

The End of the “Two Solitudes”? The Presence (or Absence) of the Work of French-speaking Scholars in Canadian Politics

FRANÇOIS ROCHER *University of Ottawa*

Introduction

It is useful to discuss the origins of this text as they highlight the underlying problem it aims to discuss. When I was director of the School of Canadian Studies at Carleton University, I received a phone call from a colleague at the University of Ottawa. One of his students wanted to take a course, taught in English, dealing with the broad question of French and English relations Canada. The discipline (sociology, political science, history, literature) did not matter, as long as the theme was discussed. After looking at the list of courses offered by my own university, I saw that none matched this student’s interests. There were a few courses regarding Quebec politics, history, and literature, but none that focused specifically on the relations between French and English societies in Canada. My first observation was that in Ottawa, the “national” capital of Canada, it was impossible for a student to learn about one of the main aspects of Canada’s social, cultural and political life.

A few months later, I received a phone call from another colleague, at Laval University in Québec City. He wanted to know which French-

Acknowledgments: This study was made possibly by a SSHRC research grant obtained by the Groupe de recherche sur les sociétés plurinationales (GRSP). I must thank my two research assistants, Charles-Antoine Sévigny and Olivier de Champlain, who did a remarkable job of compiling the data. I also thank Yves Gingras and Vincent Larivière from l’Observatoire des sciences et des technologies (OST) at the Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM) for their interest and useful advice. Equal thanks to my colleagues Alain-G. Gagnon for his constant support and to Micheline Labelle, Ann-Marie Field, Michael Orsini, Patrick Fafard and Catherine Côté for their critical enlightenment. I gratefully acknowledge the helpful critical comments of the anonymous reviewers of this journal. I am solely responsible for any errors and omissions contained in this research.

François Rocher, School of Political Studies, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, K1N 6N5, frocher@uottawa.ca

speaking authors in the social sciences were, to my knowledge, the most cited in English on questions about Canadian society. This was an intriguing query to which I had no response. A quick look at the bibliographies of a half dozen books about Canadian politics left me further perplexed. This brings me to my second troubling observation. The academic research on Canada done by my francophone colleagues seemed almost ignored in English literature dealing with Canada.

These introductory remarks, albeit anecdotal, are the starting point for this article. It should be said that the scope of this project is both narrow and large. In its narrowness, it is concerned with the presence of academic work produced by francophone scholars (written in either English or in French) within the work published in English in the field of Canadian politics. I do not seek to measure the dissemination of works written in French. The focus will be less on the language of dissemination (although it will be present in my analysis) than on the issue of knowledge of scholarly works produced in what I will call the *universe* or the *scientific space* of French-speaking scholars in Canada.¹ In other words, this article also takes into account research done by French-speaking academics outside Quebec. The focus is, thus, placed on the *producers* of knowledge more than on the language of dissemination.

This research is also narrow in that it focuses only on a specific and limited aspect of the field of political science, on what usually belongs to “Canadian politics” broadly defined. Excluded here, therefore, are works related to international politics, comparative politics, political philosophy, or political theory that are not in some way linked to the Canadian context.

The research question, however, underscores wider issues regarding the production and reproduction of a specific representation of the Canadian political community. The focus of our attention will be the sources used to identify issues and problems confronting the Canadian political community. Hence, it is not a linguistic issue that will be addressed here (the fact being that a good number of French-speaking scholars choose to publish in English rather than in French) nor that of the status of French in Canada. Our main concern will be, rather, the process of knowledge production and reproduction in a so-called multinational society.

The issue of inclusion/exclusion is always present not only in the scientific discourse, but also in how Canadians collectively perceive the political community to which they belong. For instance, in her inauguration speech in September of 2005, the new Governor General of Canada proclaimed no less than the end of the “two solitudes”:

The time of the “two solitudes” that for too long described the character of this country is past. The narrow notion of “every person for himself” does not belong in today’s world, which demands that we learn to see beyond our wounds,

Abstract. The paper explores the presence (or the lack thereof) of references to work done by French-speaking scholars in the broad literature dealing with Canadian politics over the past ten years. It surveys books published by commercial and university presses and analyzes both quantitatively and qualitatively the reference and use of scholarly work by French-speaking scholars published in English and French. The paper sheds light on the sociology and the politics of scientific production in the field of Canadian politics. It examines a phenomenon that is both troubling and revealing of the unequal status of scholarly contributions to the field of Canadian politics. Moreover, it questions the extent to which the current Canadian politics field reflects a comprehensive and inclusive understanding of the Canadian political dynamic.

Résumé. L'article se penche sur la présence (ou l'absence) de références aux travaux réalisés par les politologues francophones dans la vaste littérature sur la politique canadienne publiée au cours des dix dernières années. Il passe en revue des ouvrages publiés par des maisons d'édition commerciales ou universitaires et procède à une analyse quantitative et qualitative du texte afin de déterminer dans quelle mesure les travaux des universitaires francophones, publiés en français ou en anglais, ont été pris en considération. Cet article apporte un éclairage différent, à la fois sociologique et politique, sur le processus de production scientifique dans le champ de la politique canadienne. Il met en lumière un phénomène troublant qui révèle le statut inégal des contributions scientifiques dans l'univers politique canadien. Il s'interroge sur le caractère global et inclusif de la compréhension courante de la dynamique politique canadienne.

beyond our differences for the good of all. Quite the contrary: we must eliminate the spectre of all the solitudes and promote solidarity among all the citizens who make up the Canada of today. As well, we must make good use of our prosperity and our influence wherever the hope that we represent offers the world an extra measure of harmony. (Jean, 2005)

This comment reflects more wishful thinking on the part of the Canadian head of state than an accurate sociological description of the relationship between the two “solitudes.” Nonetheless, the Governor-General raises an important issue in presupposing that there exists a reciprocal recognition between French and English Canadians. According to Jean-François Gaudreault-Desbiens, a law professor formerly at the University of Toronto and now at the Université de Montréal, the intention of the Governor General was to invite all Canadians to question their preconceived ideas about the way in which the two groups perceive and understand each other. He added that “if Canada still has to deal with the fabled ‘two solitudes,’ it is not because Quebeckers resent what other Canadians do or want, or because Canadians outside Quebec wish ill to Quebeckers. It is first and foremost because there is very little communication between these two societies” (Gaudreault-Desbiens, 2005: 33–34). In other words, it is still necessary to be conscious of the presence of the “other,” or to have simultaneous interest in and intellectual curiosity towards what the other has to offer. It is why paying close attention to the presence of francophone Canadian scholarship in research published in English Canada on the topic of Canadian politics and society is of some interest. It wishes to go beyond the usual remark that we often read in book reviews about the lack of references to a significant num-

ber of works done by Québécois scholars and to provide stronger evidence on the way Canadian politics is constructed as a field within Canadian political science.

