Labour/Le Travailleur

For a New Kind of History: A Reconnaissance of 100 Years of Canadian Socialism

Ian McKay

Volume 46, 2000

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/llt46art03

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

Canadian Committee on Labour History

ISSN

0700-3862 (imprimé)
1911-4842 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer cet article

McKay, I. (2000). For a New Kind of History: A Reconnaissance of 100 Years of Canadian Socialism. *Labour/Le Travailleur*, *46*, 69–125.

Résumé de l'article

Le nouveau millénaire marque aussi le centenaire du socialisme canadien, daté de 1901 (le premier organisme national indépendant) ou 1905 (la formation du premier parti socialiste qui a réussi au scrutin). En explorant la logique et la rhétorique des textes principaux du mouvement socialiste canadien, nous pouvons faire la distinction entre quatre formations différentes — la science évolutionnaire, la praxis révolutionnaire, la gestion de l'État, et l'humanisme révolutionnaire et la libération nationale — dans une histoire marquée partout par un ordre libéral hégémonique. Ces stratégies méritent d'être étudiées de façon soigneuse, sympadiique et critique à mesure que les mouvements socialistes se regroupent au cours du vingt et unième siècle.

For a New Kind of History: A Reconnaissance of 100 Years of Canadian Socialism

Ian McKay

THE CENTENNIAL OF CANADIAN socialism is upon us — in 2001 if one focuses on the creation of the first free-standing pan-Canadian socialist organization, in 2005 if one selects the formation of the first party to attract the support and the votes of thousands of supporters.[1] It is symptomatic of the problem of socialist memory in Canada that this centennial will probably be pretty much forgotten. Some of the reasons for this oblivion relate to the hegemonic neo-liberalism of the late 20th

[1]There were many socialist parties, including Canadian branches of the US-based Socialist Labor Party, and a wide range of socialist intellectuals, in late-Victorian Canada; but in terms of continuing free-standing Canada-wide institutions, the clearest time and place of birth is Toronto and Montréal, June-October 1901, culminating in a Thanksgiving weekend conference in Toronto launching the pan-Canadian career of the Canadian Socialist League, founded as an Ontario body two years earlier. The formation of the Socialist Party of Canada, founded in British Columbia in 1905, marked the start of the first electorally successful Canada-wide socialist party. Providing Canadian socialism with this birth certificate is a way of marking a general distinction between, on the one hand, socialist ideas articulated in larger bodies devoted to other issues, or in strictly local or provincial terms, or as "echoes" of a political movement decisively centred outside the country, and on the other hand, a socialist political movement principally focused on the socialist transformation of capitalist realities, working on a "Canadian" as well as a local, provincial, or international level, and adapting and reintegrating international socialist ideas to the peculiarities of the Canadian social landscape. For this early institutional history, see especially Gene Homel, "James Simpson and the Origins of Canadian Social Democracy," PhD thesis, University of Toronto, 1978, which contains much fascinating food for reflection on this period; and Martin Robin, *Radical Politics and Canadian Labour, 1880-1930* (Kingston 1968) — which, despite its age, has not been superseded on many points of detail.

Ian McKay, "For a New Kind of History: A Reconnaissance of 100 Years of Canadian Socialism," *Labour/Le Travail*, 46 (Fall 2000), 69-125.

century, which has transformed "socialism" into an epithet. But others of them relate to the strange and inadequate way the Canadian socialist past has customarily been constructed by socialists themselves for use in the present.

Some General Reflections on Methodology and Historiography

What has been most sorely lacking in the writing of our socialist history is an adequate theorization of that project of liberal order that goes under the heading "Canada." No history of Canadian socialism is minimally adequate unless it understands the force of qualification the adjective "Canadian" exerts over the noun "socialism." "Canada" denotes a project of liberal rule in a territory secured by force of British arms and modeled primarily on British and American precedents, a project which became hegemonic in northern North America from the third quarter of the 19th century. Grasping that Canada is a project of *deep liberalism* is key to a new critical history of Canadian socialism. The innovation is to treat Canadian socialism(s) as a series of relatively autonomous experimental attempts to escape the liberal labyrinth. Before the 1940s, socialists were positioned as the liberal project's most serious and rigorous *external* critics, who contested its defining characteristics: the epistemological and ontological primacy of the individual, the structuring influence of private property, and the political subordination of the state to its functions of capitalist accumulation and bourgeois legitimation. The real reason for the anomaly of a relatively influential Canadian socialist movement in a continent otherwise quite hostile to a formal socialist politics lies not in the ideological convolutions traceable back to some supposed Tory tinge,[2] but rather to the conjunctural specifics of a new liberal "passive revolution"[3] in the

[2]An earlier tradition tried to explain this "Canadian exceptionalism" in North America by looking at 18th-and early 19th-century Toryism. The *locus classicus* of this discussion can be found in Gad Horowitz, *Canadian Labour in Politics* (Toronto 1968). A more promising avenue to explore is that of the markedly radical nature of the Canadian liberal order, a program that was imposed from the centre with Jacobin zeal and ruthlessness, with a much weaker republican opposition than found in the United States, over a subcontinent containing a multitude of aliberal positionalities, which explains both its conceptual rigidity (well beyond the 1940s), its necessary compromises (most notably with religious and ethnic communitarianism in Québec), and its characteristic political debates (classical liberal federalism countered by pragmatic "*functional politics*"). For further reflections on the liberal-order reconnaissance of Canadian history, see Ian McKay, "The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History," *Canadian Historical Review*, forthcoming.

[3]On Gramsci's concept of the passive revolution, see the editors' helpful comments in Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* ed. and trans. by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (London 1971), 46; Christine Bucci-Glucksmann, "State, transition and passive revolution," in Chantal Mouffe, ed., *Gramsci and Marxist Theory* (London 1979), 207-236. There remains to be written a major study of the "Canadian passive revolution" of the 1940s, but for interesting work on new liberalism, see Robert Campbell, *Grand*

1940s, whereby a threatened liberal order transformed both itself (into a "new democracy" answerable to its "citizens") and many of its socialist adversaries (into "new democrats" comfortable with Fordism at home and American globalism abroad) in response to an apprehended social insurrection. What arguably set the Canadian experience apart from the American was the coincidence of socialist leftism with the first powerful "independentist" articulation of Canadian nationalism: socialists in Canada became, thanks to the passive revolution, "internal" to the Canadian project. Elements of socialism became central to the myth-symbol complex that legitimates both the existence of the Canadian state-nation and the Québec state-within-a-state that, at least for the time being, it encompasses.

As Stuart Hall reminds us, hegemonic ideological formation, such as the liberal order in Canada, formulates its own objects of knowledge, its own subjects, is driven by its own logic, establishes its own regime of truth; it evolves its "space of formation" and constantly interrupts, displaces and rearranges its opponents. Relations of power are not, then, monopolized by the state, but affect the entire social body. Yet an ideology's transition to hegemony within the state is decisive, because it allows for the naturalization of particular readings of the social world. In the case of Canadian liberalism, the "liberal revolution" of the mid-19th century would gradually acquire precisely this self-perpetuating character, through a myriad of laws, an array of cultural institutions, and an implied philosophy of "individualism," applied not just to abstract thought but also to such seemingly unconnected realms as religious faith and material life. Liberalism involved not just a "political ideology" in the narrow sense but an entire approach to political economy and daily life. By reason of its holism and ambition, because from its inception it was based upon historic compromises with aliberal forces (such as the Catholic Church in Québec), and because of its deep involvement in conflictual capitalist social relations, liberal order was never finally or perfectly "sealed": in the interstices of its commonsense have emerged a multitude of oppositional ideological formations, from various forms of nationalism to contemporary feminism. The most historically significant of these challengers to date, in terms of its impact on the state, has been "socialism," understood positively in this essay, following the lead of Margaret Cole, as a three-fold doctrine: "(1)the belief that any society founded on large-scale private ownership is unjust; (2)the conviction that a more equitable form of society can be established, one that will contribute to the moral and material improvement of humankind; and (3)the idea that social revolution is imperative" (with significant debate regarding whether such revolution necessarily entails violence).[4]

Illusions: The Politics of the Keynesian Experience in Canada 1945-1975 (Peterborough 1987); Barry Ferguson, *Remaking Liberalism: The Intellectual Legacy of Adam Shortt, O.D. Skelton, W.C. Clark, and W.A. Mackintosh, 1890-1925* (Montréal and Kingston 1993).

[4]Cited in Harry Ritter, ed., *Dictionary of Concepts in History* (New York 1986):418. I have found consistently helpful Michael Luntley, *The Meaning of Socialism* (London 1989), especially for its discussion of the socialism/liberalism distinction (9-12).

The very etymology of "socialism" suggests its profoundly adversarial relationship to liberal order.[5] To be a socialist in Canada means to seek to 'de-link' the liberal concept of individuality from the socialist concept of species-being, to articulate new conceptions of the sociality of human beings, and to think of ways in which their "metabolism" with the natural world could be placed on a "rational basis." In less abstract terms, there has never been a historically significant Canadian socialism that was not preoccupied with establishing a relationship with the tradition of a (variously construed) "Marx," whose words have been read in Canada since the 1870s, but with very different emphases depending on the time, place, and access to appropriate texts. These various "Marxes" have all agreed that a full program of human freedom entails conscious, rational control over economic and social forces. "The main enemies of such freedom were the 'blind forces' of the market; freedom would only be realized by rational planning, by liberating people from objective dependence on things and alienated social forces." Socialism aims to establish a society in which production is subject to the associated control of the producers, "not left to the mercy of the spontaneous decisions of millions of consumers and the calculations of thousands of capitalists."[6]

What would happen if we started to take these international definitions seriously in the writing of Canadian socialist history? For one thing, we would change the subject(s) of the history of Canadian socialism, to encompass a far greater diversity of people — those of religious and cultural figures, the First Nations and visible minorities, feminists and environmentalists, Québec nationalists and so on — whose words and deeds can be linked directly to the post-liberal counter-logic of socialism. This would entail decentering the formal parties as *the* core of the "history of Canadian socialism." The parties are significant, but their significance lies in their being partial experiments in making socialism a thing of this world. Second, certain narrative conventions would be re-opened for scrutiny. Every socialist movement in Canada and every socialist has, by not realizing their full ambitions, compromised to some extent with the liberal order. Canadians are "liberals by default": it is what they become when their socialist powers of resistance are worn down. Quite apart from its coercive apparatus, which is never

[5]The word "socialism" evidently first appeared in Italy in 1765, in Ferdinando Facchinei's commentary on Beccaria's *On Crime and Punishment*; twenty years later, it appeared in the writings of Appiano Buonafede to underline the idea that sociability is a natural human condition. See G. de Bertier de Sauvigny, "Liberalism, Nationalism, and Socialism: The Birth of Three Words," *The Review of Politics*, 32 (1970), 147-66; Arthur E. Bestor, "The Evolution of the Socialist Vocabulary," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 9 (1948), 259-302. The *Oxford English Dictionary* (1989) suggests a somewhat different early history of the word.

[6]I draw here from Andrzej Walicki, *Marxism and the Leap to the Kingdom of Freedom* (Stanford 1995), quotations at 6, 14, 17, 38, without endorsing his tendentious equation of Marxism and totalitarianism; the last quotation comes from Donald Sassoon, *One Hundred Years of Socialism: The West European Left in the Twentieth Century* (London 1997), xxii.

to be overlooked, the liberal historic bloc has persistently penetrated, fractured and fragmented the territory of the dominated classes and groups, making it difficult — but never impossible — to conceptualize alternative counter-hegemonic practices and discourses.

The existing historiography on Canadian socialism is extensive, varied and often superbly researched and written. Research tools, such as bibliographical aids and published primary documents, are easily accessible.[7] Collections of essays abound.[8] Collected writings and reprints of books from some prominent socialists have also appeared.[9] The major parties — the Socialist Party of Canada,[10] the various Labour (and Farmer-Labour) parties,[11] the Communists,[12] the Co-operative

[7]A useful general research tool is Peter Weinrich, *Social Protest from the Left in Canada, 1870-1970: A Bibliography* (Toronto 1982). For the important manifestos of the CCF-NDP, see Michael Cross, ed., *The Decline and Fall of a Good Idea: CCF-NDP Manifestoes, 1932 to 1969* (Toronto 1974); for NDP policy statements, see Cliff Scotton, ed., *New Democratic Policies 1961-1976* (Ottawa 1977).

[8]A useful collection for left nationalism is David Godfrey and Melville Watkins, eds. *Gordon to Watkins to You: A Documentary: the Battle for Control of Our Economy* (Toronto 1970). See also Leo Heaps, ed. *Our Canada* (Toronto 1991); Laurier LaPierre *et al.*, eds., *Essays on the Left: Essays in Honour of T.C. Douglas* (Toronto and Montréal 1971).

[9]See, for some of these collections, Larry Hannant, ed., *The Politics of Passion: Norman Bethune's Writing and Art* (Toronto 1998); L.D. Lovick, ed., *Till Power is Brought to Pooling: Tommy Douglas Speaks* (Lantzville, B.C. 1979); Edith Fowke, ed., *Towards Socialism: Selections from the Writings of J.S. Woodsworth* (Toronto 1948). Among the reprints of "socialist classics," see William Irvine, *The Farmers in Politics* (Toronto 1976 [1920]); League for Social Reconstruction, *Social Planning for Canada* (Toronto 1975 [1935]); J.S.Woodsworth, *Strangers Within Our Gates, or Coming Canadians* (Toronto 1972 [1909]); *My Neighbor: A Study of City Conditions* (Toronto, 1972 [1911]); League for Social Reconstruction, *Social Planning for Canada* (Toronto 1975 [1935]).

[10]On the S.P.C., see particularly Peter Campbell, "'Making Socialists': Bill Pritchard, the Socialist Party of Canada and the Third International," *Labour/Le Travail*, 30 (Fall 1992); David Frank and Nolan Reilly, "The Emergence of the Socialist Movement in the Maritimes, 1899-1916," *Labour/Le Travailleur*, 4 (Fall 1979), 85-113.

[11]Local labour parties emerged across Canada in the first decade of the 20th century; in the second, they attained a limited national presence. The most substantial monograph is James Naylor, *The New Democracy: Challenging the Social Order in Industrial Ontario, 1914-25* (Toronto 1991).

[12]On the Communists, see especially Ian Angus, *Canadian Bolsheviks* (Montréal 1981); Robert Comeau et Bernard Dionne, *Le droit de se taire: Histoire des communistes au Québec, de la Première Guerre mondiale à la Révolution tranquille* (Montréal 1989); M. Fournier, *Communisme et anticommunisme au Québec 1920-1950* (Montréal 1986); John Manley, "Does the International Labour Movement need Salvaging? Communism, Labourism and the Canadian Trade Unions, 1921-1928," *Labour/Le Travail*, 41 (Spring 1998); Manley, "'Starve, Be Damned!': Communists and Canada's Urban Unemployed, 1929-1939," *Canadian Historical Review*, 79, 3 (September 1998); Norman Penner, *Canadian*

Commonwealth Federation[13], and the New Democratic Party[14] have attracted serious scholarly attention. Much less studied, it would seem, have been the New Leftists of the 1960s in Canada,[15] and the Marxist-Leninist vanguard parties of the 1960s-1980s.[16] Even scarcer have been attempts to describe and theorize the history of these left movements taken together.[17] The co-operative movement has generated a large literature, some of which has focused on the often complex relationship

---

Communism: The Stalin Years and Beyond (Toronto 1988); William Rodney, *Soldiers of the International: A History of the Communist Party of Canada, 1919-1929* (Toronto 1968); Merrily Weisbord, *The Strangest Dream: Canadian Communists, the Spy Trials and the Cold War* (Toronto 1983). For a glimpse of Communist Party cultural activities, see Ruth McKenzie, ed., *Eight Men Speak and Other Communist Plays of the 1930's* (Toronto 1976), and for the experience of a Communist education in Québec, see G.A. Cohen, *If You're An Egalitarian, How Come You're So Rich?* (Cambridge, Mass. 2000). A vivid sense of the research possibilities still open to historians of Communism in Canada is provided by George Bolotenko, "The National Archives and Left-Wing Sources from Russia: Records of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion, the Communist Party of Canada and Left-Wing Internationals," *Labour/Le Travail*,37 (Spring 1996), 179-203.

[13]The literature on the CCF is immense. The most significant titles include Gerald Caplan, *The Dilemma of Canadian Socialism: The CCF in Ontario* (Toronto 1973); Seymour Martin Lipset, *Agrarian Socialism: The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan, a Study in Political Sociology* (Berkeley 1968); D. McHenry, *The Third Force in Canada: The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation 1932-1948*. (Berkeley 1950); Walter Young, *The Anatomy of a Party: The National CCF 1932-1961* (Toronto 1969); Leo Zakuta, *A Protest Movement Becalmed* (Toronto 1964).

[14]Out of an immense literature, one might especially mention Dan Azoulay, *Keeping the Dream Alive: The Survival of the Ontario CCF/NDP, 1950-1963* (Montréal and Kingston 1997); Desmond Morton, *NDP: The Dream of Power* (Toronto 1974); Norman Wiseman, *Social Democracy in Manitoba* (Winnipeg 1983).

[15]For accounts contemporaneous with the New Left, see Dimitri Roussopolous, ed., *The New Left in Canada* (Montréal 1970), and his edited collection *Canada and Radical Social Change* (Montréal 1973), and T. Reid and J. Reid, eds., *Student Power and the Canadian Campus* (Toronto 1969). Cyril Levitt, *Children of Privilege: Student Revolt in the Sixties* (Toronto 1984), is a comparative sociological study. There are some interesting reflections in Norman Penner, *The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis* (Scarborough 1977), ch.7.

[16]See, however, the interesting Bourdieuvian (and acerbic) reflections of Pierre Milot, *Le paradigme rouge: L'avant-garde politico-littéraire des années 70* (Montréal 1992), especially Ch.2 and 3; and Roger O'Toole, *The Precipitous Path: Studies in Political Sects* (Toronto 1977), which attempts to apply insights derived from the sociology of religion to the Toronto left of 1968-69. Bryan D. Palmer, ed., *A Communist Life: Jack Scott and the Canadian Workers Movement, 1927-1985* (St. John's, 1988) has interesting materials on Canadian Maoism.

[17]But see Penner, *The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis* and his "The Socialist Idea in Canadian Political Thought," PhD Thesis, University of Toronto, 1975.

between business-oriented pragmatism and socialist ideology.[18] Socialism in Québec during the 1960s and 1970s, especially insofar as it touched upon the rise of nationalism and the history of the Communist Party among francophones, has generated an extensive library.[19] Political scientists have analyzed voting patterns and speculated on the more distant ideological forces contributing to Canadian socialism.[20] General thematic studies — particularly on the questions of religious radicalism,[21] ethnic minorities,[22] feminism,[23] socialist leadership in the trade union movement[24] and the impact of the Cold War[25] — have become much more significant in the past ten years. A recent, welcome trend has been to focus on the

[18]See especially Ian MacPherson, *Each for All: A History of the Co-operative Movement in English Speaking Canada, 1900-1945* (Toronto 1979) and Rusty Neal, *Brotherhood Economics: Women and Co-operatives in Nova Scotia* (Sydney 1998).

[19]Andrée Lévesque, *Virage à gauche interdit. Les communistes, les socialistes et leurs ennemis au Québec, 1929-1939* (Montréal, 1984); Robert Comeau et Bernard Dionne, *Le droit de se taire: Histoire des communistes au Québec, de la Première Guerre mondiale à la Révolution tranquille* (Montréal 1989); Pierre Jalbert, *De la social-démocratie européen au Parti Québéecois* (Montréal 1982).

