SOCIAL CONTROL. XIX.

CLASS CONTROL.

It was shown in the last paper that inhibiting impulses radiate not only from the social mass, but also from certain centers of extraordinary prestige and influence. Control under these circumstances is still social. But when the chief center of such inhibition is a class living at the expense of the rest of the community, we no longer have social control in the true sense, but *class control*. This may be defined as *the exercise of power by a parasitic class in its own interest*.

There are various devices by means of which a body of persons may sink their fangs into their fellows and subsist upon them. Slavery, or the immediate and absolute disposal over the labor force of another, is the primary form of the parasitic relation. By modifying this into serfdom the parasitic class, without in the least abating its power of securing nourishment from others, places itself in a position more convenient to it and less irritating to the exploited. When the absolute state comes into being, that direct absorption of nutriment by the parasite from the host, which characterizes feudalism, falls a little into the background. For example, the French state, as it existed under the old régime, was a vast coercing apparatus that collected goods from the producers by means of taxation and redistributed them among the favored parasites by means of royal patronage. Finally, the institution of property is so shaped as to permit a slanting exploitation under which a class is able to live in idleness by monopolizing land or other indispensable natural means of production.

These successive modulations of parasitism obey the principle of economy. To economize coercion, to economize supervision, to economize direction—these are the motives which lead masters to substitute for the coarse and direct kinds of exploitation refined and slanting kinds of exploitation. During this transition a great many personal rights come to be recognized

by the exploiters. The slave has no rights at all as against his master. The serf directs his own labor and looks out for his own keep, but is bound to the glebe. The subject of the absolute state is free to labor and to move about, to own and to sell as he pleases, but he must meet the heavy demands of the tax-gatherer. In the legal state the exploited is conceded as many personal freedoms as the exploiter, but he must scrupulously respect the rights conferred by ownership. In this expansion of rights there is a gradual escape of the person from the grasp of the parasite. More and more he becomes master of himself and of the fruits of his toil after he has rendered certain fixed dues to the master. The tremendous stimulus that such enfranchisement gives to the energy and capacity of the producers invariably causes a considerable accumulation of wealth in the hands of the non-parasites which veils the parasitic relation from incurious eyes.

Besides these changes in form which make it less harsh and palpable, social parasitism is further softened and attenuated by changes in the *personnel* of the exploiting and the exploited classes. The wall between these classes is least passable when it runs along the abyss that divides race from race, or people from people. The parasitic relation, pure and simple, is founded on unlikeness and transmitted by heredity. Those of noble blood have a perpetual claim to gratuitous support. Those who are base-born are under a perpetual obligation to render dues. Now the grimness of this situation is mitigated as soon as members of the superior class are liable to forfeit their places on the dais, while certain of the inferior may for signal merit be promoted to seats among the privileged. The heaving and strain of the wretches crammed in the hold of a slaver is less if, now and then, a few of the most redoubtable are let up on deck.

Likewise the admitting of a few brave, talented, or successful commoners into the charmed circle above has a wonderful effect in calming the rage and envy of the exploited, and thereby protracting the life of the parasitic system. In the absolute monarchy the yielding to capable commoners of a fair proportion of the rich posts and sinecures in state, army, and church is recognized

as an excellent means of prolonging the hold of the nobles upon the remainder. The short-sightedness of the French parasite orders on this point was one cause of their premature downfall; while, by timely and ample concessions to the new industrial élite, their brethren in England have, so far, saved their estates and their monopoly of the best offices.

The ennobling of new fortunes, the opening of careers to talent, the equalizing of opportunities, the dissolving of the hereditary classes through one another, and the increase of the social capillarity that facilitates the free ascent or descent of men in the social scale according to their personal fitness are the successive steps by which a society of parasites and hosts passes over into a hierarchy of classes graded according to success in a fair competition.

No people will toil and sweat to keep a class in idleness and luxury unless cajoled or compelled to do so. The parasitic class is, therefore, always a ruling class, and utilizes as many as it can of the means of control. But it is not by the means used that we can best distinguish this class control from social control. If we would know the real tenor of a control we should scrutinize the laws, obligations, and exceptions which it upholds. In other words, it is by studying the *constitution* of the society that we learn if there is a parasitic relation, and discover who are the parasites and who are the hosts. It is *what* men obey, rather than *why* they obey, that betrays the presence of class exploitation.

