Diana Brydon

This article was read as a paper at the second ASAL conference held in Canberra last May. Diana Brydon will return to Canada shortly to take up a position in the English Department at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver.

AUSTRALIAN LITERATURE AND THE CANADIAN COMPARISON

1. *Introduction: Establishing First Principles*

Several Canadian and Australian literary critics have made a good case for the comparative study of Canadian and Australian literature, arguing that although there was little direct contact between the two countries, and although their responses to the colonial dilemma took different forms, the two countries do share a common ancestry. In **Tradition in Exile**, the first book-length study devoted to this area of research, John Mathews notes that 'comparisons are most effective and helpful when they deal with divergences that spring from a common base'[1] and that 'more may be discovered about both Canadian and Australian letters when they are compared than when they are studied in isolation.'[2] The same points might be made about the teaching and criticism of the national literatures in the two countries. In the last few years there have been movements toward re-assessing the aims and methods of literary criticism in Canada and Australia, but little interaction between the two.

It is no longer necessary to make a case for comparative study in general, but before we can begin, the assumptions, both cultural and critical, which have underlain studies of the two national literatures up to the present must be reconsidered. In 1928, A.J.M. Smith complained in 'Wanted: Canadian Criticism' that 'One looks in vain through Canadian books and journals for that critical enquiry into first principles which directs a new literature as tradition guides an old one'.[3] Nearly fifty years later Malcolm Ross similarly suggested that 'we may have been, we may still be, in search of the **ground** of criticism'.[4] This search for first principles, for the ground of criticism, is a necessary one for both Canadian and Australian critics.

For many years, the experience of colonialism diverted critical attention into the unprofitable areas of self-justification or self-denigration. Everyone is familiar with the old questions these critics found it necessary to debate: Is there an Australian, or a Canadian, literature? Is it worth studying in its own right, or only as a source of information for historians or sociologists? These questions reinforce the doubts which they seek to resolve.

Instead of asking whether or not distinctive and worthy national literary traditions exist in Canada or Australia, the critic might study what has been written, and its critical reception, from within an interdisciplinary framework. Psychological theories about the relationships between colonised and coloniser, as described by Albert Memmi and Frantz Fanon, throw light on the analysis of the colonial mentality put forward by writers like George Grant, Margaret Atwood and Northrop Frye in Canada and A.A. Phillips and Judith Wright in Australia. Atwood's Basic Victim Positions in **Survival** are the most explicit acknowledgement that the colonial experience distorts the consciousness of those it involves, but the other critics also suggest that there is a close relationship between political status and national consciousness as expressed in literature. Similarly, economic and sociological theories of metropolis/hinterland or centre/periphery relationships as outlined by Ander Gunder Frank are relevant for understanding literature. Patricia Marchak, a sociologist, has already begun such an approach to Anglo-Canadian writing. Canadian scholars are also investigating the implications of the historian Harold Innis's work on the 'bias of communcation' for literary studies. In Australia, John Docker has pointed out the usefulness for literary critics of Louis Hartz's historical model of the fragmentation process as the underlying structure in the founding and development of new societies, while Brian Kiernan's book **Criticism** is similarly informed by notions of 'localist' and 'universalist' values.[5] Each of these approaches supplies a framework for discovering fresh perspectives on old problems.

These theories provide insights into the assumptions on which both nationalist and 'universal' critics operate: it is up to the critics themselves to re-evaluate their role, re-write their literary histories and re-assess their literature, a process which must continue if the literary traditions are not to atrophy. This article is a first small step in such a direction: it looks at significant problems Canadians and Australians face in understanding the interactions between the writer and society, the work of art and the reader. It tries to suggest what they share and where they diverge in an effort to see the two literatures from a slightly different angle, not only by defining them one against the other, but also by seeing them both as products of the colonial experience of transplanted Europeans.