This work rests upon two premises. The first is that francophone political scientists have not limited themselves to producing knowledge only about Quebec society. Their object of study is also inscribed within a much larger framework, notably that of Canadian society. Many are interested in political parties and elections, public policy in varied areas, such as health, environment, public administration, immigration, security, feminism, social movements, federalism, etc. In other words, French-speaking scholars produce knowledge which leads to a better understanding of the social and political realities as they relate to the whole of Canada. This general comment calls for a second. Let it not be presumed that the the work of francophone Canadian scholars is, *a priori*, qualitatively different from that of English-speaking Canadian scholars. These works do not necessarily and by default shed a distinct light on issues analyzed. The second point rejects, therefore, all forms of ethnicism or essentialism found in these works. This does not exclude the fact that nuances can be different, but it neither presumes nor presupposes that.

Trivial Nationalism or the Production of “Meaning”

In 1999, the publication of *Si je me souviens bien / As I Recall: Regards sur l'histoire*, by John Meisel, Guy Rocher and Arthur Silver for the Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP), attempted to bridge the gap that exists between the contradictory interpretations of history between French and English Canada. In the concluding chapter, political scientist Meisel spoke of how he benefited from the intellectual and social advantages that stem from contact with the other cultural universe in Canada. He noted that “continuous contact enlarges the universes of both groups involved, which, in turn, encourages members to compare their own ideas and realizations to those of the others, and gives each party the opportunity to look anew upon the other” (Meisel et al., 1999: 406; author’s translation). In sum, developing relations with people from other cultures allows one to broaden their horizons, ask questions which, otherwise, would not be raised, and better understand the other’s representations and motivations.

Few would disagree with Meisel. At the same time, however, it seems that four decades after the Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, much of the proposed path has yet to be explored. Social science research does not occur in a vacuum. The way in which one understands, defines, conceives and refers to one’s subject of analysis influences the

knowledge produced. When the subject of inquiry is society, the researcher, whether intentionally or not, can influence how the society will perceive itself, and can be seen as an agent and an actor in the transformation in the society. It means that scholarly works contribute to shape (construct and deconstruct) current representation of society. They may also change it either by criticizing or reframing it. In this sense, the researcher can be an agent of change through the choice of the critical lens adopted to examine society. When, moreover, this society is one's own, the social scientist helps to identify important issues that should be examined, the problems that demand our attention, and the solutions that can be applied to solve or manage problems or social tensions.

What has just been said is by no means original. A number of sociologists, namely Max Weber, Thomas Kuhn, Robert K. Merton, Talcott Parsons, Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu, have long been aware of the meaning of social reproduction, objectivity and the logic of scientific knowledge. In its discussion of the relationship between the researcher and the object of study, sociology recognizes itself as being inscribed in a particular social and intellectual context of which we must be fully conscious.

Neither is the focus of this research new. At the annual meeting of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association (CSAA) held in Winnipeg in June 1970, sociologist Guy Rocher noted that researchers perceived expectations to which they attempt to respond. He added that these expectations centred on three modes of social interaction. The first mode refers to the fact that the production of knowledge constitutes a new form of capital used as a form of power and influence by those wishing to either support, reinforce or contest contemporary authorities. The second mode of interaction is that of the researchers developing comprehensive analyses on issues that are socially controversial. These analyses are not done with a narrow empiricism, but reflect upon society in general. Finally, he noted that sociologists (and, by extension political scientists) were increasingly called upon to share their knowledge either as experts, consultants or intellectual leaders. Therefore, they not only seek to explain social, political and economic issues (as they define and analyze them obviously), but also to identify, inform, shape orientations and respond to social issues deemed important. They become credible social actors whose conclusions are used by others to justify their respective points of view (1973: 270–72).

Conscious of the role played by social science researchers, Rocher invited francophone scholars to exercise more influence outside Québec by the quality, quantity, and the scope of their research. Moreover, he noted that, with the exception of a few individuals who wish to communicate with the other universe, usually in a manner that he qualified as sporadic and superficial, a large majority of Canadian sociologists exclusively belong to their own linguistic universe (1973: 273).

This compartmentalization of the Canadian knowledge into two distinct linguistic universes is problematic in a society marked, among other features, by its constitutive duality. More than three decades ago, the fact that English-speaking scholars knew little of the works of French-speaking scholars was a source of frustration for the latter. However, the manner in which researchers define and understand their object of analysis is more problematic in light of the three modes of social interactions identified by Rocher. When we consider knowledge production as social capital and the role played by academics in the identification of social and political issues, the importance of who gets heard among scholars can no longer be taken for granted. These factors deserve greater attention *because* those who contribute to produce and reproduce the dominant representation of the Canadian society (in government, media, and institutions of knowledge) do so partially, by ignoring an entire universe of scholarly work while seemingly not being fully aware that they are so doing. French sociologists Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant speak of a cultural imperialism in the form of the power to universalize a single historical tradition and misidentify things as such (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1998: 109). The conscious or unconscious exclusion of voices and concerns of one of the two core linguistic groups in Canadian society merits further analysis.

The interest of this research is not limited to taking into account the diversity of scholars involved in the production of scientific knowledge in the field of Canadian politics. It highlights how certain practices within this scholarly field contribute to produce and reproduce specific representations and definitions of the political subject, the state and the stakes at play in Canadian society. In this regard, the production of scientific knowledge contributes to the process of construction, reproduction, advancement, and consolidation of the existence of the Canadian nation (Lecours and Nootens, 2007: 33). The majority of works about nationalism emphasize how minority groups express and structure their identity. However, the underlying principles of nationalism, be it majority or minority nationalism, are similar in as far as they both aim to circumscribe the political and identify pathways to uphold political legitimacy for their project. Nevertheless, what might be called “majority nationalism” is generally absent from the analysis. Analysis of the modes of identity construction and expression of this nationalism remains to be done. More and more, this majority nationalism, which conceived itself in terms of citizenship, patriotism, formal equality and respect of diversity, does not present itself as another form of nationalism (McRoberts, 1993, 1997; Resnick, 1995; Jenson, 1998; Bickerton, 2007). According to Marianne Gullestad, “there are close relations among egalitarian cultural themes, majority nationalism, and racism” (2002: 45). For the most part, the culture, identity and political tradition of the majority group are of lesser

interest and rarely looked at as manifestation of nationalism. Despite all this, it constructs itself through a process of identity production and reproduction, of identification and articulation of "communal" problems, of mobilization of knowledge which influences the key players as well as the structures of power. It is within this framework that the mode of construction of majority nationalism must be analyzed as an object of study.

The normative character of this research rests upon an *expectation* which seems legitimate. To fully understand the social and political Canadian reality implies a deep awareness of its complexity. It also implies that the researcher will take into consideration the works related to the object of research without systematically ignoring a significant proportion of scholarly work, particularly emanating from a different linguistic universe. If Canada, as a political community (and a national community, as is used widely in the vocabulary of English Canada), is composed of two global societies (to reclaim the terms of the Dunton-Laurendeau Commission), scholarly production related to it must reflect this reality if it wishes to be *inclusive* and *comprehensive*. Knowledge of the French language, at least the capacity to read it, constitutes a prerequisite for a complete and serious analysis of Canada. This statement will be very controversial for some, self-evident for others. For the former, they will argue that their research interests do not deal with French-speaking Canada or they have access, in English, to the data and information they require. The rejoinder is, of course, that an ability to read French accords access not only to data but to different perspectives, that is French-speaking ones, of the Canadian reality. But there is more. It is also essential that Canadian scholars look systematically at the knowledge produced within the francophone scientific universe. That they seek to know what is published in English, certainly, but also in French. The paper will explore the presence (or the lack thereof) of reference to work done by French-speaking scholars in the broad literature dealing with Canadian politics.

