



WILEY

Review

Author(s): H. Reinherz

Review by: H. Reinherz

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 90 (Jun., 1913), pp. 280-281

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2222157>

Accessed: 28-06-2016 09:48 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*

as personal, York was one of these, it became a matter of first importance that a good title should be secured," &c. There are many such sentences. The Index is not quite perfect, as it should be in a book of this kind. There are two mistakes in the five entries under "Clapham." But there is no reason to think that this is an average proportion of error, and one of the mistakes is only the still very common confusion of Claphams with Chapmen.

J. H. CLAPHAM

Weibliche Dienstboten und Dienstbotenhaltung in England. By DR. LISA ROSS. (Tübingen : J. C. B. Mohr. 1912. Pp. viii + 99. 3 marks.)

THIS little book describes the conditions of female domestic service in England, institutes a comparison with Germany in this respect, and draws some general inferences. It makes no claim to solve the servant problem, and very little attempt to forecast the future.

The writer examines the motives underlying the practice of keeping domestic servants, and finds four factors at work. The housewife may help her husband in breadwinning, and employ a servant to replace her in the home. Or she may delegate her household duties in order to devote her time to the education of her children, to social work, or merely to culture and recreation. Again, the mistress of a house may employ a servant, or a given number of servants, simply to conform to the standard adopted by her class. Lastly, she may keep any number of servants as a mere matter of luxury. Between the motives at work in the last two cases it is not easy to draw a definite line.

It is clear that the practice first mentioned is economically productive, and directly so. The second, in the majority of cases, is indirectly productive, and therefore economically sound. In the third class of cases we are dealing with conventions which it is difficult to criticise. The fourth must be unconditionally condemned. Where the energies of women are set free for no useful purpose, we can only get national waste.

Dr. Ross is of opinion that the second factor is the more predominant in Germany, while the third operates more strongly in England. She supports this view by the fact that technical improvements and labour-saving appliances in the home are immediately followed by a reduction in the number of servants in German households; while in England the correspondence

between the amount of work and servants employed is much less marked, showing that the practice is more a matter of custom than of need.

In England the proportion of servants kept has always been greater, their wages have always been higher, and their conditions better than on the Continent. The lowest wage, *e.g.*, paid to cooks and parlourmaids in London is well above the average paid anywhere in the German Empire. In England, too, the domestic servant is a much more independent and detached individual than in Germany. Domestic service is, indeed, in a transition stage everywhere; it is losing its personal character, and tending at last towards the condition of free contract which exists in other occupations. England, which has been half a century ahead of the Continent in all matters affecting domestic service, is naturally in the van of this movement also.

The servant problem is doubtless not to be solved by the arm-chair economist. Still, it is a pity that the thoughtful analysis of the early chapters of this book was not followed up by a consideration of the future of domestic service on the basis of free contract—a development which is imminent. The writer has deliberately restricted her inquiry to household servants in direct personal relations with their employers, and therefore leaves out of consideration the whole body of hotel, club, and institution servants. These are, however, much more highly organised than the rest of their class, and have already achieved the impersonal relation to which all are tending. A little more consideration of their conditions would have repaid study, and might have indicated the lines on which a solution of the servant problem may be sought.

H. REINHERZ

Die allgemeine Nährpflicht als Lösung der sozialen Frage. By JOSEF POPPER-LYNKEUS. Dresden: Carl Reissner. 1912. Pp. xvi + 813.

THERE have been many suggestions put forward for the amelioration of the world and the improvement of social conditions. Louis Blanc's, Proudhon's, Henry George's, Richard Bellamy's, Franz Oppenheimer's, are a few that are well known to Economists; and now comes Josef Popper (Lynkeus) as the latest prophet of the golden age. He has weighed his precursors in the balance, and has found them wanting. Hence his own scheme, in which he appears to place exceeding great faith.