

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*Social and Regional Factors in Canadian English: A Study of Phonological Variables and Grammatical Items in Ottawa and Vancouver*, by Gaelan Dodds de Wolf. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 1992. xiv, 184 pp. Tables. \$24.95 paper.

This book, published with the help of a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, contains seven chapters of very unequal length and a countless number of tables and charts which in several cases are repetitive or of dubious relevance to the main argument. The text itself is satiated with references to authors, making the reading of this book a very tedious affair. For instance, on page 5 one finds the following sentence: "Within a sociolinguistic framework, the interaction of these factors [factors influencing change and choice] in English has been discussed by Labov (1966b) for New York City, Wolfram (1969) for Detroit (Black English), Trudgill (1974) for Norwich, England, Macaulay (1977) for Glasgow, Woods (1979) for Ottawa, Milroy (1980) for Belfast, Gregg (1984) for Greater Vancouver, Petyt (1985) for West Yorkshire, and Clark (1985a, 1985b) for St. John's, Newfoundland." Indeed, for whom has this book been published? If it is for the dialectologist, the linguist, or the scholar of the English language, most of these references are superfluous, as are several passages of the book — for instance chapter IV about "Sociolinguistic Methodology." If it is for the average reader, the maze of phonetic and phonological representations in the various tables and charts and the use of linguistic terminology without explanation will be a definite stumbling block. The precise purpose of this book remains a mystery.

The substance of the book is based on two unpublished sociodialect surveys, one by H. Woods, *A Sociodialectology Survey of the English*

*Spoken in Ottawa: A Study of Sociological and Stylistic Variation in Canadian English*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1979, and the second by R.J. Gregg, *Final Report to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada on "An Urban Dialect Survey of the English Spoken in Vancouver,"* 1984. From these two studies, de Wolf has selected *eight* phonological variables and *twenty-three* grammatical items. The phonological variables include the voicing of intervocalic [t], for example, in tomato, the variable *ing*, some of the so-called Canadian diphthongs, etc. . . . In neither of the two surveys quoted above can one find data elicited from *actual* conversations. Lists of single words, pictures, and the reading of passages are used. Some have argued that the reading style, in some cases, is quite close to the actual use of language, however, it is not *actual use*. Examples of the grammatical items are the present perfect standard variants: drunk, lain, proven; the use of agreement with "be," "there is, there are"; "between" + object pronoun (between J. and me or I), etc. . . . These grammatical items were tested through elicitation frames. Here again, the point must be made that it is not *actual use*, but *reported use*. It is from these very restricted data, gathered in two Canadian locations, Vancouver and Ottawa, using a methodology that has serious limitations, that the author based her conclusions on "Language Use in Canadian English," which is the title of the last chapter. The conclusions are certainly not modest. They cover *Canadian English language* use according to sex, age, socio-economic status, and regions. Many conclusions are also supported by percentages. One wonders if these percentages can justify some of the sweeping statements, for instance about gender and age in Canada: "The higher the score for women over forty when compared with that of the previous style suggests once more a heightened awareness of language use or, . . . a conservatism derived from greater linguistic insecurity" (p. 63).

De Wolf has a great admiration for the work of W. Labov. She writes, "Labov's seminal New York City research launched a branch of sociolinguistics wherein theoretical observations and methodological analyses are based on sound sociological and statistical techniques" (p. 1). Nobody would deny that Labov's influence on the study of social dialects has been immense, mainly because he was the first to show that seemingly random linguistic behaviour can be patterned. However, the response to other aspects of the Labovian analysis has not been uniformly positive. He has been criticized for making unwarranted, sweeping generalizations about the nature of linguistic

variation. (For instance, Hans Kurath, "The Investigation of Urban Speech," *Publication of the American Dialect Society* 49: 1-7, 1968). In other words, care must be exercised when drawing general conclusions from small samples. Reading some of de Wolf's conclusions — for instance, "Cultural and linguistic heterogeneity is recognizably present in the national speech community. Within this variable framework, an underlying uniformity in Canadian English is expressed through an overall consensus both of majority preference and of educated usage with respect to a large number of salient linguistic items, and through the recurrence across location of social factors significant to linguistic variability" (p. 151) — one can rightly wonder if these affirmations are based on data presented in the book.

