

A COMMON COUNTENANCE?

PART VI

During the interwar years - here Tomkins references Neil Sutherland who wrote the foreword to Tomkins' book - as Progressivism shifted from "a creative social experiment to a single-minded pursuit of its program with solutions to problems applied from diverse sources, a *de facto* national curriculum took shape almost adventitiously."¹ By 1945, curricular resemblances "considerably outweighed the differences."² He asserts that the "objectives proclaimed in Ontario's 1915 teacher's manual - social control, the diffusion of basic knowledge, social improvement and industrial efficiency - had largely been achieved through ostensibly progressive means that served these unabashed conservative ends."³ Even as the "ethos" of Canada's universities has been "undermined by the corrosive power of modern social and natural science, the school remained the last bastion of Victorian cultural moralism and disciplined intelligence."⁴ I'm unclear how Progressivism can be progressive if it produces conservative ends, as Progressivism tethers itself to consequences. Even Tomkins judges the Canadian curriculum as "schizophrenic," resembling, he continues, "Canadian politics, in which one of the nation's chief political parties was identified by the contradictory title of progressive-conservative."⁵

After making this interesting perhaps provocative characterization, Tomkins backs off, refocusing "schizophrenic" from a characterization of the Canadian curriculum (and politics) to Progressivism itself, writing that a "schizophrenic orientation may in part be explained by the fact that Progressivism was a many-faceted movement."⁶ Calling Alberta "the cradle" of Progressivism in Canada, he moves to describe the movement as amorphous, appealing "to different groups with different goals: to groups seeking to improve rural education; educators seeking pedagogical reform and the professionalization of teaching; and business proponents of vocational education."⁷ Tomkins reports that the argument that Progressivism in its "conservative manifestation did not fail, since the centralized control, the testing and streaming procedures and the vocational thrust advocated by the conservative wing of the movement took hold during the 1930s and 1940s."⁸ Tomkins also reports the argument that Progressivism was "well-intentioned if cautious attempt at curriculum reform that lacked proper policy direction and was never given a fair trial."⁹ If such Progressivism is its progressive wing - associated with Counts, Dewey, and Rugg - and not its more "conservative" wing (Bobbitt and Charters) - then the two are not mutually exclusive.

After 1945, the "most marked social phenomenon" was the "population explosion fueled by the baby boom and immigration."¹⁰ Regarding the latter, Tomkins tells us that "many European immigrants were Roman Catholics," a fact supporting an increase in the number of separate schools.¹¹ Many immigrants were "skilled workers, professionals, intellectuals, and artists," a fact that supported the spread of

“multiculturalism” while reducing enthusiasm for “vocational and technical programs.”¹² after 1960s, many immigrants arrived from Asia, the Caribbean and Latin American, encouraging more extensive coursework in the acquisition of English as a second language.¹³ This wave of immigration also prompted attention to the “cultural adjustment of these newcomers and to cope with the racial tensions and prejudice that their arrival sometimes provoked.”¹⁴ Despite this immigration, “the 1981 census indicated that 84 percent of the total population had been born in Canada, a statistic that had changed little in a century.”¹⁵

Regarding the post-World War II population explosion, high-school enrolments increased by 29 percent between 1950 and 1955.¹⁶ In Ontario the school population more than doubled from 663,000 in 1946 to 1, 319,000 in 1959, but by 1976, falling birthrates produced a decline in the number of elementary school children to 3.3 million (from 3.7 million in 1971).¹⁷ Universities suffered their surges in enrolment too; they were “hard pressed to accommodate the thousands of veterans who flooded into them.”¹⁸ There was an increase too in births of babies to unmarried mothers during this period, prompting “calls for more sex education in the curriculum, a demand that reflected the native but typical North American belief that complex social problems could be alleviated, if not solved, by formal instruction.”¹⁹ He notes that in certain communities, the sex education curriculum contained content on “birth control.”²⁰ Returning to Ontario, Tomkins adds the 1969 Mackay Report recommended the abolition of religious instruction in public schools.²¹

Tomkins reports that, aside from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the National Film Board, “Canadian cultural life remained notably underdeveloped” in the years immediately following the conclusion of World War II, but during 1950 it showed signs of development, signaled by the establishment of the Stratford Festival, the Canadian Ballet Festival, the National Library and the Canada Council.²² Animating these events was the 1951 report of the Royal Commission on the Arts, Letters and Sciences - the Massey Commission.²³ Commissioners affirmed “the traditional moral-intellectual basis of Canadian life which they claimed rested on certain habits of mind and convictions which Canadians shared and would never surrender.”²⁴ They referenced Canada’s “Loyalist heritage” that had led to a “common set of beliefs.”²⁵ Indeed, commissioners declared that Canada had been “sustained through difficult times by the power of this spiritual legacy”²⁶ which had been “complemented by the vitality and historical tradition of French Canada.”²⁷ This legacy also constituted a “foundation ... for a national tradition of the future.”²⁸

The Massey Commission’s recommendations led to the establishment of the Canada Council and the affirmation, through federal funding, of Canada’s universities as “central institutions of that life,” events that, Tomkins tells us, had “momentous consequence for Canadian cultural and intellectual life.”²⁹ The commissioners proclaimed their concerns about the Canadian school curriculum, “at all levels, in so doing portending the criticism of progressive education and of American influences

that will be discussed in Chapter 14.”³⁰ But the Massey Commission’s most “momentous consequence” was support for the arts; by 1971, the arts were supported by governments on a per capita scale almost ten times that in the United States,” a fact that “reflected a new public sympathy for and awareness of the arts.”³¹ In the public schools, this “cultural explosion was reflected in new facilities for expanded, largely extra-curricular music, drama and fine arts programs.”³²

This “flowering of Canadian culture” was especially evident then in literature, both fiction and non-fiction.³³ He cites the “immense popularity of Pierre Berton’s books” as reflecting a strong interest in Canada’s historical and cultural traditions by an adult population whose school curriculum had been largely absent Canadian content.³⁴ He cites “one of the nation’s leading novelists, Margaret Atwood,” who composed “a thematic guide to Canadian literature for schools, significantly entitled *Survival*.”³⁵ Not only cultural survival – especially vis-à-vis the behemoth to the south – but also physical survival was a key concern, as “external military, scientific and industrial threats arising from the Cold War and related international crises were a source of continuing national anxiety.”³⁶ National anxiety was also sourced “internally,” as “real continuing problems of poverty, disadvantage, regional disparity, racism, and cultural discrimination,”³⁷ what Clark called “cultural islands”³⁸ were “becoming articulate publics, demanding participation in the society,” here referencing “francophone nationalists, feminists, Native peoples and radical students.”³⁹

