

vides many other compelling points and, even more importantly, refreshing questions. How was tourism shaped? How were tourist experiences created and why? How and why did this change over the twentieth century. This book should set up a great debate about the nature of consumer culture in Canada. How much control have consumers had in controlling the meaning of what they purchase, whether this be household furniture or tourist getaways? And how much attention should historians give to the advertisers' and producers' rhetoric as compared to the consumers' responses? In this book, Dawson sides with the former, giving us a thorough account of the way British Columbia's promoters sold the province to visitors.

He has a point. If you every have the chance to wander down to the totem poles in Vancouver's Stanley Park you are bound to find groups of tourists milling about. The fact that there are rarely any First Nations people around, and that, on most days at least, most Vancouverites walk by the poles without even noticing them does not seem to matter. For many tourists the totem poles are what Vancouver is all about. And if there just happens to be a café and shop nearby ... well, I am sure that is just a coincidence.

Christopher Dummitt
Institute for the Study of the Americas, University of London

Jordanna Bailkin, *The Culture of Property: The Crisis of Liberalism in Modern Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

At first glance Jordanna Bailkin's *The Culture of Property* might well have been titled *The Strange Death of the Liberal Museum*. It is a book that seems to want to use Edwardian debates about museums to cast new light over George Dangerfield's classic thesis of a sustained crisis brought about by Edwardian feminism, labour activism, Irish home rulers, and a group of Liberal parliamentarians bent on limiting the power of the landed aristocracy. But this book is actually far more interesting and significant, as Bailkin is not merely warming over Dangerfield's dated thesis. The "crisis of liberalism" for her is really shorthand for the complex tensions between property and citizenship within liberalism. Thus, Bailkin sets out to explore the nature of "cultural property" and detail the contested relationship between culture *and* property during the Edwardian era.

Bailkin starts her study with some probing questions — what kind of property is art? Is art property at all? Does the possession of art reinforce existing social inequities, or can it transcend, even "revolutionize" them? — and offers four case studies and a wealth of evidence from court transcripts, gallery archives, exhibition reviews, private correspondence, cartoons, and photo-

graphs as a means to discuss the contradictions evident in the liberal idea of art as property.

Her first study is of the idea of cultural “repatriation” using the so-called Celtic Gold controversy. Bailkin details the court case brought against the British Museum by the attorney general for Ireland in 1903 over the patrimony of some gold artifacts dug out of a Derry peat bog in 1896. The case turned on the complex wrangling over the legal principle of treasure-trove, which threw up awkward questions for both British unionists and Irish nationalists about the meaning of “national” artifacts. Indeed, the case revolved around a series of ironies. In seeking the repatriation to Dublin of items of somewhat dubious Irishness, uncovered in a distinctly unionist part of Ireland, the Irish nationalist protagonists successfully argued for repatriation on the principle that the protection of property rested with British monarchical authority.

The second case study concerns the travails of the Scottish National Museum Bill, debated at Westminster between 1901 and 1906, which was essentially about reform of the financial and governing arrangements of the Edinburgh institution. Bailkin shows that the debate here turned on the history and continuing problematic nature of the Anglo-Scottish union and the status of law in regulating national cultures: in this case the discussion over culture and property allowed for the questioning of the Liberal assumption that British citizenship was a product of the ownership and possession of property.

The third case is of the attempts to prevent the export of a privately held Hans Holbein portrait in 1909 on the grounds that it represented part of the British national heritage. Again, the “national” claims about the object were actually quite dubious. Bailkin skillfully uses this example to probe the complex interactions of gender and art in the Edwardian museum, connecting the fears of the removal of “British” art treasures and the claims and actions of the Suffragettes. As gallery art had been slashed by feminist activists as a means of bringing attention to the hypocrisy of valuing the pictures of women more than real women themselves, the revelation, or at least suspicion, that a feminist had actually saved the Holbein from being sold overseas through an anonymous donation caused a sensation and raised further questions about the contentious relationship among women, property and cultural patrimony.

The fourth and final study is the story of the founding of the new London Museum in 1912, and the confrontation over the celebration of “folk culture” in this new urban, civic museum, captured in the invented terminology of the “civi-otic” (the combination of the civic and the patriotic). Here elite and popular visions of culture, and liberal individualism and liberal (republican) collectivism, all came into collision. Bailkin argues that the new museum survived precisely because it incorporated elements of protest and critique of classic liberal assumptions within its collections.

The case studies reveal that collective claims on culture collided with lib-

eral individualist notions of art as property, and were sometimes responsible for changes in the law and sometimes a complex re-evaluation of political positions. The supposed role of art and artifacts in bolstering the claims of national identity is shown to be far more convoluted than either contemporary nationalists or recent historians and museum specialists have supposed. Similarly, categorical understandings of gender, and to a much lesser degree, class, are shown to imbricate claims about art and property in a manner that belies easy social designations of cultural institutions. In her analysis Bailkin asks some fascinating and provocative questions, and complicates our understanding of culture and its relationship to politics. Indeed, she successfully adds the cultural realm to the story of the “crisis” of liberalism.

Arguably, however, one of the real strengths of her analysis — the demonstration of how the ambiguities of liberal claims about cultural property were debated outside of the realm of political theory — is also one of the book’s limitations. For Bailkin finds no way to connect the debates in the press and among the agents in her cases, with the ongoing refashioning of liberal ideas by intellectuals and political activists in other realms. The “new” liberal thinkers, Fabians, and even populist liberals are part of the backdrop, but are rarely if ever present in her narratives. So at times the book reads quite like Dangerfield in that all the challenges to the liberal conceptions of citizenship and cultural property seem to be coming from without, when clearly Liberal thinkers themselves were also trying to reformulate the liberal tradition from within. Still, if at the end of the book the reader is still left with nagging doubts that she has really answered all her own questions, they will nonetheless be impressed with Bailkin’s extremely sophisticated and coherent discussion.

Stephen Heathorn
McMaster University

Rudolf Rocker, *The London Years*, translated by Joseph Leftwich (Nottingham: Five Leaves Press; Edinburgh/Oakland: AK Press, 2005.

London in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century was a breeding ground for politically based reform movements. While the country’s Liberals and Conservatives jockeyed for power at the parliamentary level, a hearty and disparate variety of radical groups emerged at street level. They organized and agitated, marched and demonstrated, sometimes even rioted, but in general laboured after the reform of everything from tax, landholding, and education. Radical socialists were among the most active groups in Britain’s Labour movement and the Jewish Anarchists, an offshoot of the Jewish Labour Movement,