Alternate Routes
a critical review

Editorial Board: Dan Clendaye, Don Cray, Judy MacRae, Terry O'Donnell

Editorial Assistants: Stan Marshall, Heather McAllister

Alternate Routes is an annual publication of Graduate students in Sociology and Anthropology. Manuscripts and communications should be addressed to: Alternate Routes, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: Individuals $1.00 per annual issue in the United States and Canada, $1.50 elsewhere. Make cheques payable to Alternate Routes.

Vol. 1 CONTENTS 1977

Macrosociological Approaches Toward a 'Canadian Sociology'
Wallace Clement 1

The Dominion Government as Gatekeeper to the Canadian Ethnic Mosaic, The Case of Québec, 1867-1885
Dan Glenday 38

Embourgeoisement or Proletarianization?
Stan Marshall 58

Social Mobility:Current Thrusts (and Non-Thrusts):A Critical Approach to the Analysis of Mobility
Jan Mayer 87

Toward a Marxist Theory of Transition
Chuck Smith 103

Commentary

Class Analysis and Technological Determinism
Ken Campbell 131

Implications of the Domestic Role of Women
Eileen Saunders 142

Editorial Statement

This is the first issue of a Canadian graduate students journal dedicated to the dissemination of theoretical and empirical problems in the disciplines of sociology and anthropology. We have had to rely on our colleagues within the Carleton University community due, in part, to our feeling of isolation from other centers of intellectual activity in Canada. I believe it can be safely said that we, here at Carleton, are not alone in this perception. We hope the publication of this journal will help to 'break the ice' and in the years to come contribute to a dialogue between our friends and colleagues, not only in the province of Ontario but throughout Canada.

ISBN 0-7709-0012-7

Macrosociological Approaches Toward a 'Canadian Sociology'*

Wallace Clement

There is an element of truth to the analogy between the blind men and an elephant and the sociologist and a society. This paper is no more than an attempt to move toward a wider perspective, a macrosociological approach to Canadian society, by examining some models and theories of modern national societies. It attempts to contribute to the development of what will be called a 'Canadian sociology' approach. As a topic of substantive inquiry, Canading society needs to be informed by many disciplines, encompassing history, economics, political science (or more generally political economy), social pyschology, social geography, anthropology and sociology. Because of its breadth the latter seems suited, more than the others, to encompass each of these disciplines--at least potentially it can.

There is little evidence of a general movement in English-speaking Canada toward a 'Canadian sociology' approach in the sense of a holistic analysis generated from an understanding of distinctive characteristics, relations and patterns within Canada. Many approaches have been 'imported', largely by way of the United States, using Canada simply as another data source or experimental situation without developing a national society perspective. However, in Quebec the situation is exceptional since a 'total society' or societe globale viewpoint is common and the analysis has been indigenous to Quebec, thus recognizing the obvious: Quebec is not a miniature replica of the United States--something English-speaking counterparts often find hard to comprehend for the rest of Canada*.

LEVELS OF ANALYSIS

Following Georges Gurvitch, Guy Rocher suggests three classificatory levels of analysis:

> The first is the macrosociological plane of total societies, which includes social groups that are sufficiently complete to satisfy all the needs of their members--such as a country, or Western civilization. These groups are considered as wholes or units. The

---

*Canada's 'two solitudes' are suggested by Guy Rocher, "It must be recognized that among many differences, Canadian sociology separates clearly into two major categories: French-language sociology and English-language sociology. They are almost airtight entities. Two almost impermeable worlds live side by side in almost total, mutual ignorance" (1974:501). Ignorance of the societe globale perspective used by Quebec sociologists has impeded others from developing a perspective on Canadian society as a whole while Quebec sociologists seldom venture into the rest of Canada to apply their perspective, maintaining a somewhat understandable but narrowed inward focus. See also Claude Gousse's, "Reflexions sur l'Avenir de la Sociologie au Québec" in Loubser (editor), 1970.

> second is the plane of partial groupings which form part of total societies, such as the family, lineal groupings, voluntary associations, social classes, and so forth. Finally, there is the microsociological plane of different types of social links...the various social relationships which are established between the members of a collectivity and the different ways in which these members are linked to and by the total society (1972:3-4).

These are various points of perception for the analyst but are meant to "interpenetrate" and "link" with one another. For Rocher, the macrosociological plane is both the place to begin and end; it is the context for all other investigation and the level towards which all investigation is directed (5). The goal is the "total context" or a holistic analysis.*

However, Rocher's meaning of macrosociology is much more precise than others. Usually macrosociology refers to "large-scale social systems and patterns of interrelationships within and between these systems, including, for example, national and international forms of social organization" in contrast to microsociology as "the study of small groups".** Thus many of the aspects classified by Rocher on the second plane are often referred to as macrosociological, serving to impose a very large gap between macro and micro levels without any mediating levels. For this reason the Rocher-Gurvitch classification is more useful.

Classificatory problems are different from analytical ones. To provide an analysis of Canadian society it will be necessary to distinguish three types of macrosociological terms. The first may be called 'macrogroupings' and corresponds to Rocher's second plane and what is usually referred to as macrosociology. The other two aim at a holistic perspective and may be referred to as 'total society' and 'national society' approaches. A 'total society' approximates the first plane identified by Rocher in the sense that common social and cultural bonds prevail, as exhibited in common identity, values and traditions, usually carried in a common language and organizations which serve to preserve a particular culture. The conditions for a 'total society' are much stronger than those for a 'national society' in terms of the degree of cultural integra-

---

*This approach may be contrasted with a social-psychological one like Manzer who turns his analysis towards 'human needs' or the microsociological level (1974:5-22).

**These definitions are provided in George and Achilles Theodorson's Modern Dictionary of Sociology, Thomas Y. Crowell: New York, 1969.

tion evident since the latter is delineated simply by territory and legal-political perimeters commonly referred to as a 'state'. In the former, the degree of social integration is much more important in terms of setting 'boundaries' for analysis while in the latter, the extent of integration within states is left problematic. To demonstrate that a 'national society' is at the same time a 'total society', it would be necessary to show that its members share a common identity, common values and traditions and that these members are bounded by a political-legal state which they command. It may be that in some cases the two coincide at particular historical junctures--although it appears this seldom occurs--while in other cases they do not. This distinction is particularly relevant to Canada but elsewhere as well.*

The primary defining characteristic of macro units is the scale of their implications for the total society and the scope of their inter-relationships within the total social structure. Thus, S.Z. Klausner has adopted the term "total society", to refer to:

> an ecologically delimited, more or less interdependent set of human collectivities. The student of a total society could inquire into the spatial and/or organizational interdependence of events. He could report the impact of a society's northern upon its southern region, of its army upon its factories, and of its ethnic groups upon its political parties. The term 'total' indicates an intent to consider all of the people in that particular area (1967:3).

As this suggests, what is of central importance is the relationships, or as Klausner prefers "links", which mediate between various dimensions. As he says, "A model of a 'total society', while recognizing the distinctness of various theoretical levels, must be concerned with statements which link a term on one level with a term on another" (6). He remarks that many attempts at 'total society' analysis have failed to specify these 'links' between different aspects and levels. These 'mediating mechanisms' are the critical component for models of 'total societies' because they specify how relationships occur and provide direction to correlations. This parallels the

---

*See, for example, Jan Szczepański's, Polish Society, where he says, "In the years 1795-1918, Poland was a nation without statehood, and, because it lacked its own independent political organization, culture constituted the very basis of national existence ....This distinction must always be kept in mind when dealing with Eastern and Central Europe, where the ethnic and cultural areas have never been the same as the political-state demarcations" (1970:4). Jews and Israel may be a further example.

earlier point by Rocher but just as with Rocher does not distinguish between a 'total' and 'national' society as two distinct ways of delineating the perimeters of study.

In Canada it may be that les Quebecois have a 'total society', as may some English-speaking Canadians, but les Quebecois do not have a 'national society' (although some are striving to achieve this); moreover, it may be that for some the English-speaking 'total society' extends beyond Canada as a state into the United States and possibly the West as a whole. These are both empirical propositions which could be explored. Language is a problem here because in French, nation has the connotation given here to 'total society', as in Lord Durham's famous caricature of "two nations warring in the bosom of a single state".* The tension between the lack of coincidence between a 'total' and 'national' society in Quebec has been one of the major motor forces explaining developments in that society and accounts for many of the reasons why Quebec sociologists have been so intimately concerned with this issue. However, in the rest of Canada a similar problem has also emerged in the form of nationalism which attempts to identify a distinctiveness vis à vis the United States. The native peoples in Canada experience a similar dilemma vis à vis the white world, while there are rumblings of similar contradictions between western, eastern and central Canada.

Finally, in terms of levels of analysis, before proceeding to the major distinction in this paper, it is important to specify the particular level of analysis being pursued here. The focus is on what may be called the national level or what was referred to earlier as a 'national society' approach to macrosociology. This being said, however, it is important to note this does not mean that the external level can be ignored; indeed, the external impact is crucial to an understanding of the national level and will receive a good deal of emphasis later in the paper. Similarly, a focus on the national level does not ignore the internal level, either in terms of the implications of internal phenomenon on the national level or in terms of the implications of the national level for internal developments.

---

*The distinction between 'total' and 'national' society adds a necessary analytical distinction to macrosociological theory. This problem is pointed to by Anthony Giddens when he says, "The primary unit of sociological analysis, the sociologists' 'society', in this sense, has never been the isolated, 'internally developing' system which has normally been implied in social theory" (1973:264-265). It is only a 'total society' which is really a 'society' in this sense, yet it too must be placed in the context of other societies which compose its environment.

