THE FEDERATED STATE AND THE HETEROGENEITY OF SPACE

GÉRARD BOISMENU

G. Boismenu,
« The Federated State and the Heterogeneity of Space »,
dans *Federation in Canada; selected reading*, G. Stevenson (ed.),
Toronto, McCelland and Stewart, 1989, p. 269-295.

Traduit du français par Garth Stevenson

THE FEDERATED STATE AND THE HETEROGENEITY OF SPACE[1]

When one undertakes to analyze the social, economic, and political reality of Quebec, one is confronted with a major dilemma. Either one maintains the implications, mistakes, and misunderstandings of an already existing literature, and consequently places oneself within that tradition, or else one decides to confront the problem directly and must make a theoretical detour in order to employ a new methodology. The following propositions are presented as a consequence of clearly opting for the second approach.

As Daniel Salée emphasizes, Quebec society appears, in most of the existing studies, to be detached from Canada as a whole. Attention is concentrated on the specificity of Quebec and on the Quebec "state," leaving unexamined the relations between Quebec society and Canadian society, neglecting to situate the Quebec state within the whole of the Canadian federated state. On the pretext that it is a federated state, everything proceeds as though the Canadian state were dismantled into distinct parts endowed with an independent logic and coherence.

The theoretical and practical consequences of such a concept for research are numerous. Notably, the concept has a certain influence on studies of Quebec that are founded on the concept of class struggle and inspired by historical materialism. This influence shows itself in turn, or all at once, in three ways.

1. Quebec is at best located in the Canadian social formation in an intuitive or descriptive way. Quebec's "regional specificity"

can be summarily outlined without being rigorously based in theory.[2] Despite certain terminological propositions, the conceptualization is inadequate in the way it inserts Quebec into the whole of Canada, both at the economic and at the political-ideological level. However, this is still better than the analyses which, beginning with the fact of national oppression, end by viewing the structures of Canada/Quebec as parallel and separate.[3]

2. The Canadian state is perceived in terms of a model of the state that is the product of two different modes of analysis, analysis of the bourgeoisie in terms of its fractions, which are assumed to have no relations that can be perceived, and analysis of the two levels of government in terms of relations that also cannot be perceived. This means that each fraction or layer of the bourgeoisie is assigned to one level of government, with some other fraction assigned to the other level.[4] This approach lends to a mechanistic view of class relations in the Canadian state. I will return to this subject.
3. Class relations vis-à-vis the provincial level of the state are not studied in their totality. The provincial level is analyzed as a state, perhaps qualified as a "truncated" state, tending to materialize a distinct power. Consequently, one seeks, at least implicitly, to locate the class direction that is the basis of the power materialized by the state. The provincial level of the state is then placed in relation more specifically with the classes more influenced, in their composition, by the territorial limits of the province (the non-monopolist bourgeoisie, the middle class, and the farmers), significantly underestimating the main component of the power bloc – a component that directs the power structure within the federated state – the big bourgeoisie.[5]

It seems quite essential, in an effort to escape from these effects and theoretical tendencies, to present some conceptual tools that enable us to establish the relations between the specific reality (society and state apparatus) of Quebec and the whole of the Canadian reality, and to uncover the social base that produces the specificity of the

class relations being analyzed In this perspective, the spatial configuration in which these relations are connected is placed at the heart of the discussion. We must inevitably approach the problem of the social space as it appears in Canada and place Quebec in relation to that space. Thus I will deal, in the first place, with the connection between class relations in the space of the Canadian social formation and those in the regional space of Quebec. Secondly, I will attack the question of the mediatized reproduction of the connection between these relations in and through the Canadian federated state.

To treat this project in depth would surpass the framework of this chapter – I will limit myself especially to formulating propositions that will allow me to outline a methodology. More specifically, presenting the concept of a social formation space associated with Canada will allow me to introduce the concept of a regional space. These are starting points that can lead to a discussion concerning the Canadian federated state and the mode of expression of the contradictory class relationships that pervade it.

SOCIAL FORMATION SPACE AND REGIONAL SPACES IN CANADA

The concept of "space" that guides the discussion is mainly inspired by the work of Alain Lipietz. The social space is understood as the dynamic product of the spatial deployment of the connections between class relations, as they appear at the economic, political, and ideological levels. Considering that the connection between social structures defines the "morphology" of space, the specific modes of connection between the structures engender a differentiation of concrete spaces. Thus one can say, with Lipietz, that "the structuring of space is the spatial dimension of social relations and, since these are class struggles, the structuring of space is class struggle, not only in the sense that it is the product of class struggle, but in the sense that it is the object, and even an instrument of class struggle."[6] This comprehension of social space, which sees in it the differentiated materialization of a form of inscription of the class struggle, takes us far from a primary locating of territory in the reality of space.

The deepening of this understanding of space allows one to grasp the complexity of the configuration and of the modes of articulation of class relations in Canada in their spatial setting. To begin with, it must be recognized that Canada, as a socio-economic space and as a state, has been constituted and formed similarly to other societies dominated by capitalism, notwithstanding its distinctive characteristics. Conceptually, one must not lose sight of the fact that Canada is a capitalist social formation.

THE PROCESS OF ESTABLISHING THE SOCIAL FORMATION IN CANADA

In the British colonies of North America the beginning of class struggles in the mid-nineteenth century was marked by the development of capitalism and became part of the process of constituting a social formation space, a process whose political object revolved around the formation of the Canadian federation.[7] A many-faceted fundamental tendency gave impetus to the constitution of a unified space and of a state uniting the British colonies. This movement grew mainly out of the interests of the mother country, the rise of a commercial and financial bourgeoisie, the plans of the railway companies, the development of industrial capital, and the need to enlarge the field of capital accumulation and to create an internal market.

This movement, however, was not one-sided and straightforward; it encountered resistance and opposition that necessitated the political compromise of federalism. I will return later to this compromise. I would like to emphasize at this point that the process of constituting the Canadian space, as a social formation, was highly contradictory. On the one hand it was directed by the bourgeoisie and had the tendency to provide an overall unity of the development of economic, political, and ideological relations; it was a process of constituting an overall direction of class relations on the basis of which developed a typical organization of political power relations. But on the other hand, this process was influenced from the beginning by a striking regional specificity of class relations and it is known that subsequently the process could only develop by way of renewing and reinforcing

this specificity. Historical perspective makes it possible to affirm that the structuring of the unity of the Canadian social formation was marked by the competitive existence of opposing tendencies, of varying intensity, expressing the regional specificity of class relations.

Historically, it thus appears that the establishment of the Canadian space and state was part of a general process of establishing the capitalist social formation and state but that this process was only completed by overcoming, always provisionally, the contradictory tendencies that indicate a diversified class base. Locating this contradictory character requires a theoretical reflection on the form of articulation of social relations that makes the social formation and differentiates this space.

THE SPACE OF THE SOCIAL FORMATION

Contrary to what a simplistic view might suggest, the domination of capitalist production in society has not eliminated all the other forms of production; thus it must be recognized that other types of productive relations lead to the production of material goods. The concept of a social formation, created to express the complexity of social relations, allows us to understand the concrete social reality, which is structured by the way different coexisting productive relations are combined. Far from coexisting in an anarchic manner or in mutual isolation, the different productive relations are connected in such a way that one type of productive relations is dominant and its laws have a decisive influence on the others.