Still there is no doubt that in the gamut of motives to obedience the ruling class does not strike quite the same chords as the social group. When the exploited are not a cowering spaniel race, but are, from a purely human point of view, the equals of their masters, they will not respond to all the instruments of control that society is able to use upon its wayward members. Some of these instruments cannot be used at all, and others that can be used are so modified as to be scarcely recognizable. For instance, those pressures which reach the individual through the suggestion and opinion of those close about him cannot well be turned to account by the parasitic class. The immediate influences to which the slave, serf, or peasant is exposed

come from his afflicted fellows, from those who share his lowly station and lot, and who, like himself, are under the harrow. Their encouragement, indeed, will often fortify him in defiance and resistance of his spoilers. Of the slaves in old Rome we read :

They shrink from no blows ; they brave the most horrid punishments because they are proud to have deserved them. Among them, as happens sometimes among bands of criminals, there is formed a public opinion favoring everything that the public opinion of the masters condemns.

With them the point of honor is reversed. They pride themselves on lying, theft, deceit, just as their masters pride themselves on the opposite. One has but to mark the compliments they pay one another. The worst of them all, the one who has incurred the heaviest penalties, is the one who is most admired.¹

Likewise it is impracticable for the ruling class to manage their subjects by skillfully molding the personal ideals and valuations that reign in the social deeps. These are likely to shape themselves among the oppressed people quite independently of the will of the master. Indeed, he may count himself lucky if they do not antagonize his purposes in every way.

As unlikeness of interests, education, and mode of life forbids exploiters and exploited to share intimately a common life, there is between them little of the give-and-take that readily establishes itself among true associates. The leeches as a class cannot apply to the bled as a class any of those delicate pressures on the spirit, those volatile, suasive forms of psychic coercion, which bear upon the individual so long as he is among comrades and equals. It is safe, then, to lay it down as a rule that *only those inhibitive impulses which flow from a central determinate source can be controlled by a predaceous class.*

Thus, *suggestion* and *public opinion* are hardly come-at-able by an organization of *seigneurs*, because they do not flow out from a central source. They distill upon one from all sides. It is easy to poison a well ; but to poison the dew—that is quite another thing !

While, on the other hand, the checks and stimuli connected with *religion*, *art*, *personality*, and *personal ideals* do flow out from

¹ LACOMBE, *La Famille dans la société romaine*, p. 316, quoted by VACCARO, *Les bases sociologiques du droit et de l'état*, p. 271.

central sources, they cannot be reached for another reason. Because they emanate from the great man, the prophet, or the spiritual élite, their source is not determinate. They spring up, now here, now there. It is now this little knot of enthusiasts, and now that, which radiates these impulses. Vainly does the crafty, ruling class seek to control them and get them to do its work. It gains possession of the spring, but the spring forthwith dries up or turns bitter. It suborns the prophet, and his inspiration leaves him. It seduces the hero, and his followers miss the old charm in him and fall away. It wins over the singer, and lo! his voice rings cracked and false. It takes the ministers of religion into its pay, and behold! the people leave the appointed sanctuaries and hang on the burning words of some wild-eyed fanatic from the hills—a Shepherd of Tekoa, for instance, or a Piers Ploughman. It is chiefly, then, upon such engines of control as the supple hand can easily reach and manipulate that a ruling class must rely. Its best tools will be *law*, *belief in the supernatural*, *instruction*, *custom*, *ceremony*, and *illusion*.

These are the agents that, from the nature of the case, we should expect the ruling class to employ. But what are the facts? The props of parasitic rule, as history has revealed them over and over again, are *force*, *superstition*, *fraud*, *pomp*, and *prescription*. At first glance there appears to be a discrepancy here, but in a moment it is clear that these are simply degenerate forms of certain familiar supports of social order. What is *force* but the coarse, physical compulsion of *law*, without law's guarantees for the moderate and scrupulous exercise of this compulsion? What is *superstition* but a kind of *belief in supernatural sanctions* which in no wise springs up from the natural longing to see the iniquities of this world righted by the just decrees of the next? *Fraud* is one form of *illusion*. *Pomp* is *ceremony*, intended to impress, not the individual entering upon new responsibilities, but the envious, presuming populace. *Prescription* is that sanctity of *custom* which attaches to the social edifice within which we have been reared.

