the wampum trade (pp. 105-12) in that same chapter was an exceptional synthesis of how environment, resources, culture, and economics came together to turn this early ritualized native shell bead currency into the basis of the fur trade and the foundation of the early colonial fiscal system.

This saltwater frontier remained contested until the English drove out the Dutch in the 1660s and fully subjugated native populations in the 1670s. A key part of Lipman’s thesis is that English victory “ultimately pushed Indians, not colonists towards the ocean,” (p. 7) referencing the enslavement of Pequot and Wampanoag war captives, their transshipment to distant parts of the Atlantic basin, and the fact that many remaining Algonquians took to seafaring to earn a living following conquest. The final chapter chronicling these developments is largely a synthesis of the rich body of scholarship on both King Philip’s War and native seafaring in the northeast. However, this does not detract from the strength and originality of Lipman’s first five chapters, which amounted to a complete reframing of regional history from 1600 to 1675.

Brian D. Carroll  
Central Washington University


Almost since governments started directing public tax monies toward sport matters, the question of priority has existed. Whom to select: athletes who train and compete at high levels representing municipalities, provinces, and nations, or the masses, folks like you and me, who pursue exercise options in various “other” sport and recreation programs? It is evident that the elites have won the day. In the midst of such a situation one can often spot the litter of struggle between the voices of discontent, sometimes successful, more often unsuccessful, and their opponents. *More than Just Games* and *Playing for Change* are two recent works that deal in part with the effort by various individuals and parties to address the primary debate—the “struggle” of those who feel compromised, indeed disenfranchised, versus those whom government has favoured, indeed empowered.

Just when one believes that “everything possible” has appeared on Olympic history’s most written-about event, the both “glorious and notorious” Olympic Games of 1936 in Berlin, there arrives *More than Just Games*, a book I conclude to be the most thorough scholarly treatment available in any language on the events surrounding one country’s decision to participate—or not—in those historic competitions some eighty years ago. There have been many excellent (along with
some not quite so superb) examinations of participation at Berlin; most have been articles in peer-reviewed scholarly journals or chapters in thematic anthologies; there never has been, to my knowledge, an entire monograph on one country’s grappling with the dilemma of whether to “show up or not” for the Games that the Nazis shaped and Adolf Hitler endorsed and that, in the end, Canadian athletes, like their British brethren and American neighbours, dignified with their presence.

Bruce Kidd, considered one of the foremost chroniclers and analysts of Canadian sport, and a staunch defender of athletes’ rights, in The Struggle for Canadian Sport (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996) brushes aside in two sentences the quest to which the authors of More than Just Games devote some 200+ pages of text, plus 40 more in endnotes. Stated Kidd: “Despite considerable opposition to the 1936 Olympic Games in Nazi Germany, when the British Olympic Association decided to send a team Canadian Olympic officials simply voted to do the same. There was no further discussion” (p. 71). That was “it!” Although the issue of boycotting participation in the United States receives cursory attention from Richard Mandell in The Nazi Olympics (London: Macmillan, 1971), and in Great Britain from Duff Hart-Davis in Hitler’s Games (London: Harper & Row, 1986), more penetrating are the treatments by William Murray, George Eizen, and Stephen Wenn. Murray focuses on France: “France, Coubertin and the Nazi Olympics” (Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies, I-1992). Eizen and Wenn explore U.S. boycott events, in Eizen’s case: “Voices of Sanity: American Diplomatic Reports from the 1936 Berlin Olympiad” (Journal of Sport History, vol. 26, 1999; in Wenn’s: “A Tale of Two Diplomats: George S. Messersmith and Charles H. Sherrill on Proposed Participation in the 1936 Olympics” (Journal of Sport History, vol. 16, 1989). Far more than Canada’s, the U.S. boycott debate aroused widespread attention and opinion on whether “to go or not to go.”

The idea for More than Just Games, and indeed its title, evolved from the exhibits More than Just Games: Canada and the 1936 Olympics and Framing Bodies: Sport and Spectacle in Nazi Germany, both of which opened on October 15, 2009, at Vancouver’s Holocaust Education Centre in British Columbia. The writing and research experts for the exhibit More than Just Games were the Jewish-Canadian writers Richard Menkis and Harold Troper. Indeed, they themselves “kicked off” the exhibitions with keynote addresses, in Troper’s case, “The Story behind the Story,” and in Menkis’s, “The Next Step.” Journeys into family collections (including those of P. J. Mulqueen and David Halton), as well as the Canadian Jewish Congress National Archives, the Canadian Sports Hall of Fame Archives, and Library and Archives Canada, to cite three of the more prominent repositories, together with the authors’ impressions of the Vancouver exhibition(s), prove that their dedicated and far-ranging research was not in vain.

