National Diversity and Citizenship Education in Quebec and the United Kingdom

Preliminary Draft
Please do not cite without permission of the author

Raffaele Iacovino
Postdoctoral Fellow
Canada Research Chair in Democracy and Sovereignty
Université du Québec a Chicoutimi

Introduction

Citizenship "confers membership, identity, values, and rights of participation and assumes a body of common political knowledge."[1] Debates surrounding the means and ends of education for citizenship thus not only occur in light of pedagogical practices, but invariably formulate some prescribed ideal for social cooperation. Added to this already complex picture of trying to use education for highly contested ends are observations that the institution of citizenship is presently in a state of crisis in several respects: low levels of democratic engagement within advanced liberal democracies, including concerns about representation (failed institutions, non-recognition of politically salient identities, etc), the issue of managing or accommodating increasingly diverse populations, the growing apathy and distrust in government among youths, and falling levels of trust among fellow citizens.[2]

With regards to citizenship theory more specifically, the contemporary age is increasingly characterized by numerous avenues of exploration concerning the role of national identity as a legitimate organizing principle for the existence of particular states, its relationship to citizenship, the institutional role of federalism in addressing identity-based social cleavages, and the place of culture and other group identities that challenge monocultural and uninational conceptions of liberal democratic political systems.[3] The relatively linear link that was assumed to exist between national identity, sovereignty, citizenship and territory has become a source of protracted contestation among theorists, including normative exercises in de-construction and re-construction of the bases of legitimate political and social orders that has in many ways outpaced perceived empirical transformations of the state and the state system.[4] Contemporary political life is characterized by the sociological fact that politically salient differences are those that are constitutive of identity.

Much liberal theory, as well as many strands of civic republicanism, rely upon methodological individualism as a starting premise, and assume that theoretical frameworks meant to remedy perceived political crises hindering just, stable and legitimate societies remain constant in time and place. As such, most accounts focus on constitutional matters, in the broad sense of the term, rather than specific policy areas. In the field of education for citizenship, however, we actually observe attempts by various states to understand themselves and where they want to go – a somewhat unique policy

---

[1] Kathleen Knight Abowitz and Jason Harnish, "Contemporary Discourses of Citizenship", in *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 76, No. 2, Winter 2006, p. 653.

[2] William Galston, "Civic Knowledge, Civic Education and Civic Engagement: A Summary of Recent Research," in *Constructing Civic Virtue: A Symposium on the State of American Citizenship* (Syracuse, NY: Maxwell Public Affairs Institute, 2003), pp. 35-59.

[3] See Michael Kenny, *The Politics of Identity*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004).

[4] For more on the resilience of the nation form as an avenue for political and social mobilization, sovereignty and citizenship, see Walter Connor, 'National Self-Determination and Tomorrow's Political Map', in Alan C. Cairns, John C. Courtney, Peter MacKinnon, Hans J. Michelmann, and David E. Smith, (eds)., *Citizenship, Diversity and Pluralism: Canadian and Comparative Perspectives*, (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999); and Michael Keating, *Plurinational Democracy: Stateless Nations in a Post-Sovereignty Era*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

area that forces societies to reflect upon, validate and (re)-construct the meanings and relationships of identities that are constitutive of citizenship. The structure and substance of public education for citizenship is unique in the sense that it forces members of particular societies, from parents to elites, to actually ask themselves about what they stand for, what kind of society they want to live in, how they relate to others who are not like themselves by various social markers, what they remember and where they are going – in short, legitimating principles of the political system.

Adding to the complexity of diversity is the particular socio-political configuration of the multinational state, which requires a more sophisticated examination of the political sociology of collective identities that make claims on citizenship.[5] The multinational democracy is characterized by groups with divergent and sometimes conflicting aims with regards to the actual framing of the contours of citizenship, and both theorists and particularly states that are characterized by this condition have been slow to account for this entanglement – and the notion that citizenship spaces are themselves the subject of contestation is not incorporated into the 'fact' of pluralism in such societies.

This paper argues that minority nations that seek to consolidate their standing as self-determining political communities cannot rely on the framework put forward by the bulk of approaches to citizenship education, in both theory and practice, which rely heavily on political/procedural liberalism, civic republicanism, cosmopolitan or critical pluralist frameworks that are undifferentiated. A minority nation's survival as a self-governing group is, by definition, a comprehensive and substantive matter that cannot avoid the stipulation of some explicit collective attributes of citizenship. I will attempt to demonstrate the shortcomings of these justificatory schemes for citizenship education, illustrate how they have dominated recent initiatives to strengthen citizenship education in the United Kingdom and in Quebec, and provide some broad directions for citizenship education in cases constituted by national pluralism. In the context of a multination: Can we at once provide a justificatory framework for the value of national pluralism, or the flourishing of minority nations as legitimate democratic poles of deliberation and decision-moments, while conceiving citizenship education away from the nation and its perceived instrumental benefits – away from traditional patriotic education that seeks to indoctrinate citizens with an uncritical base of knowledge in order to secure allegiance?

Diversity, Theory and Method of Inquiry

It must be acknowledged that the concerns to be addressed here can only be assessed indirectly. Why look at cases and measure approaches in citizenship education against a normative theory that is not empirically grounded? Or why create a justificatory scheme for a structure that has been 'invented' in the first place? I will briefly address these apparent shortcomings.

---

[5] See Will Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); and Alain-G. Gagnon and James Tully, (eds.), *Multinational Democracies*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

First, while these are legitimate concerns, I do not have the required space here to go into a retrieval of the virtues of multinational democracies – I have looked at that question elsewhere.[6] However, if a federal spirit or ideal[7] is expected to prevail in a state characterized by national pluralism, then it is necessary to formulate socialization efforts accordingly – 'conscious social reproduction' cannot be conceived outside of these parameters. If it is, then one is consciously reproducing something else, and citizenship comes to be isolated from the kinds of identities that sustain federalism in these conditions. Conscious social reproduction is not a neutral enterprise – it must provide for the contours of political community.

Second, one must also consider state actions outside of the strict parameters of citizenship education for purposes of consistency. If people collectively decide to make the flourishing of their minority nation a concern, throughout their history and in many other areas of public policy, then why should citizenship education be exempt from this grand orientation? The theorist can thus legitimately point to initiatives that are undercutting attempts made elsewhere, and citizenship education comes to be self-defeating. I suspect that we do not have the analytical tools to appreciate the challenges that multinational democracies place on education for citizenship, and I propose a rough sketch of the virtues of exclusion and contestation as a path to good citizenship in such contexts below.

Third, the constitutional challenges of cultural diversity have led to a methodological awakening. Theorists have begun to look at the actual practices of liberal states with regards to socio-cultural diversity, and whether or not they are empirically committed to the idea of neutrality, and under what set of circumstances.[8] The highly contingent 'facts' of political sociology thus serve as the context through which normative theory is given its parameters. Education for citizenship involves a certain measure of recreating and teaching the political referents through which societies have constituted themselves over time. An ideal-type theory potentially runs the risk of either proposing a complete re-creation of the values and norms that legitimate citizenship in a given society according to the dictates of either a majority or a sectarian minority, or it may altogether strip the society of its particular sources of identity in the name of cosmopolitan or global citizenship, which usually take the form of pre-political rights, exogenous to particular communities and inherently lying outside of the democratic

---

[6] Alain-G. Gagnon and Raffaele Iacovino, *Federalism, Citizenship and Quebec: Debating Multinationalism*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007).

