Geographic scattering will change the interpretation of Canadian politics, since what political scientists study is influenced by where they are located. The developing interest in provincial politics is a response not only to decentralizing trends in the federal system, but is also a product of the new circumstances of at least minimum clusters of political scientists in each province,[28] and of the attendant

[26]The coexistence of divergent worlds of scholarship is revealed in three recent texts dealing with the Canadian political system. J.R. Mallory, *The Structure of Canadian Government* (Toronto 1971) and R.M. Dawson and Norman Ward, *The Government of Canada* (Toronto 5th ed., rev., 1970) employ a historical, institutional approach for which Bagehot and Dicey are still relevant. Richard J. Van Loon and Michael S. Whittington, *The Canadian Political System* (Toronto 1971) employ the language of systems analysis and structural functionalism, make limited use of the traditional language of parliamentary government, set themselves against an institutional approach, and vigorously exploit contemporary writings in American political science. See Alan C. Cairns, "Alternative Styles in the Study of Canadian Politics," this JOURNAL VII, 1 (March 1974).

[27]"How familiar, and how touching, is the figure of the Ontario professor awaiting, in Ovidian exile, the call that will take him back to Toronto!" W.L. Morton, "Clio in Canada: The Interpretation of Canadian History," in *Approaches to Canadian History*, ed. Carl Berger (Toronto 1967), 48

[28]In the 1971 survey of the profession, 258 political scientists, 50 per cent of the total, were located outside of Ontario, including 74 in Quebec. W.H.N. Hull, "The 1971 Survey of the Profession," this JOURNAL VI, 1 (March 1973), 96, table 1

growth of graduate work which makes the local polity a likely laboratory for thesis research.

Part two: the debate on the "Americanization" of political science

Anti-Americanism has been a recurrent feature of Canadian history. Manifestations of American power and influence have been viewed at various times as threats to Canadian political independence, cultural distinctiveness, and control of the domestic economy. Only in the last decade however has the scope of apprehension expanded to include American political science as an object of troubled attention.[29] Not one of the numerous major and minor investigations and interpretations of political science in Canada from the inaugural address of W.J. Ashley at the University of Toronto in 1888 to Donald V. Smiley's "Contributions to Canadian Political Science since the Second World War," given in 1967, identified American political science as a serious threat to the healthy development of the discipline in Canada.[30] Until the sixties, the problems facing political science did not include any existing or anticipated engulfment by the powerful branch of the discipline across the border.

This absence of concern did not reflect a complete absence of impact. Pendleton Herring's 1940 book, *The Politics of Democracy*, "influenced a whole generation of Canadian political scientists in their attitudes to political parties" by expounding "with great force the doctrine of brokerage politics."[31] In general, however, the American impact was neither pervasive nor seen as such. Particular American scholars who had done research on Canada were praised for their contributions, and the beneficence of American foundations in financing Canadian scholarship was gratefully noted.[32] There was, however, no sense of an overpower-

[29]In a new chapter incorporated into the second edition of *The Canadian Identity* (Toronto, 1st ed., 1961, 2nd ed., 1972), 141, W.L. Morton caught the changing mood in his somewhat exaggerated observation: "Political science ... was quite different from the same subject in the United States, and for good reason, as the political traditions and systems of the two countries are quite different. It was, however, a relatively undeveloped subject in Canada, yet a newly popular one. It was accordingly one in which foreign scholars were particularly in demand, and one in which foreign control is most evident. The result could be the introduction of an alien tradition into Canadian university teaching."

[30]Although Bourinot, "Study of Political Science," did warn his countrymen not to be seduced "by the glamour of republicanism or the social tendencies of purely democratic conditions" in the United States, 15, his references to American political science at that time were highly favourable, 3. A minor exception to the general absence of concern can be detected in Macpherson's 1938 paper "Study of Politics in Canada," where he observes that most of the growing interest in political science had gone into the study of government "and the concrete aspects of politics," and continues, "the influence in this direction of contemporary American scholarship is not to be overlooked," 163. His fear was that theory would be given insufficient attention if descriptive studies were too avidly pursued.

[31]John Porter, *The Vertical Mosaic* (Toronto 1965), 377.

[32]In a review article, A. Brady cited Dean McHenry's *The Third Force in Canada* and S.M. Lipset's *Agrarian Socialism* to "illustrate further the ... rich contribution which American scholarship is making to an understanding of Canadian life." He also paid tribute to the "abundant American largess" from foundations given to the Canadian Social Science Research Council and the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. "Social Studies," *University of Toronto Quarterly*, xx (1950–1), 279. The Social Science Research Council, established in 1940, was primarily supported by American foundation money until the establishment of the Canada Council in 1957, after which this source of funds was phased out. Mabel F. Timlin, "The Social Sciences in Canada: Retrospect and Potential," in Timlin and Faucher, *The Social*

ing presence which threatened the somewhat different Canadian disciplinary tradition. As recently as 1957 C.B. Macpherson observed the absence of much Canadian support for the extensive effort of American political scientists to develop "a more rigorous empirical theory of the political process." Canadian scholars, he was pleased to note, had a greater affinity to the British approach to political science in this matter.[33]

The silence of the past ended about seven years ago.[34] Since then, publications, official inquiries, and agitation have appeared in quick and bewildering succession. They focus on a cluster of interrelated factors which the critics view as capable of bringing about a unidirectional integration of political science and other social sciences on both sides of the 49th parallel – proximity to the United States, a common language for English-speaking Canadians, the extensive resort to American graduate schools, widespread use of American texts, and the presence of American graduate students and American faculty.

The Canadian response of recent years is one of many around the world which have grappled with the intellectual and political impact of the inequalities of capacity of the various national social science communities, with the different stages of development they have reached, and with the associated question of the actual and desirable relationships of particular social sciences to particular cul-

---

Sciences in Canada, 63–5. The lengthy series edited by James T. Shotwell, *The Relations of Canada and the United States*, and the *Canadian Frontiers of Settlement* series edited by W.A. Mackintosh, were both financed by American foundations. Even the Royal Society of Canada fellowships were funded by "a great American foundation" according to J.B. Brebner, who found the failure of Canadian wealth to support academic endeavours "shocking." "Uses and Abuses of History," *Dalhousie Review* XXIV, 1 (April 1944), 39. The Rockefeller Foundation provided substantial support to the Humanities Research Council for a survey of *The Humanities in Canada* (Ottawa 1947), by Watson Kirkconnell and A.S.P. Woodhouse. A study by Brebner himself on the state of Canadian graduate education was undertaken with "the generous cooperation of Columbia University and the Rockefeller Foundation" in providing partial relief from academic responsibilities. Brebner, *Scholarship for Canada*, 3. In this study Brebner noted that "all Canadian university presidents seem to turn up in New York at least once a year to make a round of the foundations," 69. Dependence on American charity for research into basic Canadian higher education policy continues unabated. James Duff and Robert O. Berdahl, *University Government in Canada* (Toronto 1966), was financed by a $50,000 grant from the Ford Foundation. The Rowat-Hurtubise Commission on the Relations between Universities and Governments was also financed by the Ford Foundation by a grant of $150,000. Henry B. Mayo, "Universities and Governments: A Preliminary Political Analysis," in *Studies on the University, Society and Government*, Vol. 1, 568, 570

Extensive information on Carnegie and Rockefeller grants to mid-century in Canada is provided in *Report: Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences 1949–51* (Ottawa 1951), 436–42.

[33]"The Social Sciences," 214.

[34]The public emergence of the Americanization issue can be clearly dated from the Carleton controversy, and the publication of *The Struggle for Canadian Universities*, ed. Mathews and Steele, although there were two earlier expressions of concern in 1967. Michael Oliver was troubled by a tendency for Canadian political scientists "to replicate American studies, or at least to accept a delimitation of problem areas that originates in the United States." *Proceedings: Annual Meeting Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada* (Ottawa 1967), 114–15. Anthony Scott, "The Recruitment and Migration of Canadian Social Scientists," stated: "as students of a society divided up into nations, provinces, and cities, we must realize that we are depending on departments elsewhere that are conducting studies, and evolving methods for studies, of serious problems that are not our most serious problems. We are in danger of defining our fields solely by what foreign departments are doing." 506.

tures, political systems, and civilizations.[35] In the case of political science these discussions inevitably examine the consequences which flow from the unique strength and resources of political science in the United States, which has more political scientists in a single average sized department than are possessed by many of the smaller and poorer third world countries. As a consequence of marked differences in the size of national political science communities, the political systems of the world can be ranged on a continuum from those which undergo examination primarily from their own scholars[36] to those which undertake only a token amount of the analysis applied to their polity. Johan Galtung has aptly described the latter situation as scientific colonialism, "a process whereby the center of gravity for the acquisition of knowledge about the nation is located outside the nation itself," which produces the situation in which scholars from the "*scientifically powerful nations often know more about other nations than these nations know about themselves.*"[37] In these circumstances the aggressive and well-financed research of American scholars is frequently viewed in the third world, where the social sciences are usually underdeveloped, as one of the weapons in the political and military arsenal of the United States.[38] This is the outsiders' recognition of the truth of Pendleton Herring's 1953 statement, in another context, that the American political science profession "is now a part of our national strength."[39]

While there is a growing American interest in Canadian studies,[40] Canada would still be placed towards the end of the continuum of those polities which largely undertake their own self-examination. The Canadian situation, therefore, is not characterized by an American monopoly in the study of Canadian politics,

[35]For India see Marshall B. Clinard and Joseph W. Elder, "Sociology in India: A Study in the Sociology of Knowledge," *American Sociological Review* XXX, 4 (Aug. 1965), which notes Indian hostility to " 'Exploitation' by Foreign Researchers," and discusses the distinctiveness of Indian sociology. The Clinard-Elder article has been criticized by Imtiaz Ahmad, "Note on Sociology in India," *The American Sociologist* I, 5 (Nov. 1966). Useful material on the Indian situation is contained in the short-lived journal *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 1957–1966.

[36]There is an admitted ambiguity here if many of the local scholars examining the domestic polity are foreign citizens, or if significant numbers of those who analyse the polity from outside are nevertheless citizens of it, such as Canadian students of Canadian issues resident in the United States.

[37]"After Camelot," in *The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot*, ed. I.L. Horowitz (Cambridge, Mass. 1967), 296–7. Italics in original.

[38]See Satish Saberwal, "International Social Science: Some Political Aspects," *Economic and Political Weekly* V, 27 (4 July 1970). This article, which links U.S. social scientists with the "politico-military establishment of their country," 1044, includes Canadian social scientists in its indictment.

Third World countries, declared Albert O. Hirschman, "have become fair game for the model-builders and paradigm-molders, to an intolerable degree." He notes that the social sciences have specialized in finding "iron laws or rigid models from whose working there is no escape," and speculates whether "these theories were inspired primarily by compassion or by contempt for the under-developed world." "The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding," in *The Political Economy of Development*, ed. Norman T. Uphoff and Warren F. Ilchman (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1972), 67

[39]"On the Study of Government," *American Political Science Review* XLVII, 4 (Dec. 1953), 961, cited in Bernard Crick, "The Science of Politics in the United States," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* XX, 3 (Aug. 1954), 308.

[40]Dale C. Thomson, "Canadian Studies in the United States: A New Frontier?" *PS* V, 1 (Winter 1972), and Dale C. Thomson and Roger F. Swanson, "Scholars, missionaries or counter-imperialists?" *Journal of Canadian Studies* V, 3 (Aug. 1970)

but by American ascendancy in political science as an international discipline, an ascendancy which raises questions for political scientists wherever they may be, including in the United States.

While the basic fact of American pre-eminence in the social sciences is unlikely to be eroded in any short term future, a modest attenuation is probable. The former Director of the UNESCO Department of Social Sciences notes a movement "from a uni-polar to a multi-polar world in the social science enterprise," allied to an "increasingly critical appraisal of American contributions to social science made over the years of domination" since the Second World War.[41] External criticisms from growing communities of social scientists outside the United States are fed by passionate, domestic American debates within each of the major social science disciplines which have been wracked by controversy over their function in a crisis ridden society. Within the United States the emergence of Black studies and women's studies reflects the efforts of particular groups united by race or sex to gain control of the instruments of self-analysis, often to the extent of denying legitimacy to "outsiders" whose research is suspect. Exclusivist tendencies inside the United States have their counterpart in the third world. The easy research access formerly enjoyed by American and other Western scholars has been cut back by third world governments.

The pursuit of desires to assert and enhance racial, sexual, and national pride fragments the scholarly community and, in its more extreme manifestations, raises the spectre of research monopolies confined to members of in-groups. The anti-intellectual tendencies of academic tribalism intermingle with legitimate academic concerns in a manner not always easy to disentangle. The Canadian debate on Americanization is not immune from these confusions.

