



September 2004
Newsletter

Inside this Issue:

Congress 2005

Introducing the New Executive:

- The Secretary-Treasurer
- President of the Graduate Student Caucus
- The Sessionals' Representative

Professional Concerns Panel on SSHRC Transformation

ACCUTE Conference Member-Organized Sessions

ACCUTE Conference Joint Sessions

Published by the Association of Canadian College and University Teachers of English

President: Keith Wilson
Secretary-Treasurer:
Jennifer Panek
Coordinator: Tobi Kozakewich
Assistant: Shoshannah Ganz

ACCUTE'S MANDATE

To promote the interests of those teaching and studying English language and literatures in Canadian colleges and universities by facilitating the dissemination and exchange of research and the exploration of professional issues, by organizing scholarly and professional meetings, by seeking to improve work conditions, by representing the interests of members before provincial and federal decision-making bodies, and by supporting the interests and aspirations of members entering the profession.

President's Column

Keith Wilson

Greetings to everyone from ACCUTE's new home at the University of Ottawa.

This first Ottawa-generated edition of the Newsletter is arriving in somewhat unfamiliar (but we hope no less enjoyable) form. Those of you who were present at the last AGM in Winnipeg or who read Neil's President's Column in the last Newsletter will know why. On a motion brought by Andrew O'Malley, who as Secretary-Treasurer was well placed to know the economic constraints under which ACCUTE, like most other learned societies, is increasingly forced to operate, the assembly voted unanimously that newsletters and membership directory move to exclusively electronic formats. The financial case for this is irrefutable. Over a two-year period, printing and mailing four Newsletters a year to every member costs in the region of \$24,000. This is money which, even in those years when ACCUTE may have it, could much more productively be spent on other initiatives. But at the moment, those resources are simply not there. So the idea of moving to electronic form, periodically mooted over the years, has finally seen its time come. Neil predicted in the June Newsletter that this change would occur "at some point this coming year." We decided that delay would be costly and serve no real purpose, and therefore that the change should happen with the first issue from the new team. Should there be any initial blips in this process, we apologise and solicit your



Arts Hall, University of Ottawa

understanding (and, please, do let us know if you encounter any difficulties with reception of the Newsletter). Incidentally, as many of you will have observed, the directory, produced every two years, has inevitably been out of date almost before it was even printed because of the frequency with which members move. Once it has been made available electronically, it will become a much more useful resource since it can be constantly updated as current information is submitted to the ACCUTE office.

I had silently vowed when planning this column not even to mention the great SSHRC transformation debate, on the assumption that the summer would yield little new to report. After last year's voluble country-wide debates, after the contributions made by many of you to both CFHSS and individual university representations to SSHRC, and after Neil's forthright summary in the last Newsletter of the day-long CFHSS-SSHRC mini-conference held immediately after the ACCUTE meetings, you would probably have welcomed a brief respite from SSHRC-transformation mania. I almost honoured this vow, but in the event decided not to ignore Neil's suggestion in

President's Column Continued...

the last Newsletter that we make available the position papers that David Bentley and I gave at an ACCUTE Professional Concerns panel at the end of May. So you will find both papers reproduced in this issue (pages 10-14). They appear accompanied by the fervent editorial hope that by this time next year they will seem entirely redundant because of the enthusiasm with which SSHRC has decided to listen to and act upon the kinds of views they represent.

As Neil also reported in the June Newsletter, membership of ACCUTE is on the rise again, up to more than 900, a dramatic increase from the previous count of little more than 700. This gratifying news, so much more invigorating than the melancholic reports of contraction that we have been accustomed to hearing over the last few years, must continue, for reasons that have always existed but that the recent SSHRC debate has surely encouraged us to recognize with renewed urgency. A strong discipline requires a strong national voice, and ACCUTE is the voice of our discipline in Canada. As some of you will have heard me say on other occasions, the reasons for English academics to be members of ACCUTE are not, as is so often assumed, exclusively to do with whether they regularly go to our Congress meetings or read *ESC* from cover to cover, vital as both the conference and the journal are to our sense of ACCUTE's identity. Membership of ACCUTE needs again to become naturalized, as it once was, as a marker of someone's active involvement in the English academy in Canada, an essential part of the professional culture of English Departments. While the Ottawa team will be doing everything it can to bring this assumption back into currency, its most effective promulgators are all of you: the current members. Talk about ACCUTE in your Departments. Mention the very active part it

plays in the life of CFHSS, and the very active role that CFHSS itself plays in influencing SSHRC policy (presumably even those colleagues who aren't members of ACCUTE must be favourably disposed to the idea that humanities research of every kind continue to be supported). Explode those tediously inaccurate myths when you hear them trotted out yet again: that ACCUTE favours certain kinds of scholarship over other kinds (nonsense); that it favours older faculty over younger faculty or *vice versa* (nonsense); that its conference is primarily for the presentation of graduate student papers (have people who say this actually looked at the program?); that *ESC* is an old-fashioned journal with limited circulation (show them a recent copy, tell them of the ways in which *ESC* is positioning itself to become a major international journal with the distribution to match). The continuation of the upswing that ACCUTE is presently undergoing is in substantial part in your hands. Please do all you can to ensure that it does indeed continue.

There is no real reason why an arbitrarily chosen number should ring with particular resonance. But we all know, especially in these post-millennium times, that certain numbers do. As long-standing ACCUTE members will recall, for many years the membership stood comfortably above 1,000. By the time the ACCUTE offices leave Ottawa, I hope that ACCUTE numbers will have so far outshot that once conventionally-invoked figure that newcomers to the profession can one day say "I hear that in the old days ACCUTE had only 1,000 members."

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank Neil Besner, Andrew O'Malley, and Nicole Rosevere—the Winnipeg team—for their excellent stewardship of ACCUTE over the last two years. Members of the association and the profession countrywide are most grateful for their work on our behalf.

*Membership in
ACCUTE is on the
rise again.*

Congress 2005

London 2005 – May 28-May 31
University of Western Ontario

Congress Theme:

**Paradoxes of Citizenship –
Environments, Exclusions, and
Equity**

Open Call for Papers and Proposals Related to your Current Research

Anything goes – and goes by our vectors. You certainly do not have to match your research and writing to any of the Congress themes. We are always interested in strong and promising proposals on any aspect of English studies, so please consider submitting something in response to this general call. Individual papers emerging from your own specific work in your fields always dominate the Congress program. You may submit **only one proposal** and, to have your proposal considered for possible inclusion in the ACCUTE program, **you must be a current member in ACCUTE.**

All proposals that receive two positive readers' reports are automatically included in the ACCUTE program. Our challenge is then to match the accepted papers with a view to shaping coherent and engaging panels. ACCUTE is not a specialist society; we are aiming to create a cohesive program that takes into account the breadth of our members' interests and activities.

Member Organized Sessions

Please see the call for papers for member-organized and joint ses-

sions beginning on pages 14 and 21, respectively, of this Newsletter. Please note that organizers may not advise panelists that they are presenting until the ACCUTE second reader has made her or his assessment, and ACCUTE has contacted the organizer.

Plenary Speakers

Full information about our plenary speakers will be available in the December ACCUTE Newsletter.

Conference Notes

As is our custom, we will endeavour to offer as diverse a set of disciplinary and interdisciplinary papers as we can. If you think your proposal might work well as part of a joint session with a learned society in an allied area, please let us know and we may be able to establish joint panels where appropriate.

Travel Funding

Travel claim forms – applications to cover part of presenters' travel costs to the ACCUTE conference – will be available at the ACCUTE desk at the conference. Be sure to get your form in before the late-June deadline (the exact date will be printed on the form).

Procedures for Submitting Proposals and Papers

If you are responding to our general call for papers, please send **one** hard copy **and** an electronic copy of your paper or proposal to the ACCUTE office at the University of Ottawa.

Submissions must be received no later

than **15 November 2004.**

If you are responding to the organizer of a proposed special session, please send **three** hard copies of your paper or proposal **directly to the organizer** by the same date. The organizer will forward copies of the proposals or papers (both electronic and paper) received to the ACCUTE office by **5 December 2004** together with assessments of each submission.

Unless otherwise indicated by the organizer of a special session, proposals should be approximately 500 words in length.

If you are submitting a completed paper, it should be no longer than 10 to 12 double-spaced pages (no more than 20 minutes speaking time). While an email electronic submission is strongly preferred over disk submissions, the latter will be accepted. If you are submitting a disk, please label it clearly, indicating your name, the title of the paper, and the computer program you used.

Electronic copy facilitates the vetting of proposals and reduces the costs of postage, thereby leaving more funds to spend in support of presenters' travel costs.

*Please remember to **email** your response to our general CFP to the ACCUTE office at: accute@uottawa.ca*

Congress 2005 Continued...

