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LINTON KWESI JOHNSON
Politics in the Cultural Trenches

It's not for me to define my audience. Who are you? What are your political views? Are you political or non-political? Why did you come to see my show? For the music? For the poetry? I don't know who my audience is. My audience is whoever comes. Being involved in sound organizations who have a clear political position worked out over a period of years is a source of tremendous strength to me and it would be very strange if I'm writing about things going on in England and whatever I have to say isn't informed by that political position. My audience? I see black people come to my shows. I see white people come to my shows. I see young, I see old.

In this sense Johnson joins on oral history within popular music pioneered by the jazz poets or the "Bbs", Gil Scott-Heron, Amiri Baraka, Melvin Van Peebles, Elaine Brown and The Last Poets. Their poetry expressed, through distinctly Afro-American forms, the daily effects of capitalism in limiting and shaping the life experience of oppressed people. Perhaps this was clearest in Johnson's reading alone a poem for his father who died two years ago, "Reggae Fi Daddy". The story of a man who had "nothing but just one life to give". Through this unsentimental unfolding of the nature of his father's life, Linton Johnson captures the essence of neo-colonial existence.
Within this cultural history, Linton Kwesi Johnson's position is unique. He expands and continues the aural/ oral traditions of a national culture. Johnson's poems arise out of a political sensibility and commitment; they are at once critical and popular. Throughout his material, independence of action and autonomy are strained, whether for blacks in Britain or for black Americans in the Third World. His difference within a popular field, even within reggae itself, is as expressive of his own independence as an artist, poet, and political activist.

I'm just writing poetry in my language, Jamaican poetry, about things I feel are important, trying to convey the experience of what blacks and Asians are in Britain. I'm doing so in the reggae tradition... Nothing has changed (since the rise of 1980). Only that some of the houses we burnt down should be demolished years ago and now they are building some new ones. But Britain isn't black Britain. Black Britain is London, Birmingham, Liverpool, Bradford, Leeds, the inner cities. We're stronger now than we've ever been and we have a greater sense of what we can do in extreme situations. From that point of view there's been a transformation in people's consciousness, people are much more aware of what they can do now than before.

Johnson is a member of the Race Today collective and the liner notes on 'Making History' (his latest LP) give a comprehensive outline of their activities in such groups as the Black Panther Movement, Black Youth Movement and of Johnson's relationship as an artist to these. Unlike many performing artists and entertainers Johnson is not immersed in music as the expression of a political practice. It is this which defines Linon Johnson's strengths and consistency as an artist and what surfaces in his poetry, his recordings and through his presence on a club stage.

We've been able to win some new audiences because I'm sure some of the people coming to see me have never heard of me before... that's why I always take the trouble to introduce each number so people can be clear what I'm going on about. I believe in beginning with the particular and coming to the general. It's in our particular focuses that we tend to make general statements of universal relevance. You don't suddenly from somewhere out of the blue grasp the universal.

Donnis Corcoran

DISCOGRAPHY
'Dread Beat An' Blood'—Poet and The Roots, Virgin, 1978
'Pieces of Victory'—Linon Kwesi John- son, Mango, 1978
'The Calibre'—Linon Kwesi Johnson, Mango, 1980
'Making History'—Linon Kwesi John- son, Mango, 1984

'The Bun, the Beef'

There were somewhat fewer than 45 billion papers served at the 1984 convention of The Popular Culture Association and The American Culture Association. Given the claim by the association that there were 1,400 participants, my guess is that about 1,100 papers were given. How are we to read this figure? Does it simply assert that volume is a virtue in and of itself? Or is it a subtle warning that given the number of papers some may leave the audience asking, 'What's the beef?' For me, the number of titles in the program simply represented an array of sessions. In the end those I chose to attend, were for the most part based on literary texts. While a few of the papers I heard might be described as intellectual white buns, devoid even of sesame seeds (and a couple could be described as stale), the majority were intellectually meaty. Speakers chose to discuss a wide range of texts: Alcott, Emerson, Canadian women poets, the novels of Seng, of Hammett, and of Hansen, to name a few. But for me, attending the conference as both a participant and a member of the audience, the important issue became the assumed relation of the literary critic to the study of popular culture.

Of course, the sophomoric analogy to be read in my title was intended to make an obvious point: while the subject of the conference was popular culture it was also its determinant. None of us is immune to the effects of popular culture. It defines our consciousness. Yet, the posturing literary critic so assuredly adopts is that of the outsider who critiques popular culture from this position of privilege. Thus, there is a failure to acknowledge that culture reads the critic even as the critic reads culture, no position of critical privilege exists.

Let me recount two incidents which precipitated my formulation of the question. The first was an exchange in one of the few non-literary sessions I attended. After an unctual, and therefore politically problematic, presentation of ethnic jokes, the speaker was asked, 'What is popular culture?' She had no answer. Her inability even to begin to address the term 'popular culture' was not, I suspect, exceptional. While it might be expected that all of the speakers would question to some degree, the notion of popular culture, this was not the case. Not only did the speakers fail to interrogate the terms of their criticism but the audience never called for them to do so. This suppressed interrogation of the notion of popular culture in all of the papers I heard (and I include my own) is curious. I now ask: what is the implication of this suppression? What is this silence?

If we allow that commodification constructs mass culture, which in the industrialized world is an aspect of popular culture, the silence is a refusal to articulate critical praxis within relations of commodification. This was illustrated by the session called 'Cultural Metamorphosis in Margaret Atwood's Work.' After the four papers had been read an agent from a university press in Texas announced that a collection of essays in honour of Atwood's visit to the campus will be published. Submissions were invited. When there was another announcement made by someone else to the assembled: The Margaret Atwood Society, to be affiliated with The Modern Language Association, is being founded. Atwood's cultural metamorphosis would seem not to be simply restricted to her literary work. She is a commodity. Canadian publishers have long recognized that Atwood's picture on the jacket of a book or the cover of a magazine will generate sales. Atwood, the commodity, now has been franchised to academics. Atwood scholarship is an industry of feminist and Canadian studies. What could be more symptomatic of Atwood's cultural metamorphosis into a commodity than my grammatical transposition of her name into an adjective?

While I am not prepared to assert that economics is the primary determination of human activity it is one of them. The silence inscribed in the literary critic's refusal to acknowledge this determination allows the construction of critical privilege. The importance of the critic is validated by his role as the de-coder of textual mysteries. The critic, however, does not stand outside of the network of textual relations. The critic reads from within a praxis which is socially constructed. Thus, a complex inter-reading between society and critic is established by every reading. It is neither to be condemned nor celebrated because there is neither an inside nor an outside where critical praxis is located. Literary criticism must be recognized as a project is located within social and historical determinants. The refusal to make such a recognition is tantamount to an affirmation of existing social relations. Thus, the silence pre-empts the possibility of a radical literary praxis. Critics must articulate the complex of relations so that they may speak of popular culture. Regrettably this did not happen at the literary sessions.

Ann Wilson
Discussions: Art & Criticism in the Eighties

Because Toronto would not go to the mountain, Paragraph brought the conference to Shadows. Speakers at the conference magazine had to bring the three-day conference on art and criticism of the Eighties, of March 16-18) to the communications capital of Canada, so that is where you come to talk. The double-bound of the art critic is that he got heard one thereby confirms that Toronto is where everything happens.

Yet it would be an extraordinary reduction to describe this conference as a conflict between two cities: Montreal busily assimilating post-structuralist discourse from France, Toronto longing for a country where "art" is spelt with a capital A. Even if this describes the difference between Lamentations of Paragraph magazine and Richard Rhodes, Toronto-based editor of the new C art magazine, there were many other voices, many other discussions.

Indeed, it seemed that Richard Rhodes had a rough time of it. The highlights of the three-day discussion can be described in terms of the trace or shadow that is the beloved of the post-structuralists, or in terms of an on-going activity or practice. The first neo-expressionist painting seen by John Scott was spray-painted on a Detroit store window and it survived three minutes until the glass was smashed by a rock or a bullet. The first slide shown at this conference was a lingering gay pornographic image by Tim Guest. My own memory is the deeper impression of the slide Benjamin Buchholz. It seemed to embrace what he had to say. These are the shadows of the three-day conference repeatedly described our situation as uneven, post-feminist and beyond revolutionary politics. The voices of activity seemed not to believe this. These voices are local and women's voices. John Bentley Mays and Philip Monk want a local and historical art criticism about the city of Toronto. And as yet another male-dominated panel took the stage, the third day of the conference an anonymous woman's voice said, "It's another boys' club."

Inspite of the Dewe's denial that he intends to raise a new universalism, it is difficult to see how such a project could ever mesh with local art-critical discourses called for by John Bentley Mays and Philip Monk. Recent art in Toronto, said Mays, operates to create a pseudo-community among artists, dealers, collectors, curators, built around the idea of the artist as victim. We must denysify artists' transnational projects about desire and subjectivity. A proper historical question might be: what are the problems in Toronto such that artists feel victimized? The answer, suggests Mays, is that Toronto is the most authoritarian civic structure in North America. At the centre of Canadian information networks, the city of Toronto is enclosed in rigid authority structures. In attempting to develop a local criticism for this centre of power, a weak and discredited language of criticism may be most useful, Mays suggested two possibilities: the critique of a culture of information development and the "theaniconic theology, and a fictional criticism drawing on the bourgeois novel. For example, the trade of the author is a specificity about desire and the city in the novels of Dickens. This example may provide a format for a local, historical criticism. Mays is himself writing, apart from his work for The Globe and Mail, such a fictional criticism.

The first slide of the conference was shown at the end of day one by Tim Guest. From the first of four exhibitions which he organized at a Space in 1983 on the theme of "Sex and Representation," the image was one of those slightly absurd classical Greek figures beautifully photographed a century ago by de Glooden. Someone said that it was refreshing to see an image at last. What no one said in this image at an international conference on recent art practice, still had the effect of a shock, chalenged, as did the exhibition it came from, the taboo on gay imagery in Toronto. So the small order in the cottage-industry period of homosexual pornography, de Glooden's vaguely classical imagery remained an important prototype of gay porn until the 1960s. Describing viewers' reaction to the exhibition, Guest said that different responses told us something about the social order rather than about the amorous soul. It says something about the social construction of sexual representations that straight men were indifferent or worse, women found the exhibition graphs cold and forbidding (women's socialization is sexuality is surrounded by warnings and prohibitions), while gay men recognized the imagery even if they had never heard of the name of de Glooden. Commenting on this show, and the three other "Sex and Representation" exhibitions, seemed to have little direct effect on debates in the women's movement, the gay movement, or the Toronto art scene, Guest suggested that that may have been because he offered attacks and instead of immediate answers.

Alan O'Connor
"There is no getting away from the machine."

"Jean Barzin -

The A/PCA Conference: Science Fiction

Approximately 33 of the approximately 416 sessions at the A/PCA conference dealt approximately with science fiction (that's approximately 5%).

Insofar as these sessions dealt with science fiction, then, as concerns a certain methodological machinery brought to bear upon objects of interest for criticism or analysis, they deal with science fiction. They handled science fiction.

Insofar as these sessions dealt with a certain methodological machinery brought to bear upon objects of interest for criticism or analysis, they marked the efficacy, or sufficiency, of the application of the machinery. They say that it is all cut and indicated the strength of the bond.

Insofar as these sessions marked out the operation of a certain methodological machinery and further marked out the demarcation of a certain social machinery, these machines were put into motion without grounding in the relationship between the construction of machines which construct the machinery of construction of a narrative machinery which demarcates the social machinery, and the very putting into motion of these machines as another (or a further) certain narrative machinery demarcating a certain social machinery. These stories about stories with significant implications did not implicate themselves socially. These analyses were not analyzed.

Insofar as these analyses were analyzed they were analyzed insofar as the interest in the machine was outlined as an interest in knowledge. This interest in knowledge was not outlined. In this regard, it could be said that knowledge (particularly as an interest) was not a machine to speak of (i.e. not spoken of either as a machine or an interest and in this respect, interest in knowledge was not spoken of as a machine, which is to say, as a production).

Insofar as this was the case, usage, seen in its particular identified sense (i.e. as in "this usage"), was seen as an indication of a certain controlling of a certain machinery, but was not seen as the machinery which identifies the machinery and produces this identification as a production of knowledge which is administered towards further productions of usage and itself. This machinery (call this machinery) remains in control of its use. This machinery: use. This machinery is only the (exception and the repetition of the exception) your control (which will control you) speaking. This contradiction is yet to be approximate as a topic.

How was it? well, it was fun, but it was very tiring. And even though I could not attend every session, it was good to get an overview of the possibilities of such a variety of topics. I always enjoyed the first day and after that, the other sessions were more interesting.

"Jean Barzin -

The A/PCA Conference: Science Fiction

How was it? well, it was fun, but it was very tiring. And even though I could not attend every session, it was good to get an overview of the possibilities of such a variety of topics. I always enjoyed the first day and after that, the other sessions were more interesting.

"Jean Barzin -

The A/PCA Conference: Science Fiction

Michael Bayoe
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If you're old enough to remember the days when television production was broadcast live, perhaps (like me) you have a certain fondness for the kind of energy and mistakes that can only happen in live programming. I don't mean TV programs that are "live" now, that long faces, or "taped before a live studio audience." I'm talking about TV programs that were meant for us in real-time, as they are happening in the studio or on location. The distinction has to be made because TV now has so scrambled the notion of what is live. Of course, nowadays almost nothing is broadcast live. But in the early 50's, when I was growing up, there was a kind of humanness that managed to transcend the recording process and come through to us watching at home.

That essence of humanness was the result of Murphy's Law. Anything that could go wrong, would go wrong. Gary Moore lost his pants unzipped. Red Skelton, making a sales pitch for pies made from Ped-i-milk, had to once into a wild dance bring a cow out in front of the camera. The gags were promptly delivered its own form of editorial commentary before the show and the commercial. On a Saturday morning kids' show, the host announced that we would be shown the commercial. "I hope that keeps the little beasts happy."

The problems for doing live TV drama were even more immense. Not only did the teleplays have to be written to facilitate the scene changes and the costume changes, but there was always the possibility that a TV camera might blow out during the broadcast, actors might miss their chalk marks on the floor and be left in silhouette, a lighting shroud was fluffed or an actor could go "cold" in front of millions of viewers and end up collapsing or a "corpse" might accidentally be shown crawling across the floor. If mistakes did, in fact, happen in one dramatic production or another.

In addition, there was always the problem of timing. A teleplay required a specific amount of time, and a required length during rehearsal, but because of the pressure of actual broadcast, the actors would often deliver their lines faster. The director would then have to stretch out the program by either drastically slowing down the closing scenes or, more often, by forcing the film credits to crawl past at the end at an agonizingly slow pace.

But mistakes are an inevitable part of live TV. The actors performed at peak interest levels without a safety net. The Mowwows had that special feeling of "being there". It was daily event programing that was anything today. The mistakes, the production "errors" only made it all seem human, likeable, risky and exciting. I suspect it's called "the golden age of TV" because there was so much creative talent involved, but because the medium was being utilized to do what it does best, and what only it can do: transmit live in real-time over vast geographical distances.

Somehow, this unique ability that did so much good had gotten lost, forgotten, by the end of the 50's. Maybe or not forever, but it's gradually being rutted out by the powers-that-be in the industry. As Erik Barnouw wrote in his book, Tube of Plenty and The Sponsor, advertisers wanted safer, less risky programming that would enthral consumer and envy as a way of life. Live TV gave them small studio sets, close-ups on faces—with an emphasis on psychological as well as moral exploration. The psychological depth in the dramatic programming tended to make the commercials appear fraudulent. They were propping, after all, that any problem could be fixed with the purchase of product. So sponsors were basically interested in advertising and not with live broadcasting. They were an additional factor, the push towards for (and later taking) virtually all TV production. The standardized, two-week, or longer, preference was the episodic series, where the same characters and sets were repeated week by week. This would ensure not only that production costs would be lower, but that once a soapy program premise had been created (complete with glamorous stars), the episodes could be churned out weekly with little danger of any contrivance sneaking in. Moreover, the series could nicely match the commercials, pro- duce a suitable context for them—glamorous sets and people, or simplistic social situations that would not worry, anxiety, inner depth or political consciousness.

By the '60's, with higher standards, not only could they be shot on location (Westerns were popul- lar with viewers) or in color, they would be guaranteed to be error-free. TV news only needed to improve. Hearing such claims of classic Hollywood cinema, wherein no human being was involved, would reveal the human and technological process of production. And this knowledge would also mean that, just like feature films, TV programs could be distributed around the world to all those countries in the process of setting up their own TV networks.

Well, for these and many other reasons, by the late '50's American TV had become largely a filmed product made under the auspices of Hollywood wood film studios. The whole TV industry had changed to reflect a desire for safe predictable- and strict control over all aspects of production. One aspect of programming was, in a way, summarizes this whole ethos is the use of what's called "the sweep," that apparatus that generates pre-recorded-lift-tracks and actions. (As they say) the sound-track of TV productions. Not surprisingly, it is the sweeping that was invented at the time the Hollywood studios were gearing up production and the filmed sitcoms and other filmed product that would soon take over the network airwaves. A man named Charlie Douglas, who had been a sound technician at ABC, put together a machine that could reproduce a wide variety of lift-tracks—everything from the few quiet audience chuckles to uproarious crowds guffawing and applauding wildly.

It was, of course, a timely invention in that most of the new filmed sitcoms were being produced with no studio audience. Here, with Charlie's magic box, the production could be given the ambiance of live TV. Better yet, there would be perfect control over this "audience." It would last at exactly the right moments, and to just the right degree. All you'd have to do is let Charlie orchestrate the gig- gles, whoops, groans, and bursts of hilarity into a perfectly timed tune and sound-track, and your program would seem to be the most crowd-pleasing epitome of entertainment that ever entered our airwaves. Charlie Douglas first approached Desi Lu- pro Productions in the mid-50's and the rest, as they say, is history.

Despite the fact that Charlie kept his machine shrouded in secrecy and under lock and key, other independent lift- men sprang up to rival his position in the industry. Neverthe- less, there was plenty of work for all. Canada, too, having followed US production style, even though the broad- casting structure here was quite different and did not necessitate such imitation. As filmed and then taped produc- tion overtook live broadcasting in Canada, Canadian TV producers, too, wanted to know the studio-audience response or replace it where necessary. As Peter Campion points out, the thinking behind CBC's sound-effects department, puts it: "Until recently, guys like John Pratt and Charlie Doug- las from the States would come to Canada and sweep the shows."

Eventually, a Canadian—Rafael Markowitz (now in Cali- fornia)—entered the busy sweeping scene with his own machine. Says Campbell, who worked with Markowitz for years, "It took us two-and-a-half years to develop this thing we wanted" in terms of variety of lift. After all, competition was fierce. CBC's TV producer and co-creator of CBC's "Hangin' in," who recalls that they would go out and record live the audience for "King of Kensington" in order to sell the show, comments, "And we always wondered if Cana- dian liftts were being used for American series. And so the Canadian TV networks were strictly dependent on the traveling lift operators, who crossed the border with ease. Says Partington, when you rented a lift "inside your place, it was a real secret how the machine worked."

Douglas, perhaps who whoever was working the sweeping machine would hide it in the overall operation so CBC personnel wouldn't be able to see how it worked. But finally, CBC's crew of sound engineers took on the challenge and decided to build their own sweeping machine. Nobody I talked to could remember how far back the historic date of its first use was, but everybody agreed it was about the same age, during the making of "King of Kensington." Accord- ing to Joe Richard, the lift was rented from the US and the lift and applause were accumulated from studio recordings of "Papa's Girls" and "King of Kensington." They are exclusively Canadian liftts. And people like Tom Wood and Peter Campbell, of CBC's special- effects department, are continuously upgrading the repertoire, adding diversity and nuance to the collection. Says Campbell, "You want to get a special feel, create character to match the voice, and means having a wide range of sounds from a wide range of different sources. The machine can respond quite sensitively."

