

DÉPARTEMENT DES LETTRES ET COMMUNICATIONS

Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines

Université de Sherbrooke

**"They're Coming!"  
Manichaeism and the Paranoid Style in Post-World-War-Two Literature in the  
United States and Quebec by Oliver Lange, Orson Scott Card, Mary Jane Engh,  
Paul Chamberland, Hubert Aquin and Claude Jasmin**

Par

Alexandre Desbiens-Brassard

Mémoire présenté en vue de l'obtention de la Maîtrise ès Arts

Littérature Canadienne Comparée

Sherbrooke

Mai 2015

## COMPOSITION DU JURY

**"They're Coming!"  
Invasion and Manichaeism in Post-World-War-Two Literature in the United States  
and Quebec by Oliver Lange, Orson Scott Card, Mary Jane Engh, Paul  
Chamberland, Hubert Aquin and Claude Jasmin**

**Alexandre Desbiens-Brassard**

Ce mémoire a été évalué par un jury composé des personnes suivantes:

Dr. David Leahy, directeur de recherche

(Département des lettres et communication, Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines)

Dr. Domenic Beneventi, membre du jury

(Département des lettres et communication, Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines)

Dr. François Yelle, membre du jury

(Département des lettres et communication, Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines)

## **Dédicace**

Je dédie ce fruit de plus de deux ans de labeurs à mon frère, Vincent Desbiens-Brassard ainsi qu'à mes parents, Christine Desbiens et Alain Brassard qui m'ont épaulé émotionnellement, financièrement et moralement durant la rédaction de ce mémoire.

Je souhaite également remercier Dr. Gregory Reid pour m'avoir poussé vers le cycle supérieur alors que j'hésitais à m'y lancer. Merci aussi à mon directeur de recherche, Dr. David Leahy, ainsi qu'aux autres membres de mon jury, Drs. Domenic Beneventi et François Yelle, pour leurs précieux conseils.

Finalement, je souhaite remercier Rye Stevenson, Jimmy Gaulin, Serge Langlois, Samuel Préfontaine et Benjamin Gardeur, sans qui mon séjour de six ans à l'Université de Sherbrooke aurait été beaucoup moins agréable et enrichissant.

## Abstract

This thesis develops an ideological critique of selected works by Oliver Lange, Orson Scott Card, Mary Jane Engh, Paul Chamberland, Hubert Aquin, and Claude Jasmin in order to uncover how they use the politico-literary discourse of the paranoid style and its Manichean binary of Us versus Them within the contexts of the United States during the Cold War (and its on-going repercussions into the early 1970's) and Québec during the *Révolution tranquille* (Quiet Revolution). The consequent ideologemes manifest narratives describing the fight of an oppressed group (Us) against a demonized hegemonic enemy (Them.)

This comparative literature project includes political and historical analyses in order to situate the works in the socio-historical contexts of their production, and since the ideologies of a period may be imbedded (knowingly or not) by an author in a text. The United States and Québec were extremely different culturally, as well as politically, during the decades in question and the issues their populations had to face were often quite dissimilar. Yet it is precisely the interrogation of their dissimilarities that is central to my project of demonstrating, through the selected texts, how two different societies narrativise key predominant ideological anxieties and struggles using the same rhetoric and similar tropes of the paranoid style and its Manichean ideologemes.

**Keywords:** Comparative Canadian Literature; United States Cold War Literature; Literature of the Quiet Revolution; Paranoid Style; Manichean binary; Ideologemes; Pseudo-idea; Proto-Narrative; Post-Colonial Studies; Ideological Critique; Parti Pris; Anti-Communism

## Précis

Ce mémoire réalise une critique idéologique de textes littéraires produits par différents auteurs : Oliver Lange, Orson Scott Card, Mary Jane Engh, Paul Chamberland, Hubert Aquin et Claude Jasmin. Cette critique a pour but d'étudier comment ces textes utilisent le discours politico-littéraire du *paranoid style* (style paranoïaque) et le manichéisme (*Us versus Them* ou Eux ou Nous) qui lui est associé à l'intérieur du contexte sociohistorique des États-Unis au plus fort de la Guerre froide (et durant sa période plus chaude des années 1970) et du Québec au plus fort de la Révolution tranquille. Les idéologèmes qui en résultent façonnent des histoires décrivant le combat d'un groupe opprimé (Nous) contre un ennemi hégémonique et démonisé (Eux)

Ce projet de littérature comparée fait appel à des analyses politiques et historiques pour situer les textes analysés dans leur contexte sociohistorique de production respectifs puisque les idéologies d'une époque peuvent être insérées (consciemment ou non) par un auteur dans un texte. Le Québec et les États-Unis étaient des sociétés extrêmement différentes culturellement et politiquement durant ces décennies et les problèmes auxquels elles devaient faire face étaient différents également. C'est l'exploration de ces différences qui est centrale à ma démonstration, à travers les textes sélectionnés, du processus par lequel deux sociétés différentes opposées à deux ennemis différents mettent en scène leurs principaux combats et anxiétés idéologiques en utilisant la même rhétorique et les mêmes conventions reliées au style paranoïaque et à son Manichéisme.

**Mots-clés** : Littérature canadienne comparée; Littérature américaine de la Guerre Froide; Littérature de la Révolution tranquille; Style paranoïaque; Manichéisme; idéologèmes; Études postcoloniales; Critique idéologique; Parti Pris; Anticommunisme.

## Table of Contents

Dédicace.....	3
Abstract.....	4
Précis .....	5
Table of Contents.....	6
Introduction.....	7
Chapter 1 The Enemy Without: Paranoia, Corruption and the Creation of Apocalyptic Threats .....	40
Chapter 2 The Enemy Within: National Deprecation and Revolutionary Romance .....	66
Chapter 3 Us, Them and Who Else? Anti-Intellectual, Heterosexual and Ethnocentrist Exclusion from the Binary.....	93
Conclusion .....	125
Work Cited.....	136

## Introduction

"They're Coming!" This is a warning but it can also imply a question. It warns against a threat, but begs the question of who or what that threat is. This question stands unanswerable unless it is contextualized. The beginnings of contextualization can be found in the next few words of the title: paranoid style and Manichaeism.<sup>1</sup> Paranoia has two meanings – a common and a medical one – that are complementary but slightly different. In common parlance, to call someone paranoid is to say that this someone is seeing threats where there are none. It carries connotations, often pejorative in everyday usage, of being delusional, insane or crazy. In medicine, paranoia refers to an array of symptoms characterized by actual, specific delusions and feelings of persecution. Various mental disorders have paranoia as a possible symptom, the *paranoid personality disorder* being foremost among them :

The essential feature of paranoid personality disorder is a pattern of pervasive distrust and suspiciousness of others such that their motives are interpreted as malevolent. . . . They suspect on the basis of little or no evidence that others are plotting against them and may attack them suddenly, at any time and without reason. . . . They are preoccupied with unjustified doubts about the loyalty or trustworthiness of their friends and associates, whose actions are minutely scrutinized for evidence of hostile intentions.

(American Psychiatric Association 649-650)

In this thesis, I use the term paranoia in a way that is different from these two common meanings. I use it to refer to the literary manifestations of a type of political discourse, “the paranoid style”, that was named and theorized by the American historian Richard Hofstadter in the late fifties. Summarily put, the paranoid style possesses three main characteristics: an obsession with conspiracy, a victim complex and a propensity for irrationality. A conspiracy is defined as "a secret plan to commit a

---

<sup>1</sup> The capitalization of Manichaeism is not consistent from one scholar to another. For example, Eco capitalizes the word while JanMohamed does not. I chose to capitalize it throughout this thesis – except when quoting a text that does not, of course – purely and solely as a personal aesthetic choice.

crime or do harm" (Conspiracy 197). According to Hofstadter's schema, the paranoid style spokesperson or writer does not believe in a conspiracy behind one particular event but rather in a global, universal conspiracy:

The distinguishing thing about the paranoid style is not that its exponents see conspiracies or plots here and there in history, but that they regard a "vast" or "gigantic" conspiracy as *the motive force* in historical events. History *is* a conspiracy, set in motion by demonic forces of almost transcendent power, and what is felt to be needed to defeat it is not the usual method of political give-and-take, but an all-out crusade. (Hofstadter 1965, 29, emphasis in the text)

This is not to say that a writer using the paranoid style is never focused on a particular topic. On the contrary, the paranoid style is often deployed to advance a specific ideology. Rather, viewing history as a conspiracy means that a chosen conspiracy is seen as the cause of multiple events, often throughout a long period of time, whether or not there are commonalities and links between these events.

Practitioners of the paranoid style also generally see themselves as oppressed agents working for the greater good against a clearly defined, demonized or amoral enemy that is superordinate to its colonized and/or complacent opponents, or in imminent danger of becoming so:

"The paranoid speaker is constantly David against a quasi-divine Goliath: [the enemy] is a perfect model of malice, a kind of amoral superman: sinister, ubiquitous, powerful, cruel, sensual, luxury-loving. Unlike the rest of us, the enemy is not caught in the toils of the vast mechanism of history, himself a victim of his desires, his limitations. He is a free, active, demonic agent" (31-2).

In other words, the second characteristic of the paranoid style is a worldview centered around a Manichaeic binary. The third and final characteristic of the paranoid style can be formulated as such: "Nothing but complete victory will do. Since the enemy is thought of as being totally evil and totally



unappeasable, he must be totally eliminated—if not from the world, at least from the operations to which the paranoid directs his attention. This demand for unqualified victories leads to the formulation of hopelessly demanding and unrealistic goals . . . " (31). In other words, the paranoid style is an *emotional* discourse, not a *rational* one. Fear is its operative word and any rhetoric, facts or statistics that can be used to support a paranoid thesis will be interpreted in order to feed that fear.

To conclude this overview of the paranoid style, I want to come back to the notion of clinical versus metaphorical paranoia. Hofstadter himself was quick to dissociate the paranoid style from any kind of psychiatric diagnostic of paranoia:

When I speak of the paranoid style, I use the term much as a historian of art might speak of the baroque or the mannerist style. It is, above all, a way of seeing the world and of expressing oneself. . . . [There] is a vital difference between the paranoid spokesman in politics and the clinical paranoiac: although they both tend to be overheated, oversuspicious [sic], overaggressive [sic], grandiose, and apocalyptic in expression, the clinical paranoid sees the hostile and conspiratorial world in which he feels himself to be living as directed specifically *against him*; whereas the spokesman of the paranoid style finds it directed against a nation, a culture, a way of life whose fate affects not himself alone, but millions of others. (4, emphasis in the text)

I agree with Hofstadter that saying a writer uses the paranoid style should under no circumstances be taken as a judgment about the mental state of said writer. Furthermore, his distinction between medical paranoia's focus on a threatened *individual* and the paranoid style's focus on a threatened *community* is extremely important. My selected primary texts can be said to espouse the paranoid style because they deal first and foremost with perceived or actual, but exaggerated, threats to a collectivity. Most of them do have individual protagonists that have to face personal dangers, of course, but the central conflict always remains a collective one. What is at stake in these works is not an individual goal, but the fate

of an entire community.

The concept of Manichaeism helps one to grasp or recognise how and why this last point is evident, or made manifest, in a text since its ideological and symbolic manifestations can be summarized by simple well-known stock binaries like White versus Black, Good versus Evil, or the one I will use most often for this thesis, *Us versus Them*. In other words “Manichean” is an adjective that designates a worldview that sees conflicts and situations strictly as binary structures whose polar characteristics and boundaries are rigidly defined. The paranoid style inevitably embraces this worldview, but it is not the only political or literary genre to do so. In fact, Manichaeism was already in existence in the mainstream popular culture of the era, as demonstrated by Umberto Eco’s analysis of James Bond novels (and films, to a lesser extent):

[Ian] Fleming seeks elementary oppositions; to personify primitive and universal forces, he had recourse to popular standards. . . .

At most, he tempers his choice with irony, but the irony is completely masked and revealed only through incredible exaggeration. In *From Russia, With Love*, the Soviet men are so monstrous, so improbably evil that it seems impossible to take them seriously. And yet, in his brief preface, Fleming insists that all the narrated atrocities are true. He has chosen the path of the fable, and fable must be taken as truthful if it is not to become a satirical fairy tale. (Eco, 46)

Eco’s use of “fable” is very *à propos* here, since texts written in the paranoid style and traditional fables both aim at teaching a moral or lesson, at promoting individual or collective self-improvement.<sup>2</sup> But the line between fable and satire is thin, as Eco states, and attempts to avoid crossing that line can lead to many internal contradictions or ambiguities, as I will demonstrate throughout my thesis.

As a short aside, while the influence of James Bond on American pop culture is obvious, many

---

<sup>2</sup> Unlike traditional fables, however, the paranoid style does not promote self-improvement for its own sake, but as a way to fight a threatening Other. See Chapter 1, especially its introductory section, for more details.

readers might be suspicious of its applicability in the Quebec context. However, there is evidence that the radical sovereigntists (and, we can assume, the population at large as well) of the 1960s and 1970s knew and even enjoyed the stories of Bond, in either novelistic or filmic form. For example, Jacques Godbout wrote an article about James Bond in an issue of *Parti Pris*. In this article, he characterized James Bond as “**le premier héros de la petite bourgeoisie**” (Godbout 60, in bold in the text) and, interestingly enough, stated that “Pierre Maheu, directeur de cette revue, nous confiait — mais ce n’est pas pour publication — qu’il donnerait n’importe quoi pour être James Bond plutôt que Pierre Maheu” (59). If, as Godbout’s text proves, James Bond can be seen as a shared cultural object between the United States and Quebec, then it would make sense for these two contexts to share the Manichean worldview used therein as well.<sup>3</sup>

Another important facet of the Manichean binary is its intrinsically reactionary nature, as Eco explains once again: “If Fleming is reactionary at all, it is . . . because he makes use of stock figures. The very use of such figures (the Manichean dichotomy, seeing things in black and white) is always dogmatic and intolerant – whereas he who avoids set figures, who recognises nuances and distinctions and who admits contradictions is democratic”(Eco 46). Accordingly, everything that cannot fit into either pole, that is neither black nor white, is not tolerated. These kinds of elements are ignored or marginalized within my selected literary works. In other words, they are *estranged*, i.e. they are made *strange* (marginal) or made *strangers* (excluded from the group).<sup>4</sup> The recourse to Manichean binaries does not allow for grey areas. Therefore, it is more conducive to the emotional excess or zeal of the paranoid style than to the rational and logical analysis of a problem. In short, the relationship between the paranoid style and Manichaeism is a circular, self-fulfilling one.

<sup>3</sup> Many literary critics have also suggested that the spy narrative in *Prochain Épisode* might have been inspired in part by those of Ian Fleming, though I have not been able to find any solid evidence that Aquin indeed took inspiration from Fleming. The best I was able to find is an editor’s footnote in the scholarly edition of *Prochain Épisode* I am using for this thesis. The footnote point out supposed allusions Aquin might be making to Bond, namely “M.I.5: Military Intelligence 5, service de contre-espionnage . . . . Y est rattaché le personnage de James Bond” and “l’allusion faites plus loin [dans *Prochain Épisode*] aux Chinois (dans *You only live twice* [sic])” (n 13, page 174-5). Unfortunately, those allusions are faulty. James Bond works for the M.I. 6, not M.I. 5, and *You Only Live Twice* features not Chinese but Japanese characters.

<sup>4</sup> I go more in depth on this concept of the strange/r at the beginning of Chapter 3.

In addition, my use of the concept of Manichaeism in this thesis is greatly indebted to decolonization theory. In treatises about decolonization, the Manichean divide between colonizers and colonized is a highly important concept. Frantz Fanon, one of the main theorists of decolonization in the 1960's, described the colonial world thusly: "Le monde colonial est un monde manichéiste. Il ne suffit pas au colon de limiter physiquement . . . l'espace du colonisé. Comme pour illustrer le caractère totalitaire de l'exploitation sociale, le colon fait du colonisé une sorte de quintessence du mal" (Fanon 44). One particular characteristic of colonial Manichaeism that will be of special importance here is how the Them is represented by the paranoid style as using its dominant position to dehumanize and subjugate the colonized Us. The colonial binary is therefore not a binary of equals, but one in which one pole is represented as hegemonically superior to the other, as more "human" than the other: "Parfois ce manichéisme va jusqu'au bout de sa logique et déshumanise le colonisé. À proprement parler, il l'animalise. Et de fait, le langage du colon, quand il parle du colonisé, est un langage zoologique" (45). My selected primary texts from Quebec were influenced by decolonization theory, and therefore borrowed its notions of a dehumanizing colonial binary for their own brand of revolutionary discourse. My selected primary texts from the United States, on the other hand, do not evidence any influence from, or even awareness of, decolonization theory but nevertheless exhibited the same Manichean worldview.

In decolonization theory, as well as in most post-colonial theories' recuperation of the concept, it is the coloniser that views the world in Manichaeian terms:

We can better understand colonialist discourse, it seems to me, through an analysis that maps its ideological function in relation to actual imperialist practices. Such an examination reveals that any evident "ambivalence" is in fact a product of deliberate, if at times subconscious, imperialist duplicity, operating very efficiently through the economy of its central trope, the manichean allegory. This economy, in turn, is based on

a transformation of racial difference into moral and even metaphysical difference. . .

.Even the works of some of the most enlightened and critical colonial writers eventually succumb to a narrative organization based on racial/metaphysical oppositions, whose motives remain morally fixed but whose categories flex to accommodate any situation.

(JanMohamed 61)

However, I am primarily looking at works by writers that saw themselves as part of an actual or imagined colonized group. Therefore, while the conventional Manichean colonial binary can be expressed as

Us (Coloniser, Dominant) versus Them (Colonised, Subjugated)

the binary that will be identified and analysed in my selected primary texts is better expressed as

Us (Colonised, Subjugated) versus Them (Coloniser, Dominant.)

The colonized or oppressed status of the groups I will analyse is extremely debatable in all cases. But I am not interested in judging the truth or falseness of the groups' or their selected spokespersons' claims of oppression. Rather, I am interested in analysing how these claims of being oppressed are expressed in a paranoid style and through the use of Manichean binaries.

The paranoid style and Manichaeism can be said to qualify who "They" are in the exclamatory phrase "They're coming". "They" obviously designates Them, the feared enemy that dominates, or is imagined as being on the verge of dominating, the Us. But this is still a rather abstract allusion. The concrete socio-historical identities and anxieties represented in my selected literary texts are by writers hailing from either Quebec or the United States. These works were all written after the Second World War. More precisely, I will be studying primary sources written mostly in the 1960's or early 1970's. I will also sometimes refer to complementary texts from the 1950's, since political and literary trends rarely fit the neat boundaries of decades.

I say political and literary trends because, while this thesis is firmly a comparative literature

project, the nature of my subject requires the inclusion of political and historical analyses. As my goal is to produce an ideological critique of selected works by Oliver Lange, Orson Scott Card, Mary Jane Engh, Paul Chamberland, Hubert Aquin, and Claude Jasmin, it is crucial to situate the works in the socio-historical contexts of their production, since the ideologies imbedded (knowingly or not) by an author in a text are created and given purpose by their initial and on-going contexts. The contexts of my selected texts were the United States of America at the height of the Cold War and its on-going repercussions into the early 1970's and Quebec at the height of the Quiet Revolution. Both societies were (and in some ways still are) extremely different culturally, as well as politically. The issues they had to face during the period under current scrutiny were often as dissimilar as possible. Yet, in many ways, it is precisely the interrogation of their dissimilarities that is central to, or at the core, of my project: to demonstrate that different societies can express very different ideologies by using the same Manichean rhetoric of the paranoid style.

There were of course commonalities between the two societies. Quebec (and Canada in general) and the United States shared the prosperity of the post-war years, which led to the rise of post-modern consumer culture. In the late 60's, both societies also experienced strong currents of popular unrest. Such currents of revolt could be found all over the Western Hemisphere during the decade, especially around 1968. Finally, globally speaking the period was defined by the Cold War, and Canada (and thus Quebec) was firmly ensconced inside the Capitalist block led by the United States. But I am more interested in the differences than the commonalities of said societies, especially at the level of the population at large on whose behalf the user of the paranoid style supposedly fights. Accordingly, I will now provide a short historical overview of each society.

These potted histories are not comprehensive, complete looks at the entirety of what happened in Quebec and the United States between the 1950s and 1970s. Rather, they outline the socio-cultural trends, political ideas and historical events that are pertinent to the ideological critique of the elected

examples of the paranoid style that is performed in this thesis.

The end of World War Two was the beginning of another, very different war – the Cold War. The Cold War was an ideological conflict in which two superpowers, the Communist Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Capitalist United States of America (each flanked by a multitude of client and allied nations,) vied for ideological, military and economic supremacy on the global stage:

The victors [after WW II] were the Soviet Union and the United States (also England, France and Nationalist China, but they were weak). Both these countries now went to work—without swastikas, goose-stepping, or officially declared racism, but under the cover of "socialism" on one side, and "democracy" on the other, to carve out their own empires of influence. They proceeded to share and contest with one another the domination of the world, to build military machines far greater than the Fascist countries had built, to control the destinies of more countries than Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan had been able to do. They also acted to control their own populations, each country with its own techniques—crude in the Soviet Union, sophisticated in the United States—to make their rule secure. (Zinn 424-5)

Among the techniques of ideological control alluded to by the leftist American historian Howard Zinn, one favored by the US was anti-Communist propaganda. Mass circulation magazines published articles on how to detect Communists, or on how to protect oneself against Communist manipulation, while newspapers and civil rights organizations publicly stated their refusal to hire anybody with known ties to a Communist or leftist organization. The entertainment industry also did its part. Hollywood churned out movies (many of them government sponsored) featuring the evils of Communism, while books that did the same became bestsellers overnight. Even comic books did their part. Captain America, a Nazi-fighting superhero whose dwindling popularity had led to the cancellation of the magazine bearing his name in 1949, was revived as "Captain America, Commie Smasher!" and brought back for a few stories

in 1953 (Zinn 435)<sup>5</sup>.

In other words, anti-Communist paranoia took hold in Washington, a paranoia that helped create a national consensus between conservative and liberal politicians:

The United States was trying, in the postwar decade, to create a national consensus—excluding the radicals, who could not support a foreign policy aimed at suppressing revolution—of conservatives and liberals, Republicans and Democrats, around the policies of cold war and anti-Communism. Such a coalition could best be created by a liberal Democratic President, whose aggressive policy abroad would be supported by conservatives, and whose welfare programs at home (Truman's 'Fair Deal') would be attractive to liberals. . . . And perhaps, if the anti-Communist mood became strong enough, liberals could support repressive moves at home which in ordinary times would be seen as violating the liberal tradition of tolerance. (427)

This consensus made it easy for politicians to convince themselves and the American public that a bona-fide invasion of the United States by Communists troops could occur at any moment. With hindsight, we know that such an invasion was unlikely at best, but during the hey-day of anti-Communism it was a scenario commonly described not only in pop culture, but also in official statements. "Long before they possessed the technical means Soviet attacks on the USA were imagined and the popularity of dystopias with elaborate systems of surveillance coincided with the hardening of a consensus on the Soviet threat. By 1950 this perception had hardened into government policy in the attribution of a conspiratorial design to the Kremlin" (Seed 94).

When Hofstadter theorized the paranoid style in the late fifties, anti-Communist paranoia was his first example of the style in action. One anti-Communist discourse or trope<sup>6</sup> that especially permeated its paranoid style was the belief that Communists could be, and probably were, *everywhere*.

---

<sup>5</sup> When Captain America came back into publication permanently in 1964, these prior adventures were treated as never having happened.

<sup>6</sup> See Chapter 1 for more detail on this discourse and how it can be conceptualized as a pseudo-idea.



This conspiracy theory rapidly made its way to the highest ranks of the Establishment, as evidenced by this excerpt from a speech by Truman's Attorney General in 1950: "There are today many Communists in America. They are everywhere—in factories, offices, butcher shops, on street corners, in private business—and each carries in himself the germs of death for society" (qtd in Zinn 435). This fear of a vast Communist fifth column caused the rise in power and influence of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which was a part of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. This subcommittee reached unprecedented heights of zealotry when Joseph McCarthy became its Chairman during the 1950's and started using its broad mandate to lead a witch hunt against anybody he suspected of being even slightly sympathetic to Communism, with or without any evidence to back up his allegations. Or as the famous left-journalist, I. F. Stone, reported on one occasion:

"Of the pamphlet *Psychological and Cultural Traits of Soviet Siberia* which he has attacked, McCarthy said, 'We had testimony in executive session the other day that a Major Wilson – I think it was a Major Wilson – strongly objected to this [pamphlet], and pointed out this was Soviet propaganda, Communist propaganda, from beginning to end.'

Loose charges are taken at face value while official inquiry into them is brushed aside. 'He [Major Wilson] objected so loudly,' McCarthy said 'that Army Intelligence finally was forced to call a board to pass upon this.' The findings are not revealed but 'for some strange reason,' McCarthy went on, the board thought the pamphlet should still be used. There are implied threats of future exposure to make the timid tremble. 'I should point out,' McCarthy warned, 'it was a civilian who was selected to head this board, and that civilian also is holding a high position as of today over the Pentagon.' His head may be next." (Stone 19)

The above quote is simply an example of the kind of accusation and prosecution that was McCarthy's

bread and butter. McCarthy's problem with the pamphlet in question turned out to be that it "does not assert that all people under the Soviet tyranny are opposed to it" (Stone 19), a good example of how a paranoid style rhetoric can influence one to perceive reality as a simple Manichean binary – tyrants versus oppressed – with nothing in between.

McCarthy was not the only one doing this kind of inquisitorial work. The House Committee on Un-American Activities, created before the Second World War to investigate any "subversive activities" in the country, became permanent in 1945 and participated in the witch-hunt against Communists with the same fervor as Senator McCarthy. It is interesting to note the name of that last committee, as it ties into the idea that embracing Communist ideas weakened one's *American-ness*. In other words, to be a Communist was to be one of Them, not one of Us. This opposition between United States' identified Capitalism and patriotic nationalism versus Communism was central to American anti-Communist discourse and movements:

What other country finds it so necessary to create institutional rituals for the sole purpose of guaranteeing to its people the genuineness of their nationality? Does the Frenchman or the Englishman or the Italian find it necessary to speak to himself as "one hundred per cent" English, French or Italian? Do they find it necessary to have their equivalents of "I Am an American Day"? When they disagree with one another over national policies, do they find it necessary to call each other un-English, or un-French, or un-Italian? No doubt they too are troubled by subversive activities and espionage, but are their countermeasures taken under the name of committees on un-English, un-French, or un-Italian activities? (Hofstadter 1965, 59)<sup>7</sup>

The paranoid style was of course very common in anti-Communist discourse. A good concrete example of it can be found in the writings of Robert Welch, who founded the John Birch Society in 1958 as a

---

<sup>7</sup> I think Hofstadter is exaggerating American specificity here. What he describes here is simply a systematized manifestation of the No True Scotsman fallacy, which is "a kind of ad hoc rescue of [a] generalization in which the reasoner re-characterizes the situation solely in order to escape refutation of the generalization." (Dowden N.p.)

new voice for the extreme right-wing.<sup>8</sup> Welch saw Communists as enemies so intelligent they were able to disguise themselves as vocal opponents of Communism – a perfect example of the “rationale” of the paranoid style:

Welch, exploiting fears of what McCarthy had called an "immense" domestic conspiracy, declared that the federal government had already fallen into the Communists' clutches. In a tract titled "The Politician," he attacked President Dwight D. Eisenhower as "a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy" who had been serving the plot "all of his adult life." Late in 1961, after the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion, he accused the Kennedy Administration of "helping the Communists everywhere in the world while pretending to do the opposite." (Willentz 32)

By using the paranoid style to convince the public of the urgency of fighting Communism by all means necessary, anti-Communists like Welch would give birth to a new, more radical right-wing movement inside the Republican party. This movement's influence would eventually culminate with the radical candidate Barry Goldwater winning the Republican nomination for the 1964 Presidential election thanks to the fanatical support of this radical Republican minority.<sup>9</sup> Goldwater's failure to win the presidency dealt a severe blow to the radical right and allowed the more moderate faction of Republicans to retake the reins of the party. The paranoid style and anti-Communism, however, would live on in the United States, the former becoming central to some radical leftist discourses<sup>10</sup> before making an important return inside the Republican Party after the election of Barack Obama.<sup>11</sup>

Until then, let's turn our attention to Quebec. From the end of World War Two to 1960, the government of Quebec had been formed by the Union Nationale under the leadership of Maurice

<sup>8</sup> The John Birch Society still exists today, and is a strong supporter of the Tea Party political movement, in addition to its continuing obsession with Communism, especially in South America. For more information on the modern-day activities of the organisation, one can visit its website at <http://www.jbs.org/>

<sup>9</sup> For more information on this primary and how Goldwater's brand of conservatism was fundamentally different from the mainstream conservative rhetoric of the era, see Hofstadter 93-141.

<sup>10</sup> Examples of leftists organization that used the paranoid style include the Symbionese Liberation Army, the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), and the Weather Underground (also known as Weatherman or the Weathermen).

<sup>11</sup> I will discuss this contemporary version of the paranoid style in more detail in the Conclusion to this thesis.

Duplessis. Since the sixties, his reign has been dramatized hyperbolically as *la grande noirceur* (The Great Darkness.) More objectively, Maurice Duplessis' government could be described as having been conservative in nature, leaving healthcare, education and other social institutions in the hands of the Catholic Church, while on the economic level it was strongly pro-Capitalism, preferring the implantation and subsidization of foreign businesses (many of them American) over nationalising resources or supporting homegrown business. Duplessis was also virulently anti-Communist, and waged a campaign against any who would promote it. He favored the propagation of nationalism based on a traditional view of the province's agricultural past along with strong ties to the Church and a marked anti-Communist bent.

This past-focused brand of nationalism would be the target of the first iconic movement of resistance against the Duplessis regime, as manifested in a pamphlet called *Refus Global* published in 1948: "Le passé dut être accepté avant la naissance, il ne saurait être sacré. Nous sommes toujours quitte avec lui . . . . Fini l'assassinat massif du présent et du futur à coups redoublés du passé" (Borduas 36). Such resistance brewed in the background during the fifties, especially amongst academics and the secular intelligentsia in general, but emerged publicly and violently from time to time, notably during the strikes in Asbestos, Louiseville and Murdochville which all turned into altercations between the strikers and the provincial police (Monière 305). However, it would only coalesce as a real political alternative after Duplessis' death in September 1959. Soon after, the Union Nationale lost its first election in fifteen years to the Liberal Party of Jean Lesage. This regime change started what would soon be called the Quiet Revolution.<sup>12</sup> It was a period of great social and political changes that led to the creation of a new Quebec society that was almost a complete reversal ideologically and economically from the Quebec of Duplessis' era. Culture was in many ways removed from the hands of big businesses to become a state matter led by the newly created Ministry of Culture. Education too

---

<sup>12</sup> The origin of this term is hard to pin down with exactitude, but it seems to have emerged first in English in an anonymous article published in the Toronto newspaper *The Globe and Mail* around 1962 (Dickson 9).

eventually got a new master, the Ministry of Education. This Ministry reformed the entire system of higher education to make it both adapted to the modern world and, ideally, it was hoped, accessible to all.