One of the major factors contributing to tension in Canada, as elsewhere, has been what Shils labels the institutionalization of the social sciences. By this term Shils refers to the creation of specific structures by means of which the intellectual activity of a particular discipline takes place, its intellectual products are disseminated, its standards are maintained, new recruits are socialized, and incentives and disincentives are systematically given to intellectual work in accordance with evolving criteria of quality. The relevant structures include courses, departments, libraries, and undergraduate and graduate programs which give recognition and support to particular disciplines. To these university aspects of structure must be added professional journals, learned societies, publishers, funding agencies, and the "invisible college" of colleagues working on related problems who use these instrumentalities to coordinate their efforts and to transmit cues to each other.

In these terms it is clear that political science is far more institutionalized in the United States than in any other country, a fact possessed of crucial intellectual consequences. As Shils notes, "institutionalization ... renders more probable the consolidation, elaboration, and diffusion of a set of ideas. It ... serves ... to make ideas more available to potential recipients, it renders possible concentration of effort on them, it fosters interaction about them, and it aids their communication ... institutionalization makes a difference to the fate of ideas." The institutionalization of political science in the United States thus enhances its "radiative power."

[41]Gene M. Lyons, "Globalizing the Social Sciences," *PS* VI, 1 (Winter 1973), 7

Equally important, the institutionalization of disciplines in potentially recipient countries "increases receptive power."[42] Canadian receptiveness was thus stimulated by the long process of institutionalization of political science which increased in tempo in the sixties. The establishment of professional journals and associations, first with economics, then separately, the diminished support for the British academic ideal of the gentleman scholar, the growth of professionalism, the stress on degrees (especially the doctorate), the increasing focus on research, and the recently accelerated development of domestic graduate programs have all played a part in enhancing Canadian receptive power.

Domestic graduate programs have been particularly important in the short run in increasing the interdependence between political science in Canada and in the United States. The rapid development of graduate studies in the sixties, especially at the doctoral level, weakened academic links with Great Britain, and strengthened links with the United States. The minimal place accorded graduate work, and the less developed state of the social sciences in Britain, reduced the availability and attractiveness of British models. The Canadian development of doctoral work was essentially modelled on American practice. The American requirements of courses, comprehensives, and a thesis quickly became the norm in the rapidly developing Canadian programs. The development of graduate schools and the placing of a premium on research are correctly described in the Canadian context as "American influences," which after the Second World War "began to spread more widely and to affect the calculations of most Canadian universities. About 1960, they became pervasive."[43] More important, the focus of doctoral work on the "frontiers of the discipline" increases contact for both faculty and students with international, primarily American, political science.

One effect, therefore, of institutionalization is to increase the receptivity of political science in Canada to the more elaborately institutionalized American version.[44] The process, however, was not as smooth as Shils implies. The initial development of a scholarly infrastructure in the thirties had been designed to focus Canadian scholarship on Canadian problems. In part, it had reflected desires for intellectual distinctiveness. The survival of these desires partly accounts for the tensions precipitated by increasingly intensive contacts between the more institutionalized American and the less institutionalized Canadian discipline, contacts which primarily became a one way conduit of American influence. There was also an obvious element of discordance between the nationalistic impulse which led to the development of Canadian graduate programs to reduce dependence on outside sources of academic supply on the one hand, and the American inspired graduate structures within which such programs developed, the heavy dependence on American scholars to man them, and any suggestions of an inappropriate and undue Americanness in the discipline into which graduate students were being initiated in Canada. Conflict was especially likely for political science, a discipline

[42]Edward Shils, "Tradition, Ecology, and Institution in the History of Sociology," *Daedalus* (Fall 1970), 777, 790

[43]Bonneau and Corry, *Quest for the Optimum*, 18

[44]Shils' general comment on the effect of institutionalization in sociology is equally applicable to political science: "Once sociology reduced the freedom of its exponents to believe what they wished and to call sociology whatever they liked to think sociology ought to be, American influence was bound to increase." "Tradition, Ecology, and Institution," 790–1

for which nations and states were central foci of attention and for which national considerations were especially salient.

The debate which has emerged out of this context has been untidy and sprawling, addressed to a variety of audiences, and possessed of a number of facets which apply to more than political science. Some of the more polemical contributions recall the heated controversy between Slavophiles and Westernizers in nineteenth-century Russia.

The employment of non-Canadians, particularly Americans, has become a political issue with the emergence of a restricted academic job market and unemployed graduate students. The dramatic university expansion of the sixties compelled a search for foreign scholars who came in large numbers at a time when Canadian graduate work in the social sciences was only beginning. For the period 1960–1 to 1970–1, when political science faculty in Canada increased by 490, only 27 Canadian doctorates were awarded, an amount which was "negligible in relation to the rapidly growing Canadian demand for qualified professors" in political science.[45] For the latter year, 1970–1, the Hull survey found that nearly one-half of the political scientists in Canada were non-Canadians by birth, with Americans at 19 per cent constituting the largest group.[46] The Moir Report found that 61 per cent of the arts faculties in Alberta, and 67.4 per cent of political scientists in that province were non-Canadians.[47] It is scarcely surprising in these circumstances that the prospective unemployed have attempted to use nationality as an aid to employment, and that they have been countered by others who profess the non-nationality of knowledge and scholarship. The opponents of American faculty in Canadian social science departments, including political science, assert that they are either ignorant of Canadian society or insensitive to its nuances. It is alleged that they incorrectly view it as either a replica of the United States or as a failed version of the American dream, departures from which indicate inferiority.

The issue is now public and political, and has elicited extremist statements. In this paper, which is directed to the disciplinary relationship, existing and desired, between aspects of political science in the two countries, there is little to be said, beyond two elementary observations which indicate the boundaries within which useful discussion can take place. (1) Since the social sciences rest on the capacity of specially trained individuals to enter vicariously into and explain realities other than those which have been part of their daily life experience, any general argument linking nationality to sensitivity must be rejected.[48] It is necessary to resist tribal claims in the realm of knowledge which would lead to the "balkanization of social science, with separate baronies kept exclusively in the hands of Insiders bearing their credentials in the shape of one or another ascribed status."[49] Not only would this lead to a "*group* methodological solipsism,"[50] but it would elim-

[45]*Interim Report of the Select Committee on Economic and Cultural Nationalism: Colleges and Universities in Ontario* (Toronto 1973), 13–14

[46]"The 1971 Survey of the Profession," Table 4. "Not stated" has been excluded from the calculation. See also "Report of the Committee on Canadian Content," submitted to the CPSA annual meeting, August 1973.

[47]*Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Non-Canadian Influence in Alberta Post-Secondary Education*, Arnold F. Moir, Chairman (no place, no date), 92

[48]See A.M.C. Waterman, "The Canadian Identity and Canadian Universities," *University Affairs* (Feb. 1963), for a helpful discussion.

[49]Merton, "Insiders and Outsiders," 13 [50]Ibid., 14; italics in original

inate the possibility of history and anthropology as disciplines, and it would render inexplicable the distinguished social science contributions of outsiders such as de Tocqueville, Bryce, and Siegfried. In fact, any assertion that we can only know what we can experience would make society impossible. (2) Another boundary emerges from the following quote by a distinguished economist, Mabel F. Timlin, who suggests the importance of time and commitment if foreign scholars are not to misunderstand the society in which they have come to live and possibly to analyse:

> As one who was born in the United States and had the greater part of her education there, the writer is well aware of the number of years it takes before the newcomer can become fully cognizant of the deep cleavages in ideology which may underlie the superficial resemblances between two societies. General neglect of the social sciences over many years in Canada has meant that in some of the new departments in Canadian universities there have been no native Canadians or long-term residents of Canada at all and in others that the Canadian cadre has been a very limited percentage indeed of total members. The presence of highly qualified persons from other countries must be regarded as a source of particular enrichment to social science departments, but the absence or virtual absence of native-born Canadians or long-term residents of Canada, appears likely to be a more serious matter for the social sciences than for the physical or life sciences or for the humanities.[51]

The Canadian debate on Americanization has been a vehicle not only for pressing the claims of nationality, but also for the advocacy of particular kinds of political science in Canada. Most critics share the belief of Denis Smith that the recent development of political science in Canada has been fundamentally imitative, reflecting "with a time lag – the interests and approaches of American political science."[52] The standard explanation for imitativeness, and one with a long history in the litany of Canadian self-criticism, is a colonial mentality,[53] defined as a propensity to employ foreign models for reasons unrelated to their relevance. The implicit premise, which makes imitation a matter of criticism, is that political science in Canada should develop in at least partial independence of its counterpart in the United States. Supporters of this position attribute to political science in the United States various features deemed unworthy of imitation.

One of the recurring themes of Canadian critiques is a disenchantment with professionalism, identified by the Woods as "the barren cult of professionalism" with its stress on the fashionable, and greater concern with form than with con-

[51]"The Social Sciences in Canada: Retrospect and Potential," in Timlin and Faucher, *The Social Sciences in Canada*, 41–2. The CAUT policy statement on professorial appointments is a helpful summing up: "The principal criterion to be used in engaging a professor must continue to be his *competence* in the broad sense of his capacity to carry out the functions for which he was engaged. Competence thus includes not only his promise and ability as teacher and scholar, but also those qualities which affect his performance within the Canadian university community. In areas where a familiarity with things Canadian is important, as for example in Canadian history or government or literature, then competence requires that knowledge." From the text of a Canadian Association of University Teachers Position Paper adopted by the Executive and Finance Committee, 27 June 1969. From *Critical Issues in Canadian Society*, ed. Craig L. Boydell et al. (Toronto 1971), 422

[52]"What are we teaching? The nationalization of political science," *Canadian Forum* (June 1971), 4

[53]Used for explanatory purposes from John B. Bourinot, *Our Intellectual Strength and Weakness* (Montreal 1893) 46–8 (repr. Toronto 1973) to Michael Butler and David Shugarman, "Canadian nationalism, Americanization and scholarly values," *Journal of Canadian Studies* v, 3 (August 1970), 12–13

tent.[54] An analogous hostility to the narrowly defined professional is evident in Denis Smith's support for the role of the intellectual who provides "a philosophical and moral study which penetrates the political malaise of the society and offers alternative visions of a better social order."[55] Hostility to professionalism shades off into an antipathy to disciplinary boundaries. Resnick criticizes the breaking down of the social sciences into "ever smaller and more water-tight compartments," indicates his own preference for a Marxist political economy, and favourably cites Innis for his recognition of the need for "an integrated social science."[56] John W. Warnock identifies professionalism with what he views as an absurd stress on disciplinary distinctions which separate politics, economics, sociology, and ideology, and which inhibit the attainment of his goal – "to see the past, the present and the future as a totality."[57] Macpherson opposes an "assumption, taken over from the Americans, that political science was a science in its own right by virtue of having a distinctive subject-matter."[58] It was this assumption, sustained by the growth in numbers, and feeding on the political scientists' "lust for professional independence and discipline autonomy, especially independence from economics" which separated the two studies in Canada and undermined the political economy tradition whose revival he feels necessary.[59] The separation of political science and economics keeps both of them weak and unrealistic because, Macpherson argues, "that is what the society that is the market for their services has required."[60]

This desire to grapple with "real" issues, to see the world whole, unhampered by the artificial boundaries of academic disciplines, is pragmatically justified on the ground that particular boundaries are harmful to the pursuit of knowledge and to the changing of the world in preferred directions. At another level, it is possible to detect an esthetic, psychological antipathy to the bureaucratization of social analysis, as professional social scientists supplant intellectuals. Unease is expressed at a division of labour which suggests that the specialized competence, which is all individuals can attain, must be purchased at the heavy price of general

[54]Ellen and Neal Wood, "Canada and the American science of politics," in *Close the 49th Parallel etc: The Americanization of Canada*, ed. Ian Lumsden (Toronto 1970), 183

[55]"The nationalization of political science," 5

[56]"Towards a Class Analysis of Canada," *Papers Presented to the 44th Annual Meeting of the CPSA* (Montreal 1972), 4, 10. Ian Lumsden, who writes in the same vein, claims: "The revitalization of Canadian studies must entail resistance to the compartmentalization and professionalization of academic pursuits that have accompanied the Americanization of Canadian universities ... It is worth emphasizing that the most brilliant work that has emanated from dependent countries in history and the social sciences has invariably been inter-disciplinary in its scope and methodology. It is not by chance that Canada's most distinguished economist and political scientist, Harold Innis and C.B. Macpherson respectively, have been political economists." "Academic Underdevelopment in a Dependent Country," in a newspaper pamphlet, "Whom do our Universities Serve?" ed. C.A. Abrahams and R.C. Levesque, and distributed at the Learned Societies in Montreal, 1972. The papers were originally read at a symposium held at Bishop's University, 11 Nov. 1971.

[57]"International Relations as a Canadian Academic Discipline," *Journal of Canadian Studies* VIII, 1 (Feb. 1973) 49; see also 54–5

[58]"After Strange Gods," 66–7

[59]Ibid., 64, 68, 71

[60]Ibid., 67. Macpherson is also bemused by and opposed to the increasing fragmentation within the discipline. See his comments on the recent CPSA classification system for research interests which was taken from the APSA, and which included 8 categories and 64 subcategories, in contrast to the much smaller number which would have sufficed 20 years earlier. Ibid., 56–7

ignorance. Renaissance man in Canada, as elsewhere, balks at this restrictive conclusion.

