book, White has placed a group portrait of Sun Dance participants above an excerpt from an 1895 edition of The Saskatchewan Herald that pointedly notes the absence of torture in contrast to former such ceremonies. Again, without any reinterpretation of the image the negative connotation remains.

Despite these drawbacks, White’s book does present a selection of Moodie’s most compelling photographs from diverse phases of her photographic career. This gives the reader a concise but rich sample of the photographer’s work. Moreover, although the quality of the reproductions varies, In Search of Geraldine Moodie gives readers a chance to see images that have been unavailable to the public for almost a century. There are myriad paths into history that these images provide and this publication will spark further interest in Moodie’s work and that of other historical photographers.

Sherry Newman
Ottawa, Ontario


If one sentence could possibly summarize this prodigious yet highly readable *tour de force*, this would be my choice, quoted from the Canadian Forum, June 1939: “Although professors are always told that they have the full right of free speech, it has often been made plain to them that they should exercise that right in silence.” The price of liberty, as Michiel Horn of York University’s Glendon College History Department might have concluded, is that of eternal vigilance. Many of the long-ago battles for academic freedom described evoke familiar names – Frank Underhill, Eugene Forsey, and Harry Crowe, to name but three. And several cases of much more recent vintage demonstrate that academic freedom is still a moving target: political correctness and the Royal Ontario Museum’s “Out of Africa” exhibition; Dr. Nancy Olivieri’s experiences at the University of Toronto and Hospital for Sick Children; business schools’ responses to the siren song of corporate “partnerships”; and so forth.

Horn reminds us that academic freedom has traditionally encompassed two discrete ideas: the freedom for professors to do their work, and the preservation of universities from external control. While acknowledging that the latter is no less critical, it is the former that here concerns him. Horn argues how “professors have invoked academic freedom in order to free themselves from religious tests, to resist the authority of administrators and boards, to claim independence in their research, to control the content of their courses, to be judged by their peers and not by outsiders, and to be assessed on their achievements and not their beliefs.”
As an historical exposition, Horn’s examination begins around 1860 with a focus primarily on English Canadian and Protestant or nonsectarian academies. Here the concept of academic freedom was primarily articulated and the tensions largely played out. (He concludes from various authorities “that academic freedom was not until recently a value acknowledged by Roman Catholic universities.”) While religious contexts and issues were often crucial during the first seventy-odd or so years, the recurring fly in the ointment was the Canadian value set – the interplay resulting, in the author’s hands, in well-told narratives of high drama. These values encompassed an ingrained self-censorship, a loyalty to one’s enterprises (especially where livelihood is concerned), a deference to authority and reluctance to challenge it, and a respect for order and for smooth, non-confrontational conduct of affairs. As Horn observes, “these sapped the critical spirit. Yet a handful of professors did assert themselves, refusing to remain silent when faced with what they regarded as errors of policy or abuses of power. Speaking up when it would have been prudent to say nothing, they were the early heroes and martyrs of academic freedom in Canada.”

If there is a flaw in this argument it may be that Horn ascribes too much uniqueness to the Canadian value set and its impact. The American sociologist, C. Wright Mills, made comparable observations in his 1956 work, *White Collar: The American Middle Classes*: “Although the large [American] universities are still relatively free places in which to work, the trends that limit independence of intellect are not absent there. ... [The] deepest problem of freedom for teachers is not the occasional ousting of a professor, but a vague general fear – sometimes called ‘discretion’ and ‘good judgment’ – which leads to self-intimidation and finally becomes so habitual that the scholar is unaware of it. The real restraints are not so much external prohibitions as manipulative control of the insurgent by the agreements of academic gentlemen” (p. 151).

Academic freedom, when and where it flourishes, is something not only for professors to celebrate, but archivists as well. A society that can learn to espouse a spirit of open, honest, and unencumbered enquiry of ideas and public affairs is a society that will cherish its documentary records and encourage their use. All too often, however, when push comes to shove, political or economic ambition and desire for control mean that more repressively inclined societies, government bodies, and institutions actively discourage the preservation of records of their affairs. Vital material that may escape the bonfires and shredders is all too often placed under blanket controls, such as overly restrictive “access” to information and privacy laws. Although such legislation is valuable when applied reasonably to records still in the originating organization, archivists have argued (with limited success) that archives have no need for the regulation, having for years previously dealt successfully with confidentiality issues related to their holdings. Tools have been built around
the “test of harm” principle, often informed by donors’ input, allowing for
customized (rather than blanket) controls at the fonds, series, and lower levels.

