

# **Home-Grown IR: The Canadianization of International Relations**

**Kim Richard Nossal**

Over the quarter-century since T.H.B. Symons issued his report on Canadian studies, the discipline of international relations (IR) and Canadian foreign policy studies – found to be so meagre and Americanized by Symons – has been transformed. In English-speaking universities, the discipline has been Canadianized in a number of ways, including the development of a vibrant literature and a national approach distinct from the American mainstream. Most important, however, the IR professoriate has been progressively Canadianized, not simply in terms of citizenship, but also in doctoral training. Moreover, the pattern of IR hirings altered how international relations is taught in Canada, creating a theoretical pluralism that, again, is distinct from the American academy. In short, the vision articulated by Symons and other Canadian nationalists in the early 1970s has been almost perfectly realized in the case of international relations and Canadian foreign policy studies. The very success of the push for Canadianization has, however, given rise to the growth in postmodern theoretical approaches that are not unquestioningly nationalistic. As these perspectives increasingly take over mainstream scholarship, the pursuit of such overtly national projects as Canadian foreign policy studies will become more problematic.

Depuis que, il y a un quart de siècle, T.H.B. Symons a publié son rapport sur les études canadiennes, la discipline unissant les relations internationales (RI) et les études canadiennes sur les affaires étrangères – que Symons avait jugée maigre et américanisée – a subi des transformations. Dans les universités de langue anglaise, la discipline a été « canadiarisée » de plusieurs façons, y compris par la création d'une documentation vivante et la pratique d'une approche nationale qui se distingue des façons de faire à l'américaine. Chose importante, le professorat en RI a été progressivement « canadiisé », pas simplement en ce qui concerne la citoyenneté, mais aussi en ce qui concerne la formation doctorale. Plus encore, la façon d'embaucher en RI a modifié l'enseignement des relations internationales au Canada en créant un pluralisme rhétorique qui, là encore, se distingue de l'école américaine. Bref, dans le cas des relations internationales et des études canadiennes sur les affaires étrangères, on a presque parfaitement réalisé la vision qu'avaient articulée Symons et d'autres nationalistes canadiens au début des années 1970. Le succès de ce mouvement de canadianisation a cependant amené une augmentation de théories post-modernes qui ne sont pas nationalistes a priori. Alors que ces perspectives prennent de plus en plus d'ampleur face aux idées reçues, la poursuite de projets aussi ouvertement nationaux que les études canadiennes sur les affaires étrangères deviendra progressivement problématique.

"To know themselves," the Commission on Canadian Studies argued in 1975, "Canadians must have a knowledge and understanding of the international context in which their country has developed and exists.... To know ourselves we must know others and be able to see ourselves in relation to others." But in the view of T.H.B. Symons – the Commission's only member – such knowledge and information was not being imparted, at least not in Canada's universities. The study of Canadian foreign policy and international relations (IR) from a Canadian perspective was, in his opinion, sadly underdeveloped, reflecting what he argued was a broader lack of attention given to all aspects of Canadian studies in an academy dominated by non-Canadian scholars working on non-Canadian issues, using non-Canadian methodologies and assumptions and assigning their students non-Canadian texts and readings (Symons 1975, 85-88).

A quarter of a century later, Symons would be hard pressed to recognize the landscape that he found so bleak in 1975. Foreign policy studies and courses in international relations flourish at universities across the country. Indeed, every Canadian university has courses on IR or Canada's place in the world; many have members of faculty whose primary responsibility is to teach and to conduct research on Canadian foreign policy; and not a few universities have specialized centres devoted to the study of Canada's international relations or defence or foreign policy. Moreover, federal government programmes have led to the establishment of numerous centres of Canadian studies around the world (Wright 1985). In Canada, those who profess IR today are overwhelmingly Canadian, both in their citizenship and in their academic training.

The literature on international relations and Canadian foreign policy that Symons found so meagre is now abundant, in both English and French. In addition to the *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, three scholarly journals – *Études internationales*, *International Journal* and *Canadian Foreign Policy* – are devoted to the field. And the assumptions and methodologies that guide IR scholarship are more home-grown than they are foreign; indeed, as I will show, Canadian students of international relations have overwhelmingly rejected the dominant theoretical perspective of the American academy. In short, it can be argued that in the field of IR and Canadian foreign policy, the vision articulated by Symons and other Canadian nationalists in the early 1970s was almost perfectly realized.

Yet the growth of a clearer and more explicit Canadian focus since the Symons report has resulted in an interesting paradox: the push for Canadianization was extraordinarily successful but the way it evolved has ended up creating the conditions where the explicitly *national* project of that era is no longer unquestioned. As dependence on imported American scholars has declined, international political economy (IPE), postmodernism, critical theory, feminism and post-nationalism have become the approaches of many colleagues who have joined the Canadian

academy in the last decade, and who will soon replace the large cohort of Canadianists hired in the wake of the Symons report.

The purpose of this article is to examine these developments, focussing in particular on changes in curriculum, research, hiring and the approaches to the discipline. It must be noted, however, that "Canadianization," in the context of the debates of the late 1960s and early 1970s that gave rise to the Symons report, was an issue almost entirely limited to Canada's English-language universities. The report, though nominally pan-Canadian, was in effect addressed to English-speaking Canadians: when he referred to Canadian universities, he really meant English-language universities. In this article, I look through the same restricted focus. While teaching and research on IR in Canada's francophone universities have not been entirely disconnected from the patterns we see in English-language institutions, the development of the francophone IR discipline is sufficiently different that it should be explored separately.

### **The Symons Critique: Canadian IR as an American(ized) Social Science**

Symons left no doubt that he felt Canadian universities were simply not doing what we needed to do "to know ourselves" in the area of international relations. Although some positive developments were noted, the report none the less asserted that "the amount of attention directed to international relations and foreign policy studies is still well below the needs of our society." The bill of particulars elaborated by Symons was wide-ranging:

Teaching and research about Canadian foreign policy and about international affairs from a Canadian perspective have been particularly neglected. There are, for example, *no* textbooks written by Canadians for Canadian students in the field of international relations.... Nor are there any textbooks specifically directed to the teaching of Canadian foreign policy. (Symons 1975, 86; emphasis in original)

Much of the tone of the critique was unabashedly nationalist, mirroring the mood – and discourse – of the era (Granatstein 1996). Thus Symons pronounced it "startling" that there were so few undergraduate programmes in international relations; "astonishing" that so few university programmes focussed on the Asia Pacific or Latin America; "strange" that there was so little study of the Commonwealth and la Francophonie; "puzzling" that there were so few courses on Canadian-American relations (Symons 1975, 86, 87).