Other Required Documents

Whether you are submitting a paper or proposal, in response to our general call or to a member-organized session, your submission should be accompanied by a cover page containing the following information:

- your name (in the form LAST, FIRST)
- your full mailing address
- your email, phone, and fax numbers
- the title of your paper
- a 50-word bio-bibliographical note
- a description of any audio-visual support you may require

Also include, on a **separate** page, a 100-word abstract of your paper including its title. *Abstracts and bios exceeding these limits will have to be cut for inclusion in the conference program.* Please include electronic copies of your bio and abstract in your submission. Lastly, in order to permit blind reviewing by assessors, the papers and proposals themselves **should not** include the author's name, position, or institutional affiliation.

Vetting of Papers and Proposals

With the exception of presentations in executive-organized sessions, all submissions for the ACCUTE conference program are vetted by at least two specialists in the field and read by the ACCUTE president.

In the case of member-organized sessions, the organizer acts as the first vettor; the submissions to the proposed session are then sent out to a second vettor, with the names

of the submitters withheld, as in the case of submissions received in response to the general call for papers.

In the case of joint sessions with other societies, ACCUTE is prepared to respect the other society's procedures for selection. But wherever possible, we also seek the opinion of a specialist reader who is a member of our own Association as well.

Papers and proposals should not indicate the author's name, position, or institutional affiliation.

The ACCUTE office will do everything within its power to ensure that papers or proposals submitted in response to the general call for papers and those submitted to the organizers of special sessions have an equal chance of being included in the conference program. Assessors are asked to judge each paper or proposal according to the following criteria.

A. Guidelines for the Assessment of Papers

1. Significance: the paper should make an original contribution to scholarship, to theoretical understanding, or to current debates on matters of common interest to ACCUTE members.
2. Accessibility: if focusing on a single and little-known text, the paper should address issues that would be of interest to members unfamiliar with it, and indicate these issues in its title. A good paper should invite the interests of non-specialists.

3. Presentation: the arguments of the paper should be made coherently and with rhetorical polish.

4. Length: papers at the conference must be effectively presentable in 20 minutes or less. Papers written without consideration of this time constraint (i.e., papers over 3000 words) will clearly need significant re-writing. When the scholarly significance of the paper might justify such re-writing, vettors may make the case for it, but this remains a matter of their professional judgment.

B. Guidelines for the Assessment of Proposals

1. A good proposal should have a clear thesis. It should present some indication of the evidence that will be put forward to support it. It should take into account published scholarship relevant to the topic being investigated. In short, it should read like the abstract of an argument written by some-one knowledgeable in the field concerned.
2. As well, a good proposal should give a strong indication that it will result in a paper meeting the criteria in ACCUTE's guidelines for papers, above.

Remember: ACCUTE reserves only 20 minutes per presenter at its annual conference

Congress 2005 Continued...

Criteria for Selection

In their assessments, vettors are asked to rank proposals as outstanding, acceptable, or unacceptable.

When making final decisions about the program, the conference organizers place most emphasis on the reports of the vettors. Any submission receiving two assessments of "Outstanding" by our vettors is automatically included in the conference program. In the small number of cases where a paper or proposal is assessed as outstanding by one vettor and poor by another, the organizers try, wherever possible, to obtain the opinion of a third specialist vettor.

The organizers also consider the necessity of including a range of period, national, theoretical, and critical interests on the program, and the ways in which the papers can be intelligently grouped into coherent sessions. Other factors taken into account in deciding between equally ranked submissions include the scholarly achievement reflected in the bio-bibliographical note (particularly in the case of proposals as opposed to completed papers); regional representation; and whether the submitter presented at the preceding year's ACCUTE conference. As always, you will receive notification of the decision concerning your submission in late February. A draft version of the program will appear in the March 2005 issue of the ACCUTE Newsletter.

Any submission receiving two assessments of "Outstanding" is automatically included in the conference program.

From the Secretary-Treasurer

Jennifer Panek

Before I introduce myself, I'd like to thank the past secretary-treasurer, Andrew O'Malley, for showing me the way around the intricacies of the job. Andrew has a knack for making things apparently baffling become much less so. The membership renewals began trickling in in early July, and are now arriving at a mail-box filling rate. Keep them coming: we might be a bit slow in our response while we're starting out, but the renewals and applications are being processed, and the letters are on their way.

This is my fourth year teaching at the University of Ottawa, after a Ph.D. at the University of Toronto and a SSHRC postdoc at Harvard. I started out here in a two-year contract position, lived through

the uncertainties of being the "internal candidate" for a tenure-track job search, and made it to the other side (take heart, contract workers!). My area of teaching and research is the Renaissance; most of my research has been on gender issues in non-Shakespearean drama. And given that I'm writing this mere weeks before my first book is scheduled to appear, I hope I'll be forgiven a shameless plug for *Widows and Suitors in Early Modern English Comedy*, forthcoming October 2004, with Cambridge University Press.

I look forward to working with Keith and the other members of the executive, and meeting many of you by e-mail and in person.

Member News

Danielle Fuller's new book, *Writing the Everyday: Atlantic Canadian Women's Textual Communities* will be published by McGill-Queen's University Press next month.

Calling All Sessionals

Jo Devereux, Sessional Representative

To become a member of the ACCUTE sessionals on-line discussion group, email your request to accute@uottawa.ca

Having been a part-time faculty member at UWO for the past fifteen years, I am delighted to be joining the ACCUTE executive this year as your sessional representative. As you know, the 2005 conference will be held at Western, and it would be wonderful to see a large and boisterous turnout of sessionals from across Canada in attendance. Before that time, of course, I would be very interested in hearing from anyone who would like to share his or her experiences as a current or previous sessional instructor. I'd also like to take this opportunity to invite all sessionals to participate as fully as possible in ACCUTE by joining the sessional listserv and by submitting a proposal or paper to the sessional cfp (see page 14). To become a member of the ACCUTE sessionals on-line discussion group, please email your request to accute@uottawa.ca and the moderator will add you to the list.

If you are a new sessional professor you will undoubtedly have questions or

concerns, such as what are the different expectations of the sessional as opposed to the tenure-track professor? How did the current employment situation develop? Why are so many undergraduate courses at Canadian universities being taught by sessionals? What does the future hold? If you have been a sessional for some time, you may also wish to explore a number of issues about the world of sessionals. And if you are one of those people who have made the jump from sessional to full-time employment, you may have ideas or questions to present, as well as advice and helpful hints for those seeking full-time employment. I look forward to hearing from all of you in the near future.

See the CFP for the Sessional Panel at 2005 Congress, on page 14 of this Newsletter.

Learning the Ropes

Tobi Kozakewich

I would be remiss if I did not begin by extending my thanks to Nicole Rosevere, whom I repeatedly pestered with questions over the summer, and whose advice and assistance helped make the transition from the University of Winnipeg to the University of Ottawa a smooth one. I am most grateful for her assistance.

Of course, there were some things I had to figure out for myself, and the summer saw me learning the

intricacies of ACCUTE's website and database software. Happily, I can report a modicum of success, and members who send in postings for either the website or the listservs can now expect much prompt service than before.

One of the technological innovations ACCUTE Ottawa has introduced is the creation of a new, permanent website, at www.accute.ca, and we are presently building a password-protected subweb for the exclusive

use of ACCUTE members. On a more purely administrative level, we are updating ACCUTE's filing system, a major task that was made possible only by the addition of a fourth member to the ACCUTE Ottawa team: Shoshannah Ganz, the ACCUTE assistant.

Finally, before signing off, I want to say how pleased I am to be part of the new ACCUTE team, and how eager I am to get to know you during the coming months.

Report from the President of the GSC

By Jennifer Drouin

Greetings

As the incoming president of the GSC, I'd like to introduce myself and encourage all of you to contact me and share your concerns as fellow graduate students. I'm an ABD doctoral candidate in Shakespeare studies at McGill University. I've been very active in the university community here, and have sat on a department hiring committee, a few university senate committees, and several grad student committees. Please feel free to e-mail me at jennifer.drouin@mail.mcgill.ca with any questions or concerns about your grad student experience or just to say hello.

As my first act as your new president, I'd like to extend warm thanks to outgoing president Sara Humphreys for her hard work this past year. Sara spearheaded the GSC's major initiative last year, the letter of concern expressing grad students' anxieties regarding departmental hiring practices, and, as noted in Sara's last report, this letter was sent out over the summer to all graduate English departments and the HRDC. Grad students know that our departments want us to succeed when we enter the job market with degrees which represent our university, and we hope that raising the issue of hiring practices through this letter will foster better communication between grad students and their departments. The GSC looks forward to receiving feedback from grad students, faculty, graduate coordinators, and department chairs in response to this letter.

Projects for 2004-2005

Departmental hiring practices remain on the GSC's radar this year with the fact-finding committee chaired by Susan McNeill (Alberta). Our second issue this year is graduate funding, and Diana Lobb (Waterloo) is leading a fact-finding committee to tackle this question. Finally, our third project is to gather statistics on grad student life in the various English departments across the country. Thanks to our new Information Officer, Gregory Betts (York), this project is well under way already. Anyone interested in these issues is more than welcome to join a committee —just send me an e-mail.

