

Resources for Teaching Canada in U.S. Schools

Vol. II, 2009-2010

A Rationale for Teaching Canada

By

William W. Joyce, Professor Emeritus
Michigan State University

Published by the Canadian Studies Center, Michigan State University, 306 International Center, East Lansing, MI 48824. This publication was funded in part by a grant from the Government of Canada and by the Michigan State University Canadian Studies Center. This paper is intended for distribution at meetings of the National Council for the Social Studies, the Michigan Council for the Social Studies and at other meetings of educators.

All rights reserved. Do not duplicate without written permission.

In the student-managed newspaper of an American university, the caption of a photograph referred to “Ottawa, Quebec.” That error likely went unnoticed outside the local area, but when President John F. Kennedy referred to Japan – rather than Canada – as “our best trading partner,” one must wonder to what extent otherwise knowledgeable Americans are ignorant of Canada’s importance to the United States.¹ Even in those states on the U.S.-Canadian border, misconceptions about Canada exist. Studies of social studies students’ knowledge of Canada uniformly reveal that at all levels, elementary through college, students know very little about Canada and its relations with the United States. This conclusion is particularly vexing when one considers two studies, one by Segal,² the other by Joyce,³ which revealed that pre-service social studies teachers at the college level knew about as much about Canada as their colleagues at other institutions—despite the fact that more than 40 percent of the subjects had grown up less than 10 miles from the Canadian-U.S. border!

U.S. students can complete their K-12 and college educations without acquiring important information about Canada. These students are likely to acquire information about ancient Rome or Mesopotamia and many other areas of the world, past and present, yet one need not argue against including existing subject matter in social studies to suggest that Canada deserves far more attention in the social studies curriculum than it receives.

Two Best Friends

Americans’ lack of knowledge about Canada is particularly disturbing when one acknowledges that the U.S. and Canada maintain a strong friendship. Not only are the

two nations neighbors closely bound by geography and history, they also have strong, unique connections; consider these examples:

- Many of our family members and friends are Canadian.
- The vast majority of consumer products made in Canada are imported by the U.S.
- We purchase more manufactured oil products from Canada than from any other country in the world.
- The U.S. is heavily dependent on electrical power generated in Canada.
- The U.S. and Canada share in governing the Great Lakes and other bodies of water on the U.S.-Canadian border.
- The U.S. and Canada maintain the world's largest trade relationship, amounting to nearly 600 billion dollars annually.
- Canada-U.S. trade supports more than seven million U.S. jobs; Canada is the leading export market in 35 states.
- Canada fears U.S. domination of its culture industries—especially radio, TV, publishing, composing music and painting.
- Canada and the U.S. are committed to fighting terrorism on a global scale.
- The U.S. and Canada jointly maintain an electrical power grid linking the two countries.
- Numerous Canadian entertainers and media personalities perform before U.S. audiences. A few of them: Celine Dion, Shania Twain, k.d. Lang, Michael J. Fox, Donald and Kiefer Sutherland, Robert McNeil, Paul Gross and William Shatner.
- With the exception of the recent war with Iraq, Canada has willingly supported U.S. military engagements in countries abroad, including Afghanistan.

- Prior to the Civil War, between 40,000 and 50,000 runaway slaves fled to Canada, where they built new lives for themselves.
- Quebec and Ontario and the eight Great Lakes states are opposed to the bulk sales of Great Lakes water to other nations and are committed to keeping Asian carp and other invasive species of aquatic life out of the Great Lakes.
- Many thousands of Canadians fought in the U.S. Civil War; 5,000 are known to have died in this war; a century later, many Canadians fought in U.S. uniforms in the jungles of Vietnam.