Methodological Considerations

This research analyzes a statistically representative number of works published in English on issues dealing with Canadian politics and society between 1995 and 2005. Books were privileged over peer-reviewed journal articles because they constitute the outcome of a longer research process. They are more likely to be comprehensive in terms of the literature they refer to than journal articles which are, by definition, more focused. Furthermore, this choice allows one to better circumscribe the field of analysis to major works on different aspects of Canadian politics and society that were published in Canada.

This methodological decision also emanates from practical considerations. While one can identify with relative ease books that focus on an aspect or another of Canadian politics, it would have been practically impossible to come up with a database of articles published in peer-reviewed journals. Not only would these be too numerous (likely in the thousands) to constitute a body of evidence that could be analyzed fully and systematically, a number of these publications appear in journals that address a specific topic. It was possible, however, to create a database of the list of works published in Canada on a topic specific to the discipline of Canadian politics. This is our focus here.

The sample consists of a total of 84 books (n)—79 specialized works and five recent introductory books to Canadian politics (see appendices A and D). They were all found on MUSE, the McGill University electronic catalogue. They were selected from a catalogue of the following publishers: University of Ottawa Press, McGill-Queen's University Press, University of Toronto Press, Oxford University Press, Garamond Press, Fernwood Publishing, Broadview Press, and University of British Columbia Press.² The total number of books dealing with Canadian politics published between 1995 and 2005 by these presses is estimated to be around 300.

With respect to methodology, we must locate the analysis geographically and temporally. The research consisted of an elaboration of a list of publishers and works, the collection, examination and organization of the different data. This was done in Montréal between the March 1 and April 10, 2006.

Both time and place constraints have had an impact on the way the research was conducted certain books were not listed in MUSE, some were not available in libraries at the time of analysis, others were disregarded because they used overly complex systems of referencing and required too much time to be treated properly. Nevertheless, considering the number and the diversity of books retained for this research, the number of publishing houses, their geographic distribution and the total number of references, this study remains statistically valid.

The bibliographies from each of the works selected from MUSE were photocopied. First, the number of references was counted, excluding newspaper articles, government documents and other official publications. Following that, the references belonging to French-speaking authors were tabulated.

The data collected is statistically representative. It represents approximately 30 per cent of the books published in English by major publishers on issues related to Canadian politics. This research includes more than 28,500 references. It is important to mention that it is the number of references that was tabulated and the number of existing works. For example, the same book or article could have been referred to several

times in different books, accounting for several entries. On the other hand, if a reference appeared more than once in the same book or chapter, it was only counted once. In other words, occurrences of *ibid.*, *loc. cit.*, and other references of the same nature, were disregarded.

Analysis of the Results

Estimation of knowledge production

It is important first to assess the scope of the universe of French-speaking scholars in Canada. There is no measure to know the exact number of scholarly publications by political scientists in Canada (books, book chapters, journal articles, etc.). In the same manner, there are no tools allowing for an assessment of the proportion of publications by French-speaking scholars. The available databases, like the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), are problematic in some respects as a source of information. First, SSCI takes into account only articles published in peer-reviewed journals, despite the fact that seminal contributions are likely published in books. Moreover, many academic journals are not included in this database. Finally, there is an over-representation of academic journals published in English, and an under-representation of those published in other languages (Larivière et al., 2005; Archambault et al., 2006). Hence, many important Quebec academics journals, such *Politique et Sociétés*, *Globe* and *Recherches sociographiques*, to name a few, do not figure in the databases of referenced journals.

If it is impossible to know the exact proportion of publications from francophone scholars (outputs), it is certainly possible to infer an approximate proportion in looking at grants received (inputs) from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (see Table 1). SSHRC approved 975 standard research grants for the fiscal years between 1998–1999 and 2005–2006 to researchers in political science. French-speaking

TABLE 1
SSHRC Standard Research Grants to Canadian Political Scientists
1998–1999 to 2005–2006

	Grants		Amounts	
	N	%	\$	%
English-Speaking Scholars	760	77.9	15821283	74.6
French-Speaking Scholars	215	22.1	5399856	25.4
Total	975	100	21221139	100

Source: SSHRC (our compilation)

scholars, as principal investigators, accounted for 22.1 per cent of the researchers that obtained grants. We have not counted the grants obtained by research teams including one or more francophone scholars who were not principal investigators. This would have likely increased their numbers. Nonetheless, it is important to mention that the total amount of money accorded to French-speaking scholars corresponds to more than a quarter of the entire budget for these grants.

Another way of assessing the scientific production of the French-speaking researchers consists in taking into account their relative importance within the community of the researchers belonging to the field of the Canadian politics. By browsing the Internet websites of all the departments of political science in Canada (as listed on the website of the Canadian Political Science Association as of June 2006), 369 professors have identified Canadian politics as one of their fields of research or have listed publications related to the field. Out of this number, 89 were French-speaking scholars, or 24.1 per cent.

In sum, it is plausible to think that the production of knowledge by French-speaking scholars in the field of political science represents approximately a quarter of all intellectual production in Canada in this field. The assessment of the under- or over-representation of francophone scholarly work is not an easy task. For instance, a mechanical approach would expect that, in order to be just and equitable, at least 20 per cent of all references should link to French-speaking scholars. However, we must also take into consideration that works cited lists are not only made up of Canadian authors. Even if a book studies a Canadian issue, theoretical frameworks are often borrowed from approaches developed by foreign authors (American, British, German, French, etc.) Moreover, Canadian issues are often put into comparative perspectives, adding references to foreign authors. One can, therefore, expect that the Canadian scholars (francophones *and* non-francophones) would be more or less under-represented in the measure of bibliographies that include works by non-Canadian authors. Nevertheless, in most books on a Canadian topic, the bulk of the bibliographies are published in Canada.³ Hence, the issue here is one of proportion and level.

Systemic and chronic under-representation

The sample is made up of (n) 79 books (see appendix A), published between 1995 and 2005, for a total of 26,040 references. Of this number, 1962 refer to francophone-Canadian authors, which makes up 7.5 per cent of the total references (this number includes references from French-speaking authors who have published a chapter in a book collection). Since all the books do not count an equal number of references, it is important also to calculate an average of averages per book to obtain a

similar result: 7.7 per cent. This percentage, however, also reflects a relatively low number of works ($n = 9$) in which the number of francophone references is relatively high due to the nature of the subject of inquiry: questions tied to Canadian and Quebec nationalism, constitutional politics and Quebec politics (appendix B).

It is important, therefore, to account for the *median* that underscores the "thematic effect." In this case, the median falls at 4.9 per cent. For a more objective analysis, the books that deal to a large extent to Quebec were excluded from the database (appendix A minus appendix B). In this case, the average and the median were respectively 6 and 4.4 per cent.