The author uses the word "standard" quite frequently, as in "standard value" (pp. 49, 57, 63, 76, 83, etc.). This raises an interesting question: Is there a Canadian English standard use? De Wolf does not deal directly with this question, although she often refers to a "standard." In one section, however, she gives some indication of what "standard" means for her. For phonological variables, the conservative English orthography will be considered as the standard form (p. 49). For syntactic items, the standard is that expressed either through the majority usage, or, in the case where such usage has recently shifted or is currently shifting, the formerly prevalent or traditional variant of the standard British English form" (p. 4). Such subjective and *a priori* decisions are, to say the least, surprising in a book which pretends to be based on the statistical analysis of data (p. 41). It could probably be said that no one dialect is recognized as standard in Canada simply because no one city or area dominates the political, economic, and cultural life of the country, and therefore no one dialect is recognized as standard by the society at large. What are the tendencies of Canadian English? Do speakers of Canadian English follow either a British or American English model? Due to the paucity of her data, de Wolf has very little to say about this important question. In her last chapter, she makes the following statement: "Although there are examples of uncertain usage, the traditionally standard grammatical variants of British English are strongly evidenced in Canada, despite the influence of the American model. . . ." (p. 150). Although this statement might be true, I have failed to see any justification for it in the data and the analysis presented in this book.

In spite of these remarks, this book raises some challenging questions and will certainly encourage more research on Canadian English. It is highly regrettable that Canadian Scholars' Press has not

provided more guidance regarding the content and the organization of this book.

*The University of British Columbia*  
*Aichi Shukutoku University*

BERNARD SAINT-JACQUES

*British Columbia Reconsidered: Essays on Women*, edited by Gillian Creese and Veronica Strong-Boag. Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers in association with The Centre for Research in Women's Studies and Gender Relations at the University of British Columbia, 1992. x, 451 pp. \$21.95 paper.

Collections of previously published material provide an excellent opportunity to assess the development of a field. This is true with respect to *British Columbia Reconsidered*. It consists of twenty-two articles published between 1980 and 1991, divided into six sections: pioneering, politics, domestic life, culture, work and poverty, and one excellent bibliographical essay. The introductory essay by the editors places the articles which follow within the context of previous examinations of British Columbian society and points out that few, if any, of these examinations took gender into account. The editors describe the developing intricacies of studies on women, how researchers are becoming more sensitive to the interrelationship between gender, race, class, etc., and how these researchers are revising accepted theories on women's oppression in light of the experiences of women who have remained outside the mainstream of Canadian society. Not all the articles exhibit that sensitivity, but this reflects the rapidly changing field more than any intransigence on the part of the authors.

What also stands out in this collection is the breadth of work being done in women's studies in general and on British Columbia women in particular. For example, the pioneering section consists of two articles which taken together reveal the variety of experiences of women living in isolated areas of mid-nineteenth century British Columbia. The article by Sylvia Van Kirk examines women in the Cariboo Gold Rush, certainly an event not ignored in the traditional historiography of B.C. But what Van Kirk has revealed is the involvement of women on this frontier in a multitude of roles. The politics section follows with four studies on the early efforts of women to gain the franchise, the role of Dorothy Gretchen Steeves and Grace Mac-

Innis in the CCF, the modern difficulties of women in political parties in B.C., and Sechelt women and the issue of self-government from their perspective. What emerges from this section is the reality of solitudes which separates many women. The section on domestic life consists of five essays, all of which reveal the breadth of topics that only begin to make up a study of this vast area: domestic training in schools, the changing experience of childbirth, life in the suburbs, the power which comes to women in some Native societies because of their mothering responsibilities, and the violence that seems to be part of so many domestic situations. All these studies expose the complexity of what early analysts referred to as the private sphere and the difficulty of generalizing women's experiences. The section on culture and work, too, highlights the tension between various group experiences of particular women and the position of women as a collective separate from men.

