Mais, outre que la question du contre-pouvoir est évoquée, les rapports entre la démonstration du texte de présentation et les articles sont souvent fragiles, gratuits et parfois même contradictoires. Ce texte de présentation en est même déconcertant. Les auteurs semblent prendre à partie d'invisibles opposantes et formulent quelques affirmations surprenantes. Les analyses critiques du pouvoir patriarcal sont-elles « dogmatiques » (9)? Les féministes ont-elles déjà « formé un bloc monolithique » (11)? « Le féminisme n'a nulle part produit de cadres politiques nationaux » (19)? « La peur d'introduire des différences entre femmes nous a empêchées d'investir le champ théorique de l'inégalité » (20)? À chacune de ces déclarations, on pourrait opposer une longue bibliographie attestant, à tout le moins, que ces questions sont en chantier et ne peuvent être réduites à ces formules à l'emporte-pièce.

Au fond, la question du pouvoir politique des femmes ne saurait se résoudre en opposant sans cesse la problématique de la différence à celle de l'égalité. Ces deux cadres théoriques ont amplement révélé leurs limites. L'ouvrage Femmes et Contre-Pouvoirs en est une excellente illustration. Certes, la diversité des expériences rapportées dans ce livre laisse « émerger le langage social des femmes » (10). Mais est-ce bien une « prise en compte du sujet féminin (qui) constitue l'affirmation nouvelle de son pouvoir » (12)? Assiste-t-on, en Italie, à l'émergence d'une « politique de la différence radicale » (14)? Les modulations multiples de l'expérience politique des femmes doivent au moins être partiellement expliquées par la référence au cadre économe-social où s'inscrit cette expérience. Ce n'est pas par hasard que l'exposé du cas de la Pologne, si dramatique, se termine sur ce souhait : « en espérant que d'ici là les autres problèmes sociaux auront été solutionnés d'une manière satisfaisante » (36). Le pouvoir politique s'exprime beaucoup plus fondamentalement par le système économique et social que par les structures politiques elles-mêmes. Que les femmes aient développé, dans l'histoire, des formes de solidarité, de sociabilité, de responsabilité, qu'elles aient formulé des discours et des revendications axés sur leurs différences; qu'elles aient choisi de s'immiscérer dans les intertices du pouvoir formel; tout cela forme un ensemble d'évidences qu'on ne peut que constater.

Est-ce que cet ensemble constitue un contre-pouvoir? Les analyses présentées dans ce livre nous permettent d'en douter.

Micheline Dumont
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Few people suffered more during the Second World War than the residents of the Baltic countries: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. They endured three hostile occupations, each followed by attempts to impose a new political and social order on the local population. The book under review tells the story of those Lithuanians who had lived through some of these ordeals and had ended up in Canada after the war.

When the Nazi war effort began collapsing in the Baltic region in 1944, tens of thousands of local residents decided to flee with the retreating Wehrmacht rather than face another occupation of their native land by the Red Army. For most of these people this was a choice between two evils: the evil of life as refugees in a totalitarian and beleaguered Germany, and the evil of life under Soviet control. The experience of Soviet occupation in 1940-41 had convinced these people that of the two evils, the second posed the greater danger to them and their loved-ones. In fact, some members of the Lithuanian intelligentsia had found out after the departure of the Soviets in 1941, that they had been on the Communist's "hit lists," i.e. they had been marked for deportation and they would have probably ended up in Siberia had the German-Soviet war not broke out. Few of the Lithuanian ref-
ugees had imagined the enormity of the privations that awaited them after their departure from their homeland. At first there were the perils of existence in the Third Reich as it experienced its death-throes: the danger of being pressed into the German armed forces (or into work-battalions), being killed or maimed in Allied air raids, and the almost inevitable fate of living without adequate shelter, nutrition, and medical care. Even after the war, Lithuanians, as part of a vast army of DPs in war-ravished Germany, often faced near-starvation and lived precarious lives in refugee camps.

It was from these conditions that refugees began to be picked, at first in very small numbers, by western nations including Canada, during the closing years of the 1940s. It is this story that is told in a systematic and comprehensive manner in this book. In addition to being a chronicler of the lives of immigrants, Danys also describes the process of administering Canada’s refugee policy, including the rivalries that developed between the Department of Labour and the Immigration Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources, the ministry nominally in charge of handling immigration to Canada at the time. She argues convincingly that many of the initiatives in Canadian immigration policy in these years came from the former department, especially when it came to the devising of the labour contract system under which the majority of DPs came to Canada.

Danys’ book is a significant contribution to Canadian immigration history. It is based on massive oral-history research, as well as research in archival sources. Unlike many works published nowadays, its scope is wider than its title would imply. The book is at once a history (admittedly not quite complete) of the Lithuanian community of Canada, and a history of the administration of Canada’s refugee admission program in the late 1940s. A few shortcomings, gaps, and awkward terms can be spotted in the book. It is incorrect to talk of a “British army” in Canada in 1885 (79), and it is questionable to attribute a “historic” or “deep-rooted” sense of “inferiority” to French-Canadians and immigrants from Ukraine or “other parts of East Europe” (240). In the introduction to the concluding chapter the author talks of “assimilation” when context calls for a discussion of “immigrant adjustment” (299). It is also unusual for a book of this scope to avoid a treatment of the person of J.A. Glen, the minister officially responsible for immigration in the five years from 1945 to 1950. In fact, neither he, nor Prime Minister Louis Saint-Laurent, is listed in the book’s index. But this omission might be at least partially appropriate, as policy in this period often originated with officials of C.D. Howe’s ministry (and he is discussed in the book).

These and other minor shortcomings notwithstanding, Danys’s book must be listed among the most important recent contributions to Canadian immigration and ethnic history, and should be read both by students studying Canada’s ethnic groups from East and East-Central Europe, and people interested in the administrative history of the central governmental machinery involved in the making and the execution of Canadian immigration policy.
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World War I crushed the flowering of Britain’s and Europe’s manhood during a period when concern about both racial health and racial purity was stimulating medical research, being fanned in the press and being embodied in societies of social reformers. During the war, the results of this concern included the legislative requirement in France of rooms for breast-feeding in factories employing a hundred or more women, and the provision in Britain of nurseries for the children of working women on a scale previously unimaginable. After the war, throughout Europe women were told by all authorities that their role was at home, bearing and nurturing the new generation so badly needed to replace the one that had been slaughtered.