



Kim Richard Nossal, “F-f-fading Away: The Evanescent Canadian Foreign Policy Professor,” in Brian Bow and Andrea Lane, eds., *Canadian Foreign Policy: Reflections on a Field in Transition* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2020), 21–38. (Pagination indicated thus: [22]; footnotes were published as endnotes)

A baby boomer contributing to an edited collection about the “generations” of scholars of Canadian Foreign Policy (CFP) should be forgiven for invoking “My Generation,” the 1965 hit by The Who. That song, with its angry stuttering lyrics sung by Roger Daltrey, particularly the transgressive possibilities of the stuttered “f” in the second verse, has long been an emblematic anthem of the 1960s. But I do not invoke the song just because I came of age in the 1960s. Rather, as the title of this chapter suggests, that one line in the song captures perfectly my overall argument: the kind of Canadian Foreign Policy professoriate of which I have been a part since 1976 is now in the process of disappearing.

This chapter seeks to trace the rise — and slow evanescence — of a distinct CFP professoriate in the Canadian academy. There is, it must be acknowledged, an autobiographical element in the tracing: I was lucky enough to be part of a cohort of PhD students who was hired to teach and conduct research in the general area of Canadian international policy: foreign policy, defence policy, trade policy, or development assistance policy. But at the end of my academic career, the environment is very different. Today we see a paradox: at virtually every university in Canada, there is a course — usually at the third year level, usually offered by the Political Science Department — that focuses on Canadian foreign policy. These courses are persistently popular, which is one of the reasons that they remain in university calendars. But many of these courses are no longer offered regularly, and many of them are taught by part-time adjunct professors. Moreover, many of the full-time members of the professoriate [22] who do teach their university’s CFP course were probably not hired *specifically* for that task, as I and many of those in my generational cohort were. Rather, they have a much broader scholarly focus.

The Making of a CFP Professor

I begin with how I joined the CFP professoriate. Among the job advertisements in the February 1976 issues of *University Affairs* and *CAUT Bulletin*, the two publications in which Canadian

academic positions are advertised, was one placed by the Department of Political Science at McMaster University, seeking two lecturers or assistant professors, one in Canadian politics, the other in “international relations, comparative foreign policy, and Canadian foreign policy.”¹ I was a doctoral student in the Department of Political Economy at the University of Toronto, in the middle of my second year. My thesis — still being researched — was on a Canadian foreign policy topic. Given that I had not even completed my “residency” (the mandatory two-year period of residence that was common to doctoral programs back in the day), I was an unlikely candidate, but I applied for the position anyway. To my surprise I was called for an interview. I was even more surprised when the chair of the department, Adam Bromke, telephoned me in early April and offered me the job. In July 1976, I settled into my new office in Kenneth Taylor Hall, and in September I began teaching two full-year courses: a third year course on Canadian foreign policy and a fourth year seminar on comparative foreign policy.

At first blush, my path to becoming a CFP professor at McMaster seems straightforward. I arrived at the University of Toronto in 1970 after completing high school in Hong Kong, where my father was posted as a foreign correspondent for the now defunct *Toronto Telegram*, covering the two major stories of the day in the Asia Pacific — the Cultural Revolution in China and the war in Vietnam. I thus arrived at U of T with a keen interest in international politics and hopes of a career in the Canadian foreign service. Given my career goals, I was particularly interested in International Relations and CFP, but during my last two years as an undergraduate, POL 312, the CFP course, was not offered. James Eayrs, the professor who normally taught it, had been awarded a Killam Senior Research Scholarship to enable him to write a fourth volume of his five-volume *In Defence of Canada*, and the department chose not to offer it in his absence.

[23] However, in my fourth year, I petitioned the department to be allowed to take a graduate CFP course, POL 2203. Since 1967, it had been offered by John W. Holmes, a former Canadian diplomat, who was the director-general of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs (CIIA) and also a visiting professor of international relations at the University of Toronto.² Happily, Holmes supported my petition, which was granted by the department, so in the 1972–73 academic year, I made the weekly trek across campus to Edgar Tarr House, the headquarters of the CIIA, where Holmes offered his weekly graduate seminar. Tarr House quickly became a favourite haunt for me and other members of the class, because it was also home to the CIIA library, which in addition to an extensive holdings of books and journals on international affairs, also had clippings files³ on a range of international and foreign policy issues — a magnificent resource for students in a pre-Internet era.

¹ *University Affairs* (February 1976), 24.

² For an excellent biography of Holmes, see Adam Chapnick, *Canada's Voice: The Public Life of John Wendell Holmes* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009).