Following the historical process of class struggles, the capitalist mode of production becomes dominant in the social formation, attaining a certain coherence and a certain correspondence between its different levels of social relations (economic, political, and ideological). The arrival of capitalist domination assumes a spatial dimension of the first importance. In effect, the transformation of the social formation under the direction of rising capitalism is accompanied by the structuring of new social space[8] (whose matrix differs from those of the ancient or medieval societies) and by the destruction of economic, political, ideological, and linguistic barriers. These barriers are contrary to the existence of a broader market and field of accumulation and to

the organization of political power in a state that controls the major processes of organization of the space. This new space has typically, although not always, taken the form of the nation-state.

In the course of consolidating its dominance, the capitalist mode of production determines the principal organization of the whole of social relations, both at the level of the economic base and at that of the superstructure, and it reproduces itself on a larger scale. In these circumstances, within the capitalist social formation space, appear the problems of the "persistence" of the dominated forms of production, the connection of these forms to capitalism, and the effect the reproduction of capital has on them.

The reproduction of capital, as enlarged social reproduction, carries in its wake the totality of social relations – capitalist and non-capitalist – and produces two kinds of significant effects on the development of non-capitalist relations. Firstly, it tends toward the dissolution – decay and destruction – of the non-capitalist forms of production. Secondly, it tends to conserve and maintain them, subsuming them within itself and restructuring them. In the capitalist social formation the non-capitalist forms of production, subordinated and restructured, reproduce their social and material conditions of existence under the auspices of capital in such a way that these conditions are henceforth an integral part, and even a condition, of the reproduction of capital.

The social formation, as a space based on the overall connection of the dominant capitalist mode of production with the non-capitalist forms of production, is the historical product of the class struggle at the moment of the consolidation of the power of the bourgeoisie. It has taken the typical form of the nation-state. On this last point, a clarification is required. In many situations, including Canada, the process of constituting the capitalist social and political space has given rise, within the same state and within a social formation space recognized as unitary, to the establishment, under the direction of the dominant class, of relations of national oppression between the agents of two nations. In fact, the national question is not a directly pertinent factor for the designation of the social formation space.

If the social formation space is often thought of by reference to the nation-state, it cannot be reduced to that.

To sum up, the capitalist social formation represents a given space[9] for the investment of capital and for the manifestation of the class struggle under the domination of the bourgeoisie. In it are defined an overall connection of the development of all kinds of social relations, a general structure of class relations, and an organization of political power relations manifested by and in the state.

REGIONAL DIFFERENTIATION OF THE SOCIAL FORMATION

Although the social formation depends on a process of unification of space, in which is located an overall connection, a general structure of classes, and an organization of power, this space cannot be considered, in its development, as uniform and homogeneous. In fact, the connection of social relations only manifests itself uniformly within the whole of the social formation.

It is known that the enlarged reproduction is dominated by the reproduction of capital. This reproduction is fundamentally contradictory. First, the reproduction of capital, tending toward the decay of the non-capitalist forms of production, constantly modifies the contradictory relations between those forms and capital. The relations assume in the end, by their exacerbation, brutal and violent forms. Next, the reproduction of capital signifies as much the reproduction of the social and material conditions for the existence of capital as the reproduction of contradictions inherent in capitalism, such as uneven development or the antagonistic and non-antagonistic relations between classes. In other words, the enlarged social reproduction of capitalism necessarily brings about a regional differentiation in the ways in which social relations are connected across the social formation space.

The regional specification of the manifestation of social relations is based principally on five sets of circumstances:

1. The concrete modalities of the "persistence" of non-capitalist modes of production, especially in agriculture, and their connection with capitalist production. If agriculture, historically, has experienced an external connection, and then integration, it must be noted that on the one hand this progression has followed various evolutionary paths (the Anglo-Prussian, American, and French versions) and on the other hand the present phase of integration is far from absolute proletarianization; instead, there is a differentiation of the exploitative relations.[10]
2. The spatial deployment of monopoly capital in its relations with the other layers and fractions of the bourgeoisie, particularly with non-monopoly capital and "big family-regional capital."
3. The specialization and inequality of capitalist development. In the prolongation of what precedes it, the economic regions exist as arenas tending to group different types of branches and different types of work with productive networks (head offices, centers of skilled production, centers of "unskilled" labour).[11]
4. The spatial segregation of labour forces, which is a set of circumstances associated with the foregoing. With the segmentation and regionalization of the labour market is found a differentiation of pools of manpower, of salary zones, etc.[12]
5. The globalization of the economy and its effects of dislocating the economic space. We should emphasize, especially in Canada, that the penetration of foreign capital is combined with the preceding factors, which contribute to the specification of regional spaces, and even to balkanization.[13]

The utilization of these sets of circumstances in an objective economic analysis allows us to measure the "determination in the last instance at the economic level of spatial heterogeneity and its mutations."[14] But if this determination alone delineates the outline of the space, it is far from accounting for the multifaceted relations that compose its real appearance. Before exploring this question in depth we can state at this point that the connection between capitalist and non-capitalist modes of production and the manifestation of the contradictions inherent in the development of capital constitutes the

social formation space, as well as, by the regional specifications of this connection, a certain number of regional spaces. The specified regional spaces, as spatial morphologies of the social formation, contribute to the contradictory unity of this formation.

THE CONTRADICTORY UNITY OF THE CANADIAN SOCIAL FORMATION

The Canadian social formation, a spatial configuration produced by a complex social structure, develops itself and enhances its unity while reproducing the regional spaces which, without becoming uniform, participate in this unity in a contradictory manner – so much so that, in a general way, Canada has a structural unity, both economic and political (the latter aspect will be considered carefully in another section), which comprises the overall site of the manifestation of class struggles under the domination of the bourgeoisie. At the same time, however, this structural unity only exists in and through the specificity of its materialization of regional spaces.

It must be understood that the unity of the social formation and of the regional specificity are two contradictory aspects that imply one another, under the domination of the former aspect. This raises the problem of the simultaneous perception of these two aspects in the same situation, in the sense that each phenomenon is part of the regional specificity and a concurrent element, in a contradictory way, to the unity of the formation. This also raises the problem of the more or less unstable domination of unity over regional specificity. The latter problem is crucial for Canada; on this subject I will not provide a definitive response but will be content to advance some hypotheses that have not yet been investigated in depth.

In Canada, no doubt more than elsewhere, the unity of the social formation cannot be related to any uniformity or any harmonization of social relations. The structural unit y of the social formation is not a given. Quite the contrary, this unity is realized by and through a multiplicity of social, economic, political, and ideological contradictions. In addition, the economic and political unity of Canada is always in question, because it must contend with the increased differentiation

of regional spaces and the deepening of inequalities, with the regional specificity of class struggles, with national oppression and the resistance it provokes, with ideological regionalisms and Quebec nationalism, with struggles inside the state and conflictual relations between the levels of government. Economic and political unity is thus particularly affected by an endemic tendency toward disintegration, which means that in Canada the question of the reproduction of the unity of the social formation is constantly, or rather regularly, on the agenda.

THE ROLE OF THE POLITICAL SYSTEM IN THE FORMATION OF SPACE

At this stage of the discussion it is necessary to emphasize a major point in the formation of space, namely the role of the political system.

