

# ACCUTE Newsletter

December 1992

Department of English ♦ University of Guelph ♦ Guelph, ON N1G 2W1 ♦ (519) 824-4120, x3268 ♦ Fax: (519) 837-1315  
President: Michael Keefer ♦ Secretary/Treasurer: Ann Wilson ♦ Executive Assistant: Dorothy Hadfield

Published by the Association of Canadian College and University Teachers of English ISSN 1187-8282  
Publication of this Newsletter is supported by funds from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

## ACCUTE Electronic Mailbox

ACCUTE now has an online computer "mailbox" that can be used to communicate information of urgent interest to our members. Members having information they would like to have appear in the electronic mailbox should send it by fax to 519-837-1315 and we will post it. To access the mailbox from your E-mail account, call [LISTSERV@vm.uoguelph.ca](mailto:LISTSERV@vm.uoguelph.ca). Once connected, enter the command **SUB ACCUTEMB name**, where "name" is your full name, not your userid.

### Inside this issue:

#### The Research Council Merger:

Cause for Concern ..... 2  
*by Michael Keefer, University of Guelph*

#### Thinking About the Profession

Even More Thoughts on "Professional Skills" ..... 7  
*by Clara Thomas, F.R.S.C.  
Professor Emeritus, York University*

The Hard Facts Figured ..... 7  
*by Kim Ian Michasiw, York University*

A Response to Kim Ian Michasiw ..... 9  
*by Michael Keefer*

Calls for Papers / Conference Notices ..... 10

President's Column ..... 11  
*New Directions in English Studies in Canada*

CACE/ACCUTE Listing of Academic Positions ..... 12

News of Members ..... 13

1993 Membership Form ..... 15

## The Research Council Merger: Cause for Concern

*by Michael Keefer  
University of Guelph*

The Mulroney government's decision last year to merge the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada with the Canada Council and with the Department of External Affairs' special cultural programs was taken without any visible consultation of the scholarly and artistic communities. It is therefore scarcely surprising that these communities were not invited to take any part in the discussions which preceded the announcement, in the last week of November 1992, of the legislation designed to bring about this merger. Equally characteristic of this government's evident contempt both for scholars and also for writers and other artists, is the announcement that it intends to pass this legislation before the end of the current session of parliament — that is to say, before Christmas.

There were very good reasons for the separation in 1978 of humanities and social sciences research funding from arts funding, and for the corresponding establishment of the SSHRC as distinct from the Canada Council. In reversing this separation, the Mulroney government has not offered any comparably persuasive arguments to show that the communities presently served by the two councils will benefit from the merger, or that there will be any significant saving in administrative costs. What then is the government's agenda? And what should our response be?

### The legislation

Let's consider the proposed legislation. The council merger figures as Part II of an omnibus bill, C-93, which also deals with

twenty-five other distinct matters. According to the preamble to Part III,

The purpose of this part is to wind up the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and transfer its functions and staff to the Canada Council and to transfer certain functions and staff of the Department of External Affairs concerned with the promotion of Canadian culture abroad to the Canada Council. The Canada Council would be renamed the Canada Council for the Arts and for Research in the Social Sciences and Humanities to reflect its expanded functions.

As Craig McNaughton, Executive Director of the Canadian Federation for the Humanities, has observed, the language of Bill C-93 gives the "strong impression... that the Government is simply 'tacking on' the research function to the arts function." The government, he suggests, "is not serious about maintaining the momentum of the research enterprise created through SSHRC over the past fourteen years. The original promise was that this would be a brand new agency with equal weight given to each former component. It is not."

There is indeed cause for concern in the details of what the legislation says — and equally so in what it does not say.

Bill C-93 separates the function of management from that of governance. It provides for a President (the Council's chief executive officer) and a Vice-President, and at the same time establishes a governing Council of 21 members. The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of this Council, like the President and Vice-President, are to be appointed for a term of five years, and the other council members will be appointed for a term of three years. So far, so good — and

the fact that Dr. Paule Leduc, the present President of SSHRC, will be the first President of the new Council is no doubt grounds for relief. ACCUTE has had differences with Paule Leduc on such matters as research time stipends (a subject on which I will have something to say below), but she has stood up strongly for the interests of researchers in the humanities and social sciences.

We have every reason to be worried, however, by the fact that the government's legislation makes no provision for the oversight or approval of executive or Council appointments by parliament or by any parliamentary committee. What then prevents the government from stacking the Council (as the Reagan and Bush administrations did in a quite scandalous manner with the Advisory Council of the U.S. National Endowment for the Humanities) with people whose opinions, or rather prejudices, on cultural matters happen to coincide with its own? When I put this question to a well-informed source in Ottawa, he replied, in so many words: "Nothing — except the vigilance of the academic and cultural communities."

Equally worrisome is the fact that Bill C-93 does not require that people appointed to the governing Council should be Canadians who have made outstanding contributions or who have outstanding expertise in the humanities, the social sciences, the arts, or the area of international academic and cultural relations. The only requirement is that as a group they should be "broadly representative" of the Council's goals.