Grad students know our departments want us to succeed when we enter the job market

Gregory and I have devised a short survey which will be sent to campus grad reps and the GSC listserv, and the results will be available on the GSC website. The information gathered will help future grad students in their choice of an English department which will meet their needs, and it will also permit current grad students to gain more equitable treatment with their Canadian peers by increasing transparency in the comparison of different universities. As the first such survey designed by grad students for grad students, this list of questions is by no means comprehensive yet, so please send any suggestions you have for other topics which you think need to be addressed and we will incorporate them into the survey before distributing it. If, on the other hand, you find the survey too long, we

are asking you to provide only as much information as you can, or as you feel comfortable giving. Our first draft of the survey appears on page 8 of this Newsletter.

Please send your suggestions about its form or content to either Gregory (gbbetts@yorku.ca), myself, or your campus grad rep. Our current representatives are:

- Wendy Matthews (Alberta)
- Tony Adolf (UBC)
- Jennifer Drouin (McGill)
- Karley Jones (McMaster)
- Robin Sutherland (UNB)
- Lia Marie Talia (Ottawa)
- Nicole Berard (Saskatchewan)
- Juliet O'Keefe (SFU)
- Travis DeCook (Toronto)
- Martha Crealock (Trent)
- Chris Fox (UVic)
- Diana Lobb (Waterloo)
- J.E.D. Lacoste (Western)
- Gregory Betts (York)

If your department does not have a grad rep, or if your current rep has finished his or her studies and moved on, then why not volunteer yourself! Duties, as outlined on the mandate page of our website, (www.sfu.ca/~okeefe/gscaccute/gsc.html) are minimal (forward information, bring up issues relevant to your graduate community, promote ACCUTE, and attend the Congress if possible), but it is very important to maintain lines of communication between GSC and each campus across the country. This is your association and the GSC wants to reflect your concerns, so don't hesitate to speak up!

I wish you all a happy and productive academic year and hope to hear from you soon!

Proposed GSC Survey

- 1) Number of graduate students currently enrolled (total):
MA: PhD: Part-time:
- 2) Guaranteed departmental funding? (yes or no)
 - a) If yes, number of students (as percentage or gross):
 - b) If yes, amount per year:
 - c) If yes, number of years:
 - d) If yes, does "funding" really signify "work" (i.e., TAship):
- 3) Departmental success rate for SSHRC graduate funding (as percentage or gross):
- 4) Number of Teaching Assistant-ship positions (as percentage or gross):
 - a) TA hours/week:
 - b) TA pay/hour:
 - c) Presence of a TA union (yes or no):
- 5) Conference funding (amount and frequency):
- 6) Office space within the department (yes or no; private or shared):
 - a) If yes, is office space dependent on TA or RA work, dissertation progress, or available to all students:
 - b) If shared, number of students per office:
- 7) Extra perks (photocopying, computers, Internet access, printing, coffee, etc.):
- 8) Number of new professors hired in the past year:
 - a) If any, number of grad students on hiring committee:
 - b) Departmental reception of grad student input in hiring decisions (positive or negative):
 - c) New hires tenure-track or sessional:
 - d) New hires citizenship and/or school of PhD:
- 9) Degree requirement for the MA
Number of courses:
Thesis:
Second language:
Bibliography course:
Other requirements:
- 10) Degree requirements for the PhD
Number of courses:
Number of special field or comprehensive exams:
Second language:
Bibliography course:
Other requirements:
- 11) Average time to degree completion for MA and for PhD:
 - a) Official timely completion policies (yes or no; if yes, describe):
- 12) Please use this space to add your own comments about the particular strengths and weaknesses of your department. This may also be a good space to indicate items you'd like to see added to future versions of this survey.

This survey will be sent to all graduate representatives and the listserv once its format has been finalized. Please send your suggestions about its form or content to either Gregory Betts (gbbetts@yorku.ca), Jennifer Drouin (Jennifer.drouin@mail.mcgill.ca), or your campus grad rep (see list on page 7 of this Newsletter).

Christianity and Literature Study Group – Call for Papers

The Christianity and Literature Study Group (one of the Allied Associations) invites proposals or papers on any aspect of religion and literature (including pedagogy and critical theory) for its annual Conference at the 2005 Congress at the University of Western Ontario, Saturday 28 May to Tuesday 31 May 2005.

We welcome submissions from doctoral students and suggestions for member-organized sessions. Please send submissions with a brief abstract

and bio-bibliographical note (electronic submissions preferred) by 15 January 2005 to:

*Dr. Barbara Pell,
Department of English
Trinity Western University
Langley, B.C. V2Y 1Y1
Tel. 604-513-25121 x3331
Fax, 604-513-2010
Email: pell@twu.ca*

Call for Papers

Aboriginal Oral Traditions: Theory, Practice, and Ethics

Location:

Gorsebrook Research Institute,
Saint Mary's University,
Halifax, Canada

Time: April 21-24, 2005

The increasing emphasis on traditional Indigenous knowledge in a number of academic disciplines calls for new ways of understanding how Aboriginal communities produce and preserve knowledge. Contemporary environmental, social, and cultural studies of collective knowledge communicated through oral tradition encourage collaboration between researchers inside and outside aboriginal communities. While these partnerships are important in the sharing of knowledge within and beyond communities, they also present challenges. Who should interpret and disseminate such knowledge? For what purpose?

This interdisciplinary conference will explore theory and practice as well as aspects of research ethics regarding oral traditions in an Aboriginal context. We welcome proposals from all disciplines on diverse topics, including

- archival research on collections of oral narratives
- intellectual property rights and the repatriation of stories
- the importance of oral traditions in contemporary Aboriginal literatures
- storytelling in Aboriginal communities today

- the role of electronic media in the dissemination of oral narratives
- partnership between community and university researchers
- the role of stories in environmental studies
- the role of stories in economic development

The Gorsebrook Institute, at which the conference will be held, is dedicated primarily to promoting and supporting interdisciplinary research on Atlantic Canada. A special focus of the conference will be work being done by, with, and in Aboriginal communities of Atlantic Canada. The programme will include an excursion to the archives of Acadia University (Silas T. Rand collection), as well as a workshop on Silas Rand's Legends of the Micmac. However, we welcome and encourage proposals on a range of topics on Aboriginal oral traditions in all communities.

Please send a proposal (250-300 words), an abstract (50 words), and a short biographical note (100 words) by **September 30, 2004** to gorsebrook@smu.ca or contact one of the organizers:

Renate Eigenbrod, Native Studies,
University of Manitoba
eigenbro@ms.umanitoba.ca

Renee Hulan, English,
Saint Mary's University
renee.hulan@smu.ca

Robert Leavitt, Mi'kmaq-Maliseet Institute,
University of New Brunswick
rleavitt@unb.ca

Professional Concerns:

SSHRC Transformation

Resisting Idols in the Transformation of the SSHRC

By D. M. R. Bentley

Readers of "The City of the End of Things," Archibald Lampman's dark vision of "The Issue of Things that Are," will recall that as the city crumbles into "rust and dust" all that remains of its builders are four "carved idols," three of which sit "face to face" in an "iron tower" while the fourth — the one destined to survive the rest — is a "grim Idiot" without "mind or soul" that sits at the city gate staring "toward the lightless north." Although the temptation to think so is sometimes very strong, Lampman's visionary city is not Ottawa and the "grim Idiot" at the gate is not the quintessential Canadian politician. Nor is Lampman's poem being advanced here either as a simulacrum of the federal government or, heaven forbid the gloomy thought, as a reflection of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council; rather, I would like to think of Lampman's four "carved" figures in Baconian terms as representations of the four classes of idols that the SSHRC appears to be in the process of avoiding as its transformation proceeds from consultation to policy — the idols of scientolatriy, instrumentolatriy, productolatriy and — perhaps more controversially — researcholatriy.

It seems like eons ago — actually, it was in 1940 — that the American educational theorist John Dewey (in)famously argued that the "future of our civilization depends on the widening spread and the deepening hold of the scientific habit of mind." Yet anyone who has observed the changes even in the SSHRC's application forms over the last decade or more can scarcely doubt that the "widening" and "deepening" has continued almost unabated. So it

must be with relief and gratitude that we in the Arts greet the Council's abandonment of "Human Sciences" and the retention of "Humanities" as the term for what we do in our disciplines. The scientific method was designed as an instrument for exploring physical nature, and useful and fruitful as it is for examining those aspects of human beings that belong to the physical realm and for thinking and theorizing about how we approach our subjects, it sits to one side of the realm of human values and the world of human, often imaginative, artefacts in which humanists live and work. The debate about the relative educational and social importance of the Arts and Sciences that so exercised Matthew Arnold, T.H. Huxley, and others towards the end of the Victorian period continued into the twentieth century, and echoes of it can still be heard today in discussions of federal and provincial funding for research. No less now than in previous decades, the interests of both society and the universities are surely best served by adequate funding for research across the full spectrum of the Arts and Sciences, a goal that is unlikely to be achieved by papering over the contributions of the Humanities and Social Sciences with graph paper to make them seem other than what they are and, it must be said, other than what a great many people readily recognize and value as one of the university's and society's most important components.