For a show like "Hangin' in," which is taped without a studio audience, the sweeping technician and the associate producer go through the tape during an audio mix and hear what kind of sweeper to put in. Says Campbell, "You feel like you're directing a film, they have the rough, they've made it "making it seem live.""

The machine has 24 tracks and can hold up to 6 of the liftts. It can fade or have applause and liftts at once, making possible a finely balanced sound that is different for every set.

For shows that do have a live audience, the sweeper- process is used. They didn't particularly like the jokes? No problem. They just shut off their live response and put in some sweeter. Is the applause all too uniform? No problem. The repertoire of the sweeping machine can match the dimen- sions of the room, the size of
The Last Post in Retrospect

The Last Post is like Christ, it's not dead but merely asleep. We wrote about the Second Section. Admittedly the people who wrote for it have disappeared into darkest concubinage or have become victims of that lamentable activity described by actors as "doing a number on the public" or "working in the media," possibly some of these latter holding onto that illusion perpetuated by "Red" Rudi Dutschke of "the long march towards the common man:" it will not then be by way of a post-mortem; there's no body to be identified and even if there is a death, I'm fortified by something I came across the other day—"we are doing the same thing in the US"—of "Simppe Lepidupsa: Finche 'e morte, 'e perania"—so long as there is life in the spirit, the particular work from which that is drawn, Il Gattopardo, The Leopard. The Leopard, during the week of the War of the House of Commons—never having been to the Common House before, he was taken aback at what he heard and then tear. He showed the Honourable Members registered on both sides of a vast swimming pool on the floor of the House, into which from time to time, the defenders of our way of life were seen to be taking a dive.

And then of course Quebec happened. Here The Last Post's coverage was, I think, both informed and cogent. Bolstered by the good knowledge of Montreal real estate agents and by the smugness of the Anglo-Saxon elites, the Post proved to be an entitlement. I have to say, in these times of a board's most active members, put it: The Last Post doesn't publish names, it just publishes "Tisse Weeds," I believe. The Manifesto of 1969 set in motion, along with the Committee for an Independent Mind its work into the feeling that waivered—that is what a wave does—between the rhetorical and the concrete. During the last legislative session, the latest cyclical manifestation of Canada first-is, as a result of a lot of bad novels got written and praised to the skies, a lot of none-
day wonder came and went, some of them indeed not waiting out the report of one day. Kenneth Thompson's desire to fix up the Canadian newspaper called "Keith Davey's media reform," the result from a Renoir film by way of an American short story writer and some song, it is not a surprise then to say "Bobbi Kennedy saved from drowning..."

In the feature section of our own spring publishing lists, parodies of the new nautivist efforts, replete with such titles as Old Barns of Ontario, or The Bestiaries on the #2, etc. A work as mediocre as Stephen Leacock's Man Called Intrepid would be transformed by Last Post alchemy into A Man Called Unaffable. The paragraph at the beginning of a review of the Memoirs of Arnold Hickey still stands as a symbol of the man's incomprehensible insomiacs, I, Larry Zolt, do hereby beseech that the Memoirs of Arnold Hickey appear in a bedtime. And so on. We even found poems burned in the editorial of the Globe that I don't think our readers ever found called poems.

James Eares it was who pointed out the correlation that identifies a Canadian more quickly than the saying, "I'm not an economist," I'm an economist, but I do think that in part the Post was a product not only of a bit of a feeling that the quality of public life but also of a time when the economy was such that manufactured goods were cheap and the quality of life was a priority item. We were wrong.

Of course, it should be said that magazines are about writing, and we were all writers and the magazine was readable, while attributes are important, attitudinizing is the unaffordable of the magazine world. Politically, we had a shared view that we would not fight the Cold War; the poet and political scientists were not allowed to write—except for Mel Lastman and Larry Pratt, the former because he was a bad economist but a good writer, the latter because he was an economist, not a definite plus in the Post's case since none would sue us because he is a lawyer. Finally, Larry Pratt tried the same trick at the CBC, only then did the writers begin to fly.

The Last Post moved from Montreal to Toronto and soon began to die. As I knew it would. My perfectly cogent observation that Goethe had remained in Westport and did not relocate to Berlin fell on deaf ears. Still, I find nothing unhealthy about the current state of things. We live on, and I think, our real world sweeter.

Joyce Nelson

Patrick McAdden
**Nostalgia and Terror**

The Fureys and David Arthur: *When You Were Sweet Sixteen* 1942, Republic.

Moyle Bloom (in Joyce’s *Ulysses*) had an expanse of love which spilled out beyond her affirmation of herself to Leopold, that half-jeal, no-man, every-man. These songs should be heard in that context, but also another context, one within which love is not possible, where gratitude is frozen by boredom and where fatherhood is negotiated through death. Where are we now, after W.B. Yeats, James Joyce, and Samuel Beckett? The gun firing is meaningless, preserved only by the old photograph which remains. The sisters lost love, lost fathers, lost jobs, lost wars, a lost Ireland: Yesterday’s War haunts us.

“*The Green Fields of France*” is probably the most startling and shocking song on *Irish Rebel Songs*. It is a lyrical bombast, set not in Ireland, but in the trenches of France at the end of the First World War, turning itself into a pastiche of Irish Rebel Songs (*Finnch Kant and that stick*) that does not recall a continuity. It is a bilgerrant nostalgia - “*I remember every moment of their history: the English nonce of theirs, except as artifice,*” as someone said or should have said. But how do we remember? The English sacrifice the monuments of imperialism, the Irish remember the heroes of colonialism. The ‘generals’ of the first and second world wars were largely Irish; one of the first was Lord Kitchener, who was, as his kith and kin, Scottish, Nepithean (*The Gael*) or one of other ‘Commonwealth’

Fighting for what? The war to end war, according to Caesar Cassamans was not against the Germans but the Irish on behalf of Irish independence. There are memories and memories. The English remember their part in ‘civitisation’, the Irish the continuity of nobility and contempt.

Part of Irish culture has always been dedicated to talking about the unanswerable. The pain of knowing that we are all double-agents, Kim Philby of the imagination. Whose side are you on? POW! Protestant! Bastard! Papist! But these voices have largely been literary, or revealed in drunk conversations in pubs in Westminster St. Dublin or immigrant retreats in New York in America. (Cahill?)

—don’t you remember the deconstruction of selective amnesia? No? Then you haven’t read Brian Moore.

In a hurry to appropriate the nostalgia from here and to take the tourist version of bombs and Joyce’s map of Dublin. But what actually happens in Dublin? Does anyone sing any more? What do they sing about? If you have a long memory Nostalgia is the bombs, round the Post Office in 1946. But Ireland is free of bombs, except in Belfast where they crackle off like the dull rumour of another war. The Fureys’ songs come alive in the concern of that imaginary bombs"

(*What are you carrying in your pocket? A grenade? But it might go off: Boom!* and the mundane reality of getting by, being made redundant at 20. Yesterday’s people, fighting yesterday’s war, obviously today’s.

The Fureys’ cut nostalgia down to the present. That war that you thought you were fighting then is our war, here, now. We inherit your miseries in your graphs. When the drums played the Last Post a slow, solemn" it was not only for you, but for us. We drudged that retreat from your battles.

And “When you were sweet sixteen,” and our “Anniversary song,” and “Oh Rububuka” and meeting and not meeting you at the railway station, all the other nostalgia cut through me like a knife. I am back with Beckett and Joyce and the whole raggle-taggle bunch who will tell me that the Irish are the Jews, that Palestine and Belfast are one and the same thing. And of course it’s a lie. “My love is like a Red Rose that’s newly sprung in June,” but meanwhile my son lies in a green field of France, and “although you died back in 1946, in that fateful heart you are forever 19.” I am breeding sons who will be strangers "without even a name, ensconced there forever behind a glass frame.”

The Fureys shock us out of our romanticism. War is not nice; sex is war; nostalgia is both a sense of our own histories and violation of our own privileged space; the past lives in our presence. The guns that you hold against my groin exactly replicate the guns that I hold against yours. But yet I worry why neither of us pull the trigger: obviously because “I will never see you again.”

The Fureys are about that knife blade that would slit you apart but knowing that other knives have slit other necks like yours. I like your neck. I wouldn’t have anyone touch it.

If? You? History? Violence? These poems/songs discourses, are about living on the borderline of experience. Not that romantic bombisc of D.H. Lawrence, which implied the romantic Sartre/Pavaron concen-
tation that violence is necessary to our well being. But that absolutely mundane sense that violence strikes our sensuality, that the tone of the horns is heard in your present. I never completed this song in my own time. With little blood flows with your menstrual blood. *Les Sang Des Autres*, as Simone de Beauvoir said in another context. My blood, your blood.

In a hurry to propose to me you first I gave him the whole bit of what a noble and supreme love and muscle and I was looapop in your now eye 15 years ago my son say to me, how long should I love you, how long will I love you, how long will he love me, is love a true thing he said in his life and the sun shines for you to-day that way that was only for him because I sure he understood or felt what a woman is and I knew I would never get him back and I gave him all the pleasure I could lead-
ing him on till his death. And even more I would never answer first only looked over the sea and the sky the only way I was looking at him meant things he didn’t know of Malovey and Mr. Symons and history and father and old captain Gruen and birds and blowing all birds fly and I keep sopping and wiping up the paper tin on the piano and the piano wire in front of the government house with the broken Clients and his white powder打扮 and the Spanish girl’s lauging in the dining room and the Jews and the Arabs and the devil knows who else from all the ends of Europe and Duke stremes and the joint stands all click-

outside Lady Shors and the poor desert dogs sipping about the cut and the sword glances in the little bit of a shop and Runa and all the birds and the last thing that glancing eyes a little kettie for her lover to open the door and they were already at one with the street at night and the current and the night we missed the boat at Athlone the watchmans going about somewhere in the serious and the big wheels of the cots of the bulls and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they teased me and I lost the boat and the old adder and the cromleach with the Thuiner and then and how they tease...
THE TRAPPER'S PLEASURE OF THE TEXT

Geoff Miles

Standing above it all, he sensed the power of his position.

The text needs its shadow!
This shadow is a bit of ideology, a bit of representation, a bit of subject.

The direction of his gaze, revealed the future.

Every fiction is supported by a social jargon, a sociolect, with which it identifies.
OCCUPATION: WRITER

Hubert Aquin

(1963)

From the time this
concealed investigation
was put on my passport, I
have not ceased committing
usurpations against it, until
it reached a point at which
I enjoyed cheating with my
calling, and even began
transforming systematically
into an absolute non-writer. While I
repeat that I am no longer in word man-
agement, it has not escaped my notice
that I harboured this hypocritical ambi-
tion of surprising my customers by a re-
turn no less unexpected than
staggering...But the time has come to
change professions other than on my
passport, and I have had to face up to
the fact that, for my interlocutors, my former
activities constitute me as a man of let-
ters. A few commissioned texts, an all but
irreversible enlistment in the Société des Aute-
urs: this is how little it took to remind me
that, once and for all, despite my denials and
dispersions - I am caught without oil, in a
mechanism which throws me back into
place. A rather vicious circle, this social-
bio-political circuit of mine! I have
experimented with it, and, distressed, I
set about writing again, as a postman de-
livers letters. The gaze of others makes
me feel like a Jew. I bear my Jewish trace
like a scar: it is -decidedly!- written
across my features. Never have I felt so
less a writer, yet I continue to write. And
if fortune or my laziness do not throw me
out of my social seat as a writer, I intend
to have its majesty pay dearly for my
partly dead language, my syntactic inac-
ceration and the asphyxiation that
threatens me; yes, I plan to take my re-
venge through gib expressions, on that
fine career which opens before me in the
manner of a mine that closes over
whoever goes in deeper. I am prey to
destructive urges against the nasty French
language, in all its majesty rated second!
Writing kills me. I don't wish to
write any longer, nor juggle words
words...nor clearly state the incoercible,
or premeditate the unfolding of the
verbal crime, nor search a dark room
for a black box, especially when there is
nothing to be found...This being said, one
might justifiably ask why it is that I now
write these easily disowned thoughts.
The truth is, I myself hardly know why,
tending to consider my conscription to
"Parti Pris" as a traffic accident!. And I
certainly have the right to lapse into illog-
icality once I get free of any semiotic
mission. In this disintegrated country
which resembles a brothel in flames, writ-
ing amounts to recitation of ones bre-
viary while seated on a nitroglycerine
bomb that is set to go off when the big
band advances five minutes. Each of us is
freed and I am convinced I can invoke
the civic rights to recognize the right of any
citizen, if necessary, to write his brevity
whenever he pleases.

There are some who will think I
am in flames like a crepe
suizette, and that my non-
writing... is determined by
possible neurotic factors.
These sincere readers
will not be convinced of the contrary by me, and I remain no less persuaded that,
standing like an antiquated tropical
vegetation of words on a white
page, I am not the one being tailed, but
the agent! I make a contract with
them to respond in passing to a given historical
challenge. In December 1963, Paul
Complois being Lieutenant-Governor of
Galilea! and I being what I am, in this
dormant period and confusion-ridden
province, solemnly affirm that one fine
intellectual work and one novel good for
the Governor General's award, invari-
ably purport that literature is a function of
our national organism. Now aren't we
disillusioned, or so it seems... We
might just as well admit that the original-
ity of a writing stands in direct propor-
tion to the ignorance of its readers. There
is no oneway literary transfers: as
transfers (which, it goes without saying,
are functional in a society consuming
great amounts of leisure and endowed
with pulp, moreover) pressed from ef-
faced counter types which derive from
other originals transferred from transfers
which are faithful copies of old forgotten
with which one need not be acquainted to
understand that they were not arches-
type, but mere variants. A cruel invar-
ance governs the serial production of
variants which we are accustomed to cal-
ing original works. History itself
transfers. Originality is as impossible
there as in literature. Originality does
not exist, it is an illusion. Fashion is all there
is covering that differentiates fa-
sion, the film-like veil, the deceptively
diaphanous surface, the garment-screen
used for covering being identical in their
nakedness. A few trivial details serve to
differentiate me from an ill Hungarian
who, one May evening, would endeavour
to write an article in order to exercise his
constant necessity. August. A man
must have worried a double-breasted
jacket and a false collar; unable to write
in front of a small television screen, he
doubled darkened his Austrian broad
paper while drinking a German beer in
the Cafe Mozart.

These few differences are minor, and

could not hide our sorry
resemblance, our implacably
similar national syphilis,
and the distress at coming to see who we
are in a world where exhibiting politeness
means putting oneself in parentheses, if
not in a jar. Unfortunately, Freud did not
psychoanalyze the Hongrie! of an
arrogant Vienna, which was characterized
by its will to repress the Hungarians liv-
ing there, with their minority bad breath,
and their music which nobody took the
time to differentiate from that of the gyp-
sies - which shows all too clearly the will
of the Viennese to view their historical
partners only as nomads. In any situation
of an emulating domination, the lower
layer seems to be the most musical of the
two: the Hungarians, whose musical-
ity was vaunted by their model, the
American blacks, even the French Cana-
dians, who have a gypsy's calling to face
members of the higher group, who in turn make a well behaved audience. The domination of one human group over another, places too much emphasis on the harmless strengths of the lower group: sex, propensity for the arts, natural talents for music and creating... Don’t we have French Canadians who are not interested in Eskimo Art and the mythology of the American Indians who we keep on reserved? That is the blind compensation of the domination that there is a group beneath it which allows it to show its domination without a hint of bad conscience.

"gifted in the arts? No, that is lost. I am gifted in the arts by the very fact that I am dominated, that all people are dominated, and that the dominating like them as gypsies, singing, artistic to the tip of our fingers. I have naturally worked toward the most deficient social activities. I refuse to write works of art, after years of conditioning in this direction. Because I unequivocally refuse the significance taken on by art in an equivocal world. As a result I would play the role attributed to me that the dominated artist who is an artist is an artist. Now, I refuse this talent, perhaps, because I see. I simply refuse my domination. I may as well say, should I continue to write the present article, that I am going to strive inwardly for an article which contains everything that should not be found in the article accepted from me by the mediumistically pursuing this endeavour, I do my best to bring to light the artistic in all the everyday life, to prove the way the domination is that I am no longer loved by domination, that I have no taste for its historical insignificance, nor its security either, and that I oppose it in every way provided they are challenging. The good French Canadian, promised a brilliant future in the future, the Canadianisation all of a sudden to produce a writing dominated by a thematic of refusal to write, a meaningless gesture which could only attain to the simultaneous explosion of every stick of dynamite now rotting in the Province of Quebec’s arsenals. There are serious disadvantages brought about by the explosion, one of them being that it causes any historical structure situated along a radius of the shock wave to fly into pieces. Structure must be detected, even in a literary architecture of the Robbe-Grillet type. Structuring amounts to structuring if it relates to a like sphere of activity, to literature, for example. In my case, if the structure bursts out from the fire in me, it does not in a room so small that one could not counter structure, but to leave no room for a literature which, if I were to give way to its charms, would express merely the domination which I have taken after for two generations. A lame excuse, one might say, to have pardon for a simple absence of talent... But such an objection, inevitable because situated on another level, does not pertain to me, for even the poverty of talent here could be considered as the line of domination, as a show of bad temper on the part of the dominated, who, though not very certain, why, shuns a calling which he believes is beneficial to that which is historical; in the same manner, the talent of the dominated comes from a desire for artistic revolution, for want of the power to bring about an historical revolution.

