pet programs. Mr. Johnson's was poverty; Mr. Nixon's obviously was not. An unsympathetic administration or one that employs outright harassment, such as Mr. Creger and his fellow workers experienced, can be extremely detrimental to the programs of an agency and to the services that can be provided for those the agency is intended to benefit. Federal administrative changes are often accompanied by reorganization, and in extreme cases, as almost happened with O.E.O., agencies can be "reorganized" right out of existence.

In addition to exposing the corruptness of politics within agencies, Mr. Creger's book does what appears to be a very thorough job of explaining the basic principles of Community Action Programs and effectively dispelling the myth that it is a "give away" or welfare program. Since the program involves participation on the part of the poor, it not only serves to benefit the poor materially, but by eliminating total dependency it also serves to benefit them psychologically. Mr. Creger believes Community Action Programs to be the most beneficial of all government programs in alleviating poverty, and potentially they could be. The ideas are there, and there is dedication on the part of those directly involved, but public and political support is the essential element that seems to be lacking. The disorganization and lack of leadership during the Nixon years dealt a crippling blow to an agency that gave the poor a sense of control over what was happening to them. The loss of efficiency and the blatant misuse of funds during these years left scars that will take a tremendous amount of time and effort to heal.

In the forward of the book Hubert Humphrey says: "It is a story which should be read by legislators, administrators, and those contemplating a career in government service, and by anyone who wants a more humane and responsive society for his tax dollars." Even after taking into consideration the problem of objectivity and the geographical limitations of Mr. Creger's Midwest background and experience, there is much to be learned by reading Ralph Creger's book, The Lord Will Wipe Them Out.

Kansas State University

Sharon L. Mickey


Jobs For Americans is the timely product of eight papers prepared by economists for a national conference on "Manpower Goals for American Democracy" at Arden House in May, 1976 in conjunction with the American Assembly. Ginzberg's assumption that the American economy has fallen short of its aim to provide productive jobs for all who want to work is an underlying current throughout the selections in the book. The problem of high unemployment accompanied by significant inflation, with emphasis on the recent period (1969-1976), is approached by discussions of the relative merits and "best mix" of demand management and manpower programs, two methods for effecting full employment. Federal administrative measures are analyzed by each author in an effort to place labor market structures and policies since the Employment Act of 1946 in relation to the goals of current manpower policies in the United States.

The thrust of Jobs For Americans, even given the slightly different orientations of the papers contained in it, is not sociological, but one of macroeconomic and microeconomic theoretical foundations. Yet the consistency of effort displayed in the book adds to its readability and allows at least two appealing elements for the sociologist to surface. First, the healthy use of historical examples and second, the descriptive narrative, often comparative in nature, are lucrative tools that have often been overlooked but aspired to in the sociology of work, occupations and professions, and their use by the authors in this book offers a linkage between the complementary studies of sociology and economics.

A brief highlighting of examples from the individual papers is in order. Abramovitz, who focuses on the relationship between, evaluation of, and prospects for aggregate demand policy and specific manpower programs, provides a historical-comparative analysis of demand management from the Truman administration through the Nixon administration.

Solow utilizes unemployment data, which he admits is not perfect, to provide a rudimentary comparison between the U.S.
and other industrialized countries. He also provides a very illustrative discussion of age-sex proportions (young and female, specifically) in order to compare two years of labor force composition, 1969 and 1975, and to provide answers to the broader question of the limits of macroeconomic policy.

Okun provides a well-organized paper in which the major interest for the sociologist is dual-pronged: both comparison, in which the Kennedy and Johnson administrations are analyzed in concert, and conflict analysis, in which the conflicts between goals of high employment and other national goals such as budget balancing, are considered. The conflicts discussed by Okun are diminished somewhat by the fact that he does not describe the process of administrative resolution of conflicts of national policy. However, the groundwork is laid and could be viewed as a first step toward such an analysis.

Ulman, noting that there is a tendency to expand the notion of manpower policy so that it will escape relegation “to the dustbin of sexist nomenclature,” presents the partner to demand management, namely, the set of all manpower policies (p. 85). The key section for the sociologist is a comparison of attempts to increase worker productivity in both Sweden and the U.S. Such worker productivity increases are seen as goals of traditional manpower policies. Ulman also sets forth the view that a national manpower policy would best include both demand management and manpower programs, and he provides ramifications of this, particularly from the point of view of manpower programs.

Bergmann focuses upon the progress and current status of minorities and women in the labor market. Although the author notes that sociologists have supplied theories of stratification and socialization, she does not apply them to the current situation—a labor market in which it has been “fairly easy for American industry to place a greater proportion of black women into the kinds of jobs hitherto reserved for white women, but that little progress has been made in placing a higher proportion of blacks and white women into jobs hitherto reserved for white men” (p. 122). A straightforward discussion of the reduction of discrimination through legal enforcement emphasizes the ineffectiveness of the E.E.O.C. enforcement mechanism.

