

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

10 June 2016

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Hurl, C. and Christensen, B. (2015) 'Building the new Canadian political economy.', *Studies in political economy*, 96 (1). pp. 167-193.

Further information on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19187033.2015.11674942>

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor Francis Group in *Studies in Political Economy: A Socialist Review* on 04/03/2016, available online at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/19187033.2015.11674942>.

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

Building the New Canadian Political Economy: Oral histories of an intellectual community in the 1960s and 1970s

By Chris Hurl and Benjamin Christensen

Abstract:

Since the late-1960s, the New Canadian Political Economy (NCPE) has played an important role in shaping the trajectory of the social sciences in Canada and informing the political goals and strategies of a range of progressive social movements. However, there have been few studies that have attempted to trace the history of the NCPE as a distinctive intellectual tradition or account for its place in consolidating a left political milieu in Canada outside of Quebec. Exploring the NCPE as a part of a wider left formation, this article examines the role played by organic intellectuals in building this tradition. Drawing from eleven oral history interviews and archival analysis, we begin by locating these intellectuals in the disciplinary struggles unfolding within social science departments through this period. We then explore how, working through networks between the academy and progressive social movements, intellectuals were able to consolidate a space for the revitalization of this approach. Beyond simply acting as purveyors of new ideas, we argue that these intellectuals also played a vital role in establishing the institutional foundations – in texts, seminars, and meeting rooms – through which the NCPE took shape as both an academic discipline and political discourse.

Keywords: New Canadian Political Economy, Left Formation, Organic Intellectuals

Introduction

The revival of political economy has factored centrally in the distinctive trajectory of the social sciences in Canada over the past forty years. Against the dominance of positivist approaches in the American academy, the Canadian social sciences – including sociology, political science, history and geography – have all tended towards a more historical, holistic, and materialist analysis.¹ Yet there have been very few studies that account for the history of the New Canadian Political Economy (NCPE) as an intellectual approach. Beyond Clement's (2001) article profiling NCPE's influence on Canadian sociological scholarship, one must piece together an assortment of brief descriptions from introductory chapters of various edited volumes.² While these sources account for some of the key debates that have defined the intellectual terrain, they do not consider the broader socio-economic context in which NCPE was institutionalized, nor do they theorize the interplay between emergent social movements, various left political groupings and intellectual cohorts involved in developing this approach.

In this article, we draw from Ian McKay's theoretical approach in examining the New Canadian Political Economy as part of a wider 'left formation'.³ McKay defines a left formation as "an emergent historic bloc, a complex unity made up of unique individuals, contrasting and even contradictory social forces, using its own dialect of a

shared language ... and its own distinctive way of crafting a relationship between past and future in present-day politics”. Rather than seeking to map out a single intellectual lineage, we highlight how differently situated intellectuals have drawn from the language of political economy in generating alternative understandings of their political and economic context. Beyond all the scholarly discussions and debates, we are centrally concerned with the institutional foundations through which this intellectual approach solidified. We argue that the NCPE tradition was a *collective* undertaking, demanding the establishment of shared venues – study groups, books and magazines, conferences and regular meetings – through which intellectuals and activists could discuss core problems facing the left political community, define priorities and debate political strategies. As we show, organic intellectuals critically situated between the academy and emergent social movements played a central role in establishing this infrastructure.

This article draws on oral histories from thirteen intellectuals associated with the NCPE from the early-1960s until the present period. Oral history provides a useful means of generating knowledge of the past beyond official texts available in libraries and archives. Moreover, in the context of heterodox economics, Mata and Lee note that it provides “clues to the emergence of communities of scholars, revealing the making of bonds of identity that underpin their intellectual commitments.”⁴ From this perspective, oral histories are useful in exploring not only the scholarly work that was done by intellectuals, but also the work forging and maintaining connections as well as understanding the breaks or disjunctures between intellectual groupings.

In seeking to understand the way that political economy was taken up in the 1960s and 1970s, we aimed to interview participants that came from different intellectual backgrounds, worked in different regional areas of Canada outside of Quebec, and who played different organizational roles in the institutionalization of NCPE. We undertook semi-structured, open-ended interviews with intellectuals based in the university sector from a range of disciplines including economics (3), political science (5) and sociology (5). Those interviewed have come from different regions of Canada – including British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, and Ontario – and have drawn inspiration from a variety of political tendencies and intellectual approaches in developing their views. We have engaged in one- to two-hour interviews with each respondent, questioning how they became involved with political economy as an academic discipline, their political activism, and the forms of association they created through the 1960s and 1970s. This is supplemented by several oral history interviews and accounts of the period that have been published in other sources.⁵ Additionally, we undertook an analysis of key texts and journals of the period, including *Canadian Forum*, *Canadian Dimension*, *Studies in Political Economy*, *Labour / Le Travail*, *Cahiers du Socialism*, *This Magazine*, *Our Generation* and the *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*. By placing texts in dialogue with oral history interviews, we hope to shed light on their production, distribution and critical reception across the left political milieu.

We recognize that the knowledge generated from these interviews is by no means unmediated, pure or objective.⁶ This is not simply a nostalgic attempt to “recuperate” the memory of a past intellectual community. Indeed, the perspectives presented are

necessarily subjective, advancing specific understandings of the past that are ensconced in the emotional bonds that were created through this period and projecting narratives that also speak to the perceived state of political economy today. Beyond simply recovering the memory of Canadian political economy as an intellectual tradition, we recognize that the perspectives presented may provide strategically useful knowledge – described by McKay as ‘reconnaissance’ – for those who are seeking to adopt a political economy approach today.

Drawing from our interview data, we identify three themes in the formation of the NCPE tradition in Canada. First, we note the place of political economy in the differentiation and fragmentation of the social scientific disciplines through the early 1960s. While there was a growing schism between political science and economics through this period, we highlight how a residual community of heterodox economists and left scholars helped to lay the foundation for a revival of political economy research. Second, we examine the NCPE in the context of a wave of social activism informed by a nascent anti-imperialist politics through the mid- to late-1960s. During this period, we discuss how intellectuals associated with the left political milieu developed expertise in organizing events, administering organizations and assembling texts which would provide much of the foundation for the later institutionalization of NCPE as a discipline. As a collective project, we see the NCPE emerge unevenly, taking root as a product of accumulated institutional expertise at a number of different sites. Third, we explore the consolidation of the NCPE in the 1970s, as the locus of scholarship shifted from the discipline of economics to history, sociology, and political science. While this was often a contentious period – in which different intellectual approaches competed to frame the field of debate – we highlight how the NCPE was able to carve out a distinctive disciplinary niche with the establishment of a shared infrastructure, including a regular book series, an academic association, annual meetings and a regular journal. While this organizational work often gets lost in the vitriol of the debates, we argue that it was essential in building an enduring basis for political economy scholarship in social science departments across Canada.