Of the total sample ($n = 79$), twenty were edited books in which at least one chapter was written, or co-written, by a francophone author (appendix C for the list of chapters). Since the aim of this research is to measure the degree of usage of francophone scholarship, references to chapters written by francophones were not counted. When these references were subtracted to keep only those works by non-francophone authors, the average and the median became 6.3 and 4.4 per cent respectively.

Thus, francophone Canadian scholars made up around *five per cent* of bibliographical references in scholarly books published in Canada between 1995 and 2005 dealing with Canadian politics and society.

The same, however, is not true when we consider Francophone authors who published a chapter in edited books ($n = 38$) making frequent reference to their francophone counterparts, for an average of 44.4 per cent and a median of 38.2 per cent. Not surprisingly, eight chapters (21 per cent) dealt specifically with Quebec issues. The tendency of francophone authors to refer to works of other francophone scholars does not reveal itself by the topic under scrutiny. Although references to the works of scholars not belonging to the same universe were predominant (with a median of 61.8 per cent), one notes a greater usage of the works produced by scholars inscribed within the same linguistic universe. All in all, while the works of francophone scholars help to bridge the two intellectual traditions, the same cannot be said of non-francophone scholars who refer little (around 5 per cent) to the knowledge produced by francophones.

Some may attribute the lack of references to French-speaking authors to the fact that a large number of these scholars focus to a large extent on Quebec politics. Although that statement may be accurate, this raises a fundamental question: what is included in the field of Canadian politics? Are the realms of Canadian and Quebec politics mutually exclusive or does the former include the latter? If content that has to do with Quebec politics is considered by English-speaking scholars of little if any use for a better understanding of Canadian politics as a whole, then we

TABLE 2
References by Topics

	Quebec		Quebec/Canada		Canada		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
By English-speaking scholars	402	28.8	185	13.2	736	52.6	77	5.5	1400	100
By English-speaking scholars excluding Appendix B	153	15.9	101	10.5	635	66.2	70	7.4	959	100

must conclude that research that focuses on the “other” Canada (that is, Quebec) does not belong in the field of Canadian politics. The idea of “two solitudes” likely finds its origins in this skewed vision of Canadian society and politics.

The database created for this research does not, however, allow us to establish if the works of French-speaking political scientists focus more on issues of Canadian or Quebec politics. To come up with these numbers, we would have had to examine their inputs rather than references to their work by other scholars (outputs). This constitutes a subject of a distinct study that remains to be done. From the works cited, it is possible to measure, however, whether they focus specifically on Quebec. Table 2 shows data compiled from the works cited in the books retained for our analysis (appendix A) and edited books from which we excluded chapters written by francophone scholars (appendix B). We reviewed each reference to French-speaking authors and, using the title as a guide, classified the information into four categories: works that focus on Quebec-specific issues, works that look at the relation between Canada and Quebec, works that focus on pan-Canadian issues and works that are of a more general nature.

Clearly, the data show that these works give a particular attention to research that focuses on Quebec (28.8 per cent) or on Quebec-Canada relations (13.2 per cent). To diminish the impact of the focus on these more Quebec-specific subjects, we removed from our sample the works listed in appendix B. By doing so, the overall picture changes considerably. The proportion of references to works that focus more generally on Canadian issues increased from 52.6 per cent to 66.2 per cent. Meanwhile, references to works that are more Quebec specific in their focus (categories 1 and 2 of the table below) diminish to about a quarter of references. These data do not allow us to establish whether the majority of works produced by French-speaking authors have a broader focus than Quebec-related issues. It does permit us, however, to establish that the works cited make use of research beyond that which focuses primarily on Québec.

Also compiled were data relative to the language in which the texts referred to were written (Table 3). There exists little variation between francophone authors who contributed to a chapter in English in an edited

TABLE 3
Language of Referenced Texts

	English		French		Total
	N	%	N	%	
References by Non-French-speaking authors to texts published by French-speaking scholars in:	1068	55.1	869	44.9	1937
References by French-speaking authors to texts published by French-speaking scholars in:	479	52.6	432	47.4	911
Total	1547	54.3	1301	45.7	2848

book, and non-francophone authors. On average, a little more than half (54 per cent) of the texts referred to by the two linguistic groups were published in English. These results may seem odd at first. We would have expected French-speaking scholars to refer more often to works published in French and for English scholars not to do so as often. It is possible, however, to formulate a hypothesis to explain these results. When we take into account the small number of references to works by French-speaking authors (5 per cent), English-speaking scholars probably refer to these works as often because they are more likely to have developed an openness to the works produced in the French-speaking universe. They are also more likely to be bilingual than researchers who focus on more general aspects of Canadian politics. Overall, it seems references to French-speaking authors translate into a greater awareness of the existence of what is produced in the scholarly literature.

Despite the fact that our database did not include articles published in journals, it is worth noting that references to work published in academic journals are numerous in the lists of references retained for our analysis. Does publishing in a peer review journal increase the likelihood that French-speaking scholars will be read? Table 4 illustrates the

TABLE 4
Works Referenced to French-speaking Scholars
by Type of Publication

	By English-speaking		By French-speaking	
	N	%	N	%
Books	1523	77.3	700	76.8
Articles	447	22.7	211	23.2
Total	1970	100	911	100

TABLE 5
Journal Articles Referenced to French-speaking Scholars
by Place of Publication

	QC		ROC		UK		USA		EURO		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
By English-speaking	239	53.5	115	25.7	23	5.1	49	11.0	21	4.7	447	22.7
By French-speaking	107	50.7	70	33.2	7	3.3	19	9.0	8	3.8	211	23.2
Total	346	52.6	185	28.1	30	4.6	68	10.3	29	4.4	658	100

type of publications to which I am referring. Interestingly, close to three quarters of referenced works were books. Intuitively, one would expect anglophones to refer more often to books belonging to the French-speaking universe rather than to journal articles. There were no differences between francophone and anglophone authors. One noticeable trend, however, was those researchers working on book-length syntheses on specific topics were more likely to refer to books than to articles. When considering the process of knowledge production, this is an interesting fact. Our research does not, however, allow us to establish if this holds true for articles published in academic journals.

Does publishing an article in a refereed journal published outside Quebec increase the chance of a French-speaking author being referenced? Table 5 shows that around 50 per cent of these journal articles were published in Quebec. Francophone authors who published chapters in edited books accounted for 33 per cent of journal articles outside Québec, while the proportion for non-francophone authors was 25 per cent. In other words, francophones refer more often than non-francophones to articles published in academic journals outside of Québec. Again, this is a surprising finding which can likely be explained using the same factors stated above with regards to references to works published in French: a greater awareness and openness towards the knowledge produced in the French universe. Not surprisingly, the majority of articles referred to (more than 75 per cent) were published in Canada, of which the majority were in Québec.