Tomkins references Clark again, for whom the “real significance” of public schools and universities concerned “their role in reducing social barriers and in becoming the chief melting-pot in post-war Canadian society.”⁴⁰ (And I thought only the U.S. was a “melting pot.”) They provided opportunities for economic and social mobility as well as sites of dissent. Anglophone Canadians protested the Americanization of Canadian economy and culture; curiously, Tomkins adds that “their nationalism paralleled that of francophone Canadians,” clearly not the case.⁴¹ “Nationalism replaced religion as the dominant ideology of Québécois,” Tomkins continues, “and the moral fervor previously reserved for maintaining religious integrity focused on maintaining linguistic integrity. One result was cultural conflict between the linguistic communities, focused at first largely on the schools,” noting that in 1974 French was made the sole official language of Québec.⁴² Concerning Indigenous peoples, Tomkins notes that in 1951, the Indian Act had been revised to allow the integration of Registered Indian children into provincial school systems. He also notes that “increasing Native pressure for a strong voice in, if not outright control of, their schools was part of an assertion of a wide range claims, notably including native land claims and their right to maintain their cultural identity.”⁴³ Tomkins follows these acknowledgements by noting that in 1971, the federal government formally recognized multiculturalism by declaring, in Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau’s words, that Canada was a nation of two official languages but no official culture, that cultural pluralism was “the very essence of Canadian society,” that Canada’s government would be committed

to assisting all cultural groups toward full participation in the society; one result was an emphasis on multiculturalism in the curriculum.⁴⁴

During the late 1950s and the early 1960s there also royal commissions focused on Canadian education, ranging from the “extreme conservatism” of British Columbia’s Chant Commission to the “neo-progressivism” of Ontario’s 1968 Hall-Dennis and Alberta’s 1972 Worth reports.⁴⁵ Tomkins judges these as “less the application of thought-out philosophies or rational solutions, than desperate responses to public and political pressures.”⁴⁶ They were also interpreted variously. For instance, the Chant Commission advocated the restoration of intellectual development as the primary function of the school, reaffirming the acquisition of “factual knowledge” as the point of education, was interpreted by curriculum reformers in terms of “Bruner’s rather different concept of discovery learning.”⁴⁷ Québec’s Parent Report (1963-66; see research brief #24) presaged the appointment, in 1964, of the province’s first Minister of Education since 1875, as schools passed from religious to civil control.⁴⁸ While a new advisory Superior Council of Education blurred the Roman Catholic-Protestant boundary within the dual system, the committees of each faith remained to advise the council on the curriculum.⁴⁹ In secondary schools religious teaching became “voluntary” but was routine in elementary schools; parents did have the option to protect their children from either.⁵⁰ In secondary schools co-education was “proposed” if with “caution,”⁵¹ given “the moral, pedagogical and economic factors involved.”⁵² While Québec schools remained “officially designated as Catholic or Protestant, in practice they were divided along linguistic rather than religious lines.”⁵³

From Québec Tomkins moves to Ontario, suggesting that, as in the United States, curriculum change in that province had been influenced by the 1957 launching of the Soviet satellite Sputnik.⁵⁴ Appearing a decade later was “a new child-centered thrust in which Ontario took the lead,” led by the Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario, publicly known as the Hall-Dennis inquiry after its joint chairmen, Justice G. Emmett Hall, an eminent jurist and architect of Canada’s public medical care system, and Lloyd Dennis, an Ontario school administrator.⁵⁵ Its 1968 report, entitled *Living and Learning*, was praised by Progressives as the “most important educational document ever produced in Ontario.”⁵⁶

Given that public education is a provincial concern, federal educational interventions were, Tomkins tells us, “usually cloaked under the guise of cultural activities, as in the case of broadcasting policy, or were disguised to serve national political goals, as in the case of bilingual policy.”⁵⁷ In “whatever guise,” he continues, Ottawa’s interventions “had notable curricular effects,” citing increased attention to the teaching of French, and the expansion of vocational curricula.⁵⁸ Despite the latter, in the early 1950s, W. J. Dunlop, Ontario’s Minister of Education, had complained that “Too many fads are creeping into education these days to the exclusion of down-to-earth fundamentals,” adding that only when “the last shreds of this so-called progressive education are gone,” could the schools again produce “loyal, intelligent,

right-thinking and freedom-love citizens.”⁵⁹ Similar criticisms were expressed by the Massey Commission, with Vincent Massey himself asking: “How many Canadians realize that over a large part of Canada the schools are accepting tacit direction from New York that they would think of taking from Ottawa?”⁶⁰ That not so oblique reference to Teachers College, Columbia University, located in the City of New York, was accompanied by concern over “Canadian dependence on American curriculum materials which reflected an emphasis and direction unsuitable for Canadian children.⁶¹ Like American mass media, American textbooks would lead to a “weakening of the critical faculties” as well as “cultural annexation,” both of which undermined, if not threatened altogether, “wholesome Canadianism.”⁶² “It was,” Tomkins comments, “a familiar Canadian lament.”⁶³

The curriculum criticism made by Massey was “most pointedly adumbrated” by Hilda Neatby’s *So Little for the Mind* (1953), a scathing critique of progressive education which “attracted unprecedented public attention.”⁶⁴ What Canada “badly needed”⁶⁵ was a Canadian curriculum theory, a conclusion reached as well by Cynthia Chambers some four decades later, if from a very different point of view.⁶⁶ For Neatby, Tomkins explains, “the central problem in Canadian education is the neglect of the primary intellectual function of the school,” ignoring it in favour of “character education,” “critical thinking,” “meaning” and “understanding.”⁶⁷ Teacher preparation was also to blame, as its “emphasis on professional knowledge at the expense of liberal education exemplified the same American influences, anti-intellectual tendencies and Deweyan uniformity of thought found in the schools.”⁶⁸ Neatby argued for a restoration of “a humanistic curriculum based on the cultivation of a ‘vision of greatness’ of the type then being advocated by the English educator and classicist Sir Richard Livingston (1880-1960). Moreover, She felt that “religious and moral instruction based on Christian principles”⁶⁹ should be forefronted in the curriculum. While sounding strange to many of us living in a secular and technological society where STEM dominates school curriculum, in the 1950s Neatby’s critique “struck a responsive chord in an uneasy public faced with the challenge of post-war educational demands.”⁷⁰ Educators were, Tomkins tells us, “caught off guard and ... did not always make very credible rejoinders to her arguments.”⁷¹ Neatby’s analysis is also noteworthy as it was “the last major idealist-moralist critique of school to gain national public attention.”⁷²