The essays in *British Columbia Reconsidered* reflect the changing approaches of scholars both to research on women and to the experiences of women. An example of the first is the increasing emphasis on oral tradition. It provides immediacy and a reality to topics which might otherwise not have existed. This is particularly true in Melody Hessing's study of the role of office conversation among women who are balancing both home responsibilities and paid employment and in Sheila Baxter's study of the poverty experienced by women. With respect to the actual experiences of women, what starts to emerge is a tension between variety and standardization. As scholars expand their areas of research, the diversity of women's experiences is revealed. At the same time, there does seem to be an underlying thrust in the society to standardize those experiences. For example, the introduction of domestic science in schools as studied by Barbara Riley reveals that increasingly domestic labour was to approach an ideal norm. Even childbirth came under this conforming force.

For anyone desiring an introduction to the work being done in women's studies, this collection would be an excellent beginning. It reveals how the study of women can change received interpretations of a society, in this case the development of British Columbia. It introduces the reader to the remarkable variety of topics that scholars have been probing and continue to probe. Some of these topics are traditional and some force the reader to think about the nature of what it is we do in our daily lives. More questions are asked than answered, but this is as it should be. More topics come to mind than are covered — where are women on the right in this study, investigations of women in science,

women in the arts, or analyses of gendered language? That this collection may stimulate the expansion of more research is something about which all the contributors should be proud.

University of Waterloo

WENDY MITCHINSON

*Law for the Elephant, Law for the Beaver: Essays in the Legal History of the North American West*, edited by John McLaren, Hamar Foster, and Chet Orloff. Pasadena and Regina: Ninth Judicial Circuit Historical Society and Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1992. ix, 322 pp. \$24.00 paper.

Writing in 1979, historian J. M. S. Careless bemoaned the explosion of work on regional interests, observing that “[l]imited identities threaten to take over and settle the matter of a Canadian national identity by ending it outright, leaving perhaps a loose league of survivor states essentially existing on American outdoor relief.”<sup>1</sup> Just over a decade later, in the wake of the failed Meech Lake constitutional accord, one of his graduate students, Michael Bliss, argued (in, appropriately enough, the 1991 Creighton Lecture at the University of Toronto) that Careless’s prediction was close to being realized. The “sundering of Canada,” Bliss suggested, was in large part due to the diminution and actual loss of a national sensibility, something Canadian historians had contributed to by pursuing their own increasingly specialized research. “The situations of interest to historians now tend often towards the private and personal,” Bliss wrote. “This is so true it’s become a cliché: political history has been out, social and personal history have been in.” “Really,” he asked, quoting Jack Granatstein, “who cares?”<sup>2</sup>

If the essays contained in *Law for the Elephant, Law for the Beaver* are any indication, all of us should. This collection of papers given at the transboundary conference on the legal history of the West and Northwest of North America in 1991 would seem to represent just the kind of historical writing Bliss *et al.* have criticized: not only is it social history — dealing with topics like violence, ethnic and aboriginal groups, and legal culture — but it is also social history of a specialized

<sup>1</sup> J. M. S. Careless, “Limited Identifies — Ten Years Later,” *Manitoba History* 1 (1980): 3.

<sup>2</sup> Michael Bliss, “Privatizing the Mind: The Sundering of Canadian History, the Sundering of Canada,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 26(1991-92): 6,11.

kind (the law) and of a delimited place that does not coincide with national boundaries (the North American West). However, this anthology illustrates how social history can illuminate the pasts of both nation and region; and in doing so, also reveals the limitations of the existing national and regional frameworks in understanding the past as well as suggesting a new one — one that animates what American scholars have dubbed “the new Western history.”<sup>3</sup>

Uniting these new western historians is their fundamental repudiation of Frederick Jackson Turner’s frontier thesis. Avoiding even the use of the term “frontier,” these historians emphasize the cultural diversity of the West, rather than the homogeneity and sexism implicit in the Turnerian notion of the “new man,” noting the persistence and resistance of Native peoples, as well as the folkways of various immigrants to the region. Rather than portraying western history as an epic battle, pitting man against nature, these revisionists have given us a new story; one that conceptualizes European settlement in terms of the extension of state power and the collective actions of a variety of cultural groups while still recognizing the prescriptive and indeed mythological power of individualism in structuring public policy and private behaviour. Moreover and finally, the new western history also acknowledges the ideological dimension of individualism, recognizing the central role the myth of the self-made man played in sustaining commercial and industrial capitalist enterprise while simultaneously masking its corporate form and the environmental destruction that followed in its wake.

