Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory/Revue canadienne de théorie politique et sociale, Volume XII, Numbers 1-2 (1988).

A THOROUGHLY HIDDEN COUNTRY: *RESSENTIMENT*, CANADIAN NATIONALISM, CANADIAN CULTURE

Michael Dorland

> The object is to explore the huge, distant and thoroughly hidden country of morality
>
> Nietzsche, Genealogy of Morals

> ...the Canadian cultural obsession with victimization is the flip side of a belief in total superiority
>
> B. W. Powe, The Solitary Outlaw

Introduction

> ...the most terrible antidote used against...people is to drive them so deep into themselves that their re-emergence is inevitably a volcanic eruption
>
> Nietzsche, Schopenhauer As Educator

With the distinguished yet qualified exception of George Grant and the writings of some Canadian historians, the theme of *ressentiment* as such has been all too neglected in the critical literature on Canadian culture. Not because the theme is not a major one in the Canadian discourse, but on the contrary perhaps because it is so massively pervasive by its absence. For in this negative form, ressentiment presents profound problems in the development of cultural expression, and the formation and application of a cultural politics that would include artistic practices, their institutional orientation and critical interpretation — in short, for the problems of Cana-

dian culture. If as will be argued here, ressentiment does, in fact, constitute a dominant theme explicitly in Canadian political and cultural practices and implictly in the administrative practices of their institutional orientation, its non-recognition hitherto in Canadian critical writing might indicate if not interpretive timidity, then at least a strategy of avoidance worth examining in greater detail.

Ontology of Canadian ressentiment: the discourses of Canadian silence

> I had come to see that everything was radically connected with politics, and that, however one proceeded, no people would be other than the nature of its government made it
>
> Rousseau, Confessions

Reflecting, forty years ago, on his "unhappy experiences" at academic conferences, Harold Innis had discerned a rhetorical pattern at such meetings, namely that Americans and Englishmen, "quickly made aware of our sensitiveness", spent much of their time commenting on how much better things were done in Canada than in Great Britain or the United States. As Innis observed, "The demand for this type of speech implies a lack of interest in a Canadian speaker who might say something distasteful about domestic affairs."[1]

As Innis would go on to explain, the "lack of interest" came not from foreign guests, in any event invited only to praise, but from Canadians and so suggested, as Innis was aware, the presence of something more problematic than mere lack of interest. In fact, it suggested something deeply rooted in Canadian experience, the presence, as he put it, of "a continuous repression"[2] of "a very great fear of pronouncements" by Canadians, indeed, that there was something, possibly dreadful, about Canada that only a Canadian might be able to utter "since . . . non-Canadians . . . could not make statements about Canadian affairs which would be taken seriously."[3]

But if tasteful statements about domestic affairs by non-Canadians would not be taken seriously and there was such a great fear of distasteful pronouncements on the part of Canadians such that, if they were actually going to attempt to say something, their only recourse was, as Innis put it of his own experience, "writing in such guarded fashion that no one can understand what is written"[4], what was being maintained in silence, and silenced to such an extent as to suggest, again, something possibly more considerable than lapses of taste?

The notion of a distasteful statement, however, provides a clue as to what might be involved, since the idea of taste suggests, narrowly, that which goes into or comes out of the mouth (as food, drink or words) and so more broadly an idea of politeness, manners, i.e., culture. The distasteful statement, then, would be the expression of a form of culture (or perhaps, more precisely, non-culture) whose 'taste' has been so affected or altered in such

a way as to have become 'distasteful'. As for the nature of that distaste, suffice it for now merely to indicate its lack of specificity by way of a potentiality that could range from the merely unpleasant through the bitter to the extremities of the poisonous or even the monstrous. More important, however, might be the question of what happens when the mouth, i.e., the organ of communication and culture, is filled with unpleasantries to the point of becoming so unspeakable that these cannot be expressed openly, or whose public forms of expression must, therefore, be subjected to rigorous policing or strict morality? What happens when a nation, i.e. a territorial configuration of mouths, establishes silence as the cultural norm for domestic affairs?

This paper will attempt to begin to account, by means of a theory of ressentiment, for the discrepancies between the very great fear of unauthorized pronouncements by Canadians that Innis indicated, and the mere talk of an officialized nationalist and culturalist discourse whose *precondition* is silence, i.e. the security that comes from knowing that nothing can ever be contradicted because nothing will ever be said. And this principally because, in William Kilbourn's grim formulation, *Canadian nature* "dreadful and infinite has inhibited the growth of the higher amenities in Canada": "Outnumbered by the trees and unable to lick them, a lot of Canadians look as though they had joined them — having gone all faceless or a bit pulp-and-papery, and mournful as the evening jackpine round the edges of the voice, as if...something long lost and dear were being endlessly regretted."[5] Such an account must then begin with an interrogation of the nature of Canadian silence.[6]

Writing last year some months after the opening of the current (and largely secret) round of Canada-US free-trade talks, *Report on Business Magazine* editor Peter Cook remarked that "There is probably no better sign of our own maturity than the fact that the average Canadian spends twice as much on imported goods as the average American without feeling bitter or resentful about it."[7] The valorization of an absence of ressentiment is what one might term, after Innis, a tasteful Canadian statement about domestic affairs, especially when, according to Cook, Americans by contrast are not only bitter and resentful but in addition "pugnacious" and "xenophobic" as a result of *their* trade deficit. However, Cook went on, if Canadians display remarkable maturity by their absence of resentment and bitterness, American "tantrums and tirades" are nevertheless "particularly vexing" for Canadians who in opening the free-trade talks "made the decision that America is the trade partner with whom they want to share their future."[8]

Cook's statement at a remove of forty years illuminates what Innis meant, at least in part, by the "distasteful", namely, bitterness and resentment. But if, on Cook's account, Canadians today possess such maturity as to not feel bitterness and resentment on economic questions, they are still capa-

ble of feeling particularly vexed on other accounts, such as being rebuffed by the *trade* partner with whom they want to share their future. In other words, and contrary to what Cook writes explicitly, Canadians *do* implicitly feel economic bitterness and resentment, and so much so that in addition they feel emotionally vexed as well. But vexation, like resentment, is an emotion or a form of expression that does not suddenly surface; rather, it is slow-burning and long-term: to say of something that it is vexed, as in 'a *vexed* question', is to say that it has occurred again and again, that it is tormenting, and that it is something that needs to be much debated and discussed. Like resentment, and perhaps this becomes clearer in its French form as *re-sentiment* (lit., feeling again), vexation is experienced repeatedly, repetitively, compulsively, and obsessionally: "a gruesome sight is a person single-mindedly obsessed by a wrong" (Nietzsche).[9] Furthermore, Cook's use of metaphor suggests that Canadian vexation or resentment arises from a perception of intimacy and (fear of) the rejection of that proposed intimacy by a chosen partner. As for the gender of the chosen partner, Cook makes clear, by two references to American films (RAMBO and CONAN THE BARBARIAN), how he regards at least one partner in the future relationship. The gender of the Canadian partner, however, is ambivalent: "...if the deal is not... rushed through Parliament and Congress, we will face a fresh administration in Washington which, like a spoilt child, will have to be tutored in the ways of the world anew."[10]

Canadian *denial of ressentiment* — the cultural celebration of silence as the highest form of our modernity — thus conceals a complex interlocking of multiple resentments: 1) a resurfacing of economic resentment that is 2) then displaced to a general emotional resentment where it recharges itself as vexation and 3) is displaced again as an interpersonal relationship in which fear of (and resentment of) rejection causes it to shift once more to 4) a moral plane now, where, from rebuff to rejection, Canada emerges radiantly as master of the ways of the world. In addition, Cook's use of what one could term a gender-bound metaphor (of the family, in which resentment is processed by morality and transformed into love, the rejection of which becomes an occasion for self-pity and so further resentment) evokes similar such recurrences in Canada's past that, as with the 1987 round of free-trade talks, involved fundamental relationships and orientations in Canadian history, internal and external, in which metaphors of the family encode far greater violences. The first example is internal and refers to the long and never-declared civil war between Canada and Quebec or what Hubert Aquin in 1964 called "the theme of the shotgun marriage" in Confederation, namely "the coexistence between two nations [might this not equally apply to Canada and the US?] [that] seems to form a venereal relationship pushed to a paroxysm of disgust, when it is not [in] the very image of a Christian marriage, indissoluble and in ruins...."[11] The second example is external (Canada's place in imperial relations) and thus entails a reversal in venereal relationships, from the aggressive wag-

ing of internal civil war to a more passive form of commodity-transfer, here from one pimp (the British Empire) to another (the American Empire). As William L. Grant put it in a 1911-1912 address on "The Fallacy of Nationalism": "I have no desire that this country of mine should be either the kept woman of the United States, or the harlot of the Empire."[12] A third example from the time of Canada's entry into the Second World War sees an American writer describing Canada as "the problem child of the Western Hemisphere", a typical product of family estrangement with an Oedipus complex with the mother country that prevents her ever growing up. As the writer puts it: "'Canada,' exploded one of her resentful intellectuals, 'is in international affairs not a man but a woman!'"[13]

In other words, and in a concretization of George Grant's "listening for the intimations of deprival,"[14] attending to intimations of *ressentiment* becomes a way of hearing Canadian silence speak. Instead of mere silence, following the chains of Canadian resentment soon unconceals discursive fields that extend from the landscape to economics, to politics, to sociology, to technology, to the intimacies of sexuality, and to the "higher amenities" of culture. What I'm suggesting here, in fact, is that there are few areas, if any, of Canadian experience where one is not struck by the extent to which the discourse upon that experience, whether acknowledged or repressed, whether official (government and press), intellectual (academic), or cultural (literary and artistic), to make some possibly arbitrary distinctions, is a discourse of *ressentiment*. This may sound a lot more overwhelming than it might actually turn out to be; in fact, this may simply be a guarded way of saying that, so far perhaps, Canadian experience has been intensely given over to nursing the petty wounds of the small, as Denys Arcand has suggested in films such as LE CONFORT ET L'INDIFFERENCE and LE DECLIN DE L'EMPIRE AMERICAIN or Harold Town in his painting "Canadian Retirement Dream" or the many other Canadian artists who, like Nietzsche's Zarathustra, may have sighed for a homeland where they need no longer "stoop before those who are small." But Canadian artistic expression may be just as imbricated with resentment as any other dimension of Canadian existence. The point is simply that, at the outset, we do not know this without, first, a better grasp of Canadian *ressentiment*: what is it? how prevalent is it? how does it articulate itself? what have been its effects? and lastly how does one overcome it? since, according to Nietzsche, *ressentiment* does not disappear without being overcome.

