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This volume is the introitus to an official 21 (half-)volume series on a History of [German] Social Policy since 1945. The series covers social policy in occupied Germany, five periods of welfare state (Sozialstaat) development in the West, three in the East and one during German unification (1989–94). The first half-volumes 2–11 consist of analyses, the second of reprinted key documents. (The outline of all 21 volumes is described by the historian Hans Günter Hockerts on pp. 193–8.) This massive introspective series – to span some 20,000 pages – was initiated under the government of Helmut Kohl in 1994 in Norbert Blüm’s Labor Ministry as intra-German social cohesion (Sozialunion) had been achieved: the West German welfare model had been extended eastwards wholesale, and the new challenges of European integration and globalisation loomed on the horizon. The first three volumes have appeared: the overview volume 1, the analytical half-volume 2/1 covering the period from 1945 to 1949 (2001 pp.), and the documentary volume 2/2 (681 pp.). What a grand way of looking back at the glorious involution of well-protected, semi-sovereign Germany.

Volume 1 is a must for anyone interested in post-WWII German welfare state development (see also Alber/Kohl 2001; Kaufmann 1997; Leibfried/Wagschal 2001; Schmidt 1998, 2001). It contains six, often book-length contributions covering extensive terrain. It is written by the most experienced and renowned scholars across four major ‘welfare state professions’, often the elder statesmen of the field, and not predominantly by historians:

- ‘The Concept of Social Policy and its Scientific Explication’ (Franz-Xaver Kaufmann (I), sociology, Bielefeld), an impressive and elucidating 100 page history of ideas from the early nineteenth century to the present, delineating the peculiar changing connotations and the cumulative trajectory of the social.
- ‘The Central State Administrations in Charge of Social Policy in Germany – An Administrative History’, an 80 page piece looking separately at West (Friedrich P. Kahlenberg, former president of the Federal Archives) and East (Dierk Hoffmann, history) Germany’s development of the national bureaucratic infrastructure of welfare statism.
- ‘Historical Foundations – Social Policy in Germany until 1945’ (Michael Stolleis, law, Frankfurt am Main), a 134 page overview that digs much deeper backwards than Bismarck’s social legislation of the 1880s (see Born et al. 1994—), also reaching forward into the German welfare state’s future (indirectly) suggesting the (relative) artificiality of the 1945 dividing line of this entire encyclopaedic undertaking.
‘Foundations of Social Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany’ (Hans F. Zacher, law, Munich), an almost 350 page piece, reconstructing the nature of the social as the cement of the old pre-1990 and the new post-1990 German republic, well-anchored in Germany’s constitution and in widespread popular expectations. The Sozialstaat is a constitutional building block just like the Rechtsstaat. Unlike the latter with its Supreme Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht), the welfare state is not protected by an independent public ‘care-taker’ institution, especially important in the new politics of hard times.2

‘Foundations of Social Policy in the German Democratic Republic’ (Manfred G. Schmidt, political science, now Heidelberg), a 113 page summary on how this part of Germany, contrary to most expectations, unsuccessfully flew backwards into the future with its economically integral welfare state (Einheit von Wirtschafts- und Sozialpolitik).

‘The German Sozialstaat Compared’ (Franz-Xaver Kaufmann (II)), an almost 200 page contribution containing six country studies – Soviet Union, US, UK, Sweden, France, and Germany – and positioning Germany and, thus, the whole volume in that contrast. This contribution breaks the national German shell. It is key to an – outsider’s as well as insider’s – understanding of this encyclopaedic undertaking as it reveals the special traits and pathways characteristic of the German Sozialstaat.

Of all the 21 volumes, this tome should surely be made available in a paperback four-volume university press English edition: The Welfare State in Germany, vol. 1: Comparison (Kaufmann II), vol. 2: History (Kaufmann I & Stolleis), vol. 3: The Federal Republic of Germany (Zacher), and vol. 4: The German Democratic Republic (Schmidt).

This series is a stock-taking of more than five decades of German social history, extending far beyond the one-third of German GNP taken up by the welfare state still today – surpassing past Swedish records with over 50 per cent of GNP in the East. These are official, commissioned histories – like Problems of Social Policy, History of the Second World War by Richard M. Titmuss (1950): All government papers were made available to the authors though the series is not overseen by government in any revelant way, not even rationed in length. These are histories of ‘winning the peace’ in half a century, in a once, and to some extent still, divided nation. Two contemporary challenges are not fully confronted in this volume:

- Europeanization, which in a (relatively) large country like Germany, was only generally recognised as a challenge by Sozialstaat-scholars and the welfare-state political class in the 1990s or even later (see Kaufmann, II, pp. 985ff.; now Eichenhofer 2001; Haverkate/Huster 1999), though it objectively dates back to the early 1980s at the latest and
- economic internationalization and its interaction with national welfare states in the OECD world, which became topical in Germany even later than the EC did. It is still not well understood, though building the universal welfare state since the 1950s paved the way for a second era of globalisation in the post-1970s, after the first era had been shattered in 1914 and economic internationalisation was put to rest for half a century (see Rieger/Leibfried 2001).

Encyclopedia spotters would most certainly demand a volume 22 (12). Yet, would such a ten-year plan be feasible in the UK, in a research environment
shaped by a Research Assessment Exercise with a highly individualized four-year horizon of productivity?

1 The difference between Sozialstaat and ‘welfare state’ lies in the former’s strong focus on entitlement/law and in a different notion of stateness, one which implies a public monopoly on such security.

2 Presently this is taken up in debates on a permanent ‘Royal Commission on Welfare State Reform’, a constitutionally warranted Council of Social Policy Advisors (see Zacher, Die Dilemmata des Wohlfahrtsstaates, Wirtschaft & Wissenschaft, 9:2, 48–57).


STEPHAN LEIBFRIED with BENJAMIN W. VEGHTE
Centre for Social Policy Research (CeS) & Graduate School of Social Sciences (GSSS), Bremen University
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When I began teaching social policy in 1968, I was required to teach an introductory course on the social services. The course ran for the whole of an academic year. It concentrated almost entirely on state-provided services; the voluntary sector was consigned to a couple of lectures at the very end, one of which was concerned with the importance of voluntary bodies in the history of social provision. At the time this was not unusual.

Such an approach would hardly be defensible at present. There has been a quite remarkable upsurge of interest among academics and politicians in the role of the voluntary or non-profit sector in social provision and as a vital component in civil society. There are now three scholarly journals in English devoted entirely to non-profit sector studies, and mainstream public administration and social policy journals more frequently include material in this area. In the United States there are numerous research and teaching centres specialising in non-profit studies and many other countries have similar centres. In the UK, probably the best known is the Centre for Civil Society at the LSE whose director is the first-named author of this book.
The book is one of a series of monographs stemming from the Johns Hopkins Comparative Non-profit Sector Project, in which local associates were recruited in thirteen countries (since extended to about forty) to conduct studies of the non-profit sector in their own countries. The initial group included seven advanced industrial societies, five developing societies and one country from the former Soviet bloc. Comparison was made possible by the adoption of a common structural/operational definition devised by Salamon and Anheier (see pp. 20–6).

This is a closely argued but immensely readable book written by two authors who are really on top of their subject. After a brief introductory scene-setting chapter there is a chapter dealing with definitions, which includes a brief overview of the legal and constitutional framework. How this came into being is the subject of the succeeding chapter on the emergence of the German non-profit sector. The story is a complex one and it is difficult to sum up in a few words. Perhaps the most significant feature is a series of ‘major compromises between social ideological and political forces that dates back to the seventeenth century’ (p. 31). The non-profit sector injected a countervailing element of stability during long periods of political disorder. Subsidiarity eventually became the guiding principle in the West German welfare state leading to the growing dominance of the free welfare associations in health and social services.

The German non-profit sector is identified as a major economic force, accounting in 1995 for almost 5 per cent of total employment and spending almost 4 per cent of GNP. The funding is predominantly from government (about 65 per cent) and the question of dependence is discussed. The proportion of public funding is highest in the areas of health and social services where the principle of subsidiarity is strongest. However, the principle of subsidiarity is being re-interpreted. In the past the predominant beneficiaries of subsidiarity and government funding have been the free welfare associations. Anheier and Seibel say that this resulted in a ‘provider-based quasi-monopoly rather than a client-centred system based on individual choice’ (p. 6). However, new organisations, notably self-help groups, are challenging the position of the free welfare associations, and the whole of the non-profit sector is facing competition from for-profit enterprises. Other problems arise from cuts in government funding and the erosion of the social base of the principle of subsidiarity as church, union and party membership decline. The authors note that reunification has further cut away at the base of subsidiarity because church membership in the former GDR is very much lower than it is in the West. The book devotes a chapter to the effects of German reunification. Other changes are likely to arise from greater European integration, and in the final chapter the authors reflect on the probable impact of the European Union on the German non-profit sector. There is an interesting comparative chapter in which France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States are compared in terms of scale, revenue sources and policy styles. A modified version of Esping-Andersen’s regime types is used to offer a tentative and incomplete explanation of differences.

This is a scholarly yet accessible book. It is full of interesting material and there is a good balance between description and analysis. It is certainly the most thorough and up-to-date treatment of the German non-profit sector currently available. There is something here for everyone with an interest in Germany, but
readers with a basic knowledge of Germany’s political and social system stand to
gain most. The book is also timely as the German non-profit sector is presently
undergoing extensive changes. Anheier and Seibel have produced a very wel-
come addition to the literature.

NORMAN JOHNSON
University of Portsmouth

Patricia Kennett, *Comparative Social Policy*, Buckingham: Open University
Press, 2001, xv + 176 pp., £50.00, £15.99 pbk.

