

# CANADIAN CULTURAL NORMS & AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL RULES

*Susanna Moodie's "Roughing it in the Bush"*  
and *Marcus Clarke's "His Natural Life"*

*John F. Tinkler*

**R**OUGHING IT IN THE BUSH and *His Natural Life* are dissimilar in a number of immediately striking ways. The first is the autobiographical account of a British gentlewoman's attempt to come to terms with a "rough" farming life in the Upper Canadian bush; the second is a fictional record of the convict system in Eastern Australia, in which the innocent protagonist, Richard Devine, is arrested in Britain and transported under the name Rufus Dawes, finally escapes imprisonment to re-emerge as a storekeeper (now named Tom Crosbie) in the gold rushes, and returns at the end of the novel to England and his rightful inheritance.<sup>1</sup> Yet both works first appeared within twenty years of each other in the middle of the nineteenth century, both concern themselves largely with the 1830's in each country, both deal with the phenomenon of British colonial settlement, and both have proved successful and enduring works in their respective cultures. These similarities between the cultural positions of the two books make the differences between them significant.

This paper will attempt to understand some dissimilarities between the two books by showing how they display different patterns of cultural sensibility in nineteenth-century Canada and Australia. In particular, I will argue that Canadian literature of the period displays a commitment to the notion of cultivation, and to the implementation of cultural norms as a way of achieving progress, whereas Australian literature demonstrates a national tendency to rationalise activity by creating social rules and institutions. To avoid drawing too much significance from the merely personal eccentricities of each writer, I also consult other works from each culture — most notably Alexander Harris' *Settlers and Convicts* (for Australia), William Dunlop's *Statistical Sketches of Upper Canada*, and Catharine Parr Traill's *The Backwoods of Canada*, all works which have stood the test of time, if only in a minor way, and which were either published in the 1830's or deal with that period.<sup>2</sup>

The obvious place to begin a comparison of Moodie's and Clarke's books is their titles. The title of Moodie's book does not contain an irony so much as express an underlying faith: "roughing it" is a polite vulgarism, an expression specifically derived from the vocabulary and values of the "smooth" life which it implies as the norm. To "rough it" is to take a pastoral break, like the Duke and his entourage in the Forest of Arden, without losing one's sense of the distinctions between "rough" and "smooth," without relinquishing the verbal discriminations and mental structure of one's smoother origins.<sup>3</sup> Mrs. Moodie is not quite in a class with Shakespeare's Duke, but so firm is her commitment to the distinctions of her inherited culture that her initial responses to Canada are naive and far too schematic. She glows at the Canadian landscape with a sense of the Edenic potential of pastoral: "Cradled in the arms of the St. Lawrence, and basking in the bright rays of the morning sun, the island and its sister group looked like a second Eden just emerged from the waters of chaos"; and glowers at fallen man with a clear-sighted sense of his corruption: "here, as elsewhere, man has marred the magnificent creation of his Maker." As a woman enlightened by Christianity's saving faith in the virtues of order, her endeavour becomes, rather like that of the Duke's entourage, to carry purified courtly manners, or their nineteenth-century genteel equivalent, into the wilderness.

From a philosophic point of view, the most interesting aspect of her initial attitude to the new colony lies in her imported conviction of man's natural evil: "You would think they were incarnate devils, singing, drinking, dancing, shouting, and cutting capers that would surprise the leader of a circus. They have no shame — are under no restraint — nobody knows them here, and they think they can speak and act as they please." Natural man, with "no shame," is not for Mrs. Moodie, and her book becomes a monument to the power of culture. On all levels, culture, the taming of the wilderness, provides the premise upon which her view of the world is built. On the subject of the equality of classes, she is firm to Mrs. D—— about the importance of cultivation through education: "There is no difference in the flesh and blood; but education makes a difference in the mind and manners, and till these can assimilate, it is better to keep apart." Mr. Malcolm strains her faith in cultivation, but she remains firm in her commitment to the values of gentlemanly education: "A dirtier or more slovenly creature never before was dignified by the title of a gentleman. He was, however, a man of good education, of excellent abilities. . . ." This faith in the need for social culture in man is repeated in the broader context of the Moodies' relations with the natural environment. The structural skeleton of the book is her record of the family's attempt to restrain, put in order, cultivate the bush, and it is for this purpose of agricultural cultivation that they have come to Canada. Culture, both of the physical environment and of the social man, is a dominant theme and faith of Moodie's narrative.

