Academic inquiry into social policy has made enormous progress over the last half century when the first systematic attempts to document and analyze the social policies and programs of governments in Europe and North America were initiated. These early attempts were primarily concerned with describing government provision and documenting their historical, legislative and administrative contexts. Theoretical ideas were not widely used to frame these activities, and when they were, they drew implicitly on ideological beliefs to assert preferences for particular approaches. However, by the 1980s, theory was being more systematically applied to social policy scholarship. Building on formative accounts of the implications for social policy of the ideas of major social theorists, and attempts to locate social policies within established ideological frameworks, social policy scholars have now transcended the subject's original descriptive preoccupations and have infused it with a substantive degree of theory.

These two books by British authors provide insights into just how sophisticated the use of theory in social policy has become. While most previous accounts of social policy or welfare theory, as it is also known, are organized around major theoretical schools of thought, and examine the implications of these schools of thought for social policy, these two book approach the subject from the perspective of key concepts. Drake's book, which is slim and concise, discusses concepts such as freedom, equality, justice, rights, needs, empowerment, diversity, change and citizenship. He explains these concepts and considers their relevance for social policy. Although Fitzpatrick's book is not substantially longer, it is noticeably more ambitious and covers a much larger territory. The material in his book is organized in terms of 10 chapters which cover both concepts and theories. These include the concepts of welfare, equality, liberty, citizenship, ideologies and new social divisions as well as recent theoretical developments such as post-industrialization, post-Fordism, globalization, post-
modernism and communitarianism among others. Although the two books share similarities, it seems that Drake’s book is better suited for an undergraduate readership while Fitzpatrick’s would be more appropriate for graduate students and others who already have an understanding of the issues.

The selection of the topics and their organization of the content in terms of chapters is somewhat arbitrary. For example, Fitzpatrick categorizes the concepts of poverty and human nature as ‘key political concepts’, and Drake’s inclusion of a chapter on policy analysis seems out of place in a book focused primarily on conceptual principles. Nevertheless, the two books cover a large range of issues and will assist students to appreciate the importance of conceptual frameworks in the field. Fitzpatrick’s book will be particularly helpful to those students who require a more nuanced analysis of the intricacies of particular concepts. For example, his discussion of globalization transcend the usual condemnatory rhetoric of the popular media and provides a detailed, multifaceted and insight account. The two books are a very helpful addition to the social policy literature. They reveal the extent to which students in Britain are being exposed to theoretical issues. They deserve to be widely used in social policy teaching the United States where theory is still not given as much emphasis as it deserves.


Images of the poor in intellectual and popular discourse have fluctuated over the years. At times, the poor have been viewed as victims who are deserving of government aid and public sympathy. At other times, they have been regarded as undeserving actors responsible for their own condition. The former approach was more common in the 1960s, when the United States rediscovered poverty, largely through Michael Harrington’s writings. On the other hand, during the 1980s, scholars portrayed the poor as a socially isolated underclass and attributed the perpetuation of poverty to individual irresponsibility and a social welfare system that promoted and maintained a ‘culture of poverty’. Most