Neatby’s critique also struck a responsive chord with several prominent educators. B. C. Diltz, the “controversial dean” of the Ontario College of Education, agreed that “educational engineering” must go, replaced by an “organic” education organized around studies of great scientific and artistic works that expressed “God’s purpose for men.”⁷³ Hugh MacLennan, “widely regarded as Canada’s leading man of letters during the 1950s,”⁷⁴ was less religious but equally adamant in deploring what he termed “the rout of the classical tradition.”⁷⁵ The allegation that progressive education made “social adjustment its chief goal” was reductionistic – there were those who advocated social adjustment but others who demanded social change even radical

change - but it was not altogether mistaken to complain that “the school was no longer concerned with disciplining the mind and with seeking to illuminate life. With life itself no longer represented as a coherent experience, there has been a loss of individual and collective self-confidence and of a respect for truth.”⁷⁶ Such sweeping generalizations inevitably ignore those countless educators committed to intellectual rigor, truth and to profound reflection upon life, but it’s also true that trends toward vocationalism – aggravated by capitalism’s command to monetize everything – undermined those educators’ efforts.

A “leading Canadian historian” – Professor Frank Underhill⁷⁷ – apparently appreciated that point. In a 1954 Royal Society symposium on education that had been occasioned by the appearance of *So Little for the Mind* Underhill agreed with Neatby that “the root cause of the retreat from traditional values was the false materialism that pervaded society and was reflected in the anti-intellectual nature of schooling.”⁷⁸ Unlike Neatby and other critics of Progressivism, Underhill knew that Dewey was not to blame; he knew that “Dewey had been misinterpreted everywhere in North America,” including Canada.⁷⁹ Tomkins terms “Dewey was a tough-minded political progressive who had been associated with a program at Teachers College, Columbia University, designed to produce sophisticated teachers as critical of the materialism of American society as were any conservatives.”⁸⁰ Underhill regretted that such a program had “no counterpart in Canada, where there was little awareness of the need to help teachers to confront a society torn by basic value conflicts.”⁸¹ For Underhill, Tomkins continues, the real cause of the intellectual weaknesses of Canadian schooling was a bureaucratic, “authoritarian system of administration that left teachers with no scope for decision-making similar to that possessed by academics,”⁸² a point as relevant today as it was sixty years ago. “The debates of the 1950s,” Tomkins concludes, “were among the most stimulating that had ever occurred in Canadian education.”⁸³

Evidently the launching of the Soviet satellite Sputnik in 1957 had almost as much curricular significance in Canada as it did in the United States.⁸⁴ Tomkins tells us that the “Gordon Commission on Canada’s Economic Prospects was voicing concerns similar to those being expressed in the U.S. about the scientific-technological gap between the Soviet Union and North America,” and “as in that country [the U.S.], national shortcomings were laid out at the door of deficient school curricula.”⁸⁵ The post-Sputnik emphasis upon mathematics and science started before Sputnik but intensified afterward, especially in the United States, where the event led “to the most searching reappraisal of schooling that had been seen for half a century.”⁸⁶ Again Tomkins cites Harvard psychologist, Jerome Bruner, whom he characterizes as “the most influential educational theorist since John Dewey,”⁸⁷ even though he wasn’t one: Bruner was a psychologist. Bruner’s assertion that “any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development”⁸⁸ attracted wide attention, as it promised that any child could learn whatever school reformers deemed knowledge of most worth. “Unlike Dewey,” Tomkins continues, “Bruner and

his fellow reformers tended to see the learner as a miniature scientist, with the result that their curricula often embodied the subject matter of the discrete disciplines as represented in the world of the mature scholar rather than in that of the child or adolescent.”⁸⁹ Bruner’s assertion was appealing, Tomkins adds, “because it promised to restore academic rigor to schooling and offered a solution to the problem of the knowledge explosion by reducing the complexity and clutter of unlimited quantities of information.”⁹⁰ How? Bruner argued that the academic disciplines – he assumed the school subjects should be organized in their image - contained “an inherent structure that could be the basis of teaching their most seminal ideas and ways of thinking.”⁹¹ Tomkins notes that Bruner never defined the concept of structure “precisely and it was used so variously that it seemed like an expression in search of a definition.”⁹² To structure were added concepts of “inquiry” and “discovery,” prompting Tomkins to observe:

It was ironical that eminent scientists and mathematicians committed to improving content soon found themselves promoting child-centered “discovery” and other teaching methods that owed much to the despised progressive theories they aimed to supplant. Discovery learning could, in fact, be traced to Dewey’s earlier progressive scientific problem-solving method set out in such works as *How We Think*.⁹³

This was hardly the first progressive ideas that had been rerouted for rather unprogressive ends: in early 1920s Italy progressive reformer accepted an appointment as Minister of Education under the fascist dictator Benito Mussolini.⁹⁴

In Canada, in 1962, the Joint Committee published *Design for Learning*, a book of curriculum proposals made by subcommittees in English, the social sciences and science, a book introduced by Canada’s “most eminent scholar,” Northrop Frye.⁹⁵ Frye mentions that members of the subcommittees had read *The Process of Education* and Bruner had addressed the full committee; according to Frye, his concept of structure “entered deeply into all the reports.”⁹⁶ Despite this apparent “tribute to Bruner’s influence, Frye’s account suggested that the Joint Committee had found the new dispensation in some respects less than helpful,” as “structure” remained “undefined.”⁹⁷ Indeed, Frye reported that the English subcommittee had found “little help”⁹⁸ from Bruner’s book “beyond a somewhat vague suggestion that tragedy is a central structural principle.”⁹⁹

Earlier, Tomkins had reported “Northrop Frye rejected social adjustment as an [educational] aim and saw schooling as an apprenticeship for an ultimate cultural and intellectual education that was a worthy end in itself.”¹⁰⁰

So it’s unsurprising to read that Frye disdained harnessing the curriculum to “the same military and national security imperatives that animated their American counterparts,”¹⁰¹ writing that: “The kind of vague panic which urges the study of science and foreign languages in order to get to the moon or to uncommitted nations ahead of the communists is ... remote from the educational issues that these reports

face.”¹⁰² Such instrumentalism, even the laudable social goals of Progressivism, were unacceptable because, Frye insisted, “the aim of whatever is introduced into the school curriculum at any level should be educational in the strict and specific sense of the word.”¹⁰³

Other aspects of Bruner’s recommendations met with a more favourable response. Following Bruner’s recommendation that a “co-operative Canadian curriculum agency” be established, the Ontario Curriculum Institute was formed in 1963 on the model of the Toronto Joint Committee, renamed in 1966 the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education affiliated with the University of Toronto.¹⁰⁴ “The rapid growth of the new institute,” Tomkins comments, “and a large influx of American scholars were seen in some quarters as a mixed blessing.”¹⁰⁵