Sources of Friction

From time to time, best friends can have disagreements. Growing animosity between the U.S. and Great Britain early in the Civil War, fueled by British and Canadian fears of U.S. annexation of Canada, caused Canadians to favor the U.S. South. No doubt the Northern blockade of Atlantic ports and the powerful, provincial influence of thousands of wealthy, cultured Southerners residing in Canada were major factors. In the final days of the Civil War, Toronto, Halifax and Montreal housed Confederate spy networks, harbored escaped prisoners and served as launching pads for raids along the Northern border states, including a failed attempt to burn hotels and public buildings in New York City. Northerners, perhaps justifiably angered by these unwanted incursions, began to speak of annexing Canada, which increased Canadian rhetoric about confederation.⁴

From time to time, best friends can have disagreements. One of the more serious disputes between Canada and the U.S. occurred during the second Iraq War, when Prime

Minister Jean Chretien's government refused to join President George Bush's coalition of nations against Iraq and made it abundantly clear that they would not send Canadian combat troops to Iraq (eventually Chretien allowed U.S. war material to be shipped to Iraq in Canadian vessels). For the duration of the war, the U.S. was criticized in the Canadian press, which claimed from the onset of hostilities that weapons of mass destruction did not exist and that the Bush-Cheney administration had lied to the American public about Saddam Hussein's military intentions against the U.S. and its allies. The majority of these prescient sentiments originated in Quebec and in other parts of Canada with few direct economic ties to the U.S. When the Iraq war ended, Canada requested and received U.S. permission to participate in the rebuilding of Iraq.

Today, Canada is an active player in the war in Afghanistan and in other hot spots in that area, though Prime Minister Stephen Harper has publicly spoken of withdrawal in 2010. (It is interesting to note that the U.S. media rarely acknowledges the participation of Canada and other countries in the war in Afghanistan.) To a great extent Canada's seemingly about face in military intervention in the Middle East can be attributed to Prime Minister Harper, who has proclaimed his desire to strengthen ties and friendship with the U.S. Perhaps Harper was thinking of the many economic realities affecting the U.S.-Canada relationship—particularly the burgeoning close-knit integration of the economies of both countries, or their steadfast, common commitment to combating terrorism in North America. This friendship is being tested frequently by the U.S., as it tightens restrictions on crossing the border into the U.S. Earlier we noted a growing decline in border crossings—especially between Michigan and Ontario, where well over 60 percent of border traffic between the two nations occurs. Since Canada's economy is

driven in large part by trade with the U.S., this decline has adversely affected Canadian business and industry, a situation that could grow worse if further restrictions on the flow of traffic into the U.S. are imposed. Currently, U.S. officials are contemplating tightening the border by initiating searches on a truck-by-truck basis of U.S.-bound traffic from Canada and Mexico. A recent report commissioned by the Brookings Institution calls for greater local flexibility to facilitate the flow of people and trade across the U.S.-Canadian border and recognizes that security on the U.S. northern border should be applied differently than at the Mexican Border.

Other sources of friction have erupted in the past 10 years; among these: “mad cow” disease in Alberta, softwood timber, nuclear plants, oil drilling, and the U.S. Coast Guard exercises. In 2003, a steer infected with “mad cow” disease was discovered in southern Alberta, astride the U.S. border. Local residents claim that this part of the international border is not clearly marked where the steer was found (and if it were marked, cattle could not read the sign anyway) and cattle typically roam back and forth across the border. The Bush administration officials claimed that since the steer in question was in Alberta at the time of the discovery, they were justified in imposing a ban on the importation of Canadian beef, a ban that lasted for several years and cost Canadian beef producers devastating financial losses. A dispute over importation of Canadian softwood lumber into the U.S. continues to fester. Claiming that Canadians were overcharging their American customers for this lumber, the U.S. government imposed a ban on the shipping of Canadian lumber to the U.S., which caused Canadian suppliers huge losses. This case, under adjudication by an international court, has not been resolved as of this writing. Canadian utility companies built and operate nuclear power

plants near Lake Michigan. The presence of these plants and their potential threat to the public have gone largely unnoticed; nor have oil wells in the Canadian water of Lake Michigan. While Congress permanently banned drilling in U.S. waters, Canada has not altered its production plans. U.S. studies reveal that oil spills are common near the Canadian wells yielding significant pollution detrimental to wildlife and humans.⁵

In the early 2000s the U.S. Coast Guard, without consulting with the Canadian government, initiated training exercises on the Great Lakes, using live ammunition. These were not abandoned until Canadian authorities formally objected to the U.S. government. Fortunately, no injuries were reported during the exercises. Currently the U.S. and Canada are involved in planning the construction of a new bridge linking Detroit, Michigan with its neighbor, Windsor, Ontario. The owner of the existing bridge between these cities prefers one location for the new span, while the U.S. and Canadian governments prefer another. This show of cooperation is a more typical example of positive Canadian-American relations.

