The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2

1

Property

1. The principles which have been set forth in the first partthis Treatise, are, in certain respects, stronglyfrom those, on the consideration of which we areabout to enter. The laws and conditions of the production ofpartake of the character of physical truths. There isoptional or arbitrary in them. Whatever mankind produce,be produced in the modes, and under the conditions, imposedthe constitution of external things, and by the inherentof their own bodily and mental structure. Whether theyit or not, their productions will be limited by the amounttheir previous accumulation, and, that being given, it will beto their energy, their skill, the perfection ofmachinery, and their judicious use of the advantages oflabour. Whether they like it or not, a double quantitylabour will not raise, on the same land, a double quantity of, unless some improvement takes place in the processes of. Whether they like it or not, the unproductiveof individuals will pro tanto tend to impoverish the, and only their productive expenditure will enrich it.opinions, or the wishes, which may exist on these different, do not control the things themselves. We cannot, indeed,to what extent the modes of production may be altered, orproductiveness of labour increased, by future extensions ofknowledge of the laws of nature, suggesting new processes ofof which we have at present no conception. But howsoevermay succeed in making for ourselves more space within theset by the constitution of things, we know that there mustlimits. We cannot alter the ultimate properties either ofor mind, but can only employ those properties more or less, to bring about the events in which we are.

It is not so with the Distribution of Wealth. That is aof human institution solely. The things once there,, individually or collectively, can do with them as they. They can place them at the disposal of whomsoever they, and on whatever terms. Further, in the social state, instate except total solitude, any disposal whatever of themonly take place by the consent of society, or rather of thosedispose of its active force. Even what a person has producedhis individual toil, unaided by any one, he cannot keep,by the permission of society. Not only can society take ithim, but individuals could and would take it from him, ifonly remained passive; if it did not either interfere en, or employ and pay people for the purpose of preventing himbeing disturbed in the possession. The distribution of, therefore, depends on the laws and customs of society.rules by which it is determined, are what the opinions andof the ruling portion of the community make them, andvery different in different ages and countries; and might bemore different, if mankind so chose.

The opinions and feelings of mankind, doubtless, are not aof chance. They are consequences of the fundamental lawshuman nature, combined with the existing state of knowledgeexperience, and the existing condition of social institutionsintellectual and moral culture. But the laws of theof human opinions are not within our present subject.are part of the general theory of human progress, a farand more difficult subject of inquiry than political. We have here to consider, not the causes, but the, of the rules according to which wealth may be. Those, at least, are as little arbitrary, and havemuch the character of physical laws, as the laws of. Human beings can control their own acts, but not theof their

acts neither to themselves or to others.can subject the distribution of wealth to whatever rulesthinks best: but what practical results will flow from theof those rules, must be discovered, like any otheror mental truths, by observation and reasoning.

We proceed, then, to the consideration of the different modesdistributing the produce of land and labour, which have beenin practice, or may be conceived in theory. Among these,attention is first claimed by that primary and fundamental, on which, unless in some exceptional and verycases, the economical arrangements of society have always, though in its secondary features it has varied, and isto vary. I mean, of course, the institution of individual.

2. Private property, as an institution, did not owe itsto any of those considerations of utility, which plead formaintenance of it when established. Enough is known of rude, both from history and from analogous states of society inown time, to show, that tribunals (which always precede laws)originally established, not to determine rights, but toviolence and terminate quarrels. With this object chieflyview, they naturally enough gave legal effect to first, by treating as the aggressor the person who firstviolence, by turning, or attempting to turn, anotherof possession. The preservation of the peace, which was theobject of civil government, was thus attained; while by, to those who already possessed it, even what was notfruit of personal exertion, a guarantee was incidentallyto them and others that they would be protected in what was.

In considering the institution of property as a question inphilosophy, we must leave out of consideration its actualin any of the existing nations of Europe. We may suppose aunhampered by any previous possession; a body of, occupying for the first time an uninhabited country'.nothing with them but what belonged to them in common,having a clear field for the adoption of the institutions andwhich they judged most expedient; required, therefore, towhether they would conduct the work of production on theof individual property, or on some system of commonand collective agency.

If private property were adopted, we must presume that itbe accompanied by none of the initial inequalities andwhich obstruct the beneficial operation of thein old societies. Every full grown man or woman, wesuppose, would be secured in the unfettered use and disposalhis or her bodily and mental faculties; and the instruments of, the land and tools, would be divided fairly among, so that all might start, in respect to outward appliances,equal terms. It is possible also to conceive that in thisapportionment, compensation might be made for theof nature, and the balance redressed by assigning to therobust members of the community advantages in the, sufficient to put them on a par with the rest. Butdivision, once made, would not again be interfered with;would be left to their own exertions and to thechances, for making an advantageous use of what wasto them. If individual property, on the contrary, were, the plan which must be adopted would be to hold theand all instruments of production as the joint property ofcommunity, and to carry on the operations of industry on theaccount. The direction of the labour of the communitydevolve upon a magistrate or magistrates, whom we mayelected by the suffrages of the community, and whom weassume to be voluntarily obeyed by them. The division of thewould in like manner be a public act. The principle mightbe that of complete equality, or of apportionment to theor deserts of individuals, in whatever manner mightconformable to the ideas of justice or policy prevailing incommunity.

Examples of such associations, on a small scale, are theorders, the Moravians, the followers of Rapp, and: and from the hopes which they hold out of relief from theand iniquities of a state of much inequality of wealth,for a larger application of the same idea have reappearedbecome popular at all periods of active speculation on theprinciples of society. In an age like the present, when areconsideration of all first principles is felt to be, and when more than at any former period of historysuffering portions of the community have a voice in the, it was impossible but that ideas of this naturespread far and wide. The late revolutions in Europe haveup a great amount of speculation of this character, and anshare of attention has consequently been drawn to theforms which these ideas have assumed: nor is thislikely to diminish, but on the contrary, to increaseand more.

The assailants of the principle of individual property may beinto two classes: those whose scheme implies absolutein the distribution of the physical means of life and, and those who admit inequality, but grounded on some, or supposed principle, of justice or general, and not, like so many of the existing social, dependent on accident alone. At the head of theclass, as the earliest of those belonging to the present, must be placed Mr. Owen and his followers. M. Louisand M. Cabet have more recently become conspicuous asof similar doctrines (though the former advocatesof distribution only as a transition to a still higherof justice, that all should work according to their, and receive according to their wants). Thename for this economical system is Communism, aof continental origin, only of late introduced into this. The word Socialism, which originated among the English, and was assumed by them as a name to designate theirdoctrine, is now, on the Continent, employed in a larger; not necessarily implying Communism, or the entireof private property, but applied to any system whichthat the land and the instruments of production shouldthe property, not of individuals, but of communities or, or of the government. Among such systems, the twohighest intellectual pretension are those which, from theof their real or reputed authors, have been called St.and Fourierism; the former defunct as a system, butduring the few years of its public promulgation, sowed theof nearly all the Socialist tendencies which have sinceso widely in France: the second, still flourishing in the, talent, and zeal of its adherents.

3. Whatever may be the merits or defects of these various, they cannot be truly said to be impracticable. Noperson can doubt that a village community, composed offew thousand inhabitants cultivating in joint ownership theextent of land which at present feeds that number of people,producing by combined labour and the most improved processesmanufactured articles which they required, could raise anof productions sufficient to maintain them in comfort; andfind the means of obtaining, and if need be, exacting, theof labour necessary for this purpose, from every memberthe association who was capable of work.

The objection ordinarily made to a system of community ofand equal distribution of the produce, that each personbe incessantly occupied in evading his fair share of the, points, undoubtedly, to a real difficulty. But those whothis objection, forget to how great an extent the sameexists under the system on which nine-tenths of theof society is now conducted. The objection supposes,honest and efficient labour is only to be had from those whothemselves individually to reap the benefit of their own. But how small a part of all the labour performed in, from the lowest-paid to the highest, is done by personsfor

their own benefit. From the Irish reaper or hodman tochief justice or the minister of state, nearly all the worksociety is remunerated by day wages or fixed salaries. Aoperative has less personal interest in his work than aof a Communist association, since he is not, like him,for a partnership of which he is himself a member. Itno doubt be said, that though the labourers themselves have, in most cases, a personal interest in their work, they areand superintended, and their labour directed, and thepart of the labour performed, by persons who have. Even, however, is far from being universally the fact. In all, and many of the largest and most successful private, not only the labours of detail but the control andare entrusted to salaried officers. And though"master's eye," when the master is vigilant and intelligent,of proverbial value, it must be remembered that in a Socialistor manufactory, each labourer would be under the eye not ofmaster, but of the whole community. In the extreme case ofperseverance in not performing the due share of work,community would have the same resources which society now hascompelling conformity to the necessary conditions of the. Dismissal, the only remedy at present, is no remedyany other labourer who may be engaged does no better thanpredecessor: the power of dismissal only enables an employerobtain from his workmen the customary amount of labour, butcustomary labour may be of any degree of inefficiency. Evenlabourer who loses his employment by idleness or negligence,nothing worse to suffer, in the most unfavourable case, thandiscipline of a workhouse, and if the desire to avoid this besufficient motive in the one system, it would be sufficient inother. I am not undervaluing the strength of the incitementto labour when the whole or a large share of the benefit ofexertion belongs to the labourer. But under the presentof industry this incitement, in the great majority of, does not exist. If Communistic labour might be lessthan that of a peasant proprietor, or a workmanon his own account, it would probably be more energeticthat of a labourer for hire, who has no personal interest inmatter at all. The neglect by the uneducated classes offor hire, of the duties which they engage to perform,in the present state of society most flagrant. Now it is ancondition of the Communist scheme that all shall be: and this being supposed, the duties of the members ofassociation would doubtless be as diligently performed asof the generality of salaried officers in the middle orclasses; who are not supposed to be necessarily unfaithfultheir trust, because so long as they are not dismissed, theiris the same in however lax a manner their duty is fulfilled., as a general rule, remuneration by fixed salariesnot in any class of functionaries produce the maximum of: and this is as much as can be reasonably alleged againstlabour.

That even this inferiority would necessarily exist, is by noso certain as is assumed by those who are little used carrytheir minds beyond the state of things with which they are. Mankind are capable of a far greater amount of publicthan the present age is accustomed to suppose possible.bears witness to the success with which large bodies ofbeings may be trained to feel the public interest their. And no soil could be more favourable to the growth of such a, than a Communist association, since all the ambition,the bodily and mental activity, which are now exerted in theof separate and self-regarding interests, would requiresphere of employment, and would naturally find it in theof the general benefit of the community. The same cause,often assigned in explanation of the devotion of the Catholicor monk to the interest of his order — that he has noapart from it — would, under Communism, attach theto the community. And independently of the public motive,member of the association would be amenable to the most, and one of

the strongest, of personal motives, that ofopinion. The force of this motive in deterring from anyor omission positively reproved by the community, no one isto deny; but the power also of emulation, in exciting tomost strenuous exertions for the sake of the approbation andof others, is borne witness to by experience in everyin which human beings publicly compete with one, even if it be in things frivolous, or from which thederive no benefit. A contest, who can do most for thegood, is not the kind of competition which Socialists. To what extent, therefore, the energy of labour wouldddiminished by Communism, or whether in the long run it wouldddiminished at all, must be considered for the present anquestion.

Another of the objections to Communism is similar to that, sourged against poor-laws: that if every member of thewere assured of subsistence for himself and any numberchildren, on the sole condition of willingness to work,restraint on the multiplication of mankind would be atend, and population would start forward at a rate which wouldthe community, through successive stages of increasing, to actual starvation. There would certainly be muchfor this apprehension if Communism provided no motives to, equivalent to those which it would take away. Butis precisely the state of things m which opinion mightexpected to declare itself with greatest intensity againstkind of selfish intemperance. Any augmentation of numbersdiminished the comfort or increased the toil of the mass,then cause (which now it does not) immediate andinconvenience to every individual in the; inconvenience which could not then be imputed to theof employers, or the unjust privileges of the rich. Inaltered circumstances opinion could not fail to reprobate,if reprobation did not suffice, to repress by penalties ofdescription, this or any other culpable self-indulgence atexpense of the community. The Communistic scheme, instead ofpeculiarly open to the objection drawn from danger ofpopulation, has the recommendation of tending in an especialto the prevention of that evil.

A more real difficulty is that of fairly apportioning theof the community among its members. There are many kindswork, and by what standard are they to be measured one against? Who is to judge how much cotton spinning, orgoods from the stores, or bricklaying, or chimney, is equivalent to so much ploughing? The difficulty ofthe adjustment between different qualities of labour is sofelt by Communist writers, that they have usuallyit necessary to provide that all should work by turns atdescription of useful labour. an arrangement which, byan end to the division of employments, would sacrifice soof the advantage of co-operative production as greatly tothe productiveness of labour. Besides, even in the sameof work, nominal equality of labour would be so great a real, that the feeling of justice would revolt against itsenforced. All persons are not equally fit for all labour;the same quantity of labour is an unequal burthen on the weakthe strong, the hardy and the delicate, the quick and the, the dull and the intelligent.

But these difficulties, though real, are not necessarily. The apportionment of work to the strength andof individuals, the mitigation of a general rule tofor cases in which it would operate harshly, are notto which human intelligence, guided by a sense of, would be inadequate. And the worst and most unjustwhich could be made of these points, under a systemat equality, would be so far short of the inequality andwith which labour (not to speak of remuneration) is now, as to be scarcely worth counting in comparison. Weremember too, that Communism, as a system of society, existsin idea; that its

difficulties, at present, are much betterthan its resources; and that the intellect of mankindonly beginning to contrive the means of organizing it in, so as to overcome the one and derive the greatestfrom the other.

If, therefore, the choice were to be made between Communismall its chances, and the present state of society with allsufferings and injustices; if the institution of privatenecessarily carried with it as a consequence, that theof labour should be apportioned as we now see it, almostan inverse ratio to the labour — the largest portions towho have never worked at all, the next largest to thosework is almost nominal, and so in a descending scale, thedwindling as the work grows harder and more, until the most fatiguing and exhausting bodilycannot count with certainty on being able to earn even theof life; if this or Communism were the alternative,the difficulties, great or small, of Communism would be butdust in the balance. But to make the comparison applicable, wecompare Communism at its best, with the regime of individual, not as it is, but as it might be made. The principle ofproperty has never yet had a fair trial in any country;less so, perhaps, in this country than in some others. Thearrangements of modern Europe commenced from aof property which was the result, not of just, or acquisition by industry, but of conquest and: and notwithstanding what industry has been doing forcenturies to modify the work of force, the system stillmany and large traces of its origin. The laws of propertynever yet conformed to the principles on which theof private property rests. They have made propertythings which never ought to be property, and absolute propertyonly a qualified property ought to exist. They have notthe balance fairly between human beings, but have heapedupon some, to give advantage to others; they havefostered inequalities, and prevented all from startingin the race. That all should indeed start on perfectly equal, is inconsistent with any law of private property: but ifmuch pains as has been taken to aggravate the inequality ofarising from the natural working of the principle, hadtaken to temper that inequality by every means notof the principle itself; if the tendency ofhad been to favour the diffusion, instead of theof wealth — to encourage the subdivision of themasses, instead of striving to keep them together; theof individual property would have been found to have noconnexion with the physical and social evils whichall Socialist writers assume to be inseparable from it.

Private property, in every defence made of it, is supposed to, the guarantee to individuals of the fruits of their ownand abstinence. The guarantee to them of the fruits of theand abstinence of others, transmitted to them without anyor exertion of their own, is not of the essence of the, but a mere incidental consequence, which, when ita certain height, does not promote, but conflicts with,ends which render private property legitimate. To judge offinal destination of the institution of property, we musteverything rectified, which causes the institution toin a manner opposed to that equitable principle, ofbetween remuneration and exertion, on which in everyof it that will bear the light, it is assumed to be. We must also suppose two conditions realized, withoutneither Communism nor any other laws or institutions couldthe condition of the mass of mankind other than degraded and. One of these conditions is, universal education; the, a due limitation of the numbers of the community. With, there could be no poverty, even under the present social: and these being supposed, the question of Socialismnot, as generally stated by Socialists, a question of flyingthe sole refuge against the evils which now bear down; but a mere

question of comparative advantages, whichmust determine. We are too ignorant either of whatagency in its best form, or Socialism in its best, can accomplish, to be qualified to decide which of the twobe the ultimate form of human society.

If a conjecture may be hazarded, the decision will probablymainly on one consideration, viz. which of the two systemsconsistent with the greatest amount of human liberty and. After the means of subsistence are assured, the nextstrength of the personal wants of human beings is liberty; and(unlike the physical wants, which as civilization advances becomemoderate and more amenable to control) it increases insteaddiminishing in intensity, as the intelligence and the moralare more developed. The perfection both of socialand of practical morality would be, to secure to allcomplete independence and freedom of action, subject torestriction but that of not doing injury to others: and thewhich taught or the social institutions which requiredto exchange the control of their own actions for any amountcomfort or affluence, or to renounce liberty for the sake of, would deprive them of one of the most eLevatedof human nature. It remains to be discovered howthe preservation of this characteristic would be foundwith the Communistic organization of society. No, this, like all the other objections to the Socialist, is vastly exaggerated. The members of the associationnot be required to live together more than they do now, northey be controlled in the disposal of their individual sharethe produce, and of the probably large amount of leisure, if they limited their production to things really worth, they would possess. Individuals need not be chained tooccupation, or to a particular locality. The restraints ofwould be freedom in comparison with the presentof the majority of the human race. The generality ofin this and most other countries, have as little choiceoccupation or freedom of locomotion, are practically ason fixed rules and on the will of others, as they couldon any system short of actual slavery; to say nothing of thedomestic subjection of one half the species, to which itthe signal honour of Owenism and most other forms of Socialismthey assign equal rights, in all respects, with those of thedominant sex. But it is not by comparison with thebad state of society that the claims of Communism can be; nor is it sufficient that it should promise greaterand mental freedom than is now enjoyed by those who haveenough of either to deserve the name. The question is,there would be any asylum left for individuality of; whether public opinion would not be a tyrannical yoke;the absolute dependence of each on all, and surveillanceeach by all, would not grind all down into a tame uniformitythoughts, feelings, and actions. This is already one of theevils of the existing state of society, notwithstanding agreater diversity of education and pursuits, and a much lessdependence of the individual on the mass, than wouldin the Communistic regime. No society in which eccentricitya matter of reproach, can be in a wholesome state. It is yetbe ascertained whether the Communistic scheme would bewith that multiform development of human nature, thoseunlikenesses, that diversity of tastes and talents, andof intellectual points of view, which not only form apart of the interest of human life, but by bringinginto stimulating collision, and by presenting to eachnotions that he would not have conceived of himself,the mainspring of mental and moral progression.

4. I have thus far observations to the Communistic doctrine,forms the extreme limit of Socialism; according to whichonly the instruments of the land and capital, are the jointof the community, but the produce is divided and theapportioned, as far as possible,

equally. The objections,well or ill grounded, to which Socialism is liable, applythis form of it in their greatest force. The other varietiesSocialism mainly differ from Communism, in not relying solelywhat M. Louis Blanc calls the point of honour of industry, butmore or less of the incentives to labour derived frompecuniary interest. Thus it is already a modification ofstrict theory of Communism, when the principle is professedproportioning remuneration to labour. The attempts which havemade in France to carry Socialism into practical effect, byof workmen manufacturing on their own account,began by sharing the remuneration equally, without regardthe quantity of work done by the individual: but in almostcase this plan was after a short time abandoned, andwas had to working by the piece. The original principleto a higher standard of justice, and is adapted to a muchmoral condition of human nature. The proportioning ofto work done, is really just, only in so far as theor less of the work is a matter of choice: when it dependsnatural difference of strength or capacity, this principle ofis in itself an injustice: it is giving to those who; assigning most to those who are already most favoured by. Considered, however, as a compromise with the selfishof character formed by the present standard of morality, andby the existing social institutions, it is highly; and until education shall have been entirely, is far more likely to prove immediately successful,an attempt at a higher ideal.

The two elaborate forms of non-communistic Socialism known as. Simonism and Fourierism, are totally free from the objectionsurged against Communism; and though they are open toof their own, yet by the great intellectual power which inrespects distinguishes them, and by their large andtreatment of some of the fundamental problems ofand morality, they may justly be counted among the mostproductions of the past and present age.

The St. Simonian scheme does not contemplate an equal, but andivision of the produce; it does not propose that allbe occupied alike, but differently, according to theiror capacity., the function of each being assigned, likein a regiment, by the choice of the directing authority,the remuneration being by salary, proportioned to the, in the eyes of that authority, of the function, and the merits of the person who fulfils it. For theof the ruling body, different plans might be, consistently with the essentials of the system. It mightappointed by popuLar suffrage. In the idea of the original, the rulers were supposed to be persons of genius and, who obtained the voluntary adhesion of the rest by theof mental superiority. That the scheme might in somestates of society work with advantage, is not. There is indeed a successful experiment, of asimilar kind, on record, to which I have once alluded;of the Jesuits in Paraguay. A race of savages, belonging toportion of mankind more averse to consecutive exertion for aobject than any other authentically known to us, wasunder the mental dominion of civilized and instructed menwere united among themselves by a system of community of. To the absolute authority of these men they reverentiallythemselves, and were induced by them to learn the artscivilized life, and to practise labours for the community,no inducement that could have been offered would haveon them to practise for themselves. This social systemof short duration, being prematurely destroyed by diplomaticand foreign force. That it could be brought intoat all was probably owing to the immense distance in pointknowledge and intellect which separated the few rulers fromwhole body of the ruled, without any intermediate orders,social or intellectual. In any other circumstances itprobably have been a complete

failure. It supposes andespotism in the heads of the association; which wouldnot be much improved if the depositaries of the(contrary to the views of the authors of the system)varied from time to time according to the result of acanvass. But to suppose that one or a few human beings,selected, could, by whatever machinery of subordinate, be qualified to adapt each person's work to his capacity,proportion each person's remuneration to his merits — to be,fact, the dispensers of distributive justice to every membera community; or that any use which they could make of thiswould give general satisfaction, or would be submitted tothe aid of force — is a supposition almost tooto be reasoned against. A fixed rule, like that of, might be acquiesced in, and so might chance, or annecessity; but that a handful of human beings shouldeverybody in the balance, and give more to one and less toat their sole pleasure and judgment would not be borne,from persons believed to be more than men, and backed byterrors.

The most skilfully combined, and with the greatest foresightobjections, of all the forms of Socialism, is that commonlyas Fourierism. This system does not contemplate theof private property, nor even of inheritance; on the, it avowedly takes into consideration, as an element indistribution of the produce, capital as well as labour. Itthat the operations of industry should be carried on byof about two thousand members, combining theiron a district of about a square league in extent, underguidance of chiefs selected by themselves. In the, a certain minimum is first assigned for theof every member of the community, whether capable orof labour. The remainder of the produce is shared in certain, to be deterred beforehand, among the three elements,, Capital, and Talent. The capital of the community may bein unequal shares by different members, who would in thatreceive, as in any other joint-stock company, proportional. The claim of each person on the share of the produceto talent, is estimated by the grade or rank whichindividual occupies in the several groups of labourers tohe or she belongs; these grades being in all casesby the choice of his or her companions. The, when received, would not of necessity be expendedenjoyed in common; there would be separate menages for all whothem, and no other community of living is contemplated,that all the members of the association should reside in thepile of buildings; for saving of labour and expense, notin building, but in every branch of domestic economy; and inthat, the whole of the buying and selling operations of thebeing performed by a single agent, the enormous portionthe produce of industry now carried off by the profits of meremight be reduced to the smallest amount possible.

This system, unlike Communism, does not, in theory at least,any of the motives to exertion which exist in thestate of society. On the contrary, if the arrangementaccording to the intentions of its contrivers, it wouldstrengthen those motives; since each person would have muchcertainty of reaping individually the fruits of increasedor energy, bodily or mental, than under the present socialcan be felt by any but those who are in the mostpositions, or to whom the chapter of accidents isthan ordinarily favourable. The Fourierists, however, haveanother resource. They believe that they have solved theand fundamental problem of rendering labour attractive.this is not impracticable, they contend by very strong; in particular by one which they have in common withOwenites, viz., that scarcely any labour, however severe,by human beings for the sake of subsistence, exceeds inthat which other human beings, whose subsistence isprovided for, are found ready and

even eager to undergopleasure. This certainly is a most significant fact, and onewhich the student in social philosophy may draw important. But the argument founded on it may easily betoo far. If occupations full of discomfort and fatiguefreely pursued by many persons as amusements, who does notthat they are amusements exactly because they are pursued, and may be discontinued at pleasure? The liberty ofa position often makes the whole difference between itspainful and pleasurable. Many a person remains in the same, street, or house from January to December, without a wisha thought tending towards removal, who, if confined to thatplace by the mandate of authority, would find theabsolutely intolerable.

According to the Fourierists, scarcely any kind of usefulis naturally and necessarily disagreeable, unless it isregarded as dishonourable, or is immoderate in degree, orof the stimulus of sympathy and emulation. Excessiveneeds not, they contend, be undergone by any one, in ain which there would be no idle class, and no labour soan amount of labour is now wasted, in was here useless; full advantage would be taken of the power of, both in increasing the efficiency of production, andeconomizing consumption. The other requisites for renderingattractive would, they think, be found in the execution oflabour by social groups, to any number of which the samemight simultaneously belong, at his or her own choice:grade in each being determined by the degree of servicethey were found capable of rendering, as appreciated by theof their comrades. It is inferred from the diversity ofand talents, that every member of the community would beto several groups, employing themselves in various kindsoccupation, some bodily, others mental, and would be capableoccupying a high place in some one or more; so that a real, or something more nearly approaching to it than mightfirst be supposed, would practically result: not, from the, but, on the contrary, from the largest possible, of the various natural superiorities residing inindividual.

Even from so brief an outline, it must be evident that thisdoes no violence to any of the general laws by which human, even in the present imperfect state of moral andcultivation, is influenced; and that it would berash to pronounce it incapable of success, or unfittedrealize a great part of the hopes founded on it by its. With regard to this, as to all other varieties of, the thing to be desired, and to which they have a just, is opportunity of trial. They are all capable of beingon a moderate scale, and at no risk, either personal or, to any except those who try them. It is for experiencedetermine how far or how soon any one or more of the possibleof community of property will be fitted to substitutefor the "organization of industry" based on privateof land and capital. In the meantime we may, withoutto limit the ultimate capabilities of human nature,, that the political economist, for a considerable time to, will be chiefly concerned with the conditions of existenceprogress belonging to a society founded on private propertyindividual competition; and that the object to be principallyat in the present stage of human improvement, is not theof the system of individual property, but theof it, and the full participation of every member ofcommunity in its benefits.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2,

Chapter 2

Same Subject Continued

1. It is next to be considered, what is included in the ideaprivate property, and by what considerations the applicationthe principle should be bounded.

The institution of property, when limited to its essential, consists in the recognition, in each person, of a rightthe exclusive disposal of what he or she have produced byown exertions, or received either by gift or by fair, without force or fraud, from those who produced it.foundation of the whole is, the right of producers to whatthemselves have produced. It may be objected, therefore, toinstitution as it now exists, that it recognises rights ofin individuals over things which they have not produced.example (it may be said) the operatives in a manufactory, by their labour and skill, the whole produce; yet,of its belonging to them, the law gives them only theirhire, and transfers the produce to some one who hassupplied the funds, without perhaps contributing anythingthe work itself, even in the form of superintendence. Theto this is, that the labour of manufacture is only one ofconditions which must combine for the production of the. The labour cannot be carried on without materials and, nor without a stock of necessaries provided in, to maintain the labourers during the production. Allthings are the fruits of previous labour. If the labourerspossessed of them, they would not need to divide the produceany one; but while they have them not, an equivalent must beto those who have, both for the antecedent labour, and forabstinence by which the produce of that labour, instead ofexpended on indulgences, has been reserved for this use.capital may not have been, and in most cases was not, createdthe labour and abstinence of the present possessor; but it wasby the labour and abstinence of some former person, whoindeed have been wrongfully dispossessed of it, but who, inpresent age of the world, much more probably transferred histo the present capitalist by gift or voluntary contract:the abstinence at least must have been continued by eachowner, down to the present. If it he said, as it maytruth, that those who have inherited the savings of othersan advantage which they may have in no way deserved, overindustrious whose predecessors have not left them anything; Ionly admit, but strenuously contend, that this unearnedshould be curtailed, as much as is consistent withto those who thought fit to dispose of their savings bythem to their descendants. But while it is true that theare at a disadvantage compared with those whosehave saved, it is also true that the labourers arebetter off than if those predecessors had not saved. Theyin the advantage, though not to an equal extent with the. The terms of co-operation between present labour andfruits of past labour and saving, are a subject forbetween the two parties. Each is necessary to the. The capitalists can do nothing without labourers, nor thewithout capital. If the labourers compete for, the capitalists on their part compete for labour, tofull extent of the circulating capital of the country.is often spoken of as if it were necessarily a causemisery and degradation to the labouring class; as if highwere not precisely as much a product of competition as low. The remuneration of labour is as much the result of theof competition in the United States, as it is in Ireland, andmore completely so than in England.

The right of property includes then, the freedom of acquiringcontract. The right of each to what he has produced, implies ato what has been produced by others, if obtained by theirconsent; since the producers must either have given it fromwill, or exchanged it for what they esteemed an equivalent,to prevent them from doing so would be to infringe theirof property in the product of their own industry.

2. Before proceeding to consider the things which theof individual property does not include, we mustone more thing which it does include: and this is that a, after a certain period, should be given by prescription.to the fundamental idea of property, indeed, nothingto be treated as such, which has been acquired by force or, or appropriated in ignorance of a prior title vested inother person; but it is necessary to the security ofpossessors, that they should not be molested by chargeswrongful acquisition, when by the lapse of time witnesses mustperished or been lost sight of, and the real character oftransaction can no longer be cleared up. Possession which hasbeen legally questioned within a moderate number of years,to be, as by the laws of all nations it is, a complete. Even when the acquisition was wrongful, the dispossession,a generation has elapsed, of the probably bonâ fide, by the revival of a claim which had been long, would generally be a greater injustice, and almosta greater private and public mischief, than leaving thewrong without atonement. It may seem hard that a claim,just, should be defeated by mere lapse of time; butis a time after which (even looking at the individual case,without regard to the general effect on the security of), the balance of hardship turns the other way. Withinjustices of men, as with the convulsions and disasters of, the longer they remain unrepaired, the greater become theto repairing them, arising from the aftergrowths whichhave to be torn up or broken through. In no human, not even in the simplest and clearest, does itthat a thing is fit to be done now, because it was fit todone sixty years ago. It is scarcely needful to remark, thatreasons for not disturbing acts of injustice of old date,apply to unjust systems or institutions; since a bad lawusage is not one bad act, in the remote past, but a perpetualof bad acts, as long as the law or usage lasts.

Such, then, being the essentials of private property, it isto be considered, to what extent the forms in which thehas existed in different states of society, or still, are necessary consequences of its principle, or areby the reasons on which it is grounded.

3. Nothing is implied in property but the right of each to(or her) own faculties, to what he can produce by them, andwhatever he can get for them in a fair market; together withright to give this to any other person if he chooses, and theof that other to receive and enjoy it.

It follows, therefore, that although the right of bequest, orafter death, forms part of the idea of private property, theof inheritance, as distinguished from bequest, does not.the property of persons who have made no disposition of ittheir lifetime, should pass first to their children, andthem, to the nearest relations, may be a properor not, but is no consequence of the principle ofproperty. Although there belong to the decision of suchmany considerations besides those of political economy,is not foreign to the plan of this work to suggest, for theof thinkers, the view of them which most recommendsto the writer's mind.

No presumption in favour of existing ideas on this subject isbe derived from their antiquity. In early ages, the propertya deceased person passed to his children and nearest relativesso natural and obvious an arrangement, that no other wasto be even thought of in competition with it. In the first, they were usually present on the spot : they were in, and if they had no other title, had that, soin an early state of society, of first occupancy., they were already, in a manner, joint owners of hisduring his life. If the property was in land, it hadbeen conferred by the State on a family rather than onindividual: if it consisted of cattle or moveable goods, itprobably been acquired, and was certainly protected and, by the united efforts of all members of the family whoof an age to work or fight. Exclusive individual property inmodern sense, scarcely entered into the ideas of the time;when the first magistrate of the association died, he reallynothing vacant but his own share in the division, whichon the member of the family who succeeded to his. To have disposed of the property otherwise, would haveto break up a little commonwealth, united by ideas,, and habits, and to cast them adrift on the world. These, though rather felt than reasoned about, had soan influence on the minds of mankind, as to create the ideaan inherent right in the children to the possessions of their; a right which it was not competent to himself to. Bequest, in a primitive state of society, was seldom; a clear proof, were there no other, that property wasin a manner totally different from the conception of itthe present time.(1*)

But the feudal family, the last historical form oflife, has long perished, and the unit of society isnow the family or clan, composed of all the reputedof a common ancestor, but the individual; or at mostpair of individuals, with their unemancipated children.is now inherent in individuals, not in families:thewhen grown up do not follow the occupations or fortunesthe parent: if they participate in the parent's pecuniaryit is at his or her pleasure, and not by a voice in theand government of the whole, but generally by theenjoyment of a part; and in this country at least(except as far as entails or settlements are an obstacle) it isthe power of parents to disinherit even their children, andtheir fortune to strangers. More distant relatives are inalmost as completely detached from the family and itsas if they were in no way connected with it. The onlythey are supposed to have on their richer relations, is topreference, caeteris paribus, in good offices, and some aid inof actual necessity.

So great a change in the constitution of society must make adifference in the grounds on which the disposal ofby inheritance should rest. The reasons usually assignedmodern writers for giving the property of a person who dies, to the children, or nearest relatives, are, first, thethat in so disposing of it, the law is more likelyin any other mode to do what the proprietor would have done,he had done anything; and secondly, the hardship, to those whowith their parents and partook in their opulence, of beingdown from the enjoyments of wealth into poverty and.

There is some force in both these arguments. The law ought,doubt, to do for the children or dependents of an intestate,it was the duty of the parent or protector to have done,far as this can be known by any one besides himself. Since,, the law cannot decide on individual claims, but mustby general rules, it is next to be considered what theseshould be.

We may first remark, that in regard to collateral relatives,is not, unless on grounds personal to the particular, the duty of any one to make a pecuniary provision for. No one

now expects it, unless there happen to be no direct; nor would it be expected even then, if the expectationnot created by the provisions of the law in case of. I see, therefore, no reason why collateral inheritanceexist at all. Mr Bentham long ago proposed, and other highhave agreed in the opinion, that if there are noeither in the descending or in the ascending line, the, in case of intestacy, should escheat to the State. Withto the more remote degrees of collateral relationship,point is not very likely to be disputed. Few will maintainthere is any good reason why the accumulations of somemiser should on his death (as every now and then) go to enrich a distant relative who never saw him, whonever knew himself to be related to him until there wasto be gained by it, and who had no moral claim upon himany kind, more than the most entire stranger. But the reasonthe case applies alike to all collaterals, even in the nearest. Collaterals have no real claims, but such as may bestrong in the case of non-relatives; and in the one casein the other, where valid claims exist, the proper mode ofregard to them is by bequest.

The claims of children are of a different nature: they are, and indefeasible. But even of these, I venture to thinkthe measure usually taken is an erroneous one: what is duechildren is in some respects underrated, in others, as itto me, exaggerated. One of the most binding of all, that of not bringing children into the world unlesscan be maintained in comfort during childhood, and broughtwith a likelihood of supporting themselves when of full age,both disregarded in practice and made light of in theory in adisgraceful to human intelligence. On the other hand, whenparent possesses property, the claims of the children upon itto me to be the subject of an opposite error. Whatevera parent may have inherited, or still more, may have, I cannot admit that he owes to his children, merelythey are his children, to leave them rich, without theof any exertion. I could not admit it, even if to be sowere always, and certainly, for the good of the children. But this is in the highest degree uncertain. Iton individual character. Without supposing extreme cases,may be affirmed that in a majority of instances the good notof society but of the individuals would be better consultedbequeathing to them a moderate, than a large provision. This,is a commonplace of moralists ancient and modern, is feltbe true by many intelligent parents, and would be acted uponmore frequently, if they did not allow themselves toless what really is, than what will be thought by othersbe, advantageous to the children.

The duties of parents to their children are those which areto the fact of causing the existence of a human. The parent owes to society to endeavour to make the childgood and valuable member of it, and owes to the children to, so far as depends on him, such education, and suchand means, as will enable them to start with a fairof achieving by their own exertions a successful life. Toevery child has a claim; and I cannot admit, that as a childhas a claim to more. There is a case in which thesepresent themselves in their true light, without anycircumstances to disguise or confuse them: it is thatan illegitimate child. To such a child it is generally feltthere is due from the parent, the amount of provision forwelfare which will enable him to make his life on the whole aone.I hold that to no child, merely as such, anythingis due, than what is admitted to be due to an illegitimate: and that no child for whom thus much has been done, has,on the score of previously raised expectations, any, if the remainder of the parent's fortune is devoted touses, or to the benefit of individuals on whom in the's opinion it is better bestowed.

In order to give the children that fair chance of a desirable, to which they are entitled, it is generally necessarythey should not be brought up from childhood in habits ofwhich they will not have the means of indulging inlife. This, again, is a duty often flagrantly violated byof terminable incomes, who have little property to. When the children of rich parents have lived, as it isthey should do, in habits, corresponding to the scale ofin which the parents indulge, it is generally theof the parents to make a greater provision for them thansuffice for children otherwise brought up. I say generally,even here there is another side to the question. It is aquite capable of being maintained, that to a strongwhich has to make its way against narrow circumstances, toknown early some of the feelings and experiences of wealth,an advantage both in the formation of character and in theof life. But allowing that children have a just groundcomplaint, who have been brought up to require luxuries whichare not afterwards likely to obtain, and that their claim,, is good to a provision baring some relation to theof their bringing up; this, too, is a claim which isliable to be stretched further than its reasons. The case is exactly that of the younger children of theand landed gentry, the bulk of whose fortune passes toeldest son. The other sons, who are usually numerous, areup in the same habits of luxury as the future heir, andreceive as a younger brother's portion, generally what theof the case dictates, namely, enough to support, in theof life to which they are accustomed, themselves, but notwife or children. It really is no grievance to any man, thatthe means of marrying and of supporting a family, he has toon his own exertions.

A provision, then, such as is admitted to be reasonable incase of illegitimate children, for younger children, whereversho rt the justice of the case, and the real interests of theand of society, are the only things considered, is, I, all that parents owe to their children, and all,, which the State owes to the children of those who die. The surplus, if any, I hold that it may rightfullyto the general purposes of the community. I would, however, be supposed to recommend that parents should nevermore for their children than what, merely as children, theya moral right to. In some cases it is imperative, in many, and in all allowable, to do much more. For this,, the means are afforded by the liberty of bequest. It is, not to the children but to the parents, that they shouldthe power of showing marks of affection, of requitingand sacrifices, and of bestowing their wealth accordingtheir own preferences, or their own judgment of fitness.

4. Whether the power of bequest should itself be subject to, is an ulterior question of great importance. Unlikeab intestato,bequest is one of the attributes of: the ownership of a thing cannot be looked upon aswithout the power of bestowing it, at death or during, at the owner's pleasure: and all the reasons, whichthat private property should exist, recommend pro tantoextension of it. But property is only a means to an end, notthe end. Like all other proprietary rights, and even in adegree than most, the power of bequest may be soas to conflict with the permanent interests of therace. It does so, when, not content with bequeathing anto A, the testator prescribes that on A's death it shallto his eldest son, and to that son's son, and so on for. No doubt, persons have occasionally exerted themselves moreto acquire a fortune from the hope of founding ain perpetuity; hut the mischiefs to society of suchoutweigh the value of this incentive to exertion,the incentives in the case of those who have the opportunitymaking large fortunes are strong enough without it. A similarof the power of bequest is committed when a person who

doesmeritorious act of leaving property for public uses, attemptsprescribe the details of its application in perpetuity; whenfounding a place of education (for instance) he dictates, for, what doctrines shall be taught. It being impossible thatone should know what doctrines will be fit to be taught afterhas been dead for centuries, the law ought not to give effectsuch dispositions of property, unless subject to the perpetual(after a certain interval has elapsed) of a fitting.

These are obvious limitations. But even the simplest exercisethe right of bequest, that of determining the person to whomshall pass immediately on the death of the testator, hasbeen reckoned among the privileges which might be limitedvaried, according to views of expediency. The limitations,, have been almost solely in favour of children. Inthe right is in principle unlimited, almost the onlybeing that arising from a settlement by a former, in which case the holder for the time being cannotbequeath his possessions, but only because there isto bequeath, he having merely a life interest. By thelaw, on which the civil legislation of the Continent ofis principally founded, bequest originally was notat all, and even after it was introduced, a legitimawas compulsorily reserved for each child; and such isthe law in some of the Continental nations. By the Frenchsince the Revolution, the parent can only dispose by will, ofportion equal to the share of one child, each of the childrenan equal portion. This entail, as it may be called, of theof every one's property upon the children collectively,to me as little defensible in principle as an entail inof one child, though it does not shock so directly theof justice. I cannot admit that parents should be compelledleave to their children even that provision which, as, I have contended that they have a moral claim to.may forfeit that claim by general unworthiness, orill-conduct to the parents: they may have otheror prospects: what has been previously done for them,the way of education and advancement in life, may fullytheir moral claim; or others may have claims superior to.

The extreme restriction of the power of bequest in French, was adopted as a democratic expedient, to break down theof primogeniture, and counteract the tendency of inheritedto collect in large masses. I agree in thinking theseeminently desirable; but the means used are not, I think,most judicious. Were I framing a code of laws according toseems to me best in itself, without regard to existingand sentiments, I should prefer to restrict, not whatone might bequeath, but what any one should be permitted to, by bequest or inheritance. Each person should have powerdispose by will of his or her whole property; but not toit in enriching some one individual, beyond a certain, which should be fixed sufficiently high to afford theof comfortable independence. The inequalities of propertyarise from unequal industry, frugality, perseverance,, and to a certain extent even opportunities, arefrom the principle of private property, and if wethe principle, we must bear with these consequences of it:I see nothing objectionable in fixing a limit to what any oneacquire by the mere favour of others, without any exercise offaculties, and in requiring that if he desires any furtherof fortune, he shall work for it.(2*) I do not conceivethe degree of limitation which this would impose on theof bequest, would be felt as a burthensome restraint by anywho estimated a large fortune at its true value, that ofpleasures and advantages that can be purchased with it: onthe most extravagant estimate of which, it must be apparentevery one, that the difference to the happiness of thebetween a moderate independence and five times as much,insignificant when weighed against the

enjoyment that might be, and the permanent benefits diffused, by some otherof the four-fifths. So long indeed as the opinionprevails, that the best thing which can be done forof affection is to heap on them to satiety thoseworthless things on which large fortunes are mostly, there might be little use in enacting such a law, evenit were possible to get it passed, there would generally bepower of evading it. The law would be unavailing unless thesentiment went energetically long with it; which (judgingthe tenacious adherence of public opinion in France to theof compulsory division) it would in some states of societygovernment be very likely to do, however much the contrarybe the fact in England and at the present time. If thecould be made practically effectual, the benefitbe great. Wealth which could no longer be employed inenriching a few, would either be devoted to objects ofusefulness, or if bestowed on individuals, would beamong a larger number. While those enormous fortunesno one needs for any personal purpose but ostentation orpower, would become much less numerous, there would be amultiplication of persons in easy circumstances, with theof leisure, and all the real enjoyments which wealththose of vanity; a class by whom the services which a nationleisured classes is entitled to expect from them, eithertheir direct exertions or by the tone they give to theand tastes of the public, would be rendered in a muchbeneficial manner than at present. A large portion also ofaccumulations of successful industry would probably beto public uses, either by direct bequests to the State,by the endowment of institutions; as is already done veryin the United States, where the ideas and practice in theof inheritance seem to be unusually rational and.(3*)

5. The next point to be considered is, whether the reasons onof property rests, are applicable to all things ina right of exclusive ownership is at present recognised;if not, on what other grounds the recognition is defensible.

The essential principle of property being to assure to allwhat they have produced by their labour and accumulatedtheir abstinence, this principle cannot apply to what is notproduce of labour, the raw material of the earth. If the landits productive power wholly from nature, and not at allindustry, or if there were any means of discriminating whatderived from each source, it not only would not be necessary,it would be the height of injustice, to let the gift ofbe engrossed by individuals. The use of the land inmust indeed, for the time being, he necessity; the same person who has ploughed and sown must beto reap: but the land might be occupied for one season, as among the ancient Germans; or might be periodicallyas population increased: or the State might he thelandlord, and the cultivators tenants under it, eitherlease or at will.

But though land is not the produce of industry, most of itsqualities are so. Labour is not only requisite for, but almost equally so for fashioning, the instrument.labour is often required at the commencement, tothe land for cultivation. In many cases, even when cleared,productiveness is wholly the effect of labour and art. TheLevel produced little or nothing until artificially. The bogs of Ireland, until the same thing is done to, can produce little besides fuel. One of the barrenest soilsthe world, composed of the material of the Goodwin Sands, thede Waes in Flanders, has been so fertilized by industry, ashave become one of the most productive in Europe. Cultivationrequires buildings and fences, which are wholly the producelabour. The fruits of this industry cannot be reaped in aperiod. The labour and outlay are immediate, the benefit isover many years, perhaps over

all future time. A holdernot incur this labour and outlay when strangers and notwill he benefited by it. If he undertakes such, he must have a sufficient period before him into profit by them: and he is in no way so sure of havinga sufficient period as when his tenure is perpetual.(4*)

6. These are the reasons which form the justification in anpoint of view, of property in land. It is seen, thatare only valid, in so far as the proprietor of land is its. Whenever, in any country, the proprietor, generally, ceases to be the improver, political economy hasto say in defence of landed property, as there. In no sound theory of private property was it everthat the proprietor of land should be merely aquartered on it.

In Great Britain, the landed proprietor is not unfrequentlyimprover. But it cannot be said that he is generally so. Andthe majority of cases he grants the liberty of cultivation onterms, as to prevent improvements from being made by any one. In the southern parts of the island, as there are usuallyleases, permanent improvements can scarcely he made except bylandlord's capital; accordingly the South, compiled with theof England, and with the Lowlands of Scotland, is stillbackward in agricultural improvement. The truth is,any very general improvement of land by the landlords, iscompatible with a law or custom of primogeniture. When thegoes wholly to the heir, it generally goes to him severedthe pecuniary resources which would enable him to improve, the personal property being absorbed by the provision forchildren, and the land itself often heavily burthened forsame purpose. There is therefore but a small proportion ofwho have the means of making expensive improvements,they do it with borrowed money, and by adding to thewith which in most cases the land was already burthenedthey received it. But the position of the owner of a deeplyestate is so precarious; economy is so unwelcome to oneapparent fortune greatly exceeds his real means, and theof rent and price which only trench upon the marginhis income, are so formidable to one who can call little morethe margin his own, that it is no wonder if few landlordsthemselves in a condition to make immediate sacrifices forsake of future profit. Were they ever so much inclined, thosecan prudently do it, who have seriously studied theof scientific agriculture: and great landlords haveseriously studied anything. They might at least hold outto the farmers to do what they will not or cannot do; but even in granting leases, it is in England acomplaint that they tie up their tenants by covenantson the practices of an obsolete and exploded; while most of them, by withholding leases, and giving the farmer no guarantee of possessiona single harvest, keep the land on a footing little moreto improvement than in the time of our barbarous,

— immetata quibus jugera liberas

Fruges et Cererem ferunt,

Nec cultura placet longior annuâ.

Landed property in England is thus very far from completelythe conditions which render its existence economically. But if insufficiently realized even in England, inthose conditions are not complied with at all. Withexceptions (some of them very honourable ones), theof Irish estates do nothing for the land but drain it ofproduce. What has been epigrammatically said in theon "peculiar burthens" is literally true when appliedthem; that the greatest "burthen on land" is the landlords.nothing to the soil, they consume its whole produce,the potatoes strictly necessary to keep the inhabitantsdying of famine; and when they have any purpose of, the preparatory step usually consists in not leavingthis pittance, but turning out the people to beggary if notstarvation.(5*) When landed property has placed itself uponfooting it ceases to be defensible, and the time has comemaking some new arrangement of the matter.

When the "sacredness of property" is talked of, it shouldbe remembered, that any such sacredness does not belong insame degree to landed property. No man made the land. It isoriginal inheritance of the whole species. its appropriationwholly a question of general expediency. When private propertyland is not expedient, it is unjust. It is no hardship to any, to be excluded from what others have produced: they were notto produce it for his use, and he loses nothing by notin what otherwise would not have existed at all. But itsome hardship to be born into the world and to find all's gifts previously engrossed, and no place left for thecomer. To reconcile people to this, after they have onceinto their minds the idea that any moral rights belongthem as human beings, it will always be necessary to convincethat the exclusive appropriation is good for mankind on the, themselves included. But this is what no sane human beingbe persuaded of, if the relation between the landowner andcultivator were the same everywhere as it has been in.