Despite Frye’s critique, “subject-centered Bruner-type curriculum reform took root in all provinces during the 1960s,” although these “Canadian curriculum reform efforts tended to be characteristically cautious and derivative.”¹⁰⁶ Despite caution, by the 1970s, many of these curricular innovations were “under attack.”¹⁰⁷ Critics claimed that new mathematics “undermined traditional computational skills,” while others doubted that reformed curriculum in the sciences had taken “wide hold.”¹⁰⁸ Apparently asserting that the reform “took root” and yet had not taken “wide hold” are not mutually exclusive. In any case, any “humanistic” pushback was itself attenuated due to “the formalism of teaching, with its emphasis on memorization and preparation for passing matriculation examinations, attenuated a reflective approach associated with true liberal education.”¹⁰⁹

Still, studies conducted during the 1960s indicated that Canadians had a less instrumental conception of education than Americans and were “less concerned that it be vocationally oriented,” that despite the Federal Technical and Vocational Assistance Act of 1960 which encourages vocational education.¹¹⁰ Economic uncertainty – even a sense of crisis – “meshed with criticisms of schooling,” one result of which was Career Education, “touted as a solution to the problem of the school-work transition.”¹¹¹ Critics complained “this solution was a false panacea that made the schools a scape-goat for economic ills.”¹¹² By the late 1960s, however, “subject-centered and vocationally-oriented curriculum reforms were being superseded by a neo-progressive child-centered and teacher-centered thrust that reflected a new era of decentralization,” adding with understated humor: “The teacher-proof curriculum of the preceding decade was superseded, to a degree, by the curriculum-proof teacher.” Not only “decentralization” was in play it would seem, as “social unrest and youth disaffection”¹¹³ were drivers too; even Bruner himself announced, “I would be satisfied to declare something of a moratorium on the structure of knowledge and deal with it in the context of the problems that face us.”¹¹⁴

Tomkins returns to the 1968 Hall-Dennis Report – officially titled *Living and Learning* – that he had cited earlier. He likens it to 1920 American Progressivism, “with the significant and characteristic Canadian difference that progressive ideology was

enshrined in an official government document.”¹¹⁵ Its 258 recommendations affirmed “individualization, continuous learning, and maximum flexibility in curriculum facilities and scheduling,”¹¹⁶ recommending that the curriculum be “organized around general areas such as environmental studies, humanities and communications.”¹¹⁷

Elementary-school teachers and administrators were “more positive” about Hall-Dennis than secondary-school teachers and administrators “who maintained a strong subject orientation.”¹¹⁸ Tomkins notes that “the reception accorded the report indicated that Canadian reformers were less on the defensive by 1970 than were their American counterparts.”¹¹⁹ Outside Ontario – recall that Hall-Dennis was an Ontario undertaking – “neo-progressivism was most strongly evident in western Canada.”¹²⁰ He notes that the “British Columbia Teachers’ Federation produced its own report – *Involvement – The Key to Better Schools*, which reflected the same progressive spirit as *Living and Learning*,” and “in Alberta, the Worth Commission study was likewise written from a neo-progressive futuristic perspective.”¹²¹

Recall that *Stability and Change in the Canadian Curriculum* is the subtitle of Tomkins’ canonical work, a dynamic discernible again when Tomkins returns to “decentralization” (attributing it to “increased teacher professionalism and militancy, themselves a product of a better education teaching force than in the past.”) and “centralization,” a “Canadian tradition” that functioned “both as a break on precipitate change and as a spur to innovation in Ontario where, with official endorsement, neo-progressive ideas became more firmly rooted and resistant to attack even when they became less popular.”¹²² While “the absence of Canada-wide or even province-wide longitudinal data” precludes any assessment of “the impact of neo-progressivism and the validity of claims and counter-claims regarding its effects on achievement,” evaluation instruments introduced in the late 1970s (which largely superseded traditional external examinations) indicated no “serious decline in standard.”¹²³

During the two decades following 1960s, Canadian educators were “probably” more involved in “systematic curriculum development” than they had ever before, curriculum development that had “become largely technical.”¹²⁴ Such a conception of curriculum development, “whether based on psychological models such as behavioral objectives or the associated familiar Tyler model, had the effect of inhibiting teachers and the public alike from engaging in an open discussion of issues.”¹²⁵ In addition to Tyler, Tomkins cites Benjamin Bloom, whose concept of “mastery learning would sanction “a shift from long range goals to goals defined in terms of immediate behavior.”¹²⁶ Such myopia Tomkins appears to attribute to the ascendancy of “value free social science,” which, “with its concept that good and bad were simply subjective preferences, had been elevated to the status of a public religion.”¹²⁷

As with stability and change, decentralization and centralization, there was as well “pushback” against such a privatization of self-expressivity and normativity. Tomkins cites Robertson Davies, “another leading Canadian man of letters,” who argued that “we would be forced by experience ... to realize that no single system of

education could suit all children,” a statement seemingly qualified by his view that the “greatest weakness of the curriculum was its failure to promote an intelligent use and understanding of language.”¹²⁸ The Canadian curriculum, Robertson concluded (in Tomkins’ paraphrase) “should aim at producing a nation of people who knew what they were saying and what was being said to them.”¹²⁹ In his gloss of these decades Tomkins also cites Marshall McLuhan, calling him a critic “of print-oriented culture, whose work was paradoxically disseminated mainly through best-selling books,” and who “appeared to favor a bookish curriculum more than his image implied.”¹³⁰ Retrospectively, Tomkins acknowledges the founding figures of Canadian curriculum studies, including the towering Ted Aoki.¹³¹