The ultimate level of analysis in macrosociology would be the study of a wide range of total societies and national societies. But it will be argued later that a prerequisite to this is a solid base in a number of national society analyses, and particularly here, to develop such an analysis for Canada.

A 'SOCIOLOGY OF CANADA' AND A 'CANADIAN SOCIOLOGY'

A 'sociology of Canada' is restricted to the level of 'macrogroupings' at best, and at a microsociological level at worst. On the other hand, a 'Canadian sociology' attempts to move between the analytical levels of 'national' and 'total' societies, both of which inform the type of analysis being promoted here, and be informed by a holistic perspective.

There have been some recent attempts to develop a 'Canadian sociology' approach, an analysis of the enterprise as a whole and the formation of Canada as a state, but a variety of 'sociology of Canada' perspectives continue to dominate; that is, most sociological studies are of individual aspects of Canadian society viewed either in isolation or compared with similar phenomenon elsewhere. Each approach is important but essentially different.

A 'Canadian sociology' focuses on major structural features of the country--such as regionalism, ethnic relations, foreign and indigenous investment patterns, political-legal formations and class structures--as they relate in a national context, especially as they unfold and transform historically. 'Canadian sociology' is not a theory about Canadian society, although it implies a series of models for organizing information. Rather, it is a synoptic perspective which conceptually links together a variety of theories and data on Canada while making the analyst aware of other factors which may affect or be affected by the particular aspect of society under study. For example, if the subject under study is education, it would be fruitful to know the linkage this has with immigration and the Canadian practice of importing highly qualified manpower rather than creating indigenous educational institutions or the linkage between the type of economy Canada has and demands this creates for particular training. Similarly, it is important to know the type of class structure Canada has if education is to be related to class inequalities or the type of sex roles if it is to be related to sexual inequalities. The point is self-evident. The implication being that there emerges from these linkages a broader understanding of various developments by removing them from a narrow view common to a great deal of sociology. Similarly, it is concerned about aggregating data on Canada into meaningful units of analysis. All that makes it a

'Canadian sociology' perspective as distinct from a 'Japanese, American, Polish, British, French, Australian, Russian, etc. sociology' is the substantive focus. This does not mean that various key features such as regionalism, ethnicity, class, etc. will be identical or even similar in each nation. The similarity is that what is being pursued here is simply a specific case of a more general 'national society' perspective. The key is the holistic analysis of a variety of important social phenomenon within a national context.

A 'sociology of Canada' perspective, on the other hand, focuses on particular aspects of the society, such as those listed above or others like education, immigration, sex roles, deviance, voting patterns, urban studies, etc. but does not relate each to other developments within Canada. It may compare them with other countries, à la Lipset or Alford, but is not essentially concerned about the way they combine, emerge and affect one another. If Rocher's point about the macrosociological plane being both the place to begin and end is accepted, then the problematic is the extent to which several 'sociologies of Canada' could be turned into a 'Canadian sociology' by transcending individual studies and relating them to one another.* While the individual models and frameworks used in 'sociologies of Canada' do not facilitate this end, the information and theories generated may be able to inform a 'Canadian sociology'. The idea of a 'Canadian sociology' is not based simply on a series of microsociological or macrogrouping studies or even an enumeration of national statistics, but hinges on the relationships and combinations of various elements which crystallize into a unique whole. Rather than dealing with each substantive aspect of Canadian society discretely, it attempts to tie them into a total framework on the development, structure and operation of the society.

A recent book by Ronald Manzer, Canada: A Socio-Political Report (1974), will illustrate the distinction being drawn here. Although covering a very wide range of topics and providing abundant empirical data on Canada, Manzer does not organize his analysis or direct himself to the question of a national society. Rather, he tends to deal with a wide range of rather specialized topics without attempting to bring them together in a comprehensive national statement in the way, say, John Porter did in The Vertical Mosaic (1965) where he elaborated relations between

---

*As Amitai Etzioni metaphorically points out, it may be "that the study of the trivial fruit fly led to the understanding of some general laws of genetics....But just as the anatomy of elephants cannot be studied by dissecting fruit flies, so, too, the morphology of macroscopic social units cannot be effectively explored by studying the structure of small groups" (1968:48).

the themes of class, power and ethnicity within the context of Canada as a national society. Manzer provides a 'sociology of Canada', Porter a 'Canadian sociology'. This is not to say Porter produced the complete analysis of Canada as a national society; this probably could never be accomplished in one book (and even if possible, it would certainly become dated). For instance, Porter focused his analysis of Canada on indigenous national elites and tends to by-pass regional differences which a national framework could have paid more attention to, particularly asking why some regions tend not to produce elites or elites of different types. Similarly, he had a tendency to by-pass in some senses the external impact on Canada and also overlook the historical specificity of some of the many studies recorded in his book. But what he did do was analyse the interaction between class, power and ethnicity as they form Canada's social structure and 'the vertical mosaic'. Manzer's report, however, has no real theme or theory about the operation or organization of Canadian society.* He provides an evaluation based on the ideals of fraternity, equality and liberty, but not a national society approach which would be addressed to a total set of conditions explaining why these ideals have not been achieved, if indeed, they are the ideals of Canadian society.

In this paper there is no attempt to provide a sociology of sociology for Canada, nor a survey of sociological findings themselves. Rather, the attempt is to examine a series of models and approaches which may prove useful in developing a 'Canadian sociology', particularly those which may expand the analysis of Canadian society already provided by Porter's path-breaking work and some issues relevant to such an analysis. But first, a larger context is necessary.

MACROSOCIOLOGY AND THE 'CLASSICAL TRADITION'

Macrosociology** focuses on structures, types of relationships, and their degree of dependence or independence; in short, how social systems work***. It is in the tradition of sociolo-

---

*For example, in a book of well over 300 pages, Manzer devotes less than 10 pages to his introduction and conclusion combined, while his first chapter on "Human Needs and Political Goods" has only a passing reference to Canada. The remainder of the book is devoted to reporting on important statistical comparisons with other countries.

**For a recent discussion of macrosociology, see Paul F. Lazarsfeld's Main Trends in Sociology, Harper & Row: NY, 1973:22-36.

***C. Wright Mills provides a series of questions in his Sociological Imagination which represent some areas a national society approach could explore: "(1) What is the structure of this par-

gists like Marx and Weber who attempted, in the words of Gerth and Mills, "to grasp the interrelations on all institutional orders making up a social structure" (1946:49). But what is meant by 'structure'? A social structure is a stable set of relationships among the various parts or elements making up the totality of a society. However, to say these relationships are stable does not discount their continuous transformation. As Z.A. Jordan has said in his summary of Marx, "macro-sociological structures and laws can claim validity only within a specified period of time and, therefore, must be considered historically" (1971:66). To analytically 'weave' various institutional orders into a whole from the perspective of national societies requires a historical dimension which seeks to comprehend the interactive effects between different orders, their exchanges--both of decision-makers and resources--and their relative strengths or weaknesses vis à vis each other and different orders. For example, someone examining present-day Canada may tend to dismiss the religious order in the overall pattern of power but historically it has had an enormous effect, particularly in Quebec, but elsewhere as well, in helping to shape the current orders. In Quebec it could be argued that the church was important in retarding indigenous capitalism but effective in increasing the power of the state and unions vis à vis capital. The impact of religion thus could be detected only through a historical analysis.*

Thus the call for a 'Canadian sociology' is not meant as a replacement for the 'classical tradition'** in sociology; ex-

---

ticular society as a whole? What are its essential components and how are they related to one another? How does it differ from other varieties of social order? Within it, what is the meaning of any particular feature for its continuance and for its change? (2) Where does this society stand in human history? What are the mechanics by which it is changing? What is its place within and its meaning for the development of humanity as a whole? How does any particular feature we are examining affect, and how is it affected by, the historical period in which it moves? And this period--what are its essential features? How does it differ from other period? What are its characteristic ways of history-making? (3) What varieties of men and women now prevail in this society and in this period? And what varieties are coming to prevail? In what ways are they selected and formed, liberated and repressed, made sensitive and blunted? What kinds of 'human nature' are revealed in the conduct and character we observe in this society in this period? And what is the meaning for 'human nature' of each and every feature of the society we are examining?" (1959:6-7).

*See Hubert Guindon's, "The Social Evolution of Quebec Reconsidered" (1964:154ff).

**For an important collection of some major works in the 'classical tradition' of sociology, see C. Wright Mills (editor), Images

actly the opposite. It is the application of classical approaches, such as those used by Marx and Weber, to macrosociological issues of Canadian society. It is within the tradition of 'holistic' analysis which maintains that the whole cannot be reconstructed from the parts; the parts can only be understood in light of the whole. Rather than a separate focus on theory and methodology, it calls for a reflexive relationship between theory and research and the development of sociologies at several levels of analysis, especially as they relate to one another, including an understanding of the past, a feeling for the present and an eye to the future.

A 'Canadian sociology' approach is consistent with what Irving Zeitlin sees as the main task of theory construction, 'a problem oriented approach to social science'. He argues that, "If one is generally interested in empirical social systems, one ought to have questions about their workings that one would like to answer. To do this, one does not begin with 'society' in the abstract but with a specific society (or several of them) and with an interesting problem" (1973:23).