Ressentiment as a concept for cultural studies

As a concept for contemporary cultural studies, *ressentiment* has been curiously under-employed, though I suspect that as Nietzsche increasingly comes to be seen as *the* philosopher of (the overcoming of) *ressentiment*[15], this is likely to change. For certainly, in some of its earlier applications including Nietzsche's, *ressentiment* would appear to offer

an infinitely rich terrain for cultural studies. Thus, for instance, Nietzsche's own characterization of the entire Judeo-Christian tradition as "the very seat of *ressentiment*"[16], or Michelet's and Taine's use of *ressentiment* as the motive of the French Revolution[17], or Simmel's ascription of *ressentiment* as "for all time the most solid support of bourgeois morality"[18] or Max Scheler's observation that "There is no literature more charged with *ressentiment* than Russian literature."[19] Or, in more recent studies, Fritz Stern's identification of "the ideology of Resentment" as having appeared almost simultaneously in almost every continental country in the last decades of the nineteenth century, including as well in certain aspects of American Populism[20]. And, in film studies, historians of Hollywood (such as the British writer David Thomson or the American businessman Benjamin Hampton) ascribe to *ressentiment* one of the key drives in American popular culture[21].

In other words, even a brief overview of some of the applications that have been made of *ressentiment* might potentially at least indicate a concept for the study of cultural formations (eg., religion, secular ideology, forms of popular culture such as literature and cinema) in the wide range of countries or continents that could be embraced within such notions as "the Judeo-Christian tradition" or "bourgeois morality" or the Western tradition of political, social and cultural modernity.

On the other hand, it is perhaps the very all-embracingness of *ressentiment* that has militated against its wider use in recent scholarship, at least until the broader development of all-embracing fields such as the humanities and/or cultural studies. Indeed, in an extension of the Michelet-Taine hypothesis that *ressentiment* is the content of revolution, Jameson argues that "the theory of *ressentiment, wherever it appears*, will always... be the expression and production of *ressentiment*" (emphasis added)[22]. This is to say that *the production of ressentiment as a theory* cannot be distinguished (or at least only with difficulty) from *the production(s) of theorists*. According to Jameson, these are "the intellectuals... — unsuccessful writers and poets, bad philosophers, bilious journalists, and failures of all kinds — whose private dissatisfactions lead them to their vocations as political and revolutionary militants [who]...will furnish the inner dynamic for a whole tradition of counterrevolutionary propaganda from Dostoyevsky and Conrad to Orwell...."[23] However, making of some intellectuals, whether revolutionary or counterrevolutionary, the producers of *ressentiment* is only restating the theory (or phenomenon) of *ressentiment* whereby, in Jameson's concept, 'authentic *ressentiment*', once stripped of its bad faith, "may be said to have a certain authenticity"[24], i.e., that *ressentiment*, like the rose by any other name, is *ressentiment*.

But what exactly is *ressentiment*, this word which has no exact correspondence in German, but which a German thinker (Nietzsche) introduced into philosophy "in its technical sense"[25]? If of Nietzsche and *ressentiment*, it might be possible to say, as Nietzsche remarked of Schopen-

hauer, that "He had only one task and a thousand means of accomplishing it: one meaning and countless hieroglyphs to express it"[26], it could perhaps be said that there are also a thousand ways of defining *ressentiment* in its technical or any other sense. It is thus interesting that Walter Kaufmann, for instance, finds it impossible to define *ressentiment* other than quoting Nietzsche who in turn variously sketches *ressentiment* as "hatred," "tyrannic will", or "picture-hating drives" (Heine)[27]. Similarly, Scheler whose book is a refutation not so much of *ressentiment per se*, which like Simmel he considers the basis of bourgeois morality and modern humanitarianism, as of Nietzsche's charge that *ressentiment* is the content of Christian (or more precisely Catholic) love; but Scheler at least sidesteps Nietzsche to the extent of providing a working definition of *ressentiment* as:

> the experience and rumination of a certain affective reaction directed against an other that allows this feeling to gain in depth and penetrate little by little to the very heart of the person while at the same time abandoning the realm of expression and activity

and

> this obscure, rumbling, contained exasperation, independent of the activity of the ego, [that] engenders little by little a long rumination of hatred or animosity without a clearly determined object of hostility, but filled with an infinity of hostile intentions. (emphasis added)[28]

This is to say, then, that *ressentiment* is not so much a theory (or at least not to begin with) as a (silent) feeling. To say of what, however, requires transforming *ressentiment* from an emotion into a theory, in other words, reducing Nietzsche to a philosopher or theorist of *ressentiment* when, if anything, he was its greatest dramatist, i.e., not a preacher of *ressentiment*, but the poet of its overcoming. Be that as it may, the Nietzschean definition of ressentiment that I will employ here is that where ressentiment becomes a revolt that turns creative:

> The slave revolt in morals begins by rancor turning creative and giving birth to values — the rancor of beings who, deprived of the direct outlet of action, compensate by an imaginary vengeance....Slave ethics...begins by saying "no" to an outside, an other, a non-self, and that no is its creative act. This reversal of the direction of the evaluating look, this invariable looking outward instead of inward, is a fundamental feature of rancor. Slave ethics requires...a sphere different from and hostile to its own...it requires an outside structure in order to act at all; all its action is reaction.[29]

However, let me elaborate that a little by suggesting after Nietzsche that *ressentiment* is the emotional content of the catastrophe of modern culture whose advent — in the form of what Nietzsche called the three M's:

Moment, Mode and Mob[30], and to which we can add a fourth, namely, Mood (and later perhaps a fifth: Movies) — entails a great silencing of everything else that was or might have been. If for Nietzsche, Western culture is the progressive advent of ever-larger *adiaphora* — spheres of non-determinacy or the neutralization of difference (*diapherein*, to differ) — *ressentiment* is the mood of the *adiaphora* of the "absolute silence" of any other cultural possibility save (totalitarian) Modernity, its History, its Culture and its multi-national organization as States which "In their hostilities...shall become inventors of images and ghosts, and with their images and ghosts they shall yet fight the highest fight against one another"[31].

In what follows, however, rather than extrapolating Nietzsche quotations, I would like to illustrate this theory of *ressentiment* with particular reference to the forms of the 'creative no' developed by one modern state, namely Canada, in its experience with the adiaphora of the history, culture, and multinational organization of modernity.

Ressentiment in Canadian discourse: cultural implications

> ...there is a sort of mixture of inquisition and censorship which the Germans have developed into a fine art — it is called absolute silence
>
> Nietzsche, Schopenhauer As Educator

The greatest melancholy of the will, even the liberating will, and thus the source of its *ressentiment* and revenge-seeking, is its inability to change the past: "Powerless against what has been done, he [the will] is an angry spectator of all that is past."[32] As a result, according to Nietzsche, history, justice, willing itself and "all life" become a form of suffering or punishment, i.e., revenge-seeking but with a good conscience. In such a form of suffering or punishment — not so much a theory but "as an almost intolerable anxiety"[33] — this corresponds to the *written* experience of Canadian history and literature, in a word, the Canadian experience of culture, primarily in the form of chronicles of the (usually deserved) administration of punishment. Thus, to take what would be, in effect, the first of innumerable Royal Commission Reports, Lord Durham's (1839) recommended the "obliteration" of the nation (here French-Canada) out of fear that "the mass of French Canadians" would otherwise succumb to the "spirit of jealous and *resentful nationality*" (emphasis added).[34] Crushing the 'resentful nationalities' of North America (first French Canada, then — unsuccessfully — the Thirteen Colonies, and thirdly English Canada) "seems... to have been...the policy of the British Government [:] to govern its colonies by means of division, and to break them down as much as possible into petty isolated communities, incapable of combination, and possessing no sufficient strength for individual resistance to the Empire."[35] The absence, in Canadian experience, of any kind of revolutionary (or mere-

ly combinatory) disruption (of isolation) meant that the tradition of punitive administration assumed a deep and uninterrupted development in the form of "a continuous repression" (Innis) of Canadian cultural expression as resentful nationality (or in the more modern administrative discourse of the Canadian state, 'narrow nationalism'). What nationalism and culture there would be in Canada would thus be i) firmly Erastian, i.e. under the authority of the State, both in character and in organization[36], ii) and if not under the control of the state, either marginalized, fragmentary or nonexistent, or if neither of the above, iii) imported. Which is to say that, in Canada, *ressentiment* takes the form of the administrative practice of an absent discourse on the relationship between nationalism and culture. This absence is structured around a) its preservation by b) the denial of the relationship between nationalism and culture instituted as c) three separations: i) an administrative separation (known in the discourse of cultural policy as "arm's length") of state cultural agencies from both nation and culture, ii) an economic separation by the state of culture into public and private administrative realms, and iii) a cultural separation by nationality in that the content of the public realm is officially (and incrementally) Canadian whereas that of the private realm is unofficially (and exponentially) American.[37] Put slightly less rebarbaritively, Canadian *ressentiment* articulates itself as the three absent discourses of a social structuring of cultural contempt: that of the administrators for those whom they administer: "Inside every Canadian, whether she or he knows it or not, there is, in fact, an American"; that of middle— and upper-class Canadians "concerned with the health and viability of Canadian culture"; and thirdly, that of lower-class Canadians who express their *ressentiment* in preferring American popular culture: "...the more low-brow an American cultural activity, the wider its appeal in Canada."[38]

