WILEY

Review

Author(s): F. Y. Edgeworth

Review by: F. Y. Edgeworth

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 55 (Sep., 1904), pp. 430-433

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2221370>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 10:47 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*

One consideration of importance in relation to the New Zealand law does not appear to have engaged the attention of the author. As a matter of fact, the branches of industry, to which this law has so far been applied, are just those on which the great prosperity of New Zealand is not based, while the pastoral and agricultural interests of the Colony, which form the keystone of its wealth, have not, up to the present time, been affected by the decisions of the court of arbitration. This being the case, it is not quite easy to deduce from the success achieved by the New Zealand system any entirely convincing arguments in favour of its probable utility, if applied to the whole of the vast and complex industries of the United States.

However, Mr. Gilman does not commit himself to the opinion that the necessity for the adoption in his country of any system of legal regulation similar to that in force in New Zealand will actually arise. He has "great faith in the essential reasonableness of American employers and working-men, and in the power of such reasonableness to bring about substantial industrial peace," and has "still more confidence in the good sense and reasonableness of 'the public' as the final tribunal before which all disputes in the industrial world must be brought, directly or indirectly," and "great trust in the power of public opinion to force both parties in labour troubles to adopt reasonable policies." But Mr. Gilman has "no doubt that public opinion will reach the point of attempting the policy of legal regulation of labour disputes, if employers and working-men do not, in the next few years, greatly improve upon the record of the last few."

DAVID F. SCHLOSS

Ireland in the New Century. By the Right Honourable Sir HORACE PLUNKETT, K.C.V.O., F.R.S. (London: Murray. 1904. Pp. 300.)

SIR HORACE PLUNKETT's book belongs to the art, rather than the science, of Political Economy. It is related to the ordinary treatises, as the prescription for a particular case is related to a demonstration in anatomy. The case is a very complicated one; the *malaise* cannot be ascribed to any single cause.

There is first "the influence of politics on the Irish mind." The absence of captains of industry from the councils of the political leaders is regretted. The methods employed for the attainment of Home Rule have been injurious to the industrial

character of the people. Agitation, as Thomas Davis said, in a passage aptly quoted by our author, "leads to much disorganisation, great unhappiness, wounds upon the soul of a country which sometimes are worse than the thinning of a people by war." "The practice of boycotting," observes Sir Horace Plunkett, "is the very antithesis of industry, creating an atmosphere in which industry and enterprise simply cannot live."

It is not often that one whose opinion is as valuable as our author's has the courage to express it as openly. When the Homeric prophet is urged to declare the cause from which his countrymen are perishing, he will not speak until he is secured against the wrath of a man whose power over the Argives is very great. But the revealer of unwelcome truths about the cause of Irish distress does not hesitate to offend two powerful orders of men, the priests as well as the political leaders. He complains of excessive and extravagant church-building at the expense of poor communities. Referring to the multiplication of elaborate monastic and conventual institutions, he says: "I cannot believe that so large an addition to the 'unproductive' classes is economically sound, and I have no doubt at all that the competition with lay teachers of celibates living in community is excessive and economically injurious." A more sweeping condemnation is based on "the reliance of that religion on authority, its repression of individuality, and its complete shifting of what I may call the moral centre of gravity to a future existence." To these causes are attributed a "listlessness and apathy in regard to economic improvement which amounts to a form of fatalism, and in backward districts a survival of superstition which saps all will and purpose."

Defects in the educational system of Ireland are pointed out with equal freedom. Education has been in Ireland too long a thing apart from the economic realities of the country; not adapted to correct "the defects in the industrial character of our people which debar them from successful competition with other countries."