Just as scientolatriy has been resisted during the SSHRC transformation process, so too has instrumentolatriy — which is to say, the call for scholars and researchers in the Humanities and Social Sciences to view their work largely in terms of its value to users of knowledge in the public and private sectors. Few have doubted the value of emphasizing the pragmatic or utilitarian aspects of work in the Humanities and Social Sciences when it is possible and prudent to do so: the generosity of benefactors is better

encouraged by magnanimity than aloofness. But time and again the point has been made during consultations and in reports flowing from them that under no circumstances should work in the Humanities and Social Sciences be conceived or regarded as a tool that must be engineered or adjusted to fit the screws and nuts of the political and social machine, however demanding and important that machine may be. In the early nineteen sixties, Claude Bissell, who by then was not merely a distinguished commentator on Canadian culture (his *Our Living Tradition* was published in 1957), but also the president of the University of Toronto, spoke eloquently of the dangers inherent in the "governmentalization" of Canada's universities. By resisting instrumentolatriy, the SSHRC and its constituent scholars and researchers have protected the independence and resisted as far as is possible and prudent the "governmentalization" of research and scholarship in the Humanities and the Social Sciences.

Closely enough related to instrumentolatriy to be easily mistaken for its twin is the third idol that seems to have been successfully resisted during the SSHRC transformation process: productolatriy — that is, the urge to define scholars and researchers in the Humanities and Social Sciences as producers of products that can and should be marketed and consumed by the public at large. This is not to say that the importance of making the public as aware as possible of the ideas and findings of scholars and researchers in the disciplines supported by public funds through the SSHRC has not been recognized and accepted, but, rather, that the task of marketing those ideas and findings has been properly understood as best undertaken by the SSHRC itself with the assistance of the scholar and researcher,

Professional Concerns Continued...

possibly through easily accessible statements that can be regularly collected and circulated, as appropriate to local, national, and international media. A division of responsibilities along these or similar lines would, it has been suggested, make good use of the media expertise available in the SSHRC (and, perhaps, the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences) and allow scholars and researchers to maximize their capacity to generate material of actual or potential interest to the general public.

As intimated at the outset, the fourth and final of my idols — researcholatry — is perhaps more controversial than the others, the reason being the suggestion that in the Humanities especially (but not exclusively) too great an emphasis on research may be a danger, not merely because it brings with it a whiff of scientolatry, but also because it has the potential to result in the severance of research from teaching. It was partly to preclude such a severance that the concept of “confederation of learning” was proposed to the SSHRC as a means of thinking about its place in Canadian society, for learning brings with it the sense that scholars and researchers in the Humanities and Social Sciences are at once seekers of new knowledge about human life and human creations and imparters of new and received knowledge to others, be they students and peers within the educational system or members of the general public. It is our task as research-teachers and teacher-researchers both to discover all that we can about our subjects and to share our findings with our students and peers. Today we are gathered together under the aegis of the Association of Canadian College and University *Teachers of English* to reflect upon the transformation of

the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada: we are gathered as teachers *and* researchers whose very identity as humanistic enquirers and educators can be confirmed by an emphasis on our place in the learning process.

It is our task as research-teachers and teacher-researchers both to discover all that we can about our subjects and to share our findings with our students and peers.

Almost needless to say, much hard work and mutual understanding lies ahead if the SSHRC is to convince the federal government of the need for more funding for research and scholarship in the Humanities and Social Sciences. That funding may not be forthcoming, at least not in the amount requested, but even if it is not there is good reason to hope that, thanks to an open and comprehensive process of — dare it be said? — learning, the “mind [and] soul” of the Humanities and Social Sciences have asserted themselves, the “carved idols” have been recognized and, so far as possible, resisted, and the great city of which humanists and humanistic sciences are the rightful custodians saved, at least for the time being, from “rust and dust.”

(Further commentary by D.M.R. Bentley on the transformation of SSHRC and on the current situation of the Arts or Humanities can be found in the discussion papers at www.canadianpoetry.ca.)

Finding a Shared Language: SSHRC Transformation and the Humanities

By Keith Wilson

I want to begin my comments today with two prefatory remarks. First, since my presence on this panel is a consequence of my having prepared the ACCUTE report to CFHSS on the projected SSHRC Transformation materials, I wanted to underline that what I am saying does not represent any kind of official ACCUTE position. The ACCUTE report was prepared after consultation with members, was reviewed and modified by the Executive, and represents to the extent that anything does an “official” ACCUTE position. This present paper offers no more than my own ruminations on a subject that has clearly exercised the research community in recent months, to a greater degree than any other issue that I can remember in my experience of our bit of the Canadian academy. The way in which our community has been exercised is unfortunate, since the mood has been one of perceived major threat, generated by what must surely be seen as communicative failure. After all, we are all indebted at some time in some form to SSHRC, we all sympathise with SSHRC’s ambitions for the humanities to have a higher profile (and the greater funding that goes along with it) in contemporary Canada — one would have thought we were all more or less on the same wave-length. What, then, is the source of the alarmed response to SSHRC’s transformation document, *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council?* Why does “consultation” seem to have generated primarily indignant resistance in so many of our colleagues.

The second caveat is that, happy as I am to be speaking on a Professional Concerns panel, since there are few matters of greater professional concern than either the nature and

Professional Concerns Continued...

extent of support for research in the humanities or the operational priorities of the main granting council charged with the responsibility for administering that support, I feel as if this session may have been rather overtaken by events. Like ACCUTE, most other Canadian learned societies in the humanities and social sciences prepared detailed written responses to the SSHRC transformation document in the weeks leading down to the late-March meeting of the CFHSS Board of Directors with society presidents and representatives. Following that meeting, CFHSS prepared its own report, which has now been forwarded to SSHRC. The most striking feature of both the individual society responses and the collective Federation response is the degree of agreement across disciplines. The Federation's 14 recommendations in response to the SSHRC document can be found on pages 22-23 of its report, and, assuming they are listened to, we should all be heartened into cautious optimism in anticipation of the direction in which SSHRC should be heading. So what are we doing here and what more is there to say? Since the problems with aspects of the SSHRC document have been fully recognised, and clear direction given to SSHRC by the Federation's report, the most useful things I can say today probably relate to why the alarm occurred and how its recurrence might be prevented.

Over the last few years humanists have become understandably exercised over the disabling extent to which a science, or social science, model has come to dominate in thinking about research support. One of the perennial complaints about the way SSHRC seemed to be heading was that it was becoming an organization administered by a social scientist

primarily for social scientists, with little understanding of what most work in the humanities involves. So major were the reservations about the social and academic engineering many people saw implicit in certain SSHRC attitudes that there was even a sprinkling of colleagues who were beginning to advance the advisability of again dividing the humanities from the social sciences for funding purposes, even in the recognition that this might mean sacrificing the feeder link to the more direct highway that social scientists seem to enjoy to the fiscal generosity of politicians, whose eyes are supposedly well and solely focussed on the supposed social functionality of research. Advocates of this risky thrust became more vocal after the rumour gained ground that, as a negotiating strategy, SSHRC itself was willing to play its own version of hard-ball with the government, threatening, unwisely in the view of the overwhelming majority of humanists, that it would have to cancel upcoming Standard Research Grants competitions if more funds were not forthcoming (see *ACCUTE Newsletter*, June 2002, p. 13).

*Why, one wonders,
was the nation-wide
community of
humanists so
spooked by the
rumblings emanating
from SSHRC over the
last few years?*

One of the most heartening things suggested by the society responses on which the Federation report is founded is that this supposed division between the two broad disciplinary constituencies that SSHRC serves may have been more ap-

parent than actual. Certainly SSHRC can no longer be labouring under any illusions about the research support priorities of most scholars. Recommendation #3 of the CFHSS response is that "The Standard Research Grant must be supported as the most important SSHRC activity. It is the core of research in the humanities and social sciences. Every attempt should be made to expand the amount of available funds" (*CFHSS Report on the Transformation of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada* [2004], p. 22). But given this degree of agreement, why, one wonders, was the nationwide community of humanists so spooked by the rumblings emanating from SSHRC over the last few years. Did we all misunderstand what SSHRC's priorities were? Did SSHRC misunderstand what our priorities were? Why has it taken the current elaborate exercise to spell out in the CFHSS response what most of us thought, before this exercise even began, were self-evident truths about research in the humanities? For while we may be surprised and gratified at the degree of agreement across the notional humanities-social science divide, surely few of us working in the humanities will be surprised at this wholesale vindication of our own pre-suppositions.