These favorite instruments of the parasitic orders resemble the corresponding instruments in the service of society, and yet

they have a ring and temper of their own. Both use force; but the force that society applies is felt by all concerned to be less arbitrary, less "brute," than the force a class uses against its victims. Both use hell; but hell, as it shapes itself in the social imagination, is the place of just retribution or expiation, while the hell devised by priestcraft is the torture-chamber of an angry tyrant. Both use heaven; but the heaven conceived by the élite is the place where the just shall "see God," while the heaven that the hirelings of parasites hold out to the poor is a place where they shall be recompensed for patient submission to their hard lot here. Both teach religion; but genuine social religion is the cult of fellowship, while the religion an upper class provides for a lower is the cult of obedience.

The contrast of religion in the service of a social idea and religion in the service of a ruling class comes out well when we compare Ezekiel's just man with that of England's bishopdom. Ezekiel's ideal man has not "defiled his neighbor's wife, neither hath he come near a menstruous woman, and hath not oppressed any; but hath restored to the debtor his pledge, hath spoiled none by violence, hath given his bread to the hungry, and hath covered the naked with a garment; . . . hath not given forth upon usury, neither hath taken any increase, . . . hath withdrawn his hand from iniquity, hath executed true judgment between man and man" (Ezek. 18:6-8). On the other hand, the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 defines "duty toward my neighbor" as including: "To honor and obey the king and all that are put in authority under him. To submit myself to all my governors, teachers, spiritual pastors and masters. To order myself, lowly and reverently to all my betters."

In a word, the true socializing agencies have sprung partly from disinterested ethical sentiment, and partly from shrewd social policy; while the enslaving agencies spring entirely from selfish policy. Through the measures that society uses with the rowdy or the hoodlum there flames and pulses some honest feeling; but the measures that a class employs upon its subjects are cold with egoism. The great constraining, as well as the great persuasive, influences are still alive with the love, pity, reverence,

or wrath out of which they grow; while the means utilized by an exploiting class are the lifeless tools of cold-blooded policy, shaped by cunning, and achieving a control that is crude and repulsive.

Each of the well-marked classes that incline to parasitism has its favorite and characteristic means of control. Soldiers rely on physical force, and hence the rule of the military caste is characterized by *brutality*. Priests naturally avail themselves of superstition and fraud, and so their domination is marked by *hypocrisy* and *craft*. Nobles, after they have lost their military virtues and become chiefly ornamental, impress with pomp and show, and hence their rule is marked by *pride* and—since only riches can keep up external splendor—by *rapacity*. All control is consecrated by age, and becomes prescriptive. Hence every ruling class becomes in time exceedingly *conservative*.

But no single class is long allowed to sit alone in the seats of the mighty. Unless it shares with them its privileges and advantages, other power-holders in society will combine for its overthrow. So there is a natural tendency for all power-holders to get together, sink their differences, and organize one great exploiting trust. As Europe emerged from the Dark Ages various social parasites appeared, one after the other—lords of the soil, the princes, the papacy, the financiers. By playing off one parasitic interest against another, the free townsmen and the peasants shook off, for a time, their tormentors. But the princes and the rich townsmen, joining forces, ruined the lesser nobles and reduced the rest to loyal courtiers. By nationalizing the church, or by seizing ecclesiastical property and patronage, the princes then deprived the papacy of much of its power of preying upon the rest of society, and compelled that close alliance of throne and altar which was so helpful to the growth of monarchy. In France, before the Revolution, all the chief means of spoliation, the ownership of the soil, taxation, spiritual prerogatives, and finance contributed to feed a monstrous wen which was fastened by all ligaments that can attach a parasitic growth, and which drew to itself most of the juices in the social body.

A predatory minority, then, presents itself at first as a governing class that by its toils, cares, and risks contrives to draw to itself the surplus goods of the governed. But, at a later stage of development, enjoyment and control are no longer vested in the same persons. The anatomy of a parasitic organization now shows at the center certain idle enjoyers surrounded by a great number of unproductive laborers who share in their spoil, and who in return busy themselves, as retainers, mercenaries, police, priests, teachers, or publicists, in intimidating, cajoling, or beguiling the exploited majority. It is at this stage of parasitism that the contrivances for holding down the exploited are the most varied and interesting.

