

# The Pedagogy of the Pastor: The Formation of the Social Studies Curriculum in Ontario

*Sheila L. Cavanagh*

The Ontario social studies curriculum, developed in the first half of the 20th century, was modelled on the techniques of the Christian pastorate. I use a Foucaultian methodology to argue that this curriculum developed within the students an attitude that formed their thinking as democratic citizens of a developing nation — that incited both a commitment to care for those thought to need Christian instruction and a strong respect for the British Empire. At the same time, this practice of care served a colonizing function.

Le programme de sciences sociales en Ontario, qui a été élaboré au cours de la première moitié du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle, a eu pour modèle les études pastorales chrétiennes. Se servant de la méthodologie foucaultienne, l'auteure soutient que ce programme a développé chez les étudiants une attitude qui a formé leur pensée en tant que citoyens d'une nation démocratique en développement — ce qui les a amenés à se soucier du sort des personnes qui, à leurs yeux, avaient besoin d'une éducation chrétienne et à éprouver un énorme respect pour l'empire britannique. Parallèlement, cette pratique de la compassion a rempli une fonction de colonisation.

-----

Several scholars have written about the conceptual formation of the social studies curriculum in the first half of the 20th century (Barth 1991; Goodson & Marsh, 1996; Lybarger 1987; Tomkins 1986) and the development of pastoral care in Western school systems (Best, Jarvis & Ribbins, 1977; Duncan, 1988; Goodson & Marsh, 1996; Lang, 1985; Power, 1995,1991; Ribbins, 1985; Sarup, 1982). Most educational historians agree that social studies education in the North American context was a response to rapid technological innovation, industrialization, urbanization, immigration from non-English-speaking countries, the declining role of the church in public affairs, the rise of scientific rationality, and a belief in universal humanism. Speaking about the United States, Barth (1991) explains that the "country had just passed through metamorphosis — everything was changing and the country was no longer the rural, agrarian society founded in the seventeenth century" (p. 19).

Educational scholars writing on pastoral care understand its focus on the social and emotional needs of students as an extension of the modern

welfare state, and as having an intricate relationship to the development of comprehensive schooling in England (Power, 1991). Lang (1985) argued that in Canada the pastoral-care program manifested itself in “counseling and guidance practices” (p. 125) and educators had not incorporated it into the content of the curricula at that time. Although educators in Canada saw pastoral care as a pedagogical practice separate from curriculum content, unlike the British case where pastoral care was more explicitly fused with the learning material, I contend that there *is* a pastoral care component to the early 1930s and 1940s social studies program that has not been theorized.

The pastoral care component of resource material (and instructions given to teachers) for the Ontario social studies curriculum provides an example of Foucault’s (1982) analysis of pastoral power, and this organization of power manifests itself in the ethical development of the child as a citizen of the British Empire. Pastoral power has been theorized as an individualizing form of power, one that is enacted upon individuals subject to its operations, but in the case of early social studies education there is a reciprocal engagement that organizes a colonial dyad. The Canadian student is subject to a constitutive form of power that shapes his or her relationship to whom scholars would now refer to as Third World others, thereby constituting the colonial dyad. The academic literature on pastoral care has not conceptualized the colonizing dimension to the pedagogical practice of care. What it means to institutionalize the caring function in a social studies unit focusing on international relations, and subject constitution within those relations, has not been subject to analysis in the educational literature. In this article, I have analyzed the colonial dimension to pastoral pedagogy and suggest that the caring function involves a form of reciprocal constitution: the Canadian child is constituted as future agent of global care, and the Third World recipient of that care (who is both a living subject and a Canadian social fiction) is constructed to be in need of care.

To develop my thesis I questioned the line of demarcation between the subject component of social studies education and pastoral care as a pedagogical practice and orientation to student welfare. Power (1991) argued that teacher practitioners and academics have seen the principles of pastoral care as being at odds with the more academically entrenched subject areas. This, she suggested, leaves a gulf between pastoral care initiatives on the part of individual teachers and the mandate of rigorous academic training. It also enables a conceptual split between subject-based curriculum theorizing and the pedagogical practice of pastoral care, which is transposed onto the subject matter itself. As Canadian educational

scholar Goodson and Marsh (1996) insisted, "The link between subject knowledge and subject pedagogy is a crucial line of inquiry" (p. 4); this assertion is particularly true for social studies education, which is most obviously concerned with the cultivation of moral character.