One major guiding question for a 'Canadian sociology' already posed is how do major inequalities such as class, regionalism, ethnicity education, occupation, income distribution, foreign control, etc., affect and reinforce one another? Of the few national society studies now available, most seem to present their analysis around a particular theme or guiding value. Ralf Dahrendorf writes in his Society and Democracy in Germany that "the analysis of total societies requires an attempt to relate the structures of many specific areas of society to an underlying political problem" (1967:ix). He identifies his problem as follows:

> Good analyses of total societies require...a problem that removes all statements from the tedious fog of arbitrariness and provides the whole with a beginning and an end. Tocqueville had a problem of this kind: 'democracy , however, we mean something different from Tocqueville, to wit, liberté rather than égalite, a liberal political community rather than an egalitarian society (viii).

There need not be agreement with the particular problem of liberty chosen by Darendorf but few would disagree that this is a

---

of Man, George Braziller: New York (1960), where he says, "Classical sociology contains an enormous variety of conception, value, and method, and its relevance to the life-ways of the individual and to the ways of history-making in our epoch is obvious and immediate. This is why it is central to contemporary cultural work, and among the most valuable legacies of Western civilization" (17).

macro level problem and an interesting guiding question. In The Vertical Mosaic, John Porter also uses a guiding theme, that of inequality, aimed at the image of a 'middle class society'. Similar problems are posed by Sol Encel in his Equality and Authority: A Study of Class, Status and Power in Australia. These are also some of the types of problems which could be posed by a 'Canadian sociology'--problems not constrained by either theory or methodology, but problems which use theories and methodologies to resolve problems. As C. Wright Mills has said, "For the classical social scientists, neither method nor theory is an autonomous domain; methods are methods for some range of problems; theories are theories for some range of phenomenon" (1959:121).* The first task of the analyst is to provide the macro problem whether these are liberty, equality, democracy, efficiency or whatever will depend on each researcher's values.

As has been argued, one of the most important units of analysis is the nation state within which is encompassed a national society**. Within this framework the focus is on major structural components and their relationships as they interact to form the whole. Many macro studies have used the nation state as a unit of comparative analysis but this is not the same as analysing a national society. Stein Rokkan has pointed to what he calls the "whole nation bias" in comparative studies and the weakness inherent in taking aggregates rather than components. He says, "most comparisons have been limited

---

*Following this, Mills offers some advice to those concerned about substantive problems: "in actual practice, every working social scientist must be his own methodologist and his own theorist, which means only that he must be an intellectual craftsman. Every craftsman can of course learn not much more than a general kind of awareness" (1959:121), going on to add that, "The Classic focus, in short, is on substantive problems. The character of these problems limits and suggests the methods and the conceptions that are used and how they are used" (128).

**A case for using the nation state as the key level of analysis is made by C.W. Mills, "In our period, social structures are usually organized under a political state. In terms of power, and in many other interesting terms as well, the most inclusive unit of social structure is the nation-state. The nation-state is now the dominating form in world history and, as such, a major fact in the life of every man....In choosing the national social structure as our generic working unit, we are adopting a suitable level of generality: one that enables us to avoid abandoning our problems and yet to include the structural forces obviously involved in many details and troubles of human conduct today. Moreover, the choice of national social structures enables us most readily to take up the

to institutional or aggregate statistical data for each nation as a unit and have tended to neglect highly significant variations in the rates of growth among competing economic, political or cultural centres and between such centres and the rural peripheries" (1970:49). In other words, to overcome the "whole nation bias" in comparative studies requires the apriori analysis of the national society which in turn may then be compared in terms of the types of relationships found within the national society and the processes* of developing to this stage. It may seem unusual that a paper on Canadian society would have this concern about comparative studies but it is to be understood that each nation has its differences as well as similarities and much can be learned from these. Indeed, C. Wright Mills has noted, "it is only by comparative studies that we can become aware of the absence of certain historical phases from a society, which is often quite essential to understanding its contemporary shape" (1959:157). Moreover, it is not merely a theoretical or academic exercise but many Canadians themselves engage in just such comparisons--principally with the United States, but with Europe and other industrialized nations as well, although typically limiting these to other liberal democracies.

Aside from the outstanding work of John Porter, there are only a handful of sociologists in English-speaking Canada who have taken a total or national society approach--such as, at times, S.D. Clark, Kasper Naegele, A.K. Davis and, to some extent, Frank Vallee and Don Whyte. But in Quebec there are many more, such as Hubert Guindon, Maurice Pinard, Guy Rocher, Marcel Rioux, Jean-Charles Falardeau, Jacques Dofny, Gerald Fortin, Phillipe Garigue, pioneer Quebec sociologist Léon Géerin and Fernand Dumont,** to name but a few. As suggested earlier,

---

major issues of public concern, for it is within and between the nation-states of the world that the effective means of power, and hence to a considerable extent of history-making, are now, for better or worse, tightly organized" (1959:135).

*John Porter has commented, "There is no comparative analysis, for example, when six scholars produce separate papers on the educational systems of six different countries. Each study may as well have been published separately rather than bound together since they draw nothing from each other" (1970a:144). The same, of course, may be said for readers which are called Canadian Society but lack any internal unity aside from the common subject matter of Canada. They might more appropriately be called 'Sociologies of Canada'.

**See especially Dumont's, "The Systematic Study of French-Canadian Total Society" (original, 1962) along with the 14 articles in the section on 'Sociological Interpretations on the Social Evolution of French Canada', 'Economic Structure and Social Stratification' and 'Social Organization and Culture' in Marcel Rioux and Yves Martin (eds.), French-Canadian Society (1964). See also Nock (1974).

however, Quebec sociologists have limited themselves to a 'total society' analysis of Quebec and have not engaged in a 'national society' analysis of Canada. These contributions cannot be minimized because they represent necessary starting points, but their lead must be expanded, elaborated and developed if a reasonable sociological understanding of Canadian society is to be achieved. This emphasis, it needs to be stressed, is not parochial. It should be seen as a necessary requisite to national comparative analysis, as Rokkan suggested above. Nor should it be abstracted from sociological theories and methodologies developed elsewhere; rather, these should be adapted to the Canadian experience, if and when they fit.

Vallee and Whyte, in their paper "Canadian Society: Trends and Perspectives", have argued that "sociologists are too busy making up for the backlog of sheer information about Canadian society to worry about the enterprise as a whole and to engage in much soul-searching concerning the theoretical and methodological aspects of this enterprise" (1968:849). In terms of the distinction presented earlier, they are arguing that most of what has been occurring is a 'sociology of Canada' rather than a 'Canadian sociology'. In fact, they argue that, with a few notable exceptions, "Canadian sociologists have rarely adopted a holistic perspective, one in which the system-as-a-whole is the universe of study" (849).*

This does not mean that every piece of research must cover all aspects of Canadian society and address every issue. It does mean that regardless of the particular focus of study--be it ethnicity, regionalism, immigration, class, or whatever--a central question is what this means for the national society, that is, how each part relates to the whole. Similarly, it is important to stress again that the focus on a national society suggests that the differences within society are important as differences between one society and others. Thus ethnic differences, regional splits and class relations within Canada go a long way to understanding that society. At the same time aspects such as these cannot be abstracted from an analysis of Canada's international context. This means more than simply a 'comparative perspective', which itself is interesting and informative, but an international framework of analysis placing Canada's internal developments in the context of external ones.

---

*Similarly, A.K. Davis argues, "by and large anglophone academic sociology in Canada has failed to present a realistic and holistic picture of the evolution of Canadian society" (1970:31).

SOME FRAMEWORKS FOR THE STUDY OF NATIONAL SOCIETIES*

(i) REGIONAL POWER RELATIONSHIP FRAMEWORKS

Recently there have emerged some frameworks, developed mainly for Latin America's relationship with advanced capitalist nations, based on regional power relationships. These models integrate both national and international dimensions and are built on both a national society and total system perspective. That is, they analyse each nation state in terms of the indigenous regional and class power structures while simultaneously analysing the relationships between these structures and external centers of power. Central to all of these models is an unequal relationship between interdependent units which form a set of asymmetrical associations either within national societies or between nation states.**

According to Andre Gunder Frank and his 'development of underdevelopment' model, "contemporary underdevelopment is in large part the historical product of past and continuing econ-

---

*In The Canadian Corporate Elite (1975:345-353), I discussed a national society framework which will not be presented here, except to say Ralph Miliband's distinction between the state system and political system suggests a fruitful organizing framework.

**Barrington Moore, Jr., although applying an interesting analytical scheme to various societies, is a subject to a 'large society bias'. He writes, "The fact that smaller countries depend economically and politically on big and powerful ones means that the decisive causes of their politics lie outside their own boundaries. It also means that their political problems are not really comparable to those of larger countries" (1966:xiii). Is Canada a 'small country' in Moore's terms? In some respects, but not in all, nor is it an underdeveloped nation, nor totally politically or economically dependent. But it is also not a 'large country' in international terms. The 'decisive causes' are not totally outside Canada and to the extent they are, it is in large part a result of internal policy or non-policy, as the case may be. Theda Skocpal has made a similar point in her critique of Moore, emphasizing the relationship between "intersocietal" and "intrasocietal structures and processes", suggesting his focus is intrasocietal. She writes, "Variations of ultimate political outcomes of the modernizing process (Moore's dependent variable) are explained by a combination of the strength of the 'commercial impulse' and the type of class structure through which its effects are channeled....Moore was anxious to establish his cases as societies free from 'foreign influences'. But, of course, no society is free from foreign influences, and, in his case accounts, Moore is repeatedly forced to refer to 'external' conditions or events in order to explain 'internal' states or changes" ("A Critical Review of Barrington Moore's, Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy", Politics and Society, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1973:28-29).

omic and other relations between the satellite underdeveloped and now developed metropolitan countries" (1969:4). The model is not restricted to international relations; rather, it attempts to link internal developments to relationships within as well as outside of nations, or what he refers to as "a whole chain of constellations of metropoles and satellites" (6). His central hypothesis is that "within this world-embracing metropolis-satellite structure the metropoles tend to develop and the satellites to underdevelop" (9). In other words, there is a chain of exploitive relations between various levels from the local to the regional to the national and international which serve to accumulate power and resources at the highest levels and drain them from the lowest.