The art of employing the organized collective might in the systematic keeping of order appears to have been developed by a ruling class rather than by the undifferentiated social whole. Common observation shows us that, in the nature of the case, a union that has for its purpose the mutual defense of the claims of each member against outsiders is easier to form and maintain than a union for the mutual guarantee of the claims of each member against the aggressions of his fellow-members. Owing to the clash of interests in the bosom of each adherent, the instituting of the latter union is by far the more difficult feat of joinery.

Now, in a society composed of a predaceous class and a subject mass, that is to say, of spoilers and spoiled, the coercive power develops readily out of a kind of mutual-defense (and offense!) association among the spoilers. In a simple society, on the other hand, it presupposes something like a mutual-guarantee association, and is, therefore, not likely to arise at so early a point in social development. This conjecture is confirmed by the growing mass of evidence which goes to show that the historical state has, in almost every instance, taken its origin in the violent superposition of one people upon another.¹ Begun in aggression and perfected in exploitation, the state, even now when it is more and more directed by the common will, is

¹ SPENCER, *Principles of Sociology*, Vol. II, "Political Institutions;" GUMPLOWICZ, *Der Rassenkampf*; RATZENHOFER, *Die sociologische Erkenntniss*.

not easy to keep from slipping back into the rut it wore for itself during the centuries it was the engine of a parasitic class.

The means whereby the minority can physically overpower and hold down the majority are many and well understood. They arm, train, and organize themselves as did the Spartans. Like the Normans they build themselves strongholds and castles. They girdle themselves with mercenaries as the princes of the old régime surrounded themselves with Swiss. They sow the seeds of enmity among their victims after the manner of the Hapsburgs in dealing with their subject peoples. They deprive them of weapons as the Spartans did the helots. Like the West India planters they prevent them from meeting, seeing, or communicating with one another. They keep them ignorant, following the policy of the southern slave-owners. They cut off their natural leaders as did the Roman masters. They break their spirit with overwork. They terrorize them with cruelties. They keep them under constant surveillance, as in classic times the slaves on Sicilian estates were chained by day and penned underground by night. By such policies it has been found practicable for a parasitic band to hold down many times their number.

But this technique of coercion calls into being a counter-technique of freedom. In England, for instance, where the intruding Normans had brought the instruments of rule to a rare perfection, the industrial classes, long before they were able to master and use government for their own ends, had learned to safeguard themselves by hedging it with certain checks. With their acquired rights they built a rampart against the formidable engine in the hands of their spoilers. The right to bind law upon the sovereign, the right to forbid a standing army in time of peace, the right of citizens to assemble, to petition, to keep and bear arms, to be secure from unreasonable searches and seizures, to suffer only on trial and conviction, to be tried by their peers, and to be exempt from cruel or unusual punishments, availed to strip the class state of its most dreaded powers, and have justly come to be looked upon as the attributes of a free people. In this way *force* has become *law*, and *might* has been transmuted into *right*.

The virtue of *superstition* as manipulated by a parasitic class is that it causes the masses to look upon the priest as their only protector against the Unseen. The power thus accruing to the sacerdotal order may serve to support direct clerical exploitation of the laity through gifts and payments for priestly offices, or, in return for places and privileges, immunities and exemptions, it may be placed at the disposal of other parasitic classes.

Even in old Rome the augurs learned to play cleverly upon the superstitious fancies of the populace. For example :

It was directly enacted by the Ælian and Fufian law that every popular assembly should be compelled to disperse if it should occur to any of the higher magistrates to look for the signs of a thunderstorm in the sky ; and the Roman oligarchy was proud of the cunning device which enabled them, thenceforth, by a single pious fraud to impress the stamp of invalidity on any decree of the people.¹

But it is to the mediæval papacy that we must look for the classic example of an exploitation fortified by superstitious beliefs. In the course of the four centuries after Hildebrand the western church took on a parasitic character, and perfected a great array of devices and weapons for mastering the minds of men in the sacerdotal interest. To this end lay participation in ecclesiastical affairs was gradually lessened until "church" came to be synonymous with "hierarchy." The church being from time immemorial the final seat of authority in matters of faith, the papal machine was thus enabled to brand as heresy every proposition that assailed the superstitions supporting it. The tendency of all these superstitions was to make the priest independent of and necessary to the laity. The core of worship was the mass, and this was conducted in a dead language known only to the priest. To the priest alone belonged the right to administer such indispensable sacraments as baptism, marriage, or the eucharist. From the priest alone could be procured those prayers which benefit the souls of the dead. He only could forgive sins, and to him in the confessor's box was it given to peer into the bosom of his fellow-mortal and to insinuate a designing hand among his heart strings.