A major shift also happened in the economical orientations of Quebec. While Duplessis was a stalwart proponent of *laissez-faire* capitalism, Lesage opted for a more social-democratic approach. He transformed the healthcare system from a privately-funded system controlled mostly by the Church to a state-funded one controlled by the state, and nationalized some of Quebec's natural resources, including its most valuable one, hydro-electricity. This partial socialization did not eliminate the anti-Communism of the Duplessis era, however. It found new supporters, like Montreal's mayor Jean Drapeau, but never quite re-gained the cultural importance it managed to maintain in the United States.

Another defining characteristic of 1960's Quebec was the arrival of a vast number of young men and women (the "baby-boomers") on the political, social and cultural scenes, scenes they would soon dominate. This phenomenon was "un exemple parmi d'autres de l'arrivée de la jeunesse sur la scène politique des pays occidentaux. . . . Il est normal que des jeunes prennent une société à la gorge pour lui dire ses quatre vérités; il l'est peut-être moins que cette société considère ces jeunes comme ses penseurs, ses théoriciens et ses intellectuels attirés, si brillants soient-ils" (Major 5-6). With said new generation came a new form of nationalism. Various known as "sovereignism," "separatism" or "neo-nationalism,"<sup>13</sup> it differed from Duplessis' brand of nationalism in that it divorced itself from a traditional, rural-based social ideal and rejected the Church. This sovereignist ideology started as a somewhat extreme one, as exemplified by the Rassemblement d'indépendance nationale (RIN) or a cultural magazine with a revolutionary bent like *Parti Pris*, before softening and gaining mass appeal via the Parti québécois after the October crisis of 1970. In this thesis I will focus almost exclusively on

---

<sup>13</sup> I have chosen to use sovereignism throughout this thesis. For my purpose, I felt it was important to insist on the project of an independent Quebec that this new nationalism brought to the table since my selected sovereignist texts used the paranoid style and Manichaeism to further this project. I chose sovereignist over separatist because the later is often used, especially in French, to refer derogatorily or contemptuously to people expressing sympathy for a project of Quebec sovereignty.

the radical version of this sovereigntism (which I refer to as radical sovereigntism) and especially that of *Parti Pris*.

Sovereigntism was prevalent in the cultural field, especially the arts, where it contributed to an increased politicisation of intellectuals and artists. Accordingly, it soon became primordial to make every cultural work a building block of a new nation: “Dans un premier temps, qui commence vers 1950, on crée, on édite des oeuvres avec le sentiment de fonder une littérature; dans un second temps, qui commence vers 1960, on crée, on édite des oeuvres avec le sentiment de fonder une nation” (Biron, Dumont, and Nardout-Lafarge, 367). This newly emerging independence-focused left can be said to be the logical evolution of two preceding national ideologies in Quebec as well as a third ideology unto itself. The first of these ideologies was the "idéologie de conservation" that considered French-Canadians "comme un groupe ethnique, avec une langue, une religion, des traditions distinctives et donc une culture propre qu'il s'agissait de protéger" (Major 16). The second ideology came to life both as a reaction to and an extension of the first:

Il y a ensuite une idéologie de contestation et de rattrapage qui ne conteste pas l'essence de la première idéologie, c'est à dire que le Canada-Français soit un groupe ethnique bien caractérisé, mais qui refuse l'idéalisation du passé, souhaite un rayonnement de la culture à l'étendue du Canada et ainsi accuse l'élite traditionnelle d'avoir pratiquer le conservatisme, le nationalisme, le chauvinisme, le messianisme. (16)

Finally, there was the third ideology, a new form of nationalism, which can be called the "idéologie de développement et de participation":

Comme l'idéologie de conservation, elle reconnaît que le Canada français est un groupe culturel bien différencié des autres groupes nord-américains. Comme l'idéologie de contestation et de rattrapage, elle accuse l'élite clérico-bourgeoise d'être responsable ou du moins solidaire de la plupart des maux de la collectivité et reconnaît que le Québec

ne fait qu'entrer dans le XXe siècle. Mais elle va plus loin et affirme avec force que le Canada français, à toutes fins pratiques, c'est le Québec; que, beaucoup plus qu'un groupe culturel, le Québec est une société qui doit contrôler son économie et sa politique, en un mot, qui doit conquérir son indépendance et s'autodéterminer. (16-7)

This substitution of *Québécois* for *Canadien-français* was a game-changing paradigm shift and a revolutionary act in and of itself:

En témoigne le numéro de janvier 1965 [de Parti Pris] qui porte le titre 'pour une littérature québécoise' ; l'adjectif, qui va bientôt se banaliser, est ici polémique et relève d'une revendication. La plupart des ouvrages critiques qui paraissent au cours de la décennie font encore référence à la littérature canadienne-française, voir à la littérature française du Québec, et non à la littérature québécoise. L'expression revêt donc un sens nettement politique et marque une double coupure : par rapport à la France d'un côté, par rapport au Canada de l'autre. La littérature québécoise est ainsi présentée comme l'expression de l'identité québécoise. (Biron, Dumont, and Nardout-Lafarge, 417)

The biggest change this new term brought to bear was how nationality came to be constructed in Quebec. With this new term also came a progressive abandonment of religion as the hegemonic vital piece of national identity. By using "Québécois" rather than "Canadien-Français," radical thinkers promoted a conception of identity that did not depend upon religion and blood, but on the participation in a communal, predominantly francophone, and preferably secular state. In other words, the old notion of a Catholic French-Canadian "race" was being rejected and replaced by that of the nation:

La nation n'est pas, comme le laisse entendre [Pierre-Elliot] Trudeau, une réalité ethnique. Il n'y a plus d'ethnies, ou alors fort peu. Les déplacements de population, l'immigration, les assimilations (que Jacques Henripin qualifie justement de "transferts linguistiques") ont produit une interpénétration des ethnies dont un des résultats

incontestables, au Canada français par exemple, est le regroupement non plus selon le principe de l'origine ethnique (la race, comme on disait encore il y a vingt-cinq ans), mais selon l'appartenance à un groupe culturel homogène dont la seule spécificité vérifiable se trouve au niveau linguistique. Il suffit de regarder autour de soi, parmi les gens qu'on connaît, pour dénombrer rapidement le nombre de Canadiens français pure laine: ils ne sont pas les seuls "vrais" Canadiens français! Les Mackay, les Johnson, les Elliott, les Aquin, les Molinari, les O'Harley, les Spénart, les Esposito, les Globenski, etc.. en disent long sur l'ethnie-nation canadienne française. . . . De fait, il n'y a plus de nation canadienne-française, mais un groupe culturel-linguistique homogène par la langue. (Aquin 1962, 309)

In this influential essay, one of Aquin's main suggestions for improving the status of Québécois<sup>14</sup> (though he does not use that word yet) is to replace the notion of race with a notion of a cultural group, in which the main element of kinship would be the French language rather than Catholicism or a French-derived ethnicity. He also defines his civic notion of said cultural group by borrowing from E.B Taylor's views on culture in a general sense: "[Culture is] that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, laws, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society." (Taylor, qtd in Aquin 1962, 309). Moreover, for many, but not all,<sup>15</sup> radical sovereigntists the cultural group of francophone speakers had to seize its independence and create a new state built upon Marxist principles. While they did not succeed in that regard, their abandonment of the notion of the "race canadienne-française" in favor of a concept of "citoyens du Québec" has stood the test of time and is an integral part of Quebec society today.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> We will see in Chapter 3 that despite Aquin's statements, radical sovereigntism was predominantly a racialized discourse and did not accept "foreign" ethnicities as easily as Aquin believed it did.

<sup>15</sup> While Aquin agreed with radical sovereigntists on multiple points and contributed to their publications, it can be argued that Aquin never really was a radical sovereigntist in the Marxist vein, preferring a more civic form of nationalism.

<sup>16</sup> The process that led to the declaration of French as the official language of Quebec in 1974 (through the *Loi sur la langue officielle*, also known as Bill 22.) was a difficult one punctuated by numerous language Bills, activists groups,



Another contrast between the Quiet Revolution's radical sovereigntists and their predecessors was that the former tended to inscribe their nation-building project within the wider discourse of decolonisation. Decolonisation was "created," so to speak, in the first two decades following World War Two when the native populations of various European colonies in Africa and the Caribbean started revolting in order to obtain their independence from their European colonisers weakened by the war. Inside and across the frontiers of these colonies, the ideological discourse of decolonisation took form under the aegis of thinkers like Albert Memmi, Aimée Césaire and Frantz Fanon, the latter of whom I have already borrowed and will borrow even more from in the coming chapters. This theory, while created for entirely different political, social and "racial" contexts, was adopted by radical sovereigntists and led them to analyse Quebec's place in the world in a new light. No more was Quebec thought of as the last remaining French bastion in the Americas whose loyalty to tradition and religion ensured it a miraculous destiny: "Les Anglo-Saxons manieraient la matière qui menaçait de les engloutir pendant que les Canadiens français porteraient précieusement la flamme qui devait régénérer la matière et les Anglo-Saxons" (Brunet 108). According to this new brand of nationalism, Quebec was a colonized nation, similar to the many colonies in Africa that in the 60's were often in the midst of violent left-nationalist wars of independence. Works like Fanon's *Les Damnés de la terre* described and theorized the colonized world in a way that many Quebec nationalists and revolutionaries of the sixties identified with. The main difference between Fanon's rhetoric and theirs is that when it came to the frontiers between coloniser and colonised they substituted more subtle, class-based socio-economical frontiers for Fanon's "casernes" and "postes de police" (Fanon 41).<sup>17</sup>

Decolonization is an idea that impacted many during the 60's and led to the sometime violent

---

protests, student strikes and even a few riots. For details, see Mills 138-62 (Chapter 6.) The complete text of Bill 22 is available on the website of the *Office Québécois de la Langue Française* at the following address: [http://www.oqlf.gouv.qc.ca/charte/reperes/Loi\\_22.pdf](http://www.oqlf.gouv.qc.ca/charte/reperes/Loi_22.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> Applying the title of "colonised nation" to a province historically made up of mostly European immigrants and with an actual Native population enduring subpar treatment did not go over well in all circles. I discuss various criticisms of this appropriation in more detail in my first and third chapters.

radicalisation of parts of the sovereigntist movement. Violence is indeed central to decolonisation theory. For Fanon, the only way to ensure lasting freedom for a native population is to burn the oppressing structure to the ground so that a new kind of structure can rise from its ashes: "L'apparition du colon a signifié syncrétiquement la mort de la société autochtone, léthargie, pétrification des individus. Pour le colonisé, la vie ne peut surgir que du cadavre en décomposition du colon" (89).

Violence was also theorized as the ultimate act of nation-building in a situation of colonial oppression:

La mobilisation des masses, quand elle se réalise à l'occasion de la guerre de libération, introduit dans chaque conscience la notion de cause commune, de destin national, d'histoire collective. Aussi la deuxième phase, celle de la construction de la nation, se trouve-t-elle facilitée par l'existence de ce mortier travaillé dans le sang et la colère (90).

Consequently, violent groups like the Front de Libération du Québec (FLQ) were only following the theory of decolonisation to its logical end – if Quebec was a colonised people, then in order to build a liberated nation of Quebec the coloniser had to be destroyed.

Finally, the appropriation of decolonization led many radical sovereigntists to adopt Marxist tenets like many colonised people elsewhere were doing: "Ces luttes décolonisatrices, d'ailleurs, étaient inséparables du marxisme, non seulement parce qu'elles se faisaient contre l'impérialisme capitaliste, rapprochant ainsi ces peuples de tous les prolétaires en armes, mais surtout parce que le marxisme , pour les peuples en lutte, était l'école d'énergie par excellence" (Major 31). For example, Marxism quickly became the dominant ideology of *Parti Pris*: "Si les rédacteurs [de Parti Pris] ont volontiers reconnu l'influence de Sartre et ont marqué leurs dettes à l'égard des trois pontifes de la décolonisation [Berque, Memmi and Fanon], jamais la revue par contre ne s'est dite existentialiste ou fanonienne. Il n'y avait qu'une façon, globale et significative, de la caractériser: elle était marxiste-léniniste" (38). Not everyone would agree with Major's labelling of *Parti Pris* as Marxist-Leninist, especially compared to the more sectarian Marxist-Leninist groups that emerged after the October Crisis:

. . . les organisations politiques marxistes-léninistes qui témoignent, par leur apparition, des conséquences de la crise. Le groupe *En Lutte!* est mis sur pied en 1972-73, la Ligue Communiste (marxiste-léniniste) du Canada est fondée à l'automne 1975. Au fil des années, des milliers de jeunes gens seront partie prenante de ces groupes. soit comme militants, soit comme sympathisants. (Pelletier 53)

Nevertheless, Marxism influenced how radical sovereigntists used the paranoid style, particularly when it was time to define the Us in the Manichean binary, as I will explore in Chapter 2.

But like anti-Communism in the US, the aforementioned anti-colonial rhetoric would not survive very long past the early seventies.<sup>18</sup> After the October Crisis,<sup>19</sup> while many young people would join sectarian marxist-leninist organisations, the idea of a violent takeover of the province was severely undermined in the mind of most of its previous sympathizers, some of them joining the more moderate Parti Québécois as a consequence. Thus, the Québécois thinkers who had previously used decolonisation theory started progressively distancing themselves from it but did not disavow how useful it had been as a starting point in the articulation of their new nationalism: "Chamberland assure que ce langage, même s'il avait occasionné une schématisation simplificatrice lorsqu'il était appliqué à l'étude du Québec – ce qui portera *Parti pris* à progressivement le délaissier en faveur d'une approche plus rigoureusement marxiste – avait été d'une grande utilité" (Major 40-1).

This slight ideological shift accompanied the end of the Quiet Revolution itself, which is generally considered to have ended in 1966 when the Liberals lost to the Union Nationale (Biron, Dumont, and Nardout-Lafarge, 483),<sup>20</sup> though some conceptualize its ending closer to the end of the

<sup>18</sup> However, it can still be found in the margins of Quebec political scene even today. See my Conclusion for details.

<sup>19</sup> The October Crisis refers to a series of events that came to a head in October 1970 when the *Front de Libération du Québec* kidnapped a British trade commissioner, James Cross, and Pierre Laporte, Minister of Labour in the Quebec government. These acts of terrorism caused a chain reaction that would lead to the invocation of the War Measures Act, the systematic arrest of many sovereigntists on the basis of little to no evidence of them being terrorists, potential terrorists, or having committed crimes and, ultimately, the death of Laporte.

<sup>20</sup> The Union Nationale was then under the leadership of Daniel Johnson Senior. Johnson would die two years later and be replaced by Jean-Jacques Bertrand for the remaining two years before the election. This would be the Union Nationale's last government before its dissolution in 1989.

decade (Leahy). The ever-evolving sovereigntist movement would continue to grow even after the Quiet Revolution, however, leading to the Parti Québécois' eventual election sweep in 1976 and to the first referendum on Quebec sovereignty, which the sovereignty camp would ultimately lose. While I will not detail these later events, as they are beyond the historical period pertinent to my studies, I trust that ,along with my summary of the same period in the United States, I have nevertheless provided enough socio-historical contextualization to begin our analysis of my selected literary works from both societies.

My thesis analyses six primary texts, three for each society under study. Four of them are novels, one is a book-length poem and another is a short story. There is a slight dichotomy between the types of my selected American and Québécois texts and their reception. My American texts were popular or pulp narratives. They were considered neither subversive, experimental nor worthy of much critical attention. Thus, there is little-to-nothing written about them, be it reviews or critical analysis.<sup>21</sup> And even when there is, what is written does not necessarily delve into, or even consider, their deeper ideological substrata, leading to comments like these about a novel like *Vandenberg*:

When a writer tries too hard to add significance to his material, he runs the risk of overburdening a perfectly sound idea and smothering it with pretentiousness. Oliver Lange's novel of suspense [*Vandenberg*] has all the requisite elements of the genre, and when it moves it does so at a nifty clip. The trouble is that it stops too often to let the author deliver windy and usually banal philosophical comments through the voices of his otherwise interesting characters. (Decker 33)

As I hope readers will agree after reading this thesis, those ideologically loaded "philosophical comments" are far from banal but, in my opinion, the most interesting facet of the novel (the same can be said for the other two American texts). In contrast, my Québécois texts were not considered to be

---

<sup>21</sup> While a lot has been written on Card and his work, the short story I slected is not considered among his major work, and thus not often written about.

“popular” or low-quality works. On the contrary, they received a significant amount of academic attention both upon and since their release. Furthermore, the connections of the authors to the various political and cultural organizations who shaped the early days of the new independence movement has enshrined these works in the canon of Québécois literature of that era.<sup>22</sup> Consequently, the theoretical and ideological elements of the Québécois text have been much more clearly defined by prior scholarly works than is the case for my American texts.

The American portion of my corpus contains two novels, the first of which is titled *Vandenberg*. It was written by Oliver Lange, a pseudonym of the author John Wadleigh, and published in 1971. In term of plot and themes, *Vandenberg* is extremely similar to the 1984 movie *Red Dawn*<sup>23</sup> in that it dramatizes the fight of a small resistance cell striking from the wilderness against a Soviet force that has successfully invaded and conquered the United States of America. The protagonist of this novel is Eugene Vandenberg, a middle-aged misanthrope who is content to live alone and frugally on his ranch near Sante Fe, New Mexico, with his mentally handicapped son Kevin. His idyllic life is shattered one day when he gets arrested on a nebulous charge of "seditious tendencies" (Lange 112) and sent to Cowles, a Soviet rehabilitation camp. The novel opens about two years after Vandenberg's escape from the camp, as he is living and hiding in an isolated area with his son. Vandenberg's routine is interrupted when one of his old friends, Abilene Tixier, rides up to his camp along with a few companions and asks for his help in attacking the rehabilitation camp of Cowles and thus strike a blow against the Soviet Military Government. Vandenberg is suspicious at first, as Tixier had refused a similar plan when Vandenberg had first submitted it to him two years previously. But he finally accepts to lead Tixier and his men.

---

<sup>22</sup> With the possible exception of *Éthel et le terroriste*, which is significantly less well known than the two other works under study, or even less than some of Jasmin's other novels, like *Pleure pas, Germaine*.

<sup>23</sup> So much so that "Wadleigh was bitter over the fact that Hollywood stole his idea and did not credit (or pay) him. "Thaddeus Wadleigh said that while his father did feel that way, 'he also couldn't be bothered with a lot of things,' which is why he never sued." (Nott, N.p.)

The novel then cuts to an extensive flashback covering Vandenberg's internment at Cowles. There, Vandenberg had to submit to multiple interview sessions with Andrew Walters, an American who had defected a few years before the invasion of the United States by the USSR and helped plan said invasion. Through these interview sessions, Vandenberg (and the reader) learns about how exactly the invasion was planned and conducted and how supposedly easy it was to execute successfully. Vandenberg's history as a loner and an outsider is also explored in detail. Between these sessions, Vandenberg eventually finds out that he, like all inmates, is being drugged to ensure his passivity. After managing to secretly avoid taking the drugs, Vandenberg is able to escape from the camp when a lightning storm takes out the power in the entire compound. From then on, the novel describes his attempts to make his way back to town, contact his lover Terry (a woman 20 years younger than him), take his son from the foster family he had been given to, and eke out an at least marginally "good" life in the woods. All of this, of course, while evading capture by the Soviets.

In the subsequent present time of the novel, Tixier finishes assembling a small team of men to attack Cowles. This team includes a reporter with a camera, as Tixier hopes to film the successful assault of the camp and distribute it as propaganda in order to start a larger resistance movement. While the attack is initially successful, the Soviets eventually manage to get aerial reinforcements that bombard Vandenberg and his men as they are fleeing the camp. The camera and all the recordings are destroyed, but it is unknown if Vandenberg and all of his team have died since no bodies are found. Excerpts from Vandenberg's journals are also peppered throughout the novel, along with excerpts from Andrew Walter's reports, newspaper clippings, and various other documents. The final scene of the novel details the fate of the journals – they are used by the only member of Vandenberg's team that the narrative confirms as being alive after the attack in order to start a fire. This ensures that no evidence of resistance remains and, presumably, leaves the Soviet Military Government as strong as it was at the beginning of the novel.

The other American novel I selected is very different in tone and plot even if its main premise – the invasion of the United States by a foreign Communist invader – is the same as that of *Vandenberg*. Known as *Arslan* in the United States, and as *A Wind from Bukara* in the UK (Seed105), it was published by Mary Jane Engh in 1976. The book features two protagonists who alternate the narration of the book's four parts. The first part is narrated by Franklin Bond, the principal of the elementary school of Kraftsville, Illinois, and opens as the United States surrenders to General Arslan, the leader of the fictional country of Turkistan. Arslan then rides into Kraftsville and decides to make the town his operating base, and the local school<sup>24</sup> his headquarters. During his victory banquet, Arslan rapes three children, two girls and one boy, each of about thirteen years of age, in front of his soldiers and some of the townsfolk. Arslan quickly takes absolute control of the town and imposes strict rationing and a billet rule, of which only Bond is exempt, because he has to house Arslan himself. Bond is thus a witness to the conqueror's every action, including the continuous rape and abuse he inflicts on Hunt Morgan, the boy he previously raped at the victory banquet. He also learns of Arslan's misanthropic plan to rid the planet of the human race by destroying organized government and industrial structures, in addition to sterilizing the entire population of the globe – an act of extreme eco-terror that Arslan feels is the only way to save Earth from eventual destruction. Arslan then leaves Kraftsville to his second-in-command and goes off to finish his conquest of the world, with Hunt in tow. When Arslan comes back to Kraftsville a few years later, having executed his plan to the letter, he has a son (Sanjar) and a wife (Rusudan), and Bond is now the leader of an underground resistance movement, the Kraft County Resistance (KCR.) After the murder of Arslan's wife and the consequent vengeful public execution of four men, the KCR mounts a coup attempt to take out Arslan and maybe start a nationwide revolution. Their plan fails, but Arslan flees the town, his army with him.

The second part of the novel is narrated by Hunt Morgan. Hunt is the boy whom Arslan

---

<sup>24</sup> It is not clear exactly what type of school it is (elementary school, middle school, or something else) except for the fact that it is not the high school, since that one is specifically mentioned as having been turned into a bordello for Arslan's soldiers.

continuously raped and that therefore grew up a pariah in Kraftsville. For most of Kraftsville's citizens he is a reminder of Arslan's domination, but Franklin Bond nevertheless treats him like a son after his own father casts him out. This section retells many of the events of the previous part from Hunt's perspective – Arslan's arrival, Hunt's journey around the world with Arslan and Hunt's return to Kraftsville before leaving again. His torturous relationships with Arslan, Bond, Sanjar and Rusudan are explored in detail, including what Hunt has learned about how Arslan grew up to take control of the Soviet Union and then the United States.

The third part, once again narrated by Franklin Bond, begins with Arslan coming back to Kraftsville four years after his "escape" from the town, sick and dying. Bond, now the Mayor of the town, shelters Arslan until he gets better, and then decides to consider Arslan as a simple citizen, letting him install himself in the old school, as he prefers to know exactly where Arslan is and what he is doing in order to be able to use him if necessary. However, rumor has it that one girl in a nearby county has gotten pregnant after having been raped by multiple men despite the supposed fact that the human race is now to be sterile (though it is never clearly proven in the narrative). This leads to a posse of men deciding that the only way to perpetuate the human race is to rape as many women as possible. When this posse converges on Kraftsville, Bond needs Arslan who, along with Hunt and Sanjar, defends the town and drives the rapists away. After this climax, Hunt narrates the short fourth and final part of the novel, in which he admits to having been complicit in the murder of Arslan's wife and details the departure of Arslan's teenage son from the town. The novel ends with Arslan declaring himself a permanent citizen of Kraftsville, and shaking hands with Franklin Bond. This surprising final scene is evidence of Arslan's power of assimilation and corruption, a power I will address towards the end of my first chapter.

Finally, I round out the American portion of my corpus with a short story "A Thousand Deaths," first published in 1978 by the well-known science-fiction author Orson Scott Card. Set in a



futuristic, Soviet-occupied United States of America, the story opens with the arrest of Jerry Crove for complicity in the murder of a Russian official. After a mock trial, Jerry is sentenced to death until he confesses. However, given that the Soviet government has developed cloning and memory transfer, Jerry is initially killed once, his memory is transferred to a clone, and he is then asked to confess. Jerry complies, but the test audience does not believe him, and as such the process is repeated until he can make what the Soviets consider to be a decent, heartfelt confession. After a countless number of deaths and equally numerous unconvincing confessions, Jerry, now completely inured to pain, makes an eloquent speech against the Soviet government and its tyranny, convincing the entire test audience. Admitting that they cannot break him, the Soviets exile Jerry to outer space. As he enters cryo-sleep, Jerry vows to come back one day as the barbarian that will sack Rome.

The texts I selected for the Quebec portion of my primary corpus are shorter, but no less ideologically dense. This portion also contains two novels, the first and most famous of which is Hubert Aquin's *Prochain épisode*, first published in 1965. Written while he was imprisoned at the Institut Psychiatrique Albert-Prévost in Montréal (Aquin 1965, XXXVIII), *Prochain épisode* is a bicephalous novel with two narrators – an imprisoned writer, like Aquin himself, and a spy. The latter is the protagonist of a seemingly autobiographical novel-within-the novel written by *Prochain épisode's* framing narrator. Going back and forth between these two narratives, the novel within the novel is ostensibly the tale of a revolutionary agent who, after meeting up with his colleague and lover K in Switzerland, is given the mission to assassinate H. de Heutz, a federalist Canadian agent. The spy protagonist is first captured by H. de Heutz, but he is able to turn the tables on Heutz by telling him an extravagant cover story that makes Heutz hesitate long enough for the spy to steal his gun. He leads H. de Heutz to a clearing, but as he is about to kill him the tables turn again as H. de Heutz tells the narrator the exact same cover story he himself told a few moments ago. This confuses the spy-protagonist long enough that H. de Heutz's hidden accomplice, a blonde woman whose description is

suspiciously similar to that of K, knocks out the spy-protagonist and flees with H. de Heutz. The spy beats de Heutz back to his castle and lies in wait, but the final confrontation between the two takes place mostly off-screen. Somehow, however, the revolutionary spy was only able to wound H. de Heutz before fleeing back to meet K. However, he ends up missing their rendezvous and, consequently, returns alone to Montreal to discover that his network has been betrayed and captured by the RCMP. He is arrested himself soon after, ostensibly becoming the narrator-writer of the framing device. In addition to these two main narratives, Aquin includes a great number of digressions and symbolic passages about love, the act of writing, the alienation and oppression of the Québécois, and personal depression.

The second Québécois novel of my corpus is a lot more straightforward in its storytelling. *Éthel et le terroriste*, published in 1964 by Claude Jasmin, tells the story of a Quebec revolutionary, Paul, who flees to New York after performing a bombing for his revolutionary Movement. He is accompanied by his Jewish girlfriend Éthel, who warns Paul that she will quit him if his bombing kills anyone. Once in New York, Paul and Éthel try to make contact with a revolutionary ally of the Movement – an African-American man named Slide – who is supposed to help them stay safe until they can return to Quebec. While waiting for Slide, Paul struggles with a choice – going back to Quebec to continue his revolutionary actions in the Movement, or to elope with Ethel. Indeed, the Movement demands that Paul leave Ethel, fearing that her presence as the cohort of one of the Movement's central member would drive anti-Semitic French-Canadians away from the Movement and the revolution. Late in the novel, Paul is given a third choice when a secret agent finds him and offers him the option of becoming a mole for the Canadian government in exchange for Ethel's protection. In the end, Paul chooses the Movement. He breaks up with Éthel by revealing that his bombing did kill a man, and accepts to perform another bombing in New York. After the later bombing, the Movement drives Paul back to his car where, surprisingly, Éthel is waiting for him. The novel ends ambiguously

with the two heading off together.

*Éthel et le terroriste* is unique in my primary corpus in that it has a sequel, *Revoir Éthel*, which was published twelve years later. However, the sequel is quite disconnected from the main novel, as the revolutionary protagonist has a different name, and the ending of the first novel, with Éthel in the car, seems to be ignored. As such, I will not look at this second novel in my thesis and will analyze *Éthel et le terroriste* as a stand-alone work.

Finally, the last work of my primary corpus is the book-length poem *L'Afficheur hurle*. This seminal poem was written by Paul Chamberland, a co-founder of the radical nationalist and Marxist journal *Parti Pris*. It is a poetic manifesto against the domination of the Quebec people by big business, the Catholic Church, and Anglophones. There are two motifs in *L'Afficheur hurle* that are especially important for my purposes. The first one is the alienation of the Québécois, an alienation created by a crisis of national identity. The narrator of the poem stands for the entire Quebec people whose colonised nature is slowly eating away at its humanity. The second is the need to stand up and to let out one's rage against the oppressor. This motif is expressed as a call to arms, to revolution. Chamberland attacks every institution he considers to be keeping down the people of Quebec in colonised misery. Taken together, these institutions represent global imperialism, and the Québécois' fight against this imperialism makes them comrade-in-arms with other dispossessed peoples all over the planet. In the middle of these two sections there is an interlude called "Poèmes à Thérèse" which contains personal and intimate poems focused on emotions and sensations. They serve as a respite for the reader and the narrator between the two more fiery halves of the poem.

In addition, I will also draw from an "Avertissement" that preceded the second edition of the poem in 1969 (Chamberland 99-102.) In this short text, Paul Chamberland admits that, from a formalist point of view, *L'Afficheur hurle* is a "flawed" text, but denies any intention of disavowing it, stressing that the political message of the text is more important than any literary merits it might or might not

have.

Now that I have explained the main concepts and given synopses for the primary texts that will be analyzed in this thesis, I need to present the two most important theoretical tools that will underpin much of the analytical work of this thesis. The first of these is what the literary scholar and cultural theorist Frederic Jameson defines as ideologemes. Those who are knowledgeable about etymology can easily deduce what this neologism means. Just like a phoneme is the smallest possible unit of sound in language, and a morpheme the smallest possible unit of meaning in a word, an ideologeme is the smallest possible unit of ideology. Therefore, to understand what an ideologeme is, we have to understand what an ideology is. The Oxford Canadian Dictionary defines the term as "a system of ideas or way of thinking, [usually] relating to politics or society, or to the conduct of a class or group, and regarded as justifying actions, [especially] one that is held implicitly or adopted as a whole and maintained regardless of the course of events" (Ideology 483). The word "system" is very appropriate since ideologies are not simply an idea, but an ensemble of ideas – the aforementioned ideologemes – sutured together in various type of discursive and narrative relationships (comparisons, antagonisms, parallelism, causality, etc.) into a coherent system of values and thoughts. The notion of "justifying action" is also extremely important since the function of an ideology is precisely to frame which behavior or idea is acceptable or valorized and which must be cast out: "We will suggest that such an approach posits ideology in terms of strategies of containment . . . , which allows what can be thought to seem internally coherent in its own terms, while repressing the unthinkable . . . which lies beyond its boundaries" (Jameson 52-53). An ideologeme's two main characteristics are "its possibility to manifest itself either as a pseudo-idea—a conceptual or belief system, an abstract value, an opinion or prejudice—or as a protonarrative, a kind of ultimate class fantasy about the 'collective characters' which are the classes in opposition" (87).