The obvious contrast evoked by Moodie's and Clarke's titles is that between a civilized woman "roughing it" in the bush, and a writer who plunges into "natural life" unequivocally. But, interestingly, Clarke's view of "natural life" appears initially as pessimistic as Moodie's: "We must treat brutes like brutes," remarks Maurice Frere of his fellow men (III, v). Clarke's natural men are animals, and even, in the case of the convict Gabbett, cannibalistic. What is different about Clarke's attitude is that he dwells on and pessimistically exaggerates the condition of brutishness, while Moodie avoids it or attempts to civilize it.

But Clarke's title is ironically misleading, and the fact of this irony provides an important contrast with Moodie's title. Moodie's title belongs to the vocabulary of a particular class and mental outlook, and indicates a refusal to relinquish the distinctions between "rough" and "smooth" even while living in the rough. As Carl F. Klinck comments of Moodie and Traill, "a defence could be set up by use of stock words with inflexible interpretations, or surrender could be announced by a change of idiom with the risk of unpredictable responses,"<sup>4</sup> and Moodie, with no intention of surrendering, tends to want her vocabulary unambiguous. Her response to the custom of "borrowing" is so violent, and so lengthy, partly because her neighbours use the word in a way that confuses its meaning: "As you never repay us for what you pretend to borrow, I look upon it as a system of robbery. . . . If you would come honestly to me and say, 'I want these things, I am too poor to buy them myself, and would be obliged to you to give them to me,' I should then acknowledge you as a common beggar, and treat you accordingly." Her sensitivity to language is acute: she abominates swearing, she reproduces dialect with an extraordinarily keen ear, she is enormously conscious of the titles people use in addressing each other — and this sensitivity to the diversity of linguistic phenomena indicates a strong sense of the inherited norms of language.

Moodie's desire to maintain an unambiguous language for social intercourse places her in direct contrast with Clarke, whose title derives its impact from the complex set of ironies that it initiates — ironies that deprive the title of stable meaning. The most immediate irony is the one literalized by the longer title given to the novel after its author's death: *For the Term of his Natural Life*. The "natural life" of the title really refers to the most complete and intrusive of social controls: penal servitude for life. Rufus Dawes, as a convict, is made into an epitome of the unaccommodated nature of poor, bare, forked animals, and is maintained in that state by an unremitting institutional surveillance. His brutishness is in fact unnatural and socially enforced, the result of the guards' paradoxical conviction that men taken in charge by society's law are animals. Dawes the animal plunges to the depths of misanthropy, as Gabbett resorts to cannibalism, but this is not the nature of man so much as the nature of social man caught up in the paradox of penalty that Clarke evokes: at the heart of social control

and surveillance is enshrined a simultaneously unnatural and anti-social ostracism and isolation. "Rufus Dawes came back to his prison with the hatred of his kind," Clarke tells us, "that his prison had bred in him" (iv, xii). Marooned with a small group of people at Hell's Gates, Dawes is placed in a true state of nature rather than a state of institutionally controlled brutishness, and he there displays a positive social altruism. It is one of Clarke's piquant ironies that in this "semi-savage state," Dawes shakes off his enforced Hobbesian brutishness and regains the specifically social title of "Mr' Dawes" (iii, xiii).

