

lesbian women seeking to become pregnant. It is interesting to note that, while feminists have long decried the medicalization of reproduction, feminist analyses of lesbians overcoming discrimination to access ARTs are lauded as women suffering from “social infertility,” harnessing the power of medicine for their own ends.

Though Luce presents many stories of women negotiating safer self-inseminations, the trend has nevertheless been toward physician-assisted artificial insemination at clinics. Both, she argues, are political moves against the exile of gay parenthood. Mainstream health literature related to sexuality and reproduction does not speak to lesbians as potential parents. Yet, the normalization of “risk” in sexual and reproductive health is absorbed by lesbian women; they want to screen donors in terms of health risks and genetic futures. HIV and AIDS have also had a significant impact on lesbian women’s approach to finding a sperm donor.

Luce ends the book with a set of reflections on the history of ARTs, reviewing scientific evidence, media coverage and social science analysis over the 35 years since Louise Brown, the first “test tube baby” in the world, was born in England in 1978. Luce uses this closing section to remind the reader that such technologies are developed, regulated and deployed by the most powerful mainstream institutions in society. Queer women may never have been imagined ideal users for ARTs, but thanks to Luce’s work, we see these women as determined and creative agents imagining and pursuing parenthood and parental recognition in path breaking ways. This book is essential reading for individuals pursuing parenthood through ARTs and for the clinicians and advocates who work with them. *Beyond Expectation* is an excellent ethnography for inclusion in undergraduate social science courses in queer studies, women’s studies, anthropology of gender, sexuality and the body and the anthropology of reproduction. Luce’s accessible writing style makes the book suitable for introductory and second year level courses. Paired with works in classic and contemporary kinship or anthropology of the body, or science and technology studies, *Beyond Expectation* will enrich upper year and graduate level courses as well.

Barnett Richling, *In Twilight and In Dawn: A Biography of Diamond Jenness*, Montreal: McGill-Queen’s Press, 2012, 440 pages.

*Reviewer: Julia Harrison
Trent University*

Barnett Richling’s *In Twilight and In Dawn: A Biography of Diamond Jenness* (2012) was published as part of McGill-Queen’s Native and Northern Series. As such, it stands beside the work of many impressive Canadian scholars whose lives and life-long work has centred on Canadian indigenous peoples and the Canadian North. Such company would seem like a small step to move Jenness’s story as *one of the first* (some would say *the first*) Canadian anthropologist(s) out of the shadows—or out the dustbin, where some would have him languish—into the daylight. Jenness, a classic four-field anthropologist—working in the fields of ethnography, archaeology, linguistics and physical anthropology—has been critiqued for his colonialist if not racist views and his inability to develop a

school of followers or to offer any substantive contributions to the theoretical and methodological advancement of the field of anthropology in Canada specifically—and internationally, more broadly (Hancock 2006; Kulchyski 1993).

Richling argues Jenness’s capacity to contribute in these domains was hampered by the fact that Jenness spent his professional career in the public service, largely in Canada, with the Anthropological Division of the Geological Survey of Canada and, later, the National Museum of Canada. Regardless, to Richling, Jenness offers a significant contribution to anthropology in the texts he produced, drawing on his unflinching commitment to original fieldwork. He conducted research among the Melanesian D’Enstreaux Islanders, the Copper Eskimo (1914–1916),¹ the Alaskan Inupiat (1913–1914), the Carrier (1924), the Sekani (1924), the Katzie (1936), the Wet’suwet’en (1923–1924) in British Columbia, the Sarcee (1921) in Alberta, the Ojibwa (1929) in Ontario and the Newfoundland Beothuk (1927). And in his later life, he conducted fieldwork in Cyprus and other parts of Mediterranean Europe.

The book might be more appropriately listed as a professional biography. It covers Jenness’s anthropological fieldwork experiences and his career in the civil service. The debates that shaped Jenness’s research such as the historical depth of hunting territories among the Ojibwa, the migration and movement patterns of Eskimo peoples in the High Arctic and Alaska, and the links between Eskimo cultures and Beothuk peoples in Newfoundland are meticulously detailed. His many and varied fieldwork experiences are richly described, outlining the complexities and tensions that shaped these experiences and flagging some of the bureaucratic and political machinations that were the backdrop to them.

However, little is learned about Jenness’s character, the texture of personal life, how he felt about the relationships he developed with those he worked closely with in the field, or how his thinking and actions were shaped by all that happened around him. Jenness left few personalized writings and reflections about his life; thus, Richling felt he could say little beyond the most obvious. Jenness’s wife appears at various points in the text, but only the tiniest insights are offered as to how she endured his many long absences, leaving her by default to raise their three sons. Jenness and Marius Barbeau started out as close friends but became estranged as their careers and apparent rivalries collided. No reflection is offered on this latter and important turn of events, something which did have an impact on the trajectory of anthropology within the National Museum of Canada. Pivotal events in the 20th century had direct impacts on Jenness’s career: he served in the trenches in World War I and worked for intelligence services during World War II; additionally, his career path was rendered precarious at various points during the Great Depression. No engaged discussion is offered about the dynamics of Canadian federal politics and politicians and the impacts these had on Jenness. Some careful reflection by his biographer on these influences could have assisted in understanding Jenness as more than a field anthropologist and a civil servant.

In the latter years of his career, Jenness was vocal about the failings of the government to address the limited future prospects of Canada’s indigenous populations. And while his commentary ultimately seemed to be aimed at assimilation, his critiques were public enough that they raised the ire of government officials who saw him as inappropriately stepping beyond the bounds of a “scientist.” A radical he was not, but he

did do more than many thought he should have. If his application as Duncan Campbell Scott's replacement at Indian Affairs had been successful, what reforms would he have put in place, and would they have arrested the negative trajectory he outlined in his commentaries?