By analyzing the social studies program in Ontario, and drawing on illustrations from abroad to illustrate a common focus on pastoral care (despite nation-specific distinctions in the way social studies as a subject area developed), I show how the imagined cleavage between pastoral pedagogy and subject content functions to mask the operation of pastoral power first illustrated by French philosopher Michel Foucault, and to demonstrate how the ideal of pastoral pedagogy is not necessarily emancipatory or progressive (as advocates of the child-centred movement have argued), but that it mandates the ethical development of the child as Westernized citizen.

This pedagogical orientation organizes the Canadian child's relationship to formerly colonized peoples in Canada and abroad thought to be savage, uncivilized, and in need of the very pedagogical discipline the Western citizen has to offer. The motivational structure that this relationship orchestrated appears to be above reproach, yet, at the same time, is key to the liberal strategies of exclusion that continue to characterize international relations today. By understanding the emergence of this benevolent, yet colonizing, pedagogy of care in the social studies program, contemporary educators can better understand the historical underpinnings of disciplinary power in the present post-colonial context.

#### SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

Social studies education in Ontario, as in other industrialized countries, was an extension of social welfare initiatives. Teachers, social workers, and concerned philanthropists with a distinctly Christian predisposition (including those belonging to charitable organizations and settlement houses) imagined an interdisciplinary approach to the teaching of citizenship skills. These skills would prepare children to deal with uniquely modern social problems, including urban poverty, unemployment in large city centres, escalating crime rates, disease associated with urban slums, a highly routinized division of labour, and immigration policies and associated conflict between peoples of diverse lands wanting to settle in the Canadian context. Social studies promised to provide the next generation with citizenship skills to curb the difficulties associated with life in a highly diversified and changing society. Educators designed the curriculum to provide moral training for children in Ontario (as in other

Westernized societies) to guide them in understanding modern social problems and to teach them to act as rationally motivated, self-governing citizens of the newly formed, liberal-democratic order (Lybarger, 1987).

As Power (1995) argues, pastoral care — at its best — was student-centred, organized around a pedagogical commitment to the education of the whole child (including social, psychological, developmental, and educational needs) and other sorts of egalitarian educational-planning initiatives driven by a humanitarian impulse particular to the period. The pastoral care program that Power discussed was, like the Ontario social studies program, based on a conception of child welfare and social and moral neediness. Similarly, pastoral care in Britain was a feature of comprehensive schooling, which also speaks to the need to integrate children of vastly different life circumstances into a school or social system based upon principles of citizenship. The presumption that a distinction existed between the stated purpose of social studies education and pastoral care (in the English context and elsewhere) is a fallacy. Lybarger (1987) summarized the similarity of purpose between social studies education and pastoral care.

School and settlement [work] were to serve [a common] welfare [objective] by teaching either children or adults to make the best of their immediate environment by utilizing existing public and private agencies; and at the same time serve the end of social evolution by devising experiences which might [lead to] . . . respect and imitation of Anglo-Saxon ideals. (1987, p. 186)

The school focused on the “conception of need [and this was understood to be] . . . a reflection of individual personal inadequacy and not institutional shortcomings” (Lybarger, 1987, p. 187). Educators organized school work to reform individuals and restore harmony and social order to a rapidly changing world. The emphasis placed on Judeo-Christian values gave the pastoral dimension to school work a distinct configuration. The centrality of white Anglo-Saxon Protestant values to the development of Canadian education — and its related pastoral component — can not be underestimated. Popkewitz (1997) made a similar observation in the U.S. context: “Since at least the Protestant Reformation, schools have been institutions that relate the state, civil (and religious) authority and moral discipline” (p. 140). He went so far as to suggest that “We can think of the mass public schooling of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as a continuation of the disciplining and regulating project of the Reformation” (p. 140–141). Goodson (1987) also contended, in the Canadian context, that disciplined intelligence, as demanded by teachers, was

“continuous with early Calvinist dogma. The intellect disciplined by the moral sense and will to carry out Christian tasks; not knowledge for intrinsic education but knowledge to carry out moral and religious missions” (p. 9).