Clarke points to a morally positive natural man, especially in the portraits of "good Mr. Dawes" (iii, xvii) and the young Dora, but Dawes is stripped again of his title and Dora is fatally caught up in the trammels of Frere's machinations. Where Moodie believes in culture, Clarke's novel concentrates on the paradoxical symbiosis of brutish "nature" and excessive social control — with the determinant position occupied by social control. The positive conception of natural man, a man unfettered by social control, is consistently frustrated by Clarke's Australia: Dawes has to return to England to have his natural innocence vindicated. In the minds of Clarke's government officials, there are only two alternatives: law in all its rigour, or else lawlessness; convicts restrained in prison, or convicts rampaging at large. Where Moodie's attempt is to cultivate the wilderness of the backwoods, the issue for Clarke's Australian officials is so much one of institutionally regulated order opposed to mere chaos that they formulate a theory of Australia as a divinely appointed prison, a "Natural Penitentiary" (iv, xx), which sets the convicts and their environment in a state of irreducibly hostile contradiction and estrangement.

THE TRANSFERENCE OF VALUES that allows the Australian officials to see the natural environment as a function of man's institutional arrangements, a conspirator in his social conflict, reveals a scale of values with social order placed well above nature and the soil. Later Australian writers who have emphasized the facts of the natural landscape as primary characteristics of "Australianness" run quite contrary to the Australian cultural tradition as inherited from writers like Clarke.<sup>5</sup> For Clarke, the landscape is of relatively little interest beside the facts of the Australian social condition. Clarke's Australia is a social rather than a natural entity, to such an extent that social distinctions come to appear, in the minds of characters like Frere, as self-evident as the natural distinctions between animals and human beings. The social environment assumes the role and importance that might otherwise have been assumed by the natural environment.

In 1869, Patrick Maloney claimed that "In Canada they have a nation, but no national feeling. In Australia we have national feeling in abundance, but no

nation.”<sup>8</sup> In some ways, it appears a true statement (and very Australian), but we must qualify what is meant by “national feeling.” Although Moodie concludes her book with a damning warning to prospective immigrants, she is more lyrical about Canada than either Clarke or Harris about Australia: “British mothers of Canadian sons!” she exclaims, “teach them to love Canada — to look upon her as the first, the happiest, the most independent country in the world.” Moodie never quite relinquishes the idea of Canada as a potential second Eden, while Clarke instinctively uses a range of infernal images, including the striking spectre of the prison at “Hell’s Gates.”

If there is something hollow in Moodie’s rhetorical flights of national fervour which would justify Maloney’s claim, it is their abstraction, their idealization of a socio-political idea of which she understands little. While Moodie, who “knew nothing, heard nothing of the political state of the country,” is giving a rousing “Huzza for England! — May she claim / Our fond devotion ever” for the Canadian war effort, Clarke is involved in examining the conflicts and tension between predominantly unlovely government officials and the rest of the predominantly unlovely population that the officials will not, or cannot, leave without supervision. Clarke’s “national feeling” is not expressed in rhetorical flights of nationalistic fervour and optimism, but in the complexity and subtlety with which he is drawn to examine the country’s internal social oppositions and dilemmas. The Australian flavour of Harris’ and Clarke’s books is not their national optimism, but the passion with which their authors find themselves forced to examine and respond to the political and social anomalies of Australian social life.

Moodie escapes from corrupt customs officials at Québec into the backwoods to cultivate her farm, but Clarke insists that the regulatory machine of the Australian national institution is inescapable, and Harris devotes a whole chapter to the “extensive and galling inconvenience to which the labouring class is subject” because of the Bushranging Act, whose provisions are so extensive that civilian settlers “have commenced building private lock-ups on their own farms.” The distinction that our writers indicate between a pervasive Canadian faith in culture, and a pervasive Australian sense of social intrusion, has implications for the way they present the social or cultural coherence that binds each nation together.

