individuel rejouira entre autres les généalogistes, car ces hommes et ces femmes que l'on voit vivre page après page ne sont-ils pas les fondateurs de la société canadienne-française? D'aucuns jugeront que cette histoire se révèle par trop anecdotique. Il n'en reste pas moins que les chercheurs qui s'intéressent à la Nouvelle-France y trouveront une somme considérable d'informations présentées sous la plume alerte que l'on sait. Ne craignant pas les chiffres, l'historien de la *Seigneurie des Cent-Associés* sait rendre l'histoire intéressante même quand la matière est aride.

Hubert CHARBONNEAU
Yves LANDRY
Programme de recherche
en démographie historique
Université de Montréal

* * *

GEORGE K. BEHLMER — *Child Abuse and Moral Reform in England, 1870-1908*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982. Pp. vii, 320.
MARJORIE CRUICKSHANK — *Children and Industry: Child Health and Welfare in North-West Textile Towns During the Nineteenth Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981. Pp. v, 189.

Although the general focus of these two books is the same — the welfare of children, especially working-class children, during the Victorian era — there is remarkably little overlap between them in terms of content. Cruickshank chronicles the living and working conditions of children in the rapidly industrializing cities of northwestern England (primarily Lancashire) during the nineteenth century. She describes the increasingly harsh conditions under which children worked as manufacturing moved out of homes and into factories, and the rapidly deteriorating living conditions faced by them and their families as the new factories' demands for workers drew people from the country to the city. Her major concern is with the effects of these developments on children's health. She discusses mortality rates and childhood diseases in detail, analyzes the efforts of some families to find medical help for their children, and describes the woefully inadequate attempts of reformers to provide health care for poor families. Her major theme is the plight of children in a society which regarded them as an expendable work force. Those who survived epidemics of scarlet fever, measles, smallpox, diphtheria, and polio, endemic diseases like tuberculosis, pneumonia, and diarrhea, chronic malnutrition, and industrial accidents were often left weakened and deformed, condemned to lives of poverty, pain, and disability. Only slightly tempering this grim picture is her brief account of growing Victorian sensitivity to the plight of factory children, the passage of factory legislation, and the building of hospitals, dispensaries and schools as the middle class slowly awoke to the horrors of an industrial system which employed little children from dawn to dusk in dark, unhealthful factories.

Behlmer tackles the question of child welfare from a different perspective. He focuses on the issue of child abuse in the late nineteenth century, and the struggle of the London (later National) Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (SPCC) to protect children from parental abuse through the passage and enforcement of national laws. His thesis is that the SPCC was motivated by genuine humanitarian concern for the health and safety of England's children, and that its leaders fought passionately and ably, albeit sometimes unsuccessfully, for the passage of legislation that would protect children from abusive parents, baby farmers, and cruel (and immoral) employments. He argues persuasively for the commitment and hard work of the society's leaders, like the Reverend Benjamin Waugh, and its cruelty men (the agents who investigated reports of child abuse and reported them to the courts), and describes the society's resistance to the notion that poverty was the cause of child abuse (the SPCC pursued upper-class as well as lower-class child abusers), and its philosophy that not only should children be rescued from abusive parents, but that the people who abused children should be both punished and encouraged to reform.

One comes away from both books with a sense of the grimness of life for many nineteenth-century children, and, especially from Behlmer's book, with a sense of respect for the men and women who worked to safeguard children against starvation, deprivation, and physical abuse. Both works provide the reader with a wealth of detail about the health and welfare of children: Cruickshank details diseases and deteriorating living conditions in urban slums; Behlmer uses court cases of child abuse to illustrate the problem which the SPCC was bent upon eradicating. This wealth of detail is the strength and the weakness of both books, however. Their factual accounts are clear and good, but they need to be set in their proper social, historiographical and theoretical contexts.

Behlmer, for instance, provides us with evidence of significant changes in attitudes towards the rights of children and parents in the nineteenth century. He does not analyze these changes, however, despite his brief opening discussion of the mid-nineteenth-century debate over the limits of parental power and the rights of the state to safeguard children within the home. By the end of the century, the family's right to privacy, which was sacrosanct at the beginning, took second place to the child's right not to be abused, starved, over-worked, or severely beaten. Behlmer's work illustrates this change, but, instead of tracing it throughout the work, or at least analyzing it in a conclusion, he leaves it for the reader to ferret out for her or himself. In fact, the work has no conclusion, and hence no theoretical framework, at all. Instead, it has an afterword, which, like the preface, sets the work in the context of the "discovery" of child abuse by doctors in the 1960s. The important context for this work is not the 1960s but the motives of the reformers, the intellectual and legal climate within which they worked, and the ways in which their work affected conceptions of parental rights, child rights, and state responsibility.

