

ance of any discussion about the consequences of gambling, except on financial grounds. As Morton points out, gambling has always proved to be a great way for governments (and churches) to raise money for necessary services without imposing unpopular taxes.

As we are increasingly coming to realize, little is known about how we might apply the principle of “harm reduction” to popular vices — in this case, gambling — that cannot be prevented and cannot be stripped of all their potentially harmful consequences. Gambling researchers are still trying to measure and explain variations in gambling and problem gambling among people of different ages, classes, and ethnic groups. They are far from knowing what precisely causes normal gambling practices to shade into problematic practices in an individual or community. We are quickly coming to tolerate and promote practices such as Internet and casino gambling for which the human impact is far from known, much less under human control.

Morton’s study reminds us that this current problem has deep roots in our culture and society. We should not return to an earlier moralistic past, because it did not prevent gambling or reduce the harm of gambling. We should, as the author says, feel comfortable discussing the moral, social, and human consequences of gambling. We should work for “responsible gambling” and recognize that doing so is a communal and societal undertaking, but not necessarily a religious or spiritual one.

Lorne Tepperman  
*University of Toronto*

Yoon K. Pak — *Wherever I Go, I Will Always Be a Loyal American: Schooling Seattle’s Japanese Americans during World War II*. New York and London: Routledge Falmer, 2002, Pp. xv, 204.

The title comes from a letter “Emiko” wrote from the Puyallup Assembly Centre where many Seattle area Japanese were gathered in the spring of 1942 before being moved inland. Although the subtitle implies a study of the entire war period, the book deals only with the first few months of the Pacific war and is limited to Washington Public School, a junior high, and Bailey Gatzert, its feeder elementary school. By juxtaposing a study of Seattle’s progressive curriculum with its emphasis on Americanization, citizenship, and character education against student writings (which are reproduced replete with their many spelling and grammatical errors), Yoon K. Pak promises to explore “the contradiction between the schools’ mission to educate for democracy and the forced incarceration” of Japanese Americans (p. xii). She refers to the schools as “sites where democracy and dissonance came into play” (p. 108) after Pearl Harbor (December 7, 1941), but the only real example is the quick halt that school officials put to Chinese students wearing “I am Chinese” badges.

Pak explains the situation in these Seattle schools well. Miss Ada Mahon, the long-time principal of Bailey Gatzert school in Japantown, encouraged both “Americanization” and “an environment of intercultural appreciation” (p. 40). A half cen-

tury later, three Nisei (American-born) interviewees affectionately remembered her as strict though fair. They recalled little of their short time at Washington School, whose principal Arthur G. Sears and teachers had a “unique reputation” for “promoting democratic ideals” and “emphasizing tolerance and respect for differences” (pp. 98–99). Guiding the educators was a curriculum introduced in 1916 that stressed loyalty and patriotism, especially in history and civics and through such devices as state-mandated flag rituals and Good Citizenship Clubs. Influenced by the National Education Association and the Progressive Education Association, the curriculum as revised in 1935 emphasized “character education” and “democracy”, promoted community and intergroup awareness through homerooms and assemblies, and, without specifically using the word, broadened the study of citizenship through “interculturalism”. Pak argues that, unlike some school systems, Seattle adopted “a progressively moderate approach to Americanization” (p. 69) rather than following “explicit policies of ethnic erasure”(pp. 70–71). Her comparisons, however, are wanting. For example, to illustrate Seattle’s moderate approach, she notes how non-English-speaking students were expected to move to their own neighbourhood school once they had acquired sufficient language skills in special classes. Her main contrast is Hawaii’s “English Standard” schools whose purpose appears to have been racial, not linguistic, segregation.