[7] See Michael Burgess, "The Federal Spirit as a Moral Basis to Canadian Federalism", in *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, Vol. 22, Fall 2000; and François Rocher, "Le dynamique Québec-Canada ou le refus de l'idéal fédéral", in Alain-G. Gagnon, (ed.), *Le fédéralisme canadien contemporain: Fondements, traditions, institutions*, (Montréal: Les presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2006).

[8] The authority here is of course Will Kymlicka. See also, Joseph Carens, *Culture, Citizenship and Community: A Contextual Exploration of Justice as Evenhandedness*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Stephen Macedo, *Diversity and Distrust: Civic Education in a Multicultural Democracy*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999); and David Miller, *Principles of Social Justice*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999). For an excellent critical overview of this approach, see Sujit Choudhry, "National Minorities and Ethnic Immigrants: Liberalism's Political Sociology', *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 2002, pp. 54-78.

process. Citizenship, in both its horizontal and vertical manifestations, is a highly contingent institution, particularly in federal states.

In summary, by sidestepping contextual political sociology, or the facts of political sociology, we become players in the constitutive discourses that legitimate the existence of particular political communities at the expense of others. In the view defended here, the political sociology that does normative work requires the theorist to evaluate relationships between collective identities that may or may not be hierarchically positioned in terms of constitutional recognition or relative political influence, based on historical and institutional considerations. Indeed, if the facts of political sociology are regarded as constitutionally significant, then we may debate whether they can legitimately be regarded to contribute to accounts of justice or stability in our broad assessments of good citizenship. If they are not, then we fall back into a seemingly unending and irresolvable line of argumentation about how best to accommodate diversity and pluralism, with some potential pitfalls:

- We cannot define difference through empirical observation, since all groups are conceptualized as confined to the private sphere, the result of voluntary association among individuals. In this case, difference will 'resolve itself' in the public sphere since citizens that are reasonable will seek common ground. On the other hand, we may go in the other direction and treat all groups as purveyors of an identity that requires equal public recognition without differentiating among politically salient aspects of particular groups in order to avoid 'morally arbitrary' distinctions.

- We are unable to discern the legitimacy of various practices of social mobilization in terms of their implications for asymmetrical constitutional treatment and recognition, or differentiated citizenship. In other words, the very construction and legitimacy of institutions should not reflect normative assessments stemming from specific sociological observations, since these variables are taken as constant (universal), non-constitutive (private) or equally-constitutive (enlarged public sphere) in terms of political salience, as well as epiphenomenal or non-hierarchical, and so on. This leaves us with an inability to genuinely debate the impact of diversity on modern polities.

- Institutions that have been negotiated through legitimate democratic practices in a federal state over time do not figure in an account of justice here, since these institutions may be viewed as arbitrarily privileging some groups at the expense of others due to pre-existing power relationships and resources. Denying the socio-political attributes of the multination here can potentially result in attempts to perennially re-constitute a polity for the ends of justice, disregarding the historically grounded constitutional principles of mutual recognition, consent, and continuity.[9] Indeed, justice is not kind to the federal idea if political sociology is disregarded.

---

[9] See James Tully, *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*, (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Justice and stability in a multinational democracy, however, cannot be defended exclusively through a liberal paradigm in order to avoid proceeding in a morally arbitrary manner.[10]   All of the variables that are context-specific and historically relevant to political discourses and socio-political mobilization cannot simply be wished away due to the insistence that citizenship theory should not employ arbitrary criteria. The next section will more clearly expose the dominant justificatory templates upon which citizenship education has been constructed.

Citizenship and Identity: An Overview of Justificatory Schemes for Education

Several ideological templates with normative prescriptions for what ought to constitute good citizenship emerge from a survey of the literature on citizenship education – understood here as 'conventional' in the spectrum of liberal democratic norms.[11] With regards to the place of identity in theoretical accounts of citizenship, three broad conventional approaches can be exposed.

The first tract views the political community itself as a consolidated unit of study – thus citizenship is congruent with the territorial state as a unified and homogeneous entity – in which citizens share some overarching identity. This approach does not question national boundaries and assumes the existence of a 'single cooperative scheme in perpetuity'[12] in theorizing about just political arrangements. The dominant tradition here is political liberalism.[13] Citizens are conceptualized as agents that are free to form, revise and pursue their own definitions of the good life, thus thinner expectations regarding unity and consensus are required. In a simplified account of political liberalism, for example, citizens are expected to deliberate around a set of procedures that are neutral and consensus-based. Learning the values and skills necessary to partake in a culturally diverse public life is thus seen as a competency or a skill that can be applied universally.

In contrast, a second approach challenges the privileged place of national identity in the construction of liberal citizenship along two radically contrasting fronts: i-cosmopolitan thinkers[14] adopt a Kantian liberal perspective in arguing that citizenship cannot be confined to pockets delineated by national identity, since territorial boundaries

---

[10] See Wayne Norman, "Justice and Stability in Multinational Societies", in Alain-G. Gagnon and James Tully, (eds.), *Multinational Democracies*, (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 108-9

[11] For an excellent textual analysis of citizenship education discourses in the United Kingdom and how they have drawn upon these various traditions, see Dina Kiwan, "Uneasy Relationships? Conceptions of 'Citizenship', 'Democracy' and 'Diversity in the English Citizenship Education Policy-Making Process", in *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 2007, pp. 223-235. For a similar exercise in the American context, see Kathleen Knight Abowitz and Josh Harnish, "Contemporary Discourses of Citizenship", in *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 76, No. 2, Winter 2006, pp. 653-690.

[12] John Rawls, "Justice as Fairness: A Briefer Restatement", (Harvard University, typescript), p. 132; cited in Allen Buchanan, "Toward a Theory of Secession", in *Ethics*, Vol. 101, No. 2, (January 1991), p. 324

[13] John Rawls is the reference here, and his work has provided a virtual industry of commentary on the uses and limits of political liberalism as a template for citizenship education in diverse societies.

[14] See Geneviève Nootens, *Désenclaver la démocracie: Des huguenots à la paix des Braves*, (Montreal : Québec Amérique, 2004) ; particularly Chapter 3 for a good overview of this literature.

no longer define the most politically salient aspects of relations between individuals and groups. Collective identities increasingly spill over territorial frontiers, thus some transnational or global level of liberal democratic institutions would be more appropriate in framing citizenship. Rights, responsibilities and identities are universal and transnational.[15] And ii- occupying the other end of the spectrum are critical theorists (pluralist), who reject the link between national identity and citizenship on the basis of its oppressive nature. Since individuals are constituted by their particular social or cultural identities, any attempt by the state to forge a collective will or a comprehensive conception of belonging that re-constructs identities along the lines of the majority is inherently oppressive. This approach thus allows for a differentiation of rights based on the socio-structural needs of particular groups. While cosmopolitan thinkers argue that the waning of national identity as the basis for citizenship ought to result in more universal and transnational conceptions of citizenship, pluralists question the relevance of national identity from within in constructing just political institutions that allow for equal democratic participation and group-differentiated rights.[16]

A third strand does not reject the unifying force of the nation yet attempts to dispel the tendency of liberals to view citizenship through universal and abstract reasoning – where liberal principles can simply be 'plugged into' existing states. A school of liberal nationalists[17] approach particular national identities and institutions as historical and empirical developments whose commitments cannot be ruled out altogether as anathema to liberal universalism, while straying from the temptation to simply assume that the reference for discussions about liberal justice will be the consolidated territorial state. Liberal nationalists attempt to ascertain various compatibilities between the nation form and liberalism as the basis for just and stable citizenship. As such, a shared national identity is taken as either instrumental to other goods that support political doctrines such as liberalism and democracy or intrinsic to the types of dispositions necessary for the flourishing of a sense of common purpose around which legitimate forms of popular sovereignty are institutionalized. One particular dominant variant in the intrinsic camp is civic republicanism, emphasizing a concern for civic pride or the common good as the most salient attribute of citizenship. National symbols and the cultivation of national loyalty are paramount, and the virtues of citizenship are seen as a kind of buttress against the state and the market. This view is also associated with the flourishing of social capital, community service, civic literacy, and so on. In short, citizens are expected to

---

[15] See David Held, *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), for more on the transformations of the links between democratic citizenship and the national state in the contemporary period. For its application to citizenship education, see Martha Nussbaum, "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism", in M. Nussbaum and J. Cohen, (eds.), *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996).