Putting the New Canadian Political Economy in Context: Left Formations and Organic Intellectuals

A number of studies note that political economy experienced a revival in Canada in the early 1970s.⁷ Through this period, growing concerns of U.S. domination of Canada’s culture and economy led scholars in Canada outside of Quebec to develop an analysis that aimed to understand the conditions and the possibilities for challenging American imperialism. In this sense, Murray Smith views the NCPE as “the product of an historical intersection, beginning in the mid-1960s, of a rising tide of (English-Canadian) nationalism and an international radicalization inspired in large part by anti-imperialist struggles in the colonial and semi-colonial ‘Third World’”.⁸ Building from this intersection, scholars drew influence from an earlier generation of political economy scholarship in Canada and combined it in creative ways with third world theories of underdevelopment, elite theory, social history, and Marxist theories of state. Indeed, the sheer range of approaches adopted has led Clement to conclude that the NCPE tradition “cannot have one heart (or head).”⁹ Encompassing so many disparate intellectual and

political tendencies, it is argued that the NCPE is better framed as a ‘tradition’ than as a singular intellectual approach.

In examining the emergence of NCPE as an intellectual tradition we are not simply concerned with tracing the history of individual thinkers and their ideas. Rather, we consider the New Canadian Political Economy to be a part of wider ‘left formation’ that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s. Drawing from Ian McKay’s concept, we see the NCPE as a product of efforts to carve out a shared space on the left, a vantage point from which to rethink the historical trajectory of ‘Canada’ as a social formation with the aim of opening up new lines for political action. This is not to insinuate that there was a single common identity or overriding political objective that underpinned the NCPE. Indeed, oral histories often attest to the tremendous divisions and differences between various scholars through this period. For instance, in reflecting on the left milieu through this period, Dorothy Smith notes, “there were all these little groups that were formed around ideological differences. And they were so fixated on their ideological differences that they couldn’t work together.”¹⁰ However, while noting the intellectual differences and disjunctures, we are also concerned with how intellectuals maintained a commitment to scholarship as a *public* endeavour that demanded collective organization. As we show, the revival of political economy as an intellectual approach was fostered through an enduring heterodox community in social science departments across Canada, the emergence of anti-imperialist social movements, and the consolidation of New Left associations, publishing companies and community spaces.

This paper aims to examine the role of those critically situated between social movements and academic institutions – the so-called ‘organic intellectuals’ – in mapping out the NCPE as a distinctive discipline. Building from Gramsci’s insights, a range of studies has highlighted the important role played by such figures in movement-building.¹¹ According to Stuart Hall organic intellectuals must work “on two fronts at one and the same time”. On the one hand, they must be at the “forefront of intellectual theoretical work”. They must actively be contributing to the consolidation of a distinctive field of research and scholarship, establishing a conceptual universe from which they can speak authoritatively to the historical conjuncture. But, at the same time, “the organic intellectual cannot absolve himself or herself from the responsibility of transmitting those ideas, that knowledge . . . to those who do not belong, professionally, in the intellectual class”.¹² In other words, organic intellectuals must work both towards the consolidation of a discipline while at the same time advancing a shared language that is connected to a distinctive community outside of the walls of the academy. As we show, it was between the academy and a left political milieu that the New Canadian Political Economy took shape.

Between Economics and Political Science: The Changing Contours of the Social Sciences in the 1950s and 1960s

During the 1970s, intellectuals laid the institutional groundwork for the revival of political economy as a mode of inquiry – establishing a publishing series, an academic association, and a regular journal.¹³ Yet our interviews highlight how this was also part of a complex dynamic that had been playing out in the social sciences from the early 1960s

onwards. This was a period of fervent state-building and there was a certain ambivalence in the relationship between nationhood and the social sciences. While sociologists, economists, and political scientists took up theories of modernization in seeking to account for Canada's position in a wider world system, there were also efforts to understand its unique location as a nascent state formation with a distinctive historical and geographical configuration. We describe how this dynamic played out in the changing disciplinary boundaries through this period, which helped set the stage for the emergence of the New Canadian Political Economy.

The middle decades of the twentieth century, Steinmetz observes, were “critical moments in the transformation of the social sciences’ deep culture”.¹⁴ Through this period, the social sciences took on a significantly different shape both institutionally and epistemologically – speaking with a different authoritative voice. In appraising the U.S. context, Steinmetz notes the consolidation of a “relatively homogenous regime” in sociology, economics, and political science with an “epistemological predilection” for positivism. Through this period, there were efforts to ‘modernize’ the social sciences, breaking them down into a series of disciplines that were each responsible for examining a discrete sphere of human activity. The ‘economy,’ the ‘political system,’ and ‘society’ were divided into separate domains and each taken up as objects of research. Certainly, we can note similar trends taking place in Canada; however, the tendency towards disciplinary fragmentation was mitigated in some universities by an enduring heterodox economic tradition.

Prior to the Second World War, much social scientific research in Canada tended to be broadly located under the umbrella of ‘political economy’. A commitment to analyse political and economic issues together was reflected in the journal, *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, founded by Harold Innis in 1934 and published until 1967, when it was finally divided into two separate journals – one for each respective discipline.¹⁵ The ‘interdisciplinary’ orientation of the Canadian social sciences was reflected in the structure of many academic departments. Indeed, many those who we interviewed – including Wallace Clement, Mel Watkins, and Leo Panitch – noted undertaking their undergraduate studies in departments that blended together economic history, political science, commerce and sociology.¹⁶ This was perhaps most clearly exemplified by the Department of Political Economy at the University of Toronto, which acted as a flagship institution for Canadian social science scholarship – providing much of the training for academics across the country. However, the tendency to blend together economic, social and political research was also pronounced in smaller institutions where a limited number of instructors were often compelled to multitask, teaching on a variety of topics – economic history in the morning and political science in the afternoon.¹⁷

Into the 1950s, economic history remained a central line of study in the Canadian social sciences. “Virtually every chair in economics in all political economy departments,” Watkins notes, “was an economic historian.”¹⁸ The degree of leadership exercised by economic historians through the 1940s and 1950s was reflected in the centrality of figures like Harold Innis and W.A. Mackintosh in both the production of new ideas and

the setting of social policy. Their efforts to critically *locate* their inquiries in relation to the Canadian context would be quite influential in shaping an emergent cohort of intellectuals. Rather than presuming the *a priori* existence of a capitalist economy in Canada, these intellectuals were concerned with understanding the institutional, technological, climactic, and political preconditions for the establishment of economic markets – emphasizing the significance ‘staples’ such as fur, fish, wood, wheat, and coal for Canada’s economic development.

However, as early as the 1940s economic history was increasingly displaced by more ‘scientific’ approaches, in part facilitated by the steady accumulation of data made available by increasingly networked state agencies. In his 1943 address to the American Philosophical Society, Innis warned: “The increasing power of the state has involved the subordination of political economy in the classical sense if not its disappearance. Art has been displaced by science.”¹⁹ The growing division of the social sciences into disciplines was paralleled by the adoption of positivist methods, substantially changing the nature of academic inquiry. Through this time, we see the ascendancy of methodological positivism in sociology, of logical positivism in the philosophy of science, of rational choice theory in economics and of behaviourism in psychology and political science.²⁰ In this sense, Drache describes this as an era of ‘laundering,’ in which political economy was “cleaned up and made more palatable” to the American social sciences. He notes, “political economy was reduced to providing data for econometric studies of the Canadian economy. They confined themselves to explaining the economy in its technical aspects – how it functioned and operated – and they abandoned altogether any attempt to link the system of capitalism to its social milieu.”²¹ This was reinforced by the education of an emergent generation of intellectuals in the latest econometric methods in institutions that had already turned to neoclassical economics in the United States and Great Britain. For instance, after completing his training in Commerce at the University of Toronto, Mel Watkins pursued a graduate degree in economics at MIT, which he describes as the epicentre for the shift from ‘political economy’ to ‘economic science’. Here, he was educated in the latest techniques in Keynesian economics by people like Paul Samuelson, Walt Rostow and Robert Solow and would initially come to adopt a very conventional approach in his scholarship.

