



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS



Review

Author(s): Warren M. Elofson

Review by: Warren M. Elofson

Source: *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 112, No. 1 (Feb., 2007), pp. 180-181

Published by: [Oxford University Press](#) on behalf of the [American Historical Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4136033>

Accessed: 17-07-2015 20:52 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Oxford University Press and American Historical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Historical Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Canada, its largest ally in 1940, would take on this burden. As usual, Canada's wartime government initially balked. W. L. Mackenzie King's Liberals instinctively resisted commitments.

Then, as the British government had already loaded a ship with internees, Ottawa yielded, and a desperate search for accommodation began. Since the internees would disembark at Quebec City, Quebec sites were a top priority, ranging from a federal experimental farm at Farnham, to some railway sheds near Sherbrooke, to a long-abandoned border fort at Île aux Noix. World War I veterans, hurriedly enlisted in a Veterans' Guard of Canada, provided sentries. A former POW, Colonel H. N. Streight, took charge. Conditions, at least initially, were grim.

They soon improved. Internees ranged from teenagers to octogenarians, but plenty had the skills needed to repair huts, install plumbing, and provide education and cultural life. Since the internees were prisoners of Britain, not Canada, Ottawa could do little to relieve the obvious injustice of holding German Jewish and Communist refugees from Adolf Hitler in the same camps as committed Nazis. Canada's prewar rejection of Jewish refugees suggests that the government may even have been reluctant to do that little. However, by early 1941, the British came to their senses; internees in Canada became refugees, and many won passage to England by joining the British Army's Pioneer Corps. Some 996 waited impatiently to become Canadian immigrants.

The internees' place in Canadian camps was promptly taken, again at British request, by German military prisoners. Again Ottawa balked; again the compromise was that the prisoners were Great Britain's responsibility, not Canada's. Losing thousands of prisoners to the Japanese at Hong Kong and to the Germans at Dieppe, as Auger reminds us, gave Ottawa a very direct incentive to adhere faithfully to the Geneva Convention of 1929, for fear of reprisals against Canadian soldiers. Geneva regulations could sometimes work to the internees' disadvantage, since the custodial power was compelled to return prisoners only to their homeland. When Canada disposed of its prisoners at the end of the war, they were returned to their captor, Britain, where most were diverted to the hard labor of reconstruction for a couple of years. All requests to remain in Canada were denied, although many of the men returned as immigrants.

Fear of reprisal made Canada reluctant to launch the vigorous denazification programs undertaken by Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States, and the eventual efforts to re-educate so-called "White" or anti-Nazi prisoners seem to have been ineffective. "Black" prisoners at Grande-Ligne even formed Hari-Kari clubs in which dedicated Nazis plotted a suicidal breakout and sabotage campaign for whenever Hitler's defeat was announced. In practice, Auger indicates, denazification worked better than the professionals believed. Anti-Nazi prisoners reported the names of

Hari-Kari fanatics, and the war ended in 1945 without incident.

Auger limited himself to the smaller prison camps in southern Quebec while giving readers an adequate overview of national policies and all the information he could glean from published reminiscences of former internees and prisoners. The bulk of both categories were confined in much bigger Canadian camps, mostly in Ontario and Alberta, where conditions were harsher and Nazi-led resistance resulted in violence and the murder of alleged Allied collaborators. Anyone seeking a fuller account will be assisted by Auger's bibliography and may want to start with Jonathan Vance's comprehensive *Objects of Concern: Canadian Prisoners of War Through the Twentieth Century* (1994).

DESMOND MORTON
McGill University

BILL WAISER. *Saskatchewan: A New History*. Photographs by JOHN PERRET. Calgary, Alberta: Fifth House. 2005. Pp. 563. \$37.95.

This book provides an excellent account of Saskatchewan's historical development from the presettlement period of the late nineteenth century to the present. It ends with a consideration of some of the most daunting challenges the province faces for the future. The prose is lively and lucid. Bill Waiser has the innate ability (that so many scholars lack) to present historical information in such a way as to entertain as well as inform. This is particularly admirable in a survey study and it certainly earns the gratitude of the reader.

Waiser adeptly handles a great array of subjects. His knowledge and ostensible understanding of Saskatchewan's major political battles and his refreshing descriptions of the best known provincial leaders from Walter Scott and Ross Thatcher of the Liberal Party to Tommy Douglas, Allan Blakeney, and Roy Romanow of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation/New Democrats, to Grant Devine of the Conservatives are both insightful and engaging. Waiser has particular empathy for Douglas, the "extremely accessible leader," who regularly applied the "sheer force of his personality" to bring sound management to rural Saskatchewan and the economy at large while spearheading the drive to create the modern Medicare system. It must be emphasized, however, that this is much more than a political or even a politics-centered work. Native issues, farming and ranching, urban development, protest movements, prohibition, women's suffrage, economic depression, and war are nicely balanced by rural sports and culture and such things as the coming of mechanization, electricity, radio, and talking pictures.