[16] The authority here is Iris Marion Young, "Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship", *Ethics*, Vol. 99, 1989, pp. 250-274; *Exclusion and Democracy*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); and *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990). See also Melissa Williams, *Voice, Trust and Memory*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).

[17] See Yael Tamir, *Liberal Nationalism*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); Will Kymlicka, *Op. Cit.*; Jeffrey Spinner-Halev, *The Boundaries of Citizenship: Race, Ethnicity, and Nationality in the Liberal State*, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1994); and David Miller, *Citizenship and National Identity*, (Oxford: Polity Press, 2000).

assume the responsibilities of self-government as active agents committed to the common good, rather than as passive holders of entitlements.

A brief overview of the recent revival to a commitment to citizenship education in the United Kingdom and Quebec will illustrate the extent to which these dominant paradigms associated with citizenship in the contemporary age have taken hold in the area of education.

Recent Initiatives in Citizenship Education in Quebec and the United Kingdom

Quebec

A few introductory notes are in order. The goal of this section is not to rehash the history wars in Quebec.[18] Rather, its objective is to explore the ideal of citizenship as it is conceived by the recent education reforms in Quebec, which have made an explicit commitment to incorporate citizenship education as a component of social science courses from the 3rd grade (Elementary cycle 2) to the 10th grade (Secondary Cycle 3). In total, students will have been exposed to 8 years of successive courses in citizenship education, linked with either geography or history.

Quebec has moved towards a conception of history education that involves individual interpretation and de-construction of social phenomena – with the aim of allowing students to gain the skills of rational enquiry, evidentiary-based assessment and critical reflection associated with the historical method. The competencies associated with citizenship have thus moved away from knowledge based accounts of particular political institutions or a national history, and towards what Desmond Morton has called 'historical thinking' – teaching skills that an historian would employ in his/her research: causation, patterns of relationships, sequencing, and so on.[19] Identity is presented as a constructed and unencumbered phenomenon – the student is expected to be detached from this subject area in the same way that a social scientist in the strict sense ought to study an object of enquiry.

Historical events are presented as phenomena that are to be interpreted and compared rather than internalized as the precursors of a substantive collective memory – of a grand narrative into which students come to understand their 'place' in the collective project. The end game of identity is conceptualized as somewhat of an individual journey that spans throughout the totality of the school experience and across various disciplines (*compétences transversales*). No particular substantive values are transmitted to students except for the values of openness to diversity and difference (in the broad

---

[18] For an excellent analytical assessment of the recently released Ministerial program for the teaching of history and citizenship education in Secondary Cycles 2 and 3 in Quebec, see "Dossier Thématique: Débat sur le programme d'enseignement de l'histoire au Québec", in *Bulletin d'histoire politique*, Vol. 15, No. 2, Winter, 2007, pp. 7-108.

[19] Desmond Morton, "Canadian History Teaching in Canada: What's the Big Deal", in Ruth W. Sandwell, (ed.), *To the Past: History Education, Public Memory and Citizenship in Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), p. 28.

sense) and democratic deliberation with the aim of producing a capacity for formulating their own conceptions of politically-salient identity.

A few examples will suffice. Among the five 'Broad Areas of Learning' put forward by the QEP, 'Citizenship and Community Life' plays a significant role. The section lists many of the same ideas about exposure to difference and the importance of dialogue in democratic participation. In terms of the actual focus of a student's development in this area, the document proposes three axes,

- Promotion of the rules of social conduct and democratic institutions: democratic process for establishing rules of conduct in the school and in the municipal, national and international contexts; principles of democracy; charters and basic laws; actors in the democratic process and respect for the role of each one; rights and responsibilities associated with democratic institutions; other ideologies and forms of political organization; protection of the citizen and mechanisms for redress.

- Participation, cooperation and solidarity; principles, rules and strategies for teamwork; decision-making process based on compromise, consensus, etc.; establishment of egalitarian relationships; debate and argumentation; leadership; mutual help; community action projects.

- Contribution to a culture of peace; international conflicts; concept of power, interdependence of individuals, generations and peoples; equal rights; negative consequences of stereotypes and other forms of discrimination or exclusion; action to combat poverty and illiteracy; familiarization with students of cooperation and of aggression; peaceful management of power relations; respect for agreements or contracts.[20]

Each one of these axes relies on a normativity that is based on procedural and formal conceptions of liberal democratic citizenship that can conceivably be stripped from any contemporary state in the Western world. Citizenship is divorced from the particular social, cultural and political contingencies related to Quebec's status as a minority nation in Canada, and what this entails for constitutional questions. The QEP takes liberal democratic citizenship to be somewhat antithetical to any conception of popular sovereignty that is framed around the collective goals related to national identity.

In the multination, such procedural and formal approaches to citizenship move the substantive political community of reference to the larger as the formal site of collective identification. Indeed, the pedagogical act of 'naming' the nation is a necessary prerequisite on the long road of internalizing national pluralism as the fundamental

---

[20] Gouvernement du Québec, *Quebec Education Program: Secondary School Education, Cycle 1*, (Quebec City: Ministère de l'Éducation, 2004), p. 29.

structuring principle for citizenship. This cannot simply be replaced by proclaiming some vague commitment to 'pluralism', devoid of contextual meaning. Again, the 'community' is presented as an abstract entity that requires a toolkit based on ethical individualism in order to situate oneself meaningfully within its boundaries. Citizenship becomes a vocation – something you learn to do, not as a member of a particular nation or culture, or even through the lens of a conflicted national identity, but simply as an individual with the developed faculties associated with critical thought. Citizenship is conceived as a 'method', and anyone can thus learn it in order to successfully practice democracy and address politically-salient cleavages with fellow citizens – hardly what Michael Oakeshott[21] meant when discussing the salience of tradition, convention and historical meaning in political education.

The key driving principles associated with such an approach are 'rapid change' and the capacity for 'adaptation'. These skills, in other words, are almost meant to be applied to any group situation, in any country, at any point in history in which free citizens are faced with arriving at a particular decision that is not framed specifically in terms of its political character. Democracy becomes a hypothetical game that simulates generic collective action scenarios – hardly an approach that would allow students to grasp the constitutional challenges and collective understanding associated with being a citizen of Canada.

In a section entitled 'Competency 3: Constructing his/her Consciousness of Citizenship through the Study of History', the document explicitly defines identity as a social phenomenon linked to processes of individual self-discovery. In a multination state, however, the substantive differentiation among collective projects is a defining principle of the shared polity – it cannot be avoided in any account of citizenship education, even if the goal is to avoid the national indoctrination usually associated with the teaching of an exclusive and ethnocentric conception of national history. Consider the way the main challenges associated with being a citizen in Quebec is presented in the following passage:

> One of the challenges facing a pluralistic society like that of Quebec is to reconcile shared membership in a community with the diversity of identities. Students must develop a sense of who they are relative to other individuals characterized by numerous differences: individuals define themselves in relation to others, by relating to others. Constructing one's social identity, intentionally and thoughtfully, involves seeking to discover the origin of difference and specificity and the factors that explain them. This process enables students to understand that their identity is both personal and plural and that pluralism is not incompatible with the sharing of values, particularly those related to democracy.[22]

---

[21] See Michael Oakeshott, "Political Education", in Michael Sandel, (ed.), *Liberalism and its Critics*, (New York: New York University Press, 1984).

