

Book Reviews

***Gardens, Covenants, Exiles: Loyalism in the Literature of Upper Canada/ Ontario.* By Dennis Duffy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982. Pp. x, 160. \$25.00 Paper, \$10.00.**

One of the results of Northrop Frye's continuous concern with the native literature, particularly as demonstrated in the brilliant, concluding essays in the two editions of *The Literary History of Canada*, has been a few ventures into cultural history by some of his followers. In most of his work Frye was not sympathetic to cultural history. History, which is continuous, progressive, concerned with external events, was not, he implied, helpful to the study of the highest literature, which is discontinuous, circulatory, existing in its own transcendent world. But Frye made an exception for a young and developing literature since such a literature stays close to the social and political facts and thus provides material for cultural history. D. G. Jones' *Butterfly on Rock* (1970) and Margaret Atwood's *Survival* (1972) are, in one sense, cultural histories that owe a good deal to Frye — examinations of patterns of thought and image, of sets or habits of mind that help to determine the nature of our literature and are, in turn, reinforced by it. Both of these books had, however, a strong personal emphasis, deriving from psychological and philosophic assumptions; they were largely indifferent to the political and social scene, moving towards an apocalyptic insight, the vision of 'the creative non-victim', or of the new Adam recreated in our more visionary poets. Dennis Duffy's book belongs with *Butterfly on Rock* and *Survival* in the sense that he too traces patterns of ideas and assumptions in our literature. But the patterns and ideas have a firm basis in specific events anchored to chronology. They are not the creations of the literature, although they are often enunciated in the literature and influence its shape. In short, Duffy has written a piece of genuine cultural history; it is an innovative and important book.

Duffy is concerned with a particular place and a particular time. The place is Upper Canada, later Ontario; the beginning is 1776, the outbreak of the American Revolution, and the subsequent crucial dates are 1784, when the first United Empire Loyalists arrived to take up land along the Bay of Quinte, and 1812, which was seen by the loyalists as a second holy

war against the Americans. The period from 1776 to 1814 is the gestation period of loyalist ideas; the ideas live on throughout the nineteenth century, and filter into the twentieth, existing in a transmuted form in a few contemporaries. Duffy divides his book into two parts: the first part deals with writers — Kirby, Richardson, Mair, Campbell, de la Roche, who with the exception of the last, were close to the gestation period; the second with contemporary writers — Hood, Grant, Symons, Lee, and Purdy, far removed from the world of loyalism, but still responding to it.

What were the loyalist ideas? The events from 1776 to 1814 were interpreted as the ordeal of a chosen minority bound by a sacred covenant to the imperial mother, suffering, sent into exile, but finding in the new land a refuge, viewed ecstatically as garden, Canaan, even as a paradise, which successfully defended against the enemy, became the home of the redeemed. For the early writers the emphasis was upon a covenant between colony and mother country. Even for them, however, the hard political facts raised disturbing questions. Kirby was the most single-minded in his devotion to the faith, but even at that the loyalist garden gained "its unique flavour from the large number of snakes that must be routed continually from it". (37) Mair attempted to turn the great Indian chief, *Tecumseh*, into a loyalist hero, but encountered intractable facts, and had to transfer the garden to the new and untrammelled land in the west. Campbell found a conflict between the loyalist vision of an ordered society and the secular reality of democratic egalitarianism. Only Mazo de la Roche, although far removed in time from the loyalist *mystique*, was able, by rigidly constricting her society, to preserve a loyalist vision of continuity, hierarchy, and mutuality, unshaken even by the surge of passion.

For the contemporary writers, the emphasis is no longer on the covenant, but on exile, discontinuity, and loss. Hood is an exception. In *A New Athens* loyalist symbols and recollections merge in a wider vision of a redeemed society. Grant, Symons, Lee, to a certain extent, Purdy, are ravaged by a sense of loss, by the fading of a good society, which seems to be an idealized version of the loyalist vision.

Duffy raises two general questions about his book. He wonders if he has "perpetuated a series of discrete essays rather than what I am attempting: a coherent essay retaining an amplitude sufficient to explore the particular" (10). The answer is that he has written a coherent essay that manages to say a good deal that is fresh and revealing about individual books. The only failure is the chapter on Richardson, a good essay in itself, but stubbornly refusing to fit into the pattern of the book. In a reflective *Envoi* Duffy defines 'the message' of the tradition he has explored. It is, he says, a simple one: "Canada makes no sense except as part of a larger political, social, and cultural entity". He adds: "Does this mean that we are forever fated to exist within *some* empire or other..." (132) But of the two possible, existing empires, one we repudiated at our beginnings; the other the joint signatory of the covenant, we have outlived. If we cannot survive without a covenant entered into with a power outside ourselves, our choice must

surely be the empire that exists now only in the aspirations of unfettered man.

*Massey College,
University of Toronto*

Claude T. Bissell

***Putzi, I Love You, You Little Square.* By John Marlyn. Toronto: The Coach House Press, 1981. Pp. 96. \$6.50.**

Those who have children watch their own behaviour and, in particular, what they say when the children are around. It is not always pleasant to have one's own voice or actions imitated in miniature, though sometimes such imitation expands one's self-perception. Imagine the problem for prospective parents if during the nine months of pregnancy the foetus could not only hear the words of its mother and father (perhaps the foetus already does) but understand and comment upon them. John Marlyn, author of the previously-acclaimed *Under the Ribs of Death*, has imagined such a situation and, in addition, has given the unborn child, nicknamed Putzi by his mother, the gift of total recall. Putzi is intelligent beyond his months and has absorbed every word his mother has spoken and read since he was conceived. He delights in reciting Shakespeare, Baudelaire, or other scions of literature; words flow trippingly from his tongue, so aptly and quickly that no adult can keep pace. It appears that this little wunderkind will be part of a virgin birth, as his mother swallowed a strange laboratory liquid that was supposed to give her total recall but which made her pregnant instead. But virgin birth or no, Putzi is worried about the world outside the womb that will soon claim him. Given the host of characters who await his arrival Putzi has good reason to worry.

His mother Ellen refuses to yield to the love of Julian, a sensible doctor who has Putzi's backing. Instead she flits back and forth between Marty, an always hungry and pampered pseudo-intellectual who lacks moral fibre, and Alvin, ex-long-hair and slightly demented computer whiz who views life only in terms of terminals and programs. Meanwhile, Aunts Ada and Jessie moan and declaim about life in a harmless but fairly ineffective manner. This is a short novel, and Marlyn's characters do not develop — we don't *know* them, but, like Putzi, we certainly *hear* them, and it is Marlyn's skill with voice and dialogue that makes the aunts and suitors come alive. But the real star of the show is Putzi himself, who overrides the rather thin plot line, and who should, given the realistic setting (presumably north-end Winnipeg) and nothing untoward happening outside Ellen's womb, be unbelievable. Putzi is the little foetus who is heard but not seen (at least until he is born and demands a cigar to celebrate his own emergence), and he captures the reader with his non-nonsense attitude towards adults and their limited visions, helped, of course, by the language of Shakespeare *et al.*

Marlyn, however, has not written a novel of humour only — Putzi is afraid of violence: that between his mother and her suitors, as well as of the struggle in the larger world. He talks about the need for order and stability in his life, and he can be controlled by Ellen, who puts him to sleep by blowing a whistle. Putzi attempts to be a constructive critic of the territory — personal, social, and cultural — outside his place of protection, and, in particular, he helps Ellen overcome the confusion and bitterness of her relationship with her father. But, like all children, he looks to his elders for guidance.

Marlyn has chosen just the right length for his story, which strives, after all, for the level of parable. Beneath the laughter prompted by a talking foetus, there is a warning offered about life inside and beyond the womb: in everything that we do and say we are responsible, or should be, to what is and to what has the potential to be.