The reader's grasp of Diamond Jenness's extensive travels and the professional positions he held would have been aided greatly by the inclusion of a timeline of his life, which might also have included details about his personal life. The book's capacity as a reference text would have been greatly facilitated by a less opaque book and chapter title(s). Additional maps of the regions where he did his research would have added considerably to the understanding of Jenness's movements during his fieldwork.

Richling's lengthy prose documents Jenness's work scrupulously. He describes the work that was done in Canada by national agencies during the first half of the 20th century steeped as it was in the paradigms of the day. He offers insight to something depressingly long-standing: the fragility of belief in the importance of and, thus, the need to make a firm financial commitment to what became the National Museum of Canada. He demonstrates that the roots of anthropology in Canada were not as insular as sometimes imagined. Jenness's Oxford education and the encounters he had during his early career with several internationally trained colleagues beyond Edward Sapir, a Boasian-trained anthropologist, who was his superior in Ottawa, gives insight into what swirled around the nascent field in Canada. And finally, the criticisms made by individuals such as Jenness laid the groundwork for what some claim is the hallmark of a Canadian school, what Harry Hawthorn early on labelled "useful anthropology." Jenness warrants a place in the story of Canadian anthropology. Richling has made an important contribution to carving out that place.

Notes

- 1 I have used the names Jenness used in his writings, acknowledging that many of these are no longer in use.

References

Hancock, Robert

- 2006 Diamond Jenness's Arctic Ethnography and the Potential for a Canadian Anthropology. *In* *Histories of Anthropology Annual* 2. R. Darnell and F. Gleach, eds. Pp. 155–211. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.

Kulchyski, Peter

- 1993 Anthropology in the Service of the State: Diamond Jenness and Canadian Indian Policy. *Journal of Canadian Studies / Revue d'Etudes Canadiennes* 28(2):21–50.

Gérard Bouchard, *L'interculturalisme, un point de vue québécois*, Montréal : Éditions du Boréal, 2012, 286 pages.

*Recenseuse : Caroline Savard
Université de Montréal*

Dans son ouvrage *L'interculturalisme, un point de vue québécois* (2012), le sociologue et historien Gérard Bouchard présente une interprétation de l'interculturalisme comme modèle

québécois de gestion de la diversité. Le modèle y est présenté comme un principe, une troisième voie entre le multiculturalisme canadien et le républicanisme français, une voie mitoyenne entre fragmentation et assimilation. En mettant l'accent sur la dimension sociale de l'intégration, l'auteur souhaite se démarquer des définitions antérieures du modèle tout en se positionnant sur l'avenir de l'interculturalisme qu'il souhaite voir ériger en loi, « une sorte de loi 101 de l'intégration et des rapports interculturels » (p. 235).

Le principe de l'interculturalisme présenté par l'auteur est basé sur le paradigme de la dualité majorité-minorités. La majorité est tantôt entendue comme celle de la majorité francophone culturelle dite fondatrice et tantôt prise dans une acception plus large incluant les « parlants français » (p. 59) issus d'une immigration récente ou ancienne. Un des fondements de cette version de l'interculturalisme est la prise en compte du statut minoritaire de la nation québécoise—comprise comme l'appartenance au sol et le partage de la langue française—à l'intérieur d'une nation majoritaire. En cinq chapitres, l'auteur propose une réflexion sur l'importance de la question nationale, du ciment symbolique, de la composante identitaire, des enracinements, de l'appartenance, des valeurs et de la forte conscience historique de la majorité francophone qui, ici et là, semble davantage prise dans son acception plus limitée de majorité d'origine canadienne-française.

La définition de l'interculturalisme qui nous est proposée est construite autour du concept de « pluralisme intégrateur » qui signifie à la fois la prise en compte du patrimoine historique identitaire de la majorité et l'orientation pluraliste incarnée par le respect de la diversité et des droits des minorités. L'auteur souhaite la reconnaissance de la conscience historique de la majorité francophone et affirme que le Québec doit faire de l'intégration une priorité s'il veut éviter de s'affaiblir. Il reprend à son compte la définition d'intégration présentée dans le Rapport de la commission Bouchard-Taylor (2008) « laquelle est fondée sur les notions de participation, de réciprocité, d'interaction, d'égalité, de respects des droits et d'insertion socioéconomique » (p. 64), mais y ajoute l'importance du fondement du lien social et des valeurs de la société d'accueil.

Dans cette version, l'interculturalisme se veut une recherche constante d'équilibres, une prise en compte de l'avenir de la majorité fondatrice et de celui des minorités culturelles, un modèle d'arbitrage entre la majorité culturelle et les minorités culturelles permettant de concilier les droits et l'identité. Il se veut une troisième voie entre le multiculturalisme (qui, selon lui, n'est pas assez sensible à la majorité) et l'assimilation (qui, toujours selon lui, n'est pas assez sensible aux minorités), entre le pluralisme et l'homogénéité, entre la flexibilité et l'enracinement. Dans un rapport de reconnaissance mutuelle majorité-minorités, l'interculturalisme de Gérard Bouchard propose un rapprochement entre les deux composantes de la dualité, mais sans jamais viser sa disparition. L'auteur insiste sur l'idée que le lien social ne doit pas être fondé seulement sur le droit et les valeurs universelles abstraites, mais sur un « ciment symbolique », soit une culture nationale qui doit s'appuyer sur la langue et des valeurs communes. Afin de favoriser la cohésion sociale et de réduire le clivage de la dualité eux/nous, cette définition de l'interculturalisme encourage le développement d'une culture commune, tantôt entendue comme celle d'une culture en devenir, un horizon ou un avenir communs, mais tantôt utilisée de façon plus ambiguë où elle est le fait de la