

**“THE VOID IS NOT SO BLEAK”:
RHETORIC AND STRUCTURE IN CANADIAN
EXPERIMENTAL FILM**

Michael Dorland

First we eat, then we talk about God

Hegel

The Discourse of Commoditism

In a recent and perhaps predictably bleak survey of the distribution in Canada of films by filmmaker-artists, filmmaker-lobbyist Mike Hoolboom found that

...there isn't a single film artist in Canada who's able to make a living [from filmmaking]...or who could even afford to pay the RENT....I think it's time some of us got together and decided whether the situation as it stands is acceptable or not, and if not to what lengths we would be willing to go in order to change it. So far as I'm concerned the bottom line is clear: as someone devoted to my art I should be able to make my work and live.¹

Hoolboom's words, including a call for Canadian content quotas in movie theatres², fully echo the spirit if not almost the letter of those of an earlier filmmaker turned lobbyist. In April 1974, Peter Pearson, chairman of the then feature filmmakers' lobby, the Council of Canadian Filmmakers, told a Commons committee:

EXPERIMENTAL FILM

In six years, we have learned that the system does not work for Canadians. The film financing system does not work. 13 features were produced in English-Canada in 1972; 6 in 73; only 1 in 1974. The film distribution system does not work. In 1972 less than 2% of the movies shown in Ontario were Canadian....The film exhibition system does not work. The foreign-dominated theatre industry, grossing over \$140,000,000 at the box-office in 1972 is recycling only nickels and dimes into future domestic production. It is no wonder then that the Canadian Film Development Corporation cannot possibly work, and neither can we.³

And Pearson's words in turn echo those of an earlier critic also turned lobbyist, Gerald Pratley, in his baleful assessment of the state of Canadian filmmaking several decades before.

The history of film production in Canada is short and mostly undistinguished. It is one long, frustrating chapter of plans made and never realised...of large sums of money invested in brave ideas and ending in bankruptcy....Due to a combination of two factors—the country's proximity to the USA and lack of initiative on the part of the government....—most of Canada's talented people left the country. There was no work....⁴

One could keep tracing such arguments back in time. And if one did one would find that instead of film they would apply to an earlier economy and some other, previous commodity—lumber, canals, railroads, wheat—but whatever the commodity, the logic of argument would remain the same. Namely, that the regularization of production by government policy was a *civilizing* act, that is to say, a cultural action. In this logic, the measure of the rational organization of production is assessed in cultural terms. Culture, it would seem, was to be a, if not the, barometer of Canadian development. Thus according to the front-page of the *Toronto Globe* on July 1, 1867, "we celebrate the inauguration of a new nationality to which are committed the interests of Christianity and civilization over a territory larger than that of the ancient Roman empire...." Thus Joseph Taché speaking in the Commons in 1883: "After...having concluded a political union between [the Provinces], it was desirable that this political federation...be crowned with an intellectual, a scientific and literary federation....[that would be] the crowning of the great structure created by the statesmen whose genius accomplished the work of Confederation." Thus too, in a more recent example, Flora Macdonald's first speech as minister of Communications in July 1987 in which she stated that "...our ultimate goal is the development of a Canadian film culture." "This goal," she went on, however, would first be best assured "if the industry has a sound industrial base."

Mike Hoolboom's spring 1988 report on the distribution problems faced by the Canadian film artist thus articulates itself within several deep continuities: a) the discursive logic of Canadian cultural (here film) policy that is in turn but a moment in b) a productivist logic of which culture is the quantitative aggregate. Such a logic may not necessarily

EXPERIMENTAL FILM

lend itself to a theory of art and perhaps even less to a theory of indigenous or Canadian art: indeed, such a logic could be taken as a blank cheque for the importation of culture since what matters is, above all, that quantities augment, their source being secondary. Where this would leave a theory of indigenous art is a question I will hold in abeyance for now. Instead of a theory of art, then, this is more a theory of political economy, and in particular the one that in the Canadian tradition Michal Bodemann has identified as the dominant discourse of "commoditism."⁵ According to Bodemann, commoditism consists of 1) a view of Canada in terms of commodities or, in other words, a commodity view of social (and for that matter aesthetic) relations; 2) a view of Canadian commodity production as fragile and in need of a protective shield and, as a result of the need for protection, 3) the necessity to relegate power to a circumscribed elite.

