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Résumé: Tout au long de sa carrière de cinéaste, Norman Jewison a combattu des stéréotypes qui dépeignent les libéraux de race blanche comme des bien pensants hypocrites et de mauvaise foi. Il s’est également approprié—toujours en la contestant—la figure de la victimisation face à des capitalistes révolutionnaires et des antiracistes radicaux. Cet article attire l’attention sur les lieux communs qui existent entre la pensée du cinéaste canadien et celles de Robin Winks et Michael Banton, deux universitaires reconnus aux États-Unis et en Grande-Bretagne qui se sont aussi opposés aux pratiques néolibérales qui semblent faire une trop grande distinction entre l’éthique et la politique tout comme les études politiques provenant des intellectuels radicaux. L’article conclut en contrepoin de l’humanisme libéral de Jewison, Winks et Banton en se tournant vers le nouvel humanisme de Paul Gilroy et de George Elliott Clarke, deux intellectuels post-coloniaux qui se sont opposés à l’étroitesse disciplinaire et aux études nationales trop insulaires. Je défends l’idée que le travail explorateur, provocateur et évocateur de Gilroy et Clarke peut aider aux études canadiennes, dans leur tentative de s’arrimer aux débats qui ont cours aux États-Unis et en Grande-Bretagne et aussi aux travaux transatlantiques qui se prétendent trop souvent globaux.

If Canada is more or less just a “vacant lot,” one more (relatively minor) place where class, gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and so on, interact—as they do everywhere else on the planet—why not go to where the action really is, to the United States, to Europe, or “global” analyses? What, besides narrow horizons, arbitrary and dated disciplinary boundaries, or sheer timidity, would hold us to this “vacant lot”?

Ian McKay (2000). (Emphasis added.)

Ian McKay’s essay on the liberal order framework is one of the most influential articles to appear in the Canadian Historical Review. First published in 2000, it offered a critique of conservative jeremiads against a motley crew of scholars invested in Marxism and identity politics, a challenge to progressive scholars who treat Canada as if it were just another space to study the intersection of social identities, and a war of position against the long march of neoliberalism that would pave paradise and put up a vacant lot. For while McKay’s introduction wondered whether “narrow horizons, arbitrary and dated disciplinary bound-
aries, or sheer timidity” prevent Canadian scholars going “where the action really is, to the United States, to Europe, or ‘global’ analyses,”1 his conclusion explicitly linked the notion of “narrow horizons” to the problem of the twenty-first century—the problem of neoliberalism. It is worth quoting at length:

If we asked a mid-twentieth century Canadian [why support the project of Canada?] … we might well have heard a new democratic defence of national distinctiveness in terms of universal social programs, democratic inclusiveness and tolerance, east-west economic linkages, and international peacekeeping. How (or if) neo-liberals will attempt to ‘Canadianize’ themselves is an intriguing mystery. True believers in unfettered individualism and global markets, these exponents of the hegemonic ideology presently lack any persuasive justification for Canada in the reductionist market terms in which they seek to cast social and political questions. Most of the neo-liberals’ grand economic objectives would, in fact be better realized without a separate Canadian state in northern North America—and they know it. Theirs is a brilliant definitional challenge that should arouse Canadian historians from their dogmatic slumbers, petty debates, and narrow horizons.2

McKay’s article has inspired conference papers, journal articles and edited collections on liberalism and hegemony in a Canadian context.3 It has struck a chord with readers dissatisfied with progressive conservatives and paleoliberals who recoil from the unpleasant and unacceptable face of capitalism while promoting a narrow vision of Canadian history. It has also been well received by readers frustrated by postmodernists who repeat calls for the deconstruction of identity and celebration of difference. Yet some commentators have recently expressed regret that McKay’s clarion call has not received attention from readers outside the academic fields of Canadian History and Canadian Studies. For example, in his review of Liberalism and Hegemony: Debating the Liberal Revolution, a collection of essays inspired by McKay’s essay, Andrew Smith longs for writers to drop their self-indulgent and subjective chatter about the provincial concerns of their lives in Canadian universities so that they can speak to the concerns of Canadians outside of academia and engage academics in the United States and Europe.4

This article riffs on such desires to confront narrow horizons by analyzing Norman Jewison’s career in Canada, the United States and Europe during the long march of neoliberalism. Focusing on the period between 1967 and 1999, it documents how the Canadian filmmaker defined his commercial art as rational, reasonable, and respectable in opposition to two camps—avant-garde work that was largely unseen by a mainstream audience and an “Americanized” culture industry that prioritized box office receipts over social responsibility. It also contends that he maintained his commitment to a liberal order framework based on tolerance and civil rights when he lived in Canada, as well as when he “went where the action was” by living and working in the United States (between 1958 and 1969) and the United Kingdom (between 1969 and 1978). In short, this essay uses Jewison as a means to explore neoliberalism and nostalgia for a liberal hour.
The term “liberal hour” gained popularity after John Kenneth Galbraith’s *Liberal Hour* which was first published in 1960. He borrowed the term from the American politician Adlai Stevenson, who had used it to refer to the period just before Presidential elections that allowed even the most obsolete men to become reconciled, if briefly and expeditiously, to the machine age. Like Jewison, Galbraith was a Canadian-American who developed his craft during a sojourn in the United Kingdom, but is primarily remembered for his contributions to the society and culture of the United States. In challenging American politicians to support a progressive economic policy that would help the most vulnerable members of society, and dedicating his book to “the blacks,” Galbraith’s book on the liberal hour built on a web of alliances between African American intellectuals and white philanthropists and sociologists who were dismayed that New Deal programs in the 1930s had failed to “alleviate African American serfdom in the South.” After serving as the American ambassador to India between 1961 and 1963, he returned to the United States to implement his hopes for a liberal hour. As an advisor to the administrations of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, he played a significant role in the passing of civil rights legislation, as well as other reform measures in relation to health, education, housing, immigration, transportation and anti-poverty legislation, which sought to defend the individual rights of any American regardless of color, features, or culture.

