WILEY

Review

Author(s): L. L. Price

Review by: L. L. Price

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 13 (Mar., 1894), pp. 82-84

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2955873>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 01:09 UTC

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

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, Royal Economic Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to
The Economic Journal

book is set forth in such large characters and with such ability that the critics cannot evade the challenge.

It would be unfair to leave any of our readers under the impression that the work of Professor Loria is mainly destructive. It may be doubted if any other economist of our time has written so much to interest and stimulate; and there was probably never, even in Germany, one so thoroughly conversant with the literature of his subject in almost every European language.

J. BONAR

The Labour Movement. By L. T. HOBHOUSE. With Preface by R. B. HALDANE, M.P. (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1893.)

IN this able and suggestive essay Mr. Hobhouse has attempted to furnish a philosophical basis for certain tendencies of thought and action, which are now prominent, and are conveniently embraced under the popular, if vague, description of 'The Labour Movement.' He has endeavoured to show that these tendencies are, unconsciously it may be, working in the same general direction, that they are complementary, and not antagonistic, and that, while apparently proceeding on different lines, they are in reality moving towards one goal. Trades unions are defending and advancing the interests of producers, and securing for them a minimum wage which will suffice to provide the requirements of a decent and—what is more important—efficient existence. The Co-operative Movement, which even now comprehends an appreciable proportion of the English community, endeavours to 'communist' profits in the interests of consumers, and to regulate the fluctuations of production which otherwise has to seek its market hap-hazard. And compulsory municipal and state socialism is needed to supplement the deficiencies of the two voluntary movements. By factory regulation it must secure for the unorganised the needful protection which organisation might only bring by slow degrees; and it must also obtain and administer for the common benefit that surplus of rent and of interest which now passes into private hands, and undertake the direction of industrial enterprises suited to its own powers and unfitted for voluntary co-operation. All these movements are united together by the 'general character of the means they adopt for the furtherance of their ends. In one form or another all three alike are introducing the principle of the collective control of industry by the community in the interest of all its members. They are seeking to replace competition and the forces of individual self-interest as the arbiters of industry, by a deliberate and systematic arrangement of labour and commerce in the best interests of society as a whole. They are all at present in an inchoate or incomplete condition which, to some extent, disguises this common character, but this none the less expresses their essential tendencies and the secret of their life and vigour.'

The quotation we have made contains in brief Mr. Hobhouse's thesis. It represents, as Mr. Haldane points out in a preface, an attitude of thought which is now being adopted by a growing school of thinkers, who see in society 'a living whole' and 'not a mere aggregate of individuals.' It is developed in the essay before us with admirable lucidity and persuasive ardour. Mr. Hobhouse has brought to a congenial task an adequate equipment—both of philosophical and of economic knowledge—and he has displayed a tolerance and discrimination which are not always present in the writings of the school to which he avowedly belongs. The use which he has made of the conception—lately popularised by Mrs. Webb—of the Co-operative Movement as a community of consumers providing a stable market for production and communising profits for their general benefit, seems to us to be very dexterous; and no less ingenious is the manner in which he has employed Professor Marshall's distinction between long and short periods in connection with normal prices and earnings to demonstrate the shortcomings of the competitive system. We do not use these epithets with any invidious intention: we rather wish to show how abreast Mr. Hobhouse is of the latest developments of economic speculation. But we must confess that we have not been entirely convinced by the reasoning of his essay, and one of the points, to which we have just referred, may perhaps serve to illustrate our position. It is always a tempting project to bring the varied actions of men within the compass of a neat philosophical system, but it can only be done by emphasising some characteristics, and by leaving others comparatively unnoticed. The danger of this necessary process is that the emphasis may be misplaced or exaggerated, and, while we are far from saying that Mr. Hobhouse has not shown that he is alive to this danger, we do not think that he has succeeded in entirely avoiding the error which is consequent upon it. Is it, we may ask, safe to pronounce definitely that the essence of the Co-operative Movement consists in that particular conception of it which Mr. Hobhouse emphasises? His view indeed is supported by the powerful testimony of Mrs. Webb's remarkable book and by evidence recently given before the Labour Commission; but we are not sure that a broader and more philosophical view would not accord some recognition to the opinions of the Christian Socialists and their living, and by no means inactive, disciples. Similarly, when Mr. Hobhouse, forecasting the future of trades unionism, notes the present developments of federalism as likely to correct some of the narrowing tendencies of separate unions, does he allow sufficient weight to the somewhat abundant records of the failure of attempts at federalism in the past? Or, once more, when dwelling, as he does somewhat cursorily, on the possible dangers of state or municipal socialism, is his ground entirely sure when he holds up the Post Office to admiration? It is not so very long ago that the newspapers were full of the difficulty of inducing that department, protected as it was by monopoly, to supply facilities for the express

delivery of messages of equal convenience and efficiency to those which private enterprise was ready to furnish. Nor lastly, in his treatment of the communisation of rent and of interest, does he, as it appears to us, allow sufficient consideration to the practical difficulties of isolating and identifying these theoretical surpluses.

All these failings, if failings they be, we are inclined to attribute to the beguiling influence of a philosophical theory. Mr. Hobhouse seems to err, though by some doubtless it will not be regarded as error, in pushing his theory to its logical conclusion. But surely it is rarely, if ever, that the roughness of practice corresponds with the neatness of theory. In economic theory, for example, it is possible to distinguish a producer's surplus, and yet few conceptions have of recent years given birth to a larger progeny of crude illusions than that of an unearned increment. And again, it is easy to point to many signs of the times which seem to indicate the approach of Socialism, and would afford conclusive evidence of it, if only the English people were logical. But the stubborn fact remains that they are often, perhaps generally, illogical, and that never probably was there a nation so little disposed to be influenced by pure philosophical conceptions. A neglect to realise these considerations appears to us to vitiate much contemporaneous speculation; and, while we fully appreciate Mr. Hobhouse's ability, and gratefully recognise his ardour for social improvement, and admire his cogency and lucidity, we have not been able to rid ourselves of some feeling of distrust about the necessary character of his conclusions.

L. L. PRICE

Social Peace: A Study of the Trade Union Movement in England.

By DR. G. VON SCHULZE-GAEVERNITZ. Translated [and extracted from a larger work, *Zum Socialen Frieden*, 2 vols. Leipzig, 1890] by C. M. WICKSTEED and Edited by GRAHAM WALLAS. (London: Sonnenschein. 1893.)

So little has been written upon the actual facts of labour organisation that Miss Mabel Wicksteed has done a specially useful work in translating, and Mr. Graham Wallas in editing, Dr. von Schulze-Gaevernitz's impressive account of the English Trade Union Movement. In its original form, *Zum Socialen Frieden*, with its two thick volumes, its elaborate preliminary analysis of Carlyle and Ruskin, its ponderously conscientious descriptions of every existing English institution and every real or fancied social tendency, Dr. von Schulze-Gaevernitz's book is apt, while it edifies, somewhat to irritate the English reader. But Mr. Wallas has proved that it is possible to cut out of it a very passable account of Trade Unionism, framed in a setting of suggestive social theory. The resulting handy volume of 300 pages, well translated into fluent English, will usefully supplement, though it does not supersede, Mr. George Howell's *Conflicts of Capital*