Though the causes of malady are manifold, the remedy is comparatively simple: to improve the industrial character of the people. Means of effecting this improvement are afforded by the Department of Agricultural and Technical Education, of which Sir Horace Plunkett is the originator and president. As the scope and functions of this Department have already been described in the *ECONOMIC JOURNAL*, both by the Chief himself

and by his able lieutenant, Father Finlay (ECONOMIC JOURNAL, vol. vi. 205; vii. 131), we need not repeat what has been so well expressed. Suffice it to say that the statistics of continued progress are brought up to date in the work before us. Attention may also be called to the lively picture of the matters with which the Department has to deal, in particular the applications for assistance which pour in upon the Chief—"himself" in the racy vernacular. A stockowner from a remote district telegraphs, "My pigs are all spotted. What shall I do?" Another writes, "Al the pigs about here is dying in showers. Send down a Vit at oncet." We have not space to reproduce the interviews with typical callers—the man who has invented a method of utilising bogs, and the man who wants his daughter to be trained as a poultry instructress.

Hearing how much is done by the Department, the economist, indoctrinated with the principle of *laissez faire*, may be seized with apprehension. But on examination he will find that the danger of doing too much has been anticipated by the Chief of the Department—that he has carefully considered what Burke calls "one of the finest problems in legislation," to determine what the State should do for the people and what it should let the people do for themselves. Other parties too, besides the economist, who may at first have feared for their favourite cause or peculiar tenet, will find that the author's frank criticisms are directed to the improvement of industrial character, without bias in favour of Orangemen against Catholics or Unionists against Nationalists. Trojan and Tyrian have seldom been treated so "indifferently." To the even-handed criticism which has been bestowed all-round on Irish institutions it has been archly suggested that there is one exception—"The Department." To us it appears that a little parental partiality towards a successful creation is natural and venial, and not much calculated to impair the general worth of our author's judgments. If we are right in ascribing a peculiar value to these judgments as being based on a large practical experience and expressed with unique fearlessness, they cannot fail to be highly prized by such as are disengaged from party contests. In that class we may include Posterity; who will perhaps find in these pages a picture of Irish conditions as instructive, if not as artistic, as that which is presented in Berkeley's *Querist*. If our author's words prove as effectual as his work, and the effect of both is as permanent as it is beneficial, he will deserve the prophetic encomium which was bestowed upon him in a recent debate by the Chief Secretary

for Ireland : the name of Horace Plunkett will be remembered, "enshrined in History with the names of Arthur Young and Thomas Drummond."

F. Y. EDGEWORTH

La Politique agricole. Par EUGEN VON PHILIPPOVICH, Professeur à l'Université de Vienne, traduit de l'allemand par Savinien Bouyssy. Avec une préface par A. Souchon, Professeur à la Faculté de Droit de l'Université de Paris. (Paris : Giard. 1904.)

PROFESSOR PHILIPPOVICH'S name vouches for a good book, and no doubt in Austria and in Germany his *Agrarpolitik* will have been received as a valuable addition to economic literature, being generally accurate, pithy, and yet losing nothing of its lucidity by brevity. There is an unmistakable smack of the "Kolleg" about the volume, which plainly proclaims its object. For that very reason one cannot help wondering a little with Professor Souchon, who supplies the preface, why it should have been specially singled out for translation. "There is so little to interest us Frenchmen in it, or yet English people," says M. Souchon. That is not quite correct. However, it is true that when we Britons and French read about German and Austrian economics, we want to learn a good deal more than can possibly be told in these short, carefully docked, condensed chapters, perfectly sufficient as they are for students initiated in the peculiar nomenclature and economic lore. Even so, it appears to me, the contents fall short of the promise of the title. There are matters on which one might reasonably look for information on which the author is absolutely silent. On other points, of great present interest, the author—who is careful to quote at the end of every chapter a well-selected bibliography, with which it is impossible to quarrel—shows himself as relying too much upon his pet authorities, without sufficient familiarity of his own with the subject wherewith to check the borrowed opinion. This occurs where he deals with collective husbandry, with East Prussian peasants' settlements, with *métayage*, with the relative superiority of cultivation on large and small farms, with the results of agricultural labourers' agitations, and, above all things, with Co-operation, which is at the present time, at any rate in German-speaking countries, together with the tariff, the most "burning" question of all in *Agrarpolitik*.

On the other hand, there are really excellent bits in the book.

G G 2