This book is one of the ‘Introducing Social Policy’ series (series editor: David
Gladstone) aimed at undergraduate and masters level students. As such, it will
be of great interest to those of us who are constantly searching for reading mate-
rial that is easily accessible and relevant to courses on comparative social policy.
Most of the arguments are based on material already familiar to social policy
academics but they are presented in an interesting and readable format for
students. It is written by Patricia Kennett, from the University of Bristol, with
contributions from Ben Oakley – also of Bristol – and from Nicola Yeates of
Queen’s University Belfast.

In a nutshell, the book introduces a range of different perspectives and theo-
retical approaches to the study of cross-national data, not only in the Western
world, but also in developing nations. It does this by knitting together fairly
seamlessly older and newer theories, in order to extend the reader’s understand-
ing of the processes at work in the development and implementation of social
policies in very different cultural, political and economic settings. Specifically,
Kennett begins by exploring the new context of social policy formation at
national level. Nations can no longer operate within their own boundaries as the
world becomes increasingly globalised and internationalised. She discusses
the impact of these processes on individual nations, including the expansion of
transnational corporations (TNCs) during the 1980s and 1990s, the deregula-
tion of financial markets (supported by the International Monetary Fund and the
World Bank) during the 1980s, the continuing growth of international institu-
tions and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the new pervasiveness of
mass media and communication throughout the world, and the increasing influ-
ence of the European Union. I found this discussion a little boring but it will be
informative for students.

In a joint contribution, Kennett and Yeates focus on the practical problems
surrounding the carrying-out of cross-national social research. The difficulties
arising from differences in the conceptualisation of ideas across nations are
explored, with particular reference to welfare systems. For example, two of the
main concepts used to define social and economic disadvantage – poverty and
social exclusion – are used to illustrate some of the pitfalls in comparative
research. A critical evaluation of a range of sources of international data (EU,
UN, ILO, and OECD) also highlights problems inherent in using data often based
on the lowest common denominator and collected from different types of local
sources.

The importance of clarifying one’s theoretical perspective on welfare develop-
ment is the focus of two chapters. Some of these theories are critically evaluated here – theories of modernisation and industrialisation, of class conflict, of the regulation of social behaviour and, finally, Esping-Anderson’s welfare-state typologies. All are viewed as perspectives that are helpful but not necessarily definitive interpretations of events and processes in any particular country. However, though Kennett asserts that ‘theoretical perspectives are historically embedded and should, therefore, be understood within their specific temporal contexts’ (p. 90), she does not come to any conclusions as to the validity or usefulness of different approaches.

A more interesting theoretical discussion is in a chapter entitled ‘Ethnicity, gender and the boundaries of citizenship’, in which T. H. Marshall’s theory is expanded not only conceptually, but also geographically, to issues of gender and race in relation to welfare in Japan and Australia. For example, in Australia, the notion of ‘industrial citizenship’ (the right to strike and form trade unions) is basic to an understanding of the relationship of the state to the worker, while in Japan the importance of the family structure and the influence of patriarchy on welfare and employment policies cannot be ignored. This discussion, and the contribution by Oakley and Kennett on comparative research between developing countries and the industrialised world, grabbed my interest. In African countries, the lives of individuals are affected far more by international trade and welfare agreements over which they have little control, than they are by national events. For example, the policy decisions of the World Bank and the IMF have far-reaching implications for the availability of funding for welfare and employment services. The question is how can these processes be adequately researched in a way that will not be influenced by the hidden agendas of the Western mind? Colonial attitudes are still alive and well in many studies of the developing world.

In summary, I would say that this is an interesting and useful book for students that would have been improved by two or three more chapters using a case-study approach. As with the discussion on Japan, Australia and Kenya, this would have brought the reader into the exciting world of comparative research, where Western trained researchers (for the most part) grapple with policies and value systems that do not fit easily into our pre-conceived notions of human development and welfare rights.

PAULINE PRIOR
Queen’s University Belfast
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The literature concerned with comparative and international social policy has expanded dramatically during the last 10 years. This edited collection is a worthwhile addition to this material. It is an ambitious collection that brings together material and analysis on welfare provision across twelve country-focused chapters. As the title suggests the emphasis is on the ‘developed’ world
with the countries in the book ‘consciously chosen for inclusion in the book because they were representative to some extent of the different kinds of welfare regime to be found throughout the developed world’ (p. xvii). These include Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Russia, Germany, Italy, Sweden, as well as the United States and the United Kingdom. In addition, Hong Kong and South Africa are included as ‘special cases’. The editors point out, rightly in my view, that both countries provide interesting case studies of societies that have experienced substantial political change. However, I am less convinced by their second claim that both are ‘working hard to develop welfare provision in comparable ways to other developed nations...’ (p. xvii). In particular, the excellent chapter by Wilding and Ha-ho Mok on Hong Kong seems to argue that rather than seeking to emulate welfare provision in the West there is a distinctive approach to social policy which is ‘economic growth-orientated and growth-dependent.’ (p. xvii) and which interacts with the particularity of condition, culture and values in the city state. Clearly the editors had difficulty in imposing an overarching framework to justify the range of countries included in the book but this does not diminish the value of the collection in terms of the breadth of coverage and information provided in the individual chapters.

The aims of the chapters, according to the editors, are to explore the main features of political development, welfare services and expenditures and to consider future prospects for development. Although the degree of coverage of each of these sections varies from chapter to chapter, as does the quality of the data provided, most of the chapters follow this format offering a brief historical overview, outlining current circumstances and considering possibilities for the future. The chapters are informative, accessible and offer some very interesting insights into the various challenges and prospects facing welfare systems across the globe. The collection itself, however, does not provide or facilitate explicit comparisons of policy developments between countries despite the attempts made by Alcock in Chapter 1 to locate the country case-studies within the comparative literature and, more specifically, within the framework of regime types. The authors of the individual chapters do attempt to connect with these debates but it is often in a cursory manner and, in general, adds little to the discussion. Nevertheless, the country-specific chapters provide an excellent foundation from which to begin to explore social policy in a comparative, cross-national context. The book will certainly find a place on reading lists for relevant undergraduate and Masters programmes and will provide a valuable source of reference material.

PATRICIA KENNETT
University of Bristol
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Books on Scottish social policy are rare enough to prompt the hope that a little gem might lie behind the unenticing title and excessive price of this book. Deriving from a lecture series to social work students at the University of Strathclyde, the book takes us through poverty, health care, housing, education,
provision for children and older people, and services for adults and children who offend. There are general chapters on ethnicity (by the editor) and on local government (but not central government). Many of the socio-economic and professional themes of the chapters derive from a UK base, especially where social work is concerned. The editor’s introduction is a brief three pages. There are references for each chapter, but no index. The authors know their subjects well and some useful lecture-style frameworks are provided in the mould of old-style social administration. The criminal justice chapters are lively, and Chakrabarti has some thoughtful points to make on ethnicity that would be good to put to students. Such an approach can have its uses even if it seems unimaginative. The real problem is the book’s timing, or rather lack of timeliness. Apart from the editor’s own contributions, the chapters appear to have been finalised in 1998. The Scottish Executive (which took up its powers in July 1999) is mentioned in the future tense in terms of its potential and what it may or may not seek to do. What for the authors is ‘now’ is for the reader a resounding ‘then’. And so it is hard to recommend the book to current students or observers of the Scottish scene, as it would be seriously misleading to imagine that nothing much has happened since devolution or that the policies and issues of the Major government are still dominant.

The Scottish Parliament has passed substantive legislation on the organisation of housing and social work, and the Executive has grappled with important educational issues such as tuition fees and school examinations. In 1999 it issued the first of its annual reports on Social Justice, relating devolved to reserved services. The Parliament and the Executive have promoted new styles of policy formation, public participation, legislation, budgeting and central-local relations. The Executive have gone down centralising roads in their attempt to achieve uniform national standards in health, housing and social work. Labour ministers have sought to play their part in the UK-wide new Labour project while facing pressure from their Liberal Democrat coalition partners (often backed up by Conservative as well as nationalist parliamentarians) to assert distinctive Scottish and collectivist policies. Even, say, in early 2000, over a year before the book was published, it would have been possible to write something interesting on these themes. There is a worry that the detail of devolved policy-making is passing the academic community by, and the tendency evident in this and other service-orientated books to write about social welfare with the politics taken out is not an option in post-devolution Scotland.

The authors show the grasp of both policy details and research findings often found in social policy teaching and writing, and they have lacked a medium to get their material before readers in a prompt and accessible way. Perhaps the web will soon come to our rescue. Ashgate have shown a commendable willingness to issue monographs on social policy and it is unfortunate that in this case the delays of conventional book publishing have tended to undermine the value of their investment in a book about a fast-changing policy scene.

RICHARD PARRY
University of Edinburgh

This book is to be welcomed as a significant addition to Irish social policy literature. It presents a clear and detailed account of the various sectors of the Irish welfare system. It will become a core text for students of Irish social policy. Although Michael Pellion has made significant ongoing contributions to the study of Irish social policy he is, first and foremost, a sociologist. His concern in this book is to explore power relationships and interrelationships within the Irish mixed economy of welfare. He employs Bourdieu’s notion of interconnected social fields to examine the use and exchange of symbolic, economic, cultural and political capital between the Catholic church, the state and other actors within Irish social policy. He explores how the capital generated in one particular field becomes a resource in another.

There are strengths and weaknesses to this approach. The emphasis throughout upon ‘fields of welfare’ yields a distinct theoretical contribution. It builds upon earlier work by the author on interest groups in Irish society (Pellion, 1982). That work examined the role of ideology within the modernising projects of the state and other actors. Yet, in keeping with Bourdieu’s theoretical framework, there is little or no examination here of ideology. Forms of political capital, including ‘the capacity to speak authoritatively for a large category of people’, are discussed. Bourdieu’s notion of doxa (as in hetrodoxies/orthodoxies) suggests a means, not explored in the book, of getting around the problem of ideology.