The most common theory of colonial literary development sees a progression in three stages: from colonial insecurity to colonial self-assertion, and finally to the attainment of a maturity which is self-assured and relaxed, neither self-denigrating nor aggressively nationalistic. One of the problems

. "Australian Literature and the Canadian Comparison," Meanjin 2. 1979: 154-65.

with such a theory is the progression it sees occurring through the passage of time, since all three 'stages' may be present in any given period and even in the work of individual writers. Another problem is the deviation Canada (and to a lesser extent Australia) seems to present from this pattern. Canada has moved from being a political, economic and cultural dependency of Great Britain to a position of economic and cultural dependency on the United States, and this movement is reflected in much of the literature and its criticism. Australia's ties with England have remained stronger and her dependency on the United States is less extreme, but it too is feeling the pressures of American imperialism. It may be more useful to underplay theories which identify artificial stages of development, looking instead at the recurrent tensions underlying colonial experience and the changes in their relationships over time.

2. The Problem of Critical Stance

The central problem for colonial writers and critics was that of critical stance or perspective. Should the writer stand inside his newly developing and barely defined culture and look around him, or stand outside it to look down on it from the perspective of the English parent tradition which gave it birth? Or should he adopt Canadian poet James Reaney's solution of staying in the country but acting as if he weren't? — the poet as poltergeist.[6] Was there a choice? A related problem for the critic was that of evaluation. In **The Nature of Narrative**, Scholes and Kellogg point out that descriptive and evaluative terminology tend to be confused even by mainstream critics discussing established literature. It is not surprising to find similar confusions, complicated by the circumstances of colonialism, in Canadian and Australian criticism. Scholes and Kellogg note how 'realistic', a descriptive term, is commonly used as a term of praise. But what is true to life for a colonial reader may not be true to the literary conventions of the English novel. Is the colonial work to be judged by colonial standards — as true to colonial life and the conventions appropriate to it? — or by 'universal' standards, which often seem to be whether or not it is true to English life as reflected in English art?

P.R. Stephensen tried to resolve the issue in 'The Foundations of Culture in Australia', by suggesting that 'Art and literature are nationally created, but become internationally appreciated'[7], but this avoids the issue. How and why do works of art become internationally appreciated? The situation is complicated, as Vance Palmer recognised, by the fact that 'literature, particularly fiction, is not the pure medium we sometimes assume it to be. Response to it is affected by things other than its own intrinsic quality; by a curiosity or lack of it about the people it deals with, their outlook, their way of life'.[8] Critics like Northrop Frye in Canada and A.A. Phillips in Australia have dealt with this situation by directing their attention to the problem itself and the issues it raises. Frye's analysis of the colonial 'garrison mentality' as a 'frostbite at the roots of the Canadian imagination' focusses

on the colonial's misplaced desire to meet standards rather than make them, while A.A. Phillips' discussion of the 'colonial cringe' castigates the Australian tendency toward making needless comparisons of their own writing with others.

3. The Historical Framework

The tensions involved in these two problems of stance and standards took somewhat different forms in the literary histories of Canada and Australia. Miriam Waddingham identifies the two streams of English-Canadian literary expression and critical thought as the 'apocalyptic-mythic' and the 'historical-social'.[9] (Although we are here discussing only English-Canadian writing and the English-Canadian experience, the patterns in Quebec have been similar.) The 'apocalyptic-mythic' stream, expressed most clearly in the literary theories of Northrop Frye, although it pre-dates him, looks to the literature of the past rather than to the world of experience for its forms and mode of expression. It stands outside the colonial culture, within the traditions of English literature. Its critics stress universal value rather than truth to particular experience. In the terminology developed by Scholes and Kellogg in **The Nature of Narrative**, the connection between the fictional world and the real in 'apocalyptic-mythic' writing is illustrative or symbolic. The 'historical-social' stream, on the other hand, expresses itself in representational or mimetic art. The 'historical-social' critic stands inside the national culture and concentrates on its expression in the national art. The tension in Canada is between those who believe with James Reaney that 'Literature, the Bible and Shakespeare tell you more about the potentialities of Canada than Canada does itself'[10] and those, like Robin Mathew, author of **Canadian Literature: Surrender or Revolution**, who turn to the history, politics and economics for an understanding of the forms and language in which Canadians choose to express themselves. Of course, the two approaches may not be so clearly separated in practice — James Reaney is also the most regional of writers — but it is useful to isolate the two main tendencies of Canadian thinking provided one does not take them as prescriptive or as rigidly defined categories. Unfortunately, these two approaches to literature, each equally valid in itself, became confused with the debate between absolute and relative critical standards. 'Historical-social' critics are still often dismissed in Canada as parochial and narrowly nationalistic, while they themselves accuse 'apocalyptic-mythic' writers of having sold out to imperialist propaganda and of being subserviently colonial-minded.