In Hoolboom's text, the commodity nature of the film artist stems from the fact that she/he can neither make a living nor pay the rent from her/his art. (As he puts it of himself, "as someone devoted to my art I should be able to make my work and live".) This precarious commodity status is the reason why it is (always) necessary "to lobby for the many things we need locally and federally (Canadian content in theatres for instance, censorship, copyright)." Thus the necessity to relegate more power to a circumscribed elite; in this instance, the film artist: "it's time now to turn some of the ingenuity and inspiration that's gone into making artist's film into changing a situation where we continue to speak unheard, to create unnoticed, to put work into a void."

Let me be perfectly clear here that this is in no way to be construed as an attack on Michael Hoolboom. Instead, I am puzzled both by the sudden fits of attention as well as the accompanying arguments that get put forth on behalf of Canadian experimental or "artist's film", of which Hoolboom's is but one recent example, yet an example that, conscious or not, can be situated within a tradition of Canadian argumentation. More broadly, though, the questions I want to raise are: what are the arguments that have been made for Canadian experimental film and why are they being made again now?

What is most striking in Hoolboom's text is that it is *not* an argument for Canadian artist's film *per se*. He would respond that it wasn't meant to be that: "my small piece on distribution [was] meant really just for filmmakers so we could have a sense of where we all stand in relation to one another and the great world beyond."⁶ Instead, it is the argument for Canadian production, whether codfish catches or artist's film. Interestingly Hoolboom does not, in the distribution survey, make a *single* claim for Canadian artist's film *other* than its insufficient commodity status. Yet Hoolboom's argument is the more or less standard argument for Canadian production (here cultural production) but could, as I have tried to suggest, apply equally to railways, to Avro Arrows or Telidons. This sort of generic argument implies that cultural production is *as valid* a form

EXPERIMENTAL FILM

of Canadian production as any other: that is, a form of production whose validity derives not so much from an aesthetic argument, as from an historical (and often state-supported) regularization of the ability of the producing social group to specialize in that type of production. There would appear in Hoolboom's text not to be the slightest doubt that the type of production he specializes in can be anything but legitimate especially since, as he suggests, he has a calling for it ("as someone devoted to my art..."). As Max Weber reminds us in *The Protestant Ethic*, this kind of unquestioned acceptance of one's earthly calling is an early but unmistakable sign of "the spirit of capitalism"; that is, of a moral justification for worldly activity.⁷

The Experimental Documentary

Inadvertently perhaps, Hoolboom's text suggests other clues in this direction. Since he makes no particular claims for Canadian artist's film, his emphasis on commoditism makes his discourse the same as that which was used to argue for development of Canada's film "industry". The latter, and principally through state-subsidy in response to the discourse of commoditism, had from the poverty-stricken beginnings noted earlier both by Pearson and Pratley, grown, using 1986 figures, large enough to be able to make a \$930,000,000 contribution to the Canadian GNP.⁸ Yet the latter too is and remains part of a cinema which Peter Harcourt first termed "an invisible cinema"⁹, an 'industry' that continues to, as Hoolboom puts it of artist's film, "speak unheard...create unnoticed, to put work into a void". In other words, the continued relative invisibility of Canadian cinema has not been an obstacle—on the contrary, it has probably been crucial—to some producers' ability to make a lot of money. And Canadian cinema has managed to commodify itself to just under the billion-dollar mark without benefit of particularly elaborate aesthetic claims in support of its practices. The discourse of commoditism in the Canadian context is, one may suppose, thus relatively efficient, which may explain its popularity, and which might account for the fact that such discourse is surfacing in Canadian experimental or artist film.

