WILEY

Review

Author(s): A. de Foville

Review by: A. de Foville

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 49 (Mar., 1903), pp. 99-106

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2956879>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 06:50 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.

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

edition, and is to be followed by a translation of both parts of volume II. of that edition. This short explanation is offered here because a certain confusion has been caused by the fact that the second edition appeared in three sections. The reason for this fact is no doubt that Dr. Pierson took office in 1897, when he had revised only part of volume II., and his readers had to wait till he lost office in 1901 before they got the remaining instalment of the second edition.

That the present translation is very useful to students, and that we are all greatly indebted to Mr. Wotzel for undertaking and skilfully carrying out this translation, scarcely needs saying. The work of translation has been excessively difficult, but the translator has succeeded in producing a clear and readable book. But is it a book which would be suitable as a text-book for teaching purposes? Mill's treatise was unfortunately written before the theory of value was understood; Jevons' *Theory* is rather difficult and mathematical; Henry Sidgwick's *Principles of Political Economy* is far too difficult for the beginner; Professor Nicholson's three volumes are very brightly written but they have certain defects for teaching purposes; Professor Marshall's Volume I. is rather too difficult for the beginner, though it stands unrivalled in its complete excellence. Here, then, is an opportunity. Dr. Pierson's is very clear and lucid, but at the same time scientific; it is not written by a mere theorist but by a practical man; it contains many practical illustrations, and finally, it may be an advantage to the English student to read a book which is not written from the English point of view. For these reasons, economic teachers would be well advised to make the experiment of using this work as a text-book; experience alone will show how far it is fitted to replace the English text-books now in use; but the teacher should gain by using a new book: he will be less likely to remain in his old groove. Perhaps the book is a little large, but it is not larger than most treatises on economics, and certainly it is easier reading than many of them.

C. P. SANGER

Les Systèmes Socialistes. Cours professé à l'Université de Lausanne. Par VILFREDO PARETO. (Paris: Giard et Brière. 2 vols., 8vo. 1902.)

HUMOROUSLY prophesying in his review of this important work, Mr. Francesco Papafava has been telling the readers of the *Giornale degli Economisti* that within a hundred years historical dictionaries will be designating his fellow-countryman, Vilfredo Pareto, as the "eminent French economist." The name is good Italian for all that, and the soil on which the author of "Systems of Socialism" lectures and writes is Helvetian. But his preference, as author and as professor, of the French language, and his mastery of it, are sufficiently marked to justify posterity in calling it his mother tongue. And truly no one

H 2

in France, unless it might be French Socialists, would raise a protest against the annexation of one of the strongest and most penetrating intellects of the present day. In the school of French liberalism, M. Pareto, far from being supernumerary or subordinate, would have the right to a seat of honour, and would fill up a present gap.

He would become the leading national authority in mathematical economics. Cournot was its founder, but his fate was that of the prophet at home. It was beneath other skies, English, Swiss, Italian, Austrian, American even, that the seed rejected by France flourished and fructified. M. Pareto is of those who manipulate curve and equation with enthusiasm and with success. Sometimes it may appear to his friends, and even to his disciples, that his use of them becomes abuse. But this were a time ill-chosen to break a lance over that with him, seeing that, in the new work we are now to consider, he denies himself the use of algebraic formulæ elsewhere so prodigally used. The utmost he allows himself in that direction is to juxtapose, in his Introduction, elementary symbols of lines, dots and letters, to aid, in his opinion, the comprehension of the ordinary working of those sophisms, by which humanity often succeeds, and loves to succeed, in deceiving itself.

This time, then, he has expressed himself, practically throughout, in prose, judging rightly that the trial of Socialism was not a case for a handful of experts. Yet he decided with reluctance. In chapter II., he complains, as many another has done, of the want of precision, and the resulting ambiguity, in the terms which economic science is fain to borrow from current vocabularies. "Political economy," he writes, "has suffered all too much thereby, and its future progress is intimately bound up with the adoption of a strictly scientific terminology." It should be remembered that he himself laid the first stone of such an edifice in his doctrine of that species of utility which he distinguished as "ophélimité." And in *Systems of Socialism*, while he avoids all neologisms, he is indefatigable in bringing out the different meanings attaching to one and the same term denoting them, where required, by symbols. Thus, Capital P means capital as defined by Proudhon; Capital S means capital as defined by Socialists; Capital X means capital as defined by economists. And this expedient suffices to show the number of *qui pro quo* complicating discussions between opponents and defenders of capital. Elsewhere, again he shows how different parties, in applying the noble word "liberty" to illustrate their various standpoints, all, by means of arbitrary interpretations, make it subserve their particular ends. This, the fallacy of equivocation, is to him specially odious. And he illustrates his strictures by quotations from Plato and Tibullus, Hegel and Comte, M.M. Jaurès and Berthelot, which tell in a way that is the reverse of flattering to the author quoted.