Landed property is felt, even by those most tenacious of its, to be a different thing from other property; and wherebulk of the community have been disinherited of their shareit, and it has become the exclusive attribute of a small, men have generally tried to reconcile it, at least in, to their sense of justice, by endeavouring to attachto it, and erecting it into a sort of magistracy, eitheror legal. But if the state is at liberty to treat theof land as public functionaries, it is only going onefurther to say, that it is at liberty to discard them. Theof the landowners to the land is altogether subordinate togeneral policy of the state. The principle of property givesno right to the land, but only a right to compensation forportion of their interest in the land it may be theof the state to deprive them of. To that, their claim is. it is due to landowners, and to owners of anywhatever, recognised as such by the state, that theynot be dispossessed of it without receiving its

pecuniary, or an annual income equal to what they derived from it.is due on the general principles on which property rests. Ifland was bought with the compensation is due to them on evenotherwise, it is still due on that ground; even if otherwise,is still due on the ground of prescription. Nor can it ever befor accomplished an object by which community should be. When the property is of a kind to which peculiarattach themselves, the compensation ought to exceed apecuniary equivalent. But, subject to the proviso, the stateat liberty to deal with landed property as the generalof the community may require, even to the extent, if ithappen, of doing with the whole, what is done with a parta bill is passed for a railroad or a new street. Thehas too much at stake in the proper cultivation of the, and in the conditions annexed to the occupancy of it, tothese things to the discretion of a class of persons called, when they have shown themselves unfit for the trust.legislature, which if it pleased might convert the whole bodylandlords into fundholders or pensioners, might, à fortiori,the average receipts of Irish landowners into a fixedcharge, and raise the tenants into proprietors; supposingthat the full market value of the land was tendered to the, in case they preferred that to accepting theproposed.

There will be another place for discussing the various modeslanded property and tenure, and the advantages andof each; in this chapter our concern is with theitself, the grounds which justify it, and (as a corollarythese) the conditions by which it should be limited. To meseems almost an axiom that property in land should bestrictly, and that the balance in all cases of doubtincline against the proprietor. The reverse is the caseproperty in moveables, and in all things the product of: over these, the owner's power both of use and ofshould be absolute, except where positive evil towould result from it: but in the case of land, noright should be permitted in any individual, whichbe shown to be productive of positive good. To be allowedexclusive right at all, over a portion of the common, while there are others who have no portion, isa privilege. No quantity of moveable goods which a personacquire by his labour, prevents others from acquiring theby the same means; but from the very nature of the case,owns land, keeps mothers out of the enjoyment of it. The, or monopoly, is only defensible as a necessary evil;becomes an injustice when carried to any point to which thegood does not follow it.

For instance, the exclusive right to the land for purposes ofdoes not imply an exclusive right to it for purposesaccess; and no such right ought to be recognised, except toextent necessary to protect the produce against damage, andowner's privacy against invasion. The pretension of two Dukesshut up a part of the Highlands, and exclude the rest offrom many square miles of mountain scenery to preventto wild animals, is an abuse; it exceeds thebounds of the right of landed property. When land isintended to be cultivated, no good reason can in general befor its being private property at all; and if any one isto call it his, he ought to know that he holds it byof the community, and on an implied condition that his, since it cannot possibly do them any good, at leastnot deprive them of any, which could have derived from theif it had been unappropriated. Even in the case ofland, a man whom, though only one among millions, thepermits to hold thousands of acres as his single share, isentitled to think that all this is given to him to use and, and deal with as if it concerned nobody but himself. Theor profits which he can obtain from it are at his sole; but with regard to the land, in everything which hewith it, and in everything which he abstains from doing, hemorally bound, and should whenever the case admits be

legally, to make his interest and pleasure consistent with thegood. The species at large still retains, of its originalto the soil of the planet which it inhabits, as much as iswith the purposes for which it has parted with the.

7. Besides property in the produce of labour, and property in, there are other things which are or have been subjects of, in which no proprietary rights ought to exist at all.as the civilized world has in general made up its mind onof these, there is no necessity for dwelling on them in this. At the head of them, is property in human beings. It issuperfluous to observe, that this institution can have noin any society even pretending to be founded on justice, orfellowship between human creatures. But, iniquitous as it is,when the state has expressly legalized it, and human beings,generations, have been bought, sold, and inherited underof law, it is another wrong, in abolishing the property,to make full compensation. This wrong was avoided by themeasure of justice in 1833, one of the most virtuous acts,well as the most practically beneficent, ever doneby a nation. Other examples of property which oughtto have been created, are properties in public trusts; suchjudicial offices under the old French regime, and thejurisdictions which, in countries not wholly emergedfeudality, pass with the land. Our own country affords, asin point, that of a commission in the army, and of an, or right of nomination to an ecclesiastical benefice. Ais also sometimes created in a right of taxing the; in a monopoly, for instance, or other exclusive. These abuses prevail most in semibarbarous countriesare not without example in the most civilized. In Franceare several important trades and professions, including, attorneys, brokers, appraisers, printers, and (until) bakers and butchers, of which the numbers are limited by. The brevet or privilege of one of the permitted numberbrings a high price in the market. When such is the, compensation probably could not with justice be refused, onabolition of the privilege. There are other cases in whichwould be more doubtful. The question would turn upon what,the peculiar circumstances, was sufficient to constitute; and whether the legal recognition which the abuseobtained, was sufficient to constitute it an institution, oronly to an occasional licence. It would be absurd tocompensation for losses caused by changes in a tariff, aconfessedly variable from year to year; or for monopoliesthose granted to individuals by the Tudors, favours of aauthority, which the power that gave was competent attime to recal.

So much on the institution of property, a subject of which,the purposes of political economy, it was indispensable to, but on which we could not usefully confine ourselves toconsiderations. We have now to inquire on whatand with what results the distribution of the produceland and labour is effected, under the relations which thiscreates among the different members of the community.:. See, for admirable illustrations of this and many kindred, Mr Maine's profound work on Ancient Law and its relationModern Ideas.. In the case of capital employed, in the hands of the owner, in carrying on any of the operations of industry, therestrong grounds for leaving to him the power of bequeathing toperson the whole of the funds actually engaged in a single. It is well that he should be enabled to leave theunder the control of whichever of his heirs he regardsbest fitted to conduct it virtuously and efficiently: and the(ver frequent and inconvient under the French law)be thus obviated, of breaking up a manufacturing orestablishment at the death of its chief. In like, it should be allowed to a proprietor who leaves to one ofsuccessors the more burthen of keeping up an ancestral whoto one of his successors the moral burthern of keeping

upancestral mansion and park or pleasure-ground, to bestow alongthem as much other property as is required for theirmaintenance.. "Munificent bequests and donations for public purposes,charitable or education, form a striking feature in thehistory of the United States, and expecially of New. Not only is it common for rich capitalists to leave bya portion of their fortune towards the endowment of national, but individuals during their lifetime makegrants of money for the same objects. There is herecompulsory law for the equal partition of property among, as in France, and on the other hand, no custom ofor primogeniture, as in England, so that the affluent feelat liberty to share their wealth between their kindredthe public; it being impossible to found a family, andhaving frequently the happiness of seeing all theirwell provided for and independent long before their. I have seen a list of bequests and donations made duringlast thirty years for the benefit of religious, charitable,literary institutions in the state of Massachusetts alone,they amounted to no less a sum than six millions of dollars,more than a million sterling." — Lyell's Travels in America,. i. p. 263.. "Ce qui donnait a l'homme l'intelligence et la constance danstravaus, qui lui faisait diriger tous ses efforts vers un buta sa race, c'etait le sentiment de la perpetuite. Lesles plus fertiles sont toujours ceux que les eaux ontle long de leur cours, mais ce sont aussi ceux qu'ellesde leurs inodations ou qu'elles corrompent par des. Avec la garantie de la peretuite, l'homme entreprit deet penibles travaux pour donner aux marecages un, pour elever des digues contre les inondations, pourpar des canaux d'arrosement des eaux fertilisantes surmemes champs que les memes eaux condamnaient a la sterilite.la meme garantie, l'homme, ne se contentant plus des fruitsde la terre, a demele parmi la vegetation sauvage lesvivaces, les arbustes, les arbres qui pouvaient lui etre, il les a perfectionnes par la culture, il a change ensorte leur essence, et il a multiplies. Parmi les fruits,effet, on en reconnait que des siecles de culture ont seuls pua la perfection qu'ils ont atteinte aujourd'hui, tandisd'autres ont ete importes des regions les plus lointaines.'homme en meme temps a ouvert la terre jusqu'a une grande, pour renouveler son sol, et le fertiliser par lede ses parties et les impressions de l'air; it a fixe surcollines la terre qui s'en echappait, et il a couvert la facede la campagne d'une vegetation partout abondante, etabondante, et partout utile a la race humanine. Parmi ses, il y en a d'autres dont ses derniers neveux jouirontdans plusieurs siecles. tous ont concouru a augmenter laproductive de la nature, a donner a la race humaine uninfiniment plus abondant, un revenu dont une portionest consommee par ceux qui n'ont point part a laterritoriale, et qui cependant n'auraient point trouvenourriture sans ce partage du sol qui semple les avoir." Sismondi, Etude sur l'Economie Politique, Troisieme, De la Richesse Territoriale.. I must beg the reader to bear in mind that this paragraph wasmore than twenty years ago. So wonderful are the changes,moral and economical, taking place in our age, that, withoutre-writing a work like the present, it is impossiblekeep up with them.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2,

Chapter 3

the Classes Among Whom the Produce is Distributed

1. Private property being assumed as a fact, we have next tothe different classes of persons to whom it gives rise;concurrence, or at least whose permission, is necessary to, and who are therefore able to stipulate for a sharethe produce. We have to inquire, according to what laws thedistributes itself among these classes, by theaction of the interests of those concerned: after, a further question will be, what effects are or might beby laws, institutions, and measures of government, inor modifying that spontaneous distribution.

The three requisites of production, as has been so often, are labour, capital, and land: understanding by, the means and appliances which are the accumulatedof previous labour, and by land, the materials andsupplied by nature, whether contained in the interiorthe earth, or constituting its surface. Since each of theseof production may be separately appropriated, thecommunity may be considered as divided into, capitalists, and productive labourers. Each of these, as such, obtains a share of the produce: no other personclass obtains anything, except by concession from them. Theof the community is, in fact, supported at their, giving, if any equivalent, one consisting ofservices. These three classes, therefore, arein political economy as making up the whole community.

2. But although these three sometimes exist as separate, dividing the produce among them, they do not necessarilyalways so exist. The fact is so much otherwise, that there areone or two communities in which the complete separation ofclasses is the general rule. England and Scotland, withof Belgium and Holland, are almost the only countries inworld, where the land, capital, and labour employed in, are generally the property of separate owners. Thecase is, that the same person owns either two of these, or all three.

The case in which the same person owns all three, embracestwo extremes of existing society, in respect to theand dignity of the labouring class. First, when thehimself is the proprietor. This is the commonest case inNorthern States of the American Union; one of the commonestFrance, Switzerland, the three Scandinavian kingdoms, andof Germany;(1*) and a common case in parts of Italy and in. In all these countries there are, no doubt, large landed, and a still greater number which, without being, require the occasional or constant aid of hired labourers., however, of the land is owned in portions too small toany other labour than that of the peasant and his family,fully to occupy even that. The capital employed is not alwaysof the peasant proprietor, many of these small propertiesmortgaged to obtain the means of cultivating; but theis invested at the peasant's risk, and though he paysfor it, it gives to no one any right of interference,, perhaps, eventually to take possession of the land, ifinterest ceases to be paid.

The other case in which the land, labour, and capital, belongthe same person, is the case of slave countries, in which thethemselves are owned by the landowner. Our West Indiabefore emancipation, and the sugar colonies of theby whom a similar act of justice is still unperformed,examples of large establishments for agricultural andlabour (the

production of sugar and rum is aof both) in which the land, the factories (if theybe so called), the machinery, and the degraded labourers, arethe property of a capitalist. In this case, as well as in itsopposite, the case of the peasant proprietor, there is noof the produce.

3. When the three requisites are not all owned by the same, it often happens that two of them are so. Sometimes theperson owns the capital and the land, but not the labour.landlord makes his engagement directly with the labourer, andthe whole or part of the stock necessary for. This system is the usual one in those parts ofEurope, in which the labourers are neither serfs onone hand, nor proprietors on the other. It was very common inbefore the Revolution, and is still practised in someof that country, when the land is not the property of the. It prevails generally in the level districts of, except those principally pastoral, such as the Maremma ofand the Campagna of Rome. On this system the division ofproduce is between two classes, the landowner and the.

In other cases again the labourer does not own the land, butthe little stock employed on it, the landlord not being inhabit of supplying any. This system generally prevails in. It is nearly universal in India, and in most countriesthe East; whether the government retains, as it generally, the ownership of the soil, or allows portions to become,absolutely or in a qualified sense, the property of. In India, however, things are so far better than in, that the owner of land is in the habit of makingto the cultivators, if they cannot cultivate without. For these advances the native landed proprietor usuallyhigh interest; but the principal landowner, the, makes them gratuitously, recovering the advance afterharvest, together with the rent. The produce is here dividedbefore, between the same two classes, the landowner and the.

These are the principal variations in the classification ofamong whom the produce of agricultural labour is. In the case of manufacturing industry there nevermore than two classes, the labourers and the capitalists. Theartisans in all countries were either slaves, or theof the family. In the manufacturing establishments of the, whether on a large or on a small scale, the labourersusually the property of the capitalist. In general, if anylabour was thought compatible with the dignity of a, it was only agricultural labour. The converse system, inthe capital was owned by the labourer, was coeval with free, and under it the first great advances of manufacturingwere achieved. The artisan owned the loom or the fewhe used, and worked on his own account; or at least endeddoing so, though he usually worked for another, first asand next as journeyman, for a certain number of yearshe could be admitted a master. But the status of ajourneyman, all his life a hired labourer and nothing, had no place in the crafts and guilds of the middle ages.country villages, where a carpenter or a blacksmith cannotand support hired labourers on the returns of his business,is even now his own workman; and shopkeepers in similarare their own shopmen, or shopwomen. But whereverextent of the market admits of it, the distinction is nowestablished between the class of capitalists, or employerslabour, and the class of labourers; the capitalists, in, contributing no other labour than that of direction and.:. "The Norwegian return" (say the Commissioners of Poor Law, to whom information was furnished from nearly everyin Europe and America by the ambassadors and consuls) "states that at the last census in 1825, out of aof 1,051,318 persons, there were 59, 464 freeholders.by 59,464 freeholders must be meant 59,464 heads of families,about 300,000

individuals; the freeholders must form more thanfourth of the whole population. Mr Macgregor states that in(by which Zealand and the adjoining islands are probably) out of a population of 926,110, the number of landedand farmers is 415,110, or nearly one-half. InHolstein, out of a populationof 604,085, it is 196,017,about one-third. The proportion of proprietors and farmers towhole population is not given in Sweden; but the Stockholmestimates the average quantity of land annexed to a's habitation at from one to five acres; and through thereturn gives a lower estimate, it adds, that thepossess much of the land. In Wurtemburg we are told thatthan two-thirds of the labouring population are theof their own habitations, and that almost all own ata garden of from three-quarters of an acre to an acre and a." In some of these statements, proprietors and farmers arediscriminated; but "all the returns concur in stating theof day-labourers to be very small." — (Preface to Foreign, p. xxxviii) As the general status of thepeople, the condition of a workman for hire is almostto Great Britain.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2,

Chapter 4

Competition, and Custom

1. Under the rule of individual property, the division of theis the result of two determining agencies: Competition,Custom. It is important to ascertain the amount of influencebelongs to each of these causes, and in what manner theof one is modified by the other.

Political economists generally, and English politicalabove others, have been accustomed to lay almoststress upon the first of these agencies; to exaggerateeffect of competition, and to take into little account theand conflicting principle. They are apt to expressas if they thought that competition actually does, incases, whatever it can be shown to he the tendency ofto do. This is partly intelligible, if we consideronly through the principle of competition has politicalany pretension to the character of a science.So far as, profits, wages, prices, are determined by competition,may be assigned for them. Assume competition to be theirregulator, and principles of broad generality andprecision may be laid down, according to which theybe regulated. The political economist justly deems this hisbusiness: and as an abstract or hypothetical science,economy cannot be required to do, and indeed cannot do,more. But it would be a great misconception of thecourse of human affairs, to suppose that competitionin fact this unlimited sway. I am not speaking of, either natural or artificial, or of any interferencesauthority with the liberty of production or exchange. Suchcauses have always been allowed for by political. I speak of cases in which there is nothing tocompetition; no hindrance to it either in the nature ofcase or in artificial obstacles; yet in which the result isdetermined by competition, but by custom or usage;either not taking place at all, or producing itsin quite a different manner from that which is ordinarilyto be natural to it.

2. Competition, in fact, has only become in any considerablethe governing principle of contracts, at a comparativelyperiod. The farther we look back into history, the more weall transactions and engagements under the influence of fixed. The reason is evident. Custom is the most powerfulof the weak the strong; their sole protector whereare no laws or government adequate to the purpose. Customa barrier which, even in the most oppressed condition of, tyranny is forced in some degree to respect. To thepopulation, in a turbulent military community,of competition is a vain phrase; they are never in ato make terms for themselves by it: there is always awho throws his sword into the scale, and the terms areas he imposes. But though the law of the strongest decides,is not the interest nor in general the practice of theto strain that law to the utmost, and every relaxationit has a tendency to become a custom, and every custom toa right. Rights thus originating, and not competition inshape, determine, in a rude state of society, the share ofproduce enjoyed by those who produce it. The relations, more, between the landowner and the cultivator, and themade by the latter to the former, are, in all states ofbut the most modern, determined by the usage of the. Never until late times have a right to retain his, while he fulfils the customary requirements; and thus, in a certain sense, a co-proprietor of the soil. Eventhe

holder has not acquired this fixity of tenure, theof occupation have often been fixed and invariable.

In India, for example, and other Asiatic communitiesconstituted, the ryots, or peasant-farmers, are notas tenants at will, nor even as tenants by virtue of a. In most villages there are indeed some ryots on thisfooting, consisting of those, or the descendants of, who have settled in the place at a known and comparativelyperiod; but all who are looked upon as descendants orof the original inhabitants, and even many mereof ancient date, are thought entitled to retain their, as long as they pay the customary rents. What theserents are, or ought to be, has indeed, in most cases,a matter of obscurity; usurpation, tyranny, and foreignhaving to a great degree obliterated the evidences of. But when an old and purely Hindoo principality falls underdominion of the British Government, or the management of its, and when the details of the revenue system come to beinto, it is usually found that though the demands of thelandholder, the State, have been swelled by fiscal rapacityall limit is practically lost sight of, it has yet beennecessary to have a distinct name and a separate pretexteach increase of exaction; so that the demand has sometimesto consist of thirty or forty different items, in additionthe nominal rent. This circuitous mode of increasing theassuredly would not have been resorted to, if there hadan acknowledged right in the landlord to increase the rent.adoption is a proof that there was once an effective, a real customary rent; and that the understood rightthe ryot to the land, so long as he paid rent according to, was at some time or other more than nominal.(1*) TheGovernment of India always simplifies the tenure bythe various assessments into one, thus making thenominally as well as really an arbitrary thing, or at leastmatter of specific agreement: but it scrupulously respects theof the ryot to the land, though until the reforms of thegeneration (reforms even now only partially carried into) it seldom left him much more than a bare subsistence.

In modern Europe the cultivators have gradually emerged fromstate of personal slavery. The barbarian conquerors of theEmpire found that the easiest mode of managing theirwould be to leave the occupation of the land in thein which they found it, and to save themselves a labour soas the superintendence of troops of slaves, bythe slaves to retain in a certain degree the control ofown actions, under an obligation to furnish the lord withand labour. A common expedient was to assign to the, for his exclusive use, as much land as was thoughtfor his support, and to make him work on the otherof his lord whenever required. By degrees these indefinitewere transformed into a definite one, of supplying aquantity of provisions or a fixed quantity of labour: andthe lords, in time, became inclined to employ their income inpurchase of luxuries rather than in the maintenance of, the payments in kind were commuted for payments in. Each concession, at first voluntary and revocable at, gradually acquired the force of custom, and was at lastand enforced by the tribunals. In this manner theprogressively rose into a free tenantry, who held theirin perpetuity on fixed conditions. The conditions werevery onerous, and the people very miserable. But theirwere determined by the usage or law of the country,not by competition.

Where the cultivators had never been, strictly speaking, inbondage, or after they had ceased to be so, theof a poor and little advanced society gave rise toarrangement, which in some parts of Europe, even highlyparts, has been found sufficiently advantageous

to beto the present day. I speak of the métayer system.this, the land is divided, in small farms, among single, the landlord generally supplying the stock which thesystem of the country is considered to require, and, in lieu of rent and profit, a fixed proportion of the. This proportion, which is generally paid in kind, is, (as is implied in the words métayer, mezzaiuolo, and,) one-half. There are places, however, such as thevolcanic soil of the province of Naples, where the landlordtwo-thirds, and yet the cultivator by means of an excellentcontrives to live. But whether the proportion isthirds or one-half, it is a fixed proportion; not variablefarm to farm, or from tenant to tenant. The custom of theis the universal rule; nobody thinks of raising orrents, or of letting land on other than the customary. Competition, as a regulator of rent, has no.

3. Prices, whenever there was no monopoly, came earlier underinfluence of competition, and are much more universallyto it, than rents: but that influence is by no means,in the present activity of mercantile competition, soas is sometimes assumed. There is no proposition whichus in the field of political economy oftener than this-thatcannot be two prices in the same market. Such undoubtedlythe natural effect of unimpeded competition; yet every onethat there are, almost always, two prices in the same. Not only are there in every large town, and in almosttrade, cheap shops and dear shops, but the same shop oftenthe same article at different prices to different: and, as a general rule, each retailer adapts his scaleprices to the class of customers whom he expects. Thetrade, in the great articles of commerce, is reallythe dominion of competition. There, the buyers as well asare traders or manufacturers, and their purchases are notby indolence or vulgar finery, nor depend on themotives of personal convenience, but are business. In the wholesale markets therefore it is true as aproposition, that there are not two prices at one timethe same thing: there is at each time and place a market, which can be quoted in a price-current. But retail price,price paid by the actual consumer, seems to feel very slowlyimperfectly the effect of competition; and when competitionexist, it often, instead of lowering prices, merely dividesgains of the high price among a greater number of dealers.it is that, of the price paid by the consumer, so large ais absorbed by the gains of retailers; and any one whointo the amount which reaches the hands of those whothe things he buys, will often be astonished at its. When indeed the market, being that of a great city,out a sufficient inducement to large capitalists to engageretail operations, it is generally found a better speculationattract a large business by underselling others, than merelydivide the field of employment with them. This influence ofis making itself felt more and more through thebranches of retail trade in the large towns; and theand cheapness of transport, by making consumers lesson the dealers in their immediate neighbourhood, areto assimilate more and more the whole country to a large: but hitherto it is only in the great centres of businessretail transactions have been chiefly, or even much,, by competition. Elsewhere it rather acts, when itat all, as an occasional disturbing influence; the habitualis custom, modified from time to time by notionsin the minds of purchasers and sellers, of some kind ofor justice.

In many trades the terms on which business is done are aof positive arrangement among the trade, who use the meansalways possess of making the situation of any member of thewho departs from its fixed customs, inconvenient or. It is well known that the bookselling trade was,lately, one of these, and that notwithstanding the activeof rivalry in

the trade, competition did not produce itseffect in breaking down the trade rules. All professionalis regulated by custom. The fees of physicians,, and barristers, the charges of attorneys, are nearly. Not certainly for want of abundant competition inprofessions, but because the competition operates byeach competitor's chance of fees, not by lowering thethemselves.

Since custom stands its ground against competition to soan extent, even where, from the multitude ofand the general energy in the pursuit of gain, theof competition is strongest, we may be sure that this ismore the case where people are content with smaller gains,estimate their pecuniary interest at a lower rate whenagainst their ease or their pleasure. I believe it willbe found, in Continental Europe, that prices and charges,some or of all sorts, are much higher in some places than innot far distant, without its being possible to assign anycause than that it has always been so: the customers areto it, and acquiesce in it. An enterprising competitor, withcapital, might force down the charges, and make hisduring the process; but there are no enterprising; those who have capital prefer to leave it where it, or to make less profit by it in a more quiet way.

These observations must be received as a general correctionbe applied whenever relevant, whether expressly mentioned or, to the conclusions contained in the subsequent portions oftreatise. Our reasonings must, in general, proceed as if theand natural effects of competition were actually producedit, in all cases in which it is not restrained by someobstacle. Where competition, though free to exist, doesexist, or where it exists, but has its natural consequencesby any other agency, the conclusions will fail more orof being applicable. To escape error, we ought, in applyingconclusions of political economy to the actual affairs of, to consider not only what will happen supposing the maximumcompetition, but how far the result will be affected iffalls short of the maximum.

The states of economical relation which stand first in orderbe discussed and appreciated, are those in which competitionno part, the arbiter of transactions being either brute forceestablished usage. These will be the subject of the next four.:. The ancient law books of the Hindoos mention in some casessixth, in others one-fourth of the produce, as a proper rent;there is no evidence that the rules laid down in those books, at any period of history, really acted upon.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2,

Chapter 5

Slavery

1. Among the forms which society assumes under the influencethe institution of property, there are, as I have already, two, otherwise of a widely dissimilar character, butin this, that the ownership of the land, the labour,the capital, is in the same hands. One of these cases is thatslavery, the other is that of peasant proprietors. In the one,landowner owns the labour, in the other the labourer owns the. We begin with the first.

In this system all the produce belongs to the landlord. Theand other necessaries of his labourers are part of his. The labourers possess nothing but what he thinks fit tothem, and until he thinks fit to take it back: and they workhard as he chooses, or is able, to compel them. Theiris only limited by his humanity, or his pecuniary. With the first consideration, we have on the presentnothing to do. What the second in so detestable aof society may dictate, depends on the facilitiesimporting fresh slaves. If full-grown able-bodied slaves canprocurred in sufficient numbers, and imported at a moderate, self-interest will recommend working the slaves to, and replacing them importation in preference to the slowexpensive process of breeding them. Nor are the slave-ownersbackward in learning this lesson. It is notorious thatwas the practice in our slave colonies, while the slavewas legal; and it is said to be so still in among the Cuba

When, as among the ancients, the slave-market could only beby captives either taken in war, or kidnapped fromscattered tribes on the remote confines of the known, it was generally more profitable to keep up the number by, which necessitates a far better treatment of them; andthis reason, joined with several others, the condition of, notwithstanding occasional enormities, was probably muchbad in the ancient world, than in the colonies of modern. The Helots are usually cited as the type of the mostform of personal slavery, but with how little truthfrom the fact that they were regularly armed (though notthe panoply of the hoplite) and formed an integral part ofmilitary strength of the State. They were doubtless anand degraded caste, but their slavery seems to have beenof the least onerous varieties of serfdom. Slavery appears inmore frightful colours among the Romans, during the period inthe Roman aristocracy was gorging itself with the plundera newly-conquered world. The Romans were a cruel people, andworthless nobles sported with the lives of their myriads ofwith the same reckless prodigality with which theyany other part of their ill-acquired possessions. Yet,is divested of one of its worst features when it iswith hope; enfranchisement was easy and common:slaves obtained at once the full rights of citizens,instances were frequent of their acquiring not only riches,latterly even honours. By the progress of milder legislationthe Emperors, much of the protection of law was thrownthe slave, he became capable of possessing property, andevil altogether assumed a considerably gentler aspect. Until,, slavery assumes the mitigated form of villenage, innot only the slaves have property and legal rights, butobligations are more or less limited by usage, and theylabour for their own benefit; their condition is seldomas to produce a rapid growth neither of population or of.

2. So long as slave countries are underpeopled in proportiontheir cultivable land, the labour of the slaves, under anymanagement, produces much more than is sufficient forsupport; especially as the great amount of superintendencetheir labour requires, preventing the dispersion of the, insures some of the advantages of combined labour., in a good soil and climate, and with reasonable care ofown interests, the owner of many slaves has the means ofrich. The influence, however, of such a state of society on, is perfectly well understood. It is truism to assertlabour extorted by fear of punishment is inefficient and. It is true that in some circumstances, human beingsbe driven by the lash to attempt, and even to accomplish,which they would not have undertaken for any payment whichcould have been worth while to an employer to offer them. Andis likely that productive operations which require muchof labour, the production of sugar for example, wouldhave taken place so soon in the American colonies, if slaverynot existed to keep masses of labour together. There are alsotribes so averse from regular industry, that industrialis scarcely able to introduce itself among them until theyeither conquered and made slaves of, or become conquerors andothers so. But after allowing the full value of these, it remains certain that slavery is incompatibleany high state of the arts of life, and any great efficiencylabour. For all products which require much skill, slaveare usually dependent on foreigners. Hopeless slaverybrutifies the intellect; and intelligence in the, though often encouraged in the ancient world and in the, is in a more advanced state of society a source of so muchand an object of so much dread to the masters, that inof the States of America it was a highly penal offence toa slave to read. All processes carried on by slave labourconducted in the rudest strength of the slave is, on an, not half exerted. and most unimproved manner. And evenanimal strength of the slave is, on an average, not half. The unproductiveness and wastefulness of the industrialin the Slave States is instructively displayed in thewritings of Mr. Olmsted. The mildest form of slavery isthe condition of the serf, who is attached to the soil,himself from his allotment, and works a certain numberdays in the week for his lord. Yet there is but one opinion onextreme inefficiency of serf labour. The following passage isProfessor Jones,(1*) whose Essay on the Distribution of(or rather on Rent), is a copious repertory of valuableon the landed tenures of different countries.

"The Russians, or rather those German writers who havethe manners and habits of Russia, state some strongon this point. Two Middlesex mowers, they say, will mow inday as much grass as six Russian serfs, and in spite of theof provisions in England and their cheapness in Russia,mowing a quantity of hay which would cost an English farmera copeck, will cost a Russian proprietor three or four.* The Prussian counsellor of state, Jacob, is consideredhave proved, that in Russia, where everything is cheap, theof a serf is doubly as expensive as that of a labourer in. M. Schmalz gives a startling account of theof serf labour in Prussia, from his ownand observation.* In Austria, it is distinctly stated,the labour of a serf is equal to only one-third of that of ahired labourer. This calculation, made in an able work on(with some extracts from which I have been favoured),applied to the practical purpose of deciding on the number ofnecessity to cultivate an estate of a given magnitude.palpable, indeed, are the ill effects of labour rents on theof the agricultural population, that in Austria itself,proposals of changes of any kind do not readily make their, schemes and plans for the commutation of labour rents are asas in the more stirring German provinces of the North."*

What is wanting in the quality of the labour itself, is notup by any excellence in the direction and superintendence.the same writer remarks, the landed proprietors "are, in their character of cultivators of their own, the only guides and directors of the industry of thepopulation," since there can be no intermediateof capitalist farmers where the labourers are the propertythe lord. Great landowners are everywhere an idle class, or iflabour at all, addict themselves only to the more excitingof exertion; that lion's share which superiors alwaysfor themselves. "It would," as Mr. Jones observes, "beand irrational to expect, that a race of noble, fenced round with privileges and dignity, andto military and political pursuits by the advantageshabits of their station, should ever become attentiveas a body." Even in England, if the cultivation ofestate depended upon its proprietor, any one can judge whatbe the result. There would be a few cases of great scienceenergy, and numerous individual instances of moderate, but the general state of agriculture would be.

3. Whether the proprietors themselves would lose by theof their slaves, is a different question from theeffectiveness of free and slave labour to the. There has been much discussion of this question as anthesis; as if it could possibly admit of any universal. Whether slavery or free labour is most profitable toemployer, depends on the wages of the free labourer. These,, depend on the numbers of the labouring population,with the capital and the land. Hired labour is generallymuch more efficient than slave labour, that the employer cana considerably greater value in wages, than the maintenancehis slaves cost him before, and yet be a gainer by the change:he cannot do this without of serfdom in Europe, and itsin the Western nations, were doubtless hastened bychange which the growth of population must have made in theinterests of the master. As population pressed harderthe land, with any improvements in agriculture, theof the serfs necessarily became more costly, andlabour less valuable. With the rate of wages such as it isIreland, or in England (where, in proportion to its, labour is quite as cheap as in Ireland), no one cana moment imagine that slavery could be profitable. If thepeasantry were slaves, their masters would be as willing,their landlords now are, to pay large sums merely to get ridthem. In the rich and underpeopled soil of the West India, there is just as little doubt that the balance ofbetween free and slave labour was greatly on the side of, and that the compensation canted to the slave-owners forabolition was not more, perhaps even less, than an equivalenttheir loss.

More needs not be said here on a cause so completely judgeddecided as that of slavery. Its demerits are no longer arequiring argument; though the temper of mind manifestedthe larger part of the influential classes in Great Britainthe struggle in America, shows how grievously theof the present generation of Englishmen, on this, had fallen behind the positive acts of the generationpreceded them. That the sons of the deliverers of the WestNegroes should expect with complacency, and encourage bysympathies, the establishment of a great and powerfulcommonwealth, pledged by its principles and driven bystrongest interests to be the armed propagator of slaveryevery region of the earth into which its power could, discloses a mental state in the leading portion of ourand middle classes which it is melancholy to see, and willa lasting blot in English history. Fortunately they stoppedof actually aiding, otherwise than by words, the nefariousto which they were not ashamed of wishing success;andthe expense of the best blood of the Free States, but to theirelevation in mental and moral worth, the curse ofhas been cast out from the great

American republic, toits last temporary refuge in Brazil and Cuba. No European, except Spain alone, any longer participates in the. Even serfage has now ceased to have a legal existenceEurope. Denmark has the honour of being the first Continentalwhich imitated England in liberating its colonial slaves;the abolition of slavery was one of the earliest acts of theand calumniated Provisional Government of France. TheGovernment was not long behind, and its colonies andare now, I believe without exception, free fromslavery, though forced labour for the public authoritiesstill a recognised institution in Java, soon, we may hope, toexchanged for complete personal freedom.:. Essay on the Distribution of Wealth and on the Sources of. By the Rev. Richard Jones, page 50.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2,

Chapter 6

Peasant Proprietors

1. In the regime of peasant properties, as in that of, the whole produce belongs to a single owner' and theof rent, profits, and wages, does not exist. In allrespects, the two states of society are the extremeof each other. The one is the state of greatestand degradation to the labouring class. The other isin which they are the most uncontrolled arbiters of theirlot.

The advantage, however, of small properties in land, is onethe most disputed questions in the range of political economy.the Continent, though there are some dissentients from theopinion, the benefit of having a numerous proprietaryexists in the minds of most people in the form of an. But English authorities are either unaware of the judgmentContinental agriculturists, or are content to put it aside, onplea of their having no experience of large properties incircumstances: the advantage of large properties beingfelt where there are also large farms; and as this, indistricts, implies a greater accumulation of capital thanexists on the Continent, the great Continental estates,in the case of grazing farms, are mostly let out forin small portions. There is some truth in this; butargument admits of being retorted; for if the Continent knows, by experience, of cultivation on a large scale and bycapital, the generality of English writers are no betterpractically with peasant proprietors, and have almostthe most erroneous ideas of their social condition andof life. Yet the old traditions even of England are on theside with the general opinion of the Continent. The"yeomanry" who were vaunted as the glory of England while they, and have been so much mourned over since they, were either small proprietors or small farmers, andthey were mostly the last, the character they bore for sturdyis the more noticeable. There is a part of England,a very small part, where peasant proprietors arecommon; for such are the "statesmen" of Cumberland and, though they pay, I believe, generally if not, certain customary dues, which, being fixed, no moretheir character of proprietor, than the land-tax does.is but one voice, among those acquainted with the country,the admirable effects of this tenure of land in those. No other agricultural population in England could havethe originals of Wordsworth's peasantry.(1*)

The general system, however, of English cultivation,no experience to render the nature and operation ofproperties familiar, and Englishmen being in generalignorant of the agricultural economy of other, the very idea of peasant proprietors is strange to themind, and does not easily find access to it. Even theof language stand in the way: the familiar designation forof land being "landlords", a term to which "tenants" isunderstood as a correlative. When at the time of the, the suggestion of peasant properties as a means of Irishfound its way into parliamentary and newspaper, there were writers of pretension to whom the word"proprietor" was so far from conveying any distinct idea, thatmistook the small holdings of Irish cottier tenants forproperties. The subject being so little understood, Iit important, before entering into the theory of it, to dotowards showing how the case stands as to matter of; by exhibiting, at greater length than would otherwise be, some of the testimony which exists respecting theof cultivation, and the comfort and happiness of

the, in those countries and parts of countries, in whichgreater part of the land other than the labourer who tillssoil.

2. I lay no stress on the condition of North America, where,is well known, the land, except in the former Slave States, isuniversally owned by the same person who holds the plough.country combining the natural fertility of America with theand arts of modern Europe, is so peculiarly, that scarcely anything, except insecurity ofor a tyrannical government, could materially impair theof the industrious classes. I might, with Sismondi,more strongly on the case of ancient Italy, especially, that Campagna which then swarmed with inhabitants in theregions which under a contrary régime have becomefrom malaria. But I prefer taking the evidence ofsame writer on things known to him by personal observation.

"C'est surtout la Suisse," says M. de Sismondi, "qu'il faut, qu'il faut étudier, pour juger du bonheur des paysansétaires. C'est la Suisse qu'il faut apprendre à connaîtrese convaincre que l'agriculture pratiquée par ceux-là mêmeen recueillent les fruits suffit pour procurer une grandeà une population très nombreuse; une grande indépendancecaractère, fruit de l'indépendance des situations; un grandde consommation, conséquence du hien-être de tous les, même dans un pays dont le climat est rude, dont le solmédiocrement fertile, et où les gelées tardives et'inconstance des saisons détruisent souvent l'espoir du. On ne saurait voir sans admiration ces maisons de boismoindre paysan, si vastes, si bien closes, si bien, si couvertes de sculpture. Dans l'intérieur, decorridors dégagent chaque chambre de la nombreuse famille;chambre n'a qu'un lit, et il est abondamment pourvu de, de couvertures, et du linge le plus blanc; des meublesés l'entourent; les armoires sont remplies de linge, laest vaste, aérée, et d'une netteté exquise; sous le mêmeon trouve de grands approvisionnemens de blé, de viandeée, de fromage et de bois; dans les étables on voit le bétailmieux soigné et le plus beau de l'Europe; le jardin est plantéfleurs, les hommes comme les femmes sont chaudement ethabillés, les dernières conservent avec orgueil leurcostume; tous portent sur leur visage l'empreinte de laet de la santé. Que d'autres nations vantent leur, la Suisse pourra toujours leur opposer avec orgueil ses."(2*)

The same eminent writer thus expresses his opinion on peasantin general.

"Partout où l'on retrouve les paysans propriétaires, onaussi cette aisance, cette sécurité, cette confiancel'avenir, cette indépendance qui assurent en même temps leet la vertu. Le paysan qui fait avec ses enfans tout'ouvrage de son petit héritage, qui ne paie de fermage àau-dessus de lui, ni de salaire à personne au-dessous,règle sa production sur sa consommation, qui mange son propreé, boit son propre vin, se revêt de son chanvre et de ses, se soucie peu de connaître les prix du marché; car il aà vendre et peu à acheter, et il n'est jamais ruiné par lesévolutions du commerce. Loin de craindre pour l'avenir, il les'embellir dans son espérance; car il met à profit pour ses, pour les siècles qui viendront, chacun des instans que nepas de lui le travail de l'année. Il lui a suffi depeu de momens de travail pour mettre en terre le noyau quicent ans sera un grand arbre, pour creuser l'aquéduc quiéchera à jamais son champ, pour former le conduit qui luiènera une source d'eau vive, pour améliorer par des soinsrépétés mais dérobés sur les instans perdus, toutes lesèces d'animaux et de végétaux dont il s'entoure. Son petitest une vraie caisse d'épargnes, toujours prête àtous ses petits profits, à utiliser tous ses momens de. La puissance toujours agissante de la nature les féconde,les lui rend au centuple. Le paysan a

vivement le sentiment debonheur attaché à la condition de propriétaire. Aussi est-ilempressé de la terre à tout prix. Il la paie plus'elle ne vaut, plus qu'elle ne lui rendra peut-être; maisn'a-t-il pas raison d'estimer à un haut prix l'avantageplacer désormais toujours avantageusement son travail, sansêtre obligé de l'offrir au rabais; de trouver toujours au besoinpain, sans être obligé de le payer à l'enchère.

"Le paysan propriétaire est de tous les cultivateurs celuitire le plus de parti du sol; parceque c'est celui qui songeplus à l'avenir, tout comme celui qui a été le plus éclairél'expérience; c'est encore lui qui met le mieux à profit lehumain, parceque répartissant ses occupations entre tousmembres de sa famille, il en réserve pour tous les jours de'année, de manière à ce qu'il n'y ait de chômage pour personne:tous les cultivateurs il est le plus heureux, et en même, sur un espace donné, la terre ne nourrit bien, sans'épuiser, et n'occupe jamais tant d'habitans que lorsqu'ils sontétaires; enfin de tous les cultivateurs le paysanétaire est celui qui donne le plus d'encouragement auet à l'industrie, parcequ'il est le plus riche."(3*)

This picture of unwearied assiduity, and what may be calledinterest in the land, is borne out in regard to theintelligent Cantons of Switzerland by English observers. "Inanywhere in the neighbourhood of Zurich," says Mr., "in looking to the right or to the left, one is struckthe extraordinary industry of the inhabitants; and if wethat a proprietor here has a return of ten per cent, we areto say, 'he deserves it.' I speak at present of country, though I believe that in every kind of trade also, theof Zurich are remarkable for their assiduity; but in thethey show in the cultivation of their land I may safelythey are unrivalled. When I used to open my casement betweenand five in the morning to look out upon the lake and theAlps, I saw the labourer in the fields; and when Ifrom an evening walk, long after sunset, as late,, as half-past eight, there was the labourer mowing his, or tying up his vines.... It is impossible to look at a, a garden, a hedging, scarcely even a tree, a flower, or a, with perceiving proofs of the extreme care andthat are bestowed upon the cultivation of the soil. If,example, a path leads through or by the side of a field of, the corn is not, as in England, permitted to hang over the, exposed to be pulled or trodden down by every passer by; iteverywhere bounded by a fence, stakes are placed at intervalsabout a yard, and, about two, or three feet from the ground,of trees are passed longitudinally along. If you look intofield towards evening, where there are large beds ofor cabbage, you will find that every single plant haswatered. In the gardens, which around Zurich are extremely, the most punctilious care is evinced in every productiongrows. The vegetables are planted with seeminglyaccuracy; not a single weed is to be seen, not astone. Plants are not earthed up as with us, but arein a small hollow, into each of which a little manure is, and each plant is watered daily. Where seeds are sown, thedirectly above is broken into the finest powder; every, every flower is tied to a stake, and where there isfruit a trellice is erected against the wall, to which theare fastened, and there is not a single thing that has notappropriate resting place."(4*)

Of one of the remote valleys of the High Alps the same writerexpresses himself.(5*)

"In the whole of the Engadine the land belongs to the, who, like the inhabitants of every other place wherestate of things exists, vary greatly in the extent of their.... Generally speaking, an Engadine peasant livesupon the produce of his land, with the

exception of thearticles of foreign growth required in his family, such as, sugar, and wine. Flax is grown, prepared, spun, and, without ever leaving his house. He has also his own wool,is converted into a blue coat, without passing through theof either the dyer or the tailor. The country is incapablegreater cultivation than it has received. All has been doneit that industry and an extreme love of gain can devise.is not a foot of waste land in the Engadine, the lowestof which is not much lower than the top of Snowdon. Whereverwill grow, there it is; wherever a rock will bear a blade,is seen upon it; wherever an ear of rye will ripen, thereis to be found. Barley and oats have also their appropriate; and wherever it is possible to ripen a little patch of, the cultivation of it is attempted. In no country inwill be found so few poor as in the Engadine. In theof Suss, which contains about six hundred inhabitants,is not a single individual who has not wherewithal to live, not a single individual who is indebted to othersone morsel that he eats."

Notwithstanding the general prosperity of the Swiss, this total absence of pauperism and (it may almost be) of poverty, cannot be predicated of the whole country; theand richest canton, that of Berne, being an example ofcontrary; for although, in the parts of it which are occupiedpeasant proprietors, their industry is as remarkable and theirand comfort as conspicuous as elsewhere, the canton iswith a numerous pauper population, through theof the worst regulated system of poor-lawin Europe, except that of England before the newLaw.(6*) Nor is Switzerland in some other respects aexample of all that peasant properties might effect.exists a series of statistical accounts of the Swiss, drawn up mostly with great care and intelligence,detailed date, respecting the condition of the landof the people. From these, the subdivision appears to beso minute, that it can hardly be supposed not to be: and the indebtedness of the proprietors in thecanton of Zurich "borders," as the writer expresses, "on the incredible;"(7*) so that "only the intensest, frugality, temperance, and complete freedom of commercethem to stand their ground." Yet the general conclusionfrom these books is that since the beginning of the, and concurrently with the subdivision of many greatwhich belonged to nobles or to the cantonal governments,has been a striking and rapid improvement in almost everyof agriculture, as well as in the houses, the habits,the food of the people. The writer of the account of Thürgauso far as to say, that since the subdivision of the feudalinto peasant properties, it is not uncommon for a thirda fourth part of an estate to produce as much grain, andas many head of cattle, as the whole estate did.(8*)

3. One of the countries in which peasant proprietors are ofdate, and most numerous in proportion to the population,Norway. Of the social and economical condition of that countryinteresting account has been given by Mr. Laing. His testimonyfavour of small landed properties both there and elsewhere, iswith great decision. I shall quote a few passages.

"If small proprietors are not good farmers, it is not fromsame cause here which we are told makes them so in Scotland- indolence and want of exertion. The extent to which irrigationcarried on in these glens and valleys shows a spirit ofand co-operation" (I request particular attention topoint), "to which the latter can show nothing similar. Haythe principal winter support of live stock, and both it and, as well as potatoes, liable, from the shallow soil andreflexion of sunshine from the rocks, to be burnt andup, the greatest exertions are made to bring water fromhead of each glen, along such a level as will give

theof it to each farmer at the head of his fields. This isby leading it in wooden troughs (the half of a tree roughly) from the highest perennial stream among the hills,woods, across ravines, along the rocky, often, sides of the glens, and from this main trougha lateral one to each farmer in passing the head of his. He distributes this supply by moveable troughs among the; and at this season waters each rig successively withlike those used by bleachers in watering cloth, laying hisbetween every two rigs. One would not believe, withoutit, how very large an extent of land is traversedby these artificial showers. The extent of the mainis very great. In one glen I walked ten miles, and foundtoughed on both sides: on one, the chain is continued down thevalley for forty miles.(9*) Those may be bad farmers who dothings; but they are not indolent, nor ignorant of theof working in concert, and keeping up establishmentscommon benefit. They are undoubtedly, in these respects, faradvance of any community of cottars in our Highland glens.feel as proprietors, who receive the advantage of their own. The excellent state of the roads and bridges isproof that the country is inhabited by people who have ainterest to keep them under repair. There are no."(10*)

On the effects of peasant proprietorship on the Continent, the same writer expresses himself as follows.(11*)

"If we listen to the large farmer, the scientific, the" [English] "political economist, good farmingperish with large farms; the very idea that good farming can, unless on large farms cultivated with great capital, theyto be absurd. Draining, manuring, economical arrangement,the land, regular rotations, valuable stock and, all belong exclusively to large farms, worked bycapital, and by hired labour. This reads very well; but ifraise our eyes from their books to their fields, and coollywhat we see in the best districts farmed in large farms,what we see in the best districts farmed in small farms, we, and there is no blinking the fact, better crops on thein Flanders, East Friesland, Holstein, in short, on theline of the arable land of equal quality of the Continent,the Sound to Calais, than we see on the line of Britishopposite to this line, and in the same latitudes, from theof Forth all round to Dover. Minute labour on smallof arable ground gives evidently, in equal soils and, a superior productiveness, where these small portionsin property, as in Flanders, Holland, Friesland, andin Holstein, to the farmer. It is not pretended by ourwriters, that our large farmers, even in, Roxburghshire, or the Lothians, approach to thecultivation, attention to manures, drainage, and cleanof the land, or in productiveness from a small space ofnot originally rich, which distinguish the small farmers of, or their system. In the hest-farmed parish in ScotlandEngland, more land is wasted in the corners and borders of theof large farms, in the roads through them, unnecessarilybecause they are bad, and bad because they are wide, incommons, waste spots, useless belts and clumps of sorry, and such unproductive areas, than would maintain the poorthe parish, if they were all laid together and cultivated. Butcapital applied to farming is of course only applied to thebest of the soils of a country. It cannot touch the smallspots which require more time and labour tothem than is consistent with a quick return of capital.although hired time and labour cannot be applied beneficiallysuch cultivation, the owner's own time and labour may. He isfor no higher terms at first from his land than a bare. But in the course of generations fertility and value are; a better living, and even very improved processes of, are attained. Furrow draining, stall feeding all, liquid manures, are universal in the husbandry of

thefarms of Flanders, Lombardy, Switzerland. Our mostdistricts under large farms are but beginning to adopt. Dairy husbandry even, and the manufacture of the largestby the co-operation of many small farmers,(12*) theassurance of property against fire and hail-storms, by theoperation of small farmers — the most scientific andof all agricultural operations in modern times, theof beet-root sugar — the supply of the Europeanwith flax and hemp, by the husbandry of small farmers —abundance of legumes, fruits, poultry, in the usual diet eventhe lowest classes abroad, and the total want of such varietythe tables even of oUr middle classes, and this variety andessentially connected with the husbandry of small— all these are features in the occupation of a countrysmall proprietor-farmers, which must make the inquirer pausehe admits the dogma of our land doctors at home, thatfarms worked by hired labour and great capital can aloneout the greatest productiveness of the soil and furnish thesupply of the necessaries and conveniences of life toinhabitants of a country."