Given that compulsory schooling in Canadian history has been intimately related to what Popkewitz called the Reformation project (as it has in many Western nations subject to Christian hegemony), it makes sense to understand how this project operates in relation to curriculum development and the pedagogical teachings it mandates. As argued by Popkewitz (1997) “The question of what is curriculum history is also a question about the politics of the knowledge embodied in disciplinary work” (p. 131). By this, he was suggesting that curriculum as a knowledge form “inscribes rules and standards by which we ‘reason’ about the world and our ‘self’ as a productive member of that world” (p. 132). For him, curriculum can be understood as a disciplinary technology in a Foucaultian sense. It “directs how the individual is to act, feel, talk, and ‘see’ the world and ‘self’” (p. 132).

#### PASTORAL PEDAGOGY

Hunter (1994), a neo-Foucauldian scholar, first defined pastoral pedagogy. In a study of the history of Australian schooling, Hunter elaborated on the inner workings of a teaching methodology dependent on “the subject-forming techniques of pastoral pedagogy with its arts of self-examination and its care of individual souls” (p. vii). In other words, he conceptualized pastoral pedagogy as a set of techniques that the Christian pastorate perfected centuries ago that involve self-reflection and self-watchfulness, self-discipline, moral indignation at having done wrong, and ethical self-development. As he chronicled the development of Australian schooling, Hunter showed how the modern teacher uses the older, more traditional techniques of the Christian pastorate in a now secular school system to shape the ethical development of children. Hunter did not necessarily refer to these techniques under the rubric of pastoral care but, nevertheless, he noted they functioned to enact the same pastoral care functions originally sanctioned by the organizing principles of Christianity.

Christian teachings are only loosely based on the message of a Christian God, but the ethical practice of self-problematization remains the same. In the Ontario social studies curriculum educators replaced the Biblical script with the governing principles of liberal democracy: civic duty to the British Empire and Christian morality. In his critique of the relationship between

the history of the Australian school system and its connection to pastoral guidance, Hunter (1994) wrote that it is "Christianity's 'shepherd-flock game' — with its distinctive articulation of surveillance and self-examination, obedience and self-regulation — that continues to provide the core moral technology of the school, long after its original doctrinal supports have fallen away" (p. xxi) to illustrate the common ethical practice of self-problematization in ancient practices of Christianity and in the early 20th-century Australian school.

The practice of pastoral pedagogy is a concrete, observable example of Michel Foucault's analytic of pastoral power. Drawing heavily on Foucault, Hunter (1994) looked at the history of the Australian educational state and its pastoral influences as an example of pastoral power in operation. Foucault (1982) explained that for the modern state it

was no longer a question of leading people to their salvation in the next world, but rather ensuring it in this world. And in this context, the word *salvation* takes on different meanings: health, well-being (that is, sufficient wealth, standard of living, security, protection against accidents). A series of "worldly" aims took the place of the religious aims of the traditional pastorate, all the more easily because the latter, for various reasons, had followed in an accessory way a certain number of these aims; we only have to think of the role of medicine and its welfare function assured for a long time by the Catholic and Protestant churches. (p. 215)

Pastoral power, employed in the modern state, is not concerned with top-down power, corporal punishment, or overt physical control; it relies instead on the voluntary submission of individual subjects to expert authorities in the name of freedom and entitlement to social-welfare provisions. Children submit to the pastoral teacher to attain an education in both the traditional subjects areas and Christian values. For social studies students, education is in citizenship training, and as such they will gain entitlement to the very social welfare provisions outlined by Foucault: access to medical health, food, clothing, shelter.

The Foucauldian methodology of tracking institutional discourses (such as those authorized by a department of education) and the practices through which individuals subject themselves to them (student engagement with the techniques of the pastoral teacher) are governmental designs. The governing discourses are techniques of power that curriculum writers designed to work in particular ways. These designs did not always work in the intended way. Foucaultian methodology cannot account for the negotiation of governing principles by those subjected to its tentacles, the resistance that, by his own definition, is inherent to modern forms of power,

both of which are legitimate and important areas of inquiry in educational scholarship (Donald, 1985). As Donald (1985) explained, the “usefulness of a Foucaultian approach . . . lies in its power to reveal the principles governing the organization of schooling and its forms of discipline and pedagogy — those aspects sometimes referred to as ‘the hidden curriculum’” (235).

