WILEY

Review

Author(s): H. W. C. Davis

Review by: H. W. C. Davis

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 17, No. 67 (Sep., 1907), pp. 399-404

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2220487>

Accessed: 25-06-2016 03:40 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

intellectual ferment among economic students, in spite of much admirable writing intended for popular consumption, it remains true that the professional economists have very little influence upon the convictions of the great body of our people." Professors of political economy in the United States, as elsewhere, apparently are only valued by politicians and electors in so far as they are prepared to confirm the arguments and aims of political parties, and the unfavourable criticism by the professors of "the extreme policy of American protection" has not merely exposed them to personal satire and insult, but has caused a deplorable scepticism as to the value of the science they profess. This is not very encouraging. But Prof. Laughlin proceeds to emphasise two other notable considerations—the low estimate put upon the teacher as such ("as yet a position as instructor in a college or university carries with it no dignity and little honour"), and the high value set upon purely material success in all branches of the national life. These, when linked with "the nebulous, untrained thinking of this gigantic electorate," are serious elements in the future of economic science in America. That a large and continuous dose of "the abiding optimism of the American people," that "belief that the ideal thing will soon come to its own," will vanquish these obstacles, is the professor's final conviction. It may be hoped that some day he will be able to show in a second course of lectures that he is right.

C. GRANT ROBERTSON

Die Englische Kolonisation in Irland. Von DR. MORITZ JULIUS BONN. 2 vols. (Stuttgart und Berlin: T. G. Cotta, 1906.)

Modern Ireland and Her Agrarian Problem. By MORITZ J. BONN. Translated from the German by T. W. Rolleston. (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co.; London: John Murray, 1906.)

DR. BONN approaches Irish history from the economic side, giving a wide berth to the political and personal controversies with which most books on the subject are so greatly concerned. This method makes him instructive reading even where, as in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, he is greatly indebted for his facts to previous workers in the field. With pardonable acerbity he remarks in his preface that "Irish history, with a few notable exceptions, has been written by diletanti, fanatics and party politicians." But the exceptions have

proved most useful for his purpose; and his footnotes freely acknowledge his obligations to the works of Bagwell, Gardiner, Lecky, Prendergast, Miss Hickson, and Miss Murray. Although he shows great industry in working up the original sources where such guides as these writers are not available, we must confess that we follow him with more confidence when he is treading in the footsteps of others. Of his equipment as an economist there can be no doubt. But it is too much to expect that an economist should be versed in the detail of Irish history from beginning to end. For want of authoritative guides he is evidently uncertain of his path when he enters the mazes of Celtic tribal law and Anglo-Norman land-tenures. And, at the other end of his work, when he loses the assistance of Lecky, his treatment becomes comparatively jejune and halting. His separate essay on "Modern Ireland and Her Agrarian Problem" shows a close acquaintance with the history of the land-question since 1870. But between 1800 and 1870 there is a notable falling off in grasp and knowledge. We do not point out these lacunæ in order to reflect on Dr. Bonn, who sets an example of hard work which native writers might profitably imitate; but to indicate those parts of his work which seem most deserving of study.

A word must next be said of his attitude towards the conception of Irish nationality, so far as this influences the main conclusions of his work. The keynote of his longer book is the idea of the English colony as an alien community with interests separate from those of the natives. He traces the greater part of English difficulties in Ireland to the antagonism of the two nationalities. On the other hand he rejects the idea of treating national character or national institutions as primordial and sacred. Early in the "Kolonisation" he discusses the best-known estimates of the Celtic character (Mommson, Froude, &c.) and remarks that the traits which have been regarded as peculiar to the Celt are the common property of all races in the pastoral stage of evolution. He holds that institutions are moulded by natural conditions and the existing state of knowledge; national character he appears to regard as the product of institutions, and as therefore varying with the course of economic development. The conflict, then, between Englishman and Irishman has been a conflict between different stages of civilisation; and the ill-success of the Englishman is to be explained not so much by his own idiosyncrasies or by those of his opponent as by the material difficulty of raising the native Irish to that stage of civilisation in which their conquerors had been bred. He does not censure English statesmen for their