Tomkins reports a “serious lack of articulation between the elementary and secondary levels,”¹³² not new to the final decades of the twentieth century, as he had reported earlier that, “by the turn of the [twentieth] century,” there had been a “growing realization of the need to improve articulation between elementary and secondary levels and to treat the curriculum as continuous was accompanied by an effort to differentiated the high school curriculum per se in a more systematic way.”¹³³ Indeed, one-hundred twenty years ago, “reform rhetoric was already stressing the role of the high school as more than university preparation.”¹³⁴ Flash forward and “articulation” remains a curricular issue, if less between elementary and secondary school than between the latter and the university. Tomkins cites Ontario’s 1977 Interface Study, designed to assess the academic transition of students from secondary school to college and university, less to make the point that now universities dominate secondary-school curriculum and more to chastise university professors for preserving their academic freedom – to make their own marking standards, compose their own curricula and devise their own teaching methods – while being quite willing to compromise that of their colleagues in public schools.¹³⁵ He also cites the “articulation” issue to show that complaints (perhaps most memorably Neatby’s, but also a steady stream of critiques from progressive intellectuals) about a “crisis” in “academic standards had been exaggerated.”¹³⁶ In a 1976 survey of English teaching in Canadian universities, academics allowed that the top 10 or 15 percent of entering students were “every bit as good as they had ever been,”¹³⁷ and a 1978 survey of academic achievement in the senior high schools, sponsored by the Canadian Education Association reported that “respondents expressed more satisfaction than dissatisfaction with standards of achievement in the traditional academic subjects.”¹³⁸ Still, as that decade came to a close, concerns were expressed for “curriculum uniformity” – Tomkins cites Québec’s 1979 “Plan of Action” as well as the implementation of “core curricula” in Ontario and British Columbia¹³⁹ – as “neo-conservative curriculum change in Canada” meant “that curriculum guidelines showed similarities among the provinces as authorities tightened their control.”¹⁴⁰ One suspects, then, that although there was “widespread teacher involvement in the writing of local curriculum materials, a policy that had contributed

strongly to professional development,”¹⁴¹ that “involvement” and “professional development” was carefully orchestrated by “authorities.”

Concern over Canadian identity in the curriculum intensified during this period, what Tomkins terms “the greatest expression of national feeling in Canadian history” evident at Expo in 1967.¹⁴² Five years following the *Toronto Star* expressed editorially resurgent Canadian nationalism:

American textbooks ... can be an effective and insidious instrument for Americanizing the thinking of young Canadians at the most impressionable period of their lives. They can instill the idea that the United States is the center of the world; that its foreign policy is always right and its opponents have always been wrong; that its way of doing things is the most advanced and efficient on the globe.¹⁴³

Tomkins cites the \$150,000 National History Project, funded and launched in 1965 by the Board of Governors of Trinity College School, a private institution for boys located at Port Hope, Ontario, directed by A. B. Hodgetts, a “history master at the school.”¹⁴⁴

The project was to assess “civil education, that is, of the influence of formal instruction in developing the feelings and attitudes of young Canadians towards their country,” and specifically the curriculum from which those “feelings and attitudes” might follow.¹⁴⁵ Hodgetts’ study - published in cooperation with the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education 1968 as *What Culture? What Heritage?* – inaugurates, Tomkins asserts, the formal Canadian Studies movement; it was, he continues, a “pioneer study of political socialization in the classroom based on firsthand observation.”¹⁴⁶ Hodgetts judged that “textbooks offered only bland consensus interpretations of Canadian realities” and that they were often taught in a “stifling” fashion, leaving students bored and apathetic, criticism that “belied both the harsh criticism of those who had characterized the schools as glorified play pens, and the optimism of those who had assumed that Canadians classrooms were exciting centers of creative learning.”¹⁴⁷ With the “notable exception of Québec,” courses across the country “tended to be identical.”¹⁴⁸ Not only bored and apathetic, “many pupils expressed an active dislike for Canadian studies, and more than a few indicated a preference for American history, about which they often claimed to be more knowledgeable.”¹⁴⁹ Hodgetts judged administrators (principals, inspectors and consultants) as “overly concerned with ‘administrivia,’ [doing] little to support Canadian Studies,” even openly disdaining the field.¹⁵⁰ Faculties of education fared no better. Hodgetts accused them of being “often preoccupied with fussy methodologies” while neglecting “reflective or analytical” studies of “subject matter,” ignoring the social and political contexts of curriculum, doing “little” to prepare prospective teachers in “inquiry methods and discussion techniques,” leaving them with a “mindless liberalism.”¹⁵¹ Other faculties of the university also came in for criticism, as Hodgetts complained that they too often expressed “a disdain for the schools and for the problems of teachers, if not for teaching itself.”¹⁵²

Another study several years later - 1974 – surveyed 810 Ontario students aged ten to twenty-three, finding that “television was the major source of political information by a wide margin, far outranking teachers, who also ranked behind the home, newspapers and magazines.”¹⁵³ Confirming Hodgetts’ study, this study also found that history curricula in Canada constituted a “divisive rather than a binding force in contrast to the role of that subject in other societies.”¹⁵⁴ Evidently there was no mention of Indigenous youth, but “cleavages between Anglophone and Francophone youth became so wide that their political learning was described by one social scientist as ‘socialization into discord’ and as reflecting the words of another researcher ‘emergent sectionalism’,”¹⁵⁵ a politically disintegrative form of regionalism. Tomkins cites yet another study - this a 1970 study of textbooks - that “concluded that there were two mutually exclusive Canadian historical traditions representative of the two linguistic communities.”¹⁵⁶ Evidently Francophone and Anglophone textbook writers were said to dwell inside “two different worlds” with the consequence that Canadian history curricula were composed “not from the national stand-point but from the provincial.”¹⁵⁷ What was needed, this study concluded, was a common curriculum “if further national schism was to be averted.”¹⁵⁸

These studies, Tomkins tells us, “attested to a growing realization of the power of curriculum materials as socializing agents.”¹⁵⁹ He cites another study – this one conducted in 1971 study - that examined 143 textbooks for evidence of bias and prejudice, finding “these characteristics to be pervasive.”¹⁶⁰ A later study of social studies textbooks found that “most portrayed a homogenous image of society, biased towards middle-class and Anglo-Saxon cultural values, while conveying a negative image of other groups.”¹⁶¹ Discussion of “class and other social cleavages were absent and consensus interpretations were the norm.”¹⁶²

“The main recommendation of Hodgetts’ study,” Tomkins reminds, “had been that a Canadian Studies Consortium be established in the form of an interprovincial network of regional centers involving persons from every level of education.”¹⁶³ With the “assistance” of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and with the “blessing” of the Council of Ministers of Education, the Canada Studies Foundation was established in March, 1970, as a politically independent organization; Hodgetts was appointed Director and Walter Gordon, a leading Canadian nationalist of the time, was appointed Board Chairman.¹⁶⁴ Tomkins explains that the term “Canada Studies” was chosen over “Canadian Studies” because “the organization was deliberately intended to convey a national, Canada-wide perspective,” a choice reflected in the concept of “continuing Canadian concerns” that was chosen as an “organizing principle for curriculum development.”¹⁶⁵ Tomkins tells us that the modifier “continuing” was chosen to register “the historical perspective deemed necessary for an understanding of contemporary issues; the concept of “concerns” was chosen to characterize issues “significant to the quality of Canadian civic life.”¹⁶⁶ These carefully chosen concepts were set aside by those teachers preoccupied with pedagogy, with the “process of

curriculum development,” and the press of local concerns.¹⁶⁷ An assessment conducted in 1976 found that “Canadian cultural studies (literature, music, art) were nowhere required, although there had been a real increase in the teaching of these and of interdisciplinary studies.”¹⁶⁸