Much of the critique was openly directed at the Americanization of IR in the Canadian academy, unwittingly anticipating by two years Stanley Hoffmann's observation that IR was an American social science (Hoffmann 1977; Crawford and

Jarvis 2000). For example, Symons argued that "the general neglect" of international relations by Canadian universities was compounded by "the fact that much of the teaching that has been conducted in this field in Canada has been heavily dependent upon the use of methodologies and assumptions developed in the American context which are often inappropriate to the Canadian experience." It should be noted that this observation mirrored the concerns expressed in the section on political science (Symons 1975, 65-71), where Symons noted that discipline in Canada tended to be an inappropriate "miniature replica" of the field in the United States (see also Smiley 1974). Reflecting a common assumption that scholarly orientation is affected by both citizenship and where one received one's doctoral training,<sup>1</sup> Symons surmised that this "must be related to the large number of political scientists in Canada who are not Canadians, and particularly to many of those who are citizens of the United States and/or obtained much of their academic training in that country" (Symons 1975, 68). Symons also gave credence to the concerns expressed by political scientists like Alan Cairns (1975, 201) that Canadian political science would experience a "unidirectional integration" with the American discipline.

Symons's critique was not an impartial and objective assessment. He tended to ignore or downplay evidence that contradicted his assessment. While it is true that faculty members capable of teaching Canadian foreign policy courses were not spread widely across the system in the late 1960s and early 1970s, it simply cannot be said that there was as little capacity in this area as the Symons report suggests. On the contrary: there were faculty members with a strong Canadian foreign policy capacity at the University of Toronto, McGill University and Carleton University. Nor was the literature on Canadian foreign policy as slim and undeveloped as Symons suggested. Indeed, a bibliography of works on Canadian foreign relations, published while Symons was gathering his information, ran to over 6,200 entries (Page 1973). The Canadian Institute of International Affairs was still publishing the biennial *Canada in World Affairs* series, and its quarterly journal, *International Journal*, was important for students of Canada's foreign relations. Likewise, the Carleton Library series, published in association with McClelland and Stewart, was producing books on Canadian foreign policy (Glazebrook 1966; Holmes 1970; Swanson 1973). The collection edited by Clarkson (1968) was indicative of a small but vibrant body of critical scholarship. Finally, Symons's assertion that there were no textbooks on the subject simply ignored the existence of a number of Canadian foreign policy texts (Eayrs 1960; Farrell 1969; Granatstein 1969; and Thomson and Swanson 1971).

While the Symons report's comments on the state of IR in Canada were not entirely accurate, they none the less resonated in the nationalist atmosphere of the late 1960s and early 1970s (Bercuson et al. 1984, 133-35; Granatstein 1996, 192-216).

Those comments must be put in the broader context of widespread concerns in the late 1960s and early 1970s about the Americanization of many fields in the Canadian academy (for example, Steele and Mathews 1970). The numerous recommendations for the "Canadianization" of the academy fit well with the nationalism that swept Canada's English-language universities during this era; the recommendations of *To Know Ourselves* for a massive increase in Canadian studies at Canadian universities were being put in place even before Symons submitted his report to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada in 1975. As Granatstein has argued (1996, 215), the Symons report simply legitimized what was already happening.

Most importantly, the process of Canadianization was given a fillip by a change in federal government policy introduced shortly after the appearance of the Symons report. Ottawa had already ended the two-year tax holiday that had attracted so many scholars from Britain and the United States during the period of university expansion in the 1960s. In 1977, the Canadian government introduced a series of discriminatory hiring rules that privileged Canadian citizens or landed immigrants in all hiring competitions at Canadian universities. Under the new rules, before universities could consider foreigners for a full-time academic position, they were required to show that no Canadian was qualified for the position. The new regulations worked quickly: within a couple of years the majority of faculty hired by Canadian universities were Canadian citizens or permanent residents. As Granatstein (1996, 214) put it, "The problem – if there was one – had evaporated."

### **After Symons: The Canadianization of IR**

Developments in IR and Canadian foreign policy studies after the early 1970s tended to mirror these broader trends. First, in the decade after 1968, courses were added to the curriculum at a growing number of universities. To be sure, the process of Canadianizing the curriculum was not always smooth. At McMaster University, for example, a course on Canadian foreign policy was added in 1970 only after a student protest; likewise, Clarkson (1972) recounts the impediments to the introduction of courses on Canadian-American relations. Indeed, Symons noted the antipathy to Canadian studies in some quarters: "The Commission encountered, more than once, senior scholars and administrators who scarcely troubled to disguise their view that Canada's international relations were at best a minor subject for university study and that they should stay that way" (Symons 1975, 88).

Second, changes in curriculum urged by the nationalist movement led to changes in the pattern of hiring. At the end of the 1960s, most teachers of IR at Canadian universities had received their doctorates from American universities;

**Table 1: Individuals entering English-language Canadian universities to teach IR, 1970-1999, by year of entry and country of doctoral studies**

	UK	United States	Canada	Other
1970-1974	5	16	7	2
1975-1979	1	8	8	0
1980-1989	8	12	15	2
1990-1999	3	6	40	2

*Notes:* Data include full-time tenure-track or equivalent appointments to teach IR and/or Canadian foreign policy. Sessional or contractually limited appointments included only when subsequently converted to tenure track. Movements by scholars already within the Canadian system not included. Year of appointment may not coincide with year PhD obtained. Some candidates were ABD (all-but-dissertation).