#### THE SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM IN ONTARIO

The approved courses of study that the Ontario Department of Education issued in the early 1930s presented social studies as a composite subject, combining history, geography, and governmental studies — the latter becoming subsumed within the designation of manners and morals. As Goodson (1987) reflected, the Canadian curriculum was typically “broken up into a series of correlated units of study rather than conducted as a rigid sequence of lessons” (p. 28). In the case of Ontario, the social studies curriculum was meant to embody a newer focus on civic duty, but in practice closely resembled the older models of teaching history and geography as separate subject areas.

The Department of Education designed the curriculum to reflect the newly embraced child-centred model gaining force in the inter-war years, and a liberal-humanist, progressive orientation to education particular to the first half of the 20th century. The child was considered to be an active agent in the learning situation. Teachers no longer thought of their pupils as passive recipients of subject instruction. Child-centred education enabled pastoral pedagogy to flourish precisely because children were now thought to be active, inquiring, independent agents in an educational setting. They could become concerned with their own relationship to knowledge acquisition and intentionally learn the lessons of nation: citizenship, geography, and history.

In his discussion of social science curriculum in the United States, Popkewitz (1997) argued that “the production of new governing patterns was made possible through the concept of ‘childhood’” (p. 141). The emphasis that advocates of the child-centred movement placed on the active learning capacities of individual children was key to the configuration of pastoral pedagogy in the social studies curriculum. With this emphasis the children needed to be better protected from the more rigid teaching methodologies that older, more traditional teachers employed, and also the impact of modern social problems. Champions of the newly established social studies curriculum used this idea to legitimize

the focus on citizenship education. The presumption about the active, inquiring nature of children was, itself, a regulatory device. As Popkewitz (1997) attested:

At a different layer, the different curriculum theories of American schools at the turn of the twentieth century were struggles about how individuals should regulate themselves (“come to understand” and “participate intelligently”) within new sets of relations and institutions that included the state, bureaucracies, commerce and work. (p. 143)

In the Ontario educational context, the theories of learning that advocates of the child-centred movement espoused also enabled new forms of social relations in educational institutions. The curriculum should inculcate self-regulating practices in pupils because they were presumed to be independent, self-directed learners. Students could submit to lessons in global citizenship that pastoral teachers offered because they were able to actively construe children’s need to learn for social betterment.

#### MANNERS AND MORALS: GLOBAL UNREST AND THE TURBULENCE OF YOUTH

Canada claimed a devotion to “the moral superiority of British values” and Christian ethics (Tomkins, 1986, p. 102), a belief visible in the manners and morals segment of the Ontario social studies curriculum. In his history of Canadian curriculum, Tomkins (1986) explains that in the late 19th century “Idealists continued to pin their faith on a rational pedagogy which emphasized the cultivation of morality and character. For them the teacher was essentially a moral tutor purveying a curriculum based on eternal moral principles and absolute standards of culture” (p. 102). The Progressive Education movement of the 1930s and 1940s continued to embrace the Judeo-Christian moral value orientation (despite the rise of formal secularization) and the movement became intimately tied to the pastoral pedagogical orientation espoused in the Ontario teachers’ manuals of the period.

Educational theorists can understand the Ontario emphasis on citizenship, morals, and manners as an example of the pastoral desire to shape the ethical development of children. The Christian mission, once marked by the saving of souls from eternal damnation, became an incitement on the part of teachers and educational experts to foster the propriety, decorum, and social graces of the patriotic citizen in children. The morals and manners section of the social studies curriculum instilled socially correct attitudes and moral values. As written in the 1941 curriculum guidelines, manners and morals involved

Consideration for others, willingness to accept responsibility and to work with others in order to get things done; attitudes of helpfulness and loyalty to friends, home, school and community should be major outcomes of the course if it is properly conducted. (Department of Education, 1941, p. 71)

The curriculum guidelines also stated that, "throughout the courses the teacher should seek incidentally, through the songs, games, talks, and stories, from current events, and by her own example, to establish good habits in morals and in manners" (Department of Education, 1941, p. 71). The intent was to shape the ethical development of children; teachers cultivated an attitude of helpfulness and loyalty to the community and to the nation.