Thus, the Catholic Church is considered as a ‘player’ in Irish debates but Catholicism is not explored as an ideological tradition of welfare. There is no discussion of subsidiarity as a stake within Irish social policy. Again, analysis of the role of the state or other ‘fields of welfare’ such as social partnership in social policy ignores ideology. By contrast, writers such as Allen (1999) see ideology as central to the role of social partnership in Irish society. Ideologies, whatever their epistemological status, are crucial to welfare discourses. They articulate claims about the ‘good society’ that impact on social policies.

Ireland does not have a welfare state as such. The Irish mixed economy of welfare can be partially explained in terms of the emergence of two crucial yet demarcated sectors (Fanning, 1999). Each is linked to distinct ideological discourses. First, a distinct nineteenth-century project of Catholic modernisation led to the institutionalisation of Catholicism in some parts of the welfare economy. Other contemporary welfare institutions are derived from the Poor Law of 1838 and the new-liberal welfare legislation of the early twentieth century. Liberal and Catholic traditions have long co-existed even if the ideological stakes were low within a moribund welfare economy. Fahey (1998) argues that a lack of conflict between free enterprise and subsidiarity was aided by underdevelopment. The advent of rapid social and economic modernisation has arguably unsettled this. This unsettlement has, in part, been expressed within neo-liberal ideological discourses.

The framework employed by Pellion to examine the interplay between stakeholders in Irish welfare is valuable. Yet this needs to be linked to an analysis of how the stakes are ideologically constructed. Neo-liberalism posed radical chal-
lenges to Catholic and ‘one-nation’ Tory conservatisms alike. The social policy of the ‘Celtic Tiger’ has been marked by such ideological conflicts. For instance, the Report of the Commission on the Family (1998), *Strengthening Families for Life* was ideologically grounded in Catholic traditions of welfare solidarity. It was concerned that women should not be compelled to take up paid employment. It supported the single breadwinner two-parent family. These goals came into conflict with those of the Fianna Fail government and the social partners. The budgets of 1997 and 1998 were characterised by an emphasis upon tax individualisation to increase the participation of women in paid work. *Strengthening Families for Life* was sidelined but the government had to retrench in the face of strong popular opposition to a perceived undermining of the right of women to remain in the home. Here the stakes were articulated through ideological discourses on the market and the family.

Part I of the book examines ‘players and stakes’ within the Irish welfare system. In Part II of the book the author locates his analysis of the dynamics of Irish welfare system within some comparative debates. He engages with Esping-Andersen’s *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (1990) and with models that identify distinct peripheral welfare typologies. Not least amongst the achievements of this text is a well-developed empirical account of Irish welfare practices that is clearly employed to explore the relevance of such comparative approaches.


BRYAN FANNING  
University College, Dublin
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The starting point for this book was a seminar in 2000 funded by the then Department of Social Security. Also attended by members of other government Departments. Its aim was ‘to help policy makers consider, evaluate and develop different policy options’, around the general idea of ‘putting work-based systems for lone parents into practice’ (p. 3), using cross-national comparison as an aide. (Indicatively ‘work’ here means paid employment, not unpaid care).

A short introduction sets the agenda, after an even shorter, apparently unintegrated but useful preface by Ruth Lister summarising New Labour’s welfare reform project (welfare to work, making work pay, the eradication of child poverty, and means-testing). Part I then sets out detailed case studies of policies about lone parents and employment, and their socio-economic profile, in the UK and five other countries. (Although the apparently gender neutral ‘lone parent’
usually means ‘lone mother’, and as such obscures important gender issues.) These are Australia, France, the Netherlands, Norway and the USA where all—except for France—have recently introduced or further developed various measures to move lone parents into paid work. Each chapter, written by national specialists, contains a wealth of information as well as interesting insights along the way. The chapters also show that employment does not necessarily mean escaping poverty and suggest, if only by implication, that it is not so much the policies themselves which are effective or ineffective. Rather it seems to be the wider gender and family culture, in which policies are set and have their origin, that underlies lone mothers’ take-up of paid work.

Part I could be criticised for simply juxtaposing country chapters, which in itself does not amount to comparative analysis. Part II, with five thematic chapters, is more properly comparative by taking particular issues and then using cross-national analysis as appropriate to each. Indeed, Jane Millar’s chapter summarises and complements the policy content of Part I, while Bradshaw and Kilkey attempt to statistically measure how far ‘work pays’ in each country, and how this correlates with lone mothers’ employment levels (it doesn’t much). Chapters by Hilary Land and Jane Lewis are wider ranging in drawing the debate about lone motherhood into more conceptualised discussions of childcare and employment (Land) and on the relationship between paid work, care and ethics (Lewis).

I find an intriguing contradiction in the book between a government discourse—lone mothers are a problem but this can be solved by getting them into paid work—and a deeper social science understanding. And remember that the originating seminar was aimed at ‘helping’ government policy makers. There are several problems with this ‘simple’ government view. First, it sees lone mothers as essentially rational economic men where motherhood, and children, are posited as just some sort of economic constraint. The fact that many mothers feel obliged to spend a lot of time caring for their children, and indeed want to and sometimes enjoy it (if ‘enjoy’ is a permissible word) is forgotten. Equally, both care and paid work are highly gendered, and men and women have to navigate their way through some potent and immediate normatives of good mothering/fathering. Secondly, linked to this, seeing mothers along a mother–worker continuum (where the idea is to shift from the former to the latter) is probably inaccurate as well as causing a lot of guilty feelings. It is more likely that most mothers see themselves as combining both roles; even if they are in full-time employment in some demanding career job this will most often be mediated through the lens of also being a mother. Current ‘work-based’ policies miss this. In turn, the statistical category of ‘lone mother/parent’ may well be a social red herring, or put more precisely, a ‘chaotic concept’ (cf. Sayer 1992). Thus poor lone mothers living in a peripheral housing estate in a declining local labour market will probably have more in common with similar partnered mothers than with better-off middle-class lone mothers living in suburban areas in growing local labour markets. There are also important cross-cuttings by ethnicity. This is one reason why there are such dramatic variations in lone mothers’ employment rates between, and within, different local authority areas—despite uniform social policy.

Most chapters seem to show partial acceptance of the government simplification, combined with efforts to point out that the reality is actually both wider in social scope as well as being more complex, with some mounting incipient ‘escape attempts’ along the lines of the critique above. The concluding chapter
by Rowlingson and Millar reflects this mix well (only the Lewis and Land chapters largely escape). The conundrum remains – how actually can one best ‘help’ policy makers?


SIMON DUNCAN
University of Bradford
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Timpson examines why child care provision has not been linked to the pursuit of workplace equity for women in Canada in the period since World War II. The question is interesting given that Canada has shown considerable commitment to developing employment equity legislation, while child care provision remains slight, with 80 per cent of all provision remaining informal and unregulated in 1998. The answer has much to do with federal/provincial relations, as is so often the case with Canadian social programmes, as well as with those dimensions of policy making that are more familiar to UK readers, such as the role of the finance ministry, of social movements and of ideology.

The 1970 Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women, which put women’s issues firmly on the political agenda in Canada, focused largely on labour market inequalities. However, many women’s groups making submissions to the Commission were ambivalent on the issue of child care, favouring part-time work and flexible hours instead. Indeed, opinion polls in 1970 reported that 80 per cent of female respondents agreed that women with young children should not go out to work. This lack of firm support for child care by women’s groups is something that Vicky Randall (The Politics of Child Daycare in Britain, Oxford University Press, 2000) has also identified as a major explanatory factor in the UK’s failure to develop policies in this area. As Timpson observes, the safest political approach to child care in Canada became the introduction of a child tax credit (in 1978), which together with tax relief on child care costs, has remained central to child care policy. While a ‘National Strategy on Child Care’ was formulated in the 1980s, no mechanism was implemented to take forward the direct provision of child care policies by the Provinces. During the 1990s, the efforts of the Federal Government have been focused on using new social assistance legislation and tax credits to encourage ‘welfare mothers’ into work.

The Canadian response to the issue of women’s unequal position in the labour market has been conspicuously firmer. The Canadian Human Rights Commission has had a large impact on affirmative action in respect of employment discrimination (but little on child care), and, following the Report of the Royal Commission on Employment Equity in 1984, contract compliance has been used as the key mechanism to promote equality in the workplace. The Commission on Employment Equity succeeded in making the link between women’s position as paid workers and as unpaid carers, a link that opinion polls showed that Canadian women were also ready to make by the early 1990s. However, even the idea of a National Strategy on Child Care was abandoned in
1992 and the two policy areas have never been effectively linked by policy makers at either the federal or provincial levels. Like British and many other European women, but unlike those in the USA, Canadian women have tended to work part time: 28 per cent did so in 1999 (regrettably Timpson does not provide much by way of background data on either the changing patterns of female employment or on the mixed economy of child care). As in the case of countries such as the UK and The Netherlands, the issue of what women in different kinds of jobs and, in the Canadian context especially, in different geographical areas, actually want by way of working hours and child care is an important area for further research. Timpson’s book is premised on the assumption that the absence of a link between the issues of women’s employment status and child care provision has proved politically damaging. However, in European countries with conspicuously successful child care provision, the case has always been made in terms of children’s needs as well as those of working women.

Timpson explains the policy divide between employment status and child care policies largely in terms of federal/provincial relations. Child care was left by the Trudeau governments of the 1970s to the Provinces, where it became part of the seemingly endless round of federal/provincial trade-offs that have marked the development of the Canadian welfare state. In contrast, employment equity legislation was derived in large measure from its US counterpart and was implemented via the courts. It is significant that the employment equity strategy fitted well with the commitment to individual rights made in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982, whereas child care policy has been regarded as part of social policy. Furthermore, within social policy, family policies have tended to be viewed with considerable suspicion, as intrusions by government into the private sphere. But as Timpson observes, there has been no such wariness when it comes to lone mother families and policies to promote ‘welfare-to-work’, something that is also familiar in other liberal welfare regimes.