If the zenith of the liberal hour occurred between 1963 and 1966 in the United States, it is generally considered to have fallen between 1966 and 1968 in the United Kingdom. Its capstone achievement was the 1968 Race Relations Act, which made it illegal to refuse housing, employment, or public services to a person on the grounds of colour, race, ethnic or national origins, and created the Community Relations Commission to promote “harmonious community relations.” As was the case in the United States, where the liberal hour was challenged by resurgent forms of conservatism and more militant forms of Black Power that highlighted the importance of collective identities and structural forces in the battle against racism, the race relations legislation being put in place by a centre-left government acted as a catalyst for neconservative movements. In one of the most influential speeches in modern British history, Enoch Powell spoke out against non-white immigration to the U.K., purportedly on behalf of “ordinary working men” who believed that “in 15 or 20 years’ time the black man will have the whip hand over the white man.” He was invoked as a talismanic figure in mass demonstrations of working-class support and helped inspire a resurgent right-wing that considered multiracial societies indicative of a liberal death wish. He also provoked left-wing groups that believed liberal investments in displays of interracial friendship were a means to alleviate white guilt rather than encourage a more productive confrontation with the shameful history of the British Empire. Neoliberal cultural projects in the 1970s, such as those associated with the Centre of Policy Studies, a think tank established by Sir Keith Joseph and Margaret Thatcher in 1974, thus sought to sublimate Powellite rhetoric in order to question the efficacy of “liberal wets” that were unable to extinguish radical fire.

Stuart Hall is one of the leading radical voices to analyze the “authoritarian
populism” of Thatcherism’s contradictory appeals to neoconservatives (who believed that white, English culture might be “swamped” by alien groups), and neoliberals (who preferred to talk about post-racial individuals rather than the idea of societal values). His articles about the New Right’s investment in the self-possessed individual in the 1970s and 1980s built upon and extended his earlier contributions to the Caribbean Artists Movement and the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies in the 1960s and 70s, in which he critiqued liberal desires to exoticize non-white individuals.

Importantly for my argument, Hall’s critical sorties have also connected Gramsci’s work on hegemony and organic intellectuals to vernacular intellectuals, such as Malcolm X, who grasped “the popular as the most efficacious language and mode of resistance,” and developed stinging critiques of white liberal “foxes” who pretended that they were friends to the black struggle for liberation. As a result of X and other militants, the term “white liberal” was almost always used in a pejorative manner to critique middle-class slime who sought to flee from an intolerable reality while pretending to act in the best interests of blacks. It also tended to be used as a synonym for wealthy Anglo-Saxons who indulged in radical chic, so as to alleviate their guilt, or Jewish individuals who expressed their support for a civil rights movement challenging an unjust power structure.

This paper argues that Norman Jewison has confronted such stereotypes about white liberals by seizing and contesting the position of victim against revolutionary capitalists and race radicals. It also contends that Jewison’s liberal humanism bears an uncanny resemblance to the liberal scholarship of Robin Winks and Michael Banton, two prominent academics in the United States and the United Kingdom who opposed neoliberal practices that seemed to abstract ethics from politics as well as what they considered the overly politicized scholarship of radical intellectuals like Hall. As well as focusing on the commonalities between Jewison and academic members of his cohort who grew up during the Great Depression, I allude to the explorative, suggestive and provocative work of postcolonial intellectuals who have engaged closely with the work of Stuart Hall and what Hall calls the “spectral effect of Frantz Fanon.” To be more specific, my conclusion addresses the intellectual work of Paul Gilroy and George Elliott Clarke, two distinguished professors in the United Kingdom and Canada who, like Ian McKay, were born between 1952 (the year of the first publication of Frantz Fanon’s Peau Noire, Masques Blancs) and 1961 (the year of the original publication of Fanon’s Les Damnés de la Terre). While mindful of their particular generational affections and the perils of nostalgia, Gilroy, Clarke, and other members of their cohort hope to use the politics and poetics of Fanon’s work to inspire a more convivial future. They offer insightful critiques of narrow horizons involved in the production of national histories, and the defence of disciplinary boundaries that are informed by Fanon’s vision of a decolonizing new humanism, i.e. the “liberation of modernity from colonial and neocolonial underdevelopment, and the democratic salvaging of the radical intellectuals ‘technical and intellectual capital’ from alienating uses.” When read together, they can also help us to connect
Canadian Studies to debates in the United States and the United Kingdom, or transatlantic work that tries to pass as global.

**FRAMING NORMAN JEWISON AS A WHITE (CANADIAN) LIBERAL**

Norman Jewison received the Irving G. Thalberg Memorial Award at the American Academy Awards in 1999, and has been described as “Canada’s most prominent filmmaker” by officials of Victoria University (part of the University of Toronto and his alma mater, where he served as chancellor between 2004 and 2010). Although such awards and recognition have not ensured that Jewison’s work is highly regarded or carefully discussed by North American film critics, there have been some important studies of his creative artistry and commercial acumen.24 This section focuses on two critical contributions to Jewison’s career—Bart Testa’s 2007 exploration of the left-liberalism of Jewison’s films, and Eithne Quinn’s 2011 essay, which returns to the controversy surrounding Jewison’s appointment as director for a film based on *The Confessions of Nat Turner*, a Pulitzer-prize winning novel written by William Styron.

