

American Architecture Since 1780 is a book rather than a booklet, but its 313 pages are compacted into the portable Peterson *Field Guide* format. Its only shortcomings are its omission of vernacular buildings and its growing bibliographical obsolescence with the approach of its tenth birthday.

Which style guide is best? *American Architecture Since 1780* remains the most authoritative and complete. The reader who is willing to put in a little effort would be best with it. The person who wants the once-over-lightly-but-competently approach should try *Identifying American Architecture*. And the chronic building-watcher might do well to collect all of them.

Harold Kalman
Ottawa

The Historian and Film. Edited by PAUL SMITH. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976. viii, 208 p. ISBN 0 521 20992 7 \$13.95.

The publication of a group of articles always poses the question why the components were brought together as one collection. Paul Smith, editor of *The Historian and Film*, states that no substantial survey of the theme suggested by the work's title exists, and proposes "to say something about almost all the major aspects of historians' interest in film." He adds that "no line has been laid down to which contributors have been required to conform; their diversity of opinion reflects, as is proper, the state of the subject." This haphazard approach is often disastrous, but the book, which covers a wide range of ideas and themes with contributions of variable quality, has produced no outright calamities, suffers only some setbacks, and presents enough very good articles to make the work well worth recommending.

The major problems have to do with the continental contributors. For example, the English is so turgid and peculiar in Rolf Schuurmsma's contribution as to be incomprehensible in spots. No translator is credited for this article or the one by Marc Ferro, which also suffers from a touch of awkwardness. The editor should not have permitted this sort of thing to happen to foreign contributors, for it is his job to ensure that the English, if not elegant, is at least readable. The mediocrity of translation unfairly distracts the reader from what is being said, and in Schuurmsma's case, good advice about selecting compilation film footage is, as it were, lost in translation.

The book largely reflects a British perspective, which is not surprising since most of the contributors work at various British universities. Six of the eleven authors, in addition to the editor, are professors of history, three are what might be called media professionals, one is an archivist and another is a professor of film studies.

Smith defines three main areas which he hopes to treat in order to offset past neglect: the investigation of film as source material, the use of film in the teaching of history, and the making of films for academic purposes. The importance of film to the historian, Smith points out, depends upon the area of interest, "the bottom if he is studying or expounding, say, conventional diplomatic history: the top if he is studying, say, the development of popular culture. . . ."

Lisa Pontecorvo writes about film resources from the point of view of the user. Although her comments on archival matters are superficial, she does outline some of the problems involved in searching for and using film resources. She also gives an interesting account of the various problems which tracing and clearing film copyright entail. Clive Coultass looks at the use of film from the other side of the fence in a sober

account of the difficulties involved in preserving film and videotape, as well as the subsidiary problem of then making them available for viewing. He gives priority to preservation over diffusion. Although the paper is largely a description of the tribulations of the National Film Archive, Coultass rightly points out that "the various questions discussed are common throughout the world."

William Hughes' article, "The Evaluation of Film as Evidence," is the one of greatest interest to historians. Along with a thorough description of the complex problem of authenticating film sources, he provides summaries of many approaches to the use of film in historical analysis. This piece is substantial enough to serve as a starting point for anyone wishing to examine the use of film as historical evidence. Hughes is also properly wary of his own subject matter. Many of the contributions to this book, for example, claim that fiction films are, to use Lisa Pontecorvo's phrase, "a very rich source for all manner of historical studies." The point, however, is never really established in spite of earnest entreaties for a closer examination of fiction features. Only Hughes approaches this theme with suitable caution, and his reservations offer a much better basis for further study than the general encouragements offered elsewhere. Hughes also underlines the point that film history has so far emphasized aesthetic considerations rather than the social, political, or economic aspects of film production. He recommends increased participation by professional historians to broaden the range and to bring greater depth and higher standards of accuracy to the field of film history.

An excellent example of what Hughes suggests is provided by Nicholas Pronay's paper on newsreels. His analysis of the history, function, and possible ways of studying newsreels is a model of clarity. So many writers on film start from a preconceived notion which the facts must be able to fit that Pronay's neutral account is even more welcome and revealing. His statistical studies uncover points that we might not have suspected without some form of rigorous methodology: that the percentage of newsreel stories devoted to political themes was higher than in the so-called quality newspapers in England; and the positions taken by the newsreels on important topics of the day have in retrospect stood up rather well, notably the stand taken by most newsreel companies on the inevitable results of the rise of militarism in Nazi Germany.