The Canadian writers have a close involvement with nature and the soil that the Australians lack. Moodie lives in the bush and responds to nature with lyrical fervour; Catharine Traill experiments with dyes from native plants, names the flowers and tries to save groves of the native trees; Dunlop opens up new regions of the country for cultivation, and advises the new immigrant to “lose not a day in setting to work upon your farm.” But in Australia, Rufus Dawes is kept in prisons absurdly imposed on the landscape; Harris lops down trees, not for the

sake of clearing the land for cultivation, but merely in order to remove timber from the surface of the land and sell it for what he can get; and Harris' timber-cutting adventures find a striking later equivalent in Clarke's diggers who pick out of the soil what gold they can get, transforming pasture land into "lines of white tents . . . surrounded on all sides by red heaps, like molehills" where "ten thousand cradles — sometimes six abreast — whirred, hummed, and sung" (vi, v). The suggestion of a factory in Clarke's description of "ten thousand cradles" is revealing. Where the Canadians think in the terms of cultivation and adaptation natural to an agricultural society, the Australians' dissociation from the soil has all the marks of an advanced industrial society without the advanced industry. In the extensive proliferation of Australia's techniques of social organization, it is typical that money, the archetypal symbol of socialization, should assume enormous importance. Not only is it assiduously dug out of the ground as gold, but Harris ritually adds up his financial profits with evident satisfaction after each venture; Dawes (now Tom Crosbie) displays considerable business acumen in maximizing his profits by establishing a store rather than mining; and, throughout *His Natural Life*, the thread of the Devine wealth runs as the only sure line to salvation. The Australian alienation from the soil appears to be not just a negative function of the peculiar landscape, whose flora and fauna were destined to alienate a European mind, but also a positive result of the institutional nature of the country's settlement, governed ultimately by the socially constituted imperatives of money and power.

The reason for the difference between the two countries appears too obvious in our writers: Australia transported a social institution, while Canada imported a set of cultural values. The institution was intensified in its new Australian context, and this produced a distortion of cultural values. Meanwhile the cultural values imported into Canada were retained, though the conditions of Upper Canadian life loosened and even democratized the English social structure that had contained them, producing a kind of "universal gentry."

One of Clarke's more astute perceptions is that the prison officials he describes are not merely gothic monsters. They are distinct English types transported, intensified, and distorted. Mr. Meekin is a clerical dandy who would be innocuous enough in a suitable English parish, but he is a positive evil when transplanted to Australia. Of the Bible that Meekin lends Dawes in prison, Clarke remarks that "All the material horrors of Meekin's faith — stripped, by force of dissociation from the context, of all poetic feeling and local colouring — were launched at the suffering sinner by Meekin's ignorant hand. The miserable man, seeking for consolation and peace, turned over the leaves of the Bible only to find himself threatened with the 'pains of Hell,' 'the never-dying worm,' 'the unquenchable fire,' the bubbling of brimstone, the 'bottomless pit,' . . . (iv, xix). The fact that Dawes, the "suffering sinner" in question, has already passed through the prison

at "Hell's Gates," transforms Meekin's clerical inadequacy into sanctimonious malice. The delineation of Frere is masterful, for Clarke establishes him in the first book not as a pathological sadist, but as a type of the "Old English Gentleman" who has always had the potential to be intensified from Fielding's brutal country squires into Clarke's sadistic tyrant.

Clarke's Australian intensification of an English social model produces a stratification of human beings into two distinct groups separated by something more than English class, more even than race — they are separated by zoological species. Frere's dictum that "We must treat brutes like brutes" is a startling index of the Australian ruling-class mentality which contrasts sharply with the tolerant gentility that pervades the Canadian writers. But the two Australian species hold their positions because of each other. Michael Wilding has commented that "without a Dawes to persecute, Frere would be lost . . . and, in a terrible way, the prisoners are dependent on him and admire the authority he wields."<sup>7</sup> The relation between guards and convicts has something of the dialectically symbiotic nature that Hegel ascribed to masters and slaves. This mutual dependence of opposites is distinctive. John Matthews has shrewdly remarked of Australian egalitarianism that it "is felt to be necessary only because the economic conditions for its attainment have not been realised."<sup>8</sup> The ideology of equality springs dialectically from the oppressive existence of inequality. To the extent that Harris espouses egalitarianism, he does so not as a positive creed, but in reaction against the inequality of ruling-class institutions and power: "I always found my betters so readily breaking the laws of the land when they imagined them to run counter to their own 'law of honour,' that I never found the slightest difficulty in my own particular case about making the same exception in favour of the law of nature." If Clarke's and Harris' "national feeling" is measured by the extent of their response to social anomalies, in a country where social arrangements and institutions take the place of the natural environment as a focus of concern, so it is the very fact of social opposition that gives Australia its coherence. Harris' title is typical. He sees the country not in terms of a life-style *Roughing it in the Bush*, or in *The Backwoods of Canada*, but in terms of a social polarity: *Settlers and Convicts*.