Testa’s seminal work points out that Jewison shares a number of similarities with left-liberal directors from the United States, such as Sidney Lumet and Sydney Pollack. All three came to Hollywood from a television background (drama for Pollack and Lumet, and variety shows and comedy for Jewison), and looked toward European film for stylistic inspiration as well as “the Stanley Kramer-Paddy Chayefsky-Elia Kazan lineage of literate American social cinema rooted in the 1950s.”25 Yet Testa does not simply present Jewison as a pseudo-American filmmaker who is unable to resist or subvert the liberal pieties of Hollywood. Rather than depict Jewison as a David Cronenberg-lite for Canadians suffering from false national consciousness, Testa’s article proposes that we acknowledge the Canadian “political unconscious” in Jewison’s work, and suggests how an ideology of liberalism in Canada—which signifies “common sense” ideas of truth, fairness, and the right principles of law in the pursuit of progressive social relations—has influenced the shape and contours of Jewison’s decisions as a filmmaker.26 Turning to Jewison’s prominent films, particularly his trilogy about racial discrimination in America, Testa highlights their shared interest in legally sanctioned investigations: *In the Heat of the Night* (1967) concerns a black police detective from the North having to work with a hostile Southern police outfit; *A Soldier’s Story* (1984) revolves around the case of an African American military investigator; and *The Hurricane* (1999) is a story about a multiracial team of activists aligned with lawyers. In short, Jewison does not direct films in which race and class warfare are “incarnated in a cop serving behind his badge on the right side of an ideological struggle,”27 and his protagonist in *In The Heat of Night* must have his passions infuriated and then suppress them. “Law as reason and social institution” must prevail over emotion in Jewison’s films.28 Their final narrative force lies with institutions and not personality.

Eithne Quinn interprets Jewison’s desire to study issues relating to emotion and reason as emblematic of “sincere white fictions” rather than a Canadian liberal
framework. Drawing on material relating to Jewison’s attempts to direct a film based on William Styron’s portrayal of Nat Turner (which imagined the leader of a successful black slave revolt fantasizing about sexually assaulting a white woman), Quinn claims that Jewison considered himself (as well as other white authorities, such as Styron and Wolper, the film’s producer) better equipped to explore the realities of a black revolutionary in antebellum America than black campaigners who called for changes to Styron’s story. She also notes that Jewison perceived “his own antiracism as transparent and beyond interrogation” based on his direction of *In The Heat of the Night*, a film about racial discrimination that happened to be produced by white individuals and featured a predominantly white cast.20

In order to complicate and exemplify the insights of Testa and Quinn about the self-fashioning of a white (Canadian) liberal who had an ambivalent relationship to (black) business culture, I wish to contextualize Jewison’s approach to racial liberalism in relation to the work of Robin Winks and Michael Banton. Where Jewison’s concerns with the positions of radicals on the right and left seemed to coalesce with the economic success of Blaxploitation films, and the rhetoric of Black Power that could be appropriated by Richard Nixon and others to mean minority business ownership,20 Winks and Banton emphasized the perils of identity politics by contesting and seizing the position of victim against what they considered overly didactic or ideological scholarship. I do not want to collapse the differences between the three men. There is no direct evidence that Jewison, Winks and Banton engaged closely with each other’s work—to my knowledge, Norman Jewison did not study the work of Winks and Banton in any great depth, Winks and Banton were not aware of each other’s work in the fields of history and sociology, and Winks and Banton did not engage closely with the films of Jewison. Moreover, there are important distinctions to be made between a popular filmmaker who was primarily interested in visual rhetoric and academics who valued the written word. For while Banton valued what he considered Fanon’s “gripping descriptions of social institutions as they appear to members of minorities,”31 and Winks considered Fanon “the most articulate, and passionate, voice to speak for those who were at the receiving end of colonialism,”32 there is no evidence that Jewison engaged closely with Fanon’s dialectics of experience. Yet even in regards to this point, the published work of Winks and Banton tended to treat Fanon as an emotional primary source rather than a clinical analyst of society, and expressed concern with the interpretations of his work developed by radical activists and younger scholars influenced by the “cultural turn.” For example, Winks had little time for active and oppositional readings of popular cultural products, and bluntly expressed his concern about “simple” and “imprecise” minds that were unable to appreciate great literature,33 and Banton assiduously discussed the perils of work that relied on the “popular concept of race” rather than universal scientific categories.34

Consequently, I am interested in how all three men illustrate three key themes and issues relating to the hopes and aspirations of a liberal hour to eradicate overt forms of racial discrimination and reduce racial prejudice. In the first place, they were committed to the ideal of a liberal public sphere, in which
private individuals use rational and critical debate to form a public that is open and accessible to all, and highlighted examples of non-white professionals who performed admirably, and respectfully, in predominantly white institutions. Secondly, they grew increasingly frustrated with forms of multiculturalism in the 1980s and 90s, as well as neoliberal policies in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, which seemed to abstract ethics from the public sphere and valorize exhibitionist displays of black infra-humanity and hyper-humanity. Thirdly, they emphasized the ability of black individuals to advance their careers by exploiting identity politics without emphasizing the earlier contributions of black intellectuals, such as Frantz Fanon, to the critique of profiteers and schemers in the early days of multiculturalism and neoliberalism.35

The next two sections address the responses of Jewison, Winks and Banton to the threats they identified in forms of neoliberalism that made explicit appeals to black consumers in the overdeveloped world. The first is concerned with the period between 1967 and 1974, when Jewison won critical acclaim for In the Heat of the Night and courted controversy for his decision to direct a film based on The Confessions of Nat Turner. Although these two events are briefly mentioned in Jewison’s autobiography and academic commentary about his work, little has been said about his experiences producing The Landlord (1970), a film about a white liberal who buys a tenement building in a predominantly black neighborhood (it is not mentioned at all in his autobiography). In order to address this gap in the literature, I emphasize some of the connections between Jewison’s response to the Blaxploitation film industry and the descriptions of blackness in North America that Banton and Winks developed in the late sixties and early seventies. A subsequent section then engages with Jewison’s work after 1975, paying particular attention to his direction of Rollerball (1975), A Soldier’s Story (1984) and The Hurricane (1999), as well as his aborted attempt to direct a biopic of Malcolm X, in order to illuminate the positions staked by Winks and Banton against forms of identity politics developed by neoliberal think tanks and neo-Marxist intellectual clusters.