One of the main reasons for communication's having proved a little troubled is that SSHRC finds itself caught uncomfortably between two, equally demanding, audiences for its pronouncements. One is the pragmatic political constituency that finally controls the purse-strings. If SSHRC wants more money, it has to speak a language with which politicians will sympathise, and that is often assumed to be the pragmatic language of functionality and social utility, spiked with a vigorous

Professional Concerns Continued...

dose of apocalypticism. As we are particularly likely to remember at election time, this is a language in which the sound-bite, the slogan, and the unexamined uplifting sentiment tend to dominate. The most reductive version of that language (and this is a particular problem in relation to its capacity to strike an answering chord in those trained in English studies) is, of course, the language of advertising, which by its very nature is not designed to encourage probing analysis of terminological ready-mades in those to whom they are directed. While I am not altogether convinced that this is a language that works very persuasively even with politicians (after all, the fact that this is the language they themselves often use on us doesn't mean that it is also the language by which they are persuaded when it's used on them), I am certain that it doesn't work at all on humanities scholars, part of whose professional stock-in-trade is skill in linguistic analysis and a healthy capacity for scepticism.

What does a humanities scholar do, then, with a proposition like the following, selected fairly arbitrarily from SSHRC's *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council* report?:

By transforming itself into a knowledge agency, SSHRC can help Canada break the "knowledge barrier" by renewing human sciences research. (6)

It all sounds very earnest, a muscularly assertive proposition designed to make one feel almost small-minded to question. But if one reaches after its real meaning, the language dissolves: what *is* this "knowledge barrier," who is standing on either side of it, who has a vested interest in constructing and maintaining it, who has a vested interest in knocking it down, is the division it creates systemic or occasional, is it like the Berlin Wall and

designed to stop knowledge escaping or is it more like a police cordon on Oscar night to prevent *hoi polloi* invading celebrity knowledge space?

In the next sentence we discover the real source of this slippery image in the resort to a device familiar to both the politician and the advertiser: the over-elaborated illustrative metaphor:

When the first plane broke the sound barrier in 1947, scientists learned something surprising: the controls didn't work as expected. Flying faster than the speed of sound required new understanding, a new approach to aerodynamic design and controls. Failure to adjust would risk loss of control and endanger pilots' lives. (6).

Now thrillingly urgent as this all sounds, inviting a vision of the fearless pilot, potentially forced to wrestle with treacherously inadequate controls unless the boffins rise to the unprecedented challenges of their times, it has to be said that it embodies only approximately the likely experience of even the most cutting-edge of humanities scholars, and that's *before* it works itself up to its ultimate pitch of rhetorical intensity:

Today, the exponential rate of technological, political and cultural change is driving society at incredible speed towards a promising but daunting future. Major upheavals in the wake of globalization, terrorism and new technologies pose a challenging human dilemma: do existing social arrangements still work? How can we make sense of clashing traditions and world views? These are questions for the humanities and social sciences to help answer. (6)

The notion that questions couched in the volatile and approximate terms adopted here are the kind of questions that actually *have* an answer, along with the implicit assumption that other cultures and times haven't experien-

ced comparable instabilities (Europe in the 18th century? America in the 19th century? most of the world in most of the 20th century) is so alien to the precise and contextual terms in which intellectually speculative minds think as to be virtually meaningless. However politicians may respond to this kind of rhetoric (and I suspect that many of them are much less susceptible to its blandishments than we might imagine), few thinking academics are likely to be convinced by it.

The problem is compounded by the fact that language like this, far from sounding consultative, gives the impression that decisions have been made, that this way of seeing things is self-evidently the correct one, that what is being advanced is not an interpretation but a fact, and that all responsible people are reading from the same page, or soon will be if they know what's good for them. Many of us, in advance of the distribution of SSHRC's position paper, were familiar with Marc Renaud's February 2004 Fred. A. Aldrich Lecture at Memorial University, with its titular, and threateningly imperative, adaptation of François Tavernas's formulation: "Universities: Change is Mandatory; Survival is Optional; Choose Wisely." What phrasing like this does is present a self-evident truth (all human institutions change, a propensity of which no-one trained in any academic discipline is likely to be unaware) as a coercive proclamation – i. e. not only will change occur but these are the terms on which it is happening and this is what we have to do about it. Notionally consultative though the agenda was claimed to be, the tonal properties of the way in which the whole matter was presented to the academy were not such as to invite demurral, or even genuine reflection, even when soliciting feedback. "Dare to think big!" asserts *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council*' (21), which carries the unfortunate implication that most of us

Professional Concerns Continued...

have been so pusillanimous and petty-minded as hitherto to have been capable of only lilliputian thoughts, blinkered as we have been from the urgencies of the times in which we live.

This is not the way to address a sophisticated community of intellectual equals, who have long since discovered the virtues of inter-disciplinarity, long since emerged from that now empty but still facilely-invoked ivory tower, have probably been doing their bits in a myriad of different ways to bring appropriate parts of their research (however arcane it might be) before segments of the tax-paying public who support it, and probably know as much about the pressures of the contemporary world as anyone at SSHRC does,

even if their recipes for confronting them don't agree with SSHRC's. It is certainly not the way to encourage genuine consultation and a sense of shared cause – indeed, it is virtually guaranteed to generate what it did generate: scepticism, irritation, and resistance.

With lots of good will and a modicum of good luck, from this point on communication between SSHRC and its humanities constituency should run more smoothly.

Fortunately, as evidenced in the measured terms of the Federation response, we seem to have weathered

these initial squalls and placed ourselves in a position to work together with SSHRC on trying to guarantee that research in the humanities receives the attention and support that it warrants. With lots of good will and a modicum of luck, from this point on communication between SSHRC and its humanities constituency should run more smoothly. But it's not only an ACCUTE audience that will appreciate how fundamental to this continuing process will be the finding of a genuinely collaborative, non-coercive, non-heckoring language that assumes we are all indeed members of the same informed community, not benighted navel-gazers wrapped in our sub-disciplinary cocoons from which we have to be summarily awakened and rudely ejected.

The ACCUTE Sessional Session ♦ May 28-31 ♦ University of Western Ontario

How are sessional instructors changing university and college education? How can sessionals best contribute to the academy? Should there be a separate category of non-researching teachers at universities? Or should there be more internal and external support in the form of grants and fellowships for sessionals to conduct research? What are the advantages and disadvantages to long-term part-time hiring? Should we be working to establish a separate (possibly national) union for sessionals? How can the lot of the sessional instructor be materially improved? Papers that explore any of these questions or any other aspect of sessional teaching are invited. Please email proposals of about 500 words or papers of about 2500 words (no attachments, please), along with a 50-word bibliographical note, by 15 November 2004, to jdevereu@uwo.ca or mail abstracts/papers to:

Dr. Jo Devereux
 Department of English,
 University of Western Ontario
 London, Ontario
 N6A 3K7

New Approaches to Louisa May Alcott

This panel invites papers that explore new critical approaches to Alcott's canonical texts, new ways of reading her most well-known work. However, I also welcome proposals that consider those less well-known works from the almost three hundred that she published. Papers may take any number of approaches to Alcott's writing, but I am most interested in those that might explore the "dichotomous" Alcott: the writer with the extraordinary life who so often consigned her female protagonists to ordinary domesticity; the author whose proclivity for the lurid style was at odds with her desire to write great literature; or the dismayed novelist who, when *Moods* was panned by the critics, swore she would never again write about ideas, only facts and ordinary people.

Please mail papers (12-13 double-spaced pages, 3000-3500 words) or abstracts (300-500 words) with a 100-word abstract and a 50-word bio-bibliographical note to:

Dr. Roxanne Harde,
Department of English,
411 Watson Hall,
Queen's University,
Kingston, Ontario,
K7L 3N6

For electronic submission, please contact me at:

harder@post.queensu.ca.

Proposals must be received by **15 November 2004**.

Reading Canadian "Writers as Critics"

In Canada the phenomenon of the "writer as critic" is a long and sustained tradition. This panel seeks to explore the impact on "Canadian letters" of "writers as critics," including but not limited to those writers who are part of "The Writer as Critic Series" from NeWest Press (Douglas Barbour, Stan Dragland, Fred Wah, Daphne Marlatt, Phyliss Webb, Frank Davey, Aritha van Herk, Stephen Scobie, and George Bowering), whose purpose, according to its general editor Smaro Kamboureli, is to invite readers to read criticism as literature by helping them "identify the shifting boundaries and intentions of the artist creatively writing criticism." Other "writers as critics" might include AJM Smith, FR Scott, EJ Pratt, Dennis Lee, Robert Kroetsch, Margaret Atwood, Michael Ondaatje, Roy Kiyooka, Roy Miki, George Elliott Clarke, Dionne Brand, Marlene Nourbese Philip, Lenore Keeshig-Tobias, Carol Shields, Bronwen Wallace, Thomas King, Lee Maracle, Nicole Brossard, Gail Scott, Lola Lemire Tostevin, Betsy Warland, or newspaper columnists such as Russell Smith and Lynn Crosbie.

Possible questions to consider include:

- What is the function of the "writer as critic"?
- Is it a particularly Canadian phenomenon?
- What role do such critics play in narratives of nation and constructions of belonging?
- How (and why) has the function of the "writer as critic" changed/evolved?
- What do "writers as critics" have to say about the relationship between poetry and politics?
- What is their function as public intellectuals?
- What is the relationship between private and public selves in these works?
- What is the relationship between their creative and critical work?
- How does their critical writing affect our readings of their own creative work?