A second implication of the discursive continuity that has prevailed in Canadian cinema generally—and this suggests not merely a rhetorical continuity for reasons of political-economic efficiency but an internal and structural continuity—would be that Canadian experimental or artist cinema, to the extent there is such a thing, is an extension of the Canadian cinematic project generally, to the extent that there is such a thing. Here I will attempt what can no doubt be considered a formidable reduction. I would suggest that if Canadian cinema has been fundamentally preoccupied with that particular variant of documentary which Deborah Knight has defined as "exquisite nostalgia"¹⁰, then Canadian experimental or artist cinema is a variant of that: not experimental cin-

EXPERIMENTAL FILM

ema so much as an overwhelming preoccupation with one aspect of it or what one could call *the experimental documentary*.

If one takes just about any of the "classics" of Canadian experimental cinema — for instance, Snow's *Région Centrale* (1971), Wieland's *Reason Over Passion* (1968-69), Chambers' *Hart of London* (1968-70), Rimmer's *Canadian Pacifics* (1974-75), Hancox's *Landfall* (1983)— what do they have in common? They are examining elements of consciousness (machine- or apparatus-consciousness for Snow and Rimmer, political-iconic consciousness for Wieland, tragic consciousness for Chambers, or a poetically metaphysical consciousness for Hancox) in their relations to a "real" place that is both the specific sites of their actual making and, beyond, Canada. They are documenting possible forms of consciousness that might arise in response to Northrop Frye's famous notion 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?'¹¹

In Canadian cinematic terms, that disturbed sensibility has been described by Bruce Elder as a "naive realism", that is to say,

a kind of self-abandonment in the face of reality [that] implies a form of consciousness which is alienated from the world and whose sole activity is limited to passive observation — a consciousness then which plays no role in the structuring either of reality or of our perception of it. The continual rehearsal of the process of becoming familiar with the everyday things around us suggests the extreme alienation of this consciousness as it tries to come to terms with a world beyond itself.¹²

Canadian experimental film, I'm suggesting, has been a coming to terms with documenting the transition from naive to a more self-conscious realism, but a realism nonetheless.

In the 1987 Power Plant retrospective of Toronto filmmaking that he curated, Blaine Allen observes of the work of Toronto filmmakers over the previous decade:

Principally they involve the reclamation of place and the artist's voice and identity. They evoke the play of entanglement and alienation, of proximity and distance, of having a sense of location and of not knowing just where you are....Perhaps the most consistent element in the films is the evidence of the filmmaker him or herself, included almost as an act of reassurance.¹³

But why stop at Toronto? One could say the same of Richard Hancox's poetry films, taking him as a filmmaker from PEI, or Barbara Sternberg's *Transitions* (1982) made in Nova Scotia, or the frantic ending of Rim-

EXPERIMENTAL FILM

mer's Vancouver-made *Canadian Pacific II*.

The concept of experimental documentary allows one, I would suggest, to grasp what Allen calls "the reclamation of place and the artist's voice and identity" as separate yet related strategies, moving from 1) *abstract place* (of which Snow's *Région Centrale* is perhaps the best example), through 2) the personal, autobiographical or home movie phase of Canadian experimental film¹⁴, through 3) the dialectical fusion of the two (place and identity) or what one could call the *abstract personal* of, say, Chambers' *Hart of London* or the quest-romance portions of Elder's *The Book of All The Dead* cycle.

