

WILEY



Review

Author(s): Edward Jenks

Review by: Edward Jenks

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 50 (Jun., 1903), pp. 215-219

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2220887>

Accessed: 26-06-2016 08:08 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.



Wiley, Royal Economic Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Economic Journal*

before us afford convincing and repeated proof ; and we can only wish that Mr. Haggard's infectious enthusiasm may be transmitted to very many readers.

L. L. PRICE

State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand. By WILLIAM PEMBER REEVES. (Grant Richards. 2 vols. 1902.)

MR. REEVES' book is one of the most important contributions to the art of statesmanship which have been made in recent years. A politician and an official of long experience, a skilful journalist, and, above all, a serious student, the author brings to his task a rare combination of qualities which make for fitness. He writes as one who knows the difficulties and limitations of the Parliamentary arena and the Minister's room ; as one who can appreciate the many sides of a burning question, and yet avoid losing himself in a mass of details. The result is that his volumes command the respect which is due to first-hand knowledge, while they attract by their ease of style and apparent simplicity. He has treated a great subject in a manner worthy of it, and yet in a manner which makes no pretension of infallibility.

We have said that the work is a contribution to the art, rather than to the science, of statesmanship. And this for two reasons. In the first place, it does not deal with the enunciation of those abstract principles, with the establishment and explanation of which certain schools of economic and political thought are identified, and which, it must be confessed, are less popular than they were. In the second, Mr. Reeves does not even concern himself with generalisations of a less sweeping character ; he does not summarise the results, as a whole, of the political and economic experiments with which his book is concerned. His work deals, in fact, more with methods than with results, except in so far as results are directly concerned with the working of methods. Only in one branch of his subject, the "exclusion of aliens and undesirables," does he directly challenge a discussion of first principles.

On the other hand, for the man who has had enough of abstract argument, who is prepared frankly to admit that certain great objects put forward by social reformers are desirable, but doubts only whether they can be secured, Mr. Reeves' work is full of interest from cover to cover. In this country, old-age pensions, compulsory industrial arbitration, preferential voting, land reform, women's franchise, and the doctrine of the living wage, are barely within the scope of practical politics ; though they have been discussed for years. In Australasia they are the daily atmosphere of politicians and officials. It is this fact, no doubt, which causes colonial statesmen to speak of the "unreality" of English politics, an expression natural enough, though, perhaps, slightly unjust. And we are not sure that something of

colonial impatience, something of that cheerful optimism which does not fear, through dread of possible mistakes, to attack great problems, might not with advantage be adopted by the more cautious English statesman, who is apt to stand appalled before the complex machinery of a social organisation which, after all, he and his predecessors have done much to create.

But it will be a great mistake to suppose, because Mr. Reeves is practical, that he is unmethodical or incomplete. Nothing is more conspicuous in his work than the careful manner in which he marshals his facts, putting each in its right place—that is to say, in the place in which its true relation to the story most truly appears; nothing more undeniable than the fairness with which he tells us everything which can honestly be held to weigh down the scales on one side or the other. Statistics are, proverbially, dry reading; but they are the backbone, none the less, of political experiment. After hearing the arguments for and against a particular measure, we require to know what the actual result has been. A Homestead Law may arouse the enthusiasm of the land reformer; but, if it does not produce homesteads, it is a failure. In other words, a book on political experiments ought to be a dictionary as well as a description. The reader should be able to turn, almost automatically, to any detail, to see at once its genesis, its operation, and its result. In this respect Mr. Reeves' work is not only meritorious in its plan, and happy in its execution; it is singularly well-timed. The Australasian colonies are just beginning to realise the actual results of that bold policy of innovation to which for the last ten or twelve years they have deliberately committed themselves. A generation ago, competent observers were aware that Australia and New Zealand, despite their apparent freedom from the trammels of an inherited civilisation, were, in fact, fast bound in the net of tradition. Even in the matter of Protection, they did but follow a doctrine which the mother-country had only recently abandoned. Now, all is changed. The social system of the colonies is being rapidly transformed by laws which have, practically, no counterpart in the old country; and Mr. Reeves' book is the first comprehensive and adequate account of what is, in a double sense, a New World.