“THE LIBERAL PATRONAGE OF THE BLACK MAN,” CIRCA 1967-74
After In the Heat of the Night and the controversy regarding the representations of Nat Turner by a predominantly white production team, Jewison produced The Landlord, a film that directly addressed stereotypes about white liberals. The source for this film, a novel by Kristen Hunter, an African American author, was marketed as an interracial love story, and the jacket cover of the 1966 Pan books edition glibly describes Elgar Enders, the white liberal protagonist, as a pleasure-seeking playboy who “buys an apartment building in a Negro ghetto. Plunged headlong into an alien world—hectic, violent and amoral—he becomes increasingly involved in the private lives of his cheerful, uninhibited tenants. Then Elgar falls in love and black ceases to be just a colour…”36 Bill Gunn, an African American screenwriter influenced by the Black Power movement, and Hal Ashby, the white director who had committed to an alternative lifestyle in the hippie movement after leaving his Mormon family, made a number of changes to the book’s plot
in the hopes that they could create a film that would appeal to people frustrated by the clichés of radical chic and liberal sentimentality. Perhaps the most important change related to the concerns of sociologists and journalists of the 1960s about the children of “interracial sex.”37 In the book and the film Elgar has an affair with Fanny, one of his black tenants, who subsequently gives birth to a child. Yet while Fanny’s black husband is revealed as the biological father of the child at the end of Hunter’s book, Elgar is identified as the biological father of the child in the screenplay. This allowed the film to explore the implications of white supremacy in a powerful scene in which Fanny asks Elgar to raise the child “casual” with Lannie, his new mixed-race girlfriend,38 and Ashby hoped that Jewison would produce another film that addressed white supremacy with wit and imagination by purchasing the rights for Cecil Brown’s critically acclaimed novel, *The Life and Loves of Mr Jiveass Nigger*.39 However, Jewison was not committed to *Jiveass* or any other films that might be linked to the Blaxploitation genre because they liberally used the n-word and refused to ignore the sex lives of their black anti-heroes.

Although he claimed that *In the Heat of the Night* “helped give birth to the Blaxploitation genre,”40 Jewison’s letters to the United Artists Corporation (UA) in 1971 reveal his desire to attract a “mainstream [i.e. white] audience” by minimizing the racial theme of *The Landlord*.41 He was only told about the “downtown campaign” for *The Landlord*, which would later be employed in the marketing of Blaxploitation films by Fred Goldberg, Vice President at UA, who believed that they needed to focus their advertising campaign on the film’s “special appeal to blacks” since they couldn’t “disguise the fact there are black people in the film” and could target “downtown Chicago and other downtown areas, [where] the black audience is 70% of the toal [sic] downtown audience.”42 Ultimately, UA developed one campaign for *The Landlord* that spoke to Jewison’s desire to minimize images of blacks and one campaign that accentuated the themes of racial conflict in the film in order to appeal to Goldberg’s ideas of the black market. One of the posters for the so-called mainstream campaign featured three images on a black background. The largest image depicts a woman, from the waist down, who is dangling a key over an Amazonian leg that viewers could read as white or “off-white.” A tenement building is placed alongside this leg, as the woman’s foot appears to kick it towards the white liberal protagonist, dressed in a white suit and holding a plant, who intends to plant his seed in the building and its residents.

The downtown campaign added depictions of blacks “sticking it to the man” to the mainstream campaign’s general allusions to sex, sexuality and desire. One poster used the same tagline as the one discussed in *The Landlord’s* mainstream campaign, albeit without the cursive handwriting and the exclamation point. In it, the white protagonist is bent over, strategically placed with his head near the crotch of an exotic dancer, the barrel of a gun held by a black matriarch, and the fist of a young black martial artist. On his back (presumably getting a free ride) is another black youth while an angry, muscular African American man aims a bow and arrow at the man who has cuckolded him. Although the burdened
white man tries to turn his head towards the viewer, he is still somewhat focused on the broken lavatory he is bringing to service his black tenants. The mainstream campaign’s portrayal of a smiling white liberal bringing new life to the tenement was thus replaced with the burden of the white liberal forced to deal with the waste produced by a black slum.

While Jewison’s commercial art needed to address caricatures of the white liberal in its publicity material, Robin Winks’s history of The Blacks in Canada was marketed by McGill-Queens University Press as a liberal, authoritative guide to “all aspects of the Black experience in Canada, from the introduction of slavery in 1628 to the first wave of Caribbean immigration in the 1950s and 1960s.”43 Although Winks insisted that his book was not a liberal “political tract,”44 he was willing to admit that he wrote the book under the influence of liberal social scientific work that called for secular solutions to the problem of the colour line in North America. In his preface to the second edition of The Blacks in Canada, Winks noted his intellectual debts to John Porter’s 1965 book, The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada, and entitled his concluding chapter “The Black Tile in the Mosaic.” However, Gunnar Myrdal’s An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy (1944) was probably the
most important intellectual influence on a text that hoped that Canadian blacks could become exemplary modern figures by transcending race. In his wide-ranging study, Myrdal extended the work of scholars such as Frank Boas, Otto Klineberg, and Robert Park, who emphasized the social construction of race, and helped facilitate opposition to the permanent superiority and permanent inferiority of races. An American Dilemma also played an important role in the reduction of racial prejudice that emerged after the Second World War and UNESCO’s first statement on race in 1950. Yet it paid little attention to the anti-racism of black leftists, and reflected a trend of Cold War liberal scholarship to stigmatize cultures that were sub-national or supra-national as matriarchal, delinquent and immature. Myrdal’s influence is particularly evident in three interrelated features of Winks’s interpretation of Black Canadian history: 1) its faith in white leaders of the past having the best interests of “dark strangers” at heart, 2) its desire to sublimate black militancy into support for liberal civil rights organizations in North America in the twentieth century, and 3) its fear that black radicals, particularly Caribbean immigrants, would become irresponsible demagogues who called for solidarity with anti-colonial movements in the global South.