John Phillip Reid’s introductory essay, “The Layers of Western Legal History,” suggests that the law provides a useful focal point for many of these aspects of the new western history, and the subsequent pieces that follow prove him to be correct. Hamar Foster’s work on labour relations in the Hudson’s Bay Company, Paul Tennant’s and Stephen Haycox’s pieces on Aboriginal rights in British Columbia and Alaska respectively, and John Wunder’s exploration of anti-Chinese violence in the American West all bear testimony to the ongoing significance of cultural diversity as an animating principle of social relations in the North American West. As well, Foster’s essay, along with those by Kenneth Coates and Bill Morrison, John McLaren,

<sup>3</sup> On the New Western history, see for instance the essays by Patricia Nelson Limerick, Gerald Thompson, Michael P. Malone, Elliott West, and Brian W. Dippie in Patricia Nelson Limerick, Clyde A. Milner, and Charles E. Rankin, eds., *Trails: Toward a New Western History* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1991), as well as William Cronon, George Miles, and Jay Gitlin, “Becoming West: Toward a New Meaning for Western History,” in Cronon, Miles, and Gitlin, eds., *Under an Open Sky: Rethinking America’s Past* (New York, 1992).

David Percy, and Christian Fritz, also illustrate the degree to which the western periphery was integrated into various spheres of metropolitan influence: Foster reveals that both the London Governors and Committee of the Hudson's Bay Company and Russian authorities in St. Petersburg were kept apprised and took an active interest in the goings-on in distant Fort Vancouver and even more distant Fort Stikine on the Alaska Panhandle; according to Coates and Morrison, the Alaska Highway was a site of struggle between two sovereign powers; and in separate pieces, McLaren, Percy, and Fritz show how western judges, legislators, and politicians were both aware of, drew on, and modified jurisprudence outside their own regions in framing both common and statute law, and in drafting state constitutions. Finally, the extent to which social relations and, more specifically, conflict might better be conceptualized in collectivist rather than individualist terms and as an outcome of the extension of state and corporate capitalist power is suggested by both Richard Maxwell Brown and R. C. Macleod.

Together, then, these essays reveal that the distinctions between regional and national histories as well as between public (i.e., "political") and private (i.e., "social and personal") ones — distinctions which underlie the criticism Bliss, Careless, and Granatstein level against current historical writing — are misleading, if not actually false. Neither region nor nation can be considered apart from the other; and if by politics we mean state power, then the private becomes less distinguishable from the public.

Though *Law for the Elephant, Law for the Beaver* reflects many of the approaches and themes of the new western history, it also takes that body of scholarship one step further. As the subtitle of the conference suggested, both the conference organizers and participants believe that "region" can transcend the geopolitical entity known as a "nation," and, moreover, that region, thus redefined, can be the more significant and meaningful unit of historical analysis. Native peoples provide only the most obvious example of the limitations or using "nation" as a unit of analysis. Theirs were nations not bound by lines on a European map. However, the essays in this collection dealing with the non-Native population also demonstrate the same thing: for instance, there was, according to Macleod, more variation in the nature and frequency of violence in what became Canada than between Canada and the United States; and whereas the legal ideas regarding how the Chinese should be treated or how water laws should work moved readily across the forty-ninth parallel, the Rockies

proved a more formidable, but not insurmountable, barrier. In terms of sensibility and ideology, then, community and polity could be two very different things.

Despite the valuable contribution this anthology makes to regional as well as legal history, it is not without its problems. As with all collections, this one is rather uneven in its quality. Meriting special notice are the pieces by Tennant, Foster, McLaren, and Fritz. All, however, suffer from a common shortcoming, albeit to greater or less degrees: a failure to make the conceptual and historiographical connections like the ones I have discussed more explicit and to draw out their significance. Though it is, as John Phillip Reid argues in his lead article, important simply to get the narrative down, that is not enough: for if western historians — and certainly legal historians of the West — are to reach a wider audience (even a wider academic one) and to answer the question of “who cares?” in a satisfactory manner, they will have to make those wider connections.