³ Clippings files were manila folders, organized by subject, into which material that was scissored from a variety of newspapers was archived, usually in reverse chronological order.

Taking POL 2203 with John W. Holmes was, to use a tired but nonetheless accurate cliché, a transformative experience. He was an engaged and engaging professor. His teaching reflected his own education and training as an historian: he had studied history at the University of Western Ontario, taken his master's in history at the University of Toronto, and was pursuing a doctorate in history at the University of London when his studies were interrupted by the outbreak of the Second World War. Returning to Canada, he eventually joined the Department of External Affairs, as Canada's foreign ministry was then called.

Holmes the historian instilled in all of us an appreciation for the importance of the past and in particular the crucial role that history plays in determining a country's foreign policy. But his teaching also reflected the years he spent in the 1940s and 1950s as a public servant and a diplomat. He stressed the importance of pragmatism in foreign policy, the need to recognize the clash of interests that made compromise a necessary component of statecraft, and the necessity of balanced assessments of policy options. Above all, he sought to convey to us the paradoxical nature of world politics and foreign policy and — as he so often liked to say — the importance of living with paradox.⁴

My time in POL 2203 convinced me that I wanted to concentrate my studies in CFP and to continue studying with Holmes. I was admitted to the master's program in political science at U of T for 1973–74, and Holmes [24] supervised my thesis, which was on Canada's participation on the ill-fated International Commission for Control and Supervision, the new truce supervisory commission created at the 1973 Paris peace conference to supervise the end of the American involvement in the Vietnam War.

It was during my master's year that the Department of External Affairs determined (quite correctly, in retrospect) that I did not have what it took to be a good Canadian diplomat, a decision that prompted me to continue my CFP studies. As Denis Stairs noted about his choice of the doctoral program that he had made a decade earlier, “if the subject was Canadian Foreign Policy, Toronto was the obvious place to go.”⁵ I was only vaguely aware of the admonition that to be a successful academic, one should never, *ever*, get all three degrees from the same institution, but in the mid-1970s, the logic that led Stairs to choose U of T still held: its political science department was arguably the best in English Canada, and in Canadian Foreign Policy there were no other serious contenders.

I entered the U of T doctoral program in political economy in September 1974. At that time, Toronto's PhD program in political science had a distinctly mid-Atlantic structure — not quite British and not quite American. At British universities, most doctoral programs of that era had but one component: a doctoral dissertation written under the supervision of a single

⁴ For discussions of Holmes's teaching, see Denis Stairs, “The Pedagogics of John W. Holmes,” in Kim Richard Nossal, ed., *An Acceptance of Paradox: Essays on Canadian Diplomacy in honour of John W. Holmes* (Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1982), 3–16; Chapnick, *Canada's Voice*, 188–202.

⁵ Denis Stairs, “Life in a Canadian Foreign Policy Generation Long Ago: The Early Evolution of a Professorial Sample of One,” *International Journal* 72:2 (2017): 166–79, quotation at 175.

supervisor that was “an original contribution to knowledge” (to use the standard and iconic definition). In most American doctoral programs in political science, by contrast, candidates normally took two years of course-work beyond the master’s level. Next came an intense period of study of the literature in two fields of political science (a “major” and a “minor”) that was then followed by written and oral comprehensive exams to test their knowledge of these fields. Only when candidates had passed their “comps” were they permitted to proceed to the dissertation stage. At U of T in the early 1970s, doctoral candidates in political science could begin to work on their dissertation immediately. In their first year, they had to take courses in a major and a minor field and then had to write a “mini-thesis” — an extended survey of literature in the area of their dissertation (not the field as a whole) — before completing the thesis for oral defence.

This structure had a number of advantages — but several significant disadvantages. On the positive side, it meant that I was able to start on my [25] thesis during my first term in the program. In the fall of 1974, John W. Holmes, James Eayrs, and Robert O. Matthews, who had taught me international relations as an undergraduate, all agreed to be on my supervisory committee. A topic — the evolution of Canadian policy towards China in the 1940s, during the war against Japan and the civil war — was agreed to. The theoretical focus of the thesis was on the applicability of Graham Allison’s bureaucratic politics model that had just been published, and was enjoying considerable popularity in the foreign policy analysis community.⁶ A call from Holmes to his former colleagues at the Department of External Affairs magically opened doors: the diplomatic files of the department were made available to me well in advance of the normal thirty-year rule, subject only to my promise that I would not actually use them in a publication before thirty years had elapsed. The department’s Historical Division generously provided me with an office in the newly-opened Lester B. Pearson Building; but because I was taking graduate courses and was a teaching assistant for Eayrs’s second-year introduction to IR, I had only one day a week to consult the files in Ottawa. So once a week I took the overnight train (back in the day when there was an overnight train) to look at the files and take notes before returning to Toronto that night. But in this way, I was able to complete much of my thesis research over the course of 1975.