Over the years Canada has feared U.S. control over its culture industries—especially radio, TV, publishing, composing and painting. Grants to composers and painters have stimulated considerable artistic activity, but quotas regulating radio and TV content have failed to minimize U.S. content. Currently 90 percent of the movies and 75 percent of TV shows viewed in Canada are made in the U.S. Perhaps Canadians need to redefine Canadian culture before attempting to preserve it?

For many years, Canadians have been concerned that Americans do not take Canada seriously. Former Prime Minister Trudeau once claimed that sharing a border with the United States is like “sleeping with an elephant. No matter how friendly or

even-tempered is the beast, if I may call it that, one is affected by every twitch and grunt.”⁶ Clearly the U.S. has far more political, economic and military power and U.S. policies affect Canada more than the other way around. It is not surprising that Canadians can be offended when Americans are oblivious of their impact on Canada. Former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney once claimed that “Canada receives less attention down there (i.e., in Washington) than Cuba, Nicaragua or El Salvador. To get noticed in Washington, according to Mulroney, you have to be either Wayne Gretzky (the Canadian hockey star) or a good snow storm.”⁷

An Enduring Friendship

But there are numerous instances of U.S.-Canadian friendship which obscure these squabbles. Few countries would have dared to smuggle out of Iran U.S. officials who had escaped from the U.S. embassy in Teheran in 1979, where many of the U.S. diplomatic staff were held captive by Iranian militants. At great risk to themselves and their nation, Canadian Embassy officials issued passports to the Americans and whisked them through checkpoints at the Teheran airport and onto a waiting aircraft bound for home. Shortly thereafter, a huge billboard near the Canadian border at Detroit read “Thank you, Canada,” as an expression of U.S. gratitude for this courageous act.

A second example of America’s enduring friendship with Canada occurred on the day of and during the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of 9/11, when Canada allowed 226 wide-bodied commercial aircraft in U.S. airspace to land at its major airports. According to David Collinette, Canadian Transport Minister, immediately after Canada allowed the

aircraft to land on their soil, one plane was entering Canadian air space every 90 seconds⁸.

These were planes determined by the U.S. Federal Aeronautics Administration to be too dangerous to allow in U.S. air space. U.S. officials gave no advance notice about their cargoes to Canadian officials who parked the planes nose-to-nose at the airports. “We might have been putting Canadian lives at risk,” Collinette admitted, “but the alternative was unthinkable---planes running out of fuel and crashing. So on humanitarian grounds we accepted the aircraft and the risks⁹.” The Canadian people fed, housed and cared for more than 33,000 of the stranded air passengers. Its government accepted the risk of allowing the 226 planes to land at its airports. Soon after, 100,000 Canadians held a candlelight vigil at Ottawa’s Parliament Hill in honor of the 3,000 people who lost their lives in the destruction of the world Trade Center in New York. In the aftermath of 9/11, Prime Minister Chretien of Canada visited the twin towers destruction site where he pledged Canada’s total support for the war on terrorism and received President Bush’s warm words of thanks.

Where a country is permitted to build its embassy in the capital of the host nation is highly significant. Canada is the only country allowed to build its embassy on Pennsylvania Avenue, between the Capitol and the White House, while the site of the U.S. Embassy is in a place of honor on Parliament Hill, near the Canadian Prime Minister’s residence.