*Simon Fraser University*

TINA LOO

*Community, Environment and Health: Geographic Perspectives*, edited by Michael V. Hayes, Leslie T. Foster, and Harold D. Foster. Western Geographical Series, Volume 27. Victoria: Department of Geography, University of Victoria, 1992. xxiv, 411 pp. Maps, tables, illus. \$29.00 paper.

This is a collection of edited papers from a symposium whose themes were the spatial distribution of disease, geophysical correlates of disease, and the multi-faceted aspects of health care planning, policy, and delivery. These are not just papers by medical geographers. In his preface, Michael Hayes states that the book is an attempt to build a better understanding of the determinants of health and “is a step in the direction of creating a common discourse among persons interested in a richer appreciation of human health and its influences” (p. vi). Good, but I wish he had taken the seventeen chapters and written an integrating introduction to this eclectic selection of articles. Each chapter has its own introduction and conclusion, but they vary tremendously in quality.

The book begins with two articles on mapping; the first is mapping of mortality as done by the British Columbia Division of Vital

Statistics, and the second is on cancer mapping as done by the B.C. Cancer Agency. Both articles are useful reminders of the indeterminacies of mapping mortality data. Both conclude a theoretical section with a series of selected maps using B.C. data over various temporal and spatial scales. The purpose of the exercise of mapping is to help target health promotion/prevention programs at the local community level, according to L. T. Foster *et al.*, but this theme is interrupted by the next series of articles that attempt to correlate disease to the environment.

Harold Foster's article on associations between disease and soil quality reminds me of a fishing expedition into a sea of correlations and collinearity. His discussion uses only U.S. data, but Berkel and Bako's article on selenium and cancer in Alberta is more robust. Selenium deficiency, according to the literature, is related to cancers of the large intestine, but their Alberta data showed inconclusive results. The usual problem in such studies is the choice of a geographical unit; larger areas mask local variation and small units have the "small number problem." There was no discussion in the article of alternative ways of using administrative units to define areas, such as by natural physical regions. This may be a reflection of an outdated and selective literature review that allowed the author to make this questionable statement: "Table 1,4 ignores hereditary, or genetically determined, cancers. In the authors' opinion, however, heredity most likely contributes relatively little to the total cancer problem" (p. 73). The next article by Ian Norie discusses water hardness, cancers, and the protective role of selenium. He discusses digestive cancers in China in a paragraph that is almost identical to H. Foster's paragraph on the same discussion.

The last two articles in this environmental group, one on schizophrenia and the other on amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), bring into play the role of genetic predisposition to those illnesses. In the case of schizophrenia, however, there is also a possibility of acquiring that illness from factors such as head injuries and obstetrical complications, or from chemical damage incurred from neurotoxic culprits such as alcohol, drugs, and organic solvents (pp. 132-33). Environmental factors may also play a role in ALS. There may be links between ALS and "heavy metals lead and mercury, milorganite fertilizer, and increased milk consumption" (p. 176). The last two papers raise more questions than they answer, but they are necessary questions.

Michael Dear and Lois Takahashi broaden the definition of environmental factors to include the social theory of illness and health, as it applies to the homeless in the U.S. This article and the article by Isabel

Dyck on the health care experiences of immigrant women are strong articles that apply the agreed-upon holistic concepts of health to actual practice. It is a lack of this approach that Michael Hayes bemoans in his article on the failure of health promotion schemes in Canada: “. . . the spirit of its rhetoric has not been translated into action . . .” (p. 223). In a later article, co-authored with Clyde Hertzman, Hayes argues for a way to measure the health of a community based on social infrastructure over disease-based risk factors. Their scheme would support local communities which have specific groups of indicators. Both Dyck, in regard to immigrant women, and Sharon Manson Willms in her article on housing of persons with HIV also argue the need for community-based strategies. Most of the above articles talk around and about health promotion, which is the subject of an article on public policy and smoking by Hollander *et al.*

The last few articles are a disparate group. In chapter 12, Thouez discusses ways that northern communities can properly meet the health needs of the Inuit and the Cree populations. Lillian Bayne discusses why health services planning in the Greater Vancouver Regional Hospital District must be improved. Chapter 16 is an excellent literature review on medical and surgical procedural variations in Canada. The final chapter by Jonathan Mayer compares the Canadian and American health care systems as “cultural artifacts,” and argues that health care systems are “socially constructed and culturally interpreted sets of institutions” (p. 400).