A distinctly Canadian concern for multiculturalism intensified during the 1970s, but its inclusion in the curriculum was “not without controversy.”¹⁶⁹ While it was judged “that progress had been made,” it was noted that Anglophone Canada “tended to regard multiculturalism as a policy for immigrants and ‘ethnics’ while Francophones, seeking equality of status for themselves, remained preoccupied with bilingualism.”¹⁷⁰ Despite that preoccupation, a 1981 study found that 98 percent of Québec Francophones studied English in high school, while only 33 percent of Ontario Anglophones studied French.¹⁷¹ The “forced” enrolment of non-Francophone, non-Anglophone, immigrant children into Francophone schools had the effect, Tomkins suggests, of challenging the “cultural homogeneity” of Québec schools,¹⁷² as “immersion students were much more appreciative of cultural diversity than were other students.”¹⁷³ That statement Tomkins appears to contradict a page later when he writes that “although immersion increased Anglophone awareness of the French fact, it did not necessarily increase contacts with or improve attitudes toward Francophones.”¹⁷⁴ Included in the multicultural curriculum, Tomkins notes, were “anti-discrimination programs, usually crisis-oriented, short-lived and intermittent.”¹⁷⁵

Teachers tended to be “more permissive than working class immigrant parents,” Tomkins tells us, as “some teachers reinforced parental sex biases, while others countered them.”¹⁷⁶ Many might have ignored such cultural complexities; apparently the curriculum did. Tomkins cites 1977 survey of ethnicity within Canadian social studies curricula conducted by Walter Werner and his colleagues found “considerable bias by omission.”¹⁷⁷ The Natives peoples, the British and the French were represented but not new immigrant groups, and Indigenous cultures – as well as groups like the Hutterites - were “characteristically” portrayed as “exotic.”¹⁷⁸ When not exoticized, “ethnic minorities” tended to be portrayed as “problem groups.”¹⁷⁹

The Werner research referenced “four approaches that seemed to dominate curricula in multicultural and ethnic studies.”¹⁸⁰ The first was what they called the “*museum approach*, whereby a group was studied in terms of isolated, exotic details that lacked any context and led to no conceptual understanding.”¹⁸¹ The second they termed the “*heritage approach*” tended to be “ethnocentric and paternalistic.”¹⁸² Third, the “*disciplines approach*,” tended to rely on one discipline - “history” while the fourth, “the least used but potentially the most promising was the *interdisciplinary approach*, which sought to apply social science concepts to consider conflicting interpretations and to treat value issues.”¹⁸³

In 1977, an Ontario ministerial advisory committee issued “guidelines” for avoiding “bias and prejudice” in the preparation of curriculum materials.¹⁸⁴ Titled *Race, Religion, and Culture in Ontario School Materials*, it was, Tomkins suggests, “probably the

most sophisticated document of its kind in the country.”¹⁸⁵ Sophisticated perhaps, but not necessarily persuasive, as Tomkins also tells us that while Native peoples, “as the first Canadians,” were represented “apart from other ethnic groups, a stance that recognized their a priori cultural distinctiveness, while also perpetuating paternalistic attitudes towards them.”¹⁸⁶

Between 1945 and 1962, Tomkins reports, the Prairie provinces established the first local Native school systems, but apparently only a minority of Indigenous children attended them, as by the 1970s, approximately 60 percent of Native children were attending provincial schools.¹⁸⁷ He cites the Native Indian Brotherhood as exerting “pressure to slow the pace of provincialization in the interest of promoting band-operated and locally controlled federal schools.”¹⁸⁸ Other issues Tomkins identifies include “the lack of trained Native teachers,”¹⁸⁹ and the character of Indigenous “guidelines [that] tended to emphasize educational theory and strategies, to the neglect of content of needed historical and sociological insights.”¹⁹⁰

Next Tomkins moves to “moral education,” which was “beginning to lose its religious content.”¹⁹¹

He then provides a “backstory.” In a 1969 report, Ontario’s Committee on Religious Education in the Public Schools - the so-called MacKay Committee – found that in Ontario, Québec and Newfoundland students were required to study the Scriptures while in other provinces required no religious education; others offered it as an option.¹⁹² While curricular requirements varied across the country, participation in religious exercises was more “uniform,” as almost everywhere the school day opened and closed with a Bible reading, sometimes accompanied by a prayer.¹⁹³ However, no province mandated student participation in devotional exercises “against the wishes of his or her parents.”¹⁹⁴ The McKay Committee reported that “all provinces still expected the school to have a comprehensive responsibility for ethical and character education, and the teacher to be a moral exemplar ... moral tutor.”¹⁹⁵

By 1969, Tomkins continues, a variety of developments was “causing Canadian educators to reconsider curriculum policy with respect to religious education,” among them the “further secularization of society and the corresponding decline of traditional religious authority,” as well as “a growing religious pluralism that was reflected in the presence of large non-Christian religious groups in classrooms, together with children of atheists and agnostics.”¹⁹⁶ Moreover, “changing moral standards regarding sexual and other attitudes and behavior made teachers less willing and able to serve as traditional moral role models.”¹⁹⁷ Tomkins characterizes “draft-avoiding American teachers” as “missionaries of a new secular humanism that in its self-absorption and dogmatic commitment to anti-traditional values of democracy, equality and sexual fulfillment constituted a worldview as uncritically advocated as the hierarchical Christian worldview that it replaced.”¹⁹⁸ Indeed, “religious observance in classrooms was often perfunctory and, despite provincial legislation, was in many cases probably not being carried out at all by 1970.”¹⁹⁹

So, after reading all this it is unsurprising to learn that the MacKay Committee recommended the “removal of religious instruction from the Ontario curriculum,” suggesting instead an optional course on world religions for secondary school students.²⁰⁰ While demoted, even deleted, from the curriculum, religious instruction remained in the form of “character building” which, the Committee declared, “should pervade every curricular and extra-curricular activity through a program ‘carefully planned and administered incidentally throughout the whole school spectrum.’”²⁰¹ While this sounded like “old-fashioned indirect moral instruction,” Tomkins comments, if “short of its religious overtones,” he reports that in fact the idea was to “emphasize moral education for the purpose of stimulating the student’s capacity to make value judgments and moral decisions,” a concept based on “moral values education (MBV) based on Kohlberg’s well-known theory of morality reasoning which used Piaget-style stages of moral development.”²⁰² MacKay proposals caused controversy; church leaders held “predictable reservations, although they seemed to agree that the strongly Protestant orientation of the existing program could no longer be justified.”²⁰³