By this deigning myself from literature, I do myself a disservice, and what I write is condemned in advance to be a mere unfruitful expression of my refusal to write. Now literary works are characterized by the formal necessity - the urgency invoked by their authors. Writers are primarily formalists, despite the recurring protestations of non-formalism, in that the forms they use are handmaidens of their existence, and cast authors together in their uniqueness. With the progression of aligned lines, the form of the written work comes to be secondary, unimportant and often chosen circumstantially; or, in the present case not chosen and unwound. Something else is important; for me, a literature餐桌 which is neither a meta-literature, nor a new disguise for our old ambition, but the destruction of an historical conditioning in which I come to be dominated. By rejecting domination I refuse literature, the bread and butter of excellence of the dominated, a symbolic production, of which the dominated are granted the monopoly, which inevitably leads to overproduction. It has not been demonstrated that in colonized countries there invariably emerges an overproduction of literature? In the absence of realities, symbols are overproduced; understandable, moreover, is that even if colonized peoples were content to produce normally they would still not compensate for an utter unproductivelessness. Overproduce or die. Survive or disappear. Surprise or possess nothing: so many vital dilemmas for the dominated. He does just the opposite. He advances the dominated conforms to some nicely ambiguous gestures so that their meaning is lost on him. For example, the dominated shows up as a challenger but does not see to what degree the challenger and his master are complementary, nor does he size up the benevolence shown by the latter in agreeing to play beside him, while giving away for the challenger to claim the match sometimes... All part of the invisible coherence, when it refuses, amounts to the complete, irreversible choice of incoherence. Revolution brings about withdrawal from the dialogue between the dominated and dominating: strictly speaking, it is a divagation. The terrorist speaks on his own. Like Hamlet, who imagined Gertrude’s lover behind every curtain, the revolutionary chooses to be accused of madness like the sweet prince of rotten kingdom. The revolution breaks with the coherence of domination and rashly engages in a monologue interrupted at each word, nurtured work with destruction as by the distance it maintains from the dominant reason. Hesitation engenders the monologue; at the theatre, only characters in the throws of the disturbing solitude of the reason, or of the alienated, must give monologues. It takes incoherence for there to be true monologues. Incoherence is here a modality of the revolution just as the monologue constitutes its unmistakable sign.
another stock of books from the Dominican bookstore, always closed on Sunday, that were written by other writers who voluntarily or involuntarily slandered me. I am, the "inner" adventurer evokes the steamy adventure of a conference on disarmament between emissaries of better countries. Or rather: the writer's inner adventure is the migration of the vital yolk beneath the egg's hard thick amniotic capsule. With a secret, protected from the end, more worthwhile for him to inhabit, rather than be transported into an artistic and grammatical non-country in which each writer enjoys literary privilege. The non-country does not flourish its people. The 1917 model beadle of the Byelorussian mind favours the pursuit of inner adventures - on condition they are codified according to disarming canons. But even if the writer can venture into these pats as he wishes, with breakfast in bed and impeccable hotel xenophobia, this inner microbead is still nothing but a coffee decorated like the Place des Arts. In short, the preference is to hate one's country, not to be abstracted from it, while none the less hopeful of expressing it. How then to express an inadequacy? There is the real problem. Adulterous love of one country's seems even more beautiful to me than abstention in the name of "engaging in the Work itself and the detailing of self for the sake of the work", in the words of Mr. Simard, cf. "Devor" Saturday, October 26, 1963.


upsets the old French tongue, bursts the inherited structures which exercise a unilateral hegemony over the spirits by the very rigidity of the writers that respect them. Predictable, calm and organized according to the golden rule, the old idea of the work falls prey to the worst synecopes, the likes of which my bygone country has known and dreads, so many necroses which might never be followed by geneses. During these times of trouble, how can the writer end his sentence as was predicted? Everything changes or threatens change: how can somebody who chooses to write, still persevere in his ideal of an unchanged and priority work... unless he condemn himself to the production of a historical monument of some kind? Not in the literary work, or in the collective adventure can anything transcendent be found. To avoid being a witness, or to witness by omitting segments of our life and obsession, is to witness nevertheless. The writing of novels uninfluenced by the intolerable dailyness of collective life, and in an asympet Free, the shock that weakens the ground beneath our feet, is a waste of time. My passport, already expired, reads, Occupation: Writer. Even if I deny it, what is the good of completing some forms to state that I am no longer a writer, or to know what is to be when, on September 23, 1958, I completed the questionnaire to obtain a passport? I will not leave my native country again. I wish to stay. I live in my country. translated by Paul Gibson

Notes
1. The text was published in the journal, Partir Pris, in December 1963. (Editor's note, Blaise Ernottis) The essay was revised by Angus for his publication in Blaise Ernottis (1977). The remark below concerning "one novel good for the Government General's Award," refers to the novel L'ami de mesdemoiselles, which won this award. Angus declined to accept it. - Trans.
2. Gälishe (i.e. Quebec. Paul Conpoia was Lieutenant Governor of Quebec in 1963-64. - Trans.
3. Hémonduin coined after the expression of Alain Cossette, Montréal, 1963 - Trans.
4. calsimetre: a term coined by Aquin, which must be understood as an expression of unity, in the same sense as Compositor comes from. - Trans.
5. PQS, RN, PRQ: refer to the political bodies, Parti social du Québec, the Rapporteur for Faisabilité nationale (cf which Aquin, Montréal), and the Parti républicain de Québec. - Trans.
Letter From Yellowknife

Andra McCartney

The journal gives rise to connected ideas and thoughts through description of isolated images which appear significant or disturbing. This seems fitting in a place where each person or thing on the tundra becomes framed by space and time. It starts in Yellowknife, the governmental and geographical centre of the Northwest Territories, and moves out to the edge of the sea, of the land, of the Circle, to Tuktoyaktuk.

Yellowknife is interwoven with many conflicting myths. This creates a welter of confusion. Isolated frontier, boom town, government centre, sophisticated city, heart of the territories. Roadlines disconnected during freeze-up...anything or anyone from "outside" (south of 60° latitude) essentially mistrusted...including (especially?) Ottawa. Dress signifies "Northerness"-embroidered, fur-trimmed parkas, mukluks, fur mitts, plaid shirts. First question on meeting: "How long have you been in the North?" Credibility rests on the answer.

The impact of economic depression has not been felt as in the rest of Canada. Newspapers have pages of jobs. Qualifications necessary are less than outside, so opportunities for experience and advancement are greater. However, because of the "Hire North" policy, most of these carrots are unavailable to newcomers. But the promise exists that they will be - eventually, if you pay your dues and persevere. The American Dream moves North.

The North is prosperous in the way of the wild west, or Gold Rush. This mystique attracts opportunists, adventurers, gamblers. Young people can find experience and climb career ladders here in a way impossible in the economically crippled South. However positions of responsibility can be occupied by the inept or ethically bankrupt.

The "frontier boom town" atmosphere is most often felt on the streets or in some of the bars. Outside in the winter, it is hard to forget Yellowknife is an isolated Norther town. Unpaved rutted streets make roads and sidewalks hazardous; the wind bites; hair is frozen. People huddle together for rushed conversation - move on. Most vehicles are trucks and taxis. It is a relief to enter a bar and thaw out. Typical is the "Gold Range" saloon (also locally known as the Strange Range). A country and western bar with utilitarian furniture crowding a large room, it is literally jammed with people at midnight. All kinds of people...in all stages of inebriation (the hard-drinking Northerner mystique exists also). A stranger walking in might expect the tables to overturn in a B-movie brawl - and he may be right.

Illustrations by Andy Fabo
But in some ways the atmosphere of isolation is a tenuous myth. (This does not prevent it from being used by commercial establishments to "explain" outrageous prices.) It is impossible for the North to be isolated as in the past, when the news is now shown several times a day. Cable TV is available in Yellowknife, and pay-TV channels. There is a "Top 40" radio station. Video-cassette rental establishments do a huge business. Residents of the territories are aware of all that happens in the world, though through the eyes of commercial media. The myth of isolation is enlarged in the minds of Yellowknife residents to assert uniqueness in a world defined by North American media standards. It must be believed that this is a place where it is possible to be a rugged individualist.

At the same time, there is a great deal of conformity here. The radical groups expected in the shadow of the Cruise are for the most part quiet and low-profile. A peace benefit last fall sold out. Everyone sat on chairs and applauded in the right places. The (mostly original) music was reminiscent of late 60's folk, with some surprises. The high point was a rendition of "Boogie-woogie Bugle Boy" with lyrics changed to spoof Reagan -and well done. All in all, though, the atmosphere was tame, civilized, reasonable. It seems Yellowknife is too prosperous to have a vocal radical group.

No one is hungry enough? Or perhaps the transient nature of the city (few stay more than a couple of years, many stay a few weeks) prevents any cohesion? Or perhaps isolation works in a one-way direction. Commercial media use the air-waves to transmit information and perspectives immediately, and yet local resistance groups do not have the financial resources or political clout to gain access to such widespread dissemination as is available through commercial television. Alternatives - such as personal visits, phone calls, letters - are slower, more expensive or impractical here. Airlune flights from the closest contact point (Edmonton) cost about $400.

The capital city of the Territories is also its cultural centre. As such it hosts "Folk on the Rocks", a festival of Northern music. Also, the Northern Arts and Cultural Centre is now being built: a project familiar to all Canadians through its bizarre TV advertising. Both of these organizations are fraught with the same problems many territorial establishments are: lack of expertise; isolationism. But, as is often the case, these disadvantages are balanced by enthusiasm and energy on the part of some members. Yellowknife seems caught between 'frontier town' and heart of the territory; opposites by definition, tearing the fabric of myths apart.
Yellowknife is by far the largest population centre in the Northwest Territories, at around ten thousand people. Most other places have less than a thousand people. Tuktoyaktuk is a small settlement on the Beaufort Sea, within the Arctic Circle. Perhaps not typical of the rest of the Northwest Territories, but very different from Yellowknife. I arrive by Twin Otter from Inuvik. The size of the plane emphasizes the tinniness of this community in the vastness of northern tundra. There are no trees, no mountains, few buildings, much snow. We drive past the town - small wooden houses, skidoos, trucks. The air terminal, post office are trailers. The Bay is the only store. The church is heated by a wood stove. Then out to the oil camps. They look like space stations. Huge, interconnected metal modules, standing on stilts on the frozen ground, isolated from the land, self-sufficient entities. Inside is luxury. Carpets, plants, armchairs, saunas, jacuzzi, stereo room, maid service, stocked snack bars. The galley serves meals with choice of four entrees.

There is little contact with the hamlet. The council has asked for the oil companies to prevent their employees from coming into town. This is to minimize the effect of the powerful technological culture on one which has traditionally been tied close to the land. But these restrictions cannot prevent the inroads of white culture. Looking out across the ice, the inhabitants of Tuk hamlet see the sprawling oil camps. And these are just the most recent manifestations. Missionaries came to the North long ago. Ask an Inuit now what their traditional music is like - he will probably look at you in confusion. Most do not remember. The missionaries denounced Inuit music as ungodly. So to be safe the Inuit stopped playing all forms of traditional music. On Inuit programming broadcast on CBC North, there is a great deal of Scottish jigging music. This is the contribution of the whalers. There were many possibilities for cultural exchange when the whaling ships were stuck in the ice for years.
AT OUR FIRST DANCE HERE, AT THE BEGINNING EVERYONE SAT AROUND RESTLESSLY THEN "SATISFACTION" BY THE STONES CAME ON. EVERYONE GOT UP AND DANCED, STOMPED THEIR FEET. SANG ALONG. IT WAS EERIE.

The Hudson’s Bay traders supplied guns to replace harpoons and the peoples’ whole way of life changed from nomadic hunting to trapping for southern markets.

More recently, television, radio and telephone have further changed life in the settlements. Telephone allows communication (even with Northwestel’s sporadic service) across distances and in a short time. CBC radio is used for messages to family members and has Inuktitut programming. Locally popular music is also played: Scottish jigs, country and western ballads, and “Top 40” music. Motown music is extremely popular, with Michael Jackson achieving almost heroic status. The link between these forms of music is that they are all very kinesthetically oriented. The people love to sing along and dance. There is recorded music at every social occasion (dinner, dances, volleyball and floor hockey games, card games, different get-togethers of any kind. But the sound is never a background. When the music starts a volleyball game is transformed. Before the serve, people on the court sway. Even the ball seems to move in time; people’s movements become more measured and graceful. Spirits are lifted.

The medium which seems to have had the greatest effect on the changing life up here is television. CBC has been available for about fifteen years in some places and is now widespread. Recent further southern development has brought satellite stations - HBO, the Movie Channel, USA Network, the Sports Channel, etc. - to the North during the last few years. Though the Native Communications Society are trying to provide more native programming with a recently received grant, most of what is shown depicts an utterly different “reality”. Having little or no direct experience of southern life, it is easy to believe the dream sold on television exists down there.

The people want what is offered, and have come to rely on the oil companies and support services for employment to provide the money to buy. And in this region, the oil companies may not be around much longer. Once more the Inuk’s choices will be narrowed. A recent view (of a book about Dome Petroleum) spoke of the oil companies’ story as a modern myth (similar to previous myths about whalers or Northern explorers), depicted with “the macho charm of a twentieth century war without bullets, the romance of technology forced to its limits in a harsh climate, logistics turned lyrical. But war without weapons is not necessarily war without victims.”

These victims are not only huddled over the video games or in front of the T.V. set, they are physically dying, too. Toktoyaktuk (800 people) has had two murders, one castration and seven suicides in the past nine months. Other Delta communities, though less affected, have similar problems. Some people talk of the suicides as a type of subculture - but one which negates life completely? Feeling there are no choices left? It’s hard to explain.

For I too am an outsider in this place. But I feel the effect of all these mythologies, living here. I am isolated - mail takes weeks, phone calls expensive. I have made sense of isolated images and sounds through conversations with Northern residents and travellers, ulimen, natives, government employees, transient workers. There is much happening here, and little enough written. I’ve done no more than scrape the surface. The iceberg is still there, and like the frozen miles of tundra, barely touched.
A quick survey strengthened his earlier convictions.

All official institutions of language are repeating machines: schools, sports, advertising, popular songs, news.

It was his identity that counted, an ability to choose his own direction, his freedom to use what stood before him.

All continually repeat the same structure, the same meaning, often the same words; the stereotype is a political fact, the major figure of ideology.
Opening Up

When Roland Barthes (1915-1980) was 42 years old, in 1957, his famous essays on seeing, bearing, thinking and living "the modern world" were published in French as Mythologies. It was not until 1972 (under the same title) that a first selection was published in English. A second selection—called The Eiffel Tower and Other Mythologies—was published in English in 1979. By the time of the first English selection, Barthes had qualified his earlier work in very significant ways. Two essays in that crucial year of our history—1968 ("L'effet du reel", translated as "The reality effect" in French Literary Theory Today, ed. T. Todorov, Cambridge, England, 1983, II.2, and ""Texte, Theorie du", translated as "Theory of the text" in various collections) advance and change the project and politics of Mythologies. This is most clearly spelled out in a text Barthes wished to call "La mythologie aujourd'hui" but which became published as "Change the object itself" (translated in Image-Music-Text, ed. S. Heath, Fontana, 1977). Any renewal of the work of doing mythologies cannot then simply replicate what Barthes was doing in 1960s, so my writing here is a call for renewal, for re-making our senses new, with a different Mythologies done differently.

Reading In and Out

We live, work, love, and move through worlds that confront us as always-already-there, as natural, neutral, universal and obvious. The critical impulse, still necessary if not sufficient, we can take from Mythologies is one which recognises the cognitive and emotional work done by social forms. We may not like them but we always take these forms (as obstacle or enjoyment) as there, to be walked around, like, in that important familiar sense, the door that always sticks, the key that needs that extra turn, the state that always cracks. We negotiate ourselves in terms of them. This is, in so many important ways, necessary—there are always other senses to move to, other tasks at hand, projects that hurry us on. Indeed one major problem with the forms is the way they attract and distract us from other, seemingly more simple pursuits. In the face of so much abundance, how shallow it seems to raise complaints!

But the greatest donation, and it is a gift, was to make us pause, to look again, to reconsider, to re-read what we normally inadvertently "take in" and then move on from. He enjoins us (and we can, I am arguing, join with him) to ask how it is that this and that come to work for us in the ways that they do. But the later essays qualify the original mythologizing by questioning the centredness of the "logics" at the heart of the mythic, the dream of science/lust for certainty that underpins so much of the structuralist and semiotic analyses. Barthes is saying now, showing how, we should not ask over-simplifying "Why?", nor even too scientifically "What?" of the social forms, but how is it that we continuously take so much for granted? Because that taken-for-granted, apparently located "out" and the "over" there, the taken for granted, in fact involves the image we construct of ourselves. In confirming our sense of what and how we are, it allows us to forget how we might be different.

The change from the demythologizing of the 1950s (which Barthes considered by the mid 1960s to have failed: Mythology) can best be indexed, it seems to me, by use of the now fashionable description of how we actively make sense of social forms—reading. Demythologizing consists in reading off the way some form works through reading in some scheme of how it is constructed and constrained to mean what it does. In this positive moment, myth is viewed as a type of language which conveys in the descriptors, normative, evaluative and imperative directions. This, as Barthes later clarifies, does two rather unprogressive things: it leaves the world as it is, and it leaves the analyst out of the depiction. If demythologizing reads the world of the forms as texts, his later theory of the texts (perverse) denies the existence of a metala-language, and seeks an understanding of the world as textuality. This is where we are now.

I am Writing

I am in/form ed by these social forms that seem so neutral, natural, universal and obvious. Barthes' criticism of simply demythologizing—not because it was "wrong" but because it was partial—registers a set of questions which critical work (theoretical and practical) remains largely silent about. These are questions of morality and motivation. In his writing about being an intellectual and an academic (recall how he ended up, albeit describing himself as the "joker in the pack", at the Collège de France, scandalously lecturing on "my semiotics") Barthes depicts the ways in which he was constructed and constrained in power, not because of what he taught, but because of how teaching and learning works within lines of force. What regulates educational (and many social forms of communication—and are there, really, any other kind of social forms?) practices are the formal qualities of the encouraged, proper, correct forms of expression—centrally those of writing, and speaking about writing. These forms all turn and return to that condition of Good/Bad, invented (as Nietzsche explains of Virtue in general) not by those struggling to become, but by those who argue they already possess Goodness which is, as they say, next to Godliness, of course!

Against these powers of the discussion (to invent a word), he suggested, basically, the lightening, baffling, turning of those powers by exception. What is significant in the shift from reading the world of forms as text, to struggling with their contradictions as textuality, is the re-placing of the struggling subject as one who is "caught up" already. Barthes, by re-thinking and hard work, rediscovered what is precisely revolutionary in Marx's project of socialism (which works on the same terms as "social control" and "socialization") which is the re-kindling of the necessary fusion of the subjective and objective worlds to temper the practices of simultaneously changing circumstances and selves. Any form of action, engagement,
commitment or project which wishes to hold still one or other way of understanding our social being will reproduce some of the most damaging features that the initial impulse sought to transform. Objectiv-
ism. Subjectivism.

Questions about the morality of form(s) pervade Barthes' writings. Writing becomes a metaphor—hence, as always, dangerously informative—for living. With writing, language is always present; with living, social forms are always present. With writing, the dialogue, rhetorical and depicting struggle is always to stay suffi-
ciently on the ground of the forms and norms that name and endow a practice as that kind of writing/publication, and yet to make (or, more often, re-make) it new enough to open to—that is, empathically, to be able to open to, that "other" writing which we call reading. "Forms? That range of conditioned practices, relations and forces of production, modes of making public, sets of senses and sensibilities, through which social living is lived—
thought, sedimented, fragmented. "Norms? That range of conditions for those practices, relations, etc. The moral conditionings have been and are they are often in danger of being taken for
granted, i.e. repressively forgotten. What do forms make possible and what do they make difficult/impossible? Yes, and of course that too needs saying, they are posi-
tive: they make possible, encourage, facilitate, empower all of us in some ways (and, perhaps, some of us in the forms being on this am agnostic). But they make impossible, discourage, deny, dilute, disempower all of us in others.

I am Written

The key questions then become: How does this form work (locally and globally) to empower/deny the subject who is written—socially formed. Secondly, how do sets of social forms (e.g. in a major institutional practice like education or like writing-publishing) carry this normalization forward, catching up these traces of a certain social identity to make that an effective presentation of that social individ-
ual, i.e. that kind of person, as we say. Doing mythologies, now, seems to me to revive specific attention to the three Cs—
Construction, Construction, Construction—and I want to sketch a motivated meth-
odology for doing that kind of mythologies.
The three moments I depict here are (1) militant mythos, (2) making a judge-
ment, and (3) affirmation of potential. They are also (simultaneously) bodily state-
ments of engagement by the analyst/activist: the second glance (re-
reading), the search, and the encounter. Just as there is an interrogative morality to ask for form, so too is there a differential morality to find in the human capacities displaced into silence by those forms, or condensed into certain satisfactions, ubiqui-
tously abundant.
The second glance 'deranges' (makes strange) the taken for granted. Attending for the first time, perhaps, we realise (and it is a bodily state) that certain patterns are there, relational sets: the natural way we have to go from some to another place; the
neutral seeming forms through which we conduct exchanges; the universal features of a sense of responsibility, rage, love, or
gender, the Obviousness that surrounds us like (and the metaphor is very material) the very air we breathe. We look again, we start to enquire. Operating with the moti-
vated morality I have described we try to find the features of power and the modalit-
ties of control that are embodied in what these forms are and above all how they operate. We make our first strike against naturalness by finding the socially con-
structed specific features of these forms as historical: how did they come into being, change operate, stabilise, switch meanings. This is a necessarily hack description from which we have a sufficiently adequate sense of the texture of social relations we have shown. This militant negativity (Marc: ' Doubt everything') makes cen-
tral what the dominant theories and prac-
tices cannot bear to hear (their notation cannot register): those forms of social dif-
ference which are neither abstracted as totalizing institutions (citizens, voters, consumers, everyone and thus no one) nor terrifyingly concrete as individualizing practices (the subject-object fixed, scheduled and called upon).