Dalhousie University

J. A. Wainwright

***Death in the Barren Ground.* By Edgar Christian. Edited by George Whalley. Toronto: Oberon Press, 1980. Pp. 192. \$15.95. Paper, \$7.95.**

Edgar Christian's story has a kind of tragic grandeur that is heightened by the simple and unassuming way in which it is told. The heart of the story lies in the diary he kept from October 14, 1926, to June 1, 1927, and in two summary letters, to his parents, written on June 1, five days before his nineteenth birthday and probably only hours before his death by starvation in the middle of "the Barren Ground."

Under the leadership and tutelage of his cousin, John Hornby, a man some thirty years his senior who had nearly twenty years' experience of living and travelling in the North West Territories, Edgar Christian had set out from his home in England the preceding spring on the great expedition that was to lay the foundation for his life. In Edmonton, a third Englishman, Harold Adlard, was added to the expedition in a characteristically impromptu fashion. The three men travelled north from Edmonton to Great Slave Lake and then east to what is now called Hornby Point on the Thelon River, thirty miles or so below the junction of the Hanbury and the Thelon. (The area was in the news again in 1978 when the first fragment of the Soviet satellite *Cosmos* was found there by men who were commemorating the Hornby expedition.) Hornby's intention, which in his quixotic fashion he never fully declared beforehand, was to winter in the heart of the Arctic Barrens and to live off the land. He had lived in this way before, narrowly averting disaster through a combination of wit, skill, endurance, and luck. In 1927 his luck ran out. During the preceding fall, he missed, perhaps partly through nonchalance or negligence, the September migration of the Caribou, and thus failed to lay in the supply of meat and clothing essential to surviving an Arctic winter.

The early entries in the Diary give some details about exploring, trapping, and building a log cabin on the north bank of the Thelon; but from November on, the riveting preoccupation is the search for food, a preoccupation that is only intensified by routine and minute observations of the weather and by less conscious observations on the developing relations among the three men. That the search is foredoomed seems to make its small successes more triumphant and its ingenuity and persistence more courageous. Hornby died on April 16. Adlard died on May 4. Edgar Christian lived on in utter solitude for four more weeks, digging for scraps of food as the melting snow and ice revealed them around the cabin, observing dispassionately the deterioration of his skeletal body, watching in readiness for any gift of flesh or fowl that might be offered by the late Arctic spring, and above all writing his Diary in order to "Relieve the desire" for someone to talk to.

George Whalley, in his remarkable and lengthy introduction to the Diary, speaks of being haunted by its voice, of being haunted "not so much by the three deaths as by the voice that tells of the living that went before the dying," and it is here that the Diary achieves its tragic grandeur. Edgar's parents first published the Diary, with an introduction and conclusion by B. Dew Roberts, under the title *Unflinching: A Diary of Tragic Adventure* (London, 1937), a title which lays claim to the tragedy of suffering and of stoical endurance. But Whalley sees that the tragedy goes deeper than that. It can be glimpsed, for example, in nearly the last words that Edgar, in his letter to his mother, wrote: "Please dont Blame Dear Jack He Loves you & me only In this world & tell no one else this but keep it & believe." This is simultaneously a recognition of responsibility and an act of forgiveness. The present tense of the verb "Loves" goes beyond and in some way vindicates what Edgar, already somewhere between this world and the next, had just written to his father: "Jack alone was one man in this world who can let a young boy know what this world & the next are. I Love him he Loved me. Very seld [om] is there true Love between 2 men!" Edgar Christian, in other words, not only endured extreme suffering, but in its midst he preserved and even developed and strengthened his capacity for wonder, admiration, and love, and as a result his voice continues to live.

There are other profound touches. On April 20 he wrote: "I seem to remain Cool and Collective now but if anything might happen to Harold God only knows what state I will be in but of course hardships and worries have been so tremendous for so long now that I am prepared for the worst and best." The lack of punctuation here contributes to the momentum of the thought, which reaches a climax at the end of the sentence. Whalley notes that "and best" is inserted between the lines as an afterthought. It can hardly be described as a pious afterthought since Edgar says that he believes Hornby was right to make him leave his Bible and Prayer Book behind in Edmonton, yet in this simple insertion the thought is elevated, making it similar in kind to Shakespeare's "the readiness is all" (*Hamlet*,

V, ii, 223), in other words, an act of tragic resignation that is utterly distinct from feelings of despair.

It is touches such as this one that justify the way in which George Whalley has chosen to present the story. He speaks in his Preface of several attempts to cast it in a different mode, including making it into a script broadcast on CBC radio in 1953 and incorporating it into *The Legend of John Hornby*, the biography he published in 1962. It is a story that has haunted George Whalley for more than four decades; but in order to see its precise significance we will need to explore more closely the correspondences between Whalley's interest in this story and his recent work on clarifying and re-defining Aristotle's view of tragedy. Part of this work is available (in, for example, "On Translating Aristotle's *Poetics*," *UTQ*, 39(1970) 77-106), but perhaps the more important work is his yet unpublished translation of and commentary on Aristotle's work.

For this occasion, then, it is best to conclude with two observations. One is that in *The Legend of John Hornby* it is Hornby who tends to assume the role of central figure in the tragedy, not only because the book is about him but because the manner of his death is seen as the logical culmination of his life. Hornby's pride in living off the land becomes, when he attempts to do this in the most desolate region of the North and in the company of two "greenhorns," nothing short of *hubris*. Moreover, one sees in Hornby's death the death of a way of life, and not merely of Hornby's own way but of a whole possibility for Europeans to live in the North as the Indians and the Eskimos did.

Yet this observation has an aura of the legendary about it; while the second observation has to do with Whalley's concern to let the story tell itself, to let the facts speak for themselves, if that were possible. He decides, finally, to allow Edgar Christian his own chosen mode—the diary—and the explanatory materials, Preface, Introduction, RCMP report, and Appendices are kept very distinct from it. The poets and novelists writing in Canada today often treat our history in a free and easy way, and a good many of them seem to think they can be as licentious as they please with impunity. But as George Gascoigne has said, "This poetical license is a shrewd fellow, and covereth many faults." George Whalley is on record as saying that it seems to him "more than possible that what Aristotle has to say about tragedy is absolute," that his remarks are not restricted only to the Greek tragedies he knew, but are universally applicable to actions of a certain type. *Death in the Barren Ground* surely corresponds to this type. The core of its appeal is that the story is true (it has as J. V. Cunningham would say, "the compelling absoluteness of accomplished fact"), and the actions it contains are recorded simply and accurately. The importance of this kind of writing for Canadian literature has yet to be adequately explored.

***The Lost Grove: Autobiography of a Spanish Poet in Exile.* By Rafael Alberti. Translated and edited by Gabriel Berns. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981. Pp. 323. \$14.95. Paper, \$5.95.**

One of Alberti's friends, the Andalusian poet José Moreno Villa, wrote once that conversation was one of the noble arts, and it could be added that an educated Spaniard is not only a talking being, but one who would rather talk than write. Whether this oral tendency is responsible for his aversion to writing or not, there is one thing a Spaniard dislikes more than writing, and that is writing about himself.

In this sense, *The Lost Grove's* originality may very well lie in the fact that the autobiographical account is Spain's missing *genre*. This is not to say that Spaniards have never written about themselves. Miguel de Unamuno, for example, devoted his entire writing to reveal his tragic sense of life. His inner anguish became literary matter, and as he fully intended, a fact known to all. But with the notable exception of Unamuno's, the few Spanish autobiographical accounts we have are quite meaningless. Benito Pérez Galdós, the great chronicler of the XIXth century and author of seventy-seven novels of historical and social content, is a good example. He gave it a try in his *Memoirs of an absent-minded man*, and failed for obvious reasons.

