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not whether a reader committed to a socially constructive analysis of current social policies will be better informed after reading the book. They will. Of these things, there can be no doubt. Any reader committed to the traditional liberal position and wanting to know more about social policies will learn a great deal about the philosophical foundation of social policy in the United States. Will a reader with a political position other than the traditional liberal one be able to maintain interest in the book as bureaucracy as a structure is condemned and corporations are recommended for reconstruction? Of that, I’m not so sure.

Larry Nackerud
University of Georgia


The work unit or *danwei*, had for decades been the most important institution in urban China. Every working man and woman belonged to a *danwei*. The *danwei* was, however, not just a workplace. In the pre-reform economy, the *danwei* was the principal channel through which the socialist state distributed income and resources to its urban residents. *Danwei* membership established worker’s identity and entitled them to a range of state-provided benefits. These typically covered health insurance, retirement pensions, housing, nurseries, canteens, bathing facilities, various kinds of subsidies both in cash and in kind and, in large organizations, hospitals and schools. Because of these benefits and services, workers became heavily dependent on their *danwei* to meet a broad range of needs. Such dependence was accentuated by low wages, the lack of alternatives, and by the fact that there was no real exit option: job transfer was exceptional and employment within the same work unit was more or less for life. The *danwei* was therefore like a ‘small society’ encompassing many aspects of the lives of its members. Within their ‘small societies’, *danwei* leaders were more than managers responsible for production. Like heads of households, they were also responsible for the welfare of their workers and their dependents. Manager-worker relations were paternalistic and ‘fief-like’.
Workers' dependence underpinned the danwei's control over many aspects of their lives. But because the danwei was a state organization and managers were state and party officials, such control was at once also political and ideological. The danwei served as an apparatus of political and ideological control over primary groups at the urban grass roots. Within the danwei the two politics—of political performance and paternalistic distribution—played upon and fed on each other, giving rise to a distinct pattern of authority and patron-client relations at the workplace referred to by some as 'neo-traditionalism'. At another level, the danwei was an important institution because it provided an important source of regime legitimation for pre-reform China. The security and the many benefits and services which it provided, especially in times of scarcity, vindicated the 'superiority of socialism' and its care for the well being and welfare of the workers.

These factors explain why the danwei is such a unique and important institution and why the subject has interested many a sociologist, anthropologist and policy scientist. For the danwei is packed with 'materials' and it has all the 'stuff' for an ideal case study of society and politics in pre-reform China. But how did the danwei begin and where did its features come from? There are two main approaches to explaining the origin of the danwei in the literature. One, the 'socialist experience' approach, seeks to explain the danwei in terms of such factors as socialist ideology, policies of the socialist state, war and state formation experience, and China's strategy and experience of socialist industrialization. It argues that the danwei was the creation of Chinese socialism. The second, the 'cultural' approach, explains the danwei in terms of Chinese cultural beliefs, values, preferences, and shared understandings. It argues that institutions are built up over time and there is traceable continuity in these institutions from the cultural past. Paternalism, for example, is not the creation of socialism.

The Making of the Chinese Industrial Workplace seeks to go transcend and improve on both approaches. The author argues that the evolution of the Chinese industrial workplace unfolded against the backdrop of such broad processes as industrialization, state building and labor mobilization, and, within the firm, the process of bureaucratization, or the imposition of rules and procedures regarding hiring, work, and pay. He notes that 't(hese
processes were all well under way prior to 1949, and they accelerated dramatically during the 1950s'. In his view, instead of being a single institution, the *danwei*, was comprised of distinct institutions of rules and norms for how workers would be hired, organized, and compensated. These "labor management institutions" . . . emerged at different times and exerted their influence on subsequent factory politics and the process of industrial *danwei* formation'. They predated its appearance. Two key perspectives inform such analysis and understanding: one, that revolutionary states operate within the societies that they seek to transform, and two, that new, formal institutions imposed by revolutionary states interact with older, 'informal institutions'. Both suggest that there are constraints on state power and limits to institutional innovations.

The book is based on archival data going back to 1927 and paired comparisons, using these data, of two industries (textile and shipbuilding) involving four factories in Shanghai and Guangzhou. Each of the chapters from Chapter 2 to 7 traces out changes in the labor management institutions within the particular factories in question, and to some degree within production units more generally in Shanghai and Guangzhou. Together they provide an account of the history of China's industrial workplace, as illustrated by these four factories, focusing on labor management and shop-floor organizations. The book ends with an epilogue reporting field observations gleaned from interviews and factory visits conducted in 1994–5.

In my view, Frazier has made a convincing case. One is left with no doubt, after reading the book, that certain aspects of the *danwei* institution were already there, long before the institution was formally institutionalized. This was, of course, not to say that the *danwei* 'pre-dated' its existence as a socialist institution. However, there are some limitations to Frazier's study. First, it does not examine the work units of the guerrilla-war economy in the northwestern provinces of Shanxi-Gansu-Ningxia (1937–45). Second, it focuses just on two cities, both coastal ones. Third, it concentrates on large work-units and does not consider work units that are smaller than the big textile and shipbuilding firms studied. Nevertheless, the value of Frazier's contribution lies in correcting the a-historical approaches which have dominated
research in the field and in showing that what is believed to be contemporaneous can actually be traced back to a much earlier time.

M. K. Lee
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University


Sherri Broder's detailed analysis of the relationships between working class families and social reformers in late nineteenth century Philadelphia adds to a growing body of case studies that examine the interactions between poor people and social reformers, social workers, and other professional 'helpers'. Most of these studies draw on social agency case records. Close scrutiny of these records offers vivid pictures of the daily lives of the poor, the attitudes and goals of social workers and reformers responding to problems of poverty, and the strategies used by those receiving assistance in order to move beyond the role of passive recipient and to shape that assistance to meet their particular needs. Broder's book also fits within the larger context of scholarship exploring relationships between gender, poverty, and social policy.

While previous studies have focused largely on poor women, Broder broadens the scope to the entire family. She examines the views of different groups, including the poor themselves, regarding 'appropriate family life' and the causes of poverty in impoverished working class communities in Philadelphia. Her aim is to give an overview of the "wide range of gender and family issues debated in the late Victorian era" and to show that these debates included families themselves, as well as charity, child welfare, and labor reformers. Broder explores the multifaceted definitions of the good mother and the inadequate one, the unemployed father and the tramp, and the dutiful and exploited child. Using the case records of the Pennsylvania Society to Protect Children from Cruelty (SPCC), she describes the range of attitudes toward illegitimate mothers; prostitutes; men who left their families 'to