

Marquette University
e-Publications@Marquette

Management Faculty Research and Publications

Management, Department of

1-1-1980

“Territoriality” and Bilingualism: A Note on Jackson’s “Community and Conflict”

Alex Stewart

Marquette University, alex.stewart@marquette.edu

Published version. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (1980): 103-108. [Publisher Link](#). © 1980
Canadian Ethnic Studies Association. Used with permission.

COMMENT/COMMENTAIRE

ALEX STEWART

*"Territoriality" and Bilingualism: A Note on Jackson's COMMUNITY AND CONFLICT**

A longstanding question, 'should one recognize "territorial" limits as well as "personal" limits to bilingualism?' may be approached by means of an analogous question, 'are there "social scale" limits to the applicability of elite accommodation models of French-English relation?'¹ A very general model of elite accommodation would draw lines of authority and communication vertically within French- and "English-" Canada, but horizontally across the French-English cleavage only at the elite level.² A basic problem is implied: does this model apply to many levels of the Canadian social system? What would be the consequences of using the assumptions of this model to analyze data drawn from only a "local" level of the larger social system? This problem would be most acute if the local level in question included both Anglophone and Francophone populations, and if the locally-resident elites were not affiliated with major pan-Canadian institutions. I shall argue that John Jackson implicitly imposed assumptions of this model in his analysis of data drawn from such a local level: the town (or village) of Tecumseh (Jackson, 1975).

Community and Conflict is a path-breaking work on French-English relations to which I am indebted. Part of the book's interest results from Jackson's application of various assumptions that should be reserved for French-English relations at a larger "territorial" scale. A central assumption was that the elites had significant cross-cleavage contact, whereas the masses were separated. Three assumptions pertaining properly to pan-Canadian elites were as follows: separation equals divisiveness; contact is integrative; intermediary roles are integrative. These assumptions may be discerned in this quote: "Religious affiliation appeared to have *the most divisive influence*, separating Protestant from Catholic. . . . The presence of English Catholics reduced the extent of separation along linguistic lines" (Jackson, 1975: 93, emphasis added). Certain assumptions—that cross-linguistic contact was specific to the elites (English Protestant and English Catholic), and that English Catholics were mediators—may have encouraged Jackson's claim that there "was less segregation between English-speaking Protestants and Catholics than between the former and French

Canadian Ethnic Studies, XII, 1, 80

Catholics. In other words, the pattern of residential *segregation* followed *linguistic* more than religious divisions" (Jackson, 1975: 56, emphasis added).

Yet, if even in Tecumseh all significant cross-cleavage interaction was reserved for elites, the elite accommodation model would be open to question. If there was little English-French conflict, even with Francophones and Anglophones at such close quarters, it would be difficult to imagine how or where the two masses could conflict. Elite accommodations would deserve little credit for the lack of conflict, for the two subcultures would be so hermetically sealed one from the other that the mass of one would not see the other as a threat. If there *was* conflict, the elites would have caused it themselves. However, if Jackson had been mistaken and there was significant mass interaction across subcultural cleavages, we could either see something of the nature of conflicts, or, finding no conflict, regard elite accommodations as superfluous. By reanalysing Jackson's book, I intend to defend as possible, the use of the elite accommodation model and restrict it to larger scales of the overall Canadian system. Jackson's misinterpretation of his data suggests the assumption that local elites could replicate the federal bargain. This was an assumption of those who saw hope for the policies of "Bilingualism and Biculturalism." Yet Jackson's work showed not only "horizontal mass" interaction, but also the tendency for local Anglophone elites to take "mass" (unaccommodating) positions.