[22] Gouvernement du Québec, *Quebec Education Program: Secondary School Education, Cycle 1*, (Quebec City: Ministère de l'Éducation, 2004), p. 306.

How can we teach this link without understanding the political processes through which social identity has come to be considered constitutive of citizenship in the first place – how it has manifested itself in the contemporary era?

In order to reflect a strong commitment to value pluralism, or for the purposes of this study, to national pluralism as the basis of co-existence, there has to be some explicit exposure to a plurality of values that went into the structure of citizenship as it has manifested itself within the country of citizenship in question – and this entails studying political conflicts and the public justifications surrounding them. This requires that we do not view citizenship as some residual category based on universal markers associated with critical judgment, human rights, democratic deliberation, diversity, difference, undifferentiated pluralism, and so on. The perspective adopted by the QEP in effect serves to socialize students to think that wholesale social change is not only possible, but desirable – as the primary marker of good citizenship – and that political traditions, contestations, and narratives that have taken shape over time are merely constructs that can summarily be discarded or reinterpreted or left intact.

In the QEP documents relating to Secondary Cycles 2 and 3, which directly address the Quebec/Canada context, the shunning of collective identification as the basis for citizenship is explicit:

> En Occident, dans le contexte de l'avènement des États-nations il y a un peu plus d'un siècle, la généralisation de l'éducation historique à l'école publique s'est faite à partir de préoccupations relatives à l'éducation citoyenne. Au moyen d'un récit historique, il s'agissait entre autres d'inculquer aux citoyens une identité nationale et la validité de l'ordre social et politique établi. De nos jours, l'éducation à la citoyenneté occupe encore une large place dans l'enseignement de l'histoire et vise à former des citoyens capable d'une participation sociale ouverte et éclairée au sein de l'espace public, conformément aux principes et aux valeurs démocratiques. Le présent programme s'inscrit dans ce courant de pensée: il devrait aider les élèves à développer une éthique citoyenne considérée dans ses dimensions sociale et politique.[23]

In the first year of study in the 2nd cycle, students are expected to interpret the founding of Canadian federalism through the analytical lens of "la dynamique entre l'industrialisation et les transformations sociales, territoriales et politiques, notamment la mise en place des institutions politiques fédérales, que les élèves sont appelés à étudier la réalité sociale La formation de la fédération canadienne."[24] Rather than go over the various interpretations debated by historians with regards to the origins of confederation – still a hotly debated aspect that is integral to the 'Canadian conversation' today, the 'citizenship exercise' expected from students is to employ the historical method in order that they may interpret the 'social reality' that is confederation. Moreover, the 'lesson'

---

[23] Gouvernement du Québec, *Programme de formation de l'école québécoise, Enseignement secondaire, Deuxième cycle* : Domaine de l'univers social, (Quebec City: Ministère de l'Éducation, 2007), p. 1
[24] *Ibid*., p. 52.

that stems from this exercise of interpretation of the past and present is that political power is ultimately defined and applied by individuals in their role as citizens, even in the face of economic transformations. Citizenship is thus linked to some vague conception of political agency, yet there is no word about a binational conception of confederation based on a view of two founding peoples; the debates between a legislative union and a federal state; the federal principle based on a national compact theory, etc. The great political debates related to the contours of collective identity that led to confederation are simply disregarded.[25]

A second example emerges from the historical treatment of the Quiet Revolution. There is no mention of the nationalist impetus of the era and the increasingly tense relations with the federal government. While some debates about Quebec nationalism is as an attribute of the 1970's is noted, there is nothing about the actual intensity of the debates themselves, as though the nationalist movement was but another social phenomenon. Moreover, the only instance in which the Government of Canada is mentioned is in a passing reference to the 1975 signing of the *Convention de la Baie-James et du Nord québécois*, since the federal government was a signatory. The particular analytical lens through which students are invited to study the period is based on the changing mentality and role of the Quebec state. Again, students are asked to interpret this particular social reality by bringing their conceptions of contemporary 'governance' issues in Quebec and employing such insights towards an understanding of the social changes associated with the modernization process in Quebec between 1930 and 1980.

Politics is reduced to 'governance' issues, and virtually all significant constitutional repercussions of the period in question are disregarded. Citizenship is depicted as a problem-solving activity, undertaken with other individuals that are in the process of interpreting social reality – this is the fundamental basis for collective action. There is no direct reference to the Quebec nation, nor indeed, to the dynamics associated with the larger multination.

Michel Seymour asks a very pertinent question in this regard:[26] Why is citizenship thus situated as a component of history education and not within an ethics course if competencies are the real purpose of citizenship education? His answer is that this is due to the imposition of an artificial conception of citizenship – one that treats the idea of a civic nation as an oxymoron. Citizenship is situated in a non-conflictual space meant to transcend nationalism. Nationalism is interpreted as the expression of a sectarian doctrine, thus one of the aims of citizenship education is to overcome it – leaving consolidated nation-states in a better position to fill such a void relative to minority nations. For Louis LeVasseur, the purpose is to make the school a prominent

---

[25] Gouvernement du Québec, *Programme de formation de l'école québécoise, Enseignement secondaire, Deuxième cycle : Domaine de l'univers social*, (Quebec City: Ministère de l'Éducation, 2007), p. 53.

[26] See Michel Seymour, "L'impossible neutralité face à l'histoire. Remarques sur les documents de travail du MEQ 'Histoire et éducation à la citoyenneté' (Secondaire 3 et 4)" , in 'Dossier Thématique, *Op. Cit.* p. 29

actor in the construction of a modern political space based on the thin consensual bases of communicational agreement:

> (…) l'éducation à la citoyenneté favorise le passage d'une rationalité subjective monologique à une rationalité intersubjective orientée vers la construction de nouvelles références culturelles non plus imposées verticalement mais définies horizontalement. Autant la mission d'instruction, notamment par le développement de compétences communicationnelles, que celle de socialisation, orientée vers la gestion pacifique des conflits mais également vers le développement de compétences communicationnelles, contribuent à la sortie de la modernité de son impasse. [27]

The consequence is that students feel either; less bound to Quebec as a reference for political community; less bound to the Canadian project and the ideal of federalism as a cornerstone of belonging (indeed, the lack of awareness in what federalism entails, relative to national identity, is striking) and as another reference for democratic practice; and ignorant of the idea that the exercise of legitimate popular sovereignty must entail finite constitutional delineation – since citizens cannot expect to deliberate topics, reach conclusions, compromises, impasse …etc, with whomever they choose. Moreover, the powerful appeal of democratic or liberal education constitutes a double blow for the minority nation, since it is perceived to be favouring a less progressive educational policy if it chooses to abandon basic liberal commitments to neutrality about the good life in favour of more robust views premised on the fostering of particular collective goods.

United Kingdom[28]

The broad orientations of citizenship education in the United Kingdom largely follow from a policy review chaired by Sir Bernard Crick in 1998.[29] In much of the postwar period, the cross-party consensus on the form of British citizenship was largely based on T.H. Marshall's classic triad of political, civil and social rights. Indeed, beginning with Margaret Thatcher's assault on the 'entitlements' engendered by social rights through a national welfare state, and to more recent concerns about the lack of engagement and participation among citizens, Marshall's framework has increasingly

---

[27] Louis LeVasseur, "Éducation à la citoyenneté et missions d'instruction et de socialisation de l'école québécoise", in *Canadian Journal of Education*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 2006, pp. 613.

