When I first became interested in women’s citizenship, I was particularly attracted to Scandinavian feminist writing on the issue, including the work of the Danish scholar Birte Siim. Siim is a political scientist with a good feel for social policy (even if it is not listed here among her disciplinary influences). One of the recurrent themes in her important book is thus the interrelationship between women’s social and political citizenship.

The book’s subtitle underlines her basic premise that ‘politics matter’ (p. 2), together with her central concern with women’s agency. Agency provides the link between conceptions of citizenship as an active, participatory practice and as a set of rights, which are the object of struggle. Politics, as expressed through political institutions and discourses and individual and collective agency, provide the framework both for the analysis of feminist citizenship theories and for the comparative study of gendered citizenship in three very different European welfare states. One of her aims is to help shift ‘the focus of attention in feminist scholarship from a theoretical figure of patriarchy of exclusion to an analysis of the dynamic processes of women’s participation in civil society and in public political life’ (p. 2). Siim identifies three feminist accounts of citizenship.

- Carole Pateman’s highly influential ‘patriarchal hypothesis’, based on a critique of the public–private divide;
- a ‘maternal-communitarian’ model, exemplified by the work of Jean Bethke Elshtain, which emphasises women’s social and cultural difference from men;
- a ‘pluralist participatory’ model, developed by feminists such as Anne Phillips and Iris Young, inspired by civic republicanism’s ideal of active political citizenship, yet also paying attention to the demands of diversity and difference.

She is critical of Pateman’s lack of attention to women’s agency and of the maternal-communitarian preoccupation with women’s maternal role. Neither model provides a satisfactory account of women’s citizenship in a Scandinavian context. The ‘pluralist participatory’ model is closest to Siim’s own position, although she suggests it raises a number of questions, particularly with regard to gendered power relations. She also welcomes the contribution offered by postmodernism, provided that women’s agency is not deconstructed out of existence in the process. Here she places particular emphasis on the importance of discourse for her study, although the analysis of discourses is not sustained in a systematic way.

Having provided an overview of both general and feminist approaches to the theorisation of citizenship, the book is then divided into the three case studies of France, Britain and Denmark, chosen for their contrasting citizenship traditions, vocabularies and politics. She uses a gendered modification of Bryan Turner’s active/passive and public/private taxonomy and also the notions of a male breadwinner model as the basis for her analysis.
France is taken as the point of departure, for it illustrates the contradictions of a model of equal and active political citizenship, which excludes women. The chapter includes an interesting discussion of the current demand for ‘parity’ of women’s political representation. It contrasts parity, which would represent the permanent inscription of gendered difference, with the quota systems adopted as a transitional mechanism in the Nordic countries.

The UK – home of the male breadwinner model – is presented as the ‘exception to the rule of European social policies’ (p. 92), reflecting the dominant liberal philosophy of the separation of public and private spheres and non-intervention in the latter. In contrast, Denmark represents a dual breadwinner society ‘in which the old public–private divide has become degendered’ (p. 145) and motherhood/parenthood ‘has become a potential for citizenship’ (p. 124) in the ‘small democracy’ of everyday life in schools and childcare institutions. She concludes that ‘the story about women’s citizenship in Denmark is no longer about women’s exclusion and marginalisation from the public area but rather about inclusion and participation’ (p. 144).

Nevertheless, this optimistic account is qualified by the observation of new gender divisions between ‘small’ and ‘big’ democracy and between public and private sectors in the labour market. Gender still matters to citizenship. At the same time, globalisation is contributing to a new class polarisation between well-educated and unskilled women and is raising ‘new questions about the integration of immigrant women with different religious and ethnic backgrounds’ (p. 147).

The key theoretical and methodological point underlying the case studies is that ‘citizenship is a contextualised concept’ (p. 1). This is the main lesson that I will attempt to apply to my own work. However, Siim goes further and states ‘there is no universal story about gender and citizenship’ (p. 3). Yet at one level her book tells just such a universal story – of the gendered nature of the inclusions in and exclusions from citizenship and of the gendered power relations inscribed in these patterns. The point surely is that, at another level, this universal story unfolds in particular ways in different societies, as Siim’s valuable study demonstrates so well.

RUTH LISTER
Loughborough University


This is a major contribution to the comparative literature on welfare states. It breaks out of the ‘typologies’ mould and in so doing substantially increases our understanding of how to think not just about gender and welfare states, but about the whole way in which we conceptualise welfare systems. Above all, Daly appreciates the messiness of welfare systems. It is not that she refuses to look for pattern, far from it, but the analysis and interpretation of her empirical material shows a rare appreciation of the interactions of the two welfare systems as wholes.

Daly begins with the familiar elements of state, market and family, but proceeds to take all three equally seriously. This means that she is interested in labour-related policies at the interstices of market and state, and family-related policies at the interstices of family and state, but at the core of her analysis is the conceptuali-
sation of the conjuncture of all three elements in terms of the extent of care services and the treatment of dependants in respect of taxes and benefits. She thus puts care at the centre of welfare systems and hence pays more attention to the issue of de-familialisation than to de-commodification. Daly argues that three features of welfare states best serve to capture how they are gendered: ‘the universe of covered risks, the construction of entitlement, and the treatment of different family types’ (p. 231). She claims that the way in which welfare systems organise the coverage and location of female as well as male risks, whether they use an individual or collective unit of eligibility and the degree to which and how they differentiate between family types reveals the gendering of social policies.

The empirical analysis is based on the British family expenditure survey for 1985/86 and the third wave of the German socioeconomic panel. The substantive chapters examine income inequality via data on taxes and benefits; poverty in the two countries; and women’s risks in relation to marriage and its financial relations. The conclusions are intriguing. While the UK may not be the better society for women to live in, its welfare system does more to reduce male and female income inequality, especially between men and women as individuals. Indeed, in the UK there are ‘no winners’ (p. 218), male or female. The heavily means-tested system with low levels of benefits treats men and women equally badly. In Germany men win, but there is more redistribution overall and less tolerance of high poverty rates. The UK system is gendered not so much in its direct effects, but in its failure to counter women’s disadvantage, whereas Germany reinforces the inequalities between men and women directly and indirectly, especially at the individual level. Thus the welfare system that performs best overall does less well in respect of gender.

At the end of the book, Daly speculates on the future adaptability of the two systems. In some respects the profound changes in the UK system have already overtaken her comments, but this only demonstrates further the need for her kind of holistic, contextual approach that avoids the static quality that so often pervades the effort to construct typologies.

JANE LEWIS
University of Oxford


Social Inclusion is an edited collection of essays. Many of the contributions arose from a conference on ‘Stakeholding: Structures for a New Society’ held at the University of London in 1997.

The book starts from the premise that it is widely acknowledged that, in the face of global forces of economic and cultural change, new models of political and economic development to promote social cohesion and social justice are required. These forces stem partly from, on the one hand, the collapse of socialism and, on the other, the failure of unregulated markets to sustain structures of social order.

The current emphasis on the concept of ‘social exclusion’ as a response to processes of social change may have provided the raw material for much of this book. However, the deliberate focus on analyses of social inclusion as well as
exclusion in this volume highlights the claim for the construction of a wider agenda requiring ‘more fundamental changes in social organization and social relationships’ (p. 2). The editors themselves acknowledge in their concluding remarks that the idea of an inclusive society as a real and concrete possibility, rather than an ideal, remains partially unrealised.

There are four parts to the book. Part I offers a variety of perspectives on the analysis of social inclusion, in which the general context of globalisation forms the basis to some contributions. Concurrent with the widely differing analyses concerning the inclusion/exclusion polarity is engagement with the paradox of the endemic reality of tensions between democracy and pluralistic diversity. The final contribution to Part I takes a radical approach and proposes the utilisation of the concept ‘social becoming’. The author argues from a theological perspective for the validity of emerging models which accept contemporary uncertainties as givens. This relies on the idea of inclusion co-existing with exclusion rather than instead of it.

Part II explores major contexts of exclusion and inclusion, and again globalisation provides an arena for contested views. Contexts discussed include the economy, the media and corporate structures. One chapter engages with the multiplicity of meanings attached to the terms ‘social inclusion’ and ‘social exclusion’, arguing against simplistic prescriptions for inclusion based on integration of minority identities.

Part III focuses on a practical agenda for inclusion. Here again the authors’ widely differing fields of expertise are represented. For instance, contributions include proposals for a rehabilitation of the political to counter problems of inclusion ‘thrown up by the market’ (p. 211), suggesting a procedural argument focusing on shared values in a diverse world through negotiation, and enhancing the role of active citizenship. In addition, inclusiveness in the workplace is addressed from humanistic and Marxian perspectives emphasising core needs of attachment and reciprocity. The identified tensions between co-operation and rights are elaborated further in a discussion of stakeholder relations which argues the case for some regulation. The theme of mutual need as a prerequisite for social inclusion resurfaces in a concluding chapter which criticises the practices of contemporary capitalism for their failure to promote social honour in the workplace.

Part IV offers concluding thoughts from the editors. It is acknowledged that there is a huge diversity in conceptions of social inclusion, and this is reflected in the range of different viewpoints expressed by the contributors, within and between academic disciplines. This necessitates a sensitising guide to the central issues which seems actually to offer little clarification.

A strength of the book is its bringing together many eminent authors whose individual contributions provide unique and insightful commentaries on the central debates. This breadth of coverage, however, brings with it in parts a curious juxtaposition in relation to disciplines and levels of analysis. No apology is made for this and the case is made for the relevance of philosophical and humanistic theorising and praxis alongside the avowedly political and economic analyses.