While neoclassical methods would become increasingly hegemonic – contributing to a culture of ‘separatism’ by economists²² – a residual political economy tradition endured in some Canadian social science departments. Certainly, a number of schools could be identified as important centres for political economy research through this time.²³ However, there were two that factored largely in our interviews. The University of Toronto, for instance, prided itself on its lack of Keynesian economists. “We were pretty backward,” Watkins notes, reflecting on his time as both a student and professor in the department.²⁴ Under the helm of Innis, the department had continued to maintain a strong emphasis on economic history. Though Innis had felt increasingly marginalized from economics by the end of his life, a strong streak of economic history continued to be pervasive at University of Toronto following his death under the influence of William Thomas Easterbrook, who would play an influential role in recruiting a new generation of political economists to the department.²⁵ Many students were also influenced by Karl

Polanyi, who moved to Ontario in the mid-1950s after his wife was denied a visa to the United States for her past political affiliations. During this period, Polanyi was moving towards a more anthropological approach to the study of the economy, for instance co-authoring a book with Abraham Rotstein on the African slave trade.²⁶ As one of Polanyi's star students, Rotstein would play an influential role in shaping the departmental culture at the University of Toronto and, working with Watkins and others, would go on to galvanize a broader anti-imperial politics by the mid-1960s. These scholars found roots already established in a strong social democratic tradition at the University of Toronto associated with the progressive journal, *Canadian Forum*, and the University League for Social Reform (ULSR), an offshoot of League for Social Reconstruction, which undertook "a broad left-of-centre approach to current problems" through the 1960s.²⁷

A strong emphasis on economic history also endured at the University of Manitoba. In the 1940s and 1950s, the Department of Political Economy continued to be dominated by economists who had retained a strong historical streak in their writing, including Reuban Bellan, H.C. Pentland and Clarence Barber.²⁸ The influence of Pentland is especially notable, whose work stands apart from the Toronto political economy tradition in its emphasis on labour and class relations. It was in large part for this reason that Pentland's PhD thesis from the University of Toronto – "Labour and the Development of Industrial Capitalism in Canada" would be an underground classic, circulating as an unpublished manuscript for many years before it would be finally printed by Lorimer in 1981. Pentland's historical approach would be an important influence for Harold Chorney, Sam Gindin, Warren Magnusson, Leo Panitch, and other scholars who completed their undergraduate degrees at the University of Manitoba.

The enduring focus on economic history was paralleled through the 1940s and 1950s by the advancement of a 'People's History' by scholars affiliated with the Communist Party of Canada. For instance, writing in the *National Affairs Monthly* in 1949, the CPC historian, Stanley Ryerson argued that the central aim was to "restore to the working people the history of the past struggle – the real history of their land." Beyond exploring the historical and geographical specificity of a commodity-based market in Canada, the aim here was to highlight how different social classes served as agents in fomenting revolutionary change. By advancing a revolutionary people's history of Canada, scholars affiliated the CPC would galvanize a left formation that challenged the Liberal economic policies that aspired for continental integration at the time. Intellectuals would encounter the CPC in bookstores across Canada. For instance, Cy Gonick notes that in his search for left perspectives in Winnipeg in the mid-1960s, he visited a bookstore owned by the Communist Party. "The guy who ran it really liked discussing politics," Gonick notes, "He loved politics. So, people would come into the store and we would gab. I spent hours there. My wife ... was mad at me for spending too much time there, but that's where left politics were discussed".

While the social sciences in Canada were becoming divided along modern disciplinary lines, a residual tradition of economic history and the parallel efforts to establish a 'people's history' grounded in class analysis proved to be important in

providing the institutional groundwork for a revitalized political economy tradition through the 1950s and 1960s. Through this period students pursuing degrees in commerce, public administration or economics would continue to encounter political economy as a mode of analysis that was based on understanding Canadian economic development as embedded in a distinctive historical, geographical, technological and institutional context. Such enduring legacies would prove crucial in opening the doors to a new generation of political economists. As the universities rapidly grew in the 1960s and 1970s, the influence of this earlier cohort of political economists was significant in securing tenure for an emergent generation of scholars. Through the legacy, Mel Watkins, Michael Lebowitz, Cy Gonick, Paul Phillips were able to find space in economics departments for lines of research that deviated from the growing neoclassical orthodoxy.

The Incitement to Political Economy: Student Activism and the formation of a New Left

Even while political economy was divided into the modern disciplines of political science and economics in the academy, this intellectual approach encountered a revival in the left political milieu as a powerful wave of activism spread across postsecondary institutions across Canada from the mid- to late-1960s. Through this period there was a growing critique of the modern social sciences, arguing that the university had been ‘colonized’ by a brand of ‘technological liberalism’ that standardized social, political and economic analysis to the neglect of Canada’s distinctive context.²⁹ Against the assertion that Canadian institutions needed to ‘catch up’ with the rest of the world by developing modern social scientific methods, scholars such as Robin Matthews and James Steele criticized the assumption that teaching and research was carried out by “disembodied minds in a metaphysical world of learning”. In their 1968 report to the Carleton University Academic Staff Association (CUASA) they made a case for the *situatedness* of academic labour, which is “carried out by particular individuals, in particular places, at particular times, about particular problems in the context of particular communities”.³⁰ Such sentiments fuelled efforts to “Canadianize” these institutions by the late 1960s. Increasingly, it was argued that universities should be focused on cultivating a distinctly ‘Canadian’ perspective – a so-called ‘indigenous’ approach that acknowledged Canada’s distinct position in the wider world system.

By the late 1960s, the importation of American ideas and organizational models came to be increasingly problematized on the left. Beyond simply emulating what was taking place in other parts of the world, there were efforts to understand the specific national context – to delink Canadian political and economic institutions from domination by outside imperial powers. The revival of political economy through this period is often associated with efforts to establish an ‘independent socialist’ Canada, manifested in the Waffle, which would emerge as a left faction of the New Democratic Party in 1969. The central figures involved in drafting the twenty-six point ‘Waffle Manifesto’ – which included Mel Watkins, Cy Gonick and James Laxer – were heavily influenced by a political economy perspective in developing their position. The manifesto was concerned with the “survival of Canada,” which was threatened by “American control” over the economy. The push to develop a so-called “indigenous” approach to political and economic questions was fuelled by a discourse of anti-imperialism that grew in prominence through the mid- to late- 1960s.³¹ Through this period, there was an effort

to ‘decolonize’ the institutions – to identify the various ways in which institutions had been ‘occupied’ by outside forces.