A third implication, then, of such continuities (the rhetoric of commoditism and the structures of the documentary of consciousness) would be that Canadian experimental or artist film, in its preoccupation with the Canadian landscape, has tended to act as the "artistic" analog of what the Laurentian thesis has been in Canadian social thought. This thesis, whose principal exponents were the University of Toronto economic historians Innis and Creighton, could be somewhat crudely understood as a narrow geographic determinism or environmentalism. A little less crudely, W.L. Morton writes that "the implications of the Laurentian thesis are... a metropolitan economy, a political imperialism of the metropolitan areas and uniformity of the metropolitan culture throughout the hinterlands."¹⁵ Paradoxical as it would seem, this would suggest in the argumentative economy of Canadian experimental film a high degree of dependency upon more developed metropolitan economies for the arguments necessary to further practices that may, in important respects, be quite at variance with those very arguments. For instance, it is very striking (at least to me) how much what reputation Canadian experimental film possesses is due to non-Canadian critics: whether Gene Youngblood on Rimmer¹⁶, Brakhage on Chambers or Elder¹⁷, Sitney on Snow (and for a while on Wieland)¹⁸, Rabinovitz on Wieland¹⁹, etc. Even Seth Feldman argues for the domestic relevance of Canadian experimental film because "it is already seen internationally as Canada's foremost contribution to contemporary cinematic discourse."²⁰ That this external "critical imperialism" has internally helped configure Canadian experimental film within the dominance of Canadian metropolitan economies and the uniformity of metropolitan culture throughout the hinterlands can perhaps be illustrated by Richard Kerr's canon of "the rich heritage of Canada's avant-garde artist" that includes Frampton, Elder, Snow, Brakhage, Sitney, etc.²¹ There are no doubt other such effects discernible.

The C-words

I have been trying to suggest that a Canadian coming to terms with Canadian experimental film has dispensed with the need to develop aes-

EXPERIMENTAL FILM

thetic arguments on its behalf because a) it can function without them to the extent they are implied within the recourse to Canadian production traditions and b) because these aesthetic arguments have been supplied from without. In this sense, the lack of an aesthetic argument in Hoolboom's case for Canadian artist film is less surprising than it might first seem.

Here, though, one would have to examine other arguments beside Hoolboom's that have been made for the Canadian artist film and I propose to look at two such texts shortly. However, the general principle of such arguments has been recently and succinctly summed up by T.D. MacLulich²² in relation to literature as "attempts to incorporate Canadian writers into the international avant-garde....to show that the works of one or more Canadian authors are just as metafictional, self-reflexive or deconstructive as the works of leading European or American authors." For MacLulich considers that "the current enthusiasm for avant-garde forms of critical theory holds little promise of remedying the deficiencies—if they are deficiencies—of past Canadian criticism", largely, he argues, because a criticism removed from its social context makes meaningless such hybrid literary-political categories as Canadian literature, Canadian cinema, Canadian experimental or artist film. It is, he suggests, because of the continued, stubborn and—why not say it?—*stupid* presence of the C-words (Canadian culture)—that the continuing question: "what is 'Canadian' about Canadian literature/art/film?"—becomes the only question that will justify isolating Canadian literature/art/film as a distinct field of inquiry.²³

Let me then turn to two such Canadian texts, one about Canadian experimental film, the other about Canadian art, and see how they both deal with 1) the incorporation of Canadian art into the discourse of an international avant-garde and 2) the Canadianness of their objects.

The two texts are R. Bruce Elder's classic "Image: Representation and Object" on the photographic image in Canadian avant-garde film²⁴ and an unpublished paper by Gaile McGregor on Canadian art and postmodernism entitled "Geography, I-site and (Post)Modernism."²⁵

Both texts at first glance seem to illustrate McLulich's thesis on attempts to incorporate Canadian artistic production into an international avant-garde, here that of postmodernism. Elder says that Snow "was perhaps the key innovator...of postmodernist filmmaking" while McGregor suggests "that Canada, having come into its own as an independent cultural entity at a later date than the United States, simply skipped modernism altogether, thus ending up 'further ahead' simply as an after-effect of its early retardation." But the seeming affinity of Canadian artists for postmodern practices, while giving these Canadian practices the *cachet* of current (if not by now slightly tattered) theoretical fashion, only serves to unconceal specific characteristics of Canadian art itself: 1) for Elder, that "Canadian avant-garde film is *anti*-modernist in conviction" (my emphasis); and 2) for McGregor, that the Canadian oeuvre is character-

EXPERIMENTAL FILM

ised by "the discrepancy between what it says and what is said about it."