HILARY JUPP

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Although anti-racist strategies and outlooks have become increasingly important within many areas of social policy, there has not been nearly enough solid research about the outcomes and limitations. There have certainly been some very useful analyses of particular approaches (for instance Moore, 1997), but still far too few to provide an adequate picture of trends and obstacles. Penketh’s study fills one particular gap here, and does so in an effective and interesting way. She focuses on anti-discriminatory developments in social work at a specific moment, when the Central Council for Education and Training in Social Work (CCETSW) incorporated anti-racist learning requirement into its training practices. The book will be of value to anyone interested in social work, in equality issues in public services, or in the interactions between human agency and the constraints that operate within certain kinds of organisational settings.

The basis for Penketh’s account is primarily some research from 1990–92 that set out to explore how far CCETSW’s anti-racist learning requirements were being achieved, and what barriers there might be to implementation. Interviews were undertaken with students and their practice teachers, so the author is able to draw on direct quotations and individual experiences, and this is often rather illuminating. Penketh suggests that CCETSW’s anti-racist policy initiative developed as a ‘top-down’ exercise which sought to alter the conditions of social work activity by imposing forms of behaviour and practice from above onto students and practitioners in the field. It incorporated an acknowledgement of institutional racism, and thus sought to go beyond policies associated with multiculturalism and cultural sensitivity. As recent political debates about policing have reminded us, an anti-racist agenda of this type can provoke a backlash against supposed political correctness, and against attempts to challenge established practices. Penketh’s case study reveals that in an atmosphere of financial cuts, increasing stress and competition for promotion and training places, the ‘abstract imposition of anti-oppressive policies could lead to resentment and bitterness from white workers at particular junctures’ (p. 72). Her material, however, also points to deeper problems in an unreceptive work environment and an unresponsive workforce. Several students who were less experienced and less confident were ‘shocked at the levels of discrimination that they encountered in agencies, especially as most of it came from social work staff’ (p. 79). More specifically, anti-discriminatory policies were not used in a constructive manner to inform the practice of (or support for) students on placement. The agencies involved in the research were apathetic, reluctant about or hostile to anti-racist initiatives. There were few developments to improve contact with local black minority ethnic populations, to ‘open up dialogue with local black groups about their needs or perceptions of social work agencies, or to develop services that would match their needs’ (p. 117).

As well as deploying the empirical research material, Penketh provides a more general overview. She explains how national opposition to CCETSW’s anti-racist stance led to a retreat, and sets out some conclusions and recommendations. It would have been useful to have a much more comprehensive ‘update’ on recent events and politics surrounding social work and probation, and on trends in
anti-racist struggles in one or two parallel fields (see, for example, Blackaby and Chahal, 2000). Perhaps the writer also overrates the potential for an ‘anti-oppressive social work’ which ‘stands with the oppressed’ (see p. 110). It is important not to understate either the roles of entrenched material interests or of interpretations of the world that differ sharply from those of anti-racism, especially when considering interactions between multifaceted human agency and organisational constraints. While the author is intelligently sceptical about approaches that celebrate difference and may thereby trivialise oppression (p. 30), her analysis would have benefited from a fuller discussion of human agency as a factor which confirms and reshapes the hostile environments in which anti-racist practices may falter. Nonetheless, this is a lively and informative book that deserves a firm place in the social work library.


MALCOLM HARRISON
University of Leeds


Appearing when notions of ‘community involvement’ have become a central component of state strategies for advancing ‘social inclusion’, Terry Robson’s attempt to address the paucity of theoretical treatments of ‘community action’ is timely. Drawing on the Gramscian concepts of hegemony and counter-hegemony, Robson seeks to assess the potential of community development as a vehicle for social change. The book is structured into two parts. Part I examines a selection of theoretical perspectives on community action, from Marxist accounts of community development as an agency for state domination, through to the moral authority implicit in more recent communitarian treatments. A common theme in the history of community development is its utility as a tool for regulation and control. Robson highlights how the term was used at the Cambridge Summer Conference of 1948, mainly in relation to preparing the administration of African colonies after their independence. Later, it was applied to the management of social problems emerging in Britain’s inner cities in the 1960s through the establishment of Community Development Projects in areas experiencing high levels of deprivation and social unease. More recently, the influence of Christian communitarian thought, with its revival of ‘family values’ and individual responsibility, has shaped notions of ‘community’, particularly within the leadership of New Labour. Part II seeks to offer a ‘world-view’ of community action by examining key issues in community development within three different countries – Northern Ireland, the USA and Romania.

Robson’s choice of case studies is curious. While the chapter on Northern Ireland charts the rise of community radicalism in the late 1960s and its eventual marginalisation by the late 1980s, the focus of inquiry becomes Dove House in Derry’s Bogside area, built in the late 1960s to meet some of the needs of elderly people. Following a number of reincarnations, Dove House ironically then became a meeting place for young people and an education centre, provid-
ing cultural activities aimed at upholding the Irish identity (particularly the Celtic language, music and art – perceived as 'symbols of resistance'). Such forms of community organising are, no doubt, valuable in terms of protecting cultural diversity in the community. However, it is difficult to accept Robson's view that they represent an example of a 'social movement' seeking to challenge the hegemony of the state – particularly, as in the case of Dove House, when their survival depends on state funding.

Robson's assertion for his second case study (Viva House, a hostel for the homeless in West Baltimore) is even more extraordinary. While acknowledging that 'many in either Ireland or Britain ... would be horrified at the thought of community-based activity such as that carried out in Viva House bringing down the power of the state on one's shoulder. After all, providing for the needy, such as that carried out by the Salvation Army ... is common to most countries', Robson goes on to suggest that 'a cursory glance around the walls of the shops and offices which service the poverty industry in Britain and Ireland do not produce pictures of Che Guevara, Malcolm X or even Martin Luther King. In an unspecified way, Viva House represents a quite unique form of the integration of the spiritual and the material' (p. 189). Viva House may represent a valuable resource, and even present its own 'symbols of resistance', but again, it can hardly be construed as a model of community action seeking to challenge the hegemony of the state.

Robson's third case study focuses on two Derry-based missions working in poverty-stricken post-communist Romania. These projects offered essential humanitarian aid and technical expertise to remote areas of Romania. However, they are essentially technical-aid bodies, similar to the British ‘Know How’ Fund that sought to pass on Western expertise and practice on community participation to post-communist societies in the 1990s (Ambrose, 1994). Such initiatives are geared more to structural adjustment programmes seeking to enable the smooth transition from communism to capitalism, rather than the development of a counter-hegemonic project. So again, this seems a curious illustration to choose in an assessment of the potential of social movements to, or the contradictory role of radical community work in, challenging dominant values.

Not surprisingly, Robson concludes that many engaged in community action become ‘an extra-bureaucratic arm of the state and, by implication, an extension of hegemony’ (p. 224). This is no doubt true. But there are also concrete examples of community development that have led to people gaining greater say over the decisions that affect their daily lives, particularly where supported by leftist parties. For instance, the Southern African Development Education Programme that has helped to empower community activists involved in civic struggles in South Africa (Taylor, 1995), or popular movements that have transformed the political culture in cities in Brazil and Uruguay (Burden et al., 2000). Such examples provide testimony to the hypothesis that community development can, given the right context and ingredients, have more than just a symbolic effect on people’s lives.

Taylor, V. (1995), ‘Social reconstruction and community development in the transition to democ-

This study offers insights into the structural and cultural reasons for the persistence of poverty in rural America. Although the conditions of the rural poor have improved, still some 9 million rural Americans live in poverty (p. 193). From a combination of observation, interviews with 40 men and women (out of 350 interviewed in the early 1990s) and census data from 1890 to 1990, Cynthia Duncan concludes that educational policy changes are crucial for alleviating poverty in rural America. Drawing on the work of social theorists, sociologists and policy analysts, Duncan offers a critique of the culture of dependency thesis that locates poverty in the behaviour and values of individuals (p. 189) by showing that the poor in rural America are embedded in social relationships with the rich, and how the skills and habits acquired through socialisation affect behaviour and decision-making.

In Chapters 1–3 Duncan draws on a considerable amount of data to show how ‘the poverty of the have-nots is inseparable from the privileges of the haves’ (p. 192). The oral accounts of the men and women interviewed provide a sobering insight into life in three towns in rural America.

Blackwell (Chapter 1) is an Appalachian mining town characterised by class divisions. Unemployment is higher than average and job opportunities are based on who you know and who you are. For those in paid jobs, pay is often low, and the median wage is around half the national average (p. 6). Wealth, corruption and fractional politics divide the community. The poor are dependent on the company owners, and many richer inhabitants benefit from political corruption largely at the expense of the poor. Duncan observes that there is little hope of escape for the poor unless political change occurs, with an end to corruption, ‘to create a climate where economic growth can happen’ (p. 68).

Dahlia (Chapter 2) is in the heart of the Mississippi delta. Coffee, rice and soybean plantations dominate the economy. Here racism and class divisions interact. Per capita income for white people is nearly five times that of black people (p. 82). Thus ‘[B]eing black means being poor in all but a few cases’ (p. 82) and those with economic power and security, the upper middle-class elites, are mainly white (p. 96). Dahlia is characterised by racial segregation, with the black and white communities having separate schools, churches and Christmas processions (p. 84). The picture is one of deprivation, social segregation and corruption, and racism and class divisions are key impediments to progress.