Few voices

Finally, this research shows that certain French-speaking authors were referred to more often than others. As shown in Table 6, twelve scholars, all male, make up 30 per cent of all references of the sample (584 out of

TABLE 6
Principal Authors Referred to

	Referred by English-speaking authors		Referred by French-speaking authors		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
12 First Authors	309	53	275	47	584	100
Others	740	54	638	46	1 378	100
Total	1049		913		1962	

1962 references). Nonetheless, it is necessary to look at the table with caution. Firstly, if this study had analyzed all books in Canadian politics over last ten years (over 300), the list of authors cited the most often could have been quite different (or not). Moreover, when books or journal articles were co-authored, only the first name cited was noted in order to avoid counting the same article more than once. Hence, some scholars who would have been referred to are under-represented in the sample.

This table also shows that non-francophones made only 53.5 per cent of all references to francophone Canadian authors (1,049 out of 1,962 references). Interestingly, they made reference to the same dozen authors as their francophone colleagues. In other words, a relatively limited number of francophone authors have influenced, in the course of the last ten years, the study of Canadian politics. Taking account of the small number of francophone authors regularly cited, it is not possible to identify a global trend. Each of them illustrates a singular trajectory. Of the twelve, five are more often referred to by non-francophones rather than francophones, while another five are in the reverse situation, and the remaining two referred to equally by scholars of both languages.

One must ask if collaborating with non-francophone colleagues increases one's chances of being referred to in literature. As illustrated in Table 7, no clear tendency can be shown in this regard. Again, the small number of authors gave way to particular trajectories. It is possible to indicate that the three most referenced French-speaking scholars belong to pan-Canadian networks, and are, proportionally, the ones who most often co-author texts with English scholars. This collaboration has clearly contributed to their status within the profession among non-francophone scholars. Alone, they comprised 13 per cent of francophone references. Nevertheless, with few rare exceptions, it does not seem that collaborating with a non-francophone colleague increases one's chances of being cited; altogether, around 70 per cent of referenced texts were single authored.

TABLE 7
Principal Authors Referred to, as Collaborator or Single Author

	Work In Collaboration				Single Author		Total	
	with Anglophone(s)		with Francophone(s)					
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
12 First Authors	214	36.6	87	14.9	283	48.5	584	100
Others	116	8.4	166	12.0	1096	79.5	1378	100
Total	330	16.8	253	12.9	1379	70.3	1962	100

Introduction to "Canadian" politics

Finally, five recent introductory books in Canadian politics (appendix D) were analyzed for a total of 2,726 references. These data appear sufficiently significant to be able to draw up a certain number of observations. The aim of singling out introductory books is to assess the extent to which the perspectives of francophone scholars are integrated within the general understanding of the Canadian political realities, such as those taught at the undergraduate level in Canadian universities.

Introductory books play an important role in the discipline for three reasons. First, they contribute to reproduce the way in which the scientific field is structured. For example, the end of each chapter of three of these five books contained lists of "Further readings," "Selected readings" or "Selected bibliography," revealing the structuring character of introductory works. Second, these lists allow students of Canadian politics to identify authors and works that "define" the main problems in the field and the terms in which they are defined. Finally, these introductory books socialize new generations of students who, some more than others, will go on to contribute to the discipline. More importantly, the training of these students prepares them to become social and political actors in their own associations, political parties, interest groups, political institutions, and private enterprises. Their university training gives them the analytical tools to understand social and political reality on which they will eventually have a certain influence, as active players, or, more simply, though no less importantly, as citizens. This is why the presence (or absence) of certain perspectives and issues is not trivial.

The results obtained for this category of books are similar to those that characterize the literature as a whole. On average, only 4 per cent of references refer to francophone Canadian scholars (taking into account the small number of books, the variation with the median is small; the latter had 3.6 per cent). Among the so-called "suggested readings" lists,

the proportion is exactly the same, being 4.1 per cent (or 47 of 1135 suggested titles). This is particularly significant because the lists of suggested readings are limited to works written by Canadian authors.

Overall, the contributions of francophone Canadian scholars to the field of "Canadian" politics seem very marginal when introductory books on Canadian politics are taken into account.

Conclusion

Far from having passed through, as the new Governor General hoped, the time of the "two solitudes," the English Canadian intellectual tradition is still defined by it. Although it is possible to estimate the contribution of francophone scholars as being between 20 and 25 per cent of all knowledge produced in Canada, their work is not taken into account in a similar proportion to the works published by non-francophone scholars on Canadian politics and society.

As was suspected from the beginning, the production and the reproduction of knowledge, from introductory textbooks to specialized studies, ignore an important portion of scholarly works. In a certain way, this situation is analogous to with the phenomenon of systemic discrimination where such discrimination is defined as being

neither explicit, nor voluntary, nor even conscious or intentional, but revealed within a system [that], most often, underscores a type of management founded on a certain number of preconceived notions, usually implicit, pertaining to diverse groups, and understanding and comprising a number of practices and customs that perpetuate a situation of inequality with respect to members of the targeted group. (Legault, 2002—my translation)

Systemic discrimination is likely anchored in a form of cultural imperialism that is pernicious precisely and especially because it ignores the processes at play.

This study clearly demonstrates that power relations are also exercised in the field of science. The fact of ignoring, or worse, excluding, a significant proportion of scholarly works in the analysis and understanding of the Canadian reality is problematic in many regards; it produces a biased representation of social reality, and leads to tendencies to universalize the research questions of the dominant group, thereby marginalizing a group of scholars systemically discriminated against, while contributing to a disproportional increase of the influence of scholars who already serve as the social actors through which public authorities define both problems and solutions before them, even if their influence might be indirect or diffuse. In short, this phenomenon illustrates the manner in which representations of social and political reality are con-

structed in Canada, as the point of view of francophone scholars is only rarely taken into consideration. When it is taken into account, it is often only by a handful of intellectuals.⁴ The production of knowledge about Canada is both limited and biased. The dominant discursive universe reinforces itself, for reasons that need to be elaborated upon. It shows itself to be minimally open, sensitive, or conscious of the presence of a significant body of literature.

This research does not adequately measure, nor does it strive to, prejudices experienced by francophone Canadian scholars (in terms of access to pan-Canadian and foreign networks among other things). It does, however, reflect an absence of recognition of their contribution to the advancement of knowledge, especially when it deals with Canadian politics. The situation describes in this analysis is probably not specific to political science and is more likely applicable to other fields such as sociology, economics and even history.

The prescriptions placed by Guy Rocher in 1970 have been largely followed. In the course of the last decades, francophone scholars have published hundreds, if not thousands, of studies. It seems that the quality, number, and dissemination of these works have had little to do with whether they were referred to or not. Language could be an explanatory factor but serves, however, as a poor excuse for any researcher whose object of study is the social and political reality of Canada.

During the Quebec referendum on sovereignty in 1995, a federalist slogan proclaimed "My Canada includes Quebec." More than ten years later, it is difficult to recall it without a certain level of irony, regret, deception, or lucidity, depending on one's political sentiments.