*Sources:* Biographical data as reported in, *inter alia*: Canadian Political Science Association, *Directory of Political Scientists in Canada* (different years); the last published directory of the International Studies Association, *Biographical Membership Directory, 1992-1993*; and university calendars and websites.

many of them were American citizens. By the early 1970s, this was changing. The demands of a Canadian-oriented curriculum, combined with the changes in immigration policy in 1977 noted above, meant that the number (and percentage) of Canadian-trained PhDs hired increased dramatically, as Table 1 shows.

Table 1 demonstrates that in the quarter century after Symons, those hired to teach IR were increasingly scholars who had been trained in Canada, although it was not until the 1990s that a clear majority were from Canadian universities. By the late 1990s some colleagues worried about how closed the system has become.<sup>2</sup>

The degree of Canadianization tends to be understated in this table. Many individuals with non-Canadian doctorates had completed their bachelor's and/or master's degree at Canadian universities before going to the United States or Britain for doctoral work. On their return to Canada, many of these scholars taught Canadian foreign policy and devoted their research to Canadian topics. Indeed, many of the 42 scholars with non-Canadian PhDs who were hired in the period 1975-1999 fall into this category, representing a substantial contribution to Canadianization despite their non-Canadian scholarly pedigree.

Third, these interrelated developments – the Canadianization of the IR curriculum and the expansion of the number of faculty who were as much Canadianists as they were students of IR – helped to transform IR scholarship in Canada. There was

a dramatic increase in research on Canada's external relations. Doctoral dissertations were in eager search of rebirth as books. Curiosity-driven research was given an impetus by the creation of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada in 1978; "policy relevant" research was underwritten by a coast-to-coast network of strategic and defence centres funded by the Department of National Defence and government-backed centres such as the Canadian Institute of International Peace and Security. The consequence was a proliferation of specialist studies on a wide range of Canadian topics too numerous to be surveyed here; separate literatures developed in the areas of Canadian-American relations and political economy. And a new generation of textbooks on Canadian foreign and defence policy made its appearance (Lyon and Tomlin 1979; Tucker 1980; Dewitt and Kirton 1983; Nossal 1985/1989/1997; Granatstein 1986; Middlemiss and Sokolsky 1989; Munton and Kirton 1992; Keating 1993; Dewitt and Leyton-Brown 1995; Cooper 1997).

This transformation occurred relatively peacefully and smoothly. As Granatstein and others have noted, by the late 1970s the Canadianization issue was no longer as politicized. The more overt anti-Americanism that had so marked earlier departmental debates simply died away as it became clear that the Canadianizers had won. Thus Canadianization quickly became relatively less controversial, partly because many American scholars returned to the United States in the 1970s, partly because the protectionist legislation placed such powerful constraints on hiring decisions, and partly because the newly hired Canadianists themselves tipped voting balances in so many departments.

### **Home-grown IR: Professing International Relations in Canada**

The Canadianization of the curriculum, the professoriate and the research agenda brought with it a distinctly different way of professing international relations in Canada. This is not to suggest that there are *national* differences in approaches to IR; Tony Porter (2000) is surely right when he argues that there might be "variation across countries in the character of IR theorizing – but ... such variation is not likely to be primarily correlated with nationality." Rather, we see a considerable divergence in the dominant disciplinary approaches between IR scholars in Canada and their colleagues in the United States. This divergence is not peculiarly Canadian; it has become evident in a number of other countries over the last 25 years (Wæver 1998; Crawford and Jarvis 2000). The following trends, however, were noticeable over the course of the past 20 years when more Canadian-trained PhDs began to be hired to teach IR at Canadian universities.

First, Canadian foreign policy studies developed in largely idiosyncratic and essentially national ways. It is true that some of the theoretical approaches used

by some students of Canadian foreign policy were often derivative of trends (and fashions) in American scholarship; my own articles which sought to apply bureaucratic politics and statist theory to Canadian contexts (Nossal 1979; Nossal 1983-84) are examples of such derivative scholarship. The field of Canadian foreign policy studies, however, was primarily marked by a distinctly *Canadian* approach. As Molot (1990) has cogently argued, Canadian foreign policy studies tended to be concerned with establishing Canada's location in the international system. Reflecting a broader concern in English-language Canadian political culture with Canada's role and status in international affairs, much of the literature attempted to determine whether Canada was a "middle power" (the comforting preference of the middle mainstream) or a mere satellite of the United States (the preferred description of those who embraced a political economy approach). In the late 1970s and early 1980s, a new twist to this debate over location was added, with some wondering whether Canada was some kind of great power – though this was garbed in more modest clothing: Canada as a "foremost nation" (Eayrs 1975; Hillmer and Stevenson 1977) or a "principal power" (Dewitt and Kirton 1983). It is true that this relentless search for location could be – and indeed was – criticized as being both idiosyncratic and parochial (Hawes 1984; Molot 1990; Black and Smith 1993). And it is true that the nature, definition and location of middle powers in world politics remained essentially contested (Cooper, Higgott and Nossal 1993). There can be little doubt, however, that the foreign policy studies aspect of Canadian IR diverged from mainstream American IR: the debate over location was one about which American foreign policy scholars generally knew little and cared less.

Second, there was also an important methodological divergence between Canadian and American scholars. In the American academy, foreign policy studies began with a widespread belief that it was possible, by applying the scientific method, to create a "hard" science of international politics (Rosenau 1971) comparable to physics or chemistry. In this view, one could build theory by collecting enough data on the behaviour of states, analyzing it and accumulating the findings. This approach – termed behaviouralism – remained popular among American scholars (for example, Hermann 1987) long after most students in Canada had abandoned the hope that the study of foreign policy – Canada's or any other country's – could be properly "scientific." The last book on Canadian foreign policy that could be considered behaviouralist was published over 20 years ago; the aims of its editor – "to construct scientific theories of foreign policy in which theoretical statements are employed to subsume specific events within generalized patterns" (Tomlin 1978, xi) – are no longer much articulated by students of Canadian foreign policy.

A third area of divergence was theoretical. When Symons was looking at IR in Canada, foreign policy analysis was widely seen as the preferred approach. IR was taught as little more than the sum of the foreign policies of the world's various

states, or the interactions of the great powers. Adding the study of Canada was thus a natural outgrowth of that theoretical perspective. But no sooner was Canadian foreign policy entrenched in the curricula of Canada's universities than academic fashion changed. Over the 1970s and 1980s, foreign policy analysis was quickly eclipsed by theoretical perspectives that tended to focus on broader, more systemic explanations (Nossal 1990).