Needless to say, U of T’s program structure had one significant drawback: it meant that, because I had not been required to undertake a concentrated study of the literature that went well beyond my thesis topic, I was certainly not as well acquainted with the literature as those students in other doctoral programs who had been through the comprehensive exam process. (It is perhaps not surprising that in the late 1970s, the U of T department moved away from the structure that had allowed me, and a number of other students, to move through their program so — too? — quickly.)

My appointment to McMaster University in 1976 was largely the result of luck. After all, I was just twenty-four years old, I did not have a completed PhD, my only teaching experience

⁶ Graham T. Allison, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971); Kim Richard Nossal, “Allison through the (Ottawa) Looking Glass: Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy in a Parliamentary System,” *Canadian Public Administration* 22:4 (Winter 1979): 610–26.

was as a TA, and I had precisely one book review by way of publications. But I was lucky to be in a doctoral program that permitted a quick start, and thus a quick finish. I was lucky to have mentors who, I would later discover with some embarrassment, [26] wrote exceptionally strong letters of reference on my behalf to McMaster.⁷ And I was lucky that Adam Bromke, the department chair, thought enough of Holmes and Eayrs that he decided, over the objections of many of his department colleagues, to take a flier on a complete unknown. (My appointment thus confirms, and in spades, Robert H. Frank's contention that luck plays an underappreciated role in life outcomes.⁸)

But there was another bit of good fortune at work in 1976 that I believe also contributed to my appointment. The job for which I applied had an unusual specificity for an academic position — Canadian Foreign Policy — which was a much better fit with the focus of my PhD and the pedigree of my doctoral supervisors than would have been the case had the position been more broadly defined as just “international relations.” This would also have hugely widened the pool of applicants for the job. But, as I will show below, there was a brief period in the 1970s when Political Science departments were seeking faculty to teach Canadian Foreign Policy. This had not occurred in the past, and it would not recur in the future. In short, I was lucky enough to be part of a generational cohort that came onto the academic market, as it were, at a propitious time. Though the door that opened to that cohort closed fairly quickly, those who were appointed to tenure-track positions in CFP ended up remaining in place for the next thirty to forty years, and they formed a quite distinct scholarly community. To a consideration of that dynamic we now turn.

The Making of the CFP Professoriate

The 1976 McMaster ad in *University Affairs* and *CAUT Bulletin* for a CFP specialist was not at all unusual. York University had put out a similar ad the year before (David Leyton-Brown was appointed to that position), and the University of Toronto would advertise for a position in CFP the year after (John Kirton was the successful applicant). Indeed between 1975 and the mid-1980s, thirteen of the thirty-six international relations (IR) appointments made at Canadian universities were for professors who were in the CFP field. Among those appointees were a number of the doctoral students whom John Holmes supervised after he joined the University of Toronto as a visiting professor in 1967. They found positions across the country: Danford W. Middlemiss at Dalhousie University, Michael J. Tucker at Mount Allison University, Clarence Redekop at Trent University, [27] Elizabeth Riddell-Dixon at the University of Western Ontario, Donald C. Story at the University of Saskatchewan, David Taras at the University of Calgary, and Douglas A. Ross, first at Trent and then at Simon Fraser University.

⁷ In the case of Holmes, I learned this from his biographer: see Chapnick, *Canada's Voice*, 221.

⁸ See Robert H. Frank, *Success and Luck: Good Fortune and the Myth of Meritocracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016); for a short version of the argument, see Frank, “Why Luck Matters More Than You Might Think,” *The Atlantic*, May 2016.