If Spaniards avoid writing about themselves, why then *The Lost Grove*? The answer lies in the subtitle added by the editor and translator. Just as there was a literature of the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), and not always written in Spanish, the exile that followed the defeat of Republican Spain had literary consequences as well. As one might expect, the bitter experience of the exodus across the Pyrenees and the concentration camps in France and Algeria eventually became literary matter. Moreover, the violent uprooting that had taken place forced Spaniards, deeply rooted people to begin with, to face their physical loss. As a result, those who had lost everything but their memories, rooted in their past. Their world became a mental world where the wealth of details was directly related to their condition of apatrid people. At times, as in the cases of Moreno Villa and Alberti, these memories became autobiographical accounts.

There is little doubt that some autobiographies would not have been written had it not been for the experience of exile and the mental process it unleashed. On the other hand, Alberti was likely to turn his uprooting experience into literary matter, if only because he had already done so. Having been uprooted from his native Andalusia as a fifteen year old, the colours, the people, and the sea of his past filled his mental world, and eventually his first book of poems, *Sailor on land* (1924). A few years ago, while still living in exile, Alberti said that had it not been for his Andalusian childhood and those crazy uncles of his who took their Catholicism as seriously as their drinking, most likely he would not have ever written a word.

A poets' poet at first, and later on, during the Republican years (1931-1939), a poetic voice for social justice, Alberti went far beyond the mere description of a lost and found childhood paradise. But as the outcome of the war became painfully obvious, and with it the need to leave his beloved Spain, he began writing *The Lost Grove*, an account of his life from the year of his birth (1902) to that of his Andalusian uprooting (1917). That is, as he had done twenty years earlier, Alberti prepared himself to survive the present by rooting again in his Andalusian past.

Headed by a quote from Unamuno and published in Mexico (1942), *The Lost Grove* was written by a homeless and wondering poet while Barcelona fell, the Republican dream ended, and he escaped from Spain to Vichy France. It was written while working in Paris and crossing the Atlantic. The last pages were completed in a tiny Buenos Aires apartment. It is important to remember that the uniqueness of a present time from which a past is being recreated helps to explain why certain segments of the past are recreated, and not others. Ramón J. Sender, for example, focused on his childhood while being held in an Algerian concentration camp, and Alberti took refuge in his own early years not only as part of a rooting process, but also as a need to confront the tragic reality of the present with the memories of an innocent age: "The present is too harsh, too sad to write about now", he writes while in Paris, "I wish to go back to those other days of my childhood, on the shores of the Gulf of Cádiz, letting the undulating pine trees along the coast clear my mind and feel my shoes fill with sand, the blonde sand of the burning dunes shaded here and there by clumps of Spanish broom". (p. 52)

And back he goes, forced by loneliness to summon drunken uncles and cousins who would have liked to be horses rather than men, filling the dark days of despair with humour, fighting the emptiness of vertigo by focusing on that familiar "melancholy place, covered over with yellow and white Spanish broom, called The Lost Grove", so far away now for the wondering poet, and yet so near, still there "on the righthand side of a road, lined with prickly-pear cactus, that leads down to the sea and proudly bears the name of an old bullfighter". (p. 17)

In November 1954, Alberti began Book Two of *The Lost Grove*. Doubling Book One in size, and along with it, it was published in Buenos Aires (1959). It deals with the period of his Madrid years since his arrival in 1917 to the proclamation of the Republic in 1931, a period of extraordinary creativity in Spain. The tragedy of its sudden halt in 1939 changes the meaning of the Lost Grove from that of a real orchard in Book One to that of a metaphor. It is not without interest, but it is anticlimatic. Far from being "Galdosian", Book Two doesn't have the "Unamunian" qualities of Book One. Paraphrasing Alberti's quote from Unamuno, it can be said that Alberti does not carry the memories of his manhood, as he did those of his childhood, on the surface of his soul.

Fifty years have gone by since 1931. Now back in his Lost Grove since 1977, Alberti has honoured an old Spanish tradition with half a century of autobiographical silence. It may very well be our loss, but Book Three of

The Lost Grove (which would have dealt with the exile itself) most likely will never be written.

Dalhousie University

Antonio Ruiz Salvador

***Industrial Development and the Atlantic Fishery.* By Donald J. Patton. James Lorimer and Company: Toronto, 1981 pp. xvi, 81.**

This slim volume appeared in 1981, four years after the declaration of the 200-mile limit for fishing in Canadian territorial waters. Its appearance is timely, particularly in view of its attitude of looking ahead and assessing the future potential of the Atlantic fishing industry. The study looks at new demands for marine-related products and services in the light of the technological quality of these opportunities; it recommends public policy options to improve the economic, technological and regulatory environment; and it proposes business strategies for new and improved capabilities in the ocean industry. That is, it examines potential landward industrial linkages as they could be developed out of a burgeoning fishing industry. This is not a new idea, of course, as Patton himself recognises implicitly through his discussion of the inadequacies of Canada's Ocean Policy and his referencing of the Science Council of Canada's background study, *Ad Mare: Canada Looks to the Sea* (1971). But Patton is right to select this topic since there is a real problem in why the spin-offs from the fishery have not really been sought effectively to date.

Patton identifies the types of manufactures that could be considered and deals with each briefly and precisely. His discussion of the effects of government protection, both tariff and non-tariff measures, is well-researched and well-argued. However, other factors which may constrain technological enhancement in the fisheries sector, such as federal-provincial cooperation, bi-lateral fisheries agreements and regional development policies, are not so comprehensively integrated into the main arguments of the study. These factors can be equally important to the development of backward linkages out of the fishery.

This is a good and important book, despite some limitations that are worth noting. I am slightly concerned about the stress laid on import substitution. Few would doubt the wisdom of encouraging Canadian firms to supply a greater share of the domestic market, as long as it is recognised that a too-heavy emphasis on substitution for imports, especially in times when investment capital is limited, can lead to a neglect of new innovative development and to missed opportunities in the high-technology sector. Perhaps it might be wiser to allow Japan and Korea to compete in supplying Canadian fishermen with fishing nets while protecting Canadian manufacturers as they develop new forms of fishing gear containing a more sophisticated technological input and a potentially higher world market value. Again, policy makers should be careful not to use tariffs as a way of protecting Canadian mediocrity, but should strive

to promote Canadian excellence — as Patton's discussion of R and D facilities, government oceans/science policies and manpower training programmes emphasises. Secondly, while Patton's discussion of over-capitalization and over-subsidization of the fishing fleet is well taken, the fact that he does not distinguish between the needs of the offshore and inshore sectors of the industry to any significant degree weakens his arguments. While the inshore sector can be considered to be over-capitalized, many would claim that increased capitalization and technological input into the offshore fleet is the only path to greater efficiencies. But heavy subsidization and capitalization carry their own problems with them, as the dilemma of the modern Norwegian fleet demonstrates. Moreover, a reconstruction of both inshore and offshore fleets, particularly in Newfoundland, is constrained by social considerations and by the seasonal nature of fish harvesting.

This brings me to my third concern: the heavy use of Nova Scotian data and examples. A study of the Atlantic fishery must highlight any issues which are specific to a particular 'sub-region' - and there are important differences between the four provinces' fishery industries. I would have liked to see the study broken down to a 'sub-regional' level in order to see, for example, which kinds of goods and services would best suit which locations. Related to this is the lack of a sufficiently close look at the existing policies and responsibilities of the respective provincial governments. Patton seems to accept the myth that Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, for example, are always in competition with one another, whereas it would be more accurate to consider these provinces as having different interests, not because of competition, but because they have different fisheries. It is in matters of this kind, thus understood, that overall federal control and allocation of requirements can best be directed.

Nonetheless, these are small points. I am impressed with the detail of this study and the way specific problems are handled. The breadth and scope of the author's analysis, incorporating industrial, public policy and trade considerations, make this volume a valuable addition to any modern fisheries library. It is to be hoped that government policy makers will pay attention to Patton's suggestions as they seek to develop a marine technology sector arising from the Canadian fishing industry.

