

CHAPTER II

1 Nationalism Theory

Nations do not depend on State's presence to exist; they are created by nationalist feelings that are usually inculcated by the State to assure its own existence and a nation exists when its members see themselves as part of the community. Nationalism developed thanks to people's challenges to the authority and to its legitimacy. To the masses, political power is legitimate only if it reflects their desires and interests. With modern nationalism, people as a unified force, revolted against the State so that its purposes would match those of the masses, such as territorial boundaries and the defence of their interests.

Ernest Gellner, in his book *Nations and Nationalism*,¹ tries to define a "nation." His main argument is that nations are modern structures that developed after the rise of nationalism feelings. To him, nationalism is a political principle and Nations resulted after the demands that the Industrial Revolution brought. The first phase of the Industrial Revolution took place in the 1780's in Britain.

This was one of the most important changes in the history of humanity, changing ways of life and thought. It meant a shift from an agrarian, handicraft, labour-intensive based economy to a dominated by machines one. Factory production, division of labour, a free flow of capital, and the growth of cities characterized this period, as well as population explosion, decline of mortality rates and epidemics.²

¹ Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, (Ithaca: Cornell University, 1983). Ch. 1.

² Korean Minjok Leadership Academy, *The First Industrial Revolution: Britain 1770-1830*, <http://www.zum.de/whkmla/region/britain/1stindrev.html> (accessed December 10, 2003).

One of the most important advances of this era was the steamboat, by James Watt in the 1770's, which enhanced communications and transportation. Although Industrialism benefited capitalists, it affected artisans and craft and rural workers, who lost competitively towards factory production. It also created two new social classes: the middle (bourgeoisie) and a working class (the proletariat).³

With the Revolution, people from different countries began to live in the same city and they needed cohesion and common identity, as well as a common language for workers. With the spread of capitalism in this era, and having a common feeling of love and loyalty to their country, workers wanted to work harder, not only for their own benefit but also for the good of their country:

*In fact, nations, like states, are a contingency, and not a universal necessity. Neither nations nor states exist at all times and in all circumstances. Moreover, nations and states are not the same contingency. Nationalism holds that they were destined for each other; that either without the other is incomplete, and constitutes a tragedy. But before they could become intended for each other, each of them had to emerge, and their emergence was independent and contingent. The state has certainly emerged without the help of the nation. Some nations have certainly emerged without the blessings of their own state. It is more debatable whether the normative idea of the nation, in its modern sense, did not presuppose the prior existence of the state.*⁴

Nationalism is not just a problem to be solved or an issue that will fade as soon as the borders are delimited and sovereignty established. It is a sentiment of belonging to a community that goes through time, and that has been an issue of importance for the last two hundred years. It is mainly related to politics, but we can not forget it's historical, cultural and identity relation, since "long-existing patterns have contributed to national

³ Ibid.

⁴ Gellner, *Nations and*, (Ithaca: Cornell University, 1983), p. 3.

identities.”⁵ Attempting to spread a homogeneous national identity, with individuals internally unified but yet different among each other, “Nationalism has emotional power partly because it helps us to make who we are, because it inspires artists and composers, because it gives us a link with history (and thus with immortality).”⁶

Nationalism can be either a positive movement when presented as patriotism, defined as love to one’s country and willingness to sacrifice for it or a negative one, when it gets to the extremes of chauvinism, which is defined as a militant devotion and glorification of one's country or as a prejudiced belief in the superiority of one's own gender, group, or kind. A nation, to be considered and recognized as such, must have these characteristics: boundaries, indivisibility, sovereignty, popular participation, direct membership, culture, a common descent, and a special historical background.⁷

Nations’ ideologies usually have a common background and their members are identified based on a common language, religion, tradition, etc.; members of the same community share standards of culture and behaviour.⁸ Nations are seen as an indivisible singular being, as “super- individuals”⁹ that evolve through history. Individuals of a nation affirm that they cannot develop their freedom unless they enjoy self-determination.¹⁰

Michael Foucault was a French philosopher (1926-1984) who focused on studying the power within a society and how it relates to individuals and how everyday experiences shape one’s identity. According to him, events are produced by nature, God

⁵ Calhoun, *Nationalism*, (Buckingham: Open University, 1997), p. 10.

⁶ Ibid., p. 3.

⁷ Ibid., p. 4.

⁸ Ibid., p. 44.

⁹ Ibid., p. 125.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 44.

or by human effort. Foucault attempted to demonstrate that Western society has developed a new kind of power, bio-power-that, rather than being repressive, enhances life. Foucault encourages people to avoid the welfare state by developing individual potentiality.

He describes “nationalism” as a *discursive formation* since it is a discourse used by the elites in power to give shape to who we are and how we feel towards our nation. This knowledge is transmitted from the government to the members of a nation through education, media, political discourses, and the family. In democratic states the method is to repeat a feeling of national unity through mass propaganda. School is the main instrument, but it extends to all areas of daily life, from common activities, like sports, to public holidays.¹¹

Craig Calhoun in *Nationalism* also makes a distinction between nationalism, ethnicity, and kinship. Nationalism is the loyalty shown to one’s nation; kinship refers to a connection by blood, marriage, or adoption and ethnicity results from racial or cultural ties. He affirms that nationalism has three dimensions: as a discourse to shape people’s attitudes in terms of the idea of a nation and of national identity, as a project, through social movements and state policies to defend the common interests, and as evaluation or ideologies claiming to be superior to other nations;¹² sometimes, an extreme loyalty to the nation derives in negative attitudes such as ethnic cleansing, national purification, or discrimination to foreigners.

¹¹ Hubert L. Dreyfus, *Michael Foucault*, <http://www.columbia.edu/itc/english/...>

¹² Calhoun, *Nationalism*, p. 126.