[28] In the United Kingdom, the British parliament is responsible for education in England, Northern Ireland and Wales, while Scotland frames its own policies on education.

[29] More recently the Ajegbo Report has served as somewhat of an 'update' to the Crick report with a greater emphasis on the challenges relating to racism and ethno-cultural diversity, particularly in light of the national debate on integration that emerged after the terrorist bombings in London. While the report added a fourth strand to the Crick Report entitled 'Identity and Diversity: Living Together in the UK' it nevertheless has not supplanted the broad orientations established by the Crick Report. Diversity is still taken as a de-politicized phenomenon that can be addressed through awareness and exchange, without challenging the basic parameters of the political community in question. See Audrey Osler, "Citizenship Education and the Ajegbo Report: Re-imagining a Cosmopolitan Nation", in *London Review of Education*, Vol. 6, No. 1, March 2008, pp. 11-25.

been viewed as neglecting the participatory aspects of citizenship. Citizenship education for active rather than passive citizenship has thus become a primary concern.[30]

The report was accepted, and citizenship education became part of the national curriculum in 2002. The Crick Report clearly stipulates the orientations of citizenship education in its mission statement:

> We aim at no less than a change in the political culture of this country both nationally and locally: for people to think of themselves as active citizens, willing, able and equipped to have an influence in public life and with the critical capacities to weigh evidence before speaking and acting; to build on and to extend radically to young people the best in existing traditions of community involvement and to make them individually confident in finding new forms of involvement and action among themselves.[31]

The overriding principle is that schools ought to instill the capacities for active participation in students, in order that civic republican virtues and concern for the general welfare will manifest themselves among future agents. Three primary avenues for 'effective' citizenship education are social and moral responsibility; community involvement; and political literacy. The last goal is specifically conceptualized in wider terms than traditional political knowledge, and it encompasses issues of a local, national or international nature, conflict resolution techniques and processes of decision-making, and the capacity to assess the rationale for taxation and the allocation of public resources.

With regards to the 'aims' of citizenship in the face of a diversity of identities, the Crick report stipulated that unity and commonness ought to prevail:

> The main aim for the whole community should be to find or restore a sense of common citizenship, including a national identity that is secure enough to find a place for the plurality of nations, cultures, ethnic identities and religions long found in the United Kingdom. Citizenship education creates common ground between different ethnic and religious identities.[32]

Diversity management is framed around a sort of contract where newly arrived citizens learn about the 'four component parts' of the United Kingdom and citizens of the UK adopt a more international conception of belonging, with a privileged place for attempts to understand 'the homelands of our minority communities and to the main countries of

---

[30] See Keith Faulks, "Rethinking Citizenship Education in England: Some Lessons from Contemporary Social and Political Theory", in *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 2006, pp. 123-140.

[31] Sir Bernard Crick (Chair), Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA), *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools*, (Crick Report), London, 1998, pp. 7-8.
http://www.qca.org.uk/libraryAssets/media/6123_crick_report_1998.pdf

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

British emigration. At the same time, citizenship is clearly meant to be superimposed on nationality based-allegiances – to fulfill its function as the primary source of allegiance.

Like Quebec, the report also stresses that history education is particularly relevant in terms of its methodological benefits for the fostering of skills of rational enquiry. Moreover, learning about British democracy and its pluralist society provides an essential conceptual and institutional foundation to learning outcomes. The use of evidence and processes of enquiry in historical thinking contributes to the capacity to make informed decisions when engaging with contemporary issues of concern'.[33]

Diversity is thus taken as a 'universal' condition, without a full exploration of its implications, its historical and political salience, and its highly contingent character. Participation as the overriding virtue is a skill, regardless of where it is undertaken, and such competencies as elements of citizenship are meant to provide students with the capacities to manage diversity in their future interactions. The report also avoids difficult political questions related to diversity management, including the issue of race.[34] Dina Kiwan has argued that in relation to identity, the report adopts a strictly civic republican approach that is meant to provide a transcendental framework for common purpose. Identity outside of citizenship thus conceived is thus rendered as a personal characteristic. In an interview, Crick stated this explicitly,

> We didn't deal with national identity and that was quite deliberate. I said we're not dealing with nationality, we're dealing with a skill, a knowledge, and attitude for citizenship.[35]

The idea that democracy politicizes collective identity is meant to be 'corrected' by citizenship, which Crick has elsewhere described as the practice of free politics based on knowledge as historically and logically prior to democracy. As such, the mediation of group interests through compromise and dialogue, through active citizenship, is seen as a much more propitious avenue for citizenship education than democracy.[36] The distinction with Quebec's emphasis on democratic deliberation as a cure-all is clear, yet the Crick Report still engages with a conception of political conflict that is unbounded by political sociology – political actors are defined in terms of interests rather than identities, and are thus taken as temporary manifestations, and participation through community initiatives and volunteer work, for example, can alleviate such interest-based clashes in ways that the majoritarian institutions of democracy cannot.[37] Psycho-social characteristics of individuals are to be cultivated, and large political questions dealing

---

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

[34] See Hugh Starkey, "Diversity and Citizenship in the Curriculum", in *London Review of Education*, Vol. 6, No. 1, March 2008, pp. 5-10.

[35] Dina Kiwan, "Citizenship Education in England at the Crossroads? Four Models of Citizenship and their Implications for Ethnic and Religious Diversity", in *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol. 34, No. 1, 2007, p. 46.

[36] See Sir Bernard Crick, "Citizenship: The Political and the Democratic", in *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 55, No. 3, September 2007, pp. 235-248.

[37] For more on the failure of the Crick report to recognize the growing importance of conflicting identities with political salience, as manifestations of structural inequalities, see Faulks, *Op. Cit.*

with structural disadvantage and racism, for example, are attributed with less importance.[38]

In a more recent contribution, and in light of the terrorist bombing in the United States and in London, Sir Bernard Crick has more explicitly stated his intentions. He argues that diversity is too complex on which to build common attributes of citizenship, and national sovereignty in particular has to be so qualified that it barely means anything any longer. Consider this passage:

> So Britishness must express a 'shared purpose' and 'shared goals'? And [Gordon Brown] wants this to be taught in the 'new citizenship curriculum', forgetting that it only applies to schools in England. Such language is like that of the old-fashioned nationalism of central Europe between the two World Wars. But is that really how states hold together, especially in the modern world of, whether we like it or not, a global economy and of all notions of national sovereignty needing to be so qualified as to be almost useless in understanding actual politics. I do not believe in overriding national 'purpose', rather, I believe in behaviour, decent civic behaviour to each other as common citizens.[39]

The idea is that citizenship is still conceived as a way to put a finite quality into existing state structures – a response to a perceived crumbling of the purposes of a state.

In Scotland, a report[40] that followed a wide-ranging consultation exercise led by the *Advisory Council of Learning and Teaching Scotland* provides the blueprint for citizenship education. The document's introduction clearly highlights the familiar tenor of a renewed concern for citizenship education:

> The main contention of this paper is that young people's education in school and early education settings has a key role to play in fostering a modern, democratic society, whose members have a clear sense of identity and belonging, feel empowered to participate effectively in their communities, and recognize their roles and responsibilities as global citizens.[41]

Like the Crick report, the essential attribute of citizenship emphasized by the report is active participation:

---

[38] For more on this point, see Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey, "Citizenship Education and National Identities in France and England: Inclusive or Exclusive?" in *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 2001, pp. 299-300.