Memorial University of Newfoundland

Rosemary E. Ommer

The Rise of Western Rationalism: Max Weber's Developmental History. By Wolfgang Schluchter. (Translated, and with an Introduction, by Guenther Roth). Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981. Pp. xxvii, 178. \$20.00 U.S.

This is a book of great complexity, ambitious in its aims and yet compact in its arguments. Wolfgang Schluchter is a leading figure in the currently flourishing enterprise of Max Weber scholarship. This work is centered in

West Germany but it has its North American based contributors also, of whom the able translator of the present volume, Guenther Roth, is one. It would be misleading, however, to characterize Schluchter as a 'Max Weber scholar' with the implication that he is interested in Weber's work merely as an antiquarian or involved solely in exegesis of the master. Certainly in *The Rise of Western Rationalism* there is a very close attention to many aspects of Weber's writings, but Schluchter's intention is not to provide a guide to these so much as to make a contribution to contemporary sociological theory. This is done through an interpretation of Weber which firmly sees the latter's importance as lying in the provision of a basis for a sociological theory of a developmental history of the Western world. Schluchter's contention is that Weber is improperly understood if he is seen primarily as a maker of typologies for comparative historical analysis, or as a contributor to an evolutionary historical approach. Weber does make such contributions, but the modes of analysis involved in each are interwoven in his work such that he "... provides a multi-dimensional macrosociological theory for the historical analysis of basic social configurations and their variants in evolutionary and comparative perspective" (5). This is what Weber, and Schluchter, mean by the term "developmental history".

The originality of Schluchter's book lies in what he does to "reinterpret" the vast body of Weber's writings which bear on the creation of a developmental history. This task is one which requires extraction, synthesis and analysis of the original both to show that the main outline of such an approach is indeed present there, and to go beyond Weber to provide, through the reinterpretation, a new basis for the substantive and theoretical underpinnings of a grand sociology of development.

One cannot do justice to the density of Schluchter's analysis here by trying to summarize it. Suffice it to say that he bases his case for regarding Weber's approach as "developmental history" largely on Weber's writings on the great world religions and on the sociology of law and domination. Long chapters largely devoted to these are followed by a masterful chapter on "The Role of the Reformation in the Transition to Modernity" which is in essence an application of the theoretical framework reconstructed in the preceding pages to provide a causal explanation for the "autonomous vocational culture of Western modernity". This chapter should be mandatory for anyone whose awareness of Weber's work extends no further than the erroneously isolated reading of *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Throughout the book Schluchter reconciles Weber's sociology with developmental approaches in modern sociology paying particular attention to the later neo-evolutionary ideas of Talcott Parsons, the functionalism of Niklas Luhmann and the updated historical materialism of Jürgen Habermas. In drawing on these diverse sources Schluchter succeeds in showing that his reconstruction of Weber transcends their particularities by making, as Roth says in his excellent introduction, "Weber's approach an 'upgraded' alternative" to

both structural functionalism and the evolutionism of Habermas. This is a great achievement.

Many people will profit from a close reading of this book. Sociologists will be reminded of the immense range of Weber's work and will have Schluchter's authoritative demonstration of its crucial relevance for modern sociological thinking; historians will see much more clearly that treating history sociologically is an immensely fruitful possibility and will have Schluchter's exposition of Weber's intricate view of the relations between sociology and history as a guide; political scientists, philosophers and legal scholars will profit from the extended discussion of the relations between authority and power and cultural and institutional factors; and everyone interested in the basic question of the institutionalization of a particular form of rationalism in the West will confront an argument of compelling saliency.

Dalhousie University

J. Graham Morgan

***The Regional Decline of a National Party: Liberals on the Prairies.* By David E. Smith. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981. Pp. xviii, 188. \$15.70. Paper, \$8.95.**

This is a useful and interesting addition to the recent flurry of studies on the "new West" by Prairie academics. Its major focus is upon the dramatic decline over the last twenty-five years of the Liberal party in national and provincial elections in the Prairie provinces. Professor Smith, of the University of Saskatchewan, examines, in turn, the characteristics of the three provinces and, less thoroughly, of the Prairie region, the organizational strategies and policies of the national Liberals through 1977, and the clashes between the three provincial governments and the national government.

He is at his best, for obvious reasons, when discussing the Saskatchewan setting, whereas his appreciation of the political culture and tactics of Alberta under the Manning and Lougheed governments is less sure. Alberta, as demonstrated by its preference throughout its 75-year history for the single-party dominant system (most common in the developing countries of the so-called Third World), has yet to achieve the degree of democracy shown in Saskatchewan and even more in Manitoba. It is somewhat perplexing to find Professor Smith referring to the Prairies as an "integrated community" when most of the prevailing evidence suggests that only when the national government is presented as the "outside enemy" has there been any significant co-operation among the three provinces—despite a host of uniquely regional problems crying out for intra-regional solutions.

The two chapters on party structures and electoral strategies are well researched and they provide an informed criticism of the approaches master-minded by Walter Gordon and Keith Davey to 1965 and those of

Richard Stansbury which contributed to the near defeat in the 1972 election. But to see these factors as the "primary cause" of the Liberal failures on the Prairies in the 1960s and 1970s is as dubious as would be assigning to John Diefenbaker the *sole* responsibility for the political suicide of his second and third ministries.

Professor Smith then depicts Liberal policies on energy resources as tantamount to a return to the pre-1930s national control of Prairie natural resources and their bilingual policies as an affront to his "integrated community." Despite a touch of hyperbole, there is little doubt that these two policies, important as they might have been for other parts of Canada, were damaging to the electoral prospects of Prairie Liberals—witness the almost unconcealed joy with which they were attacked by Prairie premiers in election campaigns.

The concluding section on federalism is, unfortunately, the weakest part of the study. Despite some very useful insights and speculations, Professor Smith seems almost unaware of the conclusions to which his analysis points. His near adulation for the "strong and attractive premiers, like Lougheed . . . and Blakeney," and his accompanying regret about their reluctance to enter national politics is strangely simple. Premiers of provinces like Saskatchewan and, especially, Alberta have a much simpler and incomparably easier political role than a prime minister—indeed, the mayor of any of the larger cities in such provinces has a much more difficult task than a Lougheed or Blakeney. These premiers can ignore or defuse almost all opposition within the province by conducting an almost permanent electoral campaign against the national government—but woe betide the national politician who "interferes" in a provincial matter. The relative homogeneity of their party membership and their tight control over party organizations relieve them of the most difficult political task of a prime minister or leader of any major national party—that of attempting to create and maintain at least a semblance of party unity out of extreme heterogeneity. Neither Pearson nor Trudeau matched Mackenzie King in this vital role, but both of them far exceeded Diefenbaker's efforts—yet Diefenbaker would have had no problems as leader of a major provincial party. It is useful to recall that the one provincial premier to succeed in becoming prime minister did so only after being away from provincial politics for almost twenty years—and even then, under quite unusual circumstances. The very fact that the Liberals have formed the national governments for most of this century—and that they therefore have become the most obvious whipping boys for provincial premiers to use as a device to avoid their provincial responsibilities—is the major element in the decline of the Liberals on the Prairies.

The marriage of an increasingly decentralized federal system with a thoroughly out-moded parliamentary system—including a completely ineffective upper chamber which was originally intended to have some of the provincial and regional representatives functions of the powerful American Senate—is playing into the hands of the separatists or independentists of both West and East. Unless some fundamental changes are

made, the national government will more and more find itself at the mercy of parochial, often paranoid and certainly power-hungry premiers—regardless of what political party is in power in Ottawa.

University of Alberta

G. R. Davy

***The Secret War, 1914-1918.* By Stuart Ramsey Tompkins. Victoria, B.C.: Morriss Printing Co., 1981. Pp. 71.**

Although he is best known for the works published while teaching at the University of Oklahoma, S. R. Tompkins was a Canadian pioneer in Russian studies. He first served with the Canadian Expeditionary Force in France during 1914-1918, then with the Allies against the Bolsheviks in Siberia in 1919. Intrigued by these experiences, he returned to civilian life to become one of Canada's first Russian "experts." He soon gained a not insignificant reputation as a scholar in the United States, but finally retired to Victoria. There he died in 1977. And this small, beautifully printed and bound book, which has a full bibliography of his works (pp. 11-12), is obviously intended as his memorial.