For these reasons, Jackson's claims will be examined in detail, with discussions of elite and mass interaction, patterns of residential segregation, interaction in sociable gatherings and the relationship between religious and linguistic conflicts. First of all, Jackson's assertion that "there was a greater tendency for fraternization across linguistic and religious boundaries at the higher-income levels" was true *only* for "linguistic" boundaries and *only* if interpreted to mean that at the higher-income levels there was a higher rate of regular cross-cleavage contact relative to the income categories (rather than to the population as a whole; Jackson, 1975: 91). However, this presentation may have obscured the fact that, at this local level, the greater percentage of cross-cleavage contacts was between "masses," of English- and French-speaking Catholics. Rather than seeing the importance of conflicts between these two "masses," Jackson saw the English Catholics as integrative forces due to their intermediary position. An impression of the intermediary (mass-elite) position of English Catholics was given by the table on income levels for the three religious-linguistic categories (Jackson, 1975: 53).³ The income table suggests a fairly even progression in family income levels from FCs through ECs to EPs. However, \$7,000 was the highest cut-off point, and there was no *mean* income figure given for any category. Therefore, there may have been a significant number of wealthier EPs who would not be registered either by the income categories or by a mean figure, which would tend to pull EPs noticeably higher. If there was a direct relationship between occupational status levels and income, a reading of the occupational table may be made, to suggest the existence of a gap between, on the one hand, both FCs and ECs and on the other, EPs. Jackson's table, "Linguistic-Religious Groups by Occupational Status Levels, Tecumseh, 1966" (1975: 53) did not show readily the gap between Catholics and Protestants, which does become evident if one combines all status categories from "Unskilled" to "White Collar," leaving only "Professional and Managerial" as the "elite" category for contrast. We note the representation in the occupational elite for religious-linguistic categories and then the representation by religious-linguistic categories

for the occupational elite. Only EPs had a high tendency to hold "elite" jobs. 45% of EPs held such jobs, compared to 14% of ECs and 9% of FCs. This tendency of the EP minority was strong enough to skew in its favour the religious-linguistic representation in the occupational elite. EPs, who formed 25% of the sample, held 57% of the elite jobs; ECs held 26% and FCs held 17%. In terms of *structural* assimilation, then, ECs were not so much middlemen between elite EPs and mass FCs, as part of the EC-FC masses.

In line with Jackson's view of ECs as mediators was his claim that as "shown in Table 21, the higher the income level, the more cross-religious contact there was" (1975: 90). This is not what Table 21 showed. However, the reason is that a typographical error transposed the first and last vertical columns; efforts to disprove Professor Jackson's conclusion that I had attempted were thus misguided. Firstly, Jackson's interpretation was clearly accurate; the high-income skewing of the Protestants promoted cross-religious contact at higher income levels. Secondly, my point about any systematic errors in interpretation of data was that these errors imply an elite accommodation model that is not applicable for Tecumseh. Thirdly, my point was not that only masses had cross-cleavage contacts, but that in this particular territory elites did not monopolize the making and legitimizing of accommodations; Tecumseh elite interests are not pan-Canadian in scope, nor are the Anglophone elites of *Southwestern Ontario* a local minority.

Jackson's claim that the wealthy were most likely to cross linguistic as well as (allegedly) religious boundaries, referred to Table 23 (1975: 91, 92). This assertion was true only insofar as, at the highest interaction level, the highest percentage of an income category was that of the "High Income" category. There were apparently nineteen "High Income" respondents in this high interaction category; there were twenty such "Medium Income" respondents. Perhaps a more important fact was the level of moderate contact amongst "Low Income" respondents. These respondents displayed the highest tendency to have this level of contacts. Naturally, this tendency amongst a large number of respondents would affect the nature of cross-cleavage interaction in Tecumseh as a whole. If we weight a response in the moderate interaction category (1-2 contacts) as 1, and a response in the highest interaction category (3-4 contacts) as 2, we obtain figures of 145 contact situations for those with incomes under \$7,000, and 54 for those with incomes of \$7,000 and over. That is, 71% of contact situations were reported by the less affluent. Further, as Tables 21 and 23 (on Catholic-Protestant and Francophone-Anglophone association respectively) used the same sample, and there was a lower tendency for the "High Income" respondents to cross the religious line than the linguistic line, one could hypothesise that the seven cases of "High Income" responses of no Anglophone-Francophone association were from Protestants (who would cross the religious line with the linguistic) whereas the nineteen reporting high interaction tended to be Catholic. This conjecture is supported by there being many mixed FC-EC voluntary associations, but no EP-FP ones, of course.