Life in Gray Mountain (Chapter 3) contrasts with that in Blackwell and Dahlia. Gray Mountain is a mill-town in Northern New England where life is based on integration rather than segregation. Here blue-collar workers, mill workers, civic leaders and business owners work together to invest in community wide institutions (p. 152). Powerful individuals and companies have invested in education and cultural activities for the community (p. 153). Thus
Gray Mountain is characterised by ‘inclusion, participatory governance and community investment ... in stark contrast to Blackwell and Dahlia’ (p. 154). The rich civic culture has enabled greater equality and stability and, crucially, in respect of Duncan’s overall thesis, the poor ‘have been drawn into community life and activities, where they develop the same habits, speech and expectations as their non-poor neighbors’ (p. 185). The differences among the three areas in the study are clear, unlike Blackwell or Dahlia, Gray Mountain is characterised by ‘integration rather than segregation, trust rather than suspicion, public investment rather than selfish gain’ (p. 164).

In her final chapter Duncan offers conclusions as to why poverty persists in rural America and suggests ways in which changes might be made. Poverty is not the result of the ‘destructive behaviour’ of poor people, rather poverty is bound up with the privileges of wealthier inhabitants (p. 192), and a major problem is that poorer children often fail to receive a good education. Duncan concludes that the provision of good schooling for America’s poor would provide them with an escape route out of poverty, the reason being that education provides individual mobility since it ‘unlocks and expands the cultural tool kits of the have-nots’ (p. 208). In the longer term this would serve as a catalyst for lasting social change since the poor would no longer be isolated from the wealthy, and poor communities would no longer be, ‘worlds apart from the rest of America’ (p. 208).

Although at times the profiles of the interviewees seems to stray a little into stereotype, and claims that the interviewees are ‘representative of others in each place’ (p. xv) are largely unsubstantiated, the interview data provides vivid and sobering insights into the lives of the poor and the wealthy in rural America. The data enables Duncan to draw out the class and race dimensions of poverty with precision. However, the gendered dimensions of poverty could have been discussed in more detail since they were readily apparent in the data. The policy initiatives outlined by Duncan certainly show the possibilities that educational policy might have in improving the lives of poor people. However, the complex interactions between various structural obstacles to change are rather glossed over. Having said this, this interesting and well-written study provides valuable insights into poverty, politics and social change. It will be of interest to a range of readers, including academics and researchers working in the fields of poverty and inequality and those who are inquisitive about social research techniques.

Kay Peggs
University of Plymouth


I accepted the invitation to review this book thinking it might contain a critical appraisal of New Labour’s family policies to date, but in this I was mistaken. While the conceptual starting point was ‘the editors’ growing awareness of the importance of the family support debate’ in the UK and Ireland, the origin of much of the material here emerged from an international conference on family support held in Galway in 1998, rather too early for an assessment of New Labour’s family policies. The contributors, academics, researchers and practi-
tioners, are very diverse both in terms of the countries represented, (the UK, USA, Germany, Denmark and Ireland) and their subject matter (sociological analysis of communities, support for parents of delinquent children; a case study of a Neighbourhood Youth Project; drug prevention; establishing reciprocal support in the community etc.). The focus is on intervention and its outcomes, either in the form of case studies of programmes to help specific groups or a synthesis of research into theoretical underpinnings and helping models.

In *Family Support: Issues and Prospects* (ch. 1) Robbie Gilligan sets the scene by surveying a wide range of research demonstrating the importance of family support and what follows reflects the authors’ very diverse approach to the subject. It is taken to mean: support that is offered to ‘all families who are encountering the ordinary challenges of parenting and family living’ but is also a ‘compensating and protective strategy for those who are disadvantaged and at risk’; it reflects on informal support within the family but also formal support by the state or other agencies, and it means offering therapeutic individual support as well as community development.

What is not explored, except rather cursorily in the concluding chapter by John Pinkerton (*Emerging Agenda for Family Support*), is the point that not all of these differing approaches can be reconciled and some of them are contradictory. What is missing is an analysis of the conditions under which the approaches advocated might be facilitated, or indeed, why they don’t happen already in any given society. To present family support systems operating on such a diverse range of fronts is at first sight exciting but a closer reading makes one want to raise questions about the political and social conditions under which such approaches might be feasible or which inhibit the likelihood of such approaches materialising. (Wieler’s chapter on the history of social work in Germany illustrates this point but the significance of political and social history and attitudes towards the family is not taken up elsewhere).

To what extent should and can policies be devised to support families’ informal networks, and what sort of policies these are, will be determined by the political character of the country concerned, and what is possible in Denmark may not be possible in the US or Ireland. It is significant that Steen Jensen’s chapter (Denmark) is about local structures for supporting families (the universal family model) whereas Cutrona’s chapter (US) is about individual therapeutic modes of intervention (a pathologised family model). John Pinkerton’s point in the last chapter, arising out of Hardiker’s three models of welfare and state provision, that ‘whichever choice is made will have implications for the development of family support’ could have been a useful starting point, along with Gilligan’s question from Chapter 1 – *what are the key issues and challenges facing family support?* It would be helpful to those engaged at the sharp end of practice to have something that reflects, not just on the paradigms of family support and what is done elsewhere, but also on what is feasible under a given socio-economic regime.

This book is another in the series that Jessica Kingsley has published about work with children and families and each chapter has a useful supporting bibliography for further reading. There is much here to interest both the practitioner and academic in reminding us that personal action is important, whether at the informal level or under the aegis of the state and that through such intervention,
it is possible to make a difference. However, while it will be useful in providing some stimulating ideas, it doesn’t quite live up to its claim of providing direction.

PATRICIA LADLY
South Bank University


Whilst academic work can engender an instrumental approach to books, *Bathing – the Body and Community Care* is one which deserves to be read from cover to cover rather than used selectively. Neither the chapter headings nor index capture the breadth of issues covered – take, for example, the methodological asides embedded in Twigg’s discussion of the interviews with home care users and careworkers on which the book is based. Moreover, thanks to an elegant and accessible style, this is also a very enjoyable read.

The author’s aim is ‘to change the ways in which we think and write about community care’ (p. vii). Using washing and bathing as exemplars of the complex processes underlying the provision and receipt of intimate bodily care in the home, Twigg sets out to accomplish this task in three principal ways. First, she redirects attention away from the policy and institutional framework of community care to the front-line, where care is ‘co-produced’ by the client and worker in dynamic interaction. Second, she seeks to reconnect the care encounter to the quotidian meanings and rhythms of people’s domestic lives, drawing on a wide range of sociological and anthropological sources to construct an historical and cross-cultural account of bathing and to explore the associated problematic of nakedness and touch. Chapter 4 locates the care encounter within the ‘spatio-temporal world of the home’, characterised not only by an ambiguous overlapping of public and private spaces but by differing forms of time: the clock time governing service provision; the body time and associated domestic time ordering clients’ lives; and the process time of carework. That this lack of synchronicity is particularly marked for older people, who tend to be ‘time-rich’, underlines the value of conceptual tools which enable us to distinguish between the ways in which younger and older disabled people may experience community care. Finally, using insights from the sociology of the body, Twigg sets out to make explicit the nature of carework as bodywork. Coyly referred to as ‘personal care’ in policy, practice and academic texts, this is freshly analysed as work that transgresses normal social boundaries and necessitates a specialised relationship between provider and recipient of the ambiguities of which have never been adequately theorised before.

A reported bemusement on the part of recipients at the choice of research topic may help to explain why the stated intention of centring the analysis on the dynamic co-production of front-line care is, at times, overshadowed by service rationalities. In Chapters 5 and 6 Twigg deals variously with the medical/social fault-line underlying the home bath, the privatisation of domiciliary care, and the employment world of the careworker. Chapter 8 is similarly based on a provider perspective. Whilst acknowledging that carework is infused with the ethic of responsibility to imbue family care, the author argues that it should be understood principally as a form of (gendered) paid labour. Her treatment of carework as a form of emotional labour which is both rewarding and controlling
careworkers experience emotions as well as work on them’ (p. 173) – not only brings a much needed intellectual rigour to overly romanticised views of front-line ‘care’ but challenges an unthinking reliance on related familial models of care. At the same time, recipients’ transactions within the emotional economy of care, and the nature of their attachments to careworkers, remain relatively unexplored.

The analytics of gender and age, and to a lesser extent class, are deployed throughout to highlight structured inequalities bearing on the care encounter and to account for participants’ differing expectations and behaviours. To the extent that the majority of careworkers in one of the sample localities are identified as of black or ethnic minority background (no comparable details are provided for service users), ‘race’ and ethnicity are also significant issues within the study. Curiously, then, rather than forming an integral part of the analysis, ‘race’ is dealt with only in the penultimate chapter as part of a discussion of the power dynamics of domiciliary care; and the place of ethnicity in shaping cultural beliefs about intimate bodily care remains unexplored. The limitations of the interview as a methodological tool may also help to explain why little is conveyed of the micro-processes of continuous negotiation underlying bodily care. In the end, power and power relations are somewhat statically conceived.

Overall, though, this is a landmark study which opens up community care to fresh thinking and offers a range of tools for academics and professionals to penetrate the messy reality of bodily care as its core. As a social policy text, the emphasis is firmly on the ‘social’ rather than the ‘policy’. If the study is to be useful as a teaching resource, students will require guidance in connecting its insights to current policy issues – the boundary territory of nursing/personal care and the impact of local labour markets on front-line provision are obvious examples. Of potentially greater significance, however, is its publication at a juncture when the emphasis of the present government is on promoting service users’ financial and functional independence, ‘rather than just “keeping them going”’ (Department of Health 1998, para. 2.11). If ‘keeping people going’ is to be taken as a mark of policy failure, then a book capable of capturing the imagination of both policy analysts and practitioners, and encouraging a revaluation of the very stuff of community care, is very much to be welcomed.