The second glance engages the differential features of the form, in order to make a judgement. It is here where the major shift from mythologizing is greatest. The second glance and the search might be misread as what has been called the concrete analysis of the concrete situation by Lenin. But lar-
gely typical of Lenin, and certainly typical of
Leninism/Boshievism, the analyst remains outside and brings his (as histori-
cally it nearly always has) analysis to bear, to add to, to illuminate the "what is", that the analysands—the people/situation context—cannot by definition already know, or know only in a kind of 2-out-of-
10-could-try-harder intellectualist grad-
ing! Typically these analyses are in fact ambivalent analyses of phenomenal situa-
tions. "Making a judgement" means regis-
tering not what people already know (or they know far more than intellectuals judge them to know) but how their know-
ing has illuminated the historical shapeful-
lessness, the contemporary weight, and the flexible contradictions of the social forms. Through that illumination, that critical experience as it rolls, crashes and breaks against the powered forms that constrain it, the forms in their current moment may be judged: how they impact, restrain, how they are contradictory, and what work can be done within, and what work has to be done without, them.

In a responding comment concerning pastoral poetic writing (in 1977, in the book of interviews with him by New Left Review, Politics and Letters, p. 307) Ray-
mond Williams offers a clarification: . . . I think that one has to distinguish two kinds of judgement, which, however, is never possible finally to separate, lies in the one level at which we say that a specific form was historically productive and there-
fore historically valuable—in that sense it was a major contribution to human culture.

But we must also be able to say, in a distinct but connected way, that it was a disastrously powerless way of working. In the same way we can acknowledge the productive capacity of bourgeois society, or its political institu-
tions, and yet distance ourselves from them as human reasons of the order of power in a new sense of power (that is, a sense of power in a new sense of the order of power). . . .
by gender, ethnicity, class, language, age, occupation, sexual preference, is to register the limitations of the claims and the contradictions in the naming attempted by these seemingly neutral, natural, universal and Obvious forms. Just as this formation is questioned, so too is the socialization that embeds.

The encountering of this difference is already an affirmation of potential. This encounter—a social naming of a qualitatively different sort is involved—recognizes that there are within the differentially subordinated resources, means, capacities that are actually turning, deflecting, reworking dominant social forms. This involves articulating the traces—shreds of a language, hints of a collective symbology, that registers precisely what the forms deny, forms of knowledge and forms of cultural relations that operate below a level of normalised visibility, what is necessary? What is possible?

Both/And, not Either/Or

Logic chopping and concept shuffling are the commonplace features of much education. The one thing we can say about the body of intellectuals and academics is that characteristically they are rarely embodied in their work, they are not there. This is the pervasive—writing, speaking, teaching, commenting: they map, contour, gloss the Other, gracefully or mechanically, they are not there. That they are not there means they are not caught up in the depictions they offer. This authority—claim (disguised in an enforced, normalised form of writing) grounds the persistent use of dichotomies along with schema of such cleansed methodological instruments that they can only reflect the brilliance of their originators.

I think what we have to do—this "we" being located individuals like myself within the apparatus of education—is to start examining where we are. How do "our" neutral, natural, universal and Obvious forms operate, what is their differential impact, how are we embodied in them, what do they encourage and what do they deny? This is all the more urgent because education is also a "carrier" wave for power forms in/of a-know—(for I now see as centrally constraining (they hurt as much as they help)—such as modes of talking together (conference, seminar, colloquium, symposium—the challenge being with the "workshop"), making public (the journal, the occasional paper, the book, etc.). Groups that challenge dominant forms have tended to make use of what seem technical and neutral means to further their desirable ends. Significantly the main challenges to modes of communication (and modes of language) have come from social groups of doubting difference—those defined by gender, ethnicity, or language—along with local/community forms of activity of groups defined by class. The dominant "Left" Past, present and institutions of The Labour Movement have generally, at least in their national and international practices, adopted these inherited forms of talking together and making public. For ten years now I have felt, and had told to me, experiences of denial, disempowerment, exclusion and disdain in the face of these routinised practices beyond and within academic life.

Doing Mythologies

Mythologies are done, a lot of the time, quietly; sometimes, loudly and visibly, in what we might call languages of action; in second-glancing, sometimes because this looking back is enforced, at how they got done. The famous popular response to certain long-winded justifications for the current state of things is "Seems Sol!" but this does not entail commitment to strategic belief, rather it is a working response, entailing a kind of tactical seriousness. The affective movement I have described is a double one: first, there is a perversive "not yet" of hopes, aspirations, beliefs and desires which current social forms cannot relate to, even though they place some of them on the agenda! Secondly, there is an important way in which the shifts in mythologies Barthes sketched out from the mid 1960s point to a different understanding of ontology and epistemology (being and knowing) in their suggestion that what social forms "really" are can never be discovered by a clinical, brilliant exposé of their motivated operation (their General Immorality in all and every claim to be neutral, universal and Obvious)—nor yet can it be "shown" by drawing up a recipe of different institutions, a species of Left Morality that is extremely elitist. Instead, what Barthes is suggesting is that what social forms "really" can are only be found in how they are lived—within, against, without—not at the level of their abstract coding, nor yet in their concrete structure, but in their how-it-feels-like. His terms in the later writings point to this, as I have tried to by centralising Contradiction, and by making my third term "affirmation". But he also suggested something else, or several features of how intellectual and academic work could be done differently.

Instead of The Master (typically as it was and predominantly is) acting as analyst to his analyzand students and their problems—the higher level of the teaching paradigm in schooling which expects/demands obedience in return for knowledge—Barthes does one major inversion. He was the analysand and his seminar students the analysts—the what did they make of his digressions (in speech) and fragmentation (in writing)! I want to close by making a second inversion: social forms should be seen as providing us with questions, not answers: questions as to how they operate which we cannot answer alone, but which need to be reformulated in terms of the historical experience of the pragmatics of use, exchange, contradiction and refusal of those differentiated groups. Whilst I agree that one necessary form of explanation is tuatological—replacing the problem in the context of its origination and tracing the dynamic trajectory, explaining how things are what they are—this is insufficient. It removes one form of puzzlement—"Ah, that is way . . . .", but replaces another—"Then, how does this work, how am I caught up in/by it . . . ?". Here the shift of Barthes (although the traces are present in his earliest book, Writing Degree Zero) is toward a phenomenology. This needs supplementation by a pragmatics. If the phenomenological tells us about the interactive exchanges of situated communicated, the pragmatics tells us about the productive uses of differential meaning-making.

Thus the cultural forms of education can be seen to involve different moments of productivity: a structuration of space, time and text (what is taught, how it is taught, how "correct" transmissions are assessed, and the social evaluation of this final certification) embodying practices of knowledge production: making available, making public, making meaningful. This last of the fused moments is the site of particularly complicated contradictions around constraint (hence the view of education as reproduction) and construction (thus the minority view of education as positively productive). It seems to me that a form can both be phenomenologically productive/reproductive and pragmatically trivial/tedious—that is what I take many educational exchange performances to be about.

Generalizing from this it means that we cannot read/ignore the silences as if they were natural, unresponsive, uncontentious, containment, etc.; rather they are unsaid (but often showable if a second glance is given) of a pragmatics which refuses what is provided, or uses it differently. Such a view also changes our orientation to where the point of production actually is to be found.

Finally, then, I am saying that doing mythologies involves what the early work "left out"—how (with particular this-ness) do social forms mean (how do States state?). In that intertextuality, differential, historical experience rocking and rolling against separated expressions, we find the resources for a different social scape, affirming thereby the human capacities denied, the desires "not yet" accessible, and also, as importantly, the degrees (for it is variable) to which the dominant forms do not dominate. Thereby, and never alone, always with others, we shall have begun to change the objective itself, in changing our senses of our selves, who we are and who we might become.
When

first saw the movie Not A Love Story a couple of years ago, I was surprised to find the Toronto Police and the Ontario Censor Board thanked in the credits. These days, however, systematic cooperation between the anti-pornography movement and the right is pretty standard fare. Taken back by the resistance they encountered within the women's movement, Women Against Pornography and their many franchises and spin-offs regrouped, formed a hasty alliance with behavioural-mod psychologists, cops and decent citizens, and are now launching a new offensive.

Maybe I hang out with the wrong sorts, but I don't hear any apologies about this alliance. The Vancouver Anti-Pornography Network, for example, uses a rhetoric borrowed from countless law-and-order campaigns: they demand that public prosecutors "do their jobs" and convict "porn pimps, whose rights are respected over community standards."

More skillful—and sobering—initiatives have appeared in the social sciences. An example is an ordinance recently passed by Minneapolis City Council early this year declaring that trafficking in pornography is discrimination against the civil rights of women. Porn is defined as the "sexually explicit subordination of women," which includes representations of women "in postures of sexual submission, or sexual servility, including by inviting penetration." The law would allow—get this—anyone who has made porn to sue its producers or retailers whether or not they themselves "actually consented to . . . or appeared to co-operate with" its making. So much for consent. The bill was authored by Catherine McKinnon and Andrea Dworkin, "in a delirium of hope that women are as human as men." In May, a similar ordinance was successfully passed by Indianapolis city-county council. That campaign saw anti-porn feminists, including McKinnon, work with fundamentalist Christians and the police.

All the proposed legislation I've come across is based on the shaky premise that exposure to pornography and TV cop shows promotes—or even causes—rape, aggressiveness, and something called anti-social behaviour. Evidence that refutes these claims is dismissed or simply ignored.

Thelma McCormack's report for the Metro Toronto Task Force on Public Violence Against Women and Children, for example, was shelved late last year when it failed to come up with the right answer. Another report was drafted by David Scott, a clinical psychologist who is a spokesperson for the Action Group on Media Pornography and the Canadian Coalition Against Violent Entertainment. Scott likes to talk about "preventive morality" and argues that only through legislation will we be encouraged to "entertain ourselves with more prosocial activities." His organizations argue that criminal violence has risen 500 percent in the past 30 years, and that "were it a toxic food additive, it would have been taken off the market immediately."

Just how would you go about taking violence "off the market?" A number of suggestions were made at a Symposium on Media Violence and Pornography held in Toronto this past February. About 750 people, probably half of them women, sat through ten hours of panels and slide shows presented by what the publicity had called "international experts." These turned out to be, as they usually do in Canada, Americans, most of them men. The day opened with a prayer and closed with a Debriefing. I was afraid to stay for. Entrance cost $40, no one under 18 was permitted, there was no daycare, and no questions from the floor. "When a teacher lectures his students," Scott, who chaired the conference, pointed out, "he's not there for any debate."

The lecture began with ten psychologists, who had slides and charts that explained everything from crime statistics to rock videos to erections. Dr. Edward Donnerstein showed outtakes from horror movies that made "normal males" dispose to rape women. Then he showed a movie with what he called "loving sex"—a man and a woman kissing in front of a blazing fire. Dr. Dolf Zillman, however, argued that even representations of "regular heterosexual intercourse" had deleterious effects. Seems that since most porn loops show "copulation of every sort— including anal," our appetite for "more bizarre sexuality" is stimulated. Who knows what might be next. "Massive exposure to non-violent pornography," Zillman continued, "makes men and women less supportive of the female liberation movement." Applause here. Dr. Thomas Radecki, MD. Chairperson of the National Coalition on Television Violence in the US, talked about the broadcasting of "sadis
hate programming” into our homes. There followed a denunciation of most music videos, TV sports, Dynasty (“frequent scenes of violence”), punk rock and gang wars. “MTV and other violent TV network are out to guarantee that the second television generation will be more violent than the first, which turned out to be the most violent generation of Americans on record,” so that explains the string of claims made in the early 1980s. Judy Resnick, president, recipient of an $800,000 grant from the US Justice Department to study the link between pornography and violence, gave a plenary lecture that was correspondingly, precisely and polished. She spoke of her work in a five million dollar programme throughout the Americas to combat the juvenile delinquency, which aims “to classify, neurologically, both the trigger inures that support violence, and the people whose violence is unconsciously perceived by us, since humans are wired biologically.” She went on to speculate that the “sexual underpinning” of much pornography seems to be “male against male,” and was the cause of considerable violence, sexual assault and murder. Resnick then described how, in children’s minds—some of which she said she got from the FBI—and how noted how they present kids as “sexual, seductive, sexual creatures capable of consent.” We don’t know whether this is true, but we do know that sadism creeps in, and that’s of concern to the state.”

Sandy Stock showed slides from the New York WAP show. The programme had promoted Stock was from SONY Studio at 24 West, Palm Beach. She is also Director of the Human Sexuality Center in Lake Worth, Florida. A discussion of detective magazine, Hustler and jerking off, she concluded that they were “taught that to mean sex.” Stock then revealed that Al Goldstein, the “leader of the gay porn business” was planning to set up a conference in conjunction with running and taking off all his clothes. We looked around apprehensively, but apparently, apparently, “Al had shaved all his body...”

Everett Koop, the US Surgeon General, gave the most polished New Right speech I’ve ever heard. Tired up in a rest how the Koop believed that sex was right, that sex was right, and that sex was right, and that sex was right. He learned that the sex epidemic began in 1965, and that a cancer, takes several forms. Apparently, suicide is one. Nearly, suicide is one. And Koop cited Koop’s study that was supposed to show that 60% of sex was right, and 40% of sex was right, and 40% of sex was right, and 40% of sex was right. Koop then turned to the WAP conference where he discussed a new book, called “The Whole Truth About Human Reproduction.”

About 500 Americans at the conference called “Canada” and with their respective societies, Koop then continued, “We need to be a proud and fearless people in this country. Now we feel weak and victimized.” The solutions, besides injection of Depo-Provera perhaps, Murie ketchup in school lunches. Koop’s answers lay in “proactive law enforcement” and the successful work of the Task Force for the Study of Anti-social and Violence Behavior and the President’s Task Force on People Affected by Crime.
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women's concerns had prevailed. Andrea Dworkin, Susan Cole wrote in Broadside, had "come down from the mountain" and "made those women who really don't want to listen cock their ears."

Now there's a sick fantasy. My press packet had included pictures of 'the leader's' meeting with Reagan, lists of anti-social TV shows, an appeal to women to wear dresses, WAP xeroxes of Playboy cartoon, pictures of T (')(pictures of T)', denunciations of Brian De Palma, brochures from organizations with names like Citizens for Decency Through Law and Humanity in Media, Inc. A vision of the liberation of women can be glimpsed through this mishmash!

Sure, in the short term, the anti-porn movement might well attract women—and men—who are unfamiliar with explicit sexual representations and who otherwise have no interest in the issue. Is this how much of the problem seems to be the photographic image itself, in all its presumed verisimilitude? That leads me to wonder what kinds of ethical dilemmas the sex industry will pose when it discovers how to interface biofeedback and robotics and holography. But we are more speculating what will really be the fantasies of being raped once my body gets plugged more directly into the integrated circuit? As our relations to power become increasingly mediated by high technologies, what kinds of sexual representations will become possible—or desirable?

For their part, the cops are after these things: more money, more interagency cooperation, and more summary authority. Our descriptions of older forms in particular (which is usually defined in the broadest possible terms), many US labor unions have already taken turns as a leadership of state, local and state attorneys general and welfare officers. These bureaucracies are lobbying for legislation that will raise the age of rape at which children cannot be depicted in sexual conduct (including "exhibitionism"), and to include child pornography under the racketeering, fraud and corruption, and Organized Crime Act. This last allows the US Justice Department to require any person in organization to turn over any documents relevant to an investigation underway. (There has been legislation in the past that has been passed to protect the rights of adult women, young people, and marginalized. Second, the elimination of the law that has attempted to make the sexual liberation movements of the past 45 years. Lastly, the removal of the provision that makes it a crime for any attempt to engage in any activity anywhere in the world today. An anti-porn point, and cultural feminism in general, does call for the elimination of the law, and for the removal of any assumptions about the nature of men and women's sexuality. Beyond questions of gender and sexuality, what about violence and its representations? What does it mean for the Surgeon-General of the United States to say that "women are the targets of violence? Suppose we thought that was a good idea. What would be appropriate targets? Men? Ter- ritories? The military? Competitive sports? Hurricaness?)

I don't see any of these issues being raised within the anti-porn movement. Nor do I see that movement attempting to find some honest way to address the complex issues around sex, desire and pleasure that have been articulated by the sexual freedom. Finally, it is not possible to buy into the anti-porn movement, for that movement to work toward the goal of sexual liberation and economic liberation.

The anti-porn movement now touring this continent is intimately linked with the most repressive elements of the modern era. It's no coincidence that those who use "porn violence" to incite crime and sickness, for the moralistic apparatus are understood to control these transgressions, are ready to plan your next (and finest) how to stop a little pacificist, while we're at it?

The fight against pornography is taken up by the right-wing organizations in the United States, who staked out one of the radical sexual liberation movements of the past two decades. To the anti-porn movement, we stand on the edge of far more than the possibility of sexual identity and diversity. We stand to lose our very autonomy. The right understands this, but does the anti-porn movement?"
The Trapper had stumbled upon it but too suddenly to be by chance, almost by pre-destination,

There are two realisms:
The first deciphers the “real” (What is demonstrated by not seen);

He had a strong sense of intuition. Even as a child he could find things, that others could not find.

The second speaks “reality” (What is seen but not demonstrated);
It was this innate ability to see, to read the signs decisively in a moment, that made the Trapper Legend.

The novel, which can mix these two realisms, adds to the intelligible of the "real" the hallucinatory tail of "reality".
Radio must be changed from a means of distribution to a means of communication," Bertolt Brecht wrote in 1932, when the medium was barely a dozen years old. By that time, its form was already established as a one-way transmitter of messages to mass audiences whose only power lay in their control of the switch. Whether commercial or state monopoly, radio was indeed a reflection of political and cultural power relations, and a tool for maintaining them, everywhere in the world.

Brecht's own countryfolk were among the first to try to invent an emancipatory form of radio practice by taking radio-phonics into their own hands. During the revolution of 1918 German workers occupied radio studios, and illegal radio broadcasts by worker groups persisted throughout the Weimar Republic.

From the Arbeiterradioband of Weimar to the radios libres of France, Belgium, West Germany and Italy in the 1970s, radio has been used as a means of social and political intervention in western Europe. At the same time, from Algeria to Latin America, from Viet Nam to Afghanistan, radio has been an important weapon in revolutionary struggles against colonial powers. In North and South America, meanwhile, "community" radio occupies a critical, although marginal, space at the edge of the cultural colossus.

More than 500 contemporary practitioners of these different types of oppositional radios met at a remarkable conference in Montreal last August (1983), to discover they had one great unifying quality: use of the medium as a means of opposing domination, albeit of various forms and degrees. The conference was organized under the sign of "community"—a particularly North American designation, which everyone recognized was not necessarily appropriate to all the experiences represented at Montreal. In fact, if anything, there was a tacit recognition of a kind of solidarity that transcends socio-cultural context but which can not yet be named. What ties these experiences together is the way each of them uses radio as part of a process of human emancipation.

Where did these radios come from and where are they headed in 1984?