The paranoid style and Manicheanism are both often essential to the conceptualization and

expression of various pseudo-ideas and proto-narratives; they are crucial to making ideologemes "susceptible to both a conceptual description and a narrative manifestation all at once" (87). The concept of ideologemes are crucial to my ideological critique of the works that compose my primary corpus. For as Jameson stated, "the ideological analysis of these finished cultural products [in our case, my selected literary texts] requires us to demonstrate each one as a complex work of transformation on that ultimate raw material which is the ideologeme in question. The analyst's work is thus first that of the identification of the ideologeme, and, in many cases [though not in this thesis], of its initial naming in instances where, for whatever reason, it had not yet been registered as such."(87-88) In other words, I aim to demonstrate how the ideologies I am focusing upon – American anti-Communism and radical Quebec sovereigntism – molded the paranoid style and Manichaeism into tools to establish, expand or strengthen their force within my selected texts' *histoires*.

This latter term, *histoire*, is a crucial part of a second theoretical concept that underlies this thesis's analytical work: hierarchy of discourses. First defined by structuralist, marxist thinkers this concept divides a text into a *histoire* and discourses.<sup>25</sup> The *histoire* "narrates events apparently without the intervention of a speaker" while "discourse, on the other hand, acknowledges a voice" (Belsey 66). A specific text has multiple discourses, most often attached to particular characters. The *histoire* is superior to these discourses; it is a "transcendent position of knowledge constructed for the reader, a position which is in itself non-contradictory. . ." (77). In other words, the *histoire* carries the ideological "truth" of the novel, and attempts to lead its readers to agree with that truth. In order to refuse that truth, a reader must "make a deliberate and ideological choice" (77). According to this theoretical structure, narratives also tends toward a moment of "closure" (69) in which key discourses will converge into or become ideologically inseparable from the *histoire*. Therefore, the discourses which are ideologically

---

<sup>25</sup> This concept was first created with "classical" or "expressive" realist texts narrated in the third person in mind, but it can be used to perform an ideological critique of most kind of texts. For more details, see Belsey 7-13 and her chapter title "Addressing the subject" on pages 52-77. I retain the original term *histoire* rather than the oft-used English translation history to preserve the double meaning of the French word – story and history.

closer to that of the *histoire* are the ones that are hierarchically privileged. The hierarchy of discourses is a useful concept for this thesis because it can reveal how apparent contradictions in a narrative are, in fact, by way of their subordinate position to other discourses and to the *histoire*, reinforcing the ideology or ideologies privileged by the *histoire*.

That is not to say, however, that genuine, irresolvable contradictions or paradoxes will not be addressed throughout this thesis. Such contradictions are not only to be expected, they are unavoidable when talking about texts that perform "ideological work" – the work of both representing and creating ideology (Poovey 2). Indeed, such works are sites within which are revealed the two faces of any ideology: an "apparent coherence and authenticity" and a "internal instability and artificiality" (3). Throughout my thesis, I will point to particular contradictions and inconsistencies that show how any ideology is never truly a smooth, homogeneous block but always "uneven in the degree to which it could manage or symbolically resolve the contradictions it necessarily contained" (4).

To summarize, ideologemes and the hierarchy of discourses are both tools I will use to demonstrate how selected anti-Communist writers of the United States (Lange, Engh and Scott Card) and selected radical sovereigntist writers of Quebec (Aquin, Chamberland and Jasmin) used the same or analogous ideologemes of the paranoid style and the Manichean binary of Us versus Them to promote two very different ideologies in two very different contexts. In doing this work, I will also uncover and explore moments in narrative and discourse that reveals the "specific instabilities" of the various "ideological formulations" (Poovey 4) – ideologemes -- contained within this thesis.

Because the Manichean binary is at the center of my analytical work, I have structured the following three chapters in accordance with it. Chapter One will therefore examine the construction of the Them, Chapter Two the construction of the Us, and Chapter Three will explore discourses related to the several groups or identities estranged by said poles of the binary. Finally, the Conclusion will offer a synthesis of the three Chapters, as well as give a brief account of some modern heirs to the

ideological work performed by my six primary texts.

## Chapter 1

### The Enemy Without: Paranoia, Corruption and the Creation of Apocalyptic Threats

As I have explained in my introduction, this thesis will revolve around two main concepts: the paranoid style and the Manichean allegory of Us versus Them. In essence, these two concepts are reciprocal halves of a closed circular system: the paranoid style comes out of and perpetuates a Manichean world view which in turn perpetuates paranoid discourse. This chapter focuses on the various pseudo-ideas and proto-narratives that constitute the discourse which conceptualises and dramatises the ideologeme of the enemy, of Them. This enemy is a threatening Other, a force of physical, social and moral destruction. The related pseudo-ideas and proto-narratives will be analysed in terms of how they dramatises the enemy's power, Otherness and corrupting nature as they relate to the paranoid style.

As I mentioned in my introduction, all the texts I analyse were written in response to a perceived threat to the author's ethnic, social, political or national identity. The paranoid style requires such an enemy to be able to produce a focused rhetoric because it is an intrinsically combative genre or mode. The paranoid style is deployed *against* something that is hated **or despised (?)** and positions itself *in support of* something only as a way to strengthen or glorify opposition to the object of hatred: "[The] Webster [dictionary] defines paranoia, the clinical entity, as a chronic disorder characterised by systematised delusions of persecution and of one's own greatness. In the paranoid style, as I conceive it, the feeling of persecution is central, and it is indeed systematised as grandiose theories of conspiracy" (Hofstadter 1965, 4). To summarise, the paranoid style promotes values or actions only in so far as these values or actions help in the fight against perceived persecution by the object of hatred. Since the paranoid style is a reactive ideology, it is important to first understand what the Us is reacting against because this reaction shapes the ideologemes used to define who Us is.



One of the pseudo-ideas that is particularly central to the focus of this chapter is the depiction of the enemy as an all-powerful *übermensch*:

The paranoid speaker is constantly a David against a quasi-divine Goliath: [the enemy] is a perfect model of malice, a kind of amoral superman: sinister, ubiquitous, powerful, cruel, sensual, luxury-loving. Unlike the rest of us, the enemy is not caught in the toils of the vast mechanism of history, himself a victim of his desires, his limitations. He is a free, active, demonic agent. (Hofstadter 1965, 31-2)

The conceptualisation of the power of this "quasi-divine Goliath" is based or dependent upon two axes – power and foreignness. The enemy constructed by the paranoid style is both *superhuman* and *inhuman* – it is substantially stronger than the Us, but also radically different from the Us. This difference is important, because it is what allows the paranoid writer to circumscribe the world in a Manichean binary that reduces and isolates the Other as an essentially evil Them<sup>26</sup>.

The ideologemes characterising Them aim at constructing an intimidating threat so that the ideologemes characterising Us can be subsequently narrativised as presenting the only possible defense against this threat. The paranoid style emphasizes striking fear into a populace that is often considered as passive and unwilling to resist<sup>27</sup> rather than **necessarily** representing reality accurately. Accordingly, the enemy is attributed powers so vast that its portrait often strains the suspension of disbelief, as is the case in *Arslan*:

Precisely how, we ask ourselves, does this warlord from a country smaller by population than Baltimore or Manchester become tyrant of the entire globe? There's some handwaving about a 'laser missile defence' system, and a brief, melodramatic vignette of him holding a pistol to the head of the Soviet premier, but not even the most

---

<sup>26</sup> While I refer to the Them as the enemy, in the singular, the enemy, as the word Them indicates, does not have to be an actual individual. It can also be a faceless force, country or ideology. Therefore, the degree of personification of the enemy varies in each of my selected texts.

<sup>27</sup> This characterization of the masses is explored in detail in the next chapter.

naïve political theorist would believe global realpolitik [sic] works that way. (Roberts, VIII-IX)

This astute comment from the foreword to the 2010 edition of the novel puts its finger on the hyperbolic tendencies of paranoid style narratives. The Them that is dramatised in paranoid narratives is not the actual threat the Us is reacting against as it exists in reality, or is perceived as existing, but as an ideologised construction of it that conforms to the parameters of the proto-narrative rather than those of the real world. The figure of Arslan is an excellent example of this. As is alluded to in the above quotation, Arslan is the leader of a small Central Asian country named Turkistan. Right there, we have a break from reality in favor of a proto-narrative. Indeed, there is no such country as Turkistan. The name Turkistan, also spelled Turkestan, refers to an historical region of Central Asia which is often divided in two parts, Western Turkistan and Eastern Turkistan. Eastern Turkistan refers to what we now know as the Chinese province of Xinjiang while Western Turkistan became part of the Russian Empire as of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In 1920, the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic was created and then dissolved 4 years later and divided into the Socialist Republics of Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, and Kirgizstan, all of which are independent countries today. The city of Bukhara, which is described as the capital of Turkestan in the novel, is located in modern-day Uzbekistan.

Why did Engh decide on a fictional country as the place/nation of origin for her dictator rather than use a real – and thus possibly more resonant – socialist republic? My guess is that Engh did it to make Arslan more impressive. Indeed, Turkestan immediately brings to mind the Turks, who have a long history of and reputation for conquest, and thus are much more familiar to the average reader than the Uzbeks or the Kazakhs. I base this supposition on a passage from a text by David Seed which uses excerpts from M.J. Engh's letters to analyse the titular character: "Arslan himself, modelled on Kemal

Atatürk<sup>28</sup> in 'type of mind, character and motivation', carries out a policy of 'purifying' the US in a number of ways." (Seed 105). Seed also notes that "Arslan is named after a Seljuk conqueror" (106). The Seljuks were a specific historical Turkish dynasty that is credited with conquering (and keeping) Mesopotamia, what would today be Syria and Palestine, and a large part of modern Iran ("Seljuk" n.p.). The particular conqueror Seed is referring to was named Alp-Arslan<sup>29</sup> and he is credited with conquering "Georgia, Armenia and much of Asia Minor (won from the Byzantines)" (Cahen N.p.). While a complete biography of the man is not useful for our purposes, these closing remarks from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica's* article on Alp-Arslan are illuminating:

Muslims see in him a great captain, a trainer of men, an honest man, an enemy of all treachery. Christians, contrasting his reputation with that of his son Malik-Shāh, paint him in harsher colours. There is no doubt that conquest seems to have been his favourite pastime. . . . Alp-Arslan appears to have shown little interest in intellectual matters, leaving them, like the administration of his empire, to his vizier. (Cahen N.p.)<sup>30</sup>

This depiction mirrors the description of Engh's Arslan. The novel's Arslan is a paranoid transcription of Alp-Arslan as an impressive, larger-than-life, grandiose conqueror. This hyperbolic characterisation is reiterated throughout the novel as Arslan is described over and over as being so powerful that he actually reaches beyond the boundaries of a normal human: "That was what made Arslan unique, human but not merely human. How could he be a bopping droplet in the wave, he who was himself the waves embodied? He would sweep on, carrying all before him, pounding the wreckage of his enemies against the stubborn cliffs of earth until they crumbled at last and the restless waves swept past." (Engh 206) Here, Engh employs a very common literary device to heighten the reader's sense of Arlan's

---

<sup>28</sup> "The founder and first president (1923–38) of the Republic of Turkey. He modernized the country's legal and educational systems and encouraged the adoption of a European way of life, with Turkish written in the Latin alphabet and with citizens adopting European-style names" (Itzkowitz 1)

<sup>29</sup> Alp-Arslan is actually an honorific meaning "Courageous Lion" in Turkish (Cahen N.p.). Today, the Turkish word for lion is usually written Aslan rather than Arslan.

<sup>30</sup> Interestingly enough, Alp-Arslan's vizier was called Nizām al-Mulk, which is also the name of Arslan's eventually traitorous second-in-command (Cahen N.p.).

power – she metamorphoses him into a force of nature. Through this metaphor, Arslan is given the power of destruction and rebirth that only nature possesses, symbolically justifying the very improbable success of Arslan's plan to destroy civilisation and the human race because Arslan thinks that "it is natural for a civilization to destroy itself and wreck the world" (83). Thus, he intends to "cure" the Earth by destroying industrial civilisation and replacing it with autarchic agricultural communities, destroying modern production technology (factories, smelting equipment, power plants, etc) and sterilizing the world's population (77-91).<sup>31</sup> This last action, however, proves not to be foolproof at the very end of the novel when we hear of a girl getting pregnant after being gang-raped. This plan is hyperbolic and far-fetched. Not only would it be impossible for any single dictator to implement it in real life, especially a dictator operating from a small town in Illinois and without the benefits of today's instant communications networks, but it is also hard to imagine any dictatorship risking sacrificing its power for such an eco-terrorist agenda. But Arslan is willing to do so and, by the end of the novel, achieves all of his goals (excluding the above-noted exception). As a force of nature, Arslan sides with nature and ensures its triumph.

Arslan would be powerful enough if he was only a natural force, but he is also described in a few rare instances as a *supernatural* force. This is consistent with how Hofstadter speaks of the paranoid style as a "secular and demonic version of adventism" that sees the world "in apocalyptic terms" (29-30). In keeping with this trope, Arslan embodies apocalyptic characteristics, in the sense that on occasion he brings to mind the Biblical Apocalypse of Saint John. Arslan, like the Four Horsemen<sup>32</sup>, seemingly brings plagues and famine with him:

---

<sup>31</sup> It is not clear exactly if Arslan sterilized everyone or only women. When Arslan explains his plan, he gives as an example screwworm flies, which were eliminated by sterilizing males. He then states that to do the same with humans would necessitate sterilizing an entire sex, but does not indicate which sex (Engh 87). Later on, when it is revealed that Arslan had already sterilized Kraftsville county through a virus disguised as a vaccine against typhus, it is said that Arslan had everyone vaccinated but especially women and children (no mentions of the sex of the children is made) (113). Bond assumes Arslan sterilized only females (116) but we are not provided with any evidence that this is the case.

<sup>32</sup> Here I must point out that in the Bible the Horseman on the white horse is not called Pestilence, like in some pop-culture depictions, but Conquest. The power of spreading pestilence is attributed to all four Horsemen. See Revelations 6-8. Some translations, such as the King James Version, replace plagues with death.

Because that summer was like nothing I'd ever seen before, unless it was Arslan's advent. It was heartbreaking to see the potato bugs demolish a field in a day. People began to panic. We had worked hard the year before, but we had worked with confidence. Men had been masters of Kraft County for a long time, and just taking away their tractors didn't change that. But this year we were fighting for our lives. It wasn't possible there could be famine in Kraft County, we kept telling ourselves. But we weren't exactly Kraft County anymore. And then another blow hit us.

The corn was blighted. (Engh 96)

If this happened only in Kraftsville, I would hesitate to establish such Biblical parallels, but plagues and famines are described by Hunt Morgan (who travels with Arslan for a long time) as following Arslan wherever he goes, submitting to his will: "There in Japan, to my relief, I fell ill. I was to learn on that zigzag journey that the health of mankind had already deteriorated. A surprising variety of plagues afflicted the concentrations of population, plagues that Arslan accepted gladly and manipulated with growing skills" (196-7).

For the paranoid style, giving the enemy supernatural or quasi-supernatural qualities is a handy tool that heightens both the power and the foreignness of the enemy with a single, powerful and disconcerting attribute. This depiction of the enemy is reiterated throughout the novel by the *histoire* and the discourses of various characters. These discourses evidence a disbelief that Arslan is a mundane human, as noted by the protagonist Hunt Morgan: "So there had been a man [the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet,] a member of my very species, who had refused Arslan – a character as unreal, in that aspect, as Arslan's mythical parents, as the teachers in whose classrooms he had presumably sat, as the woman for whose love he had considered committing follies" (173). Since Arslan is, to borrow Hofstadter's phrase for the paranoid style enemy, a "quasi-divine Goliath," imagining him being born, or being a student, seems ludicrous, impossible. Note also the use of the term "species," implying that

Arslan belongs to another species; that he is a *Homo Superior*, not a *Homo Sapiens Sapiens*. Even when Hunt tries to convince himself – and the readers – that Arslan is just human, he only succeeds partially and his statement remains ambiguous: "Sometimes he presented himself to me as a mathematical diagram, the Platonic idea of Arslan, sometimes as a reality of close and radiant flesh. He was, take him for all in all, a man – *menschlich-allzumenschlich* – and I was also, oddly enough, a man" (223, italics in the text). The German in this passage is the title of a book by Nietzsche and translates as *Human, All Too Human*. However, asserting that Arslan is all too human using an implicit reference to the philosopher known for the concept of the *übermensch* – not to mention likening Arslan to a mathematical diagram in the same breath – is a good way for the author to introduce ambiguity and cast doubt on Hunt's judgment that Arslan is simply "a man."<sup>33</sup> Franklin Bond has a similar reaction of disbelief at seeing Arslan acting like a happy father: "The nape of my neck prickled. There he stood beside me – Arslan Khan, and Genghiz's [sic] pyramid of skulls was no more than a stepping stone to him – there he stood, smiling, with a baby in his arms" (102). Note the eloquent images of Genghis Khan and the pyramid of skulls, which are perfect elements of the novel's proto-narrative representing the Them as powerful and threatening. The pinnacle of this power is demonstrated during the novel when the entire world ends up revolving around Arslan: "Franklin had inherited, by force of some cosmic law of survivor-ship, the position for which he had been born, meshing the rusty gears of civilian government to the subterranean motor of his KCR."<sup>34</sup> But his ambition was closed in its own nutshell. His kingdom was an enclave in the unbounded universe of Arslan's curved world" (222). There is a parallel here between the world of the novel and the *histoire*. Both revolve around Arslan – the enemy, the object of hatred – and the actions taken by or against him. In other words, the *histoire* of *Arslan* is structured according to the Manichean binary of the paranoid style. Every element of the

---

<sup>33</sup> The scene where Arslan drives Bond to the outskirts of the town, gives Bond a gun and dares Bond to shoot him is another way the *histoire* dramatises Arslan as uncanny., especially since Bond is too scared of what Arslan's army could do to Kraftsville in retribution to take the opportunity to kill the conqueror.

<sup>34</sup> KCR is short for Kraft County Resistance. See my synopsis of the novel in the introduction to this thesis for more details. (28-30)

novel characterises either the Us (Krafstville as a synecdoche for United States or even the whole world) or the Them (Arlsan), with the elements characterising the Them being more numerous in order to reflect this pole's dominant, hegemonic position.

Oliver Lange's novel *Vandenberg* is also suffused with the Manichaeism of the paranoid style. Unlike in Engh's novel, the enemy is not personified by one individual conqueror. It is rather a vast political, technological and military force. This more impersonal characterisation contributes to the heightening of the the narration's and the protagonist's sense of the paranoid power of the enemy. Indeed, since the enemy is not dependent on the existence of an individual, it is dramatised as extremely resilient and flexible. One of the important discourses of anti-communist propaganda was the notion that communism was a swarm that could infiltrate anything: "The operative metaphor . . . of invasion as disease was already politicised by the 1950's. 'Cancer' had become a catch-all term 'for any kind of insidious and dreadful corruption' (Weart 1988:189-90)<sup>35</sup> and J. Edgar Hoover had railed against the Communist 'infection' spreading into American life" (Seed 133-4). The articulation of the Communist threat as viral and/or contagious fulfills both aspects of the paranoid style enemy – *superhumanness* and *inhumanness*.

The power of such discursive flexibility can be seen in the third act of the novel, when Vandenberg and his friends attack the Russian rehabilitation camp, hoping to not only destroy it, but also capture its destruction on film and use it to kick-start a revolution. As this attack begins, the commandant of the camp, Colonel Brushnevesko, is killed in the first few minutes of the assault. Andrew Walters, previously referred to as a "big wheel in shaping pre-Invasion policy" (Lange 119), is nowhere to be seen. The novel never bothers mentioning if he died in the attack, if he was away from the camp, or what may have happened to him after Vandenberg escaped from the camp<sup>36</sup>. This is because the novel is interested in portraying not individual oppressors but a *system* of oppression. It

---

<sup>35</sup> This is the full citation, from Seed's bibliography: "Weart, Spencer R. (1988) *Nuclear Fear: A History of Images*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press." (209)

<sup>36</sup> For a more detailed description of how Vandenberg was able to escape, see my synopsis of the novel in the Introduction.

shares this quality with my Quebec-based primary texts, as I will demonstrate shortly. In *Vandenberg* in particular, this portrayal perpetuates the proto-narrative of the Them as a totally inhuman threat, capable of omniscience and omnipotence, that acts as a single entity. Any individual – which is what the Us is seen as made up of and as valorising in my selected US-identified paranoid narratives<sup>37</sup> – is unimportant, no matter what the individual's hierarchical position is.

Ultimately, the Soviets not only manage to (seemingly) kill Vandenberg and his allies and to quickly recapture the escaped inmates, they also (presumably) successfully hide the attack from public records: *A faulty butane connection is believed to have been the cause of an explosion early this morning that resulted in the deaths of 12 Occupation personnel at Terrero, north of Pecos, N.M.*" (331, in italics in the text). This Orwellian act of historical revisionism is also a show of power. As the novel ends, everything is back to what it was when it began – nothing "revolutionary" was ultimately accomplished and the oppressor is as strong as ever. Thus, the binary poles of Us versus Them have not changed position by the end of *Vandenberg's* dystopian narrative.

Absolute control of the media is another Manichean facet of the Soviets' power in *Vandenberg*. Total control of the media is a classic paranoid pseudo-idea owing to paranoid speakers and writers' belief in conspiracies. "The final contention [of anti-communist paranoia] is that the country is infused with a network of Communist agents, just as in the old days it was infiltrated by Jesuits agents, so that the whole apparatus of education, religion, the press, and the mass media are engaged in a common effort to paralyse resistance of the loyal Americans" (Hofstadter 1965, 26). An excellent example of this nefarious media domination in *Vandenberg* is that the enemy succeeds in giving Cowles, their "rehabilitation" camp, a proper, clean, benign image, even for the inmates themselves. This sanitised version is so well-publicised that even Vandenberg's best friend does not believe him when he tries to tell him what the camp is really like: "I know a guy who did a stretch up there this spring—fellow

---

<sup>37</sup> See my discussion of the lone revolutionary fantasy in Chapter 2.



named Fleming. He's on parole now. Listen, don't think I haven't wondered about Cowles. Sure it's not what they say it is, but it's not what you say it is either. A guy does his time and gets out. You'd have too [sic], if you hadn't gotten a wild hare up your ass. You're too damned set in your ways, Gene" (47). This kind of control of the media creates a homogenisation of American discourse, in the sense that everyone now receives and transmits a single hegemonic message that is controlled by the Soviets. This total Soviet control is compared negatively by the *histoire* to the American government's influence on the media:

*I'd never believed much of what was printed in the old newspapers, and when the Vietnam debacle, Black Militancy and Yippiedom were at their heights, I believed even less, but it was not until I saw that headline [War declared. U.S.S.R strikes back at U.S. plot] that I understood the difference between a communications media that is bossed, cajoled, intimidated and wooed by its government, and one that is, quite simply, an extension of the government itself. (Lange 40)<sup>38</sup>*

This comparison reinforces the Manichean binary, specifically the Otherness of the Them. It excuses and diminishes the flaws of the Us while accentuating those of the Them, ensuring that the two poles stay distinctive, and that the Them stays "evil."

When analysing *Arslan*, I pointed out how the enemy is often described as supernatural in order to heighten one's sense both of its power and its foreignness. This also happens in *Vandenberg*, though this time the references come from Greek mythology:

*Whatever happened, the fact remains that our countermeasures, however sophisticated, and fail-safe were childishly inadequate. The Soviets speculated on surprise and time. They got the first immediately and won the second in the days that followed. The scope*

---

<sup>38</sup> Unless noted otherwise, all italics in excerpts taken from *Vandenberg* mirror the original text.

*of their foray, one must ruefully admit, was Olympian: in comparison, the Normandy invasion was a rudimentary five-finger exercise.* (Lange 38)

In addition to linking the enemy with divine powers, we have in this passage another comparison between Us and Them, this time insisting on the superior position of the Them in the binary. Just as Genghis Khan pales before Arslan, The Allied armies' D-Day pales before the speed and might of the Soviet war machine.

Another parallel between *Arslan* and *Vandenberg* is that the Them in both novels has a plan to forcefully sterilise the world's population: "Within five years, there'll be mandatory birth control. . . , there'll be no more babies except on an authorised basis . Mass registration. A married couple will have their choice of an IUD, hysterectomy, or, for the man, a vasectomy" (Lange 148). The protagonist is disbelieving when he first hears of the notion – he considers it "too complicated" or "wild" (149) – but the weighting process of the hierarchy of discourses allows the *histoire*'s account of the Them to supersede or dominate the sceptical discourse of the protagonist. Consider how Andy Walters says: "Gene, for God's sake, it's not a bit wilder or more insane than the notion that the United States and Russia had stockpiled over one hundred thousand atomic devices apiece . . . and then programmed fail-safe systems, activated—on both sides, and this is really insane—by computers, machines" (149, See also the totality of Walters' discourse on pages 148-9). By presenting the sterilisation project as less wild than something that, at least within the context of the story, has been proven to be true, the *histoire* counters Vandenberg's discourse of disbelief. The *histoire*'s position that the Soviet *can* sterilise a population is therefore presented to the reader as *truth*, solidifying or enhancing the reader's sense of the power of the enemy in the process.

Parallels can also be drawn between *Vandenberg* and "A Thousand Deaths." In the latter, there is a similar focus on the regime's total control of information and its "sheer Orwellian efficiency at media manipulation" (Seed 104) as a hyperbolic symbol of its power. And just like Eugene

Vandenberg's journals get destroyed at the end of the novel,<sup>39</sup> the main character's testimony as to the horrific nature of the colonising regime is censored by the regime. In short, both novels take pains to communicate to the readers that "a 'behind-the-scenes' narrative of an accused would never reach the public" (104).

"A Thousand Deaths" also emphasises how the Them is physically different from the Us, which is a unique discourse in my selected American texts: "But the uniforms [on the young Americans soldiers] were wrong. I'm not old enough to remember the old ones, but these are not made for American bodies" (Card 141). In reality, there is very little dimorphism between "American" and "Russian" bodies, but in the short story, such discourse is used as a pseudo-narrative to reinforce the pseudo-idea that the invaders, Them, are foreign, alien.

Ideologemes about a demonised, hegemonic Them are also apparent in my selected paranoid texts by radical sovereigntist writers in Québec. The main difference between the two societies as it pertains to the Them is that for the selected québécois writers, the Manichean binary is consistent not only with the paranoid style, but also with decolonisation theory. The Manichean binary, as I mentioned in my introduction, is part of Fanon's conception of colonialism. Fanon contributes to the development of this binary, and in particular the figure of the Them, when he says that "le colon ne cesse jamais d'être l'ennemi, l'antagoniste, très précisément l'homme à abattre" (52). Furthermore, Fanon does not shy away from using hyperbolic language to describe this enemy: "Monde [colonial] sûr de lui, écrasant de ses pierres les échines écorchées par le fouet" (53). I am not implying that decolonisation theory uses the paranoid style, especially since colonial and/or imperial regimes were more often than not brutal, barbaric and cruel. Rather, I am suggesting that decolonisation theory and the paranoid style can share a similar Manichean image of the Them as an essential evil (i.e. there is no "good" coloniser). Due to this shared trait, writers influenced by decolonisation can be tempted, as my

---

<sup>39</sup> For more information on the final fate of Vandenberg's journal, see Chapter 3.

selected *québécois* authors were, to define the Them by using all the tropes of the paranoid style expressed by decolonisation theory, including, but not limited to, Manichaeism.

In *Prochain Épisode*, for example, the narrator often notes how powerful and efficient H. de Heutz is. The character of H. de Heutz is, among other things, an allegorical representation of the English-Canadian oppressor (i.e. Them.) The power of this enemy agent reaches its paroxysm in the middle of the novel, when the narrator holds H. de Heutz at gunpoint, and is about to kill him. At this moment, H. de Heutz starts pleading for his life, insisting that he is not a spy, but a bankrupt man who has abandoned his children and has been trying to rob for the money he desperately needs. Since this is the same sob story the narrator himself told H. de Heutz earlier when their roles were reversed, no reader would expect the narrator to fall for it. But thanks to the power conferred to the enemy by the paranoid style, H. de Heutz convinces the narrator long enough to make him hesitate and allow for de Heutz's acolyte to come out of hiding and help him escape. H. de Heutz's power of persuasion not only defies our suspension of disbelief, it also takes on supernatural qualities when the protagonist of the novel-within the-novel starts "praising" it: "Cet homme possède un don diabolique pour falsifier la vraisemblance; si je n'étais pas sur mes gardes, il m'aurait à coup sûr et pourrait me convaincre qu'il est mon frère, que nous étions nés pour nous rencontrer et pour nous comprendre. J'ai vraiment affaire au diable" (Aquin 1965; 80). We can also discern more indirect references to Biblical imagery, similar to those seen in the earlier analysis of *Arslan*. Like the God of the Old Testament with Lot's wife (Genesis 19:26), H. de Heutz possesses the incredible ability to petrify his enemies, both physically and mentally: "Tout se ralentit. Mes pulsations mêmes semblent s'espacer. L'agilité supersonique de mon esprit s'affaisse soudainement sous le charme maléfique de H.de Heutz. Je m'immobilise, métamorphosé en statue de sel, et ne puis m'empêcher de me percevoir comme foudroyé" (83). The protagonist continues to solidify H. de Heutz's position as a supernatural Other when he states that "H. de Heutz vit dans un univers second qui ne m'a jamais été accessible" (122). In this passage, because H.

de Heutz is imagined as living outside of history, in another dimension of reality, he fulfills yet another one of the characteristics of the paranoid style enemy in the sense that he is not bound, unlike the rest of us, "in the toils of the vast mechanism of history" (Hofstadter 1965, 31).

In contrast to this clear manifestation of the Manichean binary, the proto-narrative of the enemy is slightly toned down in *Éthel et le Terroriste*. It is still one of the ideological underpinnings of the text, but it is manifested in more subtle ways than the hyperbole typical of the paranoid style. In this novel, the hegemonic enemy and its agents are never alluded to in supernatural terms, nor are they implied to be of a different species or plane of existence. Rather, the foreignness of the Them is conveyed through the ambiguities surrounding their representation. It is never made clear who exactly the enemy is – it could be either the RCMP, the CIA, both, or even neither. One could be tempted to identify the enemy as being English-speakers as a whole. Such a deduction would be comprehensible, considering that the Manichean binary tends to essentialise groups and their stereotypical characteristic differences. However, the enemy agent that makes contact with the protagonist is French (i.e. from France). This fact contradicts the previous ethno-linguistic conclusion, but also reinforces the paranoid style by creating an impression that the French-Canadian Us is alone, surrounded by the invaders/colonisers of the Them whom, it is implied, have unexpected allies and some of them can possibly be traitorous members of the Us.<sup>40</sup>

Whoever the enemy of Québec's national liberation is, it is dramatised as extremely competent and resourceful. It is able to track down the revolutionary protagonist in the United States and to blackmail him into becoming an informer for them. Once again, the power of the Them is never presented hyperbolically in *Éthel et le terroriste* – it stays in the realm of what hegemonic intelligence agencies could believably do – but it is not trivialised nor subverted either. The *histoire* ensures that the Them remains a threatening presence.