Why were there so many appointments in Canadian Foreign Policy — a phenomenon that we did not see before the 1970s and certainly have not seen since? The explanation, I argue, is to be found in the broader political environment. During the late 1960s, there was a growing wave of nationalism in English-speaking Canada, fuelled by an anti-Americanism generated by an antipathy toward the war in Vietnam, the racialized violence sweeping American cities, and a growing concern about the degree to which the Canadian economy was being dominated by American ownership.⁹

That burgeoning nationalism also found a home on Canadian university campuses. In the early 1970s, universities in Canada — and their political science departments in particular — were responding to a growing nationalist critique that the Canadian university system, which had expanded so rapidly and massively in the 1960s, was failing to teach students about their own country. To staff the newly opened universities and the increasing number of students, universities depended heavily on recruiting foreign faculty. By 1970–71, more than one-third of the professoriate were not Canadian citizens: 10.2 percent were from the United States, 15.2 percent were from the United Kingdom, and 12.0 percent from other countries.¹⁰ The large influx of foreign faculty, particularly from Britain and the United States, was partly driven by a two-year tax holiday for professors that had been negotiated by the Canadian government and the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States as a way of staffing the burgeoning Canadian university system.¹¹ The large number of foreigners had a major impact in the humanities and social sciences, since many of them knew little about Canada, with the consequence that relatively few courses on Canadian subjects were offered. Increasingly, students at Canadian universities were not being given the opportunity to learn about their country.

Even though in the aggregate more faculty were from Britain than from the United States in the late 1960s, much of the focus was on the impact of American scholars on departments and curricula in the humanities and [28] the social sciences. The growing concern on English Canadian campuses was galvanized by two literature professors at Carleton University, Robin Mathews and James Steele, who initiated a relentless campaign against what they argued was the Americanization of the Canadian academy. In December 1968, they moved a motion at Carleton’s Faculty Council deploring the fact that almost 60 percent of Carleton’s faculty was

⁹ For an excellent and engaging survey of the rise of English-Canadian nationalism — and anti-Americanism — in the late 1960s, see J.L. Granatstein, *Yankee Go Home? Canadians and Anti-Americanism* (Toronto: HarperCollins, 1996).

¹⁰ Janet Scarfe and Edward Sheffield, “Notes on the Canadian Professoriate,” *Higher Education* 6:3 (August 1977): 337–58, table III, 339.

¹¹ The two-year arrangement was reciprocal, so that Canadians teaching in the United States and Britain during this period also enjoyed the same tax break. For the perspective of York University’s founding dean of arts, who was charged with creating academic departments for the thousands of students who came to the new university in the 1960s and who needed “someone to teach them,” see John T. Saywell, *Someone to Teach Them: York and the Great University Explosion, 1960-1973* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 91–111.

American-born and calling on the university to ensure that two-thirds of the faculty be Canadian; that only Canadian citizens could hold administrative positions from department chair to university chancellor; and that departments be required to justify publicly the hiring of non-Canadians. Their short “dossier,” published in 1969, had a powerful impact across English Canada, since it melded well with other manifestations of a rising Canadian nationalism during this period.¹²

The campaign by Mathews and Steele resonated on English Canadian campuses and often sparked student protests. Indeed, the position I was hired to fill in 1976 had its origins in such a protest. The Department of Political Science at McMaster University had expanded massively during the 1960s, growing from just four faculty members in 1964 to twenty-five faculty by 1970. Most of the new hires were Americans, and one of the divisions that quickly developed within the rapidly growing department centred on the Americanization issue. After a senior American academic was appointed as department chair in 1968, the split among the faculty intensified, and both graduate and undergraduate students were drawn into the dispute. The culmination, in 1970, was a student strike over the lack of Canadian content in the political science curriculum. One result of this protest was that the department added a course on Canadian foreign policy to the curriculum; in 1971, a Canadian who was doing his PhD at the University of Alberta was hired to teach it. But the protest at McMaster was by no means unusual: during the 1960s and early 1970s, many campuses across Canada were marked by protests, demonstrations, sit-ins, and occupations, often focusing on the Americanization issue.¹³

The increasingly acerbic debate over Americanization on campuses provoked a wider institutional and political response. In 1970, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada decided to create a Commission on Canadian Studies “to study, report, and make recommendations upon the state of teaching and research in various fields of study relating [29] to Canada at Canadian universities.”¹⁴ However, the association did not find a suitable commissioner until 1972, turning eventually to Thomas Symons, the founding president of Trent

¹² Robin Mathews and James Steele, eds., *The Struggle for Canadian Universities: A Dossier* (Toronto: New Press, 1969); James Steele and Robin Matthews, “The Universities: Takeover of the Mind,” in Ian Lumsden, ed., *Close the 49th Parallel, Etc.: The Americanization of Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970). On Canadian nationalism, see Granatstein, *Yankee Go Home?*, 192–216. See also David J. Bercuson, Robert Bothwell, and J.L. Granatstein, *The Great Brain Robbery: Canada’s Universities on the Road to Ruin* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1984).

