

fact that it has a Congress and a Supreme Court? And if we answer this question in the negative, how can we expect to maintain peace between nations which do not give the same freedom to one another's citizens?

Restrictions upon trade may take other forms than tariffs, quotas, export duties, and other interferences with exchange. They may arise also from the monopoly of natural resources. In colonies, protectorates, or other controlled territories, the controlling power may allow some of its nationals to acquire large tracts of land which are the source of minerals or other raw materials. They are thus placed in a position of great power and profit, and are able to levy a toll of rent upon the citizens both of their own and of other countries. In this case, as in the case of tariffs and other trade restrictions, we see that the injury is done to the citizens both of the country which is supposed to profit by the practice and of other countries.

The injurious effect of land monopoly (as of protectionism) arises from the defects of national law, not from the defects of international law; but it is capable of poisoning international relations. So we come back to the fundamental point that the concern of law, whether national or international, must be with the individual. To quote Mr Ralston again:—

"But what has International Law to do with all this? We start our thesis with the assertion that the unit of International Law is not the nation but the common man. His welfare must be its chiefest concern. This demands equal share in all the gifts of nature and equal opportunity now denied him in the interior law of his nation. Still more emphatically is his well-being disregarded in the so-called law prevailing between nations. Real law cannot work in such fashion. There will be no true reform in International Law till this begins at the grass roots, as it is sometimes put. But conditions can be improved in the manners we have pointed out.

"We have discussed reform in this respect as lying within the field of colonial territories over which the world is struggling to-day. We have not touched the equally important field of resources within the States recognized as to-day organized and integral governments belonging to the society of nations. Of course, no world-wide reformation can be complete if this most important portion of mankind is ignored. As to this field, however, the individual states must answer the problem. The penalty, if they do not do so, is destruction of government as now organized, with some new and vastly different set-up being brought into existence."

Although its extreme detachment may at times be a little irritating to those who form part of embattled Europe, this is a valuable and careful study which deserves to be read. It is a piece of constructive reasoning which points to the solution of the problem of international order in amendments of both national and international law that will secure the equal liberty of movement of persons and goods across all frontiers, and the equal access of all men to the natural resources which should be the equal heritage of all as the only means by which they can live their lives.

A civilization which tends to concentrate wealth and power in the hands of a fortunate few, and to make of others mere human machines, must inevitably evolve anarchy and bring destruction. But a civilization is possible in which the poorest could have all the comforts and conveniences now enjoyed by the rich; in which prisons and almshouses would be needless, and charitable societies unthought of. Such a civilization only waits for the social intelligence that will adapt means to ends.

HENRY GEORGE in *Social Problems*.

NO SCARCITY IN NEW GUINEA

THE CONDITION of labour in New Guinea is described by a missionary, the Rev Arthur Kent Chignell, B.A., in his book, *An Outpost in Papua* (John Murray), from which is taken the following extract:

"The New Guinea man, as I know him, does not overwork, since he is driven by no hard necessity to labour for another man's enrichment, nor hampered by the difficult circumstances of civilization. His wants are few and simple, and he has 'free access' to the sources at which these wants find easy satisfaction—a few hours' work each day will supply him with a good house and sufficient food and all the clothing that he needs in this gentle climate. In a *Review of Foreign Missions*, published by the United Boards of Missions of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, in 1908, I read that in the Anglican Mission in New Guinea, there are some hundreds of converts, and they are taught to work for their living. Was ever such nonsense? As if the native had ever done, or dreamed of doing, or ever had the chance to do anything else but 'work for his living.' There is not much that we can teach him in that line, for Mother Earth is most kind to him, and he has so exactly succeeded in 'adapting himself to his environment.'

"Everyone has enough, and perhaps a little to spare. He has plenty of business of his own to attend to, and there is no very obvious reason why he should of his own free will leave any of it to wait upon the foreigners. But granting that he does not work very hard at present, and that 'work' is a fine thing in itself (I am thinking of the sort of work that you and I do so steadily, because it is our pleasure or our duty, or simply because we cannot help it, rather than of the sort of work that the white man wants the Papuan to do), and supposing a considerable number of New Guinea men to be persuaded or compelled to work very hard indeed at some productive undertaking: for whose benefit is that work to be done? Hardly for his own, since his needs are already supplied by his own labour, and there is really no reason why he should work any more for himself than he does already. He could not eat any more, or live in more houses, and he would be worse off with more clothes than he has at present. Is he to work, then, for the benefit of the white man, whose social conditions certainly make him want all that he can get? There is plenty to be got in New Guinea, if we can only persuade someone to get it for us. In a few years, as the country gets opened up, and white men come here in crowds, attracted by the promising openings for enterprise and capital in an unused, fertile country where there seem to be plenty of 'hands,' there will inevitably be difficulties about land and about labour, and the white man will be irritated when he sees these natives apparently doing very little, and yet coolly refusing to labour for him.

"In the abstract, a little more work, and a little harder work, might not be bad for these copper-coloured friends of mine, but I do not want to see 'the lazy nigger made to work' (as the white man sometimes puts it) for the enriching of men who really do not care twopence about the native here—or hereafter; nor should I care to see my own countrymen attempt to teach the Papuan how to rearrange his times for work and play, and his methods, nearly perfect at present, of supplying the needs of himself and his family, until they have solved the problem of the unemployed in London and the rest of England, and the other problem of the loafers in Sydney and other parts of Australia."