The importance of "mass" cross-cleavage contact, suggested by income and occupational data, can be demonstrated by data on residential segregation. Jackson's assertion that "the pattern of residential segregation followed linguistic more than religious divisions" is simply not supported by a study of the data he offered. A map of "The Town of Tecumseh, Ontario, 1966: Distribution of Ethnic-Religious Groups by Polling Division" (Jackson, 1975: 55) shows that

ECs and FCs had a greater tendency towards co-residentiality than did EPs and ECs.⁴ This "etic" refutation of Jackson's interpretation was borne out by the "emic" evidence of a reference by one of Jackson's informants to "the two religious groups" on the north and south sides of the town (Jackson, 1975: 77).

This suggestion that "neighbourly" interaction amongst the Catholic "masses" was most encouraged, by demographic-spatial factors, to cross the linguistic line, was supported by evidence on "social gatherings." "With the exception of political and sports events," wrote Jackson, "most social gatherings in Tecumseh were either almost exclusively Catholic or exclusively Protestant" (1975: 88). An example was given of a house party in which occurred the first "social" meeting of EP and EC public leaders. "French- and English-speaking Catholics interacted with more frequency than Catholics and Protestants," but there were still "linguistically based cliques within the Catholic category" (Jackson, 1975: 89). Another example of a house party with public figures was given; in this case, ECs and FCs had to be introduced. Thus EC-FC interaction was significant, but limited by linguistic differences (Jackson, 1975: 89). The picture of such differences was further sketched in by the information that "many Francophone and Anglophone Catholics not only shared similar class and status positions, but they also worked in their community of residence." At the work-place, linguistic conflict was not uncommon (Jackson, 1975: 59-60, 94).

Contrary to Jackson's assertion that religious affiliation had the most divisive consequences, as a result of the separation of Catholic from Protestant, with only ECs to straddle the cleavages, I argue that within "religious" arenas one found conflict, due to the very *closeness* of Catholics from both *linguistic* categories. That is, the significant local conflicts were over the issue of language, within the Catholic category. Within this category, apparently small matters might lead to disputes. Unilingual Anglophones saw linguistic disputes—matters of linguistic survival for Francophones—in zero-sum terms.

"English-speaking parishioners objected to French being used as the lead language on a bilingual sign installed on the church grounds. . . . An organization with a relatively lengthy history in the parish was disbanded as a result of a conflict over which language should take priority at meetings . . . it is out of [such] apparently trivial events . . . that major issues develop" (Jackson, 1975: 63, see also 95).

"Contrary to what might be expected, although consistent with the close contact between French and English Catholics, the French Catholic and English Protestant views were closer [regarding 'Bilingualism and Biculturalism'] than the French and English Catholic views," wrote Jackson in an implicit retreat from his explicit thesis (1975: 117). Jackson quoted three ECs—an education official, a teacher, and a "prominent" figure—who expressed doubts as to the capacity of the French language to survive in their "country" (1975: 118-119).

If ECs felt their senses of country and efficiency offended by the salience of the French language, FCs in such a linguistic minority situation might have been especially sensitive to the problem of *linguistic* assimilation. This problem may have been salient due to the FC ancestry of some ECs (Jackson, 1975: 47). ECs, however, tended to see FCs' preoccupation with language as weakening the united Catholic front against Protestant pressures (Jackson, 1975: 32, 136). ECs and FCs seemed doomed to engage in conflict over *public* issues. This was true

not only with respect to Ontario- and Canada-wide issues, but with respect to local issues as well. Tecumseh, *qua* village, was Catholic. Unlike the Protestant clergy, the Catholic priests were visibly public figures (Jackson, 1975: 61). Catholic politics, certain Anglophones complained, were dominated by a "French clique" that ran Tecumseh, in the "French" interests (Jackson, 1975: 75-77). Moreover, the tendency of the Ontario government to leave sensitive issues of French-language schooling to local school boards provided the stage for "fairly intense local conflicts" in localities such as Tecumseh (Jackson, 1975: 145, see also 146-149).