Unfortunately, it is badly marred by poor editing. Worse still, intellectually it is an unfitting tribute to an eccentric but often stimulating scholar. With regard to the first point, those responsible for preparing Tompkins' slim manuscript were amazingly careless about proofing the few (70) footnotes. Bibliographical information is often simply absent or if given, given incorrectly. Similarly, the editors proved incapable even of compiling a decent index for what is only an extended essay (53 pp.). For example, it is bad enough that Tompkins himself states — on no evidence whatsoever! — that the moderate-left Socialist-Revolutionary leader and Kerensky's Minister of Agriculture in 1917, Viktor Chernov, was probably "in the service of Germany during the war" (p. 43). But it is inexcusable that Chernov is not even mentioned in the index, or identified with his first name in the text or in an editorial note that at least points out that the charge against him is totally without foundation.

The Chernov case is particularly useful inasmuch as it illustrates Tompkins' own intellectual narrowness. That historians are men who share the prejudices of their times is a cliché. Yet it is one that this little book illustrates with unusual clarity. For while Tompkins wrote it in his retirement, the sentiments are those of 1918. Thus *The Secret War* is not really interested in examining the overall behind-the-scenes diplomacy and peace efforts of 1914-1918. Rather it concentrates on demonstrating that the Kaiser's militarists and generals, by overruling saner civilian heads, brought well-deserved defeat upon themselves by policies of expansion. That their defeat was well-deserved is especially the case since they sought victory by removing Russia from the war through their support of anti-Tsarist revolutionaries in general, and of radical socialists, among whom Lenin was "the chief character" (p. 30), in particular. For

Tompkins saw such a course as evil and deserving just retribution because of his conviction, in the words of his editors, that the real significance of World War I lay in "the struggle between Socialism and traditional capitalism" — a continuing conflict in which the eventual triumph of the first will "plunge the West into moral chaos" (p. 9). In this context, of course, Lenin's victory of October 1917 is an important victory for the forces of chaos. And while Tompkins quite sensibly does not charge Lenin with being a German agent, he does lean towards the "German gold" theory of the Bolshevik success. Most surprising of all, he argues this with no reference to the careful studies of George Katkov and Fritz Fischer. So while he did make some use of papers from the German Foreign Office, his case is supported largely by conjectures that remain as unsubstantiated as they were in 1918, or which are buttressed by his use of the notorious and possibly fake "Sisson documents."

These inadequacies, along with a confused chronological presentation and Tompkins' own, frequently ambiguous prose, suggest that in fact *The Secret War* was a draft on which he intended to do further work. For all these reasons this book is of value only as a curiosity. Otherwise, its author's reputation as a pioneer in Slavic studies would have been served better by leaving it unpublished.

Dalhousie University

David R. Jones

***Building with Words.* By William Bernstein and Ruth Cawker. Toronto: Coach House Press, 1981. 100 pp. Paper, \$14.50.**

'Building with Words' is a Canadian book about Canadian Architecture. It deals with the past sixty years and future directions. After a brief introductory essay about its two architect authors, the main body of the book follows, comprising twenty-one 'statements' by Canadian architects and architectural theorists. Bernstein and Cawker, the authors and collectors, graduated in 1981, whereas their contributors graduated between 1944 and 1970. Originally intended as a magazine article, the authors expanded it to a book without clarification of purpose. We are told that the contributors are "some of Canada's best known architects", but Raymond Moriyama is noticeably absent.

The introductory essay is woven around a number of quotations and endeavours to explain the 'Modern Movement' and 'International Style' in Canadian Architecture. Unlike Tom Wolfe's racy style and outrageous commentary in *From Bauhaus to Our House*, Bernstein and Cawker let the quotations and the reader do most of the work. Twenty-one quotations from Percy Nobbs in 1922 to George Baird in 1968 make up the bulk of the essay. Some are complex, some prophetic, some naive beyond credulity. Footnotes allow us interpretation. Percy Nobbs was speaking to a women's meeting, whereas later architects were writing in professional journals to be read by other architects.

The ability of architects to communicate through words becomes an intriguing issue, and one for the whole book. For whom is it written? The general reader or the professional reader? If *Building with Words* is for the general public, the language may be too obscure to understand. Typically professionals talk to one another in semantic privacy, using their own technical language or jargon, like surgeons or air traffic controllers. Architects are no different, and this book fails to discriminate between the 'clever' and the 'simple' language, or between the 'private' and 'public' words. Architects happily borrow their vocabulary from all other walks of life, indiscriminately comprising jargon, engineering, psychological, philosophical and medical words, in their endeavour to communicate visual experience or potential visual experience without visual aids. Even if the words are in common usage their meaning may be bent. Dictionaries seldom help. Synergy or cybernetics may be well enough understood but what about 'post modernism'. Nobbs and Diamond use easy language, others are more obscure.

Information on the architects allows us to see their date and place of birth, degrees, major buildings and writings about them as well as by them. Of the twenty-one architects twelve were born in Canada, eight received some architectural training here, and only four received all their education in Canada. Canadian content is always a complex issue, and only Jackson seems to have addressed it extensively in his writings. Yet here is a problem for us. Do the seventeen who are not home grown architects truly represent our architecture? Incidentally none of Jackson's books are listed under his accomplishments.

What instructions were given to the architects? The collection of statements took more than two years and one suspects that the instructions changed. Some contributions are of philosophy, while others merely state egocentrically 'how I design'. Some are taped interviews, some translated from the French and yet others appear as succinct written statements. Did all the architects really have equal opportunity to make their points? The most pithy, articulate and penetrating, like Baird, du Bois and Jackson, appear to be teachers. Ethnic origins, regions, cultures, materials and climates generate a rich variety of expression in words and pictures, even confusion. Was diversity an intended bias of the authors? It is here in abundance as the photographs clearly demonstrate. Modernism has already been superseded, and we have moved into an eclectic period. By happy accident, the alphabetical ordering of the contributors means that Parkin lampoons post modernism and is immediately followed by Rose who extols its virtues, even to allowing that buildings might be "a little giddy." There appear to be two stories in this book, the words say one thing and the pictures another.

When hunting a Snark you may find a Boojum! The authors might have requested Ericson to write about his mirror glass box which was never built in Vancouver. It might have been more to the point of why modernism has been surpassed. Generally the contributors do not address the subject of the opening essay in their words, but their buildings obviously

have to. The passing of modernism is better dealt with by Wolfe, but for an incomplete survey of Canadian architecture read *Building with Words*. You can read its words and its pictures. Do both. You will read two stories, but either way the authors leave you to draw your own conclusion.

Coach House Press is to be congratulated on the exposure of Canadian architecture, but a firmer editorial hand was required here. Nevertheless this is a valuable book to anyone interested in Canada and its values.

Technical University of Nova Scotia

Allen Penney

Canada at the Polls, 1979 and 1980: A Study of the General Elections. Edited by Howard R. Penniman. Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1982. Pp. xiv, 426. \$17.25 Paper, \$9.25.

Readers of the American Enterprise Institute's volume on the Canadian election of 1974 will welcome this sequel. The papers in the two volumes are indispensable for students of recent Canadian politics — we should be grateful to the Institute for commissioning Canadian scholars to write them. About half of the contributors to the 1974 volume appear here again: Meisel, Irvine, Clarkson, Paltiel, and Fletcher.