Winks was convinced that “leadership remains basic to all human endeavor.” Even when he agreed that prominent historical figures may have committed immoral acts by contemporary standards, he did not think that anyone had the right to employ an “unhistorical prose style” and force contemporary judgments upon historical figures who led groups and nations. Dissatisfied with moral exhortations about subaltern social identities and deterministic structures, his correspondence expressed discomfort with “sarcasm and satire...[used] to beat... bloody, self-deluded, self-righteous” British leaders from the past. His published work used more restrained language, but still sought to defend the honor of prominent Anglo-Canadians by claiming that white leaders in the eighteenth century were free of racial bias when they claimed to understand “the Negro mentality” and “took a Negro mistress,” and providing a sympathetic reading of prominent white men in the nineteenth century who were unable to transcend prejudices about the need to protect white women from the “loose morals” of black men.

When he turned his attention to the twentieth century, Winks also chose to highlight the lack of racial discrimination in Canada and drew the attention of his gentle reader to the fact that white politicians were willing to have their photographs taken with non-whites, and accept technically proficient workers from Africa and Asia as Canadian immigrants. He felt that reasonable blacks in Canada understood the good intentions of white Canadians, and “usually wanted nothing more than to be accepted as quiet Canadians...[rather than] organize militant, noisy, pushing protests.” As a result, he was impressed by the American-born Daniel Hill III’s “quiet” leadership of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, and other blacks who joined liberal, multiracial organizations that sought to eradicate serious forms of discrimination in housing, education and employment. He was rather less impressed with a minority of Caribbean students and “paranoid” blacks who detected “racial insults...where none are intended.”

The primary targets of Winks’s ire were radical figures who appropriated
writers such as “Baldwin, Genêt, Malcolm X, and Franz Fanon [sic]” in order to stir up “thoughtless, needless, and frustrated destruction.”\footnote{57} In criticizing black radicals who were thought to threaten North America’s progression into a meri-
tocratic, rational-critical age, Winks was often unable to appreciate attempts to document the history of blacks in North America and Africa. For while the American of Welsh descent believed that ethnic groups like “the Irish…the Scots, the English” could take pride in their “old world cultures,”\footnote{58} he believed that Black Canadians did not have a “cultural base to which they could return.”\footnote{59} Such premises had important consequences for individuals who expressed con-
cern about politicized attempts to validate the subjective feelings of people of African descent and, in his private correspondence with Wayne Wilcox, the cul-
tural affairs officer of the US embassy in London, Winks was told that he would obtain quicker induction to the US Council on Foreign Relations if he were “a Black-Chicano woman…with no east coast credentials, on the far left of all known issues.”\footnote{60}

Michael Banton’s scholarly work in the 1960s and 70s also questioned the “double standards” of self-proclaimed progressives (who opposed English ethnic
nationalism while promoting “Jewish exclusiveness” and/or the “minority nationalism” of Africans),\textsuperscript{62} and claimed that blacks in the United States did not have any connection to their African heritage.\textsuperscript{63} Such concerns and premises help contextualize the shape and contours of an article Banton published in \textit{Daedalus}, the journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, about 1960 as a turning point of race relations, in which he claimed,

[r]ace could only start being a major kind of grouping, comparable to nation if less significant, only when the bogey of inequality was dispelled. Only then could previously subordinated groups accept racial designations. Such a process, I suspect, may have started around 1960. It was as if black leaders in the United States declared, “You define us as a racial group. Right. We will accept that label. We will prove that our subordinate position is not the outcome of our physical nature but of our social and political position. We will put an end to our subordination while retaining our racial characteristics.”\textsuperscript{64}

Banton’s “history of ideas” went on to argue that the “winds of change” in the 1960s were not the result of “changes in the thoughts of scholars,” but “changes in the behaviour of the people who constituted a major portion of the subject matter.”\textsuperscript{65} Although it briefly mentioned Marcus Garvey, as an “exception” in respect of his use of the word “race” as a rhetorical expression in mobilizing blacks, and noted the work of Oliver Cromwell Cox, a Marxist writer who had written widely cited books on capitalism in the 1950s and 1960s, it did not mention prominent black intellectuals, such as C. L. R. James and Aimé Césaire, who developed analytical studies of race and racism in the early twentieth century. Fanon’s analysis of racism in the 1950s, and his genealogical work about the Harlem Renaissance or Negritude, was also noticeably absent from Banton’s analysis.

It bears repetition that Banton’s address highlighted the dangers of “superficial analysis,” and “vehement attacks upon white American institutions and white American sociology” replacing the rigorous work needed to produce a “systematic body of knowledge and scholarly understanding of the social processes at work.”\textsuperscript{66} This is not because Norman Jewison considered himself a cerebral filmmaker who could produce a systematic body of knowledge or theoretical language needed for analysis. He would not, for example, follow Charles Burnett, an African American filmmaker who talked back to European scholars who repressed the intellectual foundations of Black Power with \textit{Killer of Sheep} (1977), “a fiction that feels like a documentary, a document of a place and time that feels like a poem, a film that is intriguing to watch but whose narrative intrigue is decidedly tenuous.”\textsuperscript{67} In contrast, Banton’s comment deserves repetition because of its resemblance to Jewison’s attempts to fashion himself as a clear-minded, pragmatic and independent individual.

\textbf{“THE HONEST ERRORS OF HONEST MEN,” CIRCA 1975-99}

After shooting \textit{Rollerball} (1975) in the United Kingdom and Germany, Norman Jewison told the Canadian Broadcasting Company that he defined his artistic
vision against “big corporations” in the American culture industry as well as avant-garde films influenced by European theorists. His science-fiction film about an ultra-violent sport set in a world governed by multinational corporations captured some of this self-fashioning, as Jewison captured the visceral impact of its source material (William Harrison’s “Ball Murder,” which first appeared in the September 1973 issue of Esquire, and was inspired by the author seeing a fight break out on the court during an American college basketball game) and the limits of academic theorizing. With that said, Jewison does not appear to have set out to consciously challenge Eurocentric reason. His commentary for the Rollerball DVD emphasizes how important it was for Sir Ralph Richardson, a classically trained British actor, to bring “European sophistication” to his role as the gatekeeper to the world’s history, and Jewison does not seem aware of the irony that he is talking over a scene in which Richardson’s character claims that nothing much happened in the thirteenth century “except Dante and a few corrupt popes.” Furthermore, Jewison tried to help James Caan approach the mindset of Jonathon E., the hero of the film who challenges corporate rule, by comparing the protagonist’s struggles to Rosa Parks’s opposition to racial segregation without access to elite, European, education.