Nor does Bill C-93 assign fixed numbers of Council members to represent each of the new council's constituencies. Rather, it states in deliberately vague terms that in making such appointments the government "shall

have regard to the importance of maintaining a broadly representative membership that reflects the functions of the Council."

According to Bill C-93, the functions of the new Council are to

- (a) foster, promote, sponsor and assist the study and enjoyment of, and the production of works in, the arts;
- (b) promote, sponsor and assist research and scholarship in the social sciences and humanities;
- (c) promote a better knowledge and understanding of Canada and Canadian achievements abroad, and of other countries in Canada, through its activities in support of artists, scholars, researchers and others in Canada and abroad; and
- (d) advise ministers of the Crown with respect to any matter falling within its functions and duties.

One notes, with interest and alarm, that the word "foster" appears in clause (a) but is nowhere evident in clause (b); this is presumably a signal that the Council will be expected to focus its resources more distinctly upon the arts than upon support of research and scholarship.

Another aspect of Bill C-93 is more directly alarming — and not just to scholars in the humanities and social sciences, but to members of the artistic community as well. The Bill declares that "In performing its international functions and duties, the Council shall take into consideration the foreign policy of the Government of Canada." What, in this instance, is left of the traditional "arm's length" relationship between the government and federally-funded cultural institutions? Craig McNaughton of the CFH has commented astutely on this provision of Bill C-93:

Academic relations with other nationals and with educational institutions in foreign countries should not, save *in extremis*, be subject to Canadian foreign policy. It is one thing to try to maintain control over special programs put in place by External Affairs; it is quite another to suggest that the Council may have an obligation to constrain or disrupt research and academic relations which scholars feel are essential to the integrity of their intellectual inquiry. This provision needs limitations. This is a serious compromise of the "arm's length" relationship to Government and reflects one of the inherent difficulties with the original idea to combine functions of a government department with those of an autonomous research council.

#### Non-legislated features of the Council

According to other Ottawa sources, an informal agreement has been reached as to the probable constitution of the governing Council. It appears that there will be three members from the humanities and three from the social sciences; six from the arts community; three or four from the domain of international affairs; and the remaining five or six from "the public." For reasons that have to do both with patronage and with fair representation, scholars in the humanities and social sciences should find this arrangement deeply disturbing.

The legislation provides that Council members will be paid, in addition to travel and living expenses, an allowance for each day of Council meetings that they attend. While no-one would object to such a provision for unsalaried representatives of the arts community, the payment of allowances to *all* Council members makes it overwhelmingly

likely that the five or six members of "the public" on the Council will be patronage appointments. Remember: there is no legislative requirement that these people should possess any special expertise or reputation in the humanities, the social sciences, or the arts, let alone the domain of international academic or cultural relations. Who is to say that they will not turn out to be a most egregious (if nonetheless "broadly representative") collection of Tory party pot-scrapers, gate-greasers, bagmen, belly-scratchers and ideologues?

One might also ask why international programs should be entitled to such a large representation on the new Council. The present Canada Council employs some 250 people (including 15 who are seconded to UNESCO), and has a budget of \$105 million; SSHRC, with 110 employees, has a budget of \$105 million; the cultural and academic section of External Affairs employs 16 people in Canada and a further 55 abroad, and has a budget of \$25 million. On this basis it would seem difficult to argue that the work of the External Affairs cultural program is of comparable importance to that of SSHRC. Since, moreover, this external program is entirely secondary in nature (for only if we are training and producing scholars and artists can we think of sending them abroad), it is not evident why it should require a representation equal to or greater than that of all the humanities disciplines.

The manner in which the new Council will maintain an appropriate level of consultation and collaboration with the communities it is designed to serve is another area left undefined by the legislation. Ottawa sources have indicated that each of the three areas served by the amalgamated Council is to have a Program Advisory Committee whose membership, appointed by the

Council, will be composed in equal numbers of Council members and of people from the appropriate community. Two questions come to mind. How, in the case of the external program, is the appropriate community to be defined? (Would it consist of scholars and artists who enjoy foreign travel?) And why, if the government is really committed to establishing a Council which will be responsive to the communities it serves, are these advisory structures not written into the legislation?

The prospect of a Council only 12 of whose 21 members are to be representatives — and not necessarily distinguished ones — of the productive areas which that Council serves in the arts, the humanities, and the social sciences is not an encouraging one. However, the most serious concerns raised by the proposed new Council arise in the area of finances.

### Money matters

As mentioned above, the present Canada Council has a budget of about \$100 million; SSHRC has a budget of \$105 million (which the government has said will rise to \$117 million over the next four years); and the cultural and academic section of External Affairs has a budget of \$25 million. These funds — in particular those of the present Canada Council and of SSHRC — come from what are spoken of in the dialect of Ottawa bureaucrats as different budget “envelopes.” The Canada Council’s money comes from the “cultural envelope,” within which the Council has had to compete with the National Film Board, the CBC, and the National Museums; the Council has tended to do poorly in these competitions. SSHRC’s money, in contrast, has come from the “science or research envelope”; and if SSHRC has also done poorly in competition with the

medical and natural science research councils, it has at least been recognized as a research agency.