A Growing Interdependency

A dominant theme in this paper is that in many diverse ways throughout the history of these two nations, they have grown dependent on each other. A painful example of this interdependency occurred in 2001, when a massive cascading power failure—the worst in U.S. and Canadian history—served as a terrifying reminder of how a simple event could paralyze entire regions of both countries. The power failure affected people in southern Ontario and an eight state area from New York City to Michigan, where 50 million people were without power for periods ranging from a few hours to over a week. The event was traced to defective power grids in Ohio and the failure of power providers in this vast region to send emergency warnings immediately after the power failure occurred. This event underscored the need to insure that disasters of this type do not occur in the future. It highlighted the vulnerability of power generating plants, nuclear and fossil fuel power generating levels, as well as oil and gas pipelines and electronic data systems in the U.S.-Canada energy network, and demonstrated the need for the two nations to create an integrated energy infrastructure with safeguards to protect against human error as well as terrorist attacks. It is likely that terrorists who intended to attack Canada and the U.S. probably enjoyed this monumental power failure and might have seen this as an opportunity to sabotage both nations.

U.S. needs for petroleum products, natural gas and electricity are increasingly being met by Canada. Accelerated petroleum production from Alberta's tar sands, new gas transmission lines, and greater hydroelectric capacity are increasing American dependence on Canadian energy. Over 60 per cent of U.S.-Canada border crossings occur between Ontario and Michigan—via the Ambassador Bridge, the Windsor Tunnel, and the Blue Water and Peace Bridges. As I indicated earlier, plans are underway for

building another bridge between the two countries in the Detroit-Windsor area to relieve congestion.

Experts believe that Michigan will play a greater role in trade linking Canada with Europe and North and South America. The Canada-Michigan bridge and tunnel crossings have been designated by economists as links in the NAFTA super highway linking Canada, the U.S. and Mexico. These links will grow in importance as new Europe—North America trade routes link Goteborg, Sweden with Halifax, Nova Scotia. These two deep water ports, are located at the place where the two continents are geographically closest to each other and should generate significant savings in shipping costs, especially when container ships are used.

The U.S.-Civil War: A Defining Moment?

Canada played a major role in the U.S. Civil War, one that few Americans are aware of. Clair Hoy calls this war “a defining moment in Canadian History,”¹⁰ in recognition of the tens of thousands of Canadians who fought in the war ,(many were lured by generous signing bonuses); and while an estimated 5,000 died in the struggle, thousands more suffered serious injuries and even more decided to remain in the U.S. after the war had ended. Growing hostility between the United States and Great Britain caused many Canadian loyalists to support the U.S. South. No doubt the Northern Blockade of Atlantic ports, including Halifax, Canada’s leading Atlantic port, and the growing influence of thousands of wealthy, cultured Southerners residing in Canada were major factors. In the final days of the war, Montreal, Toronto, Halifax and St. Catherine’s housed Confederate spy networks, harbored escaped prisoners and served as launching pads for raids along northern border states, including a failed attempt to burn hotels and

public buildings in New York City. A successful attack on the village of St. Albans, Vermont, yielding over \$200,000 stolen from local banks, the capture of Union ships on the Great Lakes, and numerous raids on Yankee ships by Confederate pirates, encouraged the Confederacy. One Confederate ship, the Tallahassee, captured over 100 vessels flying the Union flag. Northerners, angered by these unfriendly acts, began to speak of annexing Canada. In response to these growing fears, Canadians gave thoughtful consideration to establishing their own nation (with Britain's help) in 1867.

Canadian fear of American annexation had existed as early as 1775 when Thomas Jefferson spoke of Canada joining the fledgling American union. Later, the flavor of this idea was reiterated in the Articles of Confederation, but it was not until a newspaper writer, John Louis O'Sullivan, introduced the concept of "Manifest Destiny", that annexation of Canada by the U.S. was a strong possibility. This nationalistic belief, that U.S. annexation of land eastward and westward and northward and southward of the U.S. border, was inevitable and ordained by God, became the justification for the U.S.'s annexation of Texas, California, the Oregon Territory, and Alaska.