[20]By far the most important title in this vein, and a fresh look at the history of social democracy, is Alan Whitehorn, *Canadian Socialism: Essays on the CCF-NDP* (Toronto 1992).

[21]The major title here on the Protestant side is still Richard Allen's rich and fascinating *The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada 1914-1928* (Toronto 1973); for the Catholics and the left, see Gregory Baum, *Catholics and Canadian Socialism: Political Thought in the Thirties and Forties* (Toronto 1980). The post-1960 Christian/Marxist dialogue is largely unstudied; see Donald Evans, *Communist Faith and Christian Faith: A Report of the Committee on Christian Faith, The United Church of Canada* (Toronto 1964) for an interesting contemporary document.

[22]See Peter Krawchuk, *The Ukrainian Socialist Movement in Canada, 1907-1918* (Toronto 1979); Varpu Lindström-Best, *Defiant Sisters: A Social History of the Finnish Immigrant Women in Canada, 1890-1930* (Toronto 1988).

[23]See especially Linda Kealey, *Enlisting Women for the Cause: Women, Labour, and the Left in Canada, 1890-1920* (Toronto 1998); Linda Kealey and Joan Sangster, eds. *Beyond the Vote: Canadian Women and Politics* (Toronto 1989); Janice Newton, *The Feminist Challenge to the Canadian Left, 1900-1918* (Montréal and Kingston 1995); Joan Sangster, *Dreams of Equality: Women on the Canadian Left, 1920-1950* (Toronto 1989).

[24]The most important recent title here is Craig Heron, ed., *The Canadian Labour Revolt* (Toronto 1998). The classic account of CP/CCF rivalry in the labour movement is still Irving Abella, *Nationalism, Communism, and Canadian Labour: The CIO, the Communist Party, and the Canadian Congress of Labour, 1935-1956* (Toronto 1973). A study of the most significant free-standing Canadian radical socialist labour movement can be found in David Bercuson, *Fools and Wise Men: The Rise and Fall of the One Big Union* (Toronto 1978).

[25]Gregory S. Kealey, "The RCMP, the Special Branch and the Early Days of the Communist Party of Canada," *Labour/Le Travail*, 30 (Fall 1992), 169-204; Reginald Whitaker and Gary Marcuse, *Cold War Canada: The Making of a National Insecurity State, 1945-1957* (Toronto 1994).

history of socialist ideas.[26] Biographies of leading Canadian socialists have been especially significant: the best of them are suggestive meditations on structure, agency and subjectivity in the context of one person's life-history.[27] The memoirs of many leading participants are also available, and many of them attain a high standard.[28] Although this is a field numerically dominated by partisans of the NDP, both Communists and, more recently, "independent Marxists" have also contributed major studies, which have sought to highlight the contributions of rank-and-file socialists and local groups in the manner of "history from below."[29]

The core deficiency of this literature is theoretical. It generally does not yield, beyond the "case studies" and "biographies" that are its preferred sites, much in the way of general (and politically useful) insights. By and large, these titles usher us into fondly recollected past worlds. Before 1975, this literature of exemplary figures and forward movements might have functioned well as inspiration. Now it seems a melancholy monument to old abandoned hopes, a vast resource for recrimination. It is not a literature that often asks, or demands that we ask ourselves, hard questions. Much of it is written with the conviction that empiricist induction, warm-hearted humanism and base-and-superstructure reductionism are all that

[26]M. Horn, *The League for Social Reconstruction: Intellectual Origins of the Democratic Left in Canada 1930-1942* (Toronto 1980). There are some interesting reflections on proto-socialist ideology in 19th-century Canada in G.S. Kealey and B.D. Palmer, *Dreaming of What Might Be: The Knights of Labor in Ontario, 1880-1900.* (New York 1982). See also David Laycock, *Populist and Democratic Thought in the Canadian Prairies 1910 to 1945* (Toronto 1990); Alan Mills, *Fool for Christ: The Political Thought of J.S. Woodsworth* (Toronto 1991). Peter Campbell, *Canadian Marxists and the Search for a Third Way* (Montréal and Kingston 1999) represents a particularly significant step forward in the intellectual reconstitution of early Canadian socialism.

[27]Of the scores of titles one might mention Larry Hannant, *The Politics of Passion: Norman Bethune's Writing and Art* (Toronto 1998); Nicholas Fillmore, *Maritime Radical: The Life and Times of Roscoe Fillmore* (Toronto 1992); Gérard Fortin with Boyce Richardson, *Life of the Party* (Montréal 1984); D. Francis, *Frank H. Underhill: Intellectual Provocateur* (Toronto 1986); Claude Larivière, *Albert Saint-Martin. Militant d'avant-garde* (Montréal 1979); Joseph Levitt, *Fighting Back for Jobs and Justice: Ed Broadbent in Parliament* (Ottawa 1996), Kenneth McNaught, *A Prophet in Politics: A Biography of J.S. Woodsworth* (Toronto, 1959); and Cameron Smith, *Unfinished Journey: The Lewis Family* (Toronto 1989). A new standard for socialist biography is set by David Frank, *J.B.McLachlan: A Biography* (Toronto 1999).

[28]The outstanding title out of this collection of memoirs is David Lewis, *The Good Fight: Political Memoirs 1909-1958* (Toronto 1981). Also noteworthy: William Beeching and Phyllis Clarke, eds., *Yours in the Struggle: Reminiscences of Tim Buck* (Toronto 1977); Thérèse Casgrain, *A Woman in a Man's World* (Toronto 1972); Eugene Forsey, *A Life on the Fringe: The Memoirs of Eugene Forsey* (Toronto 1990); Donald MacDonald, *The Happy Warrior: Political Memoirs* (Markham, Ont. 1988).

[29]See especially O. Melnyk, *No Bankers in Heaven* (Toronto 1989), an invaluable collection of oral biographies.

sound socialist scholarship requires. Much of this literature should be critiqued not because it is *present-minded* (what else could a politically useful socialist history be?), but because it is *presentist*, because it abolishes the *alterity* of the past. Particularly among Marxists, but by no means confined to them, there has also been a related tendency to a form of teleological class reductionism, which sees "socialism" as a necessary outcome of "proletarianization" — a belief that stands in an awkward relationship with the fact of the deep and tenacious roots of liberalism in the working class itself. And it is often also mechanical and simplistic: it reduces the dynamic grammar of hegemony to the passive and predictable reflection of underlying class interests. Many of these patterns can be related to "socialist triumphalism," a narrative pattern in which those at the end-point of socialism's necessary evolution could fortify themselves with the conviction that, as the first of the "true socialists," they were better positioned than anyone before them (or beside them) to "achieve socialism."

The more concrete failings of this literature flow from these underlying theoretical problems. It should hardly need saying that a fundamental fact of Canadian political and cultural life is the existence within the territory claimed by the Canadian state of two predominant linguistic communities or nations. But only the most diligent and focused reader of this literature would ever think that this fact was of much importance for socialists. Strange, but true — there is not, in this vast library of titles, one major study of French/English relations on the Canadian left.[30] Does "our Canada" include "Québec"? It does so fitfully, awkwardly, and marginally — either by lumping Québec and "French Canada" into "Canada as a whole;" or by following the fashion in the (re-) writing of Canadian history, of simply regarding "English Canada" (read Ontario, and often just southern urban Ontario)

[30]The figures of Stanley Ryerson and Charles Taylor stand out as the most important socialist participants in an "anglophone/francophone" dialogue within Canadian socialism. See Gregory S. Kealey, "Stanley Bréhaut Ryerson: historien marxiste," in *Le droit de se taire: Histoire des communistes au Québec, de la Première Guerre mondiale à la Révolution tranquille* (Outremont 1989), 242-272, which may also be read, in English, in Gregory S. Kealey, "Stanley Bréhaut Ryerson: Canadian Revolutionary and Marxist Historian," *Workers and Canadian History* (Montréal and Kingston 1995): 48-100. For a contextualization of the "national question" and debates over the "nationalist deviation" in the Communist Party in the 1940s-1960s, see Penner, *Canadian Communism*, 177-181, 227-229, 256-259. Charles Taylor's work is generally pitched at a higher level of abstraction than that of Ryerson, but the Québec case has clearly strongly influenced his social-democratic advocacy of a "politics of recognition." Important texts to which subsequent scholars might refer are *The Pattern of Politics* (Toronto and Montréal 1970), and *Reconciling the Solitudes: Essays on Canadian Federalism and Nationalism* (Montréal and Kingston 1993). There is also a literature on the vexed relations of the early NDP with francophones: see, for instance, André Lamoureux, *Le NPD et le Québec 1958-1985* (Montréal1985); David H. Sherwood, "The N.D.P. and French Canada, 1961-1965," MA Internal Research Project, No.5, Report No.12, Division III, McGill University, 1966.

as the essence of the country as a whole, or by following the parallel fashion in Québec of projecting back into the past an independence from Canada that many aspire to see in the future.[31] This is poor history, but worse politics, because it will leave the coming cohort of radicals profoundly uninformed about a fundamental defining fact of the Canadian socialist experience, and subtly anesthetize them to the ambiguity and the danger of the intertwined "nation-building" projects to which both francophone and anglophone socialists have subscribed. And if the "Canadian" in the phrase "Canadian socialism" is radically undertheorized, so is the "socialism." We find a recurrent partisan pattern of treating one part as the whole. This is particularly the case with histories which take the NDP (which itself is generally and problematically presented as a necessary organic outgrowth of the CCF) as *the* only (or only worthy) exponent of socialism in Canada. What remains profoundly unexplored, on either side of the phrase "Canadian socialism," are relations with the hegemonic liberal order, without which "Canada" itself is inexplicable and the challenges facing its successive schools of socialists difficult to conceptualize. How many times have we told the story of radicals who betrayed the (transcendental) "true values" of the movement, as measured by a "revolutionary yardstick"? Or cynical and calculating governments which "skimmed off" the best of the socialists' demands? Of youthful high hopes replaced by middle-aged disillusionment? Of sell-outs to the bourgeoisie? Of the "failure" of this or that "socialist program" (often juxtaposed to the implied — generally undemonstrable — path to success had the counterfactual "correct path" been followed)? Both in left polemics and 'high-brow' historical literature, these narratives work through a kind of symbolic violence to establish the credentials of the narrator as the person-who-knows. But from the standpoint of the critique of liberal order, not to mention at a time when such socialist epistemological certainty has at best an antiquarian charm, these narratives are not only stale and self-serving, but naïve. All Canadian socialisms have failed, insofar as every one of them has failed to transcend the liberal order that is socialism's ground, context, and antithesis; and every Canadian socialist has necessarily made compromises with hegemonic liberalism, whether in daily life, in political tactics, or in cultural formation. This is at least a century-old recurrent pattern, which has affected tendencies, movements and individuals, both "opportunistic scoundrels" and "proletarian fighters." And yet, in another way, all Canadian socialisms have succeeded, at least to the extent of creating spaces of resistance, some of them extremely complex and durable, from which projections of an alternative humanity have attained reality-status. They have emerged, sometimes with dazzling speed, and attracted a mass following; and many have lastingly changed the terms of the project of liberal order itself. Whatever short-term polemical mileage can be derived from narratives of the "revolution

[31]In this essay, I use the word "Canada" to denote a process of liberal order, not a "nation" or "nation-state." The term "Canadian socialism" means "socialism found on the territory claimed by the Canadian project."

betrayed" or the "pragmatic education of the idealists" or the "inevitable maturation" of the young hotheads, the sense of inevitability they create is profoundly *defeatist*. A less teleological and judgmental approach would reconstruct a variety of Canadian socialisms — i.e., politico-discursive formations specifying distinctive problem-sets and solutions — as plausible (or at least explainable) responses to the specific challenges posed by liberal order. Each socialism was, in a sense, a kind of experiment in post-liberalism. One is asked to give up the "bogus certainties" about history's final destination; one is put to work exploring the "conjunctural specifics," probing each socialism for its rational core, its "answers" to the recurrent problems liberal order generates for anyone who wants to live otherwise. The unilinear narratives, and perhaps especially those driven by Marxism-Leninism, can only lead to a stark choice between faith and empirical evidence. Post-orthodox, non-determinist narratives, on the other hand, may lead to a more optimistic conclusion. Like many Canadians before us, we daily encounter aspects of the liberal order that are irrational, unjust, and alienating — aspects of social reality that cannot be definitively "sealed" by the ideological formation in which we are obliged to live. These fissures are open to alternative post-liberal interpretations. We socialists have everything to gain from a sympathetic and detailed understanding of all such interpretations, both internationally and in Canada.

An alternative approach to the "vertical bias" of socialist historiography would entail trying to work back from demonstrably significant texts — texts that historical evidence suggests were read by many people — to their conditions of construction. Socialists, often inspired by specific important trends or events, share, at a minimum, a common perception that liberal order is unjust and its replacement by a different system is possible and desirable. In archetypal forums — programmatic texts and manifestoes, party congresses and public meetings — socialists try to "reverse the discourse" on liberalism, to turn its language back on itself, to hold it to account against its own principles. There is, moreover, a dominant aspect of liberal order — a "core problem" or "problems", or a "matrix-event" — which above all others calls out for socialist analysis and activism. A "cohort" of such socialists can be defined by their preoccupation with this problem and by sharing significant common understandings of the ways in which it should be understood (if not necessarily how it ought to be resolved). The combination of "matrix-event," "cohort," "paradigm," and the specific parties and groups associated with them — and usually an extensive cultural penumbra of institutes, schools, summer camps, concerts, books and so on — can be termed a "political formation." I see four such formations in Canadian socialist history, with a fifth under construction today: the first, shaped pivotally by the transition from competitive to monopoly capitalism and by the rise of the theory of evolution, which flourished from c.1900 to c.1920, and which emphasized above all socialist education in the light of evolution's political message; a second, shaped pivotally by the Russian Revolution, which theorized the need for a socialist revolution guided by a proletarian vanguard party,

which flourished from c.1917 to c.1935; a third, whose matrix-event was the Great Depression, which insistently advocated the national management of the economy, which flourished from c.1932 to c.1960; a fourth, whose matrix-events were the perceived collapse of American civilization and the Cold War disorganization of the "older lefts," which highlighted the overcoming of alienation through direct democracy by direct action, and which flourished from c.1960 to c.1975.; and a fifth, shaped decisively by neoliberalism and the rise of feminism and other new social movements, which is unfolding today.

The origins of such formations can be tied down, loosely, to particular periods — yet doing so involves risks. There is the danger of simply repeating the older tropes of necessary progress, and the more subtle peril of forgetting that older paradigms of socialism are frequently (and often effectively) re-activated in subsequent periods. A formation shaped by a particular cohort and a particular matrix-event often persists beyond the two decades normally allotted a generation. An additional requirement of any theorization of socialism in Canada is that of confronting regional and national plurality: a pattern found in one nation or region cannot be casually generalized, without incurring the risk of oversimplification, beyond its borders. We need "horizontal" analyses that seek to re-create the complex networks which bound socialists — and their parties, journals, social and intellectual networks — in formations of alliance and antagonism unevenly developed across the Canadian sub-continent. The analytical outcome of a more "horizontal" approach to analysis would be a more inclusive narrative — written in terms of major and minor figures, parties, currents, texts, and debates — that seeks to track the socialist ideal in all its complex diversity. This would be a kind of history that makes it possible to imagine a socialist tradition that is both discontinuous and continuous: discontinuous in that it undoubtedly features "breaks" and "differences in focus" separating one formation from another, continuous in that it nonetheless persists in theorizing a "Canadian socialism" as an exit from a persisting liberal order. Each formation, then, was distinct; a socialist of the 1940s shared with fellow socialists, even those with whom he or she differed politically, a hierarchy of key problems and a language in which to discuss them, distinct from those which had predominated twenty years earlier. Yet, because all were concerned to chart a path out of capitalist social relations and liberal order in northern North America, all can be made, at least in our unapologetically present-mided historical imaginations, "alternative voices" in a continuing socialist conversation. Socialism as "Evolutionary Science," Socialism as "Revolutionary Praxis," Socialism as "National State Management," and Socialism as "Revolutionary Humanism and National Liberation," discussed through works of William Irvine, Maurice Spector, F.R.Scott/David Lewis, and Pierre Vallières[32], are descriptive names I have applied to these formations.

[32]I have selected the titles I go on to discuss in this essay because they are ones that *I* know, but also because they were of known contemporary importance. So far as I am aware, no

The First Socialism: Evolutionary Science

The first Canadian socialist formation (c.1900 to c.1920) was dominated by those we can describe as "scientific evolutionists," and took shape under the shadow of two related developments: the rise of monopoly capitalism and of evolutionary theory. A tone of patronage suffuses discussions of this formation. In the 1920s, Maurice Spector, the most accomplished revolutionary writer of a new formation, looked back on the people he aimed to displace:

> Although we live in an epoch of the collapse of Capitalism and the social revolution, it is not enough to proclaim the principles of proletarian dictatorship and workers' power if we hope to succeed in rallying the masses to fight for these principles. We must beware of turning these principles into abstract formulae. The Socialist parties on this continent have not in the past carried on consistent political activity. The S. P. of C. [Socialist Party of Canada] has mistaken a study circle for a political party and courses of lectures on Marx's Capital for revolutionary activity. The S.P. of A. [Socialist Party of America] and the I.L.P. [Independent Labour Party] have aped bourgeois respectability and considered electioneering as the highest form of political action. The Workers' Party wants neither the village chapel atmosphere of the S.P. of C. nor the 'democratic' conceptions of the S.P. of A. The Workers' Party will strive to be a party of action — a party of the masses. Revolutionary political activity to us means disciplined work in the labor unions, agitation in election campaigns, agitation from the floor of Parliament, mass demonstrations, organizations of the unemployed, and participation in the everyday struggles of the working class. For we realize that only through their mass experiences with the Capitalist dictatorship in the everyday struggle will the working class be rallied by its vanguard to the struggle for proletarian dictatorship. The struggle for power will inevitably grow out of the struggle for bread.[33]

Spector's caricature was vengeful, one-sided, and perceptive. Versions of it have proved extremely durable. In particular, many historians have described a passage from the village-chapel "Christian Socialism" of the early 20th century to more secular, often Marxist, socialism of the 1920s.

---

one has ever compiled a list of the "most influential fifty writings" in the Canadian socialist tradition. Irvine's work was highly influential in Alberta, and subsequently strongly influenced C.B.Macpherson's path-breaking analysis of *Democracy in Alberta;* Spector's journalism in *The Worker* was widely read across the working-class movement, although it never was published in book form (and surely should be); *Make This Your Canada* was a bestselling book in the 1940s; and *Nègres blancs d'Amérique,* first published in Montréal by Éditions Parti pris in 1966, and co-published in Montréal and Paris by Éditions Parti pris and Éditions François Maspero in 1968, was then published in New York, Italy, Germany, and Mexico: one hazards the guess that it is the most widely-read socialist book written by a Canadian citizen.

[33]"Closing Address of Maurice Spector at Workers' Party Convention," *The Worker*, 15 March 1922.

