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author of British Independence of Commerce (1807), were seen to be backward looking because of their advocacy of physiocracy. This was James Mill’s view in Commerce Defended (1808), and it summarizes the position of the philosophic radicals as a whole. For Mill, the policies of the physiocrats, or economistas as he termed them, would reduce Britain’s wealth. They were accused of considering commerce unproductive and of favoring an agricultural system that would foreclose the smaller interests of the landed aristocracy alone. This was caricature, but it was one that was passed on to generations of subsequent commentators.
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PIGOU, ARTHUR Cecil (1879-1959)

Arthur Cecil Pigou was born on 18 November 1879 in Ryde on the Isle of Wight. He was educated at Harrow School and King’s College, Cambridge, where he subsequently taught economics until his retirement in 1943. He continued to live at King’s College until his death on 7 March 1959. Pigou began lecturing at Cambridge in 1903 and succeeded Alfred Marshall as Professor of Political Economy in 1908. He wished to introduce and the welfare aspects of his economic thought from the teachings of Henry Sidgwick. Sidgwick’s influence was particularly felt in Pigou’s analysis of market failures and remedies and in his attention to long-term investments. Following Sidgwick, Pigou argued that discounting the future effects of actions on others immorally, a complete utilitarian calculus requires that future costs and benefits to all those who will be affected by a decision now and in the foreseeable future, be factored into the account.

Pigou’s standing as an economist is largely based on his major work, The Economics of Welfare (1920), though some of its central ideas are contained in the earlier Wealth and Welfare (1912). Generally, Pigou believed that a society’s welfare benefited most from free market competition, but like Marshall he believed that economic analysis ought to take into account other considerations, most importantly the negative “externalities” or social costs associated with economic activity. This consideration, coupled with the assumption that most people are alike in many ways and that the satisfaction levels of different individuals are therefore, at least in principle, comparable (if not precisely measurable), led Pigou to argue that states could do more to maximize economic and social benefits. His objective in The Economics of Welfare, he says, is “to bring into clearer light some of the ways in which it now is, or eventually may become, feasible for governments to control the play of economic forces in such wise as to promote the economic welfare, and through that, the total welfare, of their citizens as a whole” (Pigou, 1952, pp. 129-30).

One of the ways Pigou thought that governments could increase the national dividend and enhance “total welfare” is through alterations to the distribution of income, possibly through minimum wage policies. Consumer’s health insurance he also thought would serve the same purpose, and taxes might be introduced to discourage practices that produce net negative social consequences, while subsidies could be offered to encourage practices that enhance well-being. However, Pigou’s recommendations designed “to control the play of economic forces” were never brought to arrogate basic property rights, the maintenance of which was vital to the free enterprise system.

Although he is most well known for his contributions to the field of welfare economics, Pigou’s debates with Keynes and his followers, which began with Pigou’s Theory of Unemployment (1933) and continued in 1934 General Theory of Unemployment, Interest and Money (1936) and other incendiary writings, in many respects defined his later career. Previously, Keynes had collaborated with Pigou on parts of his Principles and Methods of Industrial Peace (1905), but on the relationship between real wage costs and employment levels they differed greatly (Rima, 1986).

Pigou’s influence is evident among economists who advocate compensation taxes (or Pigovian taxes, as they are sometimes called), for example, as an efficient way of dealing with pollution rather than through the imposition of government standards. On the other hand, his ideas were famously criticized as leading to substantial and unwelcome levels of state intervention by Ronald Coase and the Chicago School (Coase, 1960), though it is now commonly thought that Coase did not fully appreciate the nuances in Pigou’s recommendations nor his concerns that governments respect basic property rights (Hovenkamp, 2009).

More recent welfare economists have also been critical, particularly of the idea that social welfare decisions can be based on interpersonal comparisons of utility (for these economists the Pareto Principle provides a more promising ground for such judgments). Nevertheless, Pigou’s reputation was refurbished during the global recession triggered in 2008. Pigou argued long ago that maladjustions in one part of the economy can have an unintended but major impact in other areas. When the toxic subprime mortgage industry undermined the entire banking system in 2008-9, dragging nearly all western economies into recession, it provided a compelling illustration of Pigou’s cautionary insight.
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not until 1812 that Mill introduced Place to Jeremy Bentham. Place and Bentham developed a close and long-lasting friendship. The two men lived only a short walk from one another in central London and, according to Place’s diary, “each of our houses were as frequently entered by each as his own” (Place, 2007, p. 264). Bentham considered Place for the task of organizing and publishing a complete edition of his writings after his death (p. 128), but he yielded that role to John Bowring, with disappointing results for generations of Bentham scholars ever since. Place was among those in the Bentham circle who found the serially syndicated Bowring entirely irritating, a “fool” and a “raad cow” (pp. 178, 183).

It is thought that Place may have assisted Bentham in arranging his manuscripts for a number of publications, including Plan of Parliamentary Reform (1817), Christomathia (1813–17), and the Book of Fallacies (1824). That he had a hand in the production of Bentham’s Not Paul, but Jesus (1823) is not disputed. According to a note by Place in his personal copy of the book at University College London (autographed “From Mr. Bentham Sep. 29, 1823, FP”)—“the matter of this book was put together by me at Mr. Bentham’s request in the months of Aug. and Sept. 1817—during my residence with him at Ford Abbey, Devonshire.” In a further note attached to the book, Place’s Fabian biographer Graham Wallis claimed the manuscripts for Not Paul, but Jesus were “rearranged, condensed and ‘pulled together’ [by Place] in making the book.” However, it is difficult to substantiate what actually occurred; neither Place’s letters and diaries nor Bentham’s correspondence mention the matter.

On one occasion Place referred to Bentham as “my dear old master” and consid- ered writing his biography, commenting “I have a vast debt to what is good and of high value to him, and I hope I shall not die with- out doing my best towards discharging that honourable debt” (Place, 1972, p. 250). Yet he could not be untruthfully described as merely Bentham’s disciple, as Walrus once suggested. Place’s efforts often corresponded with Bentham’s goals, such as their joint attempt to create a Chartist school in the 1820s and their mutual support for the London Mechanics Institution, established to promote the education of London artisans, and the new University of London. Place came to accept several elements of Bent- ham’s thought, but his own work was far more idiosyncratic and eccentric than would fit comfortably into the rubric of either “Benthamite” or “utilitarian.” Persuading Place’s thoughts and actions are profound elements of Palatine republicanism, egalitarianism, atheism, and the arizonal quest for respectability.

Place’s influence and activism reached their apotheosis in the 1820s and 1830s. In 1822, he published the neo-Malthusian Illustrations and Proofs of the Principle of Populations, in which he complained of “population’s igno- minious living conditions of the poor and criticized Godwin’s pessimism about the prospects for improving these conditions. Improvement was to be had, he argued, in striking fashion, primarily by reducing the burden of large families by the use of contraception. Place also worked tirelessly for the repeal of a range of oppressive legisla- tive acts, many of which still survived from Pitt’s repressive regimes of the French Revolu- tionary era. Place achieved a notable suc- cess in 1824 when he prepared and tutored the radical MP Joseph Hume for the parlia- mentary investigation that led to the repeal of the Combination Acts, the laws criminal- izing trade unions. Then, in 1825, he helped to prevent the reintroduction of those same laws. Throughout the 1830s, in association with Bentham, Hume, Mill and others, Place remained active in the movement to reform parliament, working diligently to promote the 1832 Reform Bill. However, he soon became disillusioned with the effects of the