It is evident that both a word and its import have not the same

precision for moralist or sociologist as they have for geometer or chemist. If we required a proof, we might find it in M. Pareto himself, for even in his case it happens that he now and again strains the ordinary meaning of certain words. To take an example, there are some excellent pages in chapter IV. of the first volume, where he shows that when a social reform demands a transformation in natural character, it cannot possibly attain its end unless the sentiment of religion intervenes as the motive force. "From the point of view of Socialism," he remarks, "religious systems are those which have been most fertile in practical applications." And he acknowledges that, for holding human egoism under sustained control, religion is a passion stronger than even love or pride. We agree, and, in agreeing, are disposed to see one reason the more for not believing in the "imminent success of Marxist Socialism," either in France or elsewhere. But we must be wrong, for our author proceeds, on the contrary, to find in his assertion a reason for the rapid advance of Marxism. To do this, he in his turn turns to account the elasticity of words, and makes of contemporary Socialism a religion, calling it "the great religion of modern times." Have we not here one of those metaphors, those verbal approximations, the danger besetting which we have just seen M. Pareto very justly pointing out?

Scruples similar in kind keep us back from unreserved adherence to the author's *théorie des élites* put forward as refuting at once all Utopias based on equality. He makes of it a law of history. We, for our part, see in it an ideal often repudiated by facts. An apparent divergence which may also resolve itself into a question of words. Aristocracies are not eternal, as we know. For a new minority, uprisen from below, to supersede as governing force an older minority, in whom privilege has served but to hasten decline, is not merely a usual phenomenon in the annals of nations but a normal sequence. But when an irruptive body thus comes forward, like a predestined legion detaching itself from the main army to take the lead, does that prove it to be in very deed the "best?" In the case of a slow and silent evolution, it may reasonably be granted that the determining cause is the intellectual and moral superiority of men who will rule to-morrow over those who were masters yesterday. But in social collisions as in other combats, it often happens that not the most worthy but the least scrupulous come off victorious. We may also see this, we may, indeed, see it quite especially, where the people in virtue of manhood suffrage, are able to create and to destroy. M. Pareto will know that better than we do. Why then lay it down as a principle that the necessary explanation and justification of success lies in merit? If a garden be left to itself, the fairest flowers will quickly be choked and supplemented by weeds. Are we, therefore, to call the nettle and the thistle the *élite* of the vegetable kingdom?

We have emphasised the difficulty felt by the economist, whatever language he may use, in clearly enunciating his ideas with words that

are always more or less vague, because in the first place, M. Pareto himself has laid stress on this point. And secondly, because the subject which he has so learnedly investigated owes its extreme complexity to precisely the number and diversity of ideas called up by the term—so incessantly repeated at the present time—of “Socialism.” Take any two persons first to hand :—it is improbable that they will both attach the same meaning to the word. Even one and the same person may frequently be heard distinguishing two Socialisms :—sound Socialism, that is, his own, and false Socialism. So we find ourselves well up on the tower of Babel, and confess that the task undertaken by our gallant colleague, and so well wrought, was worth going far afield after, namely, to define Socialism as a whole ; then to disentangle each specific form in which it has been invested by different peoples, or by the conception of different thinkers, and to judge it by scientific standards. Such is the leading idea in the brilliant exposition of which the students at Lausanne University have had the good fortune to receive the first impression. The two volumes before us reproduce the lectures with but little modification.

To have defined Socialism were in itself no small achievement. M. Pareto has set himself to the task and the reader can discern how unwieldy it has proved. He will not admit that a Socialistic organisation is simply “an artificial organisation” of national life as opposed to “a natural organisation.” The optimist school is given to expressions of that sort. But he puts the question, “What is an artificial social organisation, and how may it be distinguished from a natural organisation? If, by this latter term we are to understand such as have been developed in the course of nature and do actually exist, then the term “Socialistic organisation” acquires an extension altogether too wide. . . . If by natural organisation we mean one that permits man to follow all his natural instincts, we denote Utopia pure and simple.”

According to our author, the chief point in considering social systems is to note the restrictions which they impose on the rights of property. In the concept “rights of property” there can be no absolute extreme. Private property cannot be wholly suppressed, neither can it be sanctioned without any limitations whatever. But between these two extremes lie a host of combinations tending to one limit or the other of the scale. And this criterion M. Pareto has made choice of, after full inquiry. According to his view “the essential mark of a Socialistic system is the sanctioning of the minimum of private property.” This may appear a somewhat exclusive point of view. We can point to countries, manifestly impregnated with Socialism, where the rights of property have not been abolished or even directly threatened. On the other hand there have been despotisms which involved almost the negation of private property, yet which no one has called Socialistic. The proposed criterion, therefore, may solicit our adherence, but does

not constrain it. But if we refuse it, as well close the book. And that were too great a deprivation.