How, other than as a crude first draft, can the first formation be distinguished from the radicalism of the 19th century[34] or the revolutionary socialist *praxis* of the 1920s? The key, I believe, lies in the paramount status first-wave socialists accorded a theory of social evolution. First-cohort socialists ultimately felt themselves to be underwritten by the "inscrutable power" of Evolution, that great massive social and natural force that was simultaneously the *process* of change, the *explanation* of change, and the *politico-ethical* practices logically required by that change. The key idea was the inevitable adaptation of society to its environment. Herbert Spencer's "organic analogy" — that is, that organic and social bodies shared the four fundamental qualities of naturally growing in mass, becoming increasingly complex, acquiring an ever-greater mutual interdependence of parts, and outliving as aggregatives the life-span of any individual — unified this formation.[35] This socialism attained a certain "fixity" in certain small formal institutions —the Canadian Socialist League (fd. 1901); the Social Democratic Party (fd. 1911); and especially the Socialist Party of Canada (fd. 1905), whose ideological rigour, modest membership figures, petit-bourgeois or "labour-aristocratic" personnel and distance from positions of power in both the labour movement and Canadian politics more broadly have led some scholars to dismiss its legacy as "impossibilist".[36]

Such evaluations seem limited in two respects. First, they underestimate the degree to which this first cohort of socialists, to a degree approached again only in the 1930s, focused on cultural struggle — on the changing of minds, on building alternative sources of authority, and on connecting socialist insights into the economy with an ethical critique of capitalism. Measuring first-wave socialism strictly by the yardsticks of electoral success or trade-union influence downgrades this cultural struggle, which diffused socialist ideas through wide-ranging labour

[34]That such a turn-of-the-century break was evident to contemporaries — e.g., Phillips Thompson — can be gleaned from Gene Homel, "Fading Beams of the Nineteenth Century: Radicalism and Early Socialism in Canada's 1890s," *Labour/Le Travail*, 5 (1980), 7-32.

[35]See Mark Pitinger, *American Socialists and Evolutionary Thought* (Madison 1993) for a superb guide to this moment in the history of North American socialism. In Laurence Gronlund's *The Co-operative Commonwealth* — the book which, perhaps more than any other, put Spencerian Marxism on the North American map, and whose title was to echo loudly in Canadian party politics — Spencer was likened to the hen "that had adopted and tended an orphaned duckling, and that afterwards flapped her wings and cackled horror-stricken when her *protégé* persisted in going into the water. He has nobly vindicated the organic character of society; but now, when it is simply obeying the law of evolution, he is thoroughly convinced that it is going astray." Laurence Gronlund, *The Co-operative Commonwealth: An Exposition of Socialism* (Boston 1890 [1884]), 97.

[36]The classic statement is Ross McCormack, *Reformers, Rebels, and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement, 1899-1919* (Toronto 1977); a subtler but no-less-critical evaluation can be found in Mark Leier, *Red Flags and Red Tape: The Making of a Labour Bureaucracy* (Toronto 1995).

media. It also misses what was "first formationist" about much of the cultural work outside the parties — in, for example, the Industrial Workers of the World, the Western Federation of Miners, and others. This was a pre-1914 ferment in Canada whose intellectual challenge to liberalism worried some of its stalwarts a good deal. Even O.D. Skelton, an academic far from the fray, felt he had to respond urgently to the claims of socialism.[37] Second, the role of evolutionary theory has been seriously misconstrued. There was no automatic connection between espousing a theory of social evolution and an enthusiasm for "evolutionary" (i.e. strictly parliamentary) socialism as it subsequently came to be understood. For many in this cohort, evolutionary sociological theory mandated a revolutionary social vision: radical socialists could pull from Spencer — selectively read and filtered through Marx — the message that to change capitalism one had to understand its laws, and that without social science, there could be no effective social revolution. The world of political economy analyzed in Marx's *Capital*, Vol. I, could then appear as a "case study" of a more general process of evolution in the social world. One could, and many did, arrive at "revolutionary" political conclusions via a journey through "evolutionary theory."

The applied sciences of the first-wave socialists were most often based on Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Frederick Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, Herbert Spencer (especially *The Study of Sociology*), and the many authors published by the Charles H. Kerr and Company, of whom Karl Kautsky and Arthur M. Lewis (the author of *Evolution Social and Organic*) were among the most significant. In economics, the first-wave socialists focused on the labour theory of value, which proved the exploitiveness of capitalism and the increasing gap between rich and poor. Some were also attending to new economic historians, who demonstrated, to Canadian socialists' satisfaction, that world capitalism had impoverished workers, expropriated primary producers, and led civilization repeatedly to the brink of war. In general these socialists evinced slight interest in Canadian history as such. In anthropology, they were deeply impressed by Morgan's writings (often as they encountered them indirectly through Engels). First-wave Canadian socialists based their political hopes and dreams on the prospects of a socialist ascent to power — which a surprising number of them described as a "revolution" led by the "working class" — but most of them were then forced to confront the dilemma that the working class was a small proportion of the Canadian population. Socialism would come about primarily through a widespread process of working-class education and by "making socialists" through persuasion.

[37]O.D.Skelton, *Socialism: A Critical Analysis* (Boston and New York 1911). Skelton's work — the first major book-length treatment of the topic in Canada — achieved international renown for its refutation of socialist economics; it confidently predicted the movement would come to nothing in a country such as Canada.

At the same time, first-wave socialism was characterized by interesting and symptomatic absences. In general, "Canada" as a category of analysis was, to our eyes, virtually absent: this cohort was fully immersed in a North Atlantic world of socialist discourse, and only a few spared a thought for the "peculiarities of the Canadians" or the "specific nature of the Canadian state." What we would today take to be a defining position for Canadian social democrats — viz., a belief in the state's necessarily comprehensive involvement in planning and providing social services and economic development — was noteworthy by its absence. It is in fact something of an oversimplification to see these first-wave Canadian socialists as working in "Canada" at all. They derived their theoretical sustenance from continental theory and their political strategies from both the United States and Britain, from whence many had recently come.

One could reference here the work of Colin McKay, who with George Wrigley could be called the co-founder of the Canadian Socialist League, and who drew explicitly on Spencer's *Social Statics* and from works of American Spencerian sociology to fashion a durable and sophisticated critique of the Canadian liberal order.[38] Or E. E. Winch, W. A. Pritchard, Arthur Mould, and R. B. Russell, whose "Marxism of the Third Way," expressed in such diverse institutions as the SPC, the One Big Union, the Communist Party, and the CCF, combined a belief in education with a drive to educate the working class to live up to its historical responsibilities.[39] Or A.E. Smith, whose transition from Methodism to Communism does not seem to have entailed a disruption of the "biological standpoint" from which he interpreted history and his own political activism.[40] But, arguably, *the* most influential and widely-read text from this first formation came from William Irvine (1885-1962), the Methodist-turned-Unitarian whose writings capture the flavour of the United Farmers of Alberta and "Radical Calgary".[41] Irvine's 1920 *The Farmers in*

[38]Note in this connection Ian McKay, ed., *For a Working-Class Culture: A Selection of Colin McKay's Writings on Sociology and Political Economy, 1897-1939* (St. John's, 1996); "Changing the Subject(s) of the 'History of Canadian Sociology': The Missing Spencerian Marxists, 1890-1940," *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 23, 4 (1998), 389-426; "A Third Kind of Marxism: Colin McKay, Socialist Political Economy and the Great Depression," *Studies in Political Economy*, 55 (Spring 1998), 127-154; "Of Karl Marx and the Bluenose: Colin Campbell McKay and the Legacy of Maritime Socialism," *Acadiensis*, 27, 2 (Spring 1998), 3-25.

[39]See Campbell, *Canadian Marxists and the Search for a Third Way*.

[40]Tom Mitchell, "From the Social Gospel to 'the Plain Bread of Leninism': A.E. Smith's Journey to the Left in the Epoch of Reaction After World War I," *Labour/Le Travail*, 33 (1994), 125-151.

[41]For Irvine's interest in Spencer, see Anthony Mardiros, *William Irvine: The Life of a Prairie Radical* (Toronto 1979), 98-99; and for an excellent contextual introduction to his thought, see Reginald Whitaker, "Introduction" to Irvine, *The Farmers in Politics*. (My only reservation would be that I would tend to substitute the word "Spencerian" for "Hobbesian" in Whitaker's characterizations of Irvine's politico-ethical universe.) For a general account

Politics[42] brought the Spencerian socialist[43] tradition into direct and fruitful contact with the largest mass movement of its time. Irvine's thought suggests the limitations of simply dismissing first-wave socialism for its supposed "vulgarity," "impossibilism," or "reformism," terms which are not so much erroneous as beside the point. At the core of Irvine's socialism was the conviction that radicals could scientifically interpret society in ways which accelerated the evolutionary progress of equality.

His work can be seen as an exploration of four great Spencerian themes. There is, first and fundamentally, the announcement of an epistemological break: a leap forward to a new scientific understanding of society. Just as in natural evolution, where "the higher an organism develops, the more complex its parts become," so it was in human society.

> The human organism has developed from a simple splotch of protoplasm. Included in that organism are many parts, hands, feet, stomach, heart, eyes, ears, and brains, etc. All have special functions to perform. No one would think of arguing that the development of these various organs meant anarchy, that the hands would carry off the lungs, or the feet walk off with the nerves; on the contrary, it is well-known that in the pursuit of the purpose of the intelligence, every organ becomes of service, acting in co-operation for the well-being of the organism. Society is like the human body. Once it was a social plasm, the simple form. As it evolved, it developed many parts and functions, in the performance of which groups of people act as units. It would be insane, if it were possible, to throw a man into a chemical solution that would reduce him into his original protoplasm for the sake of sameness and primitive unity. For surely the unity of parts acting in harmony is higher and more admirable than the original bit of jelly.[44]

Second, Irvine, in company with some neo-Hegelian liberals, believed that the evolution of industrial society had attenuated the epistemological and ontological coherence of the individual as the primary unit of social and political analysis. Only if "the individual" were conceptualized as the specification of a function or group would a more equitable social order be conceivable. As one might expect, this fundamental change would come about organically: "society will embrace the new social order without any cataclysmic upheaval. We are gradually growing towards it. The old cells are dropping off one by one, and new cells are being formed. The stability of society while in the process of reconstruction has already given confidence to the diffident, and paved the way for further progress. The fear of

---

of Irvine, see J.E. Hart, "William Irvine and Radical Politics in Canada," PhD thesis, University of Guelph, 1972.

[42]William Irvine, *The Farmers in Politics* (Toronto 1976 [1920]).

[43]It was not yet a "Spencerian Marxist" position: Irvine expressed criticisms of what he took to be some of the political implications of Marxist thought, while endorsing the substance of "Marxist materialism." His later work — e.g., *Is Socialism The Answer? The Intelligent Man's Guide to Basic Democracy* (Winnipeg 1945) — is much more clearly "Marxist."

[44]*The Farmers in Politics*, 184-185.

destruction has been allayed, and conservatism in itself has ceased to be a virtue."[45] Third, the group, united on the basis of its specific material needs, will replace "the individual" as the molecule of the new post-liberal political order. In contrast to Spencer, in whose sociology class played no functional role, Spencerian socialists thought class was decisive. They believed (on structural-functionalist, organicist grounds) that only the subaltern classes — specifically the working class for the SPCers, the farmers for Irvine and many other Prairie radicals — could *functionally* usher in the new social order. And fourth, for all its "telescopic" distancing effect, Irvine's cosmic socialism used natural-scientific discourse as an ethical critique. In particular, the evolutionary concepts of "degeneration" and "atavism" were brought to bear on the questions of the hour.[46] Contrary to Spector, Irvine was not so much confusing the party with a study-group as he was opposing the hypothesis that the party itself could functionally create the cultural preconditions of a new society.

For Irvine, democratic citizenship could be given an entirely new, post-liberal meaning, as the "socialization of responsibility."[47] With the collapse of the bankrupt two-party system, one was opened up to the possibility of the direct democracy of producers' groups, to a post-patronage, post-corruption political universe in which honest political debate and dialogue is possible. Irvine glimpsed, in "group government" — a democracy in which government was answerable to producers' groups organized according to occupation, in an Canadian adaptation of the British concept of "guild socialism" — a way of transcending the politics of liberal order. In this version of socialism, the language of liberal rights was turned against itself: against the merely formal rights of citizenship and party, one championed the real rights and responsibilities that would follow from function.

In his brief précis of the "socialism we have (thankfully) lost," Maurice Spector elegantly distilled what later generations would find rather "abstract" or "idealist" about first-wave socialism. Its "cosmic" evolutionary perspective did not easily combine with, and might even distract from, any *strategic* politics of socialist transformation. Concrete interventions in the present day were difficult to link to so general an evolutionary vision. But for self-proclaimed revolutionaries like McKay and gradualist Fabians like W.F. Hatheway, eclectics like Irvine and "hard Marxists" like the DeLeonites, the theory of evolution was definitional. Evolution, which taught scientific as well as moral lessons, would vindicate them. Few attempts were made to adjust the ideology to the conditions of Canadian society; and there was a yawning void where later cohorts would expect to find a detailed strategic conception of how the party, the decisive place of integration where

[45] *The Farmers in Politics*, 86-87.

[46] On the "moral degeneration" or "moral degeneracy" of the party system, see *The Farmers in Politics*, 55, 64, and 76. On atavism (and weeding) see: "The socially atavistic are being weeded out; atavism is a continually rarer phenomenon. Yesterday is passed, to-morrow is not yet; this is the twilight of the gods." (24)

[47] *The Farmers in Politics*, 45.

narrow corporate interests are translated into a disciplined class politics, would interact with its social base. Spector's brisk treatment of his predecessors alerts us to the ways in which they inhabited a very different ethical and political formation than the one he worked to bring into being.

From a 21st century perspective, however, Spector's disparagement seems less interesting than the first formation's often overlooked contributions. Many of Irvine's arguments have a contemporary feel, at a time when radical energies are once again being poured into the re-activation of the concept of citizenship.[48] Irvine was characteristic of the best thinkers of his formation in stressing the possibility that working people themselves could become their own educators. His "Spencerian" connections between seemingly disparate phenomena — such as capitalism and environmental degradation — have retained their interest. Most significant and valuable was Irvine's construction of a well-theorized and grounded counter-hegemonic challenge to liberalism at the level of *political theory*, in his deceptively simple call for *group government* — an ingenious "Canadianization" of a British atttempt to think through Marxist political theory in a non-Fabian, non-statist direction. This entailed a profoundly subversive "defamiliarization" of liberalism's claims to the mantle of "democracy." Irvine's subsequent political itinerary — into the Ginger Group, CCF, and ultimately into the role of CP fellow traveler[49] — would reveal the staying power of his post-liberal politics.

The Second Socialism: Revolutionary Praxis

Revolution is the keyword of the second socialist formation, dominated by a cohort which rose to prominence from 1917 to 1935 during a period in which the liberal order was challenged by the century's most severe crisis of capitalism. The Communists are certainly the most famous of the forces within the revolutionary formation which organized in this period; but it is a mistake to reduce this second socialism to them. The One Big Union, perhaps Canada's most original and intelligent counter-model to American business unionism, and its leader, R.B. Russell, considered themselves to be as entitled as the Communists to the mantle of vanguard revolutionaries; there was also a rival francophone attempt to organize a section of the Communist International in Québec. Before the "solidification" of the party there were scores of revolutionary groups which have faded from the historians' view as the CPC has come to monopolize attention. Still, there is a certain merit to this focus on the CPC. The most lasting and memorable monuments to the period came from the Communists and especially from *The Worker*, the party's

[48]See Chantal Mouffe, ed., *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community* (London 1992).

[49]His analysis of "Premier Stalin" as a proponent of "human resources development" suggests how one could combine first-wave Spencerianism with third-wave state-building: with lamentable effects, as we now know. See Irvine, *Is Socialism The Answer?* (Winnipeg1945), 14.

newspaper, wherein a discourse of heroic revolutionary *praxis* was richly developed. And, gradually, there came to be, around the Communists, a cohort of people who might dispute many of the CPC's specific policies, but shared much of its worldview. Such people exercised an influence well beyond their numbers, especially in the labour movement. In the interwar period especially, revolutionary analyses suddenly had a plausibility and an audience they had earlier lacked. The pivotal matrix-event was the Russian Revolution; closer to home, general strikes and "apprehended insurrections" from Vancouver Island to Cape Breton demonstrated the power of the working class. State violence and repression, exemplified by armed occupations of the coalfields and the imprisonment of radicals, as well as the development of a security apparatus, suggested the extremes which defenders of liberal order would countenance. There is a rich and abundant literature on what is perhaps the most researched period in the history of Canadian leftism.

But there has been little reflection on the implicit philosophy and sociology, the historical analysis, the cultural networks, and the shared language — in a problematic word, "the paradigm" — which influenced this second formation. Any such reflection here must be taken as preliminary. One is struck particularly by five new developments. First, for *both* the communist and non-communist left, the party as a disciplined and "professional" institution assumed a reality-status in this period it had earlier lacked. Second, the status of "revolution" also changed, from a word denoting a general "speeding-up" of social evolution, conceived in a very general or "cosmic" sense, to one that pertained to immediate political phenomena in actual countries, orchestrated by professional revolutionaries guided by specific theories.[50] (And after the revolution, a "dictatorship of the proletariat" — the phrase did not originate in this period,[51] but it unquestionably achieved a new prominence in it — would work to transform social life as a kind of "collective social scientist.") Third, there was, at the same time, a heightened socialist awareness of the relativity of any position. Even those who had studied a question minutely, and had a sound training in socialist theory, might disagree in their diagnoses. And since the new paradigm involved a far tighter interconnection between theory and practice, an intensified sense that "socialism" was not a "cosmic" tendency but an objectively definable future immanent in the present, an awareness of political "relativity" led

[50]Maurice Spector would write in 1923 that in five years, the revolution had ceased to be a "myth" and had become the "inspiring reality of a proletarian state." "Delegate To Comintern Reports to Convention. Maurice Spector Sums Up Work of Fourth Congress," *The Worker*, 15 March 1923.

[51]It originated, of course, with Marx, although he applied it to the Paris Commune, a politically heterogeneous body in which his own supporters were in the minority. For important books on the subject, see Etienne Balibar, *On the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, trans. Graham Lock (London 1977); and John Molyneux, *Marxism and the Party* (London 1978).

not to "relativism" but to an intensified search for objectively "true readings."[52] Fourth, a sharpened dialectical sensibility made socialist discourse less all-embracing and speculative and more empirical and historically specific; and "Canada" itself, with all of its internal contradictions, became, perhaps for the first time in socialist thought, something which was *necessarily* an important category. And fifth and finally, class analysis underwent a subtle shift. The *historic bloc* many socialists had theorized as necessary for the success of their movement (most commonly, the industrial working class) was now elevated to the status of the prime mover of the social world.

One field in which the distinction between the first and second formations was clear was the labour movement. Here a core text, whose lessons were not confined to Communists, was Lenin's *Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder*, which was read in Canada as an injunction to Communists to struggle within the labour movement, no matter how reactionary its leadership, and to take the leading role in "united fronts."[53] Although Lenin is nowadays almost as unfashionable a figure as Spencer, a full reconnaissance of Canadian socialist history would need to revisit his work carefully — and especially to note the selective way it was appropriated and interpreted to address specific Canadian circumstances.[54] The major thinkers who influenced Communists — Lenin above all, Trotsky, Bukharin, Luxemburg — were all serious revolutionaries; many non-communists were reading John Strachey,[55] H.G. Wells, and G.D.H. Cole, all of whom could also be seen as professional, "credentialled" socialists. From the classical tradition of Marxism one

[52]Of course, for Communists there was the additional challenge of interpreting, correctly, the sometimes delphic pronouncements on North American questions of the Communist International. For an illuminating international guide to the policies of the International, see Fernando Claudin, *The Communist Movement: From Comintern to Cominform* (Harmondsworth 1975).