---

<sup>40</sup> This feeling and idea can be heightened depending on how one chooses to interpret the character of Slyde, the black man. I discuss various possible interpretations in Chapter 3.

Lastly, *L'Afficheur hurle* dramatises the proto-narrative of the Them through settings rather than characters. The poem describes an environment so oppressive that it profoundly dehumanises and alienates French-Canadians. Once again, the hegemonic group or threatening enemy is commonly portrayed as extremely powerful. The particularity of *L'Afficheur hurle* is that this power is revealed primarily through its adverse effects on the conquered. In other words, the enemy's power is depicted more through the proto-narrative of the Us, which I will analyse in detail in Chapters Two and Three, than through ideologemes about the Them. For example, the poem contains an important metonymic element of self-identification with American Blacks, Cubans and other oppressed people across the world (Chamberland 142-3). Ironically, this identification can have the same effect as the ambiguous identity of the Them in *Éthel et le Terroriste*, since it implies a situation where the colonial, oppressive Them is a vast, far-reaching force and the Us is a small, fragile group resisting tyrants despite being heavily outmatched. The difference between this aspect of the poem and *Éthel et le Terroriste* is that its discourse on the unity of colonised people is something that defines the Us first, and the Them only indirectly, which is why I will speak about it in more details in Chapter 2 and 3.

For now, however, I will address one element that belongs to the proto-narrative about the Them in *L'Afficheur hurle* and complements the poem's characterisation of its Us. This element is manifested in this passage: "nous en serons bientôt à l'insémination artificielle, les hommes d'ici auront foutu l'camp dans un livre d'entomologiste made in USA ('Canadiens-français: espèce qui vécut de 1760 à 19...')" (Chamberland 142). The near future pathos of this passage fantasises or gives the enemy the power to drive an entire people into extinction. The Them of *L'Afficheur hurle*, like the Them of *Arslan* or *Vandenberg*, is implied to be able to sterilise the subordinate Us. And it can do so because of the aforementioned dehumanisation and alienation it imposes. This power of enforced extinction, however, only becomes clear when we consider that this passage is placed directly after a passage that is an actual, contemporary, classified ad for virility pills quoted from the newspaper *La Patrie*. This

juxtaposition is a structural, visually rhetorical way for the *histoire* to direct the readers to see these two passages as a statement of cause and effect. French-Canadian men need virility pills because, just like the residents of Kraftsville (of either sex, possibly), they have been politically, psychically, and physically sterilised by the hegemonic power of the Them. This pseudo-idea of the emasculating oppressor is consistent with Fanon, namely with his analysis of the physical and psychological effects of colonialism. Impotence is among the psychological effects that Fanon attributes to the oppressive subjugation imposed on the colonised (Us) by the coloniser (Them): "Pendant son séjour à l'extérieur, tente une aventure sexuelle qui échoue. Pensant qu'il s'agit de fatigue, normale après des marches forcées et des périodes de sous-alimentation, recommence deux semaines plus tard. Nouvel échec. En parle à un camarade qui lui conseille de prendre de la vitamine B 12. En prend sous forme de comprimés. Nouvelle tentative, nouvel échec" (Fanon 246). Impotence is for all intents and purposes a psychic castration, though a temporary one. Instead of rendering the genitals useless, the coloniser removes from the colonised the ability to use them. The method is different, but the final effects stay the same – no reproduction occurs. Chamberland's discourse of sterilisation then is simply Fanon's case study interpreted through the hyperbolic lens of the paranoid style. Psychically or physically, sterilisation in both Fanon and *L'Afficheur hurle* is a condition that is seen as affecting only men, in contrast with the general application of sterilisation in *Arslan* and *Vandenberg*. Such gendered examples are dependent upon masculinist and heteronormative ideologemes that reinforce the paranoid style and its implicit Manichean binary by excluding or marginalizing any group or trait that refuses assimilation into either the Them or the Us. These ideologemes will be explored in details in the third chapter of this thesis.

In the meantime, let us move our analysis to an important element often used to symbolically distance the oppressor from the oppressed: language. I chose to study the paranoid style's use of

language in its own sub-section rather than with the rest of the analysis of the proto-narrative of the Them as powerful and foreign because of the complexity of the topic

In Quebec, this complexity is readily apparent, since the struggle for French rather than English as the predominant language of civil society in Québec was a fundamental issue for the radical sovereigntists rather than simply a device to other the enemy. Since they considered English-speakers as their colonisers, it is only logical that signs of the English language quickly became one of the most the distinctive signs and symbols of the enemy in their literary works. No text demonstrates this more clearly or succinctly than Michèle Lalonde's poem "Speak White:"

    speak white  
    de Westminster à Washington relayez-vous  
    speak white comme à Wall Street  
    white comme à Watts  
    be civilised (Lalonde qtd in Mills 82)<sup>41</sup>

But what is more fascinating is how the defence of the French language became interwoven with a racialised discourse to form this singular pseudo-idea of "speak white". I am not speaking here of race in the traditional sense of the "'race française' dans le nouveau monde" which was destined to have an "avenir mirobolant" (Brunet 108) but in the more widely spread form of Whites versus Blacks that became so prevalent in North America and globally during the 1960's as a symbol of colonial oppression and resistance. Indeed, in appropriating a theory of decolonisation created for Africa and the Caribbean, the radical sovereigntists also adopted its racialised language. As such, English-Canadians became the Whites while French-Canadians became the Blacks, as was popularised by the now (in)famous phrase "Nègres Blancs d'Amériques."<sup>42</sup> This racial discourse also served as a counter-

---

<sup>41</sup> The poem was originally published in the journal *Socialisme* 68, issue 15 (1968) on pages 19 to 21. I am citing the reproduction of the poem in Mills for ease of reference. (If a reader desires to track down the original, it should be noted that many libraries and archives collections lists the journal as simply *Socialisme*.)

<sup>42</sup> Vallières et al. did not actually create the term, but recuperated it. It was first used by English-speaking colonisers to



discourse to traditional, religious nationalism. Chamberland sums up this approach pretty well in *L'afficheur hurle*:

je suis cubain je suis nègre nègre-blanc québécois  
 fleur-de-lys et conseil-des-arts je suis colère dans  
 toutes les tavernes dans toutes les vomissures  
 depuis deux cents ans je n'écoute plus les sermons des curés  
 les pastorales-annales-valeurs-éternelles"(Chamberland 142-3).

Yet as rhetorically powerful as such tropes were, applying this racialised discourse to the Québécois context gradually revealed itself to be problematic.

An interesting symptom of this problematic was how the radical sovereigntists tended to depict France. Indeed, the decolonisation theory they were borrowing from was crafted mainly in French colonies in Africa and the Caribbean (especially Algeria.) As such, the French, in decolonisation theory, were the imperialists, the colonisers, the oppressors. This created a paradox for radical sovereigntists – how could they, descendants of French settlers, define themselves (the Us) as “nègres” just like Algerians, African-Americans or the peoples of the Caribbean yet also claim their French identity as the reason they were oppressed? In other words, how could they state that "the French language was their *blackness*" (Mills 83, emphasis in the text)? This paradox is one of the main criticisms that was, and still is, directed toward the radical sovereigntist movement of the period. The other main criticism was (and is) that despite their low standing in the Canadian socio-economical hierarchy of the time, French-Canadians were, from a global point of view, highly privileged and benefited from industrialised society a lot more than the average colonised person in Africa or the Caribbean, who tended to be a peasant. These two things made radical sovereigntists' claims of equivalence with other colonised people questionable at best:

---

subordinate people: "This was originally an insulting, coercive, idiomatic term used in various parts of North-America to enforce the speaking of English among immigrants and other non-English speakers, such as the French-Canadians in Quebec and New England. (Leahy 2010, 83)

If the concept of decolonisation kindled dreams, it was not without its own inner contradictions, tensions, and ambiguities. Quebec's status as a colony was always contested, continually being challenged both within the province and by potential sympathizers abroad. How could the descendants of European colonizers, many asked, claim to be fighting the same battle as the liberation movements of Algeria and Cuba? . . . For those who had developed their ideas [of decolonisation] in the context of French settler-colonialism in North Africa, seeing White descendants of French settlers claiming to be "colonized" immediately raised questions. (Mills 5)

To rationalise and mitigate this contradiction, radical sovereigntists started to distance themselves from France. This was especially visible in literature, where the radical sovereigntists introduced a new way to refer to their writings that marked a clear separation from French literature:

En témoigne le numéro de janvier 1965 [de Parti Pris] qui porte le titre 'pour une littérature québécoise' ; l'adjectif, qui va bientôt se banaliser, est ici polémique et relève d'une revendication. La plupart des ouvrages critiques qui paraissent au cours de la décennie font encore référence à la littérature canadienne-française, voir à la littérature française du Québec, et non à la littérature québécoise. L'expression revêt donc un sens nettement politique et marque une double coupure : par rapport à la France d'un côté, par rapport au Canada de l'autre. La littérature québécoise est ainsi présentée comme l'expression de l'identité québécoise. (Biron, Dumont, and Nardout-Lafarge, 417)

Before moving on, an example is in order. The only narrative under study to explicitly feature the previously cited shift is *Éthel et le Terroriste*, which represents it very literally by lumping France with the enemy through the aforementioned character of a counter-revolutionary French agent whom Paul meets. This man, who solicits Paul to become an informer in exchange for protection, speaks "français avec l'accent européen" which informs Paul right away that "il n'est pas du pays" (Jasmin 122). Note

the emphasis on the foreignness of this enemy agent. It adds an important granularity to radical sovereigntist's racialised discourse on language – it's not simply French that is a language of the colonised, but specifically the variety of French spoken in the province of Quebec.

While the use of language to emphasise the foreignness of the enemy seems a given in Quebec texts, it is more surprising when it appears in American texts. Indeed, both *Arslan* and "A Thousand Deaths" make numerous references to the language of the invader in ways that reinforce how different it is from American English.<sup>43</sup> In "A Thousand Deaths," the protagonist, and through him the *histoire*, considers Russians speaking English to be an intolerable act. He does not hide his contempt for Americans who "didn't give a damn which language the government was speaking" (Card 141), or for Russians who pretend to be English-speakers: "Then he remembered the night Peter Andreyevitch (no—Anderson. Pretending to be American is fashionable nowadays, so long as everyone can tell at a glance that you're *really* Russian) had drunkenly sent for Jerry . . . ." (142). There is also a moment in the short story where the protagonist asks a judge "why you all speak English [?]" and the judge's reply is "Because . . . , we are in America" (144). Such moments dramatise how much the Soviet regime is trying to disguise its foreignness to make itself more palatable to Americans. The protagonist however, insists on reminding other characters – and hence the reader – of the crucial Manichean binary – the Soviet invaders are Them, not Us.

In *Arslan*, the language of the invaders is mentioned numerous times in the opening chapters. Each time, it is couched in negative terms that emphasise how barbaric and uncivilised it sounds to Principal Bond. They range from small comments like "ungodly language" (Engh 8), "atrocious accent" (10) and "sounded wild" (15), to longer observations: "There must have been a couple of hundred voices joined in by the time I realised that singing was what it was. It puzzled me, the mindless,

---

<sup>43</sup> Of course, there are other important languages aside from English in the United States (Spanish comes to mind,) but since invasion narratives tend to be quite patriotic, this is rarely acknowledged. Only *Vandenberg* makes reference to Spanish, and coincidentally it is the only selected American narrative not to remark on the invader's language. This ties into the problematic approach to race in *Vandenberg* that I address in Chapter 3.

tuneless, inhuman noise that came out of them, till I realized this must be what passed for music in Turkistan" (15). The invader can also make English sound as alien as his own language: "Ollie Schuster and Bill T. Carmichael' – their names sounded quaint and exotic in his foreign mouth – 'you have committed murder.'" (127) In such passages, the enemy is once again dehumanised, othered, this time via atavism. The enemy's language is mindless and wild, a language of animals rather than humans. This kind of allusion is analogous to proto-narrative allusions to the supernatural, to that of the Them as superhuman and inhuman.

So far, I have examined how my primary corpus uses the paranoid style to create and reinforce a proto-narrative of the enemy as both powerful and foreign. However, as I mentioned in my Introduction, ideologies often contain their own contradictions. This is true of the binary of Us versus Them as well. There is indeed a profound paradox in this particular Manichean view, a paradox Hofstadter describes as an unconscious and subtle tendency to respect and even emulate the demonised enemy. Hofstadter gives numerous examples of this paradox, but none are more pertinent to this analysis than this one:

The John Birch society emulates Communist cells and quasi-secret operation [sic] through 'front' groups, and preaches a ruthless prosecution of the ideological war along lines very similar to those it finds in the Communist enemy. Spokesmen of the various Christian anti-Communist 'crusades' openly express admiration for the dedication, discipline, and strategic ingenuity the Communist cause calls forth (Hofstadter 1965, 33)

Seed also notes that the presence of "a grudging respect for Soviet efficiency" (95) in anti-communist fictional narratives. This paradoxical mimicry of the enemy is even present in the use of the Manichean binary itself. Indeed, in decolonisation theory and in much post-colonialist theory, the Manichean view of the world is a trait of the oppressor, not of those who perceive themselves as oppressed (rightfully or not). Abdul R. JanMohamed describes this phenomenon very succinctly when he states:

. . . the central feature of the colonialist cognitive framework and colonialist literary representation [is] the manichean allegory—a field of diverse yet interchangeable oppositions between white and black, good and evil, superiority and inferiority, civilization and savagery, intelligence and emotion, rationality and sensuality, self and Other, subject and object. The power relations underlying this model set in motion such strong currents that even a writer who is reluctant to acknowledge it and who may indeed be highly critical of imperialist exploitation is drawn into its vortex.

(JanMohamed 63)

His further comments on the Manichean binary strengthen the parallel between the Manichean worldview of colonialist texts and the Manichean worldview I have examined in my selected anti-colonial texts. Indeed, an obsession with the "savagery and evil" (63) of the Them (the native, in JanMohammed's case), or the encouragement of "essentialist metonymy" (68) and "metaphoric condensation"(68), are all aspects already discussed in this chapter. We could read this mimicry in two ways. It can be viewed as a proof that my selected texts are actually unconsciously colonialist, even though they were intended as the opposite. Another interpretation, toward which I am more favorable, is that when two parties, two societies, are involved in an adversarial relationship, they both appropriate the Manichean structure that underlies such a relationship, positioning themselves as the Us and the other as the Them. In either case when writers representing the Us become aware of this paradox that, in essence, makes the two poles of the binary *not so different*, they experience a sort of ideological anxiety. Acknowledging such a paradox would endanger the paranoid style's carefully built ideological construct of Us versus Them. Instead, the paranoid writer or speaker will turn this paradox into another sign of the threatening power the enemy. As such, the paranoid Them is often given the ability to lure the invaded Us into considering the Them as one of their own.

A great example of this is in *Arslan*. Engh is able to make Arslan sympathetic by slowly changing the town's – and through the *histoire*, the readers' – perception of Arslan: "This is where the novel's force lies. Despite the implausibility of the larger narrative and of such personalised rule, the psychodynamics of the occupation dramatise a process where submission even leads to love of the ruler. By the end of the novel there is not even the desire to get rid of Arslan and his forces" (Seed 105). Arslan is no longer one of Them but one of Us:

It was a new variation on Arslan's old theme: first the rape, then the seduction. He was wooing Kraftsville now. The difference was that this time the strength was on the side of the victim.

But for good or ill the connection had been made, and Kraftsville was committed to the extent of accepting Arslan into fairly polite conversation. After that, people talked to him. It wasn't that they were friendly, they were curious. And Arslan was always happy to explain his project" (Engh 269).

When Principal Bond, now the Mayor of Kraftsville, shelters Arslan years after the invasion, he remarks that the anger of the citizens over that fact is a "leftover feeling" that "might have applied well enough when Arslan was a foreign invader" but that did not suit "the present circumstances" (Engh 257). Not only does Mayor Bond see Arslan as a citizen of Kraftsville now, he also treats him like a necessary tool in his arsenal to administrate the town. The town has become so assimilated by Arslan's former rule that he is now an indispensable part of its inner workings:

What Leland was really asking, and a lot of other people, too, was why I'd stood by and *let* Arslan set himself up as an independent power. Well, there was no way they could have understood the answer – or appreciated it if they had. Arslan wasn't going to invade the world a second time, and I was ready to swear he wasn't going to take over Kraftsville. . . . And besides, there was a lot of solid power in that school, and I didn't

want to see it wasted. Putting Arslan out of action for good would be too much like cutting off my right hand. (Engh 273)

What more, the *histoire* ensures that Arslan's assimilation and its consequences are one of the most important things the reader takes away from the novel by concluding the novel with Arslan and Bond shaking hands. "Now Arslan swung forward a step, and I knew by the movement of his shoulders that he held out his left hand. 'On that?' *When I ask I do not dictate the answer.* [Bond responds] 'On that.' The clasp of their hands was in darkness (302 emphasis in the text). This scene is narrated by Hunt whose italicized comment, a repeat of a previous line from Arslan himself, is a way for the *histoire* to give the reader a hint that this handshake is not entirely voluntary on the part of Bond. This comment ensures the reader understands that Arslan, despite his saying a few lines before that he considers himself Bond's friend, is still an oppressive Them barking orders. In other words, this final handshake is a way for the *histoire* to ensure that, at the moment of closure, the integrity of the Us versus Them binary is maintained.

This passage's dramatisation of a shift from passivity towards needing the the invaders is represented similarly in *Prochain Épisode*: "J'ai besoin de H. de Heutz. S'il n'arrive pas que vais-je devenir? Quand il n'est pas devant moi, en personne, j'oublie que je veux le tuer et je ne ressens plus la nécessité aveuglante de notre entreprise" (Aquin 1965, 133). This is the paradox of the Québécois as Aquin understands it – he needs H. de Heutz (the Them) to be present to strike back at it but when H. de Heutz is at his mercy, he cannot pull the trigger because H. de Heutz almost succeeds, no matter how briefly, in convincing the narrator that they are *not so different*: "[S]i je n'étais pas sur mes gardes, il m'aurait à coup sûr et pourrait me convaincre qu'il est mon frère, que nous étions nés pour nous rencontrer et pour nous comprendre." (80). In addition, when the protagonist of the novel-within-the-novel attempts to kill H. de Heutz, he pretends to be H. de Heutz, the Them, reversing the Manichean binary for a brief moment: "Moi, agent révolutionnaire par deux fois pris au dépourvu, j'étais en

quelque sorte déguisé en H. de Heutz, revêtue de sa cuirasse bleue, muni des fausses identités et porteur de ses clés héraldiques" (Aquin *Prochain* 111). Interestingly enough, this is the only time in all three selected Quebec texts that the notion of a national weakness leads to a symbolic acceptance of the oppressor as part of the Us. However, we can deduce from a few essays of the period that this was a common component of the radical sovereigntist discourse even if it was not always dramatised in fiction. For example, a book-length essay published in 1971 and called *Le Canadien-français et son double* contains these two passages: "Mais il peut arriver que l'occupation, à la longue, se voile; que le conquérant, à la faveur d'une loi abstraite, devienne compatriote" (Bouthillette 85). "C'est cette ambiguïté de la présence anglaise qui entretient en nous les sentiments les plus contradictoires et les plus destructeurs. Compatriote, l'Anglais contemporain désamorce constamment une haine secrètement voué au conquérant." (87) In short, as with the representations of the enemy Arslan, or of the Soviets in *Vandenberg*, one of the conventions of the paranoid style is that the colonialist or invader is, over time, able to convince the conquered people that he is no longer an invader, but a simple citizen of their nation, like everyone else. This is a form of imperialistic assimilation that Bouthillette does not hesitate in linking to the self-destructive passivity of: "Un peuple qui éprouve un jour la servitude d'une occupation étrangère, ou il se résigne et s'assimile lentement à l'occupant, ou il chasse l'occupant" (85). This is as succinct as one could put it: either an occupied people fights back, or it stays idle and submissive and is assimilated. This concept of passivity as helping the oppressor will be a major part of my analysis of the Us in the next chapter.

In conclusion, I have looked in this chapter at how each of my selected texts manifests and dramatises an ideologeme that conceptualises the enemy as both immensely powerful and immensely foreign or alien. Such manifestations include supernatural and historical metonymy and a racialised discourse of language. But in doing such ideological work of building discourses and images of a powerful, threatening enemy, my selected texts also perpetuate a significant paradox. In order to create



such a powerful Them, the Us unconsciously admires, respects and mimics the Them, even in the very use of the Manichean binary itself. This mimicry, because it creates an anxiety the paranoid style is unable and unwilling to deal with further heightens the power of the enemy by dramatising the enemy as able to persuade the Us that they are not so different after all. This was a risky proposition, however, because while the *histoire* ultimately ensures that this discourse of the enemy stays low in the hierarchy of discourses, there is always a risk that the reader will empathise with the enemy-as-Us. In order to downplay this risk, the paranoid style solidifies the Manichean binary by tying the corruption to a consequence of the weakness of the Us. This discourse of a weak Us and its role in reinforcing a Manichean worldview is what I analyse, in detail, in the next chapter.

## Chapter 2

### **The Enemy Within: National Deprecation and Revolutionary Romance**

This chapter is intentionally a mirror of Chapter 1. Just like the ideologeme of Us is defined in the paranoid style by the relation it has with the ideologeme of Them, this chapter is influenced and shaped by the analytical elements brought to light in the previous chapter.

The object of this chapter is the representation of my selected texts' "Us". I will analyze the various ideologemes, pseudo-ideas, and proto-narratives used in this essentialist process of characterization, as well as how the various characterizations of the Them presented in the last chapter sometimes affect the representations of Us as well.

If the Them could be deconstructed into three components (superhuman, inhuman and corrupting), then the Us can generally be deconstructed into two: how the subordinate or submissive Us allegedly is, and how it is supposed it must and can resist, and eventually overcome, the Them. The first portion of this chapter is more concerned with how the state of submission in which the Us is thought to be existing in is represented. The final portion will address how the selected texts' discourses around individual and collective acts of resistance contribute to the ideological construction of the Us. This will also entail examining the sometimes contradictory nature of the individual subject, the I, in the collective, essentialized ideologeme of the Us.

In all my selected texts, the proto-narrative of the Us is constructed mainly as a way to deal with status anxiety. Status anxiety refers to the struggle for the assertion of a collective identity by a group of people within a society whose sense of belonging to a certain ethnic or social group is intrinsically linked to its social or economic prestige. Hofstadter describes this status anxiety in the American context as such:

Normally there is a world of difference between one's sense of national identity or cultural belonging and one's social status. However, in American historical development, these two things, so easily distinguishable in analysis, have been jumbled together in reality, and it is precisely this that has given such a special poignancy and urgency to our status strivings. (Hofstadter 1965, 51)

While the main point about the joining of ethnicity and status is sound, I think Hofstadter is slightly too US-centric when he insinuates that the United States of America is the sole country (or one of the very few) to experience this kind of joining. In fact, as post-colonial theory and analysis have shown multiple times, it seems to be the rule rather than the exception, especially in colonial societies:

The perception of racial difference is, in the first place, influenced by economic motives. . . . The European desire to exploit the resources of the colonies (including the natives, whom Europeans regarded as beasts of burden) drastically disrupted the indigenous societies. Through specific policies of population transfers, gerrymandering of borders, and forced production, to mention only a few such measures, European colonialists promoted the destruction of native legal and cultural systems and, ultimately, the negation of non-European civilizations. (JanMohamed 61)

Outside of colonial societies, the racial nature of many poorer neighborhoods in most Western, developed countries evidences a link between one's ethnic or racial status and one's socio-economic status. A simple example would be the poorer suburbs of Paris, called *cités*, which are populated mainly by first-, second-, or third-generations immigrants, especially immigrants from former French colonies in Africa. Another example, closer to home, would be the atrociously poor living condition imposed on Native populations in Canada.

Statistics provided by Denis Monière prove that Quebec too experienced this cause-effect relationship between ethnicity (French-Canadian) and socio-economic status (relative poverty): "Au

Québec, le revenu moyen du francophone est de 35 pour 100 [sic] inférieur à celui du Canadien anglais et dans l'échelle des salaires, le Canadien français vient au 12e rang au Canada, précédant de justesse les Italiens et les Indiens" (Monière 294). This is only one example among many given by Monière that clearly outlines the link between ethnicity and socio-economic status in Quebec.<sup>44</sup> And, as Hofstadter states, the result of this kind of linking is a society "in which so many people do not know who they are or what they belong to or what belongs to them" (Hofstadter 1965, 52).

To come to terms with this status anxiety both societies (Quebec and the United States) started in the 1960's and 1970's a process of redefining their status, a process mirrored in the ideological construction of the Us in my selected texts. The goal was simple: to secure or improve the status of the Us by redefining its identity to make sure it accurately reflected a proto-narrative in which the Us was a united, homogenous "block" devoid of any weaknesses for competing ethno-linguistic groups or nations – “the enemy” – to exploit. This process rapidly led to an obsession with the weakness of the national nerve, which grew into a pseudo-idea presenting the Us as weak.

In the United States, this pseudo-idea manifested itself as a pervasive discourse positing that the American people (Us), after experiencing the material opulence brought on by the beginning of accelerated, post-modern consumer culture in the Fifties, had become weak, complacent, and unable to fully appreciate the absolute threat posed by the Them, in this case Communism and its many agents who had supposedly infiltrated pervasively the entirety of the United States and were ready to strike at any moment. This conspiracy theory (which I have already summarized in my Introduction) became the source of fictional narratives about Russians invading the United States and encountering little to no resistance, despite the aggressive Cold War discourse and policies of the American government: "From the Fifties right into the 1980's the conviction of malignant Soviet intent produced a series of narratives dealing with the communist take-over of the USA. These works not only embody a fear of

---

<sup>44</sup> These additional examples can be found on pages 291 to 297 of *Le développement des idéologies au Québec*.

the times but also investigate retrospectively the failure of national nerve which made that invasion possible." (Seed 95) One of the best examples of this ideologeme is evident on the first page of

*Vandenberg*:

*. . . the deeper shock, then, was not that we lost, but that we lost with such ease, with an effortlessnes that approached divine imperturbability. In terms of image, the world was presented with the Statue of Liberty, not as an inviolate emblem but as a vacuously grinning old whore, who after a token assault was debauched and then rolled docilely in the hay. . . . [We] demonstrated once and for all to those who looked with interest a fact long suspected: that this nation . . . had at least achieved the most tractable, malleable—let's face it, spineless—people to walk the face of the Earth. (Lange 12, first ellipsis in the text)*

This passage is clear evidence of the the first pseudo-idea constituting the ideologeme of the Us: the weakness of said Us. The American people, according to the protagonist, was spineless, tractable, malleable, docile – all synonyms of *weak*. By contrast, the second pseudo-idea about the Us as resistant is not present in this passage except by indirect opposition – if passivity is the cause of defeat, then the key to resistance can be deduced as being action or activity.

This passage can also be said to be representative of the dominant perspective and tone of the *histoire* of the novel. This aspect of the *histoire* is for the most part synonymous with the discourse of the protagonist of the novel, which identifies the Post-World-War-Two lifestyle of the American masses as the real reason the USA fell:

Our peril was not the Bomb, or Communism, or the population explosion, but the state to which our life style had progressed. By some sequence still not entirely clear, the American psyche curdled badly by the seventies. The improvement of our human

condition, individually and nationally, our *raison d'être*, became perfunctorily mechanical. There was no spirit anywhere. (19)

A later passage elaborates slightly on this notion that something was missing from the American spirit. It contrasts the vast amount of survival gear bought before the invasion by "survival and guerilla nut[s]" with how little resistance actually manifested itself during and after the invasion:

There were the gadgets, then, enough to keep Christ knows how many men alive and operational, but there was one thing nobody considered—or maybe it was too grim to contemplate and so we conveniently wiped it out of our minds—one thing that had simply gone away from us.

Not spirit nor bravery, nor was it anything like the will to win. . . . What I'm referring to was the actual collective climate of temperament that existed at any given moment in this country: the real, as opposed to the fancied, state of mind. (49)

The pseudo-idea of weakness in *Vandenberg* is bolstered by another pseudo-idea about the despicable nature of cities, establishing ties between them and the weakness or lack of "spirit" of the Us: "We [the protagonist and his first wife] used to laugh at Santa Fe together. The phony art colony, the would-be writers. Everybody making the scene as hard as he knew how" (129). This discourse of cities being full of "phonies" is, of course, not new. Rather, it harkens back to such American classics as *The Great Gatsby*, or J.D. Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye*, in which opulence and comfort are associated in negative ways with cities. The city and its culture is therefore blamed, in Lange's novel, for the negative effects of material comfort on the "spirit" of the United States:

But now we were tested, and all our vacuous, sentimental images turned out flawed. The image of the hardy pioneer. The myth and brag of American technology, self-confidence, and know-how. Edible Church and a G.N.P. that was cornucopian. We had the Rand Corporation, and fluoridated toothpaste, and so many cars our cities were

smogged out of business. . . . A big part of it had to do with what for want of a better term I called peripheral involvement, wherein the real interest or activity is shunted in favor of an image. This was a natural result of the boredom that arose out of material overabundance. True, we had never in our history had such a lively economy, but look at the people it produced. (52-3)

The notion of “peripheral involvement” is interesting, as it justifies the focus on such a small, rural environment instead of New York, Washington, or other similarly important cities. Accordingly, at the level of proto-narrative, the real fight, the real resistance to the invader, is not dramatized as happening in the cities. Their populations have presumably become too apathetic due to material overabundance for a counter-revolution to ever take off the ground there.<sup>45</sup>

A similar pseudo-idea of generalized social weakness can be found in *Arslan*, but in a different form. It takes a more ambiguous approach to describing the enemy while nevertheless staying faithful to the paranoid style. Indeed, *Arslan*'s criticism of the American state of mind does not come from a revolutionary or guerrilla hero protagonist<sup>46</sup> of the paranoid tradition, but from Them, from Arslan himself, in fact. He states that if the United States had truly wanted victory over the world, they could have had it long ago: "Consider, Hunt. If the United States had struck intelligently and with decision, at the hour when she alone possessed nuclear weapons and her delivery capability exceeded the defensive power of every other nation, she could have conquered the world" (Engh 169). Arslan also points out that his conquest of Soviet Russia (another visage of the Them) was more challenging, more risky and more difficult than conquering the United States of America:

---

<sup>45</sup> Interestingly enough, this attitude towards the big city, as well as the protagonist's voluntary exile from it is somewhat autobiographical, as the dust jacket to my edition of the book indicates: "Oliver Lange is the pseudonym of a man who used to work at the New Yorker till he pulled the plug out. . . . He moved to New Mexico, six miles from the nearest phone. . . . He has no running water on his place, nor any electricity. He's got a wife and three kids, Paisano wine, a great view, and freedom." Because the author is writing under a pseudonym, one could easily assume that this biography is a part of the novel's narrative, and therefore as fictional as said narrative. However, an obituary of Lange (real name John Wadleigh) confirms the accuracy of the biography (Nott N.p.).