As Hans Kohn wrote, "nationalism is a state of mind in which the supreme loyalty of the individual is felt to be due the nation-state"¹³ but authors have not been able to find one single definition for the term. It is too diverse, so no single theory would be enough to explain it, but it is definitely used as tool to legitimize power. Edward H. Carr states that nationalism has gone through three main phases: the first one begins with the end of the Empire and the Church of the Medieval Ages and the formation of the National State. Modern Nationalism began to take shape with Rousseau in the 19th century, who identifies nations with people, becoming a principle of the French Revolution, but it was until the Napoleonic Wars that the second stage began.¹⁴

The Napoleonic Wars began in 1789 when French middle classes, due to their discontent against France's feudal government, exploded into a revolt, the French Revolution, with international involvement for more than two decades. This era has been called the first true world war. It is divided into two periods: The French Revolution, and the Napoleonic Empire. The peak of this period is known as "The Terror," during which King Louis XVI and Queen Marie Antoinette were put to death. General Napoleon Bonaparte took control of the army of France, defeating Austria, Russia and Prussia; the powers allied with Britain.¹⁵

King Louis XVI was proclaimed French Emperor in 1804. Napoleon Bonaparte was defeated in the Battle of Waterloo, in 1815, to a coalition composed of German, Dutch, and Belgian troops, putting an end to the Wars. Bonaparte was exiled to Santa

¹³ Flanagan, *Aboriginal Citizenship*, <http://www.misc-iecm.mcgill.ca...>

¹⁴ Edward H. Carr, *Three Phases of Nationalism*, quoted in John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (eds.), *Nationalism*, (Oxford: Oxford University, 1994), p. 241-245.

¹⁵ Wikipedia, *Napoleonic Wars*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Napoleonic_Wars

Elena where he spent the rest of his life.¹⁶ It was during this stage that the democratization of the Nation took place, asserting the political power of the masses. This is known as the Modern Period of Nationalism in which the term nation got a purely political meaning.¹⁷

Finally, the last phase began in 1914 after the outbreak of the First World War. It was until 1919 that Nationalism reached its highest point. The socialization of the Nation during this phase meant that now, the principal objective of the national policy was to provide welfare to the society and means to earn their living giving great importance to their economic claims. Wages and other labour rights were defended and became a matter of national policy, so the workers began to be interested in the policy and power of the Nation.¹⁸

Women have also played an important role in the formation of the National State and they have critiqued the role of the State describing it as a discriminatory force that treats them “unequally to men.”¹⁹

Floya Anthas and Nira Yuval-Davis describe women’s role as:

*(...) members of collectivities, institutions or groupings, and as participants of the social forces that give the state its given political projects in any particular social and historical context. On the other hand, they are a special focus of state concerns as a social category with a specific role, (particularly human reproduction).*²⁰

¹⁶ [Ibid.](#)

¹⁷ Carr, *Three Phases*, p. 241-245.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 241-245.

¹⁹ Floya Anthas and Nira Yuval-Davis, *Women and the Nation-State*, quoted in John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (eds.), *Nationalism*, (Oxford: Oxford University. 1994), p. 312

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 312

1.1 Nationalism in Quebec

Nationalism can be used both to unify and to separate a nation. In Quebec's case, it is a sentiment that keeps French speakers together, united thanks to the common French culture they share. Nationalist feelings have always existed among Quebec's population because they feel that they are treated as citizens of second class, as strangers in their own country by the English-speaking majority. About the desire for separation Horowitz affirms: "some movements emerge early in the life of a new state, seemingly with little provocation. Others develop only after a prolonged period of frustration and conflict."²¹

"Despite the infiltration of American culture, French Canadians maintain a deep sense of pride in their own heritage."²² Its main arguments come from two issues: French culture and language protection and preservation. "When accused of being uncooperative and intransigent, the French Canadians point out that thirty-six percent of his people speaks both languages, while only four per cent of the English Canadians are bilingual."²³ These sentiments have evolved through the province's history and through these changing periods, they have had different sources and goals, as well as activism levels. "(...) but it is important to remember the impact those 200 years of discrimination, oppression, and poverty has had on their culture and character. This history was a key factor in the turbulence of recent decades, and explains who the French Canadians are today."²⁴

Quebec's Nationalism is different from those movements in other parts of his world, such as the Nazi Fascism, because this movement is not an expansionist one, but a

²¹ Donald Horowitz, *The Logic of Secessions* quoted in John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (eds.), *Nationalism*, (Oxford: Oxford University. 1994), p. 261.

²² Nancy Wartik, *The French Canadians*, (New York: Chelsea House, 1989), p. 50.

²³ Mason Wade, *The French Canadian Outlook*, (New York: The Viking, 1946), p. 97.

²⁴ Wartik, *The French*, p. 17.

“defensive”²⁵ one. What this means is that it focuses on keeping the rights and values of French Canadian’s instead of attempting to extend its influence to other societies. It is used as a tool to protect French Canadian’s culture from the threat that they perceive from English- speakers’ desire to assimilate them. This discrimination has been the main cause of Nationalistic feelings among Quebecers, as Wartik says: “Yet despite Quebec’s venerable heritage and its economic and political strength, its history over the past 200 years has been marred by an ugly pattern of discrimination and prejudice.”²⁶

That is why a fraction of French Canadians in Quebec have even sought a complete independence from Canada, following the doctrine of irredentism, which is a term currently used to describe territorial claims made by a sovereign national state to lands within another supported by historical or ethnic arguments. It combines elements of territoriality and national sentiments.²⁷ During the 1897 –1936 Liberal administration, the Party tried to transform Quebec from having an agriculture-based economy to an industrial one. This was done through the exploitation of the province’s natural resources, development of manufacturing industries and the establishment of private companies. Since the society was mainly rural, they needed foreign investment to develop these sectors.