The government has promised that for the first several years of the new Canada Council’s operation, the existing funding arrangements would remain intact. But what then? Several Ottawa sources have expressed the opinion that it is vitally important for the humanities and social sciences that their research funding within the new Canada Council continue to come from the science or research envelope. However, one does not have to dig very deeply in Ottawa circles to discover that despite the best efforts of senior officers of the SSHRC, there is very little understanding in bureaucratic and ministerial circles of the specific identity of the humanities research community in particular, and even less sympathy for what we do. The danger that hostile or indifferent ministers will toss the new Canada Council into the cultural funding envelope, and then let the Council’s disparate components fight like cats in a bag for their share of a deliberately inadequate sum of money, is a very real one.

I mentioned above that I would have something to say here about the issue of research time stipends. This issue in fact provides a salient example of the level of incomprehension of and hostility to humanities research that seems to prevail in ministerial and bureaucratic circles in Ottawa.

For the past several years, SSHRC has restricted the amount of money that its Research Grants Adjudication Committees can spend on research time stipends to 10% of their total allocations. ACCUTE and the other member societies of the Canadian Federation for the Humanities have protested that this ceiling ignores the fact that one of

the most pressing needs among researchers in the humanities is for time in which to carry out their research. But SSHRC has remained unmoved, arguing that the ceiling on research time stipends makes it possible to fund 100 more researchers in each annual competition than would otherwise be possible, and claiming as well that SSHRC's governing Council is opposed to the idea of devoting the Council's research funds to what could be understood as direct support of the universities' teaching function.

This claim appears perverse, especially in view of the fact that SSHRC encourages researchers to include provision for the training of young scholars in their research projects. However, as several distinct Ottawa sources have indicated to me, research time stipends have in fact been understood in precisely this manner within bureaucratic and ministerial circles — as amounting to a diversion of (federal) research funds into the support of (provincial) teaching functions. SSHRC's inflexibility on this issue is, one may suppose, a simple measure of the fact that the pressure exerted from below has been outweighed by the opposing pressures from above.

In one sense, this example may seem to provide us with a discouraging lesson. But in another sense, it may remind us that if we wish our voices to be heard, we may have to raise them a little louder than we have done in the past.

### What is to be done?

I borrow this question, not from the title of Mavis Gallant's splendidly acerbic play, nor yet from Lenin's more famous (if now unread) tract of the same title — but rather from the 19th-century novel by Chernyshevsky whose title Lenin himself borrowed. I'm thinking in particular of that

passage in which Chernyshevsky's hero, an uncomplicated person of a strongly utilitarian persuasion, responded to the experience of being elbowed by an officer on the Nevsky Prospect by leaping at the man, flinging him into the gutter, and warning him that should he attempt to get up, he would promptly be dragged to a still muddier place.

The moral of this little story? Well, I wouldn't want to recommend that mild-mannered scholars start knocking the hats off every member of the government whom they encounter. But while we laugh at the macho antics of Chernyshevsky's protagonist, let us also remember another reader of this passage — the Underground Man of Dostoevsky's *Notes from Underground*, who is much closer in spirit to the contemporary scholar in the humanities, and who, having been similarly elbowed out of the way by an officer, spends much of the text in a state of abject indecision as to whether or how he can bring himself to respond.

We have been rudely shouldered aside by a government that harbours an evident contempt both for humanities and social science research and for the arts. Let us, at the very least, ensure that our colleagues and our compatriots know what is at stake in the Mulroney government's hasty and ill-considered actions.

### *Urgent Appeal*

*If you are concerned by the details of Bill C-93 and by the government's decision to act without consultation in merging the SSHRC and the Canada Council, write to Brian Mulroney, to Perrin Beatty, (Minister for Culture and Communications), to your own MP, and to Jean Chrétien and Audrey McLaughlin to let them know what you think about these matters. Let's make the issue known to the public as well with letters to local and to national newspapers.*

---

## Thinking About the Profession

---

### Even More Thoughts on "Professional Skills"

*by Clara Thomas, F.R.S.C.  
Professor Emeritus, York University*

I would like to affirm and support Sheila Delany's letter and her advice to young women academics: "Learn to say no." I would also extend it a little: "Learn to say no to administrative busy work — but ALWAYS SAY YES TO STUDENTS."

When I began teaching full-time for York at the opening of Glendon College in 1961, I had already been teaching part-time for Western and the U. of T. for 14 years. In the midst of the hoopla attendant on the early years of York, I was not considered a possible committee member, let alone a member of the Senate, though the name of the men who constituted the Faculty with me were engraved in brass on the Senate Chamber's door.

That, added to a number of sexist snubs that were considered a given at the time, generated a very creative and productive rage in me and issued in published work, a good deal of published work. Professor Delany is quite right — it worked then and it works now — somewhat dazedly the powers-that-be promoted me to full professor in 1969, the first woman to be so promoted at York. It is impossible to ignore publication, but it is all too possible to fritter away on committees energy and time better used for students and writing.