The same terms cannot be applied to the situation in Australia. The Australian debate was between the nationalist critics who favoured social realism, and those who wished to see nationalism transcended to attain a larger significance. Nationalist critics focussed their attention on the writers who expressed the social values they saw as distinctively Australian, imposing a narrow reading of Australian literary history. Writers such as

Christina Stead and Martin Boyd were under-valued because their work could not be seen as part of a democratic nationalist tradition. Nationalist writers write social realist fiction about ordinary people. The 'universalist' critics, in contrast, demanded the 'specifically human' rather than the 'specifically Australian'[11] in art. The problem was that their 'absolute' standards were often difficult to distinguish from traditional English standards, which automatically condemned the colonial as second-rate.

Whereas the nationalist school with its preference for social realism seems to have had the strongest influence in Australia, at least until recently, the 'apocalyptic-mythic' approach has always been the dominant mode, again until recently, in Canada. A related issue is that of the tension between the popular and the academic in the two countries, where a similar contrast may be observed: the balance is weighted in favour of the academic in Canada and the popular in Australia. Part of the explanation may lie in the Hartz thesis, which suggests that Canada and Australia represent different fragments of the European experience because their people were separated from the original at different crucial moments in time. The separated fragment became the whole of the new colonial experience, rigidified, and ultimately generated a new nationalism, with definite, different (and sometimes recessive) characteristics. Whatever the cause, the implications of these differences for writing and criticism are significant and require further study.

I have isolated these opposing tendencies in the two countries because they reveal much about the way Canadians and Australians have seen themselves, and because it is important to distinguish the literature itself from the ways in which it has been perceived by the dominant national consciousness. For example, the emphasis on social realism in Australian literary criticism encouraged critics to argue that there was no metaphysical tradition in Australian writing, and to see Patrick White as an isolated phenomenon rather than the heir to earlier Australian developments. This position is now being re-considered, and metaphysical concerns have been discovered in the work of Mrs Campbell Praed, Henry Handel Richardson, Grant Watson and even in a social realist like Kylie Tennant. Similarly, Canadian literature has usually been seen as writing in search of an identity; in Earle Birney's words: 'It's only by our lack of ghosts we're haunted'. Recent criticism, from Atwood's **Survival** to Northey's **Haunted Wilderness**, identifies a variety of ghosts, and Robin Mathew has discovered what he sees as a positive Canadian tradition and identity through his revaluation of earlier Canadian writers whose work he feels has been misread.

An understanding of these interactions between the literature, the dominant critical assumptions and the sense of national identity is also an essential basis for comparative studies. When I began my doctorate on Australian literature, my Canadian preference for the 'apocalyptic-mythic' led me to question the democratic-nationalist tradition and to seek in Aust-

ralia's expatriate writers an alternative which might enrich the current definitions of the Australian identity.[12] While training in a different environment enabled me, as an outsider, to provide a fresh perspective, I had to learn the Australian way of viewing and evaluating literature in order to understand my Australian subject. I see a similar situation in the Australian critic D.R. Burns' recent article on Canadian writing in this journal. To a Canadian, he seems to be applying nationalist Australian prescriptive criticism to a tradition which is hostile to its assumptions. He concludes that 'the range of these novels fails to establish, to the outsider's satisfaction, something that could be called "Canadian" '.[13] This statement raises several of the issues I have been concerned to clarify in this article. How does one decide between the perspectives of outsider and insider, and how far should each be educated to understand the contexts of the other's point of view? Should the establishment of national identity constitute a criterion for evaluating literature? If so, who defines national identity?