Some criticisms spring from a left-wing activism which identifies political science in the United States as part of the ideological superstructure of American capitalism. According to this viewpoint, the diffusion of American political science to Canada serves the interests of American imperialism and hinders the development of an independent socialist Canada by obfuscating the issues of class and national independence.[61] While the proponents of this view are not numerous, they are young, active, and often generate student followings.[62] They castigate social science in the United States as "bourgeois," an epithet they apply with equal fervour to the imitative Canadian version. The required task for the Marxist scholar includes "mapping the Canadian bourgeoisie, and its organic relationship to imperialism, doing a critique of Canadian liberalism and the Canadian state, analyzing the national character of Quebec and the basis for an English Canadian nationality, discovering working class consciousness in both Canada and Quebec, [and] developing the kind of social science that not only explains capitalist reality, but makes it possible to explode its contradictions."[63]

In most cases the theorizing of left-wing critics is intimately linked with a commitment to action, varying from Resnick's assertion that we need "a com-

[61]The same arguments have been applied to sociology. See Michael Gurstein, "Towards the nationalization of Canadian sociology," *Journal of Canadian Studies* VII, 3 (August 1972), for a left-wing critique of the Americanization of sociology in Canada, coupled with an argument for "a 'contextualized' Canadian social science, theoretically and technically appropriate to Canadian problems and aspirations." 51.

[62]The influence of Macpherson's thought on this group would be an intriguing study in intellectual history. Along with Harold Innis and John Porter he is one of the few Canadian social scientists for whom they have any respect. He asserted the need for a class analysis of Canadian politics as early as 1942, in "The Position of Political Science," and he has both advocated and employed Marxist categories in his own work. See *Democracy in Alberta* (Toronto 1953). In that book he suggested that Canadian independence from the United States might become a staple of Canadian politics. He has consistently advocated the development of theory appropriate to the Canadian situation. He continues to support the political economy approach, and he is now one of the most vigorous Canadian opponents of the behavioural approach in political science.

[63]Resnick, "Towards a Class Analysis," 1–3, 37. Marxism has played a minimal role in social science and historical analysis in Canada. This partly reflects the absence of European emigré scholars coming to Canada in the interwar years, and the weakness of Marxism both academically and politically in the two countries with which Canadian contacts were most profound, Great Britain and the United States. Until the 1960s the power of the clergy acted as a barrier in Quebec, and there was minimal transfer of partisan ideologies or radical thought from France. A possibly deeper explanation rests on the late development of urban industrial capitalism, the absence of a large proletariat, and the absence of a strong left-wing party launching Marxist critiques of society. The political weakness of the Communist party reduced the impact and visibility of party-connected Marxist theorists, such as S.B. Ryerson, whose influence on the academic community was further minimized by their lack of university affiliations. Given this historical context, the contemporary viability of a Marxist school of analysis in Canada is an open question. The likelihood is greater in Quebec with the radicalization of the Quebec labour movement, the sympathy of Catholic communities for total doctrines, the existence of a youthful radical faculty with far greater linguistic access to European political thought than is the case in English Canada, and the activist orientation of faculty in a pamphleteering society. See Leo A. Johnson, "The development of class in Canada in the twentieth century," in *Capitalism and the National Question in Canada*, ed. Gary Teeple (Toronto 1972), 142–5, for a controversial discussion of the weakness of left-wing theorizing in Canada. I am grateful to Professor Norman Penner of York University for helpful comments on the subject matter of this footnote.

prehensive social theory that leads to revolution,"[64] to Gurstein's search for a " 'nationalized' Canadian social science" out of which a strategy for action can emerge. "It must contribute to the rise of Anglophone Canada's self-consciousness and thus to the formation of an Anglophone Canadian national community on which the will to struggle for decolonization can be based."[65]

Another battery of criticisms focuses on tendencies which critics identify with the American version of political science, particularly behaviouralism.[66] Although this criticism overlaps the incisive criticism already offered by American scholars, it differs in two important ways. While the American debate over behaviouralism can be conducted with little reference to controversy elsewhere, the Canadian debate is partly derivative, even when the attempt is made to relate it to Canadian conditions. The second difference is that the Canadian debate employs nationalist labels to differentiate good from bad political science. Butler and Shugarman employ a dichotomy which contrasts an endangered Canadian tradition of humane inquiry with an explicit denigration of American styles of scholarship located in a "dehumanistic, mechanistic mainstream."[67] To such critics political science in the United States has gone sour. It is, states Denis Smith, "one of the archetypal vehicles and expressions of America's mechanical view of the world."[68] It is attacked for its alleged eschewing of the normative, ahistorical nature, obsession with the quantifiable, and cult of methodology which result in a sterile, status quo oriented political science capable of accumulating mountains of trivia, and incapable of attacking problems of moment. To such critics, political science in Canada should have a larger component of normative theory, and should be more practical and more problem oriented than its American counterpart.[69]

Unfortunately, little is known of the extent to which any of the preceding critiques are accepted by political scientists. The loudest response thus far has been silence. What is particularly lacking are rebuttals which either explicitly claim that American political science is superior, and hence imitation is progressive, or that political science is not (and/or should not be) affected by the national contexts in which scholars work, and hence the issue is a non-issue.

The major rebuttal, which implicitly presupposes the superiority of political science in the United States, is found in "The American Impact on Canadian Political Science and Sociology," by Allan Kornberg and Alan Tharp.[70] They focus almost exclusively on the question of the impact of American born and/or trained political scientists on the disciplinary orientation of Canadian departments.

[64]"Towards a Class Analysis," 37

[65]"Towards the nationalization of Canadian sociology," 58

[66]No up-to-date information is available on the distribution of attitudes to behaviouralism in Canada. In their 1965 study March and Jackson found that the "vast majority" of their informants lacked firm positions on behaviouralism. "Aspects of the State of Political Science in Canada," 450

[67]"Canadian nationalism, Americanization and scholarly values," 18. For a general criticism of the Butler-Shugarman article see Terence A. Crowley, "Anti-Americanism and the degeneration of Canadian scholarship: a rejoinder," *Journal of Canadian Studies* VI, 2 (May 1971)

[68]"The nationalization of political science," 4

[69]Wood and Wood, "Canada and the American Science of Politics," 192–5, and Smith, "The nationalization of political science," 4–5.

[70]In *The Influence of the United States on Canadian Development*, ed. Richard A. Preston (Durham, N.C. 1972)

They conclude that there is no Americanization issue in political science. They specifically reject the charge that the study of Canadian political institutions and processes has been neglected as a consequence of the hiring of American born and/or American trained political scientists.[71] Their presence in Canadian departments apparently had no impact at all, according to their tests. The orientation of political science departments on a normative to empirical/quantitative continuum was best predicted by "the orientations of its Canadian faculty members."[72] The orientations of American born and/or trained scholars "appear to have no discernible effect on the orientations" of Canadian departments.[73] They conclude that "neither national origins nor even the locus of professional training directly affects the conceptual and methodological orientations of political science departments."[74] The possibility of American influence is minimized by the fact that the two ranks of associate and full professor, "that at least in the past have made the majority of major departmental policy decisions,"[75] are composed of more Canadians (61 per cent) than Americans (23 per cent). The argument that the American presence in Canadian departments has distorted research priorities is rejected on the grounds "that there was neither much research nor few priorities to distort" before the American influx.[76]

Although the Kornberg-Tharp article contains useful data, their argument is inconclusive. It is difficult to believe that the large number of American born and/or trained political scientists in Canada has had no effect on the disciplinary orientations of Canadian departments or, by implication, on political science in Canada. Such a finding imputes a damning impotence to American graduate training and is a denial of common sense. If a small number of emigré European scholars between the two world wars had the impact on American social science that is usually suggested, it is curious, to say the least, that the political science community of Canada, 19 per cent of which is composed of Americans by birth, 19.3 per cent of Americans by citizenship, 24.1 per cent who earned their first degree in the United States, and 45.5 per cent who earned their highest degree in that country,[77] is unaffected by this composition. Clearly, Kornberg and Tharp employed instruments of measurement lacking the subtlety required for their task.[78]

Further, they refer only obliquely to the more general phenomenon of concern in this paper, the influence of political science in the United States on that of Canada. They identify a considerable shift in orientations of political science in Canada, revealed by a marked increase in quantitative, empirical articles, and a

[71]"Approximately one-half (i.e. thirteen) of the twenty-seven political science departments responding to our questionnaire listed 'Canadian politics' as their strongest major subfield. When this datum is combined with the fact that Canadian politics is the area in which the greatest amount of dissertation research has been and still is carried on and also is the area in which the majority of articles appearing in the principal Canadian political science journal still are written, it is difficult to accept the validity of the 'neglect of Canadian institutions' charge." "The American Impact," 78

[72]Ibid., 87

[73]Ibid., 78

[74]Ibid., 88

[75]Ibid., 80

[76]Ibid., 95

[77]Hull, "The 1971 Survey of the Profession," Tables IV, V, VIII, IX; "not stated" has been excluded from the calculations

[78]See also the review by Kenneth McRae in this JOURNAL VII, 1 (March 1974), 167–9

corresponding decline in institutional, constitutional, legal, and historical articles in *CJEPS/CJPS*.[79] However, they complacently describe this trend to "empiricism and quantification in Canadian political science" as a disciplinary wide process not confined to Canada.[80]

From their perspective a trend for political science in Canada to become more like political science in the United States is simply a desirable modernization of the Canadian branch of the discipline.[81] They note that the United States, a "gigantic adjacent society," exercises "powerful and relatively continuous influence on politics, the economy, the media and the arts" in Canada.[82] However, they ignore the possibility that the developing Canadian/American similarities they discovered in the discipline might be viewed not just as a benign modernizing process, but simply as a reflection of the penetrative power of the highly institutionalized political science developed by that "gigantic adjacent society." They are unable to consider an argument for any Canadianness to the political science of Canada, because they are unprepared to recognize any Americanness to the political science they view as the instrument of modernity. Although they provide various casual and impressionistic observations on why the Americanization issue arose, they are more interested in the sociological and psychological factors which facilitated its emergence[83] than in the possible substantive issues which may lie concealed behind the confused debate which has thus far occurred.

The discussion of the "Americanization" of political science (and of other social sciences) in Canada has been effective at the political level of raising a vaguely defined concern to public prominence. It has been less successful at the academic level, for it remains unclear what the substantive issues are that should concern political scientists as they go about the task of trying to advance understanding of the political systems of mankind. The apparent difficulty of conducting a reasoned discourse centring on issues of disciplinary concern raises crucial sociology of knowledge considerations which deserve brief examination.

The positions of the participants and bystanders in the debate are not easily altered, for they reflect variations in professional identities resulting from intensive socialization experiences. Our thinking about the issue is part of the issue we are thinking about.[84] Our intimate self-involvement precludes the playful questioning so easily resorted to, and so fruitful, when interests other than our own are at stake.

[79]Kornberg and Tharp, "The American Impact," 65, table 4

[80]Ibid., 95

[81]This assumption runs through their article. For example, recent recruits from American graduate schools are described as having had training "more congruent with the direction in which political science, as a discipline, appears to be moving." Further, the apprehensions of Canadian colleagues reflect reactions to "substantive and procedural changes in the conduct of teaching, research and interpersonal relations that really are functions of the rapid growth and expansion of certain disciplines." When recruits from American graduate schools arrive, not surprisingly having taken their scholarly models from Lasswell, Easton, Deutsch, Russett, Almond and Verba rather than Canadian models (or European, Asian, or any other) they are simply agents of modernization. Ibid., 90–3

[82]Ibid., 96

[83]Ibid., especially 90–4

[84]An analogous problem was faced by Innis when he introduced his Beit lectures on imperial economic history at Oxford. "We are immediately faced with the very great, perhaps insuperable, obstacle of attempting in this University, located so near a centre which has been the heart of an economic empire, to appraise economic considerations by the use of tools that are in themselves products of economic considerations." Harold A. Innis, *Empire and Communications*, rev. Mary Q. Innis (Toronto 1972), 3

Indeed, the passion which has inspired the Americanization controversy – including the non-contributions of the passionate abstainers – has been due to the basic questions of professional identity which it tapped. Clarification of the issues involved is further hindered by the fact that the discussion feeds on the larger controversy about Canadian-American relations in the fields of foreign policy, economics, and culture. Since this larger debate is held to concern the issue of Canadian survival it is not surprising that the discussion of "Whither Political Science in Canada" has occasionally been linked rather too melodramatically with the fate of Canada itself.

Most of the existing arguments for a degree of distinctiveness in Canadian political science either are political in their attempts to cast political scientists in a particular partisan role in the Canadian polity, or they simply express preferences for one disciplinary tendency over another and attempt to use national labels and boundaries to shore up the preferred position.

The emotionalism of the debate has led some academics to boycott what they regard as unacceptable discourse and to view some or all of its aspects as taboo matters beyond the reach of discussion. The Moir commission in Alberta encountered charges of McCarthyism and met with considerable non-cooperation as it went about its task of inquiring into "Non-Canadian Influence" in Alberta post-secondary education.[85] The controversy in political science has occurred outside the pages of the association's journal, *CJPS*, and has been conducted in pamphlets, the less central periodicals, and faculty clubs. This partial quarantine of the debate reflects professional discomfort at its very existence and the difficulty of handling it in language appropriate to a learned discipline.

