WILEY

Review

Author(s): L. L. P.

Review by: L. L. P.

Source: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol. 75, No. 4 (Mar., 1912), pp. 433-436

Published by: Wiley for the Royal Statistical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2340286>

Accessed: 09-05-2016 21:11 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 Statistical Society, Wiley are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*

therefore be old, but it is on their combinations and relationships that the author desires to lay emphasis. The first subject dealt with is the money crisis in the United States in 1907, which the author connects with the deficient but dear harvest of that year, resulting in an exceptionally heavy demand for money, and with the currency and banking systems of the States, which are said to be too inelastic to meet the fluctuating seasonal demands for money. This essay is followed by others on the German monetary system and its reform, and the causes and effects of the concentration in the German banking system. In the latter, the author refers to Germany as unblest with England's rich heritage from the past or with the great natural resources of the United States, and appeals to the necessity for organisation and combination as compensations to Germany for these deficiencies. The concentration of banking has followed inevitably from the development of the State, and the need for financing great industrial undertakings and distributing risks.

Succeeding these papers on monetary matters are essays on the organisation of the corn trade in the United States, which is submitted to very detailed treatment; the migrations of great industries in Germany and the States, a highly interesting and suggestive study of the causes at work determining the localisation of industries in the two countries; the organisation of foreign trade in China; German shipping interests in the Pacific Ocean; and the financial treatment of the internal waterways of Germany. A few shorter essays are given in an appendix.

It will be seen that Professor Schumacher covers a great deal of ground, and his wide knowledge of facts and broad treatment of them make the volume well worth study by anyone interested in the subjects with which he deals.

A.D.W.

4.—*The Case against Free Trade*. By W. Cunningham, D.D., F.B.A., with a Preface by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P. xvi + 137 pp., cr. 8vo. London: John Murray, 1911. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The Case against Tariff Reform. By E. Enever Todd, M.A. ix + 156 pp., cr. 8vo. London: John Murray, 1911. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The appearance of these two books in a series intended by the publisher to appeal to that large class of general readers which is interested in "social questions of the day" would suffice of itself to demonstrate the continuing vitality of the fiscal controversy; and this first impression would only be confirmed by closer consultation of the pages of either volume, for it is evident that both writers feel that they are dealing with practical issues of great immediate importance, and that they are not merely busied on the fruitless, if attractive, dialectics of academic theorising. Neither of the two, we may add, spares any pains to secure a satisfying statement of his "case," and their advocacy is no less able than it is persuasive. They are manifestly "on their mettle," conscious that the matter in hand requires and deserves the best that they can give to its successful handling.

This bracing sense of actuality is supported by the characteristic Preface with which Archdeacon Cunningham's book is introduced. Despite of his present bodily infirmity, the crisp and lucid sentences, in which Mr. Chamberlain, as has always been his wont, describes the situation as he conceives it, show that in alertness of observation, in the firm grasp of what he considers to be the essential points, in courage of conviction and in candour of expression, he has lost no whit of his acknowledged mental force. Such plain terse utterances as these could have proceeded from no other lips. "The future of the Empire lies henceforward, not in the power to annex new territories, but in its capacity to unite existing dominions and develop existing resources." "A common trade policy is the indispensable basis of a common imperial policy." "The great dominions are willing; we alone refuse." "Such a state of things cannot last. We are in a position of unstable equilibrium." Whether, with Dr. Cunningham we agree with, or like Mr. Todd, we dissent from, the policy thus indicated the mode of statement must command our admiration for its rare display of luminous vigour.

We cannot doubt, accordingly, that the problem here discussed is unmistakably alive. So rapidly indeed have events moved recently in the fight between "Free Trade" and "Tariff Reform," that, while the quondam Colonial Secretary ends his Preface with the lament, which was not unjustified, that "yet another Conference is wearing to its close, with many hopes disappointed and little practical result to show for its patriotic labours," the competent author of the "reply" to this book has found himself compelled to explain, and we must confess that to us he seems to have discovered some difficulty, although he has displayed some ingenuity, in the process, that the recent Canadian general election was not, as it would appear to be, a resounding victory for Imperial Preference. His argument perhaps shows disappointment at a result which was hardly expected when he began to write his book. For it is not easy for one who shares the avowed belief of Mr. Asquith that Tariff Reform was an "imposture," and would, like the British Prime Minister, have rejoiced to think that he was witnessing the "obsequies" of Preference, to account for what has subsequently occurred. But, in actual fact, however the rejection of the proposed reciprocity with the United States by the chief British Colony be interpreted, it is obviously a conspicuous incident in the history of the Fiscal Question. It must be reckoned with as one of the contributory influences which keeps the controversy going. Mr. Todd, indeed, with all his abounding confidence in the convincing strength of his "case" against Tariff Reform, hardly believes, we suspect, that he is merely "slaying the slain"; and we are sure that there will be many readers among the public at large who will welcome the opportunity offered in his and Dr. Cunningham's book of studying once more the pros and cons of either side of the debate, as it is presented by these valiant and expert combatants.