However, while the NCPE tradition has been at times linked to a populist discourse of ‘left nationalism,’ which some have criticized for its insular chauvinism, left intellectuals were often inspired by discussions and debates that were taking place in other parts of the world, drawing inspiration from the theoretical works from the American New Left, the Western European Marxists and Third World decolonization in imagining their own place in the world. For instance, Cy Gonick would get an early taste in Berkeley, where he attended graduate school in economics in 1962. There, he became active in a Marxist study group and contributed to one of the earliest New Left journals in North America -- *Root and Branch*. In Wisconsin, Michael Lebowitz edited another prominent New Left journal, *Studies on the Left* - founded in 1959 - and contributed to the economics section of the Port Huron Statement – before going on to take a position in Economics at Simon Fraser University. These journals were informed by Marxist study groups that were beginning to crop up across the United States and would provide inspiration for the formation of similar groups in Canada. Hence, Gonick would go on to draw from his experience in the United States when founding *Canadian Dimension* in 1963. Far from framing this journal as a vehicle for left nationalism, Gonick argues that he was not initially concerned with questions of Canada or Canadian identity. He was more focused on bringing the intellectual approach that he encountered at Berkeley to Canada.³² Taking up an academic position in Saskatoon, Gonick notes, “I was looking for a discussion, conversation of the kind over the years I had at Berkeley”. Failing to see such a conversation in Canadian journals or academic institutions at the time, Gonick decided “if I’m going to continue this discussion, which I held it vital for me to continue my political education, maybe I should form a magazine and maybe people will come into the magazine and I’ll learn that way”.

These New Left journals would inform the debates occurring in budding social movement organizations such as the Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA) and the Canadian Union of Students (CUS) through the mid-1960s where student activists aimed to reconcile theory with practice, creating a kind of knowledge that was directly embedded in social struggle. Through the course of movement-building, activists working with an older cohort of intellectuals (such as Carleton sociologist John Porter, who drafted at least one of the CUS reports) developed increasingly sophisticated tools of analysis – first in the immediacy of specific struggles but later broadening to include a wider political economic analysis of the national social formation.³³ This trajectory is well summarized by Hugh Armstrong, in describing his own politicization:

I got involved in the student movement as president [of the student association] at Carleton, and then president [of the Canadian Union of Students] Ontario, president Canada, and I was no Marxist. We were concerned about access to university, universal access, right? So, we start fighting on tuition fees ... But the response to us was, well, tuition fees are only part of the cost. And the cost that was really booming at the time was the cost of residence. The cost of residence was booming because of the

cost of money. They were building new residences all over the place – they were very expensive because you had to borrow very expensive money. So, we started thinking about [why] interest rates are so high ... Well, the reason, it turned out was the war in Vietnam. Lyndon Johnston was fighting a two front war, the war on poverty and the war on Vietnam. How come these things are being fought?³⁴

The political and economic environment of the 1960s and early 1970s provided a new set of challenges to the day-to-day organizing work of student activists. For many, Marxist political economy became "...a place to go for analytical tools to figure out how things work so you that could change it."³⁵ The politics of the 1960s encouraged a new form of analysis and political economy provided the toolkit for many student activists to piece together a critique of the broader structures of power they were challenging. Dorothy Smith describes it as a sort of 'pre-organization work' that involved figuring out what "you need to know in order to begin to think about making change."³⁶

The emphasis on a situated approach to political economic research would be central in informing a range of movements through the late 1960s, as activists sought to understand how the everyday life of marginalized and oppressed communities was 'colonized' in significant ways by 'outside' social forces. This approach was reflected, for instance, in the summer research projects organized by the Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA) in the mid-1960s, in which student activists undertook research in low-income and marginalized communities across the country.³⁷ While there are connections here to the Canadianization movement in the desire to advance a situated theoretical approach, the starting place for analysis were the 'everyday experiences' of marginalized people rather than 'the nation' as an abstract signifier. Likewise, in undertaking feminist research in the late 60s and 70s, Smith and others sought to move beyond simply reproducing an intellectual approach that "originates and is really about the United States."³⁸ Instead, they attempted to begin with "actual people and what they are actually doing". This emphasis on everyday experiences was reflected in a range of disciplines. For instance, scholars such as Bryan Palmer and Gregory S. Kealey drew inspiration from a wave of British and American Marxist historiography in pursuing a 'history from below,' seeking to recover the everyday struggles of working class people in Canada.³⁹ While the degree of methodological uniformity should not be overstated, this approach was very much reflected in the pages of the regular journal *Labour / Le Travail: Journal of Canadian Labour Studies*, which commenced publication in 1976.

Through the mid- to late-1960s, a whole infrastructure emerged for the pursuit of social inquiry beyond the walls of the academy – in collective houses that would spring up in major cities across Canada. Perhaps the most ambitious experiment in communal living at the time was Rochdale College, an experiment in cooperative living that was created by the University of Toronto in 1968. On each floor, Hugh Armstrong notes, weekly Marxist study groups were organized. However, even at the smaller universities, there was a demand for political economic analysis that was driven from below by student activists. For instance, Pat Armstrong mentions how student activists prompted her to establish one of the first courses to be taught in Canada on feminism at Trent

University when she was teaching there in 1971 – “they were undergraduates and came to the two of us and said, would you read women’s stuff from a Marxist perspective with us?”⁴⁰ By the early 1970s, such seminars were popping up at colleges and universities across Canada.

These activists would also develop expertise in publishing and journalism, establishing new media for the production of ideas. For instance, New Hogtown Press was initially a vehicle for the publication of research reports by the Canadian Union of Students. By the mid-1970s, it was publishing a number of key texts by upcoming scholars. Likewise, a number of other important publishing houses would get their start at this time -- New Star (1969), Black Rose (1970), Between the Lines (1977), Fernwood Books (1978). They would operate bookstores, like Spartacus Books in Vancouver (1973), Octopus Books in Ottawa (1969), or the Toronto Women’s Bookstore (1973). These spaces helped to establish an intellectual home for a political economy approach and provided activist intellectuals with important organizational expertise, which they would later take up in building the NCPE as a discipline.

The growth of publishing companies, newspapers, bookstores, and reading groups through this period provided a material infrastructure for the dissemination of political economic ideas outside of the walls of the academy. It provided a milieu where the discussion of political economic ideas was granted a new sense of vitality. Moreover, it contributed to the development of expertise in building institutions, fund-raising, organizing events, and disseminating periodicals that could be carried over into discipline-building efforts inside the academy. Through active engagement with the political milieu, many intellectuals gained experience in combining their theoretical and activist work, linking emerging political economic debates within the academy to the institutional politics of the an emergent left formation. This forged a base of experience that would facilitate the consolidation of the discipline through the 1970s.

Institutionalizing a Tradition: The Emergence of the ‘New Canadian Political Economy’

While the explosion of student activism in the late 1960s gave new life to political economy as an intellectual approach, it was only in the early 1970s that the ‘New Canadian Political Economy’ came to be institutionalized inside the academy. During this time, a young generation of scholars worked to fix the language of political economy in a series of texts, associations, and seminar groups lending weight to its claims as a distinctive ‘tradition’. As Watkins notes, “if you have your own journal, if you have a publishing series, a publishing university press, you can go a long way now saying you’re a formal paradigm.”⁴¹ Moreover, this approach was increasingly taught at the undergraduate level and occupied a central place in rapidly expanding graduate programs in a variety of social science departments, training a new cadre of intellectuals in an ostensibly ‘Canadian’ intellectual tradition.