It was not enough that children learn to behave in the ways outlined in the unit: they had to adopt an appropriate attitude of helpfulness and loyalty to the developing nation and the motherland. Governing strategies inherent to curriculum documents are not only about the content knowledge, but the "sensitivities, dispositions and awarenesses" (Popkewitz, 1997, p. 145) inherent to the subject knowledge. The inculcation of an ethical sensibility, consistent with the work of government in modern society, depends on the work of ethical self-development, not unlike the earlier pastoral concern with the state of the soul in pre-modern times. As Foucault (1982) contended in relation to the modern configuration of pastoral power, it "cannot be exercised without knowing the inside of people's minds, without exploring their souls, without making them reveal their innermost secrets. It implies a knowledge of the conscience and an ability to direct it" (p. 214). Mallory (1948) outlined expectations placed on teachers to instruct children properly in this regard.

Every teacher should spend considerable time learning her pupils. That means knowing a great deal about them and their homes. A knowledge of the child's early health, his accidents and infectious diseases, his play facilities and the nature of his interests, and playmates will help a teacher to understand her pupil. So will a knowledge of the kind of discipline used at home, of the emotional climate and moral and economic status of the home, be of great help. (p. 8)

This call to know the pupil also coincided with the invention of adolescence. By the early 20th century, adolescence was a recognizably distinct developmental stage (Kaplan, 1984; Spacks, 1981). The middle, transitional stage of adolescent development was represented as a turbulent time, much like international relations during the First and Second World Wars. Public anxiety about adolescent youth was not unrelated to public worries about international relations, foreign policy, immigration, urban

poverty, teenage delinquents, crime, unemployment, and the changing societal structures associated with modernity. Popkewitz (1997) suggested that childhood “became institutionalized as strategies to confront social disorder through privileging standards of religious, and social and moral values” (p. 140) came into effect. The conception of the adolescent youth was instrumental in the development of pastoral pedagogy because it designated a developmental stage in which students were in need of guidance, tutelage, and moral guardianship. Educators could rescue pupils from the turbulence of modern society and set them on a proper developmental course. “The curriculum reforms at the turn of the twentieth century were social technologies to govern how children are to understand who they are and what they are in society” (Popkewitz, 1997, p. 142). Scholars can similarly understand the emphasis on manners and morals in the early 20th-century Canadian context as a technique, a design of government.

The reciprocal dimension to the pastoral engagement is evident in Department of Education documents and in professional guidance given to early 20th-century social studies teachers. Authors of such documents imposed on social studies teachers to comport themselves as pastoral guides, as models of good national living. For example, a 1943 article on democracy and education in the *Educational Courier*, a joint publication of the Federation of Women Teachers’ Federations of Ontario and the Ontario Public School Men Teachers’ Federation, stated that

the first qualification of an educator in a democracy is that he or she should be a faithful and enthusiastic disciple of democracy, for no one can inspire others with a love for any cause or a willingness to sacrifice to defend it, unless he or she really believes in that cause. (Greene, 1943, p. 22)

The quotation is printed beside a call for teachers to participate in war-work. The duty of the democratic teacher is not only to cultivate in children a predisposition to national servitude, but to readily sacrifice themselves, as educators, in the effort to support the British Empire in its battles with enemy nations around the world. The teacher’s professional duty, in this example, is informed by pre-modern ideological constructions about the sacrificial and martyr-like role of the pastorate.

#### HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY: A GUIDE TO GOOD NATIONAL LIVING

Anderson (1983) argued that the narrative histories of nations shape subject relations; I contend that this phenomenon is also evident in the constitution of student identity in the social studies curriculum. As Donald (1985)

summarized, “[I]t is the construction of a national past in terms of a specific narrative conception of time [and space] that allows for subjectification within the discourses of nationalism — whether as the subjects of national destiny or as a subject to the sacrifices it demands” (p. 240). For example, the Ontario teachers’ manuals (1926) state that

children . . . have more or less immature power of generalizing . . . [and so] we wish to teach the important facts of the development of the Empire and of Canada, so that these future citizens may know how we have come to what we are and have today. So many are inclined to take for granted the social, political, and other conditions in which we live now, and do not give credit as they should to the pioneers who made these things possible. (p. 5)