Johan Galtung presents a variation on the themes of Frank. He begins, as did Frank, by focusing on "inequality within and between nations" and specifically analyses the interactive relations contained therein. The key linking or mediating mechanism he defines as "coupling" which means "some type of social causation in interaction relations and interaction structure" (1971:83). Using the imagery of 'center' and 'periphery'*, Galtung argues "there is a disharmony of interest between the Center nation [metropolitan nation] as a whole and the Periphery nation [satellite nation] as a whole" but maintains that this misses an important refinement "because it blurs the harmony of interest between the two centers, and leads to the belief that imperialism is merely an international relationship, not a combination of intra- and inter-national relations" (84). The key mediating party in the Galtung model is the "bridgehead" in the center of the Periphery nation. Inequality results from the way interaction takes place and can be identified in terms of sets of elites. In what he calls the "multinational, asymmetric stage", Galtung argues, "elites have emerged in the Periphery nations, strongly identified with and well harmonizing with the Center elites" (96). One final refinement Galtung introduces has particular relevance to Canada and that is the 'go-between' status of some nations, mediating between Center and Periphery nations in much the same way the center in the Periphery nation mediates in the general model (104).

Because of the type of imagery used, a problem with the regional power structure models is their emphasis on geographical distinctions rather than class distinctions; for example, the bourgeoisie may be located in metropolitan areas but so is much of the proletariat. While keeping the overall perspective

---

*The terms 'periphery' and 'center' as images of international economic relations have been used since at least 1949 by Raul Prebish in his The Economic Development of Latin America and its Principal Problems, New York, United Nations Department of Social and Economic Affairs, 1950:1 (original published in Spanish in 1949).

of international relationships and their intra-national implications, recent analysts have paid much more attention to the class structures within these nations and have argued that some elements of these class structures have become 'internationalized'. These types of analyses Norman Girvan has classified as "historical/institutional/structural" approaches.* The most impressive example of such an approach is the work of Osvaldo Sunkel in "Transnational Capitalism and National Disintegration in Latin America". Using five inter-related concepts of "development, underdevelopment, dependence, marginality and spatial imbalances", Sunkel argues:

> A realistic analysis of Latin America development should therefore be based on a conception which assumes our socio-economic system to be formed by two groups of structural elements: internal and external. Among the internal factors are: the pattern of natural resources and population; political institutions, especially the state; sociopolitical groups and classes; the ideologies and attitudes of different groups and classes; the specific policies followed by the government; etc. The complex of internal and external structural elements, and the interrelations among them, define the structure of the system, and constitute, therefore, the framework within which the functioning of the national system and its processes of structural transformations take place (1973:135).

More specifically, there are three dimensions of the analysis--process, structure and system--whereby "it is postulated that underdevelopment is part and parcel of the historical process of global development of the international system, and therefore, that underdevelopment and development are simply two faces of one single universal process" (135-136). The most recent phase in these relationships maintains the overall structural asymmetry between nations but now that they have become "ever more closely integrated--it is necessary to take into account that this new model of international economic relations is based operationally on the transnational conglomerate, a new kind of business organization that has experienced an enormous growth during the last decades" (139). There now appears an "internationalized" sector in both the center and periphery nations built on the institution of the multinational corporation. For the periphery nation this likely means that "international mobility will correspond to the internal

---

*For an important overview of the types of analysis which have been performed in Third World countries, see Girvan's, "The Development of Dependency Economics in the Caribbean and Latin America: Review and Comparison", Social and Economic Studies, Vol. 22, No. 1 (1973: 1-33).

mobility particularly between the internationalized sectors of developed and under-developed countries, which, as we have indicated before, constitute the nucleus of the international capitalist system, and, therefore, probably also constitutes an international market for skilled resources" (170).

Sunkel's model thus focuses on developments within center and periphery nations but, in addition, adds an international category because of his 'global perspective'. From this wider perspective, analogous with the continental system between Canada and the United States, two basic components can be identified:

> a) a complex of activities, social groups and regions in different countries which conform to the developed part of the global system and which are closely linked transnationally through many concrete interests as well as by similar styles, ways and levels of living and cultural affinities;
> b) a national complement of activities, social groups and regions partially or totally excluded from the national developed part of the global system and without any links with similar activities, groups and regions of other countries (146).

Thus the imagery used by Sunkel is of a "transnational kernel or nucleus" at the "heart" of the international system which tends to be integrated plus national segments which tend to be "segregated or marginal" to the core of the dominant national and international system. The importance of these segregated sectors in both the center and periphery is their relationship with the transnational integrated sectors in terms of the types of demands they may make and conflicts which may occur.

It is important to recognize that in Sunkel's model class relationships are of crucial importance but do not correspond to the 'integrated-marginalized' dichotomy. Rather, there is a 'core' of international capitalism into which some segments of the periphery bourgeoisie, middle class and a portion of the working class or even agricultural classes are incorporated while some parts of all classes are marginalized. There is still an overall international hierarchy between nations based on an asymmetrical relationship but above this is an integrated multinational segment 'transcending' this in an international capitalist system.

The effect of integrating Galtung's idea of 'go-between' nations with Sunkel's 'integrated and marginalized' segments of the class structures of center and periphery nations means that a rather integrate model of international and internal economic relations could be developed. Mediating between the various structural components of the model would be the institution of the multinational corporation and the elites who control them

and others who work for them. To turn this general model into a theory of international and regional capitalism would require a great deal of empirical work but as a guide to this system requires a model somewhat more developed than that for Latin American nations because of Canada's unique role of mediator for foreign controlled capital plus its own foreign investment and the extensive foreign investment within Canada itself.*

Although there has been some discussion of various regional power structure frameworks within Canada, very little empirical work has actually been done. What has been undertaken is at the level of the Frank 'development of underdevelopment' thesis and not in terms of more recent models such as Galtung's or Sunkel's. Mel Watkins, for instance, suggests using a "center-margin framework" similar to Frank's model for examining the national bourgeoisie and "its relationship of dependency or independence with respect to the imperial business class or the imperial bourgeoisie" (1970:35). In so doing, he recognizes the importance of the "metropolis-satellite chian" used by Frank (37-39), arguing that in the international framework, "Canada would lie above the line as one of the exploiting nations rather than an exploited nation" (40). But at the same time the internal relationships must also be taken into account and it is in this context that Arthur K. Davis' paper, "Caradian Society and History as Hinterland versus Metropolis" (1971), is important**. However, these humble beginnings have led to very little in the way of model building or theories, not to mention the absence of empirical research. While this is somewhat better in the case of regional analysis within Canada, there is virtually nothing published about the continental context.***

---

*See Wallace Clement, "The Canadian Bourgeoise: Merely Comprador?", a paper presented at the Marxist Study Institute, Toronto, Feb., 1975 and the section on "Absentee Ownership and 'Linkages'" at the end of the next section.

**The importance of the boundaries selected for study is also noted by Keyfitz when he writes, "If we study any institution in Canada, for example, trade unions or an automobile plant, our conclusions will come out one way if we treat it as autonomous, as though any links with the United States can be disregarded, and another way if we treat it as part of a larger continental entity" (1974:34).

***To comprehend the nature of the relationship between Canada and the United States at any given time, it is necessary to understand what is happening within each. Milner and Milner are among the few who have actually practiced this, writing, "the United States behaves toward other nations in ways which are to a great extent a reflection and outgrowth of the economic structures and social system inside its borders...in order to understand many of the most important aspects of everyday experience in Quebec, we must understand

These frameworks have a particular promise for Canadian social science as models because they reflect a centralist tradition important in Canada's development, particularly in terms of its early colonial links and the early development of central Canada as exemplified in Innis's staple theory and the Lower/Creighton 'Laurentian thesis'. Each has been built on an analysis of structural power links binding them into a whole founded on geography, regionalism, and resource extraction. One of the differences between most elite models, such as that used by John Porter in The Vertical Mosaic, and the regional power structure frameworks outlined here is the force of opposition built into the latter. They see the relationship as one of running conflict whereby Canadians are placed in a 'double-bind' between the United States and Canadian business interests, both of whom have turned toward the regional hinterlands for their surplus extraction.

Replicated in Canada are the beginnings of a model of a national society in its international context.* Although these have not as yet been developed sufficiently or applied adequately to Canadian society, there are clearly beginnings in this direction. Many more specifications are required in such a model, some of which are suggested in the international models, before it can address some particular characteristics of Canadian society. It would seem important to specify more clearly the dimensions such as regionalism, class or ethnicity being analysed and recognizing some of the differences and clusterings which may occur. For instance, there may be an important difference in French-English relations with respect to the economic domain as compared to the state. Indeed, this has recently been shown to be the case (Clement and Olsen, 1974). Also, the links between various levels must be more clearly specified and the mechanisms of mediation examined more carefully. Furthermore, the relationships between the various 'parties' in both the 'center' and 'periphery' must be examined more thoroughly. This means, for instance, examining relations based on economic and state power in terms of the ethnicity of the power holders and their regional location. It may be that there is uniformity within the 'center' but diversity in the 'periphery' which affects the types of resistences Davis suggests should exist. Finally, the international dimension must be explored more thoroughly for the internal implications of

---

some of the crucial facts of life in the United States--beginning with its internal class structure and the culture which sustains this structure" (1973:9).