Brimmer, whose article provides a myriad of statistics on employment of Black Americans to show that blacks are underrepresented in many occupational categories, unfortunately does not discuss reasons why certain sectors of employment are either relatively open or inaccessible to Black Americans. The primary use for the sociologist of this paper would be as a source of labor force data. Explanations of the trends in black labor force participation must be derived through other sources.

Lampmann offers a description, speckled with statistics, of the income-poor in the U.S., accompanied by a discussion of programs and policies developed to aid the poor. Perhaps the section of most interest, although primarily economic in orientation, is one concerning income maintenance—its rationale, its personal benefits, and its ability to reduce income poverty. However, there is no comparative data furnished to this end by Lampmann.

Kreps raises questions, in her examination of time dimensions of manpower policy, which are generally more relevant to the sociologist than many of those raised in the other papers. In suggesting that the interaction of market work, nonmarket work, leisure and schooling produce a broader framework in which to properly analyze manpower policy needs, Kreps implies the necessity for both sociological and economic theoretical underpinnings. Although there is limited historical or comparative analysis here, the theoretical concerns are obvious.

In the way of general commentary about Jobs for Americans I would first emphasize that each of the papers is cogent, and the book unfolds in an overall consistent manner in its stated theme of issues of full employment as a national policy. The economic discussions and analysis are sound. However, there is very little concrete evidence given on specific manpower program outcomes, against which some of the manpower planning issues could be judged. It would seem that many of the questions raised by the authors, which are often sociological in nature, might be partially answered if outcomes of the recent manpower programs were seriously undertaken. In addition, even though the historical
examples are useful for the sociologist, explanations for the events are usually neglected, in favor of chronological outlines of events. Such gaps should be filled.

*Jobs For Americans* must, in many ways, be treated as a sourcebook. It contains potentially useful statistics, information on government legislation, and historical documentation, but incomplete connections among these aspects create difficulties in reaching this potential. Thus, for the student uninitiated in basic economics and governmental manpower policy, it cannot provide a fruitful overview. It is much more useful for those who have completed introductory studies in these areas. On the other hand, often very profitable discussion topics are raised by the authors, such as Kreps’ “time dimensions,” or Ulman’s “increased productivity” of various industrialized nations. Therefore, in a course on the sociology of work, and to a lesser extent, a course in industrial sociology the book furnishes the beginnings from which to further delve into the issues raised.

To its disadvantage, the book suffers from some overlap in discussion among the different papers. On occasion, this overlap tends to be more redundant than illuminating. In addition, the veritable storehouse of data tends to result in statistics that are exacting, but explanations of phenomena that are inexact. One contributing factor to the gaps in explanation is that the objectives for the book set by Ginzberg are predominantly sociological, such as whether “full employment is a worthy goal,” and “the acceptability of necessary individual and institutional changes” (p. vii). Thus, the predominantly economic-manpower policy explanations do not fully succeed.


The editors of this collection of readings have an impressive list of publications to their credit. Many students of social policy are familiar with their *Dimensions of Social Welfare Policy*, which is used in many undergraduate and graduate social work programs. Neil Gilbert and Harry Specht of the School of Social Welfare at the University of California, Berkeley have attempted in this book to present a cross-section of planning articles which students can read to supplement their textbook studies. Gilbert and Specht have divided the book into four sections. The first set of articles deals with the theoretical question of whether or not to plan; the second section includes a continuum of various planning models; the third part addresses the issue of planning as a socio-political process; and the fourth section provides some perspectives on the technical aspects of planning. In addition to an overall introduction to the book, each section is introduced by comments by the editors. There are 27 reading selections in the book.

The editors tell us that their intent in putting these readings under one cover was “to highlight planning perspectives through a framework that provides the beginning student with a coherent approach to the literature,” “to introduce students to writings in the planning field that have particular salience to the institution of social welfare,” to let students become more aware of comprehensiveness and centralization as planning concepts, and to provide “the initial intellectual groundwork for developing that competence” which characterizes a good planner.

There are some planning “classics” in this collection: a selection from Alfred Kahn’s *Theory and Practice of Social Planning*, Amitai Etzioni’s essay on mixed-scanning, and Charles Lindblom’s “The Science of ‘Muddling Through.’” The compilation also contains some particularly good articles which may be less familiar to students. Neil Gilbert’s “The Neighborhood Coordinators” and Sherry Arnstein’s “Maximum Feasible Manipulation” provide readers with case-study approaches to specific planning problems faced in the Model Cities Programs. “Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning” by Horst Rittel and