

in *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*. Having read through the book, I would draw different, and perhaps not quite so sharply drawn, conclusions about the distinctions between the state and civil society. Although I agree it is important to attribute leadership of moral reform to a wide range of organizations, and that the formation of the welfare state in English Canada was (still is) uneven and inconsistent, some of the possible implications of this study are lost by drawing such clear boundaries between "the state" and "civil society." It seems to me that the issue is not so much one of determining which sphere was more important, but to consider the rich texture of educational, discursive, cultural, and organizational forms through which moral reformers worked to change social relations and social subjectivities in this period. Valverde has corrected the common error of attributing all agency to "the state," but she may have gone further to reject attribution of agency to "the state" altogether. Indeed, the accounts she gives in the book demonstrate that the state is not an "it" which acts in any kind of coherent or consistent fashion, but rather a particular (and particularly legitimated) form of organizing class, gender, and race/ethnic relations.

Likewise, there are places where Valverde moves quickly from analysis of discursive strategies (around racial and sexual purity, for example) to drawing conclusions about people's motives and intentions. It seems to me that she uses notions and strategies from post-structuralism, such as the centrality of language to the formation of subjectivity and the viability of

deconstruction for historical inquiry, while holding on to assumptions from more traditional social science, in which the investigation of writing is used to read off or reconstruct their authors' intentions. As I finished reading the book, I kept wondering whether such an alliance of theories and methodologies were possible. Although I did not arrive at any conclusion on that score, this is precisely the kind of question that important books ought to stimulate.

Mariana Valverde's book ought to be widely read by historians of education, and other historians and social scientists in Canada and North America. In rich detail and often brilliant interpretation she confronts a important period in Canadian social history and a controversial set of movements, many of whose social, cultural, and political legacies we continue to live with.

Kari Dehli
Ontario Institute for Studies in
Education

Jean Barman. *The West Beyond the West—A History of British Columbia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991. Pp. 429. \$35.00.

The West Beyond The West is the first major history of British Columbia since Martin Robin's two-volume political work of nearly twenty years

ago, and a third of a century since Ormsby's standard endeavour.

Organized chronologically and thematically, chapters in the book include the search for British Columbia, the fur trade, the pre-confederation regime, the growth years, the W.A.C. Bennett years, the recent fragile prosperity, and the provincial identity. The identity of B.C. has been largely influenced by the development of the province as a resource frontier. Britons invested in coal mining and salmon canning, Americans in lumbering, and central Canadians in railroads. As much as outsiders, Barman argues, British Columbians themselves have plundered their material heritage. Attendants of the pillage have frequently been class antagonisms and racial disensions.

There are many strengths to this book—its power of synthesis, its treatment of native issues, its broad understanding of educational history, its vibrant photographs, immaculate maps, and valuable statistical tables. In roughly a decade, Barman has become one of the foremost historians of British Columbia. The dedication, courage, and faithful application necessary to create such a work almost invariably outweigh any carping or misgiving of any reviewer. What follows is therefore more of a longing than a criticism. It takes the form of asking of the academic tradition both more and less.

An academic provincial history today almost requires an essay on sources. Possibly no one knows the sources as well, no one can so highlight their strengths, weaknesses, and biases, no one has achieved such a

triumph over the raw materials from which all good histories are crafted as the scholar who has just written such a history.

It is true that across the continent the academic writing of history is in crisis—but whatever happens to the form of presentation, the genre cannot and must not relinquish its sense of rigour and completeness in plumbing all relevant sources. New students of B.C.'s past desperately need the guidance of a master seeker—one who knows the layout of the mine, its riches and poverty, its depth and dead ends.

The creation of a new synthesis comes seldom and is the ideal moment for comment on the evolving historiography of a province. Where does the new synthesis sit in the transition from Bancroft to Howay, Gosnell, Ormsby, and Robin? How are the central bodies of primary government collections such as the McBride papers and the Oliver papers at the provincial archives, or the Tolmie papers at the University of British Columbia, insightful, distorting, or disturbing? What government collections are available for the Bennett-Barrett-Bennett regimes?

Often historians brave enough to bring their histories to the present must assimilate a different mix of sources from more recent times because sensitive materials regarding provincial administration are still closed. The latter chapters of such histories often resemble journalistic renditions, written perforce without the "interior knowledge" of the deeper motivations and machinations of a period. Such considerations are part of the general problem of writing a provincial his-

tory, and doubtless Barman's even brief assessment of them would enlighten those to follow.