While it is not very clear exactly what Elder means by the anti-modernism of Canadian avant-garde films, as he only refers to this once, it is, I think, possible to understand by this a preoccupation with the ambiguity of representations of the external world as opposed to modernist works that, in his definition, "'present' the structure of their own internal relationships." Unlike the modernist painter or writer, the (anti-modernist) Canadian filmmaker's "raw materials are...the stuff of the world, observed from a certain point of view." At best, the photographer/filmmaker can only discover the world, it is not created by him/her. As Elder explains this in an earlier text²⁶:

The representation of the world is not a parallel construct to the real world articulated in accordance with certain aesthetic demands; it is a trace of the real world informed by the same structural principles as the real itself. This of course profoundly affects the nature of the filmmaker's enterprise. His task is no longer creation but rather revelation. The process of making such a work is not the forging of an imaginative construct through an act of will but rather one of attentive submission on the part of the filmmaker; the goal of art is no longer seen as that of producing beauty but rather truth.

The "truth" of the photographic representation and what distinguishes it from painting, poetry, drawing or fictional writing is that it "cannot depict objects or events which never actually existed." The truth of Canadian avant-garde film's anti-modernity—for this is what is at issue, a *Canadian* theory of modernity is, to generalize from Elder's discussion of Snow, that it is *historical*: "The study of how things evolve over time is one that can properly be termed historical." Historical temporality "embraces the past and the future; it is not confined to the present alone. It leads one out of the present...toward that which is furnished only by reflexive acts of consciousness..." This, of course, opens up the question of the historical consciousness in the Canadian mind which is too large and tentative a question to get into here; I simply want to draw attention to it.

McGregor suggests something strikingly similar: Canadian art is historical. Canadian art's "apparent postmodernism...[is] rooted in, and pre-saged by, culture-specific features in the oeuvre of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries." Unlike the American artist who "spoke loudly of 'creating', the Canadian typically conceptualized his task as 'taking a view'—that is, reproducing the landscape-as-given. Before Confederation, the field of landscape painting was dominated by the British military topographers, with their passion for scientific exactitude; afterwards it was the camera which provided the exemplar for 'artistic' activity."

And so, she continues,

The nature we infer from Canadian landscape painting, even when not explicitly inimical, is alien, impenetrable, overwhelming

EXPERIMENTAL FILM

to the point of claustrophobia...It is a world...which categorically denies us entry...the characterizing feature of the Canadian world view is...neither affirmation nor abhorrence but a radical, deep-seated ambivalence.

For McGregor, the Canadian oeuvre is tentative, self-deprecating, isolated, evasive, yet ordered, replete with enclosure images, while also replete with signs of anxiety about the integrity and meaning of these enclosures. "The Canadian's obsession with such motifs reflects/reveals an obsessive need—stimulated by that first encounter with an unassimilable environment—to pin down, map, explore the ambiguous interface between self and non-self."

If now one thinks again of Snow's *Région Centrale*, Wieland's *Reason over Passion*, Chamber's *Hart*, or the works of Rimmer, Hancox, Elder, etc., then perhaps my earlier characterization of Canadian artist film as experimental documentary may not be quite as reductive as it might first have seemed.