Thomas D'Arcy McGee, a Canadian newspaperman-turned politician, issued many ominous warnings to his countrymen about American territorial ambitions. In his Confederation speech, D'Arcy McGee alleged that Americans always wanted to expand their country: "they coveted Florida, and seized it. They coveted Louisiana, and purchased it; they coveted Texas, and stole it, and then they picked a quarrel with Mexico, which ended by their getting California. They sometimes pretend to despise these colonies as prizes beneath their ambition but had we not had the strong arm of England over us, we should not now have a separate existence."¹¹ Oscar D. Skelton, a

historian, spoke for many knowledgeable Canadians about the profound effects of the Civil War on Canadian Confederation in these words, “If the Civil War did not bring forth a new nation in the South, it helped to make one in the far North. A common danger drew the scattered British Provinces together and made ready the way for the coming dominion of Canada.”¹²

The Canadian Connection to Abraham Lincoln

Transplanted Southerners in Canada devised schemes to harass the U.S. during the Civil War. John Porterfield, a banker, attempted to destabilize U.S. currency by buying a huge sum of U.S. greenbacks, others sought to free P.O.W.’s from Johnson’s Island in Lake Erie, and still others proposed spreading yellow fever to the Northern states through infected clothing (as the British had done to the Indians in British Columbia). Nearly every scheme failed, largely because of vigilant surveillance by eagle-eyed Canadian officials and an alert Lincoln Administration.

St. Lawrence Hall in Montreal, the city’s finest hotel, was one of John Wilkes Booth’s command centers. It was there that Booth could have planned the kidnapping of Lincoln and his cabinet, which was squelched by Confederate leaders, including Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederacy. Historians claim that at one time or another, Secretary of War Stanton, officials of the Catholic Church, the Secret Knights of the Golden Circle (recently popularized in Dan Brown’s contemporary fictional novels on Catholicism) and unnamed Jewish bankers were among those incorrectly identified as chief conspirators, but recent analyses of papers associated with Lincoln’s assassination implicate Confederate leaders who allegedly planned this event in Montreal, where mint

juleps were a popular refreshment at the St. Lawrence Hall Hotel. Booth's recruiting trips and his frequent visits to Montreal, Toronto and New York City suggest a Northern dimension to the killing of Lincoln, which seems to temper the theory of powerful Confederate connections. Perhaps Booth's misdirection was his secret weapon? Using lies and false insinuations, he crafted the impression that his conspiracy against Lincoln was larger than it actually was. Perhaps he did this to boost his credibility, confuse potential witnesses, prod his cohorts into action, or entrap anyone who might potentially betray his trust. On stage or off, he was always an actor, claimed Michael Kauffman in his book, American Brutus.¹³

Kauffman and other historians correctly alleged that the American system of state sovereignty proved to be a pernicious weakness, which contributed to the Civil War. Indeed, when the Canadian Confederation was proposed, the future Prime Minister, McDonald, and his followers insured that Canada would have a strong central government that would not repeat mistakes of the Americans.

Changing Canada, Changing Needs

Have these powerful, unifying forces detailed here encouraged Americans to take Canada for granted? Until 9/11 American diplomatic efforts to engage Canada in our military affairs was sporadic, probably because (1) our government saw Canada as a loyal ally that was within its sphere of influence, (2) Canada received minimal coverage by the U.S. media—except when an extraordinary event occurred, (3) U.S. K-12 and college institutions barely acknowledge the existence of Canada, and (4) U.S. citizens

regarded Canada more as their 51st state than as a sovereign nation lying on their northern border.

Canadian participation in U.S. global wars is a notable exception to the tendency of the U.S. to ignore this nation. In World War I, proportionally more Canadian than American servicemen and servicewomen were killed, yet this imbalance received scant attention in the U.S. Consider the implications of Canadian participation in the U.S.-Canadian war on terrorism in North America launched on 9/11. Prior to this date, Canada, seeking to attract skilled immigrants, maintained a welcoming open door policy, with poorly guarded borders. Intended to support Canada's longstanding role as a trading nation, Canada's open door policies toward immigrants were toughened dramatically at U.S. insistence after 9/11. The net result? Draconian measures instituted jointly by both nations acting in concert to reduce the risk of terrorism in North America. Backed up by tough new laws passed by Parliament and Congress in an effort to build a new impregnable "Fortress North America," these measures redefined Canada-U.S. relations along defensive, military lines dictated largely by the U.S.