On either side of this social opposition, desperate attempts are made to standardize behaviour: the settlers and guards impose overwhelmingly harsh regulations of control as a way of establishing order (and protecting their positions), while the convicts and workers develop codes of mateship and egalitarianism in their own defence. The irony of Australian culture, as its writers present it, is that the rage for order and uniformity produces disorder and opposition. The unity that develops is a unified field of oppositions and contradictions. This habit of forming conflicting interests between groups, each of which develops its own regulations and language, is typical of predominantly social man. Michel Fou-

cault has remarked that, among the human sciences, "sociology is fundamentally a study of man in terms of rules and conflicts:"

On the projected surface of economics, man appears as having needs and desires, as seeking to satisfy them, and therefore as having interests, desiring profits, entering into opposition with other men; in short, he appears in an irreducible situation of *conflict*; he evades these conflicts, he escapes from them or succeeds in dominating them, in finding a solution that will — on one level at least, and for a time — appease their contradictions; he establishes a body of *rules*.<sup>9</sup>

As Harris points out, the various rules in Australia — laws "of the land," "of honour," and "of nature" — are subsumed in the facts of conflict.

In Moodie's book, Canada's relationship to Britain is marked by neither such a slavish transportation of social systems as Clarke's Australia, nor by such violent reactions against them. Cultivation is the keynote, and it implies a specific attitude toward both the new colony and its British origins: cultural values are imported by Moodie and adapted as tools for cultivating the new land. Anna Brownell Jameson commented of Toronto in 1837 that "it is a *young* place; and in spite of this affectation of looking back, instead of looking up, it must advance,"<sup>10</sup> and Catharine Traill exclaimed that "Canada is the land of hope; here everything is new; everything going forward; it is scarcely possible for arts, sciences, agriculture, manufactures, to retrograde; they must keep advancing." Here is not only a faith in the Canadian cultural soil, but a sense of Canada advancing as a nation by developing the "arts, sciences, agriculture, manufactures" inherited from Britain. Canada appears at once different from, yet compatible with Britain, diverging into independence by developing in a necessarily different way from a common basis. The country's parallel yet different development gives it a claim to equality with Britain: "But oh!" declares Moodie, "beware of drawing disparaging contrasts between the colony and its illustrious parent."

The second, and related, keynote of the Canadian writers is independence: Moodie praises the "happy independence enjoyed in this highly-favoured land," while Traill talks of the "country where independence is inseparable from industry." The independence of individuals is analogous to the independence of the country as a whole, and is constituted by a sense of common interest that is strong enough to allow smaller differences to be countenanced. Traill, Moodie, and Dunlop share a common faith in cultivation, in a broad standard of gentility or decency, in political stability allied to Britain, though their individual attitudes to smaller matters may be quite different. When Moodie describes, through Mr. Malcolm, the absurdities of a botanist, she is in part poking fun at her botanist sister, Mrs. Traill. But these differences are personal and, as Dunlop comments of religious sects, do not, or should not, intrude as conflicts into common interest. "This blasphemous mixture of political and religious dogmas, however it may add to the numerical strength of any sect, must be pernicious in the extreme to



the true interests of Christianity," remarks Dunlop with a typical dislike of divisive "sect" and a sure sense of "true interests" that would not be possible in Clarke's divided and morally ambiguous world. Whereas the Australians become unified around a common field of conflicts, the Canadians have a sense of unified sensibility sustained at the core of divergent personal interests. Thus, when we talk of Australian egalitarianism and Canadian cultural diversity, it may be necessary to qualify our terms; for at the core of Moodie's Upper Canadian diversity lies the need for a substantial body of agreement, while Clarke's Australian egalitarianism functions within a field of oppositions and inequalities. To reverse the received definitions of each country, it is the inequality and conflict of Australian society that gives rise to the philosophy of egalitarianism in Clarke's novel; while it is the sense of a basic homogeneity of Canadian ideals that permits Moodie to tolerate the cultural diversity engendered by personal independence.