KATHRYN ELLIS
University of Luton


Is this a social policy book? The main title suggests it is, but the subtitle hints at theoretical sociology. Then again, several chapter headings have a healthcare flavour, so the casual browser may be forgiven for thinking it could be in the social policy ‘fold’. Having read it, I’m still not sure.

What is it then? Hartley Dean says in the introduction, ‘This book seeks to
make a modest contribution towards a more embodied account of welfare’. Its main proposition is that social policy has, over time, been made up of three ‘corporeal discourses’ (plain English: ‘sets of literature to do with bodies’) – ‘physical efficiency’ ‘social efficiency’ and that of the ‘independent body’.

The first two chapters proper are by Kathryn Ellis. ‘Welfare and Bodily Order’ contains a historical account in which some aspects of social policy are clearly shown to have been about bodies – the regulation of people with impairments, public health measures, the supply of high quality workers and soldiers, for example. Other intended illustrations – the social security system, taxation policy under Thatcher, and managerialism – are more tendentious: they involve people but it appears rather contrived to invoke ‘bodies’. This reader was left wondering whether there is anything of significance here. Perhaps one problem is that the organising principle of the three corporeal discourses is only lightly applied. Another is the unnecessarily difficult language in many places.

Ellis’s second chapter, ‘The Care of The Body’, looks at UK community care policy since World War II. Much of it is unexceptional and might have appeared in a range of social policy publications. However, here the writer has the burden of pushing further the thesis of this book. As in the previous chapter, though, the chosen analytical framework is not used as much as it might have been. Indeed, the word ‘body’ does not occur at all in a central block of eight pages. Later, in what appears to be a rather arbitrary place, Dean has a chapter on ‘Bodily Metaphors and Welfare Regimes’. To use his words, it ‘is as speculative as it is abstract’ but if one is trying to grasp fully the main argument, this is among the more important contributions.

The rest of the chapters – most of which are by colleagues or ex-colleagues of Ellis and Dean – are, unfortunately, a rag-bag. They seem to have been chosen for having something to do with bodies. Thus we have articles on the gift of body organs, mothers and maternity policy, safer sex and animal exploitation, amongst others. But they are not closely, if at all, connected with the main argument. Probably, only one or two are likely to interest a social policy audience.

Who might buy this book? It is unlikely that anyone would wish to do more than dip in and out, so that restricts the market. It is difficult to imagine it being high priority for social policy students because it contains nothing for them that is a really compelling read. In addition, they will probably notice that when the 40 pages of references, author index and subject index are discounted, the volume is quite slender. However, students of sociology of the body might borrow it for the chapters which attempt to extend their subject into the welfare area. Health studies and nursing students could be attracted by other parts.

The main proposition, that British social policy has long been about ‘bodies’ (construed in various ways), is a strong, radical claim. It therefore requires plenty of substantiation. Arguably, those advancing it have a further responsibility – to show that their abstraction is useful in social policy. Put bluntly, so what? How do the authors fare with these two key challenges?

After a fashion, Ellis and Dean succeed with their abstraction, but the case is not very persuasive. Even if it is accepted, does it matter? Should it be employed in social policy (as opposed to sociology, say)? A concluding chapter examining the implications might have helped. The process of abstraction has a good track record in mathematics, with discoveries often later proving to have practical
applications. As yet, it is far from clear that this will happen with social policy and bodies.

BOB ROTHERAM
The Nottingham Trent University


Conflicting perspectives on welfare have always been based upon different understandings of human nature. In recent years, however, these links have become more explicit and more prominent. Both the Thatcher and Blair governments, for example, have argued that their approach to welfare reform reflects a realistic assessment of human motivation and works with the grain of human nature. These claims, however, have received relatively little scrutiny from academic commentators, and Martin Hewitt’s careful, scholarly study fills a genuine gap in the literature.

Hewitt’s starting point is that claims about human nature are ideological. In essence they comprise three elements: an assertion about the nature of human needs, an explanation of human motivation, and a normative statement about the institutional arrangements which best enable those needs to be met and which best channel human action in ways that serve a common good. The first half of the book examines the accounts of human nature which inform the social democratic and neo-liberal traditions of thinking about welfare. Hewitt argues that both traditions draw upon disparate and not wholly reconcilable models of human nature, and that both use notions such as a national minimum as ‘sutures’ or ways of ‘stitching together’ different accounts of human nature into a more or less coherent whole.

The second half of the book reviews the alternative formulations of human nature offered in Marxist and feminist theory. In particular, Hewitt argues that it is the ideas of praxis and human mutuality found in Marxist writings that provide the fullest and richest account of human nature and human needs. It is this belief which underpins Hewitt’s distaste for the current ‘post-Enlightenment mood’. This, he writes, is ‘associated with the influence of post-modern thought’ and ‘discounts the classic choices that once shaped modern politics, between universal and selective welfare, between the state and the market, and between collective responsibility and individual freedom’ (p. 4).

Hewitt goes on to criticise Anthony Giddens’ notion of the reflexive self. According to Hewitt, Giddens views human nature as ‘plastic’ because ‘humankind’ is no longer conceived in terms of qualities embedded in human nature itself, but in terms of its responses and adaptations to external forces’. Hewitt claims that although Giddens describes individuals as ‘receptive, reflexive, and active’, he does not explain ‘wherein lie the moral capacities of agency needed to guide human action in times of rapid change’. In consequences, Hewitt argues, Giddens offers ‘a hollowed out presentation of humankind devoid of human nature’ (p. 179).

Hewitt’s critique of Giddens is forceful and persuasive, but it is also highly ironic. This is because Hewitt also fails to discuss adequately the ‘substantive capabilities’ needed to exercise agency. He makes no mention, for example, of
the work of writers such as James Q. Wilson who have discussed at length the idea that people have a natural moral sense which shapes their behaviour and their judgement of the behaviour of others (Wilson, 1993). Nor does he engage
with the work of others who have explored the implications of viewing welfare subjects as creative moral agents, able to act upon and reconstitute the outcomes of welfare policies in variable ways (Williams et al., 1999). Had he done so, Hewitt may have concluded that the current politics of welfare is not simply a ‘collapse into pragmatism’ but is one that addresses different ‘classic choices’—such as that between individual autonomy and communal obligation.

It would, however, be unfair to dwell on this omission from a pioneering study of a large and complex subject. This is a book which is both demanding and rewarding. It is demanding because it assumes that the reader is familiar with a wide range of sociological and philosophical concepts and ideas, and presents complex ideas in a clear but condensed style. It is rewarding because it draws upon extensive scholarship to present an original and important argument for a more ambitious notion of both human fulfilment and the scope and potentialities of welfare.


ALAN DEACON
University of Leeds

This is a complex, unorthodox book. The title hardly captures the subject matter. The book is not really about emotional life; there is almost nothing on the kinds of subjects people think of as ‘emotions’, like love, anger, joy, envy, desire, sorrow or excitement. It is not centrally about the politics of welfare, because much of the politics of welfare is rooted in discourse, and Hoggett is mainly concerned with aspects of human experience which go beyond discourse. Hoggett’s central theme is the relationship of the person to society, viewed from a psychoanalytic perspective. His central premise is that people are irrational: ‘we never fully understand what we do while we do it’. The book understands personal and group relationships in terms of understanding of one’s self, the formation of identity, the impetus of unconscious motivations and the establishment of relationships within small groups.

The psychoanalytic framework is tempered with an interest in social processes represented by Marxist thought, postmodernity and the work of Giddens. On the face of the matter, this might seem to lead to something like the fusion of Marxism and Freudianism found in the Frankfurt school, but Fromm and Adorno found structure and meaning in people’s emotional life, and for Hoggett the unconscious leads away from reason. His key references, apart from Freud, are to Melanie Klein, David Winnicott and Wilfred Bion. He takes a pessimistic view of human relations: the emphasis falls on destructive, dependent and self-denying behaviour, and fear and anxiety are recurring elements in the argument. ‘Other people’ are very much the object of apprehension; basic reactions
Hoggett suggests that effective dialogue is dependent on meeting certain preconditions – a desire for mutual understanding, an ability to articulate experience, a common medium for communication, and appreciation of the limits of understanding. It can be difficult to reconcile Hoggett’s emphasis on irrationality with his faith in communication and dialogue, and the case he makes is not wholly consistent; the book alternates between the two positions. (For example, he writes on racial identity that ‘racial and ethnic discourses are constantly undergoing processes of elaboration, contestation and renegotiation within the institutions, associations and public spaces of local civil society’, and emphasises the importance of articulating diversity. The statement is not especially contentious, but it reads oddly in a book founded on the principle that discourse is an inadequate basis for understanding social relationships.) Although Hoggett argues for universalistic welfare based on interdependence and inclusion, the tenor of his argument might imply some scepticism as to what it is possible for such a model to achieve.

Hoggett’s analysis is probably most obviously applicable in the discussions of interpersonal conflict and relationships in small groups. The psychoanalytic model does not apply as convincingly to wider social issues, and some of the examples that Hoggett chooses from social policy, such as the reaction to the ‘dependency culture’ or the universal welfare state, do not really lend themselves to his approach. Having said this, many of the subjects which Social Policy has focused on in recent years could have benefited from this kind of examination. Social policies relating to a gamut of issues – sexuality, crime, social exclusion, single parenthood, social security fraud or disability – are riddled with elements of unreason which discourse analysis largely fails to tackle. Hoggett challenges conventional approaches to the agendas of social policy, and that has to be welcome.