[53]John Manley's articles on the CP in the 1920s contain the most interesting reflections on the "united front" tactic; see "Does the International Labour Movement Need Salvaging? Communism, Labourism, and the Canadian Trade Unions, 1921-1928," *Labour/Le Travail*, 41 (Spring 1998), 149-50, on the difficulties in "concretizing" the Comintern's changing advice on the united front tactic. See also Penner, *Canadian Communism*.

[54]For useful reflections, see Mark A. Gabbert, "Socialist History and Socialism's Future," *Labour/Le Travail*, 29 (Spring 1992), 247-8, who after conceding the partial truth of the conventional charges against Lenin, adds: "There is the legacy of Lenin's political combativeness, his internationalism, his clear-headed understanding of the essential barbarism of capitalist civilization, and his recognition that the transition to socialism would involve a political crisis of major proportions."

[55]John Strachey is reported to have told David Lewis in 1946 of his close affiliation with the Communists in the 1930s. Cameron, *Unfinished Journey*, 178. For a skeptical appraisal of him, see David Caute, *The Fellow Travellers: A Postscript to the Enlightenment* (London 1977). Strachey's *The Coming Struggle for Power* was one of the "mandatory" books Canadian leftists were expected to have read in the 1930s. A similarly positioned figure was Harold Laski.

retained *The Communist Manifesto* and *Anti-Duhring*, which was popularized under the revealing title of *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* — but both texts could be read in ways which suggested an unbridgeable chasm dividing the "new left" c.1925 from the "old left" c.1910.[56]

Any search for the matrix of assumptions uniting a second formation of socialists runs the risk of distortion — of re-inventing a happy family of the left, when the evidence suggests precisely the opposite: parties locked in a bitter struggle for power and influence. The theses put forward by Leninism were, intentionally, not ones on which a middle ground could easily be found. "Vanguardism," the combined tactics of democratic centralism within and united front without, and the Communist emphasis on revolutionary mass terror, both before and after the inauguration of the dictatorship of the proletariat, were not subjects conducive to the achievement of a bland consensus. Communists themselves came to be deeply divided about them. The Canadian party was one of the last in the world to adhere to Stalin's leadership; by the early 1930s, among Marxist-Leninists, there were stark divisions between those who had accepted and those who had refused the party's transition to the new "ultra-left" line of 1928. Among non-Leninist Marxists, one also finds a plethora of perspectives.

So there is no point in looking for homogeneity. But is there then any plausibility to "horizontal" analysis? What defines a formation is not agreement on how to conduct politics, but rather a shared focus on a similar problem (in this case, the evident collapse of the capitalist world order), similar solutions (as suggested by the Soviet example, which drew enthusiastic support from most socialists), and a number of shared debates (in this case, most fundamentally, the question of how best to organize and run the party). The sheer energy the state poured into repression of the Communists, most notoriously under Section 98 and (in Québec) the Padlock Laws, greatly enhanced the Communists' status as the left's true fighters. Their efforts to influence the labour movement made them, no matter how small their numbers, an inescapable presence on the left, especially in the largest cities and resource towns. That the CCF issued a "Regina Manifesto" resounding, at least in its opening and concluding passages, with words of "eradicating capitalism," suggested the impact of second-formation socialists (especially strong in British Columbia) on the party. That its leadership purged Ontario dissidents with a thoroughness that recalled "democratic centralism" at its most energetic, suggested the extent to which, bittterly divided as it was, the second formation also shared certain party-centred and "objectivist" insights into how to wage socialist politics. That J.S. Woodsworth, revered leader of the Ginger Group and subsequently of the CCF, published regularly in the Communist Maurice Spector's *The Worker*, and that he, William Irvine, and many others shared a high opinion of the Soviet Union, is

[56]And Spencer was more or less retired as a serious influence on socialism, although favourable references to him were retained in Socialist Labor Party materials published in the 1940s, and reprinted as late as the 1970s.

also suggestive; so, of course, is the blunt critique Spector eventually published of Woodsworth's "misleading middle-class language."[57]

Without making any claim that he was typical, I think the writings of Maurice Spector captured many of the changes, both stark and subtle, that divided the second from the first cohort.[58] In the 53 articles signed by him in *The Worker* from 1922 to 1928 — which is undoubtedly only a fraction of his contributions — a new socialism announces itself. In them the word "revolution" occurs no fewer than 119 times. It was a time, for Spector, when it was imperative for revolutionaries to seize the moment, and transform the consciousness of the workers. Held back by "Social-Democrats" and "Labour Leaders," the workers of the world, shortly after the Treaty of Versailles, had been lulled with "pipe-dreams of Reconstruction" and the routine and inertia of the Second International. "The objective conditions for revolution were ideal. But the subjective factor — the will of the masses — was lacking. The opportunists, not the Communists, dominated the masses. There was the lesson of that crisis for us. If we had had strong Communist parties then, there would have been a different story to tell. That is true, because having a strong Communist Party means that already the masses are giving their allegiance to Communism — are coming under Communist influence."[59] What was bracing about this new discourse was its cold-water realism, its grasp on the present moment, its "non-telescopic" sense of political immediacy, its new kind of internationalism, and its explicit theorization of the need for revolutionaries to overcome the "subject/object" distinction. The Soviet Revolution, the Congresses of the International, the defeat of the revolution in Germany: these were experienced as events in *our* movement. And, for the first time in Canada, there was in this

[57]Maurice Spector, "A Criticism of the Bourgeois Element in Mr. Woodsworth," *The Worker*, 17 July 1926.

[58]For one title on Spector, see Gary O'Brien, "Maurice Spector and the Origins of Canadian Trotskyism," MA thesis, Carleton University, 1974. The relative neglect of Spector is symptomatic of the theoretical weakness of left historiography in Canada. Because he was on the "wrong side" in 1927-8, the ascendant Tim Buck faction had no reason to honour his memory; neither did the CCF-NDP tradition. In consequence, some of the most energetic, insightful and well-crafted Marxist writings in our history have been generally neglected. Spector, who remained politically active as a Trotskyist down to the 1950s, deserves a major biography. For brief comments on Spector's career, see James P. Cannon, *The History of American Trotskyism: Report of a Participant* (New York 1944), 49-50, 63; and Maurice Isserman, *If I Had a Hammer: The Death of the Old Left and the Birth of the New Left* (Urbana and Chicago 1993), 72-3, 75, wherein he is glimpsed at the time of negotiations between the Shachtmanites and the Socialist Party. Angus, *Canadian Bolsheviks,* is an attempt to rehabilitate the reputation of the Spector-MacDonald leadership.

[59]"Delegate To Comintern Reports to Convention. Maurice Spector Sums Up Work of Fourth Congress," *The Worker*, 15 March 1923.

socialism a sustained emphasis on anti-colonialism.[60] At a time when the world was polarizing, between forces of revolution and forces of reaction, there was no room for compromise. It was time to choose sides, and there were really only two: revolution or reaction. At the time of the death of Ebert, leader of the German social democrats, Spector wrote a bitter obituary under the headline "Ebert Dies and Cheats Gallows," which revisited his role as a "notorious social traitor" who had assassinated Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. It was evidence not only of the new "language of politics" but also of Spector's whole-hearted internationalist attachment to the German Revolution,[61] which he thought had dramatic lessons to teach Canadians.[62] The fate of the "ultra lefts" in the Fisher-Maslow group within the KPD, who had seized control of the party in the wake of the failed revolution of 1922, and whose cardinal error had been to "neglect Lenin's teaching that 'the actual struggle for power can begin only when the Communists have won over to their side a majority of at least the decisive sections of the working class'," was also instructive.[63]

Like the first-wave socialists, those of the second formation believed it was possible and necessary to integrate first-order apprehensions of the social world with much more abstract concepts. The difference between the two formations lay, in part, in rival constructions of "evolution." What for the first formation was a direct relationship between the evolution of the cosmos and the ultimate victory of the cause, was transformed by second-wave socialists into a relationship mediated by revolutionary activism, which, if it was undertaken correctly, would advance the pace of history." This was the logic of their unflinching support for the Soviet Revolution. For them, the social-democrats could never have mustered the wit and strength to fight the counter-revolution. Only the "heroism and vision of the Communist Party" could have defied "blockade, intervention and starvation." And with the conclusion of the period of civil war, when "military and political

[60]Maurice Spector, "Maurice Spector Sums up Work of 4th Congress," *The Worker*, 2 April 1923. Note, however, Peter Campbell, "East Meets Left: South Asian Militants and the Socialist Party of Canada in British Columbia, 1904-1914," *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, 20 (Fall 1999), 35-65 for a fascinating glimpse of variegated first-wave attempts to come to grips with colonialism. For a fascinating account of how a debate over anti-colonial struggle intersected with SPC/CP struggles in Vancouver, see David Akers, "Rebel or Revolutionary? Jack Kavanagh and the Early Years of the Communist Movement in Vancouver, 1920-1925," *Labour/Le Travail* 30, (1992), 9-44.

[61]M.S. [Maurice Spector], "Ebert Dies and Cheats Gallows," *The Worker*, 14 March 1925.

[62]An unresolved dilemma in the historiography of Canadian socialism is how much emphasis to place on "external influences" and how much on "homegrown ideas": this is particularly marked in the case of the Communist Party, where a full-fledged debate on the role of the Comintern has not yet taken place. In general, historians have been swift to note international influences, but less attentive to the ways in which they may have been "put to work" in the specific Canadian environment.

[63]Maurice Spector, "E.C.C.I. Letter to German Party," *The Worker*, 14 November 1925.

expediency had to take precedence over economic rationality," "the transition to Communism can be undertaken scientifically."[64] Irvine had written in *The Farmers in Politics* about the "Copernican Revolution" effected by Spencer's and Darwin's Theory of Evolution. Those who were fully integrated into the second formation believed, however, that the political 'Copernican Revolution' had happened in Russia, and the role of Copernicus had been filled by Lenin.

Second-formation language constructed, in essence, a bi-polar universe. Dichotomizing categories (scientific socialism vs. utopian socialism, revolution vs. reform, proletariat vs. bourgeoisie, realism vs. sentimentalism) were given a new intensity. What was generally new in the second formation was its application of objectivizing categories to immediate political and economic circumstances. In the implied epistemology of *The Worker*, it was possible to determine, with a reasonable degree of certainty, the objective truth, and to apply this knowledge to day-to-day politics. When Spector spoke of the "working class" and its "interests," he did so from a position of epistemological security: it was possible for true Communists to define the interests of workers quite apart from the workers' own experience. Yet this vanguard sensibility should not be stereotyped. At its most subtle (certainly in Gramsci's thought, and at moments in Spector's) the "vanguard" could only be such if its relationship with its followers was fully dialectical, if its leadership functioned not as something "imposed from without" but rather as a kind of long-term proletarian memory bank and steering mechanism.

One of the most interesting distinctions of the second socialism was the construction of "Canada" as an important category of analysis. That there is more reflection on "national questions" in a paper of 1925 than in, say, one from 1910 was in part a reflection of the rise of Canadian nationalism in the 1920s; but it was also the paradoxical outcome of the second formation's internationalism.[65] Communists especially were required to adopt a non-Canadian "subject-position" — to see themselves as part of a movement of revolutionaries throughout the world. Yet this very removal in the imagination required them to highlight Canada's specific position in that world. The Communist International demanded that they think in such terms; and, of course, Lenin's text on *Imperialism* provided a model of how such analysis should be undertaken. One was hence required to theorize the "peculiarities of the Canadians" by virtue of one's enrollment in the world working-class movement. For all its universalism, the new formation tended to advocate Canadian independence, carefully distinguished from the merely bourgeois inde-

[64]Maurice Spector, "Maurice Spector Sums up Work of 4th Congress," *The Worker*, 2 April 1923.

[65]First-wave Canadian socialists were internationalists, but in ways which rarely transcended the boundaries of the British Empire; and their newspapers eagerly devoured news of socialism's upward ascent across the globe, from New Zealand to Germany, but with special emphasis on developments in Great Britain, from which many first-wave socialists came, and to which they often looked for inspiration.

pendence advocated by Mackenzie King. And, even more ironically, their demographic situation required them to work out, in however early and contentious a way, and often very reluctantly, a politics which created more space for organized ethnic minorities than had hitherto existed in the Canadian socialist imagination.[66]

It is customary to explain the waning influence of this revolutionary cohort in terms of Stalinization, the Cold War and state repression, divisions between language minorities and the majority: all these and other explanations have their plausibility. From the perspective of the critique of liberal order, however, one might highlight other features of the situation as well. The politics of "industrial concentration" followed by the second cohort, and its focus on the trade-union movement, qualified its chance of an effective alliance with other subaltern groups and classes. In many parts of the country, Irvine's "universal class" of farmers was still predominant. There were of course places — Toronto's Spadina, 'The Main' in Montréal, North-End Winnipeg, east-end Vancouver, industrial Cape Breton — where the revolutionary subject-position constructed by the discourse "touched down" to interpellate living human beings. The "red bases" were real, and their cultural legacy merits much closer study on the part of people today who would like to multiply "zones of resistance" — but they were also fragile, demographically precarious, and widely separated from each other in a far-flung archipelago.

The counter-hegemonic strategy of building a "united front" of labour against capital sat uneasily with a classic Leninist strategy of "speaking truth to the erring" and ruthlessly exposing "middle-class language" and values wherever one encountered them. And if, until our own time, every Canadian socialism has been gender-specific, one might venture to say that there was a heightened masculinism in the tough-minded military language characteristic of the second formation. A rhetoric justifying armed force against the revolution's enemies probably convinced some workers, familiar themselves with the day-to-day violence of the capitalist workplace or the use of the military to repress strikes. Yet it must also have raised ethical qualms. The strategy of armed violence could also be, and was, critiqued for being fundamentally adventurist and unrealistic. The Communist discourse of *realpolitik* was to that extent self-refuting, given the gap between any "hard-boiled" assessment of the situation and the likelihood of a violent overthrow of the Canadian political system.

Perhaps most damagingly, the claim to have mastered an objective science of revolution was compromised by the eventual appearance of diametrically opposed readings emanating from the same science. There were very few empirical controls built into the party-centred model of knowledge; and little sense of experimental openness about the ways in which Marxist-Leninist formulae might be adapted and

[66]For one fascinating and heartbreaking case study, see Henry Srebrnik, "Red Star Over Birobidzhan: Canadian Jewish Communists and the 'Jewish Autonomous Region' in the Soviet Union," *Labour/Le Travail*, 44 (Fall 1999), 129-147.

applied in a Canadian setting.[67] The new paradigm's very insistence on the "before-and-after" chasm separating the serious from the frivolous, the "real" from the "abstract" socialist, imposed a barrier to its successful recapture of enduringly powerful aspects of the first cohort's work. The second formation deliberately de-emphasized aspects of antecedent socialists, who were often dismissed as mere "social democrats" unworthy of serious examination. Paradoxically, this avoidance of the past de-Marxified the second formation's political economy, which in *The Worker* was subordinated to the class struggle. The ironic consequence was that, when capitalism actually did seemingly start to crumble, Marxist-Leninists were not easily distinguished from "new liberals" in their underconsumptionism, nor from mere bourgeois journalists in their sensationalist muckraking. And the overall contours of the "bourgeois state," or the "socialist state" which might replace it, were as radically undertheorized within this formation as they had been by the first. These were fundamental *political*, as well as theoretical, problems.

The Third Socialism: National State Management

A third formation, whose matrix-events were the Great Depression and the rise of fascism, gradually emerged from 1932 to 1935 and attained hegemony on the left in the 1940s, when it was swept up in the new liberal "passive revolution" that gave rise to the welfare state. If the contrasts between the first two formations seem relatively obvious, that between the second and third is almost counter-intuitive. The argument is that — notwithstanding a fair degree of continuity in party structures and personnel, a continuing interwar "crisis of capitalism," and leadership disavowals of any discontinuity — this formation marked a significant and enduring change in the language of Canadian socialism.

There is, of course, generally accepted evidence of discontinuity. There were many new political institutions that were either founded after 1932 or which changed their function and much of their language. No one disputes that a line can be drawn from post-war Farmer-Labour through the Ginger Group through to the CCF (fd. 1932/3): but here the argument would be that, nonetheless, the CCF of 1939 was in many respects radically *unlike* the Ginger Group of 1929, in its *actual* leadership, ideology and tactics. Similarly, no one would dispute that a vertical line of descent can be drawn from the post-war Workers Party of Canada through the Communist Party of Canada to the Labour-Progressive Party (fd. 1943): but here the argument would be that, nonetheless, the Labour Progressives of 1944, who had internalized the new Popular Front strategy enunciated by the Comintern in 1935, were also in many respects radically *unlike* the Communists of 1927. And,

[67]The most striking example, of many, was perhaps the tragic fate of Spector himself. The same Spector one encountered in *The Worker* in 1925 as an authoritative guide to international revolutionary politics was scientifically "proved" to be an unreliable element and a shallow Marxist, at least by the official party decree in 1928. See "The Communist Party of Canada Maintains Leninist Ideological Clarity," *The Worker*, 24 November 1928.

to go even further, the argument would be that both the CCF and Communists had changed in roughly the same ways: that a certain convergence within a common formation had occurred. For both parties, the question of the *socialist state* had become paramount — a "convergence" in outlook that ironically inspired the left's most divisive internal struggle.

How should this "third language of socialism" be distinguished? By the rise of "state" and "nation" as paramount concepts. It was a period marked by the emergence of a galaxy of major new socialist stars: for instance, David Lewis, F.R. Scott, T.C. Douglas, King Gordon, among the CCFers, and Tim Buck, Stanley Ryerson, Tom McEwen, Norman Bethune, among the Communists. And certain events in this period have been generally marked: the CCF's near victory in Ontario in 1943 and its triumph in Saskatchewan in 1944, to form the first socialist government in North America; and the Communist Party's switch to a Common Front strategy in 1935, in line with a general Comintern pattern, its dramatic success in organizing the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion in its fight for Republican Spain, its electoral victory under the name of the Labour-Progressives in 1943 in a constituency in Montréal, followed swiftly by its débâcle in the Gouzenko Spy Affair of 1945. The CCF has in particular been analyzed at length in both historical and social scientific writing, which has probed its seemingly anomalous existence on a continent where socialism of any sort has rarely been powerful. The pitched battles between CCFers and Communists in the labour movement are also well-documented, as are the federal government's efforts to use industrial legality to "edit out" radicals from the trade unions. Depending on who is telling the story, this is the time in which Canadian socialism actually began — under the auspices of the CCF, which overcame the negative, divisive (and — one sometimes reads between the lines — foreign) influence of the Communists to eventually become the New Democratic Party in 1961, "the party that changed Canada"; or, conversely, it is the time in which Canadian socialism began to die — as the Communists were ground down by the bourgeois state, aided and abetted by the unreliable social democrats, who consistently rejected calls for proletarian unity and in whose hands the socialist vision was travestied to one of merely contesting elections.

These are well-ordered historiographical rail lines, serviceable and much-travelled, and it would be folly to blow them up. The "separate socialist spheres" they describe must have existed to some degree. Yet, from the perspective of the critique of liberal order, neither the partisan perspectives of the warring parties nor the histories which rehash their point of view ask all the questions that need to be asked. The more interesting questions, from this perspective, lie elsewhere.