¹³ There is an expansive literature on this era in the Canadian university system. See Gregory S. Kealey, Lara Campbell, Dominique Clément, eds., *Debating Dissent: Canada and the Sixties* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012) for a collection that offers a broad balanced survey that seeks to put campus dissent in broader perspective. For a more controversial analysis that compares student protests in the 1960s in Canada, the United States and West Germany, and attributing these protests to the “massification” of the university in all Western countries, see Cyril Levitt, *Children of Privilege: Student Revolt in the 1960s* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984).

¹⁴ T.H.B. Symons, *To Know Ourselves: Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies* (Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1975), vol. 1, 1.

University. At the political level, there was a similar responsiveness. In 1973, the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism of the Ontario legislature, which had been created in December 1971 to examine the dominance of American firms in the Ontario book publishing industry, widened its focus and began to hold hearings on the Americanization of the Ontario university system. Its interim report, published in 1973, was a scathing indictment of post-secondary institutions in Ontario on the matter of the citizenship of the professoriate. Stung by the refusal of Ontario universities to provide them with information about the citizenship of their faculty, the committee asserted in its report that the universities could not be trusted to make the right decisions in choosing their faculty. It called on universities to “permit discrimination in favour of Canadian citizens in faculty appointments.”¹⁵ Ontario’s minister of colleges and universities, Jack McNie, responded to the select committee’s critique by pressing the federal government to make the recruitment of non-Canadian faculty more difficult, arguing that Ontario universities needed professors “who know what they’re talking about on Canadian subjects.”¹⁶

In the meantime, Symons was holding hearings across the country. His report, *To Know Ourselves*, was officially published in 1975, but it was not actually released to the public until March 1976. Just as the efforts of Mathews and Steele were central to the beginning of the campaign for the Canadianization of the university system, so too the Symons report looms large in its completion. The report contained an extensive critique of the state of Canadian studies in Canadian universities, concluding that there was a broad lack of attention given to all aspects of Canadian studies, the result of a university system that was dominated by non-Canadian scholars working on non-Canadian issues, using non-Canadian methodologies and assumptions, and assigning their (Canadian) students non-Canadian texts and readings.¹⁷

Symons was particularly critical about the state of the IR field in Canada. In his view, the study of Canadian foreign policy was sadly underdeveloped. “Teaching and research about Canadian foreign policy and about international relations from a Canadian perspective have been particularly [30] neglected,” he wrote. There were no textbooks “specifically directed to the teaching of Canadian foreign policy.”¹⁸ The teaching in the IR field, he stated, “has been heavily dependent upon the use of methodologies and assumptions developed in the American context which are often inappropriate to the Canadian experience.”¹⁹ It should be noted that Symons’s critique of the state of CFP often ignored or downplayed evidence that contradicted his broader

¹⁵ Quoted in Ronald D. Lambert, “Canadian Nationalism in Ontario: A Review of Two Ontario Government Inquiries,” *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 14:3 (1977): 347–52, quotation at 350; see also Janet Scarfe and Edward Sheffield, “Notes on the Canadian Professoriate,” *Higher Education* 6:3 (August 1977), 337–58.

¹⁶ Granatstein, *Yankee Go Home?*, 211.

¹⁷ Symons, *To Know Ourselves*, vol. 1, 85–88.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 86.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

narrative. While it is true that professors capable of teaching CFP were not spread widely across the university system in the late 1960s or early 1970s, it simply cannot be said that there was as little capacity in this area as he asserted. In the late 1960s, CFP courses were being taught at the University of Alberta, Carleton, Dalhousie, McGill, York, and, of course, the University of Toronto.

Nor was the CFP literature as slim and underdeveloped as Symons suggested. On the contrary, a bibliography of works on Canadian foreign policy, published while Symons was holding hearings, ran to over 6,200 entries.²⁰ The Canadian Institute of International Affairs was an active publisher: it produced a biennial *Canada in World Affairs* series; a quarterly journal, *International Journal*, edited by James Eayrs and Robert Spencer; and a number of other books on topics in Canada's foreign relations.²¹ The Carleton Library series, published in association with McClelland & Stewart, was also publishing books on Canadian foreign policy.²² Finally, Symons's assertion that there were no textbooks on the subject simply ignored the existence of at least four texts that had been written by CFP professors: Eayrs, R. Barry Farrell, J.L. Granatstein, and Dale C. Thomson and Roger Swanson.²³

Moreover, by the time Symons finally released his long-overdue report in March 1976, many of its recommendations for a massive increase in Canadian studies at Canadian universities were already being put in place. Patterns of recruitment were changing. Between 1970–71 and 1974–75, the overall percentage of Canadian citizens teaching at Canadian universities had risen, albeit slightly, from 62.6 to 67.5 (though the percentage of American citizens teaching at Canadian universities increased from 10.2 percent to 14.4 percent during the same period).²⁴ Many more courses on Canada were being added to the curriculum, even though they sometimes faced stiff opposition (as the courses on Canadian-American relations did at the University of

²⁰ Donald M. Page, *A Bibliography of Works on Canadian Foreign Relations, 1945–1970* (Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1973).