Please send both a paper copy and an email or disk copy of your paper or proposal, one copy of a 100-word abstract and a 50-word bio-bibliographical note by **November 15, 2004**, to: Joanne Saul, Department of English and Film Studies, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, ON N2L 3C5 (jsaul@wlu.ca) OR Christl Verduyn, Canadian Studies/English, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, ON N2L 3C5 (cverduyn@wlu.ca). Proposals should be 300-500 words in length. A "Works Cited" section must also be included. Completed papers should be no longer than 12-13 double-spaced pages.

Sowing Social Change: Nineteenth-Century American Women's Writing

The texts produced by nineteenth-century America's so-called "mob of scribbling women" have been castigated, in their own era and even today, as consisting primarily of predictable romance plots and sentimental schematics that worked, finally, to reinforce the sexual, gendered, racial, and social status quo. Yet many nineteenth-century American women used creative writing—one of the only modes of public expression widely open to them—to comment on and posit solutions to issues of social suffering, including poverty, violence, unemployment, prejudice, etc. This panel seeks papers about nineteenth-century women's literature that engaged questions of social justice and social transformation—literature that might include women's novels that overtly scrutinized social structures like family, church, and government for the sources of (and possible solutions to) social suffering, fiction about experimental communities seeking to model reform within the American macrocosm, or nineteenth-century utopian writing that resorted to fantasy and/or technological advance to solve America's ills.

Please mail proposals (250-500 words) or papers (3000-3500 words) with a 100-word abstract and a 50-word bio-bibliographical note, to Dr. Angela Mills, Department of English Language and Literature, Brock University, St. Catharines, ON, L2S 3A1. For electronic submissions, please contact me at amills@brocku.ca. Proposals must be received by **November 15, 2004**.

Amorous Ladies

This panel seeks to participate in more recent, alternative, histories of "the rise of the novel" by focusing on the work of the popular precursors of Fielding et al. Much-maligned at the time, Aphra Behn, Eliza Haywood, Delarivier Manley and others are enjoying a critical Renaissance, with new scholarly editions and critical studies coming out with regularity. This panel will explore the amatory fictions of these writers. Papers could address these texts in terms of i) their place in literary history, ii) their antecedents and/or successors, iii) the ways in which their authors understood them, iv) the significance of their critical rebirth to literary studies and/or the teaching of literature, or v) other relevant avenues of inquiry. Papers of lesser-known authors are particularly welcome.

Please submit:

- i) one hard copy of your paper (12-13 pp., double-spaced) or proposal (300-500 words), as well as
- ii) a "works cited" section,
- iii) an abstract (100-words) and
- iv) a bio-bibliographical note (50 words),

by **November 15, 2004**, to: Dr. Miriam Jones, Dept. of Humanities and Languages, University of New Brunswick, Saint John, P.O. Box 5050, Saint John, N.B., E2L 4L5. Please submit electronic copies of the same either on disk with the hard copies, or via email to jones@unbsj.ca.

Desire in Canadian Literature

How do desires of any kind (in)form the material of the textual worlds we encounter, especially those Canadian literary and textual worlds? Which texts propose resistance to "discourses of the normalized"? Which propose integration? What are the disciplinary and cultural presuppositions behind desire in the literature currently found in university syllabi? How is desire often the unnamable, the unacceptable, the unspoken? What are the languages of desire? What are the boundaries between the "normal" and the "abnormal"?

How are desires used to control, and how do they underscore the structures of available discourses in literary texts? How have fields of specialization, such as feminism or queer theory, contributed to an expanding discussion of these texts? To what end has desire been problematic? Is desire a body style or is it something more cerebral? Is the idea of always being just "out of reach"—of striving, rather than attaining—the true definition of desire?

Possible topics/areas include desire as submission, desire to submit; legal limits of desire; geographical isolation/location or "situated" desires; pedagogical desires; history of desire in literatures; media desire: medium of desire(s) is the message; ecological/biological desires: natural and naturalized desires for the "other"; desire for difference/to be different; desire for the forbidden; "separation anxiety," the desire to separate, the desire to assimilate; desire for stabilization, to destabilize binaries, to maintain opposites, to oppose; subversive or destabilizing desires; desire to "pass" as straight, as gay, as neither, as both; style desire: camp aesthetics and desire for the feminine, the eternal feminine, the masculine underneath the feminine; commodified desires, a desire for commodities, the body as commodity, the body as ad.

Proposals on any topic concerning Canadian Literature and desire should be 300-500 words and must clearly indicate significance, the line of argument, principal texts considered, and relation to existing scholarship. One paper and one email copy of the proposal, along with a 100 word abstract and 50 word bio note, must be included. Final papers should be no more than 10 pages. Deadline is **15 November 2004**. Please mail to:

Dr Andrew Lesk, Department of English,
University of Toronto, Larkin 335, 6 Hoskin Ave,
Toronto M5S 1H8
E-mail: andrew.lesk@utoronto.ca

The Graphic Novel in Canada

Graphic novels, or sequential art narratives, have been with us for about 30 years, yet until recently they have never been considered "serious"—or at least, serious enough to be considered novels that might be on university syllabi. However, with Chester Brown's recent interpretation of the Louis Riel story (in the biography of the same name) garnering considerable attention, the graphic novel is (yet again) being hailed as the "next big thing."

But is it literature? Does the study of the genre belong in an English class? Does Brown's work, for example, contribute to the ever-growing body of "Riel Lit," and so, should it be studied alongside Rudy Wiebe's *The Scorched Wood People* or poetry by EJ Pratt, Dorothy Livesay, Lorna Crozier, and George Bowering? Are illustrated novels, such as those by Barbara Hodgson, really about the pictures and not the narrative?

Papers which examine and interpret the graphic novel, as a novel or in its role as a pedagogical tool, are welcome. Essays on graphic novels by Canadian writers/artists—David Boswell, Chester Brown, David Collier, Julie Doucet, Seth (aka Gregory Gallant), Dave Sim, Michel Rabagliati—are particularly encouraged.

Proposals should be 300-500 words and must clearly indicate significance, the line of argument, principal texts considered, and relation to existing scholarship. One paper and one email copy of the proposal, along with a 100 word abstract and 50 word bio note must be included. Final papers should be no more than 10 pages (not including artwork to be shown). Deadline is **15 November 2004**. Please mail to:

Dr Andrew Lesk, Department of English,
University of Toronto,
Larkin 335, 6 Hoskin Ave,
Toronto M5S 1H8
E-mail: andrew.lesk@utoronto.ca

Margaret Avison

George Bowering calls Margaret Avison “our best poet.” Winner of two Governor-General awards for poetry and the 2003 Griffin prize, she has received the highest recognition over decades of significant change in the literary world. She is one of our most challenging and rewarding poets for the critical reader, yet her work has not generated a large body of scholarship. This panel welcomes papers on any aspect of Avison’s poetry or prose.

Submissions should be sent to:

Dr Katherine Quinsey, Department of English,
University of Windsor,
Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4
telephone (519) 253-3000 ext 2303; fax (519) 971-3676
E-mail: kateq@uwindsor.ca

Proposals should include a title, a 100-word abstract, and a 50-word biographical note.

Memory, History, Publishers, and Diaries in Canada

The act of keeping a diary is often attributed to the desire to recall information. In other words, it is said to be motivated by a desire to create a kind of textual data archive; it enhances or assuages hypermnesia and it tries to mitigate amnesia. The value of publishing a diary (such as those issued by the Life Writing Series from Wilfrid Laurier University Press) is usually explained by editors in terms of its historical significance even though recent criticism urges attention to its literary aspects. Proposals are invited for a session that considers diary writing within the matrix of memory, history, archives, and publishers. Papers that focus on diaries written in Canada are of special interest because the records of explorers, colonial settlers, farm wives, writers, and others have been such an important part of Canadian literary history. Successful proposals will address one of the tangled relationships between the reception of (select) diaries and resulting historical narratives; between diary publication and nostalgia; between diary writing and memory (how does a diarist organize a surfeit of details into coherent narrative--and/or how do we read a lack of coherence?); or between diary writing and the lacunae of archives. Possible topics might include the publication history of a particular diary, the history of a diary that did not get published; alternative routes to publishing diaries on-line and how those are “archived”; the publishing history of books meant to be used as diaries or journals (the fact of the text) and what it assumes about textual acts of memory-making; or the relationship between diaries and their reception in archives or critical work. Do diaries offer alternative models of archiving or cataloguing information? What kind of information is privileged? Papers might also address the memorial function of scrapbooks or commonplace books, and/or the narrative disarray that results from textual “gleaning” (to use a term from Ellen Gruber Garvey’s scholarship).

Proposals should be 300-500 words in length and should indicate the originality or scholarly significance of the papers, the line of argument, the principal texts the paper will speak to, and the relation of the paper to existing scholarship on the topic. A “Works Cited” section must also be included. One paper and one electronic copy of the proposal, a 100-word abstract, and a 50 word bio-bibliographical note should be sent by **15 November 2004** to: Kathryn Carter, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, English and Contemporary Studies, Laurier Brantford, 73 George Street, Brantford, Ontario, N3T 2Y3. Tel: (519) 756-8228 X5741 Fax: (519) 759-2127 email: kcarter@wlu.ca.