*While the international context has been stressed here, internal relations can also be examined within this model. For example, Frank Vallee notes, "one cannot understand situations and trends among the native people without taking into account the non-native people who form part of the social environment" (1971:149).

these structures. These preliminary points arising from various regional power structure models may prove useful in the attempt to develop a 'Canadian sociology'. They would clearly allay any criticism of such an undertaking as parochial. Indeed, they would bring the analysis of Canada into an international framework in a more meaningful fashion than could any series of 'sociologies of Canada'--or traditional comparative studies--because they demand that relations between various institutions in Canada and other national societies be specified, not simply as they compare. For example, rather than comparing political, judicial, economic, or educational institutions and policies in Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom, the researcher would ask what implications the institutions and policies of one nation have for others--both in terms of models that have been adapted after being established in one place as well as the impact of policies and institutions from other nations and their implications for the nation under study*. Some of these questions will be returned to later but first the consociational democracy model will be examined.

(ii) CONSOCIATIONAL DEMOCRACY

There has been an attempt to present a model of certain types of national societies characterized as 'segmented' in terms of ethnicity, religion, language, or political structure. This approach has been presented and applied specifically to Canada and other nations in a collection of papers edited by Kenneth McRae, Consociational Democracy: Political Accomodation in Segmented Societies (1974). Although variously called "segmented pluralism", and "contradictarian democracy", McRae suggests that the term "consociational democracy' is most convenient (3-4). He distinguishes three perspectives in the general consociational literature:

> 1) As a pattern of social structure, emphasizing the degree of religious, ideological, cultural or linguistic segmentation in the society itself;
> 2) As a pattern of elite behavior and mass-elite relationships emphasizing the processes of decision-making and conflict regulation;
> 3) As an underlying characteristic of the political culture arising from historical circumstances that may antedate the period of mass politics (5).

McRae's summary of the literature suggests that one element stands out as most important and is a prerequisite for a society being

---

*On the relationship between 'endogenous' and 'outside' factors on development, see Giddens (1973:265).

considered consociational; he says, "the cleavage in question should be sufficiently intensive and durable to give members of the respective groups a distinctive and persistent outlook or cultural orientation that is different from that of other sectors, a raison d'être for maintaining organized segmentation" (6). Underlying the entire model, but not made explicit, is the assumption that these cleavages will become organized and be manifest in the political system so as to stabilize the society as a whole. This is apparent, for example, in Lijphart's definition: "Consociational democracy means government by elite cartel designed to turn a democracy with a fragmented political culture into a stable democracy" (1974:79). While the model explicitly deals with cleavages based on regional, religious, linguistic and ideological splits, it does not attempt to incorporate social classes as possible subcultures. Similarly, the consociational model stresses the role of the political system but does not take into account others such as the bureaucratic, economic, labour, or mass media in terms of representing population segments.

McRae has made a cautioned application of the consociational model to Canada, albeit limited to the political system because of the bias contained within the general model. His main findings are that, "The primary lines of segmentation in Canada are difficult to identify with precision on account of [sic] the reinforcing but not completely overlapping effects of province, language and religion", especially because there is not one government in Canada but eleven, including the provinces and federal government thus creating a "distorting forum" for the segments. Using a comparative method to place Canada's segmentation in a relative position to 'classic' segmented societies, the results are "inconclusive" since "by any of these criteria province, religion and language Canada must be ranked significantly lower". Probably most significant, given the political orientation of the model, is his finding that "Because of the nature of the party system and the electoral system, modern political parties in Canada have not divided along any of the axes of subcultural cleavage--accommodations between subcultures must take place within the governing party" (260-261). While there may be some resemblance between Canada and the consociational model, it does not adequately explain developments even within the political system. Some of the preconditions for the development of a consociational political system may in fact exist but they have not become organized and represented in the political system in the way the consociational model suggests.

In his book, Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics (1973), Robert Presthus has adopted a consociational approach, particularly as developed by Lijphart. His use of the model, however, is more metaphoric than real because he adapts it to the study of interest groups rather than the study of cleavages based on so-

cial segments. In fact, what he does abstract from the general model are those elements related to "elite accommodation" as "an integral part of the larger process of national integration" (4). This is simply another way of saying "elite pluralism" (see Bachrach, 1967). But what is made quite explicit in Presthus' analysis is that he regards this not only as a desirable way to organize a 'democratic' society but as the only way. He says, "elite accommodation may be regarded as a structural requisite of any democratic society in which political decisions are the result of negotiation and consultation among the elites concerned...Elite accommodation is inherent in the process of democratic government" (4). While Presthus' account of "elite accommodation" may be an interesting ideology* as a "way to overcome pervasive modern schisms between labour and capital, social classes, and indeed, between government and the governed" (25), it is not an adequate base upon which to build a theory or model of the way Canadian society operates. It is subject to the same limitations McRae pointed out for the consociational model and confines the analysis to the role of the state system, virtually ignoring the operation of other power domains in the society and not providing any insight into such issues as regionalism or class structures.**

While the consociational model does not address sufficient issues necessary to develop a 'Canadian sociology' it does provide at least some potential in terms of the two major segments of Canadian society. These are the 'two nations' of French and English Canada. Language, religion, political units and regional centralization are all elements serving to reinforce this major cleavage, as is economic position and, at least to some extent, political parties with the Liberals dominant in Quebec and the Conservatives and NDP almost totally absent. However, the issue of social class is not integrated in the model and for this it is necessary to turn to a long standing debate over the place of the concepts 'class', 'nation' and 'ethnicity' in Canadian society.

(iii) THE PROBLEMS OF CLASS, NATION AND ETHNICITY***

Although the theoretical debate has been centered mainly in Quebec, the issue has relevance for all of Canadian society,

---

*See, for example, W.L. Mackenzie King's, Industry and Humanity, Macmillan: Toronto, 1918.

**In a highly critical reveiw of the book, John Meisel has noted that Presthus introduces the idea of elite accommodation but fails to integrate it, saying, "the book makes only a marginal contribution to this still open issue", Canadian Forum, May-June, 1974:44-46.

***This question will be discussed again shortly in terms of dominant issues in Canadian society. Hubert Guindon's work, especially "Two Cultures: An essay on nationalism, class, and ethnic tension" (1968),

as John Porter's extensive analysis has demonstrated. Bourque and Laurin-Frenette have analysed the relation between the concepts 'class' and 'nation' within Quebec, maintaining that "a diversified class structure has existed within the two nations present in Quebec's social formation...the structure does not prevent, on the one hand, the collaboration between the classes whose members are in the main from different nations, and on the other hand, the class struggle, within each nation". While they see the two concepts as related they are by no means identical, nor should they be merged into such hybrids as 'ethnic-class'. They define and analyse the concepts as follows:

> An ethnic group forming a single dominated social class cannot therefore constitute a nation. We can only analyse it as a social class within the social formation and, in the case of the capitalist mode of production, the nation to which it belongs. In the case of an ethnically differentiated class, the ethnic character may be the vestigial result of another social formation; an earlier social formation in the case of conquest; another nation, where large-scale emigration is involved (1972:192).

The distinction is put more simply by Stanley Ryerson when he says, "The concepts of class and nation are not equatable. Classes embody relationships of property and work, in the context of a mode of production...nation-community embodies an identity linguistic and cultural, that is not simply an 'effect' of class, however closely its evolution may be interwoven with the shifting patterns of class relations"(1972:224).

For some time now, Quebec sociologists have been relating the issues of class and nation to a total society analysis. More than other sociologists in Canada, they have also given a 'richer' meaning to the concept of class.* This can be seen, for example, in the use given the term by Dofny and Rioux:

---

on the role of the middle class in French Canada is a total society analysis which takes into account its larger context and the interplay between 'class' and 'nation'. He clearly relates class developments and political movements within the context of ethnic differentiation. See also Maurice Pinard's paper on this topic, "Working Class Politics: An Interpretation of the Quebec Case", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Vol. 7, No. 2 (May 1970).

*Contrast Dofny and Rioux with Porter's use of class (1965:9-25).

> The concept of social class is intrinsically related to the concept of 'total society'; unless social and cultural phenomena are placed in the context of the total society, there is the risk of confusing social classes with groups based on occupation or socio-economic interests....Social classes are very large groups, real rather than nominal, that appear in those societies where the economic structure predominates and determines the congruence between the other sub-systems of the society. These groups we call social classes are mainly differentiated according to economic inequalities. Social classes appear in heterogeneous societies and tend to form subcultures, in other words, cultural systems which are relatively coherent (1964:307-308).

Later Dofny and Rioux raise the problem of the "truncated" nature of the class system in Quebec, a problem also raised by Rocher when he speaks of "a double system of classes, permeating each other at certain levels, but relatively autonomous in relation to each other" (1964:336).

While Porter is generally noted for his 'nominal' use of the term class, it is apparent in the following comment on Quebec that he is using the term as more than statistical categories. He says, "because British and French live as largely separate groups there are two class systems, each bearing the stamp of its own culture. Both French and British have their old aristocratic families as well as their lower classes. However, these two class systems while operating side by side are also firmly interlocked in the economic system" (1965:91). Unfortunately, there has not been a major attempt to provide a class analysis for the national society in the way this has been done for Quebec. Leo Johnson's article (1972) is the closest there is to analysing classes as large, active groups on a national scale. This may be because they are not real or associational groups on this level but research has not been done to either confirm or deny this.