The use of radio as a means of propaganda and ideological support for armed struggle is the oldest, clearest and least ambiguous kind of "alternative" radio. During the Second World War radio was an important propaganda and counter-propaganda tool of both sides, and also a tool of resistance. After the war, when the CIA began regular monitoring of "clandestine stations" throughout the world, virtually every imaginable revolutionary guerrilla group, of left and right, had its radio. Some of the examples to turn up on the CIA monitors in the 1940s and '50s: the Irgun, the IRA, Slovakian anti-communist nationalists, Spanish Republicans in exile, Basque separatists, Kurdish rebels.

Illustration by Peter Dako
Franz Fanon detailed the important psychological role of radio in the Algerian war of liberation. Up to the first year of fighting in 1954, radio was considered a tool of colonialism, to the point where lack of ownership of a radio was a mark of resistance among upper-class native Algerians. Then, one day in 1956, leaflets appeared in Algiers announcing the launching of "La Voix de l'Algérie", the Voice of Algeria. Suddenly the situation was reversed, and soon the colonial au-
thorities had to outlaw the sale and pur-
chase of radio stations.

Radio enjoyed a special place in the Cuban Revolution. No less than nine clandestine radio broadcasts to Cuba be-
tween six anti-Castro and three revolu-
tionary, including the famous Radio Rebelde, set up by Che Guevara in the Sierra Maestra in February, 1958. Guer-
illa radio has since been a regular fact of Latin American struggles. In Nicaragua, Radio Sandino used mobile transmitters to communicate with guerrilla forces and throw the Somoza guard off balance.

Today, the tradition is continued in the Morazan mountains of El Salvador, where the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) broadcasts Radio Venecere-
mos. Radio Veneceremos began regular broadcasts from FMLN-controlled terri-
tory January 10, 1981, after a year of sporadic "people's revolutionary radio" broadcasts in the capital. It has been on and off the air since then, depending on the fortunes of war, and is a prime target of government repression. During the 1982 elections, when the army was unable to contain its activities, United States vessels offshore jammed Radio Veneceremos broadcasts.

Radio is a "class" or "revo-
nutionary" radio. As the voice of an
armed rebel movement, it conveys vital
information and does political education,
with a view towards the communicational needs of the revolution. The problem with this type of radio is that the revolutionary context severely limits the possibility of democratic participation, and lends itself too easily to institutionalization as "party radio" after the revolution. . .

At first glance, you couldn't get much farther from the revolutionary radios of third world national liberation struggles than the communication "radios forces" and throw the Somoza guard off balance.

Radio developed as a state monopoly in most countries of the world. As a result of the monopoly situation, radio became either a high culture medium, as in the United Kingdom, or a political extension of the state, as in France. By the mid-

1 The US is the notable exception. Canada was on its way to adopting the Canadian Broadcasting Compromise in 1932.
1960s, dissatisfaction with both types of “public” monopolies led to illegal “private” initiatives to create alternatives.

The first break in the European radio monopolies came with the setting up of the offshore pirate station Radio Caroline in 1964. Its target was innocent enough: the stuffiness of the BBC. Soon there were a dozen stations broadcasting from floating offshore bases. They were never “political” as such. The BBC eventually took this action-critique seriously enough to completely change its program style, but only after legislation had crushed the pirate station movement in 1967.

The commercial broadcasting lobby in Great Britain was more successful, and in 1972 the BBC monopoly was broken with the creation of “private” broadcasting and the Independent Broadcasting Authority. Today, there is a raging debate in Britain over the shape and form of a new entity: “local” broadcasting. A blue-ribbon commission envisaged an amalgamation of the British broadcasting system recommended in 1977 the creation of a Local Broadcasting Authority, under which local radio would be independent of both BBC and IBA. The recommendation has not been realized, and a popular movement has since developed in support of the demand for non-commercial, non-governmental local community radio, politically independent of both capital and state.

The primary struggle in this case is over the political control structure of the radio, and the assumption is that this will lead to a certain kind of presumably different content. It inevitably does, but the content is widely variable, as the French and Italian situations, for example, show.

On the European continent, commercial radio developed with “peripheral” stations based in small localities like Luxembourg and Monaco, beaming their signals to large, lucrative markets like France. This satisfied a certain consumer need for an alternative to the highly politicized French state broadcasting system . . . until a certain May 68.

In the wake of the May upheavals, an entire new set of alternative stations emerged: social, political, cultural and ideological. These needs had nothing to do with commercial interests and could in no way be accommodated within the official system. By the mid-1970s, a vast transnational movement of illegal, clandestine radios had developed, most strongly in France, Belgium, Italy and the German Federal Republic.

In Italy, radio began to be used as a political tool in 1975 by organized extreme-left and alternative movements (gay, women, ecologists) determined to build an alternative cultural apparatus and out of the official ideological apparatus and the Italian state. The illegal radios were severely repressed at first, but never theless, some 300 were broadcasting by the time of the 1976 legislative elections, no doubt influencing (or reflecting?? it’s not quite clear) the gains of the left in those elections. In a climate of political crisis, Italy authorised the free radios, so long as they remained “local” and did not interfere directly with the state monopoly, RAI. This first European “deregulation” as it were, was to become the prototype of a new problem: the opening of the airwaves invited private entrepreneurs to invade a space hitherto restricted to the state and the outlaws. Soon Italy’s alternative radios—and the “public service”—were marginalised as 3,000 commercial stations filled the air.

The French free radios of the mid-1970s saw themselves as media of social and political intervention. The first to transmit regularly was the Paris-based ecologist’s Radio Vert, which went on the air in 1977, and was soon followed up by stations like Radio Lorraine-coeur d’acier, set up by steelworkers in Longwy, and Radio Verte Fosse Ouvertes, set up by activists opposing nuclear installations in Alsace. By September 1977, there was a first free radio federation, l’Association pour la libération des ondes.

Throughout the Giscard regime, police and guerrilla broadcasters played cat and mouse, and strong repressive legislation was brought in in 1978. Soon after, the Socialist Party initiated the media issue as a key source of political dissent in France, and set up Radio Riposte. When François Mitterrand was elected President in May 1981, one of his first gestures was to amnesty several dozen people facing charges of violating the state broadcasting monopoly—one of whom was himself, arrested in a raid on Radio Riposte studios while he was on the air. In the first year of Mitterrand’s regime, the radio issue was never far from the forefront, as free radio initiatives mushroomed and a government reform of the broadcasting system moved to co-opt it.

In Belgium, clandestine radios appeared in 1978, then began to emerge from hid and flout the state monopoly openly. When police tried to raid the first permanent “animation radio”, Radio Louvin-la-Neuve, hundreds of students spontaneously turned out and physically prevented them from carrying out the action.

In Belgium too, the government moved in 1981 to regularise the radio situation, wary, as were the French, to avoid an “Italian” situation. The tremendous paradox that has since emerged in most of western Europe, has the state playing the role of guarantor of non-commercial “difference” and defender against the tendency of an uncontrolled marketplace to favour commercial offerings. (From whose seat, it is tempting to refer to this situation as “canalisation” of the air . . .)

The exception is West Germany. Here, radical radio continues to exhibit its most repressive paradox. In the Federal Republic of Germany, independent, non-commercial radio is still illegal. Free stations—most of them launched by political movements in the 1970s, beginning in Berlin in 1975—are persecuted by police and authorities in a situation which is the most repressive in western Europe. The German radios, consequently, are still all “political”, in the tradition of the early French, Belgian and Italian radios libres. In Germany, it is a criminal act to listen to illegal stations, and listeners are liable to have their offending radio sets confiscated.

Media are a reflection of a political context. The political context of the 1980s is not that of the 1970s. Challenged by the free radio movement, the governments of western Europe have moved to legitimize their situation. Conveniently, this political thaw comes at a time when the geopolitical/technological context of broadcasting is rapidly evolving, making the erstwhile state monopolies less no longer useful. For example, it no longer makes sense for a government to maintain strict control over channels and frequencies in an era where direct broadcast satellites and fibre optic cable have rendered available programming. Also, as the Belgian and Italian situations show, the pressure to open up the commercial possibilities of the radio spectrum are too great for governments—even social democratic governments—facing the conservative winds of deregulation.

In Belgium, the first wave of “animation” radios was soon followed by a second group of more commercial, entertainment-oriented ones. Soon there were two radio associations: the Association pour la libération des ondes (ALO), grouping local, independent, non-profit, self-financing radios opposed to advertising or political subordination; and the Groupement des radios indépendantes de Belgique (GRIB), whose members were mostly mass-culture oriented, pro-advertising, and professional. For two years, while the Belgian state monopoly exercised tolerance, the commercial radios took the upper hand. The ALO was soon demanding regulation. In September 1981, a new law recognized independent local radio in Belgium. The legislative framework is supposed to aid “expressive” radio over commercial ones, but the marketplace has marginalised alternative.
radio to the advantage of the commercial model. By July 1983 some 380 local radio stations had been recognized, but some estimates place the number of legal and illegal ones at 1,200.

In Italy today there are some 2,000 private and concentrates on more-or-less official politics. Radical radio in Italy is found at the local level, where about 200 independent stations of "radical expression" are currently broadcasting. Democratic radio in Italy means radio with public/audience participation in programming, relying heavily on studio-to-phone hookups. Since 1981, about 150 of these "democratic" radios are organized through the Association for Democratic Information Broadcasting (LED). Many of these radios are cooperatively owned. For example, Radio Popolare in Milan has some 12,000 members who control and finance the station.

The political contradictions and frustrations of radical radio are perhaps rarest in France. Here, before May 10, 1981, the situation was at least clear: community radio was an enemy of the state and behaved as such. The unofficial radios were all radios of social and political intervention. Since May 10, radio has also become a movement of cultural expression, in addition to the commercial entrepreneurs, a new type of left-cultural radio "freak" has taken to the air. These broadcasters try to explore new forms of radiophonic language—as opposed to the culturally derivative commercial radios. But only the "intervention" radios are really concerned about the social impact of what they are doing.

An estimated 80,000 people are involved in local radio in France. There are several federations, the most important of which is the Federation nationale des radios libres (300 member stations). The FRRL groups "social expression and communication" radios, that seek financial and political independence and support civic participation. Smaller federations are more "professionalist" and the really commercial operations are not interested in the federations and their negotiations which so often stifle the government—to advertising, which it sees as inviting an Italian/American type situation.

The debate on advertising in France is typical of the type of contradiction inherent in the radio question: both commercial and left cultural/political stations want to be able to sell advertising, the first to make money and the latter to be self-sufficient. The government is opposed to advertising to protect the public interest against American-style commercialism... The free radios have been forced into Parisian boardrooms, where they negotiate protocols, frequency allocations and guidelines for advertising with socialist functionaries. The radical radios have been bureaucratized, and some of the most critical, the most innovative, the most collectivist, have been refused legal status. The irony is that now, despite the legalization and new legitimacy of alternative radio, the exclusion of some of them means there are still outlaw "radio libres"...

On the road to legitimacy, the "free radio" of Europe have taken a big step closer to their North American colleagues. In 1979, a group of French researchers decreed the fact that in Quebec, they found "community" media closely tied to the state, through various legislative/financial mechanisms (Barbier-Lhouvet et al). Today, this is becoming increasingly the case in Europe as well. Does this necessarily mean that the emancipatory potential of the medium must be undermined? The organisers of the Montreal conference, in an attempt to infuse some content to the notion of "community-oriented radio", came up with the following set of characteristics: democratic, free of any institutional dependency, locally owned, based on alternative, autonomous participatory practices. Under this umbrella, they found that different contexts led to different traditions and different meanings. Thus, "community" radio is peculiarly North American, appealing to the sense of belonging fostered by the geographically limited and self-managed communities typical of New England towns and Quebecois villages. "Popular" radio, on the other hand, is more meaningful to the movements of Africa, Latin America and Mediterranean Europe, and refers to political opposition and struggle against the political authority incarnated in traditional radio. "Free" radio, thirdly, connotes the struggle to occupy a free-speech space outside the authoritarian structure of state radio monopolies. In Anglo-Saxon cultures, "pirate", "alternative", "sidewalk", and "parachute" radios are all terms used to name the democratic impulse in radio. Radio thus takes on a different emancipatory focus in different social and political contexts: as human and cultural expression, as social and political intervention, as community-building, as tool of revolutionary struggle. Rather than look for a common thread in these diverse experiences, perhaps it may be most useful to simply marvel that in the present global context people are managing to resist the dominating tendency of mass communication at all...
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Towards a Political Phenomenology of Listening

Jody Berland

Compare the number of publications on TV or film in your local bookstore to those on radio and the culture of sound technology. The last major research projects on radio content and listening habits were conducted in the 1940s. Only in the last two or three years is this absence beginning to register.

This “renaissance” of interest in broadcast sound can be attributed, to a small degree, to the emergence of alternative forms of radio broadcasting, which themselves owe their genesis to major shifts and consolidations in the international and local structurations of technology, economics, power, and cultural production. Though alternative radio takes as many forms as there are cultural and political locations, these different forms of opposition articulate their strategies in relation to a common force: the global network of telecommunications whose musical arms have with unprecedented rapidity entered and transformed every social and cultural community in the world. It is said of music that it disdains all boundaries of language and location. If that can be argued, we are indebted for both its proof and its counter-proof to the global explorations of the music industry. These explorations both transform boundaries and create the felt necessity for their rearticulation. Whether the “global village” towards which these powerful corporations drive us marks the end or the beginning of autonomous difference depends on a complex interaction of technology, power, and politics within which music plays a very central and unique role. Knowing how the struggle progresses means learning how to listen.

My own attentiveness to radio is logical enough, since I am a musician with a professional interest in media and politics. Also I am Canadian, and (even worse) a Canadian woman, which explains a certain paranoid ear for the discourses of power effected by technology, technological processes, mediated social relationships. At the same time, as I am completely inside of these, I am completely at the margins. But
Radio is an alteration of space and a structuring of time. It extends space if you're making music; shrinks it if you're listening. It joins a vast mass of public in a way I hadn't experienced before (though similar stations in Australia first introduced me to such a possibility). The form of broadcasting had nothing to do with the usual injunction to recognize/de sire/purchase the record whose commodit y form corresponded to what I was hearing. I didn't always know whose they were, for one thing; and the different relationship between me and the music corresponded to the different relationship between pieces of music, which "made sense" of them in a different way. I forgot to be annoyed by the absence of immediate author-information. I wasn't listening to advertisements; I was listening to radio.

**STRUCTURE, SPACE, TIME**

Radio achieves this rational irrationality by its ability to place together sound messages which are disparate in terms of their location of origin, their cultural purpose, and their form, in order to create a continuous enveloping rhythm of sound and information. The rhythm's "reason" isn't about insight, originality, history, logic, or emancipation. It's about the market. Since the continuous rhythm of sound is more powerful than any single item enclosed in its progression, the reception of particular items is substantially determined by the larger discourse of radio programming, which teaches us addiction and forgetfulness. In commercial radio, the pleasures of location and identity, of specific recognizability or discoverability, are sacrificed to the (real) pleasures of the media's "boundless hospitality," which defends itself against anxiety by being totalitarian in its mode of address and in its structuring of program, genre, and rhythm. The tempo of events, information, pleasure, and interruption, with its prescribed balance of familiar and unfamiliar, is determined by economics, market research, and convention, before the DJ ever gets there. Music is meted out by measure to reward the listener. The carefully managed rapidity and predictability of pattern maintains what might be called a community of listeners who identify with its generic classifications (Top-40, country, "easy listening," big band, classical, "new music," etc.; all rigorously carved up by market research and broadcast regulation) and who share a certain locus of informed style.

Because of increased mobility, transmigration of musical space is still possible. Radio rede fines space and structures time not only in its acoustic movement over distances but also in its format. Murray Schafer has argued that the joining of geographically and philosophically unrelated items in radio achieves an "irrationality of electro acoustic juxtapositioning" which we should refuse to take for granted. Though Schafer has done as much as anyone to analyse the experiential effects of what he calls the "schizophrenia" of modern sound technology and its splitting of sound from source, we can go farther by recognizing that the principles of juxtaposition which dominate ordinary radio programming are as "rational," i.e. motivated, as they are irrational, i.e. static.

Radio entered the marketplace in the 1920s, the same decade in which American entertainers began the process of concentration and integration which now dominates the international production and dissemination of popular art. The first networks were established in that decade, and linked, via corporate ownership, to the production of radios, records, record players, music publishing, and film. The entertainment monopolies have triumphed through a process of continuous centralization and integration of all the forms of music production and dissemination; their imperatives of growth have marked the development of music technology and its communicative discourse from the beginning of broadcasting history.

Commercial broadcasting has become the dominant mode of promotion for musical commodities, and has become dependent on the strategies of those record companies for its musical programming. DJs and disc jockeys have become a substantively irrelevant embellishment, and the medium of radio a totally instrumenta lized form of communication. Record companies profit in turn through the airwaves acquired through various infamous strategies (though most communities have their own exceptions to point out). The profitability of record production contributes to the continuous economic centralization, which itself depends on exploiting the "strategic" market's ever-growing labels and innovative trends. But such centralization of profit also contributes to symbolic centralization, whereby the dynamics of technical innovation "produce" the big companies create more and more sophisticated sound production values, through which listeners learn to judge musical value. The changing modes of musical performance are, if not determined, certainly mediated by the evolving strategies of the big companies and the development of new technologies and the marketing of music as a whole. In terms of the dominant discourse, there are only two kinds of music: the rest are shadows, or so it would seem, flabby imitations, or marginal testimonies to the mythology of bounded hospitality by means of which the industrial powers weave their web.

Of course this is not the whole story, since behind this bland mask of boundlessness is the productivity of music itself, which is always also a social productivity. The traces of this are audible in the rup tures of rock, in black music, third world or women's music, the "experiments" with space of new music, in all the spaces where location names itself and makes itself heard. The historicity of technologies is not only that of the discourses of power, but also of opposition and difference, and of the production of these. At certain times the cultural productivity of making music becomes also an oppositional expression of new social formations and values, and when such cultural productivity becomes oppositional practice, it is important to understand more clearly how cultural formation works, and how it does not only its own structures of imprisoned desire but also its own alternatives and oppositions.
American broadcasting has been officially private (with notable exceptions) since the 1927 Radio Act, a government decision that acknowledged the commercial self-denial which empowered the newly formed Federal Communications Commission to license and regulate radio communications as a "public utility," not private, interest, or necessity requires." 1927 was also the year that NBC and CBS took control of programming and production. Obviously "public interest" offers a controversial framework for broadcast regulations, as indeed it has been in Canada since the federal government bestowed itself to create an alternative public broadcasting system in the 1930s. The American interpretation of "public interest" represented a clear victory for private interest and thus, explicitly, for direct broadcast advertising. The consequent strategic imperatives were imposed on broadcasters uniformly. They rationalized the maximization of audience size in order to increase advertising revenue, and this meant both a continuous standardization of musical styles and forms and an increasing reliance on the mass-produced recorded music of the big companies. Such music, while cheaper, was produced through increasingly sophisticated processes, which encouraged the entrenchment of powerful, implicit values of what constitutes "good" music. This control of technology is the real motor of symbolic centralization, rewarding listeners with continuous pleasure and thus continued confidence in the freedom of our pleasured ears.

But most of us, like our comrades in the "developing" nations, don't need to be reminded of what "free speech" really means in terms of American communications policy. As its horizons expand, we can enjoy wonderful things from Cuba, Warsaw, Liverpool, Kingston, Harlem, Nigeria, or Kamloops, B.C. We are in a particularly advantageous position to celebrate what McLuhan called the "global village." This privilege, like the Trojan horse, introduces the power dynamics of the technological conquering of space, and this has also been the case since broadcasting began.