[39] Sir Bernard Crick, "Citizenship, Diversity and National Identity", in *London Review of Education*, Vol. 6, No. 1, March 2008, p. 36.

[40] Pamela Munn (Chair), *Education for Citizenship in Scotland: A Paper for Discussion and Development (2002)*; http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/citizenship/images/ecsp_tcm4-122094.pdf

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

> Education for citizenship is important because every society needs people to contribute effectively, in a variety of ways, to the future and well-being of communities and the environment, locally, nationally and globally. Fostering active and responsible citizens contributes to the process of developing a healthy and vibrant culture of democratic participation. (…) Broadly speaking, the citizenship that formal education should seek to promote and foster needs to be *thoughtful* and *responsible* – rooted in and expressive of, a respectful and caring disposition in relation to people, human society generally, the natural world and the environment. It should also be *active*, in the sense of people being able to act and participate in various communities, wherever it seems to them desirable or appropriate to do so.[42]

The report privileges four main areas of socialization: knowledge and understanding; skills and competences; values and dispositions; and creativity and enterprise. Like the Crick Report, citizenship is taken as an individual attribute that can be applied to various situations that will confront future citizens, including 'work' and 'personal growth'. Moreover, the report did not recommend that a course devoted to citizenship education be developed, as such competencies and knowledge are expected to emerge out of a cross-section of related courses and through general school activities. For example, classrooms ought to be increasingly organized around a participatory ethos, while extra-curricular activities related to community involvement are strongly encouraged.

The most revealing sections are Annexes A and B, where the report lists a series of areas of 'knowledge' that are expected to contribute directly to responsible citizenship. The list includes statements such as: 'knowledge of the natural and made worlds in which we live'; 'structures and processes of democratic societies – locally, nationally and internationally'; a list of areas which students must be aware of, including media literacy, arts, business practices, technology, and so on; a fundamental respect for the 'diversity of identities – religious, ethnic, cultural, regional, national – within Scotland, across the UK and worldwide'; sources of conflict between individuals and groups and some problem-solving mechanisms; and finally, there is one brief mention of 'how Scottish society has evolved in the wider British, European and global context'.[43]

Annex B provides a list of core and generic skills expected to emerge from citizenship education: Core skills emphasize problem-solving, teamwork, the ability to assess and analyze practical problems in the community, and most importantly, the ability to communicate effectively with fellow citizens, including the capacity to provide reasons and argue effectively. Among the generic skills, the primary emphasis is on self-reliance, the ability to creatively find solutions to problems, the capacity to 'imagine' alternate futures for the betterment of society, and finally, the ability to experience empathy and a respect for others through such a lens.[44]

---

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 9-10, (original emphasis).
[43] *Ibid.*, p. 36.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

Again, the problem with such approaches in multination states is that participation in civil society, or in any social setting for that matter, as a focus of citizenship, rather than political cleavages relating to questions of identity, does not provide any the legitimating contours of popular sovereignty – there is no community of reference, therefore the beneficiary will be the larger state, or at least it will create a sense of ambiguity with regards to questions of belonging. The following section will provide a rough overview of some substantive and procedural aspects of multinational citizenship education.

Multinational Citizenship Education: Some Preliminary Observations

National Pluralism and Citizenship Education

Charles Taylor has powerfully described the legitimating idea of popular sovereignty as it applies to minority nations, and merits quotation in full:

> The polity emanates from the people, and therefore legitimately rules over them. Thence comes the drive to homogenization. Whoever is not part of the people, not party to the common understanding, lacks an important reason to feel bound by its decisions. This emerges clearest with national or cultural minorities. Where the majority understand the polity as the expression of their nation, or agreed purpose, whatever it be, the minority will feel crucially left out. Public debate swirls around them, while ignoring their crucial concerns, or worse, referring to them as a 'problem' which public policy has to deal with. (…) this same drive [homogenization] produces the intense anxiety that many people feel in democracies whenever regimes are proposed which give special status to minorities, however justified in the name of substantive equality. Indeed, the very inability to understand equality as distinct from uniformity draws on this fear that our peoplehood will be undermined by any recognition of non-homogeneity.[45]

As Jocelyn Maclure has shown in the case of Quebec, the nation form as a reference for belonging has historically provided the basis for much of the political community's political/identitive narrative.[46] As such, socio-political mobilization, or the very project aimed at determining the boundaries of citizenship in Quebec draws upon what people have been conditioned to believe about commonness and unity, about contestation and consensus, about the place of individuals and groups in the wider Canadian context, and so on. The specificity of political identities in distinct political communities is also brought to light in a broader perspective by Michael Walzer, who employs the term 'shared understanding' to capture this phenomenon that is usually left out of conventional

---

[45] See Charles Taylor, "Multiculturalism and Political Identity", in *Ethnicities*, Vol. 1, No. 4, (2001), pp. 123-124.

[46] See Jocelyn Maclure, *Quebec Identity*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003).

approaches.[47] If identities are to be taken seriously in liberal accounts, then discounting the nation form in discussions about education in multinational democracies misses a big part of the picture in terms of how political communities have consolidated their legitimacy in the eyes of their citizens.

Contemporary approaches thus fail to distinguish between communities of reference to which education 'attaches' individuals. Citizens of the multination must be endowed with a sense of the intrinsic value of national diversity itself, and monist conceptions of citizenship can never effectively articulate the value pluralism necessary for such norms to take hold.[48] Indeed, political mechanisms associated with devolution of powers, through institutions such as federalism (competence over education for member-states of the federation), or even more substantive expressions of recognition such as provisions for special status, are by themselves not sufficient for generating this kind of intrinsic acceptance of national pluralism because they merely scratch the surface on an institutional level – they do not fundamentally contribute to 'shaping' citizen dispositions or identities in this direction. This is precisely why education is such a prominent component of citizenship. As Ferran Requejo argues,

> Recognition implies multilaterality. In other words, it must be done in a number of directions: from each national collective to the others and vice versa. It is not, therefore, a question that can be assimilated into the distribution of a system of freedoms or material resources.[49]

In other words, national pluralism ought to be internalized as an integral aspect of citizenship.

Citizenship Education for the Multination

The following theorists have proposed novel approaches to the question of reconciling citizenship with various expressions of difference, conceived in political terms. While I cannot provide a tight theoretical picture at this stage, these authors nevertheless provide much insight into thinking about citizenship education for multination states that does not simply superimpose thinner, procedural or identity negating principles on the larger society as the primary markers of belonging.

Drawing on Maclure and his conception of pluralist public reason, essentiality on both national and socio-cultural scales can be avoided in such a structure due to the presence of separate *demoi*. Public reason in a context of national pluralism is thus best conceptualized as a 'politics of disclosure' that builds upon and enriches the idea of making claims for recognition. Since it has been established that identity cannot be a

---

[47] Michael Walzer, *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*, (New York: Basic Books, 1983). See also Charles Taylor, *Philosophical Arguments*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997).

[48] See Bhikhu Parekh, *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*, (London: Macmillan, 2000).