Somewhere along the line a Martin Luther King would come along because of Jonathan, not because of anything he did other than the fact that he questioned it—he didn’t have the answers...Just like the lady who said “I’m not getting on the back of the bus.” She wasn’t a great genius, she wasn’t learned—you know, she didn’t go to Oxford—she was a washer woman. And because she didn’t get on the back of the bus, Martin Luther King was born.

So, while Jewison was sometimes criticized for his over-direction of actors in the 1960s, it also seems possible to question his mis-education of actors in the 1970s. That is to say, Jewison might have helped Caan anticipate popular fairytales that announce, “Rosa sat so Martin could walk; Martin walked so Obama could run; Obama runs so our children can fly,” but he was unable to direct his leading man to historical narratives that go beyond the myths of iconic individuals. He was apparently unaware that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) refused to support poor African American women who challenged racial segregation on public transportation, and thought it was too risky to support the legal campaign of women like Claudette Colvin who refused to get on the back of the bus before Parks’s famous protest.

Jewison continued to direct films that focused on legalistic campaigns of African American individuals that received recognition by the American establishment after he relocated from the U.K. to Canada in 1978. His investment in liberal humanism was particularly evident in the promotional tour for A Soldier’s Story, a film adapted by Charles Fuller from his own Pulitzer-prize winning play, which revolves around an investigation into the murder of an African American sergeant in a black army unit during World War Two. First screened in 1984, one year before Steven Spielberg directed The Color Purple, the first big budget
Hollywood film about African American history with a predominantly black cast, Jewison maintained that *A Soldier’s Story* was written in such a way that “it didn’t matter whether you were white or black when you were sitting in the audience.” Such assertions were complemented with his demand that the film be screened to desegregated cinemas in South Africa, and his decision to scrap the play’s ending, which informed the audience that the “221st Chemical Smoke Generating Company, all its officers and enlisted men, were wiped out in the Ruhr valley during a German advance in heavy fog,” and replace it with a handshake between black and white officers. American reviewers could thus praise the film’s ability to allow “non-WASP whites” to identify with black individuals who “penetrated” an American middle-class. However, other critics were less sanguine about Jewison’s inability to keep pace with a Black Consciousness Movement that emphasized black autonomy and agency. Philip French, for example, provided an eloquent indictment of its “rigid pro-establishment thinking...most of the film’s sympathy goes to a pathetic, Queeg-like monster, and none to the [militant black] man who struck back.”

French’s review of *A Soldier’s Story* appeared in a British newspaper after elections in the U.K in which the Conservative Party pronounced the end of racism by marketing “exotic” individuals as “new” national citizen-consumers. In a telling example of post-racial discourse, the Conservative Party placed two advertisements in the “ethnic press” in 1983 that suggested the categories of blackness and Britishness were mutually exclusive. Such examples of neoliberal multiculturalism opposed overt racial discrimination, especially legal systems that enforced racial apartheid, and adopted and appropriated the discourses of racial liberals, like Jewison, who found it hard to understand (“evil,” serious, and overt) racial segregation in the US or South Africa. Yet they could easily be combined with attempts to view cultural identity politics as a way to make money. So, while Jewison would continue to insist that his identity as a white Canadian director helped provide a critical degree of distance to black culture so that he could see the “real” human issues more “clearly,” the successes of African American directors such as Spike Lee and Robert Townsend in independent features in the 1980s meant that they could present an alternative means to frame the authenticity, clarity and marketability of African American culture.

According to Jewison, Spike Lee’s appearance on the *Today Show* on January 19th 1990 led to a letter-writing “campaign” against his direction of a movie based on Malcolm X’s life. I do not want to ignore Lee’s attempt to shame and intimidate white liberals who committed themselves, rhetorically at least, to forms of multiculturalism that valued the “authentic” voices of African Americans. However, we cannot solely rely on Jewison’s testimony about his fellow director’s attempt to make Hollywood executives an offer that they could not refuse. *Pace* Jewison, Lee did not argue that “only black American directors are capable of dealing with a black POV in American films.” In contrast, the African American director insisted that his objection to [Jewison] doing Malcolm X has nothing to do with admiring his other films, it’s that a white director couldn’t do this one. It would’ve been
fucked up and there would’ve been an outcry from the black community that no PR campaign could manage. I’ll never say that whites can make films only about whites and black only about blacks, but in some cases it makes a difference. You can’t say that Coppola’s being an Italian-American didn’t enhance the Godfather series. It did. And the people who talked to me about Malcolm wouldn’t have talked to a white director. They wouldn’t trust him.82

Many of the letters sent to Warner Brothers questioning Jewison’s appointment as director of a Malcolm X biopic were also more nuanced than Jewison’s description of a campaign to make him see that “a white man, however well-intentioned, could never know Malcolm X.”83 To give one example of letters that called for a director who would approach the topic of Malcolm X with insight, wit and imagination, John D. Van Fleet pointed out that “anyone—white, black, or green—who grew up in a black neighborhood or who has lived in one for many years, thereby being immersed in black culture, might be, in my opinion, an effective choice for director.”84 Shifting our attention away from debates about racial authenticity towards questions about ethics, aesthetics, and cultural sincerity and sensitivity is helpful for a number of reasons. Perhaps most importantly, it reminds us that Jewison did not only depart from the Malcolm X film project because he was “mau-maued” by a particular segment of the black community that opposed the choice of a white director. Nor did he graciously step aside just because Warner Brothers indicated that they would rather give a black director a shot. He ultimately left the project because he thought that the film’s script read like a “docu-drama,” and was unable to see how he could create a film based on Malcolm’s life that would attract a multiracial audience.85