Promiscuity and Prostitution in Contemporary Canadian Fiction

In the past, promiscuous women and prostitutes have been treated with little sympathy in Canadian fiction. As Canadian literature over the past four decades has come to include more explicit sexuality, and as cultural influences have produced generations of writers concerned with the emancipation of their characters from restrictive social and moral codes, sex workers and/or sexually promiscuous women are often portrayed more sympathetically than ever before. However, while novels such as Adele Wiseman's *Crackpot* (1974), Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985), and Daphne Marlatt's *Ana Historic* (1988), offer readers a glimpse of potentially "emancipatory" sex work and three-dimensional prostitute characters, there remains a sense of distance from this work and these women in such texts.

A growing body of contemporary Canadian fiction refuses its readers this "safe" vantage point from which to consider characters who are sexually promiscuous or work in the sex industry. In so doing, this literature may newly confront and explore what Gail Pheterson terms "the whore stigma." Dionne Brand's *At the Full and Change of the Moon* (1999), for example, includes a number of female protagonists whose many sexual encounters—some of which involve the exchange of money—empower them to face the day-to-day challenges of their lives. And Rebecca Godfrey's *The Torn Skirt* (2001) features an adolescent girl who becomes a street person because she idolizes a young prostitute who may or may not be another facet of her increasingly fragmented psyche. In contrast, Tomson Highway's *Kiss of the Fur Queen* (1998) includes details from a series of ghastly murders of sex workers interspersed throughout the narrative; and Evelyn Lau's *Fresh Girls and Other Stories* (1993) offers first person narration of often depressing day-to-day events in a downtown Vancouver brothel.

How can we read promiscuous or 'prostitutional' characters in narratives like these? What roles do they play? How is this significant? Papers that explore the thematic, theoretical or cultural implications of female sexual promiscuity or sex work in contemporary Canadian literature are invited for this panel.

Proposals should be 300-500 words in length and should include a "Works Cited" section along with a 100-word abstract and a 50-word bio-bibliographical note. One paper copy of each of these documents should be submitted, and an email or disk copy of the proposal should also be submitted by **November 15, 2004** to:

Shawna M. Ferris,
Department of English and Cultural Studies,
CNH 321, McMaster University,
1280 Main Street West,
Hamilton, Ontario, L8S 4M2
E-mail: shawnamferris@yahoo.ca Fax: 905-524-5338

Entangling Ethics: Reconsidering the Ethical Imagination in Early Modern Literature

The widespread circulation of exempla, emblems, and allegories throughout early modern writing attests to this period's concern with normative moralities, whether Protestant, Stoic, or Aristotelian. Prescriptive, didactic, and mimetic codes of conduct were centered on self-fashioning, simultaneously bolstering the subject's narcissism and advancing the ideological agendas of the state. However, in early modern literature, the struggles of the ethical imagination are more ambivalent, more nuanced, and more entangled than the questions of self love and the submission to authority. With the rise of individualism and the emergence of new modes of interiority, the early modern ethical imagination not only problematized normative moralities—as in Spenser's *Faerie Queene* and Browne's *Religio Medici*—but more significantly grappled with situations and issues well in advance of twentieth-century philosophy's revision of ethics: the self's entanglement in the other; renunciation's entanglement in pleasure; and masculinity's entanglement in femininity.

All papers and proposals on the topic of "Entangling Ethics" in early modern literature are welcome. Special consideration will be given to papers and proposals that are theoretically or philosophically oriented to the topic: examples may include the ethics of alterity (Derrida and Levinas), the ethics of sameness (Badiou), ethics and language (Wittgenstein), the ethics of the Real (Freud, Lacan, and Žižek), and the ethics of gender (Irigaray and Butler).

Please send one paper copy of the proposal or the paper, accompanied by one paper copy of a 100-word abstract and a 50-word bio-bibliographical note, by **November 15, 2004**. One email or disk copy of the proposal or paper must also be submitted. Proposals should be 300-500 words in length and should include the following:

1. the originality or scholarly significance of the proposed paper
2. the line of argument
3. the principal texts that the paper will deal with
4. the relation of the paper to existing scholarship on the topic
5. a "Works Cited" section

Completed papers should fulfill the aforementioned criteria too and should be no longer than 12-13 double-spaced pages. All proposals and papers must be sent to the following address:

Grant Williams,
Nipissing University, English Studies Department,
100 College Drive, Box 5002,
North Bay, Ontario, P1B 8L7
E-mail: grantw@nipissingu.ca

Joint Session of ACCUTE and the Victorian Studies Association of Western Canada
May 28-31 ♦ U of Western Ontario

Victorian Public Culture

The Victorian Studies Association of Western Canada is sponsoring this panel, for which we invite proposals for papers that will examine aspects of Victorian public culture. Possible topics for individual papers include, but are not limited to, struggles for citizenship, fictions of democracy, public spaces, beyond separate spheres, print and speech cultures, identity performance, the public man/public woman, decorum/manners/behaviours, and Victorian inclusions/exclusions.

Proposals should be 300-500 words in length, and should clearly indicate the originality or scholarly significance of the proposed paper, the line of argument, the principal texts the paper will speak to, and the relation of the paper to existing scholarship on the topic. A list of works cited should also be included. Complete papers should fulfill these criteria and should be no longer than 10 double-spaced pages. Three copies of papers and/or proposals, accompanied by three copies of a 100-word abstract and a 50-word biographical note, should be sent by **November 15, 2004** to:

Dr. Vanessa Warne
Department of English
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, MB R3T 5V5
Tel. 204-474-7145

Joint Session of ACCUTE and the Eastern Canadian Victorian Studies Association
May 28-31 ♦ U of Western Ontario

Victorian Literary Criticisms

Papers are invited for a session sponsored jointly by ACCUTE and the Eastern Canadian Victorian Studies Association on the topic "Victorian Literary Criticisms." Papers might reflect on aspects of 19th-century literary reviewing and criticism; on contrasts or relationships between 19th-century and contemporary criticism; on 19th-century literary texts as forms of literary criticism; on the role of 19th-century texts in particular critical approaches (e.g. *Jane Eyre* and feminist criticism); or on ways the 19th century and its texts have been criticized (e.g. through postcolonial critical readings).

As per ACCUTE guidelines, proposals should be 300-500 words in length, and should clearly indicate the originality or scholarly significance of the proposed paper, the line of argument, the principal texts the paper will address, and the relation of the paper to existing scholarship on the topic. A list of works cited must also be included. Completed papers should fulfill these criteria, and should be no longer than 12-13 double-spaced pages. One hard copy of the paper or proposals, accompanied by one copy of a 100 word abstract and a 50-word bio-bibliographical note, must be sent by **November 15, 2004** to:

Rohan Maitzen
Department of English, Dalhousie University
6135 University Avenue
Halifax, Nova Scotia, B3H 4P9

An electronic copy of the proposal or paper must also be submitted by disk or e-mail (Rohan.Maitzen@Dal.Ca). Microsoft Word files are strongly preferred.

Joint Session of ACCUTE and the Eastern Canadian Victorian Studies Association
May 28-31 ♦ U of Western Ontario

Nervous Reactions: Romantic Heterologies and Victorian Hegemonies

These two proposed panels explore the 'Victorianization' of Romantic writers, texts, and ideas, and the construction of 'Romanticism,' by Victorian and Romantic writers alike. Nineteenth-century (re)appropriations of Romantic identities frequently inscribed a dominant ideology of later Victorian insight over an earlier Romantic blindness. As Matthew Arnold writes, there was something about the "first quarter of this century" that was "premature" because it "didn't know enough" about itself. What did the Victorians know, or pretend to know, that the Romantics didn't, and that they used as a way of buttressing their own literary, social, political, economic, sexual, and cultural hegemonies? Victorian attempts to regulate Romantic issues of class, gender, sexuality, aesthetics, politics, nationality, and/or the body are often simultaneously unsettled by these issues in ways that exacerbate nineteenth-century anxieties about (Romantic) heterodoxy. In Victorian attempts to appropriate Romanticism's cultural legacy, how does Romanticism displace a later Victorian legacy in which Romanticism's children become its admonitory parents? How is Victorianism a "nervous reaction" to Romanticism?

1. Victorian Romanticism

This panel seeks papers that explore the legacy of Romanticism, Romantic writers, and Romantic cultural currents in Victorian England. To what extent did Victorian England rely on earlier Romantic ideas when fashioning its own aesthetics, culture, politics, psychology, science, the public sphere, sexuality, etc.? Possible topics include, but are not limited to: Victorian responses to Romantic representations of nationality and nationhood; auto/ biography and the refashioning of Romantic subjectivity; Romantic sexuality/the body/ Victorian discipline; Romanticism and the gendering of the separate spheres; re-imagining Romantic economics and consumerism for the Victorian marketplace; the canonization and/or mourning of Romantic authors/Romanticism through "recollections," "reminiscences," and "literary remains"; editorial and/or critical reconstructions of Romanticism and Romantic writers; Victorian psychology's debt to Romanticism's science of the mind; Victorian science's debt to Romantic science.