PAUL SPICKER
University of Dundee

These two volumes are the result of an intensive degree of co-operation between the editors and their contributors over a relatively short space of time. From an opening conference at the Max Planck Institute in Cologne in 1998 to the project’s conclusion at the end of 1999, experts from a wide range of countries followed an agreed pattern for showing how different welfare and employment systems had, in the last thirty years, adapted to a more globalised, competitive economy. Each of them was provided with a lengthy background paper and a common data-base. When the chapters devoted to single countries – which form the basis of volume 2 – had been written, the editors, with two colleagues, wrote
the comparative chapters which make up Volume 1. The aim was to produce more than a set of 'loosely connected papers based on ongoing work'. The editors sought to ensure that an agreed set of guidelines was followed and common hypotheses adopted.

The editors also claim that they have gone further than many other comparative studies which had examined the changing nature of welfare states. These had been either 'very general' or 'very narrowly focused' and their empirical evidence 'inconclusive'. They therefore set out to carry out a more wide-ranging, complex and systematic project. The countries studied were Sweden and Denmark; Britain, New Zealand and Australia, Austria, the Netherlands, Germany, Belgium, France, Italy and Switzerland. While this grouping, and indeed much of the analysis, followed Esping-Andersen’s typology of welfare state regimes, the editors refer throughout their work to Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon and Continental welfare states rather than Social Democratic, Liberal and Conservative Corporatist.

Scharpf’s Chapter 2, in the first volume, is devoted to the changing economic environment – discussing the stagflation of the 1970s, the rise of capital interests in the 1980s and the open economy of the 1990s. The author concludes that the Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon economies proved more robust and adaptable than the continental ones. Chapter 3 by Hemericjck and Schludi analyses the policy responses of different countries and comes to the conclusion that it was those countries which deviated from their regime clusters that were most successful in dealing with the need for policy change. Denmark and the Netherlands were selected as being particularly successful in retaining public trust in ‘the problem-solving capacity of their political institutions’. Schmidt in Chapter 4 is more concerned with the normative aspects of change and the public discourse employed to discuss them. The Anglo-Saxon countries, she claimed, were able to build on their historical traditions of liberalism. In Scandinavia, Sweden clung to its traditional social democratic discourse while at the same time cutting benefits. Denmark by comparison was more successful in adopting a new discourse based upon fairness and efficiency, partly because its problems occurred gradually, over a longer period of time. Schmidt felt that the public discourse on welfare had changed most drastically in the continental countries. Volume I concludes by asserting that within economic constraints the size of the welfare state and the degree of redistribution ‘remain a matter of political choice’.

The first volume does to a large extent achieve its aim of capturing ‘complex causal constellations and sequences of changes’ in different economic, employment and welfare systems and the editors are right to say that it is not easy to come up with a single, neat set of conclusions. It should therefore be read as an attempt to grapple with empirical complexity while making a valuable contribution to the literature on globalisation, national autonomy and convergence. Having said that, there are two qualifications that need to be made. First, a more explicit statement concerning the theoretical orientation adopted by the editors would have been welcome. It would seem to be functionalist by implication since much of the analysis is based upon the interaction of social sub-systems with frequent references to adjustment, integration and equilibrium. Secondly, while there is a good set of tables in the statistical appendix which often go up to 1998,
those for social expenditure only go up to 1995 and are not broken down (except for the broad category for ‘families, the elderly and the disabled’) in terms of social security, social services or more importantly health care or any other useful dimension. Similarly disappointing are the figures on public sector employment in Chapter 2 which exclude local government employees.

This last point is reinforced and amplified for the social policy analyst when reading Volume 2. The single country accounts (in fact two chapters cover two countries – Sweden/Denmark, Australia/New Zealand – and another deals with three – Austria/Belgium/Netherlands) of social and economic change are fascinating but the strictly welfare/social policy content is in fact very limited. Pensions, social services, health care and social assistance get very short shrift in comparison with developments in trade, manufacturing, industrial relations and employment structure. Each author concentrates on the interaction of the economy, employment and welfare with the emphasis often being to the advantage of the first two. They each begin by describing some golden age of welfare, proceed to examine the economic difficulties which occurred in the 1970s and 1980s and assess how each country has adapted to change. The studies, however, are carried out by political scientists with a primary interest in economics or employment. They do not seem to be primarily social policy experts. Moreover, although most of the single country chapters consist of more than 40 pages, this is not a great deal when you consider that each author has to write about a wide range of political, economic and social issues covering a thirty-year period. Nor is it surprising that the editors should in their introduction emphasise ‘the diversity of national differences’ (p. 17) and the ‘causal influence of country-specific factor constellations’ when it is detailed empirical accounts rather than general and theoretical ones that the country case study contributors were clearly asked to produce.

The four remaining chapters in Volume 2 reflect the balance already referred to above. While two of them deal with the relationship between welfare and work (Mary Daly’s concerns women in the labour market and Bernard Ebbinghaus has written about early retirement) the other two concern the privatisation of public utilities and tax competition. While each of them is well written and interesting, those primarily interested in social policy might feel let down by the relative lack of solid social policy material.

The editors make enormous claims for what their study achieves – implying that it reaches parts which other social policy comparativists do not. This is something of an exaggeration. What they do is – like other studies of welfare state developments – limited. They have brought together a number of political scientists to examine in a systematic, internally consistent way, the interaction between the economic, employment and welfare systems of a wide range of countries against a background of an increasingly globalised environment. The main advantage the study has over Flora, Esping-Andersen and Pierson and others – which will inevitably prove short-lived – is that it is fairly up-to-date. It is also undeniable that the whole project has certainly been skilfully and thoroughly executed. But while the two volumes are clearly a valuable addition to our knowledge of welfare developments, they complement rather than replace their predecessors.

ARTHUR GOULD
University of Loughborough

It is ten years since the collapse of Eastern European state socialism. There are now twenty-seven countries that have emerged into some kind of independence from the old Soviet empire. In this book, Henryk Domanski, who is professor of sociology at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, traces the changes that this independence has made in the social stratification of Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Bulgaria and Russia. The data are a random sample survey of adult men undertaken in 1993. The book was first published in 1996 in Poland, and then translated and updated for the CEU in 2000.

Despite the age of the data, particularly significant in this case where societies have been changing rapidly, there are a number of interesting conclusions presented. The main change since 1993 has been that, apart from in Russia, economic growth has now recovered since the dark days in the early 1990s, to the point where the level of GDP now exceeds the 1989 level in Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic (EBRD, 1999). However this has been accompanied by a sharp growth in inequality, to Latin American proportions in the case of Russia.

The book is premised on the observations, common in the 1970s and 1980s, that industrialisation was steadily constraining all industrial societies towards common patterns of social stratification. The main picture was a decline in the numbers working in agriculture, and the growth of the professional and managerial strata, with the steady move from unskilled to skilled work. Key barriers to social mobility existed between these occupational groups, with the majority of social mobility accounted for by the relative growth or decline in the overall size of the groups, rather than movement between them. The question is whether the Central European societies were moving in the same direction as those in Western Europe, presumably as a result of the common impact of industrialisation.

The data presented in Chapters 1–3 confirms this expectation in detail, and moreover show that the rapid changes that had occurred by 1993 had not affected this emergent pattern at all: the East was rather like the West. The second half of the book is devoted to an exploration in more detail of some specific patterns within the broad structure of stratification, and has the more interesting things to say. First is the confirmation across the whole range of occupational types that Russia is an outlier: it has a sharply lower level of income, and a vastly greater level of inequality. At 2.00, the coefficient of variation of family incomes is twice as high as Poland, and three times that of the other countries in the study. In addition, the incomes of Russian professional and managerial groups is little higher than skilled, unskilled or agricultural workers, with business owners, even small ones, three or four times better off. In all the other countries, professional and managerial groups have remained closer to owners, and further from other workers in their incomes.

A second finding addressed the question of where the new capitalists in this region came from. There are three popular views: that the nomenklatura converted political into economic power; that the technocrats converted their knowledge and qualifications; or that those with cultural capital, such as education and family/network influence, were flexible and shrewd enough to adapt.
The data in this book suggest that Russia is an outlier in this respect also: Russian nomenklatura were key members of the new business class, but far less so in the other countries, where both technical and cultural inheritances were more important.

The third notable finding was the way in which gender, geographical location and industrial sector determined income inequalities. The gender income gap is very large in these countries, with women typically earning between 50 per cent and 75 per cent of men. Russia again being the worst case, but Bulgaria the best. Geographical location also has a highly significant influence on income for all of them, with key urban settings pulling steadily away from the rest of the country. Moreover, differences between industrial sectors, particularly heavy industry, service, professional and agricultural sectors are heavily determining of incomes. Economic recovery has been accompanied by very acute and multidimensional inequalities and growing poverty, especially in Russia (Manning, Shkaratan and Tikhonova, 2000).

Although somewhat dry in parts, this book has a lot of useful data on display, and the author has woven into it some of the major questions that confront any study of stratification in Central and Eastern Europe. As such, I don’t think undergraduates would find it accessible, but it is good for graduate students and researchers. No doubt there will be technical concerns about the use of the Goldthorpe scale, and the sample of men only (on the grounds that they are representative of all adults), but sufficiently sensitive a discussion is presented to justify the methods on this occasion.