[49] Ferran Requejo, "Value Pluralism and Multinational Federalism", in *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, Vol. 50, No. 1, 2004, p. 25.

purely private matter, as some political liberals claim, a structure of public reason must thus account for the fact of non-neutrality and be seen as the expression of heterogeneous and contested identities in the constitution of citizenship:

> The focus must be shifted from the end-state of recognition to the form of democratic activity embedded in struggling for recognition. (…) Identity politics must be thought of not only as struggles for recognition, but also as games of disclosure and acknowledgment.[50]

For Maclure, the interplay of identities struggling for mutual recognition cannot be met with definitive resolution. A politics of disclosure is a constant process of deliberation around the idea of recognition, and the much sought after civic 'virtues' that liberals seek in conditions of cultural and moral pluralism are the latent result of such a structure. Citizenship comes to be imbued with the norm of national and cultural pluralism – it is not an end-state that structures unity, but a device through which horizontal and vertical relations of citizenship are negotiated. The reciprocity to which Requejo appealed is more apparent when monism is rejected as the basis for public reason. Maclure highlights some implications of this approach,

> (P)articipants both get to speak in their own terms and according to their own narratives and seek to make their claims intelligible in the language of the other participants. (…) One can learn about different comprehensive doctrines, to move to another's position and to situate one's own ontology in a plural ontological landscape through the activity of exchanging reasons with diverse others. (…) By focusing on the similarities and differences among people and peoples, we seem to catch sight of an escape route from the alleged paralyzing effect of post-structuralism and from political liberalism's problematic commitment to consensualism.[51]

The act of disclosure itself, in an ongoing democratic conception of recognition, produces public exchanges that do not rest upon essentiality. As Parekh reminds us, cultures have no essence, they contain competing narrative elements. Universal values, however, strip away the internal resources with which to evaluate, transform and adapt to cultures – they remove the sources of meaningful horizontal citizenship in the name of social unity and common purpose. In approaches that rest on minimal conceptions of autonomy or tolerance, such consensual values are necessarily very thin in order for agreement to emerge, yet this brings us back to justifications about the place of national diversity in the first place. The virtues usually associated with the reproduction of liberal-democracy cannot in themselves respond to national diversity.

Chantal Mouffe also provides an important contribution in highlighting the limits of individualistic, universal and rationalist frameworks for the resolution of political

---

[50] Jocelyn Maclure, "The Politics of Recognition at an Impasse? Identity Politics and Democratic Citizenship", in *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 36, No. 1, (March, 2003), p. 4.
[51] *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

questions. For Mouffe, structures based on formal ethics or procedural frameworks, currently the vogue in theories about deliberative democracy that seek to reconcile unity with pluralism, fail to grasp the vary nature of political conflict. As such, a 'moral' conception of individual rationality comes to replace economic models premised on interest-based considerations, yet it remains limited and limiting to the extent that it views politics as an area that can be resolved if only everyone followed certain principles, or rules. In her words,

> By proposing to view reason and rational argumentation, instead of interest and aggregation of preferences as the central issue of politics, they simply move from an economic model to a moral one. Their move consists in replacing the market-inspired view of the public sphere by another conception that conceives political questions as being of a moral nature and therefore susceptible of being decided rationally. This means that they identify the democratic public sphere with the discursive redemption of normative validity claims. It is clear that what is missing, in both approaches, is the dimension of the political.[52]

Mouffe proposes 'agonistic pluralism' as an alternative in managing socio-political diversity. In this perspective both power and legitimacy are taken as constitutive of social relations, as opposed to deliberative models in which power is altogether eliminated in favour of distinct rules based on a certain form of rationality. Mouffe is concerned not with discounting power altogether in legitimate social relations, but to ask what sort of power is compatible with democratic values, since power is always an integral element of the social. Through this understanding of political life, Mouffe arrives at the following conclusion with regards to pluralism:

> Politics aims at the creation of unity in a context of conflict and diversity; it is always concerned with the creation of an "us" by the determination of a "them". The novelty of democratic politics is not the overcoming of this us/them distinction – which is what a consensus without exclusion pretends to achieve – but the different way in which it is established. What is at stake is how to establish the us/them discrimination in a way that is compatible with pluralist democracy.[53]

As such, an agonistic relationship between adversaries, as opposed to the seemingly irreconcilable situation of antagonism between enemies, can very well constitute the legitimate basis of democratic exchange between collective identities, which will inevitably involve constant shifting and evolving of such identities in contact – more on the level of slow conversion over time, rather than the rational persuasion associated with consensus. Mouffe's conclusion is particularly poignant with regards to the paradox of formulating the rules of democratic practices through a lens that attempts to eliminate

---

[52] Chantal Mouffe, "Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism", in *Social Research*, Vol. 66, No. 3, (Fall, 1999), pp. 745-6.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 755.

political conflict, and speaks directly to the norms inherent in multinational democracy that were developed above:

> By postulating the availability of a non-exclusive public sphere of deliberation where a rational consensus could obtain, they imagine that they can close the gap between legitimacy and rationality, finally resolving the tension that exists in democracy between the collective will and the will of all. But this is to transform pluralist democracy into a self-refuting ideal, since the moment of its realization would also be the moment of its disintegration.
>
> (…) By warning us against the illusion that a fully achieved democracy could ever be instantiated, [agonistic pluralism] forces us to keep the democratic contestation alive. An "agonistic" democratic approach acknowledges the real nature of its frontiers and recognizes the forms of exclusion that they embody, instead of trying to disguise them under the veil of rationality or morality.[54]

Finally, while not directly addressing the condition of multinational democracy, Daniel Weinstock nevertheless makes some key arguments about the necessity of framing the boundaries of public reason without necessarily discarding the idea that public positions will almost inevitably be tinged with comprehensive perspectives. With regards to the impact on religion instruction and the capacity to engage in public reason, he notes that:

> Les partisans de la raison publique, qu'ils aient opéré dans un cadre habermassien ou davantage libéral, ont tous été tentés par l'idée, fallacieuse à notre avis, que la discipline de la raison publique nécessaire à la santé et à la vigueur des débats démocratiques peut être spécifiée sous forme de règles. Or, il semble que la raison publique est presque autant un « savoir-faire » qu'un « savoir-que ». (…). Il faut une sensibilité au contexte conversationnel, plutôt qu'un ensemble de règles qui constitueraient LA raison publique, afin de savoir dans une situation particulière quel est le type d'attitude requise pour mener la délibération à bon port.[55]

While Weinstock looks specifically at religion, I argue that expressions of collective popular sovereignty in multinational democracies are amenable to the same kind of reasoning. Weinstock is concerned about the wealth of knowledge and deliberation that has been produced historically by religion, and only discounts its inclusion within a framework of public reason in cases where citizens elevate their religious beliefs to the level of non-negotiable identity and in instances where deliberation is cut off due to an

---

[54] *Ibid*. pp. 756-7.
[55] Daniel Weinstock, "Religion, raison publique et éducation à la citoyenneté", in André Duhamel and France Jutras, (eds.), *Enseigner et éduquer à la citoyenneté*, (Quebec City: Les Presses de L'Université Laval, 2005), pp. 240-241.

interlocutor's insistence that the spiritual instruction they bring to the debate is the final authority.

In terms of the kind of citizenship I propose in the multination, the logic is similar. The condition of multinationality is a politically-salient historical contingency through which citizens have viewed their place in the larger association. Denying this aspect of existence undercuts a narrative that has provided a wealth of wisdom, reasoned debate, mutual understanding and contestation, political agonism, and generally, a more sophisticated understanding of the role of national identity as it relates to citizenship in these states. For educators concerned with providing students with the tools to engage with the political system as responsible and informed individuals, an emphasis on procedures and competencies serves only to reinforce the notion that past generations had little to contribute to citizenship; that history is interesting only as it relates to contemporary events; and that national identity is one of those relics of the past that 'good' citizens interpret as being inimical to democracy, since it is taken as divisive and interest-based – just another authoritarian mechanism that kept individuals from 'emancipation' – like religion, family or any other constraining source of meaning that dominate the generations of their ancestors.