While much of the literature on Americanization is deservedly ephemeral, it is premature to conclude that its often polemical nature indicates the absence of any issue. However, the polemical features of the debate, perhaps appropriate for the political arena, are neither appropriate nor helpful in an academic setting. A profusion of unacceptable antitheses facilitates political reactions and hinders understanding. Debating confrontations between isms, such as nationalism, cosmopolitanism, and universalism are not helpful. The choice between service in the academic army of American imperialism or the academic branch of the people's army of Canadian independence is unreal. Alternatively, the defining of academic excellence as scholarship undertaken in ivory towers by non-national men for non-national purposes evades the practical problem of defining excellence in a way that makes sense for all the dissimilar contexts in which it may be pursued. An additional dangerous oversimplification is the practice of identifying political science in the United States with one of its manifestations, usually behaviouralism, and political science in Canada with political economy or with some older tradition of humane learning. These debating dichotomies and simplifications mystify rather than clarify. Political science in both countries is and will remain plural, and there will be a high degree of overlap in the pluralism that each contains. Overlap, however, is not identity. The pluralism of political science in Canada need not coincide exactly with the pluralism of political science in the United States. Distinctions of degree, nuance, and subtlety are not necessarily trivial. What they should be is a matter for further discussion, experiment, and learning from experience.

[85] *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Non-Canadian Influence in Alberta Post-Secondary Education*, 3, 55

Part three: neglected factors in the Americanization controversy

THE DOMINANCE OF AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE

The inequalities of power, wealth, and resources which exist between nation states are reflected in inequalities of capacity of the social science communities they sustain. Accordingly, the overwhelming preponderance of American scholarship on our bookshelves is a fact of life unlikely to change markedly in the immediate future and one possessed of major consequences for our understanding of the world. To a very large extent, what is known depends on what American scholars have decided to study. Sociology is disproportionately about "Western, industrial peoples, especially Americans, especially middle-class ones."[86] The interdependence of American sociology and American society is evident in the "remarkable correspondence" between the subfields of sociology and the "social evils and social problems that burden contemporary American society."[87] Psychology, as various authors have noted, is given a particular colouration by American predominance.[88] In political science there is the unfortunate skewing effect, to quote Michael Haas, that "probably more is now known about American voting behavior than about any other subject in political science."[89] Students of the judiciary, to take another example, "have been provincial in their reference and have generalized largely from the American experience ... and work on non-American judicial systems has tended to be an extension of the interests of scholars trained and experienced in the American judiciary."[90] Arend Lijphart notes that most of what is known about democracy is empirical knowledge of the very atypical case of American democ-

[86]Raymond W. Mack, "Theoretical and Substantive Biases in Sociological Research," in *Interdisciplinary Relationships in the Social Sciences*, ed. Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif (Chicago 1969), 53. For the comments of a Canadian sociologist on certain American features of sociology in the United States see S.D. Clark, *The Developing Canadian Community* (2nd ed. Toronto 1968), chaps. xviii and xix.

[87]*Sociology*, ed. Neil J. Smelser and James A. Davis (Englewood Cliffs N.J. 1969), 116. The history of sociology in the United States reveals "that it has always been in large degree a barometer of the dominant political, social, and intellectual currents of the larger society." Ibid., 109. Guy Rocher has recently noted the remarkable American ignorance of contemporary French sociology, to the extent that even the publications of prominent French sociologists are unavailable in major American universities. "L'Avenir de la Sociologie au Canada," 26–7

[88]"That today's psychology is 'culture bound' needs little illustration. On a superficial level, it may be noted that there are now more psychologists in the United States than there are in the whole of the rest of the world, that psychological publications are overwhelmingly in the English language, that few of the writers of these can read with ease any language other than their own, and that still fewer can actually communicate in another language. 'Parochial' might be a more appropriate word for this than 'culture bound'; twentieth-century psychology reflects predominantly the interests and prejudices of one national group." Robert B. MacLeod, "Phenomenology and Cross-cultural Research," in Sherif and Sherif, eds., *Interdisciplinary Relationships*, 178. See Donald T. Campbell, "A Cooperative Multinational Opinion Sample Exchange," *Journal of Social Issues* XXIV, 2 (1968), for a proposal to lessen the undesirable effects of American dominance in social psychology. See also *Perspectives in Personality Theory* ed. Henry P. David and Helmut von Bracken (New York 1957), especially chapters by Gordon W. Allport, Robert B. MacLeod, and David C. McClelland.

[89]"The Rise of a Science of Politics," in *Approaches to the Study of Political Science*, ed. Michael Haas and Henry S. Kariel (Scranton, Pa. 1970), 33

[90]Kenneth N. Vines, "Judicial Behavior Research," in ibid., 139. Herbert Jacob's review of *Comparative Judicial Behavior: Cross-Cultural Studies of Political Decision-Making in the East and West*, ed. Glendon Schubert and David J. Danelski (New York 1969), notes the weakness of this study which applies concepts primarily formulated in American studies to the judiciaries of non-American polities. *American Political Science Review* LXVI, 4 (Dec. 1972), 1394–5

racy, a consequence of the highly developed condition of the American political science community.[91] D.G. Hitchner recently complained of the "very low level of generalization [in American political science] because of ... over-preoccupation with American affairs and the culture-bound product of it," and went on to advocate more comparative studies on the ground that the premises leading to the rejection of a "German physics or a Soviet biology" were no less applicable to "an American political science."[92]

The preceding biases in the composition of political science knowledge result from the exclusive American possession of superpower status in the international system of national political science communities. In general, the strength of American political science derives from the magnitude of higher education in a large, wealthy, egalitarian society. Special support comes from the importance of political science as a university subject, which is related to the long-standing American propensity to employ education in the service of American democracy. Political science, observed Carl Friedrich in 1947, is "a peculiarly *American* discipline," in terms of its strength and status. He contrasted its great importance in the United States with its minor position in Europe, a contrast which he attributed to differences in the political and cultural contexts of the United States and Europe, and to the important stimulus given political science in the United States by the "endemic" domestic reform movements of America.[93]

Precise data on how many of the world's political scientists are American is unavailable, but several estimates exist, varying from Gabriel Almond's 1966 assertion that 9 out of every 10 political scientists in the world were then American,[94] to W.J.M. Mackenzie's more recent estimate that "at least three-quarters of all political scientists work in the United States."[95] In either case it is clear that political science in the United States has no close competitors in terms of faculty numbers. It enjoys an equally lonely eminence in the extent of its funding, amount of publication, diversity of journal outlets, variety of high quality graduate schools, and the depth and range of its coverage of the discipline. These factors, indicative of extensive institutionalization, combine with the general "ascent of the United States to a condition of academic centrality"[96] to give unequalled international visibility to American political science scholarship.

American political science receives an extra boost of strength from its association with the American university system which, with its flexible departmental structure, willingness to regroup fields of study, extensive financial resources, and the entrepreneurial skills of its academics, possesses an adaptive capacity probably unparalleled anywhere in the world. Thus Almond exaggerates only slightly, in repeating Friedrich's earlier observation, with his recent claim that "political science as a profession, with specialization of interests, substantial research support, emphasis on systematic field research, and rigorous logical methods, is relatively new, and at the present time is almost entirely American."[97]

[91]"Towards Empirical Democratic Theory," *Comparative Politics* (April 1972), 419
[92]"Political Science and Political Culture," *The Western Political Quarterly* XXI, 4 (Dec. 1968), 552
[93]"Political Science in the United States in Wartime," *American Political Science Review* XLI, 5 (Oct. 1947), 978–9
[94]*Political Development: Essays in Heuristic Theory* (Boston 1970), 237
[95]*The Study of Political Science Today* (London 1971), 32
[96]Shils, "Tradition, Ecology, and Institution," 790
[97]*Political Development*, 238

American political science influences more than it is influenced. In a survey in the mid-sixties political scientists in Canada placed 10 American graduate schools ahead of the first Canadian school, the University of Toronto, and placed the same American universities in the top eight ranks as had American respondents in the Somit-Tanenhaus survey, with only slight changes in rank order. Respondents in Canada also placed five American journals of political science ahead of the first Canadian journal, the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*.[98]

The penetrative power of the American version of political science, endowed with an elaborate apparatus for its own propagation, does not confine itself to North America. The assumptions it contains, the concepts it employs, and the ideas it generates are given special weighting "in the competition of interpretations of social reality."[99] A visitor to the 1971 annual meeting of the Japanese Political Science Association expressed "amazement at the absolute predominance of American political science in the discussions ... The names of Easton, Dahl, Deutsch, Almond, Coleman, Apter, Riggs, Pye, Kornhauser, etc. ... seemed to be on the lips of everyone ... I almost had to pinch myself to remember I was not at a meeting in the States."[100] The relationships are asymmetrical. No one who attends the APSA annual meetings and observes the names on everyone's lips will be tempted to conclude that he is in Tokyo, and there is no debate in the United States on the Canadianization of American political science.

The very size and power of the American political science community isolate it from those it influences. It possesses a degree of intellectual self-sufficiency unattainable by and unthinkable for political scientists in Canada. A high degree of unilingualism adds a special barrier to American contact with other political science traditions.[101] Immigration restrictions, which contrast starkly with Canadian openness, make it extremely difficult for non-Americans to gain academic employment

[98]March and Jackson, "Aspects of the State of Political Science in Canada," 438–9, 441. It should be noted that an unknown number of the respondents were Americans teaching in Canada. Their data on graduate school ranking probably exaggerates Canadian-American similarities. Foreign universities, which at that time constituted one-third of the sources of PHDs in Canada, were excluded. "Because overseas doctorates are generally research degrees, we felt that it would not be as meaningful to compare them with North American degrees which combine course work with research," 438. Thus one of the marked Canadian-American differences in graduate work, going overseas for the doctorate, was eliminated from their comparison.

[99]Shils, "Tradition, Ecology, and Institution," 762

[100]George O. Totten, "1971 Annual Meeting of the Japanese Political Science Association," *PS* v, 1 (Winter 1972), 64. The situation varies from country to country. "The impact of American writings on scientific and behavioral methods on German political science has been limited, though there have been several collections of writings by American political scientists which have appeared." R. Taylor Cole, "American Studies in Western Continental European Universities," in *Theory and Politics: Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag für Carl Joachim Friedrich*, ed. Klaus von Beyme (Haag 1971), 252

[101]See David Pfotenhauer, "Conceptions of Political Science in West Germany and the United States, 1960–1969," *Journal of Politics* XXXIV, 2 (May 1972), 584–91, for the much lesser citation of foreign language sources in footnotes, and much lesser use of non-native literature by American than by German political scientists in selected American and German periodicals.

An extreme example of one way traffic is evident in Japanese-Western relationships in sociology. Japan has more academic sociologists than any country except the United States. Most Japanese sociologists read one Western language, and "Japanese scholarship ... is very much in the mainstream of Western sociology ... and much research of good quality is conducted." However, since few Westerners read Japanese, and little Japanese work is translated "sociology as a world discipline has benefited too little from the extensive work of the Japanese." Smelser and Davis, *Sociology*, 113

in the United States, thus providing legislative support for parochial tendencies. The quality and number of graduate schools in the United States generate another kind of self-sufficiency, again in marked contrast to Canada, which allows most American political scientists to take both undergraduate and graduate work at home. Of the 196 officers and council members of the American Political Science Association from 1945 to 1965 who had doctoral degrees, only 5 had foreign degrees compared to 191 American doctorates.[102] This insularity of educational experience contrasts strongly with the resort to European graduate schools of the late nineteenth-century pioneers of political science in the United States and tends "to abet a kind of scientific parochialism or, at least, has lessened the likelihood of the widest possible range of methodological dispositions."[103]

What is known about the political systems of mankind would be different, probably significantly so, with a more "equitable" distribution of political scientists. Such a distribution would bring with it a different selection of questions, different objects of study, other organizing concepts, and possibly the acceptance of alternative types of explanation.[104] The evaluation of research findings would also occur under the aegis of a different mix of values than that which prevails in the existing situation. Even though, in the words of Gunnar Myrdal, "we are seeking truth, we are not less conditioned by our mental make-up and the society in which we live and work than are other men. Social scientists ... are part of a social system and a culture. Our research interests, the particular approach we choose, the course we follow in drawing inferences and organizing our findings, are not determined by facts and logic alone. We are not automatons."[105]

The influences which affect social scientists in open societies are not to be equated with the totalitarian controls on social and political theory in Soviet Russia,[106] the political purifications of the Chinese cultural revolution, or the politically dictated distortions of the social sciences in Nazi Germany. Nevertheless, political science in the United States, like history in French Canada,[107] sociology in Britain,[108] and Freudian psychoanalysis in nineteenth-century Vienna,[109] can

[102]Somit and Tanenhaus, *The Development of American Political Science*, 165–6, and see 38 for the Americanization of graduate training

[103]George Feaver, "Contemporary Political Thought and the American Science of Politics," this JOURNAL I, 3 (Sept. 1968), 358. Somit and Tanenhaus have recently suggested that there is a growing interest in foreign scholars, partly in response to participation in the International Political Science Association. *The Development of American Political Science*, 195, 201–2

[104]See R.K. Merton, "Social Conflict over Styles of Sociological Work," in *The Sociology of Sociology*, ed. Larry T. Reynolds and Janice M. Reynolds (New York 1970), 180

[105]Gunnar Myrdal, *Asian Drama* (New York 1968), Vol. 1, 6

[106]While there are differences of opinion on the degree of permissible free inquiry accorded Soviet social scientists, it is clear that the impact of the political system and its controlling social theories is pervasive, and in the past has often been brutally so. See Gordon Skilling, "In Search of Political Science in the USSR," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* XXIX, 4 (Nov. 1963); Bohdan R. Bociurkiw, "The Post-Stalin 'Thaw' and Soviet Political Science," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* XXX, 1 (Feb. 1964); *Social Thought in the Soviet Union*, ed. Alex Simirenko (Chicago 1969); and David E. Powell and Paul Shoup, "The Emergence of Political Science in Communist Countries," *American Political Science Review* LXIV, 2 (June 1970).