The charismatic aura which surrounds the great stars, especially the CCFers, suggests that they now figure in a nationalist myth-symbol complex, that they have become "national figures" and not mere leftists.[68] And this is deeply suggestive.

[68]One indication: T.C.Douglas, who regularly figures on popular lists of Canadian heroes, enjoys a respect in Canada as one of the founders of "medicare" which is not reducible to his role as the country's first socialist premier.

Perhaps the domination of nationalist party-mindedness explains why critical examinations of socialism in the period have been so slow to come. One has the impression of a period overcrowded with scholars, when in fact there are many significant questions about it that are left to be resolved. For example, why did class and class struggle recede in socialist thought and analysis? Why did the nation loom so large? What was the general 'left reception' of Keynes? Did a language of painfree modernity replace the earlier emphasis on dialectic and struggle? If so, why? Were the Labour Progressives just another name for the Communists — or did the strategy of "Labour Progressivism" position its partisans in a different realm, somewhere between the CCF and the Liberals, with whom they were to some extent and in some places allied?[69] These questions of detail lead to a more general question of theory: how did the two major socialist parties relate to a general transformation of liberalism, the Fordist "passive revolution" which reshaped the Canadian political order in the 1940s and 1950s?

A provisional answer to this last question opens a path to a more complex understanding of this formation. Both parties could be re-interpreted as elements in this new liberal passive revolution — simultaneously resisting and promoting a newly conceptualized managerial liberalism that had overtly learned from Keynes, and covertly from Marx, about the requirements of preserving power; and which had, in the Soviet Union, a countermodel drawing the support from many of Canada's sober-minded citizens. This was the epoch, precisely the one in which Stalin's terror reached its full fury, in which the third edition of Sidney and Beatrice Webb's *Soviet Communism: A New Civilization*? ditched its hesitating question-mark. The conventional dichotomizing strategy pitting Communists against CCFers — the "revolutionaries" against the "democratic left," if one prefers — misses some important things that a more horizontal, cohort-specific view opens up. In some respects, the CP unintentionally instructed the CCFers in the arts of party-building, political-economic analysis, and strategy.[70]

One can read "irony" but also a profound historical logic into the fact that, out of the fierce competition among political tendencies in the 1920s and 1930s, there did emerge a party of quasi-professional socialists who followed a strategy of "industrial concentration," with a strongly hierarchical leadership convinced of its superior ability to read the historical situation and act decisively in it. That party was the ostensibly anti-Leninist CCF, as shaped especially by David Lewis, the ardent Labour Bundist whose "parliamentary Marxism" was not as far removed

[69]The Communist/Liberal alliance is too often subjected to a kind of scandal-mongering critique, when in fact it is a problem calling out for more sensitive and subtle treatment. Perhaps the most interesting treatment of how the LPP/Liberal alliance felt on the ground can be found in Weisbord, *The Strangest Dream: Canadian Communists, the Spy Trials and the Cold War.*

[70]For interesting reflections on ties between the CCF and CP, see Penner, *The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis*, 258 and *passim.*

from the perspective of the CP as he would later make it out to be.[71] The CCF, ostensibly the CP's "democratic antithesis," actually incarnated (at least after 1936 or so) certain important features of the vanguard party — a canon of official, must-read literature, study cells, a hierarchical top-down national leadership, strict party discipline, and so on; one might even say it did so with more Leninist discipline than the Communists, who in their LPP heyday in the 1940s had attracted a substantial middle-class membership and were virtually allied with the Liberal Party. There were of course major differences between Spector's "vanguard revolutionary party" guided by Leninist theory, capable of disciplined mobilization, and so deeply integrated into the world revolutionary movement that it might be considered one of its battalions, and the "mass party" constructed principally by David Lewis out of the more decentralized and federal "coalition" framework of the CCF. But it is interesting to note certain symptomatic "horizontal" similarities.

Both the CCF and the CP, and many of the intellectuals and other figures active in this moment, marginalized an older language of class struggle and emphasized a new language of national management and consolidation. And this had the effect of taking both parties into new conceptual terrain, and making them *both* highly vulnerable to the new liberal politics of *passive revolution*. In a sense, they were both called upon to *govern*, at least in their imaginations, and — for the Saskatchewan CCF at any rate — ultimately in reality. In this period, and in marked contrast to anything before or after it, it was easy to get the impression that a weakened and discredited liberal order was being encircled by a world-changing matrix of socialist ideas and initiatives. And this was a period in which the charge of positivism habitually and often misleadingly brought to bear against all older traditions of Canadian socialist thought has a certain validity. Value-free science and state planning were esteemed as fundamental aspects of modernity: "science" could be organized "for the people." After the first socialism's belief in a truth imminent in a cosmic evolutionism, and the second's that the truth was revolutionary and dialectical, the third formation developed a new "positive" emphasis that the truth was "out there," empirically accessible to professional social scientists and economists.

It was the third formation, then, that wrestled most urgently and directly with the logic of the conventional liberal order, as encirclement, as temptation — and as that which had to be defended against the more radical liberal despotism of fascism. The logic of this moment was complex and defies a unilinear reading. Yet, precisely because it is so bound up with the formation of the modern Canadian project, it has been systematically misrepresented. Often writers on the NDP have equated the CCF's socialism with the liberal Keynesian welfare state that the NDP (founded after the Canadian Labor Congress' 1956 revealing appeal to all "liberally

[71] Obviously, one would need to correlate Lewis's caution here with the Cold War. For an excellent discussion of David Lewis's Marxism, see Smith, *Unfinished Journey*, 285-7 and *passim*.

minded" Canadians) has doggedly supported since the 1960s. One can readily understand why so many people, perhaps especially on the left of the party, have invested in this emphasis on seamless continuity. For some of today's mainstream New Democrats, it not only frees them from any guilt-by-association with Communists, but it also allows them to narrate their party's history as a tale of martyrdom in the interests of the nation: the CCF's proposals in the 1940s, short-sightedly opposed by a well-orchestrated cabal of fanatics, were really just reforms that led to the widely-accepted welfare state consensus. For their Marxist critics, the same thesis of continuity has often given them the soft-headed social-democratic "Other" from which their genuinely revolutionary project can be distinguished.

From the liberal-order perspective, neither reading captures what is most interesting about the 1940s. The most compelling statement of the third socialist formation can be found in *Make This Your Canada* (1943), authored by David Lewis and Frank Scott, which sold 25,000 copies in less than a year[72] — making it one of the most widely-read socialist texts in Canadian history. Given Frank Scott's subsequent closeness to Pierre Trudeau and his eventual stature as an authority on the constitution, and David Lewis's leadership of the federal New Democratic Party from 1971 to 1975, one might expect this book to be a quintessential "social-democratic" expression of moderation, a call for a humane welfare state to redress some of the more problematic features of capitalism. It certainly emerges, not from the left wing, but from the powerful centre of the party, from two of its most respected and influential figures. In retrospect, both its authors, although awkward about the book, attempted to place it in welfare-state narratives.[73] What a fresh reading of *Make This Your Canada* surprisingly suggests is that it was, for all intents and purposes, a Marxist text — albeit a Marxism shaped by the imperatives of the national management formation. True, there is an emphasis on the continuity of the outlook of the CCF with pre-1914 "democratic socialist analysis," in the text's one, somewhat dismissive reference to the record of "the tradition" on Canadian soil.[74] But the key point is that *Make This Your*

[72]Alan Whitehorn, *Canadian Socialism: Essays on the CCF-NDP* (Toronto 1992), 159. *Un Canada Nouveau: Vue d'ensemble de l'historique et de la politique du mouvement C.C.F.* (Montréal 1944) appeared one year later.

[73]It is odd how books devoted to the authors skate around the issues raised by *Make This Your Canada* itself. Sandra Djwa's immensely stimulating *The Politics of the Imagination: A Life of F.R. Scott* (Toronto, 1987) devotes a mere 287 words to the book, and 84 of these, oddly enough, focus on J.S.Woodsworth. David Lewis, *The Good Fight* barely refers to the book, except to congratulate F.R.Scott for his "democratic socialist's political thesis" (221-2) and to complain about the hostile reception given the book by the media (309, 313, 314, 316). For a discussion of the book, which ably brings out its "Marxist side," see Smith, *Unfinished Journey*, Appendix J, 508-510.

[74]"At the time," the authors write of the pre-1914 socialists, "... they had few listeners and even fewer adherents," *Make This Your Canada*, 113-114. Of course, this positive reference back to the correctness of the views of the adherents of the Socialist Party of Canada and

Canada looks forward to a country in which capitalist ownership has been *replaced* by social ownership, and "the rapacious system of monopoly capitalism" *replaced* by a "democratic socialist society."[75] True, there is a *small* opening for the private ownership of small, non-monopolistic companies, and the door is left slightly ajar to the market as an indicator of consumer demand.[76] But these are qualifications in a pattern of a comprehensive socialization of the economy, as systematic a replacement of capitalist by socialist social relations of production as would be found in, say, some Eastern European countries after 1945.[77] *Make This Your Canada* does not even attempt to conceal its obvious indebtedness to the "the mountainous labors of Karl Marx," thanks to whom, according to the authors, socialism obtained a "positive programme for political action by the working classes for the purpose of supplanting capitalism by a new economic order."[78] This is no mere rhetorical flourish. The implied ontology and epistemology of *Make This Your Canada* were clearly drawn from Marx's base-and-superstructure model. The text represents the "forces of production" as the chief agents in breaking down whole economic systems (such as 18th century mercantilism), in passages which obviously echo Marx's 1859 *Preface*.[79] A "relentless logic" of events proceeds from the material base to the superstructure. History teaches that political revolutions follow swiftly on economic revolutions. We learn, when we read of the consequences of "technological revolution," that "nothing could stop the process of change, and states that did not adapt themselves more gradually, like England, were changed swiftly and violently, like France."[80] This was "technological determinism" of the first order.

---

the Social Democratic Party of Canada did accommodate both Marxist parties in the "democratic socialist" tradition.

[75]*Make This Your Canada*, 197.

[76]*Make This Your Canada*, 162-3, 172.

[77]David Lewis would later convey the impression that the extent of nationalization advocated in *Make This Your Canada* had been greatly exaggerated by fear-mongers. One finds more compelling the analysis of this book by Cameron Smith: With regard to the question of the extent of nationalization, Smith points out that the book never actually defines monopoly capital. "To escape nationalization, *Make This YOUR Canada* said companies had to (1)be in no position to exploit the public, (2)show no signs of becoming a socially dangerous vested interest, (3)be operated with reasonable efficiency under decent working conditions, and (4)be ready loyally to play their part in the fulfillment of the national plan." The book "set down criteria for deciding which industries would be nationalized. That approach assumed everything would be nationalized except those industries exempted." This reversed the earlier approach of the CCF's other "bible," *Social Planning for Canada*, which stressed "that nothing would be nationalized except those industries that fit the criteria for nationalization." Smith, *Unfinished Voyage*, 510.

[78]*Make This Your Canada*, 84.

[79]*Make This Your Canada*, 41.

[80]*Make This Your Canada*, 42. A no-less-relentless "logic of events" would bring more and more Canadians to support the policies and objectives of the CCF. *Make This Your Canada*, 145.

No less than second-wave socialists did Scott and Lewis believe it was possible to be objectively correct about the way the world was going. Herein lay the appeal of the CCF, which had understood that its "imaginative political programme" needs must be based on "a correct social philosophy" and a "fearless economic analysis."[81]

As one would expect, classes exist in the Marxist world of *Make This Your Canada*, but they are not the same entities one finds in Spector's *The Worker*. They are objective functions, not potentially revolutionary agents. The book's implicit sociology of trade unionism suggests a pliable movement whose quest for "labour unity", challenged by divisions of race, language, religion and "geographical isolation," called out for state assistance.[82] Similarly, there is an implicit critique of capitalist autocracy and the commodification of labour, but this is developed not *via* an in-depth critique of capitalism, but rather by way of noting "the undemocratic habits of big business."[83] The working class, although existing objectively within this text and endowed with its own interests, becomes a sociological category among many others: it was one of the "four major classes of modern industrial society" (the others were the white collar and professional workers, the farmers, "and, finally, the few who own and control the industrial and financial resources of the country.")[84] There is "contradiction" within capitalism in *Make This Your Canada* — but it is not the contradiction described by *The Communist Manifesto*. Decisive is not the struggle between classes, or between the forces and relations of production, but rather the *moral* and *historical* contradiction between a profit-oriented economy and the "objectives of a progressive society."[85] Similarly, "monopoly" and "monopoly capitalism" operate in the text, but — as is generally the case with both Second and Third Wave Socialisms — they are not rigorously constructed in terms of Marx's "mountainous labours" on the question of value. In short, this is a very Webbian Marx.

When *Make This Your Canada* comes to explain its own place in history, it does so in a way which erases prior knowledges, especially those developed by earlier autodidacts. Explicitly, the text invites readers to take up the subject-position of the frustrated "socially-minded production men," who are "offended by a system which frequently interferes with their production job."[86] It is striking that there is no parallel attempt to put the reader into the shoes of the frustrated worker on the

[81] *Make This Your Canada*, 122.
[82] *Make This Your Canada*, 78.
[83] *Make This Your Canada*, 17.
[84] *Make This Your Canada*, 91. This Mackenzie-King-like quadrilateral formation subsequently reduces to one closer to populism, involving two primary classes, "monopolies" and "us," members of "the 99%."
[85] *Make This Your Canada*, 101.
[86] *Make This Your Canada*, 53.

assembly line.[87] In the "Canada" constructed by *Make This Your Canada*, there would be ample room for university-trained experts. Of course, formally, full sovereignty in the "new Canada" will rest with the people. On this point, Prime Minister-elect M.J. Coldwell's imagined "victory speech" upon the CCF's electoral triumph, which is presented to us as the text's moment of concrete utopianism, is clear. "It is not the C.C.F. as a party, but you as a people who have won power to-day. Because it is not physically possible for each one of you to be a member of the government, some of us are privileged to be the trustees of your power. But we in the Cabinet shall not forget, and you in the country must always remember, that in the New Canada which was born to-day, the government is the Board of Trustees for all the people — that and no more."[88] These trustees of the "New Canada" will be closely advised by the National Planning Commission — a "small group of economists, engineers and statisticians assisted by an appropriate technical staff." Lest this appear to be a government by bureaucrats, the text immediately adds: "Keeping the responsibility for planning in the hands of a democratic government is the guarantee that we shall have no totalitarian state nor a society dominated by 'experts'."[89]

Yet in two respects *Make This Your Canada* is self-subverting in its position on the role of the expert in the New Canada. Again and again, it is the Soviet Union that shimmers before the reader as capitalism's Other. No other country or model comes close.[90] It is in the Soviet Union that "we" find proof of a post-capitalist society's ability to mobilize its population to meet a great purpose. "The Soviet Union is an example of a whole economy being run successfully on new lines."[91] It is in the "Russian" people that we can see a vast population embarked "upon a colossal plan of organized social revolution," which has already given them "a powerful new system capable of withstanding the onslaught of the world's mightiest armies."[92] There is almost a hushed reverential tone when *Make This Your Canada* describes "all the energies of a united people and the techniques of planning

[87]And, needless to say, not the woman who works in the home. There is not a shadow of "socialist feminism" in the text: in this respect one can trace a marked retreat from the proto-feminism in *The Farmers in Politics* and many other works from the "first cohort," which were at least conscious of the women's question.

[88]"Prime Minister Coldwell" speaking in *Make This Your Canada*, 147.

[89]*Make This Your Canada*, 150-1.

[90]Oddly enough, given the NDP's subsequent adulation of the Scandinavian experiments in social democracy, there was no sustained discussion of Swedish successes in combating the Great Depression, and only glancing references to Australasia.

[91]*Make This Your Canada*, 87.

[92]*Make This Your Canada*, 187. The text was, of course, constructed in the depths of World War II, when all eyes were turned to the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union. But attempts to "explain away" the text's pro-Sovietism by referencing "Stalingrad fever" surely trivialize the depth, scope and persistence of CCF fascination with the Soviet Union as a working planned economy.

and production," turned to the one purpose of defeating the Nazis.[93] These energies could be so mobilized because, the text implied, "successive national plans," based on the interests of "all her people," had brought the Soviet Union's techniques of planning and production to bear on the one overriding purpose of defeating the Nazi enemy. Such was the socially unifying effect of the Soviet system: "the people" felt the country belonged to them. They were right to think so. Given the number and the fervour of these pro-Soviet declarations, and the text's eloquent and symptomatic silences (no gulag, show trials, or cults of personality shadow its imagined Soviet Union) the reader could well imagine the New Canada would be something like the new Soviet Union, with the added plus of parliamentary government. The "democratic caveat" — "We must recognize the truth of all this, and apply its lesson, at the same time that we remain determined to pursue our own democratic course and never to allow dictatorship of any kind to rule our country"[94] — qualified but hardly undermined this Webb-like enthusiasm for a Soviet regime that had undertaken such feats of national state management.[95]

The text's attempted rebuttal of the imagined charge of "expert domination" and "regimentation" subverts itself in a second way. The reader is advised again and again that Canada's Depression miseries had receded precisely because a wartime government, acting under the force of circumstances, had had to implement planning policies it had once dismissed as utopian. Wartime planning had shown Canadians what to keep and what to remove in order to achieve justice and equality.[96] Since the text constructs as "models" both the Soviet Union *and* war-time Canada, its symptomatic silences on the question of how CCF planning was to be qualitatively different from that undertaken by Soviet planners or by the Liberal government's Ottawa Men are eloquent. There was merely the *formal* guarantee of "parliamentary sovereignty." The text walks the razor's edge, between an overtly post-liberal politics and capitulation to the managerial ethos of the liberal passive revolution.

Make This Your Canada is a celebration of a specific kind of socialist state: one in which a democracy is supplemented by comprehensive and systematic state planning, similar to (at least in general terms) the type of planning seen in both the Soviet Union and wartime Canada. In contrast to either first-wave or second-wave

[93]*Make This Your Canada*, 24. That Stalin concluded a pact with Hitler and that the Soviet government was not prepared for the Nazi invasion, having recently liquidated a good portion of the Red Army, are facts unworthy of inclusion.

[94]*Make This Your Canada*, 25.

[95]David Lewis would remark in "Canada Swings Left," *The Nation*, 158 (10 June 1944), 673: "The press and the air are filled with the warning: 'The C.C.F. will take away your homes, confiscate your savings and your insurance policies, grab our farm, and regiment your life in a bureaucratic strait-jacket.' (American New Dealers will recognize the formula.) Because the Soviet Union is deservedly popular with the masses of the people, the old epithet 'Communist' has been replaced by 'National Socialist'."

