landscape beneath: annual rainfall, temperature, distribution, altitudes and contours, forest cover, and the like. The landscape ‘as such’ is never given, only one or another of the ways to map it” (6). After reading through these essays one can appreciate the way this figure, derived from Derrida’s celebrated essay on “Freud and the Scene of Writing,” is a testimony to personal modesty achieved by imperilling the collective knowledge of the land “as such” on which, for instance, indigenous peoples continue to pursue land claims. Miller’s work will, because of its themes attract students of postcolonialism, but may disappoint many by its lack of that political agenda which has, willy-nilly, sustained the efforts of every cartographer of whom I am aware, in whichever traditional, exploratory, or regulative medium they may have worked. The eyes of satellite societies, overlooked and overflown by dominant powers and their allies, are no less objective but surely more deserving of our support than the eyes of the orbitting satellite or the fighter pilot. Never mind asking a text, or uttering a neocolonial performative, or reciting some Heideggerian mantra about “the ground of things, the preoriginal ground of the ground” (7). Just ask the Innu, and then listen.

LEN M. FINLAY


Though these two books are already three years old, their relative critical neglect is indicative of their limited distribution rather than any intellectual lack. Published by the Groupe de recherche sur la citoyenneté culturelle/Research Group on Cultural Citizenship, which was based jointly at Concordia University and the Université de Montréal and which has now been superseded by the Centre for Research on Citizenship and Social Transformation (Concordia), both books are exemplary of how cultural studies is being developed in important, compelling ways within the Canadian context. They may focus on Québécois phenomena but their methodologies can also make important contributions to Canadian studies.

L’État de culture: Généalogie discursive des politiques culturelles québécoises (which is primarily in French but comes with a bilingual introduction) as the full title suggests is much beholden to Foucault. It is an archival project mapping and citing at length a complex genealogy of texts which reveal the power-knowledge relations of governance in Quebec since the dawn of the Quiet Revolution that have been most involved in the construction of what it is to be québécois. More specifically, the
introduction's thematic discourse analyses—of dozens of textual excerpts of the “Articulation and Sedimentation” and “Consulation and Intensification” of l'identitaire québécois by state instruments and formations of intellectuals over a 30-year period (1961-92)—convincingly shows how they have produced “the ‘Cultural’ field . . . as both the central legitimating agency of government and as an emergent regime of social power (26).”

L'identitaire québécois is thus articulated across a dispositif which links temporal (language and ethnicity as the historical grounds of le peuple), spatial (the regions as the figuration of cultural difference within l'identitaire) and administrative (the structuring perspective of cultural development) logics in the formation of emergent state practices. At the same time, it involves the production of the field of la citoyenneté culturelle; a field of distinction of the citizen as both the social subject, the sovereign subject of a nation, and as the object of new forms of political power linking the distinctive traits of the citizen with those of the cultural producer and consumer. (26)

Two of the many advantages of this approach are that it “moves beyond the rigid analytical framework of the state-civil society distinction (27)” and for those who like their political analyses more concrete than theoretical it enables one to better appreciate “the links and breaks between Liberal and Péquiste state interventions (32).” The latter strength may still be too abstract and too little for political scientists and sociologists who are not enchanted with poststructuralist and cultural studies, but L'Etat de culture makes no concessions to traditional common sense notions or models of public life either.

Love in a Cold Climate, which has since reappeared in an updated, shorter, even more eloquent version as a chapter in Probyn’s Outside Belongings (1996), is a highly personal, yet thoroughly theorized, queer interrogation of Quebec-itude (Quebec-ness), of how the desire to belong is always contingent, and yet how “any generality, be it about Québécoisness or lesbianism, flounders” (33). Or as she cites Deleuze, who is, like Foucault, one of the prominent influences on Probyn’s work, “singularities, in their connections with the whole, are subject to other singularities. They are affected by these other singularities; in their interactions with them, they are transformed both into structures and into other singularities” (30).

In her compelling re-telling and interrogation of some of the ways in which Québécois/es imagine and thereby supposedly possess a coherent national identity—guiding us through “Dyke Dives,” Montreal geolinguistics, “Gilles Vigneault’s quasi national anthem ‘Mon pays,’” Michel Brauit’s film La dernière partie, the téléroman Les filles de Caleb, and several other Québécois and Canadian tropes and texts—Probyn queers an impressive variety of desires, fetishes, and discourses which gender belonging to Quebec and Canada in order “to glimpse where they break down” (28). She resists identifying any of her examples as being “representative of Québécois-ness” (64) at the same that she
shows up their “reproduction of the [sic] homosocial relations, of the nation as normal” (65) as problematic and contradictory.

The book is a tour de force in its stylistic fusing of the theoretical and the personal, of the interrogation of cultural texts and personal anecdotes. Nevertheless, in the more recent aforecited version, Probyn confesses that her moving away from Quebec (these days to the University of Sydney, Australia, where she is the director of Women’s Studies) has since led to her misplacing the desire to prove her sense of “belonging in Quebec,” a powerful reminder of just how contingent a sense of identity is.

Much like Probyn, Allor and Gagnon, at the end of their discourse analyses of the govermentalized cultural politics of Québec, conclude that “l'identitaire québécoise . . . doesn’t exist per se but rather [is] a process of identification with what we already are, and with what we aren’t anymore” (46). Still, so thorough is their mapping of the 30-year coherence with which the cultural field “articulate[s] the being and becoming of the state and citizenry . . . accomplish[ing] the linked production of the people as 'subjects' whose social being the state serves and as the ‘objects’ of government power-relations” (46) that one might wrongly conclude that Allor and Gagnon consider the cultural field’s resolution of social tensions and contradictions to be hegemonic rather than simply diachronic and systemic. In keeping with Probyn’s often lyrical first-person accounts and her strategic use of more disparate genres and fields, her conclusion resists more openly such a sense of overdetermination by dominant culture. One might even call her conclusion utopian, a strong tendency within queer theory and activism, which in Probyn’s case is quite studied and tentative:

These queer means of belonging cannot be performed through general descriptions; rather . . . cruising in dives, we may glimpse them, catch our bodies “as they rise up for a moment, and it is that moment that is important, that is the opportunity that one must grab.” (Deleuze 70)

Whichever approach you might find more appealing, these two books make important contributions to the elaboration of ways to interrogate and understand better how cultural production and social identities in Quebec and Canada are produced, consumed, appropriated and, yes, even resisted, translated.

DAVID LEAHY


As Rawdon Wilson suggests in his new book, Shakespeare’s use and transformation of narrative and narrative techniques both in his “properly termed” narrative poetry and in his plays has received scant