physical to psychological concerns in the field of child welfare. *The Nursery World of Dr Blatz* suggests that here is an individual and a subject deserving of more study. It should not be seen as a definitive account of this eminently interesting physician, psychologist, and educator and parent advisor.

Kathleen W. Jones
*Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University*

***


In a time of recession, one would have expected a questioning of capitalism and a turn to socialism. Perhaps because of the collapse of socialism in Eastern Europe, this has not happened. The three provincial NDP governments completely reject pure socialism. This turn away from traditional social democratic views is echoed on the intellectual front in this new collection. These writers have formulated a critique of the old social democracy in an attempt to get the NDP to face up to what they describe as the new economic realities.

The essays originate from a conference on the economics of social democracy held at McGill University in the spring of 1988. The collection, however, includes pieces of general social interest but not specifically on social democracy. In a short review, the most useful thing to do is to discuss the main thrust of the book. Consequently, it will only respond to the criticisms of Messrs. Richards, Cairns, Blakeney, Milner and McCallum which boil down to two main points: the NDP has a negative attitude towards the market and that trade unions are unwilling to co-operate with employers to implement an industrial strategy for the Canadian economy.

Professor Robert Cairns argues that social democrats must understand the tension between the market and a democratic state. The Marxists tried to solve this difficulty by abolishing the free market all together. In contrast, Professor Cairns wishes the NDP to acknowledge the important role that a market plays in constraining monopolies by competition. He asserts that human greed can be a positive force as long as it is harnessed to collective goals. Accepting the moral legitimacy of the market means understanding that there is a constraint on the scope of social policy and the size of the public sector relative to GNP. But he also believes in the welfare state and regards it as necessary to overcome “the drag on economic growth exercised by politically organized groups that lose from technological and social change” (37). Henry Milner maintains that the experience of Eastern Europe shows that central planners cannot manage a complex economy (59) and that a well functioning market is necessary to realize a productive industrial economy (60). Finally, all writers wish social democrats to accept technological change.

It is true that social democrats would resist the proposition that greed can be a useful ingredient in the economy. But this is on an ideological level. In policy, the NDP accepts the market as a given one. Example: public ownership is no longer a moral imperative in federal NDP policy. Now, the criterion is completely pragmatic: is it better for the economy that a specific enterprise be publicly owned? Moreover,
accepting the legitimacy of the market in general does not deal with the issue of which particular economic activity should lie within its bounds. Opponents of free trade accord with the U.S. do not object to the existence of a market as such. What they oppose are certain specific acts by Ottawa such as agreeing to Canadian energy being placed at the complete whim of the continental market.

The writers call for union-management co-operation to achieve desirable goals such as full employment (52, 56). They argue that the problem is the commitment by the Left to the class struggle. There is something to this complaint. It is certainly the case with the most militant union leadership. But it does not do to exaggerate. Most unions get along quite well with their management. The greater part of contracts are renewed without any strikes. Anyone who has anything to do with unions knows how passive and uninterested the average union member is in waging the class struggle. The small turn out at union meetings, except for a strike vote, is eloquent testimony of the indifference of the membership to any serious confrontation with their employer.

In principle, the unions have not been all that adverse to the kind of co-operation that took place during World War II. More often than not, the blockage comes from management hostility. At present, the Ontario NDP government is proposing a number of measures to strengthen the trade union movement, including anti-scabbing law already existing in Quebec. The reaction of employers' associations has been one of wounded outrage and total condemnation. They claim that they wish to co-operate, but campaign to prevent any reasonable means by which unions seek to strengthen themselves. This is a clear signal to union leaders that employers do not wish them well. John Richards hits the nail on the head when he speaks of "ideological inability to understand the importance of fairness" (21). Unions will not co-operate in a social context in which they have no guarantee that they will not be weakened. Certainly, a social democratic government should be pursuing a "principled reconciliation of classes" (56). But if it needs to persuade the unions to look beyond their narrow parochial interests, it has an even bigger job to induce some employers to rethink their negative attitude towards unions.

Professor McCallum complains that NDP policy is dominated by unions (192). In fact, NDP governments in B.C. and Saskatchewan have broken strikes by ordering their union members back to work. Again, it is argued that the unions prevent the NDP from advocating a strategy to attain full employment because that would entail some control on wages and some limit to collective bargaining. Yet, while the leader of the federal NDP, Ed Broadbent, consistently spoke of the need for such a long term full employment strategy, he also maintained that, given employer co-operation, workers would accept smaller wage increases under a social contract that they believed was fair. Thus, on the whole, these essays have valuable insights, but some invalid criticisms as well.

Joseph Levitt
University of Ottawa
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