The social formation space, as a structural site determined by the development of the class struggle, is an overall space in which are defined the political power relations that are expressed, organized, and condensed in and by the state. This state, which embodies typical power relations, reinforces and renews the domination of the bourgeoisie, particularly by participating actively in the contradictory reproduction of capital and of class relations. In this regard the state, according to its traditional modalities throughout history but from the beginning, plays a significant role in the spatial inscription and materialization of class struggles and of their reproduction. In fact, by its unitary or federal organization, by its structure and by the apparatus with which it demarcates the boundaries of the space and divides up its internal diversity, the state overdetermines the constitution of social space.[15]

The overdetermination of the constitution of space has more than one dimension. The state fixes the boundaries, on the one hand, for the exercise of class power (law, citizenship, legitimate force, administrative decentralization, a system of political relations, a unifying ideology) as much by organized public violence as by its hegemony over the masses. It also fixes the boundaries for the concrete manifestation of the class struggle (at the economic, political, and administrative levels) and in effect designates the settings in which that struggle is most likely to be expressed. In addition, the state overdetermines the constitution

of space by intervening spatially to organize and reproduce relations of exploitation; this "administration of territory" takes the concrete forms of urbanization, facilities for transport and communications, restrictions on the use of land, etc. Finally, the state, while indicating in its institutional-administrative network the specific ways in which social relations are connected, acts upon these ways to consolidate, transform, or dissolve them.

If the development of the state consists of making the boundaries of the social formation space correspond with its own boundaries, the action of the state is generally less clear in shaping political spaces that reproduce the contours of economic regionalism. Nonetheless, this phenomenon has its own varied effects on the network of political, social, and ideological relations. Although these effects can express themselves by the state taking regionalism into account, designating regional centers for special attention, and arranging its administrative apparatus accordingly, political (state) boundaries rarely coincide exactly with those of economic regions. However, at the margin of the state, or in relation with it, the formation of locally distinct systems of political or economic relations, of local strongholds for one or another party or faction, of ideological or cultural traditions and ways of resisting metropolitan domination, forms regional hegemonic systems within the "local society" and thus at least begins to outline political and ideological regions that rival the economic regions.[16]

Even if these different types of diversities do not necessarily coincide exactly, they tend to reinforce one another in shaping the character of the regional space.

The federated state, by the characteristic features of its organization, accentuates the tendency for economic, political, and ideological relations to take place within coinciding regional boundaries. It can also give this regionalism a definite shape by designating formally both the sites for the polarization of multidimensional class relations and the corresponding territorial spaces. Conversely, the very functioning of the unitary state blurs and complicates the outlines of the natural region – without dissolving it – because regional "spaces" corresponding to different types of relations seem to be superimposed on one

another with distinct and eventually distant centers of convergence. These different types of "spaces" do not really coincide.[17]

OVERDETERMINATION OF THE CANADIAN FEDERATED STATE AND REGIONAL SPACES

The Canadian state fully assumes this overdetermining role in the formation of the "social formation" space; it must, however, be emphasized that this overdetermination is subject to the federated organization of this state. First of all, the Canadian space, formed in the beginning from British colonies that were independent of one another, produces, on the bases of the complex and differentiated connection between capitalist and non-capitalist modes of production, as well as the unequal redistribution of capital, a spatial unity that includes a large degree of regional specificity. That being the case, the action of the Canadian state, in overdetermining the formation of space, defines concretely both the unity of the social formation space and the differentiation of regional spaces.

The federated Canadian state, and especially its provincial level, has come sometimes to perpetuate the characteristics of the economic and social development of the regions, including the unequal distribution of capital investment, and sometimes to determine the specificity of social relations. It does this by defining the areas for the exercise of power, by designating the locations for the expression of conflict, by supporting varying policies for the administration of territory, and by acting differently in different places toward the varying development of class relations.

So much is this the case that the regional spaces produced by the different patterns of class relations and overdetermined by the organization and activity of the federal state can be designated as provincial spaces.

Although they are not the basis for designating regional spaces, statistical data on the provinces (such as data on per capita revenue, unemployment, and economic specialization) illustrate the formation of such provincial spaces.[18] Overall, the requirements of the capitalist economy in Canada imply a tendency to divide the country into

provincial spaces. This division takes on a structural character as much from the relations that bring it about as from its existence as illustrated by the statistical data.

I must make two things clear. First, if I have mentioned that the Canadian space is differentiated at a first level into regional spaces roughly corresponding with the provinces, it is because these regional spaces have a degree of complexity which, at another level, allows a distinctive and in-depth analysis of an internal spatial heterogeneity. To be precise, given that the formation of spaces depends on the specific mode of connection of social relations, when I designate a regional space that I identify with a provincial space, I am not designating a space that appears homogeneous, harmonious, or uniform. Instead, it should be understood as a site for the emergence of intense contradictions and specific conflicts. Furthermore, many studies have described the internal economic differentiation of the Quebec regional space.[19] Second, it appears that to really understand this internal differentiation in Quebec (for example) one must face the problem that the outlines of the "sub-regional" spaces are blurred by the not completely identical boundaries of "specific spaces" defined by economic, political, or ideological relations. This is the same problem encountered from the very first in unitary states.

THE REGIONAL SPACE OF QUEBEC

How can Quebec be described within Canada? The present discussion leads me to consider Quebec as a regional space within the Canadian formation.

Quebec is marked by a given mode of connection between class relations, overdetermined by the provincial level of the state. Quebec's mode of connection must be analyzed concretely in its many aspects that correspond to class realities. These aspects go beyond, although they include, national oppression. To understand this connection between class relations requires that we return to the five categories of principal factors upon which spatial heterogeneity is based. These factors as well as the political and ideological relations and practices that accompany them and the discriminatory relations, such as national

oppression,[20] which transcend the reality of classes, trace the outlines of class relations and practices in the Quebec regional space.

In addition, the regional space of Quebec participates in the formation of the Canadian economic, social, and political space and in its contradictory unity. Quebec's distinctiveness is in part a function of its insertion into the overall Canadian reality. As a result, the contradictory unity of the political power relations and the unity of the overall structure of classes cannot be correctly understood by limiting oneself only to the specific reality of Quebec. On the contrary, they must be understood in a pan-Canadian context. However, the specific reality of Quebec, at whatever level of relations, is not dissolved in the whole of Canada; it is recognized and situated within Canada. The economic, political, and ideological characteristics of Quebec can only be understood as peculiar manifestations of the class struggle within the regional space of Quebec, which is part of the Canadian formation.

Basing myself on these considerations, I am going to explore more specifically the contradictory unity of political power relations in Canada and its complex realization by and in the federated state.

THE EXERCISE OF STATE POWER IN CANADA

The unitary state is often considered to be the typical capitalist state, as though the federal state were only a poor approximation of the materialization of the political power of the bourgeoisie. Certainly the analysis of the materialization of power in the federated state must be more complex than that of its counterpart in the unitary state.

To appreciate this complexity it is useful to note some conditions basic to the formation of a federated state. We can ask ourselves under what circumstances the capitalist state adopts this form of organization. Generally, the federated state reveals a political compromise inherent in the formation of a state that tries to transcend a set of exacerbated social contradictions – not by resolving them, but by absorbing them into its structures and by decentralizing the exercise of power. These contradictions,[21] which express themselves in acute

clashes and conflicts, include the balkanization or economic spaces, the heterogeneity of the virtually dominant class, national oppression, religious rivalries, and the rigidity of the political and ideological superstructure prior to the formation of the new state.