<sup>46</sup> As I shall explore in Chapter 3, the individual revolutionary hero protagonist is actually at the heart of an important pseudo-idea of exclusion and estrangement that shapes both the Us and Them in several of my selected texts.

Beside Arslan, in the lamplight, nothing stirred in me – nothing until the sullen slow warmth of an unexpected resentment (disappointment? shame? – some degradation product of a residual patriotism I had thought I never had) roused at his casual disposal of my country's honor. 'The United States, of course, capitulated.' Why *of course*? Why was all the uncertainty, all the risk, in Moscow? (174; emphasis in the text)

Why indeed did the USA stay idle when, according to this narrative, it had the power to establish its dominance once and for all? Why was its fall inevitable? The answer is never given clearly but it is hinted, once again through the discourse of Arslan, as being similar to the answer given in *Vandenberg* – Americans had become overly passive due to material comfort and opulence: "Your hungriest paupers have been better fed than the chiefs of towns. Your people have slept in security. They were free, they were healthy, as human health and freedom go" (80). In a subsequent passage in this long discussion between Arslan and Principal Bond, the former points out that this peacefulness was only a facade hiding much darker realities – or as it was put in *Vandenberg*, the real state of mind rather than the fancied one:

You call yourselves a Christian people; and that, sir, is a lie, and you are wise enough to know that it is a lie. You would have called Kraftsville a safe and pleasant place to live, before I came, would you not? But answer this for yourself, sir. How many households do you know personally in Kraftsville? Two hundred, perhaps – three hundred? How many of these are free of serious evil – *serious* evil, sir? Agression, exploitation, cruelty – lust to possess, lust to destroy – hatred, envy, deceit – have those not been commonplace in Kraftsville? I did not import pain, sir; it is a local product. (80)

To close this analysis of *Arlsan*, I want to point out how the pseudo-idea of weakness is expressed through the novel's titular character whose discourse ranks very high in the novel's hierarchy of discourses. In fact, a reader can easily equate Arlan's discourse with that of the *histoire*. This is



unusual, because it subverts the conventional Manichean binary by suggesting that the Them could be *right* about certain subjects. However, a good part of the *histoire*, as I demonstrate in Chapters 1 and 3, ultimately reinforces the Manichean binary of Us (Good) vs Them (Evil)<sup>47</sup>.

Another common pseudo-idea reinforcing the intrinsic weakness of the Us is the notion that the invading enemy did not invent the totalitarian apparatus it imposes on the United States. Rather, this apparatus is described as a "warping of American institutions" (Seed 71). Following this logic, the surveillance of Eugene Vandenberg by the Soviet military government after he drunkenly mouths off against the Russians one too many times is mirrored by the file the CIA and FBI kept on him after he made a drunken crack about throwing Molotov cocktails at the First Lady (Lange 112-115). This mirroring is one way in which the novel posits that extreme surveillance and the curbing of freedom was in progress even before the Soviets attacked. Another way it does so is by having the Soviets find the key to invade America by analysing the aftermath of the John F. Kennedy's assassination. Specifically, they discovered that the American mass media system could be used to render the entire population idle, just like the assassination of Kennedy had caused a situation where "there wasn't a general officer anywhere in the world, not in SAC or Europe or the Far East, who was primed to commit himself or his men to doing any more than the rest of the citizenry—namely, sitting tight" (Lange, 154). The Soviets therefore concluded that all they needed were a few well-placed Fifth Columnists to turn the United States' advanced system of communication against them:

By then, we had a few key people in the wire services and at the networks, and they released different versions. That Washington was a smoking ruin, which was not true. That Chicago, New Orleans, Los Angeles, and New York—shit, right there you've got close to thirty million—had been reduced to rubble. That an armistice had already been signed. The networks went crazy. And everywhere, the magical placebo, repeated over

---

<sup>47</sup> See my analysis of the depiction of Arslan and Arslan's plan to destroy civilization in Chapter 1 and my analysis of Arslan as sexual corruptor in Chapter 3

and over: keep calm—watch for further reports. There were other aspects, which I can't discuss with you, but surprisingly it didn't take that many people to accomplish it. . . . It was really very easy. (155-6)

Once again, we have another discourse corroborating a pseudo-narrative of the United States as an easy target for conquest because, in the end, its people had not measured up to their self-given title of "Leaders of the Free World."<sup>48</sup>

"A Thousand Deaths" operates within the same logic; the success of a Soviet invasion is directly attributable to how weak the American people turned out to be when faced with a real threat to their freedom. And just like in *Vandenberg* and *Arslan*, this weakness had its origin in a lazy obsession with comfort:

Love liberty? Who knew anymore? What was liberty? Being free to make a buck? The Russians had been smart enough to know that if they let Americans make money, they really didn't give a damn which language the government was speaking. And, in fact, the government was speaking English anyway.

The propaganda that they had been feeding him wasn't funny. It was too true. The United States had never been so peaceful. It was more prosperous than it had been since the Vietnam War boom thirty years before. And the lazy, complacent American people were going about business as usual, as if pictures of Lenin on buildings and billboard were just what they had always wanted. (Scott Card 141)

In short, the examples I have cited and analysed were the building blocks with which the three anti-communist American texts in my corpus constructed pseudo-narratives of national weakness in the hyperbolic tradition of the paranoid style.

---

<sup>48</sup> Free World is a patriotic, propagandist term used to distinguish the allegedly diplomatic United States and its allies, (the USA being the Leader, of course,) from the allegedly tyrannical communist countries. Used all throughout the Cold War, it can still be heard in American culture. Hollywood movies in particular are fond of it.

My selected Quebec texts used the same paranoid style to build their own ideologemes about national weakness. But while the exact pseudo-ideas and proto-narratives used were often understandably different, they constructed an Us that, as in my selected American texts, rationalized the inferior position of the Us via a Manichean binary, which in turn, via the paranoid style, rationalized revolutionary romance and calls to arms. However, before delving into examples of how the proto-narrative of the weakness of the Us is dramatized in my chosen Quebec texts, I deem it necessary to point out an important difference in the two societies' discourses of national weakness. While in the selected American fictions the alleged weaknesses of the American people were present before the invasion and led to the invasion's success, the weaknesses of the Québécois are presented as being a consequence of the initial invasion by the British (what historians often refer to as La Conquête / The Conquest) that happened two centuries before and the subsequent status of Québécois as an exploited people that lacked sufficient powers of auto-determination. One could summarize the core of this difference by saying that in the United States, invasion was narrativised as being caused by national weaknesses while in Quebec the opposite narrativisation took place – national weakness was caused by invasion. Despite this discursive and ideological opposition, there is an important aspect of the American discourse on national weakness that is shared by the Quebec discourse – a proto-narrative of a weak people having allowed the invader to succeed and stay; a people whose weakness led it to accept its fate and assimilate rather than fight back and repel or usurp the invader. In reality, not all the inhabitants of New France stayed passive during or right after the Conquest, nor during the republican-inspired rebellions of 1837-1838, nor did all Québécois of the 60's and 70's adhere to this ideologeme of a weak Us whose recourse to revolution was supposedly its only savior. But as I have addressed elsewhere in this thesis it is the nature of the paranoid style to ignore such nuances in favor of a black-and-white world divided according to Manichean ideologemes of Us and Them.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Likewise, the "historical" narrative of the brave American of the past who put their car in their garage and went to the fight without hesitation, as espoused by *Vandenberg*, is a simplified view that leaves out many of the nuances of actual

These dual aspects of national weakness – caused by the oppressor and the perpetuation of its hegemony – are encapsulated by Aquin's concept of cultural fatigue, which he described in his 1962 essay "La fatigue culturelle du Canada Français:" "Ai-je besoin d'évoquer, dans ce sens, tous les corollaires psychologiques de la prise de conscience de cette situation minoritaire: l'auto-punition, le masochisme, l'auto-dévaluation, la "dépression," le manque d'enthousiasme et de vigueur, autant de sous-attitudes dépossédées que des anthropologues ont déjà baptisées de 'fatigue culturelle'" (Aquin 1962; 314). In this passage, the weakness of the French-Canadians is attributed to their perceived situation of oppression and its accompanying masochistic, self-deprecating psychology. For Aquin, the most important symptoms of this fatigue is the creation of a social paradox where French-Canadians simultaneously reject and accept their oppression, which perpetuates their status anxiety rather than dispersing it:

Qu'adviendra-t-il finalement du Canada français? A vrai dire, personne ne le sait vraiment, surtout pas les Canadiens français dont l'ambivalence à ce sujet est typique' [sic] ils veulent simultanément céder à la fatigue culturelle et en triompher, ils prêchent dans un même sermon le renoncement et l'ambition. Qu'on lise, pour s'en convaincre, les articles de nos grands nationalistes, discours profondément ambigus où il est difficile de discerner l'exhortation à la révolution de l'appel à la constitutionnalité, la fougue révolutionnaire de la volonté d'obéir. La culture canadienne-française offre tous les symptômes d'une fatigue extrême: elle aspire à la fois à la force et au repos, à l'intensité existentielle et au suicide, à l'indépendance et à la dépendance. (Aquin 1962, 321)

In *Prochain Épisode*, Aquin enunciates this pseudo-idea of cultural fatigue in multiple passages similar to this one: "En moi, déprimé explosif, une nation s'aplatit historiquement et raconte son enfance perdue, par bouffées de mots bégayés et de délires scripturaires et, sous le choc noir de la lucidité, se

---

history (such as draft-dodgers and forced conscription), in favour of an essentialized view that conforms to the Manichean binary.

met soudain à pleurer devant l'immensité du désastre et de l'envergure quasi-sublime de son échec" (21). The word "s'applatir" in French means to lay flat on a surface (most often the ground,) either literally or figuratively (i.e. to surrender). For Aquin, his fellow Québécois had become so submissive that they brought disaster on themselves. They were weak because they failed in "quasi-sublime" proportions.

But while Aquin's tone is empathic towards his compatriots, Chamberland's is more angry. From the very beginning of *L'afficheur hurle* he is on the offensive. He intends to shake the Us from its torpor by bluntly shoving its weaknesses in its face:

tout ce temps  
 on se console chez soi bien au chaud  
 on s'angoisse un bon coup entre son scotch et ses  
 «Pléiades»  
 on se console on se cajole on cultive l'expérience inté-  
 rieure  
 on cisèle l'aboli bibelot on sonorise ses névroses  
 on parvient à s'habituer voilà c'est fait  
 on crois qu'on tient l'homme qu'on tient le monde  
 on tient le coup  
 on s'habitue on est universel mais oui universel  
 .....  
 on est Pierre Elliot Trudeau dans sa baignoire  
 on est dans l'époque béate comme un zéro fagoté de diplômés  
 (Chamberland 130)

Due to Chamberland's frenetic, disjointed style of poetry, this passage is hard to parse. But upon a close reading two basic discourses can be discerned. First, there is the recrimination against the idleness of the Quebec people for having "got used" to their dominated status. This idleness is expressed, according to Chamberland, through self-centredness (second line) and through a false belief in a brilliant future to come (ninth and eleventh lines). Finally, the last two lines indicate who Chamberland associates with the unsavory behaviors he enumerates: the intellectuals, the federalists and the homosexuals.<sup>50</sup>

Chamberland continues his attacks throughout the poem, growing ever more virulent:

car nous avons affaire à une sacré race de couillons  
 de tontons d'éclopés de souriantes bedaines de  
 laquais speakwhite de "modérés" petit gueux  
 qui tantôt vous livrerons un peuple aux encan  
 de l'histoire en entonnant les aimez-vous-les-  
 uns-les-autres du banditisme coopératif  
 que les matins de drue lessive viennent rincer la terre  
 de ces apôtres assassins  
 et nous provoquent en un duel d'amour au soleil de  
 notre futur. (142)

The first few verses of this excerpt make a clear association between the weakness of a population and its tendency to collaborate with the hegemonic Them. Because many Québécois are "couillons" (cowards,) they act as Judases to their own people. Consequently they must be eliminated for the sun to rise. This image of the sun represents the future of Quebec that is just around the corner, if the radical

---

<sup>50</sup> Homosexuals are included as enemies because of the influence of a homophobic discourse of the time that was rooted in the heterosexist belief that homosexuals were not "real men." I analyse this trope and its effect on the discourse of radical sovereigntists in Chapter Three.

sovereignists can successfully muster its weak, self-betraying people to fight for it. This metaphor is evoked not only by Chamberland, but also by Aquin. Like Chamberland, Aquin creates a contrast between a future, Utopian Us and the current, weak Us:

. . . je devrais répondre des ténèbres qui ont retardé mon voyage à la Nation, vers cette maison de soleil et de douceur que nous habiterons un jour. Devant le juge, je devrai répondre de la nuit et me disculper de l'obscurité suicidaire de tout un peuple; répondre de mes frères qui se sont donné la mort après la défaite de Saint-Eustache et de ceux qui n'en finissent plus de les imiter, tandis qu'un écran de mélancolie les empêche de voir le soleil qui éclaire la Nation en ce moment même. (Aquin 1965, 75)

Another particularity of Chamberland is his use of the urban environment as a mirror of the alienation and weakness of the Us. This is in keeping with his, and many of his radical sovereignist colleagues', attempts at creating a more, modern, contemporary approach to realism through accounts of urban living.<sup>51</sup> The goal was to represent the reality of their compatriots – or rather, the part of this reality that contributed to the ideologemes about their profound, collective, debilitating weakness, mainly French-Canadians' alienation and (relative) poverty. Their goal was to confront Quebec society with images of its own destitution in order to "shock" it into changing:

La littérature pour Parti Pris doit être le reflet des aliénations et du mal-vivre québécois. C'est là une idée sur laquelle les partipristes tombent facilement d'accord. . . . *On y retrouve cette idée essentielle du marxisme que c'est par la conscience de l'oppression que l'on rend l'oppression davantage insoutenable. On y retrouve aussi de façon générale toute la thématique de l'aliénation coloniale à exorciser l'influence marquante du mouvement de la négritude qui a choisi de chanter ce qui était marqué d'opprobre: la*

---

<sup>51</sup> André Major, a fellow *partipriste*, used the term "réalisme critique" to describe the particular brand of realism radical sovereignists were aiming for (Major 81). This term was developed by the famous Marxist scholar György Lukács, in particular in his 1955 book, *Die Gegenwartsbedeutung des kritischen Realismus* (translated in English as either *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism* or *Realism in our time; literature and the class struggle*.)

noirceur. On y retrouve surtout les analyses de Sartre sur le regard d'autrui et la conception de la littérature qui en découle. *Parti Pris décide d'être la conscience regardante de la société québécoise, d'être le regard qui révélera cette société à elle-même et précipitera sa prise de conscience révolutionnaire.* (Major 79; emphasis mine)

Accordingly, *L'Afficheur hurle* features many gritty depictions of the nastiness, degradation and ethno-linguistic based classism of city living, especially in the poor, predominantly French-Canadian neighborhoods of Montreal, *in an attempt to provoke people to action*<sup>52</sup>. One of the most evocative of such images is this one :

qui t'a fiché sur la potence du chant de l'autre côté  
 des paysages de la force mauvais pauvre dans le  
 champ des autres dans la laurentide des tou-  
 ristes américains dans cette univers à ta mesure  
 terrains vagues jacques-cartier bidonvilles ou  
 quelque part dans une courette à détritrus dans  
 la ruelle Saint-Christophe soûle-toi de toi-même

.....  
 et les petites bineries du coin buvez du coke fumez la  
 player's ah le grand craquement du soleil em-  
 poussière de ciment de pétrole croulant d'un  
 coup sur celle qui voit pourrir la vie à travers la  
 sueur et les cordées de lessive (Chamberland 137)

---

<sup>52</sup> It is important to remember that this focus on the big city, and Montreal in particular, is a form of essentialization of the Us, as it describes every Québécois as living in an urban sprawl. But in reality, the day-to-day life and struggles of many Québécois, especially in more remote regions, was articulated around smaller cities and town, and could therefore be somewhat different than what radical sovereigntists often described.



Of note in this passage is the implication that the rural and natural areas of the province – the fields and the Laurentian forest – do not belong to French-Canadians anymore because they have been colonised by the foreign Them, dramatized here as American tourists and industries. Furthermore, its description of urban living echoes a similar passage from Frantz Fanon:

La ville du colonisé, ou du moins la ville indigène, le village nègre, la médina, la réserve est un lieu mal famé, peuplé d'hommes mal famés. On y naît n'importe où, n'importe comment. On y meurt n'importe où, de n'importe quoi. C'est un monde sans intervalles les hommes y sont les uns sur les autres, les cases les unes sur les autres. La ville du colonisé est une ville affamée, affamée de pain, de viande, de chaussure, de charbon de lumière. La ville du colonisé est une ville accroupie, une ville à genoux, une ville vautrée. C'est une ville de nègres, une ville de bicots. (Fanon 42-3)

Since Fanon, who had such a profound influence upon the *partipristes*, thinks that it is in these "bidonvilles" that a national revolution finds its primary manpower, it makes sense for Chamberland to create a pseudo-narrative that focuses on these neighborhoods and their alienating effects, because they not only illustrate clearly the weakness of the Us, they are also seen as fertile ground for the revolution that it is hoped is imminent.

A society dying at its own hands – this is what Chamberland and Aquin, along with Lange, Engh and Scott Card, portray in their texts. In this anxious state created by a necessity to define, in the face of a threatening Them, a national Us, both American anti-communists and Québécois radical sovereigntists blamed the weaknesses of the Us for their status anxiety, and therefore for their as yet unacknowledged need to re-define and transform themselves. For these writers, the enemy's superhuman and inhuman predation is made easier by the fact that the prey is already rotting from the inside.

As an aside, I will refrain from talking in this chapter about the dramatization of the weakness of the Us in *Éthel et le terroriste* because it mostly revolves around a complex discussion of the place of the Jew in Quebec society and in the revolution itself. I discuss this topic in detail in Chapter 3, along with the representation of other minorities in my corpus as a whole.

What I have demonstrated so far is how my entire corpus constructs the Us as weak, which reinforces the Manichean binary, especially the construction of the threatening Them, because the ultimate goal of Us is to become "free" by fighting and defeating Them. Even a discourse of total extermination or of the driving out of the Them neither subverts nor eliminates the binary because such discourse still presupposes and would presumably retrospectively perpetuate an absolute sense of the existence of a conflict between Us and Them. The position of the poles are simply reversed, but the poles are still ideologically intact.

For the rest of this chapter, I want to focus on a different aspect that participates in the construction of the ideologeme of the Us. More precisely, I want to focus on the various discourses that establish and frame the role and place actions of the individual subject of the identitary Us, the I, in the representations of and discourses about the relationship between the Us and the Them. One such discourse is what Mills calls the "lone revolutionary fantasy" (185). Since the Them is presented as all-powerful while the Us is presented as crippled with weaknesses, when the time comes to describe the ideal mode of resistance to Them, themes of grassroots insurrection, resistance cells, and liberation wars are woven into my selected texts and enhance the proto-narratives' dramatizations of the adversarial relationship between Us and Them. Yet, these themes consistently valorize the figure of the lone revolutionary.

The lone revolutionary, as a narrative archetype, can be thought of as a single person or a very small group of persons (half a dozen at most) working independently of any larger organization. This person or small group, which the paranoid style writer often (but not always) identifies with, is "a

member of the avant-garde who is capable of perceiving the conspiracy before it is fully obvious to an as yet unaroused public" (Hofstadter 1965, 30-1). This pseudo-idea of the lone revolutionary is termed a fantasy because it reduces a complex revolutionary ideology and potentially revolutionary context, shaped by multiple pseudo-ideas and proto-narratives, into a revolutionary romance of heroic actions and defiance. Out of all the tropes of the paranoid style seen so far, the lone revolutionary fantasy is the one that most reinforces the Manichean binary because it boils it down to its most reductive, resonant and classical expression: Good versus Evil, Hero versus Villain.

In my selected American texts, the figure of the lone revolutionary is nowhere more glorified than in *Vandenberg*. The entire narrative, from Vandenberg's arrest by the Soviets to the disastrous attack on the rehabilitation camp, is built in order to present the main character as "the very personification of male individualism, bonding with his son and rejoining his old drinking cronies" (Seed 103). *Vandenberg's* main motivation is simple – he wants to be left to his own devices. This is as true after the Soviet invasion as it was prior to it:

*The idea of anyone looking to me for insight or advice was absurd; and, too, years before, I had fallen into the habit of having as little as possible to do with my fellow Americans, having decided for myself, long before the present debacle, that if I maintained a judicious distance between them and me my life could not help but be richer. (Lange 20)*

When he reminisces about the pre-occupation days, this concept of complete individual freedom is what Vandenberg always comes back to: "All I know is that in the old days I lived my life by no means as fully as I would have liked to, but I got by. As long as I made even a token show of following society's rules, I was more or less left alone" (125). Throughout the novel, Eugene Vandenberg reminds us that he does not care about the greater good, or about his compatriots. When he mounts an assault against the Soviet rehabilitation camp, he is not doing it to start a revolutionary movement, like Tixier

hopes to do, but to protect his own individual freedom, which the Soviets threaten: "He had meant it when he'd told Andy Walters that all he wanted was to be left alone, but somehow, the way he wanted it, on his terms, it seemed like wanting the world. It was too much to ask and they weren't going to let him have it. . . ." (169). Vandenberg is paradoxically both the quintessential American patriot and a model of individualist anarchism. On one hand, he leads and participates in a small collective act of revolt against the Soviet model of collectivism in the name of a form of the lost "American spirit." On the other hand, he remains a loner and a pariah leading the revolt not out of patriotism but for highly personal, individualistic (some would say selfish) reasons.

Furthermore, it is not a coincidence that the only person to ever escape from Cowles – a feat that involves resisting the pacifying medication forced upon the inmates – is Eugene Vandenberg, the obstinate loner. Thereby, the novel reinforces a pseudo-idea that only people committed to individualism like Vandenberg can muster the strength necessary to fight against the oppressor. It is a pseudo-idea, however, whose anticipated romantic protonarrative is prevented from coalescing by the apparent killing off of the small rebel coterie.

"One Thousand Deaths" also glorifies the lone revolutionary. The protagonist is the sole person that can survive a thousand literal deaths (thanks to some science-fictional memory transplanting and cloning) and not be convinced that communism is good. In other words, in spite of the incredible, macabre, actions and odds against him, the protagonist is not converted nor is he defeated by the Them. The main protagonist's patriotic speeches throughout the story insist upon the idea that Americans were once the "freest people in history" but had been "seduced" into "loving slavery" (Card 149). Giving up individual freedom is something only the protagonist, Jerry, was successfully able to avoid. Indeed, any other citizens of the United States who has previously been subjected to the macabre multiple deaths have only been able to endure three or four of these deaths, at most, before cracking and sincerely converting to being mouthpieces for the Soviets. By contrast, Jerry's defiance is so great that he is able

to convince "a hundred loyal citizens" that the communist invaders were not a benevolent Us, but an evil Them. (150) At the end of the story, the protagonist is forcibly sent into space, where he has this thought: "Out there the Russians are creating their own barbarians. I will be Attila the Hun. My child will be Mohammed. My grandchild will be Genghis Khan. One of us, someday, will sack Rome" (150). Notice how, despite using the plural "barbarians," Jerry only talks about one person, one individual barbarian "sacking Rome." In doing so, the short story prioritises the act of individual resistance and implicitly puts the I, via a synecdoche, on the same plane as the collective act of resistance of the Us. Via this synecdoche, the *histoire* reinforces the pseudo-idea that the collectivist Them, despite its current hegemonic position, is ultimately weaker or doomed in comparison with the valorised individualist ideology of the protagonist.<sup>53</sup>

*Arslan's* approach to the lone revolutionary fantasy is more ambiguous. Indeed, there is a tension throughout the novel about community-based resistance (the Kraft County Resistance or KCR) and a resistance based on individual actions. The *histoire* seems to be in favor of the former from the very beginning, as demonstrated by an early sequence where Arslan drives Franklin Bond out of town and hands him his gun. In one single act of individual defiance, Principal Bond could kill Arslan. But he refrains from doing so because the *histoire*, in tandem with the discourse of Arslan, makes it pretty clear that such individual resistance, while satisfying in the moment, would make things worse:

'You have the strength, and the courage, and the brain, and now the gun. You lack only the army.' I could see he was swallowing blood. 'If my troops were not occupying your town, I should act differently. Perhaps I should even start the car. But now, sir, if you kill me' – he smiled thinly, swallowed again, and shrugged – 'it is the end for me, but it is the beginning of very bad things for you and for Kraftsville, and for many other places' (Engh25).

---

<sup>53</sup> One could also argue that Scott Card's text is suggestive of a cyclical view of history and politics. However, I believe that this cyclical view, while present, is a much less frequent pseudo-idea compared to that of the lone revolutionary fantasy that is deployed so strongly and consistently throughout the short story.

In addition to this piece of discourse from Arslan, the *histoire*, via the narration of Principal Bond himself also expresses how shooting Arslan is not a solution, but playing into his hands: "He had come here, occupied my town, taken over my school. And now he was passing the buck to me, to decide, on the shabbiest sort of data, which of the two intolerable directions the world should take. Well, I didn't want it. I wasn't God. The most I could do was choose for myself, for Luella and the children" (29).

By not killing Arslan, Bond's discourse (in this case dramatised by his actions rather than his words) prioritises communal resistance rather than the lone revolutionary fantasy. The only resistance movement that gets any results is Franklin Bond's patient and well-organised Kraft County Resistance. All the other would-be resistance groups, groups with "names with 'Freedom' and 'America' in them" (75) only managed to get two innocents killed before they all got arrested almost simultaneously because of their rash actions (75-6). But the novel also gives us a discourse that favors only diffuse, amorphous cells of resistance, as Hunt notes when he says that Arslan "invites the resistance to organize . . . , so he can crush it conveniently. He doesn't object to resistance, only to organization" (110). Arslan himself confirms the quoted sentences a few pages later, when he states that what makes a country easy to conquer is "organization and centralization. The more centralized, the simpler to capture. The more organized, the easier to control" (115). However, this discourse of Arslan is at once met with a counter-discourse from Bond which, because it is backed up by the continued existence and victories of the KCR, has an equally important position in the novel's hierarchy of discourses: "That was why he [Arslan] feared organization. It would be no civilian resistance that would ever break him; it would have to be an organized movement that could detach whole units of its patchwork horde." (117) These contrasting discourses, taken together, evidence a dual representation of the notion of individual resistance within the novel. On the one hand, there is the recognition that organisation gives a resistance movement the resources needed (namely numbers) to bring down the enemy. On the other hand, it also presents the idea that once a resistance organisation begins to coalesce, to expand, it

is more vulnerable to being found out and repressed. Ultimately, the *histoire* does not seem to champion either of these discourses, allowing them to cohabit somewhat equally. On one hand, the KCR does manage to drive Arslan out of Kraftsville in the middle of the novel: "The bemusing thing was that Arslan had escaped from Kraftsville. . . . He had come into Kraftsville like a young lion, rampant and triumphant, but in the end he had climbed out a window and run down a roof, and his getaway car had been waiting" (146). However, this victory is mitigated by the simultaneous failure of another part of the KCR's plan, which was to get a larger revolutionary movement off the ground with the aid of a turncoat officer from Arslan's army (who never showed up.) Kraftsville ends up being neither "the Concord of the new American Revolution" nor "the first skirmish of Armageddon" (139), but a simple fisticuff, quickly forgotten. Therefore, if the *histoire* allows the discourse promoting collective, organised resistance to succeed, it ensures that these successes are limited by the discourse promoting individual resistance.

This paradoxical cohabitation of two opposite pseudo-ideas of resistance struggling for hegemony within the *histoire* can be found in my selected Quebec texts as well. Indeed, radical sovereigntists favored a collective-based approach largely because of their adherence to Marxist ideology. Marxism and decolonisation theory of many of the radical sovereigntists was heavily influenced by and beholden to Marxist ideologies' influence upon successful international movements of national liberation. As a consequence, their writings generally created proto-narratives of communal resistance. *Éthel et le Terroriste* ends with Paul finally choosing the collective cause (armed activism to force the liberation and/or independence of Quebec) over his primary individual desire (his love for Éthel.) The ending of *L'Afficheur Hurlé* similarly extols the virtue of organised, collective resistance not by individuals, but by a whole people:

terre camarades

si la courbure du monde sous nos paumes se dé-  
 roberont toujours en ce milieu du vingtième siècle  
 et si le visage des choses s'allume loin de nous  
 par-delà l'horizon barré de nos vies

.....

camarades    ô bête entêtées    le rire couve sous  
 l'écorce et les grands craquements du feu natal  
 tressautent dans la mémoire à venir.

ô peuple intact sous la rature anglaise

terre    camarades

ton nom    Québec    comme bondissement de

comète dans le soleil de nos os    comme

razzia du vent dans la broussailles de nos

actes

voici que le cœur de la terre déjà bouleverse nos

labours et nos rues et que notre cœur lui répond

dans le saccage des habitudes (Chamberland 146-7)

Note how different this call for collective resistance is from the call for individual resistance found in my selected American texts. Also interesting to note is the implicit link made between the land (terre) and the people (camarades.) The revolt of the French-Canadians is echoed by the revolt of Nature itself, including the land, therefore implying that the land "belongs" to the French-Canadians, and thus that it is their right – if not their responsibility – to take it back.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> The land was also often consciously represented as a woman as part of a gendered, patriarchal discourse that I analyse in Chapter 3.



In addition to the content, the very form of the poem – its refusal of established, conventional, literary and linguistic codes and regulations in favor of a more oral, more free form, stream-of-consciousness style - is a plea in favor of a communal Marxist ideology and an attack on rampant individualism: "L'aboutissement logique de cette problématique est justement d'en venir à une poésie quotidienne ou à un quotidien poétisé, en somme à une poésie faite par tous et pour tous. La poésie et le poète sont alors démystifiés, démythifiés: on s'attaque ainsi à la pierre d'angle de la bourgeoisie et du système capitaliste, l'idéologie du sujet individuel" (Major 66). By creating a poem that aims at representing the daily life and alienation of all French-Canadians, but especially French-Canadian workers, Chamberland foregrounds individual experiences of exploitation and oppression in order to represent the communal ones via synecdoche.