This volume suffers from three defects — all far less important for well-informed Canadians than for the American audience for which presumably it is primarily intended. First, the focus is mainly on the 1979 election, which John Meisel felt tempted to describe as "one of the most momentous electoral contests in Canada since World War II." This was a fair appraisal in the summer of 1979 when it was written, but how valid was it after February 18, 1980? In a long epilogue William P. Irvine adds on the 1980 election; yet the fact remains that much of the book is about the 1979 campaign. That campaign, however, cannot be evaluated without taking into account the troubles suffered by the Clark government after the election as results of Progressive Conservative stances and promises during the two years before the election. Second, the book does not reveal adequately the implications for Canadians of the sun-moon relationship between the Liberals and the Progressive Conservatives. Understandably none of the contributors would feel that this came within his terms of reference; but if the main chapters had been written about the two elections this topic inevitably would have come to the fore. Third, the 1979 election is sometimes treated as yet another contest, somewhat like an annual yacht race, with attention focused on gear, tactics, and seamanship, with little or no analysis of the extraordinary sea and weather conditions that prevailed.

Taken together the two elections show how difficult it is for the Progressive Conservatives to form a viable government. To achieve even a minority they felt it necessary to make many promises. Some of those promises were irreconcilable, at least in the short run. The result was defeat in the House and in the country. That put the Liberals back in power

without the benefits of a few years of reflection and reconstruction. The book shows how ineffectual the Trudeau government became after 1974; it does not show how unrealistic some of the Progressive Conservatives became. Nor does it show how stormy the seas had become for both Trudeau and Clark. If any one of the contributors had written the whole volume these more fundamental considerations would have been brought out clearly. As it is, American readers might do better to begin with Jeffery Simpson's *The Discipline of Power*; Canadians, in contrast, will find this volume very informative.

To treat each party separately, as in this book, has obvious disadvantages; yet there is much to be said for having different writers — J. C. Courtney on the Progressive Conservatives, Stephen Clarkson on the Liberals, and Walter Young on the NDP — analyze the strengths and weaknesses and the strategies of a party as it participated in the 1979 election. These chapters should be read together with the parallel pieces in the 1974 volume. This is particularly true in the case of the Progressive Conservatives, for Liberal success is largely a function of the long-term failure of the opposition. Courtney's chapter is especially good, but it assumes a familiarity with the basic analysis given by George Perlin in his 1974 chapter (and later in *The Tory Syndrome*). Clarkson's chapter is somewhat disappointing. Constantly he distinguishes between the Liberal party and the Liberal government; the latter was unfaithful to the former. He contends that after 1974 the government "proceeded to defeat itself by its indecisiveness, its incompetence, and its improprieties." Probably there is much truth in this; certainly, his catalogue of bumbles is disheartening for a Liberal. But a campaign is not a yacht race sailed under selected weather conditions. Surely the very rough times — mostly economic — of the late 1970s contributed to the foundering of the *Grit* in 1979. His implied praise for Conservative strategists who, unlike the Liberals, had "substantial, newsworthy promises for every region", seems cynical or unrealistic. Was not John Crosbie to rue some of those promises? In the epilogue Irvine states: "It now seems clear that the Progressive Conservatives did not fully appreciate the magnitude of the task ahead when formulating campaign promises for 1979."

In addition to the introductory pieces by Cairns, Meisel, and Irvine and the three party chapters, the volume contains five topical studies. The one by Leslie Seidle and K. Z. Paltiel on election money deserves special mention. After sketching the background of the reforms of the 1970s, the authors provide an account of the operation of the new law during the 1974-80 period. They deal with both elections. This is a first-class piece. F. J. Fletcher wrote a chapter for the 1974 volume on the mass media in that campaign; he now follows up with a revealing study of the media in 1979. His conclusions are sobering: "As practiced in 1979, the (media) coverage misrepresented the political system, narrowed the focus of public debate, and denigrated political leaders and institutions." The volume contains a good essay on candidate selection by R. J. Williams, a short but

solid piece on women in the 1979 election by Brodie and Vickers, and a discussion of the 1979 election in Quebec by Lemieux and Crête.

Irvine's epilogue outlines the problems of the Clark government; it summarizes Crosbie's budget and it gives a short description of the 1980 contest. The brevity and accuracy of these accounts make them admirable. Equally good, although somewhat speculative, is his concluding analysis of the changes in party support in the 1974-80 period. One might have guessed that high unemployment would have driven support to the Progressive Conservatives. Evidently this did not happen: the worse things were the more likely electors were to vote for the Liberals and the NDP, especially for the former in the east and the latter in the west. The Progressive Conservatives already had the disability of being thought anti-French by francophone voters. Perhaps the party is again, after the Diefenbaker-Stanfield interlude, coming to be seen as the party of the rich, this time of those whose prosperity is based on the export of oil, gas, lumber, wheat, ores, and coal from western Canada — as distinct from the manufacturers who once made Ontario the Conservative citadel — and who resent government restraints on their freedom to exploit their natural resources. If neo-conservatism carries the day within the party, despite the warning given by Robert Stanfield on May 14, 1982, the Progressive Conservatives will be even weaker as the alternative. This prospect may delight partisan Liberals, but it could mean that Canadians will continue to suffer the disadvantages of a one-party-dominant political system.

St. Francis Xavier University

John Stewart

***The Good Fight.* By David Lewis. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1982. Paper. \$14.95.**

This book, subtitled *Political Memoirs 1909 - 1958*, outlines the development of socialist doctrines in Canada in exhaustive detail; indeed it could be said, in exhausting detail. Anyone interested in the history of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation from its formation in 1932 to its pre-NDP national convention in 1958 will welcome this account. Care is taken to refer to the goals and leaders of early farm and labour movements that pre-dated the CCF.

However, for David Lewis, this book was a personal memoir as well, from his birth in 1909 in Svisloch, now, as then, lying east of the Polish border in Byelorussia, through the years of his involvement in socialism until the cut-off date.

The first chapter dealing with his early years in Svisloch, in a family of Orthodox Jewish grandparents but agnostic Jewish parents, and his arrival in Montreal in the fall of 1921, is a fascinating and poignant story. The following two chapters also detail his private life, student years in Montreal and as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford; but the private and public lives of David Lewis are so closely linked as to defy separation. As a

toddler he heard, in the bosom of his family, detailed discussion of socialism. His friendships and his one great love developed in the culture of socialism. Perhaps the most attractive feature of this book is the warmth of affection expressed for his wife, Sophia.

The remaining chapters deal with the work of Lewis in various capacities for the CCF, and the men with whom he was associated. He describes the shifts and turns of the CCF policy from 1932 to 1958. However, though democracy did not start its advance in Great Britain until 1832, there were men in the two Canadas and in Nova Scotia who, even before that, had called for political action to remove unfair discrimination, and indeed had developed great reform parties to achieve their ends in the nineteenth century. Hence, the self-righteous tone of the author in regard to the CCF and NDP may well irritate the non-socialist reader.

Nevertheless, any student of the political system and of the role of parties in democratic parliamentary government will gain immeasurably from reading this book. The interplay of ideas and personalities in the formation of the CCF and NDP, as sketched by Lewis, should help to show how a party keeps near to the lives of the human beings it seeks to serve. And, surely, Lewis incidentally reveals the debt that the ordinary Canadian owes to men and women who sacrifice much in the rough and tumble of political life.

Halifax

Gene Morison Hicks

***Underdevelopment and Social Movements in Atlantic Canada.* Edited by Robert J. Brym and R. James Sacouman. Toronto: New Hogtown Press, 1979. Pp. 252. \$15.00 Paper, \$7.95.**

This is a collection of ten essays, including four reprints, written by several members of the 1970s generation of university-trained neo-Marxists. They engage in the customary theoretical posturing which we have come to expect of young social scientists anxious to make their mark as critics of the monopoly capitalism that trains and feeds them. The attention here centres on the political economy and culture of the Atlantic region where, we can all agree, underdevelopment, however defined, has not been passively accepted in the twentieth century. The object of the essays is to illustrate both the problems and the solutions that regional underdevelopment has thrown up since the rise of the centralized state in Canada.

