



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

misplacing of emphasis is all the more remarkable in a book designed for business readers. While much of his discussion is valuable, Mr. Kelly, in common with most educators, unduly emphasizes school training given away from the job. Recent experience seems to indicate that supervised training on the job itself is a far more valuable way of acquiring trade competence. The failure on the part of most schoolmen and employers to appreciate this principle has given a somewhat false emphasis to vocational education, both without and within factory walls.

Both of these books will probably justify their existence in the use that will be made of them by men who otherwise would read little or nothing about personnel work. One cannot help wishing, however, that workers in the field would abandon the attempt to make two books grow where one grew before and instead center their efforts on specific research in the myriad of unexplored fields. Personnel work at present is suffering from a plethora of publicists and promoters, but there is a great dearth of investigators and students.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

*Applied Eugenics.* By PAUL POPENOE and ROSWELL HILL JOHNSON. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1918.— xii, 459 pp.

A fair portrayal of the present status of eugenics, revealing the shortcomings as well as the claims and the virtues of this relatively new field of social science, is to be found in this short but comprehensive treatise by Popenoe and Johnson. To the intelligent layman, the book will be welcome as a readable and interesting general introduction to the problems of eugenics, albeit the subject is clothed in technical terminology, charts, figures and all the other paraphernalia which make up the garb of science. Such scientific apparel, however, fails to conceal an emotional fervor, an intense zeal, which must surely make objective scientific judgments difficult.

With all the assurance of enthusiastic converts, the authors confidently apply the principles of eugenics to the solution of the most varied social problems. For instance, in one chapter of forty pages the following questions are reviewed, in the order given: taxation, the back-to-the-farm movement, democracy, socialism, child labor, compulsory education, vocational guidance and training, the minimum wage, mothers' pensions, housing, feminism, old-age pensions,

the sex-hygiene movement, trade unions, prohibition and pedagogical celibacy. A rather bewildering and uneven list! No doubt the unevenness is less disconcerting when viewed from the high vantage-point of eugenics. According to eugenic standards, the authors seem to imply, the initiative and referendum cannot be given a clean bill of health (p. 361). A reader ignorant of the ramifications of the subject might imagine that old-age pensions, being given to those who have passed the child-bearing period, were not legitimately related to eugenics; on the contrary, it appears that old-age pensions are pernicious. Without such pensions, a son burdened with the support of his aged parents would have to restrict the number of his own children—a highly desirable result by eugenic canons. With pensions granted by the state, "the economic pressure would be taken off these inferior families and the children would thus be encouraged to marry earlier and have more children"—a socially undesirable consequence, according to the eugenists. Should one, therefore, and for this reason alone, oppose old-age pensions? By the time one has read 380 pages of eugenical doctrine, the momentum of argument has become terrific, and the reader is almost persuaded.

It may be questioned, however, whether social problems should be made to revolve on the one issue of eugenics. There are two big factors in society; one is biological and the other cultural. The eugenists not only over-emphasize the biological, but it is thought that they do not give sufficient credit to the stability of the race factor. And they certainly seem to have only the slightest conception of what culture is and little or no understanding of how it grows or of its potency. The culture of a people is quite naïvely seen as the product of the biological ability of the people (p. 284); apparently there is no recognition of cultural diffusion; no appreciation of the historical factor; no admission that inventions depend on the existing status of culture as well as on ability. Consider this sentence: "A race of nothing but mediocrity will stand still, or very nearly so; but a race of mediocrities with a good supply of men of exceptional ability and energy at the top will make progress in discovery, invention and organization, which is generally recognized as progressive evolution" (p. 293). Culture and race are certainly confused in this sentence. What is meant by a race standing still? Is it meant that there is no biological change through mutations? Or is it meant that the culture or civilization stands still? How could this be a race of nothing but mediocrity? Is this denying variation? Does not variation in biological measurements quite gen-

erally conform to the normal-probability curve? In some cultures "a good supply of men of exceptional ability and energy" may discover, invent and organize. But in others they may not. It depends a good deal on the state of the culture. In some cultural situations, generations may pass and there may be no inventions. On the other hand, with a constant race factor, that is, the average and variability remaining the same over many generations, there may be discoveries, inventions and new organizations in abundance. Eugenics cannot be fairly estimated without a generous consideration of the cultural factor.

WILLIAM F. OGBURN.

*The Frontier of Control: A Study of British Workshop Politics.*

By CARTER L. GOODRICH. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920.—xvii, 277.

Mr. Goodrich's book offers a picture of the actual range and extent of control by the English workers over such matters of workshop procedure as employment, discharge, promotion, selection of foremen, methods of payment, introduction of technical changes, and the like. The picture is timely, useful and well presented. It comes to this:

If the question is how much positive control?—and this question is of importance as marking the newest Frontier of Control—the answer can be given in a very few instances, of which the staffing of shops and choice of foremen by the Staff Pressers, the work of the labor-directors at Dawson's, and the insistence by a few miners' output committees on specific improvements in management, are the most conspicuous. If the question is how much contagious control?—and this question is important for any guesses about the future—nearly half the cases mentioned, including some of the more striking forms of positive control and the greater part of the negative control covered by the phrase "the right to a trade", must be ruled out as having little bearing on the moving tendencies in the great industry.

The conclusion thus is that there has not been any extended concession to the rank and file of control over matters of personal adjustment or personnel procedure. Mr. Goodrich is not engaged in philosophizing, however, so that no attempt is made to answer the question: Why is it that with a labor movement of the proportions, strength, and maturity of the English movement so little has been done to secure self-determination in the shop? One wonders if the meager results are due less to aggressiveness than to an actual doubt