All this industrial development occurred during Louis Alexander Taschereau’s administration. Taschereau was the Liberal premier of the province from 1920-1936. He was known for giving the provincial government the monopoly to sell alcohol during the Prohibition era and for his liberal-capitalistic economy that introduced the province into

²⁵ Quinn, *The Union Nationale*, (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1963), p. 27.

²⁶ Wartik, *The French*, p. 16.

²⁷ Horowitz, *The Logic*, quoted in Hutchinson and Smith (eds.), *Nationalism*, (Oxford: Oxford University, 1994), p. 263-268.

the modernization. These policies challenged the survival of the province's traditional culture and values, as well as of Quebecer's traditional way of life.²⁸

The most important Institution that was being challenged was the Catholic Church and its religious values, by bringing secularization to the province with new ideals of materialism rather than spiritualism. These economic policies brought opposition to the Liberal administration. Nationalist's opposition was against industrialization because it meant a challenge to the traditional rural way of life. Both the Nationalist movements and the Church attempted to stop the migration to urban areas and the modernization of the province.

The two main sources of this opposition were the League of French Action and Catholic organizations such as the Catholic Association of the French-Canadian Youth or the Young Catholic Students. The League of French Action, in French Le Ligue d'Action Francaise, was originally named La Ligue des Droits du Francais (the League of French Rights). It was composed of nationalist intellectuals and was formed by Henri Bourassa's followers. Its goal was to protect the French Canadian's rights and values. According to Quinn:

*The League of French Action was the most important single agency in the formulation and development of a nationalist ideology, which was to have a revolutionary impact on political developments in the province... It differed considerably from the earlier forms of nationalism, however, in its awareness of the serious nature of the economic problem, that is, of the threat which industrialization presented to the maintenance of the traditional cultural system and of the subordinate role, which the French Canadians played in the new economy.*²⁹

²⁸ Louis Alexander Taschereau, http://www.fact-index.com/l/lo/louis_alexandre_taschereau.html

²⁹ Quinn, *The Union Nationale*, p. 37.

About the role of French Canadians in this new economy, Nationalism was strongly against foreign investments. To them, this investment meant that the province would be under the control of foreigners. To Quebecers, their participation on the economy of the province was a right that was being taken away by the English and American companies. The truth is that the opposition groups were against these new industries not because of their capitalist means but because they were American and British and not French owned enterprises.

Economically “Nationalism seeks to extend the property owned by nationals so as to gratify the taste for nationalism,”³⁰ what can be done through confiscation, which is the appropriation of private property for public use without compensation. Through it, French speakers wanted to lower the labour discrimination they suffered from English-speakers’ owners or investment of resources so that Quebecers, and not foreigners, would be the ones enjoying the benefits from the province’s natural resources.

Harry Johnson defines Economic Nationalism as an “attaching utility or value to having certain jobs held or certain property owned by members of the national group,”³¹ referring to important and socially precious occupations or properties that could provide them with the power to put the French speakers down, oppressing them. The groups in power tended to defend nationalism because by taking out the foreigners, they would be able to occupy the positions that were once occupied by the British and English speaking foreigners. The middle classes would be benefited from this redistribution even if the lower classes were not: “the existence of a substantial middle class may be a prerequisite

³⁰ Harry Johnson, *Economic Nationalism in New States*, quoted in Hutchinson and Smith (eds), *Nationalism*, (Oxford: Oxford University, 1994), p. 238.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 236.

of a stable society and democratic government.”³² Even with the strong campaign done by the opposition groups, they were unable to spread anti-industrialism ideas among the population, who were more concerned about protecting their interests than by the intervention of foreign capital in the economy.

This passivity changed after the Great Depression. The Great Depression took place in 1930 because of the high American tariffs imposed to commerce and the U.S. Stock Market crash of 1929. During the Depression, deflation happened, technology had eliminated more jobs than it had created, supply of goods was bigger than demand, and the world market system was weak. European countries were hit even harder because they had not been able to fully recover after World War I.³³

Nationalistic ideas against industrialization were spread and they became more radical. *Le Devoir*, a nationalistic newspaper founded and directed by Henri Bourassa in 1910, and the League of French Action attacked foreigners even harder for benefiting themselves from the province’s richness, specifically the electric industry, which is connected to many other large and profitable industries such as banks and insurance companies. With the Depression getting worst, “Quebec for the French Canadians”³⁴ became the nationalists’ slogan.

Nationalism was widespread among merchants and businessmen who were less competitive than the English producers. The young Quebecers graduating from universities were also influenced by nationalism since they couldn’t get a job in the labour market because English-speaking professionals occupied the high positions. They organized themselves in different leagues and societies, all with the same idea: they were

³² Ibid., p. 240.

³³ American Memory, *The Depths of Depression*, <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/today/jul08.html>.

³⁴ Quinn, *The Union Nationale*, p. 44.

against English, and pro-French Canadian. The most radicals of these groups even wanted a separation from Canada to establish a French-Canadian state. Luckily for Federalists, these groups' influence was limited, with a small number of members, and their duration was short.

The main target of nationalist critics was the Liberal Party. To them, the "Liberals had betrayed the true interests of the province by their policy of concessions and grants to the industrialists."³⁵ Quebecers began to demand stronger policies to ease the economic situation. Liberal's failure to put in practice the economic and political reforms that the society demanded caused the party's defeat and the victory of the Union Nationale in 1936.

1.2 The Union Nationale's

The Union Nationale was formed in 1935 after Maurice Duplessis, a member of the Legislative Assembly and elected leader of the Conservative Party in 1931 and Paul Gouin, who was influenced by Bourassa's and the League of French Action nationalist ideas against industrialization and foreign investment. They agreed to act against Taschereau and the Liberal policies. Leaders of Catholic and other nationalist organizations joined them, such as René Chaloult, one of the leaders of the League of French Action. The Party's program included politic, economic, and social reforms. This was the main difference between the Union Nationale and the nationalists of the last decade. Now, the society demanded clear proposals to change the province's situation and the Catholic structure gave Quebec's population what it wanted.³⁶

³⁵ Ibid., p. 45.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 55.