In fact, in the late forties, "The Word" as spoken by Harvard was that faculty members were expected to do two out of three of teaching, writing and administration.

How and why did we get to this three-out-of-three plateau of unreal expectation and galloping tension? Why don't we dig our heels in and stop it?

---

### The Hard Facts Figured

*by Kim Ian Michasiw  
York University*

I'm certain that Michael Keefer's "Preliminary Report on the CACE/ACCUTE Workload Survey" (*ACCUTE Newsletter*, Sept. 1992) strove in its search after "hard facts" to avoid replicating what one respondent characterized as "belly-aching and whining." However, there are several purported "hard facts" in the report that read, to me at least, as highly pitched and diaphragm-supported.

The first involves the apparent assumption that forty hours is "what most people in other walks of life would consider to be an honourable workweek" (7). This assumption may well hold true for the few remaining workers in what used to be Canada's manufacturing sector. It may also be true for clerical workers, and for those who are trapped in the growing pool of service workers. It is *not*, however, the case with most of those workers with whom university teachers would claim equal status-class.

For the majority of dedicated doctors, lawyers, architects, psychologists, editors, etc., the forty-hour week is as imaginary (or as real) a phenomenon as it is for the dedicated university or college teacher. In any profession in which currency with the literature is a portion of the job-description, work after the nominal workday is inevitable.

It seems to me a dubious strategy to

make comparisons with those who are employed very differently, especially as our working conditions — in terms of flexibility of work hours and choices of intensity of work — are wholly unlike those of persons on the line, or even of most other professionals. All ACCUTE members ought to try putting in a month of nine-to-five days at their work places and see what this does to their stress levels.

More substantively, I am completely flummoxed by the claim that, on average, we spend 18.1 hours per week marking. Even granting that this applies to term-time and that out of term we suddenly find ourselves with 18 hours a week for other activities, this seems an astounding number. Assuming a thirteen-week semester, this marking time suggests that each of us spends 235.3 hours per semester marking (practically ten full days). If we factor in the average number of students per semester (87), the hour figure means that we spend two hours and forty-two minutes grading the work of each of our students, each semester.

This makes me wonder about what other universities ask their students to produce in a given term. York's *graduate* programme recently passed a resolution to the effect that it was unfair of an instructor to demand more than 30 pages of written work from a student in a *full-year* course. Our assumed word-length for full-year undergraduate courses range from 5,000 words (usually spread over four essays) for first-year students, to 6,000-7,000 words (spread over two or three essays) for our fourth-year students.

It may be that these are remarkably low figures, but my recent studies of undergraduate calendars and mini-calendars from other Ontario universities suggest that this is not the case. I recognize that essays are

not the only form of marking in which we are engaged. At the same time, exams are universally acknowledged to be quicker to mark than essays, and even those instructors who offer written commentary on oral presentations (and these are few at either of the universities at which I have taught) must grant that this too is a less time-consuming process than marking an essay. How long, then, does it take each of us to mark an essay? Allowing that we all spend one hour per student per semester marking some other form of assignment (which seems generous), the figures suggest that we mark at roughly the rate of 29 words per minute, or 51.7 minutes for a 1,500-word essay.

This is *not* a figure I would recommend showing to CUEW negotiators in the next round of bargaining. I seem to recall in a TA orientation session some years ago being assured by several senior faculty members that anything more than 20 minutes for a 1,500-word paper was dogging it. If we spend at least six hours per course per week (assuming a three-course load), how can we expect our most junior colleagues, who work within a ten hour per week time limit to find time to prepare or teach?

And this is without querying what the marking time is spent *on*. Is the average student's essay covered with valuable commentary? Are the one-line "Good and well-typed" comments I encountered as a student a thing of the past? My own samples are far too small to permit a judgement, but conversations with tutors in York's writing labs suggest that the answer to both questions is no.

Without going further in the direction of subjective judgement (it may be, after all, that the three-sentence comment over which the marker broods for forty minutes is more serviceable to the student than reams of



probably irrelevant and almost certainly illegible commentary in the margins of each page), I would suggest simply that these figures be carefully thought through before any conclusions are drawn. I am sure many of us feel that from the first of October through to the end of April the red pen or pencil between our fingers is a prosthetic graft, but is this in fact the case?

In general there is a danger, in attempting to discover "hard facts," of being bamboozled by the subjective determination of the real. Or, to take it from another angle, if Lacan is right and the affective dimension is the real, and if the real wholly resists encasement within the symbolic order, then any attempt to discover the hard facts that represent (or even cause) our affective response to our work<sup>1</sup>—of which overwork is a screening symptom that in the manner of all signifiers obscures its purported signified—will fail, and become another prop for the symptomatic order against which we struggle.

