June 2003


Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw

Part of the Social Work Commons

**Recommended Citation**


Available at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol30/iss2/19
distinct poignancy which makes it essential reading for all social work educators.

However, the book provides little ground for the profession to engage in self-congratulation. It is to Kendall’s credit that she does not offer a romanticized view of the history of social work education. Instead, she presents a verismo account showing how different factions struggled around a number of key issues. The most serious struggle concerned the issue of graduate versus undergraduate education but other issues, such as curriculum content, the nature of social work practice and the relationship with the practice community consumed an enormous amount of time and emotional energy. One cannot help thinking that these inward focused struggles deflected the profession from being an effective agent for social change and social justice. Unfortunately, these struggles continue today. While has been made progress in recognizing the value of undergraduate education, the tendency to be exclusionary still characterizes contemporary debates on social work education. For example, the latest revision of the accreditation standards discriminate and excludes from leadership positions in social work education those who do not have an MSW degree. Those with an undergraduate social work qualification, immigrants and non-social workers who have worked for many years in schools of social work are not permitted to serve as deans or directors. Kendall’s excellent history should give pause for thought. Her discussion of the role of the universities and their impatience with intrusive accreditation is salutary. The profession needs to learn from its past and hopefully, by transcending internal squabbles and struggles, it will play a more positive role in the far more critical struggle for social justice facing our society today.

Guy Standing, Beyond the New Paternalism: Basic Security as Equality. New York: Verso, 2002. $70.00 hardcover, $22.00 paperback.

People’s welfare has historically been closely associated with their ability to engage in activities that may be described as ‘work’. For millennia, families, clans and tribes met their needs by using their skills, knowledge and physical capacities to hunt and gather food. Subsequently, skills, physical resources and knowl-
edge were applied to agricultural tasks and even today, agriculture sustains hundreds of millions of people around the world. In the 19th century, mass employment in industrial occupations emerged as a new and important way by which a substantial proportion of the world’s population secured their livelihood. Although industrial employment was regarded by many as the best means of raising standards of living, the emergence of post-industrial economies in Europe, North America and elsewhere has created new uncertainties and insecurities.

It is in this context that Guy Standing of the International Labour Office discusses diverse aspects of work, security and the role of government in human welfare. The key to the book lies in its last sentence which states: “Dignified work can only exist when it is done for intrinsic reasons, and not because a landlord, a boss or the state says shall be so (p. 277).” Although Standing believes that work is central to the human experience, work must be organized and linked to just, humane and satisfying social arrangements if it is to contribute positively to the creation of a Good Society. And this requires the rejection of paternalism by the state, corporation and other social institutions.

This premise paves the way for a lengthy and discursive review of many different aspects of work in modern society. The book begins by discussing what the author calls ‘the century of the laboring man’—in other words, the period of mass industrial employment when creativity and self-fulfillment were shaped by machines and when governments of quite different ideological hues introduced extensive social policies and programs designed to regulate labor. This era has now been replaced by an era of market regulation characterized by employment insecurity and uncertainty and a new trend towards individualization in work, social relationships and attitudes. However, the author contends that this new era is already facing the prospect of fragmentation and collapse. In this situation, there is an opportunity to introduce a new set of values and policies that will promote ‘dignified work’ and authentic opportunities for the full realization of human welfare.

The book contains much that is of interest and relevance to social policy scholars but it is discursive and ranges of a great variety of complex issues. It also contains a huge amount of
information. At times, the reader feels that the book loses its focus as the author digresses into numerous tangential issues. On the other hand, some of the topics the author addresses are highly pertinent to the book's central theme. Perhaps the most important of these is the issue of basic income or 'basic security', as the author calls it. One very useful chapter is devoted to the topic and its history, dimensions and implications are examined in some depth. Other related topics of importance include profit sharing, stakeholding in firms and the issue of the right to work. Other useful chapters deal with workfare, unemployment benefits and retirement pensions. The book will certainly be of interest to anyone concerned with the link between work, employment and human well-being.


Although religious congregations have historically been engaged in social welfare, their charitable activities have now been politicized. Influenced by Christian conservatives, the Republican Party has actively promoted the greater involvement of religious charities in social service delivery arguing that they are an effective alternative to public provisions. Supporters of faith based services claim that religious charities are far more responsive to the poor and needy, and that their programs are less costly, more efficient and delivered with greater compassion than those of government bureaucracies. They urge the government to fund religious charities and permit them to use public revenues to promote their sectarian agenda.

Following the election of President George W. Bush, some of these proposals have been implemented. For the first time, an office responsible for faith based initiatives was established in the White House, and the provisions of the 1996 welfare reform legislation that permitted religious charities to provide social services, without separating their charitable and religious missions, was given greater impetus. The President made it clear that he favored the greater involvement of the churches in social welfare