While this eclipse occurred in IR theorizing in the United States and in other English-speaking countries, the discipline itself took a direction very different in the United States from that in the rest of the world. There, the turn was towards structural and rationalistic explanations of world politics. A particular favourite was the neo-realist (or, more properly, the structural realist) approach, which held that world politics could be best explained by the anarchical structure in which states operated: the absence of world government demanded that states seek to maximize their power in order to survive (Waltz 1979). Within several years of the publication of Kenneth W. Waltz's *Theory of International Politics* in 1979, numerous American scholars had been seized with his simple message. And although the neo-realist perspective was criticized by some in the United States (see Ashley 1984, for example), it quickly achieved what most in the field have argued is a dominant position (Smith 1987), reinforced by the growing popularity of the rational choice approach among American political scientists,<sup>3</sup> and the formal modeling that went with it (Wæver 1997).

But these American trends were not widely embraced in the academy in other parts of the English-speaking world, such as Britain (Denemark and O'Brien 1997) or Australia. Certainly neither rational choice nor neo-realism migrated north to any appreciable degree. It is true that it is sometimes asserted that the Canadian IR community is in thrall to American realism; in the mid-1980s, for example, a group of junior IR scholars, looking at intellectual trends in Canadian universities, concluded that those who taught IR in the Canadian academy had simply bought into the American-dominated neo-realist perspective. "Canadian academics," Axel Dorscht and his colleagues wrote, "not having a significant role in the Canadian foreign policy process, tend to legitimize themselves and their work by publishing in US journals and attending conferences in the United States.... In the process, they continuously reconfirm their US-centred view of the world as a valid one" (Dorscht et al. 1986, 3). Melakopides (1998, 14), writing about Canadian academics a decade after Dorscht et al., argued that an American-inspired realism dominated their thinking: "Trained in the axioms, aphorisms, and interests of the realist world view, such scholars imported to the study of Canadian foreign policy the theoretical biases and methodological preferences present in the analysis of the foreign policies of the great powers and superpowers." Keeble and Smith (1999, 9-10) also noted the "realist legacy" that they saw pervading the approach to IR in the Canadian academy.

While the question of realism among Canadian IR scholars continues to generate debate (see Cameron et al. 1999), it is not at all clear that neo-realism made the kind of inroads into the Canadian academy claimed by Dorscht et al. in the mid-1980s. On the contrary: an impressionistic survey of the Canadian IR professoriate at the end of the 1990s would suggest that neo-realists are hardly in a significant minority, much less a hegemonic position.

And if neo-realism did not find great favour among the Canadian IR community, the rational choice approach, so popular in the United States, found virtually none. In 1984, for example, the department at McGill University hired a rational choice scholar to teach IR. This scholar had completed a BA at a Canadian university, and had gone on to take a PhD at the University of Maryland before returning to Canada in 1983. By his own account, however, being an IR "rat choicer" in Canada was a somewhat lonely intellectual existence; by the early 1990s, he had moved back to the United States. (One of his doctoral students, hired by a Canadian university, remains one of the few IR professors in Canada who embrace a rational choice approach.)

Indeed, for all of the assertions of American influence among the Canadian IR professoriate, there is in fact little evidence to support such claims. On the contrary: through the 1980s and 1990s, the Canadian academy was increasingly filled with scholars whose approach differed dramatically and fundamentally from the American IR mainstream. We have seen the emergence of scholars who teach IR from numerous perspectives that would be considered non-mainstream in the United States: international political economy (for example, the contributors to Stubbs and Underhill 2000), feminist perspectives of different kinds (for example, Stienstra 1994-5; Whitworth 1995; Keeble and Smith 1999) and post-positivism (for example, Neufeld 1995; Black and Sjolander 1996). In addition, many Canadian IR scholars probably identify with another approach that has emerged in the United States to challenge the American mainstream – the constructivist school (e.g., Ruggie 1998, Hopf 1998; Klotz and Lynch 2000).<sup>4</sup>

At the same time, a home-grown IR metatheoretical literature has emerged, or perhaps more correctly, some academics at Canadian universities are contributing to the broader metatheoretical debates that continue to mark the field of IR, at least in English. For example, the theoretical contributions of Robert W. Cox, Stephen Gill, Kal J. Holsti, R.B.J. Walker and Mark Zacher have all been widely cited by students of IR theory in other countries (see, for example, Cox 1981; Gill 1995; Holsti 1985; Walker 1993; Zacher 1992). And while these scholars are far too diverse (not to mention divergent) in outlook to be considered some kind of "Canadian School" of international relations – comparable to the "English School" or "Copenhagen School" – there can be little doubt that together and separately they constitute a distinct voice in the broader IR debate. To be sure, that voice is not always *seen* as different: for example, in his survey of contemporary IR for the 50th anniversary

of *International Organization*, Wæver (1998) simply lumped Canadian and American students of IR together.

Finally, one small manifestation of a home-grown IR is the emergence of an indigenous textbook literature. Ironically, while the IR community has been increasingly Canadianized over the last 30 years, and while the vast majority of academics in Canada approach IR very differently than their American colleagues, IR textbooks written by Americans continue to dominate the English-language market in Canada (as in many other countries: see Holsti 1985), despite their often blatant ethnocentrism (Alker and Biersteker 1984; Robles 1993; Nossal 2000). Yet over the past two decades, texts authored by scholars at Canadian universities (e.g., Matthews, Rubinoff, and Stein 1984/1989; Haglund and Hawes, 1990; Sens and Stoett, 1998; Nossal, 1998; Jackson and Sørensen, 1999; Madar, 1999) have made their appearance.

### Explaining Divergence

I have argued to this point that the nationalist movement of the early 1970s – encapsulated, in a sense, in the Symons exercise – set in train a process that saw not only the massive growth of Canadian foreign policy studies, but also a wholesale Canadianization of IR as a discipline. By the turn of the century, Canadian IR looks not at all like the IR that is professed in the American academy. What explains this fundamental divergence?