The Union Nationale's program has its background in a study called "The Restoration Program," which appeared in 1933. The Program, which led the Party to the victory in the provincial elections in 1936, after which Gouin left the party stating that Duplessis wanted to dominate the Party and resurrect the Conservative Party under the Union Nationale's name, included four areas of reform: "Rural Reconstruction," to develop the rural sectors, "The Labour Question" to increase salaries and social security, "Trusts and Finance" to limit large companies and "Political Reforms" would eliminate corruption in the electoral system and the administration.³⁷

To stop the foreign domination of the economy and to increase French Canadian participation, Nationalists proposed to raise wages so that Quebecers would have more capital to purchase property, to form co-operatives, enterprises or organizations owned or managed jointly by those who use its services and enjoy its benefits, to compete with already existing monopolies, support to small and medium sized French-Canadian business, government control over large enterprises, and the nationalization of certain industries.

All these proposals were intended to benefit the community and not only certain elites. "The formation of the Union Nationale meant that for the first time since the days of Honoré Mercier in the 1880's a powerful nationalist movement had arisen to play an important role in provincial politics."³⁸ It was meant to protect the values and traditions that were important to preserve the French Canadian culture. It also attempted to change

³⁷ Ibid., p. 58-60.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 61.

the economy of the French Canadians. This is why Quinn describes it as a “radical nationalist movement.”³⁹

The main enemy of nationalism and the Union Nationale was English domination. The Union Nationale saw British, American, and English-Canadian’s power as the main threat to their culture and economy committing itself to protect the small French Canadian businessmen’s interests. But these were just promises; once in power, Duplessis did try to clean the old administration of corruption but implemented very few economic reforms or the radical proposals he promised in the Program. The only proposal that was accomplished was to raise the standard of living of farmers, through agricultural credits and schools, increase the expenditure on social services and assistance to modernize their farmlands and purchase new ones. This agrarianism would become one of the most important principles of Quebec’s Nationalism before the Quiet Revolution.⁴⁰

Maurice Duplessis was against social welfare because he saw it as paternalism and believed that the province had the right to collect its own taxes and to decide how to spend them. Paternalism is defined as the assumption by the governing power of a quasi-fatherly relation to the people, involving strict and intimate supervision of their business and social concerns, upon the theory that they are incapable of managing their own affairs. The Union Nationale was also against trade unions, what brought opposition from all the labour sectors.⁴¹

Surprisingly, the Party had the support of the urban and working classes. This was because the Union Nationale was not only a conservative party, but also a nationalist party and these were the ideas that helped it gain support among all Quebecers. But in the

³⁹ Ibid., p. 61.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 84-86

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 83.

1956 provincial election, the Union Nationale lost and the Liberal Party returned to power. Economic, religious, and political groups' opposition to the Party's policies caused the defeat. These groups were radical nationalists, the trade union movement, and some Roman Catholic groups.⁴²

1.3 Opposition to the Union Nationale's Nationalism

1.3.1 The Radical Nationalists

Even though Duplessis weakened the radical nationalists who opposed its economic conservatism and its alliance with the industrialists, he did not destroy them completely. It was them who kept radical nationalism alive. In fact, groups of left wing nationalists, federal liberals who had broken with their party and young nationalists tried to create a political party, the Bloc Populaire. This Party opposed the war, the centralization and wanted to destroy the economic control that the foreigners had over the province. To accomplish this, they proposed a stronger governmental control, more attention to the rural sector and social expenditure.⁴³

Yet with these proposals, the Bloc never gained enough support. After the disappearance of the Bloc Populaire, radical nationalism was silent until the early fifties, when a new school of nationalism appeared, the Social Nationalism. They were a group of radical nationalists, but never big enough to form a mass movement or a political party. Social Nationalists were an elite composed mostly of young intellectuals, but it also included famous and experienced nationalist political figures such as René Chaloult,

⁴² Ibid., p. 152-153.

⁴³ Gordon O. Rothney, *Bloc Populaire Canadien*, <http://www.thecanadianencyclo...>

member of the Legislative Assembly.⁴⁴ He proposed the official adaptation of the flower of lily by the province to symbolize French presence in North America. On January 13, 1948 the province adopted the flower in its flag as emblem of French Canadians in Quebec.

André Laurendeau, who was a journalist, intellectual, and politician co-founder of the Nationalist Youth Movement “Young person-Canada” and Paul Gouin. They agreed with the Union Nationale on some issues, such as opposition to federal tax revenue and provincial social legislation, but believed that Duplessis’ economic and social policies were also a threat to French Canadian culture.

Social Nationalists wanted French Canadians to have control of their natural and economic resources, as well as improving their standard of living. René Chaloult believed that “political independence is a utopia without economic independence.”⁴⁵ Most of the Radical Nationalists, including Social Nationalists and Bloc Populaire, were inspired by postwar Social Catholic thought, which states that the main economic difference is not between rich and poor people but between rich and poor nations and the defence for world’s farmer’s rights.⁴⁶

Social Nationalism theory also states that the rich industrialized countries have the obligation to help poor, non-industrialized nations but respecting their culture, without subjugating them. Also, that cooperation among nations is basic due to the interdependence that exists in the modern world. It was after World War II that the

⁴⁴ Quinn, *The Union Nationale*, (Toronto: University of Toronto. 1963), p. 153-155.

⁴⁵ Ibid., trans. by Daniela Nieto, p. 156.

