

Salutation

THE EDITOR

The Dalhousie Review has a new look, a new editorial staff, and a new editorial advisory board. The personnel are identified on the title-page of this volume; I will say no more about this question, except that I am deeply grateful to each of the persons listed for agreeing to set out on a collaborative adventure. The new design, on the other hand, requires a word of introduction. The image on the front cover is taken from an architectural drawing made by Andrew Cobb in 1913; specifically, it is a detail of a window for the Macdonald Library, constructed in 1914 and now known as the Macdonald Building. Cobb's long association with Dalhousie has left its mark on our immediate environment; most of the buildings on the old Dalhousie campus, as well as the original buildings for the University of King's College in its current location, were designed by him. In September of 1920 Cobb drew a north elevation for what he called the Arts Building (now the Arts and Administration Building). Around the same time Herbert L. Stewart, Professor of Philosophy at Dalhousie, was making plans of a different kind: he was doing the preliminary work that would result in the publication of the very first issue of *The Dalhousie Review*, under his editorship, in April of 1921.

Cobb's name is therefore imbricated with the history of Dalhousie and the surrounding community. But beyond its historical interest the Cobb drawing on the cover has given us an icon that may in some ways stand for the mandate of *The Dalhousie Review*. A window is an invitation to observe, to inspect, to survey, to know. *The Dalhousie Review* offers members of the university community the opportunity to use their specially trained powers of intellectual observation in wide-ranging and panoramic ways. It also offers members of the general public, including the many alumni of Dalhousie, the opportunity to see and evaluate some of the

kinds of thinking and writing being practised within the academy. This interpretation of Cobb's window implies a desire on the part of the editorial staff to reanimate the relationship between *The Dalhousie Review* and its readers.

It is with this goal in mind that the various changes already described or alluded to have been undertaken. The new design elements begin with the Cobb drawing, held in the Permanent Collection of the Dalhousie Art Gallery; I am grateful to Michele Gallant and Mern O'Brien of the Gallery for their patient advice and for their permission to use the Cobb drawing on our cover. The inside look of the *Review* has been changed as well; the typeface in which these words are set is a version of Garamond, and the layout of the page has been redesigned so as to ensure compatibility with the other visual changes. I am grateful to Dalhousie Graphics, and especially to Gail LeBlanc, for creating the new design package, inside and out.

None of the various changes I've been describing would have been possible without the discovery of new sources of administrative and financial support for the *Review*. For showing the persistence, resourcefulness, and flexibility required to bring about the new arrangements, I would like to thank especially Graham D. Taylor, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and John Baxter, Chair of the Department of English. The generosity of the Laing Foundation and of the President's Office have been crucial to securing a financial position from which it is possible to build for the future.

The present number of *The Dalhousie Review* begins with three articles on Crime and Punishment, all of them based on their authors' contributions to the Killam Lectures in 1996. John Braithwaite makes the assumption that official criminal justice as practised in western societies often makes matters worse than it found them: criminals are stigmatized, incarcerated under conditions highly conducive to the development of anti-social behaviour, and then released into a society they are no longer equipped to negotiate. Instead of this dismal and familiar scenario, Braithwaite proposes the doctrine of restorative justice: a system of practices designed to restore the various losses of victim, offender, and society alike. Lawrence M. Friedman's article draws a parallel between judicial proceedings in American culture and theatrical performance; the truth that emerges in the real-life drama of the courtroom turns out

to be heavily reliant on rhetorical strategies, postures, and persuasions. Perhaps many of us would have expected as much to be true of O. J. Simpson's California, but Friedman's account is full of rich anecdotal evidence in support of his model from the American past. Christine Boyle is also concerned with the history of criminal justice, specifically with the role played by women at two crucial junctures in the reform of the Canadian penal code: the prohibition of hate literature and the redefinition of sexual assault. Boyle's is an explicitly feminist approach to questions of legal reform, but it is also pluralistic and hopeful: pluralistic in that it would invite other disadvantaged groups to benefit from the gains made by women in the last generation or so, and hopeful in that it celebrates the ways in which women have made a difference even in one of the most conservative reservoirs of Canadian life. Taken together, these three articles make an important point about our intellectual culture, namely, that questions of justice are not the restricted preserve of a designated professional class, but belong to us all insofar as we accept the challenge of acting as responsible, thinking readers and concerned citizens.

In addition to these discursive enquiries, this number of the *Review* offers creative work in both fiction and poetry. "Whipping Boy" by Edward O'Connor is a searching exploration into the dangerous field of human cruelty as it develops in even the most ordinary situations. Justine Brown's "The Miser" is a brief and poignant revelation of value emerging from the most unlikely source. "The Anatomy Lesson" by Mark Blagrove is a virtuoso piece of writing; it includes, among many other things, an unusually sensitive creation of a female narrative persona by a male writer. The poetry section begins with a series of five poems of memory by Elizabeth Brewster. None of the other poets is nearly as well-known as Brewster, but I think all of them can take legitimate pride in having their work appear alongside hers.

This brief description of the principal contents of the present number of the *Review* has already implied many lines of continuity between past practice and current editorial policy. In critical and scholarly work, the *Review* hopes to foster writing that addresses the concerns of any one discipline in such a way as to be of interest to readers outside it. The strong commitment to creative work, both fiction and poetry, will continue; indeed, it is underscored by the creation of separate sections for fiction and poetry where writers

can see their own works in a more immediately congenial context, and where readers of fiction and poetry will be more likely to find them. Book reviews will also be an important feature of the *Review* in the future, as indeed they have been since the beginning of this venture in 1921. Having raised the issue of continuity, I now wish to thank my immediate predecessor (Alan Andrews) and his fiction and poetry editor (Andrew Wainwright) for helping to make the transition from their last number to this one a happy and collegial event.

Will there be substantial revisions to editorial policy in the months and years ahead? Do the visual changes to the format of the *Review* imply corresponding changes to its contents? The short answer to both of these questions is yes. Many of the innovations will be small adjustments, but some will be obvious new directions as well. I'm not yet in a position to say much more than that, but I promise that subsequent editorial statements will outline various new departures. Some of these will be invitations to readers to play a more active role than heretofore in the intellectual life of the *Review*. What I have in mind is a forum in which readers can argue about, in print, some of the texts and issues they have encountered in previous numbers of the *Review*. I want *The Dalhousie Review* to be not only a window but an open window, a place where conversations happen, where disagreements are spoken, where genuine choices can be made. In short, I am hoping for a journal in which seriousness of purpose and playfulness of mind can coexist—not always gracefully, perhaps, but at least in meaningful dialogue.