4. Among the many flourishing regions of Germany in whichproperties prevail, I select the Palatinate, for theof quoting, from an English source, the results ofpersonal observation of its agriculture and its people.. Howitt, a writer whose habit it is to see all English objectsEnglish socialities en beau, and who, in treating of thepeasantry, certainly does not underrate the rudeness ofimplements, and the inferiority of their ploughing,shows that under the invigorating influence of theof proprietorship, they make up for the imperfections ofapparatus by the intensity of their application. "Theharrows and clears his land till it is in the nicest, and it is admirable to see the crops which he."(13*) "The peasants(14*) are the great and everpresentof country life. They are the great population of the, because they themselves are the possessors. This country, in fact, for the most part, in the hands of the people. It isout among the multitude..... The peasants are not, asus, for the most part, totally cut off from property in thethey cultivate, totally dependent on the labour afforded bythey are themselves the proprietors. It is, perhaps, fromcause that they are probably the most industrious peasantrythe world. They labour busily, early and late, because theythat they are labouring for themselves..... The Germanwork hard, but they have no actual want. Every man hashouse, his orchard, his roadside trees, commonly so heavyfruit, that he is obliged to prop and secure them all ways,they would be torn to pieces. He has his corn-plot, his plotmangel-wurzel, for hemp, and so on. He is his own master; and, and every member of his family, have the strongest motives to. You see the effect of this in that unremitting diligenceis beyond that of the whole world besides, and his economy,is still greater. The Germans, indeed, are not so activelively as the English. You never see them in a bustle, or asthey meant to knock off a vast deal in a little time.....are, on the contrary, slow, but for ever doing. They plod onday to day, and year to year — the most patient, untirable,persevering of animals. The English peasant is so cut offthe idea of property, that he comes habitually to look uponas a thing from which he is warned by the laws of the large, and becomes, in consequence, spiritless,..... The German bauer, on the contrary, looks on theas made for him and his fellow-men. He feels himself a; he has a stake in the country, as good as that of the bulkhis neighbours; no man can threaten him with ejection, or the, so long as he is active and economical. He walks,, with a bold step; he looks you in the face with theof a free man, but of a respectful one."

Of their industry, the same writer thus further speaks:"There is not an hour of the year in which they do not findoccupation. In the depth of winter, when the weatherthem by any means to get out of doors, they are alwayssomething to do. They carry out their manure to theirwhile the frost is in them. If there is not frost, they arecleaning ditches and felling old fruit trees, or such as dobear well. Such of them as are too poor to lay in astock of wood, find plenty of work in ascending intomountainous woods, and bringing thence fuel. It wouldthe English common people to see the intense labour withthe Germans earn their firewood. In the depths of frost and, go into any of their hills and woods, and there you willthem hacking up stumps, cutting off branches, and gathering,all means which the official wood-police will allow, boughs,, and pieces of wood, which they convey home with the mosttoil and patience."(15*) After a description of theirand laborious vineyard culture, he continues,(16*) "In, with its great quantity of grass lands, and its large, so soon as the grain is in, and the fields are shut up forgrass, the country seems in a comparative state of rest and. But here they are everywhere, and for ever, hoeing and, planting and cutting, weeding and gathering. They have aof crops like a market-gardener. They have their, poppies, hemp, flax, saintfoin, lucerne, rape, colewort,, rotabaga, black turnips, Swedish and white turnips,, Jerusalem artichokes, mangel-wurzel, parsnips,beans, field beans, and peas, vetches, Indian corn,, madder for the manufacturer, potatoes, their greatof tobacco, millet-all, or the greater part, under themanagement, in their own family allotments. They have hadthings first to sow, many of them to transplant, to hoe, to, to clear of insects, to top; many of them to mow and gathersuccessive crops. They have their water-meadows, of which kindall their meadows are, to flood, to mow, and reflood;to reopen and to make anew: their early fruits to, to bring to market with their green crops of vegetables;cattle, sheep, calves, foals, most of them prisoners, andto look after; their vines, as they shoot rampantly insummer heat, to prune, and thin out the leaves when they arethick: and any one may imagine what a scene of incessantit is."

This interesting sketch, to the general truth of which anytraveller in that highly cultivated and populous regionbear witness, accords with the more elaborate delineation bydistinguished inhabitant, Professor Rau, in his little treatise"On the Agriculture of the Palatinate."(17*) Dr. Rau bearsnot only to the industry, but to the skill andof the peasantry; their judicious employment of, and excellent rotation of crops; the progressiveof their agriculture for generations past, and theof further improvement which is still active. "Theof the country people, who may he seen inall the day and all the year, and are never idle,they make a good distribution of their labours, and findevery interval of time a suitable occupation, is as wellas their zeal is praiseworthy in turning to use everywhich presents itself, in seizing upon every usefulwhich offers, and even in searching out new andmethods. One easily perceives that the peasant ofdistrict has reflected much on his occupation: he can givefor his modes of proceeding, even if those reasons arealways tenable; he is as exact an observer of proportions asis possible to he from memory, without the aid of figures: heto such general signs of the times as appear to augur himbenefit or harm."(18*)

The experience of all other parts of Germany is similar. "In," says Mr. Kay, "it is a notorious fact, that during thethirty years, and since the peasants became the proprietorsthe land, there has been a rapid and continual improvement incondition of the

houses, in the manner of living, in theof the peasants, and particularly in the culture of the. I have twice walked through that part of Saxony calledSwitzerland, in company with a German guide, and on purposesee the state of the villages and of the farming, and I canchallenge contradiction when I affirm that there is noin all Europe superior to the laboriously carefulof the valleys of that part of Saxony. There, as incantons of Berne, Vaud, and Zurich, and in the Rhine, the farms are singularly flourishing. They are kept incondition, and are always neat and well managed. Theis cleared as if it were a garden. No hedges or brushwoodit. Scarcely a rush or thistle or a bit of rank grass isbe seen. The meadows are well watered every spring with liquid, saved from the drainings of the farm yards. The grass isfree from weeds that the Saxon meadows reminded me more oflawns than of anything else I had seen. The peasantsto outstrip one another in the quantity and quality ofproduce, in the preparation of the ground, and in the generalof their respective portions. All the littleare eager to find out how to farm so as to producegreatest results: they diligently seek after improvements;send their children to the agricultural schools in order tothem to assist their fathers; and each proprietor soon adoptsnew improvement introduced by any of his neighbours."(19*) Ifhe not overstated, it denotes a state of intelligence verynot only from that of English labourers hut of English.

Mr. Kay's book, published in 1850, contains a mass ofgathered from observation and inquiries in manyparts of Europe, together with attestations from manywriters, to the beneficial effects of peasant. Among the testimonies which he cites respecting theiron agriculture, I select the following.

"Reichensperger, himself an inhabitant of that part ofwhere the land is the most subdivided, has published aand very elaborate work to show the admirable consequencesa system of freeholds in land. He expresses a very decidedthat not only are the gross products of any given numberacres held and cultivated by small or peasant proprietors,than the gross products of an equal number of acres helda few great proprietors, and cultivated by tenant farmers, butthe net products of the former, after deducting all theof cultivation, are also greater than the net productsthe latter.... He mentions one fact which seems to prove thatfertility of the land in countries where the properties are, must be rapidly increasing. He says that the price of thewhich is divided into small properties in the Prussian Rhine, is much higher, and has been rising much more rapidly,the price of land on the great estates. He and Professor Rausay that this rise in the price of the small estates wouldruined the more recent purchasers, unless the productivenessthe small estates had increased in at least an equal; and as the small proprietors have been graduallymore and more prosperous notwithstanding the increasingthey have paid for their land, he argues, with apparent, that this would seem to show that not only the grossof the small estates, but the net profits also have beenincreasing, and that the net profits per acre, of land,farmed by small proprietors, are greater than the netper acre of land farmed by a great proprietor. He says,seeming truth, that the increasing price of land in theestates cannot be the mere effect of competition, or ithave diminished the profits and the prosperity of the small, and that this result has not followed the rise.

"Albrecht Thaer, another celebrated German writer on thesystems of agriculture, in one of his later works(Grundsätze der rationellen Landwirthschaft) expresses

hisconviction, that the net produce of land is greater whenby small proprietors than when farmed by great proprietorstheir tenants.... This opinion of Thaer is all the more, as, during the early part of his life, he was veryin favour of the English system of great estates andfarms."

Mr. Kay adds from his own observation, "The peasant farmingPrussia, Saxony, Holland, and Switzerland is the most perfecteconomical farming I have ever witnessed in any country."(20*)

5. But the most decisive example in opposition to the Englishagainst cultivation by peasant proprietors, is the caseBelgium. The soil is originally one of the worst in Europe."The provinces," says Mr. M'Culloch,(21*) "of West and East, and Hainault, form a far stretching plain, of which thevegetation indicates the indefatigable care and labourupon its cultivation; for the natural soil consistswholly of barren sand, and its great fertility is entirelyresult of very skillful management and judicious applicationvarious manures." There exists a carefully prepared andtreatise on Flemish Husbandry, in the Farmer'sof the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Theobserves(22*) that the Flemish agriculturists "seem tonothing but a space to work upon: whatever be the quality orof the soil, in time they will make it produce something.sands in the Campine can be compared to nothing but the sandthe sea-shore, which they probably were originally. It isinteresting to follow step by step the progress of. Here you see a cottage and rude cow-shed erected onspot of the most unpromising aspect. The loose white sand blownregular mounds is only kept together by the roots of the: a small spot only is levelled and surrounded by a ditch:of this is covered with young broom, part is planted with, and perhaps a small patch of diminutive clover may show:" but manures, both solid and liquid, are collecting, "andis the nucleus from which, in a few years, a little farmspread around.... If there is no manure at hand, the onlythat can be sown, on pure sand, at first is broom: thisin the most barren soils; in three years it is fit to cut,produces some return in faggots for the bakers and. The leaves which have fallen have somewhat enrichedsoil, and the fibres of the roots have given a slight degreecompactness. It may now be ploughed and sown with buckwheat,even with rye without manure. By the time this is reaped, somemay have been collected, and a regular course of croppingbegin. As soon as clover and potatoes enable the farmer tocows and make manure, the improvement goes on rapidly; in ayears the soil undergoes a complete change: it becomes mellowretentive of moisture, and enriched by the vegetable matterby the decomposition of the roots of clover and other.... After the land has been gradually brought into a good, and is cultivated in a regular manner, there appears muchdifference between the soils which have been originally, and those which have been made so by labour and industry.least the crops in both appear more nearly alike at harvest,is the case in soils of different qualities in other. This is a great proof of the excellency of the Flemish; for it shows that the land is in a constant state of, and that the deficiency of the soil is compensatedgreater attention to tillage and manuring, especially the."

The people who labour thus intensely on their smallor farms, have practised for centuries thoseof rotation of crops and economy of manures, which inare counted among modern discoveries: and even now theof their agriculture, as a whole, to that of England,admitted by competent judges. "The cultivation of a poor light, or a moderate

soil," says the writer last quoted,(23*) "issuperior in Flanders to that of the most improved farmsthe same kind in Britain. We surpass the Flemish farmerin capital, in varied implements of tillage, in theand breeding of cattle and sheep," (though, according tosame authority,(24*) they are much "before us in the feedingtheir cows,") "and the British farmer is in general a man ofeducation to the Flemish peasant. But in the minuteto the qualities of the soil, in the management andof manures of different kinds, in the judiciousof crops, and especially in the economy of land, soevery part of it shall be in a constant state of production,have still something to learn from the Flemings," and not frominstructed and enterprising Fleming here and there, but fromgeneral practice.

Much of the most highly cultivated part of the countryof peasant properties, managed by the proprietors,either wholly or partly by spade industry.(25*) "When theis cultivated entirely by the spade, and no horses are kept,cow is kept for every three acres of land, and entirely fed ongrasses and roots. This mode of cultivation isadopted in the Waes district, where properties aresmall. All the labour is done by the different members offamily;" children soon beginning "to assist in various minute, according to their age and strength, such as weeding,, feeding the cows. If they can raise rye and wheat enoughmake their bread, and potatoes, turnips, carrots and clover,the cows, they do well; and the produce of the sale of theirseed, their flax, their hemp, and their butter, afterthe expense of manure purchased, which is always, gives them a very good profit. Suppose the wholeof the land to be six acres, which is not an uncommon, and which one man can manage;" then (after describingcultivation), "if a man with his wife and three youngare considered as equal to three and a half grown up, the family will require thirty-nine bushels of grain,nine bushels of potatoes, a fat hog, and the butter andof one cow.. an acre and a half of land will produce theand potatoes, and allow some corn to finish the fatteningthe hog, which has the extra buttermilk: another acre in, carrots, and potatoes, together with the stubble turnips,more than feed the cow. consequently two and a half acres ofis sufficient to feed this family, and the produce of thethree and a half may be sold to pay the rent or theof purchase-money, wear and tear of implements, extra, and clothes for the family. But these acres are the moston the farm, for the hemp, flax, and colza are; and by having another acre in clover and roots, acow can be kept, and its produce sold. We have, therefore,solution of the problem, how a family can live and thrive onacres of moderate land." After showing by calculation thatextent of land can be cultivated in the most perfect mannerthe family without any aid from hired labour, the writer, "In a farm of ten acres entirely cultivated by the, the addition of a man and a woman to the members of thewill render all the operations more easy; and with horsecart to carry out the manure, and bring home the produce, anddraw the harrows, fifteen acres may be very well.... Thus it will be seen," (this is the result of someof details and calculations,(26*)) "that by spade, an industrious man with a small capital, occupyingfifteen acres of good light land, may not only live andup a family, paying a good rent, but may accumulate asum in the course of his life." But theindustry by which he accomplishes this, and ofso large a portion is expended not in the mere cultivation,in the improvement, for a distant return, of the soil itself- has that industry no connexion with not paying rent? Could it, without presupposing neither a virtually permanent tenure,the certain prospect, by labour and economy on hired land, ofone day a landed proprietor?

As to their mode of living, "the Flemish farmers andlive much more economically than the same class in: they seldom eat meat, except on Sundays and in harvest:and potatoes with brown bread is their daily food." Iton this kind of evidence that English travellers, as theythrough Europe, pronounce the peasantry of everycountry poor and miserable, its agricultural andsystem a failure, and the English the only régime underlabourers are well off. It is, truly enough, the onlyégime under which labourers, whether well off or not, neverto be better. So little are English labourers accustomedconsider it possible that a labourer should not spend all he, that they habitually mistake the signs of economy forof poverty. Observe the true interpretation of the.

"Accordingly they are gradually acquiring capital, and theirambition is to have land of their own. They eagerly seizeopportunity of purchasing a small farm, and the price is soby competition, that land pays little more than two perinterest for the purchase money. Large properties gradually, and are divided into small portions, which sell at arate. But the wealth and industry of the population isincreasing, being rather diffused through the massesaccumulated in individuals."

With facts like these, known and accessible, it is not asurprising to find the case of Flanders referred to not inof peasant properties, but as a warning against; on no better ground than a presumptive excess of, inferred from the distress which existed among theof Brabant and East Flanders in the disastrous year-47. The evidence which I have cited from a writer conversantthe subject, and having no economical theory to support,that the distress, whatever may have been its severity,from no insufficiency in these little properties to supply, in any ordinary circumstances, the wants of all whomhave to maintain. It arose from the essential condition tothose are subject who employ land of their own in growingown food, namely, that the vicissitudes of the seasons mustborne by themselves, and cannot, as in the case of large, be shifted from them to the consumer. When we rememberseason of 1846, a partial failure of all kinds of grain, andalmost total one of the potato, it is no wonder that in soa calamity the produce of six acres, half of them sownflax, hemp, or oil seeds, should fall short of a year'sfor a family. But we are not to contrast the distressedpeasant with an English capitalist who farms severalacres of land. If the peasant were an Englishman, henot be that capitalist, but a day labourer under a. And is there no distress, in times of dearth, amonglabourers? Was there none, that year, in countries whereproprietors and small farmers are unknown? I am aware of nofor believing that the distress was greater in Belgium,corresponds to the proportional extent of the failure ofcompared with other countries.(27*)

6. The evidence of the beneficial operation of peasantin the Channel Islands is of so decisive a character,I cannot help adding to the numerous citations already made,of a description of the economical condition of those, by a writer who combines personal observation with anstudy of the information afforded by other. Mr. William, in his "Plea for Peasant Proprietors," a book which byexcellence both of its materials and of its execution,to be regarded as the standard work on that side of the, speaks of the island of Guernsey in the following: "Not even in England is nearly so large a quantity ofsent to market from a tract of such limited extent. Thisitself might prove that the cultivators must be far removedpoverty, for being absolute owners of all the produceby them, they of course sell only what they do notrequire. But the satisfactoriness of their

conditionapparent to every observer. 'The happiest community,' says Mr., 'which it has ever been my lot to fall in with, is to bein this little island of Guernsey.' 'No matter,' says SirHead, 'to what point the traveller may choose to bend his, comfort everywhere prevails.' What most surprises thevisitor in his first walk or drive beyond the bounds of. Peter's Port is the appearance of the habitations with whichlandscape is thickly studded. Many of them are such as in hiscountry would belong to persons of middle rank; but he isto guess what sort of people live in the other, which,in general not large enough for farmers, are almostmuch too good in every respect for day labourers..., in the whole island, with the exception of a few's huts, there is not one so mean as to be likened toordinary habitation of an English farm labourer.... 'Look,'a late Bailiff of Guernsey, Mr. De L'isle Brock, 'at theof the English, and compare them with the cottages of our.'... Beggars are utterly unknown.... Pauperism,bodied pauperism at least, is nearly as rare as mendicancy.Savings Banks accounts also bear witness to the generalenjoyed by the labouring classes of Guernsey. in the1841, there were in England, out of a population of nearlymillions, less than 700,000 depositors, or one in everypersons, and the average amount of the deposits was 30l.Guernsey,in the same year, out of a population of 26,000, theof depositors was 1920, and the average amount of the40l."(28*) The evidence as to Jersey and Alderney is ofsimilar character.

Of the efficiency and productiveness of agriculture on theproperties of the Channel islands, Mr. Thornton producesevidence, the result of which he sums up as follows: "Thusappears that in the two principal Channel Islands, thepopulation is, in the one twice, and in the other,times, as dense as in Britain, there being in the latter, only one cultivator to twenty-two acres of cultivated, while in Jersey there is one to eleven, and in Guernsey oneseven acres. Yet the agriculture of these islands maintains,cultivators, nonagricultural populations, respectivelyand five times as dense as that of Britain. This differencenot arise from any superiority of soil or climate possessedthe Channel Islands, for the former is naturally rather poor,the latter is not better than in the southern counties of. It is owing entirely to the assiduous care of the, and to the abundant use of manure."(29*) "In the year" he says in another place,(30*) "the average yield of wheatthe large farms of England was only twenty-one bushels, andhighest average for any one county was no more thansix bushels. The highest average since claimed for theof England is thirty bushels. In Jersey, where the averageof farms is only sixteen acres, the average produce of wheatacre was stated by Inglis in 1834 to be thirty-six bushels;it is proved by official tables to have been forty bushels infive years ending with 1833. In Guernsey, where farms aresmaller, four quarters per acre, according to Inglis, isa good, but still a very common crop." "Thirty(31*) an acre would be thought in England a very fairfor middling land; but in the Channel Islands, it is onlyinferior land that would not let for at least 4l."

7. It is from France, that impressions unfavourable toproperties are generally drawn; it is in France that theis so often asserted to have brought forth its fruit inmost wretched possible agriculture, and to be rapidly, if not to have already reduced the peasantry, byof land, to the verge of starvation. it is difficultaccount for the general prevalence of impressions so much theof truth. The agriculture of France was wretched and thein great indigence before the Revolution. At that timewere not, so universally as at

present, landed proprietors.were, however, considerable districts of France where the, even then, was to a great extent the property of the, and among these were many of the most conspicuousto the general bad agriculture and to the general. An authority, on this point, not to be disputed, isYoung, the inveterate enemy of small farms, the coryphaeusthe modern English school of agriculturists; who yet,over nearly the whole of France in 1787, 1788, and, when he finds remarkable excellence of cultivation, neverto ascribe it to peasant property. "Leaving Sauve,"he,(32*) "I was much struck with a large tract of land,nothing but huge rocks; yet most of it enclosed andwith the most industrious attention. Every man has an, a mulberry, an almond, or a peach tree, and vinesamong them; so that the whole ground is covered withoddest mixture of these plants and bulging rocks, that can be. The inhabitants of this village deserve encouragementtheir industry; and if I were a French minister they shouldit. They would soon turn all the deserts around them into. Such a knot of active husbandmen, who turn their rocksscenes of fertility, because I suppose their own, would dosame by the wastes, if animated by the same omnipotent." Again:(33*) "Walk to Rossendal," (near Dunkirk)"where M. le Brun has an improvement on the Dunes, which he veryshowed me. Between the town and that place is a greatof neat little houses, built each with its garden, and onetwo fields enclosed, of most wretched blowing dune sand,as white as snow, but improved by industry. The magicproperty turns sand to gold." And again:(34*) "Going out of, I was surprised to find by far the greatest exertion inwhich I had yet seen in France; and then passed bysteep mountains, highly cultivated in terraces. Muchat St. Lawrence. The scenery very interesting to a. From Gange, to the mountain of rough ground which I, the ride has been the most interesting which I havein France; the efforts of industry the most vigorous; thethe most lively. An activity has been here, that hasaway all difficulties before it, and has clothed the verywith verdure. It would be a disgrace to common sense to askcause; the enjoyment of property must have done it. Give athe secure possession of a bleak rock, and he will turn ita garden; give him a nine years' lease of a garden, and heconvert it into a desert."

In his description of the country at the foot of the Western, he speaks no longer from surmise, but from knowledge."Take(35*) the road to Moneng, and come presently to a scenewas so new to me in France, that I could hardly believe myeyes. A succession of many well-built, tight, and comfortablecottages built of stone and covered with tiles; eachits little garden, enclosed by clipt thorn-hedges, withof peach and other fruit-trees, some fine oaks scatteredthe hedges, and young trees nursed up with so much care, thatbut the fostering attention of the owner could effectlike it. To every house belongs a farm, perfectly well, with grass borders mown and neatly kept around thefields, with gates to pass from one enclosure to another.are some parts of England (where small yeomen still remain)resemble this country of Béarn; but we have very little thatequal to what I have seen in this ride of twelve miles fromto Moneng. It is all in the hands of little proprietors,the farms being so small as to occasion a vicious andpopulation. An air of neatness, warmth, and comfortover the whole. It is visible in their new built housesstables; in their little gardens; in their hedges; in thebefore their doors; even in the coops for their poultry,the sties for their hogs. A peasant does not think ofhis pig comfortable, if his own happiness hang by theof a nine years' lease. We are now in Béarn, within a fewof the cradle of Henry IV. Do they inherit these blessingsthat good prince? The benignant genius

of that good monarchto reign still over the country; each peasant has the fowlthe pot." He frequently notices the excellence of theof French Flanders, where the farms "are all small,much in the hands of little proprietors."(36*) In the Pays de, also a country of small properties, the agriculture was; of which his explanation was that it "is acountry, and farming is but a secondary pursuit tocotton fabric, which spreads over the whole of it."(37*) Thedistrict is still a seat of manufactures, and a country ofproprietors, and is now, whether we judge from theof the crops or from the official returns, one of thecultivated in France. In "Flanders, Alsace, and part of, as well as on the banks of the Garonne, France possesseshusbandry equal to our own." (38*) Those countries, and apart of Quercy, "are cultivated more like gardensfarms. Perhaps they are too much like gardens, from theof properties."(39*) In those districts the admirableof crops, so long practised in Italy, but at that timeneglected in France, was already universal. "The rapidof crops, the harvest of one being but the signal ofimmediately for a second," (the same fact which strikesobservers in the valley of the Rhine) "can scarcely beto greater perfection: and this is a point, perhaps, ofothers the most essential to good husbandry, when such cropsso justly distributed as we generally find them in these; cleaning and ameliorating ones being made thefor such as foul and exhaust."

It must not, however, be supposed, that Arthur Young'son the subject of peasant properties is uniformly. In Lorraine, Champagne, and elsewhere, he finds thebad, and the small proprietors very miserable, in, as he says, of the extreme subdivision of the land.opinion is thus summed up:(40*) — "Before I travelled, Ithat small farms, in property, were very susceptible ofcultivation; and that the occupier of such, having no rentpay, might be sufficiently at his ease to work improvements,carry on a vigorous husbandry; but what I have seen in, has greatly lessened my good opinion of them. In, I saw excellent husbandry on properties of 30 to 100; but we seldom find here such small patches of property ascommon in other provinces. In Alsace, and on the Garonne,is, on soils of such exuberant fertility as to demand no, some small properties also are well cultivated. Inéarn, I passed through a region of little farmers, whose, neatness, ease, and happiness charmed me; it was whatalone could, on a small scale, effect; but these were bymeans contemptibly small; they are, as I judged by thefrom house to house, from 40 to 80 acres. Except these,a very few other instances, I saw nothing respectable onproperties, except a most unremitting industry. Indeed, itnecessary to impress on the reader's mind, that though theI met with, in a great variety of instances on little, was as bad as can be well conceived, yet the industrythe possessors was so conspicuous, and so meritorious, that nowould be too great for it. It was sufficient tothat property in land is, of all others, the most activeto severe and incessant labour. And this truth is offorce and extent, that I know no way so sure of carrying.to a mountain top, as by permitting the adjoiningto acquire it in property; in fact, we see that in theof Languedoc, &c., they have conveyed earth in baskets,their backs, to form a soil where nature had denied it."

The experience, therefore, of this celebrated agriculturist,apostle of the grande culture, may be said to be, that theof small properties, cultivated by peasant proprietors, iswhen they are not too small: so small, namely, as notto occupy the time and attention of the family; for hecomplains, with great apparent reason, of the quantity oftime which the peasantry had on their hands when the landin very small portions, notwithstanding the

ardour with whichtoiled to improve their little patrimony in every way whichknowledge or ingenuity could suggest. He recommends,, that a limit of subdivision should be fixed by law;this is by no means an indefensible proposition in countries,such there are, where the morcellement, having already gonethan the state of capital and the nature of the stapleof cultivation render advisable, still continues. That each peasant should have a patch of land, evenfull property, if it is not sufficient to support him in, is a system with all the disadvantages, and scarcely anythe benefits, of small properties; since he must either liveindigence on the produce of his land, or depend as habituallyif he had no landed possessions, on the wages of hired labour:, besides, if all the holdings surrounding him are ofdimensions, he has little prospect of finding. Theof peasant properties are conditional on their not beingmuch subdivided; that is, on their not being required totoo many persons, in proportion to the produce that canraised from them by those persons. The question resolves, like most questions respecting the condition of theclasses, into one of population. Are small properties ato undue multiplication, or a check to it?:. In Mr Wordsworth's little descriptive work on the scenery ofLakes, he speaks of the upper part of the dales as havingfor centuries "a perfect republic of shepherds and, proprietors, for the most part, of the landsthey occupied and cultivated. The plough of each man wasto the maintenance of his own family, or to theaccommodation to his neighbour. Two or three cowseach family with milk and cheese. The chapel was theedifice that presided over these dwellings, the supreme headthis pure commonwealth; the members of which existed in theof a powerful empire, like an ideal society, or ancommunity, whose constitution had been imposed andby the mountains which protected it. Neither high-born, knight, nor esquire was here; but many of these humbleof the hills had a consciousness that the land which theyover and tilled had for more than five hundred years beenby men of their name and blood... Corn was grown invales sufficient upon each estate to furnish bread for each, no more. the storms and moisture of the climate inducedto sprinkle their upland property with outhouses of native, as places of shelter for their sheep, where, inweather, food was distributed to them. Every familyfrom its own flock the wool with which it was clothed; awas here and there found among them, and the rest of theirwas supplied by the produce of the yarn, which they cardedspun in their own houses, and carried to market either underarms, or more frequently on packhorses, a small train taingway weekly down the valley, or over the mountains, to thecommodious town." — A Description of the Scenery of thein the North of England. 3rd edit. pp. 50 to 53 and 63 to.. Etudes sur l'Economie Politique, Essai III.. And in another work (Nouveaux Principes d'Economie Politique,, iii, ch. 3 he says: "Quand on traverse la Suisse'entiere, plusieurs provinces de France, d'Italie, et'Allemagne, il n'est pas besoin de demander, en regardant chaquede terre, si elle appartient a un cultivateur proprietairea un fermier. Les soins bien entendus, les joissancesau labourer, la parure que la campagne a recue de ses, indiquent bien vite le premier. Il est vrai qu'unoppressif peut detruire l'aisance et abrutir'intelligence que devait donner la propriete que l'impot peutle plus net du produit des champs, que l'insolence desdu pouvoir peut troubler la securite des paysans, que'impossiblite d'obtenir justice contre un puissant voison peutle decouragement dans l'ame, et que, dans le beau pays quiete rendu a l'administration du Roi de Sardaigne, unporte aussi bien qu'un journalier l'uniforme de la." He was here speaking of Savoy, where the peasants areproprietors; and according to authentic (though not) accounts, extremely miserable. But, as M. de

Sismondi, "On a beau se conformer a une seule des regles de'economie politique, elle ne peut pas operer le bien a elle; du moins elle diminue le mal.". Switzerland, the South of France, and the Pyrenees, in 1830.. 1, ch. 2.. Ibid. ch. 8 and 10.. There have been considerable changes in the Poor Lawand legislation of the Canton of Berne since thein the text was written. But I am not sufficientlywith the nature and operation of these changes tomore particularly of them here.. 'Eine an das unglaubliche granzende Schuldenmasse" is the. (Historish-geographisch-statistische Gemalde der. Erster Theil. Der Kanton Zurich. Von Gerold Meyer Von, 1834, pp. 80-1) There are villages in Zurich, he adds, inthere is not a single property unmortgaged. It does not,, follow that each individual proprietor is deeplybecause the aggregate mass of encumbrances is large. InCanton of Schaffhausen, for instance, it is stated that theproperties are almost all mortgaged, but rarely for moreone-half their registered value. (Zwolfter Theil. Der Kanton, von Edward Im-Thurn, 1840, p. 52) and the mortgagesoften for the improvement and enlargement of the estate.(Siebenzehnter Theil. Der Kanton Thurgau, von J.A. Pupikofer,, p. 209.). "Denselben Erfolg hat die Vertheilung der ehemaligen grossenin mehrere kleinere eigenthumliche Bauerguter. Es istnicht selten, dass ein Drittheil oder Viertheil eines solchennun eben so viel Getreide liefert und eben so viel Stuckunterhalt als volmals der ganze Hof." (Thurgau, p. 72). Reichensperger (Die Agrarfrage) quoted by Mr Kay ("Socialand Education of the People in England and Europe,"), "that the parts of Europe where the most extensive andplans for watering the meadows and lands have been carriedin the greatest perfection, are those where the lands aremuch subdivided, and are in the hands of small proprietors.instances the plain round Valencia, several of the southernof France, particularly those of Vaucluse and BouchesRhone, Lombardy, Tuscany, the districts of Sienna, Lucca, and, Piedmont, many parts of Germany etc., in all which partsEurope the land is very much subdivided among small. In all these parts great and expensive systems andof general irrigation have been carried out, and are nowsupported by the small proprietors themselves; thus showingthey are able to accomplish, by means of combination, workthe expenditure of great quantities of capital." Kay,. 126.. Laing, Journal of a Residence in Norway, pp. 36, 37.. Notes of a Traveller, pp. 299 et seqq.. The manner in which the Swiss peasants combine to carry onmaking by their united capital deserves to be noted. "Eachin Switzerland hires a man, generally from the district ofin the canton of Freyburg, to take care of the herd, andthe cheese. One cheeseman, one pressman or assistant, andcowherd are considered necessary for every forty cows. Theof the cows get credit each of them, in a book daily forquantity of milk given by each cow. The cheesemen and hismilk the cows, put the milk all together, and makeof it, and at the end of the season each owner receivesweight of cheese proportionable to the quantity of milk hishave delivered. By this co-operative plan, instead of thesized unmarketable cheeses only, which each could produceof his three or four cows' milk, he has the same weight inmarketable cheese superior in quality, because made bywho attend to no other business. The cheeseman and hisare paid so much per head of the cows, in money or in, or sometimes they hire the cows, and pay the owners inor cheese." Notes of a Traveller, p. 351. A similar systemin the French Jura. See, for full details Lavergne,Rurale de la France, 2nd ed. pp. 139 et seqq. One of theremarkable points in this interesting case of combination of, is the confidence which it supposes, and which experiencejustify, in the integrity of the persons employed.. Rural and Domestic Life of Germany, p. 27.. Ibid. p.

40.. Rural and Domestic Life of Germany, p. 44.. Ibid. p. 50.. Ueber die Landwirthschaft der Rheinpfalz, und insbesondere inHeidelberger Gegend. Von D. Karl Heinrich Rau. Heidelber,.. Rau, pp. 15, 16.. The Social Condition and Education of the People in EnglandEurope; showing the results of the Primary Schools, and ofdivision of Landed Property in Foreign Countries. By Joseph, Esq., M.A. Barrister-at-Law, and the later Travellingof the University of Cambridge. vol. i.. Kay, i, 116-8.. Geographical Dictionary, art. "Belgium".. Pp. 11-14.. Flemish Husbandry, p. 3.. Ibid. p. 13.. Flemish Husbandry, pp. 73 et seq.. Flemish Husbandry, p. 81.. As much of the distress lately complained of in Belgium, asin any degree of a permanent character, appears to beconfined tothe portion of the population who carry onlabour, either by itself or in conjunction with; and to be occasioned by a diminished demand formanufactures.

To the preceding testimonies respecting Germany, Switzerland,Belgium, may be added the following from Niebuhr, respectingRoman Campagna. In a letter from Tivoli, he says, "Whereverfind hereditary farmers, or small proprietors, there you alsoindustry and honesty. I believe that a man who would employlarge fortune in establishing small freeholds migh put an endrobbery in the mountain districts." — Life and Letters of, vol. ii, p. 149.. A Plea for Peasant Proprietors. By William Thomas Thornton,. 99-104.. Ibid, p. 38.. Ibid. p. 9.. Ibid. p. 32.. Arthur Young's Travels in France, vol. i, p. 50.. Ibid. p. 88.. Ibid. p. 51.. Ibid. p. 56.. Young, pp. 322-4.. Ibid. p. 357.. Ibid. p. 325.. Ibid. p. 364.. Young, vol. i, p. 412.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2,

Chapter 7

of the Same Subject

1. Before examining the influence of peasant properties onultimate economical interests of the labouring class, asby the increase of population, let us note the pointsthe moral and social influence of that territorial, which may be looked upon as established, either byreason of the case, or by the facts and authorities cited inpreceding chapter.

The reader new to the subject must have been struck with theimpression made upon all the witnesses to whom I have, by what a Swiss statistical writer calls the "almostindustry" of peasant proprietors.(1*) On this point at, authorities are unanimous. Those who have seen only oneof peasant properties, always think the inhabitants ofcountry the most industrious in the world. There is asdoubt among observers, with what feature in the conditionthe peasantry this pre-eminent industry is connected. It is"magic of property" which, in the words of Arthur Young,"turns sand into gold." The idea of property does not, however,imply that there should be no rent, any more thanthere should be no taxes. It merely implies that the rentbe a fixed charge, not liable to be raised against theby his own improvements, or by the will of a landlord.tenant at a quit-rent is, to all intents and purposes, a; a copyholder is not less so than a freeholder. Whatwanted is permanent possession on fixed terms. "Give a man thepossession of a bleak rock, and he will turn it into a; give him a nine years' lease of a garden, and he willit into a desert."

The details which have been cited, and those, still more, to be found in the same authorities, concerning theelaborate system of cultivation, and the thousandof the peasant proprietor for making every superfluousand odd moment instrumental to some increase in the futureand value of the land, will explain what has been said inprevious chapter(2*) respecting the far larger gross produce, with anything like parity of agricultural knowledge, isfrom the same quality of soil on small farms, at leastthey are the property of the cultivator. The treatise on"Flemish Husbandry" is especially instructive respecting theby which untiring industry does more than outweighof resources, imperfection of implements, andof scientific theories. The peasant cultivation ofand italy is affirmed to produce heavier crops, in equalof soil, than the best cultivated districts ofand England. it produces them, no doubt, with an amountlabour which, if paid for by an employer, would make the costhim more than equivalent to the benefit; but to the peasant itnot cost, it is the devotion of time which he can spare, to apursuit, if we should not rather say a ruling.(3*)

We have seen, too, that it is not solely by superior exertionthe Flemish cultivators succeed in obtaining these brilliant. The same motive which gives such intensity to their, placed them earlier in possession of an amount ofknowledge, not attained until much later inwhere agriculture was carried on solely by hired. An equally high testimony is borne by M. de Lavergne(4*)the agricultural skill of the small proprietors in those partsFrance to which the petite culture is really suitable. "In theplains of Flanders, on the banks of the Rhine, the Garonne,Charente, the Rhone, all the practices which fertilize theand increase

the productiveness of labour are known to thesmallest cultivators, and practised by them, howevermay be the advances which they require. In their, abundant manures, collected at great cost, repair andincrease the fertility of the soil, in spite of theof cultivation. The races of cattle are superior, themagnificent. Tobacco, flax, colza, madder, beetroot, inplaces; in others, the vine, the olive, the plum, the, only yield their abundant treasures to a population oflabourers. Is it not also to the petite culture thatare indebted for most of the garden produce obtained by dintgreat outlay in the neighbourhood of Paris?"

2. Another aspect of peasant properties, in which it isthat they should be considered, is that of anof popular education. Books and schooling arenecessary to education; but not all-sufficient. Thefaculties will he most developed where they are most; and what gives more exercise to them than the having aof interests, none of which can be neglected, and whichbe provided for only by varied efforts of will and? Some of the disparagers of small properties laystress on the cares and anxieties which beset the peasantof the Rhineland or Flanders. It is precisely thoseand anxieties which tend to make him a superior being to anday-labourer. It is, to be sure, rather abusing theof fair argument to represent the condition of alabourer as not an anxious one. I can conceive noin which he is free from anxiety, where there is aof being out of employment; unless he has access to adispensation of parish pay, and no shame or reluctance init. The day-labourer has, in the existing state ofand population, many of the anxieties which have not aneffect on the mind, and none of those which have.position of the peasant proprietor of Continental Europe isreverse. From the anxiety which chills and paralyses-theof having food to eat-few persons are more exempt: itas rare a concurrence of circumstances as the potatocombined with an universal bad harvest, to bring himreach of that danger. His anxieties are the ordinaryof more and less; his cares are that he takes hisshare of the business of life; that he is a free human, and not perpetually a child, which seems to be thecondition of the labouring classes according to thephilanthropy. He is no longer a being of a differentfrom the middle classes; he has pursuits and objects likewhich occupy them, and give to their intellects thepart of such cultivation as they receive. If there is aprinciple in intellectual education, it is this-that thewhich does good to the mind is that in which the mindactive, not that in which it is passive. The secret forthe faculties is to give them much to do, and muchto do it. This detracts nothing from the importance,even necessity, of other kinds of mental cultivation. Theof property will not prevent the peasant from being, selfish, and narrow-minded. These things depend on other, and other kinds of instruction. But this greatto one kind of mental activity, in no way impedes anymeans of intellectual development. On the contrary, bythe habit of turning to practical use every fragmentknowledge acquired, it helps to render that schooling andfruitful, which without some such auxiliary influence aretoo many cases like seed thrown on a rock.

3. It is not on the intelligence alone, that the situation ofpeasant proprietor exercises an improving influence. It is nopropitious to the moral virtues of prudence, temperance, andcontrol. Day-labourers, where the labouring class mainlyof them, are usually improvident: they spend carelesslythe full extent of their means, and let the future shift for. This is so notorious, that many persons stronglyin the welfare of the labouring classes, hold it as aopinion that an increase of wages would do them little, unless accompanied by at least a corresponding improvementtheir tastes and habits. The tendency

of peasant proprietors,of those who hope to become proprietors, is to the contrary; to take even too much thought for the morrow. They areaccused of penuriousness than of prodigality. They denyreasonable indulgences, and live wretchedly in ordereconomize. In Switzerland almost everybody saves, who has anyof saving; the case of the Flemish farmers has been already: among the French, though a pleasure-loving and reputedbe a self-indulgent people, the spirit of thrift is diffusedthe rural population in a manner most gratifying as a, and which in individual instances errs rather on the sideexcess than defect. Among those who, from the hovels in whichlive, and the herbs and roots which constitute their diet,mistaken by travellers for proofs and specimens of general, there are numbers who have hoards in leathern bags,of sums, in five franc pieces, which they keep by themfor a whole generation, unless brought out to be expendedtheir most cherished gratification the purchase of land. Ifis a moral inconvenience attached to a state of society inthe peasantry have land, it is the danger of their beingcareful of their pecuniary concerns; of its making them, and "calculating" in the objectionable sense. The Frenchis no simple countryman, no downright "paysan du Danube;"in fact and in fiction he is now "le rusé paysan." That isstage which he has reached in the progressive developmentthe constitution of things has imposed on humanand human emancipation. But some excess in thisis a small and a passing evil compared withand improvidence in the labouring classes, and aprice to pay for the inestimable worth of the virtue ofdependence, as the general characteristic of a people: awhich is one of the first conditions of excellence in thecharacter — the stock on which if the other virtues aregrafted, they have seldom any firm root; a qualityin the case of a labouring class, even to anydegree of physical comfort; and by which the peasantryFrance, and of most European countries of peasant proprietors,distinguished beyond any other labouring population.

4. Is it likely that a state of economical relations soto frugality and prudence in every other respect,be prejudicial to it in the cardinal point of increase of? That it is so, is the opinion expressed by most ofEnglish political economists who have written anythingthe matter. Mr. M'Culloch's opinion is well known. Mr.affirms,(5*) that a "peasant population raising their ownfrom the soil, and consuming them in kind, are universallyupon very feebly by internal checks, or by motivesthem to restraint. The consequence is, that unless somecause, quite independent of their will, forces suchcultivators to slacken their rate of increase, they will,a limited territory, very rapidly approach a state of want and, and will be stopped at last only by the physicalof procuring subsistence." He elsewhere(6*) speakssuch a peasantry as "exactly in the condition in which thedisposition to increase their numbers is checked by theof those balancing motives and desires which regulate theof superior ranks or more civilized people." The "causesthis peculiarity", Mr. Jones promised to point out in awork, which never made its appearance. I am totallyto conjecture from what theory of human nature, and of thewhich influence human conduct, he would have derived. Arthur Young assumes the same "peculiarity" as a fact; but,not much in the habit of qualifying his opinions, he doespush his doctrine to so violent an extreme as Mr. Jones;, as we have seen, himself testified to various instanceswhich peasant populations such as Mr. Jones speaks of, weretending to "a state of want and penury", and were in nowhatever of coming into contact with "physicalof procuring subsistence."

That there should be discrepancy of experience on this, is easily to be accounted for. Whether the labouringlive by land or by wages, they have always hithertoup to the limit set by their habitual standard of. When that standard was low, not exceeding a scanty, the size of properties, as well as the rate of, has been kept down to what would barely support life.low ideas of what is necessary for subsistence, arecompatible with peasant properties; and if a peoplealways been used to poverty, and habit has reconciled themit, there will be over-population, and excessive subdivisionland. But this is not to the purpose. The true question is,a peasantry to possess land not insufficient butfor their comfortable support, are they more, or less,to fall from this state of comfort through improvident, than if they were living in an equallymanner as hired labourers? All à prioriare in favour of their being less likely. Theof wages on population is a matter of speculation and. That wages would fall if population were muchis often a matter of real doubt, and always a thingrequires some exercise of the thinking faculty for itsrecognition. But every peasant can satisfy himselfevidence which he can fully appreciate, whether his piece ofcan be made to support several families in the same comfortit supports one. Few people like to leave to their children alot in life than their own. The parent who has land to, is perfectly able to judge whether the children can liveit or not: but people who are supported by wages, see nowhy their sons should be unable to support themselves insame way, and trust accordingly to chance. "In even the mostand necessary arts and manufactures," says Mr. Laing,(7*)"the demand for labourers is not a seen, known, steady, anddemand: but it is so in husbandry" under small. "The labour to be done, the subsistence that labourproduce out of his portion of land, are seen and knownin a man's calculation upon his means of subsistence.his square of land, or can it not, subsist a family? Can heor not? are questions which every man can answer without, doubt, or speculation. It is the depending on chance,judgment has nothing clearly set before it, that causes, improvident marriages in the lower, as in the higher, and produces among us the evils of over-population; andnecessarily enters into every man's calculations, whenis removed altogether; as it is, where certainis, by our distribution of property, the lot of but aportion instead of about two-thirds of the people."

There never has been a writer more keenly sensible of thebrought upon the labouring classes by excess of population,Sismondi, and this is one of the grounds of his earnestof peasant properties. He had ample opportunity, in morethan one, for judging of their effect on population.us see his testimony. "In the countries in which cultivationsmall proprietors still continues, population increasesand rapidly until it has attained its natural limits;is to say, inheritances continue to be divided andamong several sons, as long as, by an increase of, each family can extract an equal income from a smallerof land. A father who possessed a vast extent of natural, divides it among his sons, and they turn it into fieldsmeadows; his sons divide it among their sons, who abolish: each improvement in agricultural knowledge admits ofstep in the subdivision of property. But there is nolest the proprietor should bring up his children to makeof them. He knows exactly what inheritance he has tothem; he knows that the law will divide it equally among; he sees the limit beyond which this division would makedescend from the rank which he has himself filled, and afamily pride, common to the peasant and to the nobleman,him abstain from summoning into life, children for whom heproperly provide. If more are born, at least they do not, or they agree among themselves, which of several brothersperpetuate the family. It

is not found that in the Swiss, the patrimonies of the peasants are ever so divided asreduce them below an honourable competence; though the habitforeign service, by opening to the children a careerand uncalculable, sometimes calls forth aabundant population."(8*)

There is similar testimony respecting Norway. Though there islaw or custom of primogeniture, and no manufactures to takea surplus population, the subdivision of property is notto an injurious extent. "The division of the land among," says Mr. Laing,(9*) "appears not, during the thousandit has been in operation, to have had the effect ofthe landed properties to the minimum size that willsupport human existence. I have counted fromand-twenty to forty cows upon farms, and that in a countrywhich the farmer must, for at least seven months in the year,winter provender and houses provided for all the cattle. Itevident that some cause or other, operating on aggregation ofproperty, counteracts the dividing effects of partitionchildren. That cause can be no other than what I have longwould be effective in such a social arrangement; viz.in a country where land is held, not in tenancy merely, asIreland, but in full ownership, its aggregation by the deathsco-heirs, and by the marriages of the female heirs among theof landholders, will balance its subdivision by the equalof children. The whole mass of property will, I, be found in such a state of society to consist of asestates of the class of 10001., as many of 100l., as many ofl., a year, at one period as another." That this should happen,diffused through society a very efficacious prudentialto population; and it is reasonable to give part of theof this prudential restraint to the peculiar adaptation ofpeasant-proprietary system for fostering it.

"In some parts of Switzerland," says Mr. Kay,(10*) "as in theof Argovie for instance, a peasant never marries before hethe age of twenty-five years, and generally much later in; and in that canton the women very seldom marry before theyattained the age of thirty.... Nor do the division of landthe cheapness of the mode of conveying it from one man to, encourage the providence of the labourers of the ruralonly. They act in the same manner, though perhaps. in adegree, upon the labourers of the smaller towns. In theprovincial towns it is customary for a labourer to own aplot of ground outside the town. This plot he cultivates inevening as his kitchen garden. He raises in it vegetables andfor the use of his family during the winter. After his's work is over, he and his family repair to the garden for atime, which they spend in planting, sowing, weeding, orfor sowing or harvest, according to the season. Theto become possessed of one of these gardens operates veryin strengthening prudential habits and in restrainingmarriages. Some of the manufacturers in the canton oftold me that a townsman was seldom contented until he hada garden, or a garden and house, and that the towngenerally deferred their marriages for some years, into save enough to purchase either one or both of these."