desire to anglicise the Irish. In fact he argues that the Tudors were largely influenced by those considerations which have led the democracy of modern England to govern coloured races according to the principles of English law. The Tudors believed that uniformity of law would strengthen the English supremacy and weaken the chiefs. But they also believed, with some justice, that it would improve the position of the Irish *kerne* by giving him fixity of tenure. Dr. Bonn blames the precipitation with which English statesmen pursued these objects, and the violence of the methods employed. But for the customary law of Celtic Ireland he has scant respect.

It may be objected that he has unduly emphasised the racial, to the neglect of the religious and economic, factors in Irish discords. Foreign observers, while they often perceive facts which escape the eye of the native, are also apt to present an unduly simple view of complicated situations. But Dr. Bonn has by no means ignored the feud of Protestant with Catholic, of landlord with tenant. He merely argues that it is the racial question which has made these feuds particularly virulent in Ireland. Protestantism long remained the religion of the Scottish and English settlers; and one main object of the penal laws was to concentrate all landed property in the hands of the Protestant interest. The present relations of Protestant with Catholic and of landlord with tenant are a legacy from the days when English policy was to emphasise the distinction of races. Such seems to be the author's view of the case, and it is supported by his account of the old clan-system. To judge from the particulars which he has collected, the position of the Irish peasant was never worse than when his land was held under a chieftain of his own blood, and the tyranny of the chieftains tended in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries to become more severe. Yet it was accepted by the tribesmen as part of the natural order, and the first relief which they obtained was procured not by their own efforts but by the intervention of the English government.

It is impossible to give, within the limits of a review, a satisfactory analysis of Dr. Bonn's longer work. But the main ideas which run through it may be shortly stated. The English colony, whether in the middle ages or in the seventeenth century, was large enough to constitute a grievance, but not to hold the country without help from home. Colonisation was a political necessity rather than a natural efflux of surplus population from England. The colony could only be maintained by offering great inducements to adventurers; whenever the fortunes of the English

interest were clouded there was a disposition on the part of the settlers to throw up their concessions or to become absentee landlords. The policy of colonisation was most successful in regard to the towns, which had always been centres of foreign influence. But in the open country of all the provinces, save one, the English government only succeeded in creating a landed aristocracy. The Ulster colony, with its relatively large proportion of poor and middle-class settlers, was in great measure a fortunate accident, the result of private enterprise. The great landlords of English or Scottish extraction soon realised, at every period of Irish history, that native tenants would pay higher rents and native labourers would accept lower wages than English immigrants. Thus the very class which was expected to further the colonial policy did much to discourage the process of immigration. Dr. Bonn contends that in several respects the English settlers contributed to increase material prosperity. They introduced better methods of agriculture. They founded markets. They introduced coined money, and they developed certain industries. But their tendency was to sink, in a few generations, to the level of the subject population; to adopt native manners and to accept native methods of agriculture and manufacture. Ireland was doomed by the scantiness of her natural resources and her geographical situation to remain a poor country. But her poverty was increased by an expensive government, by English interference with her industries, and by the devastating wars which resulted from an intermittent and languid policy of conquest. It was under the Commonwealth and the Protectorate that the policy of colonisation came nearest to success; and Dr. Bonn describes the thirty years which followed the Restoration as the golden age of Irish history. But the policy of colonisation was not continued as it should have been; and the strength of the colonial element declined from the Revolution onwards. The Tudor idea of assimilating Ireland to England was abandoned, for it was now believed that the Irish Catholics were irreconcilable. Not only did the Whigs return to the old policy, expressed in the Statute of Kilkenny, of erecting a barrier between the immigrants and the natives; they also did their best to make the Catholics powerless for harm by excluding them from all offices and from the influence attaching to the possession of freehold property. The penal laws were designed less as a measure of vengeance than as a measure of self-protection. They were a confession of weakness rather than a tyrannous abuse of strength.