In the opening essay, Henry Veltmeyer examines how uneven capitalist development affected the Atlantic regional periphery in comparison with the centre of the country. He favours the Marxist concept of the reserve industrial army to explain the impact of capitalist policies. The creation of a class structure based on regional differences accentuated the class conflict and shaped the region's protest movements. At the other extreme, the concluding essay by James Overton on neo-nationalism in Newfoundland suggests that regional protest is a middle-class movement designed to

secure local autonomy for the purpose of promoting regional capitalism rather than overthrowing the class basis of society. Between these two divergent positions, we are treated to two essays on the co-operative movement by R. James Sacouman, two essays on political traditions—conservative and socialist—by Robert J. Brym and by David Frank in conjunction with Nolan Reilly, and four essays on the fisheries of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland by L. Gene Barrett, Rick Williams, Steven Antler, and Robert J. Brym in conjunction with Barbara Neis.

The most satisfactory and least pretentious essays by Frank and Reilly on the emergence of the socialist movement and by Brym and Neis on the Fisherman's Protective Union, challenge received notions on the basis of empirical evidence instead of sweeping theorizing. The socialist movement in the Maritimes in the first two decades of the twentieth century is represented as a vigorous response to the industrial capitalist order which was increasingly squeezing the working class. This analysis effectively demolishes the myth that socialism in this region was an aberration without strong ideological underpinnings. In contrast Brym's single-authored essay on political conservatism seems curiously at odds with this essay since he argues that third party activity in the 1910s and 1920s was attributable to the weaknesses of old-line parties other than the strength of radical political alternatives. It makes more sense to explore the integration of third party objectives into the platforms of the traditional parties. The middle class of the 1920s was surely as capable of turning other people's theories to its own advantage as Overton argues the Newfoundland bourgeoisie is today.

In the essay co-authored by Neis, however, Brym does add a new dimension to our understanding of the Fisherman's Protective Union. He stresses that the degree to which the FPU was embraced in outport Newfoundland resulted from localized economic activity and specific methods of organizing work rather than from ethnic or denominational antipathies towards unionization. The authors argue convincingly that structural rather than cultural considerations were central to the spread of the FPU among Newfoundland's early twentieth-century fishermen.

The belaboured and repetitious essays by Barrett, Sacouman, and Antler lack rigorous historical specificity. They illustrate the problems that inhibit Atlantic regional studies when it comes to fitting the historical development of economic activity into a theoretical strait-jacket. Antler applies the characteristics of Newfoundland in the seventeenth century to an analysis of conditions in the nineteenth century. Similarly, Barrett has difficulties with periodization, and Sacouman's comparisons of prairie wheat with Nova Scotia apples, as well as his explanations for the weakness of class structure in eastern Nova Scotia, raise more questions than they answer.

In some respects the most satisfactory of the essays is the most journalistic. Rick Williams' investigation of the contemporary struggle of the inshore fishermen of Nova Scotia provides a compelling case study of Shelburne by focusing on the experiences of a typical young professional

fisherman. It describes in a lively manner the response to unionization and points to the dangers of applying Marxist analysis developed in other contexts to an area of the workforce in which control of production remains a primary pre-condition for unionization.

While the publication of Atlantic regional studies should be encouraged, collections of ill-assorted essays like this are unlikely to provide a sophisticated and convincing analysis of regional responses to underdevelopment. Nor are they going to halt the decline in our literary standards, about which the less said the better.

Dalhousie University

Judith Fingard

***Bitter Grounds: Roots of Revolt in El Salvador.* By Liisa North. Toronto: Between the Lines, 1981. Pp. 110, xxxiv \$16.95 Paper, \$7.95.**

Since the Latin American content of our media recently has been drawn from the Falklands fiasco, we may be excused for believing that conditions in Central America have improved somewhat. Such an assumption would be very misguided, however, for despite the fraudulent election (and subsequent coup) in Guatemala, and El Salvador's own "election," the misery and the brutality continue. North's book, which provides the historical backdrop for this continuing tragedy, is a timely, well-researched work that is essential for all interested in contemporary Latin America.

The title of this study reflects the traditional dependency of Third World nations on a monoculture economy—in the case of El Salvador, coffee. Employing mainly secondary sources, Professor North traces the development of the resulting stranglehold of the coffee barons, popularly known as the "Fourteen Families." She links, clearly and concisely, the development of this coffee oligarchy (And coffee, it must be remembered, represented 95.5% of El Salvador's exports by 1931) with the foundation of a rural police force and the hated National Guard to control "social unrest," and shows that the present civil war is just the latest phase in a century-long conflict.

The outstanding feature of this work is the succinct way in which Liisa North illustrates the development of El Salvador's problems in the 1980s from their 19th-Century roots. We are quite accustomed to the present-day scenario: the assassination of Archbishop Romero and the American religious workers, the mutilations and daily body-count, have all been etched on our subconscious. What we need to be shown, though, are the reasons *why* the "natives are restless," and why—as a result—more than 30,000 have been killed since the October 1979 military coup (And this in a country just one-half the size of Nova Scotia).

North's study fills this void, showing that almost a century before President Reagan blamed the current civil war on "communist subversion," in fact there were very obvious reasons for attempts at revolution:

the taking of more than a quarter of El Salvador's land area from the peasantry in a campaign initiated in the 1870s, the conversion of land from domestic to export production (with food price increases and occasional shortages), the widespread acceptance by the coffee oligarchy of social Darwinism, and the brutal repression by the security forces of any attempt to change the status quo. Little wonder, then, that popular uprisings should occur in 1872, 1875, 1880, 1885 and 1898. More than seventy years later, North shows, little had changed for the *campesinos*: indeed between 1961 and 1975 the percentage of landless rural families rose from 11.8% to 40.9%. *Plus ça change...*

Somewhat disappointing perhaps, is North's chapter on the 1932 peasant rebellion, in which some 30,000 peasants were massacred by the security forces. Again, the standard sad litany of underdevelopment can be cited, but more is needed to illustrate the role and philosophy of communist leader, Farabundo Martí (after whom the 1982 opposition FDR-FMLN are named), and the programme of the opposition at that time.

This is a small quibble however, and is more than compensated for by the wealth of precise material found elsewhere, including Tim Draimin's insightful analysis of Canadian foreign policy on El Salvador, a detailed chronology of events between 1977 and 1981, a summary of US military aid and an excellent bibliography. Together with *El Salvador: Central America in the New Cold War* (ed. Gettleman, Lacefield et al. New York: Grove, 1981), it provides a much-needed historical framework for understanding the present conflagration in Central America, and should be read before media attention returns (as it inevitably will) to that strife-torn area.

Dalhousie University

John M. Kirk

***The Limits of Liberalism: The Making of Canadian Sociology.* By Deborah Harrison. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1981. Pp. 137. \$19.95. Paper, \$9.95.**

The title of this volume might well lead one to expect that we have finally witnessed the arrival of a study treating the origins and development of sociology as a discipline in Canada. That unfortunately is not the case. The book is rather an examination of the work of S. D. Clark, surely a worthy subject for, as the author notes, Clark is commonly regarded to be the "father of Canadian sociology". However, it is fair to say that Clark achieved this status not solely by virtue of his scholarly contributions; perhaps equally important was the pivotal role he played in establishing sociology as a legitimate province of inquiry through the founding of academic programmes, professional associations, learned journals, etc. Whilst Clark's pioneering efforts on this front are acknowledged by the

author they are incidental to her focus on the distinctive features of his intellectual perspective.