The same writer shows by statistical evidence(11*) that inthe average age of marriage is not only much later thanEngland, but "is gradually becoming later than it was," while at the same time "fewer illegitimate childrenborn in Prussia than in any other of the European countries.""Wherever I travelled," says Mr. Kay,(12*) "in North Germany and, I was assured by all that the desire to obtain land,was felt by all the peasants, was acting as the strongestcheck upon undue increase of population."(13*)

In Flanders, according to Mr. Fauche, the British Consul at,(14*) "farmers' sons and those who have the means tofarmers will delay their marriage until they getof a farm."

Once a farmer, the next object is toa proprietor. "The first thing a Dane does with his," says Mr. Browne, the Consul at Copenhagen,(15*) "is toa clock, then a horse and cow, which he hires out, andpays a good interest. Then his ambition is to become aproprietor, and this class of persons is better off thanin Denmark. Indeed, I know of no people in any country whomore easily within their reach all that is really necessarylife than this class, which is very large in comparison withof labourers."

But the experience which most decidedly contradicts thetendency of peasant proprietorship to produce excess of, is the case of France. In that country the experimentnot tried in the most favourable circumstances, a largeof the properties being too small. The number ofproprietors in France is not exactly ascertained, but onestimate does it fall much short of five millions; which, onlowest calculation of the number of persons of a family (andFrance it ought to be a low calculation), shows much morehalf the population as either possessing, or entitled to, landed property. A majority of the properties are soas not to afford a subsistence to the proprietors, of whom,to some computations, as many as three millions areto eke out their means of support either by working for, or by taking additional land, generally on metayer tenure.the property possessed is not sufficient to relieve thefrom dependence on wages, the condition of a proprietormuch of its characteristic efficacy as a check topopulation: and if the prediction so often made in Englandbeen realized, and France had become a "pauper warren," thewould have proved nothing against the tendencies ofsame system of agricultural economy in other circumstances.what is the fact? That the rate of increase of the Frenchis the slowest in Europe. During the generation whichRevolution raised from the extreme of hopeless wretchednesssudden abundance, a great increase of population took place.a generation has grown up, which, having been born incircumstances, has not learnt to be miserable; and uponthe spirit of thrift operates most conspicuously, in keepingincrease of population within the increase of national. In a table, drawn up by Professor Rau,(16*) of the rateannual increase of the populations of various countries, thatFrance, from 1817 to 1827, is stated at 63/100 per cent, thatEngland during a similar decennial period being 1 6/10, and that of the United States nearly 3. According toOfficial returns as analysed by M. Legoyt,(17*) the increasethe population, which from 1801 to 1806 was at the rate of.28 per cent annually, averaged only 0.47 per cent from 1806 to; from 1831 to 1836 it averaged 0.60 per cent; from 1836 to, 0.41 per cent, and from 1841 to l846, 0.68 per cent.(18*)the census of l851 the rate of annual increase shown was only.08 per cent in the five years, or 0.21 annually; and at theof 1856 only 0.71 per cent in five years, or 0.14. so that, in the words of M. de Lavergne, "la populations'accroît presque plus en France."(19*) Even this slowis wholly the effect of a diminution of deaths; theof births not increasing at all, while the proportion ofbirths to the population is constantly diminishing.(20*) Thisgrowth of the numbers of the people, while capital increasesmore rapidly, has caused a noticeable improvement in theof the labouring class. The circumstances of thatof the class who are landed proprietors are not easilywith precision, being of course extremely variable;the mere labourers, who derived no direct benefit from thein landed property which took place at the Revolution,unquestionably much improved in condition since that.(21*) Dr. Rau testifies to a similar fact in the case ofcountry in which the subdivision of the land is probably, the Palatinate.(22*)

I am not aware of a single authentic instance which supportsassertion that rapid multiplication is promoted by peasant. Instances may undoubtedly be cited of its not beingby them, and one of the principal of these is Belgium;prospects of which, in respect to population, are at presentmatter of considerable uncertainty. Belgium has the mostincreasing population on the Continent; and when theof the country require, as they must soon do, thatrapidity should be checked, there will be a considerableof existing habit to be broken through. One of thecircumstances is the great power possessed over theof the people by the Catholic priesthood, whose influenceeverywhere strongly exerted against restraining population. As, however, it must be remembered that the indefatigableand great agricultural skill of the people have renderedexisting rapidity of increase practically innocuous; thenumber of large estates still undivided affording by theirdismemberment, a resource for the necessary augmentationthe gross produce; and there are, besides, many largetowns, and mining and coal districts, which attractemploy a considerable portion of the annual increase of.

5. But even where peasant properties are accompanied by anof numbers, this evil is not necessarily attended with theeconomical disadvantage of too great a subdivision ofland. It does not follow because landed property is minutely, that farms will be so. As large properties are perfectlywith small farms, so are small properties with farmsan adequate size; and a subdivision of occupancy is not anconsequence of even undue multiplication among peasant. As might be expected from their admirablein things relating to their occupation, the Flemishhave long learnt this lesson. "The habit of notproperties," says Dr. Rau,(23*) "and the opinion thatis advantageous, have been so completely preserved in, that even now, when a peasant dies leaving several, they do not think of dividing his patrimony, though itneither entailed nor settled in trust; they prefer selling it, and sharing the proceeds, considering it as a jewel whichits value when it is divided." That the same feeling mustwidely even in France, is shown by the great frequency ofof land, amounting in ten years to a fourth part of thesoil of the country.. and M. Passy, in his tract "On thein the Agricultural Condition of the Department of thesince the year 1800,"(24*) states other facts tending to theconclusion. "The example," says he, "of this departmentthat there does not exist, as some writers have imagined,the distribution of property and that of cultivation, awhich tends invincibly to assimilate them. In noof it have changes of ownership had a perceptibleon the size of holdings. While, in districts of small, lands belonging to the same owner are ordinarilyamong many tenants, so neither is it uncommon, inwhere the grande culture prevails, for the same farmer tothe lands of several proprietors. In the plains of Vexin, in, many active and rich cultivators do not contentwith a single farm; others add to the lands of theirholding, all those in the neighbourhood which they areto hire, and in this manner make up a total extent which incases reaches or exceeds two hundred hectares" (five hundredacres). "The more the estates are dismembered, the moredo this sort of arrangements become: and as they conducethe interest of all concerned, it is probable that time willthem."

"In some places," says M. de Lavergne,(25*) "in theof Paris, for example, where the advantages of theculture become evident, the size of farms tends to, several farms are thrown together into one, and farmerstheir holdings by renting parcelles from a number ofproprietors. Elsewhere farms as well as properties ofgreat extent, tend to division.

Cultivation spontaneouslyout the organization which suits it best." It is a striking, stated by the same eminent writer,(26*) that thewhich have the greatest number of small côtesères, are the Nord, the Somme, the Pas de Calais, the Seineérieure, the Aisne, and the Oise; all of them among theand best cultivated, and the first-mentioned of them therichest and best cultivated, in France.

Undue subdivision, and excessive smallness of holdings, area prevalent evil in some countries of peasant, and particularly in parts of Germany and France. Theof Bavaria and Nassau have thought it necessary toa legal limit to subdivision, and the Prussian Governmentproposed the same measures to the Estates of itsProvinces. But I do not think it will anywhere be foundthe petite culture is the system of the peasants, and theculture that of the great landlords: on the contrary,the small properties are divided among too many, I believe it to be true that the large propertiesare parcelled out among too many farmers, and that the causethe same in both cases, a backward state of capital, skill,agricultural enterprise. There is reason to believe that thein France is not more excessive than is accounted forthis cause; that it is diminishing, not increasing; and thatterror expressed in some quarters, at the progress of the, is one of the most groundless of real or pretended.(27*)

If peasant properties have any effect in promotingbeyond the degree which corresponds to thepractices of the country, and which is customary onlarge estates, the cause must lie in one of the salutaryof the system; the eminent degree in which it promoteson the part of those who, not being yet peasant, hope to become so. In England, where thelabourer has no investment for his savings but thebank, and no position to which he can rise by anyof economy, except perhaps that of a petty shopkeeper,its chances of bankruptcy, there is nothing at allthe intense spirit of thrift which takes possession ofwho, from being a day labourer, can raise himself by savingthe condition of a landed proprietor. According to almost all, the real cause of the morcellement is the higherwhich can be obtained for land by selling it to the, as an investment for their small accumulations, thandisposing of it entire to some rich purchaser who has nobut to live on its income, without improving it. The hopeobtaining such an investment is the most powerful inducements,those who are without land, to practise the industry,, and self-restraint, on which their success in thisof ambition is dependent.

As the result of this enquiry into the direct operation andinfluences of peasant properties, I conceive it to be, that there is no necessary connexion between thisof landed property and an imperfect state of the arts of; that it is favourable in quite as many respects as itunfavourable, to the most effective use of the powers of the; that no other existing state of agricultural economy has soan effect on the industry, the intelligence, the, and prudence of the population, nor tends on the wholemuch to discourage an improvident increase of their numbers;that no existing state, therefore, is on the whole soboth to their moral and their physical welfare.with the English system of cultivation by hired labour,must be regarded as eminently beneficial to the labouring.(28*) We are not on the present occasion called upon toit with the joint ownership of the land by associationslabourers.:. "Fast ubermenschliche Fleiss". Der Canton Schaffhausen (ut), p. 53.. Supra, Book i, ch. ix, sec. 4.. Read the graphic description by the historian Michelet, of theof a peasant proprietor towards his land.

"Si nous voulons connaitre la pensee intime, la passion, dude France, cela est fort aise. Promenons-nous le dimanchela campagne, suivons-le. Le voila qui s'en va la-bas devant. Il est deux heures; sa femme est a vepres; il est; je reponds qu'il va voir sa maitresse.

"Quelle maitresse? sa terre.

"Je ne dis pas qu'il y aille tout droit. Non, il est libre cela, il est maitre d'y aller ou de n'y pas aller. N'y va-t-ilassez tous les jours de la semaine? Aussi, il se detourne, ilailleurs, il a affaire ailleurs. Et pourtant, il y va.

"Il est vrai qu'il passait bien pres; c'etait un occasion. Ilregarde, mais apparemment il n'y entera pas; qu'y ferait-il?- Et pourtant il y entre.

"Du moins, il est probable qu'il n'y travaillera pas; il est; il a blouse et chemise blanches. — Rien n'empeched'oter quelque mauvaise herbe, de rejeter cette pierre.y a bien encore cette souche qui gene, mais il n'a pas sa, ce sera pour demain.

"Alors, il croise ses bras et s'arrete, regarde, serieux,. Il regarde longtemps, tres-longtemps, et semble'oublier. A la fin, s'il se croit observe, s'il appercoit un, il s'eloigne a pas lents. A trente pas encore, il'arrete, se retourne, et jette sur sa terre un dernier regard,profond et sombre; mais pour qui sait bien voir, il estpassionne, ce regard, tout de coeur, plein de devotion." —Peuple, par J. Michelet, 1re partie, ch. 1.. Essai sur l'Economie Rurale de l'Angleterre, de l'Ecosse, etl'Irlande, 3me ed. p. 127.. Essay on the Distribution of Wealth, p. 146.. Ibid. p. 68.. Notes of a Traveller, p. 46.. Nouveaux Principes, Book iii. ch. 3.. Residence in Norway, p. 18.. Vol. i. pp. 67-9.. Ibid. pp. 75-9.. Ibid. p. 90.. The Prussian minister of statistics, in a work (Derim Preussischen Staate) which I am obliged toat second hand from Mr Kay, after proving by figures theand progressive increase of the consumption of food andper head of the population, from which he justly inferscorresponding increase of the productiveness of agriculture,: "The division of estates has, since 1831, proceededand more throughout the country. There are now many moreindependent proprietors than formerly. Yet, however manyof pauperism are heard among the dependent labourers,never hear it complained that pauperism is increasing amongpeasant proprietors." — Kay, i. 262-6.. In a communication to the Commissioners of Poor Law Enquiry,. 640 of their Foreign Communication, Appendix F to their First.. Ibid. 268.. The following is the table (see p. 168 of the Belgianof Mr Rau's large work:

per centStates

1820-30

2.92(according to Rohrer)

2.40

1811-21

1.78

1821-31

1.60

(Rohrer)

1.30

1816-27

1.54

1820-30

1.37

1821-31

1.27
1821-28

1.28

1821-31

1.30

1815-30

1.15

1820-30 (Heunisch) 1.13

1814-28

1.08

1814-24

0.83

1817-27 (Mathieu) 0.63and more recently Moreau de Jonnes 0.55

But the number given by Moreau de Jonnes, he adds, is notto implicit confidence.

The following table given by M. Quetelet (Sur l'Homme et lede se Facultes, vol. i, ch. 7, also on the authorityRau, contains additional matter, and differs in some itemsthe preceding, probably from the author's having taken, incases, an average of different years:

per cent

2.45

2.40

1.66

1.65Prussia

1.33

1.30

1.08

0.94

0.83

0.63

0.58

0.45

A very carefully prepared statement, by M. Legoyt, in theof Economistes for May 1847, which brings up the resultsFrance to the census of the preceding year 1846, is summed upthe following table:

According to the Census

According to the excess

births over deaths

percent

percent

0.83

1.14

1.36

1.30

—

0.95

—

0.65

0.85

0.90

1.84

1.18

1.45

0.90

—

0.85

—

0.71 0.01

1.00

0.90

1.03

—

0.76

1.08

—Britain(exclusive of Ireland)

1.95

1.00

0.68

0.50States

3.27

—. Journal des Economistes for March and May 1847.. M. Legoyt is of opinion that the population was understated1841, and the increase between that time and 1846 consequently, and that the real increase during the whole periodsomething intermediate between the last two averages, or notmore than one in two hundred.. Journal des Economistes for February 1847. In the Journal for1865, M. Legoyt gives some of the numbers slightly, and I presume corrected. The series of percentages is.28, 0.31, 0.69, 0.60, 0.41, 0.68, 0.22, and 0.20. The lastin the table that of 1861, shows a slight reaction, the, independently of the newly acquired departments,0.32.. The following are the numbers given by M. Legoyt:

From 1824 to 1828 annual number of births 981,914, being 1 in.30 of the population.

From 1829 to 1833 annual number of births 965,444, being 1 in.00

From 1834 to 1838 annual number of births 972,993, being 1 in.39

From 1839 to 1843 annual number of births 970,617, being 1 in.27

From 1844 to 1845 annual numbrr of births 983,573, being 1 in.58

In the last two years the births, according to M. Legoyt,swelled by the effects of considerable immigration. "Cettedes naissances." he observes, "en presence d'unconstant, quoique peu rapide, de la populationet des mariages, ne peut etre attribue qu'aux progres de'esprit d'ordre et de prevision dans les familes. C'est'ailleurs la consequence prevue de nos institutions civiles et, qui, en amenant chaque jour une plus grande subdivisionla fortune territoriale et mobiliere de la France, developpentsein des populations les instincts de conservation et deetre."

In four departments, among which are two of the most thrivingNormandy, the deaths even then exceeded the births. The census1856 exhibits the remarkable fact of a positive diminution inpopulation of 54 out of the 86 departments. A significanton the pauper-warren theory. See M. de Lavergne'sof the returns.. "Les classes de notre population qui n'ont que leur salaire,qui, par cette raison, sont les plus exposees a'indigence, sont aujourd'hui beaucoup mieux pourvues des objetsa la nourriture, au logement et au vetement, qu'ellesl'etaient au commencement du siecle.... On peut appuyer [ce] du temoignage de toutes les personnes qui ont souvenir depremiere des epoques comparees.... S'il restait des doutes aegard, on pourrait facilement les dissiper en consultant lescultivateurs et les anciens ouvriers, ainsi que nous'avons fait nous-memes dans diverses localites, sans rencontrerseul temoignage contradictoire; on peut invoquer aussi lesrecueillis a ce sujet par un observateur exact, M.(Tableay de l'Etat Physique et Moral des Oyvriers, liv.. ch. i)" From an intelligent work published in 1846,sur les Cayses de l'Indigence, par A. Clement, pp.-5. The same writer speaks (p. 118) of "la hausse considerables'est manifeste depuis 1789 dans le taux du salaire de nosjournaliers;" and adds the following evidence of astandard of habitual requirements, even in that portion oftown population, the state of which is usually represented asdeplorable. "Depuis quinze a vingt ans, un changements'est manifeste dans les habitudes des ouvriers devilles manufacturieres: ils depensent aujourd'hui beaucoupque par le passe pour le vetement et la parure... Lesde certaines classes, tels que les anciens canuts de," (according to all

representations, like their , our handloom weavers, the very worst paid class of,) "ne se montrent plus comme autrefois couverts de sales." (page 164.)

The preceding statements were given in former editions ofwork, being the best to which I had at the time access; but, both of a more recent, and of a more minute and precise, will now be found in the important work of M. LeonceLavergne, Economie Rurale de la France depuis 1789. Accordingthat pains-taking, well-informed, and most impartial enquirer,average daily wages of a French labourer have risen, sincecommencement of the Revolution, in the ratio of 19 to 30,, owing to the more constant employment, the total earningsincreased in a still neater ratio, not short of double. Theare the words of M. de Lavergne (2nd ed. p. 57):

"Arthur Young evalue a dix-neuf sols le prix moyen de ladu travail, qui doit etre aujourd'hui d'un franccentimes, et cette augmentation ne represente encore'une partie du gain realise. Bien que la nation rurale soita peu pres la meme, l'excedant de population survenu1789 s'etant concentre dans les villes, le nombre effectifjournees de travail a grossi, d'abord parce que la vies'etant allongee, le nombre des hommes valides s'est, et ensuite parce que le travail est mieux organise, soitla suppression de plusieurs fetes chomees, soit par le seuld'une demande plus active. En tenant compte de'accroissement du nombre des journees, le gain annuel de'ouvrier rural doit avoir double.... Cette augmentation dans lese traduit pour l'ouvrier en une augmentation au moinsde bien-etre, puisque le prix des principauxnecessaires a la vie a peu change, et que celui des objets, des tissus, par exemple, a sensiblement baisse.'habitation est egalement devenue meilleure, sinon partout, dudans la plupart de nos provinces."

M. de Lavergne's estimate of the average amount of a day'sis grounded on a careful comparison, in this and all otherpoints of view, of all the different provinces of.. In his little book on the Agriculture of the Palatinate,cited. He says that the daily wages of labour, whichthe last years of the war were unusually high, and sountil 1817, afterwards sank to a lower money-rate, butthe prices of many commodities having fallen in a stillproportion, the condition of the people was unequivocally. The food given to farm labourers by their employers hasneatly improved in quantity and quality. "Sie heutigen Tagesbesser ist, als vor ungefahr 40 Jahren, wo das GesindeFleisch und Mehlspeisen, keinen Kase zum Brote u. dgl.." (p. 20) "Such an increase of wages" (adds the) "which must be estimated not in money, but in theof necessaries and conveniences which the labourer isto procure, is, by universal admission, a proof that theof capital must have increased." It proves not only this,also that the labouring population has not increased in andegree; and that in this instance as well as in that of, the division of the land, even when excessive, has beenwith a strengthening of the prudential checks to.. He cites as an authority, Schwerz, Landwirthschaftliche, i. 185.. One of the many important papers which have appeared in theof Economistes,the organ of the principal politicalof France, and doing great and increasing honour toknowledge and ability. M. Passy's essay has been reprintedas a pamphlet.. Economie Rurale de la France, p. 455.. See, for facts of a similar tendency, pp. 141, 250, and otherof the same important treatise: which, on the other, equally abounds with evidence of the mischievous effect ofwhen too minute, or when the nature of the soil andits products is not suitable to it.. Mr. Laing, in his latest publication, "Observations on theand Political State of the European People in 1848 and", a book

devoted to the glorification of England, and theof everything elsewhere which others, or even hein former works, had thought worthy of praise, argues"although the land itself is not divided and subdivided" ondeath of the proprietor, "the value of the land is, and withalmost as prejudicial to social progress. The value ofshare becomes a debt or burden upon the land." Consequentlycondition of the agricultural population is retrograde; "eachis worse off than the preceding one, although the landneither less nor more divided, nor worse cultivated." And thisgives as the explanation of the great indebtedness of thelanded proprietors in France (pp. 97-9). If thesewere correct, they would invalidate all which Mr.affirmed so positively in other writings, and repeats in, respecting the peculiar efficacy of the possession of landpreventing over-population. But he is entirely mistaken as tomatter of fact. In the only country of which he speaks fromresidence, Norway, he does not pretend that the conditionthe peasant proprietors is deteriorating. The facts alreadyprove that in respect to Belgium, Germany, and Switzerland,assertion is equally wide of the mark; and what has beenrespecting the slow increase of population in France,that if the condition of the French peasantry was, it could not be from the cause supposed by Mr.. The truth I believe to be that in every country without, in which peasant properties prevail, the condition ofpeople is improving, the produce of the land and even itsincreasing, and from the larger surplus which remainsfeeding the agricultural classes, the towns are augmentingin population and in the well-being of their inhabitants. Onquestion, as well as on that of the morcellement, so far asFrance, additional facts and observations, brought up tolater date, will [52, 57 observations will] be found in the.. French history strikingly confirms these conclusions. Threeduring the course of ages the peasantry have beenof land; and these times immediately preceded theprincipal eras of French agricultural prosperity.

"Aux temps les plus mauvais," says the historian Michelet,(Le Peyple, lre partie, ch. 1) "aux moments de pauvrete, ou le riche meme est pauvre et vend par force, alorspauvre se trouve en etat d'acheter; nul acquereur ne se, le paysan en guenilles arrive avec sa piece d'or, etacquiert un bout de terre. Ces moments de desastre ou lea pu acquerir la terre a bon marche, ont toujours eted'un elan subit de fecondite qu'on ne s'expliquait pas.1500, par example, quand la France epuisee par Louis XIachever sa ruine en Italie, la noblesse qui part estde vendre; la terre, passant a de nouvelles mains,tout-a-coup; on travaille, on batit. Ce beau moment(dans le style de l'histoire monarchique) s'est appele le bonXII.

"Il dure peu, malheureusement. La terre est a peine remise enetat, le fisc fond dessus; les guerres de religion arrivent,semblent raser tout jusqu'au sol, miseres horribles, faminesou les meres mangeaient leurs enfants. Qui croirait quepays se releve de la? Eh bien, la guerre finit a peine, de ceravage, de cette chaumiere encore noire et brulee, sort'Epargne du paysan. Il achete; en dix ans, la France a change de; en vingt ou trente, tous les biens ont double, triple de. Ce moment encore baptise d'un nom royal, s'appelle le bonIV et le grand Richelieu."

Of the third era it is needless again to speak: it was thatthe Revolution.

Whoever would study the reverse of the picture, may comparehistoric periods, characterized by the dismemberment ofand the construction of small properties, with thespread national suffering which accompanied, and thedeterioration of the condition of

the labouring classesfollowed, the "clearing" away of small yeomen to make roomlarge grazing farms, which was the grand economical event ofhistory during the sixteenth century.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2,

Chapter 8

Metayers

1. From the case in which the produce of land and labourundividedly to the labourer, we proceed to the cases init is divided, but between two classes only, the labourersthe landowners: the character of capitalists merging in theor the other, as the case may be. It is possible indeed tothat there might be only two classes of persons to shareproduce, and that a class of capitalists might be one of; the character of labourer and that of landowner beingto form the other. This might occur in two ways. The, though owning the land, might let it to a tenant, andunder him as hired servants. But this arrangement, even invery rare cases which could give rise to it, would notany particular discussion, since it would not differ inmaterial respect from the threefold system of labourers,, and landlords. The other case is the not uncommon, in which a peasant proprietor owns and cultivates the land,rises the little capital required, by a mortgage upon it.does this case present any important peculiarity. Therebut one person, the peasant himself, who has any right orof interference in the management. He pays a fixed annuityinterest to a capitalist, as he pays another fixed sum into the government. Without dwelling further on these cases,pass to those which present marked features of peculiarity.

When the two parties sharing in the produce are the labourerlabourers and the landowner, it is not a very materialin the case, which of the two furnishes the stock,whether, as sometimes happens, they furnish it, in aproportion, between them. The essential differencenot lie in this, but in another circumstance, namely,the division of the produce between the two is regulatedcustom or by competition. We will begin with the former case;which the metayer culture is the principal, and in Europethe sole, example.

The principle of the metayer system, is that the labourer, or, makes his engagement directly with the landowner, and, not a fixed rent, either in money or in kind, but a certainof the produce, or rather of what remains of theafter deducting what is considered necessary to keep upstock. The proportion is usually, as the name imports,half; but in several districts in Italy it is two-thirds.the supply of stock, the custom varies from place to; in some places the landlord furnishes the whole, in others, in others some particular part, as for instance the cattleseed, the labourer providing the implements.(1*) "This," says Sismondi, speaking chiefly of Tuscany,(2*) "isthe subject of a contract, to define certain services andoccasional payments to which the metayer binds himself;the differences in the obligations of one suchand another are inconsiderable; usage governs alike allengagements, and supplies the stipulations which have notexpressed; and the landlord who attempted to depart from, who exacted more than his neighbour, who took for theof the agreement anything but the equal division of the, would render himself so odious, he would be so sure of nota metayer who was an honest man, that the contract ofthe metayers may be considered as identical, at least in each, and never gives rise to any competition among peasantssearch of employment, or any offer to cultivate the soil onterms than one another." To the same effectâteauvieux,(3*) speaking of the metayers of

Piedmont. "Theyit," (the farm) "as a patrimony, and never think ofthe lease, but go on from generation to generation, onsame terms, without writings or registries."(4*)

2. When the partition of the produce is a matter of fixed, not of varying convention, political economy has no lawsdistribution to investigate. It has only to consider, as incase of peasant proprietors, the effects of the system firstthe condition of the peasantry, morally and physically, and, on the efficiency of the labour. In both thesethe metayer system has the characteristic advantagespeasant properties, but has them in a less degree. The metayerless motive to exertion than the peasant proprietor, sincehalf the fruits of his industry, instead of the whole, areown. But he has a much stronger motive than a day labourer,has no other interest in the result than not to be dismissed.the metayer cannot be turned out except for some violation ofcontract, he has a stronger motive to exertion than anyfarmer who has not a lease. The metayer is at least his's partner, and a half-sharer in their joint gains., too, the permanence of his tenure is guaranteed by custom,acquires local attachments, and much of the feelings of a. I am supposing that this half produce is sufficientyield him a comfortable support. Whether it is so, depends (ingiven state of aciculture) on the deCee of subdivision of the; which depends on the operation of the population principle.multiplication of people, beyond the number that can besupported on the land or taken off by manufactures, iseven to a peasant proprietary, and of course not lessrather more incident to a metayer population. The tendency,, which we noticed in the proprietary system, to promoteon this point, is in no small degree common to it withmetayer system. There, also, it is a matter of easy and exactwhether a family can he supported or not. If it isto see whether the owner of the whole produce can increaseproduction so as to maintain a greater number of personswell, it is a not less simple problem whether the ownerhalf the produce can do so.(5*) There is one check which thisseems to offer, over and above those held out even by thesystem; there is a landlord, who may exert apower, by refusing his consent to a subdivision. I do, however, attach great importance to this check, because themay be loaded with superfluous hands without being; and because, so long as the increase of handsthe gross produce, which is almost always the case, the, who receives half the produce, is an immediate gainer,inconvenience falling only on the labourers. The landlord isdoubt liable in the end to suffer from their poverty, by beingto make advances to them, especially in bad seasons; and aof this ultimate inconvenience may operate beneficiallysuch landlords as prefer future security to present profit.

The characteristic disadvantage of the metayer system is verystated by Adam Smith. After pointing out that metayers"have a plain interest that the whole produce should be as greatpossible, in order that their own proportion may be so," he,(6*) "it could never, however, be the interest of thisof cultivators to lay out, in the further improvement ofland, any part of the little stock which they might save fromown share of the produce, because the lord who laid out, was to get one-half of whatever it produced. The tithe,is but a tenth of the produce, is found to be a very greatto improvement. A tax, therefore, which amounted tohalf, must have been an effectual bar to it. It might be theof a metayer to make the land produce as much as couldbrought out of it by means of the stock, but it could never beinterest to mix any furnished by the proprietor; part of hiswith it. In France, where five parts out of six of the wholeare said to be still occupied by this species of, the

proprietors complain that their metayers takeopportunity of employing the master's cattle rather inthan in cultivation; because in the one case they getwhole profits to themselves, in the other they share themtheir landlord."

It is indeed implied in the very nature of the tenure, thatimprovements which require expenditure of capital must bewith the capital of the landlord. This, however, isthe case even in England, whenever the farmers areat-will: or (if Arthur Young is right) even on a "nine' lease." If the landlord is willing to provide capital for, the metayer has the strongest interest in promoting, since half the benefit of them will accrue to himself. Asthe perpetuity of tenure which, in the case we are, he enjoys by custom, renders his consent a necessary; the spirit of routine, and dislike of innovation,of an agricultural people when not corrected by, are no doubt, as the advocates of the system seem to, a serious hindrance to improvement.

3. The metayer system has met with no mercy from English. "There is not one word to be said in favour of the," says Arthur Young,(7*) and a "thousand arguments thatbe used against it. The hard plea of necessity can alone bein its favour; the poverty of the farmers being so ceat,the landlord must stock the farm, or it could not be stockedall: this is a most cruel burden to a proprietor, who is thusto run much of the hazard of farming in the mostof all methods, that of trusting his propertyin the hands of people who are generally ignorant,careless, and some undoubtedly wicked.... In this mostof all the modes of letting land, the defraudedredeives a contemptible rent; the farmer is in thestate of poverty; the land is miserably cultivated; andnation suffers as severely as the parties themselves....(8*) this system prevails, it may be taken for granteda useless and miserable population is found.... Wherever the(that I saw) is poor and unwatered, in the Milanese, itin the hands of metayers:" they are almost always in debt tolandlord for seed or food, and "their condition is morethan that of a day labourer.... There (9*) are but few" (in Italy) "where lands are let to the occupyingat a money-rent; but wherever it is found, their crops are; a clear proof of the imbecility of the metaying system.""Wherever it" (the metayer system) "has been adopted," says Mr.'Culloch, (10*) "it has put a stop to all improvement, and hasthe cultivators to the most abject poverty" Mr.(11*) shares the common opinion, and quotes Turgot andTracy in support of it. The impression, however, of allwriters (notwithstanding Arthur Young's occasionalto Italy) seems to be chiefly derived from France, andbefore the Revolution.(12*) Now the situation of Frenchunder the old régime by no means represents the typicalof the contract. It is essential to that form, that thepays all the taxes. But in France the exemption of thefrom direct taxation had led the Government to throw thehurthen of their ever-increasing fiscal exactions upon the: and it is to these exactions that Turgot ascribed thewretchedness of the metayers: a wretchedness in someso excessive, that in Limousin and Angounmois (thewhich he administered) they had seldom more, accordinghim, after deducting all burthens, than from twenty-five tolivres (20 to 24 shillings) per head for their wholeconsumption: "je ne dis pas en argent, mais en comptantce qu'ils consomment en nature sur ce qu'ils ontécolté."(13*) When we add that they had not the virtual fixitytenure of the metayers of Italy, ("in Limousin," says Arthur,(14*) "the metayers are considered as little better thanservants, removable at pleasure, and obliged to conform inthings to the will of the landlords,") it is evident thatcase affords no argument against the metayer system in

itsform. A population who could call nothing their own, who,the Irish cottiers, could not in any contingency be worse, had nothing to restrain them from multiplying, andthe land, until stopped by actual starvation.

We shall find a very different picture, by the most accurate, of the metayer cultivation of Italy. In the first, as to subdivision. In Lombardy, according toâteauvieux,(15*) there are few farms which exceed fifty acres,few which have less than ten. These farms are all occupied byat half profit. They invariably display "an extent(16*)a richness in buildings rarely known in any other country in." Their plan "affords the greatest room with the leastof building; is best adapted to arrange and secure the; and is, at the same time, the most economical, and theexposed to accidents hy fire." The court-yard "exhibits aso regular and commodious, and a system of such care andorder, and that our dirty and ill-arranged farms can conveyadequate idea of." The same description applies to Piedmont.rotation of crops is excellent. "I should think(17*) nocan bring so large a portion of its produce to market as." Though the soil is not naturally very fertile, "theof cities is prodigiously great." The agriculture must,, be eminently favourable to the net as well as to theproduce of tlhe land. "Each plough works thirty-two acresthe season.... Nothng can be more perfect or neater than theand moulding up the maize, when in full growth, by aplough, with a pair of oxen, without injury to a single, while all the weeds are effectually destroyed." So muchagricultural skill. "Nothing can be so excellent as the cropprecedes and that which follows it." The wheat "is thrasheda cylinder, drawn hy a horse, and guided by a boy, while theturn over the straw with forks. This process lastsa fortnight; it is quick and economical, and completelyout the grain..... In no part of the world are the economythe management of the land better understood than in, and this explains the phenomenon of its great, and immense export of provisions." All this undercultivation.

Of the valley of the Arno, in its whole extent, both abovebelow Florence, the same writer thus speaks:(18*) — "Forestsolive-trees covered the lower parts of the mountains, and byfoliage concealed an infinite number of small farms, whichthese parts of the mountains; chestnut-trees raised theiron the higher slopes, their healthy verdure contrastingthe pale tint of the olive-trees, and spreading a brightnessthis amphitheatre. The road was bordered on each side with, not more than a hundred paces from each other.....are placed at a little distance from the road, and separatedit by a wall, and a terrace of some feet in extent. On theare commonly placed many vases of antique forms, in which, aloes, and young orange-trees are growing. The houseis completely covered with vines..... Before these housessaw groups of peasant females dressed in white linen, silk, and straw-hats, ornamented with flowers..... Thesebeing so near each other, it is evident that the landto them must be small, and that property, in these, must be very much divided; the extent of these domainsfrom three to ten acres. The land lies round the houses,is divided into fields by small canals, or rows of trees,of which are mulberry-trees, but the greatest number, the leaves of which are eaten by the cattle. Each treea vine..... These divisions, arrayed in oblong squares,large enough to be cultivated by a plough without wheels, andpair of oxen. There is a pair of oxen between ten or twelve offarmers; they employ them successively in the cultivation ofthe farms..... Almost every farm maintains a well-looking, which goes in a small two-wheeled cart, neatly made, andred; they serve for

all the purposes of draught for the, and also to convey the farmer's daughters to mass and to. Thus, on holidays, hundreds of these little carts are seenin all directions, Carrying the young women, decoratedflowers and ribbons."

This is not a picture of poverty; and so far as agriculturereconcerned, it effectually redeems metayer cultivation, asin these countries, from the reproaches of English; but with respect to the condition of the cultivators,âteauvieux's testimony is, in some points, not so favourable."It is(19*) neither the natural fertility of the soil, nor thewhich strikes the eye of the traveller, whichthe well-being of its inhabitants. It is the number ofamong whom the total produce is divided, which fixesportion that each is enabled to enjoy. Here it is very small.have thus far, indeed, exhibited a delightful country, well, fertile, and covered with a perpetual vegetation; I haveit divided into countless enclosures, which, like so manyin a garden, display a thousand varying productions; I have, that to all these enclosures are attached well-built, clothed with vines, and decorated with flowers; but, onthem, we find a total want of all the conveniences of, a table more than frugal, and a general appearance of." Is not Châteauvieux here unconsciously contrastingcondition of the metayers with that of the farmers of other, when the proper standard with which to compare it isof the acicultural day-labourers?

Arthur Young says,(20*) "I was assured that these metayers(especially near florence) much at their ease; that onthey are dressed remarkably well, and not withoutof luxury, as silver, gold, and silk; and live well, onof bread, wine, and legumes. In some instances this maybe the case, but the general fact is contrary. It isto think that metayers, upon such a farm as is cultivateda pair of oxen, can live at their ease; and a clear proof ofpoverty is this, that the landlord, who provides half thestock, is often obliged to lend the peasant money to procurehalf..... The metayers, not in the vicinity of the city, arepoor, that landlords even lend them corn to eat: their food isbread, made of a mixture with vetches; and their drink islittle wine, mixed with water, and called aquarolle; meat ononly; their dress very ordinary." Mr. Jones admits thecomfort of the metayers near Florence, and attributes itto straw-platting, by which the women of the peasantry can, according to Châteauvieux,(21*) from fifteen to twentya day. But even this fact tells in favour of the metayer: for in those parts of England in which eitherplatting or lace-making is carried on by the women andof the labouring class, as in Bedfordshire and, the condition of the class is not better, butworse than elsewhere, the wages of agricultural labourdepressed by a full equivalent.

In spite of Châteauvieux's statement respecting the povertythe metayers, his opinion, in respect to Italy at least, isin favour of the system. "It occupies(22*) and constantlythe proprietors, which is never the case with greatwho lease their estates at fixed rents. Ita community of interests, and relations of kindnessthe proprietors and the metayers; a kindness which I havewitnessed, and from which result great advantages in thecondition of society. The proprietor, under this system,interested in the success of the crop never refuses toan advance upon it, which the land promises to repay with. It is by these advances and by the hope thus inspired,the rich proprietors of land have cadually perfected therural economy of Italy. It is to them that it owes thesystems of irrigation which water its soil, as also theof the terrace culture on the hills: gradual butimprovements, which common peasants, for want of means,never have affected, and

which could never have beenby the farmers, nor by the ceat proprietors who letestates at fixed rents, because they are not sufficiently. Thus the interested system forms of itself thatbetween the rich proprietor, whose means provide for theof the culture, and the metayer whose care and labourdirected, by a common interest, to make the most of these."

But the testimony most favourable to the system is that of, which has the advantage of being specific, and fromknowledge; his information being not that of a, but of a resident proprietor, intimately acquaintedrural life. His statements apply to Tuscany generally, andparticularly to the Val di Nievole, in which his ownlay, and which is not within the supposed privilegedimmediately round Florence. It is one of the districts inthe size of farms appears to be the smallest. The followinghis description of the dwellings and mode of life of theof that district.(23*)

"Cette maison, bâtie en bonnes murailles à chaux et à ciment,toujours au moins un étage, quelquefois deux, au-dessus dude-chaussée. Le plus souvent on trouve à ce rez-de-chausséecuisine, une étable pour deux bêtes à corne, et le magasin,prend son nom, tinaia, des grandes cuves (tini) où l'on faitle vin, sans le soumettre au pressoir: c'est là encorele métayer enferme sous clé ses tonneaux, son huile, et soné. Presque toujours il possède encore un hangar appuyé contremaison, pour qu'il puisse y travailler à couvert à raccommoderoutils, ou à hacher le fourrage pour son bétail. Au premierau second étage sont deux, trois, et souvent quatre chambres à.... La plus spacieuse et la mieux aérée de ces chambres estgénéral destinée par le métayer, pendant les mois de Mai et de, à l'éducation des vers à soie: de grands coffres pourles habits et le linge, et quelques chaises de bois,les principaux meubles de ces chambres; mais une nouvelleépouse y apporte toujours sa commode de bois de noyer. Les litssans rideaux, sans tour de lit; mais sur chacun, outre ungarde-paille rempli de la paille élastique du blé de Turquie,voit un ou deux matelas en laine, ou, chez les plus pauvres,étoupe, une bonne couverture piquée, des draps de forte toilechanvre, et sur le meilleur lit de la famille, un tapis dede soie qu'on étale les jours de fête. Il n'y a deée qu'à la cuisine; dans la même pièce on trouve toujoursgrande table de bois où dîne la famille, avec ses bancs; lecoffre, qui sert en même temps d'armoire pour conserver leet les provisions, et de pétrin; un assortiment assezet fort peu coûteux de pots, de plats et d'assiettes encuite; une ou deux lampes de laiton, un poids à la romaine,au moins deux cruches en cuivre rouge pour puiser et pourl'eau. Tout le linge et tous les habits de travail defamille ont été filés par les femmes de la maison. Ces habits,pour les hommes que pour les femmes, sont de l'étoffe qu'ilsmezza lana si elle est épaisse, mola si elle est légere.trame est un gros fil ou de chanvre ou d'étoupe, leest de laine ou de coton; elle est teinte par lesêmes paysannes qui l'ont filée. On se figurerait difficilement, par un travail assidu, les paysannes savent accumuler ettoile et de mezza lana; combien de draps se trouvent au dépôt: comhien chaque membre de la famille a de chemises, de, de pantalons, de jupons, et de robes. Pour le faire, nous joignons en note une partie de l'inventaire defamille de paysans que nous connaissons le mieux; elle n'estparmi les plus pauvres ni parmi les plus riches, et elle vitpar son travail sur la moitié des récoltes de moins dearpens de terre. (24*) Cette épouse avait eu 50 écus de dot,20 payés comptant, et le reste à terme, à 2 écus par année.'écu de Toscane vaut 6 francs. La dot la plus commune

pour les, dans le reste de la Toscane où les métairies sont plus, est de 100 écus, 600 francs."

Is this poverty, or consistent with poverty? When a common,. de Sismondi even says the common, marriage portion of a's daughter is 24l. English money, equivalent to at leastl. in Italy and in that rank of life; when one whose dowry ishalf that amount, has the wardrobe described, which isby Sismondi as a fair average; the class must becomparable, in general condition, to a large proportionof capitalist farmers in other countries; and incomparablythe daylabourers of any country, except a new colony, orUnited States. Very little can be inferred, against such, from a traveller's impression of the poor quality offood. Its unexpensive character may be rather the effect ofthan of necessity. Costly feeding is not the favouriteof a southern people; their diet in all classes isvegetable, and no peasantry on the Continent has theof the English labourer respecting white bread. Butnourishment of the Tuscan peasant, according to Sismondi, "isand various: its basis is an excellent wheaten bread,, but pure from bran and from all mixture." "Dans lasaison, il ne fait que deux repas par. jour. à dixdu matin il mange sa pollenta, à l'entrée de la nuit illa soupe, puis du pain avec quelque assaisonnement(companatico). En été il fait trois repas, à huit heures, à une, et au soir, mais il n'allume de feu qu'une seule fois par, pour son diner, qui se compose de soupe, puis d'un plat ouviande salée ou de poisson sec, ou de haricots, ou d'herbages,'il mange avec du pain. La viande salée n'entre que pour uneé bien minime dans cet ordinaire, car il estime quelivres de porc salé par individu suffisent amplement àprovision de l'année; il en met deux fois par semaine un petitdans son potage. Le dimanche il a toujours sur sa tableplat de viande fraiche, mais un morceau qui ne pèse qu'uneou une livre et demie suffit à toute la famille, quelquequ'elle soit. Il ne faut point oublier que le paysanrécolte en général de l'huile d'olive pour son usage: il'en sert, non seulement pour s'éclairer, mais pour assaisonnerles végétaux qu'il apprête pour sa table, et qui deviennentbien plus savoureux et plus nutritifs. A déjeuner il mangepain, et quelquefois du fromage et des fruits; à souper, duet de la salade. Sa boisson se compose du vin inférieur du, et de la vinelle ou piquette fait d'eau fermentée sur ledu raisin. Il réserve cependant toujours quelque peu de sonvin pour le jour où il battra son grain, et pourfêtes qui se célébrent en famille. Il estime à dixde vinelle par année (environ cinquante bouteilles) et àsacs de froment (environ mille livres de pain) la portionpour un homme fait."

The remarks of Sismondi on the moral influences of this statesociety are not less worthy of attention. The rights andof the metayer being fixed by usage, and all taxesrates heing paid by the proprietor, "le métayer a lesde la propriété sans l'inconvénient de la défendre.'est au propriétaire qu'avec la terre appartient la guerre: pouril vit en paix avec tous ses voisins; il n'a à leur égardmotif de rivalité ou de défiance; il conserve la bonneavec eux, comme avec son maitre, avec le fisc et avec'église: il vend peu, il achète peu, il touche peu d'argent,personne ne lui en demande. On a souvent parlé du caractèreet bienveillant des Toscans, mais on n'a point assezé la cause qui a le plus contribué à préserver cette; c'est celle qui a soustrait tous les agriculteurs,plus des trois quarts de la population, à presque toutede querelle." The fixity of tenure which the metayer, soas he fulfils his known obligations, possesses by usage,not by law, gives him the local attachments, and almoststrong sense of personal interest, characteristic of a. "Le métayer vit sur sa métairie

comme sur sonéritage, l'aimant d'affection, travaillant à la bonifier sans, se confiant dans l'avenir, et comptant bien que ses champstravaillés après lui par ses enfans et les enfans de ses. En effet, le plus grand nomhre des métayers vivent deénération en génération sur la même terre; ils la connaissent enétail avec une précision que le sentiment seul de la propriétédonner... Les champs élevés en terrasses les uns au-dessusautres n'ont souvent pas plus de quatre pieds de largeur,il n'y en a pas un dont le métayer n'ait étudié en quelquele caractère. Celui-ci est sec, celui-là froid et humide;la terre est profonde, là ce n'est qu'une croûte qui couvre àle roc; le froment prospère mieux sur l'un, le seigle sur'autre; ici ce serait peine perdue de semer du blé de Turquie,la terre se refuse aux fèves et aux lupins, plus loin leviendra à merveille, et le bord de ce ruisseau sera propre au: ainsi l'on apprend du métayer, avec étonnement, que dansespace de dix arpens, le sol, les aspects, et l'inclinaisonterrain, présentent plus de variété qu'un riche fermier n'enen général distinguer dans une ferme de cinq cents acres'étendue. C'est que le dernier sent qu'il n'est là que de, que de plus il doit se conduire par des règlesénérales, et negliger les détails. Mais le métayer, avec'expérience du passé, a senti son intelligence éveillée par'intérêt et l'affection pour devenir le meilleur des, et avec tout l'avenir devant lui, il ne songe pas àseulement, mais à ses enfans et à ses petits enfans. Aussi'il plante l'olivier, arbre séculaire, et qu'il ménage audu creux qu'il fait pour lui un écoulement aux eaux quilui nuire, il étudie toutes les couches de terrain'il est appelé à défoncer." (25*)

4. I do not offer these quotations as evidence of theexcellence of the metayer system; but they surelyto prove that neither "land miserably cultivated" nor ain "the most abject poverty" have any necessary connexionit, and that the unmeasured vituperation lavished upon theby English writers, is grounded on an extremely narrowof the subject. I look upon the rural economy of italy asso much additional evidence in favour of small occupationspermanent tenure. it is an example of what can heby those two elements, even under the disadvantagethe peculiar nature of the metayer contract, in which theto exertion on the part of the tenant are only half asas if he farmed the land on the same footing of perpetuitya money-rent, either fixed, or varying according to some rulewould leave to the tenant the whole benefit of his own. The metayer tenure is not one which we should heto introduce where the exigencies of society had notgiven birth to it; but neither ought we to be eager toit on a mere à priori view of its disadvantages. If thein Tuscany works as well in practice as it is representeddo, with every appearance of minute knowledge, by so competentauthority as Sismondi; if the mode of living of the people,the size of farms, have for ages maintained and stillthemselves(26*) such as they are said to be by him, itto be recetted that a state of rural well-being so muchwhat is realized in most European countries, should be puthazard by an attempt to introduce, under the guise ofimprovement, a system of money-rents and capitalist. Even where the metayers are poor, and the subdivision, it is not to be assumed as of course, that the changebe for the better. The enlargement of farms, and theof what are called improvements, usually diminishnumber of labourers employed on the land; and unless theof capital in trade and manufactures affords an openingthe displaced population, or unless there are reclaimableon which they can be located, competition will so reduce, that they will probably be worse off as day-labourers thanwere as metayers.

Mr. Jones very properly objects against the French Economiststhe last century, that in pursuing their favourite object ofmoneyrents, they turned their minds solely to puttingin the place of metayers, instead of transforming themetayers into farmers; which, as he justly renmarks, canbe effected, unless, to enable the metayers to save andowners of stock, the proprietors submit for a considerableto a diminution of income, instead of expecting an increaseit, which has generally been their immediate motive for makingattempt. if this transformation were effected, and no othermade in the metayer's condition; if, preserving all therights which usage insures to him, he merely got rid of the's claim to half the produce, paying in lieu of it afixed rent; he would be so far in a better position thanpresent, as the whole, instead of only half the fruits of anyhe made, would now belong to himself; but even so,benefit would not be without alloy. for a metayer, though nota capitalist, has a capitalist for his partner, and hasuse, in Italy at least, of a considerable capital, as isby the excellence of the farm buildings: and it is notthat the landowners would any longer consent to perilmoveable property on the hazards of aagrcultural, when assured of a fixed money income without it. Thusthe question stand, even if the change left undisturbed the's virtual fixity of tenure, and converted him, in fact,a peasant proprietor at a quitrent. But if we suppose himinto a mere tenant, displaceable at the landlord's, and liable to have his rent raised by competition to anywhich any unfortunate being in search of subsistence canfound to offer or promise for it; he would lose all thein his condition which preserve it from being; he would be cast down from his present position ofkind of half proprietor of the land, and would sink into atenant.:. In France before the Revolution, according to Arthur Young (i.) there was great local diversity in this respect. In"the landlord commonly finds half the cattle and halfseed, and the metayer, labour, implements, and taxes; but indistricts the landlord bears a share of these. In, the landlord pays half the taxes; and in Guienne,Auch to Fleuran, many landlords pay all. Near Aguillon, onGaronne, the metayers furnish half the cattle. At Nangis, inIsle of France, I met with an agreement for the landlord tolive stock, implements, harness, and taxes; the metayerlabour and his own capitation tax: the landlord repairedhouse and gates; the metayer the windows: the landlordseed the first year, the metayer the last; in theyears they supply half and half. In the Bourbonnoislandlord finds all sorts of live stock, yet the metayer, changes, and buys at his will; the steward keeping anof these mutations, for the landlord has half the productsales, and pays half the purchases." In Piedmont, he says,"the landlord commonly pays the taxes and repairs the buildings,the tenant provides cattle, implements, and seed." (II. 151) . Etydes sur l'Economie Politiqtue, 6me essai: De la ConditionCultivateurs en Toscane.. Letters from Italy. I quote from Dr. Rigby's translation (p.).. This virtual fixity of tenure is not however universal even in; and it is absence that Sismondi attributes the inferiorof the metayers in to its some provinces of Naples, in, and in the Riviera of Genoa; where the landlords obtain a(though still a fixed) share of the produce. In thosethe cultivation is splendid, but the people wretchedly. "The same misfortune would probably have befallen theof Tuscany if public opinion did not protect the; but a proprietor would not dare to imposeunusual in the country, and even in changing onefor another he alters nothing in the terms of the." Nouveaux Principes, liv. iii. ch. 5.. M. Bastiat affirms that even in France, incontestably thefavourable example of the metayer system, its effect inpopulation is conspicuous.