MUSIC IN/OUT OF CANADA

Canada - the space, the people, the airwaves - has had a unique role: it is the point of cultural and economic effects of the American communications empire more than most other countries. We're not unique with respect to this challenge: but because the problem is a much older one here, it takes a different form. When the world hears African music, which it increasingly seems to want to do, our immanent recognition forms part of the pleasure and experience of listening to what is heard as African music. (For music producers, who have heard African music and wanted to join in, which is also increasingly the case.) African-ness can be heard. The music fills a specific symbolic and ideological space, which is constructed as African-icity. Our hearing it is part of an international technological exchange, which is in turn a symbolic of pre-industrial culture, itself affected. As the tools of that network edge their way into the various centres of African music (which itself has never been a single style or discourse), they transform its social organization and, to some extent, its form. Africans themselves have, in response, begun to mobilize their own music production through various strategies of technological appropriation: cassette tapes and broadcasting policy in those countries, like many others, have become central to campaigns for cultural self-production. What we hear as "African" is increasingly infused with the strategic language of such resistance/appropriation.

The same phenomenological representation marks American music, in a completely different sense. Its power signals not only the entrepreneurial prowess of the "big 5" of the music industries, but also the symbolic powers attached to American formulations of the modern, the free, and the fun. American and African music articulate different kinds of aspirations for listeners in various locations. This difference is also a relationship, again not only economic, but also in terms of symbolized value systems struggling over formulations of the modern, the free, and the fun. Of course it is people who actually struggle, not symbolic systems. In all this global, symbolic warfare, this "creative" tension between centre and articulate margins, where do we stand?

When you hear Canadian music, its Canadian-ness doesn't often reach out and effect the products of the national culture. It becomes an issue, so to speak, after the fact. This is part of how we are constituted as listeners. We may know that Rough Trade or Joni Mitchell or Burton Cummings or Ann Murray are Canadian, but we mainly know this factually, not musically. To ask whether the music we listen to is knowable musically as Canadian raises a number of questions which in themselves have been disturbingly productive. Here I place native and Quebecois music in brackets. In any case, hearing "prairies" or "Toronto" as a climactic aura framing the voice may be an externally informed part of the experience of listening, but it is part of it nonetheless. We still claim what we want of it as ours. What arises more readily as an immanent question from our historical experience as listeners concerns what we hear and how we hear what we hear. How we hear what we hear has, from the moment there was a listening "we", been predominantly from the radio. Because of this fact, and the specific patterns it implies, how we hear what we hear has been a question as long as we have heard it, and so this question is part of what we have always heard, though we haven't always heard it musically.

This historical centrality of radio to Canadian cultural experience is a function of geography, which was given, and of attention, which was mediated, in the initial form, not long after American radio had firmly taken root, as a conscious strategy of public purpose in the name of national development. Following the triumphs the CBC developed a radically different approach to broadcasting and specifically to music broadcasting, and a fascinating history of cultural self-defense (mediated by colonial elitism) which remains largely unwritten. For some decades, the CBC was the single most influential system for the production and dissemination of Canadian music. Composers and historians maintain that without CBC radio there would not have developed a community of music producers able to conceive of the possibility of making music. The CBC organized, produced, and broadcast across the country a range of musical performances, from new operas to a prize-winning pipe band of CPR employees, from big bands to Irish folk songs, from commissioned compositions for radio and film documentaries and dramas to national talent hunt singing contests. No doubt it was an inspiring moment, that bringing together of so many voices under the protective umbrella of the CBC. Listeners congregated in rural living rooms and wrote letters about being truly thrilled by the sound of the bells ringing out from Orillia or Otago hill-top. . . . it didn't seem like so much state-spread maple syrup. But clearly something was happening in Canada in the 40s and 50s. Regions and communities had their voices and their voices could be heard. The CBC provided a space for this to happen in, if not for everyone, for the largest number, for the most, voice in a political sense. They proved that when people themselves produce such complex sociality, the juxtaposition of messages and languages can be intelligible (rather than "coherent," a term that implies singularity). The provision of resources for expressive social communication, and the making of such communication in a continually new and different way, rather than simply the making of new versions of old structures, has been tantamount, by its growing vulnerability to commercial pressures and decreasing protection from the Canadian state. These pressures led to the consolidation of broadcasting conventions in which music broadcasting in urban centres (especially the more "serious" FM) has become largely predictable and dead as it is predictable and transient on the private stations. The fertile interdependency of music production and broadcasting, which has been a situation in changing musical thinking, has mostly given way to the triumph of the economic and formal interdependency of broadcasting space, and pre-recorded music. The former CBC music producer argues that this change has worked to discourage imagination, to decrease the number of voices over the final broadcast format, and to sever the relationship between host and musician. The effects of the transformed mode of musical packaging are passed on to the listener, to whom the daily spate of music becomes simply a component of the familiar daily environment. Music on radio ceases to matter. Against such an attitude it is all the more difficult for the radio producer of imagination and originality to make his
As the station’s manager explained to me, CKNL has no difficulty fulfilling Canadian content requirements because they like to play local music. A resource can be a catalyst: after a year of broadcasting, their library now contains two hundred and fifty local cassette tapes. Without CKNL (I speak from experience) many of these would not have been made. Many won’t be heard elsewhere. The more complex and open the musical thinking of the station’s programmers, the more autonomous, and “significant” as communication, can be the musical thinking that goes into making these tapes. It is not so much the individual authorship of music which is important within the programming discourse of the station, but the control and creative use of the medium as it mediates our musicality and our sociality. This can only evolve through an interaction between the station and the community, between listening and playing, and between music and other issues and activities.

The programs in which local tapes appear are not merely organized around Canadian-ness, though there are special programs on local music (as on women’s music, Reggae, blues, imported music, experimental music, jazz; musical “location” is a funny thing). Most frequently they are woven into a fabric of music discourse which connects to other discourses in many different directions. Nowhere else would you hear the particular combinations and threads connecting those pieces of music. The juxtapositions cutting across time or space pull different sound thoughts together, as (for instance) when I heard The Birthday Party follow Janis Joplin, and suddenly recognized something about the voices of west-coast angst, or when I heard a series of pieces by the end of which I really heard the clarinet. Such reworking can change as it responds to - is produced by - the community which is also the listening public. This process of enfranchisement has political effects, evident in the production of “documentary” talks on social issues in which the music intervenes, not (as it often is) as propaganda, but as a separate-but-equal moment of musically embodied expressive response to a politicized world. The station’s evolving strategies of mediation make possible the development of a political phenomenology of listening, without which no emancipatory strategy in sound is possible.

NOTES

This article has been revised from a talk given in Guelph for the Bordersline/C.S.A.A./Communications session on “Emancipatory Cultural Practice” during the Learned Societies. I would like to acknowledge the helpful contributions of Anton Lee (CKNL), John Twomey (Radio and TV, Ryerson), M. Rabb, A. Beland, and other friends, who, like all friends, cannot be held responsible for what I envisioned.


Some recent publications and resources on radio:


delay: The Other Magazine about the Airwaves. 2a St. Paula Road, London Nl.


Other relevant publications:


Wallis, Roger and Kristin Malm, Big Sounds from Small People (The music industry in small countries. Constable, London, 1984.)

I said earlier that the recent emergence of alternative broadcasting is tied to major shifts in the international and local structuration of technology, economies, power, and cultural production. While this structure is not itself a series of identical forms, its local forms vary, as do strategies of local mobilization and cultural opposition. For many years “alternative” broadcasting in Canada took the form of a national public network (demanded and fought for by Canadians) whose mandate was to broadcast on behalf of a national community whose identity it simultaneously sought to build. That mandate could only have been fulfilled by allowing a far more complex and multiple concept of “public” than the dual imperatives of national (cultural) defense and the economy of dependency permitted. The failure of the CBC joins with the simultaneous effects of a more universal colonization of musical resources, which make cultural opposition at once more international and more local. The “margins” reassert their power and find mutual recognition. The potential strength of CKNL is that it can exemplify and reinforce this dialectic of internationalism and localism; both are strengthened as it participates in the evolution of cultural self-determination within, and between, the various musical communities in Toronto.
The game was easy,
posing,
no real threat to the trapper.

The language I speak "within myself"
is not of my time;
it is prey, by nature,
to ideological suspicion.

Whatever he wanted was there.
It was new, exciting,
yet somehow, natural.

The new is not a fashion
it is a value,
the basis of all criticism.
GREETINGS FROM CANADA

Two Nations by Susan Crean and Marcel Rioux
(Toronto, James Lorimer, 1983)

This fine and stimulating short book has the originality of being a collaboration between a Quebec nationalist and a Canadian one, both of whom here jointly defend what I suppose must be called a "sovereign-association" relationship between the "two nations". Marcel Rioux is one of the most-emininet Quebec sociologists and the author of many important studies on Quebec, while Susan Crean, an editor of This Magazine, represents the newer, Canadian nationalist (our language problem here is obviously a significant symptom) which emerged only after Quebec nationalism and in response to (though not against) this last. Among the many asymmetries in this relationship is the fact that while Quebec nationalism emerged in opposition to anglophone Canada’s, "Canadian" nationalism emerged in opposition to the United States. The book has much to say about the next and latest turn of the screw, namely the threat to the Western provinces against Ontario, yet the authors sum up this whole exceedingly complex situation as follows: "The Quebec-Canada, two-nations, two languages tension represents a cultural contradiction; the regions versus Ottawa a political one, and Canada-US relations primarily an economic one" (140). This volume focuses especially on oats and indeed expresses an interesting and original "New World" sentiment on what has come to be called British "culturalism" (Raymond Williams, E.P. Thompson, Stuart Hall). The culturalism eloquently expressed here surely originates in Quebec and owes much to Rioux's earlier work, if it is more convincing than its UK counterpart. One of the main stress is the authority of working class culture, perhaps that is because the Quebec experience is one of cultural imperialism and domination, and the function of an embattled cultural movement. I am not sure how appropriate it is for this book to be reviewed by an American, even an anti-imperialist one, with some personal experience of and much sympathy for both of these nations. A few years ago I interviewed a number of political leaders of all tendencies in Quebec and was astounded to discover that, with a single exception (Pierre Vallerio), none of them (including PQ government officials) were seriously worried about what would happen to an independent Quebec if released into the force field of its enormous neighbour to the South. It is therefore encouraging to see that in the Quebec chapters of the present work this alarming indifference has been corrected: the stress here is not merely on cultural imperialism (following the pioneering White Papers on that subject prepared by the PQ government), but on US cultural imperialism, very specifically including the whole area of media control and the American monopoly on the new information technology. With this section, therefore, a study of what might otherwise have seemed to outsiders an exceptional and historically unique situation (Canada) at once becomes a central exhibit in a worldwide drama of crucial concern to every other country in the world (not excluding Europe). For whatever the crises and contradictions of the US economy, the American information monopoly has rapidly come to be recognized in the last decade as an even greater threat - because for more insidious - than American (nuclear) militarism. While the authors also carefully document American economic penetration of the older kind in Canada, it is perhaps somewhat oversimplified of them to describe this particular menace (in the passage quoted above) as a merely "economic" one: here, indeed, cultural and economic domination are united in a new and historically original form of imperialism.

All of which leads us to yet another form of that omnipresent contemporary dilemma: what effective forms of political resistance can be invented in the multinational era? The author of Two Nations underscores the much more universal paradox that, as with Gaulism, the first form of recent Canadian resistance to US preponderance came from the flight and was inspired by an older kind of nationalism (or patriotism): the ill-fated Diefenbaker attempt, followed by the ignominious Arrow cancellation. They also emphasize the importance of an independent Canadian foreign policy, not least of all because of the "political ambiguity of the Parti Quebecois itself, in the immediate future. I certainly seem to impose itself centrally in this context. Whatever the reasons for this omission, I suspect that one of them has to do with the confines of culture and politics that underpins the book’s positions. I am myself somewhat ethnocentric to the notion of a cultural politics as that form of political activity historical Suicide to seek the uniqueness of this latest moment of multinational capitalism. On the other hand, I must confess that the conclusions of these valuable volume seem weak and disappointing to me: a call for a respect for autonomous cultures from which any consideration of concrete political strategies (and tactics) seems to have been removed. In one sense, of course, the realignment of the cultural politics of both nations - Canada and Quebec - against the United States would seem to be a productive one, which could overcome many of the older differences and tensions between them. But that could happen, surely, only under special circumstances - that is to say, in the framework of a general transformation of the Canadian socio-economic system. We are talking, if other words, about socialism; yet the author describes the process of reversion and other popular New Left visions of democratic socialism scarcely reflects any of the confusions and disappointments of current French experiments, while popular references to the double "capitalism" of the Soviet Union been taken "even-handed" nod to American anti-communist prejudices which seems singularly inappropriate in a work which seems to identify the principal adversary). I don’t mean to suggest that any of the rest of us have gone much further than Crean and Rioux in attempting to reinvent the most effective left politics for our own time, indeed, even this final disappointment is a stimulating and satirical one, and does not detract from the great interest of this valuable and readable book.

Frederic Jameson is the author of The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1983), and is a frequent visitor to Canada.
It slams the door on too much which I hold precious as political resources. All that work which has shown resoundingly how things and people could be exposed by the signified, represented nature of the world against naturalism, or religious and secular Doxa, from the montage of Eisenstein, through the staging of Brecht, to the dancing, musical, festive, humourous politics of popular cultural forms.


Writing of the situation of the writer in 1947 in What is Literature? (1971), Williams argued: 'A clear-sighted view of the darkest possible situation is in itself already an optimistic act. It implies, in effect, that the situation can be thought about, that is, that we are not lost in a dark forest and that, once we choose, we can break away from it, at least in spirit, and make our resolutions in the face of it, even if these resolutions are hopeless'. Some of this clearly informs Raymond Williams writing in the shadows of the late 1970s and 1980s - from the opening quotations - 'Dyme ni yw ar dail ein gothol' (here we are now on the journey); Morgan Rhys' 'Y Cyflignon Cymreig' (1795), who holds that 'it is that way to the Better there be, it excists a full look at the worst', Thomas Hardy in Teneris, 1895 through to the closing part of the book. He concludes 'The Long Revolution'.

The main point is that there can be some sharing of this process of reflection, a general discussion and revision of outlook. This could be impossible beyond the book itself. I conclude it with an essay on 'Resources for a Journey of Hope' to facilitate slowly and deliberately encouraging argument. From what began in 1983, as an idea of the long revolution, then an intended and hopeful movement towards 2000. ('p. 211')

The reference is to his book The Long Revolution which has as its third part his essay 'Britain in the Sixties': the main section 'Towards 2000' - is the deliberate encouragement argument. Part Three is 'The Analysis Reconsidered' and Part Four is 'The Analysis Extendied'. Here, in Williams's own estimation, 'The pivotal essay is on the culture of nations: in part a conclusion, in part a reconsideration of the perspective of the 1989 essay, in part a challenge to the controlling "national" form to which much of us still try to think. But, as he goes on to argue, this is a "dissolving" perspective of the "national" perspective "cannot be corrected by any simple move from "national" to "international" forms". Thus the reading of this book becomes the international - the international - "East-West, North-South" and the part concludes with 'War, The Last Enemy'.

It is a typically honest, courageous action for Raymond Williams to republish a resplendent analysis, on the edge of the decade it discusses, some 26 years later. It still reads well, as did it to me then. I have written elsewhere of how Raymond Williams the historian is an unacknowledged figure, favouring the "Brilliant in the Sixties" with the superlative, "easy to read" when quoting the closing pages of E.J. Hobsbawm's Industries and Empire. The "reconsiderations" on page 75. There are three, the main, consolidations of the streams of Williams' earlier analysis; they are in and of themselves resources and strengths. I happen to have a discussion on peasants - in London, England, the Friday after that dark, dark Thursday 13th May 1979 when the Thatcher government announced its policies. Two of the speakers were Raymond Williams and Eric Hobsbawm. The contrasts of their reactions to the previous day's events were striking. Williams was silent, but not distraught. Hobsbawm speaking of 'betrayal' by the working class. I mean it to point the way to the resources of Williams' writing being resources for a hope: the strengths of the current writing relate in part to this calm (a keyword) of hopefulness. A key passage, for me, is the following: 'There are, in times of the current crisis, when the image materializes of a disintegrated world, which somebody is trying to think, while there is a feint-dancing on in one corner and a military band blasing away in the other. It is not the ordinary enjoyment of life that are diverting serious concern, as at times, in a natural human rhythm, they must and should, it is a systematic euphony which may indeed not be as bad as it sounds. There is no hope that is diverting the important, but which is nevertheless, and so far successfully, doing just that.'

Out of this book come crucial social prescriptive suggestions with regard to the necessary and sufficient forms for socialist politics in our time - regarding production (pp. 98), socialist democracy (pp. 164), culture and technology (p. 151), the general interests in terms of the political (pp. 174), the socialist movement (p. 174), a variable socialising regarding social identities and effective and essential governing societies (p. 199), and more diversified recommendations regarding "internationalism" and "peace" in the concluding chapters of Part Four: I entirely endorse his points regarding the latter: 'To build peace, now more than ever, is necessary to build more than peace. To refuse nuclear weapons, we have to refuse much more than nuclear weapons. Unless the refusals can be connected with such building, unless protest can be connected with and surpassed by significant practical construction, our strength will be insufficient. It is then in making hope practical, rather than despair convincing, that the ways of peace can be entered.'

I would wager that the last sentence will be quoted in 2073 - if there is a 2073, in the way that I and others turn to that wondrous text of William Morris, Communism (1883).

In what ways, then, is hope made practical in Towards 2000? First, there is, first, the calmness (although I shall critically qualify this in a moment), which conveys also a refusal of trendiness, of expecting sudden victories. It is a book which has marked the writing of other socialists and communists of Williams' generation. There is, secondly, the recognition that there is always a feature of his writing - of hope and strength, yes, but also of pervasive, complex, obstinate difficulties too. More specifically I want to say "theoretically" - to check myself, these are historical experiences and understandings of millions of ordinary women and men after all - there are the twin emphases of much of Williams' other work: 1) reactions of production (and, I would stress, social
under the plinking of feminism in relation to peace and ecological movements (248), Third, and this is an extraordinary change, given at who it is directed, that a profound weakness of the book turns around the discussions of cultural production (pp. 125-152; 177-199), but it is true for me. It is within that discussion that the one moment of rancour occurs. What is being condemned in the following pages is to include - as a kind of ill-tempered concordance - a profound radical of a profound rapprochement that there is also a pseudo-radical "practice", in which the negative structuralist and postmodernist art are attached to a nominal revolutionary or libertarian radicalism, though all the ideal to end in the end undermines this, turning it back to the illusions of the 'late bourgeois subjection'. The next page speaks of "the reduced and distorted shape of the modern and post-modernist representations." (This is not a new theme, see also Politics and Letters, passaging, and his brief mentions of "late bourgeois modernism" and "a desperate vanguardism," New Society, 5 January 1984 p. 19). That cannot be a thesis principle or serious. It slams the door on top much I hold precious as political resources. All that work which was in the book was righteous, but how things are changed and people could be different by exposing the signified, represented nature of the world against naturalisms, or religious authority. Do not, through the language of Esquire, the study of Margaret from the through of Bragin, to the dancing, musical, festive, humorous politics of popular cultural forms. Socialism, a project always in the making - is a serious, principled negation and an exuberant, affirmative "festival of the oppressed".

Do I make too much of a few words? Yes and no. No, because it was Raymond Williams who taught me (and thousands of others) that art, literature, criticism are terms of anti-socialist speculation and bourgeois control. No, because the glaring absence of this book is educational, taken in its widest meaning, to which Williams again stand in the same Long Revolutionary moment our attention. Yes, finally, and in the remaining pages, in the mass and times of massive distraction, pain, despair and worse, we need a calm consideration, a reminding and remembering that socialism requires mutual and co-operative social practices (as distinct from the dominant bourgeois idea of individual practice, p. 167).