²¹ For example, J. King Gordon, ed., *Canada's Role as a Middle Power* (Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1966).

²² For example: G.P. de T. Glazebrook, *A History of Canadian Foreign Relations*, rev. ed., 2 vols. (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1966); John W. Holmes, *The Better Part of Valour: Essays on Canadian Diplomacy* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1970).

²³ James Eayrs, *The Art of the Possible: Government and Foreign Policy in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961); R. Barry Farrell, *The Making of Canadian Foreign Policy* (Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada, 1969); J.L. Granatstein, ed., *Canadian Foreign Policy Since 1945: Middle Power or Satellite?* (Toronto: Copp Clark Publishing, 1969); Dale C. Thomson and Roger F. Swanson, *Canadian Foreign Policy: Options and Perspectives* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1971).

²⁴ Scarfe and Sheffield, "Notes on the Canadian Professoriate," 339, table III.

Toronto),²⁵ or were added under duress (as the CFP course [31] at McMaster was). In short, the Symons report simply legitimized what was already happening.²⁶

Most importantly, *To Know Ourselves* legitimized the change in federal policy that had been in motion since the Ontario government's decision in 1973 to recommend to Ottawa that it tighten the immigration rules governing the recruitment of non-Canadians for university positions. Ottawa had already ended the two-year tax holiday that had attracted so many British and American academics during the period of expansion in the 1960s. In 1977, Ottawa introduced a series of discriminatory hiring rules that privileged Canadian citizens and landed immigrants (as permanent residents were then called) in all hirings at Canadian universities. Under the new rules, before universities could offer a foreigner for a full-time academic position, they would be required to secure approval from federal immigration authorities by showing that no Canadian or permanent resident was qualified for the position. The new regulations worked quickly: by 1979, the vast majority of faculty being hired by Canadian universities were Canadian citizens or permanent residents. As J.L. Granatstein put it crisply, "The problem — if there was one — had evaporated."²⁷

CFP Courses Today

One of the many consequences of the victory of the Canadianizers in the IR field was the creation at most universities of courses that deal with Canada's foreign policy or external relations.²⁸ And a survey of universities in 2017 revealed that those effects were long-lasting.²⁹ According to the survey, eighty-one courses on that broad topic were listed in the calendars of fifty-seven Canadian universities.³⁰ Of these, forty-nine (60 percent) had "Canadian foreign policy/politique étrangère du Canada" in their titles, though some titles broadcast a wider perspective ("Canada in World Affairs," "Canada in World Politics," "Canada and the World"), and six encompassed defence policy as well. Nine courses on Canadian-American relations were

²⁵ See Stephen Clarkson, "Lament for a Non-Subject: Reflections on Teaching Canadian-American Relations," *International Journal* 27:2 (Spring 1972), 265–75.

²⁶ Granatstein, *Yankee Go Home?*, 216.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 214.

²⁸ For a survey of the Canadianization of the IR sub-discipline, see Kim Richard Nossal, "Home-Grown IR: The Canadianization of International Relations," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 35:1 (Spring 2000): 95–114.

²⁹ The calendars/course offerings of sixty-three Canadian universities were surveyed in 2016, with an update completed in the summer of 2017. Teaching data about courses and instructors was gleaned from department timetables, websites, and course outlines posted on-line. Further information about this survey may be obtained by emailing nossalk@queensu.ca.

³⁰ Five universities do not offer courses specifically on Canadian foreign policy or the foreign relations of Canada (or Canada/Québec): Acadia University, the University of Guelph, Université du Québec à Chicoutimi, Université du Québec en Outaouais, and Université du Québec à Trois Rivières. Acadia had a fourth-year CFP seminar, but dropped it in the mid-2000s.

included in the CFP category. At francophone universities in Québec, the course tended to focus not only on Canadian foreign policy but also on the highly-developed international relations of Québec.³¹ Of the CFP courses on the books in 2017, 56 percent were offered at the third-year undergraduate level; 33 percent were upper-year and graduate [32] seminars. Almost two-thirds were listed as political science courses, but a number were given by history departments, and several were part of the curriculum in specialized schools of policy studies or international affairs, or in multidisciplinary IR programs.