⁴⁶ Pope John XXIII, *Christianity and Social Progress*, <http://www.uscatholic.org/cstline/tline.html>

Catholic Church for the first time internationalizes its Socialism by formally discussing the situation of no industrialized countries.⁴⁷

This new Radical Nationalism contrasted with older radical ideas in many ways. The new theory did not want to bring back the old way of life or economic organization of rural society. In fact, there was a big concern to protect urban workers' right to organize, to collectively negotiate, and to strike. Also, the most radical nationalists believed that the provincial government should take control of public utilities and profits from natural resources. Politically, Social Nationalists worried about democratic institutions and how well they functioned; they considered that corruption dominated electoral results, the use of public funds, the Parliament, and other aspects of the Union Nationale's government. Even though Radical Nationalists were not numerous, by combining Socialism and Nationalism, they were the Union Nationale's most dangerous ideological competition.⁴⁸

1.3.2 The Catholic Church

Before 1949, the Catholic Church had a good relationship with the Union Nationale, especially since both institutions were against the federal government's centralization. But after this year, the situation began to change.⁴⁹ The hierarchy had some conflicts with Duplessis, specifically on the Party's conservative policies, its attitude against trade unions, the electoral abuses and mainly because Duplessis wanted to control the Church's activities. In these days the Church was more identified with the workers and it supported important strikes, such as the Asbestos strike of 1949. In fact, the Church declared on a

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Quinn, *The Union Nationale*, (Toronto: University of Toronto. 1963), p. 153-155.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p.160-167.

pastoral letter in 1950 that “in spite of the improvement in economic conditions since the 1930’s, the wealth and resources of the province were still far from being equitable distributed, and large numbers of workers lacked economic security and proper housing conditions.”⁵⁰

The Catholic Church also suggested in the letter that the private enterprises should reform their structures so that workers would receive profits from the industry they worked for and it accepted the industrialization that had taken place in the province and did not express any desire to go back to the land as the main source of capital resources in Quebec. This statement caused the relationship between the ruling party and the Catholic Church to break. Duplessis had now an opposition source in its former best ally as can be noted in one of his speeches, where he stated: “Unless there is sharing in the debts and losses, there can be no share in benefits. That is common sense.”⁵¹

More attacks from the Church came from magazines like *Relations*, published by a Jesuit order to attack the Union Nationale for its labour policies, declaring that the government favoured the employers and not the employees, and from the faculty of Social Sciences at the Laval University. Rev. Georges H. Levesque, member of the Dominican Order, who was clearly against the government’s social policies, directed the Laval University at that time. In 1956 two fathers, Gérard Dion and Louis O’ Neill, connected to the University, published the pamphlet *Political Immorality in the Province of Quebec* where they described the electoral corruption in the election of that year.⁵²

Politically, the Catholic Church was against the Party’s electoral abuses and corruption in the administration. Its members accused the Union Nationale of creating

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 163.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 164.

⁵² Ibid., p. 165.

false voters and misuse of public funds. Many voters supported the Party selling their votes in exchange for governmental positions, payment of their bills or to obtain social services such as the construction of schools in their communities. Drinking problems rose because the party easily gave liquor licenses to its supporters and because the government allowed nightclubs and other nightly entertainment places to remain open after the legal closing time.⁵³

To control the Church's activities, the Duplessis' government began to help financially those who wanted to co-operate with him. This cooperation meant that education and charity institutions would support the government and in exchange, it would give them licenses for new buildings, money to buy equipments or for charity.⁵⁴

1.3.3 Other Sources of Opposition to the Union Nationale

There were several other groups of opposition, but the most significant was the Electors Union and the League of Civic Action. The Electors Union was created before World War II. It used Social Credit and Radical Nationalism theories. It was opposed, like most of the other nationalist movements, to Canada's participation in World War II and pledged for more provincial autonomy. The Union considered that most of the economic problems of the province, like the unemployment, and low standards of living were caused because Quebecers did not have the purchasing power needed to buy what was offered.

The solution that they proposed consisted in that the federal government should give the provinces a monthly amount to be distributed among each citizen. This included

⁵³ Ibid., p. 165.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 166.

payments to over sixty years of age citizens and extra payments for parents on births of each child. They also proposed to slowly reduce taxes until they disappeared. And finally, that the federal government should increase the money offer so that the citizens could afford to buy the goods that were produced. Although the Electors Union participated in the 1948 provincial election, it did not win any seat.⁵⁵

Some Montreal citizens who wanted to reform their civic administration by eliminating corruption and to eliminate the toleration policy, through which the provincial government allowed some establishments to participate in illegal activities, such as gambling, selling liquor or staying opened longer than the established hours, formed the League of Civic Action. In 1954 Jean Drapeau, an ex- member of the Bloc Populaire, was elected Mayor of Montreal, but only until 1957 when the Party was taken out of the administration by supporters of the Union Nationale.⁵⁶

Contrary to the expected, with this defeat the League of Civic Action became one of the most active oppositions of the Union Nationale and extended its activities to all Quebec with the promise that they would restore democracy and make a political and administrative reform. They also proposed to nationalize some natural resources, like the electricity and to press more for provincial independence from the federal government. In spite of its program, the League of Civil Action's support was limited to the French-speakers in east Montreal and some parts of Quebec; they were never able to occupy any important position in the provincial government.

⁵⁵ Quinn, *The Union Nationale*, (Toronto: University of Toronto. 1963), p. 167-169.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p 167-169.

1.4 Nationalism after the Quiet Revolution.

In the general elections of 1960 the Union Nationale was finally defeated. This change in the ruling Party also brought changes to Quebec's Nationalism; Quebecers wanted more free and modern ideas. The Liberal Party with Jean Lesage as Premier of the province saw the Union Nationale's Nationalism as an obstacle for economic growth and egalitarianism.⁵⁷ This term is defined as the equality of mankind and the desirability of political and economic and social equality, replaced communitarian thinking. French Canadians think of equality in terms of a collectivity, not of individualism, being this one of the main differences with English Canadian's thinking. The Nationalization of electricity in 1963 was a clear sign of the new nationalism. With it, the State took control of one of the most important sectors of Quebec's economy.

