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Agricultural Head Rents, Pre-Famine and Post-Famine

CORMAC Ó GRÁDA

No country can ever be held in just estimation, proclaimed Arthur Young in 1789, when the rental of it is unknown. Young, in his Tour in Ireland, proceeded to estimate the rental of this country. He was the first to embark on aggregate calculations. Several of the best-known past observers of the Irish scene, from Sir William Petty to the elder Wakefield, also left their own estimates. Some, like Petty’s, were based almost totally on hearsay or speculation. Needless to say, it is difficult, if not impossible, to assess the accuracy of these estimates. Wakefield’s, for instance, seem too high, and some of several contemporary population level of the country are often based on faulty guesses at the aggregate rental can be inferred from available estate accounts in the rental at least. A start has been made in this work, for it is still much too early to risk such accounts should inform us of movements in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The present paper provides estimates, necessarily somewhat tentative, of the rental in 1845 and 1852, and discusses briefly some of their implications for the economic historian.

*This note is based on a data-appendix to my dissertation, "Post-Famine Adjustment: Essays in Nineteenth-Century Irish Economic History" (Columbia University, unpublished, 1973). I am grateful to Professor Louis Cullen and an anonymous referee for their comments on a previous draft.
Our starting point is an appendix to Ayn Rand's *Atlas Shrugged*. The appendix's main theme is the concept of " Calculation of the Rent", which Rand uses to illustrate her ideas on the role of the state in the economy. Rand's appendix is a vivid and powerful argument against the traditional view of rent as a cost of production, and in favor of the idea that rent is a measure of the value of land, independent of any labor inputs.

Rand's appendix is a classic example of using a powerful metaphor to make a complex economic point. By treating rent as a "calculation," she is able to make a clear distinction between the value of land and the value of labor. The appendix's clear and concise exposition of the concept of rent makes it a valuable reference for anyone interested in understanding the nature of property rights and the role of government in the economy.

Rand's appendix is also notable for its use of the "inelastic demand" argument to make the case for rent control. By showing that the demand for land is not very sensitive to changes in rent, Rand is able to argue that rent control is an effective way to "free" the market from the tyranny of rent. This argument is still widely used by economists today, and it is a testament to the power of Rand's writing that her appendix remains a relevant and influential work.
After much controversy and discussion, an Irish Poor Law broadly based on
the English model was introduced in 1838. Ireland was divided into new
administrative units called Poor Law Unions, and a valuation system similar to
that of England was introduced. 

## Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number 1</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Some: Crofts, pp. 38-94**

| 1838 | 46 | 175 |
| 1839 | 48 | 100 |
| 1840 | 58 | 110 |
| 1841 | 69 | 130 |
| 1842 | 59 | 118 |
| 1843 | 59 | 118 |
| 1844 | 50 | 119 |
| 1845 | 48 | 119 |
| 1846 | 59 | 118 |
| 1847 | 59 | 118 |

**Table 1: County's Estimate I Amended (f.000)**
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would be the order of:

Valuation was 50.9% of £1,111,900 million.

The difference between the two valuations is

| 11 | More than 20% greater than Valuation |
| 10 | 15 - 20% greater than Valuation |
| 9  | 10 - 15% greater than Valuation |
| 8  | 5 - 10% greater than Valuation |
| 7  | 0 - 5% greater than Valuation |

Valuation equals Valuation
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The amount did in fact pay landlords $9.9 million, the amount of the completed valuation, in terms of its impact on the economic position was by no means negligible. Our guess is that their economic position was by no means negligible. Out of a total of $11.1 million in 1845, landlords in a class were hardly affected. Just a total basis on which the landlords had reduced their rents. The newspapers have published lists of landlords who had reduced their rents. The landlords incomes declined sharply during the Great Famine, Rent deficiency.
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$13.18742 \times 0.79 \times 0.84 = 11.1 \text{ million}
The output and rent levels combined seem to suggest that average non-landlord

not to have the same effect. Thus, in Table 1 and only a few very extreme observations are offered here.

If would be rash to seek a standard of living arrangements policy in the figures

The table may also be seen to be understood.

This table may also be seen to be understood.

In addition, the availability of more lucrative investment alternatives—many of these

The small size of holdings, the uncertainty political situation, general economic

This table may also be seen to be understood.

Indeed, the nature of these figures reported 0.33 per cent more of less in line with the stamp-
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The geographical differences were important in the last and the earlier