Aside from their importance in terms of 'class' and 'nation', what is important in the way these concepts have been related analytically is the use of a historical perspective. This is particularly true for Bourque and Laurin-Frenette, Ryerson and Guindon, but is also evident in Porter, who says, "To understand the interplay between ethnic inequalities and class inequalities it is important to look at how ethnic differentiation within a society develops. In most historical instances it has been through conquest or migration" (1974:5). Porter differs from others mentioned in one other important respect; he analyses the relationship between 'ethnicity' and 'class'

rather than 'nation' and 'class'.* This allows him to deal more broadly with Canadian society as a whole because it extends the analysis to cover 'third' ethnic groups, representing about one quarter of the Canadian population.

A recent book by David Hughes and Evelyn Kallen, The Anatomy of Racism: Canadian Dimensions (1974), has expanded the study of ethnicity well beyond earlier attempts. Although they begin with one central problem, that of racism in Canada, they expand their analysis to include a wide range of inter-related phenomenon, such as conquest, immigration, individual, institutional and structural racism, ethnic group boundaries, the role of education, religion and language, and the effect of state policies, as they affect and are affected by their central problem. Of particular note is the way they are able to relate ethnicity and power, privilege and prestige in Canada in a way not evident since The Vertical Mosaic. Hughes and Kallen systematically deal with many problems at the core of a 'Canadian sociology' by searching out the linkage between inequalities in each of these phenomenon.

Thus there are two fairly distinct issues; one concerning the place of Quebec in Confederation and another the relationship between class and other relatively fragmented ethnic groups. The first may be analysed in terms of conquest; the second is better understood in terms of selective migration and other factors.

To summarize this discussion before examining some dominant issues in Canadian society, it may be said that there is much that is suggestive in regional power struggle models, the consociational democracy model and the 'class'-'nation' distinction but they have not been developed into what could be called a model of Canadian society. A number of sub-theories or models are available in the literature but they have not been brought together into a coherent and comprehensive 'Canadian sociology'.

SOME ISSUES IN CANADIAN SOCIETY

The preceding sections have discussed the idea of a 'Canadian sociology' and some approaches which may prove useful in the attempt to develop this perspective. This final section will provide a few dominant issues (for illustrative purposes) which could be addressed in such an undertaking. The conclusion will provide some suggestions about how these issues could be related and expanded.

---

*On the relationship between ethnicity, cultural groups and territory, see Hughes and Kallen (1974:88).

(i) NATIONAL IDENTITY AND THE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF CANADIANS

The literature in Canadian sociology on 'national identity' is probably more extensive than on any other single topic*, particularly one at the national level, yet little consensus has emerged in terms of what this means in Canada or what its implications are for a 'Canadian sociology'. Some have argued Canada is conservative because of its 'tory' origins and rejection of the American Revolution, others that it is liberal because of its American orientation, still others that Canadians are engaged in a love-hate relation with themselves and the United States. Whatever the case may be, the 'national character' route to understanding Canadian society seems a 'dead end', not a place to begin but a place to arrive. The only conclusion seems to be that there are a number of social forces affecting the way Canadians act and believe. It seems more reasonable to first identify these social forces and then address the consequences for the Canadian consciousness.

One of these social forces is ethnic diversity, the struggle between the French and English plus the ethnic pluralism of the other one quarter of the population. In the absence of alternative identities, the Canadian state has pursued policies of 'biculturalism', and more recently, 'multiculturalism', which serve to reinforce these atomized 'organized' minorities.** It is difficult to tell if these are identities arising from the Canadian 'mosaic' or ideologies projected by the Canadian state elite (see Clement and Olsen, 1974).

Sociologists themselves are not free from responsibility on this matter, as Vallee and Whyte have said:

> Sociologists who have written on national character and values in Canada have based their conclusions on impressions, introspection, and on inferences from such disparate sources as literature, historical developments, and statistics on a variety of subjects. The framework within which these studies are carried out and presented is almost always a comparative one in which Canadians are

---

*See, for example, Kasper Naegele (1968); S.D. Clark (1974); George Grant (1965); Mildred Schwartz (1967); J.M.S. Careless (1969); John Porter (1967, 1971, 1974); G. Horowitz (1971); S. M. Lipset (1964, 1971); Don Whyte (1973).

**Examining the consequences of these policies Porter says, "It really seems questionable that we seek our psychic shelters through ethnic identification. There is no doubt that ethnic groupings can play this role, but at the cost of perpetuating ethnic stratification" (1974:10).

> viewed as not quite as American as the Americans, not quite as British as the British, not quite as Australian as the Australians, not quite as French as the French. In this way, sociologists reinforce a folk impression of long standing that Canada is a hybrid product and an intermediary between the United States and Europe (1968:836).

Religion, ethnicity, linguistic groups, class, sex and region all compete with a sense of national identity but it seems an understanding of how and why these operate can best follow from the study of the structure of Canadian society. A study of regionalism using the framework outlined earlier would suggest some of the reasons why there are several identity references operating simultaneously. In the West, for example, there is one pull to central Canada and another north-south pull to the United States. Nations need not be monolithic or highly integrated; indeed, precisely the way the parts (be they ethnic, regional, class, etc.) relate to the whole is one of the most important and interesting variables.

Only very recently with the appearance of Patricia Marchak's Ideological Perspective on Canada has the weakness of the 'Canadian character' literature begun to be overcome and this has been done by using a methodology different from the earlier studies. She has chosen to do her macrosociology of Canada by counterposing "two versions of the Canadian reality" --dominant and counter ideologies (1975:viff). The method is to contrast ideology and reality and see why some classes adopt one or another, and evaluate which 'fits' an understanding of Canadian society. Marchak is able to weave an analysis of history, class, nation, foreign ownership, sovereignty, regionalism, French Canada, ethnicity, native peoples, sexual inequality, professions, unions, political parties, institutional arrangements--public and private, education, wealth and income distribution into her theme of dominant and counter ideologies, and this is all done at the national society level. Although they are not as yet related in such a way that it could be said that they constitute a model or theory of Canadian society, the beginnings of such an attempt are apparent.

An analysis using the regional power structure discussed earlier which attempted to integrate the findings of Rex Lucas' study, Minetown, Milltown, Railtown, John Porter's study of the national power structure and other work on the international level* is another approach worth exploring. The number of such

---

*In a paper, "Economic Elites in Ontario: A Broader Perspective on Regionalism" (presented to the Canadian Studies Institute, University of Waterloo, November, 1974), I attempted to show the linkages between the local, regional, national and international levels. This approach is particularly useful for illustrating the implications of broader power structures on the day to day activities of Canadians.

links as education, corporate control, regionalism, urban-rural migration, social mobility, unions and others, are innumerable.* A study which tried to examine national identities based on these types of linkages would probably have more to say about how people develop 'identities' than those undertaken within the 'national identity' approach thus far. Indeed, studies such as the impressive work of Lucas have done a great deal to link the social psychological level of analysis into broader social forces and structures. It is likely that studies such as his or Marchak's would be the primary way that a 'Canadian sociology' approach could tap this level of analysis yet still retain its broad national focus.

(ii) FRENCH CANADA AS A HINTERLAND MODEL

It was mentioned earlier that Hubert Guindon's analysis of French Canada provides an analysis of a total society which could be expanded to the whole of Canada. Guindon links the "increase in the political and economic relevance of the provincial governments at the expense of the federal government" to changes which have occurred in the class structure of Quebec (1968:33ff). This could also be related to postwar transformations in the Prairies, particularly oil in Alberta, which have catalysed similar developments there.** Although all of the parallels and points of analysis cannot be developed here, it is worthwhile to suggest some of the more obvious. Guindon says,

> The vulnerability of the traditional elite set the stage for an easy introduction of industrialization even if it meant dependence on foreign capitalists. The capitalists transformed the French Canadians into urban dwellers. To service the needs of the recently urbanized masses, the traditional power elite had to transform its institutions into large scale bureaucracies, giving birth in the process to the new middle class of French-Canadian society (44).

In these few sentences Guindon has introduced and integrated a historical framework for the study of industrialization, bureaucratization, foreign investment, class transformations and the study of elites. Later he discusses social mobility, saying, "French-Canadian bureaucratic pyramids have a narrow base --geographically, socially, and organizationally--because of their small scale. This means that upward mobility is more re-

---

*These linkages will be returned to in the final section.

**See John Barr and Owen Anderson (editors), The Unfinished Revolt, McClelland and Stewart: Toronto, 1971.

stricted, less diversified, and less extended" (51). All of this resembles closely the experience of other regional hinterlands in Canada.* It places the analysis within its Canadian and international context, shows the limitations of attempting to create parallel mobility structures alongside dominant ones (and the need to do this because of exclusion from dominant ones); it explains the role local elites have in mediating with outside power centers and where their interests are located.

Vallee and Whyte have commented:

> compared to the total Canadian nation-state, the distinctive entity called French-Canadian society is easy to grasp in its totality. The inter-dependence 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 (1968:850).

Perhaps it is not so much the size or complexity of Canadian society as the lack of attempting to develop such an approach among English-speaking sociologists that explains this failure. Surely the same kind of analysis can be done for the rest of Canada; it even has the model of such analyses as Guindon's to start with.

