
Ethical Neutrality and the Distribution of Income

Author(s): W. L.

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Oct., 1988, Vol. 47, No. 4 (Oct., 1988), pp. 491-492

Published by: American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3486565>

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.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*

33. The High Church bent explains, among other things, Headlam's otherwise illogical refusal to marry Parnell to Mrs. O'Shea.
34. *Church Reformer* (Vol. III, p. 217 and Vol. IV, pp. 76, 125 and 177).
35. *The Times*, April 7, 1884, p. 6.
36. *Justice*, 24 January 1885, pp. 1, 6; *Fabian Tracts*, 1884–1905, (London, 1905), No. 42, p. 11.
37. S. D. Headlam, *Fabianism and Land Values* (London, 1908), *passim*.
38. See Jones, pp 148ff.
39. *Christian Socialist*, Vol. III, No. 36, May 1886, p. 190; No. 37, June 1886, pp. 194, 201–2; Vol. IX, No. 103, December 1891, pp. 129–30.
40. Jones, pp. 308–30.
41. Though a determined High Churchman, C. L. Marson displayed greater tolerance towards the unbaptized than did Headlam.
42. *Labour Annual*, 1895, p. 167; *Labour Prophet*, Vol. I, No. 3, April 1892, p. 27; *Christian Socialist*, No. 10, March 1884, pp. 147–48 and No. 12, May 1884, pp. 182–83; *Brotherhood*, Vol. VI, No. 10, May 1892, p. 223.
43. W. H. P. Campbell, *The Robbery of the Poor* (London, 1884), *passim*; *Christian Socialist*, No. 10, March 1884, pp. 147–48; No. 12, May 1884, pp. 182–83.
44. For detailed references see Jones, *ibid*.
45. *Labour Annual*, 1897, pp. 125–28 ("The Great Battle of Labour," reprinted from the *New York Journal*).
46. Three years later the first Clarion Van set out in Liverpool (1894), and on June 18, 1896 the first Clarion Women's Van, begun by Julia Dawson. It is easy to confuse Georgist Red Vans and these Clarion Vans. Blatchford himself was in any case strongly influenced by George and devised a complex scheme for periodically equalizing wealth, based on the Single Tax.
47. *Labour Annual*, 1895, p. 127.
48. J. K. Hardie, *After Twenty Years* (London, 1913), p. 11.
49. February 10, 1884, HGC. The second half of the letter and signature is missing. Details and style point to Hardie: it is addressed "Hamilton" and states that the author no longer works in the pit. Hardie, who began work in 1866 when he was just over 10, was at this time Secretary of the Hamilton Miners' Union.
50. J. B. Glasier, *Keir Hardie: The Man and His Message*, (London, 1919), p. 5.
51. See for instance his *Concerning Four Precursors of Henry George and the Single Tax* (London, 1899) and *Land for the Landless* (written with Verinder, undated).
52. See *ILP News*, Vol. I, Nos. 2 (May, 1897), 3 (June, 1897), and 7 (October, 1897).
53. Speech to the International Conference on the Taxation of Land Values, Oxford, August 16, 1923.
54. The Single Tax Panacea, of course, was partly forced on George by his more religious followers. In the United States, people did take his arguments and developed a program which helped to produce the Progressive Era and policies that included the progressive income tax and anti-trust legislation.

Ethical Neutrality and the Distribution of Income

JOAN ROBINSON ONCE SAID that the 'second crisis of economic theory' has occurred because "we have not got a theory of distribution." She added, "We have nothing

to say on the subject which above all others occupies the minds of the people whom economics is supposed to enlighten."

In this day when a speculator conspiring with bankers can threaten the control of a large corporation and thereby obtain a bribe the newspapers call 'greenmail' in the multi-millions, when a television comedian can get a yearly wage of \$84 million while a scientist working to rid society of a disease that cripples children is paid less than \$84 thousand, there is not much evidence that a fair and just distribution of income is yet on the minds of the public, though it should be.

Renato Cirillo pointed out in his book, *The Economics of Pareto* (P.O. Box 327, Totowa, NJ 07511: Frank Cass and Co., Ltd., 1979, p. 58) that Vilfredo Pareto argued that economic science must be neutral, and was the first economist to declare himself completely neutral on matters of income distribution. But he did not intend that economics should be used to buttress the status quo, as many used it. "More than once he stressed that concrete problems, such as the welfare problems, should be left to sociology which, according to him, is the science which deals with the political and ethical aspects of social life," Dr. Cirillo writes. "To solve welfare problems we need the help of other social sciences besides economics." (p. 57).

I, of course, being a follower of Henry George, John Dewey and Bertrand Russell, believe that it is impossible, factually as well as psychologically, to separate ethics from economic institutions, practices and activities. But certainly it is clear that the solution of social problems requires knowledge and insights from all the social sciences, not merely economics. And that when economists, imperialistically, deign to offer opinions on social policy, they are practicing outside the scope of their scientific license. (As Pareto did, and all of us do, including the present writer.)

"It is heartening to note however," Professor Cirillo remarks, "that many economists today seem to be moving back to Pareto's original vision of the social sciences. As a result of (Kenneth) Arrow's studies on social choice and democratic group decisions, some are seriously considering the possibility that welfare economics might be rescued one day by political science and economics working hand in hand to find the right criteria.

"I strongly believe that the solution will come from these two sciences in conjunction with ethics, sociology and all the social sciences which can contribute to a better understanding of man in society." Dr. Cirillo goes on:

"One last reflection: the restrictive nature of his criterion as well as its simplicity makes one wonder sometimes whether Pareto did not introduce it precisely in order to make economists conscious of the limitations of their science!"

W. L.