[96]*Make This Your Canada*, 3.

socialism, this expression of a third-wave socialism works with a construction of the social order that recognizes class only in a very general way: any sense of "the workers" taking control of the means of production and seizing the surplus value generated by their labour is missing. If the "master-thinkers" of the first wave were Kautsky and Spencer, and of the second wave Lenin and Trotsky, those of the third were Saint-Simon, Keynes, the Webbs, and (a certain Canadianized version of) Josef Stalin, who could all in various ways be seen as the architects of new and effectively managed states, the most successful of which was the Soviet Union.[97]

There is, in addition, something else that is new about third-wave Canadian socialist discourse as epitomized by this text: its emphatic and unabashed Canadian nationalism. It was in the very title: *Make This Your Canada*. "Nation" more than "class" is the key to its architecture. The "despair and irony of modern history"[98] described in this text was not the failure of the international proletarian revolution — but the inability of Canadians to achieve any national purpose: "Canada, by her neglect of her unemployed, her depressed areas and her youth during the 1930s, provides a striking example of a state that was not a national community."[99] *Make This Your Canada* draws deeply from the language of national patriotism.[100] When he assumes the reins of office, the authors imagine, Prime Minister Coldwell will remind all Canadians that Members of Parliament are merely the trustees of the people; and the election of the CCF will mark the people's "final victory." Against the people are the people's enemies, the "claims and power of special privilege," "monopoly," the forces of cynicism and withdrawal. Indeed, anyone who disagrees with strengthening democracy is a reactionary "who denies the very cause for which we are fighting."[101] "The people" as constructed in this discourse and articulated to a more traditional socialist critique of capitalism is a category that treats as one the entire population inhabiting the territory claimed by the Canadian state. This is a call to construct a national-popular general will.[102] Maritime and western dispari-

[97]No history of Canadian socialism will measure up which does not acknowledge the extent to which the Soviet Union was held up as the fulfillment of socialist hopes, both inside and outside the CP. For an impressive theorization of this problem, see Mark Kristmanson, "Plateaus of Freedom: Nationality, Culture and State Security in Canada," PhD Thesis,, Concordia University, 1999. For a parallel suggestive discussion with regard to the status of women, see Joan Sangster, "The Communist Party and the Woman Question, 1922-1929," *Labour/Le Travail*, 15 (Spring 1985), 25-56.

[98]*Make This Your Canada*, 29.

[99]*Make This Your Canada*, 192.

[100]The hold of "the interests" over the state is blamed for the frustration of the "national will" (37), and the book vividly denounces "the unpatriotic strike of capital for higher profits" at the start of the war. (28) A text that has virtually nothing to say about the working class has a great deal to say about "the people": the "people's needs" (9-10), the "common people," even the "democratic concept and organization of a people's citizen army fighting a people's war." *Make This Your Canada*, 60, 103.

[101]*Make This Your Canada*, 108, 15, 16, 22, 91 ("monopoly"), 61.

[102]Cf. Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, 131.

ties are explained in terms of technological determinism[103] and to dwell upon them is to insist on differences that are less fundamental than others.[104] Differences of "race" and language pose graver difficulties. Writing the book in North Hatley, in the Eastern Townships, Lewis and Scott, both English-speaking Quebeckers, acknowledged that there were "genuine differences of language, culture, tradition and religion " at play in Canada in the 1940s. Yet, clearly, these differences could not be allowed to disrupt the formation of a Canadian national subject-position. The language of self-determination had already been pre-empted by the text's prior commitment to a "Canadian" nationalism with parliament in Ottawa as its sovereign voice. The text becomes elusive and even incoherent at this point. And when translated into French, it did not say the same thing as it did in English.[105]

[103]*Make This Your* Canada, 105. Lewis will later advance a vintage "culture of poverty" explanation for the alleged political passivity of the Maritime Region. See Lewis, *The Good Fight*, 158.

[104]Within "the people," as imagined by this text, one finds the co-operators, building on the heroism of the 19th-century Rochdale pioneers (75), and Canada's Catholics, who were members of the country's largest single denomination (and who could be described via an aggressive reading of the papal encyclicals *Rerum Novarum* (1891) and *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931) as incipiently socialist (85)). For discussion, see Baum, *Catholics and Canadian Socialism*.

[105]*Make This Your Canada* enigmatically finds French-Canadian nationalism offensive, without being able to be explicit about the offense entailed: "The small anti-democratic forces in Quebec encourage the unfortunate mistake made by the Quebec people, feed on it and built it into a false theory which threatens the welfare both of the French-Canadian people themselves and of Canada as a whole." (107) This is an arresting, rich and ambiguous passage: what, precisely, is this "unfortunate mistake"? how can entire people make such a "mistake"? what is the "theory" and wherein lies its falsity? What is the immediate danger to the French-Canadian people? The reader guesses: (1) French-Canadian nationalism and/or separatism; (2)by being manipulated by self-interested bigots and demagogues; (3)who propound a 'theory' of integral nationalism *à la* Charles Maurras or, closer to home, a Laurentian nationalism along the lines of Abbé Groulx; (4)thereby opening up French Canadians to the ultimate risk of a Fascist victory. In the French-language edition, the passage undergoes a metamorphosis: "D'une part, un petit groupe de Canadiens de langue anglaise, intolérants et bigots, a toujours cherché à priver le Canada français de ses droits. D'autre part, un petit groupe de Canadiens de langue française, également bigots, s'est servi des griefs réels des Canadians français pour favoriser le développement d'un provincialisme étroit et antisocial." David Lewis and Frank Scott, *Un Canada Nouveau: Vue d'ensemble de l'historique et de la politique du mouvement C.C.F.* (Montréal 1944), 139. This French-language version does more than clarify the English-language text: it transforms it, because "the mistake" — i.e., resistance to the transcendent cause of Canadian National Unity — is now shared out equally between the two language groups, both of whom harboured the intolerant, the bigoted, the narrow (but, seemingly, only in the French-Canadian case, the "provincial"). One can trace in *Make This Your Canada* the shape of the contradiction that would shape left nationalism in Canada ever since: why, if it is right for "us" to be nationalist,

Because the CCF speaks for Canada, it has a claim to speak for Canadian sovereignty — even to extend the effective sovereignty of a social democratic Canadian state into the "Canadian northland," this "last great North American frontier" which it will save, in a kind of Socialist Manifest Destiny, *from* the "robber barons" and *for* "the new era of democratic social planning"[106] It is nationalism, not socialism, which serves as the Other of capitalism. Leaving to one side the Conservatives and Liberals, whose ties to the capitalist class disqualified them from this task of national salvation at the outset, the obvious challenger to this left nationalism was the Communist Party. Lewis and Scott predictably scorn the CP as a party which had made no attempt to become a mass organization, bound as it was to a mechanistic and inherently divisive philosophy. Yet nowhere is the CP denounced for its Marxism, for its atheism, for its slavish pro-Sovietism, for its class militancy. These silences suggest a certain delicacy for the CCF. To undermine completely the legitimacy of the Communists' Marxist perspective could call into question the CCF's own privileged access, via Marxist theory, to what was essentially "Canadian."

The conventional account of the Canadian left's civil war tells half the story. The CCF, and many of its members, were both drawn to and repulsed by the Communist Party. *Make This Your Canada* is only superficially an anti-communist, and not at all an anti-Marxist, text.[107] Later CCF/NDP works, influenced especially by the Cold War, would absolutize the distinction between "social democracy" and "communism" — but this, revealingly, is not a binary opposition set to work in *Make This Your Canada*. Subsequent historians sought to give the CCF-NDP an immaculate conception, and protect themselves from the Canadian equivalents of Joseph McCarthy; it followed that they would dwell lovingly on the anti-CCF rhetorical excesses of the Communists' "third period," and build up the Social Gospel into the primary motivation of the CCF (and no influence whatever on the CP). Those more sympathetic to the CP, or at least to the ideal of working-class revolution, have often repeated the same binary, simply reversing the "plus" and "minus" signs. But re-reading *Make This Your Canada* with some liberal-order questions helps destabilize these habitual responses. The priority announced in this text in 1943 was not the construction of a liberal-democratic welfare state. It was, rather, the construction of a sleek, efficient, modernized, centrally-planned socialist

i.e., to set about to construct "our own" national project in northern North America on the grounds of a universal ideology (i.e., socialism), is it so wrong for "them," the French Canadians/Québécois, to be nationalist? Because, of course, the first nationalism claims to "speak for" and assumes epistemological and political primacy over the second.

[106] *Make This Your Canada*, 157.

[107] An indication of what might be loosely called its 'proto-communist cultural sensibility' can be seen in the tone of revolutionary asceticism which pervades it, as seen in its selection of an illustrative example of capitalism's irrationality (entrepreneurs making costume jewelry when children cried out for shoes) and in its denunciation of the wartime production of luxury automobiles. *Make This Your Canada*, 23, 15.

state, in which planning for social welfare was just one, not particularly crucial, aspect of the socialist program. In fact, the very idea of elevating partial welfare schemes into overall strategies for social change is *explicitly critiqued and rejected* in this text.[108]

Nevertheless, this welfare-state addendum gradually came to be remembered as the whole program. In highly selective CCF-NDP invented traditions the entire rationale of the party is, and always has been, and always will be, the same: the provision to Canadians of compassionate and effective social programs through a liberal democratic regime. But, clearly, as we have seen, the paradigm of national management was never so narrowly bound. In its earliest, most radical expressions, it proposed an integral socialist state. One might argue that, even as their actual policies, in power and out, came to resemble less and less the sweeping plans outlined in *Make This Your Canada*, many of the newly-baptized "social democrats" remained (and some still do remain) within its conceptual universe. They champion an attenuated but still powerful post-liberal ideal of the Canadian state as a "national manager," an exalted conception of citizenship and equity, and an all-inclusive "democratic Canadianism." When they do this, they have recourse to a language of socialism that has otherwise been subordinated in their thinking and by their party to the hegemonic authority of post-1960 new liberalism.

The socialism articulated in *Make This Your Canada*, socialism as national management, would endure in various forms long after the 1940s, and well beyond the CCF. In many respects, and obviously with allowance for the need of the "vanguard party" to present itself as superior to social democrats and as unfailingly orthodox, it might be argued that the post-1935 Communist Party came to develop a parallel socialist discourse, in which nationalism, the management of the economy, and the restoration of harmony to the international order were seen as paramount. In this new style of Communist discourse, the Soviet Union was now represented, not as the exemplar of revolutionary working-class *praxis*, but rather as a fully rational, well-managed state, the true homeland of a scientific "modernization theory" (and a model for Ottawa to follow.) Similarly, as the CCF transformed into the NDP, it was perhaps less a matter of a movement succumbing to the

[108]As the text advises us, schemes for social security cannot be "an adequate national objective." (32) More vividly: "...social insurance schemes are umbrellas and not homes. Umbrellas are necessary as additional protection but they are no substitute for a home." *Make This Your Canada*, 34. Obviously, all modern economies were "developing in the direction of central control and regulation," and "New Canadians" would hardly want to resist this trend. But the CCF's priority was the socialization of the capitalist economy, not providing for its victims. In the six-part specification of "what is to be done," we find: "(1)Full employment, (2)Continuous production unbroken by recurring crises, (3)Democratic participation by the people in the control of the economy, (4)An expanding national income, (5)An equitable distribution to all the people of the goods and services produced by all the people, (6)A comprehensive system of social security." *Make This Your Canada*, 35.

iron law of party oligarchy, and rather more one of a "socialist model of national management" undergoing "realist" amendments. If Keynesian economic formulae and Swedish social welfare schemes allowed for "socialism" without the trauma of large-scale socialization, then what need of revolution, parliamentary or otherwise? Yet Lewis's continuing (if increasingly closeted) "evolutionary Marxism," his profoundly shrewd grasp of power within the trade-union movement as the nucleus of hegemony within the postwar left, his genius for making base-and-superstructure arguments politically and culturally acceptable, even under Cold War conditions — all of these meant that positions that bore more than a passing resemblance to those of "Eurocommunism" would still surface in the NDP as late as the 1970s, inside and outside the Waffle,[109] and as late as the early 1980s within the Parti Québécois, which named a different "people," "state" and "nation", but in ways that would have been recognizable to the authors of *Make This Your Canada*.[110]

It was thanks to this cohort of state-building socialists, inside or outside the two main leftist parties, that "socialism" came to be written — although not in indelible ink — into the myth-symbol complex of the Canadian state-nation. Saskatchewan's brave government stood as an exemplar of Canadianism, not just of "prairie radicalism." There came to be a profound identification of social democrats with the project of *renovating* the Canadian liberal order, focusing especially on Ottawa as the proper carrier of socialist hopes and dreams. In sharp contrast to their marginalized comrades in the United States, third-formation socialists could honestly tell themselves that they were shaping a new Canadian state for a new Canadian people. And many of them commenced a long march through the federal and provincial institutions, a march which changed the marchers — into new liberals and bureaucrats — as much as it changed the institutions.

It would be hard to fix a "death date" for this third formation. Certainly, by the 1970s, when the CP was largely peripheral, no one was expecting that the election of an NDP government would transform the fundamentals of Canadian capitalism. The obvious "external pressure" was the Cold War and Canada's vulnerability to American ideological and military influences. But there also were three major internal contradictions. First, the marginalization of the First Socialism's project of "socialist education" and of Second Socialism's "class warfare" in socialist thinking, and especially the reliance on a professionalized labour bureaucracy as the way to secure the support (and the money) of rank-and-file workers, carried with it the risk of a profound alienation from working people. It was easy to succumb to the

[109]Some evidence of a residual Marxism was to be found in the hard-hitting "corporate welfare bums" campaign of the 1972 election. See David Lewis, *Louder Voices: The Corporate Welfare Bums* (Toronto 1972).

[110]For an analysis of "social democracy" within the PQ, see Leon Dion, *Quebec: The Unfinished Revolution* (Montréal and London 1976), Ch.5. Dion discerned that what had been a marked "social democratic" tendency within the PQ was being weakened by a convergence with the Liberals, accelerated by the party's own technocratic bias.

liberal-utilitarian temptation of substituting the "passive party" allegiance for the "active cultural struggle"envisaged by the earlier cohorts: the "political check-off" was one of the most powerful of the forces that changed the prospects of Canadian socialists. Second, as the grey and bureaucratic "socialism of administration" gradually came to resemble more and more the liberal order that contained it — necessarily so, perhaps, at the level of subordinate provincial governments — those who had once questioned liberal order were increasingly disposed to defend it. And third, and perhaps most crucially, by so fervently embracing the Canadian nationalist agenda, bedecking their pamphlets with maple leaves and their rhetoric with "the people," all with a discernibly centralist bias, the third-wave socialists were to find themselves unable to address the "other nationalism," that would arise in Québec.

The Fourth Socialism: Revolutionary Humanism and National Liberation

These contradictions of conventional leftism, both social democratic and Communist, would be relentlessly exposed by a fourth formation, wherein a new paradigm of socialism evolved in the 1960s and 1970s. The matrix-event here was the Cold War, which simultaneously disorganized and discredited the older socialist forms and made the struggle against nuclear war seem a matter of human survival. Internationally, this "break" often announced itself without subtlety: an "obsolete communism" and a "sold-out social democracy" were overtaken by a New Left proclaiming a new emancipatory politics, a "socialism" of self-management, anti-imperialism, decolonization, and direct democracy. This and other aspects of the New Left were strongly influenced by American precedents, which influenced these leftists of the 1960s as strongly as British and Soviet models had moved their predecessors in the 1930s.

To simplify, New Leftism could be seen as a critique of, and alternative to, the first three formations. Against the Spencerian evolutionists' "necessary progress" was counterpoised the need to individually resist a looming nuclear disaster and the image of individuals heroically struggling against it. Against the Leninist "dictatorship of the proletariat" as a necessary phase of working-class revolution, this cohort drew from "actually existing socialisms" the conclusion that, unless the oppressed truly empowered themselves, a formal shift in the ownership of the means of production did not an emancipatory social revolution make. And against quasi-Keynesian strategies of socializing investment and managing the national economy, this cohort, often repulsed by consumerism and the "culture industries," would contrast the humanist critique of alienation made by the young Marx with the economism of his distant descendants, the state planners.[111] All three earlier

[111]In terms of "implicit" (and in an increasingly academic environment, often "explicit") theorization, the fourth socialism favoured the young Marx — whose works had not been widely read (or even translated) before the 1960s — over the old, the Lenin of *State and Revolution* over the Lenin of *Left-Wing Communism*, and often Mao and Che Guevara over

socialisms were brought before the bar and asked: How does your project address what is really wrong with modern life — the profound sense so many people have of being alienated from themselves, from their own products, from their own societies? How does your politics speak to the problem of spiritual suffocation in an oppressive, meaningless and ugly world? Or counter both superpowers' drive to exterminate humanity in a nuclear war? New Leftists — only some of them happy to call themselves "socialist" — identified new objectives, and marginalized old ones. Their goal was a future of de-alienated men and women realizing their full human nature. And if, for some working in this new paradigm, old theoretical concepts — e.g., the decisive revolutionary working-class party as *the* instrument of socialist transformation — remained in place, they were nonetheless often functioning in a different way: as *anticipatory forms* of a humanistic, emancipated society more than as *functional requirements* of systemic change.[112] For many others, oppressed Third World nations, ethnic groups, and (especially in the 1970s) women and sexual minorities came to play as central a role in strategies for socialist revolution as class. Freud became as significant as Marx.

If, for some, existing parties could integrate at least part of the new paradigm — this was a major time of growth and ideological change for the NDP, which embraced New Left ideas to a surprising extent[113] — for many others in the fourth wave the conventional Canadian left parties, and perhaps *no* parties, could do so. Rather than investing energies in political parties, one could turn to the Company of Young Canadians, the Student Union for Peace Action, the Student Christian Movement, or a host of community groups. This was a cohort attracted by a plethora of ideologies, from anarcho-syndicalism to left nationalism, whose basis of unity lay only in a humanistic critique of capitalism and the liberal order — "the system" — and an impatient sense that radical action could bring about its downfall. It was, finally, a formation that demarcated itself generationally, to an extent not really seen before in Canadian socialist history. The leading anglophone theoretical

---

both. But this is perhaps to give too "Marxist" a reading of the fourth wave, which also drew from all manner of non-Marxist sources — Freud, Lévi-Strauss, Sorel, Bakunin — and which was characteristically disinclined to invest too much time in reading the Marxian economic theory that the first cohort would have considered *the sine qua non* of genuine socialism.

[112]For a most influential title, see André Gorz, *Strategy for Labor: A Radical Proposal*, trans. by Martin Nicolaus and Victoria Ortix (Boston 1967).

[113]New Left themes resounded throughout the history of the Waffle movement within the NDP, and can also be traced in *Canadian Dimension*, the Winnipeg-based magazine that has most clearly reflected left-wing thought in or near the party from the 1970s on. In Edward Broadbent, *The Liberal Rip-off: Trudeauism vs. the Politics of Equality* (Toronto 1970) one finds a marked break with the world of *Make This Your Canada*: Yugoslavia has replaced the Soviet Union as an exemplary model, by virtue of its programs for worker self-management.

journal of this youth-oriented socialism was a Montréal publication called *Our Generation.*[114]

In some respects the history of Canadian socialism could be written with only glancing attention to the New Left. By and large Canadian New Leftists were sympathetic bystanders to movements organized by other people in other places. They were against the bomb and the Vietnam War. They were for the American Civil Rights and later the Black Power movements. They cheered on African and Latin American national liberation struggles, and occupied university campuses with "non-negotiable demands" familiar across North America and Europe. Yet, in another way, the impact of this cohort, in one specific respect, was massive, and reshaped the entire field of Canadian politics. This was because New Leftism and left nationalism coincided to contribute to a profound crisis of Canada itself. In anglophone Canada, left nationalism, whose socialist forms were evident in the emergent mass universities and in the left-nationalist "Waffle" movement within the NDP, integrated conventional nationalist themes carried forward from the days of *Make This Your Canada* with contemporary discourses of anti-imperialism, participatory democracy, and feminism.[115] But the place where the fourth formation became genuinely dominant within socialism was francophone Québec.