OVERALL, THE APPROPRIATE MODEL for these Canadian writers is not the social one of conflict and rule, but what Foucault defines as the biological model of function and norm, in which the physical facts of the environment (soil, nature) play a central role in man's adaptation to, and cultivation of them:

It is upon the projected surface of biology that man appears as a being possessing *functions* — receiving stimuli, . . . reacting to them, adapting himself, evolving, submitting to the demands of an environment, coming to terms with the modifications it imposes, seeking to erase imbalances, acting in accordance with regularities, having, in short, conditions of existence and the possibility of finding average *norms* of adjustment which permit him to perform his functions.<sup>11</sup>

This model helps us to illustrate how the Canadian writers, in their concern to adapt to and cultivate the natural environment, developed a strictness of normative values to accompany their social flexibility. Moodie sees herself in terms of the gentry, and struggles to maintain the values of gentility. Her initial response to Canada involves a shock at the loss of class distinctions, and she never quite relinquishes her sense of having fallen in Canada from her genteel origins. In her closing pages she remarks with some bitterness of Canada that "to the poor, industrious working man it presents many advantages; to the poor gentleman, *none!*" Her reluctance to work on the farm appears to spring from a reluctance to descend below the level of the gentry defined as a class whose members do not work with their hands. But, with the aid of some religious reflections, she survives the ordeal of manual labour with her sense of values intact. She begins to learn that her values of gentility can be adapted and generalized without the attendant social relativity and wealth of the gentry. There is a revealing irony to the term

“inferiors,” and a revealing emphasis on proper conduct rather than on class in her remark that “The conduct of many of the settlers, who considered themselves gentlemen . . . was often more reprehensible than that of the poor Irish emigrants. . . . The behaviour of these young men drew upon them the severe but just censure of the poorer class, whom they regarded in every way as their inferiors.” Moodie begins to accommodate herself to a kind of universal cultural gentry on a reduced social scale, as Dunlop had already advised: “A man of fortune, in my opinion, ought not to come to Canada. It is emphatically ‘the poor man’s country’ . . . though the necessaries and most of the luxuries of life are cheaply and easily procured.”

Like Moodie, Dunlop is aware that Canada is not the country for the English gentry, but it is a country where the “poor man” can acquire the “necessaries and most of the luxuries” of a kind of reduced or democratized genteel independence. Drawing a contrast between England and Canada in the way employers treat their servants, Moodie remarks that “In Britain, for instance, they [servants] are too often dependent upon the caprice of their employers for bread. . . . They are brought up in the most servile fear of the higher classes,” whereas “the happy independence enjoyed in this highly-favoured land [Canada] is nowhere better illustrated than in the fact that no domestic can be treated with cruelty or insolence by an unbenevolent or arrogant master.” The contrast with Clarke’s and Harris’ Australia is striking: the convicts who act as servants are reduced to a completeness of literal servility that Moodie does not dream of. What Moodie describes as “that common vice of English mistresses, to scold them for any slight omission,” is transformed in Australia into an imperiousness which inflicts physical tortures of sometimes gothic dimensions, leading in the case of Clarke’s unfortunate Kirkland, who cannot bear to hear his master swear, to being whipped to death.

If Clarke’s Australia imported and intensified English social institutions with a corresponding intensification of class conflict, Moodie’s tendency was to import the values of a class and then to begin emptying them of their class specificity. The distinctive demographic spread of Canada, with each settler on his own farm, implies an extended landed gentry which contrasts sharply with the Australian habit of huddling together in the social monoliths of large cities. This extended gentry (or gentility) is socially paradoxical: its values are those of a distinct and definite class, while their universal applicability appears to empty them of the pejorative and divisive implications of conflicting class interests. The values which, in Australia, would characterize a particular class in a state of conflict become in Canada universal *norms*. For an Australian, this phenomenon is sinister and obscures real conflicts of interest, while for the Canadian writers it is an assurance of harmony and progress.