The 1926 Ontario teachers’ manuals also stated that “knowledge of history is useful for citizenship and statesmanship [and this] is shown by the fact that our best citizens and our leading statesmen are faithful students of the past” (p. 6). To be students of the past — as social studies pupils are imposed upon to be — they must locate themselves in relation to the historical lessons taught. In other words, students must partake in what might be called the cultural unconscious, which demands patterns of subjectification to the discourses of nation, citizenship, and its history that are implicit, unspoken, and yet culturally salient. The process of subject constitution demands that self-directed students willingly submit to the expert knowledge of the teacher without questioning the authority that gave rise to the particular configuration of the nation’s past.

Post-colonial scholar Said (1979) wrote that “imaginative geography and history help the mind to intensify its own sense of itself by dramatizing the distance and difference between what is close to it and what is far away” (p. 55). Focusing on the rhetorical devices used to orchestrate a division between people of the Western and East Asian world, Said showed how the identity and history of Western nations depends on discursive techniques used to separate the First World from developing nations, and to claim superiority on the part of the former. Donald (1985) also contended that, “If the curriculum is a mechanism for instituting patterns of social differentiation, then it operates not through its content but by regulating the circulation and appropriation of symbolic codes for classifying knowledge and representing reality” (p. 240). The core curriculum becomes the homogenizing conceptual system for understanding what gets to count as history and who someone is in that narrative structure. The fictional unity that comprises the historical curriculum renders it difficult to opt out of the cultural logic on which the story is founded, and to imagine oneself outside of the pre-ordained subject positions constituted by the

dominant script.

Pastoral pedagogy demands that students of history engage in self-forming activities. Foucault (1985) explained in his discussion of moral action that it is not only

self-awareness but self-formation as an ethical subject, a process in which the individual delimits that part of himself that will form the object of his moral practice, defines his position relative to the precept he will follow, and decides on a certain mode of being that will serve as his moral goal. And this requires him to act upon himself, to monitor, test, improve, and transform himself. (p. 28)

Submission to a governing moral discourse (and history is, of course, one such discourse) involves "behavioral [modification] and forms of subjectivation" (Foucault, 1985, p. 29). It is not enough that the devout pupil learn the content information pertinent to the development of the British Empire and Canada as a colony. The teachers imposed this attitude on children to foment an emotive attachment to the lessons of history. As written in the 1926 Ontario teachers' manuals, teachers measured the success of teaching not by knowledge or method but by a "well balanced mixture of knowledge, method and interest" (p. 9). The manual goes on: "It is also the function of the teacher to build up a taste for history, so that, by the pleasure it gives, history may help to fill up wisely the leisure part of life" (p. 7). Rote memorization of discrete names and dates will not alone fulfil the call to subjectivation that is essential to the pastoral pedagogical programming of the child-centred social studies program. Students must willingly submit themselves to the area of study.

The provincial curriculum stressed that the teacher should not fail to "Emphasize the extent, power and responsibilities of the British Empire, its contributions to the highest form of civilization, the achievement of its statesmen and its generals, and the increasing important place that Canada holds amongst the Over Seas Dominions" (Department of Education, 1930, p.17). This emphasis should be accompanied by supplementary reading of Canadian and British stories about history, lessons on the significance of the flag, and inscribed duties of citizenship. As future voting members of Canadian society,

Children need to be taught that citizens have responsibilities as well as rights; and the problem of teaching citizenship is mainly how to inculcate in children the spirit of *service* to the community, to make them realize that there are *others*, that citizenship is, after all, just *living together in a community*. (The Ontario Teachers' Manuals, 1926, p. 89)

The writers of these manuals deemed the ethic of the citizen to be the

most important objective of historical and geographical study. "It is a difficult matter to introduce this idea of service, of living together, into the minds of children, but it must be attempted" (The Ontario Teachers' Manuals, 1926, p. 89).