[107]Ramsay Cook, *Canada and the French-Canadian Question* (Toronto 1966); Marcel Trudel and Geneviève Jain, *Canadian History Textbooks: A Comparative Study* (Ottawa 1970)

[108]Philip Abrams, *The Origins of British Sociology 1834–1914* (Chicago 1968)

[109]As Malinowski observed: "we might say that in the Oedipus complex there is the repressed desire to kill the father and marry the mother, while in the matrilineal society of the Trobri-

only be understood by reference to the national, cultural, and political context in which it evolved, and to which it still responds.[110]

Theodore Lowi recently suggested that, with a certain time lag, "professional fashions were shaped by whether a Democrat or a Republican majority held Washington. For a time after World War II, public administration and national government were dominant. During the Republican 1950s, when Washington access was reduced, the most exciting work was done in urban politics. Congressional studies revived for the same reasons."[111] The connection between society and discipline extends far beyond professional fashion. One of the "most striking characteristics" of behavioural studies in the United States is their acceptance of the "prevailing political paradigm" of American society "as the frame of reference and as the source of research problems." Research on voter attitudes and preferences, voter apathy, the "functional value of non-participation," the extent of elite domination and responsiveness, proceeds from their definition as problems by the paradigm of "a liberal or democratic regime."[112]

The impact of the American milieu is particularly noticeable in American texts which reveal the responsibility assumed by political science "for transmitting to the nation's youth the knowledge and the patriotic sentiments deemed essential for the successful functioning of our democratic system."[113] This missionary, proselytizing character of the American text is in striking contrast to the British approach. The British have lacked the compulsion constantly to reassure themselves and others of the superiority of their political institutions. "A speaker," states R.H. Pear, "who talks about the 'British way of Life' will, if he is not careful, raise a giggle before he has gone very far."[114]

The American textbook approach also contrasts strongly with the Canadian. There is no Canadian creed against which a Canadian text could judge the system's performance and find it lacking. Had Gunnar Myrdal written of Canada he could not have contrasted prevailing inequalities with an official creed of equality. The anglophone political scientists of a country endowed with a counter-revolutionary tradition have felt minimal compulsion to explore the meaning and development of Canadianism.

Given the circumstances of numerical predominance, general unilingualism, limited contact with other ways of doing political science, and the understandably

---

ands the wish is to marry the sister and to kill the maternal uncle." B. Malinowski, *Sex and Repression in Savage Society* (New York 1955), 76

[110]See Bernard Crick, *The American Science of Politics* (London 1959), for "an interpretation of American political culture that seeks to show why in recent years political theory in the United States has commonly taken the form of belief in a political *science*," vi; italics in original.

[111]"The Politics of Higher Education: Political Science as a Case Study," in *The Post-behavioral Era*, ed. George J. Graham and George W. Carey (New York 1972), 12

[112]Sheldon S. Wolin, "Paradigms and Political Theories," in *Politics and Experience*, ed. Preston King and B.C. Parekh (Cambridge 1968), 151–2

[113]Somit and Tanenhaus, *The Development of American Political Science*, 45. The significance of education for citizenship for American political science is discussed at 42–8, 195–9. See also *Political Science*, ed. Heinz Eulau and James G. March (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1969), 8

[114]"The Great American Textbook," *Parliamentary Affairs* XVII, 2 (Spring 1964), 220. See also George Carey, "Introductory Textbooks to American Government," *The Political Science Reviewer* I (Fall 1971)

introspective tendencies of a dynamic, powerful branch of the discipline it is easy, too easy, for American treatises on political science to equate, or confuse, political science with its largest national component. Thus, a recent president of the American Political Science Association in discussing "The Quest for a Discipline," commenced with references to political science in general, and then, after a brief apology, proceeded to analyse political science in the United States. After all, as David Truman stated in 1965 in defence of his approach, "the problems of political science are, if only because of the number of practitioners involved, chiefly problems of American political science."[115] Smaller academic communities elsewhere with different problems, he neglected to add, will have to conduct their own inquiries into their quest for a discipline.

The recent American reaction against behaviouralism, one of the more prominent orientations of political science in the United States in the last three decades, in favour of a more policy-oriented, applied approach is an excellent illustration of the impact of American problems on American disciplinary debates. The brief comments which follow reveal that non-American political scientists were clearly designated as outsiders by the premises of this intense debate on the future of (American) political science.

David Easton's qualified support for the post-behavioural revolution in his 1969 Presidential address[116] does not speak directly to non-American political scientists and their problems. Its message only intermittently transcends the boundaries of the American political science community to which it was addressed. Although he includes such global issues as fear of nuclear war, the population explosion, and environmental pollution in the urgent conditions requiring a response from political scientists, they are of secondary importance in his analysis. The major compelling issues are found in the worsening crises then confronting the American political system – Vietnam, internal cleavages deriving from inequality and racial conflict and verging on civil war, and the prospects of authoritarianism raised by the failure of the system to solve these problems. The justification offered for a change of direction in political science reduces itself to the proposition that the American political system is in crisis. Although Easton variously refers to American political science and *the* discipline of political science, his message is clearly addressed to the American version of the latter.

The American activist critics of behaviouralism, to whose criticisms Easton was presumably responding, share his domestic frame of reference by focusing almost exclusively on what they view as the sickness of American society as justification for their animadversions.[117] They parade a succession of domestic crises before the reader as they react in anguished language against the dispassionate behaviouralist attempt to build a science and the reality of burning American cities, Vietnamese children napalmed by American "boys," and American air that threatens the

[115]"Disillusion and Regeneration: The Quest for a Discipline," *American Political Science Review* LIX, 4 (Dec. 1965), 865

[116]"The New Revolution in Political Science," presidential address to the American Political Science Association, 1969, reprinted in David Easton, *The Political System* (2nd ed., New York 1971)

[117]See Marvin Surkin and Alan Wolfe, "The Political Dimension of American Political Science," *Acta Politica* v (1969–70), and Lowi, "The Politics of Higher Education," 13, 15. The radical movement in American sociology is equally clearly a reaction to conditions in American society. See J. David Colfax and Jack L. Roach, eds., *Radical Sociology* (New York 1971).

lungs of those compelled to breathe it. The plea is insistently made that American political scientists should address themselves to the urgent problems of a society racked by racial disorders and continuing inequality. Behaviouralists are criticized because "their work seems unrelated to the needs and concerns of the times."[118] In all of these criticisms there is minimal interest in the different dilemmas of political scientists outside the United States and the problems they or their society might face. The constant plea for relevance has been consistently parochial in focus and concern.[119] The possible breakup of Canada, apartheid in South Africa, and the confrontations between India and Pakistan have not been part of the American debate on the future of political science in the United States. The only prominent external issue given pride of place is Vietnam, which wreaked havoc on the internal workings of American society, and which was described by Michael Haas and Theodore L. Becker as "the first major crisis to confront behavioralists since their success in the 1960's."[120]

In its responsiveness to domestic circumstances this academic controversy on the future of political science has links and parallels with the discussions which, a quarter of a century earlier, heralded the arrival of behaviouralism and the onslaught on traditional political science. That intradisciplinary controversy also fed on the relationship between political science, the American system of government, and the problems of American society.[121]

[118] *Apolitical Politics: A Critique of Behavioralism*, ed. Charles A. McCoy and John Playford (New York 1967), 8

[119] See for example Gitlin, 145, and Goldschmidt, 229–30, in McCoy and Playford, *Apolitical Politics*. Similar introspection is displayed in *Power and Community: Dissenting Essays in Political Science*, ed. Philip Green and Sanford Levinson (New York 1970). Eight of the 12 essays "attempt to illuminate aspects of the American polity inadequately analyzed by mainstream political science" in such a way as to undermine complacent myths about the American system, viii. The introspective focus is well stated by Kenneth M. Dolbeare: "The discipline of political science itself is of marginal relevance to the problems and prospects of America's future. But it is where we work, and we must make our efforts where we work, or we shall make no efforts at all," 109.

[120] "The Behavioral Revolution and After," in Haas and Kariel, *Approaches to the Study of Political Science*, 501. The impact of Vietnam on scholarly discourse in the United States is well revealed in *The Dissenting Academy*, ed. Theodore Roszak (New York 1968), a volume critical of the social sciences and humanities in the United States. In a preface largely devoted to Vietnam, Roszak asserts that the Vietnam war "is very largely a product of the academic community's own cultural default," vi.

[121] The genesis of behaviouralism was complex, and cannot be explained simply as an American response to American circumstances. See Robert A. Dahl, "The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest," in *Politics and Social Life* ed. Nelson W. Polsby et al. (Boston 1963), for an extended discussion. It is clear however that the precipitating factors included the disillusioning experience of Washington-based American political scientists in the Second World War who found that their discipline seemed inadequate to explain what they encountered, and who observed that their advice carried little weight with government, in comparison to the more scientific disciplines. "In order for the advice of a political scientist to carry more weight, the behaviorists advocated the use of scientific methods in tackling policy problems." Haas, "The Rise of a Science of Politics," in Haas and Kariel, *Approaches to the Study of Political Science*, 13–14. The existence of particular traits in American culture also helped. Dahl agrees with Crick that "the rapid flowering of the behavioral approach in the United States no doubt depended on the existence of some key attitudes and predispositions generated in the American culture – pragmatism, factmindedness, confidence in science, and the like." Dahl, "The Behavioral Approach," 15

It might be objected that the preceding is to argue *no more* than the obvious, that everything begins somewhere, and where that somewhere is affects the development. I agree, but I prefer to say that it is to argue *no less* than the obvious.

It is evident therefore that political science in the United States is, in more than a trivial way, a response to American circumstances. This was apparent in the pre-First-World-War failure of the German historical school to establish roots in American political science despite the number of Americans trained in Germany and the prestigious sponsorship it enjoyed from Burgess and others at home. Essentially, it could not compete with conceptions of scholarship more in tune with American character and conditions.[122] The interaction between discipline and society continues to this day. At the most general level, the evolving definition of political science and the tasks to which it addresses itself are heavily influenced by the American context in which those definitions and tasks are worked out. The values and goals of American political scientists, stated Dwight Waldo in 1956, were "set forth in the opening phrases of the Declaration of Independence: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these, are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.' " American political scientists, he continued, "immersed in this culture, are deeply and subtly influenced by these values – even when they seek a 'value-free' political science." He suggests that the liberal tradition of America may explain why "the range of opinion has on the whole and in the larger perspective of all political thought been remarkably small."[123]

The connection between American society and the political science it has developed and sustained has important consequences for political science in non-American contexts. The fact that the academic community possessed of an imperialism of numbers and an elaborate institutional capacity to disseminate its products is extensively influenced by the national milieu in which it continues to evolve means that political scientists elsewhere display professional incompetence if they *uncritically* model their own professional conduct – including choice of problems, balance between pure and applied research, and overriding values – in terms of its partially culture-bound development.[124]

[122]See Jurgen Herbst, *The German Historical School in American Scholarship: A Study in the Transfer of Culture* (Ithaca 1965), for a discussion of this important episode in the development of the social sciences in the United States.

James T. Shotwell, who studied under Burgess at the turn of the century, described the graduate faculties of Columbia and other leading universities of the time as "almost like colonial offshoots of those in Germany where they [faculty] had been trained." *The Autobiography of James T. Shotwell* (New York 1961), 45

[123]*Political Science in the United States of America* (Paris 1956), 15–17

[124]Arend Lijphart recently addressed his European colleagues on the danger of an undue imitativeness which reflected the "great influence that American political science has had on the discipline in other countries." He asserted that the "approaches and products of behaviorism" were too readily accepted by the "largely underdeveloped discipline abroad," and cautioned against "an uncritical acceptance of the newest development in the form of the anti-behaviorist challenge." "Political Science versus Political Advocacy: Comments on the article by Marvin Surkin and Alan Wolfe," *Acta Politica* v (1969–70), 165

"It is often pathetic to see how much the list of projects in the social science institutes in the world periphery is copied from the world center, with obvious political implications." Galtung, "After Camelot," in Horowitz, *Rise and Fall of Project Camelot*, 307

Canada is not immune from this weakness in the social sciences and elsewhere. See G. Bruce Doern, *Science and Politics in Canada* (Montreal and London 1972), 197, for the Canadian tendency to follow the American scientific effort "without any discrimination or determination of whether or not it suits our own preferences."

