

of a now lost urban environment, as he illustrates the enduring continuities of crime with an abundance of local examples.

Weaver concludes that one of the signal achievements of the Hamilton police and their compatriots in other cities has been to reduce “a great variety of risks” (p. 21) for the urban inhabitant. Those who live in today’s large North American cities might be sceptical about such a claim, given prevalent fears for personal safety, but he makes a persuasive case. He is even more convincing in some of his other main points: the increase in state power, the role of the police in enforcing state regulations, the centralization and professionalization of the instruments of the criminal justice system, and the growing domination of science and technology in criminal justice. Weaver himself acknowledges nagging concerns about the cumulative effect of these changes on civil liberties. He certainly has succeeded in raising profound issues about the system itself in this far-reaching case study of Hamilton. These issues deserve wide debate, and Weaver’s book is an excellent starting point. It should be mandatory reading for the police themselves, from chiefs to constables, and not only in Hamilton.

David Murray
University of Guelph

Stanley R. Barrett — *Paradise: Class, Commuters, and Ethnicity in Rural Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994. Pp. xiv, 315.

Ontario lacks an indigenous anthropological tradition. The province that has refused to be one, preferring to think of itself as the nation writ large, has concentrated on describing other peoples in remote areas of the world, occasionally turning to aboriginal peoples or isolated northern communities as sufficiently exotic to be of interest. The rural history of Quebec has been enriched by anthropological studies dating from the middle of the nineteenth century, but Ontario’s rural history has turned instead to economic and social historians for extended commentaries on the decennial census. Historians of ethnic groups such as the Irish and Italians breach the gap to a more humanistic outlook through longitudinal inquiries, but by their nature such studies must be partial. While the twentieth-century United States is brought into focus through such monumental ethnologies as *Middletown* (1929) and William Lloyd Warner’s Yankee city series, the only major portrait concerning the southern part of Ontario has been of suburbia, *Crestwood Heights* (1956).

Just as the discipline of history has approached anthropology over the past three decades, so anthropology has abandoned the pursuit of the other to help us understand ourselves better. As seen in the work of the American anthropologist Marshall Sahlins or the Canadian Frans Schryer, ethnology has branched out to include the documentary as well as the oral record, in a manner that only varies in emphasis from that employed by historian Joy Parr in her award-winning *Gender of Breadwinners* (1990). Following studies of a religious community in west Africa and

right-wing groups in Canada, University of Guelph anthropologist Stanley Barrett applies this combined historical and ethnological approach to small-town Ontario.

The site of *Paradise* for Barrett is Shelburne, a small community near Orangeville, north of Toronto. Originally a “wood-up” spot on the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway, Shelburne was transformed after World War II by the automobile. With a constant population during the first half of the twentieth century, the village doubled in size between 1969 and 1978 (during which time it achieved town status). Barrett attempts to describe and explain the main ethnological changes that occurred there from the 1950s to the late 1980s. He concentrates on three groups: natives (residents for more than 30 years); newcomers (the more recent arrivals); and minorities (principally a sub-grouping of the newcomers). Three years of fieldwork (that included interviewing 341 people) were supplemented by research in assessment rolls, local history, and relevant sociological and anthropological studies. The results are fascinating reading because the details are intimate and Barrett writes well, but the study remains seriously flawed.

Barrett decided to make the concept of social class central to his finished work despite having undertaken research with the traditional presuppositions of anthropology. He therefore adopted the subjective (attributional) definition of class favoured more than half a century ago by Warner, an Australian anthropologist turned American sociologist. As this highly criticized approach has fallen into disfavour, Barrett grafted interactional (objective) definitions onto his study without complete success. He employs a system of five classes (upper, lower-upper, middle, lower-middle, and lower), but his work cries out for definitions that are never forthcoming and for explanations about the way he arrived at statistical renderings. Occasionally the five-class structure is forgotten when the author lapses with other terms such as elite, aristocracy, and working class. The larger framework that might have been provided by the published censuses is also lacking.

The heart of the book is therefore based on extended interviews that were not chosen randomly, a flaw that the author acknowledges in a chapter on methodology. Instead, Barrett lived in Shelburne, visited it frequently, and let his interviews accumulate in snowball fashion, one informant leading to another. Particularly troubling is his mention of leaving a copy of his previous book, *Is God a Racist?* (1987), with people during pre-interviews. A few stores and restaurants provided his best leads, but in pursuing French Canadians in Shelburne Barrett appears to have worked outwards from the hall of the Canadian Legion. A random sample, or beginning with such organizations as churches, would have produced a very different outcome. Such an approach would also have provided better gender balance and perhaps corrected the author’s erroneous views of women’s roles in the recent past. As E. H. Carr reminded historians decades ago, the part of the sea that the historian decides to fish in will influence the nature of the catch.

These deficiencies aside, Barrett provides a fascinating portrait of social and political change. Nowhere else can one find the depth presented here about the advantages and disadvantages inherent in small-town southern Ontario life. Barrett is always fair and even-handed, frequently providing cases before qualifying them as exceptional rather than the norm. The hell of commuting as related by some

residents is balanced with a second section in which the benefits to this mode of existence are outlined by people in their own words. The range of topics covered is large, dealing with matters as diverse as changes in local government or evolving voluntary organizations, as well as incest and abuse, although the latter discussion is completely inconclusive.

Particularly interesting is the author's portrait of four minorities in the town: those of African, Asian, French-Canadian, and Jewish descent. Apart from the Jews, these people were largely recent arrivals in what was once an overwhelmingly British and Protestant village. While the conflict between natives and newcomers that Barrett analyzes will be unsurprising to those familiar with rural Ontario in the past 30 years, the blatant racism against visible minorities that he exposes reveals how recent immigration policies have created a new urban/rural divide based on the degree of ethnic pluralism. Barrett explains that African Canadians are more vocal about the discrimination they encounter because they had arrived in Shelburne as individuals who attempted to integrate into the community. South Asians, on the other hand, experience similar discrimination, but they have been in Canada for a shorter time and protect themselves through intensive networking, seldom interacting with the community other than in work relations. Consequently South Asians are less outspoken.

While Barrett often couches his results in statistical form, the weaknesses in his methodology render such findings suspect. Rather, *Paradise* is a book that can be read to hear the residents of small-town Ontario speak and to see where history and anthropology converge.

Terry Crowley
University of Guelph

Serge Bernier *et al.*, rédacteurs — *La participation des Canadiens français à la Deuxième Guerre mondiale : mythes et réalités*, *Bulletin d'histoire politique*, vol. 3, n^{os} 3/4, printemps/été 1995, 408 p.

The Second World War, much like the Great War, was a time of trial for Quebec and French Canada. English-speaking Canadians, most especially those of British origin, wanted to participate fully in the war and had scant patience with their more reluctant compatriots, a group that encompassed francophones, many of the English-speaking of non-British origins, and a variety of conscientious objectors found in the Peace churches and throughout society. Overall, the war effort was superb, with more than a million men and women joining up out of a population of just over 11 million, and out of a male population base of just 2.5 million between the ages of 18 and 45. The percentage of those who enlisted ranged from 42 per cent in Saskatchewan, a province with a very large number of ethnic Canadians, to over 50 per cent in British Columbia.

And Quebec? In Quebec, only 25.7 per cent of the eligible male population served as volunteers. That figure excludes Quebec's more than 43 per cent of the