What characterizes these absent discourses as absences is that each forms a discursive whole whose rhetorical strategy, but not its practices, consists in the denial of its own *ressentiment*. Thus, the discourse of Canadian cultural policy is always meliorative, though its punitive characteristics do transpire. To take but one example from the cultural policy area that has had the longest history of official Canadian preoccupation, namely cinema, Peter Pearson, current head of the principal state agency with responsibility for feature-film and television series production, reported in a speech last winter before the Canada California Chamber of Commerce that "We, the private sector and Telefilm now are fulfilling our joint goal: to be on network primetime and playing the mainstream, not only in Canada, but like the Hollywood studios, all over the world." I won't discuss the validity of the claim other than to note its similarity to Peter Cook's vision of Canada as master of the ways of the world; suffice it here that, according to Pearson, this worldwide expansion of Canadian cinema is predicated upon and made possible by the silencing of the nationalism that had, until this point, been the content of Canadian films, though the

blame for this is attributed to Canadian youth who must now be punished: "Now this 'national glue theory' is coming unstuck. The reality is that teenagers in Canada won't go to a Canadian movie if you pay them. Unless of course they want to." But as they don't want to, making them **want to** would henceforth be the thrust of Canadian policy; as Pearson put it, "Canadian fannies are going to have to fill the theater seats, and Canadian eyeballs watch the programs."[39]

Similarly, the discourse of Canadian literary culture denies its double *ressentiment* (which would otherwise be directed upwards at the literary patron, the state, and downwards onto the antinationalist and uneducated masses, the cultural consumers) and instead replaces it with theories of victimization, i.e., *ressentiment* turned in upon itself as self-punishment. As I shall below offer in greater detail an analysis of the workings of this, the clearest form of Canadian *ressentiment*, let me for now give one brief example, from Margaret Atwood's classic, *Survival*: "Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that Canada as a whole is a victim...." The supposition, of course, soon becomes self-fulfilling: "...stick a pin in Canadian literature at random, and nine times out of ten you'll hit a victim."[40] If the perspectives of victim-production seemingly provide Canadian literature with a discourse that is not about ressentiment, the problem with victims as a literary natural resource is that supplies run out unless consciously produced. As Atwood notes, the productive resources of victimization over time only become depleted and increasingly obscure, thus creating the (state-supported) demand that makes of CanLit the producer of another Canadian staple, like fur, wheat or hydro-electricity: namely, the culture-victim:

> In earlier writers these obstacles are external — the land, the climate, and so forth. In later writers these obstacles tend to become both harder to identify and more internal; ...no longer obstacles to physical survival but...spiritual survival, to life as anything more than a minimally human being.... and when life becomes a threat to life, you have a moderately vicious circle. If a man feels he can survive only by amputating himself, turning himself into a cripple or a eunuch, what price survival?[41]

With that question— what price survival? — we come to the third and most literally absent discourse in Canadian *ressentiment*, namely the absolute silence of the Canadian public itself: glacial, inert, and so totally impenetrable that it can only be represented: "Have you no public opinion in that province?" a British statesman once asked Ontario's equivalent to Duplessis, Sir Oliver Mowat, while Sir Richard Cartwright, minister of finance, commented severely on the worthlessness of public opinion in the same province.[42] This absolute silence, however, is presumed by the other Canadian discourses of *ressentiment* to be the one most driven by revenge-seeking and so most to be feared and despised. For here is the

(presumed) source of the 'resentful nationality' that, in the administrative discourse (Durham), "would separate the working class of the community from the possessors of wealth and the employers of labour"[43] : namely, the inhabitants of North America who, in Canadian historical discourse, "sometimes found their greatest and most malicious pleasure in the 'freedom to wreak upon their superiors the long locked-up hatred of their hearts'"[44]; a people who in Canadian literary discourse "make up for the[ir] meekness [in the province of public criticism]... by a generous use of the corresponding privilege in private"[45]; and that Canadian philosophical discourse (George Grant) has designated as the majority population of the continent, the last men of an achieved modernity.

To dwell in modernity might thus be assumed to be the animus of Canadian *ressentiment*. The signs of modernity (eg., population, urbanization, technologization, or in its cultural form, Americanization) would then be experienced with something akin to panic, an unbalancing and literal dislocation that Northrop Frye, in a profound insight, states perfectly when he writes that: "...Canadian sensibility has been profoundly disturbed, not so much by our famous problem of identity...as by a series of paradoxes in what confronts that identity....less...the question 'Who am I?' than...some such riddle as 'Where is here?'"[46]. Understanding Canadian *ressentiment* as precisely such a dislocation, this would suggest, with the advent of modernity, an acceleration of the inability to change no longer the past now (as in Nietzschean *ressentiment*) but an intensification of *ressentiment* to include the present and future as well. As William Norris, a Canadian author of the 1870s, expressed it, half-seriously: "Under the present system [in Canada] there is no past to be proud of, no present to give reliance, and no future to hope for. Devoid of national life the country lies like a corpse, dead and stagnant; but not so bad as it has been"[47]. This fear of loss —of one's place in time or history and in the space of community, of nation, of culture; in short, of group values— is what Frye calls "the real terror" of the Canadian (garrison) imagination, namely, the individuation that is also part of modernity, in which the individual is confronted with nothingness: "The real terror comes when the individual feels himself becoming an individual, pulling away from the group, losing the sense of driving power that the group gives him, aware of a conflict within himself far subtler than the struggle of morality against evil," a struggle which Frye does not identify but which we may suggest is that of *morality as ressentiment denied*. Instead of engaging with this struggle, as Frye remarks, "It is much easier to multiply garrisons, and when that happens, something anti-cultural comes into Canadian life, a dominating herd-mind in which nothing original can grow. The intensity of the sectarian divisiveness in Canadian towns, both religious and political, is an example..."[48]. Denied, *ressentiment* proliferates, rooted in the Canadian social structure —"The garrison mentality is that of its officers: it can tolerate only the conservative idealism of its ruling class, which for Canada

means the moral and propertied middle class"[49] —garrisons multiply, the anti-cultural herd-mind dominates and "from the exhausted loins of the half-dead masses of people in modern cities" (as Frye puts it in a rare display of his own *ressentiment*[50]), the literature the garrison (but now metropolitan) society produces "*at every stage*, tends to be rhetorical, an illustration or allegory of certain social attitudes" (emphasis added).[51] And it is rhetorical, as opposed to poetic, (historical as opposed to mythic, documentary as opposed to imaginative, and single-mindedly obsessed with assertion as opposed to an autonomous literature) because, according to Frye, it avoids the theme of self-conflict[52], i.e., the theme of *ressentiment*, preferring instead the self-inflicted punishment of a good conscience.

Ressentiment and the Canadian Mind: Innis, McLuhan, Grant

If Canadian *ressentiment* can thus be understood as strategies for the avoidance of the (national and cultural) implications of modernity, even though as Frye remarks, "Canada is not 'new' or 'young': it is exactly the same age as any other country under a system of industrial capitalism"[53], does Canadian intellectual discourse share in the avoidance of *ressentiment*? Taking the three "emblematic figures in Canadian thought"[54] of Innis, McLuhan and Grant, one would have to say that they too practice survivalist strategies of avoidance, but primarily by way of attempts at displacing Canadian *ressentiment* onto larger transnational and technological entities. If Innis, McLuhan and Grant write always guardedly of Canadian *ressentiment*, their occasional lapses are, therefore, all the more powerful.

Innis

Innis' most unguarded text, and perhaps his most blunt, is his 1947 "The Church in Canada:" "...in this country [w]e are all too much concerned with the arts of *suppressio veri, suggestio falsi*. 'The inexorable isolation of the individual is a bitter fact for the human animal...and much of his verbalizing reflects his obstinate refusal to face squarely so unwelcome a realization."[55] Thus the Canadian preference for public lies, the inertia of public opinion, the notorious longevity of the political life of public figures, and the settling of "all great public questions" on the basis of petty, personal prejudices had for Innis "particular significance for the fundamental corruption of Canadian public life."[56] The uninterrupted and counter-revolutionary tradition of the dominance of church and state bureaucracies in both English and French Canada, which allowed the British to govern New France, brought Quebec into Confederation and thirdly made possible Canadian resource development by government ownership of canals, railways, hydro-electric and communications facilities, had also profoundly imprinted Canadian cultural development with what Innis termed

"ecclesiasticism." This comprised a Puritanical repression of art and other expressions of cultural life, dogmatism, heresy trials, fanaticism, and supination before the state's incipient totalitarian encroachments upon civil liberties in general and intellectual freedom in particular[57]. These aspects of the corruption of Canadian public life thus made it "not only dangerous in this country to be a social scientist with an interest in truth but...exhausting:"

> On a wider plane it is a source of constant frustration to attempt to be Canadian. Both Great Britain and the United States encourage us in assuming the false position that we are a great power and in urging that we have great national and imperial possibilities. From both groups we are increasingly subjected...to bureaucratic tendencies dictated by external forces. We have no sense of our limitations.[58]

Without once using the word, Innis manages in this text to provide what amounts to a model or research agenda for understanding Canadian *ressentiment*.

