

nological studies. The latter provide regional orientation to the later analyzed data. A chapter devoted to the description of that data also is included.

In sum, what can one say about *Lithics and Livelihood: Stone Tool Technologies of Central and Southern Interior British Columbia*? It is not a volume that you will want to snuggle up with in front of a warm fireplace on a cold winter's eve. It does, however, provide new perspectives on debitage analysis as well as some insight into the relationship of lithic technology and settlement pattern variability on the British Columbia Interior Plateau, and the purpose of the Diamond Jenness Memorial Series has been thus well served. Unfortunately, this volume also may hold the distinction of being the last of the Jenness-dedicated Mercury Series to be published in the present format with free distribution, according to G. MacDonald of the National Museum of Civilization.

*Simon Fraser University*

DAVID V. BURLEY

*Ethnic Conflict in Vancouver: An Empirical Study*, by R. A. H. Robson and Brad Breems. Vancouver: B.C. Civil Liberties Assoc., 1985. Pp. 345.

This is not a book on ethnic conflict in Vancouver (as the title suggests), but a research report on a selective sample of attitudes toward racism and prejudice primarily among South Asians in a single neighbourhood (South Vancouver). This research grew out of the Neighbourhood Action Projects sponsored by the B.C. Civil Liberties Association in Richmond and South Vancouver.

The basic rationale for this particular project, according to its authors, was to seek answers to the questions, "How frequently do members of minority groups experience ethnic incidents? What kinds of ethnic incidents are minority group members exposed to? Which minority group members are most likely to experience ethnic incidents? How hostile are members of the majority society towards minority groups?" The researchers claim that until this project was conducted, there were no hard data to enable them to provide reliable answers to questions concerning the type and frequency of ethnic incidents in Vancouver. Therefore, they "decided to undertake a well-designed study that would fill the gap in our knowledge." Yet we are not informed what exactly an "ethnic incident" may be. Even the authors admit that contradictory beliefs were held by

respondents concerning the types of frequencies of "ethnic incidents," probably due not only to differential experiences of the informants but also to differences in the definition of "racial incident" [*sic*] and "in deciding whether a given incident was ethnically motivated." It goes without saying that, good as the intentions of the researchers may have been to supply "hard data," a project is only as good as its methodological and conceptual framework, and the conceptualization of "ethnic [racial?] incidents" leaves a lot to be clarified. Later (not until Chapter 3) we are finally told that "ethnic incidents" range from racist graffiti to verbal abuse or gestures, being refused service or access to public areas, discrimination in the workplace, property damage and physical harm. Nor is a very clear distinction drawn between "minority groups" and "majority society"; the authors loosely define the latter as "a term used to designate those whose skin colour and values are similar to those of the predominant culture of English-Canadians."

Evidently this is essentially a student summer project financed by the Summer Student Employment Program of Canada Immigration and Employment. The student project supervisor, responsible for conducting the field work and tabulating the data, worked under the guidance of a senior sociologist and specialist in research methods at the University of British Columbia, Professor R. A. H. Robson, who originally conceived the project, analyzed the data and wrote much of the report.

The authors repeatedly stress the uniqueness of their study, which is questionable, although they do briefly acknowledge many studies that contributed to their understanding of ethnicity or of the issues with which they were concerned. This is rather difficult to ascertain, for several reasons: the report lacks a bibliography; the references included in the end-notes are sparse; many sources cited are rather dated; and the review of the history of ethnic settlement in Vancouver is at best cursory. Not that the researchers' intentions were not ambitious; they argue convincingly that if governments and other social institutions are to adopt policies and take actions aimed at reducing ethnic discrimination and hostility, it is essential first to have reliable information. Moreover, they point out, it will take a good deal of time to undertake research in an attempt to find more effective means of changing these hostile attitudes and to implement new techniques. Yet the authors' claim that "there have been very few attempts in Canada to secure reliable data" is highly questionable, given the plethora of ethnic research throughout Canada during the past couple of decades.