Not unlike the Christian missionary who spread the word of God, students of history disseminated the lessons of history in keeping with a British world view. For example, in the fifth-grade form of the 1930 curriculum, the teacher is required to introduce topics related to European expansion and colonization. Curriculum writers thought that the Age of Discovery was a product of a natural human yearning for a taste of the unknown. The authors of this curriculum document wrote that

By the end of the twelfth century the lure of the unknown was beginning to urge the European to enquire what lay under the clouds that enshrouded the edges of his flat world. . . . [With] the desire for riches, and the spirit of adventure, seaman after seaman ventured farther and farther into the void, and returned to astonish his friends with tales of the new lands, vast oceans and strange peoples he had found. (Department of Education, 1930, p. 75)

As Said (1979) maintained, the foreign subject, the exotic and differentiated other, became separated from the Westernized subject. Children acquainted themselves with the earth's geography and relate to the Third World subject from the standpoint of the colonist: "Continents and islands, seas and rivers, mountains, volcanoes and glaciers. Reference to maps should give the child a knowledge of their position. . . . [And] stories will show, too, strange new peoples in their desert, jungle, or tropical island homes" (Department of Education, 1930, p. 76). Because foreign lands were the object of exotic fascination, teachers encouraged students to orchestrate an imagined relationship to colonized others in keeping with the colonial standpoint. Topics in the history section of the curriculum included a focus on the riddle of distant Africa and the missionary impulse of Livingstone and Stanley in the heart of the continent. That their mission was to bring light to the Dark Continent was very well established in the social studies units presented in the curriculum guidelines.

Like the instructions given to teachers of history, the subcommittee on elementary education, appointed by the Department of Education in 1936, emphasized the human side of the geography unit. The departmental document stated that

Since geography is the study of the people of the world living under varied conditions, this committee recommends that the human side of the subject be stressed; and therefore, the matter taught will be determined by the extent to which associations, directly bearing

on the lives of people can be made. (Geography, 1936, p. 16)

The stated purpose of the unit was to consider how existing land formations and patterns of settlement have shaped Canadians — character, customs, and habits. Curriculum writers represented natural and inevitable colonial settlement patterns and social, economic, and political relations between European settlers and First Nations peoples in Canada, and tribal communities around the world. For example, the following quotation provides an example of how the geographical outlay of nations were rendered natural and inevitable:

[T]he lack of a natural boundary between France and Germany has led to many disputes between these countries; the fact that Great Britain is an island accounts for many things in her history; the lack of a good seaport has influenced the foreign policy of Russia; the physical features of Quebec and Gibraltar explain the importance of these places; the waterways of Canada account for the course of early settlement. The climate and soil of a country affect its history; treaties are often based on physical conditions, and trade routes determined by them; a nation's commerce and wealth depend largely on the character of its natural resources. (Department of Education, 1930, p. 17)

The Department's description presumes a natural order of things that removes colonial encounters and their associated atrocities from the realm of human activity and social construction. It then becomes difficult to subject geographical facts to socio-political critique, and the cultural unconscious reigns supreme. The natural environment and the international struggles that were represented in the curriculum documents were written as if they were pre-ordained by God, and the governmental structures that have given rise to such struggles were sanctified by an auspicious claim to the nature of things.

The regulatory capacity of pastoral care was particularly evident in social studies instruction, with its focus, implicit or explicit, on European exploration, European colonization, and social relations between colonizer and colonized. Teachers taught children of the Empire to see themselves as a potential carer for the lost souls of distant Africa, and translated the history of colonial domination into one of Christian, philanthropic concern. As disciples of the British Empire, the children of Canada were born into a ready-made mission that teachers were expected to cultivate with sympathetic care, moral teachings, and guidance, by carefully inciting in children the desire to adopt an allegiance to the British Empire and the developing nation of Canada. The practice of caring through sympathetic and compassionate attachment did not offset the regulatory aspects of

pastoral pedagogy in schools (or the history of European colonization), but was itself an aggressive regulatory device mediating subject identification and relations between teacher and pupil, pupil and Aboriginal/foreign/immigrant subject. Not insignificantly, this process of identity formation also set the stage for the reproduction of colonial relations (and their original subject positions of colonizer/colonized) abroad as Canadian children were taught to cultivate feelings of paternal superiority, camouflaged as selflessness.

#### FROM COLONY TO NATION: THE EMERGENCE OF THE PATRIOTIC CITIZEN

In this article I have argued that Christianity played a role in the pastoral pedagogical orientation mandated by the early social studies curriculum documents of the early 20th century. Focusing on the rise of the social studies movement (and the child-centred pedagogy associated with this project), I have explored the relationship between social studies content knowledge and the pastoral pedagogical practice of self-government, ethical self-formation, and the reciprocal subject constitutions inherent to the pedagogical practice inscribed in the provincial curriculum documents of the 1920s and 1930s.