2. Victorian Misprisionings/ Romantic Resistances

This panel seeks papers that address how Victorian refashionings of Romanticism are challenged by it. To what extent do earlier Romantic ideas unsettle later Victorian ideologies that seek to contain them? How is Victorianism a "nervous reaction" to Romanticism? Possible topics here include, but again are not limited to: the breakdown and/or tenuousness of traditional chronologies between the Romantic and the Victorian; later nineteenth-century and twentieth-century debates about "the Romantic" and "the Victorian"; Romantic writers as "already Victorian" or "self-Victorianizing" (Wordsworth, De Quincey, Hemans, Coleridge and his heirs, the Darwins, Shelley and his heirs, etc.); the emergence of Victorian imperialisms (political, encyclopedic, economic, cultural, intellectual empires) already in Romanticism; Victorianism's incomplete conservation of Romantic radicalism; the construction (as opposed to reconstruction) of "Romanticism" in the Victorian period (Romanticism as a Victorian concept that lasts into the twentieth century).

For either panel, please send by **15 November 2004** (WordPerfect or Word) 300-500 word proposals (plus bibliography) or papers of no more than 10 double-spaced pages (with Works Cited), a 100-word abstract of the paper, and a 50-word bio-bibliographical sketch of yourself to:

Joel Faflak
Department of English, University of Western Ontario,
London, Ontario, N6A 3K7 CANADA
E-mail: jfaflak@uwo.ca

Joint Session of ACCUTE and the North American Society for the Study of Romanticism
May 28-31 ♦ U of Western Ontario

1. The Periodical Press and Romantic Innovation

This panel invites papers that explore the ways in which the rapidly expanding realm of periodical publication fostered and/or resisted innovation in the literary field of the Romantic period. How did the periodicals understand innovation? to what extent did they themselves help to reshape genres, literary hierarchies and critical categories? Please email abstracts of about 500 words (no attachments, please) by **15 November 2004** to iferris@uottawa.ca or mail abstracts to:

Professor Ina Ferris
Dept. of English, University of Ottawa
70 Laurier East,
Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5

2. Crime, Sin, Violence, Violation

Romantic culture often involves complex revisions and reconstitutions of traditional concepts. What is crime to the Romantics? Traditionally there is a distinction between "crime" and "sin." How do the Romantics perceive or formulate the distinction, or discard it? How do they see violence? And what is the relation between violence and violation? How do the Romantics understand theft? Relations between Romantic practice and law, church law, and custom are of interest here, but this call is not limited to Historicist or New Historicist approaches. Psychological, philosophical or cultural approaches, depictions of violence and its significance, and differences and continuities between previous and later practice are also of interest.

Please email abstracts that give a clear idea of the paper by **15 November 2004** to Nicholson@cariboo.bc.ca (rather than attachments, just include the abstract in the message itself), or mail abstracts to:

Professor Mervyn Nicholson
Department of English, University College of the Cariboo
Box 3010, Kamloops, BC V2C 5N3

3. An Open Session on Byron

New thoughts and observations about Byron, about Byron's place in literary history, about the history of criticism of Byron are welcome. Relations between Byron and later or earlier writers, relations between Byron and other arts (painting, music), relations between Byron and history and his historico-political influence generally. In short, an open session.

Please email papers or abstracts that give a clear idea of the paper by **15 November 2004** to Nicholson@cariboo.bc.ca (rather than attachments, just include the abstract in the message itself), or mail abstracts to:

Professor Mervyn Nicholson
Department of English, University College of the Cariboo
Box 3010, Kamloops, BC V2C 5N3

The ACCUTE Professional Concerns Panel ♦ May 28-31 ♦ University of Western Ontario

The Professional Concerns Committee requests ACCUTE's members to propose topics of debate for the next round of the Professional Concerns Committee sessions. The following topics have already been proposed:

- Teaching load
- Academic professionalization, especially with regard to graduate students
- Research and teaching
- Teaching English beyond the traditional university
- Why do we do what we do: what are the ethical principles governing our approach to the Humanities today?
- First-year teaching in universities and colleges

- From PhD to tenure-track: professionalization and nurturing of young faculty
- Best practices: pedagogical challenges and pedagogical strategies

If you are interested in debating one of these topics at a Professional Concerns session, please send a brief proposal to me. If you wish to add to the list of suggestions, contact me (Anne Quéma) at: aquema@acadiu.ca

The Professional Concerns Committee also proposes to discuss issues explored in the pages that *ESC* devotes to its forum of ideas. Members who wish to organize a panel to respond to the views expressed in *ESC*'s Forum should contact me.

ACCUTE Executive Members

Keith Wilson, President
and Representative to the CFHSS
English Dept., University of Ottawa
70 Laurier Ave. E.
Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5
kgwilson@uottawa.ca
(613) 562-5800 ext. 1160

Neil Besner, Past-President
English Dept., University of Winnipeg
515 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, MB R3B 2E9
n.besner@uwinnipeg.ca
(204) 786-9942

Jennifer Panek, Secretary-Treasurer
Dept. of English, University of Ottawa
70 Laurier Ave. E.
Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5
jpanek@uottawa.ca
(613) 562-5800 ext. 1219

Anne Quéma, Member-at-Large
English Dept., Acadia University
Wolfville, NS B4P 2R6
aquema@acadiu.ca
(902) 585-1264

Jo-Ann Episkew, Member-at-Large
First Nations University of Canada
1 First Nations Way
Regina, SK S4S 7K2
jepiskew@sifc.edu
(306) 790-5950 ext. 3156

Judith Herz, Member-at-Large
English Dept., Concordia University
1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd., West
Montreal, QC H3G 1M8
jherz@vax2.concordia.ca
(514) 848-2424 ext. 2360

Jo Devereux, Sessional Representative
English Dept., University of Western Ontario
London, ON N6A 3K7
jdevereu@uwo.ca
(519) 661-2111 ext. 85804

Jennifer Drouin, President of the Graduate Student
Caucus
Dept. of English, McGill University
853 Sherbrooke West
Montreal, QC H3A 2T6
jennifer.drouin@mail.mcgill.ca

Brian Corman, President of CACE
Trinity College, University of Toronto
6 Hoskin Ave.
Toronto, ON M5S 1H8
bcorman@chass.utoronto.ca
(416)978-3197

Jo-Ann Wallace, Editor,
English Studies in Canada
English Dept.,
University of Alberta
3-5 Humanities Centre
Edmonton, AB T6G 2E5
jo-ann.wallace@ualberta.ca

ACCUTE 2004-2005 Membership Form

Renewing Member New Member

Member's Name: _____

Institution: _____

Delivery Address: _____

_____ Postal Code: _____

Phone (work): _____ (home): _____

Fax: _____ Email: _____

Professional Designation: Professor Associate Professor
 Assistant Professor College Professor Sessional Graduate Student
 Retired Faculty Instructor Post-doctoral Fellow
 Other (Please specify): _____

Languages: _____

Main Area of Specialization: _____

Additional Areas: _____

Authors: _____

If you are not already a discussion group member...

Do you wish to become a member of the ACCUTE discussion group? YES

Do you wish to become a member of the ACCUTE sessionals' discussion group? YES

Do you wish to become a member of the ACCUTE graduate students' discussion group? YES

I enclose:

The regular membership fee of \$80

The reduced membership fee of \$40 (sessionals, part-time faculty, graduate students, retired faculty, underwaged)

The household membership fee of \$130 (two memberships, one subscription to ESC).

Please also complete the form on the reverse.

A three-year membership fee (2004-2007) of \$205

A three-year household membership fee (2004-2007) of \$335

A \$5 donation to be directed to the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences (CFHSS)

Please complete reverse and mail to:
Jennifer Panek, ACCUTE Secretary-Treasurer
Department of English
University of Ottawa
70 Laurier Ave E.
Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5

Additional Information
To Be Completed by Those Applying for Household Memberships

Renewing Member New Member

Second Householder's Name: _____

Institution: _____

Delivery Address: _____
_____ Postal Code: _____

Phone (work): _____ (home): _____

Fax: _____ Email: _____

Professional Designation: Professor Associate Professor
 Assistant Professor College Professor Sessional Graduate Student
 Retired Faculty Instructor Post-doctoral Fellow
 Other (Please specify): _____

Languages: _____

Main Area of Specialization: _____

Additional Areas: _____

Authors: _____

If you are not already a discussion group member...

Do you wish to become a member of the ACCUTE discussion group? YES

Do you wish to become a member of the ACCUTE sessionals' discussion group? YES

Do you wish to become a member of the ACCUTE graduate students' discussion group? YES

Please complete reverse and mail to:

Jennifer Panek, ACCUTE Secretary-Treasurer
Department of English
University of Ottawa
70 Laurier Ave E.
Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5