4. *National Identity, Literature and Criticism*

Margaret Atwood has used her talent for brilliant generalisation to contrast the Canadian critic with his American and English counterparts:

> . . . there seem to be important differences between the way Canadians think — about literature, or anything — and the way Englishmen and Americans do. The English habit of mind, with its preoccupations with precedent and system, might be called empirical; reality for it is the social hierarchy and its dominant literary forms are evaluative criticism and the social novel. It values 'taste'. The American habit of mind, with its background of intricate Puritan theologising, French Enlightenment political theory and German scholarship and its foreground of technology, is abstract and analytical; it values 'technique' and for it reality is how things work. The dominant mode for some years has been 'New Criticism', picking works of art apart into component wheels and springs; its 'novel' is quite different from the English novel, which leans heavily towards comedy of manners and a dwindled George Eliot realism; the American novel, closer to the Romance, plays to a greater extent with symbolic characters and allegorical patterns. The Canadian habit of mind, for whatever reasons — perhaps a history and social geography which both seem to lack coherent shape — is synthetic. 'Taste' and 'technique' are both of less concern to it than is the ever-failing but ever-renewed attempt to pull all the pieces together, to discover the whole of which one can only trust one is part. The most central Canadian literary products, then, tend to be large-scope works like **The Anatomy of Criticism** and **The Gutenburg Galaxy** which propose all-embracing systems within which any particular bit of data may be placed. Give the same poem to a model American, a model Englishman and a model Canadian critic: the American will say 'This is how it works'; the Englishman 'How good, how true to life' (or, 'How boring, tasteless and trite'); the Canadian will say 'This is where it fits into the entire universe'.[14]

The model Australian response might be 'This is how it relates to our image of ourselves'. Unlike Canada, which Douglas LePan has labelled 'a

country without a mythology', Australia developed a concrete self-image very early in its history. A group of convict colonies, Australia became proud of its dubious heritage and made heroes of its convicts and bush-rangers as rebels against an unfair system. The qualities of these men became assimilated into the type of the bushman and later again that of the Digger. The Australian legend, associated with the values of mateship and egalitarian democracy, became for many an image with which to identify, for others an image to reject, but always an image which had to be confronted. Yet because the Australian critic, as a colonial, cannot make the assumption that Australian life is real life, the 'Life with a capital L'[15] which Richardson's Mahony is always seeking, she cannot make the Anglocentric response 'How good, how true to life', but must modify it to say 'how good, how true to Australian life', which immediately involves her in a somewhat different process. Nationalist critics are diverted into praising the typically Australian and condemning work which questions or ignores the established Australian legend. Internationalist or 'universal' critics are still thinking within the same framework, only instead of asking 'Which of our writers most truly express the Australian experience?' as the nationalists do, they are asking, 'Which of our writers transcend the Australian experience?' For both, the Australian experience itself is central, as either fulfilment or starting-point, and for both the concept of a canon is important. Like the English, they are concerned with evaluation, whereas the Canadians, like the Americans, are more interested in explication. This alignment is partly an indication of the relative influences of England on Australian thought and America on Canadian thought, influences which are strongly reinforced by the presence of large numbers of English or English-trained academics in Australian universities and their American counterparts in Canadian universities.