<sup>1</sup> Think, for instance, of the naive faith in scientific cause and effect shown by the colleague with the recurring "stress-related" viruses. One assumes that, as a relatively young academic, this correspondent can easily deconstruct the logic of this kind of attribution when she/he finds it in a text. When they are our own, however, our symptoms have, or rather are granted, an ontological security and our inferences a truth value that we would deny to other texts.

## A Response to Kim Ian Michasiw

by Michael Keefer

Perhaps I can indicate more clearly what the respondents to the ACCUTE Workload Survey told us about the time they spend on marking. Our 16 college members who answered the question about marking indicated that, with an average of 105 students per semester, they spent

2.8 hours on average marking the work of each student; they thus devoted an average of 294 hours per semester to marking.

The university results can most conveniently be presented in tabular form.

Rank	# responses	# students	@ hours each	= total hours
Full prof	67	79.57	2.72	216.43
Associate	66	86.61	2.63	227.78
Assistant	55	90.87	2.45	222.63
Lecturer	17	70.24	2.71	190.35
TA	6	45.5	2.83	128.77
Other	9	82.33	2.17	178.66
Total:	220	82.97	2.61	216.55

The figure of 18.1 hours of marking per week which I presented in the September *Newsletter* was based upon the responses of full, associate and assistant professors only—and upon the assumption of a 12-week (not a 13-week) semester.

I fully share Kim Michasiw's concern for our TAs. If our six TA respondents are in any way representative, then TAs are spending almost as much time on marking as they should be allotting to their teaching duties in their entirety. Although TAs do seem to spend more hours per student than do more senior faculty (who are also, it should be remembered, correcting and marking the work of graduate students), it would hardly be fair to expect the same level of efficiency from TAs that we would from faculty who have passed through the apprenticeship phase of their careers.

It seems clear, to speak more generally, that any attempt to get at the "facts" (call them symptoms, if you prefer) is fraught with difficulties, both practical and methodological. The administrative Gradgrindism which I mocked in the opening paragraph of my article fetishizes "hard facts," refusing to recognize the extent to which these malleable artefacts are a product of the inquirer's gaze; and Kim Michasiw is surely right to warn us against falling into a parallel fetishism of our own. But let us not commit the opposite error of lapsing into one or another form of epistemological scepticism: our experiences, if difficult to formalize and resistant to quantifying of the kind attempted by our Workload Survey, are not therefore occult.

## Calls for Papers / Conference Notices

The **Christianity and Literature** study group (which will meet concurrently with the ACCUTE meetings at Carleton) invites papers of any length and on any period under the general rubric of "literature and religion." The group would particularly welcome submissions from graduate students and contributions to a session on pedagogy and postmodernism. Contact  
Barbara Pell  
Dept. of English  
Trinity Western University  
Langley, BC V3A 6H4.

The **Elizabeth Bishop Society** was formed at the most recent MLA convention in San Francisco to coordinate the information and to promote sessions and conferences for the study of Bishop's work. There was a conference in Great Village, Nova Scotia to celebrate Bishop this summer, and plans for a conference at Vassar College surrounding the Bishop papers are in the works. For information on joining the Elizabeth Bishop Society, contact  
Ross Leckie  
Department of English  
University of Toronto  
7 King's College Circle  
Toronto, ON M5S 1A1.

Contributors are being sought for the *Dictionary of Literary Biography* volumes on British novelists 1890-1913 and 1919-1939. If you are interested in contributing to these volumes on lesser-known writers of the period, please contact the editor immediately for a list of novelists to be included. Deadlines for completed submissions are June 15 and December 1, 1993. Contact  
Dr. George M. Johnson  
Department of English  
University College of the Cariboo  
900 College Drive, Box 3010  
Kamloops, BC V2C 5N3.

I am planning to do a survey of recent graduates from our Honours English programme (Faculty of Arts, York University), asking about 1) the occupations they now find themselves in; and 2) their reflections now, looking back, on the value (job-related and otherwise) of their English courses. The information elicited might help us better advise our present students on career planning and might also influence our teaching and the way we shape our curriculum. If any other Canadian English departments have conducted or plan to conduct such a survey, I'd be grateful if you'd contact me.

Prof. Ruth Grogan  
Department of English  
Stong College  
York University  
North York, ON M3J 1P3  
Tel: 416 736-5166  
E-mail: rgrogan@vm2.yorku.ca

The annual conference of the **Jane Austen Society of North America** will be held in Lake Louise, "the jewel of the Canadian Rockies," on October 7-10, 1993. Guest speakers are Margaret Drabble, Isobel Grundy, and Elaine Showalter. Further speakers include Julia Prewitt Brown, Ed Copeland, Jan Fergus, Gary Kelly, Gene Koppel, Jane Millgate, Judith Terry and Tara Ghoshal Wallace. The Austen novel featured on the occasion will be *Persuasion*; and plans include a production of a new musical based on it, "An Accident at Lyme." For further information contact  
Juliet McMaster or Bruce Stovel  
Department of English  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, AB T6G 2E5.