The comparison between Moodie and Clarke reveals differences between the aspects of British culture and society that were of most significance in the two colonies — a social institution in Australia versus cultural values in Canada. Clarke sees Australia as developing from an imported social institution of which stratification and conflict are the key features. As his book progresses, the convict system becomes the pattern for later historical development. Thus, when the action is brought forward in Book vi to the gold rushes of the 1850's, patterns of social tension are seen to be reproduced from the convict beginnings, even though many of the actors of the new drama of the gold fields are recent immigrants unacquainted with the convict prisons. The diggers of Book vi, "yellow figures, bare-armed and bearded" (vi, v), are yellow from the soil, but their appearance immediately recalls the yellow uniforms of the convicts, and the opposition that develops between the diggers and the police, culminating in the Eureka Stockade, is intended to be seen as repeating the pattern of opposition between the convicts and their guards which had culminated in the prisoners' riot of July 1, 1846, in Book v (v, iv).

The extent to which Clarke intended to say that the convict system established a national pattern is suggested by the way he revised the book. When he excised the whole of Book vi, he also withdrew the earlier riot chapter (the only chapter dealing largely with convict life withdrawn from the original Book v). The only plausible reason for the withdrawal of this chapter is that Clarke had set himself to explain in Book vi a landmark of Australian history, the Eureka Stockade, by pointing to its reproduction of an already established pattern of opposition and unsuccessful revolt. When he removed the famous diggers' rebellion, he also withdrew the convict riot on which it was patterned, thus leaving in his revised version, which is almost exclusively a record of the convict system, a starker model of oppression and social opposition.

Moodie, on the other hand, sees a social development that is the exact reverse of Australia's. In the revised introduction that she wrote for Canadian reprints of her book in 1871, she remarks that her compatriots "can lead a more independent social life than in the mother country."<sup>12</sup> This is not to say that there is no method of social control involved in Moodie's vision. Comparing the Canada of 1871 with the country she had known forty years before, she comments that "its aspect is wholly changed." What is not changed are her values, her sense of cultural norms — and these norms are triumphant. The bond that she sees holding together the independent individuals of her world is a commitment to cultural standards imported from Britain, represented especially by an ideal of education. "A young Canadian gentleman is as well educated as any of his compeers across the big water," she reports proudly. She witnesses the ideals of the British gentry taking hold, and is able to record with satisfaction that "the farmer gradually became a wealthy and intelligent landowner . . . and was able to send his sons to

college and his daughters to boarding school." The educational norm is British genteel culture, and when she remarks, with an odd phrase, that "our print shops are full of the well-educated designs of native artists," she clearly means that the native artists are conforming to the cultural standards of Europe. In sum, then, she can point in 1871 to the social fulfilment of an inherited cultural ideal that binds together the socially diverse and independent individuals of her world.