Much of the explanation lies in the often idiosyncratic patterns of “academic social reproduction” in the years after Symons. Throughout this period, the process of reproduction was deeply constrained by federal government regulations that limited the candidate pool to Canadian citizens and legal residents of Canada. No other country in the English-speaking world embraced this degree of academic protectionism. (Those with a jaundiced eye might suggest that the near-universal tendency of American universities to hire only American-trained PhDs demonstrates that one can have academic protectionism without actually having to legislate it.) Although, as Table 1 demonstrates, Canadian political science departments often chose candidates from non-Canadian universities – overwhelmingly British and American, and overwhelmingly universities perceived to be highly prestigious (Oxford, Harvard, Stanford and the London School of Economics) – many of those trained in non-Canadian doctoral programmes were, as noted above, those who met the restrictive federal immigration requirements.

Table 1, however, does not show how uneven the Canadianization of IR was. While by the mid-1990s the IR cohort in most political science departments comprised a mixture of PhDs from both Canadian and foreign universities, at least three departments – UBC, McGill and Toronto – stand out as exceptions. The IR specialists

at those universities manifested three similarities over the period under review: most, if not all, of them were American-trained; newly hired faculty also tended to be American-trained; and they did not have Canadian topics at the core of their research agendas. At UBC, six of the seven members of the department who are IR scholars received their doctorates at American universities; the lone holder of a Canadian PhD was not hired until the late 1990s. None of the American-trained scholars describes themselves as Canadianists, and indeed, throughout this period, UBC often employed non-permanent faculty to teach its Canadian foreign policy course. Similarly, all three of McGill's IR hires after 1975 were scholars from American doctoral programmes, and none were Canadianists; McGill, too, has often had to depend on sessionals to fill its Canadian foreign course. At Toronto, a similar situation obtained: from 1977 to 1990, the department made four entry-level appointments in IR, all of whom had doctorates from American universities. Of the seven IR faculty members hired between 1980 and 1999, none had Canadian topics at the core of their research agendas. Given this pattern, it is not surprising that between them, UBC, McGill and Toronto account for approximately one-third of all candidates with American PhDs hired to teach IR between 1975 and 1999.

Nor does Table 1 show the *pattern* of academic reproduction in the years after Symons. Table 2 shows where successful IR candidates who were Canadian-trained received their doctorate.

**Table 2: Canadian-trained IR appointments, 1970-1999,  
by University Granting Doctorate and Year of Appointment**

	Total	1970-79	1980-89	1990-94	1995-99
Alberta	8	1	3	2	2
Carleton	6	1	2	3	
Dalhousie	6	1	2	2	1
McGill	3			3	
Queen's	15	1	1	6	7
Toronto	16	8	3		5
UBC	6	2	2	1	1
York	8	1	1	4	2
Other	2		1	1	

In the early days of the Canadianization movement – the early and mid-1970s – the University of Toronto was the central Canadian “supplier” of junior IR faculty to other English-language Canadian universities. Of the 15 Canadian-trained IR faculty hired between 1970 and 1979, eight came from U of T. Table 2 demonstrates,

however, Toronto's predominant position collapsed suddenly after 1980: in the 70 IR competitions at English-language Canadian universities between 1980 and 1994, candidates with U of T PhDs were hired in but three.

While a number of factors no doubt contributed to Toronto's decline as a supplier, one reason is that after 1980 Toronto was no longer as Canadianized in its IR offerings as it had been in the 1970s, when the U of T students who took so many IR jobs in that decade had in the main written their doctoral dissertations on Canadian foreign policy topics under the supervision of professors like James G. Eayrs and John W. Holmes, whose central teaching and research concerns were Canada and Canadian foreign policy. In 1980 Eayrs moved to Dalhousie, and Holmes, who turned 70 in 1980, progressively withdrew from active doctoral supervision, leaving but one IR faculty member at U of T whose core area of interest was Canadian foreign policy.

Toronto's collapse as a dominant "supplier" had a longer-term impact on the discipline. While counterfactual musing has its limits, it is instructive to consider what the IR professoriate in Canada might look like in 2000 had Toronto academically reproduced itself in IR in the 1980s and 1990s at the same rate (50 per cent of domestic hires) that it had achieved in the 1970s. At the same time, however, demand at Canadian universities for faculty to teach IR and Canadian foreign policy remained high, particularly as these courses increased in popularity over the 1980s and 1990s. As a consequence, hiring departments, always constrained by federal law, increasingly looked to other Canadian doctoral programmes in IR. As Table 2 shows, by the end of the century, supply was somewhat more even. Although students from Queen's enjoyed considerable success in the 1990s, no single Canadian doctoral programme dominated. (It should be noted that Table 2 does not show those IR doctoral students from Canadian departments hired by Canada's French-language universities, community colleges or universities in other countries.)

There can be little doubt this broadening in the domestic sources of IR faculty brought with it a change in the way that IR has come to be professed at Canadian universities. First, the U of T cohort from the 1970s had a limited longer-term impact on the system as a whole, for all but two of those students were hired at universities where the PhD in international relations was not offered. This is not to suggest that had these students all been hired at PhD-granting institutions they would have simply reproduced mini-versions of themselves and their 1970s doctoral training, unaffected by broader trends in the IR discipline. Rather, it is to note that virtually the entire U of T cohort from the 1970s was unable to engage in *any* sort of "academic social reproduction" at the doctoral level.

Second, the students from the doctoral programmes in IR at Alberta, UBC, Carleton, Dalhousie, McGill, Queen's and York who were hired after 1980 brought a broad range of theoretical perspectives, including traditional foreign policy analysis, international political economy (IPE), post-positivist theories, critical theory and

different strands of feminism. While some of these perspectives were “imported,” reflecting scholarly fashion and trends originating outside Canada – particularly in Britain, Australia and Europe – others were quite clearly home grown.

Most importantly, the “imported” perspectives tended not to reflect the American mainstream. Although Canadian political science departments continued to leaven the ranks of their IR cohorts with scholars who received their PhDs at American and British universities (albeit at a diminishing rate), the approaches favoured in American universities found little favour in Canada, as I noted above. This was reinforced by the fact that in the 1980s and early 1990s, the most American-oriented IR programmes – UBC, McGill and Toronto – placed relatively few of their students in other Canadian universities: out of 70 competitions between 1980 and 1994, just over 10 per cent of the positions went to candidates from these three universities (three from each, in fact).