I am taking an informal survey of how many of our membership are presently teaching, have taught, or plan to teach a course in Native Literature; or, if you are personally not teaching this material, do you know if anyone in your department is? I have been interested in North

American Native Literature since 1980 and in incorporating courses with Native content into the English curriculum. Perhaps next year at the Learned's those of us with this interest could organize a panel of papers. If you are interested, please contact  
 Angelika Maeser-Lemieux  
 English Department  
 Vanier College  
 821 St. Croix Blvd.  
 St. Laurent, PQ H4L 3X9.

Submissions are invited for a special issue of *English Studies in Canada* devoted to Gay and Lesbian Studies. Please address inquiries, abstracts, and papers to  
 Robert Martin  
 Chair, English Studies  
 Université de Montréal  
 PO Box 6128, Station A  
 Montréal, PQ H3C 3J7.

Papers by Canadian scholars are sought for a collection of essays on and interviews with Madonna. Please send abstracts by February 15, and completed essays by May 1, 1993, to  
 Robin Potter  
 York University  
 North York, ON M3J 1P3.

---

## President's Column

---

### New Directions in English Studies in Canada

From its inception in 1975, *English Studies in Canada* has served the Canadian scholarly community well. Our association has benefited greatly from the fine judgment, the sustained hard work, and the creativity of the editorial teams led by Lauriat Lane at the University of New Brunswick, Rowland McMaster at the University of Alberta, and Doug Wurtele at Carleton. The fact that a healthy proportion of the best scholarly work done in our discipline in Canada during the past eighteen years has made its first appearance in the pages of *English*

*Studies in Canada* is one measure of their success in building up the journal's reputation. In the wake of the SSHRCC's deep cuts last year to its program of aid to scholarly journals, one might add that the continued survival of our journal testifies as well to the efficiency and good financial sense of its managers.

The tradition of innovative editorial work established by previous editorial teams is being continued by Doug Wurtele and his team at Carleton. At the November meeting of the ACCUTE executive, Doug Wurtele presented a bold new two-colour cover design, which involves among other things a shortened title (*ESC*—with the full name and affiliation of the journal in small print), and which will be accompanied by corresponding changes in the journal's typeface and layout. If all goes according to schedule, this new format will make its first appearance early in 1993.

Other proposed changes were likewise warmly supported by the ACCUTE executive. The 1989 special issue on Feminism was a striking critical success. With the dual aim of gaining a wider international readership for Canadian scholarship and of attracting a larger proportion of the best work produced by ACCUTE's membership and of the best papers presented at our annual conference, *ESC* will in future offer one special issue each year. It is anticipated that some of these special issues will be reprinted, possibly in expanded form, by university presses.

The previously announced issue on Northrop Frye, produced by a special editorial board including A.C. Hamilton, Linda Hutcheon, Sandra Djwa and Barry Rutland, is already forthcoming: the next special issue, tentatively scheduled for March 1994 and devoted to Gay and Lesbian Studies, will be guest-edited by Robert Martin.

Doug Wurtele and his colleagues at Carleton do not intend to keep these developments a secret: a subscription drive, directed in particular at American and European university libraries, is now in progress.

## CACE/ACCUTE Listing of Academic Positions

This new feature of the *ACCUTE Newsletter* is provided courtesy of the Canadian Association of Chairs of English. We will attempt in our December and March issues to provide as complete as possible a listing of positions currently available in Canadian universities and colleges.

### McGill University

1 nine-month, non-renewable sessional position in Cultural Studies area with expertise in Contemporary Culture, Critical Theory, Women in Media and Film. **Deadline: February 1, 1993.**

### Mount Allison University

1 tenure-track or term position for a Drama specialist. Retirement replacement: position not yet sanctioned by university. Inquire: Michael Thorpe, Head, Department of English.

### University of British Columbia

4 tenure-track positions: 1) 19th-century Literature with an emphasis on Poetry; 2) Rhetorical Theory; 3) Commonwealth Literature with interest in Post-Colonial Theory; 4) History of the Language. Assistant Professor level. **Deadline: January 8, 1993.**

### Université de Moncton

2 tenure-track positions: 1) English as a Second Language and Linguistics; 2) Language and

Composition (including Remedial), Rhetoric, and possibly Literature. Rank will be commensurate with qualifications. Must be fully fluent in spoken and written French as well as English. **Deadline: January 15, 1993.**

### University of St. Jerome's College

1 tenure-track position in 20th-century Canadian Literature. Assistant Professor level. **Deadline: December 15, 1992.**

### University of Regina

1 tenure-track position in Literary Theory and one or more of the following: Linguistics and Literature (with Composition), Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama with an emphasis on Shakespeare, 18th-century Literature, 18th- and 19th-century English Fiction, Victorian Literature, Post-Colonial Literature. Assistant Professor level. **Deadline February 15, 1993.**

### University of Windsor

1 tenure-track position in Contemporary British Literature and secondary interest in Critical Theory. Assistant Professor level. **Deadline: December 15, 1992.**

### University of Winnipeg

1 probationary (tenure-track) position in the Writing Program at Instructor II level (minimum Master's degree) or Assistant Professor level (Ph.D. and graduate courses in Rhetoric). Strong interest in teaching undergraduate Rhetoric; science background desirable. **Deadline: January 8, 1993.**

---

## Membership Renewals

It's that time again to think about renewing your membership to ACCUTE to ensure that you continue to enjoy the benefits of your professional organization — including the ACCUTE newsletter, which keeps you abreast of the professional issues facing faculty teaching English across Canada; *English Studies in Canada*, the journal forum for new research; and of course, the opportunity for stimulating professional, intellectual, and social exchange offered by the annual conference.