NICK MANNING
University of Nottingham

This book comes ten years after Leathard’s first edition which proved to be a popular text. and this second edition like the first, provides a clear, straightforward and well structured text for students taking courses on the health care services in Britain, and their teachers. However, the price of the book may put it beyond the student market.

It begins with a chapter on pre-war provision and proceeds more or less chronologically to Chapter 14 on New Labour and the NHS, which covers the 1999 White Paper on Saving Lives: our healthier nation (Secretary of State for Health, 1999) but not The NHS Plan (Secretary of State for Health) which was published in the summer of 2000, too late to be incorporated. However, there are also more thematic chapters on finance, politics and priorities, inequalities in health with references to race and gender. There is also a chapter which describes other health care systems. The final two chapters which look forward to the twenty-first century, pick up the themes of the education and training of
health care practitioners and financing the NHS. The concluding chapter pro-
vides an overview of the four models for provision of health care thought to be
most appropriate to health care in Britain, namely: the state as a safety net; the
state as primary provider, the state as primary funder and the Third Way. This
last model is described as an evolutionary model, drawing on selected elements
of the three other but also including an element of a public-private partnership.
The book has a sectionalised reading list on different aspects of the contemporary
history of the NHS as well as a comprehensive set of references and an index.

Leathard demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the policy documents and of
commentaries on the NHS – both opinion pieces and research-based studies. The
spread of issues covered is impressively broad. For example, dentistry, social care,
the Maastricht Treaty, the unification of Germany and professional education are
dealt with as well as the areas usually covered by texts of this type. The very wealth
of detail makes the book one which students are likely to dip into for accounts of
particular policy documents or legislation rather than read from cover to cover.
They will be helped in this by the comprehensive index. The book is also written in
a style which aims to make the book useful for essay writing with bullet points
which summarise policy intentions or outcomes. There are also boxes, charts and
for light relief reproductions of contemporary cartoons. One such from January
1999 shows the conventional ward round scene with the caption: ‘What you’ve
got is very unusual. It’s called a bed.’ These serve to break up what is otherwise a
dense narrative packed with detail on the ebb and flow of policy changes.

In short, I would recommend this book as a reliable student text and for those
who wish to refresh their memory on particular aspects of NHS history and con-
temporary policies. However, because the chosen canvas is so broad, there was,
for this reader a sense of losing sight of the wood for the trees.

Secretary of State for Health (2000), The NHS Plan: a plan for investment, a plan for reform. Cm 4818,
HMSO, London.

JUDITH ALLSOP
De Montfort University

Chris Nottingham (ed.), The NHS in Scotland: the legacy of the past and the
prospect of the future, Ashgate, Aldershot, 2000, xiii+194 pp., £37.50.
The essays in this volume derive in part from a stimulating and enjoyable confer-
ence held at Glasgow Caledonian University in late 1998. As a number of the
contributors note, the National Health Service in Scotland was created by a sep-
ate piece of legislation in the late 1940s and its subsequent history has in some
respects differed from its English and Welsh counterpart. Furthermore, Scottish
standards of health have been, and remain, worse than elsewhere in Great
Britain. Add to this that one of the primary responsibilities of the recently created
Scottish parliament is health care and it becomes apparent that any serious
scholarly work on post-war medical provision in Scotland is to be welcomed.

And indeed some of the pieces in the volume under review do significantly add
to our understanding of the Scottish health services. Among these are Rona
Ferguson’s innovative essay on district nursing; and Ronald Johnston and
Arthur McIvor’s somewhat overwritten, but nonetheless rigorously researched
and compellingly argued, contribution on occupational health and asbestosis on Clydeside. Jacqueline Jenkinson provides a useful pre-history of the Scottish NHS which again brings to our attention differences (as well as similarities) with the English and Welsh experience. A thought-provoking piece on the politics of health in post-devolution Scotland comes from the volume’s editor, Chris Nottingham. Alistair Tough’s essay is, at seven pages, far too short but does manage nonetheless to raise some important issues about the less positive aspects of the NHS in Scotland. Marguerite Dupree’s contribution on her research on the National Health Service in Glasgow and the West of Scotland is, given the stage her work had reached at the time of the conference, speculative rather than anything else but does provide a useful research agenda.

Of course, and as is commonly observed, books based on conference papers often vary considerably in quality, coverage and coherence. The volume under review has problems especially in the last two of these. So, for example, while there are three essays on nursing there are none devoted specifically to general practitioners or hospital doctors, to patients themselves, or indeed to health outcomes. It is also the case that some of the contributions are, at best, only tangentially related to the Scottish experience. Susan McGann’s essay is carefully researched, elegantly written and persuasively argued. It is a significant contribution to the history of nursing. But it remains the case that it is essentially about a strike of student nurses in London in the late 1940s. Similarly, the rather curiously titled ‘Beveridge in Holland’ is a fascinating account of the development of the Dutch health services post-1945, but if there is a comparison to be made with Scotland it needs to be drawn out much more clearly. This might have been less of an issue if a conclusion, drawing together the various strands of the contributions, had been included. Such an essay could also have engaged more fully with the existing literature on the historical autonomy of parts of the Scottish welfare system, and thereby opened up the possibility of comparison with other countries as well as with England and Wales.

In short, this is a volume to be purchased because of the quality of some of its individual contributions – especially those of Ferguson, McGann, and Johnston and McIvor – and not because of its overall unity. Perhaps its publishers could be persuaded to bring it out in paperback to make these individual essays more readily available to researchers and students alike. This would also give them the opportunity to carry out some much-needed copy editing.

JOHN STEWART
Oxford Brookes University

The New Deal is probably the single most important policy initiative to be undertaken by the new Labour government since they won the general election of 1997. It is the centrepiece of their broader strategy for the promotion of ‘welfare to work’, which is itself the major theme of both economic and social policy planning. It was also the only significant area of public spending to escape the two year moratorium on expanded public expenditure imposed by the government after the 1997 election because, as championed in the manifesto, it was financed
through a specific ‘windfall’ tax on public utility profits. It is therefore the only major change in public expenditure to have had much time to produce any results, although as revealed in this report, even here the general message is that it is still early days – especially since the full roll out of the programmes was preceded by pilot activity. In such a context, therefore, this early review of the evidence emerging from the evaluation of the New Deal programmes is likely to be welcomed by the social and economic policy communities, as many of us are no doubt as eager as are the government sponsors to discover how it is working and what can be learnt from it.

The new Labour government has also committed itself to an evidence-based approach to policy development, captured in the phrase, ‘what counts is what works’. They have thus commissioned research to evaluate all of their major policy initiatives, and the New Deal is certainly no exception here. Much of this research, of course, is still underway and will continue to monitor activity and explore outcomes for a number of years. Nevertheless, over twenty evaluation studies have already been published on the New Deal, and what this report provides is a summary of the emerging findings from these and from other related published material. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation have established a commendable record for promoting the wide dissemination of their own research findings, and in supporting the report they, and the author, have provided a valuable further service in bringing a wide range of policy research work to the immediate attention of the social policy community.

The report provides a useful summary of the different New Deal programmes themselves. There are now in effect six: for young people, the long-term unemployed, lone parents, partners of the unemployed, disabled people and over 50s; and a table (pp. 2–3) provides a simple guide to the different features and scale of each. By far the most important, of course, both in volume and policy terms, is the New Deal for Young People (NDYP), which became available nationally from April 1998 with a budget of over £2.6 billion. The others are smaller, and later, with the New Deal for the Long-Term Unemployed (NDLTU) the most significant with a budget of £450 million. The report also situates the New Deal programmes within the broader welfare to work strategy of the government, similarly neatly summarised in tabular form (pp. 8–9).

There is a chapter summarising the labour market effects of the programmes with details of the numbers entering and exiting and the proportion of different types of participant. There is also some discussion of the knotty question of employment additionally – how many new jobs have really been created? – although, as is pointed out, from the point of view of the target groups this is perhaps a less important issue. The impact on the individuals on the programmes is summarised in two chapters dealing separately with the compulsory and voluntary programmes. The NDYP and the NDLTU are compulsory programmes, individuals must take up one of the four options presented to them (two options only for NDLTU until April 2001); and here, as Millar points out, the programmes have a strong ‘human capital’ element, mirroring the more general philosophy behind welfare to work. On the other voluntary options the regime is more one of advice and support, gearing customers towards a ‘work first’ orientation, although the evidence is that many were unaware of the services offered under the programmes and the potential benefits of these.
In all cases, however, one of the main features of the programmes is the allocation of personal advisers to customers; and the key role of the personal advisers was one of the strongest messages to emerge from this initial overview of evaluation activity – Millar refers to this as ‘pivotal’. Advisers are the main point of contact with the programmes, and by and large responses to their new role here were positive, especially when contrasted with previous experiences of Jobcentre staff. The need to continue to build on this positive role is one of the main conclusions coming out of these early evaluations. More generally, however, Millar concludes that the evaluations can only tell a partial story – the time period is too short, many related aspects of the welfare to work strategy have not been fully implemented, much evaluation activity has focused only on prototypes, and (most importantly perhaps given the regional variation in employment patterns) there is insufficient information available about the operation of the programmes at local levels. This is only to be expected in what is nevertheless a valiant attempt to co-ordinate rapidly research findings on such a major new policy initiative. It is to be hoped, therefore, that, when more detailed and considered evaluation is later made available, Rowntree can be persuaded to support a further attempt to keep track of these important welfare reforms.