*Prochain épisode* also evidences a number of passages where the narrator reminds the reader that his situation and his actions are in fact only synecdoches for the situation of French-Canadians as a whole: "Je suis un peuple défait qui marche en désordre dans les rues qui passent en dessus de notre couche" (Aquin 1965, 132). The "I" here becomes indistinguishable from the "We," the Us. The ending of the novel, like the ending of the two previous Québécois texts, hammers home this idea by having the narrator admit that he cannot complete his personal, individual project – finishing his book and killing the enemy (H. de Heutz) – alone. Rather, he contends that the project will be completed for him by the people during the national revolution:

Non je ne finirai pas ce livre inédit : le dernier chapitre manque qui ne me laissera même pas le temps de l'écrire quand il surviendra. Ce jour-là, je n'aurai pas à prendre les minutes du temps perdu. Les pages s'écriront d'elles-mêmes à la mitrailleuse: les mots siffleront au-dessus de nos tête, les phrases se fracasseront dans l'air...

Quand les combats seront terminés, la révolution continuera de s'opérer; alors seulement, je trouverai peut-être le temps de mettre un point final à ce livre et de tuer H. de Heutz une fois pour toutes. (Aquin 1965, 166-7, ellipsis in the text)

However, just like in *Arslan*, this strong discourse of communal resistance is challenged or troubled within the hierarchy of discourses by the lone revolutionary fantasy.

The most extreme manifestation of this lone wolf mentality among radical sovereigntist movements is not found in my selected texts, but in culture and practices of the FLQ, which was supported explicitly by Aquin, who wrote *Prochain épisode* while serving a prison term for his avowed identification with the group, by Chamberland<sup>55</sup>, and by some other radical sovereigntist writers, including Pierre Vallières (who also did prison time for his participation in the FLQ). Interestingly, such identification put the deeds of some radical sovereigntists in contradiction with their words to a certain extent. For the FLQ, when it came to following up words with gestures, the masses took a backseat to individual patriotic sacrifice:

The FLQ spoke in the language of popular democracy, but its actions demonstrated anything but a belief in popular participation. At the heart of the FLQ mythology lay the image of the solitary urban guerrilla, a member of the revolutionary elite who forgoes the comforts of life for the good of his people – people who themselves are seen to be ignorant and in need of awakening. (Mills 185)

*Prochain Épisode* offers an excellent example of such contradictory coexistence of a communal discourse of liberation with the representation of actions that are nevertheless centered on individual prowess and weaknesses. The communal, revolutionary nationalist ideal is present throughout the novel, but the focus of the *histoire* (the framing narrator), and of the novel within the novel's hierarchy

---

<sup>55</sup> Chamberland's sympathy for the FLQ is most obvious in his poetry collection *Terre Québec*, published a year before *L'Afficheur hurle*. One of the poem in this collection is titled "Deuil 4 juin 1963", a reference to the date of an arrest of some FLQ members, and is dedicated "aux camarades du FLQ/victimes de la délation/cet inutile glas" (Chamberland 47). I did not find enough evidence to say if Chamberland, or Aquin for that matter, still supported the group during the October Crisis.

of discourses, is on the elite, increasingly paranoid (in the popular sense) revolutionary and his important, ultimately failed mission to kill an enemy agent. Aquin's fictional alter-ego (the spy protagonist of the novel within the novel) is not a cog in the revolutionary machine, but a spearhead member:

Pirate déchainé dans un étang brumeux, couvert de Colts 38 et injecté d'hypothermiques grisantes, je suis l'emprisonné, le terroriste, le révolutionnaire anarchique et incontestablement fini! L'arme au flanc, toujours prêt à dégainer devant un fantôme, le geste éclair, la main morte et la mort dans l'âme, c'est moi le héros, le désintoxiqué! Le chef national d'un peuple inédit! (*Prochain Épisode* 20-21)

Notice that while the two aforementioned contradictory discourses – one promoting individual resistance and one promoting collective resistance – coexist within *Prochain Épisode*, the pseudo-idea of the Us as weak, as "fatigué culturellement," is nevertheless dramatised constantly inside both competing discourses throughout the novel.

So far my thesis has examined how my chosen selected texts use the paranoid style – and a variety of discourses and ideologemes associated with it – in order to construct and reinforce the binaries between two competing categories of ideologemes. In Chapter 1, I analysed ideologemes constructing the Them as an enemy that is both superhuman and inhuman in addition to being a corruptor and tempter. Then, in this chapter, I analysed the similarly constructed Manichean ideologeme of the Us as a weak, alienated mass that needs the leadership and the help of the lone revolutionary in order to overcome this weakness and engage in resistance against Them. Such resistance is carried out either by individuals, collectivities, or a contradictory mix of both. But the Manichean binary of Us versus Them is shaped and enforced by more than just the ideological composition of its two extreme poles and their attendant ideologemes. It is also influenced by any group of people that are generally considered not to be truly or fully part of the Them or the Us. These

groups are what I called “estranged elements” in my Introduction, since this lack of total agreement with either Us or Them causes their exclusion from or marginalization within these two binary poles. It is the representation of these estranged or interstitial groups that I will now discuss in the third and final chapter of this thesis.

## Chapter 3

### Us, Them and Who Else? Anti-Intellectual, Heterosexist and Ethnocentrist

#### Estrangement from the Binary

In the previous two chapters of this thesis, I have endeavored to describe the Manichean structure of Us versus Them that underlies my selected narratives. All the elements I have looked at so far have described either the pole of the oppressive enemy or that of the oppressed kin, and shown how both of them are dramatised by the use of the paranoid style. I now turn my attention to a third pole that sits just outside but also within the cracks of the dialectal space imposed upon a text by the Manichean binary. This pole can be conceptualised as everything, or more precisely *everyone*, that is purposefully (but not necessarily consciously) excluded or marginalized from the binary poles of Us and of Them. More specifically, this third pole is less a pole than a fluid ensemble of key gendered and ethnic groups or identities. These identities are, as I alluded to in my introduction, strangers to the Manichean binary that underpins the paranoid style. Strangers in the sense of unknown unwelcome or foreign, but also in terms of its suggestion of its cognate *strange*: weird, marginal, *against the conventions*. The Manichean binary tries to exclude, reject or expunge these strangers from its rigid confines but can never perform a total dialectical purge of these outsiders. Their existence is simply transposed *around, between* and *within* the binary poles. Both marginalised by the Manichean binary and constitutive of it, they shape and are shaped by the interactions between Us and Them. As identities that are constituted as much by what they *are not* as by what they *are*, Us and Them define themselves and are defined not only through their adversarial relationships to each other but also through a kaleidoscope of elements they have *essentialised out* and that are, as a result, discursively orbiting around and within them.

In the case of the texts under study, these interstitial, external elements tend to be intellectuals, women, queer men, and ethnic minorities (Jews, Blacks, Latinos, Natives.)<sup>56</sup> Thus, in this chapter, I will look at how the representation of these groups – and especially the representation of their estrangement – contributes to the reinforcement of a binary structure of fundamental antagonisms between two competing groups that permits few nuances or shades of grey. In short, the question I am focusing upon in this chapter is: what are the groups that are estranged, ignored, marginalised, excluded, subordinated or silenced in order to help establish, maintain and reinforce the highly restrictive, fixed, essentialist Manichean binary of my primary corpus' ideological or cultural work? And since the exclusion and marginalization of intellectuals and artists is expressed in a substantially different proto-narrative than exclusion and marginalization based on gender, "race" or sexual orientation, I shall explore it first in order to have a more cohesive discussion of the other three groups afterward.

In my selected texts, anti-intellectualism acts as a discourse of estrangement because it others a group of people, specifically intellectuals and artists. It others a facet of the author, narrator or protagonist's own self as well, since writing in itself is an intellectual and artistic act. Anti-intellectualism is an interesting concept to associate with the paranoid style because Hofstadter himself wrote one of the most famous books on the subject. Accordingly, my definition of anti-intellectualism – and especially the broad range of its definition – is mostly identical with his own:

[Anti-intellectualism] does not yield very readily to definition. As an idea, it is not a single proposition but a complex of related propositions. As an attitude, it is not usually found in a pure form but in ambivalence—a pure and unalloyed dislike of intellect or intellectuals is uncommon. . . . The common strain that binds together the attitudes and ideas which I call anti-intellectual is a resentment and suspicion of the life of the mind

---

<sup>56</sup> This is not an exhaustive list of the classes or groups that could be classified as strangers in anti-communist or in radical sovereingtist discourses as a whole but rather a list of the most important, ideologically significant ones in my selected texts. For instance, I do not discuss the very limited presence of islamophobia in Arslan and "One Thousand Deaths."

and those who are considered to represent it; and a disposition constantly to minimize the value of that life. (Hofstadter 1963, 7)

This multiplicity of possible strands of "anti-intellectualism" is what makes me able to analyse, under the same rubric of "anti-intellectualism", slightly different pseudo-ideas articulated against various groups – writers, painters, scientists, doctors, etc. Despite their different targets, all these pseudo-ideas have the same effect on a society; "to the extent that they become effective in our affairs, [they would] gravely inhibit or impoverish intellectual and cultural life" (9). In Hofstadter's essay on the paranoid style, published two years after his book on anti-intellectualism, he did not try to link the two together. This is a surprise and a missed opportunity, since anti-intellectualism takes on very interesting qualities when theorized and analysed vis-à-vis the paranoid style. Indeed, in paranoid style narratives anti-intellectualism tends to be associated with the lone revolutionary fantasy that permeates them. I will come back to the latter concept that I addressed in Chapter 2 a few times in this chapter, because it forcefully ascribes revolution to a very specific sphere of activity – that of violent individual actions – while relegating other spheres, and the classes of people associated with them, to the margins. It is therefore at the ideological root of many instances of estrangement presented in this chapter, not just anti-intellectualism.

Anti-intellectualism manifests itself in my selected texts via a pseudo-idea that violent actions by lone revolutionaries are more important to a revolution than philosophical pondering and political manoeuvring. "Real" revolution, therefore, is created and won by actions, not thoughts. Revolutionary art and literature is devalued as a waste of precious time unless the producers of this art and this literature *do their parts* and take up arms as well. This pseudo-idea is made manifest most frequently and explicitly in my Quebec-based texts, but it does appear somewhat in my American texts as well, especially in *Vandenberg*. There is a kernel of truth to this pseudo-idea. One does not simply topple a hegemonic regime with words and art – at one point, acts are required to achieve any political victory.

But this pseudo-idea becomes a promoter of exclusion when it starts denying the helpful contribution of revolutionary intellectuals and casting them as passive bystanders at best and collaborators at worst. Mills reflections on the words of the *felquiste* Francis Simard sums it up very well:

[Simard] recalls being driven by "a will to act," and he describes how the FLQ was living "at gut level." He spoke out against intellectuals who spent too much time theorizing and not enough time in action, and described how "I lived it before I put it into words." It was this prioritization of action over reflection in combination with the legitimation of violence as a political tactic that allowed activists to rationalize the murder of Pierre Laporte. (Mills 185)<sup>57</sup>

Hubert Aquin subscribed fully to this proto-narrative, as he made clear in his 1963 article "Profession: Écrivain," published in *Parti Pris*. In this article, Aquin declares his intention to abandon being a writer, an artist, and to give himself fully to political activism. He explains that in a colonial situation artistic pursuits among the colonised are valorised by the coloniser as a way to keep the colonised passive and harmless. As Aquin puts it, the oppressor likes the oppressed "tzigane, chantant, artiste jusqu'au bout des doigts, porté tout naturellement vers les activités sociales les plus déficitaires" (Aquin 1963, 49). Thus, to refuse to be an artist is a rebellion against the hegemonic structure of the colonizer's world. "Artiste, je jouerais le rôle que l'on m'a attribué : celui du dominé qui a du talent. Or, je refuse ce talent, confusément peut-être, parce que je refuse globalement ma domination" (49).

*Prochain épisode's* relationship to this article is ambiguous and paradoxical. By its mere existence, the novel (and those that will follow it,) contradicts the rejection of literature expressed within the article. In addition, the novel is not shy about making literary allusions (notably to Balzac, Baudelaire, and Camus.) In fact, it starts with a quotation from Alfred de Musset. Similarly, when the

---

<sup>57</sup> Simard was one of the members of the Chénier cell that kidnapped and killed Pierre Laporte during the October Crisis of 1970. It should be noted that there are still some doubt among journalists, writers, former *felquistes* and former or present sovereigntist activists as to whether or not the Chénier cell was entirely in control of – and therefore responsible for– the death of Pierre Laporte.



spy protagonist of the novel within the novel is waiting for H. de Heutz inside the latter's castle, he spends a lengthy period of time admiring the works of art inside. Be it the book "*Histoire de Jules César. Guerre civile*," the painting *La mort du général Wolfe*, or the engraving of two knights fighting on a desk, "chaque objet que H. de Heutz à choisi me séduit" (Aquin 1965; 121). Nevertheless, the novel does not contradict "Profession : écrivain" wholesale as it dramatises the essay's central pseudo-idea at the same time as it contradicts it. It does so through multiple passages where the narrator devalues his writing and/or glorifies revolutionary actions. Take these two excerpts:

Encaissé dans ma barque funéraire et dans mon répertoire d'images, je n'ai plus qu'à continuer ma noyade écrite. Descendre est mon avenir, plonger mon gestuaire unique et ma profession. Je me noie. (18)

Déjà, je brûle d'impatience en pensant à l'attentat multiple, geste pur et fracassant qui me redonnera le goût de vivre et m'intronisera terroriste, dans la plus stricte intimité. Que la violence instaure à nouveau dans ma vie l'ordre vital. (90)

The strong metaphorical language at work here creates a contrast between the presumed kiss of death for revolution that lies within intellectual and artistic pursuits and the promise of life offered by acts of revolutionary violence. Such language contributes to the formation of the anti-intellectual pseudo-narrative by performing an othering of intellectuals and artists by linking them to – and blaming them for – the death of the nation and of the colonised self. A later passage summarizes the same ideas, but this time by focusing on a fantasized contrast between before and after the Revolution. "Notre histoire s'inaugurera dans le sang d'une révolution qui me brise et que j'ai mal servie. Ce jour-là, veines ouvertes, nous ferons nos débuts dans le monde. . . . Seule l'action insaisissable et meurtrière de la guérilla sera considérée comme historique; seul le désespoir agi sera reconnu comme révolutionnaire. L'autre, l'écrit ou le chanté, émargera<sup>58</sup> à la période prérévolutionnaire" (Aquin 19). The emphasis on

---

<sup>58</sup> It is hard to elucidate the meaning of this rare word in this particular context. Used almost solely in business writing, it can either mean signing in the margins or receiving an expected grant or subsidy. Neither of these meanings seems to fit

the revolutionary action as a necessarily violent or murderous one is taken directly from *Les Damnés de la Terre* in which Fanon speaks of decolonized nations being built with "[un] mortier travaillé dans le sang et la colère " (Fanon 90)<sup>59</sup>.

This paradoxical approach to literature in *Prochain épisode*, both towards its symbolic role in a colonized situation and its symbolic power in the process of national liberation, is the subject of Anthony Purdy's observations on how the very style of *Prochain épisode* represent this struggle between literature as a deliberate act of writing by an author and literature as the representation of this same author as being written by his society:

La structure de *Prochain Épisode* [sic] se caractérise par une tension extrême à l'intérieur même du signe narratif. Une histoire qui se voudrait l'instrument d'une logothérapie compensatrice s'y trouve contestée par un discours qui hésite sans cesse à l'organiser. Par conséquent, l'univers fictif ne se construit pas selon le modèle projeté. Quelles sont les modalités de cet échec? L'histoire voudrait venger une impuissance réellement vécue; le discours refuse cette vengeance littéraire en affirmant la réalité irréfutable de l'impuissance. . . . L'histoire aspire à la clôture de l'Oeuvre [sic], à la cicatrice littéraire et anhistorique; le discours y oppose l'ouverture de la blessure quotidienne. Ce discours qui hésite sans cesse à organiser une histoire insérée à l'avance dans le système qu'elle voudrait contester, c'est l'individu qui se trouve aux prises avec une structure qu'il n'invente pas et par laquelle il se trouve encadré. (Purdy 121)

The uses of the terms "histoire"<sup>60</sup> and "discours" can be seen at first as references to the concept of a hierarchy of discourses. However, Purdy is using these words in their more common sense. The word

---

here, and I could not find an annotated edition that gave any information on this specific word. My best guess is that Aquin meant it in the sense of "will be confined to the margins (of prerevolutionary history)."

<sup>59</sup> It is important to note that the lone revolutionary fantasy that gives anti-intellectualism its force in my selected texts is not present in Fanon. Rather, he emphasized the need for organized resistance built on the solid foundation of the uprising of the *lumpenproletariat* in colonial contexts. The discourse of the lone revolutionary stemmed more from anarchist rhetoric than decolonization theory. On this subject, see Rowbotham, Segal, and Wainwright.

*histoire* therefore refers to the story, the plot – the novel-within-the-novel. Meanwhile, the discourse is the framing narrative – or another level of *histoire* – which interrupts the *histoire* of the novel-within-the-novel at various points to impose its view. Consequently, if we want to consider Purdy's reading in terms of a hierarchy of discourses, the terms have to be reversed. The novel-within-the-novel is a discourse whose aspirations to a successful revolution are thwarted by the *histoire* – the framing narration – that imposes the inevitability of failure and of *fatigue culturelle* on the discourse. At the end, the text experiences a moment of closure when the spy-protagonist of the novel-within-the-novel is arrested, sent to prison, and possibly reveals himself to be the framing narrator. At this moment, the two narrators become one and the discourse is subsumed by the framing *histoire*. The latter delays the expected climax – the revolution, the "cicatrice littéraire" hoped for by the discourse – to a "prochain épisode". By doing so, the novel keeps the "blessure quotidienne" open.

*L'Afficheur hurle* also exhibits this paradoxical ideologeme of literature as both a tool of liberation and as a control mechanism of the oppressive Them. In the foreword included in the second edition of the poem<sup>61</sup> Chamberland makes explicit his objective of making *L'Afficheur hurle* a "poème-éditorial" (Chamberland 102), a poetic equivalent of the "réalisme critique" of other radical sovereigntist writers:

Le texte de l'AH oscille entre la parole poétique et la parole politique, d'où son instabilité constitutive. Car la parole politique n'a de statut, et de portée, qu'en prose, que dans une prose intégrale: elle doit reproduire, en transparence, la figure et le processus de son objet. S'il en est ainsi, c'est-à-dire s'il y a eu confusion des deux registres, il est peu étonnant que l'AH, à la lettre, date: il aurait tracé, bien malgré [moi],<sup>62</sup> l'inscription du passage de la parole poétique et de la parole politique. (Chamberland 102)

---

<sup>60</sup> It is important to keep in mind that, in French, the word "histoire" means both story and history.

<sup>61</sup> While it has the function of a foreword, in the original French this passage is titled "Avertissement," which could be translated as Warning or, to be witty, Forewarning.

<sup>62</sup> This passage contains a typographical error in my edition that substitutes "toi" for the "moi" of the original edition.

I believe that Chamberland's intention with this poem was to be able to say about it what Fanon said about the poem "Aube Africaine" by the Kenyan poet Keita Fodeba: "La compréhension du poème n'est pas seulement une démarche intellectuelle, mais une démarche politique. Comprendre ce poème c'est comprendre le rôle qu'on a à jouer, identifier sa démarche, fourbir ses armes" (Fanon 220). Such a call for grounded poetry deemphasises its "art". Such a discourse constrains art to specific subjects and approaches and often privileges anti-intellectual proto-narratives.

This said, the pseudo-idea of anti-intellectualism, as seen in both Aquin and Chamberland's works, simultaneously agrees and clashes with decolonisation theory. Fanon dedicates an entire chapter to national culture, but Aquin and Chamberland seem to have taken only half of it into consideration developing their anti-intellectual stance. Specifically, they consider only the half of the chapter in which Fanon warns that culture can only go so far in advancing revolt and a successful revolution, and that the colonised intellectual must join the actual fight in order for his cultural work to matter:

L'homme colonisé qui écrit pour son peuple, quand il utilise le passé, doit le faire dans l'intention d'ouvrir l'avenir, d'inviter à l'action, de fonder l'espoir. Mais pour assurer l'espoir, pour lui donner densité, il faut participer à l'action, s'engager corps et âme dans le combat national. On peut parler de tout mais quand on décide de parler de cette chose unique dans la vie d'un homme que représente le fait d'ouvrir l'horizon, de porter la lumière chez soi, de mettre debout soi-même et son peuple, alors il faut musculairement collaborer. (Fanon 212)

By contrast, the other, ignored half of Fanon's chapter on national culture stresses the importance of performing a resurrection, through literature, of the pre-colonial past. He states that in a situation where the coloniser is performing a deliberate "dévalorisation de l'histoire d'avant la colonisation," the cultural work of the colonised intellectual "n'est pas un luxe mais exigence de programme cohérent. L'intellectuel colonisé qui situe son combat sur le plan de la légitimité, qui veut apporter des preuves,

qui accepte de se mettre nu pour exhiber l'histoire de son corps est condamné à cette plongée dans les entrailles de son peuple" (201). Fanon accepts a literary return to the past as a legitimate way in which "les intellectuels colonisés [prennent] du recul par rapport à la culture occidentale dans laquelle ils risquent de s'enliser" (200). This stance was ignored or devalued by Aquin, Chamberland and many of their fellow contemporary writers because the valorisation of the pre-colonial past was highly problematic within the context of Quebec. In the African colonies where decolonisation theory was put into action, colonisation was a relatively recent phenomenon, dating back no more than a century at most. In Quebec, however, the British conquered the province in 1760 (200 years before the appearance of the radical sovereigntist writers). Looking back to the pre-colonial past in the kinds of ways that Fanon suggested meant attempting to valorise Nouvelle-France which, as a monarchic colony of the French Empire, was not a model mostly secular and/or Marxist writers wanted to glorify or follow. Furthermore, the eulogisation of the past had long been the domain of the Catholic Church (i.e. through the "roman du terroir" genre that it championed,) that radical nationalist writers saw as one more institution that was submissive to Them. In short, such partial adoptions of decolonisation theory on the subject of art highlights the problems, which I have noted before, that come with adapting this theory to a context so vastly different from the one it was tailored by and for.

In my American texts, the anti-intellectual ideologeme manifests itself most obviously in *Vandenberg*. The very nature of the main character is anti-intellectual: he regards his own art with disdain, laments his initial difficulties with living alone in the woods and prefers his isolated ranch to the city and its art community. Various other characters are constructed in ways that promote an anti-intellectual view of the world. Indeed, the most prominent intellectual in the novel is a villain – Andrew Walters – who majored in government at UCLA and was a graduate student at Columbia's Russian Language Institute before he grew dissatisfied with the state of the United States' government and defected to the Soviets, ultimately ending up in the very intellectual think-tank of the Division of

Foreign Statistics that masterminded the invasion of the USA (Lange 134-5). Walters, the closest the novel has to a personal nemesis for the protagonist, is portrayed as an intellectual through and through, despite his military experience in the Air Force.

There are also two intellectuals among Vandenberg's campmates: Harris the physicist and Sorensen the psychiatrist. Both are characterised as passive and submissive, with no intention of rebelling or causing trouble. Harris even states that he enjoys the prison/rehabilitation camp, observing that "a facet of a really civilised man is the ability to extract something worthwhile from the unlikeliest of situations"(102). As for Sorensen the psychiatrist, he suspects, as does the protagonist, that the inmates are drugged, but he insists that as "a philosopher", and because he has a family he wants to return to, he is not "about to fuck around with this operation" and is determined to get out "by playing their game"(151). This characterization of intellectuals as either villainous or ineffectual and unwilling to resist – in stark contrast with the active noncompliance of the protagonist – are perfectly consistent with the anti-intellectual proto-narratives of other texts in my corpus.

*Vandenberg* also seems to share Aquin's view on the role of art in a colonised world as ultimately a distraction from real, successful, revolt, as is evidenced by this the novel's Soviet document which insists on valorising Vandenberg's status as an artist in order to "rehabilitate" him:

*Aware that the subject had been an artist and that he had in the past been able to earn a living from his vocation, I asked about his feelings toward painting. Initial responses were disinterest, bitterness, disgust, and resentment over not having achieved success. I believe this may constitute the most important aspect of successful rehabilitation and that with proper indoctrination and encouragement a useful role for this subject may be found in some department of the Ministry of Culture, possibly as an instructor or teacher. (Lange 133)*

Card also manifested a similar view of the role of artists in "A Thousand Deaths" via a simile about sexual violence: "Then he remembered the night when Peter Andreyevitch . . . had drunkenly sent for Jerry and demanded, as Jerry's employer (i.e., owner) that Jerry recite his poems to the guests at the party. . . . Little Andre said afterward, 'The poems were good, Jerry,' but Jerry felt like a virgin who had been raped and then given a two-dollar tip by the rapist" (Card 142). Considering that, in all likelihood, neither Lange nor Card had read Aquin or Fanon, the fact that they included this proto-narrative of the colonisers disarming their "subjects" by valorising their harmless artistic talent suggests strongly that the lone revolutionary fantasy is necessarily anti-intellectual, especially in allusion to art. This is a natural consequence of emphasising action over reflection and is intrinsically linked to the paranoid style's previously discussed inclination to paint its spokespersons as "member[s] of the avant-garde who [are] capable of perceiving the conspiracy before it is fully obvious to an as yet unaroused public" (Hofstadter 1965, 1965, 30-1).

There is however an inherent paradox to the anti-intellectual ideologeme –its manifestations as pseudo-ideas and in a novel, short story or poem are by their very nature intellectual and artistic acts. Once again, I go back to Hofstadter's work on the subject for excellent illustration of this phenomenon:

In any case, anti-intellectualism is not the creation of people who are categorically hostile to ideas. Quite the contrary: just as the most effective enemy of the educated man may be the half-educated man, so the leading anti-intellectuals are usually men deeply engaged with ideas, often obsessively engaged with this or that outworn or rejected idea. Few intellectuals are without moments of anti-intellectualism; few anti-intellectuals without single minded intellectual passions. (Hofstadter 1963, 21)

Despite how common such a paradox might be, it nevertheless produces a significant amount of self-denial. For a creative writer to discursively label the intellectual as a stranger requires labeling part of oneself as an inner stranger. Consequently, the paranoid style writer performs a form of political or

ideological sublimation through their art. Sublimation is a class of defense mechanism conceived by Freud " that [can] transmute psychic conflict not into a source of pathology, but into culture and virtue" (Vaillant 3358). Sublimation also "distort[s] and alter[s] awareness of and emotional response[s] to conscience, relationships, and reality" (Vaillant 3357). By writing works that condemn intellectuals, my selected writers transferred – sublimated – their inner stranger onto the page, thus casting it out of themselves. But this cathartic casting out does not resolve the paradox itself, it simply represses it via the aforementioned anti-intellectual ideologeme so the writer can fit into or conform to the Manichean notion of Us without any conscious sense of ambiguity or contradiction.

Corrupt or submissive intellectuals are not the only interstitial identities or subject positions that are estranged by the narrow, rigid practices and ideas that define what constitutes the oppressed group of the Us. That such exclusions or marginalizations happen while attempting to constitute a unified, non-contradictory, collective revolutionary identity is hardly surprising given that, as I am going to demonstrate, many hegemonic heterosexist and racist/ethno-centric ideologies of the era ~~could~~ can be found in the discourses of a number of progressive groups and individuals. I will now single out three of these interstitial groups – three victims of these aforementioned ideologies – in my selected narratives. These three groups are, namely, male homosexuals<sup>63</sup>, women and ethnic minorities. I will look briefly at each of these groups of “strangers” in turn and explain how their particular estrangement is performed.

The portrayals of homosexuals in my selected paranoid style narratives revolves entirely around the idea that the enemy is sexually – and therefore morally – corrupted. With the birth of modern psychiatry, this age-old idea combined with the “modern” view of homosexuality as a mental illness or deficiency that offered "scientific" support to homophobic views.<sup>64</sup> Depending on the specific society

---

<sup>63</sup> I single out male homosexuals for the purpose of this thesis because my selected texts (and the general homophobic discourse of their respective societies) tended to acknowledge and to only deal with this particular permutation of what we now tend to broadly call queer identity.

<sup>64</sup> The American Psychological Association, for example, only removed homosexuality from their *Diagnostic and Statistical*



we examine, however, this corruption is identified and expressed by slightly different pseudo-ideas and proto-narratives.

For instance, American anti-communist texts, like early Cold War discourse in general, subscribed to an ideologeme of homosexuality as a conspiracy whose members were seen as "associated directly with communism and spying for the USSR or seen as an easy target for blackmail and therefore a risk to 'national security'" (Kinsman 120).<sup>65</sup> This view was shared by the military, governmental bodies and a sizeable portion of the public, which resulted in texts like the following being published in various journals, magazines or newspapers:

If the homosexuals did nothing but diffuse their particular brand of moral and physical corruption through the media of entertainment, they would merit well by Khrushchev. . . . The moral advantages for the Communist cause of getting the American "home folks" to absorb and applaud these indecent nance-acts cannot be overrated. (Waldeck 453)

The most obvious example of such a discursive link between communist and homosexual corruption in my primary corpus is *Arslan*. As the novel begins, Arslan chooses two girls and one boy (each about thirteen years old) and proceeds to rape them in front of his troops and members of the conquered populace. Arslan then takes the raped boy, Hunt Morgan, and the youngest of the schools' female teachers, back to his command center in Franklin Bond's home and uses them as his sex slaves. The teacher is quickly forgotten by the narrative<sup>66</sup> but Hunt Morgan becomes a main character and the peculiar relationship between him and Arslan becomes the central subplot of the novel. The main narrative thrust of this relationship is how, via repeated sexual assaults, Arslan desires to make Hunt love him: "[Franklin Bond:] 'I want you to stop systematically corrupting that boy.' [Arslan:] 'I am wooing Hunt,' he said smugly. 'First the rape, then the seduction.'"(Eng 59). Arslan succeeds, at least

---

*Manual of Mental Disorders* in 1974.

<sup>65</sup> As Kinsman points out, the same view was espoused by Canadian officials, especially the RCMP and the Army (see Chapter 8, in particular pages 120-5).

<sup>66</sup> This happens very frequently to female characters in the entirety of my primary corpus, as I demonstrate later in this chapter.

in part. Hunt indeed comes to feel a kind of "love" – or rather obsession – that ultimately makes him jealous of Arslan's wife, Rusudan. Ultimately, this jealousy will lead Hunt to indirectly help a few of Kraftsville's men to murder Rusudan (295).

I realise that being raped and emotionally abused in no way makes Hunt homosexual. However, the novel's *histoire* creates a symbiosis between being raped and being homosexual, and in consequence his perceived "homosexuality" is the cause of Hunt's exclusion from the narrative's privileged Us, as Hunt realises: "I was (since the Russians, faithful in their fashion, had taken the brothel with them) the only visible vestige of Arslan's regime. I had notably failed to repudiate him and all his works. I had declined the helping hand of Kraftsville custom. I was queer" (222). The word "queer" is unambiguous – the citizens of Kraftsville see Hunt as corrupted not because he was raped by Arslan but because he had sexual relations with another male.<sup>67</sup> What is more, Hunt's being queer is a product of his being quite literally or physically colonised by the enemy. Hunt's father expresses this heteronormative prejudice almost as clearly as Hunt himself:

'When Hunt comes home, it's going to be the real thing, Franklin. Nobody's going to use my house as a . . . a . . . !'