If the address label on this newsletter (or your last copy of *ESC*) indicates "(92)" after your name, your membership will expire at the end of this year. You will find a membership renewal form on the last two pages of this newsletter. Please take a few moments to fill it out and send it back. If you have renewed your membership within the last fortnight, your mailing label might not yet reflect the change; rest assured, however, your membership has been updated. Should you or your colleagues require additional copies of the form, feel free to photocopy as many as you need. All membership fees will be acknowledged by a receipt.

## News of Members

**Pamela BANTING** (Western Ontario) delivered the keynote address and presented a paper, "'Body the words thrum': Writing the Feminine In," at the Text on Edge Conference, St. John's College, University of Manitoba, and has published "The Body as Pictogram: Rethinking Hélène Cixous's *écriture féminine*," *Textual Practice* 6.2 (1992): 225-46.

**Deanne BOGDAN** (OISE) has recently published *Re-educating the Imagination: Toward a Poetics, Politics, and Pedagogy of Literary Engagement* (Portsmouth, NH: Boynton-Cook/Heinemann, 1992; Irwin in Canada); "Reading as Seduction: The Censorship Problem and the Educational Value of Literature," *The ADE Bulletin* 102 (Fall 1992): 11-16; and in joint authorship with K. Judith Millen and Alice Pitt, "Feminist Approaches to Teaching: John Updike's 'A&P'," in Emrys Evans, ed., *Young Readers, New Readings* (Hull University Press, 1992). She will deliver the Phi Kappa Delta Lecture at Massey College, University of Toronto, February 4, 1993.

**Kristin BRADY** (University of Western Ontario) has recently published *George Eliot*, Macmillan Women Writer Series, ed. Eva Figes and Adele King (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1992) and "Physiology, Phrenology, and Patriarchy: The Construction of George Eliot," *Women and Reason*, ed. Elizabeth D. Harvey and Kathleen Okruhlik (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992): 201-224.

**Laurel BRASWELL-MEANS** (McMaster) has published "Antiquarian or Bibliographer? The Dilemma of Thomas Frognall Dibdin (1776-1847)," *Studies in Medievalism* 4 (1992): 105-12; and "Ffor as moche as Yche man may not haue [th]e astrolabe": Popular Middle English variations on the Computus," *Speculum* 67 (1992): 595-623. Forthcoming is "Electionary, Lunary, Destinary, and Questionary: Towards Defining Categories of Middle English

Prognostic Material," *Studies in Philology* (Winter, 1992).

**Daniel W. DOERKSEN** (New Brunswick) was appointed Book Review Editor for *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* commencing August 1991. He published "'Too Good for Those Times': Politics and the Publication of George Herbert's *The Country Parson*," in *Seventeenth-Century News*, 49 (Nos. 1 and 2, 1991): 10-13, and read a paper, "'Let There Be Peace': Eve as Peacemaker in *Paradise Lost*, Box X," at the annual meeting, Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies, Charlottetown, May 1992.

**Mary Jane EDWARDS** (Carleton) is pleased to announce the publication by Carleton University Press of John Richardson's *The Canadian Brothers*, edited by Donald Stephens (UBC). This is the ninth work in the CEECT Series of scholarly editions, of which Professor Edwards is general editor.

**Norman FELTES** (York) has published "International Copyright: Structuring 'the Condition of Modernity' in British Publishing," in an issue on "Intellectual Property and the Construction of Authorship" of the *Cardozo Arts and Entertainment Law Journal*, 10 (1992): 535-544, and "Misery or the Production of Misery: Defining Sweated Labour in 1890" in *Social History*, 17(October, 1992): 441-452.

**Tom HASTINGS** (York) has recently published "Said's *Orientalism* and the Discourse of (Hetero)sexuality" in *The Canadian Review of American Studies* 23 (1992): 127-48; "Earle Birney's Equivocal Dance: The Cultural Politics of 'The Bear On the Delhi Road'" in *Inside the Poem*, W.H. New, ed. (Oxford University Press, 1992): 70-80; and has forthcoming "Peter McGehee and the Discipline of the Gay Body" in *Open Letter*.

**Richard HILLMAN** (York/visiting at University of Western Ontario) has published *Intertextuality and Romance in Renaissance Drama: The Staging of Nostalgia* (Macmillan/St.

Martin's) and "La Création du monde et The Taming of the Shrew: Du Bartas comme intertexte," *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* ns 15 (1991): 249-58.