Un fait bien constate, c'est que la tendance a unedesordonnee se manifeste principalement au sein declasse d'hommes qui vit de salaires. Cette prevoyance quiles mariages a sur elle peu d'empire, parce que les mauxresultent de l'exces de concurrence ne lui apparaissent queconfusement, et dans un lointain en apparence peu. C'est donc la circonstance la plus favorable pour und'etre organise de maniere a exclure le salariat. Dans lesde metairies, les mariages sont determines principalementles besoins de la culture; ils se multiplient quand, parcirconstance, les metairies offrent des vides nuisiblestravaux; ils se ralentissent quand les places sont remplies., un etat de choses facile a constater, savoir, le rapportl'etendue du domaine et le nombre des bras, opere comme laet plus surement qu'elle. Aussi voyons-nous que sicirconstance n'intervient pour ouvrir des debouches a unesurnumeraire, elle demeure stationnaire. Nosmeridionaux en sont la preuve." — Considerationsle Metayage, Journal des Economistes for February 1846.. Wealth of Nations, book iii. ch. 2.. Travels, vol. i. pp. 404-5.. Ibid. ii. 151-3.. Ibid. 217.. Principles of Political Economy, 3rd ed. p. 471.. Essay on the Distribution of Wealth, pp. 102-4.. M. de Tracy is partially an exception, inasmuch as hisreaches lower dowvn than the revolutionary period; butadmits (as Mr. Jones has himself stated in another place) thatis acquainted only with a limited district, of greatand unfertile soil.

M. Passy is of opinion, that a French peasantry must be inand the country badly cultivated on a metayer system,the proportion of the produce claimable by the landlordtoo high; it being only in more favourable climates that any, not of the most exuberant fertility, can pay half its grossin rent, and leave enough to peasant farmers to enableto grow successfully the more expensive and valuableof agriculture. (Systemes de Culture, p. 35) This is anonly to a particular numerical proportion, which isthe common one, but is not essential to the system.. See the "Memoire sur la Surcharge des Impositions'eprouvait la Generalite de Limoges, adresse au Conseil d'Etat1766," pp. 260-304 of the fourth volume of Turgot's Works. Theengagements of landlords (as mentioned by Arthur) to pay a part of the taxes, were according to Turgot, oforigin, under the compulsion of actual necessity. "Lene s'y prete qu'autant qu'il ne peut trouver deautrement; ainsi, meme dans ce cas-la, le metayer estreduit a ce qu'il faut precisement pour ne pas mourir de." (p. 275). Vol. i. p. 404.. letters from Italy, translated by Rigby, p. 16. Ibid. pp. 19, 20.. Ibid. pp. 24-31.. Pp. 78-9.. Pp. 73-6.. Travels, vol ii. p. 156.. Letters from Italy, p. 75.. Ibid, pp. 295-6.. From his Sixth Essay, formerly refered to.. "Inventaire du trousseau de Jeanne, fille de Valene Papini, amariage avec Giovacchino Landi, le 29 Avril 1835, a Porta, pre Pescia:

"28 chemises, 3 robes de bourre de soie en couleur, 4 robesfleuret de soie en couleur, 7 robes d'indienne ou toile de, 2 robes de travail d'hiver (mezza lana), 3 robes et juponstravail d'ete (mola), 3jupes blanches, 5 tabliers de toile, 1 tablier de soie noir, 1 tablier de merinos noir, 9de travail (mola) en couleur, 4 mouchoirs blancs, 8en couleur, 3 mouchoirs de soie, 2 voiles brodes et 1de tulle, 3 essuie-mains, 14 paires de bas, 2 chapeaux,'un de feutre, l'autre de paille fine: 2 camees d'or, 2 boucles'oreilles en or, 1 chapelet avec deux piastres romaines, 1de corail avec sa croix d'or... Toutes les epouses plusont de plus la veste di seta, la grande robe de toilette,soie, qu'elles ne portent que quatre ou cinq fois dans leur.

"Les hommes n'ont point de trousseaux; l'epoux en se mariant'avait que 14 chemises, et la reste en proportion. Il n'aa present que 13 paires de draps, tandis que dans

lade sa femme il y en a 30 paires.". Of the intelligence of this interesting people, M. despeaks in the most favourable terms. Few of them can; but there is often one member of the family destined forpriesthood, who reads to them on winter evening. Theirdiffers little from the purest Italian. The taste forin verse is general. "Les paysans du val de Nievolele spectacle les jours de fete, en ete, de neuf aheures du soir: leur admission ne leur coute guere que cinqde France. Alfieri est leur auteur de prediliction; toute'histoire des Atrides est familiere a ces hommes que ne saventlire, et qui vont demander a ce poete austere un delassementleurs rudes traveaux." Unlike most rustics, they find pleasurethe beauty of the country. "Dans les collines du val deon trouve devant chaque maison, l'aire pour battre le, qui a rarement plus de vingt-cinq a trente toises carrees,'est le plus souvent le seul espace de niveau qu'on recontretoute le metarie. En meme temps c'est une terrasse quiles plaines et al vallee, et d'ou la vue s'etend sur unravissant. Presque jamais je ne m'y suis arrete pour'admirer, sans que le metayer soit venu jouir de mon admiration,m'indiquer du doigt les beautes qu'il croyait pouvoir m'avoir.". "On ne voit jamais," says Sismondi, "une famille de metayersa son maitre de partager sa metairie, a moins que lene soit reellement superieur a ses forces, et qu'elle nela certitude de conserver les memes jouissances sur unespace de terrain. On ne voit jamais dans une famillefils se marier en meme temps,et former autant denouveaux; un seul prend une femme et se charge des soinsmenage; aucun de ses freres ne se marie, a moins que lui-meme'ait pas d'enfans, ou que l'on n'offre a cet autre frere unemetaire." — Nouveaux Principes, liv, iii. chap. 5.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2,

Chapter 9

Cottiers

1. By the general appellation of cottier tenure I shallall cases without exception in which the labourer makescontract for land without the intervention of a capitalist, and in which the conditions of the contract, especiallyamount of rent, are determined not by custom but by. The principal European example of this tenure is, and it is from that country that the term cottier is.* By far the greater part of the agricultural populationIreland might until very lately have been said to betenants; except so far as the Ulster tenant-rightan exception. There was, indeed, a numerous class ofwho (we may presume through the refusal either ofor of tenants in possession to permit any further) had been unable to obtain even the smallest patch ofas permanent tenants. But, from the deficiency of capital,custom of paying wages in land was so universal, that evenwho worked as casual labourers for the cottiers or for suchfarmers as were found in the country, were usually paidin money, but by permission to cultivate for the season aof ground, which was generally delivered to them by theready manured, and was known by the name of conacre. Forthey agreed to pay a money rent, often of several pounds an, but no money actually passed, the debt being worked out in, at a money valuation.

The produce, on the cottier system, being divided into two, rent, and the remuneration of the labourer; the one isdetermined by the other. The labourer has whatever thedoes not take: the condition of the labourer depends onamount of rent. But rent, being regulated by competition,upon the relation between the demand for land, and theof it. The demand for land depends on the number of, and the competitors are the whole rural population.effect, therefore, of this tenure, is to bring the principlepopulation to act directly on the land, and not, as in, on capital. Rent, in this state of things, depends onproportion between population and land. As the land is aquantity, while population has an unlimited power of; unless something checks that increase, the competitionland soon forces up rent to the highest point consistent withthe population alive. The effects, therefore, of cottierdepend on the extent to which the capacity of populationincrease is controlled, either by custom, by individual, or by starvation and disease.

It would be an exaggeration to affirm, that cottier tenancyabsolutely incompatible with a prosperous condition of theclass. If we could suppose it to exist among a peoplewhom a high standard of comfort was habitual; whosewere such, that they would not offer a higher rentland than would leave them an ample subsistence, and whoseincrease of numbers left no unemployed population toup rents by competition, save when the increasing producethe land from increase of skill would enable a higher rent topaid without inconvenience; the cultivating class might be asremunerated, might have as large a share of the necessariescomforts of life, on this system of tenure as on any other.would not, however, while their rents were arbitrary, enjoyof the peculiar advantages which metayers on the Tuscanderive from their connexion with the land. They wouldhave the use of a capital belonging to their landlords,would the want of this be made up by the intense motives toand mental exertion which act upon the peasant who has

atenure. On the contrary, any increased value given toland by the exertions of the tenant, would have no effect butraise the rent against himself, either the next year, or atwhen his lease expired. The landlords might have justicegood sense enough not to avail of the advantage whichwould give them; and different landlords would do sodifferent degrees. But it is never safe to expect that a classbody of men will act in opposition to their immediateinterest; and even a doubt on the subject would beas fatal as a certainty, for when a person is consideringor not to undergo a present exertion or sacrifice for aremote future, the scale is turned by a very smallthat the fruits of the exertion or of the sacrificehe taken away from him. The only safeguard against thesewould be the growth of a custom, insuring aof tenure in the same occupant, without liability toother increase of rent than might happen to be sanctioned bygeneral sentiments of the community. The Ulster tenant-rightsuch a custom. The very considerable sums which outgoingobtain from their successors, for the goodwill of their,(1*) in the first place actually limit the competition forto persons who have such sums to offer: while the same factproves that full advantage is not taken by the landlord ofthat more limited competition, since the landlord's rentnot amount to the whole of what the incoming tenant not onlybut actually pays. He does so in the full confidence thatrent will not be raised; and for this he has the guarantee ofcustom, not recognised by law, but deriving its binding forceanother sanction, perfectly well understood in Ireland.(2*)one or other of these supports, a custom limiting theof land is not likely to grow up in any progressive. If wealth and population were stationary, rent alsogenerally be stationary, and after remaining a long time, would probably come to be considered unalterable. Butprogress in wealth and population tends to a rise of rents.a metayer system there is an established mode in which theof land is sure of participating in the increased producefrom it. But on the cottier system he can only do so by aof the contract, while that readjustment, in acommunity, would almost always be to his advantage.interest, therefore, is decidedly opposed to the growth ofcustom commuting rent into a fixed demand.

2. Where the amount of rent is not limited, either by law or, a cottier system has the disadvantages of the worstsystem, with scarcely any of the advantages by which, inbest forms of that tenure, they are compensated. It ispossible that cottier agriculture should be other than. There is not the same necessity that the condition ofcultivators should be so. Since by a sufficient restraint oncompetition for land could be kept down, and extremeprevented; habits of prudence and a high standard of, once established, would have a fair chance ofthemselves: though even in these favourablethe motives to prudence would be considerablythan in the case of metayers, protected by custom (likeof Tuscany) from being deprived of their farms: since afamily, thus protected, could not be impoverished by anyimprovident multiplication than their own, but a cottier, however prudent and self-restraining, may have the rentagainst it by the consequences of the multiplication offamilies. Any protection to the cottiers against this evilonly be derived from a salutary sentiment of duty or, pervading the class. this source, however, they mightconsiderable protection. If the habitual standard ofamong the class were high, a young man might notto offer a rent which would leave him in a worse conditionthe preceding tenant; or it might be the general custom, asactually is in some countries, not to marry until a farm is.

But it is not where a high standard of comfort has rootedin the habits of the labouring class, that we are everupon to consider the effects of a cottier system. Thatis found only where the habitual requirements of the ruralare the lowest possible; where as long as they are notstaring, they will multiply: and population is onlyby the diseases, and the shortness of life, consequent onof merely physical necessaries. This was the statethe largest portion of the Irish peasantry. When a people haveinto this state, and still more when they have been in ittime immemorial, the cottier system is an almost insuperableto their emerging from it. When the habits of the peoplesuch that their increase is never checked hut by theof obtaining a bare support, and when this supportonly be obtained from land, all stipulations and agreementsamount of rent are merely nominal; the competition formakes the tenants undertake to pay more than it is possibleshould pay, and when they have paid all they can, morealways remains due.

"As it may fairly be said of the Irish peasantry," said Mr., the Secretary to the Irish Poor Law Enquiry,(3*) "that every family which has not sufficient landyield its food has one or more of its members supported by, it will easily be conceived that every endeavour is madethe peasantry to obtain small holdings, and that they are notin their biddings by the fertility of the land, or byability to pay the rent, but solely by the offer which islikely to gain them possession. The rents which they, they are almost invariably incapable of paying; andthey become indebted to those under whom they hold,as soon as they take possession. They give up, in theof rent, the whole produce of the land with the exceptiona sufficiency of potatoes for a subsistence; but as this isequal to the promised rent, they constantly have againstan increasing balance. In some cases, the largest quantityproduce which their holdings ever yielded, or which, undersystem of tillage, they could in the most favourablebe made to yield, would not be equal to the rent bid;, if the peasant fulfilled his engagement with his, which he is rarely able to accomplish, he would tillground for nothing, and give his landlord a premium for beingto till it. On the seacoast, fishermen, and in thecounties those who have looms, frequently pay more inthan the market value of the whole produce of the land they. It might be supposed that they would be better without landsuch circumstances. But fishing might fail during a week or, and so might the demand for the produce of the loom, when,they not possess the land upon which their food is grown,might starve. The full amount of the rent bid, however, ispaid. The peasant remains constantly in debt to his; his miserable possessions-the wretched clothing ofand of his family, the two or three stools, and the fewof crockery, which his wretched hovel contains, would not,sold, liquidate the standing and generally accumulating debt.peasantry are mostly a year in arrear, and their excuse forpaying more is destitution. Should the produce of the, in any year, be more than usually abundant, or shouldpeasant by any accident become possessed of any property, hiscannot be increased; he cannot indulge in better food,in a greater quantity of it. His furniture cannot be, neither can his wife or children be better clothed.acquisition must go to the person under whom he holds. Theaddition will enable him to reduce his arrear of rent,thus to defer ejectment. But this must be the bound of his."

As an extreme instance of the intensity of competition for, and of the monstrous height to which it occasionally forcedthe nominal rent; we may cite from the evidence taken by Lord's Commission,(4*) a fact attested by Mr Hurly, Clerk ofCrown for Kerry. "I

have known a tenant bid for a farm that Iperfectly well acquainted with, worth 50l. a year: I saw theget up to such an extent, that he was declared theat 450l."

3. In such a condition, what can a tenant gain by any amountindustry or prudence, and what lose by any recklessness? Iflandlord at any time exerted his full legal rights, thewould not be able even to live. If by extra exertion hethe produce of his bit of land, or if he prudentlyfrom producing mouths to eat it up, his only gain wouldto have more left to pay to his landlord; while, if he hadchildren, they would still be fed first, and the landlordonly take what was left. Almost alone amongst mankind theis in this condition, that he can scarcely be eitheror worse off by any act of his own. If he were industriousprudent, nobody but his landlord would gain; if he is lazy or, it is at his landlord's expense. A situation moreof motives to either labour or self-command, imaginationcannot conceive. The inducements of free human beings areaway, and those of a slave not substituted. He has nothinghope, and nothing to fear, except being dispossessed of his, and against this he protects himself by the ultima ratioa defensive civil war. Rockism and Whiteboyism were theof a people who had nothing that could be calledbut a daily meal of the lowest description of food, not toto being deprived of that for other people's convenience.

Is it not, then, a bitter satire on the mode in whichare formed on the most important problems of humanand life, to find public instructors of the greatest, imputing the backwardness of Irish industry, and theof energy of the Irish people in improving their condition,a peculiar indolence and insouciance in the Celtic race? Ofvulgar modes of escaping from the consideration of the effectsocial and moral influences on the human mind, the most vulgarthat of attributing the diversities of conduct and characterinherent natural differences. What race would not be indolentinsouciant when things are so arranged, that they derive nofrom forethought or exertion? If such are thein the midst of which they live and work, whatif the listlessness and indifference so engendered are notoff the first moment an opportunity offers when exertionreally be of use? It is very natural that a pleasure-lovingsensitively organized people like the Irish, should be lessto steady routine labour than the English, because lifemore excitements for them independent of it; but they are notfitted for it than their Celtic brethren the French, norso than the Tuscans, or the ancient Greeks. An excitableis precisely that in which, by adequate inducements,is easiest to kindle a spirit of animated exertion. It speaksagainst the capacities of industry in human beings, thatwill not exert themselves without motive. No labourers work, in England or America, than the Irish; but not under asystem.

4. The multitudes who till the soil of India, are in asufficiently analogous to the cottier system, and atsame time sufficiently different from it, to render theof the two a source of some instruction. In most partsIndia there are, and perhaps have always been, only twoparties, the landlord and the peasant: the landlordgenerally the sovereign, except where he has, by a special, conceded his rights to an individual, who becomes his. The payments, however, of the peasants, or ryotsthey are termed, have seldom if ever been regulated, as in, by competition. Though the customs locally obtaininginfinitely various, and though practically no custom couldmaintained against the sovereign's will, there was always aof some sort common to a neighbourhood; the collector didmake his separate bargain with the peasant, but assessed eachto the rule adopted for the rest. The idea was

thusup of a right of property in the tenant, or at all events,a right to permanent possession; and the anomaly arose of aof tenure in the peasant-farmer, co-existing with anpower of increasing the rent.

When the Mogul government substituted itself throughout thepart of India for the Hindoo rulers, it proceeded on aprinciple. A minute survey was made of the land, andthat survey an assessment was founded, fixing the specificdue to the government from each field. if this assessmentnever been exceeded, the ryots would have been in theadvantageous position of peasant-proprietors,to a heavy, but a fixed quit-rent. The absence, however,any real protection against illegal extortions, rendered thisin their condition rather nominal than real; and,during the occasional accident of a humane and vigorousadministrator, the exactions had no practical limit but theof the ryot to pay more.

It was to this state of things that the English rulers ofsucceeded; and they were, at an early period, struck withimportance of putting an end to this arbitrary character ofland-revenue, and imposing a fixed limit to the government. They did not attempt to go back to the Mogul valuation.has been in general the very rational practice of the Englishin India, to pay little regard to what was laid downthe theory of the native institutions, but to inquire into thewhich existed and were respected in practice, and toand enlarge those. For a long time, however, it blunderedabout matters of fact, and grossly misunderstood theand rights which it found existing. Its mistakes arosethe inability of ordinary minds to imagine a state of socialfundamentally different from those with which they arefamiliar. England being accustomed to great estatesgreat landlords, the English rulers took it for granted thatmust possess the like; and looking round for some set ofwho might be taken for the objects of their search, theyupon a sort of tax-gatherers called zemindars. "The," says the philosophical historian of India,(5*) "hadof the attributes which belong to a landowner; he collectedrents of a particular district, he governed the cultivatorsthat district, lived in comparative splendour, and his sonhim when he died. The zemindars, therefore, it waswithout delay, were the proprietors of the soil, thenobility and gentry of India. It was not considered thatzemindars, though they collected the rents, did not keep; but paid them all away with a small deduction to the. It was not considered that if they governed the, and in many respects exercised over them despotic power,did not govern them as tenants of theirs, holding theireither at will or by contract under them. The possession ofryot was an hereditary possession; from which it was unlawfulthe zemindar to displace him; for every farthing which thedrew from the ryot, he was bound to account; and it wasby fraud, if, out of all that he collected, he retained anmore than the small proportion which, as pay for collection,was permitted to receive."

"There was an opportunity in India," continues the historian,"to which the history of the world presents not a parallel. Nextthe sovereign, the immediate cultivators had, by far, theportion of interest in the soil. For the rights (such aswere) of the zemindars, a complete compensation might havebeen made. The generous resolution was adopted, ofto the improvement of the country, the proprietaryof the sovereign. The motives to improvement whichgives, and of which the power was so justly appreciated,have been bestowed upon those upon whom they would havewith a force incomparably greater than that with whichcould operate upon any other class of men: they might havebestowed upon those from whom alone, in every country, theimprovements in agriculture must be

derived, thecultivators of the soil. And a measure worthy to beamong the noblest that ever were taken for the improvementany country, might have helped to compensate the people offor the miseries of that misgovernment which they had soendured. But the legislators were English aristocrats; andprejudices prevailed."

The measure proved a total failure, as to the main effectsits wellmeaning promoters expected from it. Unaccustomed tothe mode in which the operation of any given institutionmodified even by such variety of circumstances as existsa single kingdom, they battered themselves that they had, throughout the Bengal provinces, English landlords, andproved that they had only created irish ones. The new landeddisappointed every expectation built upon them. Theynothing for the improvement of their estates, but everythingtheir own ruin. The same pains not being taken, as had beenin Ireland, to enable landlords to defy the consequences ofimprovidence, nearly the whole land of Bengal had to beand sold, for debts or arrears of revenue, and ingeneration most of the ancient zemindars had ceased to exist.families, mostly the descendants of Calcutta money dealers,of native officials who had enriched themselves under thegovernment, now occupy their place; and live as uselesson the soil which has been given up to them. Whatever thehas sacrificed of its pecuniary claims, for theof such a class, has at the best been wasted.

In the parts of India into which the British rule has beenrecently introduced, the blunder has been avoided ofa useless body of great landlords with gifts from therevenue. In most parts of the Madras and in part of thePresidency, the rent is paid directly to the government byimmediate cultivator. In the North-Western Provinces, themakes its engagement with the village community, determining the share to be paid by each, but holding them jointly responsible for each other's. But in the greater part of India, the immediatehave not obtained a perpetuity of tenure at a fixed. The government manages the land on the principle on which aIrish landlord manages his estate: not putting it up to, not asking the cultivators what they will promise to, but determining for itself what they can afford to pay, andits demand accordingly. In many districts a portion ofcultivators are considered as tenants of the rest, themaking its demand from those only (often a numerous) who are looked upon as the successors of the originalor conquerors of the village. Sometimes the rent isonly for one year, sometimes for three or five; but thetendency of present policy is towards long leases,, in the northern provinces of India, to a term ofyears. This arrangement has not existed for a sufficientto have shown by experience, how far the motives towhich the long lease creates in the minds of the, fall short of the influence of a perpetual.(6*) But the two plans, of annual settlements and ofleases, are irrevocably condemned. They can only be said tosucceeded, in comparison with the unlimited oppression whichbefore. They are approved by nobody, and were neverupon in any other light than as temporary arrangements, toabandoned when a more complete knowledge of the capabilitiesthe count should afford data for something more permanent.:. "It is not uncommon for a tenant without a lease to sell theprivilege of occupancy or possession of his farm, withoutvisible sign of improvement having been made by him, at fromto sixteen, up to twenty and even forty years' purchase ofrent." — (Digest of Evidence taken by Lord Devon's, Introductory Chapter. the compiler adds, "thetranquillity of that district" (Ulster) "may perhapsmainly attributable to this fact.". "It

is in the great majority of cases not a reimbursement forincurred, or improvements effected on the land, but a mereinsurance or purchase of immunity from outrage." — (Digest,supra) "The present tenant-right of Ulster" (the writerremarks) "is an embryo copyhold." "Even there, if theright be disregarded, and a tenant be ejected withoutreceived the price of his goodwill, outrages are generallyconsequence." — (Ch. viii.) "The disorganized state of, and the agrarian combination thoughtout Ireland, area methodized war to obtain the Ulster tenant-right.". Evils of the State of Ireland, their Causes and their Remedy.10. A pamphlet containing, among other things, an excellentand selection of evidence from the mass collected by thepresided over by Archbishop Whately.. Evidence, p. 851.. Mill's History of British India, book vi, ch. 8.. Since this was written, the resolution has been adopted by thegovernment of converting the long leases of the northerninto perpetual tenures at fixed rents.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill 2,

Chapter 10

of Abolishing Cottier Tenancy

1. When the first edition of this work was written and, the question, what is to be done with a cottier, was to the English Government the most urgent ofquestions. The majority of a population of eight, having long grovelled in helpless inertness and abjectunder the cottier system, reduced by its operation tofood of the cheapest description, and to an incapacity ofdoing or willing anything for the improvement of their, had at last, by the failure of that lowest quality of food,plunged into a state in which the alternative seemed to bedeath, or to be permanently supported by other people, orradical change in the economical arrangements under which ithitherto been their misfortune to live. Such an emergency hadattention to the subject from the legislature and fromnation, but it could hardly be said with much result; for,evil having originated in a system of land tenancy whichfrom the people every motive to industry or thriftthe fear of starvation, the remedy provided by Parliamentto take away even that, by conferring on them a legal claimeleemosynary support: while, towards correcting the cause ofmischief, nothing was done, beyond vain complaints, though atprice to the national treasury of ten millions sterling fordelay.

"It is needless," (I observed) "to expend any argument inthat the very foundation of the economical evils ofis the cottier system; that while peasant rents fixed byare the practice of the country, to expect industry,activity, any restraint on population but death, or anysmallest diminution of poverty, is to look for figs onand grapes on thorns. If our practical statesmen are notfor the recognition of this fact; or if while theyit in theory, they have not a sufficient feeling ofreality, to be capable of founding upon it any course of; there is still another, and a purely physical, from which they will find it impossible to escape.the one crop on which the people have hitherto supportedcontinues to be precarious, either some new and greatmust be given to agricultural skill and industry, or theof Ireland can no longer feed anything like its present. The whole produce of the western half of the island,nothing for rent, will not now keep permanently inthe whole of its people: and they will necessarilyan annual charge on the taxation of the empire, until theyreduced either by emigration or by starvation to a numberwith the low state of their industry, or unless theare found of making that industry much more productive."

Since these words were written, events unforeseen by any onesaved the English rulers of Ireland from the embarrassmentswould have been the just penalty of their indifference andof foresight. Ireland, under cottier agriculture, could nosupply food to its population: Parliament, by way of, applied a stimulus to population, but none at all to; the help, however, which had not been provided forpeople of Ireland by political wisdom,

came from ansource. Self-supporting emigration — the Wakefield, brought into effect on the voluntary principle and on ascale (the expenses of those who followed being paidthe earnings of those who went before) has, for the present,the population down to the number for which the existingsystem can find employment and support. The census1851, compared with that of 1841, showed in round numbers aof population of a million and a half. The subsequent(of 1861) shows a further diminution of about half a. The Irish having thus found the way to that flourishingwhich for generations will be capable of supporting incomfort the increase of the population of the whole; the peasantry of Ireland having learnt to fix their eyesa terrestrial paradise beyond the ocean, as a sure refuge boththe oppression of the Saxon and from the tyranny of nature;can be little doubt that however much the employment forlabour may hereafter be diminished by the generalthroughout Ireland of English farming-or even if,the county of Sutherland, all Ireland should be turned intograzing farm — the superseded people would migrate to Americathe same rapidity, and as free of cost to the nation, as theof Irish who went thither during the three years previous1851. Those who think that the land of a country exists forsake of a few thousand landowners, and that as long as rentspaid, society and government have fulfilled their function,see in this consummation a happy end to Irish difficulties.

But this is not a time, nor is the human mind now in a, in which such insolent pretensions can be maintained.land of Ireland, the land of every country, belongs to theof that country. The individuals called landowners have no, in morality and justice, to anything but the rent, orfor its saleable value. With regard to the land, the paramount consideration is, by what mode ofand of cultivation it can be made most useful tocollective body of its inhabitants. To the owners of the rentmay be very convenient that the bulk of the inhabitants,of justice in the country where they and theirhave lived and suffered, should seek on anotherthat property in land which is denied to them at home.the legislature of the empire ought to regard with other eyesforced expatriation of millions of people. When theof a country quit the country en masse because itswill not make it a place fit for them to live in, theis judged and condemned. There is no necessity forthe landlords of one farthing of the pecuniary value oflegal rights; but justice requires that the actualshould be enabled to become in Ireland what they willin America-proprietors of the soil which they cultivate.

Good policy requires it no less. Those who, knowing neithernor any foreign country, take as their sole standard ofand economical excellence English practice, propose as theremedy for Irish wretchedness, the transformation of theinto hired labourers. But this is rather a scheme forimprovement of Irish agriculture, than of the condition ofIrish people. The status of a day-labourer has no charm forforethought, frugality, or self-restraint, into a peopleof them. If the Irish peasant could be universally changedreceivers of wages, the old habits and mentalof the people remaining, we should merely seeor five millions of people living as day-labourers in thewretched manner in which as cottiers they lived before;passive in the absence of every comfort, equally recklessmultiplication, and even, perhaps, equally listless at their; since they could not be dismissed in a body, and if they, dismissal would now be simply remanding them to therate. Far other would be the effect of making them peasant. A people who in industry and providence haveto learn — who are confessedly among the mostof European populations in the industrial virtues —

for their regeneration the most powerful incitements bythose virtues can be stimulated: and there is no stimulusyet comparable to property in land. A permanent interest insoil to those who till it, is almost a guarantee for the mostlaboriousness: against over-population, thought not, it is the best preservative yet known, and where it, any other plan would probably fail much more egregiously;evil would be beyond the reach of merely economic remedies.

The case of Ireland is similar in its requirements to that of. In India, though great errors have from time to time been, no one ever proposed, under the name of agricultural, to eject the ryots or peasant farmers from their; the improvement that has been looked for, has beenmaking their tenure more secure to them, and the soleof opinion is between those who contend for, and those who think that long leases will suffice.same question exists as to Ireland: and it would be idle tothat long leases, under such landlords as are sometimes tofound do effect wonders, even in Ireland. But then they mustleases at a low rent. Long leases are in no way to be reliedfor getting rid of cottierism. During the existence of cottier, leases have always been long; twenty-one years and threeconcurrent, was a usual term. But the rent being fixed by, at a higher amount than could be paid, so that theneither had, nor could by any exertion acquire, ainterest in the land, the advantage of a lease wasnominal. In India, the government, where it has notmade over its proprietary rights to the zemindars, isto prevent this evil, because, being itself the landlord, itfix the rent according to its own judgment; but underlandlords, while rents are fixed by competition, andcompetitors are a peasantry struggling for subsistence,rents are inevitable, unless the population is so thin,the competition itself is only nominal. The majority ofwill grasp at immediate money and immediate power; andlong as they find cottiers eager to offer them everything, ituseless to rely on them for tempering the vicious practice byconsiderate self-denial.

A perpetuity is a stronger stimulus to improvement than alease: not only because the longest lease, before coming toend, passes through all the varieties of short leases down tolease at all; but for more fundamental reasons. It is very, even in pure economics, to take no account of theof imagination: there is a virtue in "for ever" beyondlongest term of years; even if the term is long enough tochildren, and all whom a person individually cares for,until he has reached that high degree of mental cultivationwhich the public good (which also includes perpetuity)a paramount ascendancy over his feelings and desires, henot exert himself with the same ardour to increase the valuean estate, his interest in which diminishes in value every. Besides, while perpetual tenure is the general rule ofproperty, as it is in all the counties of Europe, a tenurea limited period, however long, is sure to be regarded as aof inferior consideration and dignity, and inspiresof ardour to obtain it, and of attachment to it when. But where a country is under cottier tenure, theof perpetuity is quite secondary to the more important, a limitation of the rent. Rent paid by a capitalist whofor profit, and not for bread, may safely be abandoned to; rent paid by labourers cannot, unless the labourersin a state of civilization and improvement which labourersnowhere yet reached, and cannot easily reach under such a. Peasant rents ought never to be arbitrary, never at theof the landlord: either by custom or law, it isnecessary that they should be fixed; and where noadvantageous custom, such as the metayer system

of, has established itself, reason and experience recommendthey should be fixed by authority: thus changing the renta quit-rent, and the farmer into a peasant proprietor.

For carrying this change into effect on a sufficiently largeto accomplish the complete abolition of cottier tenancy,mode which most obviously suggests itself is the direct onedoing the thing outright by Act of Parliament; making theland of Ireland the property of the tenants, subject to thenow really paid (not the nominal rent), as a fixed rent. This, under the name of "fixity of tenure," was one ofdemands of the Repeal Association during the most successfulof their agitation; and was better expressed by Mr., its earliest, most enthusiastic, and most indefatigable,(1*) by the words, "a valuation and a perpetuity." Ina measure there would not have been any injustice, providedlandlords were compensated for the present value of theof increase which they were prospectively required to. The rupture of existing social relations would hardlybeen more violent than that effected by the ministers SteinHardenberg when, by a series of edicts, in the early part ofpresent century, they revolutionized the state of landedin the Prussian monarchy, and left their names toamong the greatest benefactors of their country. Toforeigners writing on Ireland, Von Raumer and GustaveBeaumont, a remedy of this sort seemed so exactly andwhat the disease required, that they had somein comprehending how it was that the thing was not yet.

This, however, would have been, in the first place, aexpropriation of the higher classes of Ireland: which,there is any truth in the principles we have laid down, wouldperfectly warrantable, but only if it were the sole means ofa great public good. In the second place, that therebe none but peasant proprietors, is in itself far from. Large farms, cultivated by large capital, and owned byof the best education which the country can give, personsby instruction to appreciate scientific discoveries,able to bear the delay and risk of costly experiments, are anpart of a good agricultural system. Many such landlordsare even in Ireland; and it would be a public misfortune tothem from their posts. A lar ge proportion also of theholdings are probably still too small to try thesystem under the greatest advantages; nor are thealways the persons one would desire to select as theoccupants of peasant-properties. There are numbers of themwhom it would have a more beneficial effect to give them theof acquiring a landed property by industry and frugality,the property itself in immediate possession.

There are, however, much milder measures, not open to similar, and which, if pushed to the utmost extent of whichare susceptible, would realize in no inconsiderable degreeobject sought. One of them would be, to enact that whoeverwaste land becomes the owner of it, at a fixed quit-rentto a moderate interest on its mere value as waste. It wouldcourse be a necessary part of this measure, to make compulsorylandlords the surrender of waste lands (not of an ornamental) whenever required for reclamation. Another expedient,one in which individuals could co-operate, would be to buy asas possible of the land offered for sale, and sell it againsmall portions as peasant-properties. A Society for thiswas at one time projected (though the attempt toit proved unsuccessful) on the principles, so far as, of the Freehold Land Societies which have been soestablished in England, not primarily for, but for electoral purposes.

This is a mode in which private capital may be employed inthe social and agricultural economy of ireland, notwithout sacrifice but with considerable profit to its.

The remarkable success of the Waste Land improvement, which proceeded on a plan far less advantageous to the, is an instance of what an Irish peasantry can beto do, by a sufficient assurance that what they dobe for their own advantage. it is not even indispensable toperpetuity as the rule; long leases at moderate rents, likeof the Waste Land Society, would suffice, if a prospectheld out to the farmers of being allowed to purchase theirwith the capital which they might acquire, as the Society'swere so rapidly acquiring under the influence of itssystem.(2*) When the lands were sold, the funds of thewould be liberated, and it might recommencein some other quarter.

2. Thus far I had written in 1856. Since that time the greatof Irish industry has made further progress, and it isto consider how its present state affects the opinions,prospects or on practical measures, expressed in the previousof this chapter.

The principal change in the situation consists in the great, holding out a hope of the entire extinction, oftenure. The enormous decrease in the number of small, and increase in those of a medium size, attested by thereturns, sufficiently proves the general fact, andtestimonies show that the tendency still continues.(3*) It isthat the repeal of the corn laws, necessitating a changethe exports of Ireland from the products of tillage to thosepasturage, would of itself have sufficed to bring about thisin tenure. A grazing farm can only be managed by afarmer, or by the landlord. But a change involving soa displacement of the population, has been immenselyand made more rapid by the vast emigration, as wellby that greatest boon ever conferred on Ireland by any, the Encumbered Estates Act; the best provisions ofhave since, through the Landed Estates Court, beenincorporated into the social system of the country.greatest part of the soil of Ireland, there is reason to, is now farmed either by the landlords, or by smallfarmers. That these farmers are improving in, and accumulating capital, there is considerable, in particular the great increase of deposits in theof which they are the principal customers. So far as thatis concerned, the chief thing still wanted is security of, or assurance of compensation for improvements. The meanssupplying these wants are now engaging the attention of thecompetent minds; Judge Longfield's address, in the autumn of, and the sensation created by it, are an era in the subject,a point has now been reached when we may confidently expectwithin a very few years something effectual will be done.

But what, meanwhile, is the condition of the displaced, so far as they have not emigrated; and of the wholewho subsist by agricultural labour, without the occupationany land? As yet, their state is one of great poverty, withslight prospect of improvement. Many wages, indeed, havemuch above the wretched level of a generation ago: but theof subsistence has also risen so much above the old potato, that the real improvement is not equal to the nominal;according to the best information to which I have access,is little appearance of an improved standard of livingthe class. The population, in fact, reduced though it be,still far beyond what the country can support as a meredistrict of England. It may not, perhaps, be strictlythat, if the present number of inhabitants are to beat home, it can only be either on the old viciousof cottierism, or as small proprietors growing their own. The lands which will remain under tillage would, no doubt,sufficient security for outlay were given, admit of a moreemployment of labourers by the small capitalist; and this, in the opinion of some competent judges, mightthe country to support the present number of itsin actual existence. But no one will pretend that thisis sufficient to maintain

them in any condition in whichis fit that the great body of the peasantry of a countryexist. Accordingly the emigration, which for a time hadoff, has, under the additional stimulus of bad seasons,in all its strength. It is calculated that within the1864 not less than 100,000 emigrants left the Irish shores.far as regards the emigrants themselves and their posterity,the general interests of the human race, it would be folly tothis result. The children of the immigrant Irish receiveeducation of Americans, and enter, more rapidly andthan would have been possible in the country of their, into the benefits of a higher state of civilization. Inor thirty years they are not mentally distinguishable fromAmericans. The loss, and the disgrace, are England's: andis the English people and government whom it chiefly concernsask themselves, how far it will be to their honour andto retain the mere soil of Ireland, but to lose its. With the present feelings of the Irish people, anddirection which their hope of improving their condition seemsbe permanently taking, England, it is probable, has only thebetween the depopulation of Ireland, and the conversion ofpart of the labouring population into peasant proprietors. Theinsular ignorance of her public men respecting a form ofeconomy which predominates in nearly every othercountry, makes it only too probable that she willthe worse side of the alternative. Yet there are germs oftendency to the formation of peasant proprietors on Irish soil,require only the aid of a friendly legislator to foster; as is shown in the following extract from a privateby my eminent and valued friend, Professor Cairnes:-

"On the sale, some eight or ten years ago, of the Thomond,, and Kingston estates, in the Encumbered Estates, it was observed that a considerable number of occupyingpurchased the fee of their farms. I have not been able toany information as to what followed thatwhether the purchasers continued to farm their small, or under the mania of landlordism tried to escapetheir former mode of life. But there are other facts whicha hearing on this question. In those parts of the countrytenant-right prevails, the prices given for the goodwill offarm are enormous. The following figures, taken from theof an estate in the neighbourhood of Newry, now passingthe Landed Estates Court, will give an idea, but a veryone, of the prices which this mere customary rightfetches.

"Statement showing the prices at which the tenant-right offarms near Newry was sold: — Acres

Rent

Purchase-money

of tenant-right1

23

£74

£ 332

24

77

2403

13

39

1104

14

34

855

10

33

1726

5

13

757

8

26

1308

11

33

1309

2

5

5

—

——

——

110

£334

£980

"The prices here represent on the whole about three years'of the rental: but this, as I have said, gives but anidea of that which is frequently, indeed of that whichordinarily, paid. The right, being purely customary, will varyvalue with the confidence generally reposed in the good faiththe landlord. In the present instance, circumstances have comelight in the course of the proceedings connected with the salethe estate, which give

reason to believe that the confidencethis case was not high; consequently, the rates above givenbe taken as considerably under those which ordinarily. Cases, as I am informed on the highest authority, haveother parts of the country come to light, also in the LandedCourt, in which the price given for the tenant-right wasto that of the whole fee of the land. It is a remarkablethat people should be found to give, say twenty orfive years' purchase, for land which is still subject to around rent. Why, it will be asked, do they not purchase landand out for the same, or a slightly larger, sum? The answerthis question, I believe is to he found in the state of ourlaws. The cost of transferring land in small portions is,to the purchase money, very considerable, even in theEstates Court; while the goodwill of a farm may bewithout any cost at all. The cheapest conveyance thatbe drawn in that Court, where the utmost economy,with the present mode of remunerating legal services,strictly enforced, would, irrespective of stamp duties, costl. — a very sensible addition to the purchase of a smallestate: a conveyance to transfer a thousand acres mightcost more, and would probably not cost much more. But in, the mere cost of conveyance represents but the least partthe obstacles which exist to obtaining land in small portions.far more serious impediment is the complicated state of theof land, which renders it frequently impracticable toa property into such portions as would bring the landthe reach of small bidders. The remedy for this state of, however, lies in measures of a more radical sort than Iit is at all probable that any House of Commons we are soonto see would even with patience consider. A registry ofmay succeed in reducing this complex condition ofto its simplest expression; but where real complication, the difficulty is not to be got rid of by mere simplicityform; and a registry of titles-while the powers of dispositionpresent enjoyed by landowners remain undiminished, while everyand testator has an almost unbounded licence to multiplyin land, as pride, the passion for dictation, or meremay suggest — will, in my opinion, fail to reach the rootthe evil. The effect of these circumstances is to place anpremium upon large dealings in land-indeed in most casesto preclude all other than large dealing; and whileis the state of the law, the experiment of peasant, it is plain, cannot be fairly tried. The facts,, which I have state, show, I think, conclusively, thatis no obstacle in the disposition of the people to theof this system."

I have concluded a discussion, which has occupied a spacedisproportioned to the dimensions of this work; and I herethe examination of those simpler forms of social economy inthe produce of the land either belongs undividedly to one, or is shared only between two classes. We now proceed tohypothesis of a threefold division of the produce, among, landlords, and capitalists; and in order to connectcoming discussions as closely as possible with those whichnow for some time occupied us, I shall commence with theof Wages.:. Author of numerous pamphlets, entitled "True Political EconomyIreland", "Letter to the Earl of Devon", "Two Letters on theOppression of Ireland", and others. Mr Connor has beenagitator on the subject since 1832.. Though this society, during the years succeeding the famine,forced to wind up its affairs, the memory of what itought to be preserved. The following is an extractthe Proceedings of Lord Devon's Commission from the reportto the society in 1845, by their intelligent manager,Robinson: —

"Two hundred and forty-five tenants, many of whom were a fewsince in a state bordering on pauperism, the occupiers ofholdings of from ten to twenty plantation acres each, have,their own free labour, with the society's aid, improved theirto the value of 4396

l.; 605 l. having been added duringlast year, being at the rate of 17 l. 18s. per tenant for theterm, and 2 l. 9s. for the past year; the benefit of whicheach tenant will enjoy during the unexpired term ofthirty-one years' lease.

"These 245 tenants and their families have, by spade, reclaimed and brought into cultivation 1032 plantationof land, previously unproductive mountain waste, upon whichgrew, last year, crops valued by competent practical persons3896 l., being in the proportion of 15 l. 18s. each tenant;their live stock, consisting of cattle, horses, sheep, and, now actually upon the estates, is valued, according to theprices of the neighbouring markets, at 4162 l., of whichl. has been added since February 1844, being at the rate ofl. 19s. for thw whole period and 5 l. 6s. for the last year;which time their stock has thus increased in value a sumto their present annual rent; and by the statistical tablesreturns referred to in previous reports, it is proved thattenants, in general improve their little farms, and increasecultivation and crops, in nearly direct proportion to theof available working persons of both sexes, of which theirconsist."

There cannot be a stronger testimony to the superior amountgross, and even of net produce, raised by small farming undertolerable system of landed tenure; and it is worthy ofthat the industry and zeal were greatest among theholders; Colonel Robinson noticing, as exceptions to theand rapid progress of improvement, some tenants who"occupants of larger farms than twenty acres, a class toodeficient in the enduring industry indispensable for theprosecution of mountain improvements.". There is, however, a partial counter-current, of which I haveseen any public notice. "A class of men,not very numerous,sufficiently so to do much mischief, have, through the LandedCourt, got into possession of land in Ireland, who, ofclasses, are least likely to recognise the duties of a's position. These are small traders in towns, who byof sheer parsimony, frequently combined with money-lendingusurious rates, have succeeded, in the course of a long life,scraping together as much money as will enable them to buyor a hundred acres of land. These people never think offarmers, but, proud of their position as landlords,to turn it to the utmost account. An instance of thiscame under my notice lately. The tenants on the property, at the time of the purchase, some twelve years ago, in acomfortable state. Within that period their rent hasraised three several times; and it is now, as I am informedthe priest of the district, nearly double its amount at theof the present proprietor's reign. The result isthe people, who were formerly in tolerable comfort, are nowto poverty: two of them have left the property andnear an adjacent turf bog, where they exist trusting forto occasional jobs. If this man is not shot, he willhimself through the deterioration of his property, buthe has been getting eight or ten percent on his purchase. This is by no means a rare case. The scandal which suchcause, casts its reflection on transactions of adifferent and perfectly legitimate cause, casts itson transactions of a wholly different and perfectlykind, where the removal of the tenants is simply anof mercy for all parties.

"The anxiety of landlords to get rid of cottiers is also toextent neutralized by the anxiety of middlemen to get them.one-fourth of the whole land of Ireland is held under long; the rent received, when the lease is of long standing,generally greatly under the real value of the land. Ithappens that the land thus held is cultivated by the ownerthe lease: instead of this, he sublets it at a rack rent tomen, and lives on the excess of the rent which he receivesthat which he pays. Some of these leases are always running; and as they draw

towards their close, the middleman has nointerest in the land than, at any cost of permanent, to get the utmost out of it during the unexpiredof the term. For this purpose the small cottier tenantsanswer his turn. Middlemen in this position are asto obtain cottiers as tenants, as the landlordsare to beof them; and the result is a transfer of this sort of tenantone class of estates to the other. The movement is ofdimensions, but it does exist, and so far as it exists,the general tendency. Perhaps it may be thought thatsystem will reproduce itself; that the same motives whichto the existence of middlemen will perpetuate the class; butis no danger of this. Landowners are now perfectly alive toruinous consequences of this system, however conveniet for a; and a clause against sub-letting is now becoming a mattercourse in every lease." — (Private Communication fromCairnes.)

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill 2

11

Wages

1. Under the head of Wages are to be considered, first, thewhich determine or influence the wages of labour, and secondly, the differences that exist between theof different employments. It is convenient to keep theseclasses of considerations separate; and in discussing the lawwages, to proceed in the first instance as if there were nokind of labour than common unskilled labour, of the averageof hardness and disagreeableness.

Wages, like other things, may be regulated either byor by custom. In this country there are few kinds ofof which the remuneration would not be lower than it is,the employer took the full advantage of competition., however, must be regarded, in the present state of, as the principal regulator of wages, and custom orcharacter only as a modifying circumstance, and thata comparatively slight degree.

Wages, then, depend mainly upon the demand and supply of; or as it is often expressed, on the proportion betweenand capital. By population is here meant the numberof the labouring class, or rather of those who work for; and by capital only circulating capital, and not even theof that, but the part which is expended in the directof labour. To this, however, must be added all funds, without forming a part of capital, are paid in exchangelabour, such as the wages of soldiers, domestic servants, andother unproductive labourers. There is unfortunately no modeexpressing by one familiar term, the aggregate of what hascalled the wages-fund of a country: and as the wages oflabour form nearly the whole of that fund, it is usualoverlook the smaller and less important part, and to say thatdepend on population and capital. It will be convenient tothis expression, remembering, however, to consider it as, and not as a literal statement of the entire truth.

With these limitations of the terms, wages not only dependthe relative amount of capital and population, but cannot,the rule of competition, be affected by anything else.(meaning, of course, the general rate) cannot rise, but byincrease of the aggregate funds employed in hiring labourers,a diminution in the number of the competitors for hire; nor, except either by a diminution of the funds devoted tolabour, or by an increase in the number of labourers to be.