'In other words, you sent your son out to be shot at because he couldn't promise he wouldn't be assaulted.'

'No, sir – and you ought to know me better than to say that to me. I didn't send him anywhere. The only thing I asked for was that he wouldn't volunteer himself to that greasy devil. For God's sake, Franklin, what do you expect me to do – encourage him?'  
(Engh 73)

Note the euphemisms and silences of Hunt's father to describe his son's corrupted sexual orientation. Heterosexuality is *the real thing* while homosexuality is *unspeakable*. The very word homosexual (or

---

<sup>67</sup> At the time *Arslan* was published, the word queer was still a pejorative term equivalent to "faggot" as opposed to its contemporary positive association with the full spectrum of non-heterosexual identities.

any synonym, polite or not) is excluded from the discourse. The ideologeme of the queer man as a corrupted individual is inscribed in meaning and in form by the discourse of the father. This discourse, because it is echoed in the discourse of the citizens of Kraftsville, of Hunt himself and in the discourse of Arslan, occupies a privileged position in the hierarchy of discourses over a discourse of acceptance and compassion expressed only by Franklin Bond. Therefore, at the moment of closure, the *histoire* privileges as its "truth" the reading that Hunt is a stranger because he had sexual relations with a man and not just any man, but the leader of the conquering enemy or Them. However, due to the character's importance in the narrative, Bond's discourse is not totally eliminated but simply downplayed.

*Vandenberg* also manifests homophobia when it deploys a Cold War proto-narrative of homosexuals as untrustworthy, namely the perception that "homosexuals make natural secret agents and natural traitors" (Waldeck 455). In Lange's novel, homosexuality is not attributed to the enemy, but to a secondary protagonist, Abilene Tixier. Tixier is one of the "good guys" that help Vandenberg attack Cowles, but his portrayal is extremely ambiguous. Vandenberg constantly mentions that he cannot be trusted and that he is a coward: "Tixier is intelligent and untrustworthy. He was like that big gelding, hobbled now down the pasture—the minute you relaxed around that animal or started depending on it, it spooked" (Lange 28). Furthermore, as in *Arslan*, being homosexual in *Vandenberg* is linked to pederasty in addition to untrustworthiness, as Tixier is described and dramatized as being attracted to teenage boys. This attraction excludes him from "normal" American society. While he attains a degree of acceptance by sublimating or disguising his sexuality (he is married to a woman), any act that reveals his true sexual orientation indelibly marks him as suspicious in the eyes of even his friends. Tixier perpetrates such an act when he "let one hand sink in a caress, half pat, half squeeze, against the boy's [Vandenberg son's] thigh" (69), a gesture Vandenberg interprets as "a pass, not even a real pass, but it was enough." It was enough, indeed, to make Vandenberg lose his already thin trust in Tixier, despite his own acknowledgement that Tixier was "maybe drunk, maybe not even thinking."

He had stared hard at Tixier, whose hand by now was back on the table, raging at himself for being so stupid to let it happen, furious for letting himself believe that Tixier, despite his weakness, was his best friend. . . . The old rancher [Tixier] apologized, and they'd had another couple of shots of wine, but after that it was not the same.

Seeing how the novel insists on the US being a weak, spineless nation (as seen in Chapter 2) it is possible to interpret the fact that a gay man is one of the few key actors of the resistance as a symbol of *how far America has fallen*. It is even easier to do so when this gay man is outright described, by both Vandenberg and the *histoire*, as well as by Tixier's own discourse (he admits that he is using Vandenberg for his own ends<sup>68</sup>), as having said "weakness."

Texts by Quebec's radical *sovereignist* movement expressed their share of paranoid homophobic ideologemes as well. The most well-known example is the FLQ manifesto. "Written in a heavily masculine language addressing itself directly to male workers" (Mills 178), the manifesto did not shy away from associating federalism, and homosexuality: "Nous vivons dans une société d'esclaves terrorisées, terrorisées par les grands patrons . . . (à coté de ça, Rémi Popol la garcette, Drapeau le dog, Bourassa le serin des Simards, Trudeau la tapette, c'est des peanuts!)" (Horguelin 13). Note how three of the four major federalist figures mentioned are described with epithets that allude to homosexuality through feminization. "Tapette" is a slur equivalent to the American English "fag," but with a definitive feminine subtext since the suffix -ette both diminishes and feminizes a word. Similarly, "garcette" means more or less "little bitch" while a "serin" is a finch, a songbird, and thus not the most masculine of images, in addition to its connotations of a pet and informer. To be a federalist or a homosexual, for the FLQ, was to be emasculated. This is ironic considering the paranoid

---

<sup>68</sup> See the conversation between Tixier and his men on pages 230-5.

attribution of the power of castration to the colonizing or Fifth Columnist enemy that I touched upon in Chapter 1.

Surprisingly, while this current of homophobia existed in the radical sovereigntist movement at large, slurs like the ones above are absent from the three texts I have chosen to study, with the exception of one phrase in *L'Afficheur hurle*, "zéro fagoté de diplômés"<sup>69</sup> (Chamberland 120).<sup>70</sup> However, the persecution of homosexuals in the movement went much deeper than hurling epithets at hated figures. One epithet in particular, "féderaste", is a concentrated neologism for an entire ideologeme of exclusion. Used often in *Partis Pris*, especially in those texts that aimed at (sarcastic) humour, it once again binds together the concepts of homosexuality and pederasty. In addition, we can, through this particular epithet, "identify the main elements of a homosexual panic that constitutes a significant undercurrent of intellectual discourse about decolonization in Quebec: Québécois who function within the federalist framework are first the victims, and then the corrupted perpetrators of what is figured as a permanent violation by a salacious 'fully grown' Canada against the waifish, innocent Québec" (Schwartzwald 179). This view of homosexuals as corrupted and corrupters harkens back to the view of the Québécois as a people whose colonization has left them spineless and emasculated. This emasculation supposedly thus leads to homosexuality, which becomes another symptom of colonial alienation and assimilation.

This conception of homosexuality as the consequence of a national "interrupted—or derailed—Oedipal itinerary" (185) led radical sovereigntists to see this "failure of manhood" (185) everywhere in the French-Canadian literature that preceded them:

Aussi ce déviationnisme sexuel me paraît l'explication la plus vraisemblable et la plus inavouable d'une littérature globalement faible, sans éclat et, pour tout dire, vraiment ennuyeuse . . . . Cette sorte d'inversion qui me paraît avoir contaminé sérieusement la

---

<sup>69</sup> Alert readers will notice that this excerpt from the poem also contains elements of the anti-intellectual ideologeme discussed earlier in this chapter.

<sup>70</sup> The term "fagoté" carries the same pejorative connotation as the English term faggot from which it is derived.

presque totalité de notre littérature, n'est pas une inversion qui s'affiche ou qui cherche à scandaliser. . . .S'il est une situation humaine génératrice de dissimulation, c'est bien l'homosexualité; et je ne vois pas pourquoi la littéraire dissimulerait moins que l'autre.

(Aquin "Commentaires I," 191)

According to Schwartzwald, the ultimate failure of the narrator of *Prochain épisode* to accomplish his goals is a rewriting, in literary form, of the ideas Aquin expressed above:

The hero/narrator's bullets miss their target, and love with elusive agent K (for Kébec!) is rendered impossible through her ultimate betrayal. Thus, the obsession for (hetero)sexual conquest that is so prominent in Aquin's novels, complete with its litanies of masculine connoisseurship, functions as a doomed compensatory mechanism. Its invariably unsuccessful resolution barely masks the homosexual panic that really fuels Aquin's writing (Schwartzwald 187).

For radical sovereigntists, diagnosing homosexuality as a symptom of colonialism, like Fanon did with mental illness, was not enough. They considered it necessary to extirpate and disarm the embedded homosexual discourse from French-Canadian literature as a prelude to the revolution. This was done through the promulgation of the pseudo-idea of the "femme-pays" (Biron, Dumont, and Nardout-Lafarge, 375), a heteronormative sexual metonymy associating love for a woman with love for the nation. In *Prochain épisode*, there are a number of passages where this concept is demonstrated by a blurring of the line between a forthcoming revolution in Quebec and a night of passion with a lover on Saint-John-the-Baptist's Day:

Il faisait chaud, très chaud en ce 24 juin. Il nous semblait, mon amour, que quelque chose allait commencer cette nuit-là, que cette promenade aux flambeaux allait mettre feu à la nuit coloniale, emplir d'aube la grande vallée de la conquête où nous avons vu le

jour et où, ce soir d'été, nous avons réinventé l'amour et conçu, dans les secousses et les ruses du plaisirs, un évènement déplaisant qui hésite à se produire. (Aquin 1965, 70)

The lover referenced above is in all likelihood K who, as the novel's female character representing Québec, is symbolically a *femme-pays* unto herself. This novel also contains a gendered discourse of betrayal that eventually links itself to the discourse of the *femme-pays*. Indeed, the description of the mysterious acolyte of H. de Heutz is unerringly identical to that of K, implying her betrayal of the protagonist and the revolution.

Finally, in *L'Afficheur hurle*, an entire section of the poem is dedicated to the *femme-pays*. It is titled "Poèmes à Thérèse." This concept can also be seen in most of Chamberland's writing throughout the period: "Chez Chamberland, la femme s'inscrit dans le quotidien, et l'image de la femme-pays s'impose d'elle-même, cueillie au passage dans le discours de l'époque" (Biron, Dumont, and Nardout-Lafarge, 376). Chamberland's espousal of the heteronormative trope of the *femme-pays*, and by association the homosexual panic it can stem from (see my discussion of Schwartzwald, above) is particularly interesting in the light of his eventual public "coming out" as a homosexual:

En ce qui me concerne je songe à l'interdit de la pédérastie. Pour moi c'est ce que j'ai à vivre, c'est un destin, je ne l'ai pas choisi" (Bayard and David, 166)

Ce qui est terrible c'est que jusqu'à maintenant, j'étais dans une situation paranoïaque telle que je ne pouvais pas me manifester. Cela commence à changer. Je peux me manifester auprès de plus en plus de gens qui sont amenés à vivre leur recherche sur le plan de leur propre sexualité." (Bayard and David, 166-8)

Such a statement, offered about eight years after *L'Afficheur hurle* and combined with a similar late coming out by Pierre Vallières<sup>71</sup> (Gauvreau 9), allows us to discern some kind of gender silencing going on inside the radical sovereigntist movement of the time. This silencing existed not only because

---

<sup>71</sup> Vallières was an important member of *Cité libre*, then *Parti Pris* and the FLQ, as well as the author of the seminal radical sovereigntist text *Nègres Blanc d'Amérique*,

of how homosexuality was interpreted as being a stranger to Quebec and decolonization theory, but also out of a belief that homosexuality would prevent the revolutionary movement from connecting with the working class masses:

For instance, many gays militated within and on behalf of the Parti Québécois during the 1970's because they believed it would (and it did) legally recognize them as equal citizens, unlike the homophobic sectarian-left where one had to pass as straight for the sake of integrating into the working-class. (Leahy)

In short, the imagined need to conform to heteronormative hegemony in order to succeed as a revolutionary was a pseudo-idea used to rationalize the exclusion of homosexuals from the movement while simultaneously demonizing the colonial Them and French-Canadians collaborators for their potential or symbolic homosexuality.

The heteronormative concept of the *femmes-pays*, however, was not only consistent with the exclusion of homosexuals but also, ironically, women, as it disqualified them as agents of the revolution and consigned them to the margins of the revolutionary stories/narratives/texts. This marginalization happens in all of my selected texts. This is not a simple coincidence, but a consequence of the fact that the exclusion or estrangement of women is strongly tied to the fantasy of the lone, heteronormative, and masculinist identified revolutionary. This fantasy centered the act of revolution firmly in a male sphere of influence, and thus implied that said subject position was inaccessible (or hardly accessible) to any other gender:

This individual militant appears as a lonely character without ties, bereft of domestic emotions, who is hard, erect, self contained, controlled, without the time or ability to express loving passion, who cannot pause to nurture, and for whom friendship is a



diversion. . . . Membership of this elect will for a start be predominantly male, for if it attracts a minority among men, it fits even fewer women. (Rowbotham 68)<sup>72</sup>

Thus, as a general rule the more the proto-narrative of the lone revolutionary is pushed to the forefront, the more marginal women become in the hierarchy of discourses. For example, *Vandenberg* is entirely built around the lone revolutionary proto-narrative and contains only one female character: Terry. Beyond her bare-bones characterization as Vandenberg's mistress, Terry's most important moment in the book comes when she challenges Vandenberg's discourse of revolutionary romanticism: "Suppose you try [warning people about Cowles]. Suppose no one listens to you, and they go believing what's in the paper, about its being minimum security. . . . Where will that leave you?" (Lange 203) In Terry's opinion, Vandenberg's actions will not make his – or anyone's – life better, and thus are futile. Seed sees Terry discourse as one-way for the novel to "turn a sceptical spotlight on Vandenberg's chosen role of lone resistance fighter which emerges as self-deception"(Seed 102). He sees Vandenberg's views as "privileged" but never "unchallenged." However, I disagree with him on this point. Though he acknowledges that Vandenberg's views are privileged, Seed glosses over the importance of this privilege and its consequences, in particular how Terry's voice is minimized within the novel's hierarchy of discourses. In this novel, the *histoire* favors Vandenberg's paranoid style discourse. As Seed acknowledges, Vandenberg "manifests himself as a voice before a character"(Seed 101), a voice that is virtually interchangeable with the *histoire*. Terry has a voice, but it is entirely drowned out by that of Vandenberg. In the conversation from which the previous example of Terry's discourse was taken, for every line Terry has, Vandenberg has a lengthy paragraph, sometimes even an entire page. In addition, Terry is completely absent from the final act of the novel – she is left behind while the men attack the camp and never mentioned again. And while, as she predicted, Vandenberg's attack proves futile, the *histoire* makes a point of showing that the *viejo* Olguin is to blame for this (more on him

---

<sup>72</sup> I am indebted here to Mills (184-185) for the idea of using Rowbotham's discussion of the place of women in socialism in the historical context of my selected paranoid style narratives.

below), and not Vandenberg's revolutionary romanticism (as his plan worked perfectly until Olguin failed to kill a soldier sent to radio for help).

*Arslan* is an exception to the trend of the estrangement of women being proportional to the importance of the lone revolutionary fantasy in the novel. As explained in Chapter 2, the novel's relationship with the lone revolutionary fantasy is an ambiguous one, sometimes supporting it and other times subverting it. Despite this, its marginalization of women's discourses is total and not the least bit ambiguous. There are only three female characters with a significant discursive presence in the novel: Hunt's mother, Jean Morgan; Principal Bond's wife, Luella Bond; and Arslan's wife, Rusudan. Jean Morgan's discourse is focused on her worrying over Hunt in a motherly way. The *histoire*, however, does not see these worries positively, but frames them as annoying and exasperating to her own son. Jean's only significant role in the story is to demonstrate Hunt's alienation from Kraftsville and, indirectly, the strength of the masculine bond between Franklin Bond and Hunt (Engh 236-237).

Luella Bond is also denied any discursive importance and even more confined to traditional roles. Her relationship to children, for instance, is ridiculously stereotypical: "Luella was willing enough to spoil him, because she was starved for children. . . ." (107). "And she needed a baby to love. She should have been a grandmother by now" (109).<sup>73</sup> When she dies in the second half of the novel the *histoire* and Principal Bond's discourse prioritise her death's impact on household chores over its emotional impact on the other characters: "'Hunt!' I yelled. He came hastily from the dining room. 'Look at this filthy mess! How did it happen?' He shrugged. 'There's been nobody to clean up,' he said mildly. I stared at him. 'But good Lord,' I said at last. 'It's only been four days. Three days.' He shrugged again. 'This is what happens in three days.'" (Engh 233) Reducing the character of Luella to the traditional female roles of housewife and surrogate mother helps to minimize and devalue her discourse and confines her to the margins of the *histoire*. Her death in the middle of the novel,

---

<sup>73</sup> This is an indirect reference to the fact that she and Franklin had a son who died very young.

meanwhile, soon excludes her from the hierarchy of discourses altogether, making the second part of the novel even more homosocial than the first. Rusudan, meanwhile, is "important" only as a plot device to advance and complicate the relationship between Hunt and Arslan. Rusudan is barely described, she is never given any discourse, and her death is treated even more trivially by the *histoire* than Luella's.

In summary, all the female characters of both *Arslan* and *Vandenberg* are similarly marginalized. While Terry from *Vandenberg* may have, at first glance, more dialogue than any of the three women in *Arslan*, the hierarchy of discourses conspires to ensure her place on the lower rung of the discursive ladder, like the aforementioned female characters.

At first blush, my selected texts from Quebec seem to fare better, inasmuch as the female characters occupy a somewhat higher position in the hierarchy of discourses, especially Ethel, whom is the second most important character by far in *Éthel et le terroriste*. *Prochain épisode* has long passages dedicated to the narrator waxing nostalgic about his love and passion for K, but K herself is barely given any discourse, and, as I noted previously, the *histoire* implies that she may have been unfaithful both to the spy protagonist and to the revolutionary cause. More precisely, her betrayal is implied by the fact that H. de Heutz' accomplice is described as having blonde hair (Aquin 195, 101) when the first thing the narrator of the novel-within-the-novel tells us about K is that she has blonde hair (25). In addition, the narrator's insistence that "[I]es cheveux blonds étaient sans doute un effet secondaire de l'éclat du soleil et de mon éblouissement" (101) reads as if he *doth protest too much*. Finally, the fact that K is never seen again but somehow the RCMP has learned everything they need to arrest the narrator's network adds to the suspicions about her.

Analogously, Chamberland dedicates an entire section of *l'Afficheur hurle* to a woman (Thérese), which means that the poem contains ample discourse *about* a woman, but none that is imagined as being *by* a woman. Clearly, the previously discussed concept of the *femme-pays* reduces

women to symbols of, rather than active participants in, the revolution. Women cannot have their own aspiration, their own goals, like the male revolutionaries, because they are not full characters or actors taking part in a revolution, but secondary – though nevertheless symbolically central – parts of the revolution. Namely, the masculinist, heteronormative vision of it that promises a better future, as dramatised in *Prochain épisode*, that is likened to or fantasized as being synonymous with the joy/*jouissance* of having passionate sex with a woman. Such images reinforce the heteronormative hegemony these texts are inevitably inscribed and participate within. Ultimately, women in such texts only exist as symbolic objects of the desires and goals of the invariably male paranoid style revolutionary. They have purpose only in relation to those desires and actions – either as possible supporters or opponents. To the extent to which this is the case, their marginalization plays a significant role in reinforcing the essentialist qualities of Us and Them and of their Manichean relationship to each other.

The case of *Éthel et le terroriste* is slightly different. Indeed, Éthel is a significantly developed character in the novel who has her own motivations and thoughts. In other words, she has her own discourse. She also has the power to reject attempts at silencing her discourse:

— Paul je ne veux pas. Pas un seul mort. Moi, tu comprends, je ne peux pas. J'en vraiment assez de cette tuerie sempiternelle. Tu comprends. Pour nous, pour moi, cela fait déjà six millions. A [sic] cause de ça. La race. La nation, je ne sais pas. Je ne sais plus rien. Je ne sais que ceci: ils en ont rayé six millions, Paul.

— Tais toi Ethel! [sic]

— Non Paul! Je te le dis, un seul mort, un seul et nous serons séparés à tout jamais.

(Jasmin 142)

She also transcends the status of a mere symbol as she is dramatised as an alternative to revolution, rather than its image, via the romantic subplot of the novel. This said, as a romantic alternative or muse

for the lone revolutionary protagonist she does not transcend the key status of an object of desire. The entire novel revolves around the narrator having to choose between two desired objects, revolution and Éthel. Furthermore, the ending of the novel, which I have already addressed several times already, removes any agency Éthel could have. Having her come back to Paul, despite her repeated statements, like the one quoted above, that she would break up with him if the bombing he committed before the start of the novel killed someone (and it did) is a way for the *histoire* to recuperate her otherwise defiant discourse and perform a closure by which this discourse is made to conform to the *histoire's* "truth" of the novel which favors the discourse and values of the lone revolutionary.

It is telling that all of my selected texts, no matter the gender or sexual orientation of the author, are similarly reductive when it comes to female characters. This seems to evidence an intrinsic patriarchal structure embedded within the paranoid style and the lone revolutionary fantasy, much as Rowbotham argues.<sup>74</sup>

So far I have described the exclusionary structure of the paranoid style narrative as it applies to (male) homosexuals and women. I will conclude this chapter by taking a brief look at the exclusion of ethnic minorities in my selected texts. I say brief because in many of my selected texts the exclusion of ethnic minorities from the hierarchy of discourses is nearly total, especially in my American texts. In "A Thousand Deaths," no mention is made of any ethnic minorities (not even as background extras like as is the case for women.) In *Arslan*, the only ethnic minorities are the titular character and his men – the invaders, the enemy. Krafstville is seemingly a town with no African-American, Asian-American, Latino-Americans, or any non-WASP citizens (ethno-religious minorities, such as Jews, are also not mentioned.) This discursive and symbolic socio-cultural lack stretches the suspension of disbelief as much as anything else in the novel.

---

<sup>74</sup> It is important to remember that at the moment these texts were written, on the cusp of second wave feminism and the gay liberation movement, this patriarchal structure was central to American and Quebec society as a whole. Accordingly, this aspect of the paranoid style simply reflects – and in some cases magnifies – the hegemonic gender politics of its socio-political context.

*Vandenberg's* depiction of ethnic minorities is very interesting – and confusing. Unlike the two aforementioned texts, it represents minorities and gives them a minimum amount of discourse since most of the men in Vandenberg's posse are Hispanic, Native or a mix of the two. Seed remarks on the peculiarity of this fact: "Apart from the nation suffering a deserved defeat, there is a historical irony in Vandenberg, the displaced homesteader, having to rely on Hispanics and Native Americans, i.e. on members of other displaced groups" (Seed 103). If we stopped our analysis here, as Seed did, we could state that the depiction of ethnic minorities in *Vandenberg* is positive, as it gives them agency via acts and discourse, to take back what is also their country. But if we look a bit more closely at the novel, we can see that the *histoire* counters these minority discourses with a series of scenes that happen after Vandenberg's escape from Cowles. In his attempt to make it back to town, Vandenberg has to defend himself against two men, first a Hispanic-American shopkeeper that he assaults with an axe, and then a Native tracker whom he shoots down. These two encounters play out like a re-enactment or parody of the "Conquest of America," echoing the wars against both Natives and Mexicans.<sup>75</sup> The purpose of this sequence of events is hard to pinpoint, but one could interpret it as a way to position Vandenberg as a traditional American pioneer and hero, as a kind of mythical cowboy. This interpretation would be in line with the very end of the novel, where the final blow against Vandenberg is struck not by the Soviets but by a single old man, Olguin, who is described as "Spanish and maybe some Indian." Olguin is the only member of the team that attacked Cowles that is shown as alive. So, in the final scene of the novel, he goes back to Vandenberg's cabin and then uses Vandenberg's journal to start a fire. Along with the camera they had brought to film the attacks in order to use it as propaganda against the Russians, the journal was Vandenberg's only legacy, the only evidence of resistance. Unfortunately, neither piece of evidence survives the attack. The camera is found by the Russian and a Spanish-Indian man destroys the journal at the *histoire's* moment of closure. To add insult to injury, it is Olguin's

---

<sup>75</sup> In addition to this sequence, it is revealed later in the novel that Vandenberg's son Kevin is sent to a foster family of Latino-Americans, the Gutierrez, after his father's arrest. The Gutierrez greedy patriarch uses him as slave labour (Lange 212-3).

failure to hit and kill a young Soviet soldier that ultimately dooms the attack on Cowles, as that soldier is then able to call in reinforcements.

In *Vandenberg*, minorities are a source of hope for the resistance but they also ultimately cause the failure of this resistance and help erase the last documentary traces and evidence of it. *Vandenberg's* ambivalent attitude towards ethnic minorities also raises doubts as to the capacity of these minorities to "defend America." Contrary to what Seed suggests, *Vandenberg's* portrayal of minorities is not progressive or subversive. It is in keeping with mainstream biases against these minorities and reinforces the Manichaeian binary. The Us in *Vandenberg*, as well as in my two other primary American texts, is almost exclusively WASP, and minorities, even when they appear, are kept outside of this Us reinforcing the pseudo-idea of Us as being *necessarily* made up of white men.

In contrast, sympathy for and identification with the struggles of African, Caribbean, Latin-American and Afro-American peoples is explicit in radical sovereigntist texts, especially through the trope of the Québécois as a *nègre blanc d'Amérique*. In *L'Afficheur hurle*, this is manifested by the poet shouting "je suis cubain je suis nègre nègre-blanc québécois" as a sort of profession of faith in the universality and inevitable success of the liberation war that is being and will be fought. In *Prochain épisode*, the framing narrator's first idea for his spy alter-ego is a Wolof secret agent named Hamidou Diop, imagining the Québécois and African spies as one single being in a common anti-colonial cause. Finally, in *Éthel et le terroriste* there is the character of Slide, a black American man who helps not only the radical nationalist Movement, but also Paul's protection of Éthel from the Movement. When Paul asks why Slide is helping him against the Movement's orders, his answer is simply "Mais, je suis un noir" (Jasmin 87), which prompts Paul to remark that "il a raison. Si Éthel était noire, cela aurait été la même histoire, ou à peu près" (Jasmin 87). The implicit idea here is that being a Jew is equivalent to being Black,<sup>76</sup> which is in turn the equivalent of being a *nègre blanc*. There is a little ambiguity as to

---

<sup>76</sup> During the heyday of the Civil Rights movement in the United States, the Jewish community was extremely supportive of the struggle of Afro-Americans. The website of the American TV channel PBS has a wonderfully comprehensive page on

the true loyalty of Slide though, because when he brings Paul and Éthel to the Movement at the end of the novel, he lies and tells Paul that the Movement suspects him of treason while the leader, Charbonneau, denies having such suspicions. He states that "Slide parle beaucoup trop" (140) and actually entrusts the protagonist with a second bombing. Or maybe Slide is telling the truth and Charbonneau is lying in order to manipulate Paul into accepting another mission – both interpretations are equally likely. Nevertheless, no explanation is ever given why (or if) Slide lied. One possibility is that he is a double agent for the federal government (presumably for the same men who offered Paul such a job; see Jasmin 122-4 and 127-9) who has been tasked with disrupting the solidarity or trust between the various members of the movement. It certainly would explain his lie at the end of the novel, as well as the fact that he did not show up at the rendezvous planned with Paul and Éthel at the Guggenheim Museum when the two fugitives first arrive in Manhattan at beginning of the novel. His absence leaves Paul and Éthel without a contact in New York nor a plan for the next step of the journey. But there is too little textual evidence to definitely validate this interpretation or any other.

*Éthel et le Terroriste* also depicts the Jewish minority in way that reinforces the sense of equivalence between oppressed peoples (including the Québécois.) Carla Fratta points out, in a paper published in 1987, how the character of Éthel is a manifestation of the myth of the "Juif errant," which leads the novel to perform the "mariage de deux mythes dans un certain sens parallèles, lorsqu'on découvre l'évidence masquée du renvoi, à travers le personnage de Paul, le terroriste québécois, au Canadien errant de longue tradition" (Fratta 162). Here, Fratta reformulates and confirms the alterities of the Jew, the Québécois and of "a troisième élément, le noir" (158) as being transubstantiated in one another by the *histoire*. This transubstantiation is a constitutive element of an ideologeme whose protonarrative can be summed up as the creation of a "panorama imaginaire des déshérités unis contre le colonisateur" (158.)



Jasmin uses the myth of the "Juive errante " not only to justify the revolutionary struggle of the Québécois through the interchangeability of such struggle with that of other minorities but also to characterise Éthel as a temptress. Fratta sees Jasmin's use of this stereotype of a Jewess tempting a man away from the "righteous" path as a way of integrating Éthel's discourse in the *histoire* by having her transmit "comme elle le peut, et de façon contradictoire, à son partenaire un message de non-violence, en essayant de l'éloigner du Mouvement armé et en secondant ainsi le processus de démythification d'une certaine cause nationaliste, effectué par l'auteur" (163). This demystifying process in Ethel's discourse can also be seen in her criticism of the anti-Semitism of leaders of the Movement (Jasmin 89), which they are able to justify as a necessary evil to reach out to and win over the masses (Jasmin 88, 99), while confirming Éthel as a stranger. "L'altérité juive d'Éthel . . . , est donc mise en relief par l'émergence d'un collectif de rejet et devient primordiale par rapport à celle du pouvoir anglophone; la coalition théorique des 'bêtes puantes d'Amérique' en résulte ainsi niée au niveau de la masse par une conception du monde irrationnelle et prélogique" (Fratta 158). This irrational discourse occupies a higher position in the novel's hierarchy of discourses than Éthel's Jewish and female-identified discourse because, once again, the end of the *histoire* proves the leaders of the movement right as Paul finally chooses to rejoin his group of revolutionary terrorists for the good of the nation rather than enjoying life with Éthel. Paradoxically, despite this choice, as I have noted previously, he gets Éthel anyway as if she is a reward for ultimately conforming to the dominant values of the privileged radical, and Manichean sovereigntist ideology of the *histoire*.

Finally, the depiction of Slide is in line with the dominant radical sovereigntist ideologemes of sympathy and identification with the struggles of ethnic minorities and Third World people. To a great extent this perspective comes from the appropriation of decolonisation theory. Indeed, since decolonization was an ideology originally developed by Caribbean and North African writers, anyone that uses it will naturally be led to identify with those oppressed groups and similar others around the

world. This indeed happened in Quebec, but one major difference separated the Québécois from the initial ethnic groups decolonization theory was written by and for: the Québécois were colonizers themselves. As the descendants of European settlers who subjugated and oppressed the indigenous Natives of the Americas, a subjugation that was still going on in the 60's (and even today), the radical sovereigntists had more in common with the French colonisers in Algeria than with the Native Algerians they supported, a fact they were not willing nor able to recognise. This refusal to see the obvious contradiction in their worldview can be attributed, at least in part, to the paranoid style. In their need to define the enemy as strong and themselves as weak, radical sovereigntists thinkers latched onto a political theory that allowed them to do so. The internal contradictions – or grey areas – this adoption created were ignored in favor of the black-and-white Manichean binary of the evil colonisers versus the innocent colonised. While this convention of the paranoid style created a sympathy towards the discourses of oppressed ethnic groups abroad, thinking of themselves as the primary oppressed ethnic group of Quebec led radical sovereigntists to ignore the discourses of actual indigenous and ethnic minorities that were marginalized and oppressed by both English- and French-Canadians. For instance, as Mills argues in analyzing Vallières' *Nègres blancs d'Amérique*:

Intent on affirming solidarity with oppressed groups elsewhere, Vallières marginalizes other oppressed groups within Quebec itself. Not only does he ignore the active role of Aboriginal groups in Quebec, but he also denies the very existence of Blacks in the province: "French Canadians are not subject to this irrational racism that has done so much wrong to the workers, white and black, of the United States," Vallières argues, but they can take no credit for this as "in Quebec there is no 'Black problem'" In fact. . . , the Black population of Montreal numbered roughly 15,000 individuals who were waging constant struggles against discrimination. (Mills 83)<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> To be fair to Vallières, he did fight for the rights of the First Nations later in his life. "A l'été 1990, durant la crise d'Oka, Vallières s'insurge contre le sort réservé aux différentes communautés autochtones. À maintes reprises, des sympathisants

The process of estrangement here functions essentially the same way as the one used against women – it reduces ethnic minorities, their discourses and their personal struggles to a symbol or secondary part of the revolution rather than allowing them to exist narrativistically as autonomous, active agents of said revolution.

