

and should not be questioned, or because they have their own reasons and precedent is a useful tool for supporting them?

It is interesting to read about Indian methods of tax evasion and smuggling which developed to outwit colonial administrators, but more might have been extracted to inform current policy: what level and what methods of taxation prompted cultivators to start breaking the law? Tobacco smuggling in contemporary Britain has grown as duty has risen on cigarettes; what factors determine the point at which such subterfuge becomes worthwhile?

While this book leaves room for further histories of cannabis in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, it is certainly an enjoyable and informative read, and I look forward to starting volume two.

Sarah Mars,
London School of Hygiene and
Tropical Medicine

John Greenaway, *Drink and British politics since 1830: a study in policy-making*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp. xii, 271, £50.00 (hardback 0-333-91782-0).

In *Drink and British politics since 1830* John Greenaway presents in detail the history of British alcohol legislation. He traces it from the acknowledgement of drinking as an issue of national interest with the birth of a mass temperance organization and the Beer Act of 1830, to the discussions of policy on drink and driving in the 1960s. This study, based mainly on Public Record Office documents, certainly fills a gap in scholarship, especially for the period after 1870.

In his concluding chapter, Greenaway briefly compares the British legislation on drink with that of other European countries. The differences in policy are remarkable. Countries that historically have most problems with excessive drinking, such as Britain and Sweden, are a rule nations with more extensive alcohol legislation. Or, one wonders, was it that an enhanced interest shed a brighter light on a problem that was not acknowledged elsewhere?

One of the questions Greenaway sets out to answer in this study of British policies is exactly how and why an issue like drink came and went on the national political agenda. He discusses the shifts of power between different pressure groups, most particularly how trade and private enterprise on the one hand, and the powerful temperance movements on the other, influenced policy making. The work questions the ways in which the issue of drink as a moral problem addressed by individual MPs became a party-political issue of the greatest importance in the late nineteenth century, and how it then developed into a topic to be discussed with matters of broader social concern after the First World War.

Greenaway identifies five main episodes in the history of drink and politics before the Second World War. During the early Victorian period the market ruled, counteracted by an ever more powerful temperance movement, a social, political and moral force, transforming the drink question into a central political theme. Then, in the last half of the nineteenth century, the focal point of the discussions shifted to the control of local authorities, as politicians disagreed on the issue of local control and licensing. Subsequently, in the period before the First World War, the abstinence pressure groups gained momentous impact, and massive rallies brought pressure to bear upon politicians discussing the possibility of a state regulated industry and licensing reduction schemes. The outbreak of the First World War is considered a turning point in the history of alcohol legislation. What Greenaway calls “a moral panic” about drink and national efficiency and the rationing of raw materials led to a major reduction in alcohol consumption, regulated by the Central Control Board on Liquor Traffic. Finally, during the interwar period the controlled sale of alcohol and restricted opening hours of the public house became further endorsed.

For Greenaway it is precisely the changeable nature of the question of drink that renders it interesting in the history of policy making. Indeed, when and why drinking became a matter deemed fit for discussion in the upper

regions of politics depended on many more factors than just the amount of alcohol consumed in a given period. His main argument is that the history of alcohol legislation reflects the complexity of the political process in this particular period, as a dialogue between new and growing pressures of collectivism and a long-established persuasive strain of liberalism.

This book is an analysis of Whitehall élites discussing a social problem. The social aspect of drinking, however, or the politics of drink at the grassroots, would be the subject of a completely different study. John Greenaway admits that as a political scholar his main concern is with power at the level of high politics and this results in a rather dry history of drink.

An Vleugels,

The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL

Signhild Vallgård, *Folkesundhed som politik. Danmark og Sverige fra 1930 til i dag*, Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 2003, pp. 299, kr 298.00 (paperback 87-7934-065-2).

What counts most in public health policy ideology and economy of a specific period or national characteristics? This is one of the questions asked by the Swedish-Danish historian Signhild Vallgård in her book on public health policies in Denmark and Sweden during the 1930s and 1940s, and from 1970 to the present. Through nearly 300 pages she analyses campaigns to promote a healthy population, health legislation (primarily mother and child) and measures taken to prevent contagious diseases such as tuberculosis and AIDS. Her sources are public documents, i.e. committee reports, legislative proposals, parliamentary debates, etc. One of her key questions is: what kind of arguments were used by politicians and the bureaucracy (supported by experts) to legitimize public health policy? Her theoretical framework is first and foremost Michel Foucault's notion of *governmentality*—the kind of power imposed upon people to obtain recognition and self-discipline—and the notion of *empowerment*—to impose power by

motivating and inspiring people to act in the interest of the authorities. The book also forms part of the big Danish research project on Democracy and Power which was launched by the Danish Parliament in 1994. The purpose of the project was to carry out an analysis of the state of Danish democracy at the beginning of the twenty-first century, and Signhild Vallgård was a member of this project's Steering Committee.

Vallgård's book, which is a thorough and well documented investigation, contains some interesting findings. As to the question of what is most influential in forming public health policy, prevailing political culture, or specific national traits, she definitely concludes from her comparison of Denmark and Sweden that political culture is more influential than nationality. For example, the population decline, which was a severe problem in both countries in the 1930s, produced similar responses. Sweden had the lowest birth rate in Europe at the time. Denmark had a relatively high infant mortality rate (no. 13 in the European table), which threatened its self-image as a civilized country. Low birth rate and high infant mortality both resulted in a decline in population. In both Denmark and Sweden political and expert rhetoric referred constantly to the need for a solid population of civilized citizens. The aim was not just to be on the same level as other "nations of culture", but to surpass them.

An overriding theme throughout these periods was the unending discussion about individual freedom versus the protection of the society, or liberalism versus the authorities' obligation to protect the citizens from such dangers as contagious disease. Here the author has found differences between the two countries but also similarities hitherto unrecognized. The Danes see themselves as liking pragmatic policies and viewing all regulations as violations of individual rights. The Swedes, on the other hand, are looked upon, by themselves and others, as restrictive and rationalistic, accepting regulations which would not be tolerated in Denmark. Vallgård's analysis shows that this is only partly true. Danish public health policy has certainly been restrictive, especially