

formance of “symbolic aggression,” it was real (125). It would have been useful to hear more from the women who took their drunken husbands to court for non-support, from children who suffered abuse, or even to have taken the narratives of members of Alcoholics Anonymous more seriously. Problem drinkers are a minority, but there are more of them than Heron wants to admit, and there are valid reasons to be concerned about the harm they do to themselves and to others. Compared to his terrific work on drinking cultures and policy, Heron pays less attention to the history of alcohol research and treatment, although he makes a compelling case for how badly many treatment professionals dealt with working-class drinkers. More than once, Heron mentions that moderate alcohol consumption has health benefits, but he pays relatively little attention to contemporary research on the costs of alcohol consumption including disease, family disruption, violence, and accidents. He dismisses the “total consumption model,” used by the Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario, but I would argue that the evidence that harm increases as total consumption increases is actually quite compelling, at least in certain drinking cultures. The World Health Organization recently determined that four percent of the global burden of disease is caused by alcohol – about the same percentage as tobacco.

These minor concerns aside, Heron has created a lively world of drinkers, temperance supporters, and workers. Heron should be applauded for taking on such an ambitious project, and adding so much to our knowledge of drinking, masculinity, and working-class culture. Cheers!

Catherine Carstairs
University of British Columbia

Marlene Shore, ed., *The Contested Past: Reading Canada's History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002).

The Contested Past performs a service to the Canadian historical community. Aside from providing excellent notes for doctoral students approaching their comprehensive exams, it assembles the essential points of nearly 80 years of Canada's leading historical journal. The book comprises 69 article excerpts accompanied by commentary by Marlene Shore. These excerpts are divided into four mainly chronological sections and then subdivided by theme within those periods. No explanation of the selection criteria is given, but presumably the choice was based on informed personal impressions. This book could anchor an undergraduate historiography class, as it reveals how some of the main trends and issues in the study of Canada's past have changed, or not

changed, with the passing decades. But more explicitly, the editor's introduction also offers a concise history of the *Canadian Historical Review* (CHR), the premiere historical journal in Canada. Here, although Professor Shore has previously written on similar subjects, the introduction falls a bit short.

My complaint is that the introduction is a simple narrative, revealing few glimpses of discussions behind the scenes. Perhaps the CHR's double-blind assessment process prevents revealing too much, but surely this could be accommodated. Simply put, the introduction glosses over contentious issues and is largely uncritical. As one example, although Shore repeatedly informs the reader that the editors tried to bridge the divide between French and English Canadians, it is difficult to perceive just how this was tried prior to the Quiet Revolution. The CHR remained firmly English in its conception, only awakening to the other solitude in the 1950s under John Saywell. Its first French-language article, appearing in 1962, was a curiously political choice – Fernand Ouellet's analysis of the historical roots of Québécois separatism – that reflected Anglophone apprehensions about Quebec and Canada more than French-language scholarship of the day. All of this receives little comment from Shore.

There are other examples that reflect, not so much a contested past, but an exercise in consensus building. This is not the fault of Marlene Shore. It would have been irresponsible to portray, for instance, a tradition of bilingualism where none really existed. But silences can be deafening, and informative. Where were the rebels and outsiders in this story? Were there no dissatisfied contributors? The CHR may be open to new methods today, but it is unfortunate that Shore does not explore the politics behind editorial decisions of the past. Editors and editorial boards sometimes have agendas (as might reviewers) and the rejected might reveal more than the published. An analysis of the reasons given for rejecting submissions, or perhaps some figures on the kinds of papers and authors most often turned down, might have revealed a greater but hidden contest to frame our collective memories. This is not investigated in the book Marlene Shore has given us. Instead we are shown a past contested, but only within the general consensus of mainstream academic historians.

Alan Gordon
University of Guelph

David Brandenberger, *National Bolshevism: Stalinist Mass Culture and the Formation of Modern Russian National Identity, 1931-1956* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2002).

David Brandenberger's *National Bolshevism* focuses on history and historical narrative as key to understanding how a particular national identity was creat-