McLuhan

Though McLuhan did not at any length write specifically on Canada, in *Counterblast* (1954) he offered the following poem on Canadian culture:

> Oh BLAST
> The MASSEY REPORT damp cultural igloo
> for canadian devotees of
> TIME
> &
> LIFE
> Oh BLAST....(t)he cring-
> ing, flunkey spirit of canadian culture, its
> servant-quarter snobbishness
> resentments
> ignorance
> penury
> ....
> BLESS
> The MASSEY REPORT,
> HUGE RED HERRING for
> derailing Canadian kulcha while it is
> absorbed by American ART & Technology.[59]

In other words, Canadian culture, as one particularly resentment-charged idiom in the residues of European nationalist print-culture, would be (deservedly) punished for its *ressentiment* by being joyously ground into

"cosmic talc" by the American crusher of art and technology. McLuhan's flight into the cosmos of the technological Pentecost of universal understanding and unity[60] is thus but another version of the denial of Canadian *ressentiment* by a moralizing fantasy of world (or now cosmic) proportions. In this sense, McLuhan, as Arthur Kroker has written, by the time "he became fully aware of the nightmarish quality of...his thought....was...,in the end, trapped in the 'figure' of his own making....In a fully tragic sense,...he was the playful perpetrator, and then victim, of a sign-crime."[61]

Grant

In Grant, Canadian *ressentiment* is not denied qua *ressentiment*; on the contrary, it is universalized as the psychology of the "last men who will come to be the majority in any realized technical society".[62] (Saved perhaps by the "nemesis" of its aspiration to nationhood or at least protected by religious remnants of an identification of virtue and reason, Canada for Grant, as for Frye, is not a realized but a "decadent" technical society[63].) The will's despair at being unable to reverse or change the abyss of existence —life experienced as public and private fields of pain and defeat— becomes the spirit of revenge against ourselves, against others, against time itself. But the central fact about the last men is that because they cannot despise themselves, they can thus inoculate themselves against existence: "The little they ask of life (only entertainment and comfort) will give them endurance"[64]. Because they *think* they have found happiness, the last men of the northern hemisphere in the modern age have not overcome *ressentiment*, but "want revenge...against anything that threatens their expectations from triviality"[65]: impotent to live in the world, "in their self-pity (they) extrapolate to a non-existent perfection in which their failures will be made good." They are the last men because they are the inheritors of a decadent rationalism, the products of (resentful) Christianity in its secularized form.

Thus, Grant's celebration of the defeat of Canadian nationalism in *Lament For A Nation* — "I lament as a celebration of memory"[66] — might be seen as a model for the overcoming of *ressentiment*, a Nietzschean exercise in *amor fati*: a willed deliverance from the spirit of revenge. For, in the realization that this "last-ditch stand of a local culture"[67] was not a trivial issue (unlike the branch-plant culture of the last men) but involves "the diamond stuff of which nationalists must be made in these circumstances," Grant suggests a heroic or noble acceptation of defeat:

> Perhaps we should rejoice in the disappearance of Canada. We leave the narrow provincialism and our backwoods culture; we enter the excitement of the United States where all the great things are being done. Who would compare the science, the art, the politics, the entertainment of our petty world to the overflowing achievements of

> New York, Washington, Chicago and San Francisco?....This is the profoundest argument for...break [ing] down our parochialism and lead[ing] us into the future.[68]

But is this acceptation not, as Grant remarked of his "incomprehension" of Nietzsche, simply too much to demand? Would the defeat of Canada's local culture be, in fact, an overcoming of ressentiment or, on the contrary, by its defeat the generalization of ressentiment to the core of modern, technical civilization? For Grant, amor fati "seems to me a vision that would drive men mad — not in the sense of a divine madness, but a madnesss destructive of good."[69] In this sense, Grant implies that accepting the defeat of Canadian nationalism would be such a form of madness — destructive of the good. But what then would be the "good" of Canada's local culture? Here, rather than further exploring Grant's writings, I would like to submit that such a definition would be the (gratuitous) undertaking of Canadian culture itself, in the Applebaum-Hebert Report's sense that "the largest subsidy to the cultural life of Canada [has] come... not from governments, corporations or other patrons, but from the artists themselves, through their unpaid or underpaid labour."[70] Defining the good of Canada would thus be a 'gift' to the nation from its artists (e.g., novelists, painters, filmmakers).

However, before turning specifically to an examination of these discourses, I would like to begin with a category of literary practitioner not currently considered an artist —namely, the historian— but who can, I think, be so considered here.[71] For one because of the literary origins of Canadian historical writing; for another because Canada's historians (at least until the mid-1960s) have all been nationalists; and thirdly because "there are hidden and unsuspected factors behind any national tradition of historical writing, and these need be raised as far as possible to the level of consciousness...."[72] In other words, what has "the diamond stuff" of Canadian nationalism consisted in?

Ressentiment and Canadian History

> L'histoire est cultivée au Canada plus peut-être qu'en aucun autre pays au monde
>
> Remy de Gourmont (1893)

Until the mid-1960s, Canadian historical writing, French and English, was predominantly and unproblematically nationalist.[73] In 1971, Ramsay Cook articulated a criticism of English-Canadian historical nationalism that English-Canadian historians had long levelled against the nationalism of French-Canadian historical writing, namely "misusing history for nationalist purposes."[74] While there would be something to say about Cook's conflation of nationalism, survivalism and historicism, his main argument for repudiating the nationalism of (English-) Canadian historians was that

> because of their common commitment to the nationalist criterion of survival...(t)his has meant that the conflict has been a battle of patriots...for national greatness. And...there is no war more bitter than...a war between patriots, even if the battle is restricted to a battle of the books.[75]

In other words, that there was a particularly fearful bitterness to Canadian expression, whether in literary or scholarly books, relative to not one but three separate realms of self-definition: a) a common commitment, b) survival, c) national greatness. To put it more bluntly, is this not simply a fearful way of stating the truism that Canadian politics (common commitment), economics and culture (survival), and statecraft in both domestic and foreign affairs (national greatness) have been bitter? If so, then what is at issue would be less the biases of Canadian historical scholarship than a quality of Canadian history itself.

By way of illustration, let us take Ramsay Cook's 1963 general history of Canada, *Canada: A Modern Study*[76], in the preface to which Cook presents all the biases of (English-) Canadian historical nationalism that he would repudiate several years later: eg., the 'miraculous' survivalism of Canadian history. Thus "If Canada's history is distinguished by anything it is a determination to survive and live according to the dictates of our historical experience." However, a close reading of Cook's history might suggest instead that if Canada's modern history is distinguished by anything, it is the bitterness and divisiveness of the historical experience he describes from, on the first page, the "tragedy" for French Canadians of Britain's conquest of Canada to, on the last page, the nation whose fourteenth prime minister found facing "serious economic problems..., was sorely divided between city and country, between French and English, and still had not solved the...problems of foreign and defence policy" — in short, whose "problems...taken together seemed to challenge the continued and healthy existence of the nation itself" (pp. 260-1).

In such a light, Canadian history would appear as a form of resentment-management, a controlling of the complex play of linguistic, class, regional, national and inter-national ressentiments that constitute Canadian historical experience. Thus, taking from Cook's text only those examples where he specifically uses the verb "to resent" (and one could substantially broaden the sampling by use of such cognates of ressentiment as 'fear', 'bitterness', 'envy', 'irritation', 'unhappiness', 'obnoxiousness' etc.), we find the following:

"The Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists deeply resented the privileges granted to the Anglicans" (p. 44); "The farmers resented the high rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway for carrying grain to market" (p. 121); "...in 1914 Canada was not an independent state and Britain's declaration of war was made on behalf of all the Empire, including Canada. Few Canadians resented this fact" (p. 165); "When the depression threw thousands of French Canadians out of work, smouldering resentment ex-

ploded into anger against 'foreign' employers" (p. 200); "This slight feeling of resentment at the attitude of the United States to the Seaway was part of a growing anxiety in Canada about the degree of influence which the United States seemed to exercise in Canadian affairs" (p. 243); and "The Liberals had been particularly worried about their ability to retain the support of Quebec, for the French Canadians had resented the conscription policy of 1944" (p. 250). Thus, even in the writings of a historian who would come to identity "the lack of 'sound thinking on the national question'" as "one of the most serious weaknesses of Canadian intellectual life"[77], one finds levels of Canadian ressentiment that are not attributable to nationalism. On the basis of the examples above, religious, economic and domestic political ressentiment would appear on their own to offer sufficient grounds for divisiveness without the added ressentiment provided by nationalism. Curiously, in Cook's examples of the two instances where nationalism is directly a factor, the level of ressentiment is less than it is with the non-nationalist forms: Canada's 1914 lack of independence vis-a-vis Britain caused little resentment among Canadians, and the growing early to mid-1950s suspicion of United States influence in Canadian affairs caused only slight resentment.

However, if one turns to the writings of avowedly (as opposed to uneasily) nationalist Canadian historians such as Creighton, Lower and W.L. Morton, the relations between ressentiment and nationalism become more pronounced and at the same time more complex. Indeed, Creighton, of the Alaska boundary dispute, writes that "the background of brutal imperialism on both sides of the Atlantic...produced a nationalist reaction in Canada more violent and sustained than anything in the history of the country.... this double resentment...so characteristic of Canadian nationalism."[78] Creighton's notion of the double resentment of Canadian nationalism is immensely suggestive of the complex interplay of ressentiment and nationalism in Canada in its double articulations: 1] a) an external ressentiment of English Canadian nationalism towards both British and American imperialism and 1] b) similarly of French Canadian nationalism towards its former metropolis as well as Anglo-Canadian imperialism; and 2] an internal ressentiment that is itself double: a) directed downwards onto the populations of Canada and b) reflected back up again as the regionalisms, separatisms or other forms of alienation that have constituted the permanent crisis of the Canadian confederation.

If the writings of Creighton and Morton[79] are invaluable for understanding external ressentiment in Canadian nationalism, those of A.R.M Lower display a similar candour in giving voice to internal ressentiment: "The weakness of Canadian democracy has lain not so much in its leaders as in its followers....Canadian nationalism was formed from the top. The farther down the scale one went, the less consciousness there was of the whole country...."[80] That the "followers" only returned this kind of ressentiment, of course, was not lost on Lower: "Secession talk and other

phenomena of disintegration proceeded either from economic disappointment or its by-product, partisan sniping. Of the former there was much and it was graven deep in the failure of the country to grow."[81] Lower expresses a Canadian nationalism made up of interlocking ressentiments that, in Morton's view, conveyed the colonial fixation of an entire generation: "They love the nation Canada, but they hate it also. They hate it because they hate its colonial origins, which they wish to deny but cannot, and must therefore tramp on endlessly in ever less meaningful frenzy."[82] Thus, in Lower's words:

> ...English Canadians...are a dour and unimaginative folk. Having failed to find a centre in themselves, they borrow the heroes, the history, the songs and the slang of others. With no vividly realized res publica of their own to talk about, they take refuge in silence, unable to formulate their loyalties, confused over their deepest aspirations. Yet they...must surely have an intuitive faith in the unexpressed essence of their traditions....If the Canadian people are to find their soul, they must seek...it, not in the English language or the French, but in....the land.[83]

For Lower, however, the failure of Canadian nationalism, always choked back into silence on its ressentiment, meant the possibility that the Canadian artist might succeed where the historian could not.