Philip Corrigan teaches at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, and is a member of the borderlines collective.

The Sexual Fix by Stephen Heath (New York, Schocken, 1984)

The Sexual Fix is a strange work which gets curiouser and curiouser and altogether weird. Even though it is clearly, even to the only half awak reader, an adaptation of Michel Foucault's mischievously inspired speculations about sexuality, the man himself is never once mentioned. He is the ghost at the banquet. But he is a ghost with a vengeance. The second curious thing about the book is its scopicism, not to say hostility, towards Freud and all his works, which is similar to Foucault's critique of psychoanalysis. Freud, it seems, was both the discoverer of the subversive workings or desire and its arch recoiler. Now Stephen Heath was one of the first intellectuals in the mid-1970s who in the pages of the theoretical journal Screen and elsewhere enjoined us to address ourselves to the insights of Lacan's received knowledge. But once again is this displaced, and so apparently I am much the better off without this book. For this cause. Since Heath's book first appeared Foucault has done plenty of displacement himself and I doubt if we shall have to wait very long the whole of this whole subject.
Sex and Love: New Thoughts on Old Contradictions

Sue Cartridge & Joanna Ryan

This new attention to the politics of sex? In part it is the result of the insistence of those feminists, gays and lesbians who for many years have been the seemingly thankless task of raising sexual issues within the left. But I suspect that this new interest is more a response to the obvious political opportunities of the new right in mobilizing itself in opposition to the supposed disunity of the family, the ostensible rise in homophobia, and lippy feminists defending their right in the workplace and the right to reproduction as self-determination. In short the right now has raised sex as a main plank in their seductive political framework.

The left today is far from enjoying the luxury that once had its struggle to regain its credibility and strength it will also have to make sexual and gender issues a central part of its own politics. The publication of these three books signals a shift in this direction. Hopefully they will encourage less lip service and more real action by socialists.

Powers of Desire, the Monthly Review contribution, is a huge and necessarily pricey collection of mostly previously published pieces. Some of the authors; Ann Siltanen's classic on mass market romance, Amber Hollibaugh and Cherie Moraga's on sexualities in literature, and Edie Langer's on "the fear that feminism will free men first" are important and provocative pieces. But because it is such an inclusive collection that tackles historical as well as contemporary issues, the book as a whole is too eclectic to pursue a single theme. If you haven't read much American feminist writing on sex, this is a good reader, but because the bulk of the articles have previously appeared, the collection reads water rather than moves our analysis forward.

The Left and the Erotic, published by Lawrence and Wishart in London, England, is a curious collection of essays, some of which address the book's intent to examine the connections and barriers between sexual politics and the politics of the left. Most of the essays fall rather wide of that mark. The introduction by Eileen Phillips, and Elizabeth Wilson's piece on the new romanticism, almost make the book worth picking up, but much of the rest of the book is a mish-mash of how badly the left has dealt with sexual issues and how difficult that has made political life for feminists and gays.

Why this new attention to the politics of sex? In part it is the result of the insistence of those feminists, gays and lesbians who for many years have been the seemingly thankless task of raising sexual issues within the left. But I suspect that this new interest is more a response to the obvious political opportunities of the new right in mobilizing itself in opposition to the supposed disunity of the family, the ostensible rise in homophobia, and lippy feminists defending their right in the workplace and the right to reproduction as self-determination. In short the right now has raised sex as a main plank in their seductive political framework.

The left today is far from enjoying the luxury that once had its struggle to regain its credibility and strength it will also have to make sexual and gender issues a central part of its own politics. The publication of these three books signals a shift in this direction. Hopefully they will encourage less lip service and more real action by socialists.

Powers of Desire, the Monthly Review contribution, is a huge and necessarily pricey collection of mostly previously published pieces. Some of the authors; Ann Siltanen's classic on mass market romance, Amber Hollibaugh and Cherie Moraga's on sexualities in literature, and Edie Langer's on "the fear that feminism will free men first" are important and provocative pieces. But because it is such an inclusive collection that tackles historical as well as contemporary issues, the book as a whole is too eclectic to pursue a single theme. If you haven't read much American feminist writing on sex, this is a good reader, but because the bulk of the articles have previously appeared, the collection reads water rather than moves our analysis forward.
Sex and Love attempts to put sex back into the context of the relationships we have and succeeds most clearly in putting sex firmly into the context of the motivations we have for forming and maintaining sexual relationships. It uses the concept of desire as the key to understanding our motivations and our pleasure. That desire for sex affects our sexual responses and our sexual relationships seems a truism, but as Wendy Holloway explains in her essay "Heterosexual Sex: Power and Desire in Another "Father.""

Sex and Love is an innovative and important book that provides essays that use psychological understandings of desire to get at the powerful emotional aspects of our sexuality. It is a relief to see psyochologically informed writing on this topic by feminism (though Freudianism was never as wholly rejected by British feminists as it was by American), and I hope this book leads us toward the Freud work as the product of a dark-minded misogynist. But a focus on desire is tricky, especially for a political approach to sexuality, and can lead to a pervasive exploration of the way each of us understands our gender and our sex role socialization. It can lead to a greater understanding of our sexual responses and why and how power is acted upon in our relationships. This approach, while potentially valuable for each of us individually, is tricky because of its focus on a desire that is formed only at the level of the individual.

If we want to pull out the politics of our day, we will need to look at the political relationship between us, not only within us. If we lose sight of this then we run the risk of sentimentalizing the political. It is a political issue because it is a huge issue, and it is an issue of how social relationships - at home, at work and out on the town. We put at risk the fragile understanding of our political and personal struggles that stretches uninterrupted into the impersonal, unattached realities that the mate left has taken as its domain. To the strange and often frightening world by and large, drawn a line across that continuum and has declared the partner political invalid. It will be that much harder to assert one's independence if we have taken. If we explore what exists within us at the expense of what exists between us.

Finch Forbes is a writer living in Toronto.

Writing in A Stage of Siege by André Brink
(New York, Summit Books, 1983)

André Brink is one of a small number of South African writers who have made their mark internationally. Others are Nadine Gordimer, Alan Paton, Alexander Trocchi and Witold Gombrowicz. Brink's novels are best sellers, reviewed in the large circulation American and British newspapers as well as the fashionable liberal left-wing journals like the New York Review of Books and the New Statesman. Writing in a State of Siege is, then, a collection of essays by a major commentator on a political situation in which the problems confronting the South African writer and, by extension, any writer attempting to practice in a society which has imposed political suppression on the norm.

Common in the other writers mentioned above, Brink is white and writes in English - two factors which contribute to their popular success. That only white South African writers are so far as managed to garner the world's attention is in some measure a consequence of the kind of readers who have accorded them their fame. These are often the reader and therefore political sympathizer of Brink and the others is a literate, curious, white, English-speaking, left-leaning liberal, who is a fundamentalist in the English-speaking world at present. By large and through there are obvious and honourable exceptions, these writers, drawing upon their personal experience, tend to write about the world of white people and its relation to that of the black. Their protagonists are, often, not the black readers, allowing a kind of "identification with them" which tends to bring the South Africa of the literature into a familiar perspective for the white Westerner. As significant to the success is the fact that, as Brink puts it in the essay, "Censorship and Literature: "For obvious reasons, can breathe more freely [than the black in South Africa]."

In other words, the South African government, in its desire to placate its business partners who publically express abhorrence to apartheid but publically continue trading with South Africa, is liberal towards white South African writers who publish their denunciation of apartheid abroad while it jails, harasses, and bans black writers who express similar views. South Africa is undeniably an industrialized country - unlike the other African nations - whose apartheid is personified, personified, as a logical, if blunt and brutal, extension of Western capitalism and whose setting is thus recognizably to us all. We in Canada may not be numerically overwhelmed by our poor native people, but we do have our poor and our blacks who are poor and leave all participants in this world of life that conspires to keep them poor and harmless. This state is the deepest intention of the apartheid system. In fact, all participants in the way of life that conspires to keep them poor and harmless. This state is the deepest intention of the apartheid system. In fact, all participants in the way of life that conspires to keep them poor and harmless. This state is the deepest intention of the apartheid system. In fact, all participants in the life of the world that conspires to keep them poor and harmless. This state is the deepest intention of the apartheid system. In fact, all participants in the way of life that conspires to keep them poor and harmless. This state is the deepest intention of the apartheid system. In fact, all participants in the way of life that conspires to keep them poor and harmless. This state is the deepest intention of the apartheid system.

The government of South Africa has been successful in keeping the blacks poor and relatively successful in keeping them harmless. Though there have been immensely significant movements of black resistance to apartheid since the inception of Brink's, the Union of South Africa and the African National Congress. In a superbly told chronicling of the struggle against white domination, "After Soweto," Brink traced the history of the relation of black and white in an attempt to place the events of Soweto in an historical perspective.

The great irony of South African history is the once-common goals of the Afrikaners and the black South Africans vividly seen in white-oriented Socialism of the Afrikaners miners in the 20s, and the resistance of the Afrikaners to the British domination and British contempt. The great tragedy of the ultimate failure of both the white and black South Africans, as Brink explains it, is the rigidly rown-rural Calvinism of the Afrikaners and the political manoeuvring of the British. This essay, which stems from those pristine beginnings of the struggle to forge a new society, between the British and the Afrikaners, and between the whites and the blacks, is an acquisition of power of the National Party of Dr. Verwoerd, the inception of the doctrine of apartheid and its ideas of racial purity, to the present, where the powerful politico-military machinery of the South African government smoothly operates one of the most efficient dictatorships in the world. It not only reminds us, had lots of time to practise and refine itself in the world knows by now, the National Party of South Africa has been in power, virtually unchallenged and apparently unshakeable, since 1948. With a will to practise and accommodation to the minuscule objections of its trading partners in the West, the government of South Africa has firmly and definitively planted the doctrine of apartheid, which, by definition, implies the subjugation of seven-eighths of the remainder of the population on the grounds of colour alone.

The success of the South African government has to do primarily with the fact that the West, inherently racist itself, has tended to regard the South African system as objectionable chiefly because of its legitimation of racism. We may, I believe, safely assume that if the South African government were to abolish the laws against blacks, broadcasting blacks to serve and such laws as legally discriminate against them, very little would change. A state would continue to exist in which a vast capitalist machine would continue to exploit a huge majority of working people and peasants who would overwhelmingly be black. And while, undoubtedly, at the top echelon a few blacks would stand out in power, send their children to expensive private schools, eat in the same restaurants as whites, ride in the same buses, even, God forbid, use the same toilets as the whites, the machine would be fueled by poor black South Africans. The difference would be that under these circumstances the Western World would totally approve of the South African government, trade even more unhindered with it than now, and South Africa would become even richer.

And while, undoubtedly, at the top echelon a few blacks would enjoy some power, send their children to expensive private schools, eat in the same restaurants as whites, ride in the same buses, even, God forbid, use the same toilets as the whites, the machine would be fueled by poor black South Africans.
African literary work has been offensive in the sense of the word, for it is the responsibility of the writer to ensure that his work is not only entertaining but also educational. The writer should strive to create a balance between entertainment and education, ensuring that his work is accessible to a wide audience. The success of a piece of literature often hinges on its ability to engage the reader and leave a lasting impression. In the case of African literature, the challenge is even greater, as the writer must navigate the complex dynamics of colonialism, racism, and cultural identity. Despite these challenges, African writers have produced some of the most vivid and powerful works of literature in the world. Their work is a testament to the resilience of the human spirit and the power of storytelling to inspire change.
In the film, They Came From Within, directed by David Cronenberg, slug-like parasites get loose in a Toronto suburb apartment complex and attack the occupants. The effect of the parasite attack is to release the victims' libido and to turn people into desiring bodies. Significantly, what's most chronicled in the film is not the attack by the parasitic monsters but the consequences of the attack, in the way the libido comes pouring out. Eventually, it is the human victims who appear to be the real monsters as, in the film's view, they give in to all too easily and willingly to forces that had been lying in wait just beneath their socialized veneer. In such a representation, They Came From Within suggest that the interest of the story is in the horror forces not so much in the immediate shock effect it is been imputed to have, but rather in the ways it taps into deeper fears, the ways it connects to the fears and contradictions of contemporary everyday life—in this specific case, the ambivalences of a society caught between sexual liberation and sexual restraint. Far from being simply an escapist genre that depicts the shock of things that go bump in the night, horror is a central form of contemporary mass culture, modelling and producing symptomatic social representations.

Interestingly, some of the most significant works in the study and production of horror films are not out of Canada. For example, the 1979 Festival of Festivals in Toronto was devoted to an overall examination of the horror genre and led to the extremely valuable anthology, The American Nightmare: Essays on the Contemporary Horror Film. In this collection, Toronto film scholar Robin Wood, the anthology reads the horror film as a social form, a particular version of contemporary life and a reflection of its political, cultural, and ideological effects, cultural reverberations. Wood, for example, suggests that the "horror film" is a "mob" genre suggestive of something more than "normal," which in turn leads to the conclusion that the "horror film" is a "mob" genre and thus a kind of horror film that is the "mob" genre.

The Shape of Rage: The Films of David Cronenberg edited by Piers Handling (Toronto, General Publishing, 1983)

This Canadian interest in horror seems accidental for the theme of normality remarked by a monster implies that a central feature of the horror genre is its occlusion of questions of marginality, of dominance and hegemony and of the alternatives to hegemony, the forces that exist in the margins, beyond or in opposition to dominant culture. As some have argued, and indeed, the theme of Canadian horror is regulated by the history behind the films as Canadian Canadian filmmakers try to break into the world market and find frequently that the only way to do so is to go back to the things that will work in America, that will play across the margins.

Alongside this critical study of horror, as equally important a development in Toronto, Canadian investment in the horror genre has been the film-work of David Cronenberg, and if the 1979 Festival of Festivals was an overall examination and the horror, the festival included a special Cronenberg event. Cronenberg's films in particular have as their subject the life of marginal figures, from the outcast telekinetic schizophrenics of Scanners to the rabid heroine of Rabid to the telepathic loser of The Dead Zone to the microscopically wandering through two wastelands that seem less like societal norms than alternate realities to meanings of contemporary Canada.

On the one hand, nature as a kind of Cronenberg's films present the great outdoors as a bleak, virtually uninhabitable place, and closing off any Rousseauian solution to contemporary ills. On the other hand, they also suggest that the modern city, the sleek glass and concrete gleam of cities and shopping malls, has also become a kind of archive where to be accepted into the mainstream can only mean that one has turned into some kind of monster. Cronenberg's films thus play on notions of transformation and obsession exclusion. The films develop to a large degree out of a cynicism in which the basic formula for saying figures in classic horror-thec doctor and scientist who know authoritatively how to deal with monstrosity—now become figures of monstrous reformation: for example, in They Came From Within, it is a mad scientist who is responsible for the parasite onslaught and the young hero-doctor is finally defeated by the monster.

The Shape of Rage: The Films of David Cronenberg is a valuable extended look at the films that Cronenberg has directed. It is important, but for a few exceptions, the book avoids a kind of academic approach to direction that has too long plagued film studies. The book is not a formalist director as a kind of chauvinist individual, a loner who unarguably special insights into whatever takes the resistant material of Cronenberg’s films, in other words, he is his or her (but usually his) personal vision. To be sure, while some of the essays are more successful than others, the book as a whole is a critical examination of the films: for example, the production history that Wood offers in "The Visual Mind: The Major Films of David Cronenberg" and that runs up to the director’s most recent work, the heavier thinker, or the social history that Piers Handling hints at in "A Canadian Cronenberg as a force within the social situation." The essays study Cronenberg as a genre director, as a director to the modern social world. Thus, to take one example, the one essay in the book that is especially critical of Cronenberg, Robin Wood’s "Cronenberg: A Decaying View," is critical not so much of Cronenberg the individual but of the ways that individual so well reflects many of the dominant sexual ideologies of the day, such as the repulsion from anything that dominates views as aberration. Wood’s essay well demonstrates the need to understand thematic analysis apart from evaluation, that is, while Wood is not at all in disagreement with the notion, expressed in many of the other essays in the book, that the films stand as thematic statements, he suggests that the new perspectival or complexification of a theme does not in itself establish value.

Rather, one has to judge the political worth of the theme. In the case of Cronenberg, Wood argues the recurrence of nihilist themes that portray an irrevocable rot of civilization in which, the films dangerously imply, women can only be unfortunates victims (for example, in They Came From Within, which pictures lesbianism as one of the ultimate marks of parasite possession). Wood’s move from aesthetic to political criteria for the evaluation of art is a useful qualification of the tendency in some of the other essays to assume that meaningfulness and aesthetic richness are automatic sources of value. Indeed, overall, the best moments in the collection are those that eschew aesthetic evaluation and turn instead to an historical study of the place of the films; for example, the production history that William Board provides in "The Visual Mind: The Major Films of David Cronenberg," and that runs against Board’s dominant desire to avoid Cronenberg as a heavy thinker, or the social history that Piers Handling hints at in "A Canadian Cronenberg as a force within the social situation."
Over the last fifteen years Terry Eagleton has been consolidating his reputation as one of the most influential Marxist literary theorists both as a philosopher and as a political critic. A Cambridge graduate working as an English lecturer at Oxford, Eagleton is a vocal sceptic, a productive sharp-shooter, a critical target who, by the very nature of his views, often becomes a target of criticism both within and outside the traditional academic establishment: challenging and difficult at times as in his seminal Criticism and Ideology (London, N.B.L., 1976) and Walter Benjamin or Towards a Revolutionary Criticism (London, N.L.B., 1981). He has also proved a skillful and clear popularizer, readily didactic and accessible, judging by the success of his Marxism and Literary Criticism (London, Methuen, 1986) and by the bombshell reviews, also a digested derivative of his most ambitious critical works and an effective bestseller as such.

Literary Theory: An Introduction

Eagleton points out in the preface, "sets out to provide a reasonably comprehensive account of modern literary theory for those with little or no previous knowledge of the topic." Apparently in line with these aims, the book is a work on literary theory such as Catherine Belsey's Critical Practice (London, Methuen, 1985); Eagleton's book, while satisfying a certain need, is necessarily more general, albeit superficial knowledge of a subject, also proves distinctly more subversive from a didactic perspective. Like those ubiquitous independent Marxist politicians who endeavour to unite the multi-layered left, Eagleton's strategy is to be committed only from a critical distance to the literary theories he brings into perspective. Through his mastery of a technique akin to the military strategy known as the "demos" he then extends and explores the subject matter, only to move on to the next theory.

The direct intuitive section of this book, Eagleton discusses phenomena, hermeneutics, reception, theory, structuralism and semiotics, poststructuralism and psychoanalysis, guiding us through the jargon in plausible, even lucid terms. In his best British tradition he demonstrates his talent in constructing a lucid form for what he calls "fragmented" ideas, examples from everyday life. He seamlessly integrates the dialogue around the nature of language and existence that has predominated in the 20th century, linking the jargon of the "anglo" to the Anglo-French and German literatures. His approach is interdisciplinary and also dialectical - he gives a fair ear to a school, a movement, and then using its vocabulary to expose its weaknesses, points and contradictions to us.