The survey upon which this study is based was a modified version of

the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (first developed in 1922-1939). Initially a random sample was to be taken among thirteen ethnic groups prevalent in South Vancouver and exhibiting wide variation in socio-economic status and residential concentration. Given the very limited budget for the project, it was impossible to utilize a stratified random sample covering all of Vancouver, although this would have been far more informative. Given the relatively heavy concentration of Indo-Canadians in South Vancouver, the decision was made to draw stratified random samples of this ethnic community as well as of the "majority society" living there. Utilizing the Blishen Socioeconomic Status Index (1976), each Indo-Canadian resident was given a score based primarily on occupation, and this score was then correlated with degree of residential concentration for a total Indo-Canadian population of 3,266, from which 392 randomly selected respondents were obtained and 294 finally interviewed (refusal rate of 3.9 percent). This Indian sample was biased in favour of male respondents, higher socioeconomic status, better education and relatively low residential concentration. The selection of the random sample representing the majority society (pop. 40,934) was limited to only one hundred (with a high refusal rate of 27.4 percent). The researchers appropriately caution that "gathering information from a random sample does not necessarily mean that the information so obtained is an exact representation of the information that one would obtain if one gathered it from the entire universe" (i.e., total population). This seems particularly true for such a small sample of the "majority society." The researchers admit that the range of errors in findings from this majority sample is greater than for the more representative Indo-Canadian sample; one in ten Indo-Canadians was interviewed compared to only one in four hundred majority society members.

The Indian respondents were interviewed about hostile or discriminatory treatment they had received from members of the majority society (but presumably not from other ethnic minority group members) during the past couple of years. Respondents were adults; children were excluded. Using a list of twelve ethnic groups, all respondents were asked whether they would or would not intermarry (or have their grown children intermarry) with them, have a close friend among them (or only as a casual speaking acquaintance), work closely with them, have them as neighbours (or prefer to have them live outside this neighbourhood), or like to prevent members of each group from immigrating into Canada. The danger inherent in this sort of attitudinal scale is obvious: it could put negative ideas into the head of the respondent.

Weak as the methodology is in some respects, let us now examine the findings of the study. Given the sampling technique, much of the study focuses on the correlation between socioeconomic status and minority concentration. The authors mention that South Vancouver contains sub-areas where the residential concentration of Indo-Canadians is the highest in Vancouver and that the region includes areas where people of Indian origin have developed commercial property. Yet the authors do not qualify correlation of ethnic residential concentration with ethnic commercial and institutional development (it is possible, of course, to have one without the other, or in widely separate locations).

A salient result obtained in the survey is that the highest proportion of East Indians (40.5 percent) reported experiencing name-calling during the past couple of years. However, there is no attempt made by the authors to analyze this interesting finding in the light of literature on ethnophobias as stereotypes. Among the respondents, 22.6 percent reported seeing racist graffiti; 13.6 percent had experienced personal property damage, 8.2 percent discrimination at work, 6.8 percent physical harm, and 4.4 percent refusal of service or public access. Distressing as these findings may be, it could be noted (and is not) that a majority — in fact, for most types of “ethnic incidents” a large majority of Indo-Canadian respondents — had not experienced such racism. To their credit, the researchers did determine exactly where the incidents occurred, precisely what constituted discrimination in the workplace, which occupations tended to experience the most discriminatory treatment, what form property damage takes, and so forth; there is ample detail in this fourth chapter on results obtained. Particularly interesting are the explanations given by the victims for hostile treatment and their responses to such actions. It is unfortunate, however, that throughout this section the blame for racist incidents is always placed ultimately on what the authors ambiguously call the “majority society”; no mention is made of the possibility of racist incidents occurring between various minority groups rather than simply between minorities and the majority. It is interesting to note that half (49.3 percent) of the East Indian respondents favoured corrective action by the Indo-Canadian community itself, compared to 40.9 percent by the majority society and 34 percent by the government (note that these categories are not mutually exclusive).

