WILEY

Review

Author(s): H. Reynard

Review by: H. Reynard

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 121 (Mar., 1921), pp. 76-78

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2223294>

Accessed: 10-05-2016 13:20 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*

the first place, these are not watertight, but are liable to overlap, clash and conflict; and, which is more important, if there is not one organisation admitted as supreme, some one or other, originally constructed for a different purpose, will arrogate to itself the right, and usurp the position.

Perhaps the least convincing portion of the book is Mr. Field's discussion on Industrial Democracy. The comparison which he draws between political and industrial democracy is both interesting and sound, but when he argues that the latter would not broaden the worker's outlook or widen his sympathies beyond the limit of trade or profession; that it would, on the contrary, cramp and narrow his mental outlook and limit his sympathies, we cannot agree with him. His treatment of the whole question of self-government in industry is somewhat lacking in sympathy, and makes it probable that any Guild Socialists who could bring themselves to read this lucid and closely-reasoned criticism of their system, would immediately reject it as having missed the soul and spirit of their philosophy.

H. REYNARD

The Principles of Sociology. By EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS, Ph.D., LL.D. (New York: The Century Co. 1920. Pp. xviii + 708.)

THE object of this book is not only to attain knowledge, but to guide conduct; not only to discover the laws that govern social relations, but to show where improvements can be effected. The work is very comprehensive, and leaves practically no corner of the field unexplored, the writer combining description of historical fact with psychological analysis of human instinct and motives. He examines first social forces, then the processes in which these manifest themselves, and the resultant products. Lastly he deduces sociological principles for the guidance of policy. This method necessarily involves some repetition, since the sins and the virtues, the motives and conduct which were investigated in the discussion of social processes, reappear in the consideration of products, and can hardly be left out when the writer comes to principles. The interest of the questions raised, however, and the lucidity and acuteness with which they are discussed, carry the reader along through the enormous mass of detail.

After making allowance for differences due to climate, geographical environment, and race *psyche*, Professor Ross comes back to elementary human instincts as fundamental sociological

facts. He lays most stress on the instinct of domination—the domination of men over women, of fighters over workers, of rich over poor; and the instinct of exploitation, which is the leading purpose of domination. The motives at work are subjected to searching analysis, and the theories so often invoked in their defence are ruthlessly exposed. The chapter on the rise of gross inequalities is less convincing. “The dominant class,” says Professor Ross, “always propagates the idea that social distinctions have originated in differences of personal capacity and virtue.” This, like the rest of his indictments of privilege, can hardly be disputed. But when he maintains that “the ups and downs of fortune which happen all about us in consequence of individual differences in ability, enterprise, character, or diligence, shed little light on the origin of fixed classes,” it is not so easy to agree with him. His own description of the founders of a leisured class could be interpreted as evidence in favour of the very point at issue. The early warriors who first protected, then exploited, the tillers of the soil; the serf who was the first to run away and eventually became lord over his old companions; the adventurous Australian sheepman who got ahead of Government surveys; the land-grabber in every corner of the globe—these, according to Professor Ross, laid the foundations of a leisured class, and they possessed precisely those qualities of superior ability, enterprise, and character, though it might be but the enterprise to exploit and rob, and the ability to get in first.

The writer can offer no panacea for the class struggle. Various factors have served in the past to mitigate the conflict. A huge exploited class may be kept inert by the opportunities for climbing out of it which deprive it of its natural leaders. The breadth of economic opportunity retarded the appearance of the Labour movement in the United States. But when “free land” came to an end, and the working man’s opportunity of becoming a capitalist disappeared, the class struggle emerged. The modern social problem, Professor Ross considers, has been created neither by labour agitators nor by capitalist greed; it arose inevitably out of the development of machine industry, and there is no sign at present of any real solution of these problems.

The sociological principles which the writer finally commends to the attention of social students and reformers are the principles of anticipation, of individualisation, and of balance. In every detail of life we anticipate—policy must be shaped, therefore, to produce results by anticipating these anticipations. Thus

the law of Workmen's Compensation is beneficial, not so much because it indemnifies the employee who is actually injured, as because it induces employers to adopt safety devices. Economists have learnt that where wealth is not safe from depredation, presently no wealth will be produced. It is a commonplace that indiscriminate charity calls into existence more poverty than it relieves.

The principle of individualisation is a necessary corrective to the tendency for dealing with mankind as a crowd. We suffer from too much machinery—from the governmental machine, the ecclesiastical, the military, and the educational machine. We are inclined to lump together all manual workers, all the poor, all the law-breakers. But human diversity is endless, and we neglect it at our peril.

Again, society must be on its guard against the "Simulator." Among these the writer gives the palm to the class of commercial evildoers, which is probably the most numerous, but the professionalising of something which ought not to be done for payment is more serious because more elusive. The professional mendicant, athlete, expert witness, the worldly cleric who uses the pulpit as a means of getting on, the labour leader whose only care is to keep his job, the professional agitator, the professional politician, and, above all, the *agent provocateur*, are plague spots which society should at all costs aim at stamping out.

We must conclude that no one element in society ought to be allowed to preponderate, since each is necessarily biased by its distinctive work and mode of living. The writer once again recapitulates the forces which have always been allowed undue sway: masculine ascendancy and its inevitable concomitant—militarism; clericalism, with its tendency to crush initiative and keep the intellect in leading strings; commercialism, with its callous blindness to everything but profit. The follies and futilities of the leisured classes receive their final measure of condemnation. All the elements must be duly balanced. "In the guidance of Society each social element should share according to the intelligence and public spirit of its members, and none should dominate."

H. REYNARD

Labour's Challenge to the Social Order. By JOHN GRAHAM BROOKS. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1920. Pp. 441. 15s.)

"If war comes between Capital and Labour, how shall you take sides?" This question was asked of the writer in 1894, and