The conditions that historically accompanied the formation or the Canadian federated state correspond to this scenario. There was a multifaceted fundamental movement conducive to the establishment of a unified space and of a unifying, if not unitary, state. The aspiration toward a unitary state was defeated by an assortment of resistances, oppositions, and obstacles that necessitated the federal compromise.

These resistances, oppositions, and obstacles consisted essentially of the contradictory class relations within the colonies. The state of these relations was the product of an economic, political, and ideological regionalism encouraged by colonial history and geography, of the diversity of economic development of the colonial provinces, of the specialization of the provincial bourgeoisies and their varying degrees of formation, of the opposition to the hegemony of the Anglo-Canadian bourgeoisie of the Province of Canada, of Quebec's resistance to national oppression, and of the opposition to the conservative and undemocratic political project of the bourgeoisie.[22] Generally speaking, the differentiation and specific character of the class struggles in the different colonies made a federated state essential.

The federal compromise, which allowed the creative of the Canadian state, confirmed the existence of the social (economic and political) spaces of the different provinces. It recognized the two historic and national components (Ontario and Quebec) of the Province of Canada by redividing them to give each a provincial level of government with constitutional powers. The federal compromise made possible the creation of the Canadian state, but it was far from resolving the contradictions that had provoked it. On the contrary, by transforming the conditions in which they were manifested, the federated state absorbed these contradictions into the organization of its internal relations, as modes of existence of power relations in Canada.

It is clear that the realization of the domination and direction of the bourgeoisie in Canada through two levels of government raises problems with respect to the way their concrete manifestations are understood. A certain model of the Canadian state tries to pass over these problems by reducing the dynamics of the Canadian state to some particular aspects and by adopting a mechanistic perspective on class relations within the state. This consists of a conception of the state that identifies for each level of government some layer or fraction of the bourgeoisie.

Several writers employ, at least implicitly, this model of the Canadian state although they do not all arrive at the same conclusions: the way they conceptualize the difference between levels is not the same. Consider three examples. In his analysis of "the political economy of the Canadian state," Garth Stevenson views the levels of government as specializing in defending the interests of one or another layer, class, fraction, or category of interests.[23] He defines three chronological periods characterized by different types of distinctions between levels. In the first period the central government represented the bourgeoisie and the provincial governments placed the interests of independent commodity producers in the forefront. In the second period the provincial level was linked with the natural resource industries while the central government represented the interests of the rail ways, manufacturing industries, and banks. In the present day, finally, Canada, which is now no more than a collection of regional economies, sees the provincial level dominated by a regionalized and specialized bourgeoisie that can only unify itself in an uncertain and precarious manner through the central government. On the other hand, Alfred Dubuc, in contrast to Stevenson for the contemporary period at least, recognizes the existence of a Canadian big bourgeoisie.[24] In this case the distinction is more along horizontal lines. Thus the big bourgeoisie basically expresses its interests through the central government, while the autonomist tendencies at the provincial level represent the interests of the middle classes, either "traditional" or "new."

In discussing the era of Duplessis, Denis Monière also draws the distinction horizontally. However, he recognizes its paradoxical nature in practice.[25] At first sight the provincial government of Quebec is

identified with the interests of the petty bourgeoisie (by which I believe he means the non-monopolistic bourgeoisie) and the central government operates on behalf of the big bourgeoisie. The paradox of the Duplessis regime is that, contrary to what is suggested above, it represented the interests of a fraction of the big bourgeoisie. Now I suggest that this consisted only of the American fraction.

This model of the state, which is applied especially to Canada,[26] leads to a formalistic and mechanistic perception of political power relations in the federated state. I introduce the concept of paradox to emphasize that this model can only lead to the accumulation of paradoxes when it is applied to the analysis of political realities. Although it bears some relation to reality, it excessively simplifies and caricatures the reality of political power relations in Canada. Besides, this model does not permit us to establish a coherent and effective methodology to analyze the materialization of power relations through the ten provincial governments and at the same time through the central government.

It is thus appropriate to develop a methodology for the analysis of the exercise of power through and in the Canadian federated state. I am thus going to advance some propositions to clear the way for a general understanding of the question and for the beginning of a methodology. To do so, it is necessary to return to certain conclusions from the preceding discussion about space.

I have said that a contradictory structural unity develops in the Canadian social formation as a result of an intense regional specialization. From the uneven development of capitalism joined to other forms of production, an overall class structure is established on which are based the relations of political power. These relations, on the one hand, determine the configuration of the power bloc and, on the other hand, take shape through and in the Canadian federated state.

The overall unity of the social formation necessarily includes the great diversity of conditions and of the manifestation and expression of classes in the different regional spaces. Furthermore, the unity of political power relations, as well as the contradictory unity of social relations, develops through the many forms in which the class struggle

is realized within the Canadian space. As a result, the study of the specific characteristics of class struggles in a regional space allows us to understand the determined forms of existence both of capitalist development and of the domination of the power bloc in Canada through the federated state. In this order of ideas, questions arise regarding the unity of political power relations, which includes the numerous political forms of the class struggle and simultaneously includes the determined forms of domination that are registered on the federated state.

In short, the discussion of the contradictory unity of the Canadian social formation and of the overall structure of class relations leads us to ask ourselves about the exercise of political power by the federated state and about the determination of forms of domination at both the central and provincial levels of government.

Proposition I. The unity of the social formation, despite its spatial differentiation, is combined with the unity of the federated state and with the consolidation of a dominant class, as contradictory as one is with the other.

The formation of the Canadian state appeared historically as a necessary corollary of the establishment of the social formation space. The Canadian federated state was intrinsically linked with the organization, consolidation, and development of the Canadian space under the direction of, and at the initiative of, the bourgeoisie.

This obvious situating of the Canadian state in relation to the Canadian space must be understood as a precondition to understanding the organization of power and of the state. I stated earlier that there is only one social formation, even though it is differentiated into regional spaces. The regional spaces, which have their distinctive characteristics, compose and participate in the contradictory unit y of the Canadian space. All the same, we must recognize that there is only one Canadian state, despite its federated form. The form of the state must not mislead us as to its unity. Federalism is a mode of existence of the capitalist state that embodies a given organization of power relations, and thus the federated form does not mean that several juxtaposed states embody distinct organizations of power

relations. In Canada there is only one state, albeit federated in form, which embodies a general organization of political power relations.

The federated Canadian state embodies the power of the bourgeoisie in Canada. Before going further, we must specify that this class is not homogeneous. Without falling into a crude generalization that would only lead to a tautological argument, let us outline several aspects of the composition and morphology of the bourgeoisie in Canada.[27] It is composed as follows: (a) the Canadian monopolist bourgeoisie, divided into financial groups whose spheres of influence and bases of accumulation are very unequal and whose elements are distinguished by differences in their relations with foreign imperialist interests and in their positions within the global system of accumulation; (b) the comprador bourgeoisie, subordinated to foreign interests which it directly represents and including, at this stage in the internationalization of productive capital, both the agents and direct representatives of the owners of foreign corporations and the partial or nominal owners of the branch plants; (c) the "provincialized" non-monopolistic bourgeoisie, whose bases of accumulation rarely extend beyond a single province, divided into fractions and reproducing within itself the contradictions of the monopolist bourgeoisie. Finally, let us note that national oppression appears within the bourgeoisie although its effects vary among the levels and fractions; these effects have an impact on the positions occupied by agents within the bourgeoisie and on the political options they defend.