After failing to direct a biopic of Nat Turner, Jewison turned to The Landlord, a project about a white liberal learning to love his black tenants. After his departure from a film project based on Malcolm X, Jewison decided to direct a film about white liberals opening up their home to a black child and working with the incarcerated ex-boxer, Rubin “Hurricane” Carter. Like X, Carter was a charismatic African American who wrote about the spiritual enlightenment he obtained in prison, and travelled outside the United States in order to share his message and learn from other cultures. Such comparisons were encouraged by the decision to cast Denzel Washington, who played Malcolm X in Lee’s biopic, as Rubin “Hurricane” Carter, and use a picture of Washington as Malcolm X in Carter’s jail cell. Yet whereas Lee’s film emphasized the importance of X’s pilgrimage to Mecca and connection to the black diaspora, Jewison’s film highlighted Carter’s relationship to selfless white Canadian liberals in the hopes of ensuring a “cross-over audience,”86 and worked with writers who pitched “a story of transcendence—a story of one who did not so much fight the system as transcend it, who answered hatred with love, who faced his own fragmented segments of personality and surrendered those which were full of violence and hate, even though they had kept him alive in prison.”87 Unsurprisingly, many reviews dismissed Jewison’s film as a boring, ideological product that was “righteously” and “relentlessly” liberal.88 Jewison’s “slightly condescending, old-school-liberal
slant” might have been suitable for concise television shows like Law and Order, the seemingly interminable police procedural and legal drama series that premiered in 1990. It seemed passé in a film that ran to 146 minutes (despite a number of changes to avoid the dangers of a “docu-drama” approach that tries “to tell all the truth, all the true facts and incidents”).

In the same year that Jewison confronted critics who considered him out of touch with the neoliberal visual culture established in critically acclaimed films, such as Pulp Fiction (Quentin Tarantino, 1994), that used irony and postmodern bricolage to talk about racial authenticity and racialized identities, Winks attempted to offer a stoic alternative to cultural productions that he linked to postmodernity and postcolonialism in the academic arena. In a book chapter about the future of Imperial History, written shortly before his death in 2003, he expressed his concerns about the legacy of affirmative action and “reverse discrimination,” and repeated his contention that historical work needed to be “objective, scholarly, based on sources.” Although he prized interdisciplinary teaching and intellectual curiosity, Winks found himself disoriented by the “haphazard” and “inaccessible” work of historians who cited Fanon and Gramsci in order to analyze “hegemonic discourse,” and insisted that radical writers were “didactic, blinkered by secularist or religious perspectives that do not admit to alternative questions, let alone alternative conclusions.” Revealingly, he also maintained that Fanon had been read “carelessly” by radicals who wanted to argue that all the imperialists were white and all the non-whites were victims.

Michael Banton’s work after 1975 has also maintained many tenets that were challenged by radicals before and after the liberal hour. He has asked radical students of race and ethnicity to avoid “double standards” and study the prejudice of the past as the “honest errors of honest men,” and avoid the “view that cultures of only European origin are racist and the forms taken by racial prejudice among black or brown peoples are neglected.” Furthermore, he has continued to assert that African Americans could not look back with pride “upon a long sequence of historical and cultural achievements” (as Germans were able to do after military defeats in 1918 and 1945), and he has critiqued Stuart Hall (as the “leader of the Cultural Studies approach”) for letting “politics interfere with scholarship.” This is not to say that Banton does not share Hall’s antipathy to neoliberal politicians who ask citizens of Britain and America to “abandon any conception of a moral community characterized by collective responsibility and public virtue, in favour of understanding of themselves as private individuals.”

Banton’s hopes to encourage greater debate between liberal and radical approaches to the study of race, ethnicity and rational choice theory were frustrated by educators who claimed that his work evinced an “underlying bitterness towards the radical camp.”

In the hopes of promoting further debate about the politics of intellectual work, I conclude this essay by scratching the surface of the recent work of Paul Gilroy and George Elliott Clarke. Although neither intellectual has extensively engaged with the creative artistry of Norman Jewison, they have provided counterpoints to the liberal humanism of Banton and Winks. Where Rohit Barot,
one of Banton’s former students, has recently praised Banton’s Kantian approach against the Hegelian approach of neo-Marxists like Hall.\textsuperscript{100} Paul Gilroy, one of Hall’s former students, has critiqued the continuing power of a Kantian moral edifice that supports a “well-stocked arsenal of resurgent liberalism” and recoils from the charge of politicization.\textsuperscript{101} Gilroy’s claim that “the humanities are still dominated by particular liberal and…sometimes ethnocentric assumptions about what counts as knowledge and where renunciation of particularity fits into the pursuit of truth,”\textsuperscript{102} as well as his comments about the limits of UNESCO-liberalism, can also be adapted to provide specific rejoinders to perspectives developed by Michael Banton, who produced a number of special reports for UNESCO and served on the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination from 1986 to 2001.\textsuperscript{103} Concurrently, George Elliott Clarke, a cultural critic who grew up as a “‘Baptist Marxist’, unsentimental and ‘radical’,” has produced critiques of liberalism in general and the “small-l liberal, American bias” of Winks’s history in particular.\textsuperscript{104}