By the end of her text, McGregor suggests that the "apparent alignment" of Canadian art "with a particular world 'ism'" is "absurd", leading her to conclude that "we may have to rethink not only modernism and postmodernism, but the whole problem of so-called international culture." Elder is not nearly so tidy, but if I can extract some kind of conclusion from his text it would be that "Canadian cinema *in all its forms* has been preoccupied with...the attempt to comprehend the paradoxes inherent in that medium" (emphasis added); that medium being *Canadian* cinema, one aspect of which, but only one, might be the paradoxes of the photographic image that Elder analyzes at length in his text. In other words, both texts return us to Maclulich's suggestion that the question "what is Canadian about Canadian literature/art/film?" is the only question that will justify isolating Canadian literature/art/film as a distinct field of inquiry.

Taciturn Beavers or Dissimulations of Canadian Discourse

Foregrounding the Canadianness of Canadian experimental film allows the emergence of a radically different object from the shadows of its discursive disguises. Not a cultural export commodity produced for the international market of advanced aestheticism, but an anti-aesthetic searching for commodification within the domestic staples economy. Not avant-gardism but, within a marginalized "national cinema", a marginal experimental form of documentary seeking governmentalization in the name of a national policy of cultural production. Not a precursor of the postmodern, but an anti-modernism in a solipsistic economy of total cultural solitude. For the discourse of Canadian experimental film is a discourse of strategic dissimulation structured by what Mackenzie King, with Canada in mind, once called "the economy of God".²⁷

EXPERIMENTAL FILM

In such a divine economy, angelic elites sing hosannas of praise to the selfless who transform raw materials into the bounties of cultural wealth. This is the divine economy of Northrop Frye's pastoral New World vision of Canada as David Cook summarizes it:

we need a more imaginative way of seeing things that retains the social vision of the pastoral myth, yet honours the technological underpinnings of the myth in the energy of the taciturn beavers.²⁸

And honouring the energy of the taciturn beavers is, according to Frye, the task of the angelic critic. For, outside the divine economy, and particularly so in Canada, there can be only "the sense of being imprisoned in the belly of a mindless emptiness... at its bleakest and most uncompromising." In that de-divinized emptiness, "the ego's one moment of genuine dignity...is the moment either of death or of some equally final alienation."²⁹

But it is precisely those very moments of final alienation which Canadian experimental film has attempted to document again and again—surviving the attempt, as testified for example by the turn of Bruce Elder (our leading film theologian) from the discourse of lamentation to that of consolation. Similarly, it is the intuition of having participated in that documentary achievement (i.e., not so much an aesthetic as an ontology) that, I would suggest, grounds the discourse of commoditism.

That Canadian experimental film has so far received little critical consideration other than of its taciturnity argues not only for continued revision of the corpus but, above all, for its (re)writing. This time, outside the economy of God.

Communication Studies
Concordia University

This is a revised version of a talk given at the National Gallery of Canada, June 23, 1988.

Notes

1. "Artist's Film Distribution in Canada: Some Thoughts About", *The Independent Eye*, Newsletter of the Canadian Filmmakers Distribution Centre, Spring 1988, 6-9.
2. Quotas for Canadian films on Canadian screens remain as utopian a demand as ever, although hardly a radical demand as even such a longtime 'observer' of the Canadian film scene as Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, is in favour of a 10% screen quota today. See the MPAA brief published under the title "The domino game: Canadian distribution as a global threat to the American way of life," Annexes to the brief, *Cinema Canada* No. 152, May 1988, 19-21.
3. Cited in Council of Canadian Filmmakers monthly column, *Cinema Canada* 14, June/July 1974, 64.