However, as divided as the bourgeoisie may seem when we focus on its composition and morphology, it exhibits its unity and cohesion, as a class, in its relations of domination over the working class and the masses. To this effect the state, which expresses and confirms the place of the bourgeoisie in the relations of power, represents a special factor of organization for the bourgeoisie where its unity and cohesion, resting on a given set of relations among its elements, are fashioned and developed. Thus the homogeneity and uniformity of the bourgeoisie and the disintegration and fragmentation of the bourgeoisie are both caricatures that distort the overall reality of that class.

Proposition II. The political power of the bourgeoisie in Canada is mediated by the whole of the federated state, that is to say, by both the central and the provincial levels of government.

Let us remember that the political power of the alliance of layers and fractions of the bourgeoisie in Canada found its form of existence in the federated state; it is precisely all the components of that state that function to maintain and reproduce that power. Thus it is quite incorrect to reduce the exercise of that power to one or the other level of government. This means that the political power of the alliance of layers and fractions of the bourgeoisie is diffused throughout the Canadian state. Although they appear dispersed, fragmented, and contradictory, the political practices at each level of government proceed from the same basic organization of class power relations. At the same time, these practices give consistency to the existence of this power.

It is necessary to stress this idea, that the fundamental organization of power relations, consolidated on the basis of an alliance between the layers and fractions of the bourgeoisie, supports the federated state and is the constantly renewed result of the practices of the political agents of this alliance, as diverse as they are and at whatever level of government they act.

If I return to it, it is because, in these terms, there would seem to be a direct link and even a coincidence or identity between the fundamental organization of class power relations and the concrete functioning of the totality of levels and branches of this federated state, which ensures the maintenance and reproduction of this power. But this is not so, perhaps because in capitalist society, especially, political power is exercised indirectly.[28] In a less general way, I will suggest that this relation between the diffusion of political power and the functioning of levels of government is indirect because it is conditional and only operates via the specific organization of political relations in each of the political arenas. The key to this relationship is thus given to us by the general combination of precise configurations of each of the political arenas. This leads us to inquire about the determination of these configurations.

Proposition III. The specific organization of political relations in the political arenas must be understood as relevant political effects of the differentiated development of the class struggle in the Canadian space and in each of the regional spaces.

The Canadian federated state, it has been said, overdetermines the constitution of the Canadian space (social formation) and the differentiation of the regional (provincial) spaces. From this discussion of the space differentiated following the joining of social structures can be deduced a distinction that designates the starting point for the analysis of the Canadian state and the political arenas.

The distinction, which will be reviewed and elaborated, is as follows: the political effects that can be observed in each of the political arenas at the provincial level are produced and reinforced by the specific pattern of class relations that constitutes each regional space. In addition, the political effects that appear in the political arena at the level of the central government are brought about by the overall pattern of class relations, which creates the social formation space in its entirety.

Beginning at this point, the reasoning must be clarified because when the distinction is made between the political effects of the specific and of the overall patterns of class relations, it must be remembered that these patterns are not unrelated or mutually isolated. In fact, we know instead that the social formation is the spatial inscription of a unifying – but not homogenizing – organization of the regional spaces. This organization reproduces itself through this contradictory unity so well that the regional spaces, despite their specific characteristics, are simultaneously integral parts of the social formation. This leads me to conclude that the relevant political effects imposed on the political arenas are brought into existence on the basis of spaces (regional and Canadian) that are closely related. It is thus artificial to separate them into water-tight compartments and then to view them as external to one another.

Within the framework of bourgeois domination and on the basis of the differentiation of the social formation, the classes, layers, and fractions organize themselves and intervene as social or political forces

whose behavior is molded by the boundaries of the federated state and its levels of government. In organizing themselves and intervening as social or political forces the classes, layers, and fractions express in terms of political interests the class effects of the numerous economic and social contradictions that appear in the Canadian space as a whole and in each of the regional spaces.[29] In other words, these class effects do not appear uniformly in the Canadian space; the types of contradictions that produce the most striking effects, the intensity of these contradictions, and the way they express themselves all vary from one regional space to another and from the regional spaces to the whole of the social formation. For its part, through its own organization the federated state comes to reveal, to channel, and to accentuate this reality.[30]

In effect, within the framework of the fundamental organization of political power relations the federated state provides different sites for the political expression of the class struggle. For each of these sites, the history of the contradictions that occurred in the past and the history of political and social forces that were present shape the way the political power of the bourgeoisie becomes a reality. In each political arena, whether at the central or provincial level, different prevailing circumstances determine the objects, the sense, the limits, and the general outcomes of political struggles. This is so because each political arena refers back to a more or less limited space, and thus to a specific class struggle, and to a given expression of the struggle, and thus to a particular political history.

In particular, it should be observed that, considering the distribution of constitutional powers, the central government is structurally and institutionally concerned with the totality of the class struggle in Canada, the reproduction of capital, the position of Canada in the world economy, etc. All of this, moreover, lessens the impact of certain contradictions which, at the regional level, appear with great intensity. The provincial level of government, in terms of preponderance, is made aware of this overall situation through the contradictions most acute within the given regional space.

Proposition IV. Taking account of the political effects of the development of the class struggle in a differentiated space and of the different sites for the manifestation of political power that comprise the federated state, the federal and provincial governments, with their different characteristics, embody types of political alliances between the dominant layers and fractions.

Governments, both at the central and provincial levels, embody types of political alliances in the sense that they express, in a fairly stable manner, distinct stratified organizations, historically and concretely determined, of the interests of dominant class layers and fractions. These types of political alliances, as specific modes of exercising power, are determined by several categories of factors, including:

- the relations within the bourgeoisie as they develop in the different spaces;
- the relations between the bourgeoisie and one or more supporting classes;
- the importance of different political forces and the concrete forms of development of the class struggle;
- the history of the parties, of their political orientation, and, more generally, of the political arenas.

Evidently these factors vary enormously from one regional space to another and throughout the history of each. Furthermore, they vary according to circumstances in a way that highlights the strictly political and ideological dimensions.

The specific characteristics of each type of alliance represented by governments must be analyzed concretely. They cannot be mechanically equated with different levels of government. Thus it is incorrect to identify a priori a type of political alliance, or a class or fraction, with the central or with the provincial level of government. Also, it should be emphasized that the levels of government, as sites for the formation of different types of alliances between dominant layers and fractions, do not operate exclusively for any layer or fraction. None of these layers or fractions is excluded, by definition, from either level of government. If there is an exclusion, it can only occur through a

particular ideological or political process that is not dictated by the structure of the Canadian federated state. Thus, generally, the types of alliances represented by governments do not bring about clear divisions within the bourgeoisie.

While they have specific characteristics that are more or less pronounced, the types of political alliance represented by the governments of the ten provinces and by the central government all fall within the framework of the exercise of power by the bourgeoisie. These types of alliance together comprise the effective structure of the overall alliance of dominant layers and fractions for the whole of Canada. For this reason, the types of alliance are part of the struggles for influence, rank, hegemony, etc. between the elements of the bourgeoisie. All alliances, neither alien nor fundamentally opposed to one another, participate in and reproduce the contradictory unity of the Canadian federated state, each in its own fashion.

