

**ECONOMICS, LABOR & BUSINESS**

---

more costly concessions to new industry than was wise (buying land, improving sites with roads and utility connections). And when new residents moved in, attracted by new job opportunities, the costs to the town of providing services were greater than the net tax revenues generated, especially if new water and sewerage facilities were needed. The worst error? Overestimating population growth and building facilities for people who never arrived.

*Distinctions,  
Not Differences*

"Why Bosses Turn Bitchy" by Rosabeth Moss Kanter, in *Psychology Today* (May 1976), P.O. Box 2990, Boulder, Colo. 80302.

Why don't more women seek or find career success? Is it because of personality differences between the sexes—an unconscious avoidance of success or inability to handle power? Not at all, says Kanter, an associate professor of sociology at Brandeis. The answer lies in opportunity, power, and tokenism. "Lack of opportunity to succeed, not a personality style that shuns success, is often what separates the unambitious from the climbers—and the women from the men." The author finds no convincing research evidence that men and women differ in their leadership styles, or that people who work for women have lower morale. A successful boss must have real power (which comes from enjoying influence in the higher, usually male echelons of the organization) to back up decisions and thus insure the confidence of subordinates. The petty, domineering female boss usually lacks such power; she tries, instead, to coerce employees into supporting her. When women do get real power, whether in politics or business, they perform just as well—or badly—as men do. Obvious "tokenism" in hiring or promotion, whether racial or sexual, implies management's lack of trust and forces the token employee to cope with stereotypes (women nurses often "test" male nurses to see if they will side with female coworkers against other men). Greater success for women will come, not from changing their personalities or attitudes, Kanter argues, but from interrupting self-perpetuating cycles of blocked opportunity and tokenism.

*Meaningful Jobs  
For the Unfulfilled*

"The Coming Age of People Work" by Brigitte Berger, in *Change* (May 1976), NBW Tower, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801.

America's universities are producing too many qualified applicants for a shrinking job market, and the situation is likely to get worse. (The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts an annual "surplus" of 140,000 college graduates by 1980.) Berger, a sociology professor at Long Island University, rejects various proposed solutions: lowered retirement age, prolonged education, government manipulation of both the job market

---

**ECONOMICS, LABOR & BUSINESS**


---

and the educational institutions that supply it. She likewise opposes a shift to technical and vocational training (the National Planning Association says that of all jobs available, 80 percent involve essentially routine tasks requiring no particular skills).

A realistic solution, Berger argues, must take account of those who regard education as a tool for self-discovery. When bonded with the New Consciousness, celebrated in 1970 in Charles Reich's best-selling *The Greening of America*, the revived Enlightenment goal of "self-fulfillment" requires that work not only be safe, well paid, and of short daily duration, but also that it be "nonmanual, nonroutine, and nonmonotonous; interesting, creative, challenging, and capable of providing personal meaning. . . ."

The author predicts that Washington will eventually be compelled to supplement a private sector incapable of producing enough "meaningful and fulfilling" jobs for the college-trained. The jobs must relate to social goals—such as better health, education, recreation, and environmental protection. Such "people work," Berger concludes, could mean new agencies for community development, political participation, and "intergroup conflict resolution," not meaningless bureaucracies.

---

**RESOURCES & ENVIRONMENT**


---

### *A Forecast of Suffering*

"Population vs. the Environment: A Crisis of Too Many People" by James R. Echols, in *American Scientist* (Mar.-Apr. 1976), 345 Whitney Ave., New Haven, Conn. 06511.

A historical process of "demographic transition" from high birth and death rates to low birth and death rates has brought relatively stable populations to North America and most of Europe. A comparable process is not occurring in many undeveloped countries. Although death rates have fallen, thanks to better medical care, birth rates remain high. Echols, former head of the Population Reference Bureau, suggests that the current "momentum of population growth" is too strong for the demographic transition to be completed in the poorer countries without a temporary return to higher death rates.

Echols examines three 100-year projections: (a) if present worldwide fertility rates remain constant, and average human life expectancy remains at the current 55 years, world population could theoretically reach 24 billion by 2075—a near impossibility because of higher death rates from starvation; (b) if fertility rates fall to a level of one-for-one "population replacement" by 2025, and mortality rates remain stable, world population will almost double (to 8 billion) by 2050, then fall to about 7 billion by 2075—but Echols notes that reducing fertility to