2. There are, however, some facts in apparent contradictionthis doctrine, which it is incumbent on us to consider and.

For instance, it is a common saying that wages are high whenis good. The demand for labour in any particular employmentmore pressing, and higher wages are paid, when there is ademand for the commodity produced; and the contrary whenis what is called a stagnation: then workpeople are, and those who are retained must submit to a reductionwages: though in these cases there is neither more nor lessthan before. This is true; and is one of thosein the concrete phenomena, which obscure andthe operation of general causes: but it is not reallywith the principles laid down. Capital which thedoes not employ in purchasing labour, but keeps idle in his, is the same thing to the labourers, for

the time being, asit did not exist. All capital is, from the variations of, occasionally in this state. A manufacturer, finding ademand for his commodity, forbears to employ labourers ina stock which he finds it difficult to dispose of; orhe goes on until all his capital is locked up in unsold goods,at least he must of necessity pause until he can get paidsome of them. But no one expects either of these states to be; if he did, he would at the first opportunity removecapital to some other occupation, in which it would stillto employ labour. The capital remains unemployed for a, during which the labour market is overstocked, and wages. Afterwards the demand revives, and perhaps becomesbrisk, enabling the manufacturer to sell his commodityfaster than he can produce it: his whole capital is theninto complete efficiency, and if he is able, he borrowsin addition, which would otherwise have gone into someemployment. At such times wages, in his particular, rise. If we suppose, what in strictness is notimpossible, that one of these fits of briskness or ofshould affect all occupations at the same time, wagesmight undergo a rise or a fall. These, however, aretemporary fluctuations: the capital now lying idle will nextbe in active employment, that which is this year unable toup with the demand will in its turn be locked up in crowded; and wages in these several departments will ebb andaccordingly: but nothing can permanently alter general, except an increase or a diminution of capital itself(always meaning by the term, the funds of all sorts, devoted topayment of labour) compared with the quantity of labouritself to be hired.

Again, it is another common notion that high prices make high; because the producers and dealers, being better off, canto pay more to their labourers. I have already said that ademand, which causes temporary high prices, causes alsohigh wages. But high prices, in themselves, can onlywages if the dealers, receiving more, are induced to save, and make an addition to their capital, or at least to theirof labour. This is indeed likely enough to be the case;if the high prices came direct from heaven, or even from, the labouring class might he benefited, not by the highthemselves, but by the increase of capital occasioned by. The same effect, however, is often attributed to a highwhich is the result of restrictive laws, or which is inway or other to be paid by the remaining members of the; they having no greater means than before to pay it. High prices of this sort, if they benefit one class of, can only do so at the expense of others; since if theby receiving high prices are enabled to make greater, or otherwise increase their purchases of labour, allpeople by paying those high prices have their means of, or of purchasing labour, reduced in an equal degree; andis a matter of accident whether the one alteration or thewill have the greatest effect on the labour market. Wagesprobably be temporarily higher in the employment in whichhave risen, and somewhat lower in other employments: incase, while the first half of the phenomenon excites, the other is generally overlooked, or if observed, is notto the cause which really produced it. Nor will therise of wages last long: for though the dealers in thatemployment gain more, it does not follow that there is roomemploy a greater amount of savings in their own business:increasing capital will probably flow over into other, and there counterbalance the diminution previouslyin the demand for labour by the diminished savings of other.

Another opinion often maintained is, that wages (meaning ofmoney wages) vary with the price of food; rising when it, and falling when it falls. This opinion is, I conceive,partially true; and in so far as true, in no way affects theof wages on the

proportion between capital and labour:the price of food, when it affects wages at all, affectsthrough that law. Dear or cheap food, caused by variety of, does not affect wages (unless they are artificiallyto it by law or charity): or rather, it has someto affect them in the contrary way to that supposed;in times of scarcity people generally compete morefor employment, and lower the labour market against. But dearness or cheapness of food, when of acharacter, and capable of being calculated on, may affect wages. In the first place, if thehave, as is often the case, no more than enough to keepin working condition, and enable them barely to support thenumber of children, it follows that if food growsdear.er without a rise of wages, a greater number ofchildren will prematurely die; and thus wages will ultimatelyhigher, but only because the number of people will be smaller,if food had remained cheap. But, secondly, even though wageshigh enough to admit of food's becoming more costly withoutthe labourers and their families of necessaries; thoughcould bear, physically speaking, to be worse off, perhapswould not consent to be so. They might have habits ofwhich were to them as necessaries, and sooner than forego, they would put an additional restraint on their power of; so that wages would rise, not by increase ofbut by diminution of births. In these cases, then, wagesadapt themselves to the price of food, though after anof almost a generation. Mr. Ricardo considers these twoto comprehend all cases. He assume, that there isa minimum rate of wages: either the lowest with whichis physically possible to keep up the population, or thewith which the people will choose to do so. To thishe assumes that the general rate of wages always tends;they can never be lower, beyond the length of time requireda diminished rate of increase to make itself felt, and canlong continue higher. This assumption contains sufficientto render it admissible for the purposes of abstract; and the conclusion which Mr. Ricardo draws from it,, that wages in the long run rise and fall with theprice of food, is, like almost all his conclusions,hypothetically, that is, granting the suppositions fromhe sets out. But in the application to practice, it isto consider that the minimum of which he speaks,when it is not a physical, but what may be termed aminimum, is itself liable to vary. If wages were previouslyhigh that they could bear reduction, to which the obstacle washigh standard of comfort habitual among the labourers, a risethe price of food, or any other disadvantageous change incircumstances, may operate in two ways : it may correctby a rise of wages brought about through a gradual effectthe prudential check to population; or it may permanentlythe standard of living of the class, in case their previousin respect of population prove stronger than theirhabits in respect of comfort. In that case the injuryto them will be permanent, and their deteriorated conditionbecome a new minimum, tending to perpetuate itself as theample minimum did before. It is to be feared that of the twoin which the cause may operate, the last is the most, or at all events sufficiently so, to render allascribing a self-repairing quality to the calamitiesbefal the labouring classes, practically of no validity.is considerable evidence that the circumstances of thelabourers in England have more than once in oursustained great permanent deterioration, from causesoperated by diminishing the demand for labour, and which,population had exercised its power of self-adjustment into the previous standard of comfort, could only havea temporary effect: but unhappily the poverty in which thewas plunged during a long series of years brought thatstandard into disuse; and the next generation, growingwithout having possessed those pristine comforts, multipliedturn without any attempt to retrieve them.(1*)

The converse case occur when, by improvements in agriculture,repeal of corn laws, or other such causes, the necessaries oflabourers are cheapened, and they are enabled, with the same, to command greater comforts than before. Wages will notimmediately; it is even possible that they may rise; butwill fall at last, so as to leave the labourers no betterthan before, unless during this interval of prosperity theof comfort regarded as indispensable by the class, israised. Unfortunately this salutary effect is by noto be counted upon; it is a much more difficult thing to, than to lower, the scale of living which the labourer willas more indispensable than marrying and having a family.they content themselves with enjoying the greater comfortit lasts, but do not learn to require it, they will peopleto their old scale of living. If from poverty their childrenpreviously been insufficiently fed or improperly nursed, anumber will now be reared, and the competition of these,they grow up, will depress wages, probably in fullto the greater cheapness of food. If the effect is notin this mode, it will be produced by earlier and moremarriages, or by an increased number of births to a. according to all experience, a great increasetakes place in the number of marriages, in seasons offood and full employment. I cannot, therefore, agree in theso often attached to the repeal of the corn laws,merely as a labourers' question, or to any of the, of which some one or other is at all times in vogue, forthe labourers a very little better off. Things which onlythem a very little, make no permanent impression uponhabits and requirements, and they soon slide back intoformer state. To produce permanent advantage, the temporaryoperating upon them must be sufficient to make a greatin their condition-a change such as will be felt for many, notwithstanding any stimulus which it may give during oneto the increase of people. When, indeed, theis of this signal character, and a generation growswhich has always been used to an improved scale of comfort,habits of this new generation in respect to population becomeupon a higher minimum, and the improvement in theirbecomes permanent. Of cases in point, the mostis France after the Revolution. The majority of thebeing suddenly raised from misery, to independence andcomfort; the immediate effect was that population,the destructive wars of the period, startedwith unexampled rapidity, partly because improvedenabled many children to be reared who wouldhave died, and partly from increase of births. Thegeneration however grew up with habits considerably; and though the country was never before in so prosperousstate, the annual number of births is now nearly,(2*) and the increase of population extremely.(3*)

3. Wages depend, then, on the proportion between the numberthe labouring population, and the capital or other fundsto the purchase of labour. we will say, for shortness,capital. If wages are higher at one time or place than at, if the subsistence and comfort of the class of hiredare more ample, it is for no other reason than becausebears a greater proportion to population. It is not theamount of accumulation or of production, that is ofto the labouring class; it is not the amount even offunds destined for distribution among the labourers: it isproportion between those funds and the numbers among whomare shared. The condition of the class can be bettered in noway than by altering that proportion to their advantage;every scheme for their benefit, which does not proceed onas its foundation, is, for all permanent purposes, a.

In countries like North America and the Australian colonies,the knowledge and arts of civilized life, and a highdesire of accumulation, co-exist with a boundlessof

unoccupied land, the growth of capital easily keepswith the utmost possible increase of population, and isretarded by the impracticability of obtaining labourers. All, therefore, who can possibly be born, can findwithout overstocking the market: every labouringenjoys in abundance the necessaries, many of the comforts,some of the luxuries of life; and, unless in case ofmisconduct, or actual inability to work, poverty does, and dependence need not, exist. A similar advantage, thougha less degree, is occasionally enjoyed by some special classlabourers in old countries, from an extraordinarily rapid, not of capital generally, but of the capital employed inparticular occupation. So gigantic has been the progress of themanufacture since the inventions of Watt and Arkwright,the capital engaged in it has probably quadrupled in thewhich population requires for doubling. While, therefore, itattracted from other employments nearly all the hands whichcircumstances and the habits or inclinations of therendered available; and while the demand it created forlabour has enlisted the immediate pecuniary interest ofoperatives in favour of promoting, instead of restraining,increase of population; nevertheless wages in the great seatsthe manufacture are generally so high, that the collectiveof a family amounts, on an average of years, to a verysum; and there is, as yet, no sign of permanent, while the effect has also been felt in raising thestandard of agricultural wages in the counties adjoining.

But those circumstances of a country, or of an occupation, inpopulation can with impunity increase at its utmost rate,rare, and transitory. Very few are the countries presentingneedful union of conditions. Either the industrial arts areand stationary, and capital therefore increases slowly;the effective desire of accumulation being low, the increasereaches its limit; or, even though both these elements aretheir highest known degree, the increase of capital is, because there is not fresh land to be resorted to, of asquality as that already occupied. Though capital should fortime double itself simultaneously with population, if all thisand population are to find employment on the same land,cannot without an unexampled succession of agriculturalcontinue doubling the produce; therefore, if wages dofall, profits must; and when profits fall, increase ofis slackened. Besides, even if wages did not fall, theof food (as will be shown more fully hereafter) would incircumstances necessarily rise; which is equivalent to aof wages.

Except, therefore, in the very peculiar cases which I havenoticed, of which the only one of any practical importancethat of a new colony, or a country in circumstances equivalentit; it is impossible that population should increase at itsrate without lowering wages. Nor will the fall be stoppedany point, short of that which either by its physical or itsoperation, checks the increase of population. In no old, therefore, does population increase at anything like itsrate; in most, at a very moderate rate: in some countries,at all. These facts are only to be accounted for in two ways.the whole number of births which nature admits of, andhappen in some circumstances, do not take place; or if they, a large proportion of those who are born, die. Theof increase results either from mortality or; from Mr. Malthus's positive, or from his preventive: and one or the other of these must and does exist, andpowerfully too, in all old societies. Wherever population iskept down by the prudence either of individuals or of the, it is kept down by starvation or disease.

Mr. Malthus has taken great pains to ascertain, for almostcountry in the world, which of these checks it is that; and the evidence which he collected on the subject,

inEssay on Population, may even now be read with advantage.Asia, and formerly in most European countries in whichlabouring classes were not in personal bondage, there is, or, no restrainer of population but death. The mortality was notthe result of poverty: much of it proceeded from unskilfulcareless management of children, from uncleanly and otherwisehabits of life among the adult population, and from theperiodical occurrence of destructive epidemics. Throughoutthese causes of shortened life have much diminished, buthave not ceased to exist. Until a period not very remote,any of our large towns kept up its population,of the stream always flowing into them from thedistricts: this was still true of Liverpool until very; and even in London, the mortality is larger, and theduration of life shorter, than in rural districts whereis much greater poverty. In Ireland, epidemic fevers, andfrom the exhaustion of the constitution by insufficient, have always accompanied even the most moderateof the potato crop. Nevertheless, it cannot now bethat in any part of Europe, population is principally keptby disease, still less by starvation, either in a direct oran indirect form. The agency by which it is limited is chiefly, not (in the language of Mr. Malthus) positive. Butpreventive remedy seldom, I believe, consists in the unaidedof prudential motives on a class wholly or mainlyof labourers for hire, and looking forward to no other. In England, for example, I much doubt if the generality oflabourers practise any prudential restraint. They generally marry as early, and have as manyto a marriage, as they would or could do if they werein the United States. During the generation whichthe enactment of the present Poor Law, they received thedirect encouragement to this sort of improvidence: being notassured of support, on easy terms, whenever out of, but, even when in employment, very commonly receivingthe parish a weekly allowance proportioned to their numberchildren; and the married with large families being always,a short-sighted economy, employed in preference to the; which last premium on population still exists. Underprompting, the rural labourers acquired habits of, which are so congenial to the uncultivated mindin whatever manner produced, they in general long surviveimmediate causes. There are so many new elements at work in, even in those deeper strata which are inaccessible tomere movements on the surface, that it is hazardous to affirmpositive on the mental state or practical impulses ofand bodies of men, when the same assertion may be trueday, and may require great modification in a few years time.does, however, seem, that if the rate of increase ofdepended solely on the agricultural labourers, it, as far as dependent on births, and unless repressed by, be as rapid in the southern counties of England as in. The restraining principle lies in the very greatof the population composed of the middle classes andskilled artizans, who in this country almost equal in numbercommon labourers, and on whom prudential motives do, in adegree, operate.

4. Where a labouring class who have no property but theirwages, and no hope of acquiring it, refrain from over-rapid,the cause, I believe, has always hitherto been,actual legal restraint, or a custom of some sort, which,intention on their part, insensibly moulds the conduct,affords immediate inducements not to marry. It is notknown in how many countries of Europe direct legalare opposed to improvident marriages. Themade to the original Poor Law Commission by ourministers and consuls in different parts of Europe,a considerable amount of information on this subject. Mr., in his preface to those communications,(4*) says that incountries which recognise a legal right to relief, "marriagethe part of persons in the actual receipt of relief appears toeverywhere

prohibited, and the marriage of those who are notto possess the means of independent support is allowed byfew. Thus we are told that in Norway no one can marry'showing to the satisfaction of the clergyman, that he issettled in such a manner as to offer a fair prospecthe can maintain a family.'

"In Mecklenburg, that 'marriages are delayed by conscriptionthe twenty-second year, and military service for six years;, the parties must have a dwelling, without which ais not permitted to marry them. The men marry at fromfive to thirty, the women not much earlier, as both mustgain by service enough to establish themselves.'

"In Saxony, that 'a man may not marry before he is twenty-oneold, if liable to serve in the army. In Dresden,(by which words artizans are probably meant) maymarry until they become masters in their trade.'

"In Wurtemburg, that 'no man is allowed to marry till hisfifth year, on account of his military duties, unlessbe especially obtained or purchased: at that age healso obtain permission, which is granted on proving that hehis wife would have together sufficient to maintain a familyto establish themselves; in large towns, say from 800 to 1000(from 66l. 13s. 4d. to 84l. 3s. 4d.); in smaller, fromto 500 florins; in villages, 200 florins (16l. 13s.d.)'"(5*)

The minister at Munich says, "The great cause why the numberthe poor is kept so low in this country arises from theby law of marriages in cases in which it cannot bethat the parties have reasonable means of subsistence; andregulation is in all places and at all times strictlyto. The effect of a constant and firm observance of thishas, it is true, a considerable influence in keeping downpopulation of Bavaria, which is at present low for the extentcountry, but it has a most salutary effect in averting extremeand consequent misery."(6*)

At Lubeck, "marriages among the poor are delayed by thea man is under, first, of previously proving that he isa regular employ, work, or profession, that will enable him toa wife: and secondly, of becoming a burgher, andhimself in the uniform of the burgher guard, whichmay cost him nearly 4l."(7*) At Frankfort, "theprescribes no age for marrying, but the permission tois only granted on proving a livelihood." (8*)

The allusion, in some of these statements, to military, points out an indirect obstacle to marriage, interposedthe laws of some countries in which there is no direct legal. In Prussia, for instance, the institutions whichevery able-bodied man to serve for several years in the, at the time of life at which imprudent marriages are mostto take place, are probably a full equivalent, in effectpopulation, for the legal restrictions of the smaller German.

"So strongly," says Mr. Kay, "do the people of Switzerlandfrom experience the expediency of their sons andpostponing the time of their marriages, that theof state of four or five of the most democratic of the, elected, be it remembered, by universal suffrage, havelaws by which all young persons who marry before they haveto the magistrate of their district that they are able toa family, are rendered liable to a heavy fine. In, Argovie, Unterwalden, and I believe, St. Gall, Schweitz,Uri, laws of this character have been in force for many."(9*)

5. Where there is no general law restrictive of marriage,are often customs equivalent to it. When the guilds orcorporations of the Middle Ages were in vigour, theirlaws or regulations were conceived with a very vigilant eyethe advantage which the trade derived from limiting: and they made it very effectually the interest ofnot to marry until after passing through the two stagesapprentice and journeyman, and attaining the rank of master.(10*) In Norway, where the labour is chiefly agricultural, it isby law to engage a farm-servant for less than a year;was the general English practice until the poor-lawsit, by enabling the farmer to cast his labourers onpay whenever he did not immediately require their labour.consequence of this custom, and of its enforcement by law, theof the rather limited class of agricultural labourers inhave an engagement for a year at least, which, if theare content with one another, naturally becomes aengagement: hence it is known in every neighbourhoodthere is, or is likely to be, a vacancy, and unless there, a young man does not marry, knowing that he could not obtain. The custom still exists in Cumberland and, except that the term is half a year instead of a; and seems to be still attended with the same consequences.farm-servants "are lodged and boarded in their masters', which they seldom leave until, through the death of someor neighbour, they succeed to the ownership or lease ofcottage farm. What is called surplus labour does not here." (11*) I have mentioned in another chapter the check toin England during the last century, from theof obtaining a separate dwelling place.(12*) Otherrestrictive of population might be specified: in someof Italy, it is the practice, according to Sismondi, amongpoor, as it is well known to be in the higher ranks, that allone of the sons remain unmarried. But such familyare not likely to exist among day-labourers. Theythe resource of small proprietors and metayers, fortoo minute a subdivision of the land.

In England generally there is now scarcely a relic of thesechecks to population; except that in parishes owned byor a very small number of landowners, the increase oflabourers is still occasionally obstructed, bycottages from being built, or by pulling down thoseexist; thus restraining the population liable to becomechargeable, without any material effect on population, the work required in those parishes being performed bysettled elsewhere. The surrounding districts alwaysthemselves much aggrieved by this practice, against whichcannot defend themselves by similar means, since a singleof land owned by any one who does not enter into the, enables him to defeat the attempt, very profitablyhimself, by covering that acre with cottages. To meet thesean Act has within the last few years been passed by, by which the poor-rate is made a charge not on the, but on the whole union. This enactment, in other respectsbeneficial, removes the small remnant of what was once ato population: the value of which, however, from the narrowof its operation, had become very trifling.

6. In the case, therefore, of the common agricultural, the checks to population may almost be considered asexistent. If the growth of the towns, and of the capitalemployed, by which the factory operatives are maintained atpresent average rate of wages notwithstanding their rapid, did not also absorb a great part of the annual additionthe rural population, there seems no reason in the presentof the people why they should not fall into as miserable aas the Irish previous to 1846; and if the market formanufactures should, I do not say fall off, but even cease toat the rapid rate of the last fifty years, there is nothat this fate may not be reserved for us. Withoutour anticipations

forward to such a calamity, which theand growing intelligence of the factory population would,may be hoped, avert, by an adaptation of their habits to their; the existing condition of the labourers of some ofmost exclusively agricultural counties, Wiltshire,, Dorsetshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, ispainful to contemplate. The labourers of these, with large families, and eight or perhaps ninefor their weekly wages when in full employment, havesome time been one of the stock objects of popular: it is time that they had the benefit also of someof common sense.

Unhappily, sentimentality rather than common sense usuallyover the discussion of these subjects; and while therea growing sensitiveness to the hardships of the poor, and adisposition to admit claims in them upon the good officesother people, there is an all but universal unwillingness tothe real difficulty of their position, or advert at all toconditions which nature has made indispensable to theof their physical lot. Discussions on the conditionthe labourers, lamentations over its wretchedness,of all who are supposed to be indifferent to it,of one kind Or another for improving it, were in noand in no time of the world so rife as in the present; but there is a tacit agreement to ignore totally theof wages, or to dismiss it in a parenthesis, with such terms"hardhearted Malthusianism;" as if it were not a thousandmore hardhearted to tell human beings that they may, thanthey may not, call into existence swarms of creatures whosure to he miserable, and most likely to be depraved; andthat the conduct, which it is reckoned so cruel to, is a degrading slavery to a brute instinct in one ofpersons concerned, and most commonly, in the other, helplessto a revolting abuse of power.

So long as mankind remained in a semi-barbarous state, withindolence and the few wants of a savage, it probably was notthat population should be restrained; the pressure ofwant may have been a necessary stimulus, in that stagethe human mind, to the exertion of labour and ingenuityfor accomplishing that greatest of all past changes inmodes of existence, by which industrial life attainedover the hunting, the pastoral, and the military orstate. Want, in that age of the world, had its uses, asslavery had; and there may be corners of the earth whereuses are not yet superseded, though they might easily be soa helping hand held out by more civilized communities. ButEurope the time, if it ever existed, is long past, when a lifeprivation had the smallest tendency to make men either betteror more civilized beings. It is, on the contrary,, that if the agricultural labourers were better off, theyboth work more efficiently, and be better citizens. I ask,, is it true, or not, that if their numbers were fewer theyobtain higher wages? This is the question, and no other:it is idle to divert attention from it, by attacking anyposition of Malthus or some other writer, andthat to refute that, is to disprove the principle of. Some, for instance, have achieved an easy victorya passing remark of Mr. Malthus, hazarded chiefly by way of, that the increase of food may perhaps be assumed toplace in an arithmetical ratio, while population increasesa geometrical: when every candid reader knows that Mr. Malthusno stress on this unlucky attempt to give numericalto things which do not admit of it, and every personof reasoning must see that it is wholly superfluous toargument. Others have attached immense importance to awhich more recent political economists have made inmere language of the earlier followers of Mr. Malthus.writers had said that it is the tendency of population tofaster than the means of subsistence. The assertion wasin the sense in which they meant it, namely, that populationin most circumstances increase faster

than the means of, if it were not checked either by mortality or by. But inasmuch as these checks act with unequal force attimes and places, it was possible to interpret theof these writers as if they had meant that population isgaining ground upon subsistence, and the poverty of thebecoming greater. Under this interpretation of their, it was urged that the reverse is the truth: that asadvances, the prudential check tends to become, and population to slacken its rate of increase,to subsistence; and that it is an error to maintainpopulation, in any improving community, tends to increasethan, or even so fast as, subsistence. The word tendencyhere used in a totally different sense from that of thewho Armed the proposition: but waving the verbal, is it not allowed on both sides, that in old countries,presses too closely upon the means of subsistence? Andits pressure diminishes, the more the ideas and habits ofpoorest class of labourers can be improved, to which it is tohoped that there is always some tendency in a progressive, yet since that tendency has hitherto been, and still is,faint, and (to descend to particulars) has not yetto giving to the Wiltshire labourers higher wages thanshillings a week, the only thing which it is necessary tois, whether that is a sufficient and suitable provisiona labourer? for if not, population does, as an existing fact,too great a proportion to the wages-fund; and whether itstill harder or not quite so hard at some former period,practically of no moment, except that, if the ratio is anone, there is the better hope that by proper aids andit may be made to improve more and faster.

It is not, however, against reason, that the argument on thishas to struggle; but against a feeling of dislike, whichonly reconcile itself to the unwelcome truth, when everyis exhausted by which the recognition of that truth can be. It is necessary, therefore, to enter into a detailedof these devices, and to force every position whichtaken up by the enemies of the population principle in theirto find some refuge for the labourers, somemeans of improving their condition, without requiringexercise, either enforced or voluntary, of anyrestraint, or any greater control than at present over thepower of multiplication. This will be the object of thechapter.:. See the historical sketch of the condition of the English, prepared from the best authorities by Mr William, in his work entitled Over-Population and its Remedy: ahonourably distinguished from most others which have beenin the present generation, by its rational treatment ofaffecting the economical condition of the labouring.. Supra, pp. 287 to 291.. A similar, though not an equal improvement in the standard oftook place among the labourers of England during thefifty years from 1715 to 1765, which wereby such an extraordinary succession of fine(the years of decided deficiency not exceeding five inthat period) that the average price of wheat during thosewas much lower than during the previous half century. Mrcomputes that on the average of sixty years preceding, the labourer could purchase with a day's earnings onlythirds of a peck of wheat, while from 1720 to 1750 he coulda whole peck. The average price of wheat, according toEton tables, for fifty years ending with 1715 was 41s. 7/4d. per quarter, and for the last twenty-three of these 45s.d., while for the fifty years following, it was no more than a, had time to work a change in the habitualof the labouring class; and this period is alwaysas the date of "a marked improvement of the quality of theconsumed, and a decided elevation in the standard of theirand conveniences" — (Malthus, Principles of Political, p. 225.) For the character of the period, see Mr Tooke'sHistory of Prices, vol. i. pp. 38 to 61, and for theof corn, the Appendix to that work.. Forming an Appendix (F) to the General Report of the, and also published by

authority as a separate.. Preface, p. xxxix.. Preface, p. xxxiii., or p. 554 of the Appendix itself.. Appendix, p. 419.. Ibid. p. 567.. Kay, op. cit. i. 68.. "En general," says Sismondi, "le nobre des maitres etait fixechaque communaute, et le maitre pouvait seul tenir boutique,et vendre pour son compte. Chaque maitre ne pouvaitqu'un certain nombre d'apprentis, auxquels il enseignaitmetier; et dans plusieurs communautes, il n'en pouvait tenir'un seul. Chaque maitre pouvait de meme tenir un nombre limite'ouvriers, qui portaient le nom de compagnons; et, dans lesou l'on ne pouvait avoir qu'un seul apprenti, on neacheter, vendre, ou travailler dans un metier, s'il'etait apprenti, compagnon, ou maitre d'annees determine comme; et s'il n'avait de plus fait son chef-d'oeuvre, auun travail designe dans son metier, qui devait etre jugesa jurande. On voit que cette organisation mettait entiermentla main des maitres le renouvellement des corps de metier.seuls pouvaient recevoir des apprentis; mais ils n'etaientobliges a en prendre; aussi se faisaient-ils payer cette, et souvent a un prix tres-eleve; en sorte qu'on jeunene pouvait entrer dans un metier s'il n'avait, au, la somme qu'il fallait payer pour son apprentissage,celle qui lui etait necessaire pour se sustenter pendant lade cet apprentissage; car pendant quatre, cinq, ou sept, tout son travail appartenait a son maitre. Sa dependance demaitre etait tout aussi longtemps absolue; car un seul acte devolonte, ou meme du caprice de celui-ci, pouvait lui fermer'entree des professions lucratives. L'apprenti, devenu, acquerait un peu plus de liberte; il pouvait s'engagerquel maitre il voulait, passer de l'un a l'autre; et comme'entree au compagnonage n'etait ouverte que par l'apprentissage,commencait a profiter du monopole dont il avait souffert, etetait a peu pres sur de se faire bien payer un travail quene pouvait faire, si ce n'est lui. Cependant ilde la jurande pour obtenir la maitrise; aussi ne seil point encore comme assure de son sort, comme ayantetat. En general, il ne se mariate point qu'il ne fut passe.

"Il est bien certain, et comme fait et comme theorie, que'etablissement des corps de metier empechait et devait empechernaissance d'une population surabondante. D'apres les statutspresque tous les corps de metier, un homme ne pouvait etremaitre qu'apres vingt-cinq ans; mais s'il n'avait pas una lui, s'il n'avait pas fait des economies suffisantes,continuait bien plus longtemps a travailler comme compagnon;, et peut-etre le plus grand nombre des artisans,compagnons toute leur vie. Il etait presque sans, cependant, qu'ils se mariassent avant d'etre recus; quand ils auraient ete assez imprudens pour le desirer,pere n'aurait voulu donner sa fille a un homme qui n'avaitd'etat." — Nouveaux Principes, book iv, ch. 10. See alsoSmith, book i, ch. 10, part 2.. See Thornton on Over-Population, page 18, and the authoritiescited.. Supra, p. 158.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2,

Chapter 12

Popular Remedies for Low Wages

1. The simplest expedient which can be imagined for keepingwages of labour up to the desirable point, would be to fixby law: and this is virtually the object aimed at in aof plans which have at different times been, or still, current, for remodelling the relation between labourers and. No one probably ever suggested that wages should befixed; since the interests of all concerned, oftenthat they should be variable: but some have proposed toa minimum of wages, leaving the variations above that pointbe adjusted by competition. Another plan which has found manyamong the leaders of the operatives, is that councilsbe formed, which in England have been called local boardstrade, in France "conseils de prud'hommes," and other names;of delegates from the workpeople and from the, who meeting in conference, should agree upon a rate of, and promulgate it from authority, to be binding generallyemployers and workmen; the ground of decision being, not theof the labour-market, but natural equity; to provide thatworkmen shall have reasonable wages, and the capitalistprofits.

Others again (but these are rather philanthropiststhemselves for the labouring classes, than thepeople themselves) are shy of admitting theof authority in contracts for labour: they fear thatlaw intervened, it would intervene rashly and ignorantly; theyconvinced that two parties, with opposite interests,to adjust those interests by negotiation through theiron principles of equity, when no rule could bedown to determine what was equitable, would merelytheir differences instead of healing them; but what ituseless to attempt by the legal sanction, these persons desirecompass by the moral. Every employer, they think, ought tosufficient wages; and if he does it not willingly, should beto it by general opinion; the test of sufficient wagestheir own feelings, or what they suppose to be those of the. This is, I think, a fair representation of a considerableof existing opinion on the subject.

I desire to confine my remarks to the principle involved inthese suggestions, without taking into account practical, serious as these must at once be seen to be. Isuppose that by one or other of these contrivances, wagesbe kept above the point to which they would be brought by. This is as much as to say, above the highest ratecan be afforded by the existing capital consistently withall the labourers. For it is a mistake to suppose thatmerely keeps down wages. It is equally the means bythey are kept up. When there are any labourers unemployed,, unless maintained by charity, become competitors for hire,wages fall; but when all who were out of work have found, wages will not, under the freest system of, fall lower. There are strange notions afloatthe nature of competition. Some people seem to imagineits effect is something indefinite; that the competition ofmay lower prices, and the competition of labourers maywages, down to zero, or some unassignable minimum. Nothingbe more unfounded. Goods can only be lowered in price by, to the point which calls forth buyers sufficient tothem off; and wages can only be lowered by competition untilis made to admit all the labourers to a share in theof the wages-fund. If they fell below this point, aof capital would remain unemployed for want of

labourers;counter-competition would commence on the side of capitalists,wages would rise.

Since, therefore, the rate of wages which results fromdistributes the whole existing wages-fund among thelabouring population; if law or opinion succeeds in fixingabove this rate, some labourers are kept out of employment;as it is not the intention of the philanthropists that thesestarve, they must be provided for by a forced increase ofwages-fund; by a compulsory saving. It is nothing to fix aof wages, unless there be a provision that work, or wagesleast, be found for all who apply for it. This, accordingly,always part of the scheme; and is consistent with the ideas ofpeople than would approve of either a legal or a moralof wages. Popular sentiment looks upon it as the duty ofrich, or of the state, to find employment for all the poor.the moral influence of opinion does not induce the rich tofrom their consumption enough to set all the poor to work"reasonable wages," it is supposed to be incumbent on theto lay on taxes for the purpose, either by local rates orof public money. The proportion between labour and thefund would thus be modified to the advantage of the, not by restriction of population, but by an increasecapital.

2. If this claim on society could be limited to the existing; if nothing more were necessary than a compulsory, sufficient to provide permanent employment at amplefor the existing numbers of the people; such a propositionhave no more strenuous supporter than myself. Societyconsists of those who live by bodily labour; and if, that is, if the labourers, lend their physical force toindividuals in the enjoyment of superfluities, they areto do so, and have always done so, with the reservationa power to tax those superfluities for purposes of public; among which purposes the subsistence of the people isforemost. Since no one is responsible for having been born,pecuniary sacrifice is too great to be made by those who havethan enough, for the purpose of securing enough to allalready in existence.

But it is another thing altogether, when those who haveand accumulated are called upon to abstain fromuntil they have given food and clothing, not only towho now exist, but to all whom these or their descendants mayfit to call into existence. Such an obligation acknowledgedacted upon, would suspend all checks, both positive and; there would he nothing to hinder population fromforward at its rapidest rate; and as the naturalof capital would, at the best, not be more rapid than, taxation, to make up the growing deficiency, must advancethe same gigantic strides. The attempt would of course beto exact labour in exchange for support. But experience hasthe sort of work to be expected from recipients of public. When the pay is not given for the sake of the work, butwork found for the sake of the pay, inefficiency is a mattercertainty: to extract real work from day-labourers without theof dismissal, is only practicable by the power of the lash.is conceivable, doubtless, that this objection might be got. The fund raised by taxation might be spread over the labourgenerally, as seems to be intended by the supporters ofdroit au travail in France; without giving to any unemployeda right to demand support in a particular place or fromparticular functionary. The power of dismissal as regardslabourers, would then remain; the government onlyto create additional employment when there was a, and reserving, like other employers, the choice ofown workpeople. But let them work ever so efficiently, thepopulation could not, as we have so often shown,the produce proportionally: the surplus, after all were, would bear a less and less proportion to the

whole produce,to the population: and the increase of people going on in aratio, while the increase of produce went on in aratio, the surplus would in time be wholly absorbed;for the support of the poor would engross the wholeof the country; the payers and the receivers would bedown into one mass. The check to population either byor prudence, could not then be staved off any longer, butcome into operation suddenly and at once; everything whichmankind above a nest of ants or a colony of beavers,perished in the interval.

These consequences have been so often and so clearly pointedby authors of reputation, in writings known and accessible,ignorance of them on the part of educated persons is nopardonable. It is doubly discreditable in any personup for a public teacher, to ignore these considerations;dismiss them silently, and discuss or declaim on wages andlaws, not as if these arguments could be refuted, but as ifdid not exist.

Every one has a right to live. We will suppose this canted.no one has a right to bring creatures into life, to beby other people. Whoever means to stand upon the firstthese rights must renounce all pretension to the last. If acannot support even himself unless others help him, thoseare entitled to say that they do not also undertake theof any offspring which it is physically possible for himsummon into the world. Yet there are abundance of writers andspeakers, including many of most ostentatious pretensionshigh feeling, whose views of life are so truly brutish, thatsee hardship in preventing paupers from breeding hereditaryin the workhouse itself. Posterity will one day ask with, what sort of people it could be among whom suchcould find proselytes.

It would be possible for the state to guarantee employment atwages to all who are born. But if it does this, it is boundself-protection, and for the sake of every purpose for whichexists, to provide that no person shall be bornits consent. If the ordinary and spontaneous motives torestraint are removed, others must be substituted.on marriage, at least equivalent to those existingsome of the German states, or severe penalties on those whochildren when unable to support them, would then be. Society can feed the necessitous, if it takesmultiplication under its control; or (if destitute of allfeeling for the wretched offspring) it can leave the lasttheir discretion, abandoning the first to their own care. Butcannot with impunity take the feeding upon itself, and leavemultiplying free.

To give profusely to the people, whether under the name ofor of employment, without placing them under suchthat prudential motives shall act powerfully upon, is to lavish the means of benefiting mankind, withoutthe object. Leave the people in a situation in whichcondition manifestly depends upon their numbers, and thepermanent benefit may be derived from any sacrifice madeimprove the physical well-being of the present generation, and, by that means, the habits of their children. But removeregulation of their wages from their own control; guaranteethem a certain payment, either by law, or by the feeling ofcommunity; and no amount of comfort that you can give themmake either them or their descendants look to their ownrestraint as the proper means of preserving them in that. You will only make them indignantly claim the continuanceyour guarantee, to themselves and their full complement ofposterity.

On these grounds some writers have altogether condemned thepoor-law, and any system of relief to the able-bodied, atwhen uncombined with systematic legal precautions

againstpopulation. The famous Act of the 43d of Elizabeth, on the part of the public, to provide work and wagesall the destitute able-bodied: and there is little doubt thatthe intent of that Act had been fully carried out, and nohad been adopted by the administrators of relief toits natural tendencies, the poor-rate would by thishave absorbed the whole net produce of the land and labourthe country. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that Mr.and others should at first have concluded against alllaws whatever. It required much experience, and carefulof different modes of poor-law management, to givethat the admission of an absolute right to be supportedthe cost of other people, could exist in law and in fact,fatally relaxing the springs of industry and theof prudence. This, however, was fully substantiated,the investigations of the original Poor Law Commissioners.as they are unjustly accused of being to the principle ofrelief, they are the first who fully proved theof any Poor Law, in which a right to relief was, with the permanent interests of the labouring classof posterity. By a collection of facts, experimentallyin parishes scattered throughout England, it wasthat the guarantee of support could be freed from itseffects upon the minds and habits of the people, if the, though ample in respect to necessaries, was accompaniedconditions which they disliked, consisting of someon their freedom, and the privation of some. Under this proviso, it may be regarded asestablished, that the fate of no member of theneeds be abandoned to chance; that society can andought to insure every individual belonging to itthe extreme of want; that the condition even of those whounable to find their own support, needs not be one ofsuffering, or the dread of it, but only of restricted, and enforced rigidity of discipline. This is surelygained for humanity, important in itself, and stillso as a step to something beyond; and humanity has no worsethan those who lend themselves, either knowingly or, to bring odium on this law, or on the principleswhich it originated.

3. Next to the attempts to regulate wages, and providethat all who are willing to work shall receive anprice for their labour, we have to consider anotherof popular remedies, which do not profess to interfere withof contract; which leave wages to be fixed by theof the market, but, when they are considered, endeavour by some subsidiary resource to make up tolabourers for the insufficiency. Of this nature was theresorted to by parish authorities during thirty oryears previous to 1834, generally known as the Allowance. This was first introduced, when, through a succession ofseasons, and consequent high prices of food, the wages ofhad become inadequate to afford to the families of thelabourers the amount of support to which they hadaccustomed. Sentiments of humanity, joined with the ideainculcated in high quarters, that people ought not to beto suffer for having enriched their country with aof inhabitants, induced the magistrates of the ruralto commence giving parish relief to persons already inemployment: and when the practice had once been, the immediate interest of the farmers, whom itto throw part of the support of their labourers upon theinhabitants of the parish, led to a great and rapidof it. The principle of this scheme being avowedly thatadapting the means of every family to its necessities, it wasnatural consequence that more should be given to the marriedto the single, and to those who had large families than towho had not: in fact, an allowance was usually canted forchild. So direct and positive an encouragement tois not, however, inseparable from the scheme: thein aid of wages might be a fixed thing, given to allalike, and as this is the least objectionable formthe system can assume, we will give it the benefit of the.

It is obvious that this is merely another mode of fixing aof wages; no otherwise differing from the direct mode,in allowing the employer to buy the labour at its market, the difference being made up to the labourer from a public. The one kind of guarantee is open to all the objectionshave been urged against the other. It promises to thethat they shall all have a certain amount of wages,numerous they may be: and removes, therefore, alike theand the prudential obstacles to an unlimited increase.besides the objections common to all attempts to regulatewithout regulating population, the allowance system has aabsurdity of its own. This is, that it inevitably takeswages with one hand what it adds to them with the other.is a rate of wages, either the lowest on which the people, or the lowest on which they will consent, to live. We willthis to be seven shillings a week. Shocked at theof this pittance, the parish authorities humanelyit up to ten. But the labourers are accustomed to seven, andthey would gladly have more, will live on that (as theproves) rather than restrain the instinct of multiplication.habits will not be altered for the better by giving thempay. Receiving three shillings from the parish, they willas well off as before though they should increase sufficientlybring down wages to four shillings. They will accordinglydown to that point; or perhaps, without waiting for anof numbers, there are unemployed labourers enough in theto produce the effect at once. It is well known thatallowance system did practically operate in the mode, and that under its influence wages sank to a lowerthan had been known in England before. During the last, under a rather rigid administration of the poor-laws,increased slowly, and agricultural wages wereabove the starvation point. Under the allowancethe people increased so fast, and wages sank so low, thatwages and allowance together, families were worse off thanhad been before with wages alone. When the labourer dependson wages, there is a virtual minimum. If wages fall belowlowest rate which will enable the population to be kept up,at least restores them to that lowest rate. But ifdeficiency is to be made up by a forced contribution from allhave anything to give, wages may fall below starvation point;may fall almost to zero. This deplorable system, worse thanother form of poor-law abuse yet invented, inasmuch as itnot merely the unemployed part of the population butwhole, received a severe check from the Poor Law of 1834: Iit could be said that there are no signs of its revival.

4. But while this is generally condemned, there is anotherof relief in aid of wages, which is still highly popular; agreatly preferable, morally and socially, to parishowance, but tending, it is to be feared, to a very similarresult: I mean the much-boasted Allotment System., too, is a contrivance to compensate the labourer for theof his wages, by giving him something else as ato them: but instead of having them made up from therate, he is enabled to make them up for himself, by rentingsmall piece of ground, which he cultivates like a garden bylabour, raising potatoes and other vegetables for home, with perhaps some additional quantity for sale. Ifhires the ground ready manured, he sometimes pays for it at asa rate as eight pounds an acre: but getting his own labourthat of his family for nothing, he is able to gain severalby it even at so high a rent.(1*) The patrons of themake it a great point that the allotment shall be in aidwages, and not a substitute for them; that it shall not beas a labourer can live on, but only sufficient to occupy thehours and days of a man in tolerably regular agricultural, with assistance from his wife and children. Theylimit the extent of a single allotment to a quarter, orbetween a quarter and half an acre. If it exceeds this,being enough to occupy him entirely, it will make him,say, a bad and uncertain workman for hire: if it isto take him entirely out of the class of hired, and to become his

sole means of subsistence, it willhim an Irish cottier: for which assertion, at the enormoususually demanded, there is some foundation. But in theiragainst cottierism, these well-meaning persons do not, that if the system they patronize is not a cottier, it is, in essentials, neither more nor less than a systemconacre.

There is no doubt a material difference between eking outwages by a fund raised by taxation, and doing thething by means which make a clear addition to the grossof the country. There is also a difference betweena labourer by means of his own industry, and subsidizingin a mode which tends to make him careless and idle. On bothpoints, allotments have an unquestionable advantage overallowances. But in their effect on wages and population, Ino reason why the two plans should substantially differ. Allin aid of wages enable the labourer to do with less, and therefore ultimately bring down the price ofby the full amount, unless a change be wrought in theand requirements of the labouring class; an alteration inrelative value which they set upon the gratification of their, and upon the increase of their comforts and theof those connected with them. That any such change incharacter should be produced by the allotment system,to me a thing not to be expected. The possession of land,are sometimes told, renders the labourer provident. Propertyland does so; or what is equivalent to property, occupation onterms and on a permanent tenure. But mere hiring from yearyear was never found to have any such effect. Did possessionland render the Irishman provident? Testimonies, it is true,, and I do not seek to discredit them, of the beneficialproduced in the conduct and condition of labourers, byallotments. Such an effect is to be expected whilewho hold them are a small number; a privileged class,a status above the common level, which they are unwillinglose. They are also, no doubt, almost always, originally aclass, composed of the most favourable specimens of thepeople: which, however, is attended with thethat the persons to whom the system facilitatesand having children, are precisely those who wouldhe the most likely to practise prudential restraint. Asthe general condition of the labouring class, the, as it seems to me, must be either nugatory or. If only a few labourers have allotments, they arethose who could do best without them, and no good isto the class: while, if the system were general, and everyalmost every labourer had an allotment, I believe the effectbe much the same as when every or almost every labourer hadallowance in aid of wages. I think there can be no doubt that, at the end of the last century, the Allotment instead of thesystem had been generally adopted in England, it wouldhave broken down at that time did really exist;would have started forward exactly as in fact it did;in twenty years, wages plus the allotment would have been, asplus the allowance actually were, no more than equal to thewages without any allotment. The only difference in favourallotments would have been, that they make the people growown poor-rates.

I am at the same time quite ready to allow, that in some, the possession of land at a fair rent, evenownership, by the generality of labourers for hire,as a cause not of low, but of high wages. This, however,when their land renders them, to the extent of actual, independent of the market for labour. There is thedifference between the position of people who live by, with land as an extra resource, and of people who can, inof necessity, subsist entirely on their land, and only workhire to add to their comforts. Wages are likely to be highnone are compelled by necessity to sell their labour."People who have at home some kind of property to apply theirto, will not sell their labour for wages that do notthem

a better diet than potatoes and maize, although infor themselves, they may live very much on potatoes and. We are often surprised in travelling on the Continent, toof a rate of day's wages very high, considering theand cheapness of food. It is want of the necessity orinclination to take work, that makes day-labour scarce, and,the price of provisions, dear, in many parts of the, where property in land is widely diffused among the."(2*) There are parts of the Continent, where, even of theof the towns, scarcely one seems to be exclusivelyon his ostensible employment; and nothing else canthe high price they put on their services, and thethey evince as to whether they are employed at all.the effect would be far different if their land or othergave them only a fraction of a subsistence, leavingunder an undiminished necessity of selling their labour forin an overstocked market. Their land would then merelythem to exist on smaller wages, and to carry theirso much the further before reaching the pointwhich they either could not, or would not descend.

To the view I have taken of the effect of allotments, I seeargument which can be opposed, but that employed by Mr.,(3*) with whom on this subject I am at issue. Hisof allotments is grounded on the general doctrine, thatis only the very poor who multiply without regard to, and that if the the condition of the existingcould be greatly improved, which he thinks might beby the allotment system, their successors would grow up withincreased standard of requirements, and would not haveuntil they could keep them in as much comfort as that inthey had been brought up themselves. I agree in as much ofargument as goes to prove that a sudden and greatin the condition of the poor, has always, through itson their habits of life, a chance of becoming permanent.happened at the time of the French Revolution is an example.I cannot think that the addition of a quarter or even half anto every labourer's cottage, and that too at a rack rent,(after the fall of wages which would be necessary to absorbalready existing mass of pauper labour) make so great ain the comforts of the family for a generation to, as to raise up from childhood a labouring population with ahigher permanent standard of requirements and habits. Soa portion of land could only be made a permanent benefit,holding out encouragement to acquire by industry and saving,means of buying it outright: a permission which, ifmade use of, would be a kind of education inand frugality to the entire class, the effects ofmight not cease with the occasion. The benefit wouldarise, not from what was given them, but from what theystimulated to acquire.