A comparative analysis of Socialistic systems might be sent out either in chronological order, or on a philosophical and rational plan. Both methods have their advantages and their adherents. M. Eugène d'Eichthal, for instance, in his excellent treatise¹ begins at the beginning, takes up Socialism at its source, follows its course, now patent, now latent, and, coming to the present, shows how the river, swollen by a hundred tributaries, splits up suddenly like the Po and the Nile at their deltas. The more didactic taste of M. Pareto prefers to be guided by the intrinsic nature of things and less by the historic succession of facts. At the outset he divides Socialist doctrines into two principal categories, subdividing these into secondary groups:—Firstly, actual systems, political or religious. Secondly, theoretical systems, metaphysico-communistic, metaphysico-ethical, mixed and scientific. As a field of study this yields a somewhat complicated flora. It is a classification that was evidently not hit upon at the first glance, since the boundaries it assumes are not all of them natural. But that is not really of much consequence.

We make no pretension here and now of following the author in his long journey over Socialistic territory. We would rather advise all who are interested in so weighty a problem to read with diligence a work where the most learned will still find something to learn while we confine ourselves to a few remarks bearing, as is but natural, on those points wherein we are not wholly at one with our distinguished friend. Such reservations as we have to state are few in number and not by any means equally important. We had hoped—why should we not confess it?—to have seen the actual, if not the theoretical systems appraised with somewhat more originality and penetration. Here too we come at once upon a very elastic expression, inasmuch as under actual systems are grouped not only “such as have existed,” but those too which “are believed to have existed.” History and legend are hardly one and the same thing. It may be no easy matter to trace the line of demarcation between each. Witness to what extent the assertions of historians like De Laveleye and Fustel de Coulange are being disputed. Our present guide after a brief incursion into the very hypothetical Edens of the golden age, where Ovid assures us that *signabat nullo limite mensor humum*, takes us to Sparta, Crotona, Athens, Rome. But his object is to estimate the real worth of the so-called types of Socialistic organisation traced by certain writers in the laws of Lycurgus, the precepts of Pythagoras, &c. When we proceed to deal with the ways of exploiting the land—collective and alternative—obtaining in Russia, India, Java and China, a similar scepticism seems out of place. In cases of agricultural communities the origin lies often in the gradual extension of the family. Not only have the servants,

¹ *Socialisme, Communisme, et Collectivisme ; aperçu de l'histoire et des doctrines jusqu'à nos jours.* Par Eugène d'Eichthal. 2e édition. Paris : 1901. Guillaumin.

whether slaves or not, been absorbed by it, but also isolated individuals and even other family groups. M. Pareto seems to take it somewhat amiss in these rural communisms to have existed at all, and in some cases to have existed prosperously. He can see in them only an accident of history, an unstable and transient feature, wherein the very extension of the group paves the way to its dissolution.

Nor can Socialist experts claim to find an apology in those Socialistic organisations, based on ignorance and servitude, which the Incas established in Peru and the Jesuits in Paraguay. And there is even less justification to be derived from certain communistic schemes, born of violence and dying early and violent deaths, such as were seen in Persia under Mastek or Babek, in Bohemia in the time of John Huss, &c. These were but sinister models to set up.

Nor is there any tendency in contemporary democracies towards religious forms of Socialism. Possibly this is the reason why M. Pareto has had recourse to the help of a friendly pen for the writing of his chapter on "Religious Systems."¹ His collaborator does not seem to have put into his contribution as much scientific effort as he was capable of. It seems to us that, if the purely anecdotal and epigrammatic materials were withdrawn, not much would remain of the chapter. Such treatment might suffice in the case of remote phases, such as that of Pythagorean philosophers, or of Buddhist fraternities, or of Mormons. But the religious orders which occupy such a considerable place in the Catholic world, deserved a less superficial estimate. Quite apart from all sectarian leanings, it is nothing less than astonishing to find assertions of the "rapid degeneration" of all religious communities, and of their "markedly parasitic character from the economic point of view." One of these statements is sufficiently answered by the extraordinary vitality of the fraternities created by men like S. Francis of Assisi and S. Dominic, Ignatius de Loyola and Vincent de Paul. As to the other, it argues scanty knowledge of the lives of missionaries, of teaching orders, or of nursing sisterhoods to call these non-values, even in the economic sense of the word. Recent events in France, first in the hospitals and subsequently in the elementary schools, have enabled us to judge between these humble servants of the masses and those by whom they have legally been superseded. It has been a striking object-lesson. It is contended that theirs is a leisured poverty, living on alms. Would it then be a progressive measure to add to the burden of the ratepayer a charge for those services which have hitherto been freely maintained by voluntary liberality? Moreover the imputation is itself inaccurate. There is not a doctor in the Paris hospitals, free thinker, Protestant, or Catholic, who does not regret the time when, in return for a salary