Proposition V. While intergovernmental relations in Canada occupy a prominent place on the agenda, it is useful to consider that the more or less acute differences between the types of political alliance, which represent quite faithfully the contradictions within the bourgeoisie, correspond to the essential basis, apart from the national question, of the contradictions within the Canadian state.

The contradictions within the state include several dimensions that contribute to the formation of certain types of political alliance in government.[31] Before considering some of them, it must be understood that the fundamental issue, which underlies federal-provincial discussions and, to an even greater extent, constitutional conflicts, is the respective capacity (or at best the fashioning of means) of intervention of the two levels of government.[32] What is effectively at stake is the definition of the sites in which the hierarchization of dominant interests takes place. This hierarchization appears, from one government to another, as so many distinct types of political alliance. Evidently this definition of the sites where power is exercised directly concerns the dominant layers and fractions because, bearing in mind the relative position of each as regards their political effectiveness in the federated organization of the exercise of power, it is a question

of their capacity to assure themselves a significant influence over the sites where the political alliances that affect them most directly are formed. In addition to this question of the first importance, some dimensions combined with it must also be considered.

The precise type of political alliance represented by a government is determined by the concrete social and political conditions under which the class struggle is conducted. These conditions vary depending on whether we refer to the whole of the social formation or to one or another regional space. To understand these conditions, let us emphasize certain aspects, such as:

- the concrete specific conditions of the exercise of power over the masses;
- the degree of development and the political mode of expression of the labour movement, including the unions;
- the place of non-capitalist relations, particularly in agriculture, and the political behavior of classes linked to them, such as the small farmers;
- the place of the middle class (new and traditional) in politics and the class position of its fractions.

These conditions lead, in the political process dominated by the bourgeoisie, to the elaboration of particular modes of exercising power and, more specifically, of given political strategies. As a result, the types of political alliance, determined by the condition of the class struggle in each of the spaces concerned, form part of the struggles of tendencies within the bourgeoisie.

Furthermore, the formation of a type of political alliance indicates the political effectiveness of the dominant layers and fractions in each of the political arenas. In this sense, the conflicts and debates between specific alliances often coincide with the differentiation of the political efficacy of the components of the dominant class in the federated state. Two questions should be borne in mind. First, these conflicts reveal, on the one hand, the divergent interests of the different fractions and/or of distinct sectors of the economy that predominate in one or another political alliance. Secondly, these conflicts express

the unequal capacity for influence and action of the monopolist bourgeoisie and of the non-monopolist bourgeoisie at different levels of government. While recognizing that the levels of government do not function exclusively on behalf of the dominant layers and fractions, it must be emphasized that the big bourgeoisie, as compared to the middle bourgeoisie, is more able to achieve coherence and political effectiveness at the level of the central government. On the other hand, the middle bourgeoisie can attain its greatest political coherence at the provincial level. This intervention of the middle bourgeoisie at the provincial level, tending to be more systematic and consistent, can significantly and decisively affect the type of political alliance represented by one or other provincial government.

Also, together with the tendency of constitutional powers to become concentrated in the central government, the accentuation of regional inequalities, the movement of capital to the west, the unceasing disparities within the regional spaces, and the deterioration or necessary consolidation of the bourgeoisie in the regions all demand a regional policy conceived and implemented at the provincial level. The political effects of class relations within the regional spaces, in terms of popular struggles and especially of the redefinition of alliances at the provincial level, impel the political representatives of these alliances[33] to recognize the capacity for a massive intervention at the provincial level in order to regulate capitalist development and to mitigate class contradictions in the regional spaces. As a result, there is a desire to maintain at the provincial level a significant role in the exercise of power and a genuine capacity to intervene in the development of the class struggle.

The totality of elements that have been discussed with regard to the differentiation of regional spaces, the formation of specific class alliances, and more generally the economic, political, social, and ideological class struggles, based on the reality of the regions, comprise the multiple dimensions of the regional question in Canada. The regional question delineates the endemic centrifugal tendency that punctuates the evolution of the Canadian state and social formation.

Proposition VI. National oppression in Quebec, which transforms the regional question into a national question, accentuates the contradictions of the federated state to the point at which its disintegration is a real possibility, or at least to the point at which the compromise pertaining to the modalities of exercising power must be renewed.

Quebec, considered as a space and as a level of government, is different from the other regional spaces in Canada. Quebec is the space in which the Québécois nation exists and consolidates itself. It is also the site of national subordination, which takes a number of concrete forms, and at this point the effects of the totality of discriminatory political and ideological relations, which appear in every sphere of social activity, provide the basis of the national question and provoke resistance and counter-attacks. Moreover, it is the site, mediated by the constitution of the federated state, of the political organization of national oppression. This is so because politics overdetermines not only the structuring and reproduction of the nation, but also its place in the relations of national oppression.[34]

National oppression develops in the cracks of the structure of power relations. Also, overcoming this national oppression directly indicates the question of political power, but also of power relations more generally, such as in the economic domain. In addition, insofar as national oppression affects, in varying ways, all classes in Quebec, nationalist discourse, profoundly influenced by the interests of the bourgeoisie and of the middle class, is still capable of mobilizing the different classes and uniting them in pursuit of their demands. (This does not negate the fact that, at the same time, national oppression has the effect, for the exploited classes, of making their exploitation more obvious.) In fact, national oppression and nationalist ideology are the elements of the evolution and development of the class struggle, not only in relation to bourgeois domination over the masses, but also in relation to the internal conflicts within the bourgeoisie.

In short, the Quebec provincial government is the special place for the representation of "national interests," which are by no means confined to the domains of language and culture, since they include the economic and political fields in particular. The supervision and

orientation of capitalist accumulation in Quebec presents itself as one of the issues uniting these two fields. The provincial political representatives of the bourgeoisie and of the middle class are oriented, historically with popular support, toward preserving and even enlarging the constitutional powers at the disposal of the Quebec provincial government. In addition, by what seems a cumulative process, the question of political self-determination appears as the necessary means of overcoming national oppression.

It must be understood that the Quebec question is deeply rooted in the national question, but that the numerous effects of national oppression in Quebec transform the regional question, which can be observed elsewhere in Canada, into a national question. This means that the national question does not eliminate the aspects, mentioned above, which provide the basis for regional concentrations but that it is combined with them to form a whole new dimension that transforms the totality and gives it a qualitatively different significance. The national question exacerbates the contradictions of the federated state by posing, in the destabilizing struggles and demands that perpetuate it, the alternative of the economic and political disintegration of Canada. As a result Quebec, by providing the basis for the crisis of the state, represents the weak link of the Canadian federation. However, there is nothing irreversible or cumulative about this process. In fact, insofar as the nationalist political movement and ideology do not lead to a genuine political self-determination and insofar as they conceal the reality of class relations, they participate in reproducing bourgeois domination and national oppression. At the same time they impose – as so many significant compromises – more or less complex and contradictory practices on the exercise of power and of hegemony.