Mankis and Troper carefully lay out their case that Canadian government authorities and the leaders of the Canadian Olympic Committee ignored evidence of Nazi crimes and persecution in favour of preserving valuable trade relationships and, in line with Britain’s consistent diplomatic posture, refused to ruffle the feathers of a German regime rapidly becoming a world power.
Much of Mankis and Troper’s expansive evidence concerns the attempts by various individuals and organizations to bring the pro-boycott argument to the attention of those making the decision. They identify several heroes as pro-boycott “messengers.” Central in that pantheon was the noted Toronto rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, a “silvery-tongued” orator and fiery proponent of denying Germany its Olympic-host destiny. Eisendrath’s ally Matthew Halton, a *Toronto Star* reporter, stood almost alone among Canadian journalists in persistently calling for a Canadian conscience to prevail against sending a team to Germany. Both men visited pre-Olympic Germany and Berlin to witness for themselves the atrocities against which each railed. H. M. Caiserman, an immigrant journalist, Zionist, and Montreal labour leader, steadfastly and effectively rallied the influential Canadian Jewish Congress in favour of the boycott. And then, there was the sports leader Hyman E. Herschorn, president of the Montreal Young Men’s Hebrew Association (YMHA), president of the Canadian Amateur Swimming Association (CASA), and a voting member of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada (AAUC), under whose authority the Canadian Olympic Committee operated. Herschorn made sure that knowledge of pro-boycott action reached his sports colleagues. Collectively, and with the aid of others, these figures helped to organize public debates, rallies, and demonstrations, and energized the literary efforts of numerous Jewish, labour, and political-left organizations bent on promoting a boycott.

There were also “establishment villains” who strongly opposed a boycott. Although Mankis and Troper identify several, none of them was greater and more damaging to the non-participation cause than P. J. Mulqueen, president of and leading spokesman for the Canadian Olympic Committee (COC). At a climactic COC meeting in Halifax, Nova Scotia, in late November 1935, Mulqueen saw to it that discussion of pro-boycott sentiment never entered into floor debates on the issue of participation. Amazingly, despite an avalanche of dramatic evidence he received from COC delegate Herschorn and other leaders of the Jewish community, the labour movement, and the political left, documenting the distressing conditions in Germany, Mulqueen publicly exclaimed that “he knew nothing of pro-boycott protests” (p. 108). Mulqueen found useful allies in James Merrick and George McLaren Brown, Canada’s two International Olympic Committee (IOC) members, each of whom vigorously vouched for Germany as an appropriate Olympic host.

After final defeat in decision-making forums on the issue of participation, the pro-boycott forces attempted a “last ditch” assault on the funding for the Olympic team. The spectre of public tax monies going to support what they termed an “immoral undertaking” ultimately failed to deter Canadian government support for the venture.

Inevitably, the 1936 boycott dilemma strikes me as parallel to that Canada faced in 1980 concerning Moscow’s Summer Olympics. Was history an informer of change? In Canada’s case, I think not! Clearly, as in 1936, Canadian Olympic fortunes once again bent to the will of government. More than 50 countries, including Canada, ended up boycotting the 1980 Games in response to Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. Unlike 1936, however, in 1980 Canada responded
to different “persuaders,” U.S. President Jimmy Carter and American politics, underscored by Carter’s sagging national popularity and “hard and fast” Cold War policy. Canada had cut most of its ties with Great Britain, removed the Union Jack from its national flag in favour of the Maple Leaf, and promoted a new national identity to its younger generation, but now the United States exacted the same “political acquiescence” from the Canadian Olympic Association as Britain had in 1936. Canadians, like Brits, had showed up for the “Nazi Games.” As Mankis and Troper argue, this reaped no credit for Canada and its Olympians. In 1980, like the Americans, Canadians stayed away from Moscow. I argue that this action reaped no credit for Canada either.

