The future of Canadian Studies: A Gen-Xer’s perspective

When I was invited to write on the future of Canadian Studies from the perspective of a scholar new to the field, I immediately jumped at the opportunity. Then the panic set in. I quickly realized that I really did not know that much about the history of the field and that published historical reflections on Canadian Studies were relatively scarce. What follows, therefore, is a brief autobiographical account of how I came to find myself in a Canadian Studies department and, on the basis of that limited vantage point, an attempt to offer some of my reflections on the future of Canadian Studies.

ECONOMIC CYCLES AND CAREER CHOICES
As befitting the worst nightmares of Robin Matthews, I completed my BA in philosophy in 1993 at an institution that nowadays brands itself as “Canada’s University” without ever taking a Canadian-focused course. To no one’s surprise, my freshly minted BA failed to open any career opportunities, and I continued to work as a waiter in an art café in Ottawa’s Byward Market. Canada was in a prolonged recession for the first 10 years or so of my adult life. Other Gen-Xers and I listened as the newly regnant baby boomers called upon us to sacrifice for the benefit of the national economy’s longterm health. The irony of the boomers calling upon us to sacrifice for the benefit of the national economy’s longterm health.

This bleak economic reality and the generally dispiriting character of a Canadian public culture dominated by the likes of Mulroney, Chrétien, Martin, Harris, and Parizeau forced a renegotiation of my relationship to the Canadian state and to Canadian nationalism. As I watched the standoff at Oka and Ipperwash, the Somalia Inquiry, Chrétien throttling a protestor, and RCMP officers pepper-spraying demonstrators in Vancouver, it became quite clear to me that the Canadian state had shed whatever utopian potential it might have once had in the 1960s and 1970s. Instead, it had revealed itself to be yet another liberal capitalist institution whose main role was to protect and expand enconced interests by any means necessary.

In spite of my anxiety about the very real prospect of downward mobility, my loss of faith in the Canadian state, and my growing annoyance toward my baby-boomer customers, working in a busy tourist district did come with the unexpected benefit of forcing me to try to explain Canada to tourists. They asked me many questions to which I could provide no clear answers. It gradually became clear to me that, as an aspiring intellectual, I would have to come to grips with the country in which I lived.

CULTURAL STUDIES AS A WINDOW INTO CANADA
In order to pursue this growing curiosity about Canada and to hopefully improve my economic prospects, I enrolled in Carleton’s MA program in Mass Communication. One reason for my attraction to the program was that I, like many people who know little about their country and its history, was probably still a cultural nationalist. From the outside looking in, the program looked like a nationalist paradise: courses in the political economy of communication, international communication, cultural policy, and the relationships among media, capitalism, and democracy.

For these scholars, the most interest-
ing examples of Canadian culture came from intellectuals and cultural producers who resisted the attempt by the Canadian nation-building apparatus to co-opt them for its own legitimation/nation-building projects. Like them, I was always struck by the fact that while the study of Canada should be fascinating because all of the complexities and contradictions of modernity could be found in one place—colonization, imperialism, nationalism, industrialization, globalization, democratization, mass immigration, and so on—the reality (especially before the 1990s) was generally disappointing, boring, and uninsightful. Because Canadian writers seemed obsessed with defining the Canadian identity or reading the Canadian past as a prefiguration of their preferred model of the Canadian or Québécois nation-state, they often overlooked the object of their study in their rush to secure their own political projects. In my MA research on New France, for example, I was struck primarily by, quite frankly, the weirdness of the French colonial project (canoe-licensing systems, missionaries teaching Aboriginal men the need to beat their children and wives, etc.) but the majority of the historians skirted around such details in order to prove how the colony’s history does or does not support the claims of Quebec secessionists. What I learned quickly from all of this was that the best place to learn about Canada was from the writings of British, European, or American writers on Canada or Canadian writers who were positioned at the margins of the traditionally defined Canadian nation. Presumably because neither was part of the Canadian garrison to begin with, they had a certain freedom to see and say things that the “official” or would-be “official” voices of the “national soul” would or could not.