American controversies between behaviouralists, traditionalists, post-behaviouralists, and others send disciplinary reverberations around the world. Controversies in smaller political science communities with less efficient instruments of communication and persuasion raise scarcely a ripple outside the circle most immediately concerned. This differential in the external impact of domestic academic controversies is not related to differences in their basic disciplinary significance, or in the quality of their discussion, but simply to differences in the visibility of the arenas in which they take place.

SIZE, RESOURCES, AND DISCIPLINARY CAPACITY

In order to render the discussion of the disciplinary relationship between political science in Canada and in the United States more specific, the remainder of part three will focus on the study of Canadian politics.

The division of academic labour is ultimately limited by the number of faculty available to be divided. Accordingly, American political science with 12 to 15 political scientists for each political scientist in Canada can apply far more faculty resources to particular fields than can be done in Canada. The research decision of the student of Canadian politics is aggregated with the decisions of some 200 colleagues[125] to constitute the collective effort employed in professional analysis of the Canadian political system at the present time. The individual American research decision is aggregated with, at the very least, that of some 2500 of his colleagues to constitute the collective effort employed in professional analysis of the American political system.[126] These conspicuous differences in the availability of personnel inevitably influence the research specializations of the two communities which study domestic politics, set different limits on the total collective effort possible, and, in conjunction with the differential availability of funds, affect the kinds of problems capable of investigation.

American students of American politics are part of a large national community of scholars whose size gives it a unique capacity to develop particular subfields, to proliferate new approaches, and generally to influence the research agenda of political scientists around the world. The rivalry of scholars, departments, and universities in the United States, with its accompanying search for academic novelty, combines with the easy availability of funds and publication outlets to provide both incentives and capacity for constant experimentation with new approaches and organizing foci. Subfields such as political development,[127] and

[125]An estimate based upon the recent figure of 750 political scientists in Canada, and the distribution of field interests shown in Hull, "The 1971 Survey of the Profession." The figure, of course, includes French Canadian political scientists.

[126]The comparison is approximate only as the various American figures I have seen, mainly found in the journal *PS*, vary widely. The comparison also excludes the contributions of outsiders. These data problems, however, do not affect the general argument.

[127]The fact that so much work in this field "has been inspired from outside the countries concerned" is described as a "conspicuous weakness," by W.J.M. Mackenzie, who also complains of the impact of fashion, and of writings designed "to satisfy academic requirements in a distant country" which display little relevance to problems as defined by indigenous scholars. *The Study of Political Science Today*, 66. Moksos and Bell make the important observation that "the ideological implications of the social science of underdeveloped areas are generally subject to less informed and less close scrutiny than is usually the case with American studies dealing with the domestic scene or other industrialized countries. For one thing, independent criticism operates at a disadvantage because there are relatively few

socialization,[128] which go back to Plato and Aristotle as objects of inquiry, take much of their contemporary colouration from the interaction of American faculty and American funds. In some cases these subfields are partially incorporated into the study of American politics, which has resources of men and money for their exploitation denied to the local students of any other polity in the world. As Smiley notes, a subfield in American studies which is capable of supporting "at least the rudiments of an organized focus of intellectual concern," such as a journal, specialized associations and conferences, a carefully tailored graduate program or research institute, if duplicated in Canadian studies would tend to produce "intellectual isolation."[129] The much smaller academic community which studies Canadian politics lacks the resources to divide itself up into the same number of subgroupings, and its individual members may be properly encouraged to select larger chunks of their focus of disciplinary concern as an area of potential mastery and specialization.

Partly as a legacy of the past when the Canadian political science community was pitifully small, and partly due to the confusion of originality with work in an untouched part of the field, a psychology of research choice exists in students of Canadian politics which encourages a scattering of research effort on the ground that resources are so scarce that duplication of research should be avoided. An inevitable result is the dominance of particular interpretations sustained by the absence of alternatives.[130] This scattering of scholarly interest, coupled with an apparent deference to the work of others, helps to account for the unusually long periods of time in which major interpretations go unchallenged. The overcoming of this undesirable situation requires an overlapping of research choice and the allocation of more resources to critical examination of works already available. In practical terms, this means that aspects of the political system, to the examination of which American scholars can devote extensive resources, must be left relatively untouched in the Canadian setting.

The crucial question of the actual and desirable impact of resources on research decisions is almost totally ignored in political science "state of the discipline"

---

scholars engaged in studies of particular underdeveloped countries, and even fewer expatriate or refugee scholars from these countries in the United States. Also, the academic communities within the underdeveloped nations frequently do not possess a caliber sufficient to serve as a counterbalance to the viewpoints of visiting social scientists. Even when there is a high level of indigenous social analyses, such local interpretations may not have wide currency in professional circles within this country." Charles C. Moksos, Jr, and Wendell Bell, "Emerging Nations and Ideologies of American Social Scientists," *The American Sociologist* II, 2 (May 1967), 67 n.3

See also Myrdal, *Asian Drama*, Vol. I, xiii, 16–20, on Western concepts as a source of bias, and Donal Cruise O'Brien, "Modernization, Order, and the Erosion of a Democratic Ideal: American Political Science 1960–70," *The Journal of Development Studies* VIII, 4 (July 1972). Almond, *Political Development*, "Introduction," is a valuable autobiographical account of the impact of the Committee on Comparative Politics of the Social Science Research Council on the study of non-Western political systems, with a focus on political development and modernization.

[128]Dennis Kavanagh, "Allegiance among English Children: A Dissent," *British Journal of Political Science* II, 1 (January 1972), discusses the insensitivity of applying American socialization assumptions to British politics.

[129]"Must Canadian Political Science be a Miniature Replica?" 32

[130]Alan C. Cairns, "The Study of the Provinces," *B.C. Studies* 14 (Summer 1972), 76

inquiries, in marked contrast to the "hard" sciences where such strategic thinking is common.[131] This failing doubtless reflects the laissez-faire nature of research choice. The individualistic ethos of academic life does not encourage the researcher consciously to integrate his intended contribution with the related efforts of colleagues working in the same problem area or subfield. It is evident, however, that effective individual research decisions must be related to collective research capacity. Even in the United States, with its prodigious resources for political science research, the question has been raised whether American political scientists have taken on too great a task.[132] There is no possibility of political science in Canada equalling the American achievement in general or with respect to the examination of domestic politics. The literature of the latter, therefore, is an arsenal to be exploited, not an effort to be duplicated by students of Canadian politics.

DIFFERENCES IN EXTENT OF THE KNOWN

An additional aspect of size is relevant. What we already know in a particular subfield reflects the amount of resources previously devoted to its study. Academic knowledge of the American polity, for this reason, is far more detailed and comprehensive than academic knowledge of the Canadian polity or that of any other country in the world.[133] The contemporary American research decision is made against the background of a huge, accumulated backlog of books and articles, traditional and otherwise, on every major aspect of the American political system. The Canadian situation is quite different. The dozens of books on the American Democratic party highlight the absence of a single academic book on the Canadian Liberal party. The plethora of recent books on the US Supreme Court is in sharp numerical contrast to its two Canadian counterparts, a royal commission sponsored research report on bilingualism and biculturalism on the Canadian Supreme Court, and a comparative study of the Court for a Quebec National Assembly committee on the constitution.[134] Canada has not had a biography of a Supreme Court Justice published since the court came into existence in 1875, while American book-

[131]The OECD *Reviews of National Science Policy: Canada* (Paris 1969), stated: "The development of Canada's science policy along the lines traced by the United States thus comes up against the obstacle of the limited resources available to the country. Moreover, it becomes increasingly clear that this development must take account of Canada's own requirements, which are not necessarily felt to the same extent in the United States," 371. According to the chairman of the Science Council of Canada, "research will be most effective if it is used selectively. We must be competent in all fields but can only be pre-eminent in a few. These fields should be selected to avoid head-on competition with the United States of America, Russia, or other major industrial nations. While not neglecting areas in which we have common needs with the rest of the world, we should try to identify those fields in which our priorities are different from others and concentrate on these." Ibid., 57

[132]See Charles S. Hyneman, *The Study of Politics* (Urbana 1959), chap. vii, "Have we Tackled too Much?"

[133]Although Crick's view merits pondering, "There is more accurate information to be found about contemporary American government and politics than for any other nation, and yet there is remarkably less knowledge about the causes and conditions which could reveal the coherence, the significance and the underlying tendencies of this information." *The American Science of Politics*, 230

[134]Peter H. Russell, *The Supreme Court of Canada as a Bilingual and Bicultural Institution* (Ottawa 1969), and Jacques Brossard, *La Cour Suprême et la Constitution* (Montreal 1968)

shelves groan under the weight of biographies, autobiographies, and correspondence of the "Nine Men."[135] There is now a well-developed literature on political socialization in the United States. A recent Canadian text based its discussion of socialization mainly on the slim base of two central Canadian case studies, one of which was a fourth year graduating essay, the other a thesis for the MA degree.[136] The subfield of community power, which is now entering its third decade in the United States[137] and which has developed an impressive secondary literature, is still virgin territory in Canada. The textbook situation is particularly revealing. Until the recent publication of two additional texts in 1971, there was only one comprehensive text in Canadian politics, *The Government of Canada*, first published in 1947 and rapidly eclipsing the only alternative then available, H.McD. Clokie, *Canadian Government and Politics*, first published in 1944. The contrast with the American situation is striking. A long list of additional remarkable discrepancies in Canadian and American knowledge of analogous aspects of their polities can be compiled with ease by anyone knowledgeable about the two bodies of literature.

While particular discrepancies might be overcome by Herculean efforts, the over-all existence of major discrepancies is an irremediable condition as long as the differential availability of academic resources is unaltered. Any attempt to "catch up" is therefore utopian, irrelevant to sensible research decisions, and fruitlessly demoralizing if pursued as an attainable objective.[138] One of the recurring characteristics of Canadian writing, to compare the paucity of literature on Canada with the extensive literature on the United States, is thus assured of a long life. The tendency to contrast Canadian deficiencies with "the American storehouse ... loaded with materials in the vein in which this book of readings has been cast"[139] is however time consuming and tedious. As an economy measure I suggest the acronym ICTEAL – "in contrast to the extensive American literature" – be suitably placed at the commencement of their works by authors who wish to remind us of the unavoidable.

Differences in what is known should contribute to different determinations of what needs to be done. It is difficult to conceive of an evolving growth of understanding of the Canadian political system if there is not a self-conscious relationship between ongoing research choices, and what has already been done. The criticism of institutional, historical, legal, and descriptive studies has a different cogency when applied to a situation in which large numbers of such studies have

[135]See Fred Vaughan, "Emmett Matthew Hall: The Activist as Justice," *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 10 (1972) for a recent Canadian contribution.

[136]Van Loon and Whittington, *The Canadian Political System*, 67–72

[137]If we date from Floyd Hunter, *Community Power Structure* (Chapel Hill, 1953), rather than from the earlier Middletown studies of the Lynds

[138]F.F. Ridley recently described Britain as "an under-developed country" in the study of public administration. Differences in the size of the two academic communities had the effect that the British "cannot hope to rival American research nor, indeed, are we likely on the simple law of averages to have as many original thinkers ... It is ... to America that we must largely look if we are to consider the development of public administration as an academic subject." "Public Administration: Cause for Discontent," *Public Administration* 50 (Spring 1972), 65, 70–72

[139]*Politics and Government of Urban Canada: Selected Readings*, ed. Lionel D. Feldman and Michael D. Goldrick (Toronto 1969), Preface; see also 3

been brought to completion, than when such studies remain in short supply,[140] as in the study of Canadian politics where it is not easy to get a satisfactory comprehensive overview of the institutional rudiments of the system and its historical development. Thus, recent data, admittedly slim, which suggest a striking decline in institutional, constitutional, historical, and legal studies, and a dramatic increase in quantitative and empirical studies may be of some concern.[141] It raises the question whether the task of the students of Canadian politics building on the scanty literature available has been sufficiently distinguished from the decidedly different task of the much more numerous students of American politics who confront burgeoning libraries of literature, much of it traditional, dealing with their political system.[142] Canadian research decisions pertaining to the Canadian polity should not be made in the light of American knowledge of the American political system. If decisions are made in the light of Canadian knowledge it is highly probable that traditional types of research will have a greater utility in the Canadian than in the American setting. Robert Dubin's admonition, that "we make progress slowly because we value description so lowly,"[143] probably has special application to the Canadian situation in which descriptive studies are still lacking.[144]

DIFFERENCES IN THE CANADIAN AND AMERICAN POLITICAL SYSTEMS

Not only do students of Canadian and American politics differ in the resources at their disposal and in the degree of attained understanding of the domestic political systems they examine, but the political systems themselves differ in history, institutional makeup, and the problems they raise for analysis. This obvious point requires only minimal elaboration as a reminder that students of domestic politics in the two countries examine political systems that are not replicas of each other.