**“FANON’S CHILDREN,” CIRCA 2000-12**

The specter of Fanon inspires the critical sorties of Gilroy and Clarke.\textsuperscript{105} Both men mourn the loss of anti-colonial intellectuals who encouraged black teenagers outside of the United States to dream about a Black Leftist International in the 1960s with Gilroy recounting his traumatic experiences at Yale University and the city of New Haven in the early 1990s—when he claimed that he had gone to America in search of a musical culture that no longer existed\textsuperscript{106}—and Clarke discussing the shock he experienced on the realization that an African American “sub-civilization” was “self-absorbed” when he taught at Duke University in the late 1990s.\textsuperscript{107} Yet both cultural critics distinguish their mourning from nostalgic or melancholic desires to recuperate the past in the present. Gilroy has moved beyond his caustic dismissal of the revolutionary conservatism of Afrocentricity by taking aim at neoliberal practices that publicize “debased” forms of the black public sphere. Sometimes this extends his critique of militarized homophilia—the “exultation of war as a space in which men can know themselves better and love one another legitimately in the absence of the feminine”—to semi-privatized spaces for sport that involve war minus the weapons.\textsuperscript{108} Indeed, his recent work has expressed his discomfort with the “Americo-centric image of the black public sphere recast in the image of an inner-city basketball court” as an “exclusively male stage for the theater and power in which sound is displaced by vision and words are generally second to physical gestures.”\textsuperscript{109} However, he is also interested in how we can articulate a healthier relationship between past, present and future and prominently features Sylvia Wynter’s systematization of Fanon’s ideas about epidermalization in the hopes of fostering further debate about what it means to be human.\textsuperscript{110} Similarly, Clarke has alluded to the politics and poetics of Wynter,\textsuperscript{111} and repeatedly engaged with the work of female authors and dramatists such as Dionne Brand, Djanet Sears and Trey Anthony in the hopes of promoting critical discussions about love and community.\textsuperscript{112} Alas, such connections between Clarke and Gilroy are often overlooked when Clarke challenges Gilroy’s
Black Atlantic for treating Canada as a “blunt irrelevance.” It simplifies Gilroy’s complex critique of anti-essentialism and, despite criticizing Canadians who can only name two or three African Canadian writers, does not name any contributors to Black British Cultural Studies other than “luminaries…such as Paul Gilroy and Stuart Hall.”

Scholars such as Marlene NourbeSe Philip and Rinaldo Walcott try to bridge the gap between Clarke’s vision of African Canadian Studies and a field of Black Canadian Diaspora Studies that suggests “that various local and outernational black geographies contribute to the production of space within the [Canadian] nation.” Yet while Philip Walcott and other interdisciplinary scholars have developed comparative and transnational analysis of Caribana in Toronto and the Notting Hill carnival in London, their work can also simplify Gilroy’s expansive vision of a Black Atlantic. For example, Walcott has replaced the metaphor of ships and docks Gilroy uses for a Black Atlantic culture with the metaphor of jogging for the “overland travel” between Black Canada and African America, and been unable to elucidate any of his Canadian case studies with empirical evidence from Black Britain. Walcott’s description of Kardinal Offishal’s “Bakardi Slang”, a seminal piece of Canadian rap music, in which Black Toronto translates hegemonic American phrases so as to cement itself “oppositionally to the nation and still articulate its diaspora connectiveness,” is one particularly striking example of how his work can use Gilroy’s theories without noting the specific contexts in which they emerged. For while Walcott’s work evokes Gilroy’s language about Smiley Culture, whose first single, “Cockney Translation” (1984), conveys a view of black diasporic and white Cockney languages as “genuinely interchangeable alternatives disrupting the racial hierarchy in which they are usually arranged,” it does not cite how Gilroy developed these ideas with reference to the politics and poetics of Black London.

My hope is that scholars in the camps of African Canadian Studies and Black Canadian Diaspora Studies, as well as those double agents that veer between both camps, continue to welcome opportunities to broaden their horizons and avoid Winks’s decision to limit the connections between Black Canada and Black Britain to one throwaway remark about British journals and magazines that “gave attention to Canada.” There are certainly encouraging signs in this direction. For example, Clarke had not read the work of Steve Biko—another activist-intellectual influenced by Frantz Fanon—before he learned that a Black British scholar had identified similarities between the rhetoric of Clarke and the South African Steve Biko. Yet once he was aware of Biko’s work, Clarke discussed the relevance of the South African intellectual to his internationalist reading of Trudeau’s after-party for the liberal hour. In a similar vein, Walcott has made important contributions to the African and Black diaspora with his insistence that historical archives only allow us to “play more carefully with another kind of trinity: history, memory and fiction.”

Walcott’s trinity is also worth invoking in order to unpack Norman Jewison’s autobiography, in which nostalgia for the liberal hour influenced the Canadian filmmaker’s attempts to play with sincere white fictions and remember
a career that largely ignored the history of Black Canadian and Black British communities. In his autobiography, first published in 2004, Jewison not only claims that he understood “the unfairness of segregation [and]...the trauma of being victimized” when he travelled to the south of the United States.\textsuperscript{123} He also contends that he was victimized after the liberal hour in the United States by black opposition to a white director bringing the life of Nat Turner, a black revolutionary icon, to the silver screen. In order to do so, Jewison highlights some sound bites from a debate involving James Baldwin and Ossie Davis that was staged in Los Angeles in 1967, as well as the conclusions of Scott French, a white historian who notes the importance of ideology as well as race in the representations of Nat Turner.\textsuperscript{124} He does not have the time, or inclination, to engage with the findings of black historians who criticized Styron’s interpretation of Turner and analyzed how ideology structures knowledge about “race.”\textsuperscript{125} Such a desire to seize and contest the position of victim against radical anti-racists can be placed in a productive dialogue with the comparative and international studies of Winks and Banton, writers who attributed their errors to the honest mistakes of honest men. Yet it can also be explored with reference to the critical reflections of writers such as Gilroy and Clarke who may, to paraphrase Fanon, be considered “honest intellectuals” who express “manifest contempt for profiteers and schemers.”\textsuperscript{126} Such Fanonian intellectuals not only suggest alternative expressions of convivial futures to liberal humanism, they also confront corporate visions of neoliberal multiculturalism and spurious definitions of narrow, “racial,” horizons.
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