EXPERIMENTAL FILM

4. Gerald Pratley, "Canadian Film" in Peter Cowie, ed., *A Concise History of the Cinema*, London: A. Zwemmer, 1971.
5. See Y. Michal Bodemann, "Elitism, Fragility and Commoditism: Three Themes in the Canadian Sociological Mythology," in S.D. Berkowitz, ed., *Models and Myths in Canadian Sociology*, Toronto: Butterworths, 1984, 210-228.
6. Personal communication, undated, 1988.
7. See *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, New York: Scribner's, 1958.
8. See Federal-Provincial-Territorial Meeting of Ministers on Film and Books, "Cultural Sovereignty" Document 830-202/006, March 3-4, 1986, 8. As no breakdown of the figure of \$930 m is given other than the mention that it includes "all the traditional/established cultural sectors", one may conclude that it is largely a rhetorical aggregate.
9. See Peter Harcourt, "The Invisible Cinema", *Ciné-tracts*, Spring-Summer 1978, 48-9.
10. See "Exquisite Nostalgia: Aesthetic Sensibility in the English-Canadian and Quebec cinemas," *Cine-Action* 11, Winter 87-88, 30-37.
11. See *The Bush Garden: Essays on the Canadian Imagination*, Toronto: Anansi, 1971, 220.
12. Bruce Elder, "On the Candid-Eye Movement," in Seth Feldman and Joyce Nelson, eds. *Canadian Film Reader*, Toronto: PMA, 1977, 92-3.
13. See Blaine Allen, "It's Not Finished Yet (Some Notes on Toronto Filmmaking)" in *Toronto: A Play of History* exhibition catalogue, The Power Plant, Summer 1987.
14. Here one of Elder's earliest texts makes this clear: "That such films should be of a deeply personal nature is hardly surprising....For such a filmmaker...filmmaking becomes one of the simple tasks of daily life, perhaps even the center of his life. And if all aspects of his life become grist for the mill of filmmaking, then naturally his life becomes, if not itself something of an art form, then at least something which is valued and consciously cultivated as the source of his art." See *Autobiography: Film/Video/Photography*, ed. John Stuart Katz, Art Gallery of Ontario, 1978, 43.
15. See W.L. Morton, "Clio in Canada: The Interpretation of Canadian History," in Carl Berger, ed. & intro., *Approaches to Canadian History*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970, 46.
16. See for instance "The New Canadian Cinema" in Feldman & Nelson, 323 ff.
17. See, for instance, the excerpt by Brakhage from a 100 page transcript of a Spring 1987 symposium held at the University of Regina featuring Brakhage and Elder, "Jack Chambers" in *The Independent Eye*, 10:1, Fall 1988, 12.
18. See "Structural Film" in P. Adams Sitney, ed. & intro. *Film Culture Reader*, New York: Praeger, 1970, 326 ff.
19. See for instance "The Development of Feminist Strategies in the Experimental Films of Joyce Wieland," *Film Reader* 5, 1982, 132-9.
20. Seth Feldman, ed. & intro, *Take Two: A Tribute to Film in Canada*, Toronto: Irwin, 1984, 246.
21. See "On (Experimental) Film" in *Cinema Canada* 145, October 1987, 78-9.

EXPERIMENTAL FILM

22. In "Thematic Criticism, Literary Nationalism and the Critic's New Clothes," *Essays in Canadian Writing* 35, Winter 1987, 17-36.
23. *Ibid.*, 31, 32, 33.
24. In Feldman, *Take Two*, 246-263.
25. Forthcoming in an expanded version in Gaile McGregor, ed. *Canadian Art and Contemporary Theory*, University of Toronto Press.
26. On the Candid-Eye Movement, 88-89.
27. In *Industry and Humanity: A Study in the Principles Underlying Industrial Reconstruction*, Toronto: Thos. Allen, 1918, 363, cited in Joyce Nelson, *The Colonized Eye: Rethinking the Grierson Legend*, Toronto: BTL, 1988, 52. The passage reads as follows: "Each nation may yet find the salvation of its own industrial life by losing itself in an effort to save the industrial lives of other and rival nations. It is in such ways, through the course of time, that the economy of God gains world expression."
28. David Cook, *Northrop Frye: A Vision of the New World*, Montreal: New World Perspectives, 1985, 101.
29. Northrop Frye, "Haunted by Lack of Ghosts: Some Patterns in the Imagery of Canadian Poetry" in David Staines, ed., *The Canadian Imagination: Dimensions of a Literary Culture*, Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1977, 37-38.