Ressentiment and Canadian Literature: Susanna Moodie and Sara Jeannette Duncan

> Her resentment was only half-serious but the note was there
> Sara Jeannette Duncan, The Imperialist

If in Lower, ressentiment of the soullessness of the Canadian people is deflected onto the landscape whose distinguishing characteristic thus becomes the celebration of what is in effect a punitive absence of population, he was only repeating a strategy practiced by Canadian letters in a long tradition of embittered or ironic criticism of Canadian society since Haliburton. As I don't propose to review that tradition here, I will restrict myself to the examples offered by Susanna Moodie's *Roughing It in the Bush* (1852), together with a brief discussion of Sara Jeannette Duncan's *The Imperialist* (1904).

In Moodie, the social basis of ressentiment precedes emigration to Canada. Emigration is forced "upon the proud and wounded spirit of the well-educated sons and daughters of old but impoverished families." That ressentiment, while acknowledged as a component of the Old World, is however denied as constitutive of the New World:

> But there is a higher motive [to emigration]...that love of independence which springs up spontaneously in the...high-souled children

> of a glorious land. They cannot labour in a menial capacity in the country where they were born and educated to command. They can trace no difference between themselves and the more fortunate individuals of a race whose blood warms their veins, and whose names they bear. The want of wealth alone places an impassible barrier between them and the more favoured offspring...and they go forth to make for themselves a new name and to find another country, to forget the past and to live in the future, to exult in the prospect of...the land of their adoption [becoming] great.[84]

Revenge against the past, ie., ressentiment, thus fuels the vision of greatness (independence) promised by the idealized and moralized Canada. In the encounter between the ideal and the impoverished reality, not only is there disappointment, but the bitterness of that disappointment releases the ressentiment that was "the ordinary motive" for emigration: "Disappointment, as a matter of course, followed...high-raised expectations...." but the disappointment is due to the "disgusting scenes of riot and low debauchery...[the] dens of dirt and misery which would, in many instances, be shamed by an English pig-sty."[85]

Not only does the populace compare unfavorably to British pigs, but the state-apparatus and its industrious pamphleteers and hired orators, whose glowing descriptions of Canada had produced a "Canada mania" in the middle ranks of British society, were scarcely better:

> Oh, ye dealers in wild lands — ye speculators in the folly and credulity of your fellow-men — what a mass of misery, and of misrepresentation productive of that misery, have yet not to answer for! You had your acres to sell, and what to you were the worn-down frames and broken hearts of the infatuated purchasers? The public believed the plausible statements you made with such earnestness, and men of all grades rushed to hear your hired orators declaim upon the blessings to be obtained by the clearers of the wilderness."[86]

By contrast, the land itself, as wilderness, i.e., once emptied of its corrupt inhabitants, presents the standard jouissances of the Burkean sublime as repertoried by Chauncey Loomis: "sound and silence, obscurity, solitude, vastness and magnificence as sources of sublime astonishment and terror."[87] Thus Moodie writes of Canada's "awful beauty," "excess of beauty," "astonishing beauty" whose "effect was strangely novel and imposing...where the forest has never yet echoed to the woodsman's axe or received the imprint of civilization, the first approach [to which]...inspires a melancholy awe which becomes painful in its intensity."[88]

If the sight of Canadian shores produces in Moodie a culturally distinct response — "I never before felt so overpowering my own insignificance" (p.29) — the fact that the same shores produce a radically different cultural response among the lower classes only brings out Moodie's ressentiment in which cultural and class differences are fused into the landscape:

> It was a scene over which the spirit of peace might brood in silent adoration; but how spoiled by the discordant yells of the filthy beings who were sullying the purity of the air and water with contaminating sights and sounds!
> The sight of the Canadian shores had changed them into persons of great consequence. The poorest and worst-dressed, the least deserving and the most repulsive in mind and morals exhibited most disgusting traits of self-importance. Vanity and presumption seemed to possess them altogether.[89]

She continues:

> Girls, who were scarcely able to wash a floor decently, talked of service with contempt, unless tempted to change their resolution by the offer of $12 a month. To endeavour to undeceive them was a useless and ungracious task....I left it to time and bitter experience to restore them to their sober senses.[90]

Moodie's resentful observations of the effects of Canadian shores upon the lower classes had already been noted some thirty years earlier by John Howison in his 1821 *Sketches of Upper Canada*:

> Many of the emigrants I saw had been on shore a few hours only, during their passage between Montreal and Kingston, yet they had already acquired those absurd notions of independence and equality, which are so deeply engrafted in the minds of the lowest individuals of the American nation.[91]

In Moodie, ressentiment becomes the basis of a vision of Canadian nationalism (pp. 29-30) in which she urges Canadians to "remain true to yourselves", ie., to the (silent) landscape ("Look at the St. Lawrence...that great artery...transporting...the riches and produce of a thousand distant climes"). Instead of becoming a "humble dependant on the great republic," Canada should "wait patiently, loyally, lovingly" for the day when Britain "will proclaim your childhood past, and bid you stand ...a free Canadian people": "...do this, and...you will...learn to love Canada as I now love it, who once viewed it with hatred so intense that I longed to die..."

It is perhaps appropriate that Moodie's book aroused resentment in Canada — as she put it, "a most unjust prejudice...because I dared give my opinion freely" — and would not be reprinted in Canada until 1871, or almost twenty years after its first edition.

In contrast, if Sara Jeannette Duncan's journalistic ressentiment of the population of Ontario whom she described collectively as "Maoris" and a "giant camp of the Philistines" has been documented[92], the absence of any such outspoken ressentiment in her novel *The Imperialist* is noteworthy. Duncan's novel affects an almost clinical detachment in which ressentiment has simply become naturalized, i.e., it's merely part of the landscape, and so there are no descriptions of the landscape, other than the social topology of the town of Elgin, until pp. 70-71:

> ...he had nothing to say; the silence in which they pursued their way was no doubt to him just the embarrassing condition he usually had to contend with. To her it seemed pregnant, auspicious; it drew something from the low grey lights of the wet spring afternoon and the unbound heartlifting wind....They went on in that strange bound way, and the day drew away from them till they turned a sudden corner, when it lay all along the yellow sky across the river, behind a fringe of winter woods, stayed in the moment of its retreat on the edge of unvexed landscape.[93]

For the young Englishman, Hugh Finlay, the Canadian silence is just the embarrassing condition he usually had to content with; for the Canadian, Advena Murchison, ("occupied in the aesthetic ecstasy of self-torture",p.184) her feelings are drawn from the ordinary landscape: what they suddenly see and share in, however, is not the ordinary landscape, but the extraordinary landscape; in Duncan's words, the unvexed landscape. Duncan continues:

> They stopped involuntarily to look, and she saw a smile come up from some depth in him.
> "Ah, well," he said, as if to himself, "it's something to be in a country where the sun still goes down with a thought of the primaeval."
> "I think I prefer the sophistication of chimney-pots," she replied. "I've always longed to see a sunset in London, with the fog breaking over Westminster."
> "Then you don't care about them for themselves, sunsets?" he asked, with the simplest absence of mind.
> "I never yet could see the sun go down, But I was angry in my heart," she said, and this time he looked at her.
> "...It's the seal upon an act of violence, isn't it, a sunset? Something taken from us against our will. It's a hateful reminder, in the midst of our delightful volitions, of how arbitrary every condition of life is."[94]

For Finlay, the sunset is, as the depopulated Canadian landscape was for Moodie, an instance of sublimity. For Advena, if the landscape was "involuntarily" and momentarily unvexed, vexation or ressentiment immediately returns such that she prefers an imaginary landscape (a sunset in a London she's never seen) to the (populated) one she can see (and lives in) since this is a hateful reminder of the cultural anger in her heart (the poem she quotes), of the violence of unsophistication, i.e., the ressentiment of the will's inability to alter the past. That ressentiment (something taken from us against our wills) is further reinforced by the discussion they have as to where the light goes: "Into the void behind time," Finlay suggests; "Into the texture of the future," Advena answers.

However, it's Advena's brother, Lorne, the imperialist of the novel's title, who defines the texture of that future in language that would be reminis-

cent of Grant's ressentiment-filled last men with their trivial desire for entertainment and comfort: "...it's for the moral advantage [of belonging to an empire]. Way down at the bottom, that's what it is. We have the sense to want all we can get of that sort of thing. They've developed the finest human product there is, the cleanest, the most disinterested, and we want to keep up the relationship...."[95]

In comparing these two moments in the development of Canadian literature, Moodie's vision offers an unvexed natural landscape, but a vexed social landscape, while Duncan blends the one into the other. As Lorne Murchison's words suggest, the advent of mechanical means of reproduction such as photography or cinema (the finest product, the cleanest, the most disinterested) might at last provide a path around the vexacious Canadian literary landscape, be it that of its philosophers, historians, or novelists.

