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.

N.F. Dreisziger
The Royal Military College of Canada

* * *

Deborah Dwork — *War is Good for Babies and Other Young Children: A History of the Infant and Child Welfare Movement in England 1898-1918*. London: Tavistock Publications, 1987. Pp. 307.

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.

Debora Dwork has written a history of the movement, in Britain from 1898 to 1918, to reduce infant mortality and raise the standard of infant health. The powerful irony central to Dwork's story is the role played by war and the killing of men in bringing the issue of the health of babies to national attention. It was the Boer War (1899-1902) which first sparked anxiety about the poor state of fitness of British troops and consequently of the populace at large, and it was World War I which brought the movement for infant health to organised fruition.

Dwork's story begins in the last decade of the 19th century when the birth rate was dropping and the infant mortality rate was increasing despite the fact that the death rate as a whole was decreasing. Various studies by medical experts in the early years of the new century revealed that the three leading causes of infant death were epidemic diarrhoea, respiratory diseases, and "wasting disease" (which included prematurity, congenital defects and other syndromes). (22-25) Researchers focussed their attention on the first of these three major causes as being the most tractable.

Studies of the aetiology of epidemic or "summer" diarrhoea, surprisingly, soon decided that "factors such as housing and maternal employment" were "only erratically correlated with diarrhoeal mortality rates." (36) The main culprit was quickly identified as the cow's milk received by the less-fortunate bottle-fed infants, and the contamination and adulteration of cow's milk soon preoccupied researchers' attention. The contamination of milk at its rural sources was highlighted in an article in the *British Medical Journal* in December 1903 dramatically entitled "Pus as a Beverage". (58) Further, milk was identified as a source of tuberculosis for both adults and children.

Controlling the distribution and quality of the milk supply proved more difficult and took years longer than had the identification of its role in spreading disease. Dwork concludes that "nor was it either accidental or coincidental that the Milk and Dairies Act of 1914 and the Milk and Dairies Consolidation Act of 1915, which were designed specifically to protect the milk supply from the cow to the consumer" were passed in the early stages of the war. (213) It took a national military crisis to overcome the reluctance of legislators to institute the central organisation needed to impose standards of hygiene on milk suppliers.

Another arm of the infant health and welfare movement was the work of voluntary health societies and municipally-employed health officers and visitors in educating working-class mothers about infant diseases. The early notification of birth was adopted in some municipal areas in 1907-08 as an essential step to enable health authorities to carry out their programmes. Dwork hails the Notification of Birth Act of 1907 as "a decisive step in the history of the child health movement in England" (155). Yet here too the role of the war is critical. The 1907 Act had created a system which municipal districts could opt to use; in 1915 the Notification of Births Extension Act, a definite product of the war, made it compulsory (213).

The correlation between the growth of the infant health and welfare movement and the First World War is so strong, Dwork argues, that it is necessary to conclude that "war was good for babies" (209). Apart from the legislative evidence there was National Baby Week in early July 1917 (a year after the slaughter on the Somme had begun) and its attendant hype. In 1914 local authorities employed 600 health visitors, and in 1918 this figure had risen to 2,577. At the beginning of the war there had been 300 municipal and 350 voluntary maternity and child welfare centres, whereas in 1918 there were 700 and 578 respectively. (211) Dwork convincingly establishes her case that the infant health and welfare movement, which had come solidly into being in the fifteen or so years prior to the war, received an enormous booster shot from the war and the national anxiety about a populace plentiful and fit enough to defend Britain and the Empire. This argument and its substantiation is the great strength of Dwork's book.

In telling her story of organised societies and expert opinions, Dwork raises interesting issues several times in passing which she as quickly drops. Citing the opinions of a few experts that the fundamental problem was the poverty and low standard of living in working-class areas, and that working mothers were often so worn out that they had no milk to give their infants, Dwork counters them with contradictory opinions but omits adjudication. Similarly, in regard to the fact that the

movement centred itself on maternal education and efforts as the best long-term solution, Dwork explicitly defends this emphasis from feminist criticism. She asserts that working-class women wanted maternal and infant health centres in their neighbourhoods, and that therefore they must have favoured this emphasis on "mothercraft." (216-17) In defending "maternalism", Dwork implicitly agrees with its loaded message of women's responsibility being to stay home and give infants the proper feeding and attention they need. Surely women wanted medical and municipal help in dealing with infant diseases, but they may also have wanted help with improving their standard of living through facilities which allowed them to be employed. Further, they may have wanted jobs which paid decent wages without wearing them down so much that they could not look after their children.

Angela Woollacott
Case Western Reserve University

* * *

S.N. Eisenstadt, L. Roniger, A. Seligman, eds—*Centre Formation, Protest Movements, and Class Structure in Europe and the United States*. New York: New York University Press, 1987. Pp. 187.

Ira Katznelson, Aristide Zolberg, eds — *Working-Class Formation: Nineteenth-century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986. Pp. viii, 470.

Eisenstadt, Roniger, and Seligman have collaborated on a book which is frustrating at best. Those historians who have a tendency to avoid theory will find this book a confirmation of their worst prejudices. This is unfortunate not only because it will further discourage those historians from theoritical exploration which could inform their work, but also because it may lead them to ignore some of the useful insights which this work contains.

The organizing concept of these essays is the "civilization approach" which assumes that the social context of political institutions and the symbolic meaning people give to those institutions, particularly assumptions of authority, justice, and the place of political activity in the overall conception of human action is important in determining the nature of those political institutions. There is a little here that most historians would either disagree with or find particularly new, although many of us will be disturbed by the author's propensity to downplay the significance of capitalism. These authors share the tendency of putting the character of the state, social institutions, or ideology ahead of economic structures with many contemporary sociologists and political scientists.

A second organizing concept behind these essays is the structuring of centre-periphery relations. The authors theorize that most of modern Europe and the United States had their centres constructed through a revolutionary process so that protest and struggle had certain legitimization within the symbolic and rhetorical ideology of the centre. Again this is not something most historians will find original. It has been an issue of some concern for American historians at least since the publication of the federalist Papers. However, most historians will have difficulty with the attempt to lift these basic concepts to the level of mega-theory. In the process the essays try to link the basic concepts of legitimization and symbolic coherence to tensions between the transcendental and mundane worlds as incorporated within western traditions stretching back to the first millennium before Christian era.

It is argued here that the symbolic traditions established in that millennium before the Christian era, centered around a basic tension between the transcendental and the mundane order, and that central to the organization of the centre was the ideological and structural attempts to reconstruct the imperfect mundane world in order to approach the transcendental ideal. Using this basic framework the authors of the various essays look at a series of sociological historians in comparative analysis in order to try and resolve some of the apparent contradictions presented by the problems.