

short, the problem of want and poverty and the economic struggle between classes and nations, is nothing but a frightful muddle, a transitory and an *unnecessary* muddle." Keynes hoped and believed that "the day is not far off when the Economic Problem will take the back seat where it belongs, and that the arena of the heart and head will be occupied, or re-occupied, by our real problems—the problems of life and of human relations, of creation and behavior and religion."⁵ He made these optimistic remarks in 1931, in the midst of a terrible depression which almost everywhere lasted until the war, and inflicted immeasurable suffering on all peoples. In one sense, Keynes' prediction was therefore wrong. It was wrong, however, only because our intellectual leadership has almost uniformly failed in the mission which is its only social excuse: the mission of useful and realistic analysis, and of effectively popular rational guidance for policy. That failure is painfully represented in the heroic but unproductive experience of the TNEC. The men who directed the TNEC had a magnificent opportunity to appraise the working of our system of public law for the control and direction of economic life. They had the attention of the country, and might have made a real contribution towards the education of public opinion, and of public policy. We could legitimately expect them to study what went wrong in the thirties, and to point out how we could learn from the inevitable mistakes of our first experiments in the public control of the national economy. Their achievement, though respectable, does not satisfy such a standard; nor does Dr. Lynch's.

EUGENE V. ROSTOW*

NOTE

In the article *Liberal Education, the Case-System and Jurisprudence* in the February issue of the REVIEW it was stated: ". . . there was striking unanimity in the reviews of Professor Hall [Hall, *Readings in Jurisprudence*] that the editing had been too severe and each reviewer had a different set of examples to cite." Reviews appearing in Yale, Pennsylvania, and Illinois law reviews were cited in footnote. Professor Hall has written to point out that there were twenty-four reviews of his book, that only four reviewers criticized the editing and then only in part, and that in general the book received high praise from all reviewers as a contribution to the field and a pedagogical tool.

It was not the intention of the article to report exhaustively on reviews of the book but simply to cite the opinions of several reviewers as evidence that in a compilation of materials, such as Professor Hall's, the editing job was in our opinion impossible and was bound to displease some readers. The use of "unanimity" may, therefore, have been misleading.

It was also not the intention of the article to disparage in any way the Hall *Readings* but rather to compliment Professor Hall in doing so well "at the impossible."

H. K., JR.

⁵ Keynes, *Essays in Persuasion* vii (1932).

* Professor of Law, Yale Law School.