The space at our disposal does not allow of individual allusion to all the great objects of social reform with which Mr. Reeves' book deals. But a few words may, perhaps, usefully be devoted to the various schemes which are, for brevity, usually spoken of as Land Reform.

Opponents of social experiment are fond of alleging, that the apparent urgency of the Land Question in England is due to special conditions, which are unlikely to prove permanent. Density of population, the overwhelming importance, for the time being, of manufacturing pursuits, the temporary depression of agriculture—these are said to be mainly responsible for a result which consists of healthy areas crying aloud for population, and unhealthy areas swarming with

multitudes who have no room to breathe. In the face of these arguments, it is at least interesting to discover that Australia and New Zealand, which certainly do not suffer either from density of population or from unfavourable agricultural conditions, have felt the pressure of the Land Question for many years. Still more significant is it to note, that, in spite of dismal prophecy and angry threats, experiments in land reform have produced neither panic nor desertion. In certain periods of industrial crisis, no doubt, there have been moments at which (to use familiar, but somewhat exaggerated language) urban sites have been a drug in the market; but these crises have not been due to experiments in land reform. On the contrary, one, at least, of the most conspicuous was largely the result of abuse of the unreformed system, which allows land values to be treated as counters in a commercial gamble. And, moreover, a sudden fall in the value of urban sites has, nearly always, been accompanied by a wholesome increase of demand for rural acres. There is, in fact, no proof whatever that reform legislation "drives capital off the land."

What then, it may be asked, has the New World to teach us in the matter of Land Reform?

First, that the great landowner is not, necessarily, a civiliser. Nothing is more striking than the accounts, from all sources, of the social conditions in the days when the great "squatters" ruled the land. Isolation, not human society, was the ideal. Strong men the old squatters were, undoubtedly, but, beyond the limits of a narrow caste, hardly sociable. One of their chief objects was to exclude new settlers, especially small settlers, or "selectors." Their own dependants were a wild and reckless class, valued, it is to be feared, almost as much for their indifference to social ties as for their industrial qualities. There was scarcely a pretence that they performed any political function, inasmuch as, owing to the sparseness of white population, and the peculiar condition of the native races, there was no opportunity for the exercise of administrative powers. Though they built splendid houses in the midst of desolation, they made no effort to improve the surrounding country. "Insecurity of tenure," says the defender of great estates. Not at all. The facts were the same where the squatter owned the freehold. The leading case is that of the Cheviot estate in New Zealand, a freehold of 84,000 acres, which was bought back by the Government under a clause in the Land Tax Act. Broadly speaking, when the Treasury took it over, the estate consisted of an oasis in the middle of a wilderness. The total population maintained on it was less than 20 souls. Ten years have now elapsed since the estate was thrown open to settlement, and, though a substantial part of it has been alienated, the residue maintains a resident population of upwards of 1,000, its economic prosperity being proved by the fact that it returns annually to the State, by way of rent or interest, over £14,000. In a word, the chief benefits arising from the most successful squatting industry, under the old system, went, not to

the people of the colony in which it existed, but to the markets of the Old World, in which its products were sold, and in which most of the squatters' income was spent.