Ressentiment and Canadian Visual Arts: The clicheization of the landscape

> One must guess the painter in order to understand the picture. But now the whole scientific fraternity is out to understand the canvas and the colours — not the picture"
>
> Nietzsche, Schopenhauer As Educator

Dennis Reid has suggested that "of all the arts in Canada, painting is the one that most directly presents the Canadian experience."[96] However, if there is any consistency to Canadian experience (and this paper has argued that there is), that experience has been predominantly characterized by ressentiment and the quest for its relocation by distancing in i) a *meta*-Canadian moralism, ii) a pan-Canadian nationalism, and iii) a *trans*-Canadian landscapism. In this sense, Canadian art rather than most directly presenting Canadian experience would continue along the same trajectory of relocation that we have encountered in Canadian philosophy, historical writing and literature. As Vancouver artist Robert Kleyn has put it:

> Plagued by questions of identity, Canadian art often proposes prescriptive frameworks which easily lead to deciphering rather than interrogating the authority of the representation behind the presentation. This identity is posed in terms of recognition, recognition outside Canada.[97]

That recognition, however, would only be made possible, in Creighton's bitter observation, "by abandoning a part, or the whole of [the artist's] own tradition or special point-of-view....A Canadian artist...could either leave Canada for the metropolitan centre of his choice, or he could give up Canadian themes, except those...regarded as quaint or barbaric, and therefore interesting, in the artistic and literary capitals of Western Europe and America."[98] But, in fact, there was another, and more intricate, possibility for the development of Canadian art as a strategy of avoidance of Canadian ressentiment, and I'd like to term this *the clicheization of the landscape.*

Between Confederation and the end of the century, Canadian art followed no direction save that of 'pleasing the public.'[99] If most Canadian artists approached painting in the spirit of the age— to become rich fast— that spirit would increasingly be one marked by the development of mechanical (or photo-chemical) means of reproduction. The impact of the camera on Canadian art would be decisive as part of the "pragmatic materialism and commercialism [that] permeated the *whole fabric* of Canadian life (emphasis added)"[100]. As indicative elements in a total transformative process affecting Canadian art, I'll single out three: i) the *institutionalization* of art, ii) the *commercialization* of artists, and iii) the *mechanization* of vision.

i) The institutionalization of art as of the 1870s, begun with the Ontario Society of Artists, the Royal Society, and the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts, would be directed by the state (the Marquis of Lorne as Governor-General) and modelled on the recreation of "little replicas of British cultural organizations"[101]. The process of statification would be distinguished by outbursts of ressentiment or a "marvelous amount of bitterness and bad language; half the artists are ready just now to choke the other half with their paint brushes".[102]

ii) The commercialization of art amounted to the subordination of painting to photography and the rise of photographic firms such as William Notman of Montreal, Notman and Fraser of Toronto, and later the other commercial studios such as Toronto's Grip, the Brigden Organization and Phillips-Gutkin Associates in Winnipeg, and Graphics Associates in Toronto, all of which played essential roles in the development of modern Canadian art and film.[103] To take but one sign of the general subordination of painting to photography (though photography would "indirectly encourage... the spread of painting through Canada" [Harper]), the Ontario Society of Artists' first exhibition (1873) would be held at the Notman and Fraser Photographic Gallery in Toronto.

iii) The aesthetic of Erastian institutionalization on the one hand and commercialization on the other was a photographic vision or realism that, at its best, aspired to be "a precise clear reflection of the world" which, in Canadian terms, meant the search for ever wilder Canadian terrain that would reach its fullest expression in the Group of Seven. At its worst, such photographic realism was "pedestrian and laborious"; and, in between, lead to a Canadian national style whose beginnings would be the production of the double volume entitled *Picturesque Canada* (1882) by which a "veritable army" of artists, including American newspaper illustrators who had worked on the earlier *Picturesque America*, "made available to public and artists alike the first great series of locally produced Canadian scenes...at a time when nationalism was being aroused on all sides."[104]

For the problem posed by the clicheization of the landscape involves a major (and I'm tempted to say absolute) displacement. In part, this displacement is the mediumistic problem of the shift from landscape as a liter-

ary figure to landscape as backdrop or cliche (from the German, *klitsch*, lump or mass, and thus its aesthetic, *kitsch*); in other words, the shift from figure to image that Walter Benjamin understood as the annihilation of metaphoricity by the advent of "the long-sought image sphere...the world of universal and integral actualities, where the 'best room' is missing — the sphere, in a word, in which political materialism and physical nature share the inner man."[105] To put it another way, the transition from literary to mechanized medium involved a double displacement of the Canadian landscape: firstly, the *objectification* of the vacant landscape (whose evacuation, as we have seen, is an effect of ressentiment) as 'reality'; secondly, the deterritorialized non-specificity or *universalization* of a vacant reality by mechanical means. If American newspaper illustrators could readily produce Canadian scenes, American film crews would within a few years produce 'Canadian' features shot entirely in the U.S., just as Canadian film producers would one day come to specialize in making 'American' features shot entirely in Canada.

The annihilation, or at least unidimensionalization, of metaphoricity by the clicheization of the landscape thus naturalized Canadian silence to a degree Canadian letters (or any literary medium, including newspapers) could never. Like the ownership of the land by the Crown, the development of Canadian communications would be a state-monopoly. But before further reference to modern media, it is necessary to conclude this discussion of Canadian visual arts by examining the ressentiment produced by the Group of Seven's attempted revolt against the cliched landscape.

If the members of the Group were "the first to speak loudly as consciously national Canadian painters,"[106] the search for something Canadian in painting had been the objective of several Toronto painters since the 1890s. But as MacDonald said of one of his teachers ("the Canadian in him is not quite dead"), this objective kept getting "switched off the tracks..."[107], and the Group was no exception: eg., the 1914-1918 war; Harris' training in Germany; Thomson's dependency on photographs; or the "tremendous" impact on Harris and MacDonald of a 1913 exhibition of Scandinavian painting seen in Buffalo. The actual origins of the Group's "cult of Canadianism" (Harper) need not concern us here; what matters was i) that they felt they were painting 'Canada', and ii) the ressentiment that such a presumption unleashed.

As Harper puts it, "Toronto critics in particular were so indignant that an observer could but assume they had been personally insulted"; Harper also writes of an "incredible flood of adverse publicity," "massive criticism", and cites Harris' claim that the first Group show (May 1920) produced whole pages in newspapers and periodicals of "anger, outrage and cheap wit [such as] had never occurred in Canada before."[108] Critics (and writers like Hugh Maclennan) saw in their work alarming expressions of terror and violence. Hector Charlesworth felt that the Group's work was detrimental to Canada's foreign image because it was likely to discourage immigration.

Members of Parliament joined in the bitter criticism, hurling abuse and humiliation at the head of the director of the National Gallery of Canada for his choice of Group of Seven paintings to be sent to the British Empire Exhibition at Wembley (1924).[109] The Royal Canadian Academy "resented the Gallery's involvement in the organization of an international exhibition..."[110] But the collective resentment suddenly evaporated when overseas critics pronounced the Group's work the most vital painting of the century. Within two years the Group were the acknowledged center of serious art activity in Canada; by 1931, the year of their last group exhibition, "their supremacy was acknowledged — both grudgingly and willingly — right across the country."[111]

For perhaps the most problematic effect of the clicheization of the landscape, and in this sense Group 'Canadianism' failed, in becoming by the 30s and well into the 50s a suffocating artistic orthodoxy, is that it was the neutralization of the only valid emotional outlet for Canadian ressentiment. Thus contained, what resulted was the dramatic intensification of ressentiment that constitutes the entire history of Canadian cinema.

Ressentiment and Canadian Cinema or 'Le mepris n'aura qu'un temps'

As the most successful Canadian feature film ever, that LE DECLIN DE L'EMPIRE AMERICAIN should be a film about ressentiment is clearly visible on a number of levels: 1) the (*intellectual*) ressentiment of the film's historians or last men of history who, because they know they will never amount to Braudels or Toynbees, can generalize into the future and the past the social and cultural decline they *already* inhabit: the loss of a social project, (to activate ressentiment, one makes separate factors causative: thus, **as a result of**) the institutional and institutionalized cynicism of elites, and (**caused by**) the effeminization of a culture they resent; 2) the (*emotional*) ressentiment of men today toward women (*and* of women toward women: eg., Dominique vis-a-vis Louise; 3) the (*inter-elite*) ressentiment which the film articulates on two levels: that of Third World intellectuals and more locally of untenured *chargés de cours* for the privileges (economic and sexual) of the First or Second World tenured professorate that the film describes as having the best labour contract in North America; 4) the (*class*) ressentiment of the uneducated toward the educated who do not do anything but only talk, and 5) Arcand's acknowledgement of Canadian (*cultural*) ressentiment in expunging from the script all specific reference to Canada or Quebec — all, that is, but one.

And that is the landscape of Lake Memphremagog and the nature footage of the water, reeds and later the snow-bound house at the film's end; in other words (and as Pierre, the cynic, says: the only reality that will remain once all the[se] people have died), the romantic primal of the Canadian landscape where, since Moodie, Canadian artists have sought refuge from (and discharged) the accumulated ressentiment of Canadian social existence.

It is thus possible to make two observations: 1) LE DECLIN, as a film about ressentiment, renews (and legitimizes) the ressentiment thematic in Canadian (cinematic) culture as explored by such films as, for instance, Michel Brault's LES ORDRES, Arthur Lamothe's LE MEPRIS N'AURA QU'UN TEMPS, or Gilles Groulx's NORMETAL, going back to, at least, that extraordinary post-Griersonian moment of the self-revelation of the Canadian psyche, in Robert Anderson's "Mental Mechanisms" series for the National Film Board of Canada (1947-1950). The series identified, in order, the four principal drives of the Canadian sensibility: THE FEELING OF REJECTION; THE FEELING OF HOSTILITY; OVER-DEPENDENCY; and FEELINGS OF DEPRESSION.[112] And yet while signalling that Canadian cinema may, and with considerable historical justification, be legitimately a *cinema of ressentiment*[113], LE DECLIN is, I think, attempting something more.

2) In part because of the landscape primal but also because of the film's humour and diegetic sympathy for its characters (since as a student of Canadian history and a filmmaker in both state and private industry for some 20 years now, Arcand understands that Canadian ressentiment is double and so includes French and English, male and female, etc.), the film is seeking, though not without hesitations, to include *within* its landscape human characters in a way that Canadian literature or history or painting has not. In other words, LE DECLIN attempts a path beyond ressentiment. If that attempt fails — by the film's offering in conclusion only the solace of another vista of the depopulated Canadian landscape — it does bring to the fore once again the clicheization of that landscape that has been a, if not the only, constant of Canadian cinema since its earliest years.