Apart from his pre-eminence in the field, Harrison has singled out Clark's thought for scrutiny because she believes it embodies a number of polarities which also represent lines of demarcation between Canadian sociologists. On the one hand, there is a tradition of sociology which is historical, comparative, and concerned with the structural properties of social collectivities. By contrast, there also exists a style of sociology interested less in the history or structure of groups and societies than in formulating universal laws about the behaviour of individuals. According to Harrison, the latter tradition is premised on a liberal conception of individual freedom that is characteristic of orthodox American sociology. The former or collective tradition, which has both a conservative and radical variant, is said to be at philosophical odds with the liberal conception of social science. Whereas most sociologists tend to gravitate toward one or the other of these orientations, Clark's approach to the study of society is said to straddle the two. More specifically, Harrison claims that there is an opposition between the form of Clark's sociological work which is concerned with the conditions under which collectivities survive or perish over time and its actual content which is said to focus on the adjustment of individuals seeking to improve their positions within such collectivities. The author applauds the nationalist form of Clark's work with its attention to the society as a whole and the historical problem of Canada's survival, but scores its individualist content for effectively promoting continentalism or a "non-resistant attitude . . . toward the continued American absorption of Canada." In short, the thesis is advanced that the development of an "indigenous Canadian sociology" should emulate the collective, nationalist form of Clark's scholarship, but reject its individualist, anti-nationalist content.

The first half of the book is largely taken up with situating Clark's thought within the aforementioned traditions and attempting to document the purported form/content split. In so doing Harrison provides a useful overview of the two traditions in general and Clark's major writings in particular. The author makes a case that Clark's effort to bridge these two perspectives was bound to fail since they are inherently irreconcilable. Not surprisingly, Clark himself denies the charge that his sociological approach is beset by such divisions and contradictions. The main question addressed by the author in the second half of the book is the rather curious one of how Clark is able to sustain and justify the uneasy co-existence of these supposedly discordant aspects and implications of his work. The short answer Harrison gives to this question is that Clark's "analytical schizophrenia" is understandable in terms of his naive adherence to certain dubious philosophical tenets of Western liberalism. To oversimplify, the author contends that it is liberal ideology's illogical dichotomies between "fact" and "value" and between "individual" and "society" that have enabled Clark to subscribe simultaneously to nationalist style of scholarship in tradition of Harold Innis and to a mode of American

imported inquiry unsuited to the task of understanding Canada in order to promote its independence.

In sum, the title of this study is rather misleading, since the book is essentially an appreciation and critique of the sociology of S. D. Clark. As such, I would regard Harrison's contribution as a qualified success. I think there can be little gainsaying that Clark's sociology harbours a fundamental ambivalence about Canada's relationship to the U.S. Whilst the putative form/content divergence is perhaps overdrawn and the individualist tradition is occasionally presented in a manner that encourages its wholesale rejection, I believe Harrison has nevertheless seized upon what are in truth real contradictions and deficiencies in Clark's work. I particularly have some sympathy for the criticism of Harrison and a whole chorus of radical political economists that Clark's understanding of Canada's economic, political, and cultural penetration by the U.S. is too simplistic. For Clark, Canada is not tied to a structured relationship of subordination and dependence with "her great neighbour to the south;" she is merely subjected to a heavy dose of American influence owing to geographic propinquity and an asymmetry of resources between the two countries. It is also probable that if Clark is indeed wrong in this interpretation, his blindspots and dissonance probably do have some connection with his professed liberalism. Happily, some of Canada's younger sociologists — the work of Wallace Clement comes especially to mind — have already gone beyond carping and conjecturing about what they perceive as the weaknesses of liberal social science by carrying out some rather sophisticated research designed to yield a more adequate analysis of Canadian society. However, I would by no means suggest that we can entrust to the radical political economists the complicated task of unravelling all of the sociological problems that are part of that understanding. I shall end with the bald assertion, unexamined by Harrison, that like liberalism and conservatism, radical ideology also imposes limits on our ability to explain social reality.

Dalhousie University

James Stolzman

***The Great Uranium Cartel.* By Earle Gray. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982. Pp. 303. \$24.95**

The purpose of a cartel is to reduce or remove competition among the producers of an item, usually by forming an agreement to restrict output. As output is restricted, price rises and the operations of cartel members become more profitable—at the expense, of course, of purchasers and potential purchasers of the item. At the same time, the higher price creates problems for the cartel managers. First, since output has been restricted, members may find themselves with output quotas that are much less than the amount that would be profitable at the lucrative cartel price. Each member is thus tempted to increase its output while secretly shaving prices

in order to make extra sales. Second, the higher cartel price is likely to attract new producers who are not members of the cartel agreement. If these two factors cannot be contained, the cartel price will be undermined, perhaps to the extent of destroying the cartel.

The uranium cartel had to deal with these problems, but as Earle Gray points out, it began with an important aid. Governments have always been part of the modern uranium industry. The cartel was fostered by governments and governments stood ready to assist with the enforcement of cartel agreements. In fact, the Canadian government encouraged firms under its jurisdiction to join.

The Canadian uranium industry developed during the cold war to serve American and, to a lesser extent, British weapons development, but the use of uranium for bombs peaked in 1959. A newly expanded industry thus faced a world-wide decline in uranium prices. In 1959, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission shielded the U.S. industry from foreign competition with an embargo on uranium imports. The Canadian industry was thereby locked out of its primary market. Eventually, the Canadian government initiated a series of meetings which culminated in 1972 with the formation of the uranium cartel. Producers in seven countries were involved.

Two Canadian companies, Gulf Minerals Canada, a subsidiary of the Pittsburgh based Gulf Oil, and Uranerz Canada, a subsidiary of the West German Uranerz Company, had been kept informed of the cartel meetings but declined to participate. These firms were co-holders of a not yet producing, but very large uranium deposit at Rabbit Lake, Saskatchewan. They apparently felt they could do better outside the cartel, but Gulf also feared that, with its U.S. parent, participation would make it vulnerable to U.S. anti-trust action. U.S. law stipulates that collusive action which raises prices in U.S. markets is an anti-trust violation, even though the action may occur outside the U.S. Ottawa responded with a cabinet regulation that Gulf and Uranerz apparently interpreted as requiring membership and as overriding Canadian anti-combines law.

Documents stolen in 1976 from Mary Kathleen Uranium, Ltd. of Australia revealed the cartel to the public. These documents fueled intense anti-trust investigations in the U.S. Various legal maneuvers were used by the Americans to obtain documents from non-American companies. To block the extraterritorial application of American anti-trust law, the Canadian government made it illegal to disclose cartel information. This led to charges by Opposition Members of Parliament that the government was simply trying to conceal its own involvement in the cartel. Faced with this pressure, the same government that earlier had encouraged membership in the cartel issued (in 1981) summonses alleging that all six Canadian firms which had participated were involved in a conspiracy to reduce competition. As might be imagined, this and many of the other litigations surrounding the cartel are not yet settled.

Gray successfully uses the tactic of letting the record speak for itself. This allows him, for example, to highlight the contradictory nature of a

U.S. policy that first raised U.S. uranium prices by embargoing uranium imports, then insisted on extraterritorial application of U.S. anti-trust law because a foreign cartel had accomplished the same thing. His treatment of the uranium industry also seems quite thorough. In fact, details are provided to the extent of making it difficult to keep track of all the elements of the story. Further, the history of the cartel itself is so tangled that one must concentrate to maintain a grasp of the story's thread, but the subplots are themselves fascinating. The story of the stolen Mary Kathleen documents and the difficulties of Westinghouse is an example. At the same time, Gray's style is quite readable.

Gray's explanation of the disappearance of the cartel seems incomplete. He suggests the cartel became redundant because by the mid-1970s other forces were driving up prices. It seems, however, that this situation would have made the cartel easier to maintain simply because there would have been less bickering over market shares and prices. It is true that a cartel should be concerned about a price boom because new competitors may be drawn into the field. The way around this, however, would have been to maintain price discipline by releasing more uranium into the market. Gray's narrative leads one to believe that the cartel simply did not have the ability to do this. However, the glare of publicity, political factors, and anti-trust action apparently indicate that the all-important element of cohesion that governments had been supplying was removed and even replaced with antagonism. This would certainly have affected the viability of the cartel.

Dalhousie University

Melvin L. Cross