This increased scepticism toward Canadian nationalism, the Canadian state, and the received tradition of writing about Canada was exacerbated by my master’s and doctoral thesis research, which familiarized me with the growing body of research in the areas of Canadian aboriginal studies, gender studies, cultural studies, and cultural memory studies. As a result, it came as a surprise to many who knew me that I accepted a position at Carleton’s School of Canadian Studies. To me, however, it made perfect sense. Having worked there as a sessional during my PhD, I knew that, under the leadership of directors like Jill Vickers, Pat Armstrong, Natalie Luckyj, François Rocher, and now Pauline Rankin, the School of Canadian Studies had been actively working to take up Vickers’ call in 1994 to develop a Canadian Studies program that rejected “the sexism, the racism, and the Anglo-Canadian ethnic chauvinism ... [and] the emphasis on passivity, dependence and despair” that characterized “much of the underlying thought in Canadian studies.”

In getting the job at Carleton, I thus had the very good fortune of joining a department in which the faculty members and the students were committed to a project of developing new ways of reading and writing Canada. If I had to brand our approach to Canadian Studies, it would have to be the 6 Cs: “Canada is a discursive and material construction that is always contested, contradictory, and complex and must be studied using tools of analysis that are critical and radically contextual.”

TRADITION OF INTERDISCIPLINARITY
In studying Canada in this way, we are helped greatly by the long-standing tradition of interdisciplinarity within Canadian Studies. While it is true that most of the other disciplines in the arts and social sciences have begun to embrace interdisciplinarity in limited ways, the fact of the matter is that Canadian Studies departments have an existing organizational capacity to facilitate the sharing of intellectual resources by scholars from diverse disciplinary backgrounds on an everyday basis. In such a space, interdisciplinary collaboration becomes second nature. Testifying to the intellectual fertility of this atmosphere is the fact that our student numbers, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, have been growing at a rate of 2% per year. In such a space, interdisciplinary collaboration becomes second nature. Testifying to the intellectual fertility of this atmosphere is the fact that our student numbers, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, have been growing at a rate of 2% per year.

Along with its interdisciplinary character, much of our success can be attributed to the strong influence of feminism, critical race theory, and Native Studies in forming the curriculum and intellectual agenda of the School. While I suspect that traditionally defined Canadian Studies programs tended to replicate the discourse of the Canadian State in their mapping of the field (the “problem” of regionalism, the “national unity” issue, etc.) and tended to focus on the activities of “leaders and nations,” we tend to focus on the experience of Canada “from below.” In other words, we study Canada from the vantage point of those who are the objects of the proj-
The hope for community and social solidarity expressed through the creation of Canadian Studies requires renewal.

... has not disappeared; it is evident in the relations between regions and classes in Canada, as well as internationally. The plurality of nations within the Canadian nation-state requires analysis of internal imperialism, which runs parallel with international inequalities. The critique of empire needs to be turned against the history and pretensions of the British Empire and the Canadian state as well as turned outward toward the United States. Perhaps most important, the defence of community in Canadian thought needs to be radicalized into a political and philosophical inquiry into the grounds of human solidarity—for it is this that the neo-liberal economy and the national security state most threatens.
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A growing cleavage between the way that Canadian Studies is being reconceptualized in university departments and the way in which the Canadian Studies project has been conceptualized and institutionalized by the Canadian state. As a result, Pauline Rankin of Carleton University, Pierre Anctil of the University of Ottawa, and Jim Struthers of Trent University have been working with the chairs and directors of other domestic Canadian Studies programs to create a university-based scholarly association. This association has tentatively been named the “Canadian Studies Coordinators Network,” and it plans to hold a national workshop in Ottawa in November 2007 with the aim of strengthening linkages between Canadian Studies programs and faculty in Canada and to begin the process of creating a national organization of Canadianists at the university level. Such an association, I would argue, marks the future of Canadian Studies in Canada: its emergence as an inclusive, mature, and fully autonomous field of study.

Note

Linkages between Programs
While this shift has rejuvenated Canadian-focused research here at Carleton, it seems to have come with a certain price: a growing cleavage between the way that Canadian Studies is being reconceptualized in university departments and the way in which the Canadian Studies project has been conceptualized and institutionalized by the Canadian state. As a result, Pauline Rankin of Carleton University, Pierre Anctil of the University of Ottawa, and Jim Struthers of Trent University have been working with the chairs and directors of other domestic Canadian Studies programs to create a university-based scholarly association. This association has tentatively been named the “Canadian Studies Coordinators Network,” and it plans to hold a national workshop in Ottawa in November 2007 with the aim of strengthening linkages between Canadian Studies programs and faculty in Canada and to begin the process of creating a national organization of Canadianists at the university level. Such an association, I would argue, marks the future of Canadian Studies in Canada: its emergence as an inclusive, mature, and fully autonomous field of study.
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