Readers can draw inferences from the footnotes, but even here there is a frugality. More and more, university presses have begun to resist over-footnoting, replacing it sometimes with over-zealous excision that can undermine a primary strength of academic history, its revelation of sources. In this volume there are several statements esoteric enough in nature to require substantiation. Cost of living increases, pulp wood production, saw-mill numbers, railway deficits, canning statistics, and strike statistics are a few.

Counterbalancing this frugality, Barman has assembled a powerful appendix of twenty tables summarizing provincial elections, origins of the population, religious affiliation of the people, fertility rates, gross domestic product, and the value of mining. Additional tables on agriculture, forestry, and fisheries would help, though sometimes these are easier requested than produced.

It should be remembered that the writing in this volume is part of an academic tradition that has endured in its present state for the better part of two generations. The tradition possesses completeness, rigour, and (in Barman's case) simplicity—all great strengths. But it also possesses a grave weakness, one which will in the end prove its undoing.

The overarching impression, the dominating imprint I felt personally upon reading this welcome volume is that the writing itself is an extraordinary understatement of Barman's vast

interest in her subject. She speaks in the first few lines of her youthful dreams of British Columbia, of her "love" for this "west beyond the west" (p. vii). This very declaration is a delight to readers. But the expression of this affection requires a language form, throughout the text, that will reveal it. And here is the great problem of most academic history—it cannot adequately reveal emotion.

Love, fascination, and enthusiasm cannot be conveyed in neutral language, in expression devoid of figurative power, in utterance shorn of motivation. They cannot be so muted, so subdued, that they are virtually lost. The academic archetype of the past forty-odd years is deliberately unemotive, purposefully bland, and sadly and most importantly unengaging. It has its strengths, and these must be preserved, but here has been its weakness. Without engagement, there can be no supporting readership; and without readership, any form of writing must sooner or later disappear.

How can one describe a province of "superlatives," and Barman is dead right in calling it that, with the use of neutral language? How can one paint the grandeur of British Columbia in faint pastels?

The neutral academic writing of history dehumanizes the author. Why? Because it reins in his or her commitment and demands an unnatural reserve. It is a type of mental corsetting, limiting, and curtailing. Evidence of the emptiness current academics feel in their own expression can be found in the fact that most scholarly historians secretly long for fiery emotional outbursts in their char-

acters, so that they can inject a modicum of feeling in their writing. But the feeling is always someone else's feeling.

It is a prize for the dead to have spoken that way, but heaven help us if we, the living, should speak with such life. In their search for the respect that cold impartiality brings, many academic historians have employed consciously and unconsciously distancing techniques, whereby their laudable enthusiasm for their subject is squelched, underplayed, and obscured. Unemotive language is a form of unnatural constraint, of over-control, of holding back, of dampening fascination and diminishing intimacy.

Neutral academic writing of history also dehumanizes its characters. Their very personalities can fade into unreality. More and more this effect is being accomplished, partially at least, by a relatively new invention—the phenomenon of the unidentified, unattached, speakerless quotation—simply inserted without a “Blake said,” “Smith said,” or “he or she said.” This form of quotation integration may seem to be more efficient, but in the end it is not, for it introduces a dislocation into the prose and ultimately a chop, because readers instinctively look to see who spoke and when they cannot find out, they often stop reading and file through the footnotes. Even then they will usually be disappointed by the description of the speaker. And so there is the paradox of something worth saying by a voice not worth mentioning.

One of the great attributes of this book is its sensitive control of literary works about the province. Possibly

the next step is to use these literary modes, even if ever so slightly, as models of how to combine substance with engagement.

All of this said, one cannot underestimate the foundational contribution of this new history of British Columbia. If there be truth in this review, however much the form of academic writing may modify for the sake of its own survival, it can never be meaningful without the painstaking groundwork Barman has so clearly demonstrated here.

David C. Jones
University of Calgary

Geoffrey Cocks and Konrad H. Jarausch, eds. *German Professions, 1800-1950*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. Pp. ix, 340. \$63.00 Cdn, cloth.

This is a welcome addition to the growing literature on the professionalization of German academic occupations, edited by two of the pioneers in this field. Geoffrey Cocks published one of the first studies in English in 1985, with his analysis of professional psychotherapists during the Third Reich. In so doing he helped to initiate what has now almost become a glut in the critical literature on modern German medicine. Konrad Jarausch is the author of several pace-setting papers and an authoritative