Notes

- 1 The universe of French-speaking scholars in Canada is not limited to French universities in Quebec. It also includes the scholarship of French-speaking individuals working in universities outside of Québec (Université de Moncton, University of Ottawa, Royal Military College in Kingston etc.). However, it excludes English-speaking scholars holding positions in French-speaking universities. In this text, the terms French-speaking and francophone scholars are used interchangeably.
- 2 This list does not include every single publisher (for example, Arbeiter Ring Publishing, Between the Lines, ISER Books, Thomson Nelson, University of Calgary Press, University of Manitoba Press, Wilfrid Laurier University Press). It is nonetheless sufficiently representative to account for the variety of works published in this field of research.
- 3 Because of the cost involved, no tabulation was done to count the proportion of non-Canadian authors in books analyzed. That would have required enquiring about the country of origin of all authors referred to and not only the location of their publications.
- 4 We are conscious of the fact that analyzing how referencing the work is not enough. Someone may reference 10 works without having really read them. It is not neces-

sarily quantity that has to be taken into account. This research has not assessed how Canadian scholars read, digest, and incorporate the ideas presented or challenge them in their own work.

References

- Archambault, É., É. Vignola-Gagné, G. Côté, V. Larivière and Y. Gingras. 2006. “Benchmarking scientific output in the social sciences and humanities: The limits of existing databases.” *Scientometrics* 68(3): 329–42. http://www.science-metrix.com/pdf/Benchmarking_SSH.pdf (April 6, 2006).
- Bickerton, James. 2007. “La question du nationalisme majoritaire au Canada.” In *Les nationalismes majoritaires contemporains: identité, mémoire, pouvoir*, ed. Alain-G. Gagnon, André Lecours and Geneviève Nootens. Montréal: Québec-Amérique, 217–70.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc Wacquant. 1998. “Sur les ruses de la raison impérialiste.” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 121/122: 109–18.
- Gaudreault-Desbiens, Jean-François. 2005. “Citizenship Between the Solitudes.” *Nexus* (University of Toronto, Faculty of Law) Fall–Winter: 32–36.
- Gullestad, Marianne. 2002. “Invisible Fences: Egalitarianism, Nationalism and Racism.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 8: 45–63.
- Jean, Michaëlle. 2005. *Installation Speech—The Right Honourable Michaëlle Jean Governor General of Canada on the occasion of her Installation*. September 27. <http://www.gg.ca/media/doc.asp?lang=e&DocID=4574> (April 11, 2006).
- Jenson, Jane. 1998. “Recognizing Difference: Distinct Society, Citizenship Regimes and Partnerships.” In *Beyond the Impasse: Toward Reconciliation*, ed. Roger Gibbins and Guy Laforest. Montreal: IRPP.
- Larivière, V., É. Archambault, Y. Gingras and É. Vignola-Gagné. 2005. “The Place of Serials in Referencing Practices: Comparing Natural Sciences and Engineering with Social Sciences and Humanities.” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (forthcoming). http://www.ost.qc.ca/OST/pdf/articles/2005/Share_Serials.pdf (April 6, 2006).
- Leclerc, Michel. 1988. “Le marché des langues en sciences: le français et l’identité nationale.” *Études canadiennes/Canadian Studies* 25: 23–40.
- Lecours, André and Geneviève Nootens. 2007. “Comprendre le nationalisme majoritaire.” In *Les nationalismes majoritaires contemporains: identité, mémoire, pouvoir*, ed. Alain-G. Gagnon, André Lecours and Geneviève Nootens. Montréal: Québec-Amérique, 19–45.
- Legault, Marie-Josée. 2002. “La situation des groupes cibles sur le marché du travail, au Québec et au Canada.” In *Équité en emploi-équité salariale. Recueil de textes*. http://www.ffq.qc.ca/commission-2004/Fiche_4_discrimination.pdf (April 26, 2006).
- McRoberts, Kenneth. 1993. “Disagreeing on Fundamentals: English Canada and Quebec.” In *The Charlottetown Accord, the Referendum and the Future of Canada*, ed. Patrick Monahan and Kenneth McRoberts. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 249–63.
- McRoberts, Kenneth. 1997. *Misconceiving Canada: the Struggle for National Unity*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Meisel, John, Guy Rocher and Arthur Silver, eds. 1999. *Si je me souviens bien/As I Recall: Regards sur l’histoire*. Institut de recherche en politiques publiques. Montréal: IRPP.
- Resnick, Philip. 1995. “English Canada: The Nation That Dares Not Speak Its Name.” In *Beyond Quebec: Taking Stock of Canada*, ed. Kenneth McRoberts. Montréal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 81–92.
- Rocher, Guy. 1973. “Réflexions sur le métier de sociologue au Québec et au Canada.” In *Le Québec en mutation*. Montréal: Hurtubise HMH, 262–78.

Appendix A—Books Analyzed

1. Abu-Laban, Yasmeen and Christina Gabriel. 2002. *Selling Diversity: Immigration, Multiculturalism, Employment*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
2. Ajzenstat, Janet. 2003. *The Once and Future Canadian Democracy: An Essay in Political Thought*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
3. Armitage, Andrew. 2003. *Social Welfare in Canada*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
4. Bakvis, Herman and Grace Skogstad. 2002. *Canadian Federalism: Performance, Effectiveness and Legitimacy*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
5. Bashevkin, Sylvia B. 2002. *Welfare Hot Buttons: Women, Work, and Social Policy Reform*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
6. Beale, Alison and Annette Van Den Bosch. 1998. *Ghosts in the Machine: Women and Cultural Policy in Canada and Australia*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
7. Beiner, Ronald and Wayne Norman. 2001. *Canadian Political Philosophy: Contemporary Reflections*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
8. Bickerton, James and Alain-G. Gagnon. 1999. *Canadian Politics*, 3rd ed. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
9. Bickerton, James and Alain-G. Gagnon. 2004. *Canadian Politics*, 4th ed. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
10. Bickerton, James, Alain-G. Gagnon and Patrick J. Smith Patrick. 1999. *Ties that Bind: Parties and Voters in Canada*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
11. Blattberg, Charles. 2003. *Shall We Dance? A Patriotic Politics for Canada*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
12. Boychuk, Gerard William. 1998. *Patchwork of Purpose: The Development of Provincial Social Assistance Regimes*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
13. Briskin, Linda and Mona Eliasson. 1999. *Women's Organizing and Public Policy in Canada and Sweden*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
14. Brodie, Janine. 1995. *Politics on the Margin: Restructuring and the Canadian Women's Movement*. Halifax NS: Fernwood.
15. Brooks Stephen and Lydia Miljan. 2003. *Public Policy in Canada: An Introduction*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
16. Brooks, Stephen. 1996. *Canadian Democracy: An Introduction*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
17. Brown, Douglas M. 2002. *Market Rules: Economic Union Reform and Intergovernmental Policy-Making*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
18. Burke, Mike, Colin Mooers and John Shields. 2000. *Restructuring and Resistance: Canadian Public Policy in the Age of Global Capitalism*. Halifax NS: Fernwood.
19. Cardinal, Linda and David Headon. 2002. *Shaping Nations: Constitutionalism and Society in Australia and Canada*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
20. Carens, Joseph H. 1995. *Is Quebec Nationalism Just?: Perspectives from Anglophone Canada*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
21. Chennells, David. 2001. *The Politics of Nationalism in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
22. Clarke, Harold D., Allan Kornberg and Peter Wearing. 2000. *A Polity on the Edge: Canada and the Politics of Fragmentation*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
23. Clement, Wallace. 1997. *Understanding Canada: Building on the New Canadian Political Economy*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
24. Cormier, Jeffrey. 2004. *The Canadianization Movement: Emergence, Survival, and Success*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