This is to say, then, that the first Canadian features from, for instance, EVANGELINE (1914) to BACK TO GOD'S COUNTRY (1919) were cliches, as were the Hollywood 'northerns' set in Canada through the mid-20s, as was the first indigenous radio drama broadcast by the CNR in 1930 (*The Romance of Canada*) since "Audiences never tired of viewing Canada's stereotyped image."[114] Peter Morris has summarized the films of these early "years of promise" as follows:

> If there was a definable quality...and it was a tentative one...it lay in relating fiction and reality, in the idea that stories should be filmed not on set but in natural locations, in applying a documentary approach to drama. Such an approach characterized many of the most successful films of the period...those of Ernest Shipman [eg., BACK TO GOD'S COUNTRY], and was to find its most potent expressions in three quasi-Canadian films: Nanook of the North, The Silent Enemy and The Viking.[115]

As producer Ernie Shipman explained it, this naturalistic or documentary quasi-realism originated in Canadian life, in "a demand for Canadian-made motion pictures as real and free and wholesome as...Canadian life."[116] However, as Barthes remarks in *S/Z*: "...realism consists not in

copying the real but in copying a (depicted) copy of the real. This famous *reality*, as though suffering from a fearfulness which keeps it from being touched directly, is set *farther away*, postponed."[117] In other words, Canadian realism originates not in the wholesomeness of Canadian life, but in the fearfulness of it, ie., in ressentiment and its avoidance by duplicity, specifically the deceptive immigration advertising, bitterly commented on by Susanna Moodie, that began in the 1830s as part of public (ie., State) effort — a government Bureau of Immigration would be formally established in the 1850s — and would continue with the creation of the National Film Board in 1939 (and, indeed, has characterized every stage of state involvement in Canadian cinema from the teens of the century to the present). From the films of the CPR with their interdiction against showing snow or ice scenes[118], to Beaverbrook's propaganda War Office Cinematographic Committee, to the Canadian Government Motion Picture Bureau whose film publicity aimed to "make Canada known, as she really is", the 'realism' of Canadian filmmaking is inscribed within a state-supported tradition of deceptiveness. As a result, the relationship between fiction and realism in Canadian image-production has, at every stage, been problematic, whether one considers the post-Grierson documentary, Canadian cinema direct, Carle-Owen's (re)discovery of the feature under the cover of documentary, Peter Pearson's and the CBC's lawsuits over THE TAR SANDS, or the more recent experiments of the NFB's Alternative Drama Program.[119] And yet for all that, there was never any doubt in Canadian philosophical realism (cf. John Watson: "we are capable of knowing Reality as it actually is....Reality when so known is absolutely rational") and its derivatives in Canadian documentary, especially Canadian experimental cinema, as to the epistemological validity of its realism. Or none until the contemporary Canadian philosopher (and filmmaker) Bruce Elder retheorized Canadian realism as the awareness of an absence: "only when the absence of the represented object is acknowledged can representation actually occur."[120]

Elder thus suggests a Canadian contribution to the critical theory of representation in which presentation or the present that can be re-presented is problematized by the absent concept of 'resentation', not a present that can be re-presented but an absent present that cannot: namely, the 'resent' or *ressentiment* that George Grant has defined "At its simplest...[as] revenge against what is present in our present."[121] In any event, as Peter Morris has remarked, excellence in the documentary form developed because Canadians "were denied access to producing feature films."[122] At the end of this study, Canadian cinema, like literature or painting, becomes visible as just another part of the ressentiment-filled discourse of the continuation of an absent present in the evacuated landscape of indefinite cultural postponement in the administration of the non-existent reality of Canadian culture.

Conclusion: Modernity, the reactionary landscape and the bias of *ressentiment*

> On a wider plane, it is a source of constant frustration to attempt to be Canadian
>
> H.A. Innis

At the conclusion of this study of Canadian cultural forms, is it possible to at least begin to situate Canadian *ressentiment*? I believe it is, if only to attempt to put the tormented question of Canadian *ressentiment* to a, by now perhaps, much deserved rest.

Since the Second World War, ie, since Canada's full-scale integration into the American empire after a decade of proto-nationhood, there developed in Canadian literature and in literary criticism principally — more broadly speaking within the instrumentalization of the humanities— a largely southern Ontario school with a curious kind of awareness of the Canadian literary landscape. "I have long been impressed in Canadian poetry, " wrote Frye in his 1965 conclusion to a literary history of Canada, "by a tone of deep terror in regard to nature."[123] Compare that with an observation of Emily Carr's: "I have often wondered what caused that fear, almost terror, of New York before I saw her."[124] I would like to suggest, therefore, that in the Canadian imaginary 'nature' and 'modernity' are one and the same, and both evoke an identical response: terror experienced as *ressentiment*. Terror in some cases admitted but more often in what Gaile McGregor terms 'the wacousta syndrome'[125], denied because *it is* terrible. However, the awareness of this, I would suggest, makes of *ressentiment* the primary characteristic of the Canadian imaginary, ressentiment which i) is displaced or projected onto the landscape and ii) denies this. Given that the landscape, or rather representations of the landscape, by their indexicality or referentiality can claim to point to, refer to, or show a 'natural' or 'objective out there', it may be possible to say that the landscape is the least mediated or non-institutionalized form of Canadian ideas of modernity itself. Thus, the Canadian 'identity' can only be said to be "fully integral to the question of technology," as Arthur Kroker has written,[126] in the sense of being dissimulated therein in the attempt to displace itself beyond the *ressentiment* occasioned by modernity. For if McGregor is correct in defining Canadian being as "a kind of normalized duplicity"[127], it becomes almost impossible to make a distinction between a threatening externality (for instance, technology or modernity or nature) and the internal core of that being itself (terror); indeed, is it possible to assign limits to an imaginary?

But, for the sake of argument, taking the external threat as so (nature as terrifying), what this produces is Frye's garrison mentality or the reinforcement of institutionalization. If space is, as McGregor says, "*the* identifying feature of the Canadian interior"[128], then it is space-binding institutions and techniques (nationalism, the state, communications and

culture) that are privileged as a result — but only to silence that space by binding it. For the institutions of overcoming space are themselves subject to the same normalized duplicity. McGregor, analyzing Canadian literature, uncovers a similar ambivalence or as she terms it "institutionalized ambivalence" with respect to institutions: "The state," she remarks, " is simply alien, and that's what makes it dangerous...'society' in Canada is viewed as fearful specifically because it is not machinelike, predictable, mechanical but [because it is] prey to confusion and disorder...in Canadian literature...the public world is somehow demonic, an utterly foreign element...." (p. 173)

If nature in Canada is terrifying and the Canadian social world is demonic, then what is safe? What becomes completely safe is precisely what is *genuinely* foreign, "machinelike, predictable, mechanical" — technology, or the empty will to will, but just to be absolutely preserved from experiencing Canadian ressentiment, that technology and that willing are preferable in their imported as opposed to the indigenous (i.e, absent or silenced) forms. For, as McGregor puts it, "Judging by our literature...many Canadians believe...that for us...symbolic capitulations to the victimizing forces is liberation"[129] — because capitulation, symbolic or real, is liberation from Canadian *ressentiment*.

I said earlier that these views of nature were characteristic of a largely southern Ontario school, i.e., were formed in the intellectual and cultural center of Canadian modernity. However the "stable and restrained society of Ontario," as geographer Cole Harris remarked in an essay on the myth of the land in Canadian nationalism, "developed in an environment which has been less a challenge than a neutral backdrop."[130] If "The land," as Harris insists, "did not create tensions," then the landscape itself becomes the primary cultural myth of Canadian avoidance of *its own* modernity; namely, what the Canadian art historian David Solkin has termed "the landscape of reaction"[131]. Canadian *ressentiment* would thus be the fullest form of the expression of Canada's *reactionary modernity*; that is to say, a form of nostalgia that is itself a (purely mythical) dimension of modernity.[132]

If this is so, and in the light of what we've examined here, it may be enough to raise some questions both in terms of the regnant interpretations and practices of Canadian cultural existence. Such a questioning would clearly, I think, bring to the forefront what I have argued is the dual displacement of the nature and institutions of modern Canadian nationalism and culture by a reactionary *ressentiment*.

If Canadian thought has excelled in comprehensive analyses of the biases of communications (Innis) and technology (Grant, Kroker), it would seem that this enterprise could only be fruitfully complemented by an understanding of the bias of the culture that connects them. Then, and only

then, might something of this huge, distant and thoroughly hidden country of ressentiment emerge finally into view.

Communications Studies
Concordia University

Notes

1. *Essays in Canadian Economic History*, ed. Mary Q. Innis, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1956), 383.
2. Ibid., 386.
3. Ibid., 387.
4. Ibid.
5. *In Canada: A Guide To The Peaceable Kingdom* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1971), xiv.
6. This is as well the starting point for Marc Henry Soulet's recent study of the Quebec intelligentsia, *Le Silence des Intellectuels: Radioscopie de l'intellectual québécois* (Montreal: Editions Saint-Martin), 1987.
7. *ROB* Magazine, September 1986, 15.
8. Ibid.
9. "On the Adder's Bite," Thus Spake Zarathustra, in Walter Kaufmann, ed. *The Portable Nietzsche* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1959), 180.
10. ROB, op. cit., 16.
11. Hubert Aquin, "Le Corps Mystique," in *Blocs erratiques*, (Montreal: 10/10, 1982), 105.
12. In Carl Berger, ed. *Imperialism and Nationalism, 1884-1914: A Conflict in Canadian Thought*, (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1969), 60-61.
13. John MacCormac, *Canada: America's Problem* (New York: The Viking Press, 1940), 32.
14. *Technology and Empire*, (Toronto: Anansi, 1969), 141.
15. Cf., Fredric Jameson, "Nietzsche's whole vision of history, his historical master narrative is organized around this proposition [ressentiment]," in "Authentic Ressentiment: Generic Discontinuities and Ideologemes in the 'Experimental' Novels of George Gissing," *The Political Unconscious*, (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981), 185-205.
16. *The Will To Power*, trans. Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale, (New York: Vintage, 1967), 100-101.
17. Jameson, op. cit., 201.
18. Georg Simmel, *Le Bourgeois*, trans. Jankelevitch, (Paris: Payot, 1926), 411-412.
19. *Uber Ressentiment und Moralische Werturteile* (1912) translated in French as *L'Homme du ressentiment*, (Paris: Gallimard, 1970), 49, note 1.
20. Fritz Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961), xx-xxi.