Waiser's narrative is, on the whole, optimistic—at times even eulogistic. However, he pulls no punches when it comes to showing the darker side of life. He illustrates the racist attitudes of the Anglo majority toward Austro-Hungarians, Ukrainians, Mennonites, Doukhobors, the French and, during war, Germans. He

is particularly concerned about the historical ill-treatment of Aboriginals and Metis and unflinchingly quotes a deputy minister of the Department of Indian Affairs in 1920 who stated: "I want to get rid of the Indian problem . . . Our object is to continue until there is not a single Indian in Canada that has not been absorbed into the body politic, and there is no Indian question and no Indian Department" (p. 183). At the same time, with as much depth as could be expected from a survey account, Waiser illustrates the economic deficiencies of a farm economy based on a single crop and international markets, and he has little compunction about underscoring farmer shortsightedness, the cruel Royal Canadian Mounted Police treatment of Native peoples, and of striking miners' in 1931, and the inadequate representation for both women and Aboriginals in the provincial legislative assembly.

The major problem with the book as a historical work is Waiser's sporadic use of generalizations that rely more on clichés than hard-nosed historical evidence. Thus, for instance, he gives lip-service to the problem of rural depopulation in Saskatchewan and openly laments "the continuing disappearance of the family farm." While he clearly recognizes that mechanization has been a major factor in the expansion of individual agricultural holdings, he fails to acknowledge that families, not agri-business or corporations, have done most of the expanding. I would direct him to Paul Voisey's excellent study of the Vulcan wheat economy in the period from 1904 to the late 1920s as well as my own recent investigations of the ranching frontier. That the family farm unit was still in control on the prairies as late as 1971 is illustrated by the fact that at that time there were only 147 farms, or .0019 of the 76,970 farms in Saskatchewan, that could be described by the Canadian Census Reports as incorporated nonfamily operations.

Waiser also praises the Crows Nest Pass legislation that until 1994 subsidized the movement of western Canadian grain to the east. Many prairie farmers, as well as transportation historians like Ted Regher, have argued that the "crow rate" was one of the artificial supports that secured the grain processing industry for eastern Canada when it might have helped to diversify and improve the rural economy out west. Waiser's penchant for hyperbole also leads him to utter an array of rather unhistorical euphemisms. Thus, for instance, Ethel Catherwood's gold medal in 1928 was "one of the sure signs that Saskatchewan was well along the road to greatness" (p. 277); and "despite the broken dreams, the cruel setbacks, and the misery and deprivation," Saskatchewan people during the depression "never lost faith in the land and its ability to provide a good living" (p. 302).

These excesses aside, however, Waiser has written a very good book. It is an interesting, even compelling, read and will unquestionably be successful in reaching out to the general as well as the academic audience. It

will also almost certainly be seen as a model for the study of provincial and, indeed, state history.

WARREN M. ELOFSON
University of Calgary

CHRISTOPHER CLARK. *Social Change in America: From the Revolution through the Civil War*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee. 2006. Pp. xiii, 342. \$27.50.

From Christopher Clark's first book, *The Roots of Rural Capitalism: Western Massachusetts, 1780-1860* (1990) onward, he has explored the theme of market and capitalist transformation in the young United States. He continues that exploration in this volume. The book is synthetic rather than monographic, drawing together Clark's mastery of a broad range of scholarship. Aiming at an upper-division undergraduate/graduate student readership, Clark tells how the United States moved from the small farmer/artisanal/slave plantation/merchant-capitalist society that emerged from the American Revolution to the industrial giant that followed the Civil War. I would gladly recommend this book to anyone, student or general reader, who wanted the sort of overview that the title promises.

As Clark notes, however, the large story of American social development cannot be a single narrative. He understands that American social history necessarily is writ small, in specific tales. Clark builds his book around six themes: families and households, the organization of work and labor, the emergence of new social structures, the relationships between elites and plebeians, regional differences, and persistent tension between extensive expansion and intensive development. Interwoven, these themes pervade the whole book.

Setting out that schema as he opens the book, Clark gives the most space to the problem of elites, which is another way of saying to the problem of social class. In two revolutionary moments, one as the British Empire broke up and one as the United States nearly failed, elites and plebeians confronted one another openly, even violently in America. But in most of the rest of Clark's account, social groups danced a Virginia reel of confrontation, mediation, coalition, and confrontation.

Clark's "they" is Whitmanesque. There is no single national elite in his pages. Nor is there a single working class, or a single group of agrarians. Yet there was an ultimately single prize worth contending for: the future direction of American society. E. P. Thompson described the making of the English working class; Clark has set out to describe the making of capitalist America, in a book about one-third the length of Thompson's.

Perhaps the biggest problem confronting anybody who attempts a class analysis of America is what to do about race. Clark is far too good a historian to exclude African Americans or to try to fold race into another schema. He recognizes that nineteenth-century American capitalist development rested heavily on the shoulders of enslaved workers. His black people are actors, not victims. But somehow they seem to have less "presence" than his northeastern capitalists and workers or