JANE LEWIS
University of Oxford
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This book provides a political economic perspective on recent events in Canadian health care, specifically the undermining of the medicare system. Universal health coverage has been the norm for all of the provinces since 1971 (p. 46), and it is an important component of the Canadian identity. Indeed, the authors note that ‘medicare has almost come to define what it means to be Canadian. It is immensely popular politically, which makes for political difficulties for those who wish to dismantle it’ (p. 2).

This publication demonstrates how political economic approaches can aid in understanding why such a popular integrally Canadian development is so besieged by problems and challenges. This explanation is based on the notion that ‘states, markets, ideas, discourses, and civil society are not independent variables but interrelated parts of the same whole. This whole is shaped, but not determined, by the mode of production, that is, by the means of producing and
reproducing for socially determined needs’ (p. vii). I would argue that while this approach is generally helpful for increasing understanding of very complicated processes, at times, the reliance on this perspective encourages a static typological framework, marked by the denial of individual human agency. Depending on one’s vision of Canadian health needs and initiatives, this may or may not be problematic.

The publication is divided into three thematic sections. The first portion introduces the Canadian medicare system, and some of the challenges which threaten to undermine it. Given the authors’ theoretical bent, it is not surprising that they concentrate on ‘the rise of neo-liberalism and globalization, which push to substitute free-market forces and private profits for the collective public good’ (p. 24). The contributions cover the history of medicare in general and several case studies. For example, Joel Lexchin concentrates on the influence of the pharmaceutical industry on medical policy and service provision in Canada, while Colin Leys documents the history of the British National Health Service in order to derive ‘the significance of the British experience for Canada’ (p. 66).

Section two is devoted to several critiques of evidence-based decision-making. ‘For political economists, the central questions about evidence in health care are similar to those raised about the economy as a whole: who benefits, who determines what counts as evidence, and how is evidence created, valued, structured, interpreted, and used in this particular time and place?’ (p. 91). In this section of the book, Linda Muzzin raises questions about the involvement of the pharmaceutical industry both in the university curriculum and in academic research endeavours. As some measure of the seriousness of this issue, it is interesting to note that recently ‘the members of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors … revise[d] their publication guidelines to require that researchers disclose their sponsors’ involvement to editors when they submit articles’ (Anonymous, 2001: 70).

Pat Armstrong examines the implications of evidence-based health-care reform for women’s issues. She notes that this is ‘a business paradigm, with an emphasis on cost, on management, and on evidence of a particular kind’ (p. 121). Basically, the type of data examined contributes to the type of solution proposed. This is also the focus of Eric Mykhalovskiy’s critique of health services research.

The final section deals with risk and risk assessment. The chapters each cover very different material and it would be useful for the reader to have linkages between them made more explicit. In this section, John Eyles discusses the environment and pollution concerns, while Peggy McDonough covers some of the areas where work and health intersect, and Dennis Raphael deals with economic inequality and health in Canada.

In conclusion, this is a useful book for both the specialist academic and for those with a general interest in Canadian health policy and issues. It is however a book with a definite political and theoretical message, which at times leaves the reader longing for greater diversity in messengers.


SUSAN J. WURTZBURG
University of Canterbury, New Zealand
This book makes a very useful contribution to debates around equal opportunities policies. Its interdisciplinary authors provide analyses of cutting edge empirical research, which addresses the recent dilemmas for the Civil Rights Act and affirmative action in the USA created by demographic changes in that society. In this way, the book problematises and criticises this legislation, which became law nearly 30 years ago. A similar process could be usefully undertaken in many other countries where much has changed, including the UK where most of the major equal opportunities legislation is nearly as old.

The various chapters ask important, but also difficult and at times uncomfortable questions. The most fundamental questions being: are the right groups now benefiting from affirmative action, and is the civil rights approach still the most appropriate way to combat discrimination? This is because, due to complex immigration into the USA, many diverse minority ethnic groups (including white groups) have been included under the affirmative action umbrella, which was originally designed only to deal with the considerable disadvantage of African Americans who were descendants of black slaves. As Skretny argues, “Afro-Americans have lost their status as “the” minority” (p. 1). Thus discrimination has now inevitably become entangled with mostly voluntary immigration, which has produced a very diverse and growing population of ‘affirmative action-eligible groups’ who exhibit greatly varying levels of education, income and achievement. Hence the title of the book, as the problem for the USA has moved from discrimination along a ‘color line’ to discrimination along many ‘color lines’. Also, the rationale of discrimination for affirmative action has in many ways been displaced by the idea and rationale of ‘diversity’ especially in the workplace. Both these changes, it is argued, increasingly strain public justifications for the policy. They also lead to anomalies and unintended consequences as outcomes of the policy.

For example, in Chapter 2, Graham shows that the previously distinct policies of affirmative action and immigration have become linked. He gives the example of the affirmative action programme for appointing academic staff at the University of Michigan based on a model of proportional representation of ethnic minority groups in society. This successfully brought in many minority professors; however, many of these reserved places were filled by foreign-born academics. Also, in Chapter 5, Douglass demonstrates a problem that arose for the University of California’s affirmative action policy in student recruitment. They altered admissions standards to achieve proportional representation of Afro-Americans and Latinos comparable to their representation in the state of California. However, this led to a surprising and curious outcome. They could continue to do this only by restricting the admission of Euro-Americans. This was because there was an over-representation of Asian Americans in the University, who had gained admission with their generally higher grades through the normal recruitment process. This leads to the inevitable and unavoidable questions, which bring the policy into disrepute: did this make Euro-Americans a minority, and should a university committed to racial diversity seek to achieve proportional representation of Euro-Americans? In fact the University of California abandoned the policy in 1995.
Multiethnic and multiracial workplaces controlled by ethnic minority employers also create difficulties for the civil rights law. In Chapter 6, Lichter and Waldinger, show how Latino and Asian small employers in Los Angeles regularly hire workers from their same ethnic group by word-of-mouth. This raises the dilemma that, although word-of-mouth recruitment was made illegal under the Civil Rights Act because Euro-Americans were using it to resist recruiting Afro-Americans, should it still be illegal when one ‘affirmative action-eligible minority group’ is using it to exclude others? Another aspect of this pattern of selective recruitment from minority groups in the USA is the goal to make the workforce ‘diverse’ enough to mirror the customer bases of firms. In other words, as Kelly and Dobson in Chapter 4 and Lichter and Waldinger show in the above chapter, customers of various cultural backgrounds show a preference for ‘co-ethnic’ service. However, this creates a paradox pointed out by Skretny: ‘many firms may pursue “diversity”, but they do so to ensure that customers encounter only ethnic homogeneity’ (p. 13).

Lee, in Chapter 7, also details racially preferential recruitment, but this time in the different context of New York. Here Korean American and Jewish American store owners undertake differential recruitment to deal with a customer base that is largely Afro-American. Thus black employees are recruited mostly to be conflict resolving ‘cultural brokers’ to this customer community, and to provide a signal of ‘giving back’ to the local community. However, an added twist to this preferential recruitment, which also demonstrates the linking of affirmative action and immigration, is that these business owners prefer to recruit immigrant blacks. This is because although they still retain the legitimacy of ‘cultural brokers’, they are also perceived as having a superior work ethic. Thus, these chapters on the workplace show, as Skretny points out, ‘that race has become again a bona fide occupational qualification, tied to obvious national-origin discrimination, perpetuated by groups often seen as victims of discrimination themselves’ (p. 14).

All the above dilemmas and controversies, and the others presented in the book, highlight the need for serious and informed reflection on what is to be done to make equal opportunities legislation relevant for contemporary society. Chapters 8 and 9, by Bobo and Swain et al. respectively, analyse the views of Americans on affirmative action programmes; the first through public opinion surveys and the second through in-depth focus groups. They both found that different groups in America vary in their support for affirmative action in its present form. Predictably, those who benefit most being most in favour (Afro-Americans), and those who do not benefit being least in favour (Euro-Americans), with Latinos and Asian Americans lying in between. However, Swain et al. also showed that there is a relative consensus in favour of affirmative action based on class. They found that greatest support from all groups was given to affirmative action, if it also benefited the poor and the disabled, regardless of race or national origin. This may be a lesson that all countries will need to learn. To retain public support for equal opportunities policies, and continue to combat disadvantage, class must be brought back into the analysis from the margins of social science.

Barbara Bagilhole  
Loughborough University
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At present President George W. Bush and a number of senior members of the Administration are engulfed in the Enron Scandal. Enron, a major multinational corporation which prior to December 2001 was valued at $60 billion is now bankrupt. The major losers are the employees who invested their pensions and their savings in Enron and who are now left with no savings and no pensions. In the meantime the chief executives managed to sell their shares early. Arthur Andersen, the accountants of Enron are accused of shredding vital documents. Enron has over the last six years paid $1.4 billion in political contributions to both Democrats and Republicans. In return they have secured a deregulated energy policy framework.

It is important in the study of principles to evaluate the connections between ideas, values and the policy process. Drake does a very good job in this book in outlining to students a number of crucial debates on values concerning social justice, freedom and citizenship. The author also seeks to make connections between ideas and the policy process. He connects the Thatcher government’s Right to Buy policy with the wider stated principles of the government to roll back the state, break up local government monopoly and increase individual choice. The question that needs to be asked is whether it was principle that guided the policy outcome or whether the government used principles to justify a series of particularistic policies veiled in arguments of principle.

Policy making also involves issues of political judgement and political arithmetic. In terms of political arithmetic the sale of council housing made great political sense in that the Conservative Party felt that council house owners would in future vote Conservative. In 1983 and 1987, the Conservative government aimed to scare people by arguing that Labour were against individual choice and were likely to renationalise council housing. In return, the Labour Party saw that the Right to Buy was a popular policy. Geoff Rooker (now Lord Rooker) and the then leader of the Labour Party, Neil Kinnock, produced policy review statements to show that Labour was now in favour of the Right to Buy policy. Secondly, there was the issue of political judgement. The losers were the homeless and those left in high rise flats who were always going to be a minority and not a winning election issue.