Historians of Canadian socialism have conveyed a sense of francophone Québec as being generally marginal to the organized socialist movement before the 1960s.[116] But after 1960, francophone Québec, and more particularly Montréal,

[114]For a brief but interesting discussion of "youth radicalism in the sixties," see Doug Owram, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby-Boom Generation* (Toronto 1996), chapter 9, which draws to some extent on the archives of the Student Union for Peace Action.

[115]For core texts, see Kari Levitt, *Silent Surrender: The Multinational Corporation in Canada* (Toronto 1970); James Laxer, *The Energy Poker Game: The Politics of the Continental Resources Deal* (Toronto 1970).

[116]Whether Québec's marginal position in the historiography relating to the first three formations is a matter of the bias of historical investigation and a product of the mechanical application of dated categories, or whether it reflects a radical contrast that any interpretive framework would have to contend with, is a question that awaits a more thorough investigation. Certainly there was enough of a francophone radical tradition in Montréal for the fourth cohort to remember: see Lévesque, *Virage à gauche interdit* on the interwar period. A first impression is that francophones were consistently patronized, their national issues reduced to marginal status (certainly in both of the "main parties"), and their quest for cultural survival subordinated within paradigms which stressed political economy. An awkward cross-cultural socialism can be occasionally glimpsed. Alfred Charpentier remembered, in his reflection on the turn-of-the-century socialist movement in Montréal, that his father had been visited in 1904 by two socialists (one of whom was Dick Kerrigan, who was the next year to attend the founding convention of the IWW): the book they brought with them, in translation, was Robert Blatchford's *Merrie England.* Alfred Charpentier, "Le Mouvement Politique Ouvrier de Montréal (1882-1929)," in Fernand Harvey, ed., *Aspects historiques du mouvement ouvrier au Québec* (Montréal 1973), 151.

was the storm-centre of New Left politics in Canada. And herein lay, of course, a paradox. The New Leftism of Montréal unfolded on what was still formally Canadian territory, but in a post-Canadian, Québécois "imagined space." It was constructed, in part, as a formation that rejected the active centralizing federal state imagined by *Make This Your Canada*.[117] Québec became far more a *nation* than a province, and the Québécois as a "new people" embraced left-wing programs with a speed that outrivalled the parallel "Canadian" upheaval of the 1940s. In part because of the "economic determinism" of the first wave and the "class reductionism" of the second, third-wave Canadian socialism rarely confronted the "national question" explicitly.[118] In the 1960s, faced with the matrix-event of Québec's unquiet revolution, with its markedly socialist overtones, the bill for this long neglect came due — with compound interest. It was impossible for English-Canadian leftists to reject socialist upheaval in Canada's largest province and city. Yet it was difficult to articulate — to the community imagined by socialists in the 1940s — a project within which the Canadian state was part of a "colonizing power" that had to be resisted and dismantled. For third-wave socialists who had wrapped themselves in maple leaves and identified whole-heartedly with the project of national state management, the Québec Revolution posed a wrenching and multifaceted problem, because it inherently called into question the "Canadian subject position" with which Canadian socialists, both Communist and CCF, had identified since the late 1930s. The "falsely generic" Canadian, who just happened to speak English, was discursively represented as an arrogant colonizer against which the national liberation movement needed to assert itself. This unflattering description suggested that an anglophone third-wave socialist should liquidate a nation- and state-building subject-position for which sacrifices had been made for three decades. "Canada" had become, in part through the socialists' own activism and in large part through the passive revolution designed to contain it, a qualified kind of state-nation, unified not by ethnicity or a common culture, but by the activities of a shared federal state espousing a "new liberal" doctrine. And, practically speaking, to step outside this pan-Canadian political common sense was to court electoral disaster among anglophones, as both the Conservatives and New Democrats would discover with "Two-Nations" formulations in the 1960s. There seemed no easy "parliamentary road" to reconciliation. Yet to *refuse* any attempt to see onself as the "Other's other" was equally impossible. It meant writing off Montréal, rejecting the data documenting francophone economic and social oppression, and — more dangerously — distancing and withdrawing oneself from "fellow Canadians,"

[117]One might add to the sense of irony by noting that Frank Scott, notwithstanding his status as a civil libertarian, approved of the very application of the War Measures Act under which Pierre Vallières was arrested. David Lewis, for his part, was opposed to it.

[118]The exception was the purge of the Québec CP in the 1940s, to remove elements perceived by the leadership to be too inclined to French-Canadian nationalism. For an interesting account, see Robert Comeau and Bernard Dionne, *Les communistes au Québec 1936-1956: Sur le Parti communiste du Canada/Parti ouvrier-progressiste* (Montréal 1980), 32-70.

thereby acknowledging the very difference of identities that one had initially been determined not to recognize.

To the conventional "factors" cited in Quiet Revolution historiography, a historian of Canadian socialism would want to consider additional elements: the political and conceptual *lacunae* of the earlier paradigms when it came to nationalism, the new openness of Québec to the French left, the reception of the French Revolution of May 1968, and the relative weakness in Québec of the partisans of the first three socialisms, who arguably might have diverted New Leftism into other channels (as was perhaps the case with the NDP in much of anglophone Canada). Arguably no other North American political jurisdiction came as close to a New Left *political* revolution, an actual crisis of the ruling political order, as did Québec in the late 1960s and early 1970s. It is in this specific Québec-centred sense that one could say that New Leftism, far from being marginal to the history of Canadian socialism, has on the contrary defined many of its postwar patterns.

The "red decades" opened in the early 1960s in Montréal and wound down in the early 1980s. These were years in which a new Québécois nationalism gained tremendous strength, culminating in the election of a social democratic Parti Québécois (PQ) government in 1976 and the holding of the first sovereignty-association referendum in 1980. They were also years in which socialism and nationalism were forcefully conjugated together. To some extent this occurred within the major sovereignist political parties — the Rassemblement pour l'Indépendance National (RIN) and later the PQ, both of which touched on the discourses of socialism when they spoke of a general "projet social." To a greater extent, it was more closely associated with a diversity of extra-parliamentary "New Left" phenomena and scores of revolutionary groups and publications (such as *La Revue socialiste, Parti Pris, Québec Libre, Résistance, Révolution québécoise,* and *Socialisme québécois*). In the wake of the October Crisis of 1970, this vast network of activists tended to be retrospectively reduced to the Front de Libération du Québec, founded in February 1963 by three RIN (and Réseau de Résistance) activists, and purportedly a shadowy, unrepresentative groupuscule lacking deep roots in society. But this is surely misleading. There were scores of groups, and hundreds of revolutionaries, in the Montreal of the 1960s. There was a sea of revolutionary socialist activism in which the urban guerrillas could swim. Nor was the FLQ's newspaper *La Cognée*[119] (fd. October 1963), which functioned as an informal nerve centre of the *gauchistes*, an isolated phenomenon. Not just a thriving left-wing press, but also a mass media alive to marxisant and independentist ideas, testified to a socialist cultural ferment

[119]The revolutionary publication, much hounded by the police, appeared in 1965 thanks to the federal government, which unwittingly supplied paper and prepaid envelopes. For interesting extracts from it, along with other contemporary documents, see R. Comeau, D. Cooper and P. Vallières, eds., *FLQ: un projet révolutionnaire (1963-1982)* (Montréal 1990).

whose only close parallel in Canadian history was the radical labour upsurge of 1917-1922.

Not all the movements in play were new — there were Communists, Trotskyists, and NDPers, at least on the margins, and some activists had had previous experience, especially with the Parti socialiste du Québec (which had spun away from its parent NDP on the 'national question')[120] or with the Communist Party. And not all were unequivocally socialist. Nonetheless, new socialist accents, and very young activists, were a hallmark of Montréal's red decades. *Gauchistes* were generally determined to combine international insights (derived from such books as Frantz Fanon, *Les Damnés de la Terre,* Albert Memmi, *Le Portrait du Colonisé,* and Régis Debray, *La Revolution dans la Revolution*) with the particularities of the Québec struggle: to make Che's slogan 'two, three, many Vietnams' the lived experience of a North American society. This fourth-wave socialist formation had a protean, dynamic quality, flowing out of avant-garde cafés, quickly mobilizing popular-cultural forms for the purposes of resistance, and uniting mainstream cultural producers with political radicals into a politico-literary avant-garde.

Québec New Leftism was easily misread as a merely updated version of Québec nationalism, when in fact solidarity with, even a prior allegiance to, the world revolutionary socialist movement was a common attribute of this cohort.[121] If the second and third socialist formations had looked for inspiration in Russia, this francophone cohort was inspired above all by Cuba, where a new "revolutionary marxist humanism" was exemplified by Che Guevara. The Guevarist belief that armed struggles centred in *foco* of liberation could spark the mass sympathy of the oppressed and accelerate the development of revolutionary conditions had a particular resonance in Québec.[122] For those who identified Québec with the Third World, the Tricontinental Congress held in Havana in January 1966 sounded the tocsin of revolutionary activism worldwide.[123] This was not a paradigm peculiar to the FLQ's *La Cognée* nor to Québec: it was the common property of the fourth formation. Its development with nationalism in Québec produced what was both literally and symbolically a different "language of socialism" than anything heard before on Canadian territory.[124]

[120]The Parti socialiste du Québec, once the wing of the NDP/NPD, merged with the MLP in March 1966 at a "left unity" congress

[121]From its very first manifesto in 1963, the FLQ proclaimed its allegiance to "oppressed people of the world" who had been "breaking their chains and winning the liberty which is *their right.*" The FLQ's first flag was based, not on the colours of 1837, but on an Algerian design in Cuban colours.

[122]See Che Guevara, *Guerrilla Warfare* (Harmondsworth 1969).

[123]Maspero, the French publisher which published the French translation of the Havana Tricontinental Conference, also distributed *Révolution québécois.*

[124]The details in this paragraph are drawn from Louis Fournier, *F.L.Q.: The Anatomy of an Underground Movement,* trans. Edward Baxter (Toronto 1984).

By far the most famous text from this period was Pierre Vallières's *Nègres blancs d'Amérique: Autobiographie précoce d'un 'terroriste' québécois*, translated into English under the title *White Niggers of America*. Materially abused, enduring a shantytown childhood and an adolescence and young manhood spent passing from one demeaning job to the next, and subsisting on manual labour during a six-month sojourn in France, Vallières knew that capitalism was a cruel fraud perpetrated on the basis of exploitation and exclusion. His spiritual odyssey — from an impassioned Catholicism, within the Franciscan order, then into liberal Catholic personalism, then into existentialism and phenomenology — was no less typical of his time. Vallières's individual path to a *praxis*-oriented Marxism was one followed by many of his generation across Europe and North America.

For Vallières in 1965, the FLQ embodied the activist vision of the young Marx — whose works on alienation, hitherto known only to select scholars, were now achieving a worldwide renown. It was possible to *will* new patterns in history, to *will* the transcendence of the split between subject and object: why could this not happen in Québec? All that was missing was a movement with a broader vision and a longer-range strategy. For this, Vallières would turn, like most within his formation — and not just in Québec — *away* from any models available in "Canada," a tainted project, and *towards* the wider world. In his case, he turned towards the Black Power movement in the United States. In fact, it was the prospect of linking up with other North American revolutionaries, especially Black activists, that led Vallières and his comrade-in arms Charles Gagnon (who shared with him a working-class background, an interest in sociological ideas, and the political experiences acquired at *Révolution québécoise*, which the two men had founded in 1964) to New York in 1966. And it was on the advice of Paul Sweezy, editor of the independent Marxist *Monthly Review*, that Vallières and Gagnon took their case to the doorstep of the United Nations, where in September they announced a 30-day hunger strike to bring attention to "political prisoners" attached to the FLQ being held in Canadian prisons. Arrested on 27 September 1966, the two would spend nearly four months in "The Tombs," and on their release on 13 January 1967, they would promptly be apprehended by US Immigration officials, taken illegally to Canada, and arrested on arrival by the RCMP. Gagnon would spend 41 months in jail, and Vallières 44, before they were both acquitted in 1973.

Nègres blancs, written in a New York jail cell, and perhaps the most internationally acclaimed book ever written by a socialist active on Canadian territory — one has to pick one's words carefully here — is customarily read into the narrative of the Quiet Revolution, where it is overshadowed by the 1970 assassination of Pierre Laporte. Perhaps in 2001 this text can be more interestingly read as a document of a New Left sensibility, and as a reflection on the possibilities of "being socialist" under conditions of late capitalism.[125] One could even question how

[125] For Vallières's later critiques of the liberal order, see especially *Le devoir de résistance* (Montréal 1994) and *La Liberté en Friche* (Montréal 1979). An interesting pattern of

"nationalist" the text of *Nègres blancs* actually is, at least if we mean by this an acceptance of the "myth-symbol complex" internalized by many Québécois (or French Canadians — to use the term often used in the book), given the ruthlessly critical view taken by *Nègres blancs* of "provincial peculiarities" and the "really existing nationalism" of the book's intended audience. Viewed from the vantage-point of Paris, Vallières would remember, Québec looked like a small provincial society whose inhabitants had mythologized their own past. In the 1960s, in fact, were there any *national* problems? Vietnam, Latin America, the re-birth of neo-Nazism, the patterns of development and underdevelopment explored by André Gunder Frank: none of these were *national* in scope, but *international*. To declare the independence of Québec would be a meaningless gesture — it would pose no real danger to Washington, the real master of North America, on whose behalf the Canadian state merely acted. Notwithstanding some reversions in the text to more traditional tropes of French-Canadian nationalism,[126] its predominant bias was towards connecting *local* with *international* struggles: the "local" context was a secondary consideration. One might even go so far as to suggest that Québec itself was somewhat marginalized in the text. Vallières's socialist intellectual itinerary, down to the Fall of 1963, had consisted very largely of international figures and forces: he worked through Lenin (who did not really impress him), Rosa Luxemburg, Mao Tse-tung, Castro, and Che Guevara, before turning, for the first time in his life, to the social history of Québec.[127] The somewhat sketchy "history of Québec" presented by *Nègres blancs* was not that far removed from the narratives of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, who juxtaposed the "Duplessist" Québec to the land enlightened by liberals such as himself after 1960.[128] Before the Quiet Revolution,

obituaries of Vallières in the mainstream Montréal media was the consistent attempt to make him a post- or even an anti-socialist, a marked misrepresentation and oversimplification of his position. See Jean Dion, "Pierre Vallières (1938-1998): 'Je défends la liberté'," *Le Devoir*, 23 December 1998.

[126]Vallières at one point would even refer to the "Anglo-Saxons" with their acute sense of their own interests: "Déjà en 1840, les Anglo-Saxons, qui possèdent un sens aigu de leurs intérêts, avaient profité du climat d'hystérie provoqué par la rébellion canadienne-française pour proclamer provisoirement l'Union des deux Canadas (Ontario et Québec)...." Pierre Vallières, *Nègres blancs d'Amérique* (Montréal 1994 [1968]), 76. References to the French text are to this edition. Even to this day, however, this is a somewhat conventional usage in French. This interpretation of the 1837 rebellion, which functioned as a "myth of origin" for the *felquistes*, erased from its record English-speaking supporters in Lower Canada, and the points of common interest between rebels in Lower and Upper Canada.

[127] *Nègres blancs*, 264-5.

[128]*Nègres blancs*, 99-107, n.2. The approach to Québec's history is even more dichotomized in Vallières, *La Liberté en Friche*. For subtler characterizations of the Duplessist régime, see Gilles Bourque, Jules Duchastel, and Jacques Beauchemin, *La société libérale duplessiste. 1944-1960* (Montréal 1994); and for a stimulating discussion of the historiographical trends which indirectly affected Vallières, see Ronald Rudin, *Making History in Twentieth-Century Quebec* (Toronto 1997).

Vallières argued, a monolithic ideology had strangled dissent; after it, all the institutions of Québec were suddenly called into question, by the combined forces of secularism, separatism, and Marxism.[129] The Church in particular draws Vallières's furious fire, with an anticlerical passion rarely heard on the left since the 1920s. Vallières's historicization of his politics was only Québec-centred in a certain limited sense: the "history of Québec" he constructed in his text contained many victims and moments of repression, but few national heroes, working models or valuably persisting traditions. In fact, the very title of the book — which alone did so much to ensure its notoriety — came to Vallières's mind *in English* and emerged as a way of making an otherwise indifferent *American* audience take notice of events in Québec.[130]

The "nationalism" of *Nègres blancs* thus typified an ambiguity that ran through much fourth-wave socialist thought about the possibilities open to radicals in northern North America. *Nègres blancs* can be seen as performing a series of dramatic refusals of "older socialisms." In the book's spontaneist, often anarchistic politics, "socialism" might be as much a pejorative word to designate the obsolete paradigm of an older generation, as it was the name to give to a future open to humanity's full development. The Communists were warmly praised in the text, but as heroic figures from a distant age.[131] Marxist political economy was bleakly evoked in a description of experts with libraries crammed with statistical tables. As for the USSR itself, it was merely one of the largest state-capitalist trusts in the world. The very text of Lenin — *Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder* — which had inspired so much of Spector's Marxism and theoretically "grounded" the CP of the 1920s and 1930s in the realities of Canadian trade unionism and labour politics, was now seen as a device used by complacently self-satisfied old leftists to curb the militancy of the young.[132] The CCF-NDP tradition was briefly noted, but mainly

[129] *Nègres blancs*, 90.

[130] After describing the "wall of indifference" towards Québec issues he encountered in New York, Vallières remarked in his 1979 preface: "C'est en voulant percer ce mur d'indifférence et de mépris que j'inventai, pour désigner les Québécois, le concept des nègres blancs d'Amérique. C'est d'ailleurs en anglais que ce concept se formula spontanément dans ma tête. White Niggers of America. Les Noirs américains furent les premiers, et pour cause, àsaisir ce que pouvait être, sur les rives du Saint-Laurent, la condition particulière des Québécois francophones" (31). And one should note that the shock tactic of using the word "Nigger" in titles was also in evidence in one of the most widely-circulated underground classics of its time, widely read in the 1960s: Jerry Farber's "Student as Nigger." According to Owram, *Born at the Right Time*, 238, this text was even read into *Hansard*.

[131] *Nègres blancs*, 143.

[132] *Nègres blancs*, 322; and also these reflections on his father's leftist sympathies: "On discutait des réformes opérées par le CCF en Saskatchewan mais le CCF ignorait que des milliers de travailleurs québécois auraient aimé entendre ses *leaders* leur dire en francais [sic] que leur parti était prêt à leur donner un coup de main, à eux aussi. Les gars étaient suls. Ils votaient obligatoirement pour Duplessis, comme ils allaient à la messe...." (150) This

to underline the weakness and tendency to compromise of social democracy; besides, the CCF had been unable to communicate with the masses of French-Canadian workers, and Vallières had felt like a maladroit delinquent in its middle-class Outremont outposts.[133] Many of these political specifics were Québécois, but much of the New Left paradigm brought to these specifics would have been familiar to radicals throughout the western world. Yet the book was "socialist" in the sense we have given to this word. Vallières, no less than Irvine, Spector, Scott and Lewis, identified his goal as the ultimate creation of a new egalitarian society, in which money would no longer serve as the cement of the social order, and science would be put at the collective service of a free humanity.

