their professional aspirations." What do these and other gift transactions mean in terms of social policy? Clearly the author has presented us with another significant dimension that must be considered in helping shape the policy decisions that determine the social, medical and welfare institutions of our society.

Richard Titmuss has given us a fascinating study and an exciting book and, perhaps most surprising of all except to those fortunate enough to know him, demonstrates that there is still cause for hope and even optimism. We can organize our social institutions to "encourage the altruism in man," to "foster integration and impede alienation," to "allow the gift of generosity toward strangers," and to "sustain and extend personal freedom." Professor Titmuss does demonstrate that altruism can and indeed will work — indeed it must if we are ever to "come together."

Mitchell I. Ginsberg, Dean Columbia University School of Social Dork,
New York, New York, U.S.A.

SOCIAL SECURITY IN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE: ESSAYS IN HONOUR OF EVELINE M. BURNS edited by Shirley Jenkins. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969. Pp. 255. \$ 9.00.

ing sa manggalang ng kalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalang Tagan ng manggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalanggalangg

This book is a commemorative volume to honour one of the most distinguished American scholars in social security, Dr. Eveline M. Burns, Professor Emeritus of Social Work, Columbia University. Professor Burns was trained at the London School of Economics, and taught at Columbia University for over 35 years until her retirement in 1967. She represents that blending of scholar, researcher, publicist and social policy participant which makes her a social economist in the best interdisciplinary tradition.

Professor Burns' first published paper is dated 1923 so she has already been publishing for 48 years — and hopefully will continue for many years to come. A bibliography records over 12 pages of books, articles, and congressional testimony.

I think I have read just about everything Professor Burns has ever written on social security. I have heard her speak innumerable times. I have never tired of either her written or spoken word. She can pour old wine into new bottles; make new wine and pour it into old bottles; and she can throw away the wine and the bottles and make you enjoy drinking the wine from her cup, drop by drop.

Dr. Burns has advised every Commissioner of Social Security in the United States, and at one time or another each of them had to decide not to take her advice because she was so far ahead of her time. Her analytical mind and sparkling prose gave her an unusual role as probably the most important university-based scholar

and writer on social security in the United States from the thirties through the sixties.

This volume, however, does not have an article by Eve Burns. The significant contributions she has made are reviewed in an opening essay by Vera Shlakman. Then there are three other excellent papers: Robert J. Lampman discusses transfer and redistribution in terms of the negative income tax and other proposals for welfare reform. Ida C. Merriam reviews the entire gamut of income maintenance programme and raises a number of key issues; and Herman M. Somers discusses cost and distribution problems facing other countries. There follow five essays facing other countries: Canada, Denmark, Great Britain, France and India.

The international papers are written by outstanding experts. The British paper is by Richard M. Titmuss, the Danish by Henning Friis, the Canadian by John S. Morgan, the French by Pierre Laroque (once head of the French social security system), and the Indian by S. Z. Hasan. These foreign essays demonstrate the universality of the problems in social security and indicate the continuing change which takes place in the development of the programmes. Incrementalism and coordination are ever-present.

Albert J. Kahn concludes with a discussion of relevant material from the other essays and raises the question as to whether social security can be analyzed as a system.

Of the ten essays in the book, eight were written by people 1 call my friends and colleagues. They have

written useful, clear, and penetrating essays. But their written words, like those of Professor Burns, do not always show the humour, dedication; skills and spontaneity which characterize their contributions in person.

Professor Burns is a real person. She was a pioneer. She had a wonderful sense of humour. Yet she was a scholar. She believed in social reform and also in rational dialogue. She was and is a great lady and an inspiring teacher. I am deeply happy I know her. Britain's loss was our gain.

Wilber J. Cohen, Dean
School of Education, University of Michigan,
Co-Chairman, Institute of Gerontology,
Ann Arbor, Michigan, and Former U.S.
Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

---::---

PROBLEMS OF PLANNING: EAST AND WEST by Rudolf Bicanic. The Hague: Mount and Co., 1967.
Pp. 123.

This book falls into three quite distinct sections. The reader should bear this clearly in mind, or he may become nettled and perplexed by some repetition and the apparent disjointedness of some of the material.

The first and larger section is mainly a collection of lectures in planning given by the author at the Institute of Social Studies in The Hague. It deals with forms and methods of planned action according to (1) the environment in which the planning takes place; (2) the actors involved; (3) the aims pursued, and (4) the instruments used.

The second section is a theoretical introduction to the morphology of planning, with special attention to the polycentric type of planning as opposed to the monocentric. The author feels it is of the utmost importance that effective means of polycentric planning must be devised to counteract the more monocentric Soviet type of planning.

The third section of the book is an essay on the role of computers in planning. The author reasons articulately and convincingly for the computer as a liberalizing and decentralizing instrument, and draws heavily on the computer "industry" in California to illustrate the case. However, he does admit that one of the explanations given for more centralized planning in the Soviet Union was that the use of computers makes centralized planning possible, effective, and even imperative.

Problems of Planning East and West is short on rhetoric, bias and debate, and long and strong on a systematic objective and theoretical analysis of economic planning which, according to the author, is really social planning. This book is therefore a useful resource for all who are interested in social planning and social policy. Although the type of planned eco-

nomy prevailing in Yugoslavia emerges as quite close to the "happy medium", the author allows the reader to reach this conclusion by deduction rather than blatant argument.

An overview of planning, especially in the industrial world, shows the relatively capitalistic free-enterprise system of the U.S.A. on one end of the spectrum, and the highly centralized totally planned approached practised in the U.S.S.R. on the other. Between these extremes one finds a whole variety of models in public-private planning in Western Europe, Great Britain, Yugoslavia and Japan, as well as in developing countries. Everywhere there has been a twofold trend: (1) toward greater joint planning between public and private in the non-socialist world, and (2) greater decentralization, that is, from the monocentric to the polycentric system, in the socialist world.

Theorists have traditionally maintained that planning can only take place nationally when the private proprietors of the means of production have been removed and their property subjected to the will of the central planners. Consequently, the main condition of planning is considered to be institutional change culminating in the nationalization of the means of production. However, as the author notes, this extreme view requires modification, largely because increasingly owners or commercial corporations no onger manage them. Since planning is more concerned with the function of management than of ownship, corporations can engage more in national planning.

In recent decades, especially in Western Europe, a wide variety of joint planning models has been developed between government and private enterprise. For example, in the case of France the model is one of "a constant dialogue" between government and private