One of the clearest consequences of the failure of the American-oriented perspectives to gain a significant toehold in the Canadian academy (and thereby, in the process, squeeze out alternative approaches) is that Canada’s home-grown IR came to be marked by considerable theoretical pluralism. A persistent comment made to Porter (2000) in his survey of IR faculty at Canadian universities is that there is no clearly identifiable “mainstream.”

It can be argued however, that this is sure to change as those hired in the expansion years of the late 1960s and early 1970s pass from the scene as early retirement schemes continue to induce 50-something professors to leave their universities and as others hit the mandatory retirement age of 65 in Ontario. There may be, as Keeble and Smith suggest, a “realist legacy” that will echo into the coming decade, but that echo is likely to be quite faint. Moreover, barring a massive Saul-like conversion by scores of Canadian political scientists, IR “rat choicers” will continue to be as scarce in Canada as they have been in the last two decades. Instead, it is likely that if an IR mainstream emerges in Canada, it will be likely be dominated by those with a post-positivist, critical-theoretical or IPE perspective.

### **Conclusion: Implications for the Future**

I have argued that were Symons to survey IR in Canada at the beginning of the 21st century, he would not recognize the discipline he had found so Americanized in 1975. But it can also be argued that he might not welcome everything that his efforts to Canadianize IR brought. The prospect that those with an IPE, post-positivist, critical-theoretical or feminist approach to IR will assume the mantle of IR mainstream has, however, interesting implications for the future. It is one of the ironies of the Canadianization project that it was exceedingly successful in Canadianizing IR; but, because of the particular way Canada’s home-grown IR evolved, this has actually made the study and teaching of Canadian foreign policy more

problematic than it was when Symons was writing. For there is the prospect of a growing disjuncture between the nature of the Canadian studies project and the theoretical perspectives of an increasingly post-nationalist professoriate.

On the one hand, the study of Canada in the world – Canadian foreign policy studies – constitutes an unreconstructed *nationalist* project. For Symons and the other proponents of Canadianization in the late 1960s and early 1970s, "Canada" was an unproblematic construct. The idea of a unified nation – and a single one at that – was conceived of as a normative good. The state – Hobbesian, Weberian and endowed with sovereignty – was likewise seen as normatively good, for the sovereign state was the means by which the nation, the national economy and the interests of all Canadians could be best protected.

On the other hand, it is equally clear that many of the theoretical perspectives that enjoy wide currency in the professing of IR in English-speaking Canada are not at all accepting of the nation, the sovereign state and national interests as an unquestioned good, analytically important or intellectually interesting. Indeed, many scholars who are post-positivists, critical theorists, feminists, constructivists and many of those with an IPE perspective tend to view the nation, the state that is supposed to protect the nation, and the ideal of state sovereignty as problematic, both theoretically and normatively. For example, IPE sees the sovereign state and the national economy as increasingly irrelevant in a globalizing era; critical theory sees the ideology of sovereignty legitimizing an inappropriate division between "inside" and "outside" in world politics; other critical theorists see the ideology of nation-hiding patterns of power and social order that serve the interests of some but marginalize others; some strands of feminist theorizing see the nation-state as an androcentric construction that serves mainly to perpetuate gendered patterns of domination and oppression; post-positivists see nationality as one kind of construction of identity that could just as easily be reconstructed in another way. In short, the theoretical fashions that are becoming increasingly dominant require that we no longer should speak of *Canada*, as Symons did so uncritically. Instead, it should be "Canada" or even "Canadas," put in quotation marks or the plural to acknowledge the problematic nature of thinking in national terms.

It is not clear how this fundamental incompatibility will work itself out in the next decade, when those whose work focusses primarily on Canadian foreign policy will retire. For logically, at least, post-nationalists should prefer that the courses, books, articles and research projects based on the essentially national project of examining how "Canada" relates to the "outside world" be given the same bridge to the Canada Pension Plan being offered to departing faculty.

In practice, of course, it is unlikely that all manifestations of the Canadian national project will be erased, if for no other reason that most of the students who come to university as undergraduates are not at all post-nationalist; they appear to

have an undiminished interest in learning about "Canada and the world," seemingly unfazed by the critique of inside/outside, we/they dichotomies that they will learn from many of their professors. This interest is perhaps best reflected in the continued popularity of Canadian foreign policy courses. A survey of Canadian university calendars reveals that no department has quietly dropped its Canadian foreign policy course; indeed, most departments of political science in Canada continue to make an effort to staff these courses, even though the days when a position is advertised as being in "Canadian foreign policy" (as was the one to which I was appointed in 1976) are long gone.

In short, Canadian foreign policy studies are not likely to disappear, even though academic fashions have changed and even though the Symons-era cohort will soon be gone. But it is likely that the generation of IR scholars who entered the Canadian academy in the post-Symons period will alter the focus of both their teaching and their scholarship on "Canada and the world" to better fit a post-nationalist perspective. Ironically, in so doing, they will add yet one more area of divergence between those in the American academy – whose approach to IR remains unabashedly nationalist – and those who profess IR in Canada from a post-nationalist perspective, thus entrenching even more firmly Canada's – or is it "Canada's"? – home-grown IR.

### Notes

1. I also use this assumption, though I do not mean to suggest that where scholars grew up and where they received their PhDs fixes them immutably for their entire lives. Rather, I see citizenship and doctoral pedigree as important for the *initial directions* in which scholars are socialized.
2. At least three colleagues, all with PhDs from Canadian universities, with whom I consulted about this article expressed the view that the process of Canadianization has ended up producing an overly incestuous IR community, increasingly composed of the graduates of only eight English-speaking doctoral programmes in IR.
3. The essence of the rational choice approach to IR is that all political outcomes are the result of aggregations of the personal preferences of millions of individuals seeking to maximize their interests; the interests being maximized are assumed to be overwhelmingly materialistic in nature.
4. Constructivists in IR argue that we cannot understand world politics simply by looking at the anarchical structure of the international system. Rather, world politics is seen as a social construction, in essence "made" by agents who are as much moved by ideational factors – culture, norms, ideas – as by structure and the kind of concrete material interests assumed by rational choice theory.

