WILEY

Wool by Frank Ormerod; Staple Trades and Industries by Gordon D. Knox

Review by: G. H. W.

Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Vol. 82, No. 1 (Jan., 1919), pp. 87-90

Published by: [Wiley](#) for the [Royal Statistical Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2340737>

Accessed: 25/06/2014 02:01

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Wiley and Royal Statistical Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

“the alteration to those affected by it, if it can rearrange processes and introduce new machinery without the workers being consulted, if it can dismiss whom it chooses without being obliged to give any account of its decision, it can, in effect, stultify trade unionism, even while according it a nominal recognition. Thus interpreted, freedom of management carries with it a control over the worker which is incompatible with civil liberty.” The problem is to create in every industry “a constitution securing its members an effective voice in its government.” Based on a system of trade boards to guard the defenceless members, development must proceed through trade unionism to “the creation in the staple industries of permanent National Councils of employers and workers, together with the establishment of district and workshop committees in different districts and in individual workshops.” At first the powers of the workmen will be critical rather than constructive, but the way will be opened to “a radical transformation of industrial relationships. . . . in substituting a relationship of co-ordinate service to the community for the present subordination of the hired wage-earner to a master who employs him for profit.” For charges which are in the nature of economic rent, or monopoly profits, or which are made merely because one party in industry is in a strong position to corner the market or to drive a bargain, there is no more moral or economic justification than there was for the *lods et ventes*, or *banalités*, or *vingtaines* of the old régime.” This leads ultimately to the public ownership of land and capital.

Turning to the views of employers, Lord Leverhulme also strikes the note of “service,” and hopes by a six-hours’ day and a system of co-partnership to secure for the worker greater leisure, less strain, more income, and better opportunities for education. Sir Hugh Bell points out that increased production is the indispensable preliminary to larger incomes for the working classes, but the cogency of his proof is little likely to make the man with 25s. a week tolerate the man with 25,000*l.* a year. Mr. Dudley Docker expects increased competition, which can only be met by new methods whose successful introduction depends on better relations between capital and labour. He attaches much importance to improved housing and better education, and holds that when labour is displaced by machinery “the first claim against such increased output should be the support of displaced labour until that labour has been reabsorbed.”

Miss Anderson and Miss Lawrence give instructive accounts of the development of women’s labour during the war, and the latter puts in a strong plea for trade boards. H.W.M.

4.—*Wool*. By Frank Ormerod. (*Staple Trades and Industries*. Edited by Gordon D. Knox,) 218 + xii pp., 8vo. London: Constable: Price 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

We have enjoyed reading Mr. Ormerod’s book, and we are pleased to be able to testify to the information pleasantly contained

within its covers. We expected a pleasure when, remembering Mr. Ormerod's intimate knowledge of the industry and his welcome personality, we settled down to read and criticise, and we were not disappointed. What the every-day reader wants to know about wool, Mr. Ormerod tells him in plain and direct and clear language intelligible even to "babes in these matters." Yet—what a little is told compared with the things some people need to know at the present moment! Mr. Ormerod tells in easy picturesque fashion the history of the settlement and growth of woollen manufactures in England; of wool producing in Australia; of classing, baling and marketing; he makes clear the distinctions between merino and crossbred, and tells how and why the latter has been produced: he explains the mechanical processes of topmaking, worsted and woollen spinning, weaving, and "finishing"; and for all these things, albeit they have been told before, we thank him. Young England can never be told too frequently how the oldest and still one of the greatest of her industries has been built up.

Yet—what a lot of things Mr. Ormerod does not—cannot—tell us! And, what a lot of these things it is imperative for somebody to know!

We are now faced with the after-war difficulties of fairly rationing the world—and particularly Europe—with wool wherewith to return to civilian trade. During the war the consumption of wool has been enormous—in countries where it could be obtained—yet curiously uneven. To-day Britain owns a huge proportion of the world's stock of wool, but it is at the other end of the globe, and shipping has yet to be freed to bring it where it can be spun and woven. Nor unlikely is it that wool will play a part in the peace negotiations; at any rate, as the Wool Council can testify, it is playing a part in certain international relations already. How then can we assess the claims put forward by the Allied Nations? and what may we, for various reasons, have to provide or allow the enemy nations with whom peace has yet to be made? How large is the wool textile industry in each country? and what proportion of the needs of each in raw material can be provided from its domestic clip? These questions we, in common with many others, have had to consider lately, and we turned to Mr. Ormerod's book for guidance. Shall we test it by the pre-war consumption? Mr. Ormerod gives, at pp. 66 and 67, two statements, which we will set side by side.

