



THE LONDON SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE ■

WILEY

Review

Reviewed Work(s): *The Affluent Worker: Political Attitudes and Behaviour* by John H. Goldthorpe

Review by: W. G. Runciman

Source: *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (Jun., 1969), pp. 231-232

Published by: Wiley on behalf of The London School of Economics and Political Science

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/588537>

Accessed: 04-03-2018 21:25 UTC

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 <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

The London School of Economics and Political Science, Wiley are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The British Journal of Sociology*

to be accorded—or not accorded—to officers, and too little on the realities of power and social structure. There is no reference to the staff colleges and their role in prescribing the ideal types of military organization and participation in the social structure. Also the theoretical postulations concerning the alienation of the officers and their resistance to change lack insight, and are unconvincing to this reviewer (who was a professional soldier); though they are not distortions of fact, they are rather too extreme to be real. Nevertheless, the paper by Feld on *Alienation* among the Military is stimulating, and makes some new and useful analytical distinctions applicable to the study of elites in general. The changing social origin of the military is referred to in a variety of papers from several countries and reflects a growing democratization of the officer corps, and in commenting on this Van Doorn makes the interesting postulation that broadening the social base of the officer corps brings not only a more professional role conception, but also a heightened awareness of its potential as a political force.

The role of the military in effecting social change by direct action is touched on in a series of papers about the developing nations which bear out Van Doorn's point and there is some useful data from studies of Pakistan and South Korea, despite some lack of precision in its presentation.

The role of armed services in contemporary states is, of course, the key topic and reference to it is made in all the papers but especially those concerned with the U.S.S.R., Australia, the new African states and Western Germany. In the latter papers by von Friedeburg and Brandt, it is surprising that Germans do not appear to regard the Bundeswehr as an imposed military structure, an enforced socio-military experiment alien in principle to any kind of military system recognized by their culture. Perhaps it could be said to have been designed *not* to work and to be little more than a symbol. It is

not surprising that von Friedeburg alleges an uncertainty about *raison d'être* and consequent low status, though he produces no hard data to support his views.

Two papers—by Jackson on the Irish Army and by Van Doorn and Mans on the U.N. forces—show a different picture in which armed forces can see themselves once more in a socially constructive role: as what Janowitz calls a constabulary force. That professional soldiers have long seen their role as preventing violence and the disruption of peace is often forgotten such is the rush to condemn them as warmongers, and it is perhaps worth remembering that the present British Minister for Disarmament is an ex-professional army officer. Both these papers are, however, of great interest in pointing out the difficulties facing international armed forces that are involved in wars in which they have no enemy, where their presence is resented, and where the peace-keeping task is as hard to maintain within the force as it is in relation to their reluctant hosts.

Clearly all this has a scope wider than the sociology of the professions within which at first sight it seems to belong. Albeit rather too historical and descriptive in many places to be consistently true to the sociological approach, it should prove a useful addition to teaching and research material. It is, however, a pity that the obvious haste to have the work published left too little time to correct some obvious errors in translation.

T. C. Willett
University of Reading

The Affluent Worker: Political Attitudes and Behaviour

John H. Goldthorpe, et al. Cambridge University Press 1968 vii + 95 pp. 30s.

This short monograph is the second to come out of the study of 229 skilled male workers in Luton which was carried out by Professor Lockwood and

Book reviews

his associates between 1962 and 1964. It is avowedly a by-product of the authors' primary interest in industrial attitudes and behaviour, but its argument is complementary to that of the previous volume. The political version of the 'embourgeoisement thesis' is examined and rejected on the strength of a clear finding that neither earnings nor house-ownership significantly reduces support in the sample for the Labour party. On the contrary, the two most readily identifiable influences turned out to be first, 'white-collar affiliations' through either the social origins or the job histories of either the respondents or their wives, and second, trade union membership.

This result is less novel in 1969 than it would have seemed in 1960 when David Butler and Richard Rose suggested that the result of the General Election of 1959 might in part be explained by the abandonment of traditional Labour support by skilled workers who had become 'middle class in terms of income and material comforts'. The changing political climate of the 1960's and the increasing amount of survey material bearing on working-class Conservatism have made it implausible to argue that either income or possession of material goods is the important influence on manual workers' political attitudes. But it is useful to have the argument as carefully formulated and tested as it is here.

The study shows, as is to be expected, both the advantages and the disadvan-

tages of a local survey. The data on earnings, group affiliations and work-situation are predictably good. One particularly interesting finding is a high level of disapproval of trade union support for the Labour party (44 per cent even of Labour supporters) and the low level of support for the political levy (in effect only 50 per cent of Labour supporters). It is also striking that those whose conjugal affiliations are entirely working-class are just as likely to be Labour supporters whether or not they are union members. On the other hand, the sample is already untypical in its remarkably high level of Labour support (79 per cent), and the numbers in any high-order cross-tabulation are inevitably small.

The authors are frank about the limitations of the study from the point of view of electoral sociology. Much information which might have been of significance is neglected, and there is no systematic longitudinal evidence on possible shifts towards the Right. Only the most fleeting reference is made to other studies which might be relevant and the two which come first to mind—Birch on Glossop and Stacey on Banbury—are not even mentioned. But despite these shortcomings, not only the findings themselves but also the authors' use of them to support their own thesis about 'privatization' are a worthwhile addition to the accumulating literature on the political attitudes of the urban working class.

W. G. Runciman