25. Courtney, John C. 1995. *Do Conventions Matter? Choosing National Party Leaders in Canada*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
26. Cross, William. 2002. *Political Parties, Representation, and Electoral Democracy in Canada*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
27. Cross, William. 2004. *Political Parties*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
28. Day, Richard J. F. 2000. *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
29. d'Haenens, Leed et al. 1998. *Images of Canadianness: Visions on Canada's Politics, Culture, Economics*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
30. Dobuzinskis, Laurent, Michael Howlett and David Laydock. 1996. *Policy Study in Canada: The State of the Art*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
31. Doern, G. Bruce and Mark MacDonald. 1998. *Free Trade Federalism: Negotiating the Canadian Agreement on Internal Trade*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
32. Doran, Charles F. 2001. *Why Canadian Unity Matters and Why Americans Care: Democratic Pluralism at Risk*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
33. Fierlbeck, Katherine. 2005. *The Development of Political Thought in Canada: An Anthology*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
34. Gibbins, Roger and Loleen Berdahl. 2003. *Western Visions, Western Future: Perspectives on the West in Canada*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
35. Gidengil, Elizabeth, André Blais, Neil Nevitte and Richard Nadeau. 2004. *Citizens*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
36. Helmes-Hayes, Rick and James Curtis. 1998. *The Vertical Mosaic Revisited*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
37. Hoberg, George. 2002. *Capacity for Choice: Canada in a New North America*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
38. Howe, Robert Brian. 2000. *Restraining Equality: Human Rights Commissions in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
39. Howlett, Michael and David Laycock. 1998. *The Puzzle of Power: An Introduction to Political Science*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
40. Inwood, Gregory J. 2005. *Continentalizing Canada: The Politics and Legacy of the MacDonald Royal Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
41. Johnson, David. 2002. *Thinking Government: Ideas, Policies, Institutions*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
42. Kelley, Ninette and Michael Trebilcock. 1998. *The Making of the Mosaic: A History of Canadian Immigration Policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
43. Kymlicka, Will. 1998. *Finding Our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
44. LaSelva, Samuel V. 1996. *The Moral Foundation of Canadian Federalism: Paradoxes, Achievements, and Tragedies of Nationhood*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
45. Lazar, Harvey. 2000. *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1999–2000. Toward a New Mission Statement for Canadian Fiscal Federalism*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
46. McBride, Stephen and John Shields. 1997. *Dismantling a Nation: The Transition to Corporate Rule in Canada*. Halifax NS: Fernwood.
47. McElligott, Greg. 2001. *Beyond Service: State Workers, Public Policy, and the Prospects for Democratic Administration*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
48. MacIvor, Heather. 1996. *Women and Politics in Canada*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
49. McRoberts, Kenneth. 1995. *Beyond Quebec: Taking Stock of Canada*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

50. McRoberts, Kenneth. 1997. *Misconceiving Canada: The Struggle for National Unity*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
51. Madison, G.B., Paul Fairfield and Ingrid Harris. 2000. *Is There a Canadian Philosophy? Reflections on the Canadian Identity*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
52. Meekison, J. Peter, Hamish Telford and Harvey Lazar. 2004. *Canada: The State of the Federation, 2002. Reconsidering the Institutions of Canadian Federalism*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
53. Mulvale, James P. 2001. *Reimagining Social Welfare: Beyond the Keynesian Welfare State*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
54. Nevitte, Neil. 1996. *The Decline of Deference: Canadian Value Change in Cross-National Perspective*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
55. Nevitte, Neil. 2002. *Value Change and Governance in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
56. Nevitte, Neil et al. 1999. *Unsteady State: The 1997 Federal Election*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
57. Ornstein, Michael and H. Michael Stevenson. 1999. *Politics and Ideology in Canada: Elite and Public Opinion*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
58. Pulkinghan, Jane and Gordon Ternowetsky. 1996. *Remaking Canadian Social Policy: Social Security in the Late 1990s*. Halifax NS: Fernwood.
59. Quaid, Maeve. 2002. *Workfare: Why Good Social Policy Ideas Go Bad*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
60. Rice, James J. 2000. *Changing Politics of Canadian Social Policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
61. Robinson, Gertrude. 1998. *Constructing the Quebec Referendum: French and English Media Voices*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
62. Rocher, François and Miriam Smith. 1995. *New Trends in Canadian Federalism*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
63. Rocher, François and Miriam Smith. 2003. *New Trends in Canadian Federalism*, 2nd ed. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
64. Romney, Paul. 1999. *Getting it Wrong: How Canadians Forgot Their Past and Imperilled Confederation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
65. Smith, David E. 1995. *The Invisible Crown: the First Principle of Canadian Government*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
66. Smith, David E. 1999. *The Republican Option in Canada, Past and Present*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
67. Smith, David E. 2003. *The Canadian Senate in Bicameral Perspective*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
68. Smith, Gordon and Daniel Wolfish, eds. 2001. *Who is Afraid of the State? Canada in a World of Multiple Centres of Power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
69. Smith, Jennifer. 2004. *Federalism*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
70. Stevenson, Garth. 2004. *Unfulfilled Union: Canadian Federalism and National Unity*. 4th ed. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
71. Telford, Hamish and Harvey Lazar. 2002. *Canada: The State of the Federation 2001. Canadian Political Culture(s) in Transition*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
72. Thomas, David M. 1997. *Whistling Past the Graveyard: Constitutional Abeyances, Quebec and the Future of Canada*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
73. Trent, John E., Robert A. Young and Guy Lachapelle. 1996. *Quebec Canada: What is the Path Ahead?* Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
74. Urmetzer, Peter. 2005. *Globalization Unplugged: Sovereignty and the Canadian State in the Twenty-First Century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

75. Watson, William G. 1998. *Globalization and the Meaning of Canadian Life*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
76. Young, Lisa and Keith Archer. 2002. *Regionalism and Party Politics in Canada*. Don Mills ON: Oxford University Press.
77. Young, Lisa and Joanna Everitt. 2004. *Advocacy Group*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
78. Young, Robert A. 1998. *The Secession of Quebec and the Future of Canada*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
79. Young, Robert A. 1999. *The Struggle for Quebec: From Referendum to Referendum?* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University.

Appendix B—Books Concerned in Large Part with Canada–Québec Relations

1. Blattberg, Charles. 2003. *Shall We Dance? A Patriotic Politics for Canada*.
2. Carens, Joseph H. 1995. *Is Quebec Nationalism Just?*
3. Chennells David. 2001. *The Politics of Nationalism in Canada*
4. McRoberts, Kenneth. 1997. *Misceiving Canada*.
5. Robinson, Gertrude. 1998. *Constructing the Quebec Referendum*.
6. Thomas, David M. 1997. *Whistling Past the Graveyard*.
7. Trent, John E., Robert A. Young and Guy Lachapelle. 1996. *Quebec Canada: What is the Path Ahead?*
8. Young, Robert A. 1998. *The Secession of Quebec and the Future of Canada*.
9. Young, Robert A. 1999. *The Struggle for Quebec*.