The Liberal Party introduced democratic ideas and promoted educated individuals who could take the most important positions to run the province to support the province's growth. For example, the Nationalization of electricity in 1963 was a clear sign of the new Nationalism. With it, the State took control of one of the most important sectors of Quebec's economy.

This new strong State was taking care of the society and responsibility for its welfare, taking the role that the Catholic Church had before the Quiet Revolution. The State's new power brought the idea that "Quebec represents the political center of French Canada and that this province must do everything it can to preserve and develop its own

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 179-181.

characteristics.”⁵⁸ Nationalism was now a justification for the provincial bureaucracy’s strong power and to get people’s support for modernization.

The Liberal Party’s nationalism, although different to the Union Nationale’s one, was moderate and never suggested independence. But when the Parti Quebecois came to power in 1976 with Rene Levesque, nationalism in Quebec turned to be more radical and concentrated on accomplishing a national identity. The Party’s nationalism was based, like most of the other nationalist movements, on the defence of French Canadian culture, especially through the use of French language. Its government passed Bill 101 to make sure that French would be the dominant language of the province.⁵⁹

There were other policies, such as the appliance of French tests to be admitted at professional jobs, the requirement of hiring at least half of the total employees in a business who were French speakers, which were applauded by the French-Canadian society but condemned by the Anglophones for being racist and exclusive. This revival of a strong nationalism was well conducted by the ruling party and they used it to accelerate the modernization of people’s mentalities and to help the rural sector overcome and accept the governmental policies that benefited the urban and industrial sectors.

The Parti Quebecois won the elections because it promised to concentrate on helping the lower classes, specially the rural ones that had supported it but discriminated the ones that opposed them like the Anglophones and those who were in favour of Federalism. Federalism has been described as a union of groups or states in which each member agrees to give up some of its governmental power in certain specified areas to a central authority.

⁵⁸ Dominique Clift, *Quebec Nationalism in Crisis*, (Montreal: Mc-Gill-Queen’s University, 1980), p.26.

⁵⁹ Parti Quebecois, *History*, <http://partiquebecois.org/nv/index.php?pg=57>

It is “a structure of government that offers the benefits of political and economic union combined with local autonomy.”⁶⁰ The system is supposed to defend the country’s cultural duality but respecting its political unity. There has been a gradual expansion of provincial authority over the past decades: “Canada is, in fact, one of the most highly decentralized federations in the world.”⁶¹ Under the Canadian parliamentary system, the executive and legislative branches of government are integrated, and the Prime Minister is responsible to the cabinet.

A 2003 survey done by the Center for Research and Information showed that the majority of Canadians believe that the federal government has too much power and wants the provincial governments to have more power. The strongest opponents to this new nationalism were the industrialists and the French businessmen. This disagreement became stronger after the Parti Quebecois announced its proposal for a sovereign-association with the rest of the country, this being its most important Nationalist policy.

Rene Levesque was the Province’s most radical leader. He considered that “our society has grave, dangerous, and deep-rooted illness which it is absolutely essential to cure if we want to survive.”⁶² His most radical nationalist proposal was sovereign-association, which proposes that Quebec keeps its economic partnership with the rest of Canada through the liberalization of trade but achieving political independence.⁶³ To Levesque, independence from Canada was the only solution to the conflicts between the

⁶⁰ Canadian Embassy, Washington , D. C., *Federalism in Canada*, <http://www.canadianembassy.org/government/federalism-en.asp?format=print>

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Levesque, *An Option*, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1968), p. 17.

⁶³ Jonty Kasku-Jackson, *Can Quebec Succeed at Secession?* www.nesl.edu/intljournal/vol4/quebec.pdf (December 19, 2003).

two groups that could benefit both the French and English-speaking Canadians because Federalism was only working for the Anglophones:

*(...) this regime has had its day, and it is a matter of urgency either to modify it profoundly or to build a new one... it is also natural that we should be in the greatest hurry to be rid of it; the more so because it is we who are menaced most dangerously by its current paralysis.*⁶⁴

He thought that two nations in one country meant that “there are *two majorities*, two “complete societies” quite distinct from each other trying to get along within a common framework.”⁶⁵ and that this situation caused nothing but difficulties to both groups. He believed that Quebecers felt inferior to the English-speaking majority so they rejected themselves, driving this to politic, economic, and social isolation.

According to Levesque these were the causes of being assimilated by the English-speaking majority and that the real danger was among themselves. To him, the solution was to “accept us as we are, succeeding somehow in making a proper and appropriate place in it for ourselves, in our own language, so that we can feel we are equals and not inferiors.”⁶⁶ Education became one of his priorities, as well as providing Quebec with social services, like pensions, hospital insurance, or Medicare.

To accomplish this goal, the province needed a strong State, “order must be re-established in the chaos of a governmental structure.”⁶⁷ Some of his economic policies were to nationalize the electric power and to create the General Investment Corporation, all directed to benefit the lower social classes and to increase their way of living. With these ideas, Levesque was able to make nationalist feelings stronger than ever among

⁶⁴ Levesque, *An Option*, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart. 1971), p. 20.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

French-Canadians, but he also angered and disappointed the rest of the Canadian society who believed that the union was possible.

This revival of nationalism was even more evident during the 1960's with the speeches of the FLQ. The FLQ's nationalism was different since they were an organization that used violence to achieve its goals. Its speeches, although looking for the same objectives as Levesque's, were clearly more aggressive and direct:

*Patriots, Ever since the Second World War, the various enslaved peoples of the world have been shattering their bonds to acquire the freedom which is theirs by right. Most of these peoples have overcome their oppressors, and can today live in freedom. Like so many others before us, the people of Quebec have reached the end of their patience with the arrogant domination of Anglo-Saxon colonialism.*⁶⁸

Another sign of the FLQ's aggressive nationalism can be seen in this other speech: "Our period of slavery has ended. QUEBEC PATRIOTS, TO ARMS! THE HOUR OF THE NATIONAL REVOLUTION HAS STRUCK! INDEPENDENCE OR DEATH."⁶⁹ But as mentioned before, even if the FLQ's nationalism had the same goals as most of the nationalist movements, its means were only a temporary method. Violence has not been the rule of Quebec's nationalism, but the exception. Most of the times, Quebec has witnessed a pacific movement.