21. See David Thomson, *America In The Dark: The Impact of Hollywood Films on American Culture* (New York: William Morrow, 1977), passim, and Benjamin B. Hampton, *History of the American Film Industry: From Its Beginnings To 1931* (New York: Dover, 1970), esp. ix-x.

22. Jameson, op. cit., 202.

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid., 205.

25. Max Scheler, *L'Homme du ressentiment*, op. cit., 11.

26. In *Schopenhauer As Educator* (South Bend, Indiana: Regnery/Gateway, 1965), 91.

27. See Walter Kaufmann, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* (New York: Meridian, 1956), esp. 319-325.

28. Scheler, 11.

29. *The Genealogy of Morals*, trans. Francis Golffing, (New York: Doubleday, 1956), 170-171.

30. See *Schopenhauer As Educator*, op. cit., 69.

31. Zarathustra, op. cit., 213.

32. Ibid., 251.

33. Margaret Atwood, *Survival: A Thematic Guide To Canadian Literature* (Toronto: Anansi, 1972), 33.

34. Cited in Tony Wilden, *The Imaginary Canadian* (Vancouver: Pulp Press, 1980), 71.

35. *Durham Report*, 1839, also cited in Wilden, 43.

36. See Innis, op. cit., 384.

37. See for instance the Report of the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee (Ottawa: Information Services, Department of Communications, Government of Canada, 1982), 15: "We start from a view of Canadian society that sees it as an aggregate of distinctive spheres of activity. Each of these has its own values and purposes and its own network of institutions, interacting with one another in myriad ways but equal in their social importance. The political order — the state — is one of these great spheres and institutional systems; the cultural world is another."
See also Theodor W. Adorno, "Culture and Administration," *TELOS* No. 37, Fall 1978, 93-111.

38. John Meisel, "Escaping Extinction: Cultural Defence of an Undefended Border," *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*, 10. 1-2, Winter/Spring 1986, 248, 252.

39. "Telefilm Fund Ready To Make 'Movies,' Not 'Films,' Sez Pearson," Variety, Dec. 3, 1986, 32. A certain sense of déjà vu or perhaps déjà entendu was echoed by the Variety writer's lead paragraph: "As it makes its decades-old pitch again to 'strike a new deal' in the international film industry and unhitch the 'old hegemony' of Hollywood, Canada is getting ready to make 'movies' rather than 'films'...".

40. Survival, op. cit., 35, 39.

41. Ibid., 33.

42. See Innis, op cit., 386, also A.R.M. Lower, *Colony To Nation* (Toronto: Longmans, 1946), 399.

43. Wilden, op. cit., 71.

44. D. G. Creighton, *Dominion of the North* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1967), 217.

45. Sara Jeannette Duncan, *The Imperialist* (Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1971), 61-62.

46. In *The Bush Garden: Essays on the Canadian Imagination* (Toronto: Anansi, 1971), 220.

47. *The Canadian Question*, 1875, cited in Wilden, op. cit., 123.

48. *The Bush Garden*, op. cit., 226.

49. Ibid., 236.

50. Ibid., 135.

51. Ibid, 231.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid, 135.

54. Arthur Kroker, *Technology and the Canadian Mind: Innis/McLuhan/Grant* (Montreal: New World Perspectives, 1984), 15.

55. Innis, op. cit., 386.

56. Ibid.

57. Ibid, 385-389.

58. Ibid., 392.

59. Cited in Wallace Clement and Daniel Drache, *A Practical Guide To Canadian Political Economy* (Toronto: James Lorimer & Co., 1978), 24. The poem does not appear in the Canada Council grant-supported subsequent editions of *Counterblast*: Toronto (1969), New York (1969) and Montreal (1972).

60. See Kroker, op. cit., 80.

61. Ibid., 86.

62. George Grant, *Time As History* (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1969), 33.

63. See *Time As History*, 34-35; also George Grant, *Technology and Justice* (Toronto: Anansi, 1986), 100, and Joan E. O'Donovan, *George Grant and The Twilight of Justice* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 4, 87.

64. *Time As History*, op. cit., 33.

65. Ibid., 40.

66. *Lament For A Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1965), 5.

67. Ibid., 66, 76.

68. Ibid., 88.

69. See *Time As History*, 46-47.

70. Op. cit., 4.

71. For such a "superlative" view of the historian, see Emery Neff, *The Poetry of History: The Contribution of Literature and Literary Scholarship to the Writing of History since Voltaire*, (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1947).

72. See Carl Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing:* 1900 to 1970, (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1976), ix, 259 and passim.

73. "Canada's historians have all been nationalists," Berger, op. cit., 259.

74. "La Survivance English-Canadian Style," in *The Maple Leaf Forever: Essays on Nationalism and Politics in Canada*, (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1977), 144.

75. Ibid., 126.

76. Written with John T. Saywell and John C. Ricker (Toronto and Vancouver: Clarke, Irwin & Co. Ltd.).

77. Ibid., p.xi.

78. Op. cit., 409.

79. On the depths of Canada's "long-accumulated" and "suppressed resentments" towards the United States, see Morton's "Canada and the United States," in *The Canadian Identity* (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1972), 58-87.

80. See *Colony To Nation* (Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1946), 399-401.

81. Ibid., 404.

82. Cited in Berger, op. cit., 252.

83. *Colony to Nation*, 560.

84. Susanna Moodie, *Roughing It in the Bush or Forest Life in Canada* (1852), (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1962), xv.

85. Ibid., xvi.

86. Ibid., xvi-xvii.

87. Cited in I.S. Maclaren, "The Aesthetic Mapping of Nature in the Second Franklin Expedition," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 20:1, Spring 1985, 41.

88. Moodie, op. cit., 22,23,24.

89. Ibid., 26,31.

90. Ibid.

91. Cited in Wilden, op. cit., 3.

92. See Karen Davison-Wood, *A Philistine Culture? Literature, Painting and the Newspapers in Late Victorian Toronto*, PhD Dissertation, Concordia University, 1981, pp. 267-8.

93. Duncan, op.cit., 70.

94. Ibid., 70-71.

95. Ibid., 98.

96. *A Concise History of Canadian Painting* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1973), 7.

97. Robert Kleyn, "Canadian Art or Canadian Artists?", *Vanguard*, February 1985, 29.

98. Op. cit., 578.

99. J. Russell Harper, *Painting in Canada: A History*, 2nd ed. (Toronto and Quebec City: University of Toronto Press and Les presses de l'université Laval, 1977), 180.

100. Ibid., 181.

101. Ibid., 183.

102. W. Stewart McNutt, *Days of Lorne* (Fredricton, 1955), cited in Harper, 184. See also Davison-Wood, op. cit., 121.

103. See Harper, 182-183; Gene Walz, "Flashback: An Introduction" in Gene Walz, ed., *Flashback: People and Institutions in Canadian Film History*, (Montreal: Mediatexte Publications, 1986), 9-15; John Porter, "Artists Discovering Film: Postwar Toronto," *Vanguard*, Summer 1984, 24-26.

104. Harper, op. cit., 180, 183, 194.

105. See "Surrealism: The Last Snap-shot of the European Intelligentsia," in *Reflections*, ed. and intro. Peter Demetz, (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovitch, 1978), 192; also Abraham Moles, *Psychologie du Kitsch: L'art du bonheur* (Paris: HMH, 1971.

106. Harper, op. cit., 288; see also Ramsay Cook, "Landscape Painting and National Sentiment in Canada," in *The Maple Leaf Forever*, op. cit., 158-179.

107. Cited in Harper, 264.

108. Ibid., 263, 279.

109. Ibid., 288.

110. Reid, op. cit., 151.

111. Ibid., 152.

112. See Peter Morris, "After Grierson: The National Film Board 1945-1953," in Seth Feldman, ed. *Take Two: A Tribute To Film in Canada* (Toronto: Irwin, 1984), 182-194.

113. In a comment on part of this paper presented at the Film Studies Association of Canada/Association québécoise des études cinématographiques Annual Conference (May 21-24, 1987) in Montreal, Professor Paul Warren of Laval suggested that, of all modern art forms, cinema might be the one whose content is most directly and literally 'pure' ressentiment, ie., a matter of the re-experiencing of feelings.

114. Peter Morris, *Embattled Shadows: A History of Canadian Cinema, 1895-1939* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978), 37.

115. Ibid., 93.

116. Ibid, 95.

117. Roland Barthes, *S/Z* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1974), 55.

118. Morris, op. cit., 33.

119. See Seth Feldman, ed. *Take Two*, op. cit., passim, but especially his very important article, "The Silent Subject in English Canadian Film", 48-57.

120. See R. Bruce Elder, "Image: Representation and Object — The Photographic Image in Canadian Avant-Garde Film" in *Take Two*, 246-263.

121. *Time As History*, op. cit., 40.

122. Op. cit, 93.

123. Op. cit., 235.

124. Cited in Cook, Maple Leaf, op. cit., 158.

125. *The Wacousta Syndrome: Explorations in the Canadian Langscape* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), passim.

126. Op. cit., 12.

127. Op. cit, 53.

128. Op. cit., 13.

129. Op. cit., 229.

130. In Peter Russell, ed. *Nationalism in Canada* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 27-46.

131. See Neil McWilliam and Alex Potts, "The Landscape of Reaction" in A.L. Rees & F. Borzello, eds., *The New Art History* (London: Camden Press, 1986), 106-119.

132. See R.K. Crook, "Modernization and Nostalgia: A Note on the Sociology of Pessimism", *Queen's Quarterly*, LXXIII: 2, Summer 1966, 289-283.