They may, however, suffer disappointment if they approach these statements of the respective "cases" against Free Trade and against Tariff Reform with the expectation that they will find plea

and counterplea brought into juxtaposition. To some extent the sub-title given to Mr. Todd's book is misleading, for it is not a "reply" to Dr. Cunningham's book, if by that is meant that to each argument advanced in the one a rejoinder is put forward in the other. Indeed, the general line of treatment followed by the two disputants is noticeably different. The Archdeacon favours the discussion of broad fundamental issues, and in that we believe him to be right; for it is only by going down to the foundations, so to say, of "convictions" we have been habituated to accept on trust, that much real progress can be made in the matter of a satisfying fiscal creed. Mr. Todd, by contrast, seems more content if he can win a superficial triumph on some point of detail. On the other hand, he is certainly more prone to the laxer use of unqualified superlatives, while the historical instinct of the industrious explorer of the records of the past, inclining away from absolute assertions of universal validity, is so far opportunist that he both thinks and says that circumstances may alter cases, and that a policy at one time confessedly successful or advantageous may at another be inexpedient or even positively injurious. Dr. Cunningham perhaps remembers, while Mr. Todd forgets, that economic "laws" are for the most part made by men rather than imposed upon them "willy nilly" by some superior external and mysterious force.

Thus the Archdeacon suggests doubts which attach to familiar Free Trade arguments. Its vaunted success in the past may, he holds, be questioned: its compatibility with the fulfilment of imperial duty is not easy or possible to reconcile with its characteristic note of *laissez faire*. Its practice has resulted in a lop-sided development, which has exalted commerce and manufacture, and has depressed agriculture; and disproportionate attention has been given to the satisfaction of the demands of consumers at the moment to which the more permanent needs of the producers have perforce given way. With such criticism as this an instructive review of the "big-loaf misconception" is conjoined, with the result that the influence of the Corn Laws in raising in the past, and that of Free Trade subsequently in lowering, the price of wheat, is shown to have been exaggerated or misrepresented. Nor does Dr. Cunningham omit to advance a vigorous protest against the perverse obsession, which, proclaiming as a principle that must never be infringed the maxim of "taxation for revenue alone," would debar Finance Ministers from touching, even tentatively, any fiscal expedient which might possibly have ulterior consequences beyond a monetary return.

Mr. Todd, on the other hand, it is evident, from the beginning to the end of his clever and readable essay, will have no parleying at all with his opponents. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that he apparently regards them as being either "fools or knaves." He entertains no doubt whatever about the certainty of his reasoning and the assurance of his conclusions. Retaliation and Preference are set by him in irreconcilable antagonism, instead of being the complementary portions of an integral tariff policy, resting, in contrast to "free trade," on purposed differentiation in the fiscal

treatment of goods of different origin. Colonial Independence is, he urges, essential in fiscal as in other matters, and, therefore, the Imperial Preference, for which the official representatives of the self-governing Dominions have more than once expressed a desire by word of mouth addressed to Great Britain, and have shown their liking by the actual practice pursued among themselves, cannot be carried into effect, and *laissez faire* is in reality in this sphere a "constructive and not merely a negative policy." This may at first sight seem to be an argumentative position which is not easy to establish, and is difficult to maintain, but it is deliberately adopted and it is also courageously defended by the author of the "Case against Tariff Reform." It is with similar boldness, and no less stout conviction, that he argues that the specialisation purposely brought into the classification found in modern tariffs cannot in the end defeat the advantage accruing to Free Trade countries from the "most favoured nation" clauses of commercial treaties. We should not wish in the face of reasonings such as these to impugn Mr. Todd's robustness of belief in the argumentative strength of the case for Free Trade; but, nevertheless, he may, with some justification, provoke our dissent when he affirms that the undoubted recent economic progress of Germany has in no degree been due to her protective policy, or that England could not be said to be peculiarly favoured at the time when Free Trade became her fiscal policy by the predominant position she then occupied in the world of industry and trade.

Mr. Todd is, on the whole, perhaps eager to prove too much. He is also disposed to select for exclusive emphasis some one cause out of a number of co-operating forces as responsible solely for the result which has ensued; and he admits no half-shades into the highly-coloured picture which he draws. One sentence we may quote in conclusion as typical of his mental attitude and his argumentative methods. "On all grounds," therefore, he declares "there is no evidence to show that we are being driven out of protected markets or that we must rely mainly in the future on the Imperial connection." This particular contention is supported by weighty evidence, which is ably presented; but the use of the unqualified expressions "all" and "no" is none the less characteristic. L.L.P.

5.—*The tariff in our times.* By Ida M. Tarbell. x + 375 pp., 8vo. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1911. Price (in United Kingdom) 6s. 6d. net.

The tariff problem seems to have become once more the dominant question in United States domestic politics, and likely to be the main issue at the approaching Presidential election. Whatever the cause, whether alarm at the increased cost of living or resentment at the supposed abuse of power by industrial combinations and a belief that such abuse is facilitated by high protection, or a growing consciousness of the manner in which tariff legislation has been manipulated on behalf of particular interests which are indifferent to, if not incompatible with, national well-being—there can be no doubt that the opposition to Protection as practised in the United