The early 1970s was as a time of growing debate and differentiation for the NCPE, with a range of political economy inspired intellectual approaches being taken up in social science departments across Canada. While the discourse of anti-imperialism had reached a high point by the late-1960s, there were growing critiques as a neo-Marxist

approach increasingly coalesced on the left. This, in part, reflected the changing orientation of the social sciences as the locus of theoretical debates began to shift from the economics departments – under the influence of figures such as Pentland, Watkins, Levitt, Gonick, Lebowitz, Rotstein and Hymer – to political science, sociology and history. Here, there was a ‘social’ turn in Political Economy as, drawing from Polanyi, the economy came to be viewed as ‘embedded’ in a specific social formation (Mitchell, 2005). Following the influence of Mills (1956) and Porter (1965), elite theory was taken up by sociologists such as Wallace Clement in his best-selling book exploring the composition of the economic elites and their influence on social policy in the Canadian state.⁴² And in political science, debates were raging by the late 1960s between Miliband and Poulantzas on the role of the state in the reproduction of capitalism as a social system.⁴³

Such literature was widely discussed in a range of Marxist seminars and study groups that were organized on university campuses across Canada. Numerous interview participants note that Marxist political economy came to be considered ‘fashionable’ in the early 1970s, possessing a degree of cultural cache in the university setting. While Toronto remained an important locus of scholarly debate –with York University and the Toronto Marxist Institute presenting neo-Marxist alternatives to the anti-imperialism at the University of Toronto – Carleton University would also emerge as a major centre by the early 1970s. This was spurred on by Leo Panitch who would take a position in the Department of Political Science. Dissatisfied with his pursuit of economics, Panitch decided to switch to political science after he encountered Ralph Miliband giving lectures at the London School of Economics based on his book, *The State in Capitalist Society*. “[I]t changed my life,” he notes, encouraging him to go on to complete a PhD under Miliband’s supervision.⁴⁴

Inspired by his experience in the United Kingdom, Panitch organized a non-credit interdisciplinary faculty-student seminar at Carleton University called the “Seminar on Contemporary Socialist Problems”. This seminar brought together faculty, graduate students, trade union organizers, student activists and other leftists to meet every other week to discuss issues of Marxism, the state and the nature of Canadian capitalism. In contrast with the anti-imperialism of the mid-1960s that aimed to develop a so-called ‘indigenous’ approach to economic problems in Canada, the neo-Marxist approach tended to advance from a different epistemological position. It was less about developing a ‘Canadian’ approach to political economy as it was a matter of developing a ‘Marxist’ analysis of Canada as a ‘national social formation.’⁴⁵ Building from the methods of Miliband, Poulantzas, and James O’Connor, there was a focus here on mapping out the structure of the state apparatus and how state agencies functioned to reproduce capitalist relations of production.

By the mid-1970s, the ‘Carleton school’ of political economy constituted a distinctive approach that was counter-posed to the Toronto school. In this sense, Jane Jenson – who was a participant in the Carleton seminars – describes Toronto and Ottawa as “two separate stories” in the unfolding of the NCPE tradition.⁴⁶ This was reflected in the debates of the period, which echoed a split within the Waffle between the so-called

left nationalists and the socialists. While some such as Laxer, emphasized the American imperialism and called for an ‘independent Canada,’ others questioned the ‘nationalist’ focus of the Waffle and instead emphasized the demand for a ‘socialist’ formation in the Canadian context. The intellectuals at Carleton tended to advance from a ‘socialist’ position that was critical of the anti-imperialist focus on relations of dependency and national underdevelopment. As Panitch notes, “The most important thing that we were doing was not so much being anti-imperialist, which was what drove the intellectuals around the Waffle. It was rather that we were rejuvenating, renewing, creating anew, a set of intellectual concepts that would better allow the prosecution of class struggle in a social environment which itself had changed in a lot of ways, so the old proletariat and the old definitions of it also needed renovation”.⁴⁷ The emphasis here was on ‘renovating’ Marxist class analysis to account for the changing political economic conjuncture.

However, while the ‘neo-Marxist’ camp is often counterposed to the ‘left nationalists’ in the literature, it is notable the extent to which these two intellectual groupings overlapped, working in combination to establish a shared infrastructure for the generation of ideas. Although substantial political and theoretical differences often existed, the neo-Marxist scholarship at Carleton University was in part facilitated by the material infrastructure and institutional expertise developed by those involved in earlier left nationalist debates and political activity. For example, prominent intellectuals associated with anti-imperialist scholarship Daniel Drache and Ian Lumsden initially proposed the idea of an edited volume compiling contributions from the Carleton seminar to Panitch while he was delivering a talk at the Toronto Marxist Institute in the mid-1970s.

By this time, a series of edited collections had been produced that were associated with the Canadian political economy tradition. Drache and Lumsden were both involved in a book series, *Studies in Political Economy of Canada* (SPEC), which had initially been founded in the 1960s by members of the University League for Social Reform (ULSR) and sponsored by the University of Toronto Press. Under the helm of R.I.K. Davidson, a sympathetic editor with the publishing company, a series of edited collections had been produced through SPEC that laid the groundwork for a distinctive Canadian political economy approach.⁴⁸ In the early 1970s, these texts had been primarily centred around questions of American imperialism and the prospects for national liberation, including Lumsden’s *Close the 49th Parallel, Etc* (1970) and Teeple’s *Capitalism and the National Question in Canada* (1972). However, royalties from these books were used to sponsor books associated with neo-Marxist scholarship, including *The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power* edited by Leo Panitch (1977). Through the late 1970s, a close relationship between neo-Marxist scholars and heterodox economists was further entrenched through the book series “The State and Economic Life,” edited by Panitch and Watkins, which began in 1978 and continued into the 1980s.

Still, the discussions of political economists often remained fragmented – broken into an array of disciplines, which often led conversations to take place in parallel. By the early 1970s, political economy had developed to such an extent that there became a

perceived need to establish shared space for discussion. A number of different centres for discussion would emerge through this period, including the Committee on Socialist Studies and the Toronto Marxist Institute. Most prominently, Daniel Drache spearheaded the creation of the Political Economy section of the Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA), meeting at the 1976 annual meetings of the Learned Society at Laval University in Quebec City. Numerous scholars highlight this as a formative event, in which Political Economy came into its own as an intellectual tradition. The initial meeting of this new section was well-attended, bringing together political economists, Marxists and other leftists of different stripes for the first time. Drache acquired funding to fly Mel Watkins from the Northwest Territories (who was then working on the Berger Inquiry), where he met Wallace Clement for the first time as members of a panel with Stanley Ryerson.