¹ MOMMSEN, *History of Rome*, Vol. III, p. 521.

From the tithes incumbent on the faithful, and from the sale of masses, absolutions, and other pious services, the priests were able to derive a vast revenue. Of this a large part was diverted from the support of the local working clergy and drawn toward certain centers to be enjoyed by those at or near the apex of the hierarchy.¹

When the peoples of northern Europe began hacking at the tentacles by which the Latin church held them fast, it was precisely these superstitions that suffered. The laity, headed by Luther, declared that the priest is not distinguished from the layman save that he exercises at the bidding of the church a ministerial office, and that the church is not the hierarchy, but the communion of the saints. Calvin insisted that confession should be made, not to the priests, but to the congregation, and that sins are forgiven, not by priestly intercession, but as a matter of free grace. The terrible power to grant or to withhold the sacrament was assailed when the Hussites made the lay chalice their symbol. The Reformers recognized not the church but the Scriptures, privately interpreted, as the final seat of authority in matters of belief. Worship was conducted in the vernacular. The mass was abolished, lay participation in worship was enlarged, and the public sermon before hearers armed with the Bible gave the laymen an important check upon the clergy.

Taken all in all the Protestant Reformation was economic rather than intellectual in origin.² It was a lay revolt, not the revolt of human reason, and the immediate result was a decay, not of belief in the supernatural, but of those particular beliefs

¹ "The Holy See, in the fourteenth century, grasped almost the whole disposable patronage of the church throughout Europe and openly offered it for sale. In this market for spiritualities it is significant to observe that benefices with cure of souls were held at a higher price than those without cure, as though there was a speculative value in the altar and the confessional. . . . In addition to this source of demoralization there was the shameless issue of dispensations to hold pluralities which had long been the cause of untold injury to the church and which ever grew more reckless, and there was, moreover, the showering of numberless benefices on the creatures of the curia, the cardinals, and their dependents, with dispensations for non-residence." (H. C. LEA, *A History of Confession and Indulgences*, Vol. I, p. 246).

² Cf. BROOKS ADAMS, *The Law of Civilization and Decay*, chaps. vii and viii.

which supported sacerdotalism. From the sixteenth century on the direct exploitation of the devout by the clergy greatly declined. The church, so far as it was still animated by greed, allied itself with the rising state and looked to the monarchy for revenue as a reward for throwing its influence in support of "the powers that be."

It is scarcely necessary to point out that *fraud*, although used freely by every exploiting class, is a favorite instrument of the class that aspires to the mastery of the mind. In connection with the church parasitic we have but to recall the False Decretals, the pseudo-miracles, the legends accumulating about saints and shrines, the *Index librorum prohibitorum*, the consecration of "safe" science, the falsification of history, and the clerical control of the universities. It is noteworthy that, on the other hand, nearly every movement against parasitism has endeavored to dispel the ignorance of the masses by some form of free popular instruction. Taborites, Waldenses, Bohemian Brethren, Reformers, New England Puritans, French Revolutionists, and European Liberals, all have given enlightenment a leading place in their program of emancipation.

Over against fraud and superstition has been elaborated a technique of enlightenment. Freedom of meeting, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the inviolability of the mails, the autonomy of institutions of learning, the liberty of investigation, the freedom of teaching, the free public university, the free open library—not without good cause have these come to be prized by democratic peoples.

Once the material foundations of its rule have crumbled an aristocratic class inevitably comes to attach great importance to *pomp* and *circumstance*. Pageantry, which is originally the swollen crimson crest of lordly pride, becomes an obligation and a solemnity when the nobility is no longer a match for the commonalty in physical contest. As the lords lose their power over the bodies of their subjects it is the more necessary to consider the impression on their minds. Accordingly the exterior of upper-class life comes in time to be regulated with an eye to the effect on the lower orders. Outwardly the mode of life of

the rulers must be as far as possible differentiated from that of the ruled, in order that the former may be looked upon as beings apart. But the splendor with which nobles surround their actions, both public and private, is costly, and hence leads to that insatiable rapacity which characterizes over-ripe aristocracies, and which so often leads them to ruin.