These propositions are only intended as conceptual instruments for analyzing the social, economic, and political reality of Quebec within Canada. They are the nucleus of a way of understanding social relations and the federated state in Canada and Quebec. They serve, for a particular subject, to state the problem, to indicate the way of understanding the given circumstances, and to mark the path of analysis. This analytical framework can only reveal its dynamic possibilities when it is applied to concrete situations.

As regards the analysis of the political position promoted by the government of Quebec, certain things should be noted. Like other governments in Canada, this one represents a type of political alliance that expresses a given stratified organization of the interests of dominant layers and fractions, even though it is affected by the national question, and which participates, contradictorily, in the political power of the bourgeoisie in Canada. The specific forms in which political power is exercised in Quebec are anchored in the particular pattern of class relations in this regional space and in the concrete organization of political forces and of political and ideological means of domination. In addition, and in contrast to other governments, the types of political alliance historically represented by the Quebec government have expressed, in one way or another and sometimes within narrow political limits, the resistance to national oppression, thus leading toward a readjustment of the real relations of subordination.

1 Translated by Garth Stevenson.

2 Gilles Bourque and Anne Legaré, *Le Québec, la question nationale* (Paris, 1979), 122-31, refer briefly to the "specificité régionale de l'articulation des modes de production." However, the discussion that follows this valuable insight is rather sketchy. I hope that their ongoing work will pursue this line of inquiry, which requires further development.

3 It should be emphasized in passing that an incorrect understanding of the national question in Canada has given rise to analyses based on the idea of parallel structures (Canada/Quebec), which are mutually exclusive for all practical purposes. Specifically, it will be possible to speak of Canadian imperialism in Quebec, e.g., S. Moore and D. Wells, *Imperialism and the National Question in Canada* (1975), 87-89; C. Saint-Onge, "Imperialisme U.S. au Québec" (Thèse de doctorat, Paris VIII, 1975); D. Monière, *Le développement des idéologies au Québec* (Montréal, 1977).

4 Notably, G. Stevenson, "Federalism and the Political Economy of the Canadian State," in Leo Panitch, ed., *The Canadian State, Political Economy and Political Power* (Toronto, 1977), 71-100; A. Dubuc, "Les fondements historiques de la crise des sociétés canadienne et québécoise," *Politique aujourd'hui*, n^{os} 7-8 (1978), 29-53.

5 For example, Henry Milner as well as G. Bourque and N. Laurin-Frenette, who have produced analyses that are useful in more than one way, overestimate and exaggerate the role of the middle class in political relations, and particularly within the state. Bourque and Legaré, *Le Québec*, are sometimes

inclined to give the non-monopolist bourgeoisie the role usually attributed to the middle class, while underestimating the position of the Canadian big bourgeoisie. Milner, *Politics in the New Quebec* (Toronto, 1978); Bourque and Laurin-Frenette, "Classes sociales et idéologies nationalistes au Québec (1960-1970)," *Socialisme québécois*, nº 20, 109-55.

6 A. Lipietz, *Le capital et son espace*, "Économie et socialisme" (Paris, 1977), 90.

7 A. Dubuc, "Une interpretation économique de la constitution," *Socialisme* 66, nº 7 (janvier, 1966), 4-13; S.B. Ryerson, *Le capitalisme et la confederation* (Montréal, 1972), 307-426; R.T. Naylor, "The rise and fall of the third commercial empire of the St. Lawrence," in Gary Teeple, ed., *Capitalism and the National Question in Canada* (Toronto, 1972), 1-41; G. Stevenson, *Unfulfilled Union* (Toronto, 1979), 27-49; J.C. Bonenfant, "Les origines économiques et les dispositions financiéres de l'Acte de l'Amérique du Nord Britannique de 1867 ," in Rodrigue Tremblay, *L'économie québécoise* (1976), 194-208; Bourque and Legaré, Le Québec, 73-109.

8 N. Poulantzas, *L'État, le pouvoir, le socialisme* (1978), 110-18; P. Allis, *L'invention du territoire*, "critique du droit" (1980).

9 Lipietz, *Le capital*, 28. "Space" in the present context means a connected set of social relations that are manifested in a particular territory. It should therefore not be confused with the use of the term "space" by G. Bourque in a recent text. For Bourque "space" becomes in effect a synonym for the field or base of accumulation of a specific layer or fraction of the bourgeoisie. See "Petite bourgeoisie envahissante et bourgeoisie tenebreuse," *Les Cahiers du socialisme*, nº 3 (printemps, 1979), 138-39.

10 Lipietz, *Le capital*, 30-53. For Quebec, see my book, *Le Duplessisme: politique économique et rapports de force* (Montréal, 1981), 235-60; and D. Perreault, "Intégration capitaliste en agriculture québécoise et structure de classes en milieu rural" (Thèse M.Sc., Université de Montréal, 1981).

11 F. Caillet, B. Denni, and P. Kukawka, "Espaces et politique; éléments de recherche sur la region Rhone-Alpes," in *Espace et politique, 1. la region dans la dynamique de la formation française* (Grenoble), m-3-m-99; Lipietz, Le capital, 92-101; A. Lipietz, *La dimension régionale du développement du tertiaire* (Paris, 1978), 65-127.

12 Lipietz, *La dimension*; J. Lafont, D. Leborgne, and A. Lipietz, *Rédéploiment industriel et espace économique: une étude intersectorielle comparative* (Paris, 1980), 54-63; B. Jobert, "Ville et reproduction des differences sociales," in B. Jobert and C. Gilbert, *Système scientifique et développement urbain* (Grenoble, 1976), 36-138.

13 A. Sales, "Système mondial et mouvements nationaux dans les pays industrialisés: l'exemple Québec-Canada," *Sociologie et sociétés*, XI, 2 (octobre, 1979), 69-94.

See especially my monograph: *Notes pour l'analyse de la politique économique dépendante dans l'État fédératif canadien* (Colloque Strategies industrielles pour le developpement, Université de Montréal, 1979); G. Stevenson, "Canadian Regionalism in Continental Perspective," *Revue d'études canadiennes*, xv, 2 (été, 1980), 16-28; P. Marchak, "The Two Dimensions of Canadian Regionalism," *ibid.*, 88-97.

14 A. Lipietz, *Sur la question régionale en France* (Paris), 65.

15 Lipietz, *Le capital*, 135-38.

16 See the very informative studies on France: P. Vieille and E. Gilbert, "Espace et politique en Languedoc, de la viticulture aux institutions régionales," and Caillet, Denni, and Kukawka, "Espace et politique," in *Espace et politique 1. La region dans la dynamique de la formation française*, n-44-n-119 and m-89-m-178; Lipietz, Le capital, 143-48, 159-63; R. Dulong, "La crise du rapport État/Société locale vue au travers de la politique régionale," in N. Poulantzas, ed., *La crise de l'État* (1978), 124-52.

17 Vieille and Gilbert, "Espace et politique en Languedoc," n-118-n-137; F. d'Arcy and C. Gilbert, "L'espace du capital et le remodelage des institutions," in Poulantzas, ed., *La crise de l'État*, I-14-I-127.