There are many worthy articles in this book, but they would have benefited from stronger editing and organizing. Although the purpose of the symposium upon which these articles are based was to explore diverse health issues from diverse research approaches, the book would have been much better had it concentrated solely on the very current issue of community health.

*Wilfrid Laurier University*

JODY DECKER

*Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes: The Anthropology of Museums*, by Michael M. Ames. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1992. xvi, 212 pp. \$39.95 cloth.

*Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes* is a collection of reflective essays on anthropology and museums, with excursions into anthropology and

everyday life. It began its existence in 1986 as *Museums, the Public and Anthropology* and its fourteen chapters include six from that earlier version. Both books seek to explore the purpose of museums and anthropology and the relations between anthropology and the people it reports upon, and to locate museums within their social, political, and economic contexts. More than anything, the essays, as Professor Ames writes, "document my own struggles to achieve a practical understanding of a cultural complex in which I was also actively involved, to relate experiences to critique and then to action" (p. 4). It is, then, a subjective book, reflecting an apparent crisis in museum anthropology that itself reflects a similar crisis in anthropology as a scholarly discipline and a crisis in Native/non-Native relations in the Americas and elsewhere.

Michael Ames is director of the Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia and Professor of Anthropology at that university. His field of anthropological speciality is outside North America, but he writes here as a Canadian museologist concerned largely with the Northwest Coast and as one who has to direct a major Canadian anthropological museum through the pitfalls of contemporary politics. His museum has been almost entirely free of public controversy, perhaps because he has an acute eye for controversies elsewhere: the Lubicon Cree boycott of the Glenbow Museum's "The Spirit Sings" exhibition, the unfortunate fracas over the Royal Ontario Museum's "Into the Heart of Africa" exhibit, and even the Robert Mapplethorpe imbroglio receive his attention. One has the feeling that Ames is a good institutional politician, very aware of the various, often conflicting constituencies that he discusses. This sensitivity gives strength to his essays.

Ames presents some of the most thoughtful and provocative essays available on the difficulties facing contemporary anthropological museums. His piece on "The Definition of Native Art" uses a review of Bill Holm's exhibition on "The Art and Times of Willie Seaweed" to deal with the apparently thorny question of whether Northwest coast artifice is artifact or art. Should they be exhibited as ethnological pieces within their religious and mythological meanings (that is, within their context as anthropological artifacts) or as singular examples of art which stand by themselves and communicate their own terms as creative achievements (that is, as "fine art" objects)? Ames uses Holm and Seaweed to demonstrate that Native art is both, that "good work can be viewed both ways, singularly as artifact-in-context or as art-standing-by-itself," as "creative work possessing both local

history and comparative significance" (p. 75). Ames thus cuts through much of the restricted vision from both sides of a quite silly argument to arrive at a common-sense conclusion.

More might be said. Why need decorative and applied art be "only decorative" (p. 72)? Why need it be relegated to a status inferior to "fine art"? To do so forces many to feel obliged to boost Native art, much of which can only be seen as applied and decorative (what else is a richly carved halibut hook?), up to the vaunted status of "fine art" so that it, its practitioners, and its scholars can have some extra prestige and status. Surely the art of, say, Frank Lloyd Wright, Josef Hoffmann, or Dale Chihuly need not be disparaged as somehow inferior to an easel painting or forced to fit into an inappropriate "fine art" category with the intention to enhance its prestige. Egyptian, medieval or early Renaissance art share many generic characteristics with "tribal" art; museums have been showing these for centuries without the same tortuous problems. If one abandoned the assumption of "only" decorative art, then the torture would be avoided in "tribal" art as well. Do medievalists have the same problem with a chalice or a crucifix as anthropologists and art historians seem to have with a feast bowl or a crooked-beak-of-heaven mask? I think not.