If in my two previous chapters I dealt with the manufacture of absolute, oppositional identities, this last chapter dealt with the collateral damage, with the peripheralized victims, of such absolutism. In order to make their reality conform to the Manichean binary of the paranoid style, the writers of my primary corpus had to evacuate, exclude or dismiss any identity position, any strangers, that could muddle the concrete, essentialized, and discursive identitarian poles of Us and Them. They did so through various pseudo-ideas and proto-narratives of exclusion, marginalization or estrangement. But these strangers were not erased but displaced into the margins and interstices inside and in-between the pole. Their existence in the spaces between and within the Manichean poles shapes those poles and helps define them by stressing or idealizing what they supposedly are not. Some of those strangers can also be found to be sublimated, or repressed, attributes of the poles themselves. For example, revolutionary anti-intellectualism mandated that writers of the paranoid style repress their own identity as intellectuals, while some radical sovereigntists writers who contributed to the propagation of a homophobic ideologeme came out as homosexuals themselves later on. These interstitial elements are the weakest points of the paranoid style's binaries because they reveal, by their *étrangeté* compared to the essentialized poles, how the Us and Them are not natural, absolute, self-evident categories, as the paranoid style writer believes and claims, but ideologically constructed identity positions that can be challenged. And challenged they have been, as many of the secondary sources I cited testify, and have since, for the most part, eventually crumbled societally and intellectually. In the following concluding pages, I will thus endeavor to show how the analysis I have conducted in these three chapters can be

---

ont pu apprécier sa faconde [verbosité] étourdissante. Alors que l'opinion publique crie haro sur les Mohawks, il s'évertue à redorer leur image" (Jourdain and Mailhot 229). See also Vallières' own article on the subject on page 243-7 of the same anthology.

used to reflect not only on the ideological work of the two Manichean ideologies of my selected examples of the paranoid style – anti-communism and radical sovereigntism – that have since become marginalized themselves, but also on contemporary manifestations of the paranoid style in the United States and Quebec.

## Conclusion

Throughout the three previous chapters, I have endeavored to create an analytical grid that can be applied to narratives which represent, wholly or in part, a conflict between an oppressed or threatened group and a feared powerful, colonizing hegemonic or ideologically opposed group. The core of this grid is the reiteration and interplay of particular ideologemes of the paranoid style and a reliance upon Manichean binaries revolving around notions and biases about Us and Them. The Manichean binary used in the literary works analysed is at its core the traditional Manichean binary of good and evil couched in identitarian or ideological terms rather than strictly moral ones (though systems of morality generally exist subcutaneously within the identitarian terms.) The Us, therefore, represents the group that the author identifies with while the Them represents an enemy that threatens the identitarian group privileged by the text or narrative.

An important caveat of the major binaries expressed in my primary texts is that the Us and Them are not on equal ground or an equal footing. The Them is in a position a power – very close to winning or having already established its hegemony (at least for the time being) – while the Us is weak externally and internally, and usually represented as colonized. This power imbalance adds a feverish urgency to the narratives and leads to a discourse of the Us where the end justifies the means. This discourse is heightened by the paranoid style, a particular kind of political rhetoric as theorized by Richard Hofstadter, that is characterised by a view of history as a grand conspiracy against a group (Us) by another all-powerful, hostile group (Them), and with a propensity towards hyperbolic, emotional discourse rather than rational analysis. Accordingly, the paranoid style, often associated with radical schools of thought, is dependent upon and deploys ideologemes that are predominantly Manichean, and as such accepts only complete and total victory. The enemy "must be totally eliminated—if not from the world, at least from the theater of operations to which the paranoid [or

more accurately, the user of the paranoid style] directs his attention" (Hofstadter 1965, 31).<sup>78</sup> In other words, the paranoid style leads to the adoption of a Manichean worldview that does not allow for compromise. The relationship between Manichean ideologemes and the paranoid style is therefore reciprocal – both feed one another in a vicious circle of self-abnegation, fear and intolerance.

This said, while the Manichean binary is a concept with a long history in post-colonial literary studies, the paranoid style is a mode of political rhetoric. One of the main contributions of this thesis to the literary field, therefore, is to show how an understanding of this particular political rethoric could be applied to the analysis of literary texts, be they post-colonial identified or not. This thesis has also aimed to demonstrate how the concept of the paranoid style can be used outside of the context of the United States where it was first created and applied to a variety of events or discourses.

This last point speaks to ideologemes's innate flexibility and adaptative potential. ". . . the 'same' ideologue [can] have radically different effects depending on the wider ideological system within which it is articulated" (Makaryk 116). This capacity for the same ideologue to manifest itself in different ways depending on the work analysed has been evidenced many times in this thesis. For example, an ideologue of homosexuality as a negative identity manifests itself in *Vandenberg* as a pseudo-idea of homosexuals as untrustworthy and as a pseudo-idea of homosexuals as corrupted and corrupting in *Arslan*. Further differentiation between these two pseudo-ideas occurs when they are dramatised by proto-narratives in their respective texts. While in *Vandenberg* the proto-narrative of the homosexual Tixier is used to reinforce the pseudo-idea of the Us as weak, self-defeating and easily conquered by the Soviet Union due to its passivity, in *Arslan*, the reverse is essentially true, since the proto-narrative of Arslan as a pedophilic rapist is used to reinforce the all around sadistic and cruel

---

<sup>78</sup> Hofstadter's use of "the paranoid" in this passage is in direct opposition to his introductory claim that he has "neither the competence nor the desire to classify any figures of the past or present as certifiable lunatics" (Hofstadter 1965, 3). Therefore, I think it is important to stress, as I did in my Introduction, that I personally do not intend to imply any such conflation between a writer who uses the paranoid style and a genuine paranoid.

nature of the Them. Thus, the same or similar ideologemes identified and analysed in this thesis perform a variety of ideological critiques, but they all contain within their conceptual identity an expression of xenophobia – a profound fear of the Other.

My appropriation of the paranoid style as a analytical tool can also be used in a reverse ideological analysis. What I mean by this is that my grid can help uncover the existence of an ideology within a work rather than simply defining it. Indeed, an ideology is a "strategy of containment, " that is, it "allows what can be thought to seem internally coherent in its terms, while repressing the unthinkable . . . which lies beyond its boundaries" (Jameson 52-53). Thus, if a text can be *contained* inside my grid, then it is because it expresses an ideology and is performing ideological work. To perform ideological work a text must both perform "the work of ideology" and "the work of making ideology", which means that the text acts as a site "on which ideological systems [are] simultaneously constructed and contested" (Poovey 2). To analyse how a particular literary work deals with the numerous contradictions of both the paranoid style and the Manichean binary of Us versus Them is one way of studying how a text performs both of these kinds of ideological work.

The work I have done in this thesis is also an extension of some of the work done in post-colonial studies, and as such can be useful to that field. In particular, it reveals how a group that is profoundly dominant or hegemonic can nevertheless characterise itself as being in constant danger of being dominated and therefore weave socio-ideological mythologies and imaginative fictions that rationalize, valorize and popularize this self-characterisation. This dystopian kind of mythology, as in *Vandenberg*, can also help to create and reinforce a paranoid mind-set that would do anything in the name of the privileged group's notions of freedom. This particular brand of ideological work is an interesting reversal of JanMohamed's conceptualization of and attention to the "Manichean allegory" in colonialist narratives in that it is the group considered as dominant that is dramatised as the quintessence of all evil. While the traditional colonial binary theorized by JanMohamed articulates a

narrative in which a superior group must bring light to "savages," the Manichean binary dramatised in my selected text articulates a narrative of a group having to free itself from the shackles of an advanced but cruel and barbaric oppressor. In other words, my thesis explores ways in which there can be a paradoxical blurring of the barrier or divide between representations of the coloniser and colonised, especially in terms of how the Manichean ideologemes of the paranoid style, of the Us versus Them binaries that are at its core, are common to both oppositional identities or subject-positions.

My thesis, especially the third chapter, can also be useful to feminist studies, queer studies, and any study of minority discourses (ethnic, religious, linguistic or otherwise). Indeed, my literary appropriation of the paranoid style is a new tool with which to evidence the well-known fact that even the most revolutionary and progressive movement, including its cultural manifestations, can still be expressed in language, discourses and ideologemes that perpetuate exclusion, marginalization and the creation of strangers.

I would now like to go back for a moment to the consideration of the two main ideologies I used as the basis for the literary analyses that were performed in this thesis – anti-Communism and radical sovereigntism. I want say a few closing words about these two ideologies, and especially their representation in my selected literary texts, because the purpose of this thesis was not only to explore the differences and similarities between selected narratives using the paranoid style within the specific socio-historical contexts of the United States and Quebec during the Cold War and the *Révolution tranquille*, (and in both cases, their immediate wake), but also how the paranoid style shaped a specific ideological discourse in each context in isolation (i.e. without comparison to the other society under study).

As I explained in more detail in my introduction, I chose American anti-Communist texts and Québécois radical sovereigntist texts as the objects of study of this thesis for three major reasons. First,



because they both contained a discourse of being threatened by powerful enemies bent on their destruction. Second, because they manifested these parallel discourses in the same paranoid style at roughly the same time. And third, because I was somewhat familiar with them due to previous research. Thus, the first impetus for this thesis was the rather surprising similarities between these two ideologies' expressions and representations of fear of an Other – and it was through researching why they seemed similar that I discovered and developed my interpretive grid of the interplay of the paranoid style and Manichaeism.

Now that I have completed said research and analytical work, what can I say about my selected texts and the two ideologies they embody? Well, I can confirm that they are indeed similar. All of my selected texts had as their central theme an oppressed group fighting against a powerful enemy bent on eliminating and/or controlling the oppressed group. They all conceived of this oppressed group – which was the group the author felt he or she belonged too – as suffering from various weaknesses that were either pre-existing or brought about by longstanding colonization or a more recent invasion. They all depicted the enemy as foreign in origin, nature, and abilities, many times in ways so hyperbolic that they defied the texts' claims of mirroring reality. They all foresaw or represented a violent fight between the oppressed group and the oppressor as inevitable. Finally, in order to express all these pseudo-ideas and proto-narratives, the selected texts, consciously or not, couched their discourses in terms that excluded or diminished the contribution of women, homosexuals and ethnic minorities.

Another thing they all had in common is that they contradicted themselves at times. For example, the texts promoting collectivism still put the emphasis on the struggle of a lone guerilla fighter, while texts portraying the enemy as a despicable monster betrayed a sense of respect or admiration for the enemy. This might seem very surprising from texts that wanted to promote an inflexible, essentialist, Manichean discourse of the Good Us versus the Evil Them. But if we come back to the previously discussed dual definition of ideological work, it is actually totally logical.

Indeed, ideology, as "a 'set' of beliefs or a 'system' of institutions and practices" (Poovey 3), may give "the impression of something that is internally organized, coherent and complete" but in fact, any ideology contains an "internal instability and artificiality" (3). Since any ideology, whenever performed in a text, is always under construction, any ideological work presents an ideological system that is "simultaneously constructed and contested" (2), as noted previously, which explains the sometimes paradoxical and contradictory nature of my selected texts' discourses.

Despite their similarities, I also discovered stark differences between my selected American texts and my selected Québécois texts. These differences stemmed mostly from their relative positions within the political spectrum – radical sovereigntist texts were usually Marxist- or leftist-inspired while the anti-Communist texts occupied the right end of the spectrum.<sup>79</sup> They were squarely on opposite sides of the struggles of the Cold War, despite so often using the same rhetoric of the paranoid style. This explains why my selected Québécois texts were focused mostly on the collectivity, with the "je" of the narrator often standing in for the Québécois as a whole, while my selected American texts focused mostly on the struggle of the individual, self-sufficient or rugged individualist protagonist.<sup>80</sup> The political dichotomy is also the source of the dichotomy between the settings. The Anti-Communist texts were set in small towns surrounded by wilderness, echoing the traditional iconology of the American Dream and frontier pioneers. By contrast, radical sovereigntist texts were set in the city. Specifically, in the poor, disaffected areas of the city where the oppressed proletariat (or the québécois as an ethnic-class), which the radical sovereigntists saw themselves as being a part of, lived.

Considering these similarities and differences, I can conclude that two radical groups with opposite political ideas can indeed couch their different ideological discourses in the same paranoid

---

<sup>79</sup> Readers should keep in mind that, as a general rule, the political spectrum as a whole tends to be positioned more to the right in the United States than in Canada – thus the mainstream left in Canada is more marginal in the US, and vice-versa for the mainstream right.

<sup>80</sup> Of course, they did so while still focusing on the fight against a threat to a community, as it is one of the defining traits of narratives using the paranoid style.

style, but this style will be modulated to fit the unique needs of its users. Thus, as I noted previously, the paranoid style is a lot more flexible than Hofstadter conceived it to be, and this flexibility allows it to be used by works and by groups that, at first blush, have nothing in common.

Finally, before concluding this thesis, I want to talk briefly about some contemporary heirs to the examples of the paranoid style that were investigated in the primary corpus of this study. Indeed, despite the paranoid style being a concept originating in the 1960's and my research having focused on this period, it always exists on the margins of society and flares up in the mainstream occasionally. The fifties and sixties was a period when such flare ups happened frequently, and more and more it seems to me that there off-spring or spiritual successors have started up again or been revived in recent years. In the United States, the most recognizable example of this is the vertiginous rise of the Tea Party, a radical wing of the Republican party which gained a lot of influence inside the party after the election of Barrack Obama in 2008. Here is an excerpt from their official website:

The fact that Barack Hussein Obama is a socialist is old news. Most critical now is that he's actively gun-grabbing, disintegrating our votes, and trying to install a Soviet-style socialist state, replacing our beloved free-enterprise republic, the United States of America. Whether citizens want to see it or not, the fact remains: Obama is Freedom Stripping America and it is all part of his plan to take us down, decimate freedom, liberty and justice for all and bring us to our knees!

We need your help today. Either you're part of the resistance or you will offer no resistance to the imperial president, king Obama.<sup>81</sup>

This sample of the rhetoric of the Tea Party is taken from a page that proclaims loudly that "Martial Law is Imminent!" It has all the hallmarks of the paranoid style – a view of history as a conspiracy, an

---

<sup>81</sup> This particular excerpt, and the larger rant from which it is taken, can be accessed at <http://www.teaparty.org/afp>

enemy that is as supremely powerful as he is cruel,<sup>82</sup> and a black and white worldview where one is either with Us or against Us (and therefore with Them). However, the recent 2014 mid-term elections seems to have stopped the rise of the Tea Party:

Despite furious threats to boot "turncoat" bums from office, the Tea Party failed to pick off any incumbent Senate Republicans in the primaries this year. Attempts to unseat sitting GOP senators in Texas, Mississippi, Wyoming, Kansas, South Carolina, and Kentucky all fizzled. Bids to nominate fringe candidates in states with Democratic incumbents went nowhere, too.

In that respect, the 2014 midterms stand in stark contrast to the two preceding elections, when the GOP's embrace of the Tea Party as a potent distillation of anti-Obama angst backfired. (Terbush N.p.)

In many ways, this rise and (apparent) fall of the Tea Party mirrors that of Barry Goldwater, the radical Republican Presidential candidate, who won the 1964 Republican primary by defeating the establishment candidate. Goldwater was also the man Hofstadter used as a primary example of his concept of the paranoid style and pseudo-conservatism (his term for the type of American right-wing radicalism that is now represented by the Tea Party). It was Goldwater's unwillingness to compromise his more radical position that led to a Democratic victory, just like the stubbornness of the Tea Party led to its being crushed by the party's more moderate establishment this past year. But this defeat is likely not the end of the Tea Party, as it still possess an incredibly potent platform in Fox News, a 24-

---

<sup>82</sup> The hyperbole in this text is pushed a lot farther than in the texts analyzed in this thesis, to the point that Obama is said to embody at the same time two things that are diametrically opposite to each other : "a Soviet-style socialist state" and a "king."

hours news and entertainment channel with an avowed conservative bent and which offers frequent airtime to Tea Party favorites such as Sarah Palin, Glenn Beck or Ted Cruz.<sup>83</sup>

In Quebec, the paranoid style, as used by radical *sovereignists*, seems to have been pushed to the fringes. There are still some organizations parroting the language of the FLQ, *Parti Pris* and other similar organizations from the Quiet Revolution period. The most prominent of them is the Réseau de Résistance du Québécois whose manifesto focuses a lot on how the 1995 referendum was "stolen" by the federal government (in other words, actually won by the "Yes" camp)<sup>84</sup> and includes rhetoric borrowed from or rooted almost directly in sixties' decolonization theory:

Partout sur la terre, des hommes et des femmes regardent notre révolution, (car l'indépendance en est une), et espèrent notre victoire. Car nous ne nous battons pas que pour nous-mêmes, mais pour une nouvelle humanité, une humanité plus juste et à l'intérieur de laquelle les peuples parviendront à s'émanciper pleinement. Notre indépendance changera la face de l'Amérique et marquera le recul de la Grande alliance anglo-saxonne, elle qui a exploité, au fil des siècles, les humains partout sur la terre. . . . L'Afrique et Haïti ne peuvent qu'espérer notre indépendance. La Palestine nous attend. Les Basques nous observent. Le Québec libre est l'espoir des peuples enchaînés.<sup>85 86</sup>

But the RRQ and similar groups are marginal, very little known, and do little beyond proselytizing and putting posters on lampposts and bus stop shelters. However, radical sovereignists have recently

---

<sup>83</sup> As I am putting the final touches to this thesis, it has been announced that Ted Cruz has been "appointed the chair of the Senate subcommittee on Space, Science and Competitiveness" (Iyengar, N.p.) and is considering running for President in 2016 (see John).

<sup>84</sup> While it has been proven, through the Gomery commission, that the federal government did use more money in the "No" campaign than they were legally allowed, the RRQ goes a lot further, alleging that the federal government used means similar to the CIA to disrupt the democratic process. These allegations are presented without any evidence to back them up.

<sup>85</sup> This quote and the allegations alluded to in the previous footnote are excerpts from the RRQ statement of principle that can be accessed at the following address: <http://www.resistancequebecoise.org/le-rrq/manifeste/manifeste-du-reseau-de-resistance-du-quebecois>

<sup>86</sup> Interestingly, note the absence of Scotland in this list, despite it sometimes being touted as the closest parallel that exist for the situation in Quebec.

accessed the mainstream by successfully electing Mario Beaulieu as the new head of the Bloc Québécois. Beaulieu's platform "[promettait] de *remettre la souveraineté à l'avant-plan*' et de mettre fin à la *'stratégie étapiste et attentiste qui a été utilisée depuis 20 ans'*" (Marin,. emphasis in the text). His victory speech, combined with the shouts of "Nous vaincrons!"<sup>87</sup> from his supporters, displeased many in the party's establishment, including the former Bloc leader Gilles Duceppe. But despite this victory, the more radical elements of the sovereigntist movement have yet to gain mainstream acceptance. Indeed, the radicalisation of the Bloc, rather than strengthening to the party, has actually weakened it, with many members, including two of its four MPs, leaving the party while decrying an internal witch-hunt:

André Bellavance [a former Bloc MP and Beaulieu's opponent during the leadership race) a également dénoncé la "chasse aux sorcières" dont sont victimes, dit-il, ses partisans et ses collègues au sein du parti, notamment sur les réseaux sociaux. Selon lui, plusieurs d'entre eux sont l'objet d'intimidation et d'exclusion par les partisans du chef Mario Beaulieu, qui les accusent de ne pas être "assez souverainistes pour être au Bloc québécois." (Radio-Canada, N.p.)

Does Beaulieu's weakening of the Bloc mean there is no significant flaring up of the paranoid style in Quebec today? I would not be so quick to jump to this conclusion. While the paranoid style indeed seems out of fashion in the sovereigntist movement, the paranoid style did flare up in Quebec recently during the debate on the Parti Québécois' controversial project for a Charter of Values. The paranoid style was used to promote ethnic xenophobia, especially islamophobia, and became very apparent during the parliamentary audiences on the Bill<sup>88</sup>, just like it did during the Bouchard-Taylor commission on "accomodements raisonnables" a few years before. The Bill died with the electoral

---

<sup>87</sup> "Nous vaincrons!" was a slogan commonly associated with the FLQ.

<sup>88</sup> One notable instance of such islamophobia is the infamous testimony of the Pineault-Caron family. Their testimony can be seen here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=opuEIAVcWEk>

defeat of the PQ at the beginning of the year,<sup>89</sup> but the undercurrent of xenophobic paranoia, especially islamophobia, has not gone away. It has only slinked back into the shadows. And with the recent shootings in Ottawa and Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, this islamophobia may very well come back to the forefront very soon, not only in Quebec, but in Canada as a whole.

In conclusion, the issues and discourses I have analyzed in this thesis may be past or marginal today, but the paranoid style that gave them life is not. It is still active and threatens to come back to prominence every now and then. Thus, analyses of previous versions of the paranoid style in a society, like this thesis has aimed to do, are as relevant as ever. Ideally, thanks to an interpretative grid dedicated to defining and detecting uses of the paranoid style in any context, we might be able to identify such discourses and ideologies before their uncompromising, Manichean worldviews cause too much irreparable damage, since it is possible for the paranoid style, if left unchecked, to become the dominant and/or official mode of thinking in a society for an extended period of time. Through careful studies of previous iterations of paranoid discourses, we might be able to ensure that this does not happen. This requires us, however, to be vigilant, and to never let ourselves, as citizens, thinkers, writers and scholars, to succumb to the temptation to use this same paranoid style to advance our own ideas.

---

<sup>89</sup> The father of the Bill, former PQ Minister Bernard Drainville, was proposing a slightly modified version of the Charter as part of his platform in the current PQ leadership race ("La nouvelle charte"). Now that he has pulled out of the race, it is unclear if his ideas will be recuperated by the new leader, Pierre Karl Péladeau.

## Work Cited

- American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 5th Edition. Washington DC: American Psychiatric P, 2013.
- "André Bellavance quitte le Bloc québécois." *Ici Radio-Canada.ca*. Société Radio Canada, 25 Aug. 2014. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.
- Aquin, Hubert. "Commentaires I" *Littérature et société canadiennes-françaises*. Ed. Fernand Dumont and Jean-Charles Falardeau. Québec: Presses de L'Université Laval: Deuxième colloque de la revue Recherches Sociographiques du département de sociologie et d'anthropologie de l'Université Laval, 1964. 191-13. Print.
- . "La fatigue culturelle du Canada français." *Liberté* 4.23 (1962): 299-325. *Érudit*. Web. 17. Jan. 2015
- . *Prochain épisode*. 1965. Ed. Jacques Allard, Claude Sabourin, and Guy Allain. Saint-Laurent, QC: Bibliothèque Québécoise, 1995. Print.
- . "Profession Écrivain." *Parti Pris* 1.4 (1963): 23-31. Rpt. in Aquin, Hubert. *Point de Fuite*. 1971. Ed. Guylaine Massoutre. Saint-Laurent, QC: Bibliothèque Québécoise, 1995. Print.
- Aubin, Françoise. "Turkestan Russe." *Encyclopaedia Universalis*, Encyclopaedia Universalis France, n.d. Web. 17. Jan. 2015.
- Bayard, Caroline, and Jack David. "Paul Chamberland la poésie, le vécu : recherche et expérimentation." *Voix et Images* 2.2 (1976): 155-72. *Érudit*. Web. 17. Jan. 2015
- Belsey, Catherine. *Critical Practice*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2002. Print
- Biron, Michel, François Dumont, and Élisabeth Nardout-Lafarge. *Histoire de la littérature québécoise*. 2007. Montreal: Boréal, 2010. Print.
- Borduas, Paul-Émile. *Refus global : Projections libérantes*. 1948. Montreal: Parti Pris, 1977. Print.
- Bouthillette, Jean. *Le Canadien français et son double*. Ottawa: L'Hexagone, 1972. Print



- Brunet, Michel. "Trois dominantes de la pensée canadienne-française : l'agriculturisme, l'anti-étatisme et le messianisme." *Essai d'histoire intellectuelle publié dans Écrits du Canada français* 3 (1957): 33-117. Print.
- Cahen, Claude. "Alp-Arslan". *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2014. Web. 17 Jan. 2015
- Card, Orson Scott. "A Thousand Deaths." 1978. *Maps in a Mirror*. Ed. Card. 1990. New York: Orb, 2004. 140-151. Print.
- Chamberland, Paul. *Terre Québec suivi de L'afficheur Hurlé, de L'Inavouable et de Autres Poèmes*. Montreal: Typo, 2003. Print.
- Dickson, Olivier. "La révolution tranquille: Période de rupture ou de continuité?" MA thesis. Université du Québec à Montréal, 2009. *Archipel*. Web. 25 July 2013
- Dowden, Bradley. "Fallacies." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, n.d. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.
- Eco, Umberto. "Narratives Structures in Fleming." *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. By Eco. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979. Rpt. in Lindner, Christoph, ed. *The James Bond Phenomenon : A Critical Reader*. 2nd ed. Manchester :Manchester UP, 2009. 34-55. Print.
- Elkin, Ali. "Ted Cruz Says He's Seriously Looking at Running for President." *Bloomberg Politics*. *Bloomberg*, 13 Jan. 2015. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.
- Engh, M. J. *Arslan*. 1976. London: Gollancz-Orion, 2010. Print.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Les Damnés de la terre*. 1961. Foreword Alice Cherki. Afterword Mohammed Harbi. Paris: La Découverte, 2002. Print.
- Fratta, Carla "L'altérité juive dans quatre romans québécois." *L'Altérité dans la littérature québécoise*. Bologne: Libreria Universitaria Editrice Bologna: Colloque de Bologne, 1987. 153-72. Print

- Gauvreau, Claude. " Les tourments et révoltes de Pierre Vallières." *L'UQAM* 29.8 (2003): 9. Journal L'UQUAM. Web. 17 Jan. 2015
- Godbout, Jacques. "007" *Parti Pris* 2.6 (1965): 59-60. Print.
- Hofstadter, Richard. *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. New York: Knopf, 1963. Print.
- . *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays*. 1965. Foreword Sean Willentz. New York: Random House, 2008. Print.
- Horguelin, Christophe, Ed. *FLQ Manifeste d'octobre 1970*. Comeau & Nadeau : Montréal, 1994. Contre-Feux. Print
- Itzkowitz , Norman "Kemal Ataturk." *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2014. Web. 17 Jan. 2015
- Iyengar, Rishi. "Senator Ted Cruz to Head Senate Subcommittee on Space." *Times*. Time Inc., 12 Jan. 2015. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.
- Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981. Print.
- JanMohamed, Abdul R. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature." *Critical Inquiry* 12.1 (1985): 59-87. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Jan. 2015
- Jasmin, Claude. *Éthel et le terroriste*. Ottawa: Librairie Déom, 1964. Print.
- Jourdain, Jacques, and Mélanie Mailhot, comp. *Paroles d'un nègre blanc*. Montréal: VLB, 2002. Print.
- Kinsman, Gary. *The Regulation of Desire: Sexuality in Canada*. Montreal: Black Rose, 1987. Print.
- "La nouvelle charte de Bernard Drainville." *Ici Radio-Canada.ca*. Société Radio Canada, 15 Jan. 2015. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.
- Lange, Oliver. *Vandenberg*. New York: Stein,1971. Print.
- Leahy, David. "The Not So Quiet, Nor Short, *Révolution Tranquille*." *Oxford Handbook of Canadian Literature*. Ed. Cynthia Sugars. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2015. N.pag. Print (Forthcoming Fall 2015).

- Lukács, Georg [György]. *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism*. Trans. John Mander and Necke Mander. London: Merlin, 1963. Print.
- Major, Robert. *Parti Pris : idéologies et littérature*. Montreal: Hurtubise HMH, 1979. Print.
- Makaryk, Irena R, ed. and comp. *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1993. Print.
- Marin, Stéphanie. "Mario Beaulieu ne changera pas son discours." *Le Devoir*. Le Devoir, 18 June 2014. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.
- Mills, Sean. *The Empire Within: Postcolonial Thought and Political Activism in Sixties*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 2010. Print.
- Monière, Denis. *Le développement des idéologies au Québec*. Ottawa: Québec-Amérique, 1977. Print.
- Nott, Robert. "John Wadleigh, 1927-2013: Artist, writer, critic was a 'big character.'" *Santa Fe New Mexican*. Santa Fe New Mexican, 2 Oct. 2013. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.
- Poovey, Mary. *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988. Print.
- Purdy, Anthony. "De 'L'art de la défaite à Prochain Épisode : un récit unique?" *Voix et Images*. 10-3 (1985): 113-125. *Érudit*. Web. 17. Jan. 2015
- Roberts, Adam. Introduction. *Arslan*. By M. J. Engh. 1976. London: Gollancz-Orion, 2010. vii-xi. Print.
- Rowbotham, Sheila. Lynne Segal, and Hilary Wainwright. *Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism*. London: Merlin, 1979. Print.
- Schwartzald, Robert. "Fear of Federasty: Québec's Inverted Fictions" *Comparative American Identities*. Ed. Hortense J. Spillers. New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.
- Seed, David. *American Science Fiction and the Cold War*. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1999. Print.
- "Seljuq." *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2014. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.

Stone, I. F. *The Haunted Fifties*. New York: Random, 1963. Print.

Terbush, John. "How the Tea Party lost the 2014 midterms." *theweek.com*. The Week Publications Inc., 5 Nov. 2014. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.

Vaillant, G.E. "Defense Mechanism" *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Ed. Neil J Smelser, and Paul B. Baltes. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2001. 3355-3359. *ScienceDirect*. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.

Waldeck, R.G. "Homosexual International." *Human Events* 29 Sep. 1960: 453-6. *Periodicals Archive Online*. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.

Wilentz, Sean. "Confounding Fathers." *The New Yorker* 18 Oct. 2010: 32. *Literature Resource Center*. Web. 22 Apr. 2015.

Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States 1492-Present*. 2003 ed. New York: Harper Collins, 2003. Print.