Behlmer implicitly addresses the thesis that the Boer War triggered concern with the health and welfare of working-class children by calling attention to the unsuitability of army recruits from working-class cities. Through his recounting of the history of the SPCC, he demonstrates that a transformation in attitudes towards children's rights and needs was well underway, at least in some quarters, before the Boer War and fears about national security arose at the end of the century. This is revisionist history, but the revision remains implicit rather than explicit. If Behlmer had set his work in the context of older views of Victorian social attitudes, this well-researched and meticulously documented study might have altered our views of the pace and goals of nineteenth-century social reform. As it is, it remains merely a good case study. One hopes that Behlmer will address theoretical issues and arguments in future work on Victorian England, since his research on the SPCC provides him with the data from which to develop important arguments.

Unlike Behlmer, Cruickshank's major concern is not with philanthropic reform, but with the health of working-class children. Her discussion of philanthropy points not to the humanitarian motives of the reformers, but to the inadequacy of the health and welfare services they provided. Focusing on the north, she does not discuss the London-based SPCC at all, and, in fact, articulates the traditional view that effective reform came not during the nineteenth, but in the early twentieth century, following the alarm over Britain's declining birthrate and the 1899 discovery that three-quarters of the military recruits from cities like Manchester were unfit for military service. Focusing on the effects rather than the motives behind nineteenth-century reform, Cruickshank presents as convincing a picture of its inadequacy as Behlmer presents of the effectiveness of the SPCC in obtaining child-welfare legislation late in the century. Together the books illustrate the importance of approaching the past from a variety of perspectives.

Like Behlmer's work, Cruickshank's would profit from being placed in a broader theoretical and social context. If she had set her information on children in the context of recent work by social historians and women's historians on working-class life, values, and behaviour, she would have questioned some of her sources more seriously, and she would have painted a fuller picture of working-class family life. For instance, she unquestioningly accepts the statements of Victorian doctors that girls were more subject to brain fever than boys were, when pushed to excel in school (pp. 141-2). The doctors' statements fit Victorian preconceptions about female frailty and the dangers of trying to educate them, and need to be questioned. Moreover, if girls were more prone to brain fever, one wants to know why. Were they more undernourished than boys? More responsible for helping at

home as well as for working in factories? More pressured by teachers or parents? Or were they actually physiologically less suited to education? Similarly, Cruickshank fails to analyze why mothers worked, when she discusses the factors affecting infant and child health. This is a topic which has been well explored by women's historians and some consideration of it would have saved her from an analysis that leaves the reader with the impression that it was short-sighted, at best, and selfish, at worst, for mothers to work, rather than a course of action dictated by economic need.[1]

Each of these books provides us with important information about children's lives in the nineteenth century. For this reason, they are important works. They are well-researched and well-docu- mented studies. Their lack of attention to broader social and theoretical concerns makes them disappointing, however. If Cruickshank and Behlmer had gone beyond the recounting of facts and information to an analysis of Victorian attitudes and values (an analysis that needs to be done by class and gender), they would have produced studies whose significance would have gone beyond the chronicling of living conditions, reform activities, and legislative debates, to the presenting of nuanced views of the attitudes and behaviour of working- and middle-class Victorians.

Gay L. GULLICKSON
University of Maryland, College Park

* * *

LINDA L. CLARK — *Schooling the Daughters of Marianne*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1984. Pp. ix, 224.

Linda L. Clark has written a thorough history of the process of socialization of girls in modern French primary schools. By an exhaustive study of the textbooks, a sampling of teachers' diaries and inspectors' reports, a look at notebooks kept by pupils and analysis of special questions for girls on examinations for certificates of primary schools, as well as thorough knowledge of education legislation, especially as it applied to girls' schools and women teachers, Clark has filled in a missing chapter in the history of French education. Building on the exemplary work of Françoise Mayeur, who was the first to focus on the study of girls' education in the current boom in French education history study, Clark chose to look at primary schools of the Third Republic because "it was in the primary school that the majority of French men and women experienced the process of acculturation designed for them either by the state authorities ... or by officials presiding over the competing and largely Catholic private schools" (p. 2).

Clark poses a series of four questions at the outset:

1. What did educators find distinctive in the personalities of girls and women?
2. How did textbooks depict a woman's responsibilities within the family and her relationship to husband, parents, and children?
3. What relation was envisioned between women and the larger world; between the domestic foyer and the forum of work, politics, and community life?
4. Finally, have the answers to the preceding questions changed significantly since the 1880s? (p. 3)

In a tightly-argued 169-page text, supplemented by copious and useful notes, she makes an admirable effort to answer each question.

---

1. In particular, see Louise A. TILLY and Joan W. SCOTT, *Women, Work, and Family*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1978); and Erna Olafson HELLERSTEIN, Leslie Parker HUME, and Karen M. OFFEN, eds., *Victorian Women: A Documentary Account of Women's Lives in Nineteenth-Century England, France, and the United States*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1981).