

asked what books had influenced him. He was puzzled by the related question of the philosophical influences on his life, "not really believing the proposition that ideas could have much to do with shaping a man's career. He looked at me with those bright, magnetic eyes, and his slow, worldly smile. 'Life made me,' said he finally" (p. 225).

Peter Waite's biography confirms that a great university president may have a deficient capacity for introspection, and may even share in a certain distaste for purely scholarly concerns that is typical of men of affairs. For the *Lord of Point Grey*, an interest in the past was an avoidable irrelevance. Poetry, music, and philosophy were also marginal to his intellectual and aesthetic existence.

Peter Waite brought humane sympathy, literary skills, and rigorous scholarship to this lucid biography. He makes it difficult for the reader not to share his respect and affection for Larry MacKenzie.

*University of British Columbia*

ALAN C. CAIRNS

*Distant Neighbours: A Comparative History of Seattle and Vancouver*, by Norbert MacDonald. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987. Pp. xxii, 259; illustrations, notes, bibliography, and index.

This is an admirable piece of work, succinct, well organized and illustrated, and very readable. It is also valuable; as a scholarly, substantive account of the two large North Pacific coastal cities, but especially as a joint historical analysis of Seattle and Vancouver: major cities close in location and environmental conditions, yet "distant neighbours" nevertheless in many aspects of their community development. The fact as well that Professor MacDonald skilfully interweaves their distinct records of experience, balancing the two and examining their similarities or differences with care and consistency, makes his volume a considerable success in the sometimes unsatisfying field of comparative urban history.

This success, to my mind, also stems from the author's decision to do a comprehensive though solidly grounded survey of his subject cities, and not to zero in on some special themes such as social mobility or patterns of élites — which can involve imposing work in theory and quantification and yet deliver little on the city as entity, leaving intricate results that may be more tautological than instructive. Mobility, élites, class and ethnic patterns are certainly treated in the book at hand often with good substantiation in detail, such as its study of civic business leaders, notably

documented from a large mass of probated wills. In the main, however, MacDonald traces a general set of themes relating to both cities, from land and transportation development to industrialization, suburbanization and political culture in the two growing urban communities that already had reached metropolitan stature by the First World War. No doubt my own approval here reflects some personal bias. Yet one still could claim that presenting a rounded story, over all, and not just abstracted slices, helps give this work its essentially convincing reality as a comparative analysis of Seattle and Vancouver through the past century and more of their history.

I need not go over its treatment further, which begins with frontier villages and winds up with the metropolises of the 1980s, having turned along the way on railroads, the Klondike rush and land booms, the impacts of war and depression, and then of consolidating urbanism in both the United States and Canada. But let me note as another merit of the general rather than "slice" approach adopted that Seattle and Vancouver are indeed seen throughout in clear terms of their larger human settings (politico-economic or socio-cultural); namely, in the American and Canadian nation-states as well as in the North Pacific physical region. We seldom lose sight of the play of wider factors upon the two particular urban places. And that points Professor MacDonald on to well-evaluated if broad conclusions about the shared and divergent traits of his two cities, duly summarized in his final chapter.

He starts these assessments with "the obvious but nevertheless basic fact" that Seattle and Vancouver existed "in separate independent nations" (though we are working on this), with consequences ranging from the role of public transport in the two city communities to their perceptions of the police. The "immensely bigger" American nation, however, not only produced earlier, more advanced development in its own Pacific Northwest, but brought Seattle facilities, markets, population, and capital beyond the scale of a young Vancouver. And though the C.P.R. decidedly built up the latter's position, the American-based city was enabled by its very base in the great republic to keep the lead in scale, on down to the present. Nonetheless, Vancouver today in popular view appears the bigger city — for being in Canada where it is third in metropolitan ranking, it has a distinction not vouchsafed to Seattle as but one more regional capital in a country of many giant urban accretions. This might be deemed a case of the well-known frog-to-puddle ratio, here at work to Vancouver's benefit. Still, MacDonald does indicate that "the sense of 'big city' Vancouver"

also arose from its geographically confined and concentrated central business district — a nice relating of human perception to physical fact.

There is no call to list all his major appraisals. But to cite a few more, he draws out the contrast (rooted in “national separation”) between Seattle’s heavy emphasis on a military-linked economy and its near lack in Vancouver. He marks the strong historic role of British immigrants in the Canadian city, as opposed to the greater European ethnic variety long found in the American community — where, more lately, a large black minority has much affected its urban society and relationships, while the British Columbian centre has instead acquired another sort of ambience deriving from its own Chinese minority. Then there are the differing influences of two differing federal systems upon the two cities, varying the inputs of political centralization or regionalism into their local existence; or the “greater awareness of public needs and public rights” in the Vancouver community, or, in conjunction, its weaker individualism and commitment to private enterprise than has been historically and characteristically manifested in Seattle. Some of these judgements may seem fairly evident already; others may inevitably sweep out to notional vagueness. Yet put together, and effectively demonstrated throughout the text, they provide plenty of stimulating concepts and insightful comparisons. In sum, Professor MacDonald’s volume shows in lucid, most engaging fashion why his selected, often very similar urban communities grew and stayed as “distant neighbours” on through their joint experience.

*University of Toronto, Emeritus*

J. M. S. CARELESS

*Part of the Land, Part of the Water: A History of the Yukon Indians*, by Catherine McClellan with Lucie Birckel, Robert Bringham, James Fall, Carol McCarthy and Janice Sheppard. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 1987. Pp. 328.

What a remarkable publishing achievement! *Part of the Land, Part of the Water* is at once informative, accessible, scholarly, beautifully illustrated, innovative, and finely crafted. Catherine McClellan, highly regarded Yukon anthropologist and main writer/co-ordinator for this volume, is deserving of the highest praise for her work on bringing this project to completion. Similarly, the Council of Yukon Indians and the Yukon Department of Education, co-sponsors of this book, to be used as a