Markets do not have a life of their own – they are socially constructed. Market liberals advocate the need to de-regulate and to create more flexible labour markets. What does de-regulation mean in concrete terms? It often means removing trade union immunities, removing the limit on the hours people work, and phasing out collective bargaining agreements. Why should market liberals advocate these policies? Is it true that de-regulation increases competition, which in turn contributes to higher rates of growth and more employment? Foundations including The Heritage Foundation, the Institute of Economic Affairs and the Adam Smith Institute have played a crucial role in articulating liberal market ideas and lobbied political parties and governments for these ideas. Very often these Foundations receive donations from conglomerates such as Enron. So ideas do not exist in a vacuum. They hide particular and narrow vested interests in the language of the public interest.
The study of principles is important because principles influence policy options—they provide limits to what is possible. In this sense this book is important because it provides students with recent academic debates on crucial issues. Debates on justice, freedom and citizenship are important because they provide access to the argument of how principles are used to define issues.

All three UK political parties are committed to citizenship, however the concern is not how citizenship is defined but what sort of policies are constructed in the making of citizenship. The Conservative government created a plethora of citizenship charters but those charters were aimed at citizens as consumers of goods and services not as citizen of the republic and participatory democracy.

In conclusion, this is a very useful and highly readable and accessible text for undergraduate students of social policy but it needs to be supplanted with studies of political choices and the continuing discrepancy between the rhetoric of policy statements and the realities of policy outputs. Clear links need to be made between principles and political party ideologies, between the expediency and the short-term nature of policy making and also issues of political arithmetic and political judgement. The need is to continually map the winners and the losers that are hidden in arguments of principles.


This short text, one of the latest from Palgrave’s admirable social history in perspective series, examines that quintessential early experiment in social legislation, the English poor law system, which also applied to Wales (there are brief sections devoted to the Scottish and Irish poor laws). The book deals with the poor laws from early eighteenth century until they were largely abolished in 1930. Anthony Brundage, is of course, very well qualified to conduct this examination since he wrote *The Making of the New Poor Law* in 1978, one of the key texts on this subjects; he also produced an interesting biography of Edwin Chadwick in 1988.

One of Brundage’s central themes is that it is difficult to generalise about the poor laws. He demonstrates that in practice, poor law provision was varied and diverse; this was true even after the 1834 amendment (which was designed to introduce a more centralised and uniform system). Describing the development of the poor laws as an ‘ebb and flow’ between what might be regarded as paternalistic or benevolent approaches on one side and a harsher, punitive, deterrent regime on the other, Brundage maintains that there has been no linear evolution towards a more humane system of dealing with the poor. He also maintains that there was nothing inevitable about the way poor law policies developed; issues were often resolved narrowly and policies may well have been different had the views of say, Adam Smith or Jeremy Bentham prevailed. Brundage also shows how opposition to the poor laws was both consistent yet disparate. Unusual alliances were formed between radicals and conservatives, the former opposed the utilitarian principles of less eligibility, while the latter were con-
cerned to defend the right of local areas to pursue their own polices without central interference. Furthermore, Brundage makes clear that the poor laws must be set against larger national struggles; he argues (2002: 157), ‘the ideological struggle over the poor laws is connected to England’s often painful transition from agrarian to industrial, from rural to urban, and from aristocratic to democratic’.

Following a survey of the ‘old’ poor laws, sections deal with the reasons for the reform, the royal commission and the debates around the amendment. The summaries of some of the main arguments put forward by a range of eighteenth-century exponents of poor law reform are useful since they help to locate some of the debates concerning reform within the wider context of economic, demographic and social transformations. The new poor law in practice over its remaining hundred years constitutes the remainder of the book. Brundage highlights the continuities between parts of the old poor law system and the new.

More recent changes in emphasis within historical and policy studies mean that the experiences of those who might not generally be included are now given more prominence. Brundage’s accounts of the opposition to the new poor law and the attempts to humanise it are fascinating. It is also interesting to have the work and contribution of women reformers more explicitly stated: the work of women in the Workhouse Visiting Societies and their gradual election onto the boards of guardians in significant numbers after 1894, ‘by 1909, there were 1289 women guardians in 500 poor law unions’ (2002: 128). The way that poor law services expanded and changed after the Andover workhouse scandal in 1845 is also important: initiatives in education and health show how the tensions between reactionaries and reformers were played out in different policy arenas. Relations between the poor law authorities and the voluntary sector – especially the Charity Organisation Society and the Workhouse Visiting Societies – are discussed and the section that deals with the ‘eclipsing and transforming of the Poor Law’ after 1900 includes a thoughtful discussion on the nature and reactions to ‘Poplarism’.

In general, the text is lucid and economical. The material is laid out chronologically and sub-divided into discrete sections; this makes the book very easy to follow and allows particular incidents like the ‘Captain Swing’ riots, or general alterations in administrative policy, such as the campaign against outdoor relief in the 1870s, to be located quickly. The book includes a set of extensive and well-referenced notes and a wide-ranging bibliography. The text could have been more carefully edited; there is a slight tendency to repetition at times and I spotted some US spellings (I’m sure I noticed ‘color’ somewhere!). But perhaps there are only a few of us left who are bothered by these things! Overall, this is a very useful and concise addition to the literature on the poor laws. It will appeal especially to undergraduate students who should appreciate the emphasis on the varied and contested nature of both history and policy-making.


MIKE MCBETH
University of Birmingham
Civitas (the ci-devant Health and Welfare Unit of the IEA) has for some time been urging a revisionist view of the role of the voluntary sector in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century social policy. (There is a good review of the broader historical debate in Gorsky, 1999: 1-20). Essentially, Whelan and his colleagues argue, the voluntary sector had strengths which were lost in the transfer of welfare responsibilities to statutory agencies, and a reversal of this trend is urged as part of a wider anti-statist enterprise.

With this in mind, Whelan revisits the Charity Organisation Society. Look first, he says, on this picture of the COS in action in Hammersmith and Fulham, carefully assessing needs and encouraging independence. Then turn to this picture of the Mansion House Fund for the relief of the unemployed of 1886: dispensing huge sums of money quickly, without proper investigation and, if to any effect at all, resulting in the demoralisation of those whom the COS and their associates had been urging back to virtue. And, he asks us to conclude, how like this second picture, of undeserved and damaging doles, is to our state welfare system today. Let us return to the virtuous paths of our COS forebears.

Whelan’s study consists of three sections. The first is an analysis of the records of the Hammersmith and Fulham COS, including a summary of nearly 200 applications for assistance in 1879–80 and more extended case-notes of 27 families which were in touch with the agency over a longer period. These records give a fascinating picture of the agency in action, and are well worth studying. From them, and the linked history of the H&F branch, one gets a picture of an agency torn between national goals of community organisation and the immediate demands of local people which students of voluntary organisations will recognise today. Life in practice, then and now, is much messier than the theory of welfare practice often allows.

The second part of the book deals with the Mansion House Fund of 1886. The research here is sketchier, and largely based on reports and correspondence in The Times. Debates between C.S. Loch of the COS and Main Walrond, the secretary of the MHF, give a recognisable if not particularly edifying spectacle of turf wars at a time when Walrond’s main aim was to keep the money flowing in and out, and when Loch’s criticisms, valid though they might have been in quieter times, were simply a distraction. As Henrietta Barnett was to comment sadly later on the damage which the fund caused to her husband’s refusal to countenance easy doles, ‘it was haste and ignorance which worked the mischief.’ (Barnett 1918: 237). Whelan does not take the time factor into account, nor does he offer any evidence-based evaluation of the work of MFH. How urgent was the need, and did it arise from pressure to head off working-class militancy or to meet real, immediate distress? And what was the role of trade unions and other working-class organisations? Some of Whelan’s marginal comments suggest that there is a larger, more complex story to be unravelled here.

But the broader question, which Whelan fails to address sufficiently seriously in his third section, is the nature of charity. He dismisses Jane Lewis’ study of the COS as based too much on theory (p. 3) and calls instead for a recognition of ‘the
painfully acquired experience of nearly four centuries of English philanthropy’ (p. 6) rather than the rights-based, dole oriented welfare state we have today. But charity contains a moral component where theory does indeed have a part. Can public charity achieve a role which is neither demoralising nor punitive, and if so what is it? Behind Loch’s secularised charity stands Thomas Chalmers’ work in Glasgow in the 1820s, urging small parochial social units to be self-sufficient. The Barnetts were doing the same thing in Whitechapel in the 1880s and 1890s, adding the necessity of living alongside the poor – as is Bob Holman today. And what of the social workers? Their recognition of the messiness of human life is acknowledged by Whelan historically, but he then caricatures them as politically correct puppets on the last pages of his study (pp. 96–7) where the argument becomes frankly crude. But the very brashness of his approach, and the liveliness of his writing, makes this a stimulating study: given students with sufficient historical knowledge it could form the basis of an interesting third-year seminar.


JOHN LANSLEY
University of Liverpool


Voluntary hospitals originated in Britain as subscription-based charitable institutions in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. They offered hospital services, not to the wealthy individuals who subscribed to them, but to those members of the community who were too poor to receive medical treatment in their own homes. During the second half of the nineteenth century, a small number of voluntary hospitals encouraged the growth of workmen’s contributory schemes, which enabled their members to contribute to the cost of their own treatment, and such schemes came to play an increasingly important part in the financing of voluntary hospitals after the First World War. However, although the establishment of contributory schemes led to a substantial improvement in the financial position of the voluntary hospitals by the middle of the 1920s, they were unable to redress some of the other weaknesses which the sector faced. As Martin Powell (1992) has recently shown, there were substantial local variations in the extent and quality of voluntary hospital provision, and the present study provides clear evidence that the sector as a whole was facing renewed financial difficulties on the eve of the Second World War.