The writings of Miss Ella Evanson’s seventh- and eighth-grade English students are the centrepiece of the book. Pak supplements compositions written at the time with a few letters from the assembly centres. Despite admitting that Nisei students may have realized they were writing for an audience and hence withheld their true feelings, Pak reads evidence of the “affirmation of their American identities” (p. 92) into their compositions. In farewell letters written that spring, all of the Nisei expressed sadness at leaving their school, teachers, and friends, but few referred to their American identity or loyalty. Only in essays written on December 8, 1941, after the principal spoke of the need for tolerance and reminded students that they were all American citizens, did the Nisei mention citizenship. In the same assignment, Caucasian classmates agreed that the Japanese had “shown the best of citizenship [*sic*] in every way” and “should have the privileges of the Americans because there [*sic*] are just as good citizens as we are”. In this, Pak discerns an “‘us-them’ distinction” implying that to be an “American” was to be white (p. 24).

Such arguments go beyond the evidence offered, and editorial problems cause considerable repetition, but Pak has provided a fine case study of how one Seattle school and its students responded to a situation “at a definable moment in the history of Japanese Americans” (p. 112) and a nice glimpse of citizenship education. Alas, the graduates were too few and too young to have a political voice.

There are Canadian parallels. Before the Pacific War, Japanese Canadian children attended regular British Columbia public schools. Vancouver’s Strathcona School, like Washington School, had a significant number of Asian students; its administrators took pride in promoting intercultural understanding and creating good Canadian citizens. Although the British Columbia curriculum included civics and the *Highroads Readers* had patriotic poems and essays, the inculcation of patriotism was less overt than it was south of the border. Yet the Nisei graduates, who unlike their

American cousins could not vote when they reached their age of majority, were proud Canadians. Muriel Kitagawa, a Canadian Nisei, recalled clinging to Walter Scott's lines, "This is my own, my native land" when, as an adult, she endured the wartime uprooting. On both sides of the border, schools promoted tolerance and good citizenship. That did not save people of Japanese ancestry from wartime dislocation, but the lessons taught may have contributed to the waning of discrimination after the war.

Patricia E. Roy  
*University of Victoria*

Bertrand M. Patenaude — *The Big Show in Bololand: The American Relief Expedition to Soviet Russia in the Famine of 1921*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2002. Pp. xiv, 818.

This spacious and engaging work provides far and away the best account yet written of the American Relief Administration and its work in combatting the Russian famine of 1921–1922. Drawing upon the letters, diaries, and reminiscences of American and Russian participants, as well as the official archives of the ARA, Bertrand M. Patenaude has produced a richly layered portrait of this extraordinary humanitarian effort. Equally praiseworthy is his dispassionate discussion of the clash of cultures and the political disputes that the relief expedition inevitably produced. The book is an unabashed paean to the nearly 300 American field workers who carried the ARA's work into Russia, but it takes full measure of their individual faults as well as the brashness and insensitivity that marked them collectively.

A word has to be said about the unfortunate title. Patenaude strives throughout to communicate the peculiar ethos of the relief effort, a mix of genuine idealism and business enterprise, college high-jinx, and lost-generation angst. The letters and conversations of the relievers (as they were referred to officially) are peppered with contemporary slang and organizational jargon. A "Big Show" was something of real significance (the 1914–1918 war had been a Big Show). "Bolos" was a term widely employed across Eastern Europe in that era to refer to Bolsheviks. "Bololand" was a purely ARA construct denoting, of course, Soviet Russia. "The Big Show in Bololand", then, was the insiders' name for the largest and most important of Herbert Hoover's relief efforts.

In 1921 Hoover's political career and disastrous presidency lay years in the future. He was known as a successful engineer and millionaire businessman and acclaimed as the world's most effective humanitarian. The American Relief Administration was the last of a series of famine relief programmes that Hoover had created, going back to the first years of the war. Prior to August 1921 the ARA's activity had been centred in the post-Versailles nations of Eastern Europe, where a successful formula had been developed in which small cadres of American administrators mobilized committees of local citizens to distribute foodstuffs. Efficiency, sound business practices, and the autonomy of the reliever on the spot were stressed.