Jackson demonstrated that there are "social scale" limits to Francophone-Anglophone elite accommodations at least for the "territory" of Tecumseh. His data did not support assumptions about local elite accommodations and the uniformly stabilizing nature of cross-cleavage contacts. It thus remains a plausible argument that accommodations must be made by elites tied to pan-Canadian interests and organizational allegiances (see Simeon 1972: 233, Meisel and Lemieux 1972: 204-209, 253-257) and that the two "solitudes" conflict when they "hear" too much from each other (see Gumperz, 1978: 14-16, 22-24 for a linguistic argument). Of course, this state of affairs may be the consequence of a history of mass exclusion from accommodations (Jackson, 1975: 20); the elitist model does not state that a mass accommodation model is abstractly impossible. Further, in areas where Anglophones are a local minority, merely local elites and masses may follow consociational norms (Hughes, 1943: 31, 34-35, 64, 91, 98, 137, 217; regarding the religious cleavage, see Chandler and Chandler, 1979: 230). That is, models of elite accommodations should perhaps focus on those elites with a proprietary interest in the whole Canadian "territory" (and beyond?) and on local elites in the remaining "bilingual belt." Thus I conclude with this question: what are the historical, structural and cultural reasons for a "territorial" limitation on Canadian bilingualism? To step beyond my critical framework into a "positive" struggle with this question, is to find *Community and Conflict* still a useful resource.

*Helpful comments on an earlier draft of this note were made by Gerald L. Gold, Social Anthropology, and Kenneth McRoberts, Political Science, York University. Similarly helpful, and generous comments were made by Professor Jackson; I thank him.

FOOTNOTES

1. In a speech of 1855, Cartier considered the first question, which is still current (Sweeny, 1976: 98; see also the testimony of Leon Dion in Canada, 1978: 31, 34, 35, 45-46, also Guindon, 1978: 234-236). Although I tend to agree with proponents of the "territorial" approach (with the qualification of the "vertical" concept of a pan-Canadian elite) I would like to see spelled out a thorough defence of the new orthodoxy.
2. This model is that of "consociational democracy" understood in a broad sense. Lijphart wrote that "the essential characteristic of consociational democracy is not so much any particular institutional arrangement as overarching co-operation at the elite level in a culturally fragmented system" (Lijphart, 1971: 10; see also McRae, 1974: 8).
3. English-speaking Protestant = EP; English-speaking Catholic = EC; French-speaking Catholic = FC.
4. Jackson's interpretation was correct for two wards that appear to have been the wealthiest ones: wards X and XI were 9% FC, 18% EC, 73% EP and 20% FC, 40% EC, and 40% EP respectively (for the reference to wealth, see page 56). Wards IV and IX were inconclusive in significance (100% FC; and 31% FC, 15% EC, and 54% EP). Wards I, II, III, V, VI, VII, and VIII tended more towards co-residentiality of ECs and FCs than EPs and ECs, even if one takes into account the relative demographic strength of the three categories (there were more than 50% more ECs than EPs; the EC population of about 30% of the total was about 50% greater than the EP population of about 20%). The respective figures for FCs, ECs, and EPs were: 46, 46, 8; 75, 17, 8; 70, 21, 9; 43, 57, 0; 44, 48, 8; 63, 25, 12; and 43, 50, 7.

REFERENCES

Canada

1978 *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada*. Issue No. 16. Wednesday, September 20, 1978. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Chandler, Marsha A. and William M. Chandler

1979 *Public Policy and Provincial Politics*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Guindon, Hubert

1978 "The modernization of Quebec and the legitimacy of the Canadian state," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 15, 2: 227-245.