Moral or values education took three forms: (1) the Cognitive Moral Development (or moral reasoning) approach associated with Kohlberg; (2) a related Reflective Approach associated the Moral Education Project at the OSIE; and (3) Values Clarification, both the “most popular” and “the most controversial.”²⁰⁴ Values Clarification was critiqued by proponents of the first two approaches and by proponents of “traditional Christian-based moral education.”²⁰⁵ Tomkins’s critique is this: “Although the Values Clarification method had worth in encouraging students to become aware of their own values, its failure to distinguish between moral and non-moral questions, and a tendency to reduce all questions to mere matters of opinion and taste without requiring students to justify their own values were serious weaknesses.”²⁰⁶ Moreover, curriculum guidelines recommended “morally neutral discussion of a full range of heterosexual activities aroused predictable opposition while also suggesting how far the Canadian curriculum was moving beyond the advocacy of the traditional moral norms.”²⁰⁷ Tomkins contextualizes these controversies: “Church and state, far from being separated in Canada, had long been partners,” adding that “religious observance was not prohibited as in the American curriculum,” in fact, traditionally it had been required.²⁰⁸

Perhaps this departure from tradition prompted private school enrolments across Canada to increase by more than 40 percent between 1971 and 1978, although, Tomkins notes, in 1978 still more than 96 percent of Canadian children enrolled in public schools.²⁰⁹ Not sure why Tomkins finds “irony in the fact that conservative parents and radical ‘free’ schoolers alike sometimes accused the public schools of preparing to fit mindlessly into a consumer society,”²¹⁰ as detachment might be a prerequisite for insight, regardless one’s ideological standpoint. Suspicions that study in religion-affiliated schools might produce intolerance were allayed by the findings of

research conducted in British Columbia's independent schools: students enrolled there were "significantly less prejudiced towards minority groups than were their public-school counterparts."²¹¹ Another study found that Newfoundland's denominational school system – "the prime example of religious pluralism in Canadian public education" – did not produce "religious intolerance or social divisiveness."²¹² Also on this general topic, a court case premised on the Alberta Bill of Rights required the province to recognize the right of parents to send their children to a Mennonite private school even though its teachers lacked provincial certification.²¹³ It was, Tomkins continues, Alberta that "went farthest during the 1970s in permitting the establishment of religiously based schools within its public system," allocating funds to the Talmud Torah School from the Edmonton Public School District; indeed, "all of its work except certain special cultural out-of-school activities was publicly supported."²¹⁴ Public funding and provincial control of private-school curriculum "blurred the distinction between the public and private sectors."²¹⁵

REFERENCES

- Bloom, Benjamin, et al. 1956. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Cognitive Domain*. David McKay.
- Chambers, Cynthia. 1999. A Topography for Canadian Curriculum Theory. *Canadian Journal of Education* 24 (2), 137-150.
- Cormier, Jeffrey. 2004. *The Canadianization Movement: Emergence, Survival, and Success*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Hodgetts, A. B. 1968. *What Culture? What Heritage? A Study of Civic Education in Canada*. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence. 1981. *Essays on Moral Development*. Harper & Row.
- Neatby, Hilda. 1953. *So Little For The Mind*. Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited.
- Piaget, Jean. 1977. *The Development of Thought: Equilibration of Cognitive Structures*. [Trans. A. Rosin.] Viking.
- Pinar, William F. 2015. *Educational Experience as Lived*. Routledge.
- Pinar, William F. 2019. *What Is Curriculum Theory?* [3rd edition] Routledge.

Pinar, William F. and Irwin, Rita L. Eds. 2005. *Curriculum in a New Key: The Collected Works of Ted T. Aoki*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tomkins, George S. 1986. *A Common Countenance: Stability and Change in the Canadian Curriculum*.
Prentice Hall.

Tyler, Ralph. 1949. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. University of Chicago Press.

ENDNOTES

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid. That party existed from 1942-2003. And Canada's first prime minister, John A. Macdonald, belonged to the Liberal-Conservative Party.

⁶ 1986, 259.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ 1986, 264.

¹¹ 1986, 265.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ 1986, 273.

¹⁹ 1986, 266. On that point, little has changed since Tomkins' text:

<https://en.ccunesco.ca/idealab/reconciliation-and-education-in-canada#:~:text=The%20Truth%20and%20Reconciliation%20Commission%20of%20Canada%20was,operated%20officially%20for%20over%20160%20years%20in%20Canada>

²⁰ 1986, 267.

²¹ Ibid.

²² 1986, 268.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ 1986, 269.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Quoted in 1986, 269.

²⁷ 1986, 269.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid. Correcting curricular deficiencies for adults – adult education as a “self-conscious enterprise” – had emerged during the 1930s (1986, 273-274).

³⁵ Ibid.

-
- ³⁶ 1986, 270.
- ³⁷ Ibid.
- ³⁸ Quoted in 1986, 270.
- ³⁹ 1986, 270.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid.
- ⁴¹ Ibid. Francophone nationalism was directed against Anglophone Canada not the United States.
- ⁴² 1986, 271.
- ⁴³ 1986, 271-272.
- ⁴⁴ Quoted in 1986, 272.
- ⁴⁵ 1986, 279.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid.
- ⁴⁷ 1986, 280. Tomkins discusses Bruner momentarily.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid.
- ⁵¹ Ibid.
- ⁵² Quoted in 1986, 280.
- ⁵³ 1986, 280.
- ⁵⁴ 1986, 281. For the U.S. response, see Pinar 2019, 55-56.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷ 1986, 282.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid.
- ⁵⁹ Quoted in 1986, 286-287.
- ⁶⁰ Quoted in 1986, 287.
- ⁶¹ 1986, 287.
- ⁶² Quoted in 1986, 287.
- ⁶³ 1986, 287.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶⁶ Chambers 1999; research brief #34.
- ⁶⁷ 1986, 287.
- ⁶⁸ 1986, 288.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid.
- ⁷⁰ Ibid.
- ⁷¹ Ibid.
- ⁷² 1986, 289.
- ⁷³ Quoted in 1986, 289.
- ⁷⁴ 1986, 289.
- ⁷⁵ Quoted in 1986, 289.
- ⁷⁶ 1986, 289.
- ⁷⁷ <http://faculty.marianopolis.edu/c.belanger/QuébecHistory/bios/frankunderhill.htm>
- ⁷⁸ Ibid.
- ⁷⁹ Ibid.
- ⁸⁰ Ibid. “Tough-minded” is true but simplistic; Dewey was a larger-than-life intellectual whose erudition and insight were celebrated (and yes criticized) worldwide. And Dewey’s association with Teachers College was intellectual not institutional; his faculty appointment was to Columbia University’s Department of Philosophy.
- ⁸¹ Ibid.
- ⁸² Ibid.
- ⁸³ 1986, 290.
- ⁸⁴ For the US reaction, see Pinar 2019, vii, 55.
- ⁸⁵ 1986, 290. Using “North America” rather than Canada risks obscuring the distinctiveness of all three countries (as Mexico is considered North rather than Central American).
- ⁸⁶ Ibid.
- ⁸⁷ Ibid.
- ⁸⁸ Quoted in 1986, 290.
- ⁸⁹ 1986, 291.
- ⁹⁰ Ibid.
- ⁹¹ Ibid.
- ⁹² Ibid.

