

of the English-speaking Canadian. He looks into the culture available to him, in his libraries, on his TV screen, on his newsstands, and he sees only the images of foreigners. It is right, of course, that he should see foreign images; but when these foreign images are all he sees, the effect is alienating.

. . . In *The Sun Also Rises* we find Hemingway describing one character: "She was a Canadian and had all their easy social graces." I think that one casual remark has been mentioned to me half a dozen times by Canadians, not because it means anything in Hemingway's work, but because Canadians are so surprised to find themselves identified in important American fiction and even more surprised to find that at least one author believed he could characterize them. In the later stories of John O'Hara there is one curious little passage which suggests that O'Hara had heard about Canadian nationalism. A husband and wife are talking about a man named Ben Harrington. The husband, a businessman, says that Ben is connected with "A bunch of Americans that are trying to do something about Canada." The wife says, "To do what about Canada?" The husband says, "Oh — to try to straighten things out between them and us." The wife says: "We having trouble with them, too? I thought they were our friends." The husband says: "That's just what they don't like. Americans taking them for granted." He goes on to say: "It isn't a crisis. It's a long, drawn-out affair. Been going on since the war." The wife then points out that their friend Ben used to go skiing and fishing in Canada and that he has relatives there. "Maybe that's why they picked him," she says.

O'Hara was a specialist in reporting the attitudes of the American ruling class, and in this passage his touch was as sure as ever. . . .

My point in citing that passage from O'Hara is its rarity; whenever I come upon a passage like it, I'm brought up short with astonishment. So when I address myself to the question behind this conference — "What has been the effect of the fact that there has been a separate nation occupying the northern part of this continent?" . . . I find myself at a loss for a helpful answer. Obviously, in the conscious-

ness of some Americans, Canada occupies an important place. . . . So far, however, this image of Canada hasn't found a place in American culture — not, anyway, in the American culture I've studied. . . .

Just recently this has had some interesting results in Canada. My generation of Canadians grew up addicted to the idea of internationalism. We learned to cherish what we thought of as Canada's special role in international affairs; some writers went so far as to say that we were a kind of Golden Hinge between Britain and the United States; others pointed to the enormous possibilities of our role at the United Nations . . . But internationalism in culture turned out to be a different matter. What we failed to realize, for some years, was that we were involved in something you might call one-way internationalism. That is, we on the Canadian end were internationalists and free-traders so far as American culture was concerned. But Americans were nationalists and high-tariff men so far as (Canadian) culture was concerned.

This led to some odd situations in the various art forms. In painting, for instance, Toronto, in the late 1950's and early 1960's, became a kind of annex of the New York School. The Toronto painters saw that, as people used to say, "New York was the art capital of the world"; therefore, it was to be taken as model and guide. Jorge Luis Borges says somewhere that when he was young, he was so infatuated with Whitman that he believed not to imitate him was a sign of ignorance. Equally, in some Canadian art circles

it was a sign of ignorance not to imitate New York. . . . But New York did not know that Toronto was alive. One or two Canadian painters made some slight impression on New York, but when they did they were assumed to be Americans. . . . It would be wrong and silly to say that Canadians' openness to a variety of cultural expressions was altogether harmful. It has had some excellent results, and one of these is called Marshall McLuhan. If McLuhan is the most important critic of American mass communications, then that is partly due to his location in Toronto . . . perched
(Continued on page 8)