Moreover, the durability of the Canadianization movement is reflected in how CFP courses continue to be seen an integral part of the curriculum. For example, British Columbia created six new universities beginning in 2005: Capilano University, Emily Carr University of Art + Design, University of the Fraser Valley, Kwantlen Polytechnic University, Thompson Rivers University, and Vancouver Island University. It is noteworthy that all of them, with the obvious exception of Emily Carr, decided that it was necessary to have courses on Canadian Foreign Policy or Canadian-American relations in their curricula.

However, while almost all universities continue to have CFP courses on the books, it is clear that the system has difficulty actually offering them on a consistent basis. As most undergraduate students discover at some point, just because a course appears in the university calendar does not mean that it will be offered. In the case of CFP courses, a significant number were not taught: as far as can be determined, twenty-seven of the eighty-one courses surveyed were not offered between 2015 and 2017. Indeed, some of the courses examined had not been offered for many more years than that.

Explaining the Gap

Why are a third of the CFP courses in university calendars not offered? It is unlikely that a lack of student demand is responsible. The persistently strong popularity of CFP courses among students suggests that most department chairs would offer these courses if they could. A likelier reason is a lack of capability or resources — or both. In other words, the department may not have a member of the permanent faculty who has the necessary expertise to teach the course (or an interest in doing so). Or it may not have the resources to hire sessional or adjunct instructors, either to replace permanent members who might be on leave or to fill gaps in the expertise of the permanent faculty. Thus, even as the number of CFP courses expanded so that virtually all Canadian universities now list them in their calendars, the professoriate available and capable of teaching all those courses actually contracted.

[33] Indeed, the capacity of the Canadian university system to mount the CFP courses is even more circumscribed than it first appears. An examination of who taught the remaining fifty-four courses that actually did run between 2015 and 2017 shows a broader trend at work: twenty-three were taught by sessional or adjunct instructors. A few of these individuals were former

³¹ Kim Richard Nossal, Stéphane Roussel et Stéphane Paquin, *Politique internationale et défense au Canada et au Québec* (Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2007).

practitioners — members of Canada’s foreign service who, in their retirement, taught the course. Some were doctoral students being given an opportunity by their department to garner some teaching experience. Some were post-doctoral fellows. But many were part of a permanent casual academic workforce created by the progressive contraction of the full-time professoriate since the 1990s.

The CFP field clearly shows the impact of the casualization in the Canadian academic workforce. When I was hired in 1976, virtually all university teaching was done by permanent tenured or tenure-track faculty. Non-permanent professors were not unknown, but they were often experts from outside the academy who were brought in to teach a specialized course, or they were one-year sessionals who were hired to cover for a colleague on sabbatical. Today, by contrast, part-time instructors are a deeply embedded reality of the university system in Canada. In many political science departments, they have become critical for delivering undergraduate education, with some departments showing that between 40 and 60 per cent of their courses are taught by non-permanent faculty.

Such “workforce dualization” has become the norm in Canadian universities. In a dualized system, the workforce consists of two types of personnel — a small core of permanent employees who enjoy high salaries, full benefits, and employment security, and a larger periphery of temporary and part-time workers who are poorly paid, have fewer benefits, and enjoy no employment security.³² However, dualization is a logical and rational response to the essentially unsustainable business model imposed on universities by provincial governments. In Canada, provincial governments do not permit universities to control crucial inputs such as enrolments or tuition fees: both are tightly regulated in order to ensure that enrolments remain high and tuition fees remain low. But there are no comparable controls on the cost side: salaries are determined by global market conditions and undergirded by widespread unionization; other operating costs, such as library acquisition or energy, are likewise determined by market forces. [34] Because provincial government grants to universities never cover the widening gap between increasing enrolments, burgeoning costs, and low tuition fees, universities have resorted to workforce dualization as a means of coping.

A glance at the arithmetic readily shows why university administrations opt for this tactic. Consider my own case. As a full-time, full-service professor, I was required to teach four one-term courses a year, which is the system-wide standard teaching load in political science departments. However, if Queen’s University had replaced me with sessionals whom it hired on

³² On workforce dualization in the university system, see Clyde W. Barrow, “Beyond the Multiversity: Fiscal Crisis and the Changing Structure of Academic Labour,” in John Smyth, ed., *Academic Work* (Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, 1995), 159–78. On the Canadian academy, see Indhu Rajagopal, *Hidden Academics: Contract Faculty in Canadian Universities* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002). For a discussion on the implications of workforce dualization for political science in Canada, see Kim Richard Nossal, “A Question of Balance: The Cult of Research Intensity and the Professing of Political Science in Canada: Presidential Address to the Canadian Political Science Association, Toronto, Ontario, June 2, 2006,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 39:4 (December 2006): 735–54, esp. 745–46. The conditions I outlined in this address in 2006 have not improved.

per-course basis, it could have put on fully twenty-eight courses. This is why so many full-time, full-service professors are not being replaced with junior full-service faculty when they retire.