As Mohan and Gorsky show, these changes in the financial structure of the voluntary hospitals meant that they came to be regarded less as charitable institutions providing medical services for the ‘sick poor’, and more as public institutions for the community as a whole. In 1937, the research organisation Political
and Economic Planning pointed out that this change was reflected in the decision to offer institutional representation to various organisations, such as the local authorities, the British Red Cross Society and the Contributory Schemes Associations, on Hospital Boards of Governors (Political and Economic Planning, 1937), but Mohan and Gorsky show that this did not mean that there was any significant increase in democratic accountability (pp. 79–84). The involvement of local authority representatives on Boards of Governors also failed to ensure that there was any great improvement in the coordination of voluntary services with those provided by the authorities themselves, and even though some progress was achieved, ‘there was still no [national] “hospital system” by 1938’ (Mohan and Gorsky: 89).

Although the establishment of the National Health Service represented a major extension of state intervention in the field of health care, both Labour and Conservative governments continued to allocate a significant role to charity, and this has become increasingly pronounced since the advent of Mrs Thatcher’s first government in 1979. However, as Mohan and Gorsky demonstrate, there are clear indications that the government’s increasing reliance on charitable funds may simply lead to a repetition of the problems faced by the voluntary hospitals in the inter-war period, including the unequal competition for scarce resources, the concentration of funds on particularly ‘appealing’ causes, a general lack of coordination, and the systematic tendency for the supply of charitable funds to be inversely related to areas of social need.

BERNARD HARRIS
University of Southampton
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In this book Bob Holman provides a chapter by chapter celebration of the lives of Eleonor Rathbone, Marjory Allen, Barbara Kahn, John Stroud, Clare Winnicott, Peter Townsend and, under duress from his publisher, himself. It can hardly be doubted that each one of these pioneers contributed much of value to improving the lives of children. Some contributed through their research and political campaigning, such as Rathbone, Townsend, and Allen, others, Kahn and Stroud, through their work in the Children’s Departments, founded under the Children Act, 1948. It is to Holman’s credit that he rescues Clare Winnicott from the shadow of her famous husband, the child psychiatrist, D. W. Winnicott, to show her important role in training child care officers and in helping to create the postwar child care profession. Holman’s approach is to combine a chronological account of their professional careers with selected details of their private lives. The result is a text full of interesting and informative material, which is presented in Holman’s familiar clear and no-nonsense prose.

The mix of these particular pioneers, all of whom will be known to readers of this journal, is perhaps a little odd since, as Holman acknowledges, they divide
into two groups: Rathbone and Townsend who represent the anti-poverty lobby, and the rest who were active in developing services for children deprived of parental care. There is of course a certain amount of overlap between the pioneers' concerns but nevertheless the division tends to obstruct the development of an effective analytical line throughout the book. Holman, however, probably has less interest in analysis than, as he says, in preserving 'the characters and deeds' of the group. And, indeed, they are a truly remarkable bunch. Through the use of secondary sources and a number of interviews (including several with the subjects themselves), a convincing picture emerges of their struggles during the years between the 1940s and the 1970s to delineate poverty and to counter its effects, to bring the deprived child into the public sphere, and to develop a local authority structure of children's departments in such a way as to make them effective in countering the destructive forces faced by so many children. Holman is good at drawing out the connections between child care policy, poverty and inequality, and his concluding remarks reveal his continuing anger at contemporary injustices done to children and their families.

This is very much a celebratory work. There are one or two criticisms of subjects here and there, but they are friendly jibes. A more critical study will surely be needed if the full history of child welfare is ever to be written. With regard to Rathbone and Townsend campaigning against poverty, their focus was never only on children and, therefore, to call them 'champions' of children is perhaps a little misleading. To do so tends to obscure the particularity of children by assigning them membership of 'the poor' or of 'the family'. The 'needs' of children require a different kind of presentation. Holman's exposition of the pioneers of the Children's Departments emphasises structures rather than the daily practice of departmental child care, and the unwary reader might easily overlook the fact that children's well-being is more than economic security and parental care. On the other hand, taken together, the chapters on Allen, Stroud, Kahn and Winnicott present an instructive impression of both the atmosphere of the time and the motives of the reformers. Moreover, there is something of a generational tone to this book in so far as all the subjects (Rathbone is probably an exception) could be said to have been influenced by either wartime experiences or by the postwar mood of social improvement and social justice. For these activists progress meant freedom from poverty and a secure family life. Unfortunately, not only are both these goals as elusive as ever, we now know that in themselves they are an incomplete solution to our perceived problems.

In the meantime, this engaging and humane book does well to remind us of the main political and economic issues at stake, and of the grit and determination with which these pioneers faced what must have seemed at the time to be insurmountable obstacles to improving children's lives. Holman expresses his Christian socialist viewpoint with an admirable clarity as he reminds us, tellingly, that there is much to be learnt 'not just from their achievements but also from their characters and approaches. They were driven more by a cause than by a career' (p. 202). One is left with the feeling that Holman chose his 'champions' because they embody his own political strategy: 'relate, activate, agitate' (p. 201). We could do worse than follow his and their example.

HARRY HENDRICK
University of Southern Denmark
*JSP*, 31, 2002, DOI: 10.1017/S0047279402366741

This book must become the classic text for students of education, social and welfare policies. Sally Tomlinson, doyenne of policy-oriented education and social research, has written with commendable clarity and comprehensiveness a superb book on British education. It covers the changing fortunes of education and welfare in relation to the state, the economy and globalisation. Each chapter provides useful boxes which summarise Acts, reports and events during the period under review and all end with guides to further reading.

The main theme is about policy changes from a welfare state perspective with a focus on equality of opportunity, to a focus on private enterprise and markets in the context of a global economy in the twilight years of the century. She takes a very clear political position on these continuities and changes, writing from a traditional Labour or socialist position, foregrounding a social class analysis and arguing that the changes have increased social divisions and poverty. Given this, there are inevitably some limitations and flaws. She contrasts the post-war welfare state perspective with post-welfarism in which privatisation, markets, consumers and individuals predominate. She argues that there are more continuities than contrasts between Thatcherism and Majorism and New Labour under Blair, using the memorable aphorism of ‘choice and diversity’ (dubbed chaos and perversity) versus ‘choice and excellence’. However, she highlights the poverty of New Labour’s contrasting perspective on poverty and social exclusion.

Tomlinson reviews carefully, in tremendous detail, yet lucidly and often humorously the myriad changes in legislation, policy initiatives, proposals and strategies, linking them with changing political ideologies, values and conflicts or squabbles in party political views. She also provides us with some clear reviews of the social research evidence about these developments, shifts and changes. She demonstrates both her passionate involvement and intimate knowledge about the education policy process, and includes some lovely nuggets of gossip about key players. For instance, in talking about whether private education will endure for middle-class families, she tells us that ‘New Labour Prime Minister Blair himself attended Fettes, a Scottish public school where his headmaster had previously been sacked from the headship of Eton for drunkenness (Morris 1995: 20)’ (Tomlinson 2001: 135). This is particularly interesting in the light of current political discussions, at the time of writing, about drugs and drunkenness in the Royal Family, and Blair’s paternal support for the Prince of Wales and the similar ‘hard-line’ response of Eton (*The Guardian*, 15 January 2002: 7).

The first six chapters weave policy developments and changes on schools, higher education and teachers or the teaching profession with some evidence about the contrasting political debates and ideas. There is a relatively short summary chapter on education in the period of social democracy, followed by chapters on the three successive Tory administrations, although it does not appear in that crude fashion. There are two pithy chapters on New Labour, contrasting schools’ policies and initiatives with lifelong learning, characterised by work and training, and yet including higher education.
The last three chapters summarise the social science research about the key issues of equity and social divisions. Given Tomlinson's particular focus, the first is about social class, with a focus of how policies have sustained rather than reduced the advantages of the middle classes. The second is about race and gender, with a focus on how policies here have ameliorated slightly the position of girls and some minority ethnic groups. The last substantive chapter is about education and the economy or work, and draws together some of the more international studies on the global and knowledge economy.

The main limitations are about the particular perspective that Tomlinson has adopted, which is to highlight her political involvement (but not biographically) rather than her excellent research and scholarship. It may be either her characteristic modesty which has prevented her from providing us with these insights or the traditional approach adopted to the social science evidence, rather than a more biographical expression. We get very little sense of her own studies which have ranged over race and ethnicity, special education, school effectiveness, home–school relations and parental involvement. Thus the first six chapters demonstrate her personal involvement but do not draw very much on her own sociological studies. They are also slightly limited in the links to a broader social policy perspective, and related aspects of social welfare, such as family, health and childcare policies. They are also wedded to a traditional understanding of social class, rather than recent developments in sociological analysis and educational studies. Yet these are some of the richest developments in our understandings of social and educational change. She relies too heavily and rather repetitively on a series of rather limited studies and misses a wealth of research, from Scottish, Australian and American studies. Moreover, despite her gender, she also ignores the wealth of feminist research which has informed our understandings of social, economic and family changes. Again, she misses some of the more fine-grained international studies of gender and sexuality. Thus there is no reference to changing forms of parenthood, sex and sexuality education, one of the key features of New Labour’s approach to social exclusion. We get no sense that the families and parents to whom policies are now addressed may not be traditional nuclear families but characterised by lone motherhood.

Nevertheless, the book ensures Tomlinson’s place as the crucial constructive critic of the poverty of New Labour’s education project.

MIRIAM E. DAVID

Department of Education, University of Keele
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The recent history of UK local government has been characterised by frenzied activity and apathy. The end of a decade and a half of Conservative domination was welcomed by local government as an opportunity to draw breath after a continued assault on structures, responsibilities and finance which saw the slimming if not the erosion of the local state. Sadly (or perhaps happily), under New Labour the pace, if anything, has quickened hence the replacement of compulsory competitive tendering (CCT) by 'best value' has gone hand in hand with a
search for ‘democratic accountability’, a programme linked to new political structures (local cabinets), elected mayors and the advocacy of widening participation and community engagement. Local authorities are therefore mandated to adopt a community leadership role and engage more widely with the private and voluntary sectors in partnerships and strategic relationships. Yet, all this is played out against a background where, if electoral statistics are any measure, public enthusiasm for local government continues to deteriorate.