Marc Ferro's article is one of three contributions from persons working outside of Britain. Smith no doubt felt that the book would be incomplete without a tip of the hat to the structuralists, but the paper seems lost and out of context. Ferro argues that the fiction film is not analogous to the novel since, according to Kracauer's oft-repeated argument, every film records something which is real, even if it is made in a studio. He then proceeds to do a detailed shot-by-shot analysis which does not seem to substantiate his thesis. Replete with expressions like "author's intentions" and "latent ideology," the objectivity of his long analysis is only apparent, not real. His article, along with Pronay's, is nevertheless one of the few in which any history is being done. I cannot but think that a collection of articles in which historians cover historical topics might be more effective than having a lot of people talk about why historians ought to use film.

The last third of the book is devoted to the making of films about history by historians, and the use of film in teaching and broadcasting. These articles concentrate on the difficulties involved in making historical films, whether on an academic shoestring or for the British Broadcasting Corporation. The touchstones are the Open University and the British Inter-University History Film Consortium. Grenville argues that historians themselves should make film, without the distorting influences of producers and mass markets. Marwick discusses areas where the use of film in teaching can be most effective, and argues that film is not suited to the presentation of complex historical analyses. Haworth offers a "how-to" approach to potential users of film for

teaching purposes. Donald Watt's entertaining article shatters Grenville's call to action with "inevitably there is an element of home movie about the final product. . . . The historian as producer is no more satisfactory than the producer as amateur historian." He is, however, an advocate of the Open University's team approach to the making of films. Jerry Kuehl unashamedly presents the professional producer's view. He is as harsh as Watt in his criticism of the Consortium's work, and is quick to point out that the medium itself has severe limitations which are not the fault of current practitioners. His discussion, although clearly from the perspective of mass television, also gives us, in the last sentence of the book, one of its most interesting suggestions: that the efforts of historians "would be more valuable if directed to making filmed records of persons or events which would otherwise go unrecorded. . . ."

The book's index seems complete and the bibliography, prepared by the Slade Film History Register, is excellent. *The Historian and Film* is, in short, a most useful tool, and quite suitable as a text book, even if only for the articles by Hughes and Pronay. The last third would be rewarding reading for any academic thinking of dabbling in film or television. The general reader in the fields of archives, history, or film will find a great deal that is superficial, but enough food for thought to make the investment worthwhile.

K.M. Larose
National Film Archives
Public Archives of Canada

Vancouver's First Century: A City Album, 1860-1960. Edited by ANNE KLOPPENBORG [et al.] Introduction by DAVID BROCK. North Vancouver: J.J. Douglas, 1977. 154 p. ill. ISBN 0 88894 146 3 \$19.95.

Winnipeg: An Illustrated History. ALAN ARTIBISE. Toronto: James Lorimer; [Ottawa]: National Museum of Man, 1977. 224 p. ill., maps, ports. (The History of Canadian cities) ISBN 0 88862 150 7 bd. \$12.95; ISBN 0 88862 151 5 pa. \$8.95.

Vancouver's First Century and *Winnipeg: An Illustrated History* are two quite different works of urban history, yet each is basically successful in its own way. The first book is a "city album" that has exaggerated Vancouver's municipal existence by a few years, while the second, despite the allusion in the title to illustrations, is essentially a scholarly text supplemented by photographs, maps, and cartoons. The photographs in *Vancouver's First Century* are an organic part of the book, whereas those in *Winnipeg* are mere vestiges. These books are good examples for archives of the two methodological extremes which employ photographs.

Vancouver's First Century is a personal vision of the city's past, with contents collected and partly synthesized by the editors of *Urban Reader*, a magazine produced by the city's Social Planning Department. The editors have demonstrated a firm grasp of current social issues in Vancouver, but their interpretation of Vancouver's history through the use of quotations from newspapers, journals, diaries and the like leaves much to be desired.

The volume, superficially magnificent in its presentation of almost two hundred duotone photographs and enough white space to reduce crowding of text and images, had its genesis in five special issues of *Urban Reader* that appeared in 1974 and 1975. The book, however, is divided into eight chapters with a noticeable thinning of dramatic and exciting images after 1914. The photographs from 1914 to 1960 might