



# WILEY

---

Review

Author(s): L. L. P.

Review by: L. L. P.

Source: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol. 81, No. 3 (May, 1918), pp. 535-537

Published by: Wiley for the Royal Statistical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2340866>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 06:52 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](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*Royal Statistical Society, Wiley* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*

even with a more effective State organization, a sufficient incentive to "competitive undervaluation" exists in the possibility of evading county and other local taxes apportioned over more than one tax district. The record of *sales*, scientifically kept, is the only safe check upon communal evasion, and in the hands of the Wisconsin Commission in particular it has reached a high pitch of efficiency. The comparison of the experience of different commissions will in due course lead to more scientific methods of assessing the great corporations, which themselves are beginning to be amenable to central control. The position of intangible wealth in the valuation roll is as unsatisfactory as ever it was, and probably will remain so while the general property tax is retained.

If ever we leave the comparatively simple paths of rental values and set out on the thorny track of capital values for local taxation, the pages of this fine work will have a very living interest for us indeed. We may in some measure avoid a century of blundering by studying its lessons.

J.C.S.

7.—*Our Daily Bread*. By George Radford. 127 pp., small 8vo. London: Constable and Co., 1918. Price 4s. 6d. net.

The author of this new pronouncement on agrarian policy may be considered sanguine when he says that the "serial issue" of "Our Land," of which "this little book" should be regarded as a "supplement," "suspended during the war," "will be resumed" (D.V.) by the publication "on the 1st January, 1919," of "*Our Land Annual*." But ardour of conviction and assurance of belief are "qualities," to which, whatever be their "defects," Mr. Radford would establish easily a claim. For it is evident that he feels no doubt whatever of the necessity and completeness of the programme of reform which he puts forward. Separate planks are perhaps more conspicuous than a joined and morticed unity. The plan, however, does not lack ambitious design. It is the "public ownership" of those things which are essentially and fundamentally national, "land and minerals," and the "public management of others which, "like the Navy, Army, education and the post office, ought unquestionably to serve and be controlled by the State as a whole." "These latter undertakings," we are informed, "are farming, railways, mining, banks and the public house." Within the limited compass of not more than a hundred and thirty pages a discursive discussion of a multitude of topics, such as those hinted in the passage we have quoted, is comprised. The gold standard, for example, is adversely noticed; and the inevitable consequence ensues that the fringe is touched rather than the centre reached of vast questions. The real difficulties are not, we feel, satisfactorily met. Bare affirmation is more prominent than detailed explanation, although some apposite suggestions on some points may, we should suppose, be properly ascribed to practical experience of concrete fact; and Mr. Radford's independent criticism of certain proposals made by the State officials, whose assistance he generally seeks and approves, is shrewd and pertinent.

He shows indeed common sense, we think, in laying stress on local devolution as a desirable characteristic of salutary agrarian administration. The counties are, in his scheme, to be the farming units, and at first the needs of separate areas for food should be met from the resources of the surrounding and contiguous country. Surpluses may then become available for more populous cities situate at greater distances from the origin of supply, but the costs incidental to the modern processes of selling, such as those of advertisement, are to be minimised or avoided. Yet inconsistencies soon present themselves in the discussion, and formidable obstacles to success appear. "Real self-government," we are assured, "is the very antithesis" of the "bureaucracy," which, we understand, is deprecated. But we do not find it easy to conceive how "free" trade, like land and minerals, banking and the rest must become "nationalised," although it may be clear that the adequate wheat production, which is desiderated, from English land is not compatible with the maintenance of the reduced prices for that essential commodity that are likely to rule in a free trade regime. "It is too late," our author declares again, "to talk to me of socialism," when he has been "saved in this war by a State-paid fleet, a State-improvised army, State railways and State fishermen," and has been "hampered at every point by the greedy individualist." But, on the other hand, when the "feudal" system of private landlordship, to which he ascribes all the past and present ills or faults of rural life, has been successfully destroyed, the farmer should, it would seem, be left to "work the land" as a tenant rather than as a "paid manager for the county," while, nevertheless, the "scientific men and women at head-quarters" will "know best" by a study of the whole unit, as well as by "consultation with the various tenants," "what the acres of each farm require."

Adjustment of forces that appear thus to conflict may perhaps be achieved by means which Mr. Radford has conceived and not explained. But he shares, as we judge, the easy though illusive faith that magic accompanies the entry on the scene of action of officials who, in the majority of instances, are ordinary men, liable to the prejudices, and prone to exhibit the shortcomings, of average human nature. They are at least unlikely to work miracles. An imperative need of the immediate juncture may, as our author and many others argue, dictate the raising of a larger quota of our food supplies, and especially of wheat, from our own soils at home. But it does not follow that such wonders as he represents will result from the mere employment of the particular machinery which he recommends, for we know that even under the remorseless pressure of war-time State regulation and official enterprise do not avoid the gratuitous friction due to irritating fussiness, or escape the delay occasioned by a relaxation of the driving force of the individual interest which moves the possessors of private property. The "government stroke" is no less proverbial than the waste of public undertakings is notorious, and, with some redeeming excep-

tions, and balancing compensation, both faults have lately received fresh exposure. Mr. Radford, like many enthusiasts for the attractive game of large "reconstruction," is perhaps unwilling to face preliminary drudgery, or to devote any great amount of tiring labour to the prosaic consideration of commonplace objections. On that account also he fails to satisfy the honest doubts we entertain.

L.L.P.

8.—*Economic Effects of the War upon Women and Children in Great Britain.* By Irene Osgood Andrews, assisted by Margaretta Hobbs. x+190 pp., post 4to. New York: Oxford University Press, 1918.

This is the second in the series of preliminary war studies undertaken by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. In many respects it is a most useful and painstaking record of the difficulties which have been met and partially surmounted in connection with the increased employment of women during the war. It should enable the United States Government to avoid many pitfalls, the chapters on control of women workers under the Munition Acts, wages, hours of work, safety, health, and comfort deserving special attention. American and British official reports, and the publications of English trade-unions, the Fabian Society and leading industrial authorities have been carefully ransacked up to November, 1917, and those in Great Britain who have found it difficult to see the wood on account of the trees, may find in it much that is illuminating.

From a statistical point of view some suspicion is aroused by a few obvious errors easily ascertained. On p. 2 it is stated that "in August, 1917, Mr. Herbert Fisher, president of the Board of Education, admitted in the House of Commons that in the past "three years some 600,000 children under fourteen had been put "prematurely to work through the relaxation of child labour and "compulsory school laws." This, had it been true, is properly described as "an increase nothing short of appalling" (p. 146); and it is further stated that "probably nine-tenths of the exemptions "were for agricultural work." Mr. Fisher's speech contains no reference to relaxation of child labour and compulsory school laws in connection with the number quoted. According to a Return as to the number of children in England and Wales excused from school for employment in agriculture on October 16, 1916 (Cd. 8171 of 1916), the numbers specially exempted for that purpose were 13,823 boys and 1,092 girls. On p. 15 some very hypothetical estimates are quoted as "official," although a reference to their source in the Labour Year Book, 1916, p. 259, shows that they were there described as unofficial.

On p. 18 it is stated that the occupation returns for girls and boys under eighteen had in November, 1917, been published only for England and Wales. The returns for Scotland were published in 1913, and