In tandem with all this the context of UK local government continues to change. Above, the influences of the European Union filter down to the town hall while the wider political landscape has altered with the devolution of powers to Scotland and Wales and a simmering debate on English regional government. In brief, a combination of forces are restructuring the old local government world into an arena where multiple players operate at different levels of government. It is this transition from local government to local governance that the authors of this book seek to address. Their argument is that old models are unsatisfactory and that the need is not to mourn the end of traditional local government but rather to seek to understand the new world of local governance.

Leach and Percy-Smith set out to map out this landscape aided and abetted by some recent and fashionable theoretical frameworks, in particular network theory and its older variant of Rhodes’s power dependence model (Ch. 2). Beyond this having set the evolution of local governance into a historical context (Ch. 3) the authors engage with a number of key issues on the new local governance agenda. These include questions of local democracy (e.g. participation, representation, responsiveness) in relation to elected and unelected bodies (Ch. 5) and the new focus on community leadership (partnerships, networking and the like) (Ch. 4). Other chapters examine efforts to combat the wicked issues such as social exclusion, crime prevention, education and health inequalities and the associated challenges of ‘joined up government’ and ‘joined up policy making’ (Ch. 8) while there is an effort to explore how traditional local administration and politics have been reshaped by the forces of new public management and markets (Ch. 7). Elsewhere the authors locate the new local governance in the wider organisational context of multilevel governance (Ch. 9) while addressing the availability of the resources that the new systems may need to control and manage, ranging from traditional finance to social capital (Ch. 6).

The discussion is underpinned by wide-ranging references both to the academic and official literature that demonstrate a close knowledge and awareness of recent developments. The book also ranges over a vast range of themes and topics both theoretical and empirical. In many ways this is a considerable strength, however it is also one of the corner stones of the text’s weakness. While the case for conceptualising current developments as a shift from local government to local governance should be made, it could be done in a crisper and more focused way. Currently the authors often appear overambitious and somewhat confused in their objectives, in particular whether this book should be viewed as a local government text in the accepted sense or as an attempt to focus and theorise the current world. This leads to a frequent failure to ‘join up’ both across and within chapters. On the first of these points the historical overview (Ch. 3) is far too compressed (from the Poor Law to New Labour in thirty pages!!) while the key discussion of multilevel governance (Ch. 9) should be inserted earlier since it is
central in setting the context of other chapters. Elsewhere the book tries to cover too much ground in too short a time (e.g. Ch. 4 on Community Leadership and Ch. 7 on Third Way Management) leading to a crowding out of analysis and a frequent failure to explain examples consigned to textual boxes (e.g. pp. 97–8, 120–1, 202–3). This is a pity, since there is a good case to be made and there is no doubt that the authors’ wide awareness of this area would have allowed them to have produced a more tightly focused and analytical volume.

In exploring the multiple and often conflicting theories that have been used to conceptualise local governance, Leach and Percy Smith argue defiantly that ‘theory is inescapable’ (p. 46). Later they assert that their account focuses on ‘policy issues, processes and outcomes rather than structures because the issues are persistent while many of the institutions are transient’ (p. 236). Yet one does not have to be an institutionalist to challenge this and indeed their conclusion points up the contradictions in the new local governance founded on institutional incompatibilities and competing political geographies. The biggest challenge facing local governance may indeed be political re-engagement (p. 242) but coping with this will require an understanding and capacity to manage the inter and intra-organisational politics that shape political processes.

BILLY JENKINS

University of Kent at Canterbury
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I sat down with relish to read this highly topical book. This is the book I have been waiting for – that would answer the questions that have preoccupied me about ‘Student debt: the causes and consequences of undergraduate borrowing in the UK’. Sadly, I was disappointed. This is a frustrating book with a selection of some tasty morsels, but which together do not amount to a satisfying meal.

The book brings together nine empirical studies, all of which use a variety of research techniques, to examine different aspects of student debt and its psychological causes and consequences. Part I of the book concentrates on the experiences of students in the UK while Part II introduces comparisons with students in France and Italy. The book concludes with a chapter that aims to pull together the various strands and themes raised in the book, along with their implications for policy.

The first main chapter concludes that students are poor money managers, although some are better than others, and they have different styles of budgeting. The most exciting idea introduced in this chapter is the notion of ‘mental accounting’, namely: students use different sources of money distinctly, and physically separate money from these sources in discrete bank accounts. Thus students used their grants or money from their parents for certain types of expenditure, and their earnings from paid work for other types of spending. However, this idea is not developed in this chapter, nor in subsequent chapters.

The next chapter attempts to develop a conceptual model of the origins of student financial behaviour and attitudes. It concludes that students’ experience of credit use induces more tolerant attitudes towards credit and debt (rather
than the causal relationship being in the opposite direction). It asserts that money management is a ‘critically important factor’ in what causes students to borrow, as is spending on socialising, especially alcohol, cigarettes and clubbing.

The following chapter argues that student loans have led to the development of a new dependency culture. It concludes that student loans have not enhanced individuals’ economic knowledge and understanding. Nor have they broken a dependency culture, as envisaged by policy makers when introducing student loans, rather dependency on the state has been replaced with dependency on banks and financial institutions.

The final chapter in Part 1, and one of the more interesting, focuses on students’ interpretations of their borrowings and the impact this has on their well-being. It reports high levels of anxiety and depression amongst students, but particularly among those with student loans. Thus students’ state of mind about their debts, such as pathological depression and anxiety, were best predicted by their psychological interpretations of their situation rather than economic factors such as their income, or the extent of debt.

The book concludes with a discussion about the implications of the findings for economic psychology and policy. Regarding the latter, first there is a need for the government to acknowledge that student debt has a negative effect on students’ well-being. Secondly, some ‘formal education regarding money management and the interpretation of debt is needed’ (p. 113)

While I would not disagree with these conclusions, they also highlight some of the major limitations with this book. The book does not build on our existing knowledge, or other studies, about student debt. Nor does the book engage in the crucial policy debates about student loans. In fact, the book seems to be devoid of any social, economic or political context, including a proper understanding of student financial support policies, or how student loans work in practice. Rather at times, the authors adopt a rather moralistic tone about student debt and students’ behaviour.

The book often treats students as if they were separate from the rest of society. Thus the authors are uncomfortable with students’ (especially men’s) ‘social’ spending on alcohol, cigarettes and clubbing. However, they do recognise it is an integral part of student life, which indeed it is. But it is also an integral part of all young people’s lives. For instance, if we compare the proportion of student expenditure spent on entertainment, including alcohol and tobacco, with that of other low-income households headed up by people under the age of 30 in the population at large – the proportion spent on entertainment is practically identical (Callender and Kemp, 2000). Indeed, as participation in higher education widens, we would expect to see increasing similarities between the spending patterns and priorities of students and young people.

At other times, the specificity of students’ situation, especially student support arrangements, are overlooked. Increasingly, students cannot choose whether or not to take out a student loan. In 2000/01, 78 per cent of all students had taken one out (Student Support, 2001). The changes in student funding policies, especially since the 1998 Teaching and Higher Education Act, give them no choice. All the money management skills in the world, can not detract from this fact, nor the ensuing debt arising from student loans. Yet, the very title of this book – the causes of borrowing, ignores this reality.
Perhaps this could be overlooked if the studies reported on borrowing from for instance, commercial sources of credit such as overdrafts, or credit cards, where one could argue students have some choice. In fact, except in one chapter, it is not clear what sources of borrowing and credit the studies refer to. Moreover, they fail to point out that the vast majority of student debt/credit/borrowing consists of student loans. So, in essence, when these studies discuss student debt/credit etc. they are really discussing student loans.

Student loans, however, are treated in the studies like any other form of credit/debt, especially in the discussion, which locates student debt within more general economic psychological theories. But student loans (at the moment at least), are very different from commercial credit, particularly in terms of the income contingent nature of the repayments and the interest rates paid on these repayments. Their distinctive nature is not taken into consideration when discussing the relevance or otherwise of existing economic psychological theories about why individuals borrow, their attitudes to debt, and perceptions of debt.

The book’s failure to acknowledge the specificity of student loans and how they operate, also brings into question some of its conclusions. For instance, one chapter uses the level of outstanding student loan debt 16 months after graduation as part of an indicator assessing the acceptability of credit and debt. However, given the loan repayment conditions at the time of the study, we would not expect graduates to have repaid their loans within 16 months of graduating.

By the end of the book, I am still left wondering about why there are variations in students’ attitudes towards debt and how they perceive student loans. Why do some students cope better psychologically with student loan debt than others? And how do they view student loans – as a form of income, a source of credit, or a debt? How do they view the student loan repayments – as a debt or tax or something else?
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This book is one of a series on Poverty, Inequality and Social Exclusion published or forthcoming, from Policy Press (for a previous volume see Journal of Social Policy October, 2001). The editors have selected a number of extracts from accounts of poverty and inequalities in health in Britain from 1800 to 2000, to provide readers with an extensive introduction to the subject. For students of social policy, the book provides an opportunity to read at first hand texts that
will be familiar in name at least, to anyone who has studied the development of the welfare state. The emphasis is on the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century and, among the better-known sources, are excerpts from Malthus; the Factory Inquiry Commission Report of 1833; Edwin Chadwick on public health reform; Mayhew on poverty in London; Engels and Marx on the association between poverty and capital; Rowntree’s 1901 and 1971 studies of poverty in York; Charles Booth on the physical pattern and social structure of the city; Spring Rice on the health of working women. The post-war social policy classics are represented with extracts from Beveridge, Titmuss, the Abel-Smith and Townsend poverty studies as well as from Roberts on the classic slum and Tudor Hart on the inverse care law. Among the lesser-known pieces is an essay from Clarkson, first written in Latin in 1785, on the trade in slaves and the physical cruelties inflicted upon them.