(iii) ABSENTEE OWNERSHIP AND 'LINKAGES'

Since I have discussed the international setting of Canada's economy elsewhere in "The Changing Structure of the Canadian Economy" (1974), only a few aspects of national level absentee ownership will be provided for illustrative purposes of some of the 'linkages' necessary to develop a 'Canadian sociology'. Canada's economy has two types of elites, comprador and indigenous, which are centered in relatively distinct economic sectors. The comprador elites are the Canadian counterpart of foreign controlled multinationals. In terms of the Galtung model, they are the 'go-between' elites in the periphery nation. Some modifications to this model are necessary because, in addition to the comprador or 'go-between' economic elites, there exist independent indigenous elites. Aside from this amendment, the fragmented economic system in Canada can be related to the fragmented political system, particularly in the context of the above re-

---

*The case studies of Philip Mathias', Forced Growth, James Lewis and Samuel: Toronto, 1971 are interesting illustrations. All five cases are located within the weakest provinces. See also Garth Stevenson, "Continental Integration and Canadian Unity" in Andrew Axline, et al, editors, Continental Community?, McClelland and Stewart: Toronto, 1974.

marks on the relationship between foreign investment and regional hinterlands. That is, the fragmented political system has encouraged the development of foreign direct investment within various provinces which compete with each other thus encouraging differential patterns of growth between provinces and higher rates of foreign investment. This, in turn, has resulted in an increase in provincial power in the postwar period, particularly in the oil rich Prairies, which has also weakened the federal system. These brief remarks suggest that it is important to establish relationships between various developments and places them within their international context. Absentee ownership on the national level has had important economic, political and regional implications but these represent only one side of the relationship. If the full implications for a 'Canadian sociology' are to be explored, then other aspects must also be taken into account.

Absentee ownership may be defined in terms of the distance from a particular center, similar to the metropolis-hinterland chain discussed earlier. The boundaries under consideration must be specified; for example, at the national level foreign ownership is absentee and the economic boundaries do not coincide with the nation state. On the community or regional level, absentee ownership refers to the branches of firms which are not locally owned but are part of larger corporations, themselves either Canadian or foreign owned. The consequences of foreign ownership at the national level and local level exhibit similar characteristics, including lack of autonomy from outside control and decision-making, withdrawal of capital and resources, as well as a higher degree of uncertainty about the continuation of the branch plant at both levels since by definition they are peripheral to the overall operation.

Another consequence of importance is the effect on the class structure and mobility of the indigenous population, either local or national. With a branch plant system, management is typically recruited outside the community and frequently transferred thus creating a system of 'transient managers'. This means local people have a lower probability of upward mobility and participation within this type of structure. On the national level the matter is more complex. If management is brought in from outside, as has often been the case in the past, the opportunity structure for indigneous Canadians is blocked. However, if foreign firms recruit within Canada to fill these positions, this opens the possibility for middle class Canadians who are university educated. Given the high degree of blockage which occurs within Canadian controlled firms, this may be desirable from the perspective of individual mobility, but must be weighted against other consequences of absentee ownership suggested above plus the fact that this may be a way that indigenous entrepreneurial talent is drained off within Canada, thus inhibiting the creation of indigneously controlled activity.

In some respects it does make a difference whether the absentee owners are Canadian or foreign. These would be with respect to the retention of profits within Canada which could be used to expand industrial activity thus creating greater surplus and more jobs. It would also mean that many of the secondary and tertiary spin-offs such as technological development could be supported and encouraged within Canada. Being based within Canada may also mean the firms would be subject to greater regulation by the Canadian state.

In other respects it makes little difference whether the branch plant is Canadian or foreign controlled, particularly for the regional or local level. In either case the major access points to occupational mobility, the major accumulation of surplus, and the sources of decision-making, occur outside the area. The community or region within which the branch plant is located is equally vulnerable to decisions taken at head office, be it in Toronto or New York.

This discussion is the result of taking several levels of analysis such as the local or regional level represented by Rex Lucas' Minetown, Milltown, Railtown, John Porter's analysis of national economic elites and tying them all together in a variation of regional power structure model. While this discussion is very brief and only illustrative, as well as being confined mainly to economic dimensions, it does provide some indication of the type of analysis that could be developed into a national society framework. The key analytical points are in the linking mechanisms between each level and a concern with the entire scope of the society, including the frequently missing local level. Several other types of analyses could be provided which link external and internal developments; for example, the relationship between immigration and retaining a French-speaking population base for the purposes of political power as evident in the recent Bill 22 controversy in Quebec or the relationship between foreign control of industry, the occupational structure of the labour force and the implications this has for post-industrialism. While these cannot be developed here, they give some indication of other types of studies which could be related to a national society analysis.

CONCLUSION

The future of Canadian sociology will depend upon its keeping up with current trends and being able to place them within the context of the national society. In Canada there is a double dilemma of trying to catch up empirically and theoretically by developing the basis for a 'Canadian sociology' while at the same time staying abreast of current developments and remaining relevant. Moreover, there are many areas that have been almost totally neglected, not only in a substantive sense but in the sense of the types of perspectives used in the analysis. For

example, there has never been in Canada a macrosociological approach by a Marxist on the scale of, say, Charles H. Anderson (1974) for the United States, although elements of such an analysis exist such as Leo Johnson (1972) on the decline of the petite bourgeoisie or in some respects Davis' metropolis-hinterland analysis (1971) following the town-country dichotomy in Marx. More work needs to be done even with existing studies. For instance, an important undertaking would be tying the analysis of class, power and elites together empirically; put crudely, this means tying Part I of The Vertical Mosaic, 'The Structure of Class', into Part II, 'The Structure of Power', by maintaining the national perspective and adding an historical analysis.

There do exist a number of theories, models or at least themes about the nature of Canadian society, some of which have already been mentioned. Porter, for instance, has identified the relationship between class, power and ethnicity, and this has now been expanded by Hughes and Kallen; A.K. Davis' hinterland-metropolis relationship based on regional inequalities; A. Richmond's relationship between immigration and ethnic inequalities, following, in part, from Porter's 'two stream model' of migration; Leo Johnson's changing occupational structure and the decline of the petite bourgeoisie; Pat Marchak's two competing versions of social reality; and I have suggested the relationship between foreign and indigneous economic development. Together, and with others, it may be possible to form these into a 'Canadian sociology'.

Social life is highly complex and experiments in types of societies have been varied. The task of social studies is to 'make sense' out of the variety of experiences and experimentations by identifying major processes, structures and relationships. Therefore, the study of Canadian society can and should be approached from a number of perspectives, using a variety of methodologies and data sources. But ultimately, to have relevance for the study of the national society, they have to be tied into an overriding framework and presumably be aimed at a common concern--such as improving the lot of Canadians, which could mean being concerned about the decline of inequalities of all sorts and the increase and redistribution of the society's resources.

It has been argued that the focus of a 'Canadian sociology' should be on an array of substantive problems in Canadian society but these in turn must also be worked out in terms of the priorities of each researcher. This means an evaluation of what are considered important or significant social issues and concerns, an analysis of them and reporting these results. The process of reporting to other scholars and the public is intended to have others re-examine what they consider to be social issues and to re-order their priorities accordingly. This goal would be one of the major tasks of such an undertaking, and one of its most important rewards.

One important question remains: Is there a uniqueness to Canadian society that makes it a valuable topic beyond its intrinsic interest to its residents? The answer offered in this paper has been in the affirmative. Canada lends itself for comparison to probably a wider range of nations than does any other single country. It encompasses a number of problems such as its industrial development, ethnic diversity and regionalism, comparable with, yet distinct from, other countries. Its role as a 'mediator' or 'go-between' generates a number of unique internal developments different from most other nations. For these reasons and more, it seems a worthwhile undertaking to continue to develop a 'Canadian sociology'.

Postscript 1977

In the two years since this paper was written there has been a maturing of my thinking about models and theories of Canadian society; although I continue to accept the paper's central direction. I would now adopt the political economy tradition as the most fruitful approach; in my view, it has the strongest historical roots and the greatest insights into Canada's social structure. It is a tradition represented in different ways in the works of such diverse people as Donald Creighton, Harold Innis, Tom Naylor and Stanley Ryerson. It encompasses scholars from C.B.Macpherson to H. Claire Pentland to John Porter. Broadly contained within this tradition is the basis for a distinctive Canadian social science which would make sense of and give meaning to the development and current structure of Canadian society.

The following are what I regard as the most central components of a model of Canada as developed within the political economy tradition. These features of Canadian society give direction to the most appropriate questions to be asked and relationships to be explained:

1. The implications of external relations for internal development, especially early colonial ties with France and the United Kingdom and current dependence on the United States in many economic, political and military activities.

2. The persistently active role of the Canadian State in the economy and its fragmented federal-provincial structure.

3. The continued survival of two nations within a single state--the conquered French and the conquering English--and the demise of the native population.

4. The role of immigration in filling the West during the early stages of development (1879 to 1914) and the urban centres of today (especially Montréal, Toronto, and Vancouver), which have served to build an indigenous

labour force and domestic market while creating an ethnically diverse society startified by class.

5.The persistence of enormous regional differences within the country, especially the underdevelopment of the Atlantic region and the northern sections of the central and western provinces.

6. The constraints imposed by geography, especially the rapids of the St. Lawrence River, the Laurentian Shield, the Rockies, and now the North.

7. The effect of technology and the ownership of that technology, especially patent rights,in shaping the economy and labour force.

8. the tremendous costs of transportation networks from early roads, canals, ports, seaways,and railways to pipelines for oil and gas and their role in creating a national and continental economy.

9. The dependence on external markets, both as outlets for raw materials (making Canada vulnerable to world conditions) and as capital sources (which ultimately act as drains on capital).

