



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

ignorance of any necessity for doubt and uncertainty. In many areas equilibrium economics is still enthroned, and its practitioners announce their conclusions with all the certainty and dogmatism of a revealed religion. Perhaps it was Professor Salter's sense of modesty that caused him to avoid any invidious comparisons between workers in his chosen field and those in other fields.

A still different type of concern if not doubt and confusion—different from the kind the author had in mind and peculiar to those classified by the Civil Service Commission as Land Economists—has arisen during the past two decades as a result of institutional change. In the judgment of this reviewer, both the demise of Land Use Planning under L. C. Gray at the national level, and the rise and fall of County Land Use Planning under H. R. Tolley are attributable in large measure to the increasing tendency at that time for the phrase "land use" to become a synonym for "agricultural." Accepting Professor Salter's own characterization of the field of land economics as one primarily concerned with public policy and public control, what actually happened in the 1930's, was a phenomenal expansion in a field of activities recognized as appropriate objects of public policy and public control.

Thus the growing relative importance of public activities only remotely related to land economics as such, as well as the tendency for soil conservation to be "dominated by physical scientists and

engineers" (Dr. Salter), has created for land economists the necessity for orienting their field in the new situation. As only one example, when "production adjustment" in the interest of price stability may or may not involve a shift of land from one major use to another general use, the line of demarcation between "production adjustment" and land economics becomes less distinct—especially when the problems of production adjustment research are referred to workers formerly known as farm-management experts.

That Professor Salter made no use of this aspect of doubt and confusion may have been due to the fact that he considered it irrelevant for his purpose, but it seems to the reviewer that it caused many land economists to look more closely at their "field," which certainly has implications for "method." It seems probable, however, that his failure to make any use of it was due to a faulty conception of the "county land-use planning" episode. In Chapter II he found it unnecessary to interpret that experience. That he did see fit to refer specifically to the "County Land Use Planning Work Outline Number One" reflects a somewhat excessive concern for a technique as compared with the over-all significance of the movement.

Be that as it may, Professor Salter was a scholar of first rank, with a high regard for intellectual and scientific integrity. His "bias" was his low regard for the pretender and the fourflusher.

Bushrod W. Allin

The Economic Mind in American Civilization. Volume 3, 1865-1918. By JOSEPH DORFMAN.
Viking Press. New York.

IN A REVIEW of the first two volumes of this series several years ago this reviewer made a summary suggestion, "that every person working with current social problems spend some time, valuable time if necessary, to relive the economic trials of early Americans as described in 'The Economic Mind in American Civilization 1606-1865'." The identical statement cannot be made for the third volume, recently released, which takes us through 1918, although it, too, is a remarkably fine piece of work. The emphasis in the first two volumes is on problems—economic issues. But in the third volume the emphasis

changes—the professional economist comes into his own. The story shifts in substance if not in form; it shifts from one of issues and protagonists to one of theory and economists. Thus we do not relive the economic trials of American civilization in that robust but ugly era of industrial growth, combinations, and trusts, 1865-1918, in a reading of volume 3.

As an economist, this reviewer enjoyed this latest volume more than the others. The discovery of Henry C. Adams alone was worth the time spent. Early in that period of industrial growth he had caught its meaning when he

asserted that the central problem of economics "is properly to correlate public and private activity so as to preserve harmony and proportion between the various parts of organic society." The Adams monograph (1887) entitled "Relation of the State to Industrial Action" this reader intends to borrow at the earliest opportunity.

Dorfman gives us cause for new pride in the achievement of Americans in the formulation of economic doctrine. This history causes one to ponder the view that the English have held a monopoly on the development of economic theory; for men like Walker, Adams, Clark, Taussig, Davenport, and Mitchell, were exploring the unknown in as profound a sense as their British cousins. Finally, this volume marshalls considerable evidence to support the view that pure competition theory was probably no more applicable to the nineteenth century than to the twentieth. There is no direct effort to establish this point; still the ideas and concepts set forth would seem to say that pure competition theory should at best have been used only as a teaching device. These are samples of the ideas which grow out of a reading of volume 3, in which the chief concern is with the origins and antecedents of professional economic thought.

But the layman who is trying to understand better and to think through the social and economic problems of today will not find the sense of perspective in this volume that emerges from the first two. Dorfman's discussions of the New England Way in the early colonial period, the Social Philosophies of the Founding Fathers in the struggle for National Survival, Higher Learning 1829-1851 and the Dominant Carolinian Contingent on the eve of the Civil War, illuminate those periods in a way that seems also to illuminate present-day problems. That presentation of continuing economic problems and the failure of the informed or "opinionated" citizenry to achieve satisfactory solutions, make present-day problems seem less terrifying. True, Dorfman presents much of the conceptual picture for 1606 to 1865 through the eyes of early thinkers—for the most part nonprofessional thinkers. But the individuals do not dominate, their ideas and doctrines do not subordinate the problems. Such critical issues as lack of specie and shortage of labor in colonial America, the public debt and the National

Bank in the early years of the Republic, dominate the presentation in the first volumes.

All this is not to depreciate the latest volume but to recognize the change in emphasis. This change, which is more a matter of degree than a break with the previous presentation, is probably an inevitable development when the central theme is the reconstruction of "the economic mind" in our civilization. As the discipline of economics developed—very rapidly before and after the turn of the twentieth century—so the theme must follow: first among the professionals who were engaged in the work and second along the paths of their reasoning. And it is not the fault of the text if the development concentrates in the hands of a few and a large part of their reasoning in the period following the Civil War loses contact with economic reality.

The emphasis on marginalism and other tools of analysis in the development of theory had the immediate effect at least of removing economic theory from the arena of economic action. Whether this was good or bad we need not decide here, but one cannot read this new volume which concentrates on the Sharpening of the Pecuniary Logic without wondering what was happening in the world of business and finance and why the theoretical concepts were developing as if in a vacuum. Except on the issue of money and more specifically, silver, the professionals seemed to have decamped, leaving the field of action to those individuals canonized in theory—the entrepreneurs. Economists cloistered in academies of higher learning were refining the theory of pure competition as the operators were engaged in organizing and reorganizing business firms into monopolistic combinations.

Taking the three volumes as a unit, and assuming that a fourth and final volume is under preparation, the series provides an excellent history of economic thought in the United States. Indeed, it is the only history dealing with, or maintaining the continuity of, indigenous economic thought. As such the series lends itself to several uses—source book, text, and general reading. And as the standards of scholarship are high and the story is unfolded in an interesting way, the series should be in heavy demand for all three uses.

Willard W. Cochrane