The excerpts of necessity have been selected, although the editors describe their selection criteria in rather general terms. They say that they wished to show areas where changes in policy were made. How scholarly writing as well as popular writing could influence opinion and how the same arguments recurred again and again. Indeed, the editors’ rationale for the reader is the importance of attending to history as it shows the recurrence of particular arguments and reveals the premises on which they are based. Particular attention is paid to biological determinism and materialist explanations. Indeed, the thrust of the volume is towards demonstrating social and materialist explanations for poverty and ill-health. Most extracts attribute poor health to poor living conditions and therefore argue for social intervention through the redistribution of income and other social resources. As far as an immediate agenda is concerned, in the introduction the editors refer to the human genome project and the potential for a resurfacing of determinist arguments of the past. They remind the reader that 2 million children, more than one in six, are experiencing multiple deprivation and poverty and comment that the Blair government is not overly concerned with evidence of increasing income inequality (see 2001 final entry in the timeline p. lxxxvii).

For the student, the book has a number of strengths. One of these is the introduction that provides on overview of trends in inequalities in health over the period using a variety of tables and boxes. Notions of absolute and relative poverty; strategies for reform through charity, welfare or self-help are discussed as well as the issue of whether poverty causes ill-health or ill-health poverty. A second strength is the variety of sources used to illustrate the link between poverty and ill-health for the pre-1970s period, as they were perceived by contemporary social critics. A timeline of parallel political and social events is provided so that the contribution of ideas can be related to subsequent social action. While all this information is available elsewhere, the book is a convenient source for those studying social history.

For the teacher of social policy, the extracts provide useful illustrations of the range of methods used by those concerned to improve social conditions. For instance, Malthus, Engels, Marx and White (1928) who writes on social selection, all begin with a set of theoretical propositions about the laws or characteristics of the social world and select their data to further their argument. For others, a rigorous method for data collection is used to generalise their findings.
to a wider population. For example, in the Rowntree studies of poverty in York, Townsend and Abel-Smith begin with definitions of poverty standards, explain their methods for data collection and demonstrate their results through statistical and analytic methods.

Yet other studies demonstrate that as routine statistics became available, these were analysed to assess the state of the nation. Thus, William Farr used the registers of deaths to establish healthy and unhealthy districts in England and, together with the efforts of Chadwick, helped to develop the appointment of public health officers and eventual improvements in the sanitary conditions of towns. In quite a different tradition, Mayhew collected vivid material on otherwise hidden aspects of London life. His account of the 'mud-larks', children who paddled the Thames to scavenge for saleable detritus can be seen as a precursor of qualitative research that seeks to ground research in the accounts given by people themselves. At the turn of the century, Charles Booth drew on the reports of School Board visitors to provide both a statistical survey of poverty in east London and also provided case studies of particular families.

The ingenuity of amateur social researchers is represented by the activities of Pember Reeves and her fellow Fabians in a study undertaken between 1909 and 1912. The study focused on the effect of insufficient nourishment on the mother and baby before and after birth among 'respectable' poor families, that is where the head of household was in work. These Lambeth families were visited every two weeks, the babies, judged healthy at birth, were weighed on each occasion and the mothers were asked to keep detailed records of how they provided for the families on about £1 a week. The research concluded that in comparison with better-off families, the survival rate was worse and those babies who did survive were less well developed and more susceptible to illness.

Unfortunately, for the already informed reader the variety of sources and methods adopted by earlier researchers is not reflected in the coverage given to contemporary data on poverty and ill-health. Only excerpts from the Black and the Acheson reports are provided for the post 1980 period. The omission skews the volume towards the past. It also fails to reflect the range of methods currently in use for researching poverty and what those sources show. For example, it does not illustrate how a life-time of exposure to poor living conditions affects individual lives or the explanations that people give for their poor health. Recent studies have provided information on both these issues. This makes the volume less useful as a resource and less powerful as an argument for change.

JUDITH ALLSOP
De Montfort University, Leicester
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This is the seventh volume in the Gildredge Social Policy Series edited by Professor Peter Alcock of the University of Birmingham. The aim of the series is to provide introductory texts for the growing number of students studying social policy at 'A' level through GNVQ courses to first year university courses. The series aims to provide well-structured texts that are short and specifically
designed to support student learning. This book by Michael Cahill meets all the Gildredge criteria admirably. For this reviewer it was quite difficult to envisage a better introduction to the subject area. Michael Cahill is an author who is writing from ‘inside’ Social Policy as well as someone with long-term ‘inside’ knowledge of green movement politics. This makes it a rare and valuable text and something more than an introductory text for further education and first-year university students. There are many people teaching and researching in the field of environmental policy studies who would benefit from studying this text closely if only for the excellent chapters on sustainability, sustainable development, and LA21. A decade after the UN conference in Rio de Janeiro one might have thought that these concepts had been done to death. Sustainability and sustainable development have become ‘top of the pop’s’ in political cliché-land. The problem for environmentalists, whether they are ‘dark’ or ‘light’ green (to use Cahill’s terminology) is that the political mainstream, both in the UK and elsewhere, has resolutely resisted incorporating the news transmitted from environmental science or from the daily environmental disaster byelines in global media communications. The environment is not yet central in social or economic policy decision making.

For £10.99 the reader gets very good value. There are nine chapters and 180 pages of well-researched and accurately documented text. The topics covered are sustainability, local agenda 21, green ideas, environmental health, housing and urban development, food, work, globalisation. Each chapter ends with a list of key points and a guide to further reading. Core concepts are mostly well introduced and illustrated. One could quibble with some of the key points, for example in quite substantial chapters on topics like sustainable development and LA21 Cahill ends up with just three or four key points, why not five or six? The structure imposed by the series editorial criteria seems a shade procrustean at times as the author endeavours to meet the Gilredge criteria within 180 pages. The book does provide the targeted students with what they need to know. It would be an interesting experiment to send a copy to your local Director of Social Services and get (by whatever means exist to make such people sit and read an introductory student text) her to read it and then to ask whether it had helped her to see the relevance of sustainability and LA21 to what Social Services are trying to do. It often seems to this reviewer that for most of them environmental/green concerns are about countryside, footpaths, and keeping the neighbourhoods’ clean. Overall, very worthy, but nothing to do with the social policy nitty-gritty of poverty, mental health, child care, racism, ageing etc. As academics find it difficult to transcend subject boundaries so local government officers find it hard to transcend administrative boundaries. What all students who try to practise the arcane but necessary art of ‘joined up thinking’ will find is that budgets and the everyday organisation of power can create some formidable cognitive barriers to learning.

The substantive policy oriented chapters of the book on health, housing and urban development, food, and work are excellent examples of ‘joined up thinking’. Cahill as a non-specialist has covered a very broad range of literature to provide cogent support for his contention that we can now engage with seriously implementing sustainability policies. As he puts it, get on with the ‘how to’. For example, the four chapters cited above show just how important the

Sheila Peace and Caroline Holland have assembled a very useful set of papers on different approaches to housing for older people. Although much of the material has appeared elsewhere in articles, books or conference presentations it is helpful to have it assembled in one place. It is largely based on papers presented to a British Sociological Society Conference held at the Open University in 1998. The authors have added papers from other experts.

The authors say that they focus in the book on ‘housing arrangements that might enable people to live to the end of their lives, with their health and care needs met or supported, in places that are valued both by them and by other people... To date our thinking around “accommodation and care” in later life has focused on very old people who are seen as unable to fit into mainstream housing and whose needs have been labelled as special, segregated or separate, rather than accepting accommodation and care as part of society’s needs in general’ (p. 2). I would not entirely accept this thesis. For example, the development of aids and adaptations, to which little attention is paid in the book, is about altering mainstream housing and not about segregation.

The book starts with an introductory chapter by the editors which sets the scene by summarising policies and information about housing and demographic trends. Part one of the book is entitled ‘Policy and technology debates’. This starts with an architect’s (Julienne Hanson) view of, as the editors put it ‘the demand for housing among older people and the extent to which living environments have been created which predispose towards disablement for anyone less than fully fit and agile’. The title of her article is ‘From “special needs” to “lifestyle choices”: articulating the demand for “third age” housing’. It is a pleasure to read a well-informed architect’s sympathetic account of housing for older people and some of the issues. Mary Kelly then puts the case for ‘lifetime
housing’ which is designed as a ‘home for life’. This home could be adapted to the changing needs of everyone who lives in them as they age and change. The next useful chapter looks at the regulatory framework for housing and considers the case for and against increased regulations.

Two detailed chapters then examine assistive technology. First Malcolm Fisk considers the implications of smart home technologies. He defines this as homes where a variety of devices, such as sensors, are linked so that communication takes place between them. He concludes that assistive technology has great potential for older people. Mary Marshall finishes this part of the book with a thoughtful account of the implications for technology for people with dementia, including the ethical issues.

Part II of the book is entitled ‘New lives for old’. Two of the chapters are about specific initiatives which are only applicable to a small number of older people. One is by Maria Brenton about CoHousing communities where older people themselves get together on the basis of self-determination and co-operation to plan and provide their own housing. A team from Keele University then consider retirement communities and present evidence from their own doorstep of a community near them as well as more general research.

Another chapter looks at the issue of integrated segregation drawing on three separate pieces of research. These are on high rise flats, traditional sheltered housing and shared housing for people with dementia. Finally, there are two concluding chapters. One is a thoughtful chapter from Leonie Kellaher which considers whether it is possible to design for life. In the last chapter the editors draw some conclusions. They say ‘Our vision is a future where desirable design features in general housing include planned accessibility and sustainability.’

The book is well referenced and has a good index. It can be recommended to policy makers, practitioners and students.

ANTHEA TINKER

King’s College London