However, workforce dualization and the increasing dependence on casual academic labour are not the only explanation for the diminishing capacity to teach CFP courses. That decline is also driven by a change in intellectual currents and priorities that is inexorably reflected in university hiring decisions. Thus, even if the university system were funded as lavishly as it was in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and resources made available to replace retiring professors, it is not at all clear that the CFP cohort would be replaced by a comparable cohort. On the contrary, contemporary job ads suggest that when political science departments get an opportunity to add a full-time faculty member to their ranks, they look for one whose scholarly focus differs markedly from the highly specific “Canadian foreign policy” that was in McMaster’s job ad back in February 1976. If a new hire can teach the department’s CFP course, that might be considered a bonus, but it is unlikely that any department today would hire specifically to fill that narrow teaching requirement.

Although there are a number of reasons for this, perhaps the most important is the intellectual shift in the academy over the years, with the emergence of scholars whose approach to international relations fundamentally challenges the theoretical and normative concerns of the CFP cohort of the 1960s and 1970s. The national project that was so central to the scholarship of that cohort has given way to a more cosmopolitan perspective. No longer is there such a concern to focus on Canada’s role in the world as a way of framing what in essence was a nationalist discourse.³³ In addition, new theoretical and methodological approaches have [35] challenged the traditional methodologies of that cohort.³⁴ Indeed, those various intellectual challenges are well reflected in the essays of those next-generation colleagues — those who joined the CFP community in the decades after 1990 — in the 2017 special issue of *International Journal* that is a companion to this collection.³⁵

Conclusion: The Evanescence of the CFP Professor

That fact that university calendars feature some eighty CFP courses is a lasting testament to those in the late 1960s and early 1970s who pressed for greater Canadianization of the Canadian university system. The on-going popularity of these courses suggests that the Canadianizers were correct in their assessment that Canadian students would be keen to learn more about their country in the world.

³³ On the focus of the CFP field during this era, see Maureen Appel Molot, “Where Do We, Should We, or Can We Sit? A Review of the Canadian Foreign Policy Literature,” *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 1–2 (Spring/Fall 1990): 77–96.

³⁴ On this, see Jean-Christophe Boucher, “Yearning for a Progressive Research Program in Canadian Foreign Policy,” *International Journal* 69:2 (2014): 213–28.

³⁵ See the contributions by Brian Bow and Andrea Lane, Ellen Gutterman, Bessma Momani, Heather A. Smith, Srdjan Vucetic, Asa McKercher, and Aisha Ahmad in *International Journal* 72:2 (Spring 2017).

However, though the university system responded to those political pressures — by adding courses and hiring faculty like me and the numerous colleagues who joined the academy in the 1970s as part of that CFP community — its willingness to reproduce itself beyond my generational cohort has been limited. Already we are seeing the impact of the stresses on the contemporary Canadian university reflected in the difficulties of offering the existing courses with full-time members of faculty. With a steady flow of retirements of members of the CFP community from that earlier era, we are seeing a slow reduction in the size of that community as universities decide not to replace them. But, as I argued above, even if my cohort were to be replaced, it would not be replaced with professors whose primary interest and expertise were in CFP.

But despite this, we are not seeing an evanescence of the CFP *community*. On the contrary, there continues to be a vibrant community of scholars across Canada who remain interested in — and expert on — CFP and Canada's location in global politics. The chapter by Jean-Christopher Boucher in this volume demonstrates clearly that, though CFP scholars are exceedingly diverse, they nonetheless constitute an intellectual community. And indeed the Generations project itself — both the collection in *International Journal* and the contributions to this volume — is testimony to the vitality of this diverse community.

Rather, what we are seeing is the evanescence of the CFP *professor* — the scholar who is singularly focused, in both research and teaching, on Canada [36] in the world, and around which singularity professorial positions were created, as was true of the post for which I applied in 1976. Forty years on, that generation of Canadian Foreign Policy professors is indeed just f-f-fading away.

[Notes published on pp. 36–38]