Atwood's generalisations may lead one into many fascinating speculations about the relationships between national identity and literature, but they may also divert energy from necessary research. Until recently, Australians have been involved in defending or attacking the concept of a single Australian literary tradition, while Canadians have been seeking to discover some kind of national identity. In the last few years, more Australians have begun to question their national mythology, as the sureness of the 'Lucky Country' image began to yield to White's vision of a 'Great Australian Emptiness'. For their part, Canadian critics are concluding that the Canadian identity may be found, not nationally, but in a mosaic of regional experiences. Hence in both countries critics are turning away from thematic and impressionistic criticism in search of a more sophisticated and inclusive critical method. It is in this context that an interest in comparative studies is emerging. Although it is true that Canada and Australia developed very differently, the comparative approach is illuminating because there are sufficient underlying similarities in their literature which can be attributed to a common experience of colonialism.

5. The Colonial Consciousness of Time

For the intellectual, the essence of colonialism is its denial of the present; for the man in the street, there is nothing else. Both are deprived of a past and a future, but the intellectual feeds on his ideal of a lost European past or on his anticipation of a brilliant future, to the disparagement of the value of the present time and place. The belief that everything of worth is somewhere else, that 'real life' is always just beyond one's reach, is the psychological reality of the colonial condition. **The Fortunes of Richard Mahony** is the supreme fictional study of this condition in Australian writing. Although Canadian literature abounds with examples, Ernest Buckler's description of the sensations of his aspiring artist hero in **The Mountain and the Valley** is quoted here for its remarkable similarity to Northrop Frye's analysis of the timeless jumble of the colonial artist's situation:

> He felt as if he were in a no man's land. He felt as if time had turned into space, and was crushing against him. He felt as if he must leap somewhere out of the now, but everywhere it was now.[16]

Frye writes:

> To an English poet, the traditions of his own country and language proceed in a direct chronological line down to himself, and that in its turn is part of a gigantic funnel of tradition extending back to Homer and the Old Testament. But to a Canadian, broken off from this linear sequence and having none of his own, the traditions of Europe appear as a kaleidoscopic whirl with no definite shape or meaning, but with a profound irony lurking in its varied and conflicting patterns.[17]

This crushing sense of all time crowded into the present moment, this kaleidoscopic whirl, can be either suffocating or potentially liberating.

Milton Wilson suggests that colonialism may be, 'in theory at least, the most desirable poetic state. It gives you a catholic sense of all the things poetry can do without embarassing you by telling you what at this particular moment it can't'.[18] Because the colonial poet has this special relationship to tradition, and little sense of progress through time, the forms his writing assumes and the concerns it develops will not only differ from contemporary writing in English elsewhere, but also from the English models which may originally have inspired them. E.J. Pratt and James Reaney are undeniably Canadian poets, yet Pratt's sensibility seems closest to that of Anglo-Saxon poetry and Reaney, in **A Suit of Nettles**, aspires to be Canada's Spenser. Similarly, A.D. Hope is an Australian Augustan. The colonial's ambiguous relationship to time simultaneously frees him from the burden of the past and condemns him to a rootless, timeless limbo. Those who felt the potential for freedom take either the conservative choice of taking at will from the riches of the past, like Hope and Reaney, or the radical one of 'un-inventing the world', of 'demythologising the systems that threatened to define them'.[19] This second choice provides the motivation for the work of writers like Robert Kroetsch in Canada and some of the playwrights of the 1960s, like David Williamson,

in Australia. Those who feel condemned by this condition set out to document and mythologise the national experience, to create a past and a sense of coherent tradition in their own writing. Laurence and Munro in Canada, and Boyd and social realists like Palmer and Prichard in Australia, seem to write from this urge.

6. *The Colonial Consciousness of Place*

A.J.M. Smith has complained that Canadian poetry was 'altogether too self-conscious of its environment, of its position in space, and scarcely at all of its position in time'.[20] The same has been said of Australia, and surely it is curious that one of its most popular historical novels is called **The Timeless Land**. The colonial's relationship to place is an enormous topic to take on at the end of an article: I only want to touch on one aspect of it here, which I think is central to an understanding of the structures the colonial experience imposed on literary thought in the two countries. Despite the great differences in landscape and climate between Australia and Canada, Australians and Canadians seem to perceive the nature of their relationships to their environments in similar ways. Northrop Frye's identification of Canadian nature as an incubus haunting the Canadian imagination corresponds to Judith Wright's belief that 'in Australian writing the landscape seems to have its own life, hostile to its human foreground'.[21]