The notion of the loyal British disciple is key to pinpointing the moment in which content knowledge becomes linked with the pastoral, pedagogical project of national identity construction. The reciprocal constitution of the loyal subject is threefold: the teacher is first designated moral guardian, carrier of the Christian message as it is transmuted into the language of citizenship education; the pupils then internalize subject specific knowledge, cultivates an attachment to it, and then see themselves as responsible, self-governing citizens, agents of care; thirdly, pupils as future citizens of the British Empire are called on to foster a paternalistic relationship to non-Westernized others that is predicated on a colonial configuration of pastoral care. The aggressiveness of this incitement to care is masked by an appeal to sacrificial, ascetic care in the tradition of the Christian missionary; colonial encounters are subsequently reproduced, at the level of subject constitution, in social studies curriculum materials.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to thank Helen Harper and Goli Rezai-Rashtu, from the University of Western Ontario, for reading and providing critical feedback on an earlier draft of this paper.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.
- Barth, J. (1991). Beliefs that discipline the social studies. *The International Journal of Social Studies Education*, 6(2), 19–24.
- Best, R. E., Jarvis, C. B., & Ribbins, P. M. (1977). Pastoral care: Concept and process. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 25(2), 124–135.
- Department of Education. (1930). *Courses of Study for the Public and Separate Schools* — Issued by the Authority of the Minister of Education.
- Department of Education. (1941). *Courses of Study for the Public and Separate Schools* — Issued by the Authority of the Minister of Education.
- Donald, J. (1985). Beacons of the future: Schooling, subjection and subjectification. In V. Beechey & J. Donald (Eds.), *Subjectivity and social relations: A reader* (pp. 214–249). Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Duncan, C. (1988). *Pastoral care: An antiracist/multicultural perspective*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Foucault, M. (1982) Afterword: The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed., pp. 208–226). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1985). *The use of pleasure. Volume 2 of The history of sexuality* (R. Hurtey, trans.). New York: A Division of Random House, Inc.
- Geography. (1936). *Geography* 6(3), p. 16-18.
- Goodson, I. (1987) *School subjects and curriculum change*. London, UK, & New York: The Falmer Press.
- Goodson, I., & Marsh, C. J. (1996). *Studying school subjects*. London, UK & Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.
- Greene, M. (1943). Democracy and education. *The Educational Courier*, 13(4), 21–22.
- Hunter, I. (1994). *Rethinking the school: Subjectivity, bureaucracy and criticism*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kaplan, L. (1984). *Adolescence: The farewell to childhood*. New York: Touchstone.
- Lang, P. (1985). Pastoral care in English schools: A Canadian perspective. *Canadian Counsellor/Conseiller Canadian*, 19(3 & 4), 220–229.
- Lybarger, M. B. (1987). Need as ideology: Social workers, social settlements, and the social studies. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *The formation of the school subjects:*

- The struggle for creating an American institution* (pp. 176–189). New York, Philadelphia, & London, UK: The Falmer Press.
- Mallory, F. (1948). Home Visits. *The Educational Courier* 18(5), 8.
- Ontario Teachers' Manuals. (1926). History, Authorized by the Minister of Education. Toronto: Copp Clark Company Ltd.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (1997). The production of reason and power: Curriculum history and intellectual traditions. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 29, 131–164.
- Power, S. (1995). *The Pastoral and the academic: Conflict and contradiction in the curriculum*. London, UK: Cassell.
- Power, S. (1991). "Pastoral Care" as curriculum discourse: A study in the reformation of "academic" schooling. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 5(1), 193–208.
- Ribbins, P. (Ed.). (1985). *Schooling and welfare*. London, UK, & Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.
- Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Spacks, P. M. (1981). *The adolescent idea: Myths of youth and the adult imagination*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sarup, M. (1982). *Education, state and crisis: A Marxist perspective*. London, UK, & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Tomkins, G. S. (1986). *A common countenance: Stability and change in the Canadian curriculum*. Scarborough, ON: Prentice Hall Canada Inc.