Few Canadian intellectuals have been more critical of U.S. domination of North American economic integration than Maude Barlow, national chair of the Council of Canadians, Canada's largest public advocacy organization. In Too Close for Comfort: Canada's Future Within Fortress North America¹⁴ Barlow addresses the environmental impacts of extraction of oil from Alberta tar sands and the political and economic ramifications of American control of these resources, the need for Canada to take action to protect its freshwater supplies (one way is to exempt the sale of Great Lakes water from NAFTA regulations), and clean up the pollution-causing practices of Canadian

mining practices. According to Barlow, A fixation with the energy and military needs of the United States has limited Canada's vision and potential. What should Canada do? Barlow believes that "Canada should rigorously control its own energy resources and withhold or reduce energy exports."¹⁵ Clearly, this is strong language aimed at the United States, which depends more on Canada for oil products and other mineral-based resources than any other nation in the world.

Conclusion

Though U.S. and Canadian citizens have much in common, Joyce and Ezell¹⁶ remind us that the two countries differ significantly in many respects. Compared to the U.S., Canada is a constitutional monarchy, slightly over 140 years of age, far larger in physical size, but with one-tenth the population, has two official languages, gives more per capita support to the fine arts and performing arts than the U.S., is vitally concerned over U.S. political, cultural and economic domination, and struggles to create a unifying national identity compatible with powerful regional and provincial interests. Moreover, Canada spends proportionally far less than the U.S. on its natural defense, maintains a quality of life for its people unsurpassed by the major nations of the world, and rigorously controls campaign expenditures of politicians running for public office. Clearly the U.S. and Canada differ in many significant ways. Is it not surprising that Canadians worry about the U.S.?

Canadians are justifiably uneasy over the U.S. presence to the south. They are worried about America's extensive, often controlling interests in their culture, business and commerce. The U.S. presence has been keenly felt in the Canadian automobile

industry, whose fortunes are closely connected with those of its dominant U.S. counterpart. During the recent U.S. economic meltdown, Canadian auto building communities—especially those in Ontario and Quebec—suffered greatly. Also, Canadians are concerned over U.S. participation in their burgeoning new petroleum industry in Alberta, where oil is extracted from rock and sold to an oil-hungry world at the risk of causing serious permanent environmental damage. From previous experience with U.S. involvement in Canadian economic development, Canadians have learned that this type of participation often brings U.S. control. Similarly, as indicated earlier, some Canadians fear U.S. control of measures taken by both countries to resist terrorist acts in North America will result impede Canadian trade and other economic activity.

Finally, Canadians are worried that we Americans know so little about their history, their institutions, their culture, their aspirations, and the numerous relationships, social, economic and political, that connect the two nations. Too often Canadians regard American ignorance of their nation as American arrogance.¹⁷ What quality of friendship exists when one party knows the other very well, but the second party hardly knows the first? Clearly there is a need for our students to become far more knowledgeable about Canada and its relations with the United States. As social studies teachers, we must promote the teaching of Canada in our schools. In view of the traditionally strong bonds between these two nations and their common political, social, economic and environmental concerns, the teaching of Canada and Canadian-U.S. relations becomes a vital investment in our future.

Questions for use in secondary social studies classes

Following are questions intended to stimulate student thinking about major ideas in this paper.