**Peter HYLAND** (Huron College/UWO) has published *Saul Bellow* (London: Macmillan, 1992).

**Martin KUESTER** (Augsburg) has contributed essays on teaching Canadian literature to both volumes of *Mediating Cultures: Probleme des Kulturtransfers*, ed. Norbert H. Platz (Essen: Die Blue Eule, 1991 and 1992), and he has published *Framing Truths: Parodic Structures in Contemporary English-Canadian Historical Novels* with University of Toronto Press.

**David JEFFREY** (University of Ottawa) would like to thank the many Canadian contributors from Memorial University to the University of Victoria, whose part in *A Dictionary of Biblical Tradition*, published in October of this year, has helped to make it finally possible.

**Angelika MAESER-LEMIEUX** (Vanier College) has published "Goddess Spirituality: The Rebirth of an Archetype," in *SPRING 52: A Journal of Archetype and Culture*, 1992 (The Piety Issue).

**Bruce MEYER** (Toronto) had his course-load quadrupled to eight courses at the School of Continuing Studies, University of Toronto. He has recently published: *Profiles in Canadian Literature* "Robert Service" and "Frank Prewitt"; *Lives and Words: Interviews with Canadian Authors* (Black Moss Press); *Radio Silence* (Black Moss Press); "Lorna Crozier,"

"C.H. Gervais," "John Newlove," "Ken Norris," and "David Wevill" for *Contemporary Poets* (St. James Press), for which he was Canadian Advisor; "The Human Balance: An Interview with Charles Tomlinson," *The Hudson Review* 43.3: 437; "The Road from Oz: Charles Tomlinson and the Canadian Landscape," *Northward Journal* 50-51: 111; and *Selected Poems of Lionel Monteith*, and *Swimming in the Afternoon: The Selected Poems of Peters Stevens* (Black Moss Press).

**Carolyn MEYER** (Toronto) recently completed a SSHRCC Post-Doctoral Fellowship in Irish Literature at McMaster. In July, she delivered "Solemnity as a Revolutionary Gesture: The Making of the *Dolmen Miscellany of Irish Writing*" at the joint CAIS/ACIS Conference at University College, Galway; and "In the Irish Grain: The Influence of William Carlos Williams on the Poetry of John Montague," at the IASAIL Conference at Trinity College, Dublin. She has recently been hired by the School of Continuing Studies, University of Toronto, to teach two courses in Irish Literature.

**Michael MILLGATE** (Toronto) has recently published *Testamentary Acts: Browning, Tennyson, James, Hardy* (Clarendon Press). His *Thomas Hardy: A Biography* has been re-issued as a Clarendon Paperback.

**Peter SCHWENGER** (Mount St. Vincent) has published *Letter Bomb: Nuclear Holocaust and the Exploding Word* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1992).

---

### News of Members

The ACCUTE Newsletter welcomes news from members about publications and papers. Entries should include members' names and university or college affiliation and the titles in MLA format of any publications or conference papers. Send "News of Members" entries to: ACCUTE Newsletter, Department of English, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON N1G 2W1.

# 1993 Membership Form

- New Member  
 Renewal

Member's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

## Academic Affiliation Information

Professional Designation:

- Professor  
 Assoc. Professor  
 Asst. Professor  
 Sessional Lecturer  
 Instructor  
 Retired Faculty  
 Grad. Student / TA  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Address (use home address *only* if you are without academic affiliation):

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Postal Code \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (wk): \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_ (hm): \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_

I enclose (Please make cheque payable to ACCUTE - University of Guelph):

- The regular membership fee of \$65  
 The reduced fee of \$30 (student / unemployed / underemployed)  
 The household membership fee of \$115 (2 memberships, one subscription to *ESC*)

Second householder's name: \_\_\_\_\_

Second householder's professional designation: \_\_\_\_\_

## ACCUTE Membership Directory Information

Please complete the information on research interests found overleaf, for use in the 1993 ACCUTE *Directory*. The *Directory* is used mainly by colleagues seeking scholars to review books, prepare scholarly papers on special topics, and to evaluate manuscripts, grant applications, conference papers, and graduate student theses. In order to help colleagues locate specialists more easily, the 1993 *Directory* will list scholars categorically by *primary area of research interest* first. In addition, members may specify other categories in which they would feel comfortable performing professional tasks; these will be included in a secondary listing format.

---

---

**Primary Listing** (*List only 1 area of specialization*)

List specialization by Period / Nationality / Genre; Other (Theoretical Methodology, Culture / Gender Studies; Authors / Works, etc.)

Example: Modern British Drama; Feminist Theory, G.B. Shaw

If you are applying for a household membership, please differentiate clearly between research interests for each member.

---

---

**Additional areas**

Periods / Nationalities / Genres \_\_\_\_\_

Culture / Gender Studies \_\_\_\_\_

Criticism / Theory / Methodology \_\_\_\_\_

Language / Linguistics \_\_\_\_\_

Pedagogy \_\_\_\_\_

Authors / Works \_\_\_\_\_

Other \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---