No remedies for low wages have the smallest chance of being, which do not operate on and through the minds andof the people. While these are unaffected, any, even if successful, for temporarily improving theof the very poor, would but let slip the reins by whichwas previously curbed; and could only, therefore,to produce its effect, if, by the whip and spur of, capital were compelled to follow at an equallypace. But this process could not possibly continuelong together, and whenever it stopped, it would leave thewith an increased number of the poorest class, and aproportion of all except the poorest, or, if itlong enough, with none at all. For "to this complexioncome at last" all social arrangements, which remove thechecks to population without substituting any others.:. See the Evidence on the subject of Allotments, collected byCommissioners of Poor Law Enquiry.. Laing's Notes of a Traveller, p. 456.. See Thornton on Over-Population, ch. viii.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2

13

Remedies for Low Wages Further Considered

1. By what means, then, is poverty to be contended against?is the evil of low wages to be remedied? If the expedientsrecommended for the purpose are not adapted to it, can nobe thought of? Is the problem incapable of solution? Caneconomy do nothing, but only object to everything, andthat nothing can be done? If this were so, political economy might have a needful, buthave a melancholy, and a thankless task. If the bulk of therace are always to remain as at present, slaves to toil inthey have no interest, and therefore feel no interest -- from early morning till late at night for bare, and with all the intellectual and moral deficienciesthat implies -- without resources either in mind or-- untaught, for they cannot be better taught than fed;, for all their thoughts are required for themselves;interests or sentiments as citizens and members of, and with a sense of injustice rankling in their minds,for what they have not, and for what others have; I knowwhat there is which should make a person with any capacity of, concern himself about the destinies of the human race.would be no wisdom for any one but in extracting from life,Epicurean indifference, as much personal satisfaction toand those with whom he sympathies, as it can yieldinjury to any one, and letting the unmeaning bustle ofcalled civilized existence roll by unheeded. But there is nofor such a view of human affairs. Poverty, like mostevils, exists because men follow their brute instinctsdue consideration. But society is possible, preciselyman is not necessarily a brute. Civilization in every oneits aspects is a struggle against the animal instincts. Overeven of the strongest of them, it has shown itself capableacquiring abundant control. It has artificialized largeof mankind to such an extent, that of many of their mostinclinations they have scarcely a vestige or aleft. If it has not brought the instinct ofunder as much restraint as is needful, we mustthat it has never seriously tried. What efforts it has, have mostly been in the contrary direction. Religion,, and statesmanship have vied with one another into marriage, and to the multiplication of the, so it be but in wedlock. Religion has not even yetits encouragements. The Roman Catholic clergy (ofother clergy it is unnecessary to speak, since no other haveconsiderable influence over the poorer classes) everywhereit their duty to promote marriage, in order to prevent. There is still in many minds a strong religiousagainst the true doctrine. The rich, provided thedo not touch themselves, think it impugns the wisdomProvidence to suppose that misery can result from theof a natural propensity.. the poor think that "Godsends mouths but he sends meat." No one would guess fromlanguage of either, that man had any voice or choice in the. So complete is the confusion of ideas on the whole; owing in a great degree to the mystery in which it isby a spurious delicacy, which prefer that right andshould be mismeasured and confounded on one of the subjectsmomentous to human welfare, rather than that the subject bespoken of and discussed. People are little aware of theto mankind of this scrupulosity of speech. The diseases ofcan, no more than corporal maladies, he prevented orwithout being spoken about in plain language. Allshows that the mass of mankind never judge of moralfor themselves, never see anything to be right or wrongthey have been frequently told it; and who tells them thathave any duties in the matter in question, while they keepmatrimonial limits? Who meets with the smallest, or

rather, who does not meet with sympathy and, for any amount of evil which he may have broughthimself and those dependent on him, by this species of? While a man who is intemperate in drink, isand despised by all who profess to be moral, it is one of the chief grounds made use of in appeals tobenevolent, that the applicant has a large family and isto maintain them.(1*) One cannot wonder that silence on this great department ofduty should produce unconsciousness of moral obligations,it produces oblivion of physical facts. That it is possibledelay marriage, and to live in abstinence while unmarried,people are willing to, allow. but when persons are once, the idea, in this country, never seems to enter any's mind that having or not having a family, or the number ofit shall consist, is amenable to their own control. Oneimage that children were rained down upon married people,from heaven, without their being art or part in the; that it was really, as the common phrases have it, God's, and not their own, which decided the numbers of their. Let us see what is a Continental philosopher's opinionthis point; a man among the most benevolent of his time, andhappiness of whose married life has been celebrated. "Lorsque des prejuges dangereux," says Sismondi,(2*) "ne sontaccredites, lorsqu'une morale contraire à nos vrais devoirsles autres et surtout envers les creatures qui nousla vie, n'est point enseignee au nom de l'autorite lasacree, aucun homme sage ne se marie avant de se trouverune condition qui lui donne un moyen assure de vivre; aucunère de famille n'a plus d'enfans qu'il n'en peut convenablement. Ce dernier compte à bon droit que ses enfans devront sedu sort dans lequel il a vecu; aussi doit-il desirerla generation naissante represente exactement celle qui s'en; qu'un fils et une fille arrives à l'âge nubile remplacent sonère et sa mère; que les enfans de ses enfans le remplacent à sonavec sa femme; que sa fille trouve dans une autre maisonle sort qu'il donnera à la fille d'une autre maisonla sienne, et que le revenu qui suffisait aux pères suffiseenfans." In a count increasing in wealth, some increase ofwould be admissible, but that is a question of detail,of principle. "Une fois que cette famille est formee, laet l'humanite exigent qu'il s'impose la même contrainte àse soumettent les celibataires. Lorsqu'on voit combienpetit, en tout pays, le nombre des enfans naturels, on doitître que cette contrainte est suffisamment efficace. Danspays où la population ne peut pas s'accroître, ou du moinslequel son progrès doit être si lent qu'il soit à peine, quand il n'y a point de places nouvelles pour deetablissemens, un père qui a huit enfans doit compter,que six de ses enfans mourront en bas âge, ou que trois de seset trois de ses contemporaines, et dans lasuivante, trois de ses fils et trois de ses filles, nemarieront pas à cause de lui." 2. Those who think it hopeless that the labouring classesbe induced to practise a sufficient degree of prudence into the increase of their families, because they havestopt short of that point, show an inability to estimateordinary principles of human action. Nothing more wouldbe necessary to secure that result, than an opiniondiffused that it was desirable. As a moral principle,an opinion has never yet existed in any country: it isthat it does not so exist in countries in which, from theoperation of individual forethought, population is,speaking, efficiently repressed. What is practisedprudence is still not recognised as duty. the talkers andare mostly on the other side, even in France, where ahorror of Malthus is almost as rife as in this. Many causes may be assigned, besides the modern date ofdoctrine, for its not having yet gained possession of themind. Its truth has, in some respects, been its. One may be permitted to doubt whether, except amongpoor themselves (for whose prejudices on this subject thereno difficulty in accounting) there has ever yet been, in anyof society, a sincere and earnest desire that

wages shouldhigh. There has been plenty of desire to keep down therate; but, that done, people have been very willing that theclasses should be ill off. Nearly all who are notthemselves, are employers of labour, and are not sorryget the commodity cheap. It is a fact, that even Boards of, who are supposed to be official apostles ofpopulation doctrines, will seldom hear patiently of anythingthey are pleased to designate as Malthusianism. Boards ofin rural districts, principally consist of farmers, and, it is well known, in general dislike even allotments, asthe labourers "too independent." From the gentry, who areless immediate contact and collision of interest with the, better things might be expected, and the gentry ofare usually charitable. But charitable people have human, and would, very often, be secretly not a littleif no one needed their charity: it is from them onehears the base doctrine, that God has decreed therealways be poor. When one adds to this, that nearly everywho has had in him any active spring of exertion for aobject, has had some favourite reform to effect which hethe admission of this great principle would throw intoshade; has had corn laws to repeal, or taxation to reduce, ornotes to issue, or the charter to carry, or the church toor abolish, or the aristocracy to pull down, and lookedevery one as an enemy who thought anything important exceptobject; it is scarcely wonderful that since the populationwas first promulgated, nine-tenths of the talk hasbeen against it, and the remaining tenth only audible at; and that it has not yet penetrated far among those whobe expected to be the least willing recipients of it, thethemselves. But let us try to imagine what would happen if the ideageneral among the labouring class, that the competition ofgreat numbers was the special cause of their poverty; so thatlabourer looked (with Sismondi) upon every other who hadthan the number of children which the circumstances ofallowed to each, as doing him a wrong -- as filling upplace which he was entitled to share. Any one who supposesthis state of opinion would not have a great effect on, must be profoundly ignorant of human nature; can neverconsidered how large a portion of the motives which inducegenerality of men to take care even of their own interest, isfrom regard for opinion -- from the expectation of beingor despised for not doing it. In the particular case in, it is not too much to say that over-indulgence is ascaused by the stimulus of opinion as by the mere animal; since opinion universally, and especially among theuneducated classes, has connected ideas of spirit and powerthe strength of the instinct, and of inferiority with itsor absence; a perversion of sentiment caused by itsthe means, and the stamp, of a dominion exercised overhuman being. The effect would be great of merely removingfactitious stimulus; and when once opinion shall have turnedinto an adverse direction, a revolution will soon takein this department of human conduct. We are often told thatmost thorough perception of the dependence of wages onwill not influence the conduct of a labouring man,it is not the children he himself can have that willany effect in generally depressing the labour market.: and it is also true, that one soldier's running away willlose the battle; accordingly it is not that considerationkeeps each soldier in his rank: it is the disgrace whichand inevitably attends on conduct by any one, which if pursued by a majority, everybody can seebe fatal. Men are seldom found to brave the general opiniontheir class, unless supported either by some principle higherregard for opinion, or by some strong body of opinion. It must be borne in mind also, that the opinion here in, as soon as it attained any prevalence, would haveauxiliaries in the great majority of women. It is seldomthe choice of the wife that families are too numerous; on her(along with all the physical suffering and at least ashare

of the privations) the whole of the intolerabledrudgery resulting from the excess. To be relieved fromwould be hailed as a blessing by multitudes of women who nowventure to urge such a claim, but who would urge it, ifby the moral feelings of the community. Among thewhich law and morals have not yet ceased to sanction,most disgusting surely is, that any human being should beto consider himself as having a right to the person of. If the opinion were once generally established among theclass that their welfare required a due regulation ofnumbers of families, the respectable and well-conducted ofbody would conform to the prescription, and only those wouldthemselves from it, who were in the habit of making lightsocial obligations generally; and there would be then anjustification for converting the moral obligation againstchildren into the world who are a burthen to the, into a legal one; just as in many other cases of theof opinion, the law ends by enforcing againstminorities, obligations which to be useful must be, and which, from a sense of their utility, a largehave voluntarily consented to take upon themselves.would be no need, however, of legal sanctions, if womenadmitted, as on all other grounds they have the clearestto be, to the same rights of citizenship with men. Let themto be confined by custom to one physical function as theirof living and their source of influence, and they wouldfor the first time an equal voice with men in what concernsfunction: and of all the improvements in reserve for mankindit is now possible to foresee, none might be expected to befertile as this in almost every kind of moral and social. It remains to consider what chance there is that opinions and, grounded on the law of the dependence of wages on, will arise among the labouring classes; and by whatsuch opinions and feelings can be called forth. Beforethe grounds of hope on this subject, a hope whichpersons, no doubt, will be ready, without consideration, tochimerical, I will remark, that unless a satisfactorycan be made to these two questions, the industrial systemin this country, and regarded by many writers as theplus ultra of civilization -- the dependence of the wholeclass of the community on the wages of hired labour, iscondemned. The question we are considering is,, of this state of things, overpopulation and a degradedof the labouring class are the inevitable consequence.a prudent regulation of population be not reconcilable withsystem of hired labour, the system is a nuisance, and theobject of economical statesmanship should be (by whateverof property, and alterations in the modes ofindustry), to bring the labouring people under theof stronger and more obvious inducements to this kindprudence, than the relation of workmen and employers can. But there exists no such incompatibility. The causes ofare not so obvious at first sight to a population oflabourers, as they are to one of proprietors, or as theybe to a socialist community. They are, however, in no way. The dependence of wages on the number of thefor employment, is so far from hard of comprehension,unintelligible to the labouring classes, that by great bodiesthem it is already recognised and habitually acted on. It isto all Trades Unions: every successful combination toup wages, owes its success to contrivances for restrictingnumber of the competitors; all skilled trades are anxious todown their own numbers, and many impose, or endeavour to, as a condition upon employers, that they shall not takethan a prescribed number of apprentices. There is, of, a great difference between limiting their numbers byother people, and doing the same thing by a restrainton themselves: but the one as much as the other shows aperception of the relation between their numbers and their. The principle is understood in its application toone employment, but not to the general mass of employment.this there are several reasons: first, the

operation ofis more easily and distinctly seen in the morefield; secondly, skilled artizans are a moreclass than, ordinary manual labourers: and the habitconcert, and of passing in review their general condition as a, keeps up a better understanding of their collective: thirdly and lastly, they are the most provident,they are the best off, and have the most to preserve., however, is clearly perceived and admitted in particular, it cannot be hopeless to see understood andas a general truth. Its recognition, at least in, seems a thing which must necessarily and immediately comepass, when the minds of the labouring classes become capabletaking any rational view of their own aggregate condition. Ofthe great majority of them have until now been incapable,from the uncultivated state of their intelligence, or from, which leaving them neither the fear of worse, nor thehope of better, makes them careless of the consequencestheir actions, and without thought for the future. 3. For the purpose therefore of altering the habits of thepeople, there is need of a twofold action, directedupon their intelligence and their poverty. Annational education of the children of the labouring, is the first thing needful: and, coincidently with this, aof measures which shall (as the Revolution did in France)extreme poverty for one whole generation. This is not the place for discussing, even in the mostmanner, either the principles or the machinery ofeducation. But it is to be hoped that opinion on theis advancing, and that an education of mere words wouldnow be deemed sufficient, slow as our progress is towardsanything better even for the classes to whom societyto give the very best education it can devise. Withoutinto disputable points, it may be asserted without, that the aim of all intellectual training for the massthe people, should be to cultivate common sense; to qualifyfor forming a sound practical judgment of the circumstanceswhich they are surrounded. Whatever, in the intellectual, can be superadded to this, is chiefly ornamental;this is the indispensable groundwork on which educationrest. Let this object be acknowledged and kept in view asthing to be first aimed at, and there will be littlein deciding either what to teach, or in what manner toit. An education directed to diffuse good sense among the people,such knowledge as would qualify them to judge of theof their actions, would be certain, even without anyinculcation, to raise up a public opinion by whichand improvidence of every kind would be held, and the improvidence which overstocks the labourwould be severely condemned, as an offence against theweal. But though the sufficiency of such a state of, supposing it formed, to keep the increase of populationproper limits, cannot, I think, be doubted; yet, for theof the opinion, it would not do to trust to education. Education is not compatible with extreme poverty. It iseffectually to teach an indigent population. And it isto make those feel the value of comfort who have neverit, or those appreciate the wretchedness of a precarious, who have been made reckless by always living fromto mouth. Individuals often struggle upwards into aof ease; but the utmost that can be expected from apeople is to maintain themselves in it; and improvement inhabits and requirements of the mass of unskilledlabourers will be difficult and tardy, unless means can beof raising the entire body to a state of tolerable, and maintaining them in it until a new generation grows. Towards effecting this object there are two resources, without wrong to any one, without any of theof mischief attendant on voluntary or legal charity,not only without weakening, but on the contrary, every incentive to industry, and every motive to. 4. The first is, a great national measure of colonization. I, a grant of public money, sufficient to remove at once, andin the colonies, a considerable fraction of theagricultural population. By giving the preference,

as. Wakefield proposes, to young couples, or when these cannot be, to families with children nearly grown up, thewould be made to go the farthest possible towardsthe end, while the colonies would be supplied withgreatest amount of what is there in deficiency and here in, present and prospective labour. It has been shown by, and the grounds of the opinion will be exhibited in apart of the present work, that colonization on anscale might be so conducted as to cost the country, or nothing that would not be certainly repaid; and thatfunds required, even by way of advance, would not be drawnthe capital employed in maintaining labour, but from thatwhich cannot find employment at such profit asan adequate remuneration for the abstinence of the, and which is therefore sent abroad for investment, orat home in reckless speculations. That portion of theof the country which is habitually ineffective for anyof benefit to the labouring class, would bear any draughtit could be necessary to make on it for the amount ofwhich is here in view. The second resource would he, to devote all common land,brought into cultivation, to raising a class of small. It has long enough been the practice to take thesefrom public use for the mere purpose of adding to theof the rich. It is time that what is left of them shouldretained as an estate sacred to the benefit of the poor. Thefor administering it already exists, having beenby the General Inclosure Act. What I would propose(though, I confess, with small hope of its being soon adopted), that in all future cases in which common land is permitted toenclosed, such portion should first be sold or assigned as isto compensate the owners of manorial or common rights,that the remainder should be divided into sections of fiveor thereabouts, to be conferred in absolute property onof the labouring class who would reclaim and bringinto cultivation by their own labour. The preference shouldgiven to such labourers, and there are many of them, as hadenough to maintain them until their first crop was got in,whose character was such as to induce some responsible personadvance to them the requisite amount on their personal. The tools, the manure, and in some cases thealso might be supplied by the parish, or by the; interest for the advance, at the rate yielded by thefunds, being laid on as a perpetual quit-rent, with powerthe peasant to redeem it at any time for a moderate number of' purchase. These little landed estates might, if it werenecessary, be made indivisible by law; though, if theworked in the manner designed, I should not apprehend anydegree of subdivision. In case of intestacy, and inof amicable arrangement among the heirs, they might beby government at their value, and recanted to some otherwho would give security for the price. The desire toone of these small properties would probably become, asthe Continent, an inducement to prudence and economy pervadingwhole labouring population; and that great desideratum amongpeople of hired labourers would be provided, an intermediatebetween them and their employers; affording them the double, of an object for their hopes, and, as there would bereason to anticipate, an example for their imitation. It would, however, be of little avail that either or both ofmeasures of relief should be adopted, unless on such a, as would enable the whole body of hired labourerson the soil to obtain not merely employment, but aaddition to the present wages -- such an addition as wouldthem to live and bring up their children in a degree ofand independence to which they have hitherto been. When the object is to raise the permanent condition ofpeople, small means do not merely produce small effects, theyno effect at all. Unless comfort can be made as habituala whole generation as indigence is now, nothing is; and feeble half-measures do but fritter away, far better reserved until the improvement of publicand of education shall raise up politicians who

will notthat merely because a scheme promises much, the part ofis to have nothing to do with it. I have left the preceding paragraphs as they were written,they remain true in principle, though it is no longerto apply these specific recommendations to the presentof this country. The extraordinary cheapening of the meanstransport, which is one of the great scientific achievementsthe age, and the knowledge which nearly all classes of thehave now acquired, or are in the way of acquiring, of theof the labour market in remote parts of the world, haveup a spontaneous emigration from these islands to the newbeyond the ocean, which does not tend to diminish, butincrease; and which, without any national measure ofcolonization, may prove sufficient to effect arise of wages in Great Britain, as it has already doneIreland, and to maintain that rise unimpaired for one or more. Emigration, instead of an occasional vent, isa steady outlet for superfluous numbers; and this newin modern history, together with the flush of prosperityby free trade, have canted to this overcrowded countrytemporary breathing-time, capable of being employed inthose moral and intellectual improvements in allof the people, the very poorest included, which wouldimprobable any relapse into the over-peopled state.this golden opportunity will be properly used, depends onwisdom of our councils; and whatever depends on that, isin a high degree precarious. The grounds of hope are, thathas been no time in our history when mental progress hasso little on governments, and so much on the generalof the people; none in which the spirit ofhas extended to so many branches of human affairs at, nor in which all kinds of suggestions tending to the publicin every department, from the humblest physical to themoral or intellectual, were heard with so little, and had so good a chance of becoming known and beingconsidered.:. Little improvement can be expected in morality until thelarge families is regarded with the same feelings asor any other physical excess. But while theand clergy are foremost to set the example of thisof incontinence, what can be expected from the poor?. Nouveaux Principes, liv, ch. 5.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill

214

the Differences of Wages in Different Employments

1. In treating of wages, we have hitherto confined ourselvesthe causes which operate on them generally, and en masse; thewhich govern the remuneration of ordinary or average labour:reference to the existence of different kinds of workare habitually paid at different rates, depending in someon different laws. We will now take into considerationdifferences, and examine in what manner they affect or areby the conclusions already established.

A well-known and very popular chapter of Adam Smith(1*)the best exposition yet given of this portion of the. I cannot indeed think his treatment so complete andas it has sometimes been considered; but as far as it, his analysis is tolerably successful.

The differences, he says, arise partly from the policy of, which nowhere leaves things at perfect liberty, and"from certain circumstances in the employments themselves,either really, or at least in the imaginations of men, makefor a small pecuniary gain in some, and counterbalance a greatin others." These circumstances he considers to be: "First,agreeableness or disagreeableness of the employments; secondly, the easiness and cheapness, or theand expense of learning them; thirdly, the constancyinconstancy of employment in them; fourthly, the small ortrust which must be reposed in those who exercise them; and, the probability or improbability of success in them."

Several of these points he has very copiously illustrated:his examples are sometimes drawn from a state of facts nowlonger existing. "The wages of labour vary with the ease or, the cleanliness or dirtiness, the honourableness orof the employment. Thus, in most places, takeyear round, a journeyman tailor earns less than a journeyman. His work is much easier." Things have much altered, as toweaver's remuneration, since Adam Smith's time; and the artizanwork was more difficult than that of a tailor, can never, I, have been the common weaver. "A journeyman weaver earnsthan a journeyman smith. His work is not always easier, butis much cleanlier." A more probable explanation is, that itless bodily strength. "A journeyman blacksmith, thoughartificer, seldom earns so much in twelve hours as a collier,is only a labourer, does in eight. His work is not quite so, is less dangerous, and is carried on in daylight, andground. Honour makes a great part of the reward of allprofessions. In point of pecuniary gain, all things," their recompense is, in his opinion, below the. "Disgrace has the contrary effect. The trade of ais a brutal and an odious business; but it is in mostmore profitable than the greater part of common trades.most detestable of all employments, that of public, is, in proportion to the quantity of work done,paid than any common trade whatever."

One of the causes which make hand-loom weavers cling to theirin spite of the scanty remuneration which it now, is said to be a peculiar attractiveness arising from theof action which it allows to the workman. "He can play or," says a recent authority,(2*) "as feeling or inclinationhim; rise early or late, apply himself assiduously or, as he pleases, and work up at any time by increased, hours previously sacrificed to indulgence or. There is

scarcely another condition of any portion ofworking population thus free from external control. Theoperative is not only mulcted of his wages for absence,, if of frequent occurrence, discharged altogether from his. The bricklayer, the carpenter, the painter, the, the stonemason, the outdoor labourer, have each theirdaily hours of labour, a disregard of which would leadthe same result." Accordingly, "the weaver will stand by hiswhile it will enable him to exist, however miserably; and, induced temporarily to quit it, have returned to it again,work was to be had."

"Employment is much more constant," continues Adam Smith, "intrades than in others. In the greater part of manufactures,journeyman may be pretty sure of employment almost every day inyear that he is able to work" (the interruptions of businessfrom overstocked markets, or from a suspension of demand,from a commercial crisis, must be excepted). "A mason or, On the contrary, can work neither in hard frost norfoul weather, and his employment at all other times dependsthe occasional calls of his customers. He is liable, in, to be frequently without any. What he earns,, while he is employed, must not only maintain him whileis idle, hut make him some compensation for those anxiousof so precarious a situation must sometimes computedof the greater part of manufacturers, are nearly upon awith the day wages of common labourers, those of masons andare generally from one-half more to double those. No species of skilled labour, however, seems more easy tothan that of masons and bricklayers. The high wages ofworkmen, therefore, are not so much the recompense of their, as the compensation for the inconstancy of their.

"When the inconstancy of the employment is combined with the, disagreeableness, and dirtiness of the work, itraises the wages of the most common labour above thosethe most skilled artificers. A collier working by the piece,supposed, at Newcastle, to earn commonly about double, and inparts of Scotland about three times, the wages of common. His high wages arise altogether from the hardship,, and dirtiness of his work. His employment may,most occasions, be as constant as he pleases. Theheavers in London exercise a trade which in hardship,, and disagreeableness, almost equals that of colliers;from the unavoidable irregularity in the arrival ofships, the employment of the greater part of them isvery inconstant. If colliers, therefore, commonlydouble and triple the wages of common labour, it ought notseem unreasonable that coal-heavers should sometimes earn fourfive times those wages. In the inquiry made into theira few years ago, it was found that at the rate at whichwere then paid, they could earn about four times the wagescommon labour in London. How extravagant soever these earningsappear, if they were more than sufficient to compensate alldisagreeable circumstances of the business, there would soonso great a number of competitors as, in a trade which has noprivilege, would quickly reduce them to a lower rate."

These inequalities of remuneration, which are supposed tofor the disagreeable circumstances of particular, would, under certain conditions, be naturalof perfectly free competition: and as betweenof about the same grade, and filled by nearly thedescription of people, they are, no doubt, for the most, realized in practice. But it is altogether a false view ofstate of facts, to present this as the relation whichexists between agreeable and disagreeable employments.really exhausting and the really repulsive labours, insteadbeing better paid than others, are almost invariably paid theof all, because performed by those who have no choice. Itbe otherwise in a favourable state of the general labour. If the

labourers in the aggregate, instead of exceeding,short of the amount of employment, work which was generallywould not be undertaken, except for more than ordinary. But when the supply of labour so far exceeds the demandto find employment at all is an uncertainty, and to beit on any terms a favour, the case is totally the. Desirable labourers, those whom every one is anxious to, can still exercise a choice. The undesirable must take whatcan get. The more revolting the occupation, the more certainis to receive the minimum of remuneration, because it devolvesthe most helpless and degraded, on those who from squalid, or from want of skill and education, are rejected fromother employments. Partly from this cause, and partly fromnatural and artificial monopolies which will be spoken of, the inequalities of wages are generally in an oppositeto the equitable principle of compensation erroneouslyby Adam Smith as the general law of the remunerationlabour. The hardships and the earnings, instead of beingproportional, as in any just arrangements of societywould be, are generally in an inverse ratio to one another.

One of the points best illustrated by Adam Smith, is theexercised on the remuneration of an employment by theof success in it. If the chances are great of total, the reward in case of success must be sufficient to make, in the general estimation, for those adverse chances. But,to another principle of human nature, if the reward comesthe shape of a few great prizes, it usually attractsin such numbers, that the average remuneration may benot only to zero, but even to a negative quantity. Theof lotteries proves that this is possible: since thebody of adventurers in lotteries necessarily lose,the undertakers could not gain. The case of certainis considered by Adam Smith to be similar. "Thethat any particular person shall ever be qualifiedthe employment to which he is educated, is very different inoccupations. In the greater part of mechanic trades,is almost certain, but very uncertain in the liberal. Put your son apprentice to a shoemaker, there isdoubt of his learning to make a pair of shoes; but sendto study the law, it is at least twenty to one if ever hesuch proficiency as will enable him to live by the. In a perfectly fair lottery, those who draw the priesto gain all that is lost by those who draw the blanks. In awhere twenty fail for one that succeeds, that oneto gain all that should have been gained by thetwenty. The counsellor-at-law, who, perhaps, at nearyears of age, begins to make something by his profession,to receive the retribution, not only of his own so tediousexpensive education, but of that of more than twenty othersare never likely to make anything by it. How extravagantthe fees of counsellors-at-law may sometimes appear, theirretribution is never equal to this. Compute in anyplace, what is likely to be annually gained, and whatlikely to be annually spent, by all the different workmen incommon trade, such as that of shoemakers or weavers, and youfind that the former sum will generally exceed the latter.make the same computation with regard to all the counsellorsstudents of law, in all the different inns of court, and youfind that their annual gains bear but a small proportion toannual expense, even though you rate the former as high,the latter as low, as can well be done."

Whether this is true in our own day, when the gains of theare incomparably greater than in the time of Adam Smith, butthe unsuccessful aspirants much more numerous, those whothe appropriate information must decide. It does not,, seem to be sufficiently considered by Adam Smith, thatprizes which he speaks of comprise not the

fees of counsel, but the places of emolument and honour to which theirgives access, together with the coveted distinction ofconspicuous position in the public eye.

Even where there are no great prizes, the mere love ofis sometimes enough to cause an adventurous employmentbe overstocked. This is apparent "in the readiness of thepeople to enlist as soldiers, or to go to sea..... Theand hair-breadth escapes of a life of adventures, insteaddisheartening young people, seem frequently to recommend ato them. A tender mother, among the inferior ranks of, is often afraid to send her son to school at a sea-port, lest the sight of the ships and the conversation andof the sailors should entice him to go to sea. Theprospect of hazards from which we can hope to extricateby courage and address, is not disagreeable to us, andnot raise the wages of labour in any employment. It iswith those in which courage and address can be of no. In trades which are known to be very unwholesome, theof labour are always remarkably high. Unwholesomeness is aof disagreeableness, and its effects upon the wages ofare to be ranked under that general head."

2. The preceding are cases in which inequality ofis necessary to produce equality of attractiveness,are examples of the equalizing effect of free competition.following are cases of real inequality, and arise from aprinciple. "The wages of labour vary according to theor great trust which must be reposed in the workmen. Theof goldsmiths and jewellers are everywhere superior toof many other workmen, not only of equal, but of muchingenuity; on account of the precious materials withthey are intrusted. We trust our health to the physician,fortune and sometimes our life and reputation to the lawyerattorney. Such confidence could not safely be reposed inof a very mean or low condition. Their reward must be, therefore, as may give them that rank in society which soa trust requires."

The superiority of reward is not here the consequence of, but of its absence: not a compensation forinherent in the employment, but an extra advantage;kind of monopoly price, the effect not of a legal, but of whatbeen termed a natural monopoly. If all labourers were, it would not be necessary to give extra pay togoldsmiths on account of the trust. The degree ofrequired being supposed to be uncommon, those who canit appear that they possess it are able to take advantage ofpeculiarity, and obtain higher pay in proportion to its. This opens a class of considerations which Adam Smith,most other political economists, have taken into far tooaccount, and from inattention to which, he has given aimperfect exposition of the wide difference between theof common labour and that of skilled employments.

Some employments require a much longer time to learn, and amore expensive course of instruction than others; and toextent there is, as explained by Adam Smith, an inherentfor their being more highly remunerated. If an artizanwork several years at learning his trade before he can earn, and several years more before becoming sufficientlyfor its finer operations, he must have a prospect of atearning enough to pay the wages of all this past labour,compensation for the delay of payment, and an indemnity forexpenses of his education. His wages, consequently, must, over and above the ordinary amount, an annuity sufficientrepay these sums, with the common rate of profit, within theof years he can expect to live and to be in working. This, which is necessary to place the skilled, all circumstances taken together, on the same leveladvantage with the

unskilled, is the smallest difference whichexist for any length of time between the two remunerations,otherwise no one would learn the skilled employments. Andamount of difference is all which Adam Smith's principlesfor. When the disparity is greater, he seems to thinkit must be explained by apprentice laws, and the rules ofwhich restrict admission into many of the skilled. But, independently of these or any other artificial, there is a natural monopoly in favour of skilledagainst the unskilled, which makes the difference ofexceed, sometimes in a manifold proportion, what ismerely to equalize their advantages. If unskilledhad it in their power to compete with skilled, bytaking the trouble of learning the trade, the differencewages might not exceed what would compensate them for that, at the ordinary rate at which labour is remunerated. Butfact that a course of instruction is required, of even a lowof costliness, or that the labourer must be maintained forconsiderable time from other sources, suffices everywhere tothe great body of the labouring people from theof any such competition. Until lately, allwhich required even the humble education reading and, could be recruited only from a select class, thehaving had no opportunity of acquiring those. All such employments, accordingly, were immensely, as measured by the ordinary remuneration of labour.reading and writing have been brought within the reach of a, the monopoly price of the lower grade of educatedhas greatly fallen, the competition for them havingin an almost incredible degree. There is still,, a much greater disparity than can be accounted for onprinciple of competition. A clerk from whom nothing isbut the mechanical labour of copying, gains more than anfor his mere exertion if he receives the wages of a's labourer. His work is not a tenth part as hard, itquite as easy to learn, and his condition is less precarious,clerk's place being generally a place for life. The higher ratehis remuneration, therefore, must be partly ascribed to, the small degree of education required being not evenso generally diffused as to call forth the natural number of; and partly to the remaining influence of an ancient, which requires that clerks should maintain the dress andof a more highly paid class. In some manual, requiring a nicety of hand which can only beby long practice, it is difficult to obtain at any costin sufficient numbers, who are capable of the mostkind of work; and the wages paid to them are onlyby the price which purchasers are willing to give for thethey produce. This is the case with some working, and with the makers of some astronomical and optical. If workmen competent to such employments were tenas numerous as they are, there would be purchasers for allthey could make, not indeed at the present prices, but atlower prices which would be the natural consequence ofwages. Similar considerations apply in a still greaterto employments which it is attempted to confine to personsa certain social rank, such as what are called the liberal; into which a person of what is considered too low aof society, is not easily admitted, and if admitted, doeseasily succeed.

So complete, indeed, has hitherto been the separation, somarked the line of demarcation, between the differentof labourers, as to be almost equivalent to an hereditaryof caste; each employment being chiefly recruitedthe children of those already employed in it, or inof the same rank with it in social estimation, orthe children of persons who, if originally of a lower rank,succeeded in raising themselves by their exertions. Theprofessions are mostly supplied by the sons of either the, or the idle classes: the more highly skilled manualare filled up from the sons of skilled artizans, orclass of tradesmen who rank with them: the lower classes ofemployments are in a similar case; and unskilled, with occasional exceptions, remain from father to sontheir pristine condition.

Consequently the wages of each classhitherto been regulated by the increase of its own, rather than of the general population of the country.the professions are overstocked, it is because the class offrom which they have always mainly been supplied, hasincreased in number, and because most of that class havefamilies, and bring up some at least of their sons to. If the wages of artizans remain so much higher thanof common labourers, it is because artizans are a moreclass, and do not marry so early or so inconsiderately.changes, however, now so rapidly taking place in usages and, are undermining all these distinctions; the habits orwhich chained people to their hereditary conditionfast wearing away, and every class is exposed to increasedincreasing competition from at least the class immediatelyit. The general relaxation of conventional barriers, andincreased facilities of education which already are, and willin a much greater degree, brought within the reach of all,to produce, among many excellent effects, one which is the; they tend to bring down the wages of skilled labour. Theof remuneration between the skilled and the unskilled, without doubt, very much greater than is justifiable; but itdesirable that this should be corrected by raising the, not by lowering the skilled. If, however, the othertaking place in society are not accompanied by aof the checks to population on the part ofgenerally, there will be a tendency to bring the lowerof skilled labourers under the influence of a rate ofregulated by a lower standard of living than their own,thus to deteriorate their condition without rising that ofgeneral mass; the stimulus given to the multiplication of theclass being sufficient to fill up without difficulty thespace gained by them from those immediately above.

3. A modifying circumstance still remains to be noticed,interferes to some extent with the operation of thethus far brought to view. While it is true, as arule, that the earnings of skilled labour, and especiallyany labour which requires school education, are at a monopoly, from the impossibility, to the mass of the people, ofthat education; it is also true that the policy of, or the bounty of individuals, formerly did much tothe effect of this limitation of competition, byeleemosynary instruction to a much larger class ofthan could have obtained the same advantages by payingprice. Adam Smith has pointed out the operation of thisin keeping down the remuneration of scholarly or bookishgenerally, and in particular of clergymen, literary, and schoolmasters, or other teachers of youth. I cannotset forth this part of the subject than in his words.

"It has been considered as of so much importance that anumber of young people should he educated for certain, that sometimes the public, and sometimes the pietyprivate founders, have established many pensions,, exhibitions, bursaries, &c. for this purpose, whichmany more people into those trades than could otherwiseto follow them. In all Christian countries, I believe,education of the greater part of churchmen is paid for inmanner. Very few of them are educated altogether at theirexpense. The long, tedious, and expensive education,, of those who are, will not always procure them areward, the church being crowded with people who, into get employment, are willing to accept of a much smallerthan what such an education would otherwise havethem to; and in this manner the competition of the pooraway the reward of the rich. It would be indecent, no, to compare either a curate or a chaplain with a journeymanany common trade. The pay of a curate or a chaplain, however,very properly be considered as of the same nature with theof a journeyman. They are, all three, paid for their workto the contract which they may

happen to make withrespective superiors. Till after the middle of thecentury, five marks, containing as much silver as tenof our present money, was in England the usual pay of aor a stipendiary parish priest, as we find it regulated bydecrees of several different national councils. At the samefourpence a day, containing the same quantity of silver asshilling of our present money, was declared to be the pay of amason, and threepence a day, equal to ninepence of ourmoney, that of a journeyman mason.(3*) The wages of bothlabourers, therefore, supposing them to have beenemployed, were much superior to those of the curate.wages of the master-mason, supposing him to have been withoutone-third of the year, would have fully equalled them.the 12th of Queen Anne, c. 12, it is declared, 'That whereaswant of sufficient maintenance and encouragement to curates,cures have in several places been meanly supplied, the bishoptherefore empowered to appoint by writing under his hand anda sufficient certain stipend or allowance, not exceeding, and not less than twenty pounds a year.' Forty pounds ais reckoned at present very good pay for a curate, andthis act of parliament, there are many curaciestwenty pounds a year. This last sum does not exceed what isearned by common labourers in many country parishes.the law has attempted to regulate the wages of workmen,has always been rather to lower them than to raise them. Butlaw has upon many occasions attempted to raise the wages of, and for the dignity of the Church, to oblige the rectorsparishes to give them more than the wretched maintenance whichthemselves might be willing to accept of. And in both caseslaw seems to have been equally ineffectual, and has nevereither able to raise the wages of curates or to sink thoselabourers to the degree that was intended, because it hasbeen able to hinder either the one from being willing toof less than the legal allowance, on account of theof their situation and the multitude of their; or the other from receiving more, on account of thecompetition of those who expected to derive either profitpleasure from employing them."

In professions in which there are no benefices, such as law(?) and physic, if an equal proportion of people were educated atpublic expense, the competition would soon be so great as tovery much their pecuniary reward. It might then not be worthman's while to educate his son to either of those professionshis own expense. They would be entirely abandoned to such asbeen educated by those public charities; whose numbers andwould oblige them in general to content themselvesa very miserable recompense.

"That unprosperous race of men, commonly called men of, are pretty much in the situation which lawyers andprobably would be in upon the foregoing supposition.every part of Europe, the greater part of them have beenfor the church, but have been hindered by differentfrom entering into holy orders. They have generally,, been educated at the public expense, and their numberseverywhere so great as to reduce the price of their labour tovery paltry recompense.

"Before the invention of the art of printing the onlyby which a man of letters could make anything of his, was that of a public or private teacher, or byto other people the curious and useful knowledgehe had acquired himself: and this is still surely a more, a more useful, and in general even a more profitablethan that other of writing for a bookseller, to whichart of printing has given occasion. The time and study, the, knowledge, and application requisite to qualify anteacher of the sciences, are at least equal to what isfor the greatest practitioners in law and physic. Butusual reward of the eminent

teacher bears no proportion toof the lawyer or physician; because the trade of the one iswith indigent people who have been brought up to it atpublic expense, where those of the other two are encumberedvery few who have not been educated at their own. The usual, however, of public and private teachers, small as itappear, would undoubtedly be less than it is, if theof those yet more indigent men of letters who writebread was not taken out of the market. Before the inventionthe art of printing, a scholar and a beggar seem to have beenvery nearly synonymous. The different governors of thebefore that time appear to have often grantedto their scholars to beg."

4. The demand for literary labour has so greatly increasedAdam Smith wrote, while the provisions for eleemosynaryhave nowhere been much added to, and in the countrieshave undergone revolutions have been much diminished, thateffect in keeping down the recompense of literary labournow be ascribed to the influence of those institutions. Buteffect nearly equivalent is now produced by a cause somewhat— the competition of persons who, by analog with other, may be called amateurs. Literary occupation is one of thosein which success may be attained by persons the greaterof whose time is taken up by other employments; and thenecessary for it, is the common education of allpersons. The inducements to it, independently of, in the present state of the world, to all who have eitherto gratify, or personal or public objects to promote, are. These motives now attract into this career a great andnumber of persons who do not need its pecuniary, and who would equally resort to it if it afforded noat all. In our own country (to cite known examples),most influential, and on the whole most eminent philosophicalof recent times (Bentham), the greatest political(Ricardo), the most ephemerally celebrated, and thegreatest poets (Byron and Shelley), and the mostwriter of prose (Scott), were none of them author by; and only two of the five, Scott and Byron, could havethemselves by the works which they wrote. Nearly allhigher departments of authorship are, to a great extent,filled. In consequence, although the highest pecuniaryof successful authorship are incomparably greater than atformer period, yet on any rational calculation of the, in the existing competition, scarcely any writer canto gain a living by books, and to do so by magazines andbecomes daily more difficult. It is only the moreand disagreeable kinds of literary labour, and thoseconfer no personal celebrity, such as most of thosewith newspapers, or with the smaller periodicals, onan educated person can now rely for subsistence. Of these,remuneration is, on the whole, decidedly high; because,exposed to the competition of what used to be called "poor" (persons who have received a learned education frompublic or private charity), they are exempt from that of, those who have other means of support being seldomfor such employments. Whether these considerations areconnected with something radically amiss in the idea ofas a profession, and whether any social arrangementwhich the teachers of mankind consist of persons giving outfor bread, is suited to be, or can possibly be, athing — would be a subject well worthy of theof thinkers.

The clerical, like the literary profession, is frequentlyby persons of independent means, either from religious, or for the sake of the honour or usefulness which mayto it, or for a chance of the high prizes which it holds: and it is now principally for this reason that the salariescurates are so low., those salaries, though considerablyby the influence of

public opinion, being still generallyas the sole means of support for one who has tothe externals expected from a clergyman of thechurch.

When an occupation is carried on chiefly by persons whothe main portion of their subsistence from other sources,remuneration may be lower almost to any extent, than theof equally severe labour in other employments. Theexample of the kind is domestic manufactures. Whenand knitting were carried on in every cottage, byderiving their principal support from agriculture, theat which their produce was sold (which constituted theof the labour) was often so low, that there wouldbeen required great perfection of machinery to undersell it.amount of the remuneration in such a case, depends chieflywhether the quantity of the commodity, produced by thisof labour, suffices to supply the whole of the. If it does not, and there is consequently a necessity forlabourers who devote themselves entirely to the employment,price of the article must be sufficient to pay thoseat the ordinary rate, and to reward therefore verythe domestic producers. But if the demand is sothat the domestic manufacture can do more than satisfy, the price is naturally kept down to the lowest rate at whichfamilies think it worth while to continue the production.is, no doubt, because the Swiss artizans do not depend for theof their subsistence upon their looms, that Zurich is ablemaintain a competition in the European market with English, and English fuel and machinery.(4*) Thus far, as to theof the subsidiary employment; but the effect to theof having this additional resource, is almost certainbe (unless peculiar counteracting causes intervene) adilution of the wages of their main occupation. Theof the people (as has already been so often remarked)require some particular scale of living, and no more,the condition without which they will not bring up a family.the income which maintains them in this condition comesone source or from two, makes no difference: if there is asource of income, they require less from the first; and(at least this has always hitherto been the case) to awhich leaves them no more from both employments, than theyprobably have had from either if it had been their sole.

For the same reason it is found that, caeteris paribus, thoseare generally the worst paid, in which the wife andof the artizan aid in the work. The income which theof the class demand, and down to which they are almostto multiply, is made up, in those trades, by the earnings ofwhole family, while in others the same income must beby the labour of the man alone. It is even probable thatcollective earnings will amount to a smaller sum than thosethe man alone in other trades; because the prudentialon marriage is unusually weak when the only consequencefelt is an improvement of circumstances, the jointof the two going further in their domestic economy afterthan before. Such accordingly is the fact, in the casehand-loom weavers. In most kinds of weaving, women can and doas much as men, and children are employed at a very early; but the aggregate earnings of a family are lower than inany other kind of industry, and the marriages earlier. Itnoticeable also that there are certain branches of hand-loomin which wages are much above the rate common in the, and that these are the branches in which neither women norpersons are employed. These facts were authenticated by theof the Hand-loom Weavers Commission, which made itsin 1841. No argument can be hence derived for theof women from the liberty of competing in the labour; since, even when no more is earned by the labour of a mana woman than would have been earned by the man alone, theto the woman of not depending on a master formay be more than an equivalent. It cannot, however,considered desirable as a permanent

element in the conditiona labouring class, that the mother of the family (the case ofsingle woman is totally different) should be under theof working for subsistence, at least elsewhere than inplace of abode. In the case of children, who aredependent, the influence of their competition inthe labour market is an important element in theof limiting their labour, in order to provide better foreducation.

5. It deserves consideration, why the wages of women arelower, and very much lower, than those of men. They areuniversally so. Where men and women work at the same, if it be one for which they are equally fitted inof physical power, they are not always unequally paid., in factories, sometimes earn as much as men; and so theyin hand-loom weaving, which, being paid by the piece, bringsefficiency to a sure test. When the efficiency is equal,the pay unequal, the only explanation that can be given is; grounded either in a prejudice, or in the presentof society, which, making almost every woman,speaking, an appendage of some man, enables men to takethe lion's share of whatever belongs to both. Butprincipal question relates to the peculiar employments of. The remuneration of these is always, I believe, greatlythat of employments of equal skill and equal, carried on by men. In some of these cases theis evidently that already given: as in the case ofservants, whose wages, speaking generally, are notby competition, but are greatly in excess of thevalue of the labour, and in this excess, as in almost allwhich are regulated by custom, the male sex obtains by farlargest share. In the occupations in which employers takeadvantage of competition, the low wages of women as comparedthe ordinary earnings of men, are a proof that theare overstocked; that although so much smaller aof women, than of men, support themselves by wages, thewhich law and usage make accessible to them areso few, that the field of their employment is stillovercrowded. It must be observed, that as matters now stand,sufficient degree of overcrowding may depress the wages ofto a much lower minimum than those of men. The wages, atof single women, must be equal to their support, but needbe more than equal to it; the minimum, in their case, is theabsolutely requisite for the sustenance of one human. Now the lowest point to which the most superabundantcan permanently depress the wages of a man, is alwaysmore than this. Where the wife of a labouring man doesby general custom contribute to his earnings, the man's wagesbe at least sufficient to support himself, a wife, and aof children adequate to keep up the population, since ifwere less the population would not be kept up. And even if theearns something, their joint wages must be sufficient tonot only themselves, but (at least for some years) theiralso. The ne plus ultra of low wages, therefore (exceptsome transitory crisis, or in some decaying employment),hardly occur in any occupation which the person employed haslive by, except the occupations of women.

6. Thus far, we have, throughout this discussion, proceededthe supposition that competition is free, so far as regardsinterference; being limited only by natural causes, or byeffect of general social circumstances. But law ormay interfere to limit competition. If apprentice laws, orregulations of corporate bodies, make the access to aemployment slow, costly, or difficult, the wages ofemployment may be kept much above their natural proportionthe wages of common labour. They might be so kept without anylimit, were it not that wages which exceed the usualrequire corresponding prices, and that there is a limit toprice at which even a restricted number of producers canof all they produce. In

most civilized countries, theof this kind which once existed have been eitheror very much relaxed, and will, no doubt, soonentirely. In some trades, however, and to some extent,combinations of workmen produce a similar effect. Thosealways fail to uphold wages at an artificial rate,they also limit the number of competitors. But they dosucceed in accomplishing this. In several trades thehave been able to make it almost impracticable forto obtain admission either as journeymen or as, except in limited numbers, and under suchas they choose to impose. It was given in evidencethe Hand-loom Weavers Commission, that this is one of thewhich aggravate the grievous condition of thatclass. Their own employment is overstocked and almost; but there are many other trades which it would not befor them to learn: to this, however, the combinationsworkmen in those other trades are said to interpose anhitherto insurmountable.

Notwithstanding, however, the cruel manner in which theprinciple of these combinations operates in a case ofpeculiar nature, the question, whether they are on the wholeuseful or mischievous, requires to be decided on an enlargedof consequences, among which such a fact as this isone of the most important items. Putting aside the atrocitiescommitted by workmen in the way of personal outrage or, which cannot be too rigidly repressed; if thestate of the general habits of the people were to remainever unimproved, these partial combinations, in so far asdo succeed in keeping up the wages of any trade by limitingnumbers, might be looked upon as simply intrenching around aspot against the inroads of over-population, andthe wages of the class depend upon their own rate of, instead of depending on that of a more reckless andclass than themselves. What at first sight seems theof excluding the more numerous body from sharing theof a comparatively few, disappears when we consider that byadmitted they would not be made better off, for more than atime; the only permanent effect which their admission would, would be to lower the others to their own level. To whatthe force of this consideration is annulled when acommences towards diminished over-crowding in theclasses generally, and what grounds of a differentthere may be for regarding the existence of tradeas rather to be desired than deprecated, will bein a subsequent chapter of this work, with the subjectCombination Laws.

7. To conclude this subject, I must repeat an observationmade, that there are kinds of labour of which the wagesfixed by custom, and not by competition. Such are the fees orof professional persons: of physicians, surgeons,, and even attorneys. These, as a general rule, do not, and though competition operates upon those classes as muchupon any others, it is by dividing the business, not, in, by diminishing the rate at which it is paid. The causethis, perhaps, has been the prevalence of an opinion that suchare more trustworthy if paid highly in proportion to thethey perform; insomuch that if a lawyer or a physicianhis services at less than the ordinary rate, instead ofmore practice, he would probably lose that which hehad. For analogous reasons it is usual to pay greatlythe market price of their labour, all persons in whom thewishes to place peculiar trust, or from whom he requiresbesides their mere services. For example, most personscan afford it, pay to their domestic servants higher wageswould purchase in the market the labour of persons fully asto the work required. They do this, not merely from, but also from more reasonable motives; eitherthey desire that those they employ should serve them, and be anxious to remain in their service; or becausedo not like to drive a hard bargain with people whom

theyin constant intercourse with; or because they dislike to havetheir persons, and continuity in their sight, people withappearance and habits which are the usual accompaniments of aremuneration. Similar feelings operate in the minds ofin business, with respect to their clerks, and other. Liberality, generosity, and the credit of the employer,motives which, to whatever extent they operate, precludethe utmost advantage of competition: and doubtless suchmight, and even now do, operate on employers of labour inthe great departments of industry; and most desirable is itthey should. But they can never raise the average wages ofbeyond the ratio of population to capital. By giving moreeach person employed, they limit the power of givingto numbers; and however excellent their moral effect,do little good economically, unless the pauperism of thoseare shut out, leads indirectly to a readjustment by means ofincreased restraint on population.:. Wealth of Nations, book i, ch. 10.. Mr Muggerridge's Report to the Handloom Weavers Inquiry.. See the Statute of Labourers, 25 Edw. III.. Four-fifths of the manufacturers of the Canton of Zurich arefarmers, generally proprietors of their farms. The cottonoccupies either wholly or partially 23,000 people,a tenth part of the population; and they consume a greaterof cotton per inhabitant than either France or England. See the Statistical Account of Zurich formerly cited, pp. 105, 108, 110.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2,

Chapter 15

Profits

1. Having treated of the labourer's share of the produce, weproceed to the share of the capitalist; the profits ofor stock; the gains of the person who advances theof production — who, from funds in his possession, payswages of the labourers, or supports them during the work; whothe requisite building, materials, and tools or. and to whom, by the usual terms of the contract, thebelongs, to be disposed of at his pleasure. Afterhim for his outlay, there commonly remains a, is his profit; the net income from his capital: thewhich he can afford to spend in necessaries or pleasures,from which by further saving he can add to his wealth.