While Menkis and Troper focus on a specific controversial “struggle saga” in sport history, University of Manitoba sport historian Russell Field, in his edited volume, Playing for Change, takes on “struggle” in a more general context, endeavouring to bring thematic harmony to a number of essays, a majority of which do not particularly relate to the book’s central theme—a sense of “struggle” by disenfranchised individuals and factions in sport, recreation, and exercise to contest the empowered. Field’s collection suffers from its grounding in colloquium papers celebrating the retirement of a distinguished colleague, Bruce Kidd, long-time dean of physical and health education at the University of Toronto, a career-long devotee of sport activism and athletes’ rights, compellingly exemplified in his The Struggle for Canadian Sport (1996). Such colloquium Festschriften are notorious for a lack of adherence to a common theme. The book contains 14 essays by “tried and true” scholars. But eight of them—by John MacAloon, Hart Cantelon/Jim Riordan, Rob Beamish, Stephen Hardy, Colin Howell, Peter Donnelly/Michael Atkinson, Patricia Vertinsky, and Douglas Booth, on a range of subjects, including baseball, the Olympics, and physical culture studies, from a variety of geographical and disciplinary perspectives—do not address particularly well the central theme of Playing for Change. That Field even attempted to produce a coherent anthology is to his credit.

He succeeds best in the six essays on his subject, including his own piece. In “The New Culture Wars: The Vancouver 2010 Olympics,” Field grapples with the negative vibrations in press coverage and public commentary during the bidding and staging processes of the mega-event that a majority of Canadians probably rank among the finest moments in Canadian sporting history, the Vancouver Winter Olympics of 2010. The great festival’s extravagant facilities, its striking opening and closing ceremonies, its avalanche of unabashed expressions of patriotism, and the 26 medals Canadians won, 13 of them gold, including one in the nation’s most venerated sport, ice hockey, support that ranking claim.

Field’s personal and persuasive view of the 2010 Games is not so enthusiasti.
empowered) feel good rather than on addressing extreme poverty and pressing urban living concerns. Resisters called for accountability and inclusion in decision making, in effect, a transfer of power from the empowered to the general population.

Parissa Safai, in “Change Rooms and Change Agents: The Struggle against Barriers to Opportunity for Physical Activity and Sport in Ethnocultural Communities in Toronto,” commences her essay with the statement: “Physical activity [is] a human right, [rightly] accessible to all.” No one would argue with this. But, in Safai’s opinion, in many cases this does not apply to the burgeoning multicultural immigrant society of Toronto. Physical-exercise opportunities and experiences for such folk are not “automatic,” as they are for most Torontonians. In fact, she argues, civic policies often discriminate against minorities and, in some cases, “constitute a form of institutionalized racism” by lack of attention to special populations, both social and ethnocultural. Compellingly, Safai details initiatives to combat such situations by forming partnerships between and among agencies whose facilities might help to address the physical-exercise needs of and opportunities for disenfranchised groups. Safai’s “change agencies” are the Toronto Community Foundation Leadership Program and the United Way, in partnership with the “owners and operators” of the “change rooms”: public and Catholic school boards, the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA), and the City of Toronto Parks and Recreation Department. Parissa Safai, whose work in kinesiology at York University focuses on sport and social inequality and its impact on gender, socioeconomic, and ethnocultural inequities, strongly underscores Russell Field’s theme of “struggle.”

Joining her in directly addressing Field’s central theme is Richard Gruneau, the distinguished social and cultural theorist at Simon Fraser University, whose lengthy career has dealt with political economy, media and ideology, as well as mega-events and globalization. In his essay, Gruneau treats the problem of access to physical activity for the urban poor internationally. As he notes, in 1950 there were 86 cities in the world with one million or more people; by most recent count (2015) there are 550, 160 of them in China alone. This exploding urban growth follows a similar pattern across cities, particularly in the Global South (24 of the 25 world’s largest cities are near or south of the equator). In each circumstance, people are abandoning the countryside and its agricultural pattern in favour of an urban society based on business and manufacturing. In the midst of the resulting concentration of population and expanding slums lurk the serious debilitating factors of “fear, dirt, decay, disease, despair, and degradation.” Such conditions, Gruneau argues, foment suspicion of the state.

As for how to react to the struggle for proper health and exercise in such circumstances, Gruneau argues compellingly that the energies and resources of private forces are more effective in providing answers than neo-liberal governmental policy, which, in his words, “exacerbates global poverty.” Using sport, recreation, and healthful exercise to confront agendas of racism and lack of attention to girls and women, the disabled, and others, Gruneau advocates a role for the United Nations and its various health-related agencies, as well as NGOs,
many of them essentially sports organizations. To confront the struggle, Gruneau identifies three “commonly-shared ideas that stand out”: first, deregulation and flexibility—emphasis on “autonomy,” and the centrality of local consultation and local community in development; second, recognition that coalitions of local, national, and international elites cannot be trusted on their own to do the right thing for slum dwellers; and, third, a belief that poverty reduction depends on structural changes that will necessarily involve collective organization and active forms of political resistance.