In **Technology and Empire**, the Canadian philosopher George Grant expresses the alienation and guilt of all colonials who are at once the forerunners of imperialism and imperialism's victims, settlers conquering someone else's land, but exiled from their own. Grant writes:

> All of us who came made some break in that coming. The break was not only the giving up of the old and the settled, but the entering into the majestic continent which could not be ours in the way that the old had been. It could not be ours in the old way because the making of it ours did not go back before the beginning of conscious memory . . . It could not be ours because the very intractability, immensity and extremes of the new land required that its meeting with mastering Europeans be a battle of subjugation. And after that battle we had no long history of living with the land before the arrival of the new forms of conquest which came with industrialism.
>
> That conquering relation to place has left its mark within us. When we go into the Rockies we may have the sense that gods are there. But if so, they cannot manifest themselves to us as ours. They are the gods of another race, and we cannot know them because of what we are, and what we did. There can be nothing immemorial for us except the environment as object.[22]

The settler is caught in the middle of a chain of exploitation in which he appears as a conquering agent on the one hand and a cast-off from European society on the other. He is torn between the poles of victim and victimiser, caught in a double magnetic field somewhat like that described in Canadian writer Dennis Lee's **Savage Fields**. Grant's eloquent despair

has meant a great deal to an entire generation of Canadian writers, especially those associated with the House of Anansi in the 1960s. For example, Margaret Atwood's **Surfacing** makes most sense to me as a fictional exploration of the implications of Grant's analysis for contemporary Canadian society. Atwood's narrator comments: 'The Indians did not own salvation but they had once known where it lived and their signs marked the sacred places, the places where you could learn the truth'.[23] But for her, the environment can never be sacred. The best she can do is refuse the roles of victim and victimiser and stand alone, in a world where 'The lake is quiet, the trees surround her, asking and giving nothing'.[24]

The similarities between this way of thinking and Judith Wright's discussions of Australians and their land is striking. Wright mourns that:

> Our attitude to this continent has always been that of the master, intent on profit and the quick dollar; our emotional homeland was for very many years not here at all, but thousands of miles overseas, and hence we have usually regarded this country as a property to be exploited, rather than an inheritance to be cherished.[25]

Wright's understanding of this dilemma has interesting implications for our reading of Australian writers, as she recognises. She interprets the deaths of Mahony, a doctor, in **The Fortune of Richard Mahony**, and of Voss, a botanist in **Voss**, as a kind of ritual sacrifice of 'the European consciousness — dominating, puritanical, analytical' — to the silence and emptiness of the Australian continent. She sees these failed heroes as the reader's 'surrogates', European men whose deaths must be enacted before they can become full citizens of their adopted land, Australia.[26] On their deaths, Mahony and Voss become absorbed into the landscape: a fictional reconciliation has been effected, but at the price of a total loss of individuality. In Wright's poetry and her articles on conservation, reconciliation between Australian people and their environment seems even more remote. A common pattern of experience is suggested by the similarity of Wright's ideas to Atwood's thesis in **Survival**, as the position of each was arrived at independently.

7. *Conclusion*

There has been much mapping and exploring in an effort to establish national literary traditions, a great deal of intuitive speculation about national identity, and some detailed, intensive research, but little thinking about first principles in Australian and Canadian criticism. In her report on a European conference on Commonwealth literature, Helen Tiffin writes that 'the most pressing need was seen to be in methodology'.[27] This article suggests that Canadian and Australian literary critics might begin to develop their methodologies in conjunction with the actual practice of their criticism, and that they might learn to apply the insights of other disciplines to their own work. Attention might be directed not only toward specific aspects of the colonial and post-colonial experience in each country, but

also to the larger issues of the underlying historical frameworks which they may share, and toward the formulation of more comprehensive theories of literary value and meaning on which to base critical discussion. An awareness of the grounds of our own criticism should accompany our attempts to question earlier classifications and evaluations: the critical assumptions of the past should be examined as closely as the literature. More specifically, changing concepts of time and place require further, extensive analysis within the contexts of our definitions of colonialism and post-colonialism, and of the historical and geographical situation.