As the wages of the labourer are the remuneration of labour,the profits of the capitalist are properly, according to Mr.'s well-chosen expression, the remuneration of abstinence.are what he gains by forbearing to consume his capital forown uses, and allowing it to be consumed by productivefor their uses. For this forbearance he requires a. Very often in personal enjoyment he would be a gainersquandering his capital, the capital amounting to more thansum of the profits which it will yield during the years heexpect to live. But while he retains it undiminished, he hasthe power of consuming it if he wishes or needs; he canit upon others at his death; and in the meantime hefrom it an income, which he can without impoverishmentto the satisfaction of his own wants or inclinations.

Of the gains, however, which the possession of a capitala person to make, a part only is properly an equivalentthe use of the capital itself; namely, as much as a solventwould be willing to pay for the loan of it. This, which asknows is called interest, is all that a person isto get by merely abstaining from the immediateof his capital, and allowing it to be used forpurposes by others. The remuneration which is obtainedany country for mere abstinence, is measured by the currentof interest on the best security; such security as precludesappreciable chance of losing the principal. What a personto gain, who superintends the employment of his own, is always more, and generally much more, than this. Theof profit greatly exceeds the rate of interest. The surpluspartly compensation for risk. By lending his capital, onsecurity, he runs little or no risk. But if hein business on his own account, he always exposes histo some, and in many cases to very great, danger ofor total loss. For this danger he must be compensated,he will not incur it. He must likewise be remuneratedthe devotion of his time and labour. The control of theof industry usually belongs to the person who supplieswhole or the greatest part of the funds by which they areon, and who, according to the ordinary arrangement, isalone interested, or is the person most interested (atdirectly), in the result. To exercise this control with, if the concern is large and complicated, requiresassiduity, and often, no ordinary skill. This assiduity andmust he remunerated.

The gross profits from capital, the gains returned to thosesupply the funds for production, must suffice for these three. They must afford a sufficient equivalent for, indemnity for risk, and remuneration for the labourskill required for superintendence.

These differentmay be either paid to the same, or to different. The capital, or some part of it, may be borrowed: mayto some one who does not undertake the risks or theof business. In that case, the lender, or owner, is thewho practises the abstinence; and is remunerated for it byinterest paid to him, while the difference between theand the gross profits remunerates the exertions andof the undertaker.(1*) Sometimes, again, the capital, or aof it, is supplied by what is called a sleeping partner; whothe risks of the employment, but not the trouble, and who,consideration of those risks, receives not a mere interest,a stipulated share of the gross profits. Sometimes theis supplied and the risk incurred by one person, and thecarried on exclusively in his name, while the trouble ofis made over to another, who is engaged for thatat a fixed salary. Management, however, by hired, who have no interest in the result but that oftheir salaries, is proverbially inefficient, unlessact under the inspecting eye, if not the controlling hand,the person chiefly interested: and prudence almost alwaysgiving to a manager not thus controlled, apartly dependent on the profits; which virtuallythe case to that of a sleeping partner. Or finally, theperson may own the capital, and conduct the business;, if he will and can, to the management of his own capital,of as much more as the owners may be willing to trust him. But under any or all of these arrangements, the same threerequire their remuneration, and must obtain it from theprofit: abstinence, risk, exertion. And the three partswhich profit may be considered as resolving itself, may berespectively as interest, insurance, and wages of.

2. The lowest rate of profit which can permanently exist, iswhich is barely adequate, at the given place and time, toan equivalent for the abstinence, risk, and exertionin the employment of capital. From the gross profit, hasto be deducted as much as will form a fund sufficient onaverage to cover all losses incident to the employment. Next,must afford such an equivalent to the owner of the capital forto consume it, as is then and there a sufficientto him to persist in his abstinence. How much will beto form this equivalent, depends on the comparativeplaced, in the given society, upon the present and the: (in the words formerly used) on the strength of thedesire of accumulation. Further, after covering all, and remunerating the owner for forbearing to consume,must be something left to recompense the labour and skillthe person who devotes his time to the business. Thistoo must be sufficient to enable at least the ownersthe larger capitals to receive for their trouble, or to pay tomanager for his, what to them or him will be a sufficientfor undergoing it. If the surplus is no more than, none but large masses of capital will be employed; and if it did not even amount to this, capitalbe withdrawn from production, and unproductively consumed,, by an indirect consequence of its diminished amount, to behereafter, the rate of profit was raised.

Such, then, is the minimum of profits: but that minimum isvariable, and at some times and places extremely low;account of the great variableness of two out of its three. That the rate of necessary remuneration for abstinence,in other words the effective desire of accumulation, differsin different states of society and civilization, has beenin a former chapter. There is a still wider difference inelement which consists in compensation for risk. I am not nowof the differences in point of risk between differentof capital in the same society, but of the verydegrees of security of property in different states of. Where, as in many of the governments of Asia, propertyin perpetual danger of spoliation from a tyrannical, or from its rapacious and ill-controlled officers;to possess or to be suspected of

possessing wealth, is toa mark not only for plunder, but perhaps for personaltreatment to extort the disclosure and surrender of hidden; or where, as in the European Middle Ages, the weaknessthe government, even when not itself inclined to oppress,its subjects exposed without protection or redress tospoilation, or audacious withholding of just rights, bypower individual; the rate of profit which persons of averagewill require, to make them forego the immediateof what they happen to possess, for the purpose ofit and themselves to these perils, must be somethingconsiderable. And these contingencies affect those who livethe mere interest of their capital, in common with those whoengage in production. In a generally secure state of, the risks which may be attendant on the nature ofemployments seldom fall on the person who lends his, if he lends on good security; but in a state of societythat of many parts of Asia, no security (except perhaps thepledge of gold or jewels) is good: and the mere possessiona hoard, when known or suspected, exposes it and the possessorrisks, for which scarcely any profit he could expect to obtainbe an equivalent; so that there would be still lessthan there is, if a state of insecurity did not alsothe occasions on which the possession of a treasure maythe means of saving life or averting serious calamities. Thoselend, under these wretched governments, do it at the utmostof never being paid. In most of the native states of India,lowest terms on which any one will lend money, even to the, are such, that if the interest is paid only for a few, and the principal not at all, the lender is tolerably well. If the accumulation of principal and compoundis ultimately compromised at a few shil1ings in the, he has generally made an advantageous bargain.

3. The remuneration of capital in different employments, muchthan the remuneration of labour, varies according to thewhich render one employment more attractive, orrepulsive, than another. The profits, for example, of retail, in proportion to the capital employed, exceed those ofdealers or manufacturers, for this reason among others,there is less consideration attached to the employment. The, however, of these differences, is that caused byof risk. The profits of a gunpowder manufacturer mustconsiderably greater than the average, to make up for therisks to which he and his property are constantly. When, however, as in the case of marine adventure, therisks are capable of being, and commonly are, commuteda fixed payment, the premium of insurance takes its regularamong the charges of production, and the compensation whichowner of the ship or cargo receives for that payment, doesappear in the estimate of his profits, but is included in theof his capital.

The portion, too, of the gross profit, which forms thefor the labour and skill of the dealer or producer,very different in different employments. This is thealways given of the extraordinary rate of' profit; the greatest part, as Adam Smith observes,frequently no more than the reasonable wages ofattendance; for which, until a late alteration oflaw, the apothecary could not demand any remuneration, exceptthe prices of his drugs. Some occupations require aamount of scientific or technical education, and canbe carried on by persons who combine with that education acapital. Such is the business of an engineer, boththe original sense of the term, a machine-maker, and in itsor derivative sense, an undertaker of public works. Thesealways the most profitable employments. There are cases,, in which a considerable amount of labour and skill isto conduct a business necessity of limited extent. Incases, a higher than common rate of profit is necessary toonly the

common rate of remuneration. "In a smalltown," says Adam Smith, "a little grocer will make for orper cent upon a stock of a single hundred pounds, while awholesale merchant in the same place will scarceeight or ten per cent upon a stock of ten thousand. Theof the grocer may be necessary for the conveniency of the, and the narrowness of the market may not admit theof a larger capital in the business. The man, however,not only live by his trade, but live by it suitably to thewhich it requires. Besides possessing a little, he must be able to read, write, and account, and must betolerable judge, too, of perhaps fifty or sixty different sortsgoods, their prices, qualities, and the markets where they arebe had cheapest. Thirty or forty pounds a year cannot beas too great a recompense for the labour of a personaccomplished. Deduct this from the seemingly great profits ofcapital, and little more will remain, perhaps, than theprofits of stock. The greater part of the apparentis, in this case, too, real wages."

All the natural monopolies (meaning thereby those which areby circumstances, and not by law) which produce orthe disparities in the remuneration of different kindslabour, operate similarly between different employments of. If a business can only be advantageously carried on by acapital, this in most countries limits so narrowly theof persons who can enter into the employment, that they areto keep their rate of profit above the general level. Amay also, from the nature of the case, be confined to sothat profits may admit of being kept up by a combinationthe dealers. It is well known that even among so numerous aas the London booksellers, this sort of combination longto exist. I have already mentioned the case of the gaswater companies.

4. After due allowance is made for these various causes of, namely, differences in the risk or agreeableness ofemployments, and natural or artificial monopolies; theof profit on capital in all employments tends to an. Such is the proposition usually laid down by political, and under proper explanations it is true.

That portion of profit which is properly interest, and whichthe real remuneration for abstinence, is strictly the same,the same time and place, whatever be the employment. The rateinterest on equally good security, does not vary according todestination of the principal, though it does vary from timetime very much, according to the circumstances of the market.is no employment in which, in the present state of, competition is so active and incessant as in theand borrowing of money. All persons in business are, and most of them constantly, borrowers: while allnot in business, who possess monied property are lender.these two great bodies there is a numerous, keen, andclass of middlemen, composed of bankers,, discount brokers, and others, alive to thebreath of probable gain. The smallest circumstance, ormost transient impression on the public mind, which tends toincrease or diminution of the demand for loans either at theor prospectively, operates immediately on the rate of: and circumstances in the general state of trade, reallyto cause this difference of demand, are continually, sometimes to such an extent, that the rate of interestthe hest mercantile bills has been known to vary in littlethan a year (even without the occurrence of the greatcalled a commercial crisis) from four, or less, toor nine per cent. But, at the same time and place, the rateinterest is the same, to all who can give equally good. The market rate of interest is at all times a known andthing.

It is far otherwise with gross profit; which, though (as willbe seen) it does not vary much from employment to, varies very greatly from individual to individual,can

scarcely be in any two cases the same. It depends on the, talents, economy, and energy of the capitalist, or of the agents whom he employs; on the accidents ofconnexion; and even on chance. Hardly any two dealers insame trade, even if their commodities are equally good andcheap, carry on their business at the same expense, orover their capital in the same time. That equal capitalsequal profits, as a general maxim of trade, would be asas that equal age or size gives equal bodily strength, orequal reading or experience gives equal knowledge. Thedepends as much upon twenty other things, as upon thecause specified.

But though profits thus vary, the parity on the whole, ofmodes of employing capital (in the absence of anyor artificial monopoly) is, in a certain, and a verysense, maintained. On an average (whatever may be thefluctuation) the various employments of capital are ona footing as to hold out not equal profits, but equalof profit, to persons of average abilities and. By equal, I mean after making compensation for anyin the agreeableness or safety of an employment. Ifcase were not so; if there were, evidently, and to common, more favourable chances of pecuniary success in onethan in others, more persons would engage their capitalthe business, or would bring up their sons to it; which inalways happens when a business, like that of an engineer at, or like any newly established and prosperous, is seen to be a growing and thriving one. If, on the, a business is not considered thriving; if the chancesprofit in it are thought to be inferior to those in other; capital gradually leaves it, or at least new capitalnot attracted to it; and by this change in the distribution ofbetween the less profitable and the more profitable, a sort of balance is restored. The expectation of, therefore, in different employments, cannot long continuedifferent: they tend to a common average, though they areoscillating from one side to the other side of the.

This equalizing process, commonly described as the transfercapital from one employment to another, is not necessarily the, slow, and almost impracticable operation which it isoften represented to be. In the first place, it does notimply the actual removal of capital already embarked in an. In a rapidly progressive state of capital, theoften takes place by means of the new accumulations ofyear, which direct themselves in preference towards the moretrades. Even when a real transfer of capital is, it is by no means implied that any of those who arein the unprofitable employment, relinquish business andup their establishments. The numerous and multifariousof credit. through which, in commercial nations,capital diffuses itself over the field of employment,over in greater abundance to the lower levels, are theby which the equalization is accomplished. The processin a limitation by one class of dealers or producers,an extension by the other, of that portion of their businessis caRed on with borrowed capital. There is scarcely anyor producer on a considerable scale, who confines histo what can be carried on by his own funds. When tradegood, he not only uses to the utmost his own capital, but, in addition, much of the credit which that capitalfor him. When, either from over-supply or from somein the demand for his commodity, he finds that itmore slowly or obtains a lower price, he contracts his, and does not apply to bankers or other money dealersa renewal of their advances to the same extent as before. Awhich is increasing holds out, on the contrary, aof profitable employment for a larger amount of thiscapital than previously, and those engaged in it becometo the money dealers for larger advances, which, fromimproving

circumstances, they have no difficulty in. A different distribution of floating capital betweenemployments has as much effect in restoring their profits toequilibrium, as if the owners of an equal amount of capitalto abandon the one trade and carry their capital into the. This easy, and as it were spontaneous, method ofproduction to demand, is quite sufficient toany inequalities arising from the fluctuations of trade,other causes of ordinary occurrence. In the case of andeclining trade, in which it is necessary that theshould be, not occasionally varied, but greatly anddiminished, or perhaps stopped altogether, theof extricating the capital is, no doubt, tardy and, and almost always attended with considerable loss;of the capital fixed in machinery, buildings, permanent, &c. being either not applicable to any other purpose, orapplicable after expensive alterations; and time beinggiven for effecting the change in the mode in which itbe effected with least loss, namely, by not replacing thecapital as it wears out. There is besides, in totallythe destination of a capital, so great a sacrifice ofconnexion, and of acquired skill and experience, thatare always very slow in resolving upon it, and hardly everso until long after a change of fortune has become hopeless., however, are distinctly exceptional cases, and even inthe equalization is at last effected. It may also happenthe return to equilibrium is considerably protracted, when,one inequality has been corrected, another cause ofarises; which is said to have been continually theduring a long series of years, with the production of cottonthe Southern States of North America; the commodity havingupheld at what was virtually a monopoly price, because theof demand, from successive improvements in the, went on with a rapidity so much beyond expectationfor many years the supply never completely overtook it. Butis not often that a succession of disturbing causes, allin the same direction, are known to follow one anotherhardly any interval. Where there is no monopoly, the profitsa trade are likely to range sometimes above and sometimesthe general level, but tending always to return to it; likeoscillations of the pendulum.

In general, then, although profits are very different toindividuals, and to the same individual in different, there cannot be much diversity at the same time and placethe average profits of different employments, (other than thedifferences necessary to compensate for difference of,) except for short periods, or when some greatrevulsion has overtaken a particular trade. If anyimpression exists that some trades are more profitableothers, independently of monopoly, or of such rare accidentshave been noticed in regard to the cotton trade, theis in all probability fallacious, since if it wereby those who have greatest means of knowledge and motivesaccurate examination, there would take place such an influx ofas would soon lower the profits to the common level. Ittrue that, to persons with the same amount of original means,is more chance of making a large fortune in somethan in others. But it would be found that in thoseemployments, bankruptcies also are more frequent, and thatchance of greater success is balanced by a greaterof complete failure. Very often it is more than: for, as was remarked in another case, the chance ofprizes operates with a greater degree of strength thanwill warrant, in attracting competitors; and I doubtthat the average gains, in a trade in which large fortunesbe made, are lower than in those in which gains are slow,comparatively sure, and in which nothing is to behoped for beyond a competency. The timber trade ofis one example of an employment of capital partaking soof the nature of a lottery, as to make it an accreditedthat, taking the adventurers in the aggregate, there ismoney lost by the trade than gained by it; in other words,the average rate of profit is less than nothing. In suchas

this, much depends on the characters of nations,as they partake more or less of the adventurous, or, asis called when the intention is to blame it, the gambling. This spirit is much stronger in the United States than inBritain; and in Great Britain than in any country of the. In some Continental countries the tendency is so muchreverse, that safe and quiet employments probably yield aaverage profit to the capital engaged in them, than thoseoffer greater gains at the price of greater hazards.

It must not however be forgotten, that even in the countriesmost active competition, custom also has a considerable sharedetermining the profits of trade. There is sometimes an ideaas to what the profit of an employment should be, whichnot adhered to by all the dealers, nor perhaps rigidly by, still exercises a certain influence over their operations.has been in England a kind of notion, how widely prevailingknow not, that fifty per cent is a proper and suitable rate ofin retail transactions: understand, not fifty per cent onwhole capital, but an advance of fifty per cent on theprices; from which have to be defrayed bad debts, shop, the pay of clerks, shopmen, and agents of all descriptions,short all the expenses of the retail business. If this customuniversal, and strictly adhered to, competition indeed wouldoperate, but the consumer would not derive any benefit from, at least as to price; the way in which it would diminish theof those engaged in the retail trade, would be by asubdivision of the business. In some parts of thethe standard is as high as a hundred per cent. Theof competition however, in England at least, is rapidlyto break down customs of this description. In theof trades (at least in the great emporia of trade),are now numerous dealers whose motto is, "small gains and" — a great business at low prices, rather than highand few transactions; and by turning over their capitalrapidly, and adding to it by borrowed capital when needed,dealers often obtain individually higher profits; though theylower the profits of those among their competitors,do not adopt the same principle. Nevertheless, competition,remarked(2*) in a previous chapter, has, as yet, but a limitedover retail prices; and consequently the share of theproduce of land and labour which is absorbed in theof mere distributors, continues exorbitant; andis no function in the economy of society which supports aof persons so disproportioned to the amount of work to be.

5. The preceding remarks have, I hope, sufficientlywhat is meant by the common phrase, "the ordinary rateprofit;" and the sense in which, and the limitations under, this ordinary rate has a real existence. It now remains to, what causes determine its amount.

To popular apprehension it seems as if the profits ofdepended upon prices. A producer or dealer seems tohis profits by selling his commodity for more than it cost. Profit altogether, people are apt to think, is a consequencepurchase and sale. It is only (they suppose) because there arefor a commodity, that the producer of it is able toany profit. Demand — customers — a market for the, are the cause of the gains of capitalists. It is bysale of their goods, that they replace their capital, and addits amount.

This, however, is looking only at the outside surface of themachinery of society. In no case, we find, is the merewhich passes from one person to another, the fundamentalin any economical phenomenon. If we look more narrowlythe operations of the producer, we shall perceive that thehe obtains for his commodity is not the cause of his havingprofit, but only the mode in which his profit is paid to him.

The cause of profit is, that labour produces more than isfor its support. The reason why agricultural capitala profit, is because human beings can grow more food, thannecessary to feed them while it is being grown, including theoccupied in constructing the tools, and making all otherpreparations: from which it is a consequence, that if aundertakes to feed the labourers on condition ofthe produce, he has some of it remaining for himselfreplacing his advances. To vary the form of the theorem:reason why capital yields a profit, is because food,, materials, and tools, last longer than the time whichrequired to produce them; so that if a capitalist supplies aof labourers with these things, on condition of receivingthey produce, they will, in addition to reproducing their ownand instruments, have a portion of their time, to work for the capitalist. We thus see that profit, not from the incident of exchange, but from thepower of labour; and the general profit of the countryalways what the productive power of labour makes it, whetherexchange takes place or not. If there were no division of, there would be no buying or selling, but there wouldbe profit. If the labourers of the country collectivelytwenty per cent more than their wages, profits will beper cent, whatever prices may or may not be. The accidentsprice may for a time make one set of producers get more thantwenty per cent, and another less, the one commodity beingabove its natural value in relation to other commodities,the other below, until prices have again adjusted themselves;there will always be just twenty per cent divided among them.

I proceed, in expansion of the considerations thus briefly, to exhibit more minutely the mode in which the rate ofis determined.

6. I assume, throughout, the state of things, which, wherelabourers and capitalists are separate classes, prevails,few exceptions, universally; namely, that the capitalistthe whole expenses, including the entire remuneration oflabourer. That he should do so, is not a matter of inherent; the labourer might wait until the production is, for all that part of his wages which exceeds mere; and even for the whole, if he has funds in hand,for his temporary support. But in the latter case, theis to that extent really a capitalist, investing capitalthe concern, by supplying a portion of the funds necessary forit on; and even in the former case he may be looked uponthe same light, since, contributing his labour at less thanmarket price, he may be regarded as lending the difference toemployer, and receiving it back with interest (on whatevercomputed) from the proceeds of the enterprise.

The capitalist, then, may be assumed to make all the, and receive all the produce. His profit consists of theof the produce above the advances; his rate of profit isratio which that excess bears to the amount advanced. Butdo the advances consist of?

It is, for the present, necessary to suppose, that thedoes not pay any rent; has not to purchase the use ofappropriated natural agent. This indeed is scarcely ever thetruth. The agricultural capitalist, except when he is theof the soil he cultivates, always, or almost always, pays: and even in manufactures, (not to mention ground-rent,) theof the manufacture have generally paid rent, in someof their production. The nature of rent, however, we haveyet taken into consideration; and it will hereafter appear,no practical error, on the question we are now examining, isby disregarding it.

If, then, leaving rent out of the question, we inquire init is that the advances of the capitalist, for purposes of, consist, we shall find that they consist of wages of.

A large portion of the expenditure of every capitalistin the direct payment of wages. What does not consist of, is composed of materials and implements, including. But materials and implements are produced by labour;as our supposed capitalist is not meant to represent a single, but to be a type of the productive industry of thecountry, we may suppose that he makes his own tools, andhis own materials. He does this by means of previous, which, again, consist wholly of wages. If we supposeto buy the materials and tools instead of producing them, theis not altered: he then repays to a previous producer thewhich that previous producer has paid. It is true, heit to him with a profit; and if he had produced the things, he himself must have had that profit, on this part ofoutlay, as well as on every other part. The fact, however,, that in the whole process of production, beginning withmaterials and tools, and ending with the finished product,the advances have consisted of nothing but wages; except thatof the capitalists concerned have, for the sake ofconvenience, had their share of profit paid to themthe operation was completed. Whatever, of the ultimate, is not profit, is repayment of wages.

7. It thus appears that the two elements on which, and which, the gains of the capitalists depend, are, first, theof the produce, in other words, the productive power of; and secondly, the proportion of that produce obtained bylabourers themselves; the ratio, which the remuneration oflabourers bears to the amount they produce. These two thingsthe data for determining the gross amount divided as profitall the capitalists of the country; but the rate of profit,percentage on the capital, depends only on the second of theelements, the 1abourer's proportional share, and not on theto be shared. If the produce of labour were doubled, andlabourers obtained the same proportional share as before,is, if their remuneration was also doubled, the capitalists,is true, would gain twice as much; but as they would also haveto advance twice as much, the rate of their profit would bethe same as before.

We thus arrive at the conclusion of Ricardo and others, thatrate of profits depends on wages; rising as wages fall, andas wages rise. In adopting, however, this doctrine, Iinsist upon making a most necessary alteration in its. Instead of saying that profits depend on wages, let us(what Ricardo really meant) that they depend on the cost of.

Wages, and the cost of labour; what labour brings in to the, and what it costs to the capitalist; are ideas quite, and which it is of the utmost importance to keep so.this purpose it is essential not to designate them, as isalways done, by the same name. Wages, in public, both oral and printed, being looked upon from theof view of the payers, much oftener than from that of the, nothing is more common than to say that wages are highlow, meaning only that the cost of labour is high or low. Theof this would be oftener the truth: the cost of labour isat its highest where wages are lowest. This may arisetwo causes. In the first place, the labour, though cheap,be inefficient. In no European country are wages so low asare (or at least were) in Ireland: the remuneration of anlabourer in the west of Ireland not being more thanthe wages of even the lowest-paid Englishman, thelabourer. But if, from inferior skill and industry,days' labour of an Irishman accomplished no more work than anlabourer performed in one, the Irishman's labour cost asas the Englishman's, though it brought in so much less to. The capitalist's profit is determined by the former oftwo things, not the latter. That a difference to thisreally existed in the efficiency of the

labour, is provedonly by abundant testimony, but by the fact, thatthe lowness of wages, profits of capital are notto have been higher in Ireland than in England.

The other cause which renders wages, and the cost of labour,real criteria of one another, is the varying costliness of thewhich the labourer consumes. If these are cheap, wages,the sense which is of importance to the labourer, may be high,yet the cost of labour may be low; if dear, the labourer maywretchedly off, though his labour may cost much to the. This last is the condition of a country over-peopledrelation to its land; in which, food being dear, the poornessthe labourer's real reward does not prevent labour frommuch to the purchaser, and low wages and low profitsexist. The opposite case is exemplified in the United StatesAmerica. The labourer there enjoys a greater abundance ofthan in any other country of the world, except some ofnewest colonies; but owing to the cheap price at which thesecan be obtained (combined with the great efficiency oflabour), the cost of labour to the capitalist is at least not, nor the rate of profit lower, than in Europe.

The cost of labour, then, is, in the language of mathematics,function of three variables: the efficiency of labour; theof labour (meaning thereby the real reward of the); and the greater or less cost at which the articlesthat real reward can be produced or procured. It isthat the cost of labour to the capitalist must beby each of these three circumstances, and by no. These, therefore, are also the circumstances whichthe rate of profit; and it cannot be in any wayexcept through one or other of them. If labour generallymore efficient, without being more highly rewarded; if,its becoming less efficient, its remuneration fell, notaking place in the cost of the articles composing that; or if those articles became less costly, withoutlabourer's obtaining more of them; in any one of these three, profits would rise. If, on the contrary, labour becameefficient (as it might do from diminished bodily vigour inpeople, destruction of fixed capital, or deteriorated); or if the labourer obtained a higher remuneration,any increased cheapness in the things composing it; or, without his obtaining more, that which he did obtain becamecostly; profits, in all these cases, would suffer a. And there is no other combination of circumstances,which the general rate of profit of a country, in allindifferently, can either fall or rise.

The evidence of these propositions can only be stated, though, it is hoped, conclusively, in this stage ofsubject. It will come out in greater fulness and force when,taken into consideration the theory of Value and Price, webe enabled to exhibit the law of profits in the concrete —the complex entanglement of circumstances in which it actually. This can only be done in the ensuing Book. One topic stillto be discussed in the present one, so far as it admitsbeing treated independently of considerations of Value; theof Rent; to which we now proceed.:. It is tobe regretted that this word, in this sense, is notto an English ear. French political economists enjoy aadvantage in being able to speak currently of les profitsl'entrpreneur.. Vide supra, book ii. ch. iv. sect. 3.

The Principles of Political Economy

John Stuart Mill2,

Chapter 16

Rent

1. The requisites of production being labour, capital, andagents; the only person, besides the labourer and the, whose consent is necessary to production, and who cana share of the produce as the price of that consent, is thewho, by the arrangements of society, possesses exclusiveover some natural agent. The land is the principal of theagents which are capable of being appropriated, and thepaid for its use is called rent. Landed proprietorsthe only class, of any number or importance, who have a claima share in the distribution of the produce, through theirof something which neither they nor any one else have. If there be any other cases of a similar nature, theybe easily understood, when the nature and laws of rent are.

It is at once evident, that rent is the effect of a monopoly;the monopoly is a natural one, which may be regulated,may even be held as a trust for the community generally,which cannot be prevented from existing. The reason whyare able to require rent for their land, is that it iscommodity which many want, and which no one can obtain but from. If all the land of the country belonged to one person, hefix the rent at his pleasure. The whole people would beon his will for the necessaries of life, and he mightwhat conditions he chose. This is the actual state of thingsthose Oriental kingdoms in which the land is considered theof the state. Rent is then confounded with taxation, anddespot may exact the utmost which the unfortunate cultivatorsto give. Indeed, the exclusive possessor of the land of acould not well be other than despot of it. The effectbe much the same if the land belonged to so few people,they could, and did, act together as one man, and fix theby agreement among themselves. This case, however, isknown to exist: and the only remaining supposition isof free competition; the landowners being supposed to be, asfact they are, too numerous to combine.

2. A thing which is limited in quantity, even though itsdo not act in concert, is still a monopolized article.even when monopolized, a thing which is the gift of nature,requires no labour or outlay as the condition of its, will, if there be competition among the holders of it,a price, only if it exists in less quantity than the. If the whole land of a country were required for, all of it might yield a rent. But in no country ofextent do the wants of the population require that all the, which is capable of cultivation, should be cultivated. Theand other agricultural produce which the people need, andthey are willing and able to pay for at a price whichthe grower, may always be obtained withoutall the land; sometimes without cultivating more thansmall part of it; the lands most easily cultivated beingin a very early stage of society; the most fertile, orin the most convenient situations, in a more advanced. There is always, therefore, some land which cannot, incircumstances, pay any rent; and no land ever pays rent,, in point of fertility or situation, it belongs to thosekinds which exist in less quantity than the demand-whichbe made to yield all the produce required for the, unless on terms still less advantageous than theto less favoured soils.

There is land, such as the deserts of Arabia, which willnothing to any amount of labour; and there is land, likeof our hard sandy heaths, which would produce something,, in the present state of the soil, not enough to defray theof production. Such lands, unless by some application ofto agriculture still remaining to be invented, cannotcultivated for profit, unless some one actually creates a, by spreading new ingredients over the surface, or mixingwith the existing materials. If ingredients fitted for thisexist in the subsoil, or close at hand, the improvementof the most unpromising spots may answer as a speculation:if those ingredients are costly, and must be brought from a, it will seldom answer to do this for the sake of, though the "magic of property" will sometimes effect it.which cannot possibly yield a profit, is sometimesat a loss, the cultivators having their wantssupplied from other sources; as in the case of paupers,some monasteries or charitable institutions, among which mayreckoned the Poor Colonies of Belgium. The worst land whichbe cultivated as a means of subsistence, is that which willreplace the seed, and the food of the labourers employed on, together with what Dr. Chalmers calls their secondaries; that, the labourers required for supplying them with tools, andthe remaining necessaries of life. Whether any given land isof doing more than this, is not a question of political, but of physical fact. The supposition leaves nothing for, nor anything for the labourers except necessaries: the, therefore, can only be cultivated by the labourers, or else at a pecuniary loss: and a fortiori, cannotany contingency afford a rent. The worst land which can beas an investment for capital, is that which, afterthe seed, not only feeds the agricultural labourers andsecondaries, but affords them the current rate of wages,may extend to much more than mere necessaries; and leavesthose who have advanced the wages of these two classes of, a surplus equal to the profit they could have expectedany other employment of their capital. Whether any givencan do more than this, is not merely a physical question,depends partly on the market value of agricultural produce.the land can do for the labourers and for the capitalist,feeding all whom it directly or indirectly employs, ofdepends upon what the remainder of the produce can be sold. The higher the market value of produce, the lower are theto which cultivation can descend, consistently withto the capital employed, the ordinary rate of profit.

As, however, differences of fertility slide into one anotherinsensible gradations; and differences of accessibility, that, of distance from markets, do the same; and since there isso barren that it could not pay for its cultivation at any; it is evident that, whatever the price may be, there mustany extensive region be some land which at that price willpay the wages of the cultivators, and yield to the capitalthe ordinary profit, and no more. Until, therefore, therises higher, or until some improvement raises thatland to a higher place in the scale of fertility, itpay any rent. It is evident, however, that the communitythe produce of this quality of land; since if the landsfertile or better situated than it, could have sufficed tothe wants of society, the price would not have risen soas to render its cultivation profitable. This land,, will be cultivated; and we may lay it down as athat so long as any of the land of a country which isfor cultivation, and not withheld from it by legal or otherobstacles, is not cultivated, the worst land in actual(in point of fertility and situation together) paysrent.

3. If, then, of the land in cultivation, the part whichleast return to the labour and capital employed on itonly the ordinary profit of capital, without leavingfor rent; a

standard is afforded for estimating theof rent which will be yielded by all other land. Any landjust as much more than the ordinary profits of stock, asyields more than what is returned by the worst land in. The surplus is what the farmer can afford to pay asto the landlord; and since, if he did not so pay it, hereceive more than the ordinary rate of profit, theof other capitalists, that competition whichthe profits of different capitals, will enable theto appropriate it. The rent, therefore, which any landyield, is the excess of its produce, beyond what would beto the same capital if employed on the worst land in. This is not, and never was pretended to be, theof metayer rents, or of cottier rents; but it is the limitfarmers' rents. No land rented to a capitalist farmer willyield more than this; and when it yields less, it isthe landlord foregoes a part of what, if he chose, heobtain.

This is the theory of rent, first propounded at the end oflast century by Dr. Anderson, and which, neglected at the, was almost simultaneously rediscovered, twenty years later,Sir Edward West, Mr. Malthus, and Mr. Ricardo. It is one ofcardinal doctrines of political economy; and until it was, no consistent explanation could be given of many ofmore complicated industrial phenomena. The evidence of itswill be manifested with a great increase of clearness, whencome to trace the laws of the phenomena of Value and Price.that is done, it is not possible to free the doctrine fromdifficulty which may present itself, nor perhaps to convey,those previously unacquainted with the subject, more than aapprehension of the reasoning by which the theorem isat. Some, however, of the objections commonly made to it,of a complete answer even in the present stage of our.

It has been denied that there can be any land in cultivationpays no rent; because landlords (it is contended) would nottheir land to be occupied without payment. Those who laystress on this as an objection, must think that land of thewhich can but just pay for its cultivation, lies togetherlarge masses, detached from any land of better quality. If anconsisted wholly of this land, or of this and still worse,is likely enough that the owner would not give the use of itnothing; he would probably (if a rich man) prefer keeping itother purposes, as for exercise, or ornament, or perhaps as apreserve. No farmer could afford to offer him anything for, for purposes of culture; though something would probably befor the use of its natural pasture, or other spontaneous. Even such land, however, would not necessarily remain. It might be farmed by the proprietor; no unfrequenteven in England. Portions of it might be granted asallotments to labouring families, either frommotives, or to save the poor-rate; or occupationbe allowed to squatters, free of rent, in the hope thatlabour might give it value at some future period. Bothcases are of quite ordinary occurrence. So that even if anwere wholly composed of the worst land capable ofcultivation, it would not necessarily lie uncultivatedit could pay no rent. Inferior land, however, does notoccupy, without interruption, many square miles of; it is dispersed here and there, with patches of betterintermixed, and the same person who rents the better land,along with it inferior soils which alternate with it. Hea rent, nominally for the whole farm, but calculated on theof these parts alone (however small a portion of the) which are capable of returning more than the common rateprofit. It is thus scientifically true, that the remainingpay no rent.

4. Let us, however, suppose that there were a validity inobjection, which can by no means be conceded to it; thatthe demand of the community had forced up food to such aas would remunerate the expense of producing it from aquantity of soil, it happened

nevertheless that all theof that quality was withheld from cultivation, by theof the owners in demanding a rent for it, not nominal,trifling, but sufficiently onerous to be a material item incalculations of a farmer. What would then happen? Merely thatincrease of produce, which the wants of society required,for the time be obtained wholly (as it always is), not by an extension of cultivation, but by anapplication of labour and capital to land already.

Now we have already seen that this increased application of, other things being unaltered, is always attended with aproportional return. We are not to suppose some newinvention made precisely at this juncture; nor aextension of agricultural skill and knowledge, bringingmore general practice, just then, inventions already inuse. We are to suppose no change, except a demand forcorn, and a consequent rise of its price. The rise of pricemeasures to be taken for increasing the produce, whichnot have been taken with profit at the previous price. Theuses more expensive manures; or manures land which heleft to nature; or procures lime or marl from a, as a dressing for the soil; or pulverizes or weeds itthoroughly; or drains, irrigates, or subsoils portions of, which at former prices would not have paid the cost of the; and so forth. These things, or some of them, are done,, more food being wanted, cultivation has no means ofitself upon new lands. And when the impulse is given toan increased amount of produce from the soil, the farmerimprover will only consider whether the outlay he makes forpurpose will be returned to him with the ordinary profit, andwhether any surplus will remain for rent. Even, therefore, ifwere the fact, that there is never any land taken into, for which rent, and that too of an amount worthinto consideration, was not paid; it would be true,, that there is always some agricultural capitalpays no rent, because it returns nothing beyond therate of profit: this capital being the portion oflast applied-that to which the last addition to thewas due: or (to express the essentials of the case in one), that which is applied in the least favourable. But the same amount of demand, and the same price,enable this least productive portion of capital barely toitself with the ordinary profit, enable every otherto yield a surplus proportioned to the advantage it. And this surplus it is, which competition enables theto appropriate. The rent of all land is measured by theof the return to the whole capital employed on it, aboveis necessary to replace the capital with the ordinary rateprofit, or in other words, above what the same capital wouldif it were all employed in as disadvantageous circumstancesthe least productive portion of it; whether that leastportion of capital is rendered so by being employed onworst soil, or by being expended in extorting more produceland which already yielded as much as it could be made towith on easier terms.

It is not pretended that the facts of any concrete casewith absolute precision to this or any other scientific. We must never forget that the truths of politicalare truths only in the rough: they have the certainty,not the precision, of exact science. It is not, for example,true that a farmer will cultivate no land, and apply no, which returns less than the ordinary profit. He willthe ordinary profit on the bulk of his capital. But whenhas cast in his lot with his farm, and bartered his skill and, once for all, against what the farm will yield to him,will probably be willing to expend capital on it (for anreturn) in any manner which will afford him a surplus, however small, beyond the value of the risk, and thewhich he must pay for the capital if borrowed, or canfor it elsewhere if it is his own. But a new farmer, enteringthe land, would make his calculations differently, and wouldcommence

unless he could expect the full rate of ordinaryon all the capital which he intended embarking in the. Again, prices may range higher or lower during theof a lease, than was expected when the contract was, and the land, therefore, may be over or under-rented: andwhen the lease expires, the landlord may be unwilling toa necessary diminution of rent, and the farmer, rather thanhis occupation, or seek a farm elsewhere when all are, may consent to go on paying too high a rent.like these we must always expect; it is impossiblepolitical economy to obtain general theorems embracing theof circumstances which may affect the result in ancase. When, too, the farmer class, having but little, cultivate for subsistence rather than for profit, and dothink of quitting their farm while they are able to live by, their rents approximate to the character of cottier rents,may be forced up by competition (if the number of competitorsthe number of farms) beyond the amount which will leavethe farmer the ordinary rate of profit. The laws which we areto lay down respecting rents, profits, wages, prices, aretrue in so far as the persons concerned are free from theof any other motives than those arising from thecircumstances of the case, and are guided, as to those,the ordinary mercantile estimate of profit and loss. Applyingtwofold supposition to the case of farmers and landlords, itbe true that the farmer requires the ordinary rate of profitthe whole of his capital; that whatever it returns to himthis he is obliged to pay to the landlord, but will notto pay more; that there is a portion of capital appliedagriculture in such circumstances of productiveness as toonly the ordinary profits; and that the difference betweenproduce of this, and any other capital of similar amount, ismeasure of the tribute which that other capital can and will, under the name of rent, to the landlord. This constitutes aof rent, as near the truth as such a law can possibly be:of course modified or disturbed in individual cases, bycontracts, individual miscalculations, the influence of, and even the particular feelings and dispositions of theconcerned.

5. A remark is often made, which must not here be omitted,, I think, more importance has been attached to it than it. Under the name of rent, many payments are commonly, which are not a remuneration for the original powers ofland itself, but for capital expended on it. The additionalwhich land yields in consequence of this outlay of capital,, in the opinion of some writers, be regarded as profit,rent. But before this can be admitted, a distinction must be. The annual payment by a tenant almost always includes afor the use of the buildings on the farm; not only, stables, and other outhouses, but a house to live in, notspeak of fences and the like. The landlord will ask, and thegive, for these, whatever is considered sufficient tothe ordinary profit, or rather (risk and trouble being hereof the question) the ordinary interest, on the value of the: that is, not on what it has cost to erect them, but onit would now cost to erect others as good: the tenant being, in addition, to leave them in as good repair as he found, for otherwise a much larger payment than simple interestof course be required from him. These buildings are asa thing from the farm as the stock or the timber on it;what is paid for them can no more be called rent of land,a payment for cattle would be, if it were the custom thatlandlord should stock the farm for the tenant. The buildings,the cattle, are not land, but capital, regularly consumedreproduced; and all payments made in consideration for themproperly interest.

But with regard to capital actually sunk in improvements, andrequiring periodical renewal, but spent once for all inthe land a permanent increase of productiveness, itto me

that the return made to such capital losesthe character of profits, and is governed by theof rent. It is true that a landlord will not expendin improving his estate, unless he expects from thean increase of income surpassing the interest of his. Prospectively, this increase of income may be regarded as; but when the expense has been incurred, and themade, the rent of the improved land is governed bysame rules as that of the unimproved. Equally fertile landan equal rent, whether its fertility is natural or; and I cannot think that the incomes of those who ownBedford Level or the Lincolnshire Wolds ought to be calledand not rent because those lands would have been worthto nothing unless capital had been expended on them. Theare not capitalists, but landlords; they have parted withcapital; it is consumed, destroyed; and neither is, nor isbe, returned to them, like the capital of a farmer or, from what it produces. In lieu of it they now haveof a certain richness, which yields the same rent, and byoperation of the same causes, as if it had possessed from thethe degree of fertility which has been artificiallyto it.

Some writers, in particular Mr. H.C. Carey, take away, stillcompletely than I have attempted to do, the distinctionthese two sources of rent, by rejecting one of them, and considering all rent as the effect of capital. In proof of this, Mr. Carey contends that the wholevalue of all the land in any country, in England for, or in the United States, does not amount to anythingto the sum which has been laid out, or which it wouldnow be necessary to lay out, in order to bring the countryits present condition from a state of primaeval forest. Thisstatement has been seized on by M. Bastiat and others,a means of making out a stronger case than could otherwise bein defence of property in land. Mr. Carey's proposition, inmost obvious meaning, is equivalent to saying, that if theresuddenly added to the lands of England an unreclaimedof equal natural fertility, it would not be worth theof the inhabitants of England to reclaim it: because theof the operation would not be equal to the ordinaryon the capital expended. To which assertion if anycould be supposed to be required, it would suffice to, that land not of equal but of greatly inferior quality topreviously cultivated, is continually reclaimed in England,an expense which the subsequently accruing rent is sufficientreplace completely in a small number of years. The doctrine,, is totally opposed to Mr. Carey's own economical. No one maintains more strenuously than Mr. Carey thetruth, that as society advances in population, wealth,combination of labour, land constantly rises in value and. This, however, could not possibly be true, if the presentof land were less than the expense of clearing it andit fit for cultivation; for it must have been worth thisafter it was cleared; and according to Mr. Carey itbeen rising in value ever since.

When, however, Mr. Carey asserts that the whole land of anyis not now worth the capital which has been expended on, he does not mean that each particular estate is worth lesswhat has been laid out in improving it, and that, to the, the improvement of the land has been, in the final, a miscalculation. He means, not that the land of Greatwould not now sell for what has been laid out upon it,that it would not sell for that amount plus the expense ofall the roads, canals, and railways. This is probably, but is no more to the purpose, and no more important ineconomy, than if the statement had been, that it wouldsell for the sums laid out on it plus the national debt, orthe cost of the French Revolutionary war, or any otherincurred for a real or imaginary public advantage. The, railways, and canals were not constructed to give value to: on the contrary, their natural

effect was to lower its, by rendering other and rival lands accessible: and theof the southern counties actually petitionedagainst the turnpike roads on this very account.

The tendency of improved communications is to lower existing, by trenching on the monopoly of the land nearest to thewhere large numbers of consumers are assembled. Roads andare not intended to raise the value of the land whichsupplies the markets, but (among other purposes) tothe supply, by letting in the produce of other and morelands; and the more effectually this purpose is attained,lower rent will be. If we could imagine that the railways andof the United States, instead of only cheapening, did their business so effectually as to annihilateof carriage altogether, and enable the produce of Michiganreach the market of New York as quickly and as cheaply as theof Long Island-the whole value of all the land of theStates (except such as lies convenient for building) wouldannihilated; or rather, the best would only sell for theof clearing, and the government tax of a dollar and aper acre; since land in Michigan, equal to the best inUnited States, may be had in unlimited abundance by thatof outlay. But it is strange that Mr. Carey should thinkfact inconsistent with the Ricardo theory of rent. Admittingthat he asserts, it is still true that as long as there iswhich yields no rent, the land which does yield rent, doesin consequence of some advantage which it enjoys, in fertilityvicinity to markets, over the other; and the measure of itsis also the measure of its rent. And the cause of itsrent, is that it possesses a natural monopoly; theof land, as favourably circumstanced as itself, notsufficient to supply the market. These propositionsthe theory of rent, laid down by Ricardo; and if theytrue, I cannot see that it signifies much whether the rentthe land yields at the present time, is greater or lessthe interest of the capital which has been laid out to raisevalue, together with the interest of the capital which haslaid out to lower its value.

Mr. Carey's objection, however, has somewhat more ofthan the arguments commonly met with against the theoryrent; a theorem which may he called the pons asinorum ofeconomy, for there are, I am inclined to think, fewwho have refused their assent to it except from notthoroughly understood it. The loose and inaccurate way init is often apprehended by those who affect to refute it,very remarkable. Many, for instance, have imputed absurdity to. Ricardo's theory, because it is absurd to say that theof inferior land is the cause of rent on the. Mr. Ricardo does not say that it is the cultivation ofland, but the necessity of cultivating it, from theof the superior land to feed a growing population:which and the proposition imputed to him there is no lessdifference than that between demand and supply. Others againas an objection against Ricardo, that if all land were offertility, it might still yield a rent. But Ricardo saysthe same. He says that if all lands were equally, those which are nearer to their market than others, andtherefore less burthened with cost of carriage, would yield aequivalent to the advantage; and that the land yielding nowould then be, not the least fertile, but the leastsituated, which the wants of the communityto be brought into cultivation. It is also distinctly aof Ricardo's doctrine, that even apart from differencessituation, the land of a country supposed to be of uniformwould, all of it, on a certain supposition, pay rent:, if the demand of the community required that it shouldbe cultivated, and cultivated beyond the point at which aapplication of capital begins to be attended with aproportional return. It would be impossible to show that,by forcible exaction, the whole land of a country cana rent on any other supposition.

6. After this view of the nature and causes of rent, let usback to the subject of profits, and bring up forone of the propositions laid down in the last. We there stated, that the advances of the capitalist, orother words, the expenses of production, consist solely inof labour; that whatever portion of the outlay is not, is previous profit, and whatever is not previous profit,wages. Rent, however, being an element which it is impossibleresolve into either profits or wages, we were obliged, for the, to assume that the capitalist is not required to payto give an equivalent for the use of an appropriated natural: and I undertook to show in the proper place, that this isallowable supposition, and that rent does not really form anyof the expenses of production, or of the advances of the. The grounds on which this assertion was made are now. It is true that all tenant farmers, and many otherof producers, pay rent. But we have now seen, thatcultivates land, paying a rent for it, gets in return forrent an instrument of superior power to other instruments ofsame kind for which no rent is paid. The superiority of theis in exact proportion to the rent paid for it. If apersons had steam-engines of superior power to all others in, but limited by physical laws to a number short of the, the rent which a manufacturer would be willing to pay forof these steam-engines could not he looked upon as anto his outlay, because by the use of it he would save inother expenses the equivalent of what it cost him: without itcould not do the same quantity of work, unless at anexpense equal to the rent. The same thing is true of. The real expenses of production are those incurred on theland, or by the capital employed in the least favourable. This land or capital pays, as we have seen, no; but the expenses to which it is subject, cause all otheror agricultural capital to be subjected to an equivalentin the form of rent. Whoever does pay rent gets back itsvalue in extra advantages, and the rent which he pays doesplace him in a worse position than, but only in the sameas, his fellow-producer who pays no rent, but whoseis one of inferior efficiency.

We have now completed the exposition of the laws whichthe distribution of the produce of land, labour, and, as far as it is possible to discuss those lawsof the instrumentality by which in a civilizedthe distribution is effected; the machinery of ExchangePrice. The more complete elucidation and final confirmationthe laws which we have laid down, and the deduction of their most important consequences, must be preceded by an explanation of the nature and working of that machinery-a subject so extensive and complicated as to require a separate Book.