Appendix C—Chapters Written by Francophone Authors

1. Balthazar, Louis. 1998. “The Liberal Idea of the Canadian Nation-State.” In *Images of Canadianness*.
2. Bauer, Julien and Philippe Le Prestre. 2001. “The State between Civil Society and the International System.” In *Who Is Afraid of the State? Canada in a World of Multiple Centres of Power*.
3. Bickerton, James and Alain G. Gagnon. 2004. “Political Parties and Electoral Politics.” In *Canadian Politics*. 4th ed.
4. Boucher, Edith and Arndt Vermaeten. 2000. “Changes to Federal Transfers.” In *Toward a New Mission Statement for Canadian Fiscal Federalism*.
5. Bourgault, Jacques. 2004. “Quebec’s Role in Canadian Federal-Provincial Relations.” In *Canada: The State of the Federation, 2002*.
6. Michaud, Nelson. 2004. “Quebec and North American Integration: Making Room for a Sub-National Actor?” In *Canada: The State of the Federation, 2002*.
7. Duquette, Michel. 1995. “Conflicting Trends in Canadian Federalism: The Case of Energy Policy.” In *New Trends in Canadian Federalism*, 1st ed.
8. Gagné, Gilbert. 2002. “North American Integration and Canadian Culture.” In *Capacity for Choice*.
9. Hébert, Raymond M. 1998. “Identity, Cultural Production and the Vitality of Francophone Communities outside Quebec.” In *Images of Canadianness*.
10. Gagnon, Alain-G. 1995. “The Political Uses of Federalism.” In *New Trends in Canadian Federalism*. 1st ed.
11. Gagnon, Alain-G. 1999. “Quebec’s Constitutional Odyssey.” In *Canadian Politics*. 3rd ed.

12. Gagnon, Alain-G. and Can Erk. 2002. "Legitimacy, Effectiveness, and Federalism: On the Benefits of Ambiguity." In *Canadian Federalism: Performance, Effectiveness and Legitimacy*.
13. Gagnon, Alain-G. and Raffaele Iacovino. 2002. "Framing Citizenship Status in an Age of Polyethnicity: Quebec's Model of Interculturalism." In *Canada: The State of the Federation, 2001*.
14. Hobson, Paul A. R. and France St-Hilaire. 2000. "The Evolution of Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements." In *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1999-2000*.
15. Jaenen, Cornelius J. 1998. "The Belgian Presence in Canada." In *Images of Canadianness*.
16. Laforest, Guy. 2001. "The True Nature of Sovereignty: Reply to My Critics Concerning Trudeau and the End of a Canadian Dream." In *Canadian Political Philosophy: Contemporary Reflections*.
17. Landry, Réjean. 1996. "Rational Choice and Canadian Policy Studies." In *Policy Study in Canada: the State of the Art*.
18. Leblanc, Phyllis E. 1995. "Francophone Minorities: The Fragmentation of the French-Canadian Identity." In *Beyond Quebec*.
19. Le Prestre, Philippe. 2001. "International Convention Secretariats and Canada's Role in Future Environmental Governance." In *Who is Afraid of the State?*
20. Leydet, Dominique. 2001. "Lifeboat." In *Canadian Political Philosophy: Contemporary Reflections*.
21. Maillé, Chantal and Lena Wängnerud. 1999. "Women's Organizing and the Political Parties." In *Women's Organizing and Public Policy in Canada and Sweden*.
22. Massicotte, Louis. 1999. "Parliament in the 1990s." In *Canadian Politics*. 3rd ed.
23. Paquet, Gilles. 2002. "Innovations in Governance in Canada." In *Shaping Nations: Constitutionalism and Society in Australia and Canada*.
24. Réaume, Denise G. 2001. "Legal Multiculturalism from the Bottom Up." In *Canadian Political Philosophy: Contemporary Reflections*.
25. Rocher, François and Christian Rouillard. 2002. "Redefining the Locus of Power." In *Capacity for Choice*.
26. Rocher, François and Richard Nimjean. 1995. "Global Economic Restructuring and the Evolution of Canadian Federalism and Constitutionalism." In *New Trends in Canadian Federalism*. 1st ed.
27. Savoie, Donald J. 1995. "Regional Development: A Policy for All Seasons." In *New Trends in Canadian Federalism*. 1st ed.
28. Savoie, Donald J. 1999. "The Civil Service." In *Canadian Politics*. 3rd ed.
29. Savoie, Donald J. 2003. "Regional Development: A Policy for All Seasons and All Regions." *New Trends in Canadian Federalism*. 2nd ed.
30. Savoie, Donald J. 2004. "Power at the Apex: Executive Dominance." In *Canadian Politics*. 4th ed.
31. Rocher, François and Miriam Smith. 2003. "Introduction." In *New Trends in Canadian Federalism*. 2nd ed.
32. Rocher, François and Miriam Smith. 2003. "Four Dimensions of the Canadian Constitutional Debate." In *New Trends in Canadian Federalism*. 2nd ed.
33. Papillon, Martin and Richard Simeon. 2004. "The Weakest Link? First Ministers Conference in Canadian Intergovernmental Relations." In *Canada: The State of the Federation, 2002*.
34. Salée, Daniel. 2002. "Quebec's Changing Political Culture and the Future of Federal-Provincial Relations in Canada." In *Canada: The State of the Federation 2001*.
35. Salée, Daniel and William Coleman. 1997. "The Challenges of the Quebec Questions: Paradigm, Counter-Paradigm, and... ?" In *Understanding Canada*.

36. Vaillancourt, Yves. 1996. “Remaking Canadian Social Policy: A Québec Viewpoint.” In *Remaking Canadian Social Policy*.
37. Vandycke, Robert. 1995. “The 1982 Constitution and the Charter of Rights.” In *New Trends in Canadian Federalism*. 1st ed.
38. Weinstock, Daniel M. 2001. “Saving Democracy from Deliberation.” In *Canadian Political Philosophy: Contemporary Reflections*.

Appendix D—Introductory Books on Canadian politics

1. Dyck, Rand. 2004. *Canadian Politics. Critical Approaches*. 4th ed. Scarborough: Thomson Nelson, 2004.
2. Grace, Joan and Byron Sheldrick. 2004. *Canadian Politics. Democracy and Dissent*. Toronto: Pearson Prentice-Hall.
3. Guy, J. J. 2006. *People, Politics, and Government. A Canadian Perspective*. 6th ed. Toronto: Pearson Prentice-Hall.
4. Jackson, Robert, Doreen Jackson and Nicolas Baxter-Moore. 2006. *Politics in Canada. Culture, Institutions, Behaviour and Public Policy*. 6th ed. Toronto: Pearson Prentice-Hall.
5. Whittington, Michael and Glen Williams. 2004. *Canadian Politics in the 21st Century*. Scarborough: Thomson Nelson.