In multinational citizenship education, one will be exposed to one or more separate political communities with whom you must invariably negotiate the substantive requirements of citizenship, including the actual extent of political interdependence itself. A monist approach to citizenship cannot allow for this – it is automatically ruled out because citizenship is seen as a transcendental category – an institution whose very purpose is to define the boundaries of collective purpose. Transcendent universalism is inadequate as a public educational philosophy in the multination, since a plurality of 'publics' seek the capacity to reproduce themselves and flourish as self-governing groups.

Since national identity is constantly under scrutiny in the multination – within a citizen's self-understanding, not by a literal 'overseer', the perils of homogeneity are more likely to be pre-empted and the pressures for moral monism as the basis for citizenship are less likely to take hold. The contingent nature of belonging to a collective identity with national overtones is not fixed – it has an immediate reference for comparison, thus avoiding the charge of essentialism that is often levied against minority nations that make claims in the public sphere. Such developments, or course, are more aptly theorized in their implications for minimal educational purposes – in the larger setting, citizens may still view citizenship as nothing but a formal category that allows them to pick and choose whatever they might want to do with their lives.

On a more practical level, and in the Canadian context, multinational citizenship education might include debates about why Quebeckers are divided over the Charter; it might explore the aims of the Charter; it might expose students in the ROC to some of Quebec's predilections with regards to the Charter in the context of constitutionalism; it might ask what form the Charter ought to take to satisfy the country's constituent nations,

and so on. While the details may vary, the idea is to expose students to the varying interpretations of the country's defining institutions.

Presently, Quebec is responsible for citizenship education and has heated internal debates about the nature of its historiography in establishing a grand narrative, engages in national consultative exercise about immigration, integration and cultural diversity, the future of the French language and Quebec citizenship, its constitutional options, and so on,[56] yet the formal institution of citizenship is left entirely to the central government, without any mechanisms for interchange. Citizenship and education are separate matters in this structure, and governments are speaking past each other in trying to foster dispositions, 'virtues' or identities that are instrumental or intrinsic to good citizenship. It is thus not surprising that the recent reforms in Quebec have tended to steer clear of such ambiguities by stripping the political away from conceptions of citizenship and focusing on procedures and competencies. Whether or not this was the motivation of those responsible for drafting the curriculum is an empirical question that cannot be answered here. What is clear from this assessment, however, is that Quebec has failed to meet even its own standards for qualitative liberal citizenship by disconnecting future citizens from a *projet de société* that has been in development throughout its history.

Citizenship education ought to expose the reasons for this country's existence without the need to shove one nation-building project or the other down the throats of students. This would involve, for example, that students in the ROC are taught about some ways to assess the legitimacy of a liberal and democratic national minority that is Quebec, and how this has expressed itself historically. On the other hand, Quebec students would be exposed to varying interpretations of key events in the history of Canada and Quebec, and why such variations existed. The main point, again, is that the multination is the perfect place with which to experiment with balancing the twin pillars of identity and autonomy that liberals claim is necessary – since citizens (students) must give reasons, must actually think about a literal contract, as opposed to a hypothetical social contract between individuals, its bases and justifications, the contours of negotiations, and so on, because the country is not based on assumed premises of social cooperation that are expected to have always endured and to continue.

.   There thus exists a framework for the constant disclosure and acknowledgment of identity that accounts for national pluralism, rather than simply widening the net of belonging through formal procedures at the center. Again, the strength of the multination is that citizens are made aware that citizenship involves identification with a political community that may not necessarily be exactly the same as other such groups in the larger association, yet the larger association forces such minority 'sites of citizenship' to constantly reveal and justify their markers of citizenship because they are linked to one or more partners in a continuing process of dialogue, self-reflection and exchange.

---

[56] The recent Bouchard-Taylor Commission is an obvious example, but there have been others that more directly addressed questions such as the situation of the French language or the constitutional future of Quebec, and so on.

A commitment to the norms of multinational democracy in the curriculum would explicitly serve to situate citizens in a continuing story whose future is nevertheless open to change. Students would also be exposed to the varying interpretations of historical events that are political – meaning they have been the subject of political contestation and are not merely the result of social or economic variables, where politics are presented as an epiphenomenal category – dissociated from the consequences of subjective agency and clashing identities. Canada's constitutional history is particularly propitious for this sort of citizenship 'grounding' – the country has never had an amending formula that has satisfied its constituent nations, the very indicator of the locus of a state's sovereignty, yet students are not made aware that this may constitute an enduring political challenge that may involve their input at some point in time. In the same vein, students might be asked questions about Quebec nationalism, the bases of its legitimacy, or instances where it may have been expressed in illegitimate terms, its political manifestations, its relationship to liberal rights, the actual movement for independence, and so on.

If a generic minimalist model can simply be adapted to undifferentiated conditions of pluralism, then this is a tacit refusal to recognize historically salient political cleavages and is tantamount to justifying existing boundaries of citizenship, which minority nations may reject. In effect, the theorist comes to ignore the most significant political cleavages that have contributed to the layered character of diversity in the multinational society. Students in the majority nation may grasp that they have rights, may learn, be exposed to, and exchange with individuals from a variety of cultures, and so on, but they may also ask themselves why there are certain groups that put this project at risk, since that is what the main political cleavages will look like to them – attempts to 'wreck' the liberal project. Status quo pluralist models that link some formulation of minimal homogeneous political identity to citizenship status in the name of 'appropriate' civic virtues contain this inherent bias against other national groups within the larger political community. Individuals in the minority nations are thus half citizens – they may not feel an affective loyalty to this structure, and they may even be taught that over the course of the country's history, this structure has been oppressive and exclusionary rather than an instrument of inclusion. Students in the majority nation, on the other hand, can be made to feel an affective loyalty to principles that seem inclusive, pass all the tests of political liberalism, civic republicanism, liberal multiculturalism, commitment to universal human rights, etc, yet they are politically socialized to distrust and therefore not recognize the forces that seemingly threaten this citizenship structure, regardless of the legitimacy or the measure of justifiable self-determination enjoyed by minority nations. While affective loyalty, identity, and civic virtues might be instilled in students in either of the national units, the levels of reciprocity, mutual trust and confidence and the outright will to live together are paradoxically eroded by the very framework that is meant to widen the net of belonging.

Students, through no fault of their own, must bear the added burden of grasping a more complex and sophisticated comprehension of what citizenship in such a setting entails. Indeed, multinational democracies demand more of citizens because of the constant existential questions associated with shifting and negotiated citizenship spaces. This paper has attempted to show that such 'burdens' on citizens are not inherently

destabilizing to liberal-democracy – indeed, they promote active and qualitative citizenship through the institutionalization of processes of 'citizenization'.[57]

A multinational democracy is unique in the sense that the theorist is confronted with the prospect of having to justify, a priori, the constitutive elements of citizenship and the configuration of rights attached to such arrangements before delving into high theory. The danger is that the theorist invariably looks as though s/he is merely serving as an apologist, after the fact, for certain practices that cannot be legitimated without recourse to history. However, as I have attempted to illustrate, the normative force of political sociology is not limited to observations about social and political practices in a descriptive capacity – this will be left to strict comparativists. The theorist in the case of multinational democracies is faced with the added burden of showing some justification for the inherent justice and stability of the overall multinational association as well as the democratic and liberal legitimacy of the collective projects that define constituent nations as socio-political subjects worthy of historical examination.

---

[57] See James Tully, "Introduction", in Gagnon and Tully, (eds.), *Op. Cit.*, p. 25, for more on the processes of 'becoming' rather than 'being' a citizen as a constitutive element of democratic citizenship.