Another excellent essay is "How Anthropologists Help to Fabricate the Cultures They Study," in which Ames returns to a theme he dealt with very thoughtfully in *BC Studies* more than a decade ago.<sup>1</sup> Here Ames relates a little of the role which museums, especially his own Museum of Anthropology and the Royal British Columbia Museum, have played in promoting and legitimizing contemporary Native art and artists, even stimulating the Indian demand for artistic products, and of how the line between museum anthropologists and Indian has blurred, with each acculturating to the standard of the other. This is but an example of one of Ames's sub-texts: that contemporary anthropological museums must work in collaboration with Native communities which are now both clients and patrons of anthropology museums.

This point forms part of another excellent little piece on "How Anthropologists Stereotype Other People." Museums reflect, as much as do books, the changing images of other cultures that anthropologists have constructed. Ames is conscious of this at his own museum, and he presents, from his own experience, a Haida view of how museums "don't tell us our view." Indians now wish to be free from glass boxes, to secure control over their own past. Director Ames tells us that we "need to listen," yet not necessarily capitulate.

<sup>1</sup> *BC Studies* 49 (Spring 1981): 3-14.

I do not believe that the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology, for example, should attempt to present the "native point of view," which it could never do properly anyway, whether by reconstructed contextualist exhibits or by other means. It is more important for a museum to concentrate on what it can do best, which is to present its own point of view as a professional institution, recognizing the limitations that implies, and to work in partnership with the museums and cultural organizations of the "Native" or indigenous peoples. (pp. 57-58)

Unfortunately, such anchors are too rare. Ames pulls too many punches, implies too often what he might have stated outright, and restrains himself here when he did not elsewhere. His remarks on "The Spirit Sings" controversy are placid and unreflective of the vigorous stand he took, against Bruce G. Trigger, in the pages of *Culture* in 1988. There he claimed for a museum an autonomy that was "the right to govern itself and to choose its own causes," to be free to reject the attempts by interest groups to impose their ideologies and restrictions.<sup>2</sup>

The essays are, moreover, burdened with an ironic paradox. One of Ames's central themes is that "museums are products of the establishment and represent the assumptions and definitions of that establishment" (p. 21). They play "an important role in expressing and authenticating established values and images of society and in affirming the subordination of other values and images" (p. 24). This is, of course, something of a truism, though Ames's presentation makes it sound a little simplistic, leaving little room for historical chance, idiosyncrasy, or individuality, factors which have certainly worked within the history of museums. They continue to work now. A paradox here is that Ames's essays themselves reflect the current values of his own society as transparently as any earlier museums have. The problems are current and the prescriptions, when given, are those generally characteristic of today's anthropological establishment. Even the language — the book is laced with "appropriation," "empowerment," "capitalism," "discourse," "hegemonic," "the politics of representation," and "the question of voice" — is self-consciously *au courant*. If ever "hegemony" was part of the "discourse," it is within these pages.

A second paradox is that, while advocating the autonomy of museums from interest groups, Ames here bends a bit. "Museums must now," he writes, "be more sensitive to national, ethnic, and local

<sup>2</sup> "The Liberation of Anthropology: A Rejoinder to Professor Trigger's 'A Present of Their Past'" *Culture* 8, 1 (1988): 83.

interest, and consider more carefully the prospects of 'repatriating' parts of their collections to the ethnic or national communities from which they were taken"; they must help "populations at risk" (p. 104). And yet Ames's critical stance does not leave him. In a candid aside, he writes that museums "would never dare to subject Native peoples themselves, or the contemporary establishment, to objective scrutiny or critical assessment." Native people, he goes on, "are equally sacred to academic ethnologists" (p. 109). This reveals perhaps too much.

The autumn 1992 issue of *BC Studies* carried an incisive article skewering the Crown's anthropological expert in *Delgamuukw v. B.C.* for her testimony,<sup>3</sup> but Ames's statements are equally troubling. They lend credibility to James A. Clifford's important critique<sup>4</sup> — and force one to ponder whether Mr. Justice McEachern may not have been partly correct, if for the wrong reasons. Such points certainly do complicate the role of the curator, anthropologist, historian, and others involved in "the Indian business," which is precisely Ames's point.