Robert Pitter and Glyn Bissix, Acadia University professors in kinesiology and in Community, Environmental, and Sustainability Development Studies, respectively, bring their expertise to Playing for Change in the form of a detailed case study on the conflict over shared trails in Nova Scotia, which pits walkers, hikers, cyclists, and cross-country skiers against users of all-terrain vehicles, snowmobilers, and off-road motorcyclists. Pitter and Bissix argue that the impact on the environment from disparate physical and sporting activities has been sadly neglected. The problem, they persuade us, is that an egocentric motive gets in the way of solving ecology problems: each conflicting faction promotes its own agenda against that of the others. To examine how various points of view compare to broader environmental discourse and ecological democracy, the authors focus on the Nova Scotia government’s “shared use policy.”

As the empowered agent, government sets forth three orientations from which to function: “Our environment, our economy; our environment, our health; our environment, our sport.” Such government orientations fluctuate between administrative rationalism and democratic pragmatism. The dictum “our environment, our economy” underlies laissez-faire capitalism, favouring groups rather than individuals, while “our environment, our health” promotes a homocentric ethic (social good for everyone). Finally, “our environment, our sport” defends the interest of the sport itself, not the individual or the environment (users of off-highway vehicles, for instance). A sense of understanding between all user parties, in discourse with government, to bring about “ecological democracy and a shared sense of environmental citizenship” is the goal towards “struggle resolution.”

In her contribution, University of Windsor professor Victoria Paraschak, notable expert on the history and sociology of Aboriginal affairs, examines sport and recreation services in the Northwest Territories (NWT) from 1962 to 2000. She details the various stakeholders trying to resolve issues in the face of barriers arising from assimilation, unequal power relations, persistence in form and value, and the powerful “prolympic” lobby of elite sport, a meritocracy based on skill. Such stakeholders are communities (large and small), ethnicities (Indigenous and others), associations (sport and recreation), and government (Territorial). Through meetings, conferences, public dialogue and debate, and referendum, a strategy emerged for creating effective and efficient delivery systems for sport and recreation, which apply the principle that all individuals have the right to carve out the life that they most prefer within the broader conditions that they face.
In their essay, Nancy Bouchier and Ken Cruikshank, professors of history at Hamilton’s McMaster University, argue the merits of historical recall in shaping issue awareness and inspiration for resolving problems. They use their case study of Hamilton’s polluted bay-waterfront to frame the struggle by concerned individuals and groups to address a problem well over a century old. Noting that some half-million Hamiltonians relate to the bay-waterfront as a site for living, working, and/or playing, they examine past efforts to engage, sustain, manage, and reshape its social and natural environment. Their “public history” translated into aroused public dialogue and action on the environment and on the community’s health and recreational spaces, bringing together social activists, political leaders, local conservation authorities, and fish and wildlife officials. Historic plaques residing amid warning signs about health and safety hazards, a new nature park created from a toxic dump site, the rejuvenation of plant, bird, and fish populations, and “people presence” are examples of this particular history’s “struggle” to inform and activate. As Bouchier and Cruikshank make evident, much has been done, and much more needs doing.

Collectively, the six essays above resemble an engagement with Marxist theory, a dimension of which Playing for Change underscores by reflection and research into unequal access to sport as a participatory form in contemporary societies. More than Just Games, in contrast, seems like Gramscian theory, in that people often play sport in contested terrain, seeking control and power. Those differences aside, both books offer a tenet worthy of reflection as well as a recipe for action: “[T]o resist is to challenge, to challenge is to change.”

Robert K. Barney
Western University


In May 1789, the six hundred non-clerical and non-noble members of the Estates-General, after having been forced to wait for two hours, were coldly received by King Louis XVI of France at Versailles. Within a few months, the outbreak of revolution had created an existential threat to the Bourbon monarchy and, in January 1793, Louis himself ascended the scaffold in Paris. Historians have often interpreted these dramatic events as the beginning of Europe’s “Age of Revolution.” In the following decades, the continent’s remaining hereditary rulers were forced onto the defensive, fighting an increasingly desperate rearguard action against the forces of constitutionalism, parliamentarianism, republicanism, and socialism. The collapse of the three great empires of Central and Eastern Europe in the final months of the First World War served as the coda to these largely hopeless efforts to safeguard monarchical privilege in an increasingly democratic age. This narrative