1. Compare and contrast the Canadian ideals of “peace, order, and good government” with the American ideals of “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”
2. One long- term, festering concern of Canadian leaders was embedded in the idea of “manifest destiny” created by U.S. journalists. In what ways could this idea have stimulated mid-19th Canadian thinking about confederation.
3. On 9/11 at the request of the U.S. government, Canada allowed aircraft in American skies to land at Canadian airports. By that evening 227 jumbo jets were parked nose-to-nose at airports in Halifax, Toronto, Vancouver, and other major cities. Explain the risks involved in such an undertaking.
4. Why did Canadian officials carefully monitor the activities of confederate spies in Canada during the Civil War?
5. U.S.-Canadian relations were at a low point during the second U.S.-Iraq war when George W. Bush and Jean Chretien lead their respective countries. Explain one central issue that divided Canada and the U.S.
6. What are some possible explanations for the U.S. Congress’ refusal to reward Harriet Tubman for her tireless, inspired work as an abolitionist and later for her work in the Union army as a spy, scout, and commando?
7. Unlike the U.S., Canada is very protectionist regarding its cultural industries—especially radio, TV and magazine, music and book publishing. List some of these measures and the results they intend to produce.
8. The U.S. and Canada are the world’s greatest trading partners. What are the positive and negative aspects of the U.S.-Canadian relationship?
9. The American presence to the south has been a continuing source of concern to Canadians. What should the U.S. be doing to alleviate Canadian anxieties?
10. A major theme of this paper is that the United States can ill-afford to ignore Canada and treat this country as its fifty-first state. What are the consequences of this unwritten policy for U.S.-Canadian relations?
11. Maude Barlow alleged that “A fixation with the energy and military needs of the United States has limited Canada’s vision and potential.” Do you agree or disagree with Barlow’s allegation? Why? /Why not?

12. Harriet Tubman had a \$50,000 reward on her head when she guided runaway slaves to freedom in Canada. Study a map depicting one of her successful routes northward to freedom in Canada, then explain why this route proved to be successful for Harriet and her followers.
13. The August 23, 2003 Canadian-U.S. power failure—the worst in the history of the two nations--which deprived 50 million people in Ontario and an eight state region of electrical power for as long as a week—has many implications for the energy infrastructure of the U.S. and Canada. What are they?

Notes

¹William W. Joyce and Macel D. Ezell, “Adding a New Dimension to Social Studies,” Introduction to Canada in the Classroom. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1985, p. 1.

²Avner Segall, “What do Prospective Social Studies Teachers in the U.S. Know About Canada?,” Michigan Social Studies Journal, 14: spring, 2003, pp. 7-10.

³William W. Joyce, “Pre-service Social Studies Teachers’ Knowledge of Canada.” Unpublished paper, 2003.

⁴Claire Hoy, Canadians in the Civil War. Toronto: McArthur, 2004.

⁵William W. Joyce “Canada Confronts the Challenges of the Future.” Michigan Social Studies Journal, 14: spring, 2003, pp. 24-28.

⁶Wayne C. Thompson, Canada 2007. Harpers Ferry, WVA: Stryker-Post, 2007.

⁷Canada 2007.

⁸William W. Joyce, “The Border and Fortress America.” In Canada and the United States: One border, Many Challenges, *Detroit Free Press*, 2005.

⁹“The Border and Fortress America.” p. 22.

¹⁰Canadians in the Civil War, pp. v-viii.

¹¹Canadians in the Civil War. pp. 321-372.

¹²Canadians in the Civil War. p. 377.

¹³Michael W. Kauffman, American Brutus. New York: Random House, 2004.

¹⁴Maude Barlow, Too Close for Comfort. Toronto, McClelland Stewart, 2005.

¹⁵Too Close for Comfort, p. 285.

¹⁶William W. Joyce and Macel Ezell, “Adding a New Canadian Dimension to Social Studies,” introduction to Canada in the Classroom. Washington, National Council for the Social Studies, 1985, p. 3.

¹⁷”Adding a New Canadian dimension to Social Studies.”

About the Author

William W. Joyce is professor emeritus of education and a former director of the Canadian Studies Center at Michigan State University. A co-founder of the National Consortium for Teaching Canada, he is the author or co-author of eight professional books, including three on Canada. His publication, “One Border, Many Challenges,” which he produced for the Detroit Free Press, won a prestigious Ed Press Award of Excellence over the New York Times, The Washington Post and other major newspapers. Currently he is writing a book on the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.