It is notable how such academic events facilitated conversations between intellectuals in universities and colleges across Canada. These relationships were further solidified through the establishment of a range of scholarly journals through this time. For instance, through the 1976 encounter at Laval, the political economists in English Canada were put in contact with Quebec intellectuals involved with the journal *Cahiers du Socialisme*, who raised the idea for a sister journal in English Canada. The creation of the peer-reviewed journal *Studies in Political Economy: A Socialist Review* (SPE) founded in 1979 became a major step in institutionalizing the NCPE as a distinct discipline in the academy. Receiving a three-year grant from SPEC, and building from the political economy section in the CPSA and a core group based out of the “Seminar on Contemporary Socialist Problems,” this journal grew from intellectual life in Ottawa and spread outwards. The journals of the period faced a tension in framing the discursive terrain. While some editors tended towards a more ‘big tent’ or ecumenical approach, others sought to more narrowly circumscribe the terms of debate. This was reflected for instance in SPE. Clement and Watkins in the editorial statement of the first volume emphasized the interdisciplinary character of the NCPE and rejected any single definition of political economy, beyond claiming that political economy referred, “...to an interdisciplinary blend of the history of economic, political *and* cultural relations.”⁴⁹ However, from this broad, ‘big tent’ definition, intellectuals maintained varying commitments in drawing methodological boundaries. For instance, while SPE was open to range of different approaches, Panitch argues that it was successful because it served as a hub for “class analysis,” which would fade more into the background by the mid-1980s.

Those interviewed also tend to describe this period as one of tension between professional commitments and community engagement. By the late 1970s, the emphasis tended to shift more to carving out a disciplinary space, as a young generation of scholars sought professional careers in the academy. Hence, according to Panitch, it was a central goal of SPE, amongst other things, to become an outlet and to “...help get neo-Marxist people on the left published [that] had been writing stuff that the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* wouldn’t touch.”⁵⁰ There were efforts here to establish a professional space for political economy. However, this raised certain challenges as many left-oriented intellectuals attempted to balance their community commitments with their

professional careers. For instance, Dorothy Smith describes losing contact with community activists as she moved to Toronto in 1977. “[O]ne of the things that I found,” she notes, was “because I was an academic or for whatever reason, I absolutely was cut out of connections to activism. And it was a very, very painful, painful, painful thing. It was like a big piece of my life was cut off, shut down. And I never quite understood it.”⁵¹ Several other scholars who we interviewed echoed this problem of staying political engaged through the late 1970s with growing professional and family commitments.

By the end of the 1970s, the NCPE had consolidated as a distinctive paradigm in the social sciences. While the political economy departments had closed their doors in most universities by this period, with the growing factionalization of the social sciences, a resurgent political economy paradigm was at the same time being institutionalized across disciplines. The problem of generating an alternative understanding of the Canadian social formation with the aim of fomenting social change brought historians, political scientists, and sociologists into conversation. Drawing from a residual political economy tradition and building from entrenched expertise in a vibrant left political milieu, this approach came to be fixed in specific texts, meetings and seminar groups that would provide an alternative space for discussion and debate over the next three decades. A book series had been established. A formal academic section was created, meeting on an annual basis with the CPSA. This material infrastructure laid the foundation for political economy as an established domain for social scientific research in the 1980s and 1990s.

Discussion and Conclusion

In many ways, the language of political economy was taken up in the 1960s and 1970s in the efforts to establish a collective voice, a constitutive ‘we’ that could serve as a protagonist in fomenting social change. In this paper, we have highlighted how this intellectual approach gathered new life in the 1960s and 1970s. While there was a trend to division, breaking down the social sciences into the modern disciplines of political science, economics, and sociology, we identify how an enduring political economic tradition emphasizing a holistic, historical and materialist approach was formative in shaping a new generation of intellectuals in English Canada. We note the importance of the left political milieu in providing popular venues for these ideas, tracing the emergence of expansive networks and infrastructure, which provided the institutional preconditions for the emergence of a “New Canadian Political Economy” in the 1970s.

This is not to say, however, that those who adopted political economic methods constituted an internally coherent community. Indeed, there were important geographical differences and disciplinary divisions that continued to separate scholars doing work in different areas. In fact, the “New Canadian Political Economy” itself was viewed by some interview participants as an “Ontario phenomenon” – linked largely to core members of the Ontario Waffle and revolving around debates centered in Ottawa, with limited interaction with scholars in other parts of Canada that were doing different kinds of research. Jenson notes that, “there was a huge amount of political economy going on in Quebec in French that wasn’t in any dialogue with the New Canadian Political Economy.”⁵² In the limited space of this article, we have only been able to focus on two major centres of political economy research in Toronto and Ottawa; however, more

research must be done on the way in which political economy was taken up in other parts of Canada.

Moreover, while scholars had been engaging with questions of gender, race, and sexuality from a political economic perspective throughout the 1970s, there were often struggles to have them recognized as legitimate areas of research. Although those involved with SPE were “consciously trying to be open,” Wallace Clement notes that “there were blinders” – blind spots around feminism and cultural issues and that Canadian political economy “required a pretty big kick in the ass to open itself up...to a variety of perspectives.”⁵³ During the 1970s political economy was often described as “male-dominated ‘professional ghetto’.”⁵⁴ As Janine Brodie recounts her time as a graduate student in the late 1970s and early 1980s at Carleton, “...it was totally frustrating. It was totally absolutely frustrating because both Innis and neo-Marxism was silent about gender, race, aboriginality and those kinds of things”. Brodie, along with other feminist political economists, was critical of the European Marxism that was brought to Carleton that viewed race and gender as “epiphenomenal”.⁵⁵

However, in spite of its limited scope and ideological blinders, the institutionalization of political economy through this period provided the material and ideological groundwork for deepening debates in the 1980s and 1990s. The emergent discourse of feminist, race, and sexuality found inspiration from this anti-imperialist sensibility, which sought to critically *locate* ideas in a specific social context. They found inspiration in an intellectual community that maintained a commitment to collectivism – in which ideas were not simply produced by any one individual, but rather that they were associated with a larger political grouping. Organic intellectuals situated between the academy and the left political milieu were committed to developing a shared space for conversation – to establishing the institutions, resources and expertise in order to have these conversations.

The role of these intellectuals in establishing such infrastructure has often been neglected to the extent that the accounts of this period have hinged around the core debates. Typically, the focus has been on the contested relationship between nation and class, the composition of the political and economic elites, or the place of Canada in the wider world system. Through interviews conducted with key intellectuals on their personal trajectories, we have attempted to shed light on the context through which these ideas emerged as a means to remember the political and institutional preconditions for the formation of the discipline. Rather than focusing on the ideas of individual thinkers, we have highlighted the role of organic intellectuals critically situated *between* post-secondary institutions and a wider left political milieu in developing alternative modes of inquiry and establishing the material infrastructure for the consolidation of a new academic discipline. It is important to remember all of the skilled work that went into establishing the material and institutional infrastructure, we argue, as it provides important lessons for those who seek to build alternative venues for research today.

Notes

Christopher Hurl 2015-8-30 6:11 PM

Deleted: socialist feminists

¹ Numerous studies have recently engaged with the legacy of positivism in the American social sciences. Most recently, the edited collection by George Steinmetz, *The Politics of Method in the Human Sciences*, Ed. George Steinmetz. (Duke University Press, 2005). Steinmetz notes a “dramatic turn” toward what he refers to as “methodological positivism” in post-World War II US sociology, economics, and political sciences. In examining the distinctive trajectory of Canadian political economy as a holistic, historical and materialist approach, see Wallace Clement. (1987). “Canadian Political Economy,” In *An Introduction to Sociology*, 2nd Edition, Michael Rosenberg (ed.). (Toronto: Methuen, 1987), pp. 453-475.