[140]A version of David Truman's point that where data is not easily available, as in Soviet studies, much work will be "reportorial, journalistic, and non-theoretical." "Disillusion and Regeneration," 870

[141]Kornberg and Tharp present data which show striking changes in the period 1968–70 for *CJPS* from earlier periods. Although the trend indicated is pronounced, it may be deceptive as books are not included, the time period is short, and "theory" articles are excluded. "The American Impact," 65

[142]See Jorgen Rasmussen's strong plea for institutional studies in European politics in " 'Once You've Made a Revolution, Everything's the Same': Comparative Politics," in Graham and Carey, *Post-behavioral Era*, 79

[143]"Contiguous Problem Analysis: An Approach to Systematic Theories about Social Organization," in Sherif and Sherif, *Interdisciplinary Relationships*, 72

[144]J.E. Hodgetts recently defended his somewhat traditional study of the public service, dealing with the organizational context of administrative activity, on the ground that "it has not yet been done and it should be done before we fly off to the esoteric realms inhabited by modern-day organizational theorists and administrative behaviouralists. The failure to adopt these exciting contemporary tools of analysis is not a mark of disapproval or disagreement: the preference for more pedestrian modes of inquiry is simply based on an old-fashioned notion that we must first learn to walk before we can fly. In this respect, such weaknesses as this study exposes are reflections of the comparative neglect of the subject by students of Canadian public administration and the retarded stage of development in which it still languishes." He also speaks of "the limited objectives imposed by the prevailing state of our studies." *The Canadian Public Service: A Physiology of Government 1867–1970* (Toronto 1973), xii–xiii

1/ French-English tension is strikingly different in origin, impact, and possible resolution from Black-White tension in the United States.
2/ Only one of the two countries has to worry about a large and powerful neighbour.
3/ Profound differences of population size and economic and military power affect the political systems of the two countries in innumerable ways.
4/ Different national histories have produced important differences in the way the two countries relate to the external world.
5/ Elections are both symbolically more important and apply to a larger range of public offices in the United States than in Canada, both differences reflecting the differential strength of populism in the two polities.
6/ Canada lacks a revolutionary experience or tradition. No American could defend conservatism under the title *Freedom Wears a Crown*.[145]
7/ There are basic institutional differences between the congressional-presidential system of the United States and the parliamentary-cabinet system of Canada. Even the formal similarity of federalism is partially belied in practice by the divergent evolution of the two federal systems.

These and other contrasts and variations in the two polities contribute to differences in the theoretical and practical questions raised for investigation. There are, therefore, important specificities in the domestic subfields of political science in Canada and the United States which affect the ready applicability of models and theories developed elsewhere, and which require each community of scholars to be sensitively aware not only of the common features of political systems, but also of those differences which constitute the political heterogeneity of mankind.[146]

The first two items mentioned exemplify features of political life which deserve special attention because Canada is a particularly appropriate laboratory for their examination: (1) political integration, or disintegration, with special reference to French-English relations, and (2) small power-big power relations, focusing on the quasi-dependent relation of Canada to the United States.[147] It is disconcerting to note that neither of these has been a major research area. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism discovered that the central topic of French-English relationships was a backward field of political science (and other social science) research in Canada,[148] a deficiency partly remedied by the Commission's own work. The Canadian-American relation has received minimal

[145]John Farthing, *Freedom Wears a Crown* (Toronto 1957)

[146]For recent arguments stressing the particularities of the Canadian situation, the problems thus posed for borrowing social science from abroad, and the necessity for indigenous social science research, see Bonneau and Corry, *Quest for the Optimum*, 72–3, and Arthur J.R. Smith, "The Social Sciences and the 'Economics of Research,'" address to the Royal Society of Canada, 3 June 1968, 5–6, cited in *A Science Policy for Canada: Report of the Senate Special Committee on Science Policy, Volume 2, Targets and Strategies for the Seventies* (Ottawa 1972), 459

[147]For an earlier indication of some of the special features of the Canadian polity of interest to political scientists, see H.F. Angus, "Canada as a Phenomenon for Political Scientists," *Western Political Quarterly* XII, 2 (June 1959).

[148]Professor Michael Oliver, research director of the B and B Commission, has described the Commission's surprise at the inadequate methods of analysis available for the understanding of French-English relations: "so the existing body of research findings, and the conceptual frameworks of the humanities and social sciences, revealed immediately the scant attention which has been paid in the past to the problems of the Commission – the range of problems that make up the current crisis." "The Research Programme of the Royal Commission on

attention from political scientists as a case study of the tensions and contradictions between the de jure Canadian status of independence and the de facto realities of the power inequalities between Canada and the United States.[149] The deficiencies in this area also reflect the division of labour within political science between students of foreign policy and students of the domestic political system, a division which contributes to the failure to see the foreign environment outside the formal boundaries of the political system as a major source of inputs into domestic policy.

The absence of major political science research in two of the most obvious areas deserving special attention challenges the adequacy of the system of cues by which we inform each other of what needs to be done.[150] It suggests an insensitivity to the Canadian setting, rather as if New Zealanders were to avoid the study of sheep, and represents a failure to exploit the research advantages of the Canadian locale.

Part four: a general approach to the study of Canadian politics

The student of Canadian politics confronts a different research agenda from the student of American politics. Differences in the size and resources of their respec-

---

Bilingualism and Biculturalism," Gray Lecture, mimeo, 2 March 1965, 10–11, cited in A.R. Kear, "Canadian Political Science – One Man's Fancy," 18

The B and B Commission also noted the "striking fact" that so little was known about cultural groups other than the British and French in Canada. "As far as a sociology of ethnic relations exists," they reported, "it is mainly American. Although much can be learnt from research carried out in the United States, the conclusions reached are frequently not applicable in Canada." They continued: "Canadian society differs from American society in a number of respects that are of direct importance to immigrants and cultural groups. Among these are the greater social role of government, the existence of two linguistic communities, the idea of a 'cultural mosaic' instead of a 'melting-pot,' the fact that large-scale immigration to Canada continued after the United States' policy became restrictionist, the low density of our population, and Canada's proximity to a more populated and more highly developed country. By studying the effects of these factors, scholars could make distinctive contributions to social science, and also help to develop the understanding which must underlie sound social policy in Canada. Since Canada is one of the most technologically advanced of the highly pluralistic societies, research on the Canadian experience could also offer other countries more understanding of complex societies." *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*, Book IV, *The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups* (Ottawa, 1970), 225–6

[149]Stephen Clarkson, "Lament for a non-subject: reflections on teaching Canadian-American relations," *International Journal* XXVII, 2 (Spring 1972). See also Richard A. Preston, "A Plea for Comparative Studies of Canada and the United States and of the Effects of Assimilation on Canadian Development," in Preston, *The Influence of the United States on Canadian Development*, for a plea for more intensive study of the impact on the United States on Canadian life. Political scientists might note with some chagrin that the two most provocative examinations of the dependent Canadian relationship are by an economist, Kari Levitt, *Silent Surrender* (Toronto 1971), and a Christian philosopher, George Grant, *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism* (Toronto 1965).

[150]The left-wing explanation of this failure is quite straightforward. Failure to come to grips with the conflict of nationalisms in Canada and the colonial-imperial character of Canadian-American relationships reflects the "subordination of social science in the hinterland," which is related to the intellectual, cultural, and political allegiance of social scientists in the "colonized hinterland to the forms, techniques and concepts of the social sciences at the imperial centre." Since the "difference between a sociology 'adequate' for the analysis of an imperial centre and that which is adequate for the analysis of a colony is quite plain" the result of colonial imitativeness is vacuity and irrelevance. Gurstein, "Towards the nationalization of Canadian sociology," 50, 52. See also Lumsden, "Academic Underdevelopment in a Dependent Country."

tive academic communities, in the extent of the known, and in the problems which their political systems present for examination do, or should, elicit differences in the kinds of problems selected and in the strategies for their examination. Extensive American resources justify a degree of high cost, low payoff research inappropriate for the less well-endowed academic community which studies Canadian politics. Additional support for a degree of autonomy in the study of Canadian politics comes from the recognition of the impact of American society on political science in the United States.

It is neither profitable nor accurate at this time in the development of political science and of political systems to view the political scientists of the world as belonging to a global scholarly community in which national distinctions in the discipline are unhappy residues of a fading past.[151] When American political scientists discuss the future of political science they pay negligible attention to the resources, knowledge, interests, and problems of those who are not part of the American national community of scholars. The recent behaviouralism controversy was clearly a response to the profound gap between the American reality and the American dream, scarcely a trivial issue, but one devoid of any logical relevance to the disciplinary orientations of political scientists in Rome, Nairobi, or Edmonton. It is therefore necessary for the political scientists of the non-American world to recognize that they have been implicitly defined as outsiders, and to increase their self-awareness by discussing the advance of their portion of the discipline in terms relevant to their own circumstances. The diffusion of disciplinary introspection around the world will create a pluralism of disciplinary sensitivities responsive to a variety and diversity of national and cultural contexts. The result should be as healthy for political science in the United States characterized by, to coin a phrase, an insular pluralism, and too little influenced by the discipline beyond its national boundaries, as for political science elsewhere, subject to the danger of being too much influenced by the American version of the discipline and too little influenced by the specificities of its own situation.

Students of Canadian politics would be impoverished if the rich literature produced by American political scientists did not exist. The possibility of employing tools of analysis developed by a larger academic community, and profiting from their prior testing by that community, are benefits too easily taken for granted. However, potential costs and dangers also exist, and they too are easily overlooked. It requires little imagination to visualize a pessimistic scenario in which inadequate attention is paid to the differences in the subject matter studied by originator and borrower, and in which students of Canadian politics participate in a continental division of labour in which they exhaust themselves trying to apply the latest, ever-changing model, approach, or theory developed by the bulk of the world's political scientists who live in the United States.[152] A related danger is the

[151]An alternative view is presented by David Easton who recently asserted that political scientists have too long suffered the "crippling effects ... of unwitting commitment to national goals and perspectives." He makes a plea for the "denationalized" social scientist who, like the "ideal international civil servant ... may be permitted to achieve maximum freedom from national commitments by being obliged to carry an international passport and to conduct himself accordingly." "The New Revolution in Political Science," *The Political System*, 347. As already noted (see above p. 218) this particular address by Easton overwhelmingly focused on problems of concern to the American political system.

[152]David Truman recently expressed pleasure at the growth of interest-group studies abroad

possibility that gaps in the literature of Canadian politics will be defined primarily in terms of that body of literature on American politics which has not yet elicited its Canadian counterpart. Mild, or even extreme versions of these depressing possibilities cannot be rejected out of hand when so many factors work to integrate political science on a continental basis, and thus not only facilitate wise selection from the American arsenal based on intimate knowledge, but also encourage uncritical copying. The probability of the latter is enhanced by the tendency noticeable in interdisciplinary borrowings, and doubtless equally applicable to intradisciplinary borrowing across national boundaries, "an uncritical selectivity that is overawed in favor of models from disciplines more prestigeful than one's own."[153]

The dangers of inappropriate borrowing were identified by Harold Innis 40 years ago in a discussion of economic history. In 1929 he lamented "the lack of a philosophy of economic history applicable to new countries." In its absence, much work "has been defective through the attempt to fit the phenomena of new countries to the economic theories of old countries." Escape from this could only come from "an intensive study" of Canadian problems and from the development of theory "suited to Canadian needs."[154] Forty years later, although the phrase "new countries" now seems inappropriate when applied to Canada, the problem remains, and the solution also remains. The contemporary problem may even be more serious if the demands for upgrading of technical skills and knowledge of more sophisticated tools inadvertently result in a decline in the substantive knowledge of, and feel for, the society to which they will be applied. Constant attention to Canadian history and Canadian society is necessary if theory is to be adapted to Canada or developed in Canada. The study of Canada will be badly done to the

---

which partly reflected "the considerable prestige of American political science ... [and] the influence of American perspectives and modes of inquiry." On the other hand, he expressed chagrin that too many had failed to note that his book *The Governmental Process* was "an analysis of the *American* system," whose findings could not be applied "indiscriminately to other, quite different, systems." The failure of foreigners to make the relevant distinction paralleled the similar failure of "much recent American social science, of couching parochial findings in universal terms and thus ignoring their limited application and the enormous variabilities traceable to cultural diversity." *The Governmental Process* (2nd ed., New York 1971), xxiii, xxvi

[153]A practice the authors felt "has not thus far been conducive to the breakthroughs anticipated." Sherif and Sherif, preface, *Interdisciplinary Relationships*, xii. See Herbert Goldhamer, "Fashion and Social Science," *World Politics* VI (1953–4), and Warren O. Hagstrom, *The Scientific Community* (New York 1965), 177–84 for fad and fashion leadership in academic life.