There is an ample section on the kinds of Indo-Canadians experiencing ethnic hostility. Characteristics related to victimization include: socioeconomic status, residential concentration, gender, age, country of origin, proficiency in English language use, frequency of wearing traditional

Indian clothing, education and religious beliefs. The problem with this type of analysis is that it seems as if the victim is being blamed for virtually inviting racism. For example, a recently immigrated poor Indian female with little education and speaking hardly any English might hypothetically be more likely to be subjected to racist acts. A more productive analysis would lie not in analyzing the victims' "peculiarities" but in attempting to fully comprehend the progenitors of racist acts.

In fact there are a lot of loose ends in this study. The authors find it difficult to account for the greater proportion of respondents exhibiting both high socioeconomic status and high area concentration who experienced refusal of service or access as well as discrimination at work. Something of an attempt is made, albeit not completely adequately, to explain why a substantially higher proportion of Indo-Canadian male respondents than female experience discrimination at work, physical harm, and property damage (don't males and females tend to share a lot of the same property?). One very suspicious finding is that respondents claiming proficiency in English tend to experience more racial attacks than those who are less proficient; again, those having the highest education reported the most discrimination at work.

The conclusions from the social distance scale majority sample are striking, but entirely in keeping with similar conclusions reached in other research: that East Indians are the least preferred for social interaction and the least preferred immigrants. This could have grave implications for South Asian refugees currently being admitted into Canada. Equally striking is the finding that fully a third of the majority respondents did not see any particular need to improve race relations. The most prevalent suggestion among this sample for improving race relations, proposed by almost a quarter, was for minority group members to assimilate into majority society (this, of course, would be impossible for so-called visible minorities such as Indo-Canadians, yet the authors fail to comment on this finding). Again, it is strange that low socioeconomic status seems to accentuate social distance, whereas higher socioeconomic status is related to less favourable attitudes toward immigration. And it is perplexing to learn that younger respondents show greater tolerance of ethnic differences and tend to favour relatively unrestricted immigration, being more inclined to blame the majority society for discrimination, yet exhibit as much social distance as do older respondents.

In sum, after an exhaustive (and quite confusing) analysis of results, the authors conclude that out of the nine socioeconomic characteristics utilized in the study, only four are clearly associated with more favour-

able attitudes toward minority group members and immigrants: high socioeconomic status, low Indo-Canadian area concentration, high level of educational attainment, and Canadian, British or Australian birth. The authors emphasize the helplessness of the Indo-Canadian minority, reporting that less than a third ever do anything about a racial attack; over two-thirds simply accept such treatment as part of living in Vancouver and think that little could be done to improve the situation.

One final word about the presentability of the report. Careful editing of this typed production should have corrected the scattered typographical errors, prevented some misleading if not erroneous statements and clarified confusing use of terminology. Perhaps the report is usefully structured; however, it seems redundant in reporting findings. Results are initially reported and selectively analyzed, then summarized again at the end of each section or chapter, only to be repeated yet again — a third time — in the concluding chapter.

While it is debatable whether the researchers have contributed either a unique study to the already large literature on ethnic relations in Canada or a well-designed and well-written study, some interesting data do emerge from this project. One hopes that continued research will be stimulated by this effort.

*University of Saskatchewan*

A. B. ANDERSON

*Vancouver's First Century: A City Album*, by Anne Kloppenborg, Alice Niwinski and Eve Johnson, with Robert Gruetter. Introduction by David Brock. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1985 (rev. ed.). Pp. 186.

*Vancouver's First Century: A City Album* is a popular illustrated history of Vancouver from 1860 to 1985. Originally produced in the mid-seventies as five special issues of the *Urban Reader*, this third hard-cover edition, expanded by thirty-two pages, has been published for the centennial. Using a family album format, the latest volume offers readers a 185-page chronology of assorted historical photographs, advertisements and anecdotes. Unfortunately, the editors' treatment of these rich sources can only be described as nostalgic and impressionistic. They fail to interpret or analyze the photographs and events and thus present readers with a limited account of their past.

*Vancouver's First Century* provides a remarkable selection of images