				P. 66.	P. 67.
				Consumption of wool in million lbs.	
U.S.A.	{ 1909-10			588	} 505
	1910-11			451	
United Kingdom				490	515
France....				460	480
Germany				380	400
Austria-Hungary				—	140
Italy				—	60

and again at p. 67 he gives the consumption in the United Kingdom at 590 millions. We confess we cannot make these figures "tie up." Are they "greasy," or "clean" wool? What about Belgium? and what about Russia? Apparently the figures given at p. 66 are the "latest available" and those at p. 67 are the estimates of post-war requirements for normal full-time running. Apparently, again, they are a compound of greasy and scoured, and have to be "appraised" before the quantities of "clean" wool can be estimated. The fact is that before the war we knew little about the consumption, production, machinery, and personnel of the industry in any country, and that to-day we only know much of a surety about our own. We know, for instance, that about 35 million lbs. clean per month has been required to run our industry during the past twelve months; that this is on a rationed civilian basis; that army goods are much heavier and consume much more wool per spindle than pre-war civilian goods; and that the hosiery trade of the Midlands, working up to 90 per cent. on heavy military goods, has had to be supplied from Yorkshire instead of from Belgian and German spindles. We have done it—to our own marvel when we look back on it. But the lesson for the moment is that somewhere about 33 million lbs. clean wool, or 400 million lbs. per annum, at roughly 58 per cent. yield, or 690 million lbs. greasy will keep the spindles of the United Kingdom going.¹ We do not know what is required, on the same basis, for any other country. How many spindles have they? How many looms? How many employees? Mr. Ormerod does not say, and we do not know. An official estimate of the spindles of the United States of America exceeds by a million the number recorded by the Association of Woollen Manufacturers. Is the discrepancy genuine or does the official estimate include "twisting" spindles, which as everyone knows are not consuming spindles at all? Again we cannot tell.

In sober truth the statistics of the trade are lamentably wanting. The statistics of the Home Office survey of textile factories are fourteen years old, and it is known that while hundreds of looms in Bradford, Keighley, and Silsden have gone from wool-using to cotton-using (the one being rationed and the other free) there are more looms to-day in the trade than then. Mr. Ormerod gives 70,000 as the number of persons employed in the woollen trade of the United Kingdom, and 190,000 in the worsted branch, all in Yorkshire. It is a good guess, but that is all. And so we might go on. Mr. Ormerod certainly tells us more than any recent writer—and tells us all he could find out, but it is precious little compared with what we want and need to know. When will the Board of Trade, or the Ministry of Labour, give us some real surveys of the main industries, at home and abroad?

¹ Possibly this is based on too high a usage of wool in the woollen branch of the trade. If so, perhaps 30 million lbs. clean a month, 360 million lbs. per annum, or about 620 million lbs. greasy would see us through.

And now, having thanked Mr. Ormerod for what he has done, and pointed out what he couldn't do, let us end by pointing to a slip or two.

At p. 10 he speaks of "something more than the baits said to have been held out by the historian Fuller" when he means that Fuller said they were held out. At p. 32 he says "and, despite the progress in machinery, even to-day the best and most durable woollen materials are made by hand." We ask, Where? At p. 48 he makes unqualified the statement that "woollens . . . are many times heavier and bulkier than worsteds," when he means that *on the average* they are so. Some worsteds are heavier and bulkier than the average woollens, by several ounces to the yard. At p. 51 the statement that during the war "Not only was there a call for every available pound of wool sheared since the war began, but old stocks were drawn upon to their utmost limit" gives the wrong impression. It is true in Europe, but the stock of wool in Australia, &c., is enormous. At p. 51 he uses the phrase "totally inadequate," which, if we understand it, means literally that in this connection there was no shipping at all! Mr. Ormerod means "very inadequate."

But these are small blemishes, easy of correction when a new edition is called for, as it will soon be if the book gets the sale it deserves.

G.H.W.

5.—*Use of Factory Statistics in the Investigation of Industrial Fatigue—A Manual for Field Research.* By Philip Sargent Florence, M.A., Ph.D. (A separate issue of vol. lxxxix of *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*, issued by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.) 153 pp. 1a., 8vo. New York and London: P. S. King and Sons, 1918. Price \$1 25 cents.

This volume deals with a subject of the highest importance. The study of industrial fatigue absorbed much of the time of the Health of Munitions Workers Committee during the War, and a new authority has now been constituted and entrusted with the expenditure of a considerable sum of public money upon furthering our knowledge of the subject. Some investigators have already been appointed, and in the near future a large staff will be engaged in the elucidation of a cardinal problem of industrial organisation; consequently a demand exists for guides to field work. Dr. Florence, who was for some time a member of the Health of Munitions Workers Committee's staff and has since filled a similar post in America, has had considerable practical experience of research work, and his book contains a good many useful hints for the beginner and valuable warnings as to the pitfalls which yawn at the feet of the unwary. He rightly insists upon what he terms the ambiguity of records and gives several helpful illustrations from his own experience. His chapter on "The Output Rate" deserves praise in this connection.

While we think that most investigators would derive useful instruction from Dr. Florence's book, we cannot honestly say that it is a