When access and privacy rules are subverted to unduly restrict information,
openness is rolled back further still. Increasingly strict or severe restrictions
on access appear. Requests are handled through close interpretation of the
wording of the relevant statute and/or precedents. In borderline cases, the pat-
tern may become to restrict access, rather than to grant it. Periodic amend-
ments of statutes, or new policy interpretations, can be used to accomplish the
same ends. Finally, institutions may raise more informal, logistical barriers
such as flouting the prescribed time period within which legitimately accessi-
ble records must be released.

Professor Horn’s latest book is a testament to the value of open enquiry, the
search for truth, and the benefits of letting the sun shine through reading room
windows (duly filtered) onto academic records, both professional/operational
and personnel/administrative. Horn generously acknowledges his debt to Can-
da’s archival repositories, having set out in 1984 on “an ambitious schedule
that included visits to the archives of almost every Canadian university in
existence before the mid-1960s.” This turned out to be overly enterprising, in
part from his needing (as researchers so often find) more time in each facility
than he had originally thought.

Yet there were also other discoveries: “At several universities, access to offi-
cial records was unreasonably restricted.” In light of his professional attain-
ments, combined with unusually comprehensive experience with archival
facilities, his comments are a warning beacon, pointing to the need to update
university policies on access. Horn nevertheless “worked in archives from
Victoria to Halifax” with remarkable results, his findings drawing on eviden-
tiary material from twenty-three university archives, seven national and pro-
vincial repositories, and two church archives. Proper archival citations, still
not universally in use, grace his endnotes. Horn mentions certain archivists
and facilities in his preface and acknowledgements, and all of the archives
cited are listed in his “Note on Sources.”

There are, however, caveats related to the layout of this book. As is so often
the case, the University of Toronto Press (UTP) displays a reluctance to join
the modern, computer-assisted world of publishing through its archaic
approach to photographs, whether contemporary or archival. This book offers
neither. Where photos do appear in its books, UTP tends to clump them all
together at the beginning or the end (as they did in 1997 with Horn’s previous
approach may have been necessary in the earlier days of publishing when
glossy paper was used for photos rather than the standard paper on which text
was printed. But UTP persists in its practices, even though the same paper
stock is now used throughout its books. I find this discordant. As archivists,
we recognize the informational and evidentiary value of photographic and
other non-textual records, as well as their aesthetic value. Such records can be valuable alone, or as complements to textual records. But our main concern is that records are not lost or displaced from their appropriate context, which is what happens when a photographic record is separated from its textual complement. (A recent exception to the syndrome, showing that UTP can get it right when it wants, is Thomas McIlwraith’s profusely illustrated *Looking for Old Ontario* [Toronto, 1997], in which the illustrations are appropriately positioned in relation to the text.) In this present case, at the very least, the readers of Horn’s work might have been interested to discover what some of the lesser known “heroes and martyrs” looked like as they read about them.

With those caveats, it is a pleasure to report that this book has accomplished what Professor Horn intended. Written in a lively style and with the author’s keen, critical, often ironic faculties on full alert, the excellent cause of academic freedom in Canada is now better understood and protected.

*John P.M. Court*

Archives for the History of Canadian Psychiatry and Mental Health Services


A common argument against the establishment or support of archives in healthcare institutions is that they are unrelated to patient care. These two complementary publications, produced by the Baker-Cederberg Museum and Archives of the Rochester General Hospital, demonstrate how healthcare archives can support the aims of a hospital. In *Organizing a Healthcare History Program*, Philip Maples argues that the value of such archives lies in meeting the information needs of various hospital departments, particularly in forging links between the institution and the community. The fruit of this emphasis is *To Serve the Community*, a handsome coffee-table book with more than 240 photographs. Prepared as part of Rochester General Hospital’s Sesquicentennial Celebration, it is a public relations dream.

*Organizing a Healthcare History Program* is comparable to Barbara Craig’s *Medical Archives: What They Are and How to Keep Them*, published by Asso-