The third chapter of the fifth book—that entitled “The Irish

Landlord from 1700 to 1845"—will probably be the most interesting to economists. It exhibits very clearly the connection of political and religious agitation with the economic movements of the period. From Dr. Bonn's point of view the salient facts of this century and a half are the great rise of rents between 1760 and 1800, and the equally remarkable decline which followed. In company with many writers, from Lord Cloncurry downwards, he lays stress upon the importance of emancipatory legislation as increasing the demand for land. But, since agrarian agitation dates from a period before the first measures of emancipation, it is probable that the growth of population was the decisive cause which produced the rise of rents. The early emancipation laws were no doubt expected to benefit the Protestant landlord, and must have done so in the rare cases where the improved rents did not go entirely to middlemen. But on the whole we are inclined to think that the emancipation movement was chiefly important, from an economic point of view, in so far as it diverted the attention of the peasantry from the agrarian to the political grievance. By degrees O'Connell and his lieutenants were forced to recognise the agrarian problem in their legislative programme. But between 1800 and 1829 they were undoubtedly successful in relegating the question of rents to the background. It was by Committees of the British Parliament and by outside observers such as Sir George Cornewall Lewis that the economic side of the Irish problem was discovered and explained. The Irish land-laws of the period 1870-1903 are the outcome of the inquiries instituted by England in 1824 and 1825. It is true that the villain of the preceding period was discovered to be the middleman rather than the landlord. But the existence of the middleman was due to the prevalence of absenteeism; and the expropriation of the landlord was a necessary means to the end of eliminating the middleman. Dr. Bonn rightly calls attention to the stringent provisions of the modern law against middlemen as one of the most hopeful signs for the future of Irish agriculture. They are provisions which can only be enforced when the State is the universal landlord.

In spite of his wide acquaintance with the agrarian problems of other countries, Dr. Bonn can produce no exact parallel to the case of Ireland. He states that the standard of comfort is lower among the Irish peasantry than among any corresponding class in Europe, and hints that the best devised of legislative reforms may prove abortive for this reason. He is appalled by the statistics of agrarian crime in Ireland, and remarks that only in

Sicily and Andalusia can a similar record be found. He is equally struck by the thoroughness of the legislation which has been framed to meet the Irish problem; laws more radical in tendency, he asserts, are not to be found in any European State. It is natural, therefore, that he should express himself with hesitation as to the results of recent English policy. He is in sympathy with the general object of creating a peasant proprietary, and holds that Irish experience has falsified the current objections to such a system of agriculture. On the other hand, he feels that no legislative measures can ensure to every Irish family the possession of an "economic" (*i.e.*, a self-supporting) tenement. Such tenements ought to be at least of 20 acres; but to give every peasant holder a farm of 20 acres it would be necessary that hundreds of families should be transplanted. And, even if tenements of the required size were called into being, it would be impossible to prevent their subdivision in the second or third generation. At present the holder of an "uneconomic" farm has the opportunity of obtaining employment on a large estate. But when such estates are broken up and the peasant is entirely dependent on his land, the problem of the "uneconomic" holder will be more serious than it ever has been in the past. Improved methods of cultivation might diminish the gravity of the problem. But so far the small Irish farmer has shown no disposition to sink capital in his land; and there is little prospect that he will begin to do so now. "No legislation can deal with this problem." After all his appreciative criticism of modern reforms Dr. Bonn comes back to the position that no legislative measures, not even the introduction of a protective tariff, can produce prosperity in Ireland without the active assistance of the Irishmen themselves. His painstaking discussion of modern laws may sometimes produce the impression that he looks to Parliament for a settlement of the Irish problem. But in the last resort he attaches himself to the school of Sir Horace Plunkett and Mr. Rolleston, his translator, and concludes with the remark that "injurious legislation and governmental oppression may indeed be a check to progress; but the mere removal of bad laws is not enough to make a people great and strong."

H. W. C. DAVIS