10. The origin of Canadian capitalism in a staple economy, its movement into commercial and financial specialization and its continued reliance on resource extraction.

11. The persistence of a petty bourgeoisie class as the most powerful class outside the capitalist class until the Second World War, prior to which Canada was largely rural and agrarian/resource based.

12. The slower development of an industrial working class, the product of large-scale industrialization which does not become a dominant force in Canada until well into the twentieth century and continues today to be rivaled in importance by the service sector of the labour force, especially the growing number of state workers adding to an already overdeveloped commercial sector.

As in any model, these central compenents are each related to the others. Various theories have been offered in the political economy tradition which order these components and purport to explaintheir relationships in Canada. For example, Innis offered the 'character of the staple' as explaining most of these other factors. Creighton, on the other hand, contended that the central explanatory relationship of Canada's development was the creative role of its commercial capitalists and their relationship to the state. Naylor also focuses on this relationship as a means of explaining Canadian development, but for him financial capitalists in Canada have a distorting rather than creative role. For Ryerson the relationship between the capitalist class and the working class is the central dynamic,although for him this class relationship is necessarily framed in the context of two nations in an 'unequal union'. Contrary to Ryerson's Marxist approach is the liberal framework of John Porter and his thesis of a 'vertical mosaic' of social class and ethnicity which has shaped Canadian society.

I am still not prepared to offer my own theory of Canadian society as a whole or to present my theory of a Canadian sociology, but I do know that these twelve features will be most important in doing so, and that the task itself is a valuable one.

References

ANDERSON, Charles H.
1974 The Political Economy of Social Class. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs.

BACHRACH, Peter
1967 The Theory of Democratic Elitism. Little, Brown: Boston.

BOURQUE, G. and N. Laurin-Frenett
1972 "Social classes and national ideologies in Quebec, 1760-1970" in G. Teeple (ed.) Capitalism and the National Question in Canada. University of Toronto Press.

CARELESS, J.M.S.
1969 "'Limited Identities' in Canada", Canadian Historical Review, Vol. L, No. 1 (March).

CLARK, S.D.
1974 "Canada and Her Great Neighbour", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Special Issue: Aspects of Canadian Society. Original 1964.

CLEMENT, Wallace
1974 "The Changing Structure of the Canadian Economy", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Special Issue: Aspects of Canadian Society.
1975 The Canadian Corporate Elite: An Analysis of Economic Power. McClelland & Stewart: Toronto.

CLEMENT, Wallace and Dennis Olsen
1974 "Official Ideology and Ethnic Power", presented at the American Sociological meetings, Montreal (August).

DAHRENDORF, Ralf
1967 Society and Democracy in Germany. Doubleday & Co.: Garden City, N.Y.

DAVIS, Arthur K.
1970 "Some Failings of Anglophone Academic Sociology in Canada: The Need for a Dialectical and Historical Perspective" in Loubser (ed.).
1971 "Canadian Society and History as Hinterland Versus Metropolis" in R.J. Ossenberg (ed.), Canadian Society: Pluralism, Change and Conflict. Prentice-Hall: Scarborough.

DOFNY, Jacques and Marcel Rioux
1964 "Social Class in French Canada" in Rioux & Martin (eds.).

DUMONT, Fernand
1964 "The Systematic Study of the French-Canadian Total Society" in Rioux & Martin (eds.).

ETZIONI, Amatai
1968 The Active Society. Free Press: N.Y.

ENCEL, Sol
Equality and Authority in Australia.

FRANK, Andre G.
1969 "The Development of Underdevelopment" in his Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution. Modern Reader: N.Y.

GALTUNG, Johan
1971 "Structural Theory of Imperialism", Journal of Peace Research, 2.

GERTH, H. and C.W. Mills, editors
1946 From Max Weber. Oxford: N.Y.
GIDDENS, Anthony
1973 The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies. Hutchinson University Library: London.
GRANT, George
1965 Lament for a Nation. Toronto.
GUINDON, Hubert
1964 "The Social Evolution of Quebec Reconsidered" in Rioux & Martin (eds.).
1968 "Two Cultures: An essay on nationalism, class and ethnic tension" in R.H. Leach (ed.), Contemporary Canada. University of Toronto Press.
HOROWITZ, Gad
1971 "Conservativism, Liberalism and Socialism in Canada" in W.E. Mann (ed.), Canada: A Sociological Profile. Copp Clark: Toronto.
HUGHES, David R. and Evelyn Kallen
1974 The Anatomy of Racism: Canadian Dimensions. Harvest House: Montreal.
JOHNSON, Leo
1972 "The development of class in Canada in the twentieth century" in G. Teeple (ed.), Capitalism and the National Question in Canada. University of Toronto Press.
JORDAN, Z.A.
1971 Karl Marx: Economy, Class and Social Revolution. Michael Joseph: London.
KEYFITZ, Nathan
1974 "Sociology and Canadian Society" in Guinsburg & Reuber (eds.), Perspectives on the Social Sciences in Canada. University of Toronto Press: Toronto.
KLAUSNER, S.Z.
1967 Total Societies. Doubleday Anchor Book: N.Y.
LIJPHART, Arend
1974 "Consociational Democracy" in McRae (ed.).
LIPSET, S.M.
1964 "Canada and the United States--A Comparative View", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Vol. 1, No. 6; reprinted in W.E. Mann (ed), Canada: A Sociological Profile. Copp Clark: Toronto, 1971.
1971 "Revolution and Counter Revolution" in W.E. Mann (ed), Canada: A Sociological Profile. Copp Clark: Toronto.
LOUBSER, Jan J. (ed.)
1970 The Future of Sociology in Canada. Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association: Montreal.
LUCAS, Rex A.
1971 Minetown, Milltown, Railtown. University of Toronto Press.
MANZER, Ronald
1974 Canada: A Socio-Political Report. McGraw-Hill Ryerson: Toronto.

MARCHAK, M. Patricia
1975 Ideological Perspectives on Canada. McGraw-Hill Ryerson: Toronto.
McRAE, Kenneth, editor
1974 Consociational Democracy. McClelland & Stewart: Toronto.
MILLS, C. Wright
1959 The Sociological Imagination. Oxford: N.Y.
MILNER, S. and H. Milner
1973 The Decolonization of Quebec. McClelland & Stewart: Toronto.
MOORE, Barrington, Jr.
1966 The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy. Beacon Press: N.Y.
NAEGELE, Kaspar
1968 "Modern National Societies" in B.R. Blishen, et al (eds.), Canadian Society. Macmillan: Toronto.
NOCK, David
1974 "History and Evolution of French Canadian Sociology", Insurgent Sociologist, Vol. IV, No. iv (Summer).
PORTER, John
1965 The Vertical Mosaic. University of Toronto Press.
1967 "The Human Condition" in J.M.S. Carless & R.C. Brown (eds.), The Canadians, 1867-1967. Toronto.
1970a "Some Observations on Comparative Studies" in D.P. Forcese & S. Richer (eds.), Stages of Social Research. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs.
1970b "A Research Biography of The Vertical Mosaic" in J.S. Coleman, et al, Macrosociology: Research and Theory. Allyn & Bacon: Boston.
1971 "Canadian Character in the Twentieth Century" in W.E. Mann (ed.), Canada: A Sociological Profile. Copp Clark: Toronto, original 1967.
1974 "Canada: Dilemmas and Contradictions in a Multi-ethnic Society" in C. Beattie and S. Chrysdale (eds.), Sociology Canada. Toronto.
PRESTHUS, Robert
1973 Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics. Macmillan: Toronto.
RIOUX, Marcel and Yves Martin (eds.)
1964 French-Canadian Society. McClelland & Stewart: Toronto.
ROCHER, Guy
1964 "Research on Occupations and Social Stratification" in Rioux & Martin (eds.).
1972 A General Introduction to Sociology: A Theoretical Perspective (translated by Peta Sheriff). Macmillan: Toronto.
1974 "The Future of Sociology in Canada" in Sociology Canada: Readings, C. Beattie and S. Chrysdale (eds.). Butterworth: Toronto.
ROKKAN, Stein
1970 Citizens, Elections, Parties: Approaches to the Comparative Study of Development. David McKay: N.Y.

RYERSON, Stanley
1972 "Quebec: concepts of class and nation" in G. Teeple (ed.), Capitalism and th e National Question in Canada. University of Toronto Press.
SZCZEPAŃSKI, Jan
1970 Polish Society. Random House: N.Y.
SCHWARTZ, Mildred A.
1967 Public Opinion and Canadian Identity. University of California.
SUNKEL, Osvaldo
1973 "Transnational Capitalism and National Disintegration in Latin America", Social and Economic Studies, Vol. 22, No. 1.
VALLEE, Frank
1971 "The Emerging Northern Mosaic" in R.J. Ossenberg (ed.), Canadian Society: Pluralism, Change and Conflict, Prentice-Hall: Scarborough.
VALLEE, Frank and Don Whyte
1968 "Canadian Society: Trends in Perspective" in B. Blishen, et al (eds.), Canadian Society. Macmillan: Toronto.
WATKINS, Mel
1970 "The Branch Plant Condition" in A.K. Davis (ed.), Canadian Confrontations: Hinterland vs. Metropolis, Proceedings of the 11 Annual Western Association of Sociology and Anthropology, Banff, Alberta (December 1969).
WHYTE, Don
1973 "Canadian Identity and the Colonial Tradition", mimeo, Carleton University: Ottawa.
ZEITLIN, Irving
1973 Rethinking Sociology. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, N.J.