It is small wonder that, with such an object-lesson before their eyes, the great self-governing colonies have aimed at a policy of land settlement which should throw open the resources of the country to larger classes; and the real interest of Mr. Reeves' admirable chapter on the Land Question lies in the result of their efforts. Some of these experiments have been dismal enough. Every attempt to apply the co-operative system to production has been, as it has everywhere been in modern times, a failure. With the old social nexus of kinship, the old power of co-operative production has gone. On the other hand, individual settlement, aided by the State, has much to say for itself. The State has purchased land, and thrown it open for settlement on strict conditions—conditions of improvement, residence, non-alienation, and the like—which severely restrict the freedom of the individual; and the result has been good. It would be too much to say that the ideal form of land-ownership has been reached; and it is noteworthy that, to all appearance, no effort to conserve the unearned increment has yet been successful, or has, in fact, seriously been made. The nearest approach to such an attempt is to be found in the perpetual leases, which provide for periodical re-valuations, and do not allow the lessees to purchase the freehold. Such leases exist in New South Wales and South Australia; but it is noteworthy that, in the older colony, they apply only to small "homesteads," and not to the large estates, where the danger of the unearned increment is much greater. It is, however, now definitely accepted, throughout the Australasian colonies, that *laissez-faire* is not a principle which can safely be allowed to regulate land-ownership, at least when the State is a landowner on a great scale.

A final word may be given to the recent development of State money-lending on the security of agricultural land. The idea is not new; but a novel feature is the assumption, made in most of the colonies, that this sphere of State activity is not connected with any special or temporary crisis, but is to be a normal state of things. Of course the State has certain great advantages as a money-lender. It can borrow, in order to be able to lend, on better terms than a private person, or even an ordinary public institution. It can protect its loans, if need be, by the enactment of special laws. It can enforce its securities easily and cheaply. On the other hand, it may be urged, that the State is more likely to be deceived in its estimate of the value of property than a private person, and that there is danger of it being "squeezed" by electors who are also borrowers of its money. In Australia and New Zealand the first of these two dangers has been avoided by careful administration. The figures, so far, show an extraordinarily small percentage of loss; and, inasmuch as loans are repaid by instalments, every year diminishes the likelihood of a deficit.

Against the second danger, the Australian colonies (wiser in that respect than New Zealand) have made provision, by raising from local sources the money expended on loans. Any loss arising from undue favour shown to borrowers would, therefore, fall upon other members of the community, not less numerous, who may well be trusted to look after their own claims.

It is, of course, quite impossible, in the limits of a review, to do justice to the value of such a work as Mr. Reeves' book. It is an object lesson in politics of the highest merit; and ought to be studied both by the theorist and the statesman. The former may find in it much that is inconsistent with his accepted beliefs, and, therefore, much to stimulate thought. The latter will be encouraged by it to believe that even the most difficult of problems will yield to patient and honest attempts at solution.

EDWARD JENKS

The Social Unrest : Studies in Labour and Socialist Movements.

By J. GRAHAM BROOKS. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1903. Pp. 394.)

In a personal and introductory note to this very interesting book, Mr. Brooks explains and justifies the peculiarity of his method. Experience had convinced him of the inadequacy of "the books" as sociological documents; not only are books too general—too unequal to the subtlety of the subject—but "most men do not put their deepest opinions into print, or state them before the public." The evidence which Mr. Brooks desires to put in, consists of the "things a wise man does not say in public." The anonymity of his interlocutors, as he himself readily admits, "may be thought to constitute a weakness in the book." The method has much of the interest, but also much of the uncertainty of a dialogue: the argument seems not only to wind, but occasionally to lose itself: it reads more like a record of moods than the development of a single thesis: it is too temperamental to be systematic. On the other hand "Social Unrest" is a singularly "human" document: its fresh and concrete matter, its unconventional and unacademic manner, combine to give it a somewhat unique place in the literature of "the labour question." Owing, however, to the defects of these qualities, it is by no means easy to focus the judgments and estimate the conclusions of a book in which the results are so inseparable from the method: we can only hope to touch on a few of its salient points.

Mr. Brooks starts his study of "Social Unrest" from the consideration of the problems arising in the coal industry of America, on the ground that "no business presents a better point of view for study, either of practice or of theory, in the labour question." According to Mr. Brooks' analysis of the situation, the employers have discovered a way of escape from "the evils of unrestricted competition," but are jealous of its wider application—"among the employers, the old chaos of competition has been overcome by organisation, a forced chaos

Q 2