Rene Levesque accepted that the Quiet Revolution had brought many positive changes to Quebec's society and that they have learned a lot from it. One of these teachings was that Quebecers "have the capacity to do the job ourselves"⁷⁰ and that they had to be responsible for making a change; it was them who should find the solutions to their problems. He said that "a nation is like an individual: those who succeed are who

⁶⁸ Carolyn J. Tuohy, *Policy and Politics in Canada. Institutionalized Ambivalence*, (Philadelphia: Temple University, 1992), p. 335.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 336.

⁷⁰ Levesque, *An Option*, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart. 1971), p. 19.

are unafraid of life.”⁷¹ So based on these ideas, in 1967 Levesque affirmed that “the way of the future consisted of a sovereign Quebec within a new Canadian union.” According to him, there was “no reason that neighbours should not remain freely associated and partners in a common enterprise which responded to the other great current of our time: new economic groupings, customs unions, common markets etc.”⁷² But these declarations of modern nationalism, although very popular among the French Canadians, did face opposition.

Both Anglo and Francophone businessmen opposed to the independence idea because they believed that a political break could also affect the economic situation of Quebec. They also criticized the Parti Quebecois’ Nationalism because they felt that the rise in taxes proposed by the Party to provide Quebecers with social welfare would harm the economic growth and affect their interests. Women and ethnic minorities were also against the Parti Quebecois nationalism. The criticism reached its highest point during the 1980 Referendum. Both federalists and businessmen were able to defeat the Parti Quebecois proposal of independence.

Opposition was mainly because big enterprises tried to maintain homogeneity among its workers to avoid conflicts. Women and ethnic minorities had a lot of trouble finding jobs in the large corporations, both private and public. Because of this, many women rejected the nationalist idea of a large State bureaucracy with a centralized administration. They were the targets of a lot of discrimination, especially at high positions, where individualism was favoured. “The poorest and least-educated people tended to be federalists while the best-educated and most dynamic elements were mostly

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 19.

⁷² Daniel Turp, *It's Time For A New Partnership With Canada*, <http://www.rocler.qc...> (accessed December 17, 2003).

behind the government.”⁷³ Against the Parti Quebecois’s goals, this trend causes a bigger division among Quebec’s society and weakened the nationalist movement.

Slowly, the poor classes felt marginalized and that the promises of equality had been broken, leading to a decrease of support for nationalism. A new clash between nationalists and the Church occurred. This time because the Church wanted to keep control over provincial education and since the secularization, the school boards were serving the government and not them. The State and its nationalism supported a social education and the Catholic Church defended moral values. The Church won the election of representatives to the Montreal Catholic School Commission.

This defeat for the Parti Quebecois and the nationalist movement was caused because it could not inspire its supporters to participate in local projects.⁷⁴ The Party’s different historical periods and events have given a different perspective to Quebec’s nationalism. Before the Quiet Revolution, nationalism was seen as an obstacle for progress, and after the Revolution it was associated with modernization, the defence and expansion of French culture and the creation of a national identity. This last perception was better accepted since it represented the majority’s wish of common good and progress.⁷⁵

1.5 Nationalism’s Current Situation in Quebec

Slowly, nationalism has lost support. This decline began in the early 1980’s as it was shown after the defeat of the Referendum in 1980 and 1995, when the Parti Quebecois

⁷³ Clift, *Quebec Nationalism*, (Montreal: Mc-Gill-Queen’s University, 1980), p. 119-120.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 121-122.

lost the provincial elections in 1985 to the Liberal Party, and when the country rejected the Meech Lake and the Charlottetown Accord. After language bills and the sovereignty-association proposal appeared, different interests began to arise and confrontations calmed the nationalist enthusiasm.

Also, the province needed to adapt to the changes that were taking place, like the ending of the public services and bureaucracy growth, the appearance of a new economic decision center, Toronto substituting Montreal and the rationalization of Canada's economy. The original goal of Quebec's nationalism, the modernization of Quebecer's way of thinking and of its Institutions brought the decline of its base, group solidarity, egalitarianism and social cohesiveness and will probably continue to cause its decline as a political movement.⁷⁶

Modern nationalists' support, more worried about their economical situation than about independence, was not enough and after the Parti Quebecois governed the province from 1994 to 2003, the Liberal Party, with Jean Charest as Party leader, won the provincial elections. The leader of the Quebec Liberal Party has had to deal with how to attract the support of nationalist Francophones who might otherwise vote again for the Parti Quebecois. Jean Charest already has the support of Federalists because he favours a renewed Confederation with the entrenchment of Quebec's unique character in the Constitution, which the other nine provinces have accepted. Quebec's unique character is based on the French language, culture, and civil law and it was accepted in the Calgary Declaration of 1997 after public consultations.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ Clift, *Quebec Nationalism*, (Montreal: Mc-Gill-Queen's University, 1980), p. 126.

⁷⁷ Unity, Diversity, Respect, *The Calgary Declaration*, <http://www.uni.ca/calgary.html>

The return of the Liberal government may be the starting point to reform the Canadian federation. When it was signed, the Declaration was just a promise without legal validity because the then secessionist government of Lucien Bouchard refused to sign it. But with the arrival of Charest, that could change and maybe Canada's two sides will come into one to form a single-united country with one national feeling among all its citizens.

