



WILEY

Review

Author(s): F. Y. Edgeworth

Review by: F. Y. Edgeworth

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 70 (Jun., 1908), pp. 308-310

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2220720>

Accessed: 14-06-2016 21:43 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

insurance at Turin, Rome, and Milan, but a strong feeling exists in favour of a national undertaking.

The author is opposed to the voluntary associations, urging that they are totally inadequate, that they merely add one more burden to the shoulders of the woman worker, and that they remove the responsibility from the State. Nor does she approve wholly of the proposed Bill, partly on the ground of its insufficiency, partly because the amount of the fund is estimated on a wrong basis. The present birth-rate among wage-earning women, which is far lower than the birth-rate for all classes, would rise as soon as insurance was granted. Moreover, a greater number of mothers would seek work in the factory.

In a final chapter of suggestions, the author throws out proposals of a somewhat impracticable nature with regard to length of absence from work, reduction of hours worked per day, and medical supervision. Her aim, apparently, is not the indirect one of preventing the employment of married women in factories, although this would be the inevitable outcome of the adoption of her proposals.

MARGRIETA BEER

ΠΕΡΙ ΑΠΟΓΡΑΦΗΣ. Α Μ ΑΝΔΡΕΑΔΟΥ. Athens: ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΤΥΧΑΚΗΣ, 1908. Pp. 47.

THIS is a lecture on the Census, given by Professor Andreades, of the University of Athens. The Greek, which is his native tongue, imparts, by its classical associations, a certain piquancy to his valuable remarks on modern statisticians and statisticians. The denizen of Western Europe will not immediately recognise, under the veil of a learned language, τὸν Βλῶκ or τὸν Βερτιγιὸν. He will wonder what modern journal is mentioned by the designation τοῦ Τάϊμς. Not all the persons mentioned in connection with a census appear as much at home in Greek surroundings as Cecrops, King of Attica, to whom an old historian ascribes the first enumeration of the Athenian people. From an historical retrospect we pass on to the uses of the census, one of which is peculiar to modern times, to secure the distribution of voting power in proportion to population. The questions asked in the Greek census suggest some interesting remarks. The first demand, *Name*, does not render the second, *Sex*, superfluous. For in Greece there are many female names, Alexandra, Constantina, and the like, which differ little from the corresponding male forms, and the differ-

ence is apt to be disguised by the bad handwriting in which the returns are often made. The second question brings into view the curious circumstance that in Greece the men outnumber the women in the proportion 100 to 92, while in the rest of Europe the preponderance is the other way—1,026 women to 1,000 men. Professor Andreades is disposed to accept the generalisation that Asiatic races have an excess of women, European, of men. Thus in Japan there is a considerable excess of men; and in the East of Europe the excess of women is less than in the West. Greece perhaps owes her exceptional excess of men to the occupation of the Turks. If so, that occupation left behind it one good result, in the judgment of our author, which deserves to be quoted in full. "In order that women should marry easily men should be in excess. It is desirable that unmarried women should not become numerous, as in politics and social life they are far from being elements of concord and order. We Greeks have an unpleasant experience of this, in spite of the fact that our women are in the minority. The English have an even bitterer experience. The unmarried women of England, the number of whom amounts to about a million, form a peculiar class which has been called 'the third sex.' Lowering wages by their competition with the men, claiming political rights for women, and introducing a freedom of action which is far from favourable to domestic life, this class has become an element of which the disturbing effect is very marked." The views of Pericles respecting the sphere of woman seem to have been inherited by the distinguished modern Athenian. Going on to another head of the census, the "Civil State," as our statisticians say, Prof. Andreades points out that inferences as to the character of a people from the number of marriages must be made with caution. In Greece, account must be taken of the excellent custom—literally "sacred tradition"—that brothers must see their sisters settled in life before they themselves marry. Professor Andreades concludes his striking and instructive address by combating the prejudices against the census, which seem to be as strong in Greece to-day as they once were in England. He reminds the devout of the memorable journey to Bethlehem that was undertaken in obedience to the requirements of the census; he warns the patriotic that deficiency in this branch of statistics is generally regarded as a mark of an imperfect civilisation.

F. Y. EDGEWORTH

THE Editor has received the following communication from Major Darwin :—

From Prof. Stanley Turner's review of my book on *Municipal Ownership* in the March ECONOMIC JOURNAL, I see that I have not altogether escaped the pitfalls which accompany condensed writing. Nor, I think, has my reviewer. As representing the substance of an argument of mine, it is stated that "Tramways owned and worked by Municipalities yielded an average net profit of only 8/10ths per cent. on the total capital, while those owned, but not worked, by Municipalities yielded about 2 per cent. to the local authority." Now I did not say that these results had actually been obtained. My words were that "the figures indicate that a city should *expect to obtain, whilst the debts remain unredeemed*, a net profit of about 8/10ths per cent. on the capital by working its own railways (tramways); whilst by leasing them out it *might expect* to make about 2 per cent.; *provided that the same conditions held good in the two cases as to sinking funds.*" It is to the qualifying phrases now printed in italics that I should like to direct Prof. Turner's attention; because the figures he gives later on, which are the actual net profits, naturally differ from mine, which represent hypothetical profits on certain conditions. The net profits made by Municipalities obviously increase concurrently with the redemption of their trading debts, and it seemed to me best to estimate what profits they would have been making if none of their debts had been redeemed; because what we want to know is whether under these conditions their true profits would or would not cover the charges for their sinking funds. As the proportion of the capital provided which had been redeemed differed considerably at the date in question in the cases of the two classes of tramways being compared, this inequality was thus also allowed for. Moreover, I endeavoured in a more questionable manner to make an allowance for the difference in the sinking fund charges, whilst other inequalities perforce remained uncorrected. All these defects, however, seemed to me to be covered by my remark that my calculations were "untrustworthy for various reasons." In short, I merely wish to point out that my figures, though open to criticism, are not mere blunders.