Notes

1 Mathews, **Tradition in Exile** (University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1962), p.vi.
2 *Ibid.*, p.viii.
3 Louis Dudek and Michael Gnarowski (eds.), **The Making of Modern Poetry in Canada** (Ryerson Press, Toronto 1970), p.31.
4 Malcolm Ross, 'Critical Theory: Some Trends', in the **Literary History of Canada** 2nd edn., Vol. 3 (University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1976), p.161.
5 Patricia Marchak, 'Given a Certain Latitude: A (Hinterland) Sociologist's View of Anglo-Canadian Literature', in Paul Cappon (ed.), **In Our Own House** (McClelland & Stewart, Toronto 1978), pp.178-206; Brian Kiernan, **Criticism** (Australian Writers and their Work series, Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1974).
6 James Reaney, 'The Canadian Poet's Predicament', in A.J.M. Smith (ed.), **Masks of Poetry**, New Canadian Library (McClelland & Stewart, Toronto 1962), p.120.
7 In John Barnes (ed.), **The Writer in Australia** (Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1969), p.207.
8 Vance Palmer, 'Fragment of Autobiography' in **Intimate Portraits and Other Pieces**, selected by H.P. Heseltine (Cheshire, Melbourne 1969), pp.56-57.
9 Miriam Waddington, 'Canadian Tradition and Canadian Literature' in Carl Klinck and Reginald Watters (eds.), **Canadian Anthology** 3rd rev. edn., (Gage, Toronto 1974), pp.627-637.
10 James Reaney, 'Local Grains of Sand', in William Kilbourne (ed.), **Canada: A Guide to the Peaceable Kingdom** (Macmillan, Toronto 1970), p.27.
11 A.D. Hope, 'Standards in Australian Literature', in Grahame Johnstone (ed.), **Australian Literary Criticism** (Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1962), p.7.

12 Diana Brydon, 'Themes and Preoccupations in the Novels of Australian Expatriates', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University, Canberra 1976.
13 **Meanjin**, 2/1978, p.179.
14 Atwood, 'Eleven Years of Alphabet', **Canadian Literature**, No.49 (1971), pp.62-63.
15 Henry Handel Richardson, **The Fortunes of Richard Mahony** (Heinemann, London 1954), p.315.
16 Ernest Buckler, **The Mountain and the Valley**, New Canadian Library (McClelland & Stewart, Toronto 1961), p.170.
17 Northrop Frye, 'Canada and Its Poetry', **The Bush Garden**, p.136.
18 A.J.M. Smith (ed.), 'Other Canadians and After', in **Masks of Poetry**, pp.137-138.
19 Robert Kroetsch, 'Unhiding the Hidden: Recent Canadian Fiction', **Journal of Canadian Fiction**, Vol.3, No.3 (1974) pp.43-45.
20 A.J.M . Smith, 'Wanted: Canadian Criticism', p.33.
21 Judith Wright, 'The Upside-Down Hut' in J. Barnes (ed.), **The Writer in Australia**, p.332.
22 George Grant, 'In Defense of North America', **Technology and Empire** (Anansi, Toronto 1969), p.17.
23 Atwood, **Surfacing** (Andre Deutsch & Wildwood House, London 1973), p.145.
24 *Ibid.*, p.192.
25 'Inheritance and Discovery in Australian Poetry' in Clement Semmler and Derek Whitelock (eds.), **Literary Australia** (Cheshire, Melbourne 1966), p.3.
26 Judith Wright, 'The Upside-Down Hut' in J. Barnes (ed.), **The Writer in Australia**, pp.331-336.
27 Helen Tiffin, Conference Report on EACLALS, Malta, **Span** (October, 1978), p.41.