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
Melvin Webber introduces the notion that planning problems are "inherently wicked," i.e., they are not amenable to solution in the same way that engineering problems are. Paul Davidoff’s "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning" is a good discussion of the planner as an advocate.

Students of social work will be glad to find that the articles do contain examples from the social welfare field. However, few of the articles clearly indicate the interdisciplinary nature of comprehensive planning. The comprehensive planner must be conversant with many different disciplines: urban design and transportation, as well as sociology, psychology, and political science.

Unfortunately, some of the articles may prove to be less than helpful to planning students. Richard Thayer’s analysis of needs in the social services and Barbara Wootton’s argument that planning is part of a free society will have limited value for American students who are not well acquainted with the workings of British social services and the British government in general. This raises a general question: why are planners seemingly so attracted to British examples? Unless we have a genuine understanding of Britain’s particular issues and institutions, any attempt to make comparisons between American and British government must remain rather superficial. With its Taoist admonitions, John Friedmann’s "The Transactive Style of Planning" may enlighten the student to the fact that there is a lot of abstruse thinking in planning theory, a conclusion s/he will come to soon enough anyway.

Obviously, there are practical limits on the length of a book of readings. Yet, one wonders why some topics were included and others were omitted. Perhaps, a heavier editorial hand would have improved this collection. Some of the readings are concerned with very specific planning questions such as the use of the Delphi technique and planning-programming-budgeting systems (PPBS). The latter topic was included even though at least one author* has argued that PPBS is a thing of the past. A little more in the way of explaining why some topics were included might have been useful. None of the readings spell out the planner’s role in grant-writing, or the planner’s role vis-a-vis the community fund-raising agencies. Moreover, most of the articles deal with interactions between planners and organizations at the same level, rather than with vertical interactions between planning components. A serious omission in the book is the lack of a subject index, although the editors have included an index of the authors mentioned in the text.

Planning for Social Welfare will be profitably used by master’s level planning students or social work students specializing in planning. The book may also be a welcome addition to the practitioner’s library in that it contains some basic essays which the planner can turn to when he is thinking about the theoretical issues which underlie his practice. Priced at $13.50, the collection of readings is, unfortunately for students, only available in hardback.

Wichita State University

Paul Traugh

*See Francis E. Rourke, Bureaucracy, Politics, and Public Policy, Boston: Little and Brown, 1976, pp. 150-51.