¹ It is stated in a note that the end of chapter IV, and the whole of chapter V, are exclusively the work of M. Vittorio Racca, professor at the University of Lausanne. The remainder of the work is solely by M. Pareto, whose name alone appears on the title-page.

of minimum amount, women saturated with the evangelical spirit lavished their quasi-motherly care on the sick poor. To-day the dominant influence is political. These women are superseded in their functions by mere hirelings, offscourings of domestic service, and expenses are trebled. The fact that the Socialist party makes no attempt to get any political capital out of the example of certain religious communities makes it all the easier for us to do justice to the merits and social utility of the latter. One would think it had been to their interest had Socialists said: "Our programme is not Utopian, for see how, in convents, men and women can live happily under conditions which insure equality by abolishing private property." To this it might be replied that such a *régime* may be practicable where exceptional natures have freely subjected themselves to it, but that it may not be acceptable to the general public with their very different aspirations. But there is no need for us to bring forward this refutation, since the Socialist programme, far from holding up the existence and prosperity of monastic orders as an argument in its favour, regards them as a rule with contempt and enmity. A fact that adds to their other inconsistencies.

The chapters of M. Pareto's book which are devoted to theoretical systems, divided as we have stated above, will give most umbrage to the apostles of Socialism, but will afford most satisfaction to the more impartial among them. The author's rigorous logic gets often a fine opportunity. It is only to be regretted that the general conclusions of the work are not more compactly brought together. The reader has to take the trouble to collect them himself, and has some title to complain. The economy in method would probably have been different had the book, prior to publication, not existed as a "course," as a series of oral lessons addressed to the youthful audience of a Swiss university. This is no doubt responsible for its material structure, and for what one may call the decentralised form of the work. The professor who comes but one or two hours in the week into contact with his pupils is, on that account, induced to arrange his expositions otherwise than the writer who compiles a book in the silence and seclusion of the study. The latter reserves his theoretical or practical conclusions for the last chapter. The professor cannot keep his hearers waiting for these till months have passed, but is constrained by force of circumstances to sow them here and there as he goes along.

We would gladly ask M. Pareto when another edition is due, to decide, in the second volume, to let synthesis definitely follow analysis. None better than he could show how all the Socialist systems, whether radically subversive or moderate in character, have this in common, that they abstract the real nature of man such as we see it, ever the same, from century to century, from one people to another. The Thomas Mores, the Jean Jacques Rousseaus, the Proudhons of the twentieth century are no less chimerical in their conceptions than the originals whom we know. All of them, more or less, make laws for

fictitious beings who bear only an external resemblance to us. How can one fail to understand that, from the day when work would no longer have, as an incentive, personal interest or family interest, the general strenuousness would suddenly falter, and production, whatever process were adopted, would be reduced to a minimum? This would involve, after a brief interval, the ruin of humanity and the break-up of civilisation. Some among us who will prove reformers have not failed to discern this truth, and have shaped their course accordingly. Envy is a sentiment so easily excited, without external fostering, that it might be possible to find a majority ready to choose general destitution, a common scarcity, in preference to the fearful contrast prevailing between the deprivations of the poor and the luxury of the millionaire.

But if a levelling collectivism were carried into effect, it would quickly dash itself against a more perilous rock than the swift impoverishment of the human race. It is evident that persuasion alone would be powerless to realise and to maintain the universal equalisation. To silence protest and to break down resistance, coercion, if not terror, would have to be applied, and applied everywhere, not only in the law-court and the barracks, but in the workshop, the farm, and even within the home. It would be the *régime* of the penitentiary, but very slightly mitigated. Society would find itself divided into two camps: the gaolers and the prisoners. Can it be believed that the people, poorer and more oppressed, as a whole, than ever, would better tolerate the yoke of Socialist mandarinism, than the supremacy of a hereditary aristocracy or the plutocratic autocracy of to-day? Were it not that the experiment of Collectivism would cost the world too dear, one could wish to see it tried, if only to open eyes that are hypnotised by a vain dream. The demonstration would be more convincing and more decisive than any that the books can show.

A. DE FOVILLE