[154]*Essays in Canadian Economic History* (Toronto 1956), ed. Mary Q. Innis, 10, 3. See Neill, *A New Theory of Value: The Canadian Economics of H.A. Innis*, for an elaboration. In "The Social Sciences," C.B. Macpherson noted the early difficulties of understanding the economy and society "by the use only of imported social science," 185. In a previous article, "The Position of Political Science," he commented that "a social science which is adequate for one country may be inadequate in another country at the same time if the economy is at a different stage of development in the two countries," 454. Donald G. Creighton's 1957 Presidential Address to the Canadian Historical Association should be consulted by those who prefer to have their criticisms of "alien" theories couched in strong, almost intemperate, language. His particular scorn is reserved for those who succumb to "imported" Marxian class theories and the Turner frontier thesis. He concluded by contrasting "imported theories of historical change" with "the manifold facts of Canadian experience." "Doctrine and the Interpretation of History," reprinted in Donald G. Creighton, *Towards the Discovery of Canada* (Toronto 1972), 45

extent that it is unduly influenced by the large, powerful, capable, and aggressive neighbouring community of scholars deeply immersed in their own society.[155] The key word is "unduly." There is no assertion intended here that Canada either constitutes some kind of ineffable uniqueness beyond the possibility of inclusion in comparative analysis, which requires a common framework, or that it can only be analysed by concepts which emerge behind some intellectual tariff barrier. What is required is the making of wise choices.

The process by which particular social science models of non-indigenous origin are selected or rejected is extraordinarily complex. C.B. Macpherson noted and deplored the rarity and unpopularity of applying "concepts which are primarily European," particularly the invidious term *petit-bourgeois,* to an analysis of Canada. However, he was encouraged to do so in his stimulating, and controversial, class analysis of Alberta politics by the overlooked similarities of the "political economies of Europe and Canada."[156] Without referring to Macpherson's work, a Marxist historian, Leo Johnson, has recently claimed that Canadian Marxist scholarship has been too derivative of European work, and hence weak because of its proneness to "facile applications of analytical models drawn from foreign and historically different circumstances," a shortcoming his own work attempts to overcome.[157] Several authors assert that the study of Canadian parties has been harmed by a too great dependence on models borrowed from American literature,[158] although it would be equally plausible to suggest that the most pervasive model in the study of parties has been British, with the recurring prediction since the 1930s of a polarized British type party system with the CCF/NDP acting as the Canadian stand-in for the Labour party. The tendency for traditional studies of the parliamentary system to draw heavily on British literature has been criticized on the ground that it leads to a failure to adequately note the departure of Canadian experience from the nineteenth-century British model – from which subsequent British experience has also departed.[159] It is worth noting in this regard that American scholars, frustrated by the alleged inefficiencies of a separation of power system and the absence of tight party discipline, have often themselves been

[155]David Coburn recently reached the same conclusion for sociology in Canada, expressing the fear that the weak Canadian data base could encourage and facilitate the "wholesale application" to Canada of the abundant American findings and theory which may be inapplicable. He called for "close attention to Canadian society" on the ground that Canadian contributions to sociology would "to a large extent" be determined by that local knowledge. "Sociology and Sociologists in Canada: Problems and Prospects," in Loubser, *The Future of Sociology in Canada,* 39. S.D. Clark has recently deplored what he describes as "a studied effort on the part of many sociologists in Canada to avoid types of study that do not appear to fit into the framework of American sociology." Elsewhere he states: "Perhaps, in the end, what is most required on the part of the sociologist is a feel for his society. That feel can only be got by knowing its history and having a strong sense of identification with it." "The American Take Over of Canadian Sociology: Myth or Reality," *Dalhousie Review* (Summer 1973), 214, 217

[156]*Democracy in Alberta* (2nd ed.), xi

[157]"The Development of Class in Canada in the Twentieth Century," 143–4

[158]Kenneth McNaught, "The Multi-Party System in Canada," in *Essays on the Left,* ed. Laurier LaPierre, et al. (Toronto 1971), 44–9; S.J.R. Noel, "Political Parties and Elite Accommodation: Interpretations of Canadian Federalism," in *Canadian Federalism: Myth or Reality,* ed. J. Peter Meekison (2nd ed., Toronto 1971), 122–4

[159]Denis Smith, "President and Parliament: The Transformation of Parliamentary Government in Canada," in *Apex of Power: The Prime Minister and Political Leadership in Canada,* ed. Thomas A. Hockin (Scarborough 1971), 228–34

bemused by an idealized model of the British parliamentary system and party system,[160] an orientation described by Polsby as a mixture of "snobbery and nonsense."[161]

The effective analysis of the Canadian political system requires a self-conscious recognition of the distinctive elements in the domestic research task founded on a continually refreshed awareness of the historical development of Canadian society and its political forms. It also requires an initimate and profound awareness of the developing political science of the United States, an understanding of which is mandatory for any sophisticated political science community in the closing years of the twentieth century. American literature, however, requires supplementing, for it almost unavoidably encourages comparisons with American experience, which are not always apposite. Understanding of the Canadian political system characterized "by an advanced level of 'stateness' combined with a relatively low level of 'nationness,' "[162] has not been aided by the next-door example of missionary American nationalism and the literature which reflects on it. The hypnotic presence of the American version militates against understanding of the very different Canadian situation and contributes to a failure to perceive alternative bases of system survival. It is partially responsible for the widespread and curious attribution of fragility to the old and thus far durable Canadian polity. Indeed, we are so conditioned by the American model that in unguarded moments we incautiously view our political system and its supports as unnatural, a misuse of language which would have fascinated Orwell.

An increasing sensitivity and discrimination in the utilization of the literature of American politics and of American political science should be accompanied by a greatly heightened awareness of various political systems outside North America with which in specific respects Canada has more in common than with the United States. Students of Canadian politics make inadequate use of relevant comparative material dealing with other parliamentary democracies of British origin, such as New Zealand, with other multilingual societies, such as Belgium and Switzerland, other vast, sprawling, thinly peopled federations, such as Australia, other examples of small power–big power relationships, such as Finland-Russia and Eire-United Kingdom, other polities where regional inequalities have been of longstanding concern, such as Italy, and other primary-producing countries throughout the world heavily dependent on foreign trade. Understanding of the Canadian political system will be aided by the broadening of perspectives to the countries suggested above, and, at least of equal importance, by the establishing of links with the academic communities and political science traditions involved in their examination.

In addition to the diversification just suggested, it is time to consider approaches to the study of Canadian politics which give economic considerations a more

[160]Evron M. Kirkpatrick, "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System: Political Science, Policy Science, or Pseudo Science?" *American Political Science Review* LXV, 4 (Dec. 1971); Bernard Crick, *The Reform of Parliament* (New York 1965), xi; Nelson W. Polsby, "Review Article: The British Science of American Politics," *British Journal of Political Science* 2 (Oct. 1972), 497

[161]"The British Science of American Politics," 497

[162]Kenneth D. McRae, "Empire, Language, and Nation: The Canadian Case," in *Building States and Nations*, ed. S.N. Eisenstadt and Stein Rokkan (Beverley Hills 1973), vol. II, 174

prominent place. Given, to cite only two examples, the economic base of much federal-provincial conflict and the economic factors in the Canadian-American relationship, the divorce of politics from economics characteristic of the mainstream of American political science, and generally adhered to in Canada, appears of questionable benefit. The self-declared realism of the new political science is unconvincing when faced with the task of analysing a collectivist system of managed capitalism. The older Canadian literature of political economy, primarily the work of economists, stands up remarkably well in comparison.

The virtual disappearance of the political economy tradition highlights the unfortunate and general absence of holistic macro interpretations of the Canadian polity.[163] With the exception of *The Vertical Mosaic* by the sociologist John Porter, there has been no major recent theoretical appraisal of the Canadian political system which has gone beyond the essay format. Porter's work, however, is not characteristic of sociology in English Canada which has been no less remiss than political science in failing to provide an integrating framework of interpretation for the evolving Canadian experience.[164]

Explanations for this failure are various. Special difficulty resides in the subject matter itself. The Canadian political experience has not provided political scientists with an image or unifying perspective capable of simultaneously comprehending the multiplicity of governments at three levels, the major French-English dualism of language, culture, and history, the subsidiary pluralism of the "third force" groups, and the regional economies, histories, and identities which still exist. There is no founding creed, or sense of overriding nationality to provide a central organizing focus capable of exercising centripetal pressures on these and other diverse phenomena which otherwise present themselves for our understanding simply as material for aggregation united only by propinquity.

The relatively widespread holistic perspective of French Canadian students of French Canada indicates, by contrast, the difficulties confronting English Canadian scholars. As Vallee and Whyte observe, "the distinctive entity called French-Canadian society is easy to grasp in its totality. The interdependence of the parts that make up the socio-political entity called Quebec can be traced historically and synchronically in a way which it would be extremely difficult to do for Canada as a whole, except at the most abstract level."[165] Holistic approaches in French Canada are given a supplementary stimulus generally unavailable in English Canada by the continuing presence of a social philosophy tradition in the social sciences, and by the related affinity of Catholicism for world views.[166]

[163]"Every generation *should* write its own history, but only a few are fortunate enough to find their historians. The postwar generation of social scientists in Canada have so far failed to produce a portrait of their age, and the result is a pervading sense of perplexity among Canadians about where they stand, economically and politically, in relation to the world of the mid-'sixties." John Dales, "Introduction," to W.A. Mackintosh, *The Economic Background of Dominion-Provincial Relations* (Toronto 1964), 2; italics in original

[164]Frank G. Vallee and Donald R. Whyte, "Canadian Society: Trends and Perspectives," in *Canadian Society: Sociological Perspectives*, ed. Bernard R. Blishen, et al. (3rd ed., Toronto 1968), 851

[165]Ibid., 850

[166]See Guy Rocher, "L'Avenir de la Sociologie au Canada," 15–16. The contrast between the explicit underpinnings of normative theory and social philosophy of the Tremblay Report and the workmanlike perspective of the Rowell Sirois Report is instructive of French-English differences.

Contemporary political science in English Canada partakes of the general lack of holistic perspectives in North American sociology and political science,[167] a failing partly related to the standard North American divorce of social philosophy from the social sciences, in contrast to continental European traditions. Formidable difficulties of subject matter and academic tradition thus stand in the way of holistic overviews of the Canadian polity. Not surprisingly, political scientists have been more successful in this task with the less complex provincial polities whose outlines and development are less difficult to grasp, as is evidenced by the works of Lipset, Macpherson, Noel, and Robin. At the national level, Porter's effort, Creighton's colony-to-nation-to-colony theme, and the older political economy tradition indicate the possibility of constructing big pictures which provide a sense of over-all purpose and coherence to students of Canada. The errors of such ambitious enterprises may be more fruitful than the cautious truths of the scholar who works at safer levels. Both types are needed, but we already have an adequate supply of the latter.

Conclusion

The prevailing climate of Canadian-American relations raises the possibility that advocacy on disciplinary grounds of a selective autonomy in the study of Canadian politics will be both misused and misunderstood. The obvious danger resides in the possibility that political criteria pertaining to citizenship and nationality will displace the continuing search for those subtle distinctions in disciplinary orientation which will improve the quality of studies of Canadian politics. This paper has attempted to focus on disciplinary concerns. If the bulk of the world's political scientists were located in Germany the general problems to which this paper addresses itself would still exist, although concern would be greater in Austria and less in Canada. It is also appropriate to repeat emphatically the earlier statement that there is *no* suggestion that studies of particular political systems should be confined to, or can only be effectively undertaken by, scholars whose understanding is a product of living experience. Any such suggestion would render impossible the meaningful survival of the social sciences and the humanities. It is also worth repeating that parts three and four of this paper are restricted to the study of Canadian politics. The position of other subfields in the nexus of political science in Canada, the United States, and the world requires a separate analysis. Finally, the selective autonomy suggested for the study of Canadian politics is not to be confused with academic isolationism. Even if desirable, which it is not, this would be impossible. Members of a community of political scientists, 42.5 per cent of whom received their first degree, and 72.3 per cent their highest degree outside of Canada, [168] are ill prepared for intellectual autarchy. In addition, it has been suggested that political scientists should develop special competence in the

[167]C. Wright Mills, "The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists," *American Journal of Sociology* XLIX, 2 (Sept. 1943); Talcott Parsons, "The Distribution of Power in American Society," *World Politics*, X, 1 (Oct. 1957), 123; Karl Mannheim, "American Sociology," in Karl Mannheim, *Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology* (London 1953); Bernard Crick, *The American Science of Politics*, 229

[168]Hull, "The 1971 Survey of the Profession," tables VIII and IX; "not stated" has been excluded from the calculation

understanding of political science in the United States, to which they are more intensively exposed by the geography of their existence than is any other political science community in the world, and should broaden their acquaintance with political science outside North America. Further barriers are placed in the way of parochialism by the academic ties involved in the historical links with the United Kingdom and France. The goal is not an academic isolationism, but a more meaningful cosmopolitanism than has hitherto existed.