PETE ALCOCK
University of Birmingham


This text will, no doubt, be widely used by students and teachers of social policy and could be read with benefit by many policy-makers and politicians. The book originated in research commissioned by the New Zealand Treasury. The brief of the researchers was to account for the growth in the number of persons in receipt of social security benefits which has occurred in Britain over the past thirty years. This is a deceptively simple question but it leads directly to core debates and divides which emerged in the 1980s.

For some, the fact that over half of the population in Britain is in receipt of at least one benefit is not inherently problematic. The increase in caseloads is located within a context made up of complex, interacting factors – most obviously, the very marked economic, social and demographic changes which have taken place. For others, the data on benefit receipt is indicative of fraud, failure, waste and the growth of a distinct class which prefers dependence on the state to employment and self-sufficiency. As New Labour wanders between these positions, the publication of a text which systematically reviews what has actually happened is very helpful.

There is, of course a substantial literature on all of this already. Much of it, however, focuses on particular groups or topics or research efforts. What the authors provide here is an integrated and comprehensive review of benefit receipt by the four main groups in the claimant population: the unemployed, persons with disability, children and families and persons of retirement age. This in itself is useful. The sheer diversity of the characteristics and circumstances of claimants points up the inadequacy of broad brush explanations. The authors consider each group in turn and do so by reference to the role of each of the four
main drivers which may account for change: the economy, demography, beliefs and attitudes and institutional factors. At each point the authors draw on a very broad range of statistical and research data.

The results are not surprising but what is of interest is the careful examination of the varying significance of these drivers across the four groups. The economy – deindustrialisation, the growth of low pay and temporary and part-time employment – is the main driver implicated in the growth of claims by unemployed persons in the 1980s. A smaller but significant role can be attributed to, for example, demography as the increase in the birth rate in the early sixties impacted on the labour market at the very point that the economy went into recession in the early 1980s. At the other end of the discussion, demography is the main driver with regard to pensions but even here the story is not absolutely straightforward. As the authors point out, the decline in reliance on means-tested provision amongst this group has been a consequence of past action taken by employers and government in the development of second tier provision with pensions themselves playing a passive role. The recasting of pensions policy over the past two years signals a sharp change of direction and it is by no means clear that the current balance between means-tested and contributory benefits will be maintained.

With regard to the disabled and families the patterns discussed and the interaction between the main drivers are more complex. In both cases changing attitudes – towards lone parenthood and the needs of the disabled – have been significant together with institutional factors. On the latter point, both groups gained – with obvious implications for the extent of benefit receipt – from the introduction of new provisions, such as Child Benefit and Disability Living Allowance, payable for very long periods of time. Again, however, the economy is a significant part of the total picture. The changes noted above undermined the capacity for self sufficiency amongst families and persons with disability. The authors find, for example, no clear evidence of incapacity benefit being used as a more comfortable haven by the unemployed. Instead, they present a more complex picture of marginalised, disadvantaged workers facing a less hospitable world of work which has higher standards of fitness and skills with various other factors – community care and health inequalities – also being of relevance.

In sum, the authors provide an account of a benefits system interacting with profound social and economic changes and a population which cannot in any sense be considered a cohesive class. Some improvements could be made to the text. First there are various typographical errors, errors of fact and oddities of expression. On page 6 we are told modern provision dates back to the 1944 National Insurance Act and on page 7 that benefit spending in 1998/99 amounted to 95.6 million. On page 3 the authors state ‘It is widely accepted [my emphasis] that social security expenditure is too high’ when, I think, they mean believed and the opening section as a whole could be more clearly and tightly expressed. Secondly, the account of the economy and the changing labour market needs some elaboration. The issue here is not simply deindustrialisation. For example, account needs to be taken of the ongoing downsizing and delayering which has clearly impacted on older workers. In addition, the shrinking and re-structuring of public sector employment, via privatisation, agentisation and the endless pursuit of efficiency savings, also contributed to the loss of full-time jobs
and growth of poorer terms and conditions. Leaving these concerns aside, however, this is an important and timely contribution.

EILEEN EVASON
University of Ulster


Often the single largest item of welfare expenditure, pensions may be a particular target for governments concerned with the ‘fiscal burden’ of the welfare state. Yet, the political costs of reform in this area are potentially high. If administrative costs of public pensions are already low, efficiency savings will be illusive with the result that governments who are determined to reduce the pensions bill have little option but to cut pension benefits or increase contributions (a goal that can be achieved by the extension of the retirement age as well as by a simple increase in the rate). In other words, pension reforms frequently take the form of a zero-sum game in which some groups, or indeed entire generations, come out as losers (p. 36). This often fraught area of welfare state retrenchment provides the focus of Bonoli’s study of pension reform in Britain, Switzerland and France from the mid 1980s to the mid 1990s. The politics of the welfare state is centre stage here, and pension reform is set in the context of national political institutions as well as the specific policy-making strategies adopted by national governments.

As one of a growing number of comparative texts, Bonoli’s manuscript achieves a rare balance between national level detail and theoretical insights that may be applied more generally. Adopting a comparative perspective also allows for interesting insights into national cases that would be difficult to achieve with a single case study. For example, he observes that while in France and Switzerland the need for reform was uncontroversial with battle lines drawn over details, the debate in the UK reflected fundamental disagreement about the necessity of reform with the result that there was scant common ground from which the details of the proposals could be discussed. Of all countries studied, the case of France provides the richest ground for Bonoli’s analysis. He contrasts the seeming contradictions in the smooth passage of the 1993 reforms (which occurred during a period of cohabitation of socialist party, President Mitterand, and the right of centre parliamentary coalition, led by Balladur), with the mass strikes and eventual defeat of the pension reforms that followed the 1995 Juppé plans (tabled during Chirac’s presidency). The explanation for this is found both in the content of the reforms, and the policy-making strategy adopted by the government in question – notably, the Juppé reforms sidelined the unions both by excluding them from the drafting of provisions and by failing to offer them any appropriate sweeteners.

Bonoli reaches some conclusions pertinent to our understanding of welfare reform more generally. He highlights the importance of the timing and scale of reforms, as well as the *quid pro quo* (or sweeteners) offered by a particular reform package. His conclusions point to the changing landscape of welfare politics, in which the salience of ideological divides between left and right is diminishing to be replaced by conflict between reforming governments and pro-welfare

To use Fitzpatrick's own closing phrase, 'the scandal of youth homelessness in the UK' (p. 157) was the focus for a great deal of housing and social policy research during the 1990s and into the new century. A huge volume of material has been published in policy reports, journal articles and edited books. Yet, there have been surprisingly few high-quality, single-authored books based on rigorous empirical investigation and analysis. Fitzpatrick's book fills that gap impressively.

*Young Homeless People*, presents the findings from a relatively small-scale, but very detailed study of young homeless people in Glasgow. Notably, a reasonable proportion of participants were traced a year later for a subsequent interview, introducing a valuable longitudinal dimension to the study. Throughout, the local study is interpreted in relation to the wider social, economic and policy context applicable across Scotland and the rest of the United Kingdom. Early chapters chart the emergence of youth homelessness in the late twentieth-century Britain and critique the various responses of national government and local housing and support service providers. There is also a helpful discussion of the meaning of home and homelessness, drawing on the perspectives of young people who had experienced extremely severe housing and social circumstances, including periods of sleeping rough.

A particular strength of this book is the breadth of analysis. As might be expected, there are detailed chapters on pathways through homelessness and young people's support needs and expressed housing preferences. In addition, however, Fitzpatrick also explores other important dimensions of these young lives. The chapters on the social networks of participants and on their experiences of school, work and public services make fascinating reading. The concluding chapter ties the various threads together and sets out some firm and quite challenging recommendations for policy and practice on youth housing and homelessness. This is a very readable book. Fitzpatrick's style is both concise and authoritative. She manages to present a balanced critique of ideas and evidence, while retaining a refreshing frankness and confidence in her own analysis.

If there is one key criticism to be made of *Young Homeless People*, this probably lies in the development of generalised conclusions (notably the typology of pathways through homelessness) from a very small sample base of qualitative interviews. Undoubtedly, there were financial and time constraints which limited the scope of the study and these are fully recognised by the author. To some extent,
the findings represent a set of hypotheses to be tested in a bigger arena, rather
than a conclusively proven set of results. Nevertheless, when interpreted in con-
junction with the findings from other studies, Fitzpatrick’s work certainly makes
a very valuable contribution to the evidence base.

This is a book which will no doubt be widely read and cited for some time to
come. It will be of significance to all those conducting research into homelessness
and publishing in this field. The book is also sufficiently accessible for under-
and post-graduate students seeking to understand the basic causes and consequ-
ences of youth homelessness in contemporary society. It is to be hoped that a
paperback edition emerges sooner, rather than later.

ISOBEL ANDERSON
University of Stirling

Nirmala Rao, Reviving Local Democracy: New Labour, New Politics, Policy

Nirmala Rao’s lively book addresses New Labour’s strategy for the modernisa-
tion of local democracy. It investigates the new modes of involvement in decision
making, and queries the extent to which they relate to each other.

