

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.

nizes that: "One's experiences, if not his biases, condition not only his analysis but what facts he seeks for analysis." Many of his suggestions do reflect his experiences in the Bureau of Land Management. The author mentions the need for widespread public discussion of Federal land problems in order to obtain a more general understanding of the public interest in these lands. He says that "no legitimate special user interest should fear from having all the facts about its interest known to the public." But the question still remains of how to obtain as adequate consideration of the public interest as of the special user interest in both the advisory process and the administrative decisions.

The conflicts in administration of public lands and in development of water resources are touched upon. In connection with water resources, the author suggests that development of a consistent water policy may be the basis for solution of some of the administrative conflicts in water development. He expresses the hope that the Presiden Water Policy Commission will develop an adequate policy framework. By implication at least the need for such a policy commission is indicated with respect to administration of Federal lands.

The author summarizes by pointing out that Federal land management is here to stay. There will be an increasing demand for use of public lands and greater need to conserve and develop them. Multiple uses will become more important in the future, and higher uses often will displace the lower uses of Federal lands. All of these forces will emphasize the need for capable public-land administration, which can be achieved only by a wider and more comprehensive understanding of this important public problem.

Sherman E. Johnson

The 1950's Come First. By Edwin G. Nourse. Henry Holt and Company, New York. 184 pages. c1951.

I N VIEW of the press and radio publicity that attended Dr. Nourse's resignation as the first chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, persons acquainted with him only through these media might well expect this small volume to contain some fireworks. It does not. It is a lucid and sober analysis of a number of developments which, in his judgment, constitute serious threats to the economic progress and well-being of this country.

Dr. Nourse is concerned first of all with what may be termed "groupism"—the tendency of organized agriculture, labor, and industry to make demands which, if granted, are certain to be detrimental to the economy as a whole. Second, he is concerned with the tendency, not only of these particular groups, but of people generally, to demand from the economy, in the name of security, more than they are willing to contribute. Third, he is concerned that excessive demands in the guise of military preparedness will result in an over-commitment of the Nation's industrial system and in the imposition of oppressive controls. Finally, he is concerned that, instead of rejecting excessive demands, an attempt will be made to meet them

through a continuous process of general inflation that will seriously undermine the basic strength of the economy.

This discussion of these threats to the economy is neither reactionary nor doctrinaire. He recognizes the legitimacy of many group aspirations and that groups will organize and act collectively to achieve them. He recognizes also that the desire for security is a deep-seated human craving which cannot be ignored. He does not expect that the economic system can be shaped to the ideal of free competition.

This reviewer thinks that what Dr. Nourse regards as "weak-spots in our economic armor" would be so regarded by a majority of economists. The real difference of opinion will arise with respect to the degree of apprehensiveness about them. It is rather clear that the author regards our economic system as already seriously undermined and that unless the weak spots are speedily repaired we face national insolvency and a dismal economic future. Personally, this reviewer thinks that the American economy is in considerably better shape than the author believes it to be.

James P. Cavin