-
- ⁹³ 1986, 291-292.
- ⁹⁴ Pinar 2023, ix-x.
- ⁹⁵ 1986, 292.
- ⁹⁶ Quoted in 1986, 292.
- ⁹⁷ 1986, 292.
- ⁹⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹⁹ Quoted in 1986, 292.
- ¹⁰⁰ 1986, 279.
- ¹⁰¹ 1986, 292.
- ¹⁰² Quoted in 1986, 292.
- ¹⁰³ Quoted in 1986, 292-293.
- ¹⁰⁴ 1986, 293.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁸ 1986, 293-294.
- ¹⁰⁹ 1986, 298.
- ¹¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹¹ 1986, 301.
- ¹¹² 1986, 301-302.
- ¹¹³ 1986, 302.
- ¹¹⁴ Quoted in 1986, 302.
- ¹¹⁵ 1986, 303.
- ¹¹⁶ Ibid. Tomkins (1986, 305) tells us that “it was the general thrust of Hall-Dennis rather than its specific proposals that as most influential. The individualization of learning that it advocated served as a rationale for the adoption of the credit system in Ontario’s high schools, which abolished fixed structured programs in favor of individualized timetables and programs that ignored grade barriers and streams.” But, Tomkins adds (almost sixty pages later), that Hall-Dennis made its “greatest impact at the elementary school level” (1986, 363).
- ¹¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁸ 1986, 304.
- ¹¹⁹ Ibid.
- ¹²⁰ 1986, 306.
- ¹²¹ Ibid.
- ¹²² Ibid.
- ¹²³ Ibid.
- ¹²⁴ 1986, 310.
- ¹²⁵ Ibid. Tomkins commits a common error in attributing the “basic principles of curriculum and instruction” – as Tyler titled his book – to Tyler himself: see Pinar 2015, 99ff.
- ¹²⁶ 1986, 311. See Bloom 1956.
- ¹²⁷ 1986, 313.
- ¹²⁸ Ibid.
- ¹²⁹ Ibid. Tomkins also cites Edgar Z. Friedenberg (author of *The Vanishing Adolescent* and *Coming of Age in America*) and George Martell, latter also known for helping to establish *This Magazine is About Schools* (Ibid.)
- ¹³⁰ 1986, 314. Once again Tomkins’ sense of humor appears.
- ¹³¹ Ibid. For Aoki’s collected works, see Pinar and Irwin 2005. Tomkins (1986, 314-317) also mentions Max Van Manen, Michael Connelly, Robin Barrow, and Suzanne de Castell, among others.
- ¹³² 1986, 316.
- ¹³³ 1986, 133.
- ¹³⁴ Ibid.
- ¹³⁵ 1986, 319.
- ¹³⁶ Ibid.
- ¹³⁷ Quoted in 1986, 319.
- ¹³⁸ 1986, 319.
- ¹³⁹ 1986, 320.
- ¹⁴⁰ 1986, 321.
- ¹⁴¹ 1986, 323.
- ¹⁴² 1986, 326.
- ¹⁴³ Quoted in 1986, 327.
- ¹⁴⁴ 1986, 327.
- ¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

-
- 146 Ibid.
- 147 Ibid.
- 148 1986, 328.
- 149 Ibid.
- 150 Ibid.
- 151 Ibid.
- 152 Ibid.
- 153 1986, 329.
- 154 Ibid.
- 155 Ibid.
- 156 Ibid.
- 157 Quoted in 1986, 330.
- 158 1986, 330. That, of course, almost occurred: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/Québec-referendum-1995>
- 159 Ibid.
- 160 Ibid. Note Tomkins' tendency to conflate textbooks with the curriculum.
- 161 Ibid.
- 162 Ibid. I note that here we have the rudiments of an intellectual history of the academic field of curriculum studies in Canada.
- 163 1986, 331.
- 164 1986, 331 The academic field of American Studies had no similarly nationalist origin: https://www.dickinson.edu/info/20090/american_studies/682/what_is_american_studies
<https://www.bartleby.com/essay/The-Field-Of-American-Studies-P33ZXJMTKRY3W>
- 165 Ibid.
- 166 Ibid.
- 167 1986, 332. Cited on this page is Ted Aoki but he doesn't show up in the references.
- 168 1986, 333.
- 169 1986, 335.
- 170 Ibid.
- 171 Ibid.
- 172 1986, 337.
- 173 1986, 338.
- 174 1986, 339.
- 175 1986, 335.
- 176 1986, 339.
- 177 1986, 340.
- 178 Ibid.
- 179 Ibid.
- 180 Ibid.
- 181 Ibid.
- 182 Ibid.
- 183 Ibid.
- 184 1986, 342.
- 185 Ibid.
- 186 1986, 343.
- 187 Ibid.
- 188 Ibid. For a theoretically provocative invocation of this and later era of Indigenous activism, see Coulthard 2014.
- 189 Ibid.
- 190 1986, 344.
- 191 1986, 345.
- 192 1986, 346.
- 193 Ibid.
- 194 Ibid.
- 195 Ibid.
- 196 Ibid.
- 197 Ibid.
- 198 Ibid.
- 199 Ibid.
- 200 1986, 346-347.
- 201 1986, 347.

²⁰² Ibid. See Kohlberg 1981, Piaget 1977.

²⁰³ Ibid.

²⁰⁴ Ibid.

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

²⁰⁶ 1986, 348.

²⁰⁷ Ibid.

²⁰⁸ 1986, 350.

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

²¹⁰ Ibid.

²¹¹ 1986, 351.

²¹² Ibid.

²¹³ Ibid.

²¹⁴ 1986, 352.

²¹⁵ Ibid.