Initially, the book traces the historical origins of local democracy. The drift to
the centre since the 1970s has been paradigmatic: just recall Anthony
Crosland’s ‘the party’s over’. Successive governments tightened the central-local
government controls. Rao charts the series of local government commissions,
such as Redcliffe-Maud, and reforms, all failing to plug the gap between rhetoric
and reality: government remained distant from ‘ordinary people’. However,
despite Thatcherism, argues Rao, Labour-led ‘hands-off’ campaigns in the 1980s
and 1990s produced a fight back against the growing Whitehall squeeze, open-
ing the way for the 1997 New Labour government’s programme. Here, Rao
detects a seminal ‘culture shift’ from electoral politics to single issue activism – a
new political culture transcending the old Left–Right dichotomy and the widen-
ing of participation, although she does not engage with critics of this thesis, such
as Bobbio (1996) or Driver and Martell (1998). Rao assiduously cites the British
Social Attitudes Surveys which reveal a breakdown of deference and overall
trust in politicians. Relatively few citizens participate in politics. Participation in
local politics reflects generational differences and geographical mobility factors.
Thus, the young are most distant and sceptical; white middle-class males partici-
pate most. Minority groups participate least. The erosion of local autonomy since
the 1970s has made matters worse: fewer people feel attachment to local democ-

...
‘Modern Local Government’ was designed to ‘get in touch with the people’, but as Rao proffers, ‘drawing in the more peripheral or excluded social groups will take effort and ingenuity’. New Labour’s agenda embraces new forms of political leadership – new people have to be attracted into local government; a new political executive is to constitute the institutional base of decision-making, coupled with directly related mayors. Curiously, Rao, even when charting the elections for London Mayor in 2000, omits reference to key political figures. Curious, because Ken Livingstone was leader of the Greater London Council at the time of Thatcher and her dismantling of the Council in the 1980s (mentioned on p. 54 and yet without reference to Livingstone and radical socialist policies). However, it was Livingstone’s candidature for London mayor in the 2000 election which ‘blew the gaff’ on New Labour’s underlying intentions to control. In the events following publication (I guess) New Labour was left with egg on its face. Cynical and undemocratic attempts to prevent Livingstone standing (too embarrassingly ‘Old Left Labour’) failed; Livingstone split with Labour and won. New Labour’s ‘official’ candidate, Health Minister Frank Dobson, suffered ignominious defeat. Clearly, the politics are important. The London mayoral election moved New Labour’s continuing battle with Old Labour and socialism to centre stage. New Labour’s ‘spin’ on participation and democratic renewal cannot be separated from its reversal of Labour policies. Yet all we glean from Rao is ‘both major parties found themselves in deep water over the selection of their candidature for the post of Greater London Mayor’. This rather smacks of extracting the politics from politics – a perennial trait of political science. Accordingly, Rao never debates with the critiques from the left, such as Barnett’s (2000) view that the pursuit of participatory ‘consensus’ democracy displaces majoritarian democracy (neutralising party and parliament), or with academics such as Ransom and Stewart (1994) who demonstrates that the stress on local participation cuts across public accountability criteria in the wider political arena. Public opinion polls and attitude surveys may add flesh to speculations, but they are not scientific or value-free. More lies behind New Labour’s ‘Democratic Renewal’ of local government than a simple desire to give people their say. In this respect, whilst the book offers a very useful account of the decline in interest in local politics, it only partially engages with its sub-title ‘New Labour, new politics?’


**HARRY COWEN**
Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education


Scholars and students of social policy necessarily require insights from comparative analysis, and for those interested in Europe it is essential to understand the growing importance of the European Union (EU) for social welfare in the member countries. This book is one of a major series of textbooks on the EU, its
institutions, politics and policies, and aims to contribute to the literature on European policy-making and to 'bring the EU alive' for a wide and general audience. The authors stress that the book is intended to be user-friendly for students and non-specialists. They are also critical of over-theoretical accounts of the EU, and base their analysis on a four-year research project involving extensive interviewing of decision-makers in the EU bodies as well as archival work.

The first chapter reviews a number of conceptual approaches to decision-making, and eschews any search for a general theory of EU decision-making. Peterson and Bomberg devise a framework which distinguishes different levels of analysis, corresponding to 'history-making', 'policy-setting' and 'policy-shaping' decisions. The framework is heuristic and eclectic; they argue it is theoretically neutral as it enables the use of different types of theory to account for different types of bargaining and action among governments, EU institutions and policy networks. Chapter 2 provides a description of the component institutions and procedures of the EU, stressing that they are still in many ways experimental, fragmented and constantly improvised. In Chapter 3 the discussion of the internal market demonstrates linkages with social policy – particularly in relation to employee rights, working conditions, sexual equality – and moves towards common standards. The authors conclude that EU social policy is far less developed than national social policies, and that the EU remains a ‘welfare laggard’.

Chapter 4 concerns external trade policy, while Chapter 5 emphasises that an important dimension of the Common Agricultural Policy is that it is a social policy to reduce rural poverty and to integrate conservative social groups in the welfare state.

Other substantive aspects of social policy decision-making are considered in Chapter 6, which discusses cohesion policy. This is shown to be an ambitious attempt to reduce economic and social disparities between EU countries, and to promote solidarity. Cohesion policy now accounts for more than a third of total EU spending, and is obviously a major area for intergovernmental bargaining, but the role of the Commission has steadily increased. Recent changes have seen a shift away from infrastructure projects towards education and training, and the authors argue that this signals a decline in importance for the objectives of social cohesion and solidarity in favour of (economic) efficiency and practicality. The succeeding three chapters deal with environmental policy; research and technology policy; and the common foreign and security policy of the EU. In each a similar format is used, with a detailed account of the main policies, decisions and institutional structure, and an assessment of the influence of key actors and bargaining processes.

The final chapter gives an overview, concluding that EU decision-making resists simple uncontroversial generalisations. Peterson and Bomberg argue that different types and levels of governance require different theoretical 'lenses', and claim that their framework and case studies offer new insights. They suggest that EU decision-making should not be seen either as the outcome of external forces, or as reflecting 'path-dependency'; instead they insist that 'history-making' decisions are fundamentally different in form and in their evolution from decisions which set policy or shape policy, and they endorse the use of policy network analysis to unravel these different modes of governance.

The book certainly offers a useful summary of the major EU institutions, policies
and procedures, and from their research the authors supply interesting vignettes of specific decisions. Overall the material is well organised and presented, and will be valuable for teaching – the use of ‘exhibits’ about case studies in the text is particularly helpful. However, whether specialists in EU politics and social policy analysts will be convinced that their heuristic framework is cogent, or that they provide new insights, remains to be seen. Those seeking a detailed elaboration of social policy in the EU, or those anticipating major advances in our theoretical understanding of decision-making more generally, may be disappointed. Nonetheless, Peterson and Bomberg’s textbook does provide us with a good introduction to the arcane and complex world of EU policy-making.

ROB FLYNN
University of Salford


This is primarily a study of the Old Poor Law in England. Of the nine chapters, only Chapter 8, dealing with ‘Welfare Under the New Poor Law 1821–1850’ addresses issues related to the changes of 1834. Even here, however, the chapter suggests that the regional variations in provision which had characterised the old Poor Law continued to be present under the new system. The key contrast of the 1830s, therefore, might not be between old and new poor laws, but between the enduring regional variations. The author has a detailed knowledge of his sources, and this publication brings together both his own previous work in local poor law records, and the now numerous publications and unpublished theses dealing with local and regional applications of the poor law. Though there are still areas of England which are sparsely covered by local studies, and some questions about whether rural and urban parishes are equally represented, the detail presented here allows the author to examine regional, sub-regional and other variations in poor law provision. His links with the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure also inform the text, which is finished with a number of maps, diagrams and tables.

After an introduction, the next four chapters deal with the general content of the old poor law, first setting out the legal framework, and emphasising the differences which crept in as this was filtered through the actions of those involved to become local practice. The next chapter on ‘The Welfare Debate’ is an excellent summary of the various academic interpretation. As the author shows, the growing availability of records and local studies has produced changes in the interpretation of the effects of the old poor law, away from the rather Manichean condemnation of the Webbs towards a variety of differing, but less emphatic analyses. After this, King looks at the practical definitions of poverty employed, noting the effect of rationing of resources, and concluding that ultimately, welfare spending by individual parishes was ‘the outcome of a multi-layered process of negotiation in which a limited supply of welfare was matched by a potentially unlimited demand for it’ (p. 104). In these chapters, an understanding of the role of the mixed economy of welfare, including charitable aid and self-help, is recognised as being essential for mature interpretation of the poor law system.

In the following two chapters, the author turns to regional and sub-regional
analysis. He reviews existing material suggesting that the poor law in the southern and eastern counties of England was relatively broader in its coverage, earlier in the timing of its intervention, and relatively generous in the support package offered than was the case in the parishes of the north and west of England. Both faced the same problem, but different responses ensued – one where pensions grew in magnitude, and the other where pension arrangements stagnated. As the author concludes in this section ‘There were at least two systems of welfare practice and sentiment evolving during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to cope with the changing point-in-time and life-cycle poverty problems’ (p. 222). The author’s primary focus is on geographical variations, though the changing gender pattern of dependency within regions is also explored. Some groups represented among the poor, particularly the elderly, receive specific mention, but others such as the ‘insane’ or ‘idiot’ are less extensively covered. In the concluding chapter, King reviews the explanations advanced for the pattern of poor law provision, and suggests that one of the key factors might be the size of the parish – face to face welfare may create groups of ‘welfare junkies’ while the larger parishes of the north and west might have a more objective (and therefore harsher) approach.

This book seeks rather ambitiously to provide both a synthesis of the existing literature which will benefit undergraduates, and to advance the academic debate over patterns of welfare under the poor law. It is to the author’s credit that it goes some way to meeting both these objectives fully. It covers the existing literature thoroughly, and the reader is presented with new interpretations of the data. Anyone with interests in the history of welfare will benefit from the discussions in this text. Unfortunately, the period covered makes it more likely that it will be social and economic historians, rather than those interested in social policy, who are most likely to use this book.

DAVID HIRST
University of Wales, Bangor