² See Wallace Clement (2001). “Canadian Political Economy’s Legacy for Canadian Sociology,” *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 26(3): 405-420. For other articles, see Daniel Drache, “Rediscovering Canadian Political Economy,” In Clement, Wallace and Daniel Drache (eds.). *A Practical Guide to Canadian Political Economy*. (Toronto: Lorimer, 1978); Daniel Drache and Wallace Clement, “Introduction: The Coming of Age of Canadian Political Economy”, in *The New Practical Guide to Canadian Political Economy*. (Toronto: Lorimer, 1985); Wallace Clement, “Canadian Political Economy,” In *An Introduction to Sociology*, 2nd Edition, Michael Rosenberg (ed.). (Toronto: Methuen, 1987) pp. 453-475; Wallace Clement, “Introduction” In *The New Canadian Political Economy*, Wallace Clement and Glen Williams (ed.). (Kingston: McGill-Queens, 1989), pp.3-15; Wallace Clement. (1997). “Introduction: Whither the New Canadian Political Economy?”, In *Understanding Canada*, Wallace Clement (ed.). (Kingston: McGill-Queens, 1997) pp. 3-18.

³ In undertaking a history of New Canadian Political Economy, we take up McKay’s notion of a ‘left formation,’ which he sets out in *Rebels, Red, Radicals* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2005). For an elaboration of this theoretical position, see also Ian McKay, *Reasoning Otherwise* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2008).

⁴ For discussions of the application of oral history methodology to heterodox economics specifically, see Tiago Mata and Frederic S. Lee, “The Role of Oral History in the Historiography of Heterodox Economics,” *History of Political Economy*, 39 (2008), 163.

⁵ For instance, a series of interviews have been published in *Socialist Studies* on the history of Canadian political economy, including William Carroll, Interview by Elaine Coburn, *Socialist Studies*, 6.1 (2010), pp. 65-92; Dorothy Smith, interview by William K. Carroll, *Socialist Studies*, 6.2 (2010), pp. 9-37; David McNally, interview by Murray Cooke, *Socialist Studies*, 7.1/2 (2011), pp. 1-36.

⁶ See Paul Thompson, “Historians and oral history,” in *The Voice of the Past: Oral History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, chap.2; George Rosenwald and Richard Ochberg, “Introduction: Life Stories, Cultural Politics, and Self-Understanding,” in Rosenwald and Ochberg, eds., *Storied Lives: The Cultural Politics of Self-Understanding* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); Lynn Abrams, *Oral History Theory* (London: Routledge, 2010); Joan Sangster, “Oral History and Working Class History: A Rewarding Alliance,” *Oral History Forum d’histoire orale*, 33 (2013): pp. 1-15.

⁷ See note 2.

⁸ Murray Smith. “Political Economy and the Canadian Working Class: Marxism or Nationalist Reformism,” *Labour / Le Travail*, 46 (2000), p. 350.

⁹ Clement, 1987: 461. Drache and Clement (1985) argue that it is better framed as a ‘tradition’.

¹⁰ Dorothy Smith, interview by William K. Carroll, *Socialist Studies*, 6.1 (2010), p. 18.

¹¹ See Antonio Gramsci. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. (New York: International Publishers, 1971). Gramsci’s notion of ‘organic intellectuals’ has inspired a whole body of work in political economy research and social movement studies. See Stuart Hall, “Cultural Studies and its theoretical legacies,” In *Cultural Studies*, Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson and Paula Treichler (eds.). (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 277-86.

¹² See Stuart Hall, “Cultural Studies and its theoretical legacies,” In *Cultural Studies*, Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson and Paula Treichler (eds.). (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 281.

¹³ Mel Watkins. Interview with authors. 2013. Watkins argues that these components – a publishing series, an academic association, and a journal – are essential in order to establish a formal academic paradigm. “[I]f you want to build for the long run you have to go slowly – I mean literally. [Universities are] very

conservative institutions when they pretend they're not. But I think Political Economy - it's worked. Wally's role in creating the MA program - when you look at the critical steps, Drache creates the association itself as part of political science; the key person behind the creation of the journal is Reg Whitaker. Then you do that – then you have the MA program, then you get this PhD specialization – then you can legitimately say there is an established paradigm here, its called the new CPE”.

¹⁴ George Steinmetz, *The Politics of Method*, p. 1.

¹⁵ We can also see the efforts to establish a distinctive Canadian intellectual tradition in the predecessor to the CJEPS – *Contributions to Canadian Economics* (1928-1934). For instance, in the “Notes and Comment” of the second issue (1929), the journal’s editor highlights the importance of focusing on Canadian problems that have their “roots deep in the Canadian soil,” reflecting the efforts of scholars at the time to identify the historically and geographically specific aspects of economic problems.

¹⁶ See Fletcher Barager, “Heterodox Economics at the University of Manitoba,” In *The History of Economic Thought and Methodology*, 22-C (2004), pp. 169-194.

¹⁷ Mel Watkins. Interview with authors. 2013.

¹⁸ Mel Watkins. Interview with authors. 2013. Drache also notes the prominence of economic history in “Rediscovering Canadian Political Economy”. In terms of H.A. Innis, see Alexander John Watson, *Marginal Man*. In looking at policy influence, MacIntosh was the principle author of the *White Paper on Employment and Income* in 1945, which would commit the federal government to Keynesian policies of high employment and counter-cyclical spending.

¹⁹ Harold A. Innis. 1944. “Political Economy in the Modern State,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 87-4 (1944), p. 335.

²⁰ George Steinmetz, *The Politics of Method*.

²¹ Daniel Drache. “Rediscovering Canadian Political Economy,” p. 29. This is reflected in many of the key texts of this period. For instance, W.T. Easterbrook and Hugh Aitken, *Canadian Economic History* (University of Toronto Press, Toronto: 1956); Kenneth Buckley. *Capital Formation in Canada, 1896-1930* (McClelland and Steward, Toronto: 1955); G.W. Bertram, “Economic Growth in Canadian Industry and the Take-Off Hypothesis,” *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* (May 1963): 159-184.

²² Mel Watkins. Interview with authors. 2013.

²³ In “Rediscovering Canadian Political Economy,” Drache identifies at least five predecessors to the New Canadian Political Economy: 1) the founders (Mackintosh, Innis, Creighton); 2) liberal reformers and social democrats; 2) University of Toronto practitioners; 3) the hinterlanders; 4) post-Innisians; 5) the launderers. Much of this history is centred around political economists at the University of Toronto. However, it is also important to note the contributions of economists like Vernon Fowke at the University of Saskatchewan and W.A. Mackintosh at Queen’s University.

²⁴ Mel Watkins. Interview with authors. 2013.

²⁵ For a biography of H.A. Innis, see Alexander John Watson. *Marginal Man: The Dark Vision of Harold Innis*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007). In terms of W.T. Easterbrook’s contributions, see *Approaches to Canadian Economic History* (Toronto: McClelland, 1967).

²⁶ Karl Polanyi and Abraham Rotstein. *Dahomey and the Slave Trade: An Analysis of an Archaic Economy* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1966).

²⁷ See University League for Social Reform. *The Prospect of Change: Proposals for Canada’s Future*, Ed. Abraham Rotstein (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1965).