Simplicity, on the other hand, comes in as class rule disappears. In the democratic era the need of solemn ostentation passes away, and the wealthy employ their riches in keeping up a manner of life very different from that of the great in the aristocratic era. Moreover, government is conducted with less of state, and the ceremony that is still retained for public occasions is religious and ethical in character rather than spectacular.

Finally, a ruling class profits by *prescription*. For the secret of the stability of an oppressive social system is not always in the weapons or even in the prestige of the class that sits aloft. Whatever be the relations it fixes between master and slave, lord and serf, priest and flock, prince and subject, the system by its very existence utters an imperious suggestion which few can resist. The young, drawing from their native feelings their ideas of what is fit and right, may criticise the established order. But a longer steeping in the silent, overmastering presence of majestic institutions adapts their notions of what is fit and right to the relations that are, and fosters a spirit of acquiescence.¹ Nothing but this triumph of suggestion over logic can explain in history those epochs of paradox when the same men are at once mystics and heresy-hunters, philanthropists and slaveholders, Christians and assertors of feudal privilege.

Those who have the sunny rooms in the social edifice have, therefore, a powerful ally in the suggestion of Things-as-they-are. With the aid of a little narcotizing teaching and preaching, the denizens of the cellar may be brought to find their lot proper

¹ "Wherever there is an ascendent class, a large portion of the morality of the country emanates from its class interests and its class feelings of superiority. The morality between Spartans and helots, between planters and negroes, between princes and subjects, between nobles and *roturiers*, between men and women, has been for the most part the creation of these class interests and feelings." (J. S. MILL, *On Liberty*, p. 15.)

and right, to look upon escape as an outrage upon the rights of other classes, and to spurn with moral indignation the agitator who would stir them to protest. Great is the magic of precedent, and like the rebellious helots who cowered at the sight of their masters' whips, those who are used to dragging the social chariot will meekly open their calloused mouths whenever the bit is offered them. This is why the social arrangements of new countries become the revolutionary models for old societies. The colonist, no longer in the overawing presence of an ancient system, reverts to first principles. Squaring his institutions with his native sense of justice and fitness he frames a social system that becomes a wonder and a terror to the usurping classes among older peoples; while, on the other hand, the Hindu cultivator, the Russian moujik, the Galician peasant, or the English hind, hypnotized by the actual, consents to the institutions about him.

This moral ankylosis that afflicts those who grow up within a bad social system explains why the economist Roscher places among the conditions that favor communistic agitations "*a violent shaking or perplexing of public opinion in its relation to the feeling of right by revolutions*, especially when they follow rapidly one on the heels of another, and take opposite directions."¹ For a series of sudden changes breaks that spell of custom which is so conducive to the peace of the parasitic class. When their minds have thus been depolarized the desires of the exploited people fly up like a released spring and the social classes jar angrily together. The social system is seen in its nakedness, and, unless enough physical force is found to uphold it, it is sure to be modified.

In order not to mistake social control for class control it is necessary to distinguish between a parasitic society and a society that is truly competitive. In respect to economic friction and the contrasts of worldly condition, a competitive society may present much the same appearance as a society composed of exploiters and exploited. Yet there is between them one great difference, a difference which has everything to do with the

¹ *Political Economy*, Vol. I, sec. 78.

volume and kind of control that will be needed to preserve social order.

In a really competitive society the hopelessly poor and wretched are, to a large extent, the weak and incompetent who have accumulated at the lower end of the social scale because they or their parents have failed to meet the tests of the competitive system. In a society cleft by parasitism, on the other hand, the poor are poor because they are held under the harrow, and not because they are less capable and energetic than the classes that prey upon them.

Now, a class of beaten people, a proletariat from which the industrially fittest have escaped or are escaping, has neither the will nor the strength to strain against the social system with the vigor of a resentful proletariat held down and exploited by means of artificial social arrangements. However sharply it may differentiate, however rude the clash of conflicting interests, a competitive society will still require no such elaborate apparatus of control as a parasitic society, with perhaps no greater contrasts of economic condition, will find it necessary to maintain. Moreover, its control will not exhibit the traits of class control, but will show the sincerity, spontaneity, and elasticity that mark the control that is truly social.

EDWARD A. ROSS.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY,
California.