In the chapter on Husserl and phenomenology, he swiftly digests the reasons why the reception theorists: Ingarden, Iser and Fish, and the two poles of liberal humanism mapped out earlier in the personages of Leavis and Eliot. The Husserlian movement, he argues, is concerned with the historical and social construction of language. The reception theorists, he says, "is the only way to say semiotics and post-structuralism. In a complete revision of Sausserian linguistics, and American formalism, he credits these with the necessary reformation of twenti

The chapter dealing with post-structuralism is probably the most controversial, as it brings literary theory into a political context. Deconstruction and feminism are on trial. At this point Eagleton admits he himself is leaning towards a practical materialist criticism: that thinking language as something we "do" which has a real effect on the way we live. Thus he confesses he feels bewilderment towards a post-structuralist theory - for all their radical deconstruction of other schools of criticism, poststructuralists are more concerned with the latest symptom rather than the solution to the social and cultural crisis in the aftermath of Modernism. Suspicious of all theory and political engagement as "terrorist" theories, the debate is conducted in "writing" as the only authorized enclave - and from this position, intellectuals rewrite history in their own image, reducing it to a more "undecidable" text. Eagleton sees feminism as a viable alternative, arguing that it is the only way to likely bring some real sense and meaning out of the struggle amongst the left, and develop out of it something constructive with liberating practices and performances. This is a courageous stand by an author whose work has been criticized by some feminists for not deviating from male discourse in spite of its Marxism.

The longest chapter in the book is dedicated to psychoanalysis and other "unconscious" and a reading of Lacan through Freud. In The Rapes of Clarissa, The Sexual and Class Struggle in Samuel Richardson (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1982), Eagleton appears keen to exploit a dazzling touch of practical applications of literary theory, in other words a novel Sons and Lovers. Eagleton reconceives a psychoanalytical text with a social interpretation of it as a means of accounting for a broader critical design: "by attending to what may seem like evasiveness, ambiguity and obscurity in the novel, it may be possible to expose something of the 'text-subtext' which, like an unconscious wish, the work both conceals and reveals."

In the conclusion, Eagleton attempts to explain his discussion of political criticism. He adds, "the presence of a literary theory is less an object of an intellectual enquiry in its own right than a particular perspective in which to view the history of our time. Such an object today may sound to some of reveries of literary theory, it is however far from dismissive, and, in fact, are an attempt to account for the particular use Eagleton gives to the subjects he discusses in the previous chapters within his own Marxist and illuminating practice. Pursuing a radical praxis, the author concludes, is to re-interpret this idea and that it's perception of discourse as a form of power and desire can learn much from deconstruction and psychoanalytic practice, and its belief that discourse can be a humanly transforming affair shares a good deal with liberal humanism.

"Literary theory is less an object of intellectual enquiry in its own right than a particular perspective in which to view the history of our times".
From time to time literature must be revitalized by new mater- ials and new forms, such as in the case of James Joyce's "Ulysses," or in the case of Samuel Beckett's "Waiting for Godot." This is also true today, when the need for a new vitality in literature is evident. The so-called "postmodern" literature of the last few decades has brought a new freshness and vitality to the literary scene. However, this vitality must be maintained, and it is our duty to ensure that it continues to flourish.
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There were no structures to control him, nor rules to bind him. Life seemed palatable, pure enjoyment.

Imagine an aesthetic based entirely on the pleasure of the consumer whoever he may be.

He could remain anonymous, his purpose, his position, his arrival concealed, private by right.

To whatever class, whatever group he may belong, without respect to cultures or languages:
For it was all there for the taking; purely a matter of imagination, notwithstanding self-determination.

The consequences would be huge, perhaps even harrowing.
An open letter addressing the issues and state of affairs within cultural journals; we solicit opinions, critiques and submissions.

JUN

ONE of the many ironies of North American intellectual life in the 1980s is the way it has moved to institutionalize the previously marginal body of French post-structuralist and/or deconstructive theory. It’s a migratory infantilism of the sort where established leaders and self-conceived students gather and move through punchlines, seminars, conferences, lectures, and writings with a focussed attention more appropriately a series of reflections and social institutions which this theory is meant to deconstruct. It’s a one-way choreography of knowledge, which empowers the voices of the previously disenfranchised. No doubt a defensive, assertive practice, but one which has some unfortunate results. It defends itself through a thick veil of disavowal. Is this Hollywood, then, hypnotized by its key performers? No, obviously not—the collected bodies peer suspiciously at selected signifiers and decay their villainous historicity, inaugurating or, at times, total loss of meaning, extricating themselves from commitment to them. It is as though this ostensible Death of Meaning in culture of all forms propels its beliver priests into series of encyclopedic waxes. Here, freed from the tired/vivacious contexts of daily life, distanced from the dislocates of Official constraints, in a spell of privileged concentration, they may celebrate this death, these recurrent deaths, as occasions for their own hypnotic speculation (while waiting for their own rebirth as guardians of the Long Wait).

The theory itself springs from an uneasy but fruitful confrontations between thought, power, institutions, and the thinkers, which French theorists (of a very particular thought, power, and place) have brought to the centre of critical theoretical work. The uniqueness of this project is manifested in its encounter with the locations of practitioners in other social and intellectual contexts. The encounter between European and Canadian traditions precipitates a series of reflections and strategies that inevitably raise questions about theory, practice, and place. It is not surprising that there should come into being a Canadian journal dedicated to making sense of these intellectual confrontations, while imposing its own imprimatur of nationalism on the "making" of its others' discourse. This exercise could easily become an occasion for saying that here is the voice of the others' discourse. This exercise could easily become an occasion for saying that here is the voice of the others' discourse. This exercise could easily become an occasion for saying that here is the voice of the others' discourse. This exercise could easily become an occasion for saying that here is the voice of the others' discourse. This exercise could easily become an occasion for saying that here is the voice of the others' discourse.
Journal of Popular Culture
Journal of Canadian Culture

ONE sense of popular cul-
ture is bound up with a feeling that it is in the public "mass" media. If the Media are American, there is little point from this pers-
pective in thinking about a Canadian popular culture at all because it must be a spin-off of American culture. The idea of a Canadian popular culture becomes a branch-plant activity: all it exemplifies is the paternal claim of the parent elsewhere. Thus we learn nothing about ourselves, but in a manner similar to the Hollywood movies located in Toronto, simply see ourselves as a carbon-copy of them. We have stopped doing this with literature or even music; we learn to think about growth, iden-
tity, community of the media.

Obviously popular culture does have elements which are im-
portant, and the newly produced mass media can be either technological or, ideologi-
cal or experiential. The media are not necessarily archaologically American, George Grant not-
withstanding, though they may become so; we are not prepared to accept bege-
monian paramountcy. If we accept the concept of technology as being a source of 

imperial and hence necessarily incapable of being transcended by people who have fallen into the ultimate pessimism of intellect which sweeps everything from the image of cowboys to our guns in the same bag, a position 

which is as fundamentally simplistic as it is also belittling. The belief that popular 
culture = mass culture = capitalist control of technology = false consciousness is one that dominates most thinking on pop-
ular culture. The major allusion of this equation is that it assumes the 

paralysed or equally uninterested control, that of everybody 

who watches Dallas or sees commer-
cials, who reads comics or plays games, perhaps even become these pro-
ducts. Mass Culture assumes a fa-
cial expression which is the necessi-
ty of people on the other hand, the 

popular study of culture assumes the 

primary role of people in the mass media that but also the media are 

used by people, almost as they choose; from a location which operates on separate rules and experiences from the one-

dimensionality of the media.

The study of Canadian popular culture should not emphasize the strategies of the mass media, technology, and then impute a consciousness to the indi-

vidual and the collective which in such premises would simply return to pleas for reorganizing relationships (it is the system) rather than 

forgetting them forever. It should rather take popular 
culture as the making sense of data, the social interpre-
tation of whatever symbols and strategies the people have at hand. Only then can it make a sense out of "the effects of the media on popu-
lar action."

Popular, of course, a major problem in saying that popular culture is simply what any defined group of a society does, thinks, 
reads, feels. Such ethnographic
ecclesicism, however noble its democratic (or sectional) senti-
ments, ends up writing and doing research on the subject of being 
ecclectic. An example of such an exercise is found in the USA with the creation of the work of the Popular Culture Association, where it appears that the only point of all the studying of anything that relates to the 
culture, past, present or future, is to find out how big or small to or the appropriation of those elements by individ-
uals from a specific type of popular culture, but in another sense nothing, because none of the major theoretical issues are ever 
discussed. The study of popular culture becomes an exercise in 
intellectual slumming; academics may come out of their closets and declare that hockey or baseball or strip-magazines or Warz or the occult or Mark Twain or even Jane Eyre can bedraulled around with the same wide-mouthed judgements or political analysis: popular culture is fun; let’s turn the media into an industrial 

sort of Disneyland of the literary 

imagination.

But the Popular Culture Association’s work and publications should be taken a little more seriously than what they have the power to imply. After all, not only has the PCA published occasional pieces on Canadian culture, but it has also 

commenced publication of the Journal of Popular Culture, which estab-
lishes an intervention in Canadian culture and research which makes a serious cultural contribution to the Culture of Canadians which should not be taken lightly.

The working assumption of the PCA’s work is ecclesicism: essays on 
hockey, or Jim, or Huckle Finn, or the importance of the ballad in 

W. H. Auden’s poetry sit side-by-
side, as surely they should. But the PCA’s hoped into cultural 
archeological excavation is dis-

play. There is no knowing whether connectedness is impor-
tant except as theme. My copies of 

PC’s Newsletter are cut out of what culture is about, of theoretical or 

political connections are unim-
portant. The PCA is little more than an 

archive: it offers me nothing that I cannot normally get in a 

library or a shopping mall. It does nothing except record what appears to be there; it has no opin-

ion, no connectedness, no self-

revelation. In a bizancine way, it is devoid of any sense of choice.

The PCA has not chosen to dis-

cuss other journals which deal with popular culture, as if those journals were in a sense questering its pitch. This is particularly disas-

trous when viewing Canadian 
culture, because in the society has 

culture been so discussed in print. The first issue of the Journal of 

Canadian Culture, however, has yet to be published. There is almost no comment on this culture so far. Only in the Canadian 

Forum, Saturday Night, Canadian Dimension, the Canadian Journal of 

Social Theory, Canadian Studies, Queen’s Quer-

terly (though Giles Provenost 

provides a cook’s tour of Quebec cultural nationalism). Instead it 

jects itself into a debate at no 

fixed point. It is possible that the impact on Canadian discourse will be profound—but I do not stop thinking about their culture and instead lean back and con-
template it in all its richness and surrounding context that is 

difficult. The chances are 

that the PCA’s intervention in Canadian culture will be yet another American appropra-
tions, suitable only for Americans who wish to experience a common to grow 

atures as the eratze. As with the Hollywood Mounties or the Brit-

ish view of the Orient, all versions of chauvinism, the Jour-
nal of Canadian Culture will be 
simmered into American views of 

what they want to know about 

Canada. (A similar phenomenon is displayed in the latest issue of Yale French Studies, devoted to 

Canadian literature.)

That is why the absence of the 

theory or politics is so unfortunate 

about the PCA’s venture into Can-

adian culture. There is a great deal of politics implicit in the 

PCA’s journal invites no discourse. But, 

then, the PCA needs a dynamic 

course. Even the short-lived attempt to include Stuart Hall from Britain’s Birmingham Cen-
tre as an advisory editor ended in 

non-comittal disaster, and it is instructive to see what the PCA does when it addresses popular 
culture in the rest of the world. Take, for example, the PCA’s annual, 

(1977, subtitled “Popular Culture Around the World,” which included some 20 papers on which estab-
lished an intervention in 

Europe (mainly France and Germany) and the rest from India, China, USSR, Argentina, Pakistan, 

the literature, and the USA (on Nazi stereotypes). What immediately 

strikes one about such a collection is why are they all there together? The obvious answer is that the world is an arena to be plucked for any material that strikes the editor’s fancy. On closer inspec-

ion one notes a certain preoccupation for understanding how or why other nations view the world in the way they do, or ‘see’ American popular cultural forms in peculiar ways. Popular culture everywhere is not an approach 

for its intrinsic interest and certainly not to discover any alien form of viewing American popular culture but rather to confirm the 

predominance of American hege-

mon. The rest of the world is searched out for examples of 

American cliomism. For horrible stereotyping of Americans by for-

eigners or for providing evidence of real unAmerican diversity, the essay on China in this particular issue is on the contemporary 

Chinese hero as developed by 

Zhdanov). Popular culture is 

the secular religion of the intellec-
tual: his task is to search th

world for Hukk Finn or Rocket Robin 

Hood wherever he may be found. Of course, American society has not 

studied their own culture in any way 

that they choose, and they may, if they wish, call ad-hoc: for the theories they may define popular culture as “all aspects of life that are not academic or creative. Beware the Canadian lowest and most esoteric sense” (blunt for the Abstracts of Popular 

Culture); and the PCA has chosen to ignore any set of theor-

ies that are uncomfortable: but when the PCA takes on world cul-

ture in order to appropriate it, we

who are in that world have a right to ask for what reasons and to 

what ends we are being approp-
riated. The PCA model of cultural research is therefore interesting 

not because of any intrinsic theo-

retical or methodological contrib-

ution to studying ourselves but 

as a penetration of quite distinc-

tive alien values. It should be exam-

ined as such.

What might be a more ap-

propriate point of departure is sug-

gested by many other authors—

Canadian, French, American, 

British, German—all of whom 

adhere, more or less, to what 

might be called the humanist-

historicist version of neo-Marxist theory. The central issue in study-

ing popular culture as action must 

surely be to specify what kinds of 

actions matter. And that invari-

ably leads us back to considering both the social structures and 

and also to the domi-

nating ideologies and hegemo-

nies. The study of popular culture is both a study of the genes of 

reactions to institutions, values, ideologies and also of the interpre-

tations (and perhaps appropria-
tions) of those reactions by the existing hegemonic orders. Popu-

lar culture is thus a dynamic 

act: we play out by playing the 

contradictions. As Simon Frith 
has noted of rock music:

One of the reasons why rock has 

been the most vital form of popular 
culture in the last twenty years is 

that it has expressed so clearly the 

struggle involved: Rock has been 

used simultaneously as a source of 

self-indulgence and individual 

escape, and of solidarity and 

active dissatisfaction. 

When one takes this view of the 

importance of the study of popular 
culture, the study is not simply how to 

carve out an ethnogra-

phic map which would do jus-

tice to all the groups that are 

found in any country, but to 

specify which are strategically important, not simply in terms of 

themselves as genre, but in terms of their relationship to people’s 

sense of their own lives.

Joan Davies
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From his position, he could look without fear of discovery.

You address yourself to me so that I may read you, but I am nothing to you but this address.
FOUCAULT REMEMBERED BY SURPRISE

Those of us who attended the seminars Foucault gave at the Summer Institute for Semiotics and Structural Studies in June of 1982 will perhaps remember his admission that for him, surprise was foremost among the feelings produced by the material that he had been discussing. In fact, at this time, Foucault proposed that the spiritual, philosophic and monastic writings of late antiquity (primarily those of Seneca, Epictetus, Galen and Cassian) would not be so interesting if they did not appear so "silly." It is probably not incorrect to view this as supplying a single dimension of Foucault's methodology, provided one follows Foucault's books, that is, his archaeologies, along the pragmatic dimension they occupy. For it is the question of what one can do with a book, and what others have done with books, that is of interest to Foucault, as well as contemporaries such as Deleuze and Lyotard.

It is in this respect that one can glimpse what the important term "archaeology" designated in Foucault's work. More than a metaphor for what it means to write or re-write history, it names the space (and not the "depth") given to the practice of using history to live and think in our times. So many have been disappointed who wanted to read into Foucault a moralization of madness, criminality, delinquency and sexual pathology, where there was only a selection of marginalia; and those who wanted to glean from his politics the sense of a system were confronted with a silent movement deconstructing any politics conducted on the stage of reason. In short, the archaeology of knowledge is a set of questions that no longer bears upon what will count as objectivity or science, but upon a map of the present produced, in a sense, by surprises, which makes truth into a politically charged record of what it omits to say.

The sad and timely end to Foucault's life and career came as three new books were nearing publication: Le Souci de Soi, L'Usage des Plaisirs, and Les Aveux de la Chair. Departing from the familiar periclitation of the previous works, these books examine in large part the composition of ascetic manuals and the conduct of spiritual direction which culminated with the Stotic and Christian practitioners (doctors and writers) of late antiquity. Foucault's is a new appraisal of what we take to be the hermeneutical articulation of the anxious, dualist self of Christian culture. His work in this area can be expected to have an ambivalent, or at least a fractured relationship to previous historical accounts, since it brings into play not the conditions of unity or filtration of ideas and practices (for example, between stoic, Christian and psychoanalytic techniques), but the disparities that make them exclusive of one another. It seems that for Foucault, psychoanalytic, and finally, archaeological research underscored these disparities since each starts from the assumption that knowledge is strange, that it obeys laws that put into question the position of the novelist, doctor, critic or historian as one who is authorized to exercise inventiveness, representational discourse and the divulging of secrets. For this reason it is interesting to examine the situation of Foucault's work, Foucault's stories are written as if all their secrets always bear upon that "present" which we take to be most public.

Along with Lacan, Foucault had earlier shown that the type of authority which had been mediated in the 19th century was just as much of a metaphor as madness. Thus although it was to Freud's credit to have recognized the metaphoricality of madness, namely, that it was resistant to the judgements of normality made about it in the previous century, it remained to specify the strange protocols of psychiatry, and the link between the formation of clinical procedures and a certain political reality that required the designation of madness as "mental illness.

Contrary to what has often been claimed, Foucault was not concerned with a deep proximity between madness and reason, but with how the question of their relationship was decisively transformed by the 19th century's codification of the effects of social dysfunction and disorder. Since the madman now had a complicity with something underlying his illness, since he was supposed to inwardly know something about its truth, he could now free himself from his undoing and, in the name of therapeutic utility, the need to control his deviant proclivities and sublimate his creative excesses. Thus, although Freud was able to challenge the romantic myth of the "gentle constraint" of nature's economy remaining a lifetime, he did so at the price of introducing the doctor's authority directly and politically into the decision about what is good or bad for individuals.

In his later work (beginning with Discipline and Punish) Foucault shows how what we now call 'social work' became a relay in a generalized tactics of power. It is well known that police methods, surveillance, procedures of internal and national security, are all reinforced as a function of a specializing and colonizing capitalism. For his part, however, Foucault emphasized that this disciplinary power needed to enforce a continuity between a "perpetual penalty" operating through the supervision of illegality (or the quasi-criminal realm of delinquency) and the role of "exercise" in training, work and education. It is under these conditions, and no longer under the old pastoral forms, that the machinery of 'liberalism,' still in the name of the curing of souls, operates in helping professions, correctional institutions and schooling.

One consequence that Foucault continued to draw from this is that the present-day political practice of liberating one's desire cannot be considered the same as a rejection of power, any more than the negative sanctions of a moral code can be said to represent power. Instead this politics is caught up in the "injunction to talk about sex" which, for the first time in the Christian world, becomes obligatory for truth, and not simply for the exhaustion of sins. He claimed that power in modern society attaches itself to the problem of how one is supposed to become the subject of his own actions, and ever more cynically enforces ties one is supposed to have in relation to his body, identity and individuality. Moreover, power cannot be said to coincide with the repressive operations of the state since it does not directly care about "who sleeps with whom"—it is more cynical than that—which means it is just as likely to encourage the pathologies of 'sex' to insert themselves in the consumption of therapy and the medicalization of one's body.

Perhaps the kind of analysis that Foucault displaced most forcefully is the one conducted by conceptual models of society that have tried to analyze power. The formation of knowledge about individuals and their factors of life and well-being, despite the claims of liberal who reigned in the 19th century, has really been governed by the conditions under which strategies of power have been invested and been made more expedient. It is in this political direction that Foucault has questioned the "right to speak history" and diminished the role of truth's putative normality. For him, truth was and is not normal, and this was most singularly demonstrated by his politics of the historical field which was held in the grip of such a surprise."

Rich Welland
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