²⁸ For a history of economics at the University of Manitoba, see H.C. Pentland. *The University of Manitoba Department of Economics: A Brief History* (Winnipeg: The University of Manitoba, 1977); Fletcher Barager. “Heterodox Economics at the University of Manitoba,” In *The History of Economic Thought and Methodology*, 22-C (2004): 169-194. This can be seen, for instance in Bellan’s research on urban history, Barber’s research on the Great Depression, and Pentland’s research on the formation of a capitalist labour market in Canada. See H.C. Pentland. (1959). “The Development of a Capitalistic Labour Market in Canada,” *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 25(4): 450-461.

²⁹ George Grant. *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism*. (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1967).

³⁰ Robin Mathews and James Steele. (1969). "Memorandum to C.U.A.S.A on de-Canadianization, and five motions, from Mathews and Steele," From *The Struggle for Canadian Universities*, Robin Mathews and James Steele (eds.). Toronto: New Press.

³¹ The publication of *Silent Surrender* (Toronto: McMillan Canada, 1970) by Kari Levitt marked a high point for the anti-imperialist approach, which frames the core problem as "Canada's slide into a position of economic, political and cultural dependence on the United States."

³² Cy Gonick. (2014). Interview with authors. St. Catharines, Ontario.

³³ For a discussion, see Myrna Kotash, *Long Way from Home: The Story of the Sixties Generation in Canada* (Toronto: Lorimer & Co, 1980); Bryan Palmer, *Canada's 1960s*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009); Philip Resnick, *The Land of Cain: Class and Nationalism in English Canada, 1945-1975* (Vancouver: New Star Books, 1977).

³⁴ Hugh Armstrong. (2013). Interview with authors. Toronto, Ontario.

³⁵ Pat Armstrong. (2013). Interview with authors. Toronto, Ontario.

³⁶ Dorothy Smith, interview by William K. Carroll, *Socialist Studies*, 6.1 (2010), p. 21

³⁷ For a critical history of these summer research projects, see Chapter 8 in Bryan Palmer, *Canada's 1960s: The Ironies of Identity in a Rebellious Era*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

³⁸ Dorothy Smith, interview by William K. Carroll, *Socialist Studies*, 6.1 (2010), p. 16.

³⁹ In social history, for instance, there were the contributions of American scholars such as Herbert G. Gutman, *Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America: Essays in American Working-Class and Social History* (New York 1976) and David Montgomery, *Workers' Control in America*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979); For Canadian working class history, see the collection by Russell G. Hann, Gregory S. Kealey, Linda Kealey, and Peter Warrian, *Primary Sources in Canadian Working Class History, 1860-1930* (Kitchener: Dumont Press, 1973); Bryan Palmer, "Class, Conception and Conflict: The Thrust for Efficiency, Managerial Views of Labor and The Working Class Rebellion, 1903-22," *Review of Radical Political Economics*, (1975); Gregory S. Kealey and Peter Warrian, eds., *Essays in Canadian Working-Class History* (Toronto 1976); Russell Hann and Gregory S. Kealey, "Documenting Working-Class History: North American Traditions and New Approaches," *Archivaria*, 4 (1977), 92-114; Bryan D. Palmer, *A Culture in Conflict: Skilled Workers and Industrial Capitalism in Hamilton, Ontario, 1860-1914* (Montreal 1979).

⁴⁰ Pat Armstrong. (2013). Interview with authors. Toronto, Ontario. See also *Ten Thousand Roses* (Toronto: Penguin, 2005), in which Judy Rebick highlights the spread of women's organizations in cities and towns across Canada by the late 1960s. A series of important texts in feminist political economy also emerged through this time -- for instance, see Margaret Benston, "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation," *Monthly Review* 21 (September 1969): 13-27; Dorothy E. Smith. "Women, the Family and Corporate Capitalism," In *Women in Canada*, Marylee Stephenson (ed). (Toronto: New Press, 1973), pp. 2-35; Charmie Guettel, *Marxism & Feminism* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1977); Dorothy Smith, *Feminism and Marxism: A Place to Begin, a Way to Go* (Vancouver: New Star Books, 1977); Janice Actor, Penny Goldsmith, and Bonnie Sheppard (eds.), *Women at Work: Ontario, 1850-1930* (Toronto: Canadian Women's Education Press, 1974); Pat Armstrong and Hugh Armstrong, *The Double Ghetto: Canadian Women and their Segregated Work* (Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1978); [Meg Luxton, *More than a Labour of Love: Three Generations of Women's Work in the Home* \(Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1980\).](#)

⁴¹ Mel Watkins. Interview with authors. 2013.

⁴² In sociology, see C. Wright Mills. *The Power Elite* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956). In Canada, this analysis was taken up by John Porter, *The Vertical Mosaic*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965); It was explicitly adapted to a political economy framework by Wallace Clement in his

Master's thesis, which would be published as *The Canadian Corporate Elite* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 1975).

⁴³ In political science, see Ralph Miliband, *The State in Capitalist Society*, (New York: Basic Books, 1969); Nicos Poulantzas, *Political Power and Social Classes*; James O'Connor, *The Fiscal Crisis of the State* (1973); These debates heavily informed debates in Canadian political economy, especially at Carleton University. This was most clearly exemplified in the collection edited by Leo Panitch, *The Canadian State* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977).

⁴⁴ Leo Panitch. (2013). Interview with authors. Toronto, Ontario.

⁴⁵ Leo Panitch. (1977). "The role and nature of the Canadian state," In *The Canadian State*, pp. 3-27.

⁴⁶ Jane Jenson. (2014). Interview with authors. Montreal, Quebec.

⁴⁷ Leo Panitch. (2013). Interview with authors. Toronto, Ontario.

⁴⁸ [Drache also notes the significance of James Lorimer in facilitating the rapid and effective distribution of political economy texts such as *A Practical Guide to Canadian Political Economy* \(Toronto: James Lorimer and Co, 1978\)](#)

⁴⁹ Wallace Clement and Mel Watkins. "Editorial Statement", *Studies in Political Economy*. 1/1 (1979): iv-vi.

⁵⁰ Leo Panitch. (2013). Interview with authors. Toronto, Ontario.

⁵¹ Dorothy Smith, interview by William K. Carroll, *Socialist Studies*, 6.1 (2010), p. 20.

⁵² Jane Jenson. (2014). Interview with authors. Montreal, Quebec. Jenson highlights the distinctive path taken by Quebec. Michael Lebowitz highlights how British Columbia has also. Michael Lebowitz. (2013). Interview with authors. Vancouver, BC.

⁵³ Wallace Clement. (2014). Interview with authors. Ottawa, Ontario.

⁵⁴ Drache and Clement. "The Coming of Age of Canadian Political Economy," p. xix

⁵⁵ Janine Brodie. (2013). Interview with authors. Edmonton, Alberta. [Through the 1970s and 1980s, Carleton University proved to be a place where political economists – such as Janine Brodie, Jane Jenson, Rianne Mahon and Hugh and Pat Armstrong –critically engaged with the European Marxist tradition, creating a space for the analysis of class and gender. The publication of Pat Armstrong and Hugh Armstrong, *The Double Ghetto: Canadian Women and their Segregated Work* \(Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1978\) was an especially significant contribution here.](#)