What was most Québécois about *Nègres blancs* was its first-person memoir of growing up in a downtrodden working-class suburb of Montréal. It would be difficult to think of another left-wing book in either francophone or anglophone Canada in which the author takes such pains to present an "unvarnished" and "completely candid" account of himself — his bitter relationship with his mother, his embrace and subsequent rejection of Catholic mysticism, his sexual relationships with women, his personal relationships with comrades, and the "adventure of ideas" which had held him spellbound since adolescence. The "Pierre Vallières" we meet in *Nègres blancs* — tortured by a sense of inferiority, twice on the brink of suicide, without secure anchorage in a world which seems "bestranged" and hostile, his words coming to us from the Manhattan House of Detention for Men — is a tragic figure drawn from Dostoyevsky's *Notes From Underground*. Under the rubric of the "precocious" and the "autobiographical," the self-confessional Vallières seemingly delivers himself up to the reader. The veils of self-presentation are lifted one by one. It is a kind of New Left truth-telling characteristic of the 1960s and North America, and atypical of socialist discourse at any earlier time, at least in Canada. The "personal as political" was enacted as a kind of ethical imperative. Laurier LaPierre was quick to note the parallels of this text with *Soul on Ice* by Eldridge Cleaver and *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*.[134] The truth of radical humanism, the possibilities of an emancipatory release of the human essence, was most vibrantly conveyed by the details of one person's autobiography, in this case the author's unflinchingly honest exploration of his own attempts to understand himself, his outcries of impatience and burning anger, and his salvation in marxist *praxis*. For Vallières, a Marxism adequate to the task of "de-alienating" the masses had to be prepared to organize a victorious popular revolution, "a successful

---

was, characteristically of the New Left, a too-easy handling of the question of working-class conservatism and the popular base for non-leftist politics.

[133]*Nègres blancs*, 266. Vallières voted for the NDP in 1962, which set him apart from many of his friends, who voted Créditiste.

[134]Laurier LaPierre, "Canada's Eldridge Cleaver and Malcolm X," *New York Times Book Review*, 11 April 1971, Section 7, 1, 10, 12.

collective psychoanalysis," which was only the first step to the transformation of life from top to bottom.[135]

Although Vallières makes no explicit mention of Sorel, a theme of "redemptive violence" runs through the text, as it would through many of the New Left.[136] Vallières argues that those who attempt to slow down the turn to violence, are themselves practising a form of terror by delaying the working class from realizing its inherent and inescapable vocation: that of the class-conscious destroyer of capitalism.[137] Vallieres's socialist revolution will be total: nothing will remain the same. Marx appears here, not so much as a political economist, but as the philosopher of praxis, whose writings had rescued Vallières from his long "proletarian's pilgrimage" transversing the works of Gide, Malraux, Camus, Proust, Mauriac, Dostoyesvky, Heidegger, and Husserl, as well as Sartre. Vallières's Marx was a revolutionary humanist, an exponent of the possibilities of a humanity free from the bondage of bourgeois civilization and culture.

An earlier Canadian reading of Marx — such as the one made by *Make This Your Canada* — might have suggested a very different, less voluntarist relationship between the means and ends of socialist struggle, one that placed a question mark over the thesis of redemptive "proletarian violence." A subsequent contemporary feminist reading of this text might underline the extent to which women are marginalized within it — and not just in the easily critiqued "personal" memoirs, with their dated sexual politics, but also in the patrilineal genealogy Vallières constructs for his intended proletarian movement. Apart from Thérèse Casgrain, dismissed in one line, no woman appears in the text as a significant political figure. The passage with which the text ends, which begins by summoning comrades and drinking buddies to take up the work of proletarian revolution — "Hé! Georges, qu'est-ce que tu attends pour te décider? Et vous autres, Arthur, Louis, Jules, Ernest? Debout, les gars, et tous ensemble: au travail!..."[138] — are energetic and

[135]"Toute psychanalyse (individuelle ou collective) fait peur. Et c'est un réflexe normal. Car une psychanalyse honnête propose rapidement des actes à poser, des actes qui contredisent radicalement nos vieilles habitudes d'agir et de penser. Plus un acte à poser provoque chez le patient (individu ou collectivité) de la résistance et de l'angoisse, plus cet acte, comme l'a démontré Freud, est nécessaire. Se désaliener n'est pas une entreprise romantique... Seuls les démagogues malhonnêtes peuvent promettre le bonheur aux masses comme le père Noël, chez Eaton, promet des jouets aux enfants." *Nègres blancs*, 390.

[136]In a sense, Jean-Paul Sartre is an obscure and powerfully shaping presence in this text. *Les Temps modernes* had been a model for Vallières's early journalism, and Sartre's interest in Fanon as an expositor of Engels's theory of violence as the "midwife of history" was influential, not just for Vallières but for the New Left in general. And one can hear more than an echo of Sartre in the text's critique of the "vast emptiness" characteristic of lives in capitalist societies. *Nègres blancs*, 96, 388-89.

[137]*Nègres blancs*, 351.

[138]*Nègres blancs*, 351.

eloquent. Still, one misses — and Vallières himself would later reach this conclusion about his earlier positions — any words for Esther, Marie, or Danielle.

Vallières's voluntarist Marxism was, in a sense, an applied politico-ethical vision, which condemned capitalism for its inhumanity, injustice, and "abnormality." A strong *moral* critique of the liberal order and the culture of consumption pervades *Nègres blancs*. Bourgeois ideology pacified working-class people, bathing them in irrationality and "sexual perversion." It also taught them to despise worldly existence, to accept the "survival of the fittest" as an ideology, and to forget about the chances of making effective political choices. Vallières gives no explicit sign of having read the Frankfurt School, but his condemnation of the "culture industries" echoes this body of socialist thought. A genuinely proletarian revolution, total and liberating, required a transformation not just of the workers' economic lives but also of their culture, ethnicity, traditions, customs, needs and tastes. At the limit of his utopianism, and echoing the Marx of *The German Ideology* and the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, Vallières called for the *disappearance* of commodity categories — of calculation in terms of value, of money, and of the financial and credit systems. Here Vallières's text was at one with much New Left cultural criticism, from the *Port Huron Statement* of the SDS to the new Hegelianism of Herbert Marcuse, which depicted the "one-dimensional lives" of people trapped in capitalist culture.[139]

Nègres blancs was considered so incendiary a book that elaborate steps were taken to prevent the Québec people from reading it; and it itself became a text in the long-running state trials of its author.[140] There is good empirical evidence, then, for the view that contemporaries thought it conveyed its point of view powerfully. Vallières was able to "speak for a generation" of the 60s, and not only francophones, because he dared to name problems that, on the left, had long been repressed. The core problem he identified was the national oppression of the Québécois at the heart of a "Canadian" liberal order; he was able to integrate the empirical and personal details of this history with his own sense of a revolutionary world afire. No Canadian book from the epoch of the New Left captures its spirit so well.

Yet how was it that Vallières, former seminarian, student of philosophy and isolated theoretician, could identify without hesitation the ways in which a future working-class struggle should evolve and the all-embracing goals it should pursue? Kindred questions would haunt much New Left discourse. On whose behalf was one speaking? Was it even legitimate to "speak on someone's behalf"? As was the case with earlier socialist formations, the politics of the form precluded the

[139]Isserman, *If I Had a Hammer* (Urbana and Chicago 1993) makes a highly original contribution in linking these archetypal "New Left" concerns to "Old Left" perceptions of the culture industries.

[140]As Vallières would marvel in 1994, "Le zèle politique de la police étant ce qu'il est, même l'exemplaire du livre obligatoirement déposé à la Bibliothèque nationale par l'éditeur fut saisi, sans doute par souci scrupuleux de 'nettoyage intellectuel'." *Nègres Blancs*, 9.

possibility of an extended, open-ended dialogue with contrary evidence. The enthusiastic, premeditated celebration of political violence seems out of keeping with any realistic sense of what such violence was expected to accomplish and the politico-ethical costs it would entail for both its architects and objects. As both Gagnon and Vallières would later conclude, although in different ways,[141] the turn to armed violence, at this time and in this form, was a mistake. Around the world, many former New Left activists would draw the same conclusion.

Nothing mounted by the New Left in the United States carried the focused disruptive potential of the October Crisis, which brought the entire Canadian state into question; and it is too easily forgotten that the revolutionary-socialist FLQ Manifesto, issued after the kidnapping of British diplomat James Cross, aroused a surprising degree of popular support, especially in working-class Montréal, but also including that of much of the English-speaking Canadian left. Then the Chénier cell executed Pierre Laporte, and such support rapidly eroded. It is important to locate this "error in judgment" or "accident" within the context of a political form which placed almost no controls over the activities of particular cells, and which tended to exalt redemptive, "therapeutic" violence. In the struggle for hegemony on the Québec left which ensued, the ambiguously social-democratic Parti Québécois would win the allegiance of most of the cohort of 1968.[142]

It is hard, at the beginning of a very different century, fully to re-experience the politics of *Nègres blancs*. There is, in Canadian socialism, no text more demandingly utopian and apocalyptic than this one, the polar opposite of the "sane and sensible" language beloved of the CCF. A measure of the changing times was the transformation of the book, from "banned substance" to "required undergraduate reading," and of its author, from "outlaw" to "celebrity." Vallières himself found these transformations bittersweet. Mixed in with the success of his text reaching many thousands of people was the realization that he himself had been transformed into a kind of commodity, a celebrity in the culture of consumption he so despised. He became, like many superstars of the 60s, a person closely watched for signs of "accommodation" and "betrayal." Meanwhile, the *serious* discussion of his ideas went nowhere. It was the signature contradiction of New Leftism that it itself exemplified the trends to fragmentation, ultra-liberalism, and commodification that it also brilliantly critiqued.

Second, it is difficult to know what to make of the *felquiste* contribution overall to an exploration of the Canadian liberal labyrinth. Vallières's politics was Québécois, and not Canadian; and including *Nègres blancs* — a text in which

[141] Whereas Vallières turned to the Parti Québécois and then to non-affiliated radicalism, Gagnon rallied to Marxism-Leninism.

[142] For contemporary accounts of subsequent Québec leftism, see Marc Ferland and Yves Vaillancourt, *Socialisme et Indépendance au Québec: Pistes pour le mouvement ouvrier et populaire* (Montréal and Sainte-Foy 1981); for a right-wing journalistic account of left politics in Québec in the 1970s, see Jacques Benoît, *L'extreme gauche* (Montréal 1977).

"Canadians" are Others against which a Fanonist campaign of decolonizing violence is fully warranted — will strike many federalists and sovereignists alike, on opposite grounds, as absurd and offensive. Tough luck. The exclusion of this book and of the moment of possibility it epitomized from any balanced consideration of socialism on 20th-century Canadian territory would be historically irresponsible, as would be any avoidance of the cultural and political divisions it highlighted.

Since the 1960s, many politically active people in Québec have been active in extra-parliamentary, Maoist, Trotskyist, socialist, and social-democratic directions, most of them at the same time supporting sovereignty in a polity starkly divided between federalist and sovereignty camps. Many of these people remain "Canadian socialists" — that is, they are socialists on soil the world recognizes as belonging to a state called "Canada" — and yet do not feel themselves to be in league with leftists elsewhere in the country. Outside Québec, interest in the territory's self-determination or sovereignty has waned on the left. In the thirty years crisis over the constitution which has dominated and, to an extent, immobilized Canadian politics, an influential socialist framework for constitutional debate has not emerged. Socialists have generally been conscripted into the rival camps, where they have only temporarily and to a small extent inserted even the slightest indications of a socialist counter-logic. Vallières's refusal to "see" any socialist history in anglophone Canada is paralleled by the disinterest in the Québec question on the part of the majority of anglophone socialists. Such dualism has rewards. And it is, in a sense, the political counterpart of the New Left's phenomenological moment. If the "constitution" and "French/English relations" and the details of Canadian history are outside my personal frame of reference, why should I integrate them into my politics? It was the achievement of the fourth formation, especially as it rose to prominence in Québec, to raise the "national questions" which Canadian socialists had hitherto repressed — but they still remain unanswered.

A Fifth Socialism?

Vallières's subsequent development after *Nègres blancs* — into feminism, environmental activism and gay liberation[143] — exemplifies that followed by many of his cohort. Once the revolutionary moment receded, many of the "personalist" aspects of New Leftism remained. Many of his generation followed something like his path. They took up employment within the state apparatus (in the universities or, like him, became social workers in the state bureaucracy). Many transferred their hopes to the international level — to El Salvador and Nicaragua, to Africa, to the Balkans (Vallières himself would embrace the cause of Bosnia). They became much less convinced, over time, that the working class would lead the revolution. They came to take the oppression of women and of homosexuals, and the degrada-

[143]See Pierre Vallières, *Homosexualité et subversion* (Montréal 1994).

tion of the environment, as seriously — and, over time, more seriously — than class exploitation.

There is a conventional way of closing this discussion of the century of socialism — with a few cautionary tales about the inevitable disappointment of youthful hopes, or (if one is a follower of the neo-liberal party line of the daily newspapers) the inherent corruption and totalitarianism of any and all socialist attempts to escape the neo-liberal labyrinth such organs daily celebrate. Socialism is merely the term to denote the "illusion of an epoch." The "history of socialism" in Canada would thus have a beginning, a middle, and an end: all that remains, on the occasion of its hundredth anniversary, is to write the obituaries. And, in certain hands, these will not be flattering. The four formations we have discussed, it will be said, were all fatally compromised by their simple-minded orthodox Marxism, that master-narrative whose day is done. The "socialisms" we have reconstructed via certain texts were all abject failures, and their emancipatory ambitions came to nothing. Throughout we find deluded provincials, struggling to "read into" Canadian circumstances an international significance they would never have. The children — of October, of the 1940s, of 1968 — have grown older and wiser, and the world has gone on. If any elements can be salvaged from this "building site in ruins" — and a true sceptic would doubt even this — they would be the ideals of "pluralism," "radical democracy" and "citizenship."[144] Everything else from the history of socialism is debris slated for the dust-heap of history.

Nothing could be further, of course, from the "liberal-order" reading I am proposing. Socialism happens in Canada because liberalism is deficient. Neo-liberalism (liberalism without an expanding welfare state) is doubly so. Over time, again and again, capitalism and the liberal order create armies of critics and activists. It is happening again. They do not yet call themselves "socialists," but they likely will.

In contrast with the earlier socialisms, women will not in the future be subordinated to party-lines and intellectual formations dominated almost completely by men. Within the historiography on Canadian socialism, the most dynamic and critical recent work has highlighted the uphill battles fought by women for respect and equity within the socialist movement. It has measured the glaring gap between socialists' proclaimed ideals of gender equality and their mixed record.[145] It is not accidental that the four works I have considered as archetypal were written by men. In ways both coarse and subtle, all four past formations were male-dominated. The outstanding question debated among historians is not whether socialist formations marginalized women, which they all did, but whether they all did so uniformly. Similarly, not even the most sympathetic reconstruction can produce a

[144]See Chantal Mouffe, *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community* (London 1992).

[145]See especially Janice Newton's aptly titled *The Feminist Challenge to the Canadian Left, 1900-1918.*

"history of Canadian socialism" that overlooks the full collusion of all earlier formations in the oppression of gays and lesbians, who were characteristically interpreted as symptoms of the degeneracy of capitalism rather than as people entitled to solidarity and respect.[146] And such an effort cannot produce a "Canadian socialist formation" that had really grasped the central significance, to any socialist project on Canadian soil, of First Nations issues, which were never allowed (for instance) to cloud the exuberant "manifest northern destiny" of *Make This Your Canada*.

Such gestures of demarcation are commonly made by those creating a new socialist formation. A new formation first makes its presence known by declaring itself unlike all previous socialist traditions. Brought into being by neo-liberal globalization, centred on a cohort of activists drawn from the new social movements, the universities, and (to some extent) the church, a cohort is working out a new paradigm of radical politics — one that combines feminism, environmentalism, and communitarianism. It may very well eschew the name "socialist," which carries so much baggage and which does not intuitively answer to many contemporary ideals. But so far as it seeks bases of unity from which to launch a post-liberal politics, so far as it continues a dialogue with Marx and expresses serious interest in economic and social equality, so far as it tries to transmit a general collective sensibility, it is working within the socialist tradition.

If the history of Canadian socialism has two major lessons to teach, it is that Canadians will often respond to calls for a radical egalitarianism, and that opportunities to reach large numbers of them can emerge swiftly, to reward the cohort which has best shaped the language and practice of its formation to articulate the subjective and objective needs of fellow citizens. To an extent never paralleled before in Canadian history, we now have a substantial socialist intelligentsia, with magazines, journals, lobbies and networks; we have a far more nuanced and sophisticated understanding of 'Marxist theory' in all its permutations; we have a well-established "socialist political economy"; and we have proto-socialist cadres drawn from the new social movements with "impossibilist" demands that cannot be easily accommodated by a second liberal "passive revolution." And we have the most radical stimulus of all: a totalitarian neo-liberalism violently imposing market logic on every human relationship, no matter the danger to living human beings and the communities that sustain them. What is primarily lacking is a powerful

[146]For David Lewis's views on homosexuality — "I know that to normal people this practice is an odious one...." — see Gary Kinsman, *The Regulation of Desire: Sexuality in Canada* (Montréal and New York 1987), 169. Interesting materials can also be found in Peter Dickinson, *Here is Queer: Nationalisms, Sexuality and the Literatures of Canada* (Toronto 1999), ch. 3, on homophobic attacks launched against the poet Patrick Anderson, editor of the Labour Progressive Party's *En Masse* magazine in Montréal. It should also not be forgotten that the FLQ Manifesto itself spares time to insult Pierre Trudeau's allegedly deviant sexuality.

political party that wholeheartedly believes in a post-liberal egalitarian order. Yet, nonetheless, the NDP, even given its origins in the new liberal passive revolution of the 1940s and 1950s, finds itself inhibited from venturing too far into neo-liberalism, partly because of the socialism in its history, and partly because of the non-negotiability of much of the identity-politics flourishing in its constituencies. Whether it can do something new with the old question of the socialist party-form, whether it can reconcile Marxist political economy with the new social movements, whether it can say something persuasive and emancipating to Canadians about the national question — these are key issues to be confronted before the fifth formation encounters its moment of opportunity.

At the beginning of a new formation, it is customary to engage in the exercise of judging the antecedent formations highly defective. But the historic risk, for each formation, has been that of being condemned to perpetually re-invent the wheel — of jettisoning insights earlier formations had achieved, and of misrecognizing the lessons they had to teach. And an equal risk has been that of imposing on Canadian realities successive models drawn from outside Canada, without due regard for the historical experiences of past Canadian socialists, wrestling as they did with the challenges cast up by a persisting liberal order. Perhaps one break with the past that fifth-formation activists could consider would be a refusal of past patterns of refusal. Finding an exit from the capitalist liberal labyrinth will not become easier by disregarding all previous attempts to do so. A less sweeping and hubristic approach would concede that all conceptual frameworks constructed to interpret and solve human problems are subject to revision — as a "fifth socialism" is bound to be. "Nothing has worked" in one limited sense, then — the "revolution" hoped for by Communists and CCFers did not happen, and the "New Jerusalem" is a distant destination — and yet, in another way, "everything worked." A "socialist good sense," which neoliberals quite rightly see as a formidable obstacle, did attain and still retains a fair measure of popular acceptance in Canada. In taking sober measure of the reinvigorated right, and the obvious sense of disorientation that prevails on the left, our "pessimism of the intelligence" should not be so exaggerated that it obscures the resources at our disposal, many of them the neglected legacies of a past century of socialist thought and struggle.

My thanks to members of the audience at the "Historians and their Audiences" conference at York University, April 2000, for their interest and comments and to Labour/Le Travail*'s anonymous readers, Peter Campbell and Gerald Friesen for their critiques.*