18 R. Parenteau, "Les problèmes du développement régional dans un État fédératif, l'experience canadienne," *Revue d'économie politique*, LXXIII, 2 (mars-avril, 1963), 161-222; T.N. Brewis, "Regional Development," *Canadian Economic Policy* (Toronto, 1965), 316-27; B. Bouin, "Repartition régionale des investissements depuis la guerre," *L'Actualité économique*, xxxv, 4 (janvier-mars, 1960), 566-95; P. Harvey, "Conjoncture et structure: les perspectives spatiales du plein-emploi au Canada," *L'Actualité économique*, XXIX (janvier-mars, 1954); Conseil économique du Canada, *Vivre ensemble, Une étude des disparités régionales* (Ottawa, 1977).

19 P.-Y. Villeneuve, "Classes sociales, regwns et accumulation du capital," *Cahiers de géographie de Québec*, XXII, 56 (septembre, 1978), 159-72; P.-Y. Villeneuve, "Disparités sociales et disparités régionales: l'exemple du Québec," *Cahiers de géographie de Québec*, XXI, 52 (avril, 1977), 19-32; J.-L. Klein, "Du materialisme historique aux inégalites régionales: le cas de la région de Québec," *Cahiers de géographie de Québec*, XXII, 56 (septembre, 1978), 173-87; S. Côté and B. Lévesque, "L'envers de la medaille: le sous-développement régional," Communication presentee à l'ACFAS, 14 mai 1980; F. Harvey, "La question régionale au Québec," *Revue d'études canadiennes*, xv, 2 (été, 1980), 74-87; S. Côté, "Enjeux régionaux et luttes pour le pouvoir," *Les Cahiers du socialisme*, nº 4 (automne, 1979), 202-11.

20 G. Boismenu, "Les classes et l'oppression nationale au Québec," paper presented to the 14th Latin American Sociology Conference, Puerto Rico, October, 1981.

21 C.J. Friedrich, *Tendances du fédéralisme en théorie et en pratique* (Belgian Institute of Political Science, 1971), 15-92.

22 See note 6, as well as A. Faucher, *Histoire économique et unité canadienne* (Montréal, 1970), 11-29; M. Lamontagne, *Le fédéralisme canadien* (Québec, 1954), 7-16; ER. Scott, *Essays on the Constitution* (Toronto, 1977), 251-60; R. Arès, *Dossier sur le Pacte fédératif de 1867* (Montréal), 223-50.

23 Stevenson, "Federalism and the Political Economy of the Canadian State."

24 Dubuc, "Les fondements historiques."

25 Monière, *Le développement des idéologies au Québec*, 296: "Les contrats gouvernementaux et le patronage renflouaient la petite bourgeoisie en concurrence inégale avec les monopoles, dont le développement était favorisé par le gouvernement fédéral et, aussi, paradoxalement, par l'Union nationale qui soutenait les intérêts américains contre les intérêts canadiens-anglais."

26 This concept is not unique to Canadian and Quebec authors; it is found even in the analysis of a unitary state like France. The studies of Dulong, cited above, are evidence of this. Lipietz brings out this aspect when he insists that the local dominant classes are also part of the national power bloc and that Dulong "sous-estime la participation au Pouvoir central des fractions hégémoniques régionales." Lipietz, *Sur la question régionale*, 66-67. It will be understood that in the case of the unitary state, as in that of the federated state, this concept results from applying a mechanistic and instrumental methodology of the state.

27 Boismenu, *Le duplessisme*, 29-47, 81-84; J. Niosi, *La bourgeoisie canadienne* (Montréal, 1980); W. Clement, *Continental Corporate Power* (Toronto, 1977).

28 E. Balibar, *Cinq études du matérialisme historique* (Paris, 1974), 90-101.

29 The class effects of the accumulation of capital, of the enlarged reproduction of capital, of the integration of dominated forms, of the development of underdevelopment, of national oppression, etc.

30 The federated form enshrines and encourages the political expression of the regional variations in the emergence and organization of contradictions. In Canada this tendency is reinforced because the major agents of integration (such as political parties) have shown themselves to be ineffective and institutions at the federal level have had difficulty in accommodating regional interests. T.A. Levy, "Le rôle des provinces," *Le Canada et le Québec sur la scène internationale* (1977), 109-145; Commission de l'unité canadienne, *Se retrouver* (Ottawa, 1979), 11-33; R. Boily, "Les États fédéralistes et pluralistes, le cas canadien: processus de fédéralisation en éclatement," *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne*, XXXII, 1 (1980); Stevenson, *Unfulfilled Union*, 183-95; D.V. Smiley, "The structural problem of Canadian federalism," *Administration publique du Canada*, XIV, 3 (1981), 326-43; L. Jalbert, "Régionalisme et crise de l'Etat," *Sociologie et sociétés*, XII, 2 (1980), 66-72.

31 I refrain from mentioning here the sources of conflict, which are only significant in association with the fundamental contradictions, even if they seem to be important from the standpoint of narrative history, political parties, institutional interests, intergovernmental status rivalry and competition, administrative mechanisms and overlapping between them, and communication. R. Simeon, *Federal-Provincial Diplomacy* (Toronto, 1972), 184-96; Stevenson, *Unfulfilled Union*, 184-85, 195-203; G. Veilleux, Les relations intergouvernementales au Canada et au Québec (1977), 399-425; D.V. Smiley, "Canadian Federalism and the Resolution of Federal-Provincial Conflict," in F. Vaughan, P. Kyba, and O.P. Dwivedi, eds., *Contemporary Issues in Canadian Politics* (Toronto, 1970), 48-66; E. Gallant, "The Machinery of Federal-Provincial Relations: 1," in J.P. Meekison, ed., *Canadian Federalism: Myth or Reality* (Toronto), 287-98; R.M. Burns, "The Machinery of Federal-Provincial Relations: II," *ibid.*, 298-304; R. Schultz, "The Regulatory Process and Federal-Provincial Relations," in G. Bruce Doern, ed., *The Regulatory Process in Canada* (Toronto, 1978), 128-46; G. Julien and M. Proulx, *Le chevauchement des programmes fédéraux et québécois* (1978); V. Lemieux, "Québec contre Ottawa: Axiomes et jeux de la communication," *Études internationales* (1978) 323-36.

32 G. Boismenu, "Vers une redéfinition des lieux d'exercice du pouvoir d'État au Canada," *Cahiers d'histoire*, nº 1 (1981), 11-30.

33 The necessity of a regional policy developed and implemented at the provincial level does not appear equally evident. The marginalization of the Atlantic provinces in relation to the development of Canada leads the governments of those provinces to consider that their own capabilities cannot compare with those of the federal government. See Simeon, *Federal-Provincial Diplomacy*, 163-65. However, simultaneously with the government of Quebec, which revived the COEQ at the beginning of the 1960s, six other provincial governments (including New Brunswick and Nova Scotia) established between 1962 and 1965 a consultative body to develop a more consistent interventionist economic policy. H.E. English, "Economic Planning in Canada," in *Canadian Economic Policy* (Toronto, 1965), 358-75.

34 G. Bourque, *L'État capitaliste et la question nationale* (Montréal, 1977), especially 115-16. The Canadian federated state in its traditional organization and operation, as well as in the recent reform of some of its principles and institutions, illustrates well the present observation. See G. Boismenu and A.-J. Belanger, "Les propositions constitutionnelles: sens et portée," *in Québec: un pays incertain* (Montréal, 1980), 225-56; "Vers une redéfinition des lieux d'exercice du pouvoir d'État au Canada," *ibid.*, 15-28.