1.6 The First Nation's Nationalism

First Nations people see themselves as members of another nation, of another political community within Canada. "Aboriginal peoples are to be part of a "multinational federalism" that practices a "multinational citizenship."⁷⁸ From the seventeenth and until the twentieth centuries, First Nations people were referred to as members of a tribe. Nation was a synonym for this term and had a different meaning to the modern term meaning a political community that does, or ought to, or could potentially exercise sovereignty.

It was until after the Dene Declaration in 1975 that the Northwest Territories demanded the right to be considered a nation: "The Dene find themselves as part of a country. That country is Canada. But the Government of Canada is not the government of the Dene."⁷⁹ Nationalist sentiments spread quickly, especially after the invention of the term First Nations that combines both nationality and aboriginality. ^{First Nations is a term used to} refer to the indigenous peoples of the Americas, alternative to Native Americans, American Indians, or Aboriginal Americans. In Canada, "First Nations" does not include Inuit or Métis peoples; they are included in the term "First Peoples ." Inuit's live in

⁷⁸ Flanagan, *Aboriginal Citizenship*, <http://www.misc-iecm.mcgill.ca/citizen/f...>

⁷⁹ *1975 Declaration of Dene Nationhood*, <http://www.canadahistory.com/sections...>

Nunavik, northern Quebec. The Métis are not recognized as a First Nation by the Canadian government and do not receive the benefits given to other aboriginal groups but the Constitution of 1982 recognizes the Métis as an aboriginal group.⁸⁰

In 1982, the National Indian Brotherhood became the Assembly of First Nations composed of members of different Canadian tribes.

The Assembly of First Nations (AFN) is the national body of representation of the First Nations in Canada. It represents the views of the First Nations in areas such as Treaty Rights, Economic Development, Education, Health, Housing, Justice, Taxation, Land Claims, Environment, and other issues that may arise.⁸¹

What Aboriginals of Canada want is to have the right to a self-government and sovereignty within its territories, to decide their form of government and the right on the use and distribution of their natural resources as well as to be able to participate in the decision-taking of the country, through the First Nations Assembly. This could be achieved through the First Nations Governance Act, which was introduced by the federal government in June 2002 to correct the Indian Act. The Indian Act has its roots in 1857 when the British House of Commons passed a law called "An Act for Gradual Civilization" which intended to convince the Aboriginals of giving up their culture in order to get the full British citizen.⁸²

The 1876 Indian Act made restrictions to the Aboriginals rights such as educating their children in special schools, electing their leaders and making illegal to sell or produce goods without the permission of local agents or to leave the reservations. Its main goal was to assimilate the Canadian Aboriginals. This assimilation attempt ended in 1969 with the "White Paper" proposal presented by then Indian Affairs Minister Jean

⁸⁰ Nation Master, *First Nations*, <http://www.nationmaster.com/encyclopedia/First...>

⁸¹ Assembly of First Nations, *First Nations Assembly*, http://www.afn.ca/Assembly_of_First_Nat...

⁸² Linda Ward, *The First Nations Governance Act*, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/indepth...>

Chrétien. The White Paper was intended to abolish the Indian Act but also the treaties and any other special status granted First Nations people.

The defeat of the White Paper may be the most important political victory for Canada's First Nations because even though it would protect Aboriginals status within the country it also meant that the restrictions of the Indian Act would continue. Since the White paper of 1969 there have been amendments to the Indian Act to bring it into accordance with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. For example, in 1985 Status Indian women who married non-Indians would no longer lose their status as Treaty Indians and that status also continued to their children.⁸³

In June 2002 the Minister of Indian Affairs Robert Nault introduced a new piece of legislation called "The Governance Act." Among other things the act proposes new election rules for Indian Band leadership. Under it, native bands would be able to choose their leaders and to create their rules on how they spend their money as well as giving the off-reserve band members voting rights in electing Band councillors. It also wishes to establish strict rules for financial reporting by Chiefs and Councils to their members. The proposed changes would allow Bands to take full title of their reserve land, so Bands could use lands to back mortgages, lease, or sell them. The proposals have not been totally accepted by First Nation's leaders.⁸⁴

Even today, ^{First Nations keep fighting these Acts through important means such as lobbying in the Canadian} Parliament. For example, Grand Chief of the Assembly of First Nations Matthew Coon Come and Chief of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations Perry Bellgarde has been among the most vocal opponents of the proposed Governance Act. Describing the

⁸³ Garth Matiere, *The Indian Act in Canadian History*, <http://sask.cbc.ca/archives...>

⁸⁴ Ward, *The First Nations*, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/indepth...>

proposal as *21st Century Colonialism*, they want to turn down both the Indian Act and the Governance Act. According to them: “there should be a new relationship between Ottawa and First Nations based on the Treaties and a guarantee in the Constitution to recognize and protect all existing Aboriginal rights, including the right to self-government.”⁸⁵ Another argument is that “Band members need more protection from the power of Chiefs and Councils.” (...) powers transferred to Band Councils was done by the federal government, without any consultation with Band members.”⁸⁶

Oppositions to First Nations’ nationalism argue it is an inconvenience for the rest of the country because the separation, due to the size and strategic location of the First Nations’ communities, would destroy Canada as the country we know, leaving only economic and social problems for the rest of the Country. Also, the rejection of the First Nations to be a part of Canada has brought feelings of unconformity among Canadians since most of them do not want to keep paying, through their taxes, for the First Nations’ Assembly and the social services for their communities if its leaders keep saying that they are not Canadians.

But realistically, there is a small chance of Aboriginals separation happening since these communities do not have the economic, politic, and social means to survive on their own. The problem is that Canadian politicians, by adopting and accepting most of their demands such as the First Nations term, have raised their expectations more than what can actually be achieved. The federal government, by speaking of many nations within Canada, has only created division among the society. Even if its intentions are conciliatory in theory, in practice they have only brought more conflicts to the country.

⁸⁵ Matiere, *The Indian Act*, <http://sask.cbc.ca/archives...>

⁸⁶ Ibid.