Normative values usually have a regulatory function. In 1871, Moodie calls on her compatriots to "unite in carrying out measures proposed by the government for the good of the country, irrespective of self-interest and party prejudice." Laying aside the possibility that there is any such thing as an abstract and universal "good," a widespread cultural agreement about normative standards of the "good" will produce the relative stability that was in fact to characterize Canadian federal politics. Robert L. McDougall argues, especially on political grounds, that "Mrs. Moodie's way, was to become the Canadian way." The power of a common cultural ideal to produce political unity is one aspect of this "way." Of Moodie's later Canadian book, McDougall remarks that "it is no wild fancy to see in *Life in the Clearings* a kind of prophecy."<sup>13</sup> This is no blind, Sybilline prophecy, but a self-fulfilling one. The regulatory function of Moodie's cultural norms is their "prophetic" capacity, through widespread assent, to realize themselves in social reality. If Moodie's title implies a mental commitment to the vocabulary of a "smooth" norm, she sees her world in 1871 gradually conforming to her norm: "The country is the same only in name. . . . The rough has become smooth, the crooked has been made straight, the forests have been converted into fruitful fields." The institution that Clarke portrays is a concrete structure of social reality in which individuals are enmeshed, willingly or not. The norms that Moodie inherits and employs to cultivate her world constitute a mental structure to which social reality is gradually brought to conform. Moodie's norms are less concrete than the institutional regulations that characterize Clarke's Australia, but they are no less definite in origins and outline. Significantly, the regulations of Clarke's officials produce opposition and rebellion, whereas the genteel norms to which Moodie gives expression invite assent in conformity.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Susanna Moodie, *Roughing it in the Bush*, ed. Carl F. Klinck (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1962); Marcus Clarke, *His Natural Life*, ed. Stephen Murray-Smith (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970). There are two versions of *His Natural Life*, the original version which was published serially between 1870 and 1872, and a shorter version, revised by Clarke for publication as a book in 1874. The Penguin edition used here follows the original serial version, and to avoid confusions book and chapter numbers are cited with all references. The history of *Roughing it's* publication is more confused. Early versions of some of the sketches first appeared serially in 1847, while the complete book was first published in London in 1852. Moodie made some further revisions for a later Canadian edition

- of 1871. Although the McClelland & Stewart edition is an abridgement of the edition of 1852, it is used here because of its general availability.
- <sup>2</sup> Alexander Harris, *Settlers and Convicts*, ed. C. M. H. Clark, 2nd ed. (London: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1954); William Dunlop, *Statistical Sketches of Upper Canada*, in *Tiger Dunlop's Upper Canada*, ed. Carl F. Klinck (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1967), pp. 63-137; Catharine Parr Traill, *The Backwoods of Canada*, ed. Clara Thomas (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1966). The original dates of publication of these works are, respectively, 1847, 1832, and 1836.
- <sup>3</sup> Washington's use of the expression (1796) cited in *OED* bears out its connotations of a departure from normal experience: "Never having been accustomed to shift or rough it" (s.v. "rough").
- <sup>4</sup> "Literary Activity in the Canadas 1812-1841," in *Literary History of Canada*, ed. Carl F. Klinck et al., 2nd ed. (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1976), I, 157.
- <sup>5</sup> The social issues that concern Clarke are quite different from the journey into the interior landscape that Patrick White places at the centre of his modern interpretation of early Australia in *Voss* (1957).
- <sup>6</sup> Quoted from *Australian Union*, 2 (1869) by John Pengwerne Matthews, *Tradition in Exile* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1962), pp. 4-5. I wish to thank Prof. Matthews for his helpful advice during the preparation of this paper.
- <sup>7</sup> "Marcus Clarke: His Natural Life," in *The Australian Experience*, ed. W. S. Ransom (Canberra: Australian National University, 1974), p. 34.
- <sup>8</sup> Matthews, p. 23.
- <sup>9</sup> *The Order of Things*, trans. Alan Sheridan-Smith (Random House, 1970), chapter 10, sections III, V, and VI; rpt. "The Human Sciences," in *The Structuralists from Marx to Lévi-Strauss*, ed. Richard and Fernande deGeorge (New York: Doubleday, 1972), pp. 259, 258.
- <sup>10</sup> *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada*, ed. Clara Thomas (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1965), p. 52.
- <sup>11</sup> Foucault, p. 258.
- <sup>12</sup> The introductory chapter of 1871 is reprinted in W. C. Bell's edition of *Roughing it in the Bush* (Toronto: Bell and Cockburn, 1913), pp. 3-15.
- <sup>13</sup> "Editor's Introduction," in *Life in the Clearings*, by Susanna Moodie, ed. Robert L. McDougall (Toronto: Macmillan, 1959), p. xx.

## HOUR 17

5:35 to 6:35 p.m.

from "A Book of Hours"

*bpNichol*

two freighters gliding in the distance  
 as if they would finally meet & touch  
 somewhere south of here  
 in the grey blue haze of lake erie