There is a great deal in *Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes* to provoke and stimulate the mind. Museums are significant scenes of culture, ideas, and ideologies. One can disagree with some of what Ames writes, and even with some of his concerns, but the book does tell us a great deal about the problems of anthropology and its museums, sometimes in ways perhaps unintended.

*Simon Fraser University*

DOUGLAS COLE

*The Alaska Highway in World War II: The U.S. Army of Occupation in Canada's Northwest*, by K. S. Coates and W. R. Morrison. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992. xix, 309 pp. Maps, illus. \$39.95 cloth.

There has already been a substantial body of scholarly writing on the Alaska Highway. In addition to a host of articles (conveniently listed in this book's bibliography), papers from a conference celebrating the fortieth anniversary of its construction were published by the Univer-

<sup>3</sup> Dara Culhane, "Adding Insult to Injury: Her Majesty's Loyal Anthropologist," *BC Studies* 95 (Autumn 1992): 66-92.

<sup>4</sup> "Introduction: Memoir, Exegeses," in James A. Clifford, ed., *The Invented Indian: Cultural Fictions and Government Policies* (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 1990): 1-28, especially 13-14.

sity of British Columbia Press in 1985, the papers from another conference marking the fiftieth anniversary are to appear in 1993, and now Professors Coates and Morrison have produced a monographic study that, from its title, purports to tell the whole story.

It doesn't. Instead, what the authors have given us is a book that ought to have been called "Some Social Aspects of the Construction and Operation of the Alaska Highway in World War II." They say almost nothing about the diplomacy that led to the highway's construction, and they provide no information whatsoever on the way Malcolm MacDonald, the British High Commissioner, pressed Ottawa into watching what the Americans were up to in the North; indeed, MacDonald is not even listed in the index. The authors offer almost nothing on the military situation that in early 1942 made building the highway seem so necessary, and when they do talk about military questions, either wartime or postwar, they reveal both the blinding sureness of hindsight in assessing the Japanese threat and an inability to understand military organization (see their table 16 for a perfect example of the latter). Nor do they say anything much about wages, either military or civilian — a serious omission. Moreover, their prose is too often breathless, and their proofreading is dreadful (e.g., General A. G. L. MacNaughton, *Ambassador* Pierrepont Moffat, and Akira Friye). This is unfortunately yet another book the University of Toronto Press failed to edit.

Nonetheless, there is much here that is useful and new. Coates and Morrison are the undoubted experts on the history of the North, and here they have done original research into a host of new areas. They offer intelligent discussion of the problems of maintaining law and order in a vast and under-policed region that was suddenly transformed by the arrival of thirty thousand foreigners. The RCMP's strength in the North was derisory, the U.S. Army's Military Police were ordinarily insensitive, and there were the inevitable problems when men sought sex and liquor or a fast buck. All these subjects are examined in detail and for the first time. (The authors must be congratulated for their restraint in not entitling their chapter on sexual relations, *Love in a Cold Climate*.) They are similarly original in their study of the impact of the war and the highway on Whitehorse, a town that boomed from nothing before the war to a population of more than ten thousand in 1943 and then sank back to some 3,600 in 1946. Dawson City, however, had no boom at all, and the tensions between the two towns were severe. And they offer a useful assessment of the environmental impact of the Alaska Highway's construction.

Where the authors are most innovative is in their attempt to put the American intrusion into the Canadian North into the context of American military occupations around the world. The war, they argue, was the first stage in the Americanization of the world that we live with today, and our North felt many of the same effects. American energy and drive, American profligacy, American games and habits made their impact felt, and the territories could never be the same. Still, when the expected postwar tourism failed to materialize, in part at least because the Alaska Highway was in wretched condition, the American impact was slowed.

This is a good book, despite its flaws. It is unfortunate that it is not the *complete* history of the Alaska Highway, but that subject can probably await the seventy-fifth anniversary.

*York University*

J. L. GRANATSTEIN