## Works Cited

Alker, Hayward R., Jr., and Thomas J. Biersteker. 1984. "The Dialectics of World Order: Notes for a Future Archæologist of International Savoir Faire." *International Studies Quarterly* 28 (March): 121-42.

Ashley, Richard K. 1984. "The Poverty of Neo-Realism." *International Organization* 38 (Spring): 225-61.

Bercuson, David J., Robert Bothwell, and J.L. Granatstein. 1984. *The Great Brain Robbery: Canada's Universities on the Road to Ruin*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Black, David R. and Heather A. Smith. 1993. "Notable Exceptions? New and Arrested Directions in Canadian Foreign Policy Literature." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 26 (December): 745-74.

— and Claire Turenne Sjolander. 1996. "Multilateralism Re-constituted and the Discourse of Canadian Foreign Policy." *Studies in Political Economy* 49 (Spring): 7-36.

Cairns, Alan C. 1975. "Political Science in Canada and the Americanization Issue." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 8 (June): 201-30.

Cameron, Maxwell A., et al. 1999. "Round Table on Canadian Foreign Policy." *Canadian Foreign Policy* 6 (Spring): 1-24.

Clarkson, Stephen., ed. 1968. *An Independent Foreign Policy for Canada?* Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

—. 1972. "Lament for a Non-Subject: Reflections on Teaching Canadian-American Relations." *International Journal* 27 (Spring): 265-75.

Cooper, Andrew F. 1997. *Canadian Foreign Policy: Old Habits and New Directions*. Scarborough: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada.

—, Richard A. Higgott and Kim Richard Nossal. 1993. *Relocating Middle Powers: Australia and Canada in a Changing World Order*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Cox, Robert W. 1981. "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory." *Millennium* 10 (Summer): 126-55.

Crawford, Robert M. and Darryl S.L. Jarvis, eds. 2000. *International Relations: Still an American Social Science?* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Denemark, Robert, and Robert O'Brien. 1997. "Contesting the Canon: International Economy at UK and US Universities." *Review of International Political Economy* 4 (Spring): 214-38.

Dewitt, David B. and John Kirton. 1983. *Canada as a Principal Power*. Toronto: John Wiley.

— and David Leyton-Brown, eds. 1995. *Canada's International Security Policy*. Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada.

Dorsch, Axel, Ernie Keenes, Gregg Legare and Jean-François Rioux. 1986. "Canada's Foreign Foreign Policy." *International Perspectives* (May/June): 3-6.

Eayrs, James. 1960. *The Art of the Possible: Government and Foreign Policy in Canada*. University of Toronto Press.

—. 1975. "Defining a New Place for Canada in the Hierarchy of World Powers." *International Perspectives* (May/June): 3-8.

Farrell, R. Barry. 1969. *The Making of Canadian Foreign Policy*. Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada.

Gill, Stephen. 1995. "Globalisation, Market Civilisation, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism." *Millennium* 24.3: 399-424.

Glazebrook, G.P. de T. 1966. *A History of Canadian Foreign Relations*, rev. ed., 2 vols. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Granatstein, J.L., ed. 1969. *Canadian Foreign Policy Since 1945: Middle Power or Satellite?* Toronto: Copp Clark Publishing.

—. ed. 1986. *Canadian Foreign Policy: Historical Readings*. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman.

—. 1996. *Yankee Go Home? Canadians and Anti-Americanism*. Toronto: HarperCollins.

Haglund, David G. and Michael K. Hawes, eds. 1990. *World Politics: Power, Interdependence and Dependence*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Hawes, Michael K. 1984. *Principal Power, Middle Power, or Satellite? Competing Perspectives on the Study of Canadian Foreign Policy*. Toronto: York University Research Program in Strategic Studies.

Hermann, Charles F., Charles W. Kegley and James N. Rosenau. 1987. *New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy*. Boston: Allen and Unwin.

Hoffmann, Stanley. 1977. "An American Social Science: International Relations." *Daedalus* 106 (Summer): 41-59.

Holmes, John W. 1970. *The Better Part of Valour: Essays on Canadian Diplomacy*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Holsti, K.J. 1985. *The Dividing Discipline: Hegemony and Diversity in International Theory*. Boston: Allen and Unwin.

Hopf, Ted. 1998. "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory." *International Security*, 23.1 (Summer): 171-200.

Jackson, Robert, and Georg Sørensen. 1999. *Introduction to International Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Keating, Tom. 1993. *Canada and World Order: The Multilateralist Tradition in Canadian Foreign Policy*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Keeble, Edna and Heather A. Smith. 1999. *(Re)defining Traditions: Gender and Canadian Foreign Policy*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Plotz, Audi and Cecelia Lynch. 2000. *Constructing Global Politics*. Forthcoming.

Lyon, Peyton, and Brian W. Tomlin. 1979. *Canada as an International Actor*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada.

Madar, Daniel. 1999. *Canadian International Relations*. Scarborough: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada.

Matthews, Robert O., Arthur G. Rubinoff and Janice Gross Stein, eds. 1984/1989. *International Conflict and Conflict Management: Readings in World Politics*, 1st/2nd eds. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall Canada.

Melakopides, Costas. 1998. *Pragmatic Idealism: Canadian Foreign Policy, 1945-1995*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Middlemiss, D.W. and J.J. Sokolsky. 1989. *Canadian Defence: Decisions and Determinants*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Molot, Maureen Appel. 1990. "Where Do We, Should We, Or Can We Sit? A Review of Canadian Foreign Policy Literature." *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 1-2 (Spring-Fall): 77-96.

Munton, Don and John Kirton, eds. 1992. *Canadian Foreign Policy: Selected Cases*. Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada.

Neufeld, Mark. 1995. "Hegemony and Foreign Policy Analysis: The Case of Canada as a Middle Power." *Studies in Political Economy* 48 (Autumn): 7-29.

Neumann, Iver B. and Ole Wæver, eds. 1997. *The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making*. London/New York: Routledge.

Nossal, Kim Richard. 1979. "Allison Through the (Ottawa) Looking Glass: Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy in a Parliamentary System." *Canadian Public Administration* 22 (Winter): 610-26.

—. 1983-4. "Analyzing the Domestic Sources of Canadian Foreign Policy." *International Journal* 39 (Winter): 1-21

—. 1985/1989/1997. *The Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy*. 3 eds. Scarborough: Prentice Hall.

—. 1990. "Opening up the Black Box: The Decision-Making Approach to International Politics." Eds. David G. Haglund and Michael K. Hawes. *World Politics: Power, Interdependence and Dependence*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. 531-52.

—. 1998. *The Patterns of World Politics*. Scarborough: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada.

—. 2000. "Tales that Textbooks Tell: Ethnocentrism and Diversity in American Introductions to International Relations." *International Relations: Still an American Social Science?* Eds. Robert M. Crawford and Darryl S.L. Jarvis. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Page, Donald M. 1973. *A Bibliography of Works on Canadian Foreign Relations, 1945-1970*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs.

Porter, Tony. 2000. "Can There be National Perspectives on International Relations?" *International Relations: Still an American Social Science?* Eds. Robert M. Crawford and Darryl S.L. Jarvis. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Robles, Alfredo C., Jr. 1993. "How 'International' are International Relations Syllabi?" *PS: Political Science and Politics* 26 (September): 526-28.

Rosenau, James N. 1971. *The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy*. New York: Free Press.

Ruggie, John Gerard. 1998. *Constructing the World Polity: Essays on International Institutionalization*. London: Routledge.

Sens, Allen and Peter Stoett. 1998. *Global Politics: Origins, Currents, Directions*. Toronto: ITP Nelson Canada.

Smiley, Donald. 1974. "Must Canadian Political Science be a Miniature Replica?" *Journal of Canadian Studies* 9.1 (February): 31-41.

Smith, Steve. 1987. "Paradigm Dominance in International Relations: The Development of International Relations as a Social Science." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 16 (Summer): 189-205.

Steele, James and Robin Mathews. 1970. "The Universities: Takeover of the Mind." *Close the 49th Parallel, Etc: The Americanization of Canada*. Ed. Ian Lumsden. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Stienstra, Deborah. 1994-5. "Can the Silence be Broken? Gender and Canadian Foreign Policy." *International Journal* 50 (Winter): 103-27.

Stubbs, Richard and Geoffrey R.D. Underhill, eds. 2000. *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Swanson, Roger Frank. 1975. *Canadian-American Summit Diplomacy, 1923-1973*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Symons, T.H.B. 1975. *To Know Ourselves: Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies*. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 2 vols.

Thomson, Dale C. and Roger F. Swanson. 1971. *Canadian Foreign Policy: Options and Perspectives*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Tomlin, Brian W., ed. 1978. *Canada's Foreign Policy: Analysis and Trends*. Toronto: Methuen.

Tucker, Michael. 1980. *Canadian Foreign Policy: Contemporary Issues and Themes*. Toronto: McGraw Hill Ryerson.

Wæver, Ole. 1997. "Figures of International Thought: Introducing Persons Instead of Paradigms." *The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making?* Eds. Iver B. Neumann and Ole Wæver. London/New York: Routledge. 1-37.

—. 1998. "The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations." *International Organization* 52 (Autumn): 687-727.

Walker, R.B.J. 1993. *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Warnock, John. 1973. "International Relations as a Canadian Academic Discipline." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 8 (February): 46-56.

Whitworth, Sandra. 1995. "Women, and Gender, in the Foreign Policy Review Process." *Canada Among Nations, 1995: Democracy and Foreign Policy*. Eds. Maxwell A. Cameron and Maureen Appel Molot. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Wright, Gerald. 1985. "Canadian Studies Abroad: Artificial Insemination in Academe." *Canadian Culture: International Dimensions*. Ed. Andrew F. Cooper. Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs. 113-20.

Zacher, Mark W. 1992. "The Decaying Pillars of the Westphalian Temple." *Governance without Government*. Eds. James N. Rosenau and Ernst Otto-Czempiel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 58-101.

## Contributors

**Christina Cameron** is educated as an historian of art and architectural history and has worked since 1970 with Parks Canada. She is Director General of National Historic Sites and represents Canada at the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO.

**Robert M. Campbell** has recently been named Dean Of Arts at Wilfrid Laurier University. He is the author of *The Politics of the Post: Canada's Postal System from Public Service to Privatization* (Broadview Press, 1994). He is presently completing a book that compares regulatory changes in 12 postal systems.

**George Elliott Clarke**, PhD, LLD (Hon.), has edited two anthologies of African-Canadian literature (1991-1992, 1997), compiled its most comprehensive bibliography (1996) and published many essays in the field. He taught at Duke University (1994-1999), served as the Visiting Seagrams Chair in Canadian Studies at McGill University (1998-1999), and now teaches World Literature at the University of Toronto. He is also a poet, playwright, librettist and screenwriter.

**Kim Richard Nossal** has been in the Department of Political Science since 1976, when he was hired to teach Canadian foreign policy; he received his doctorate from the University of Toronto in 1977. He is the author of a number of works on Canadian foreign policy and international relations, including *The*

*Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy* (1997) and *The Patterns of World Politics* (1998).

**Enoch Padolsky** teaches Canadian literature in the English Department at Carleton University. Co-editor (with Jean Burnet et al.) of *Migration and the Transformation of Cultures* (Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1992), he has published extensively on Canadian minority literature and on interdisciplinary issues in Canadian literary theory and ethnic studies.

**Judy Rebick** is the author of a new book *Imagine Democracy* (Stoddart, 2000). This article is based on some of the ideas in her book. She is also host of CBC Newsworld's *Straight from the Hip* and the former president of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women

**John Richards** teaches at Simon Fraser University and is a resident scholar at the C.D. Howe Institute. He has supervised much of the Institute's social policy work over the last several years.

**Donald J. Savoie** holds the Clément-Cormier Chair in Economic Development at l'Université de Moncton where he also teaches public administration. He has published widely in public policy and public administration.