the political inclinations of professors usually only become a matter of public concern during times of upheaval: the McCarthy era, the Vietnam protests, the culture wars, and post 9-11. Using the results from a comprehensive Neil Gross and Solon Simmons survey, he acknowledges that the majority of American faculty is politically liberal, though not to the extreme, as often portrayed. Menand attributes their left-leaning tendencies to academic training and the encouragement to question established ways. Nonetheless, he wonders why the professoriate is so homogenous. Did liberal-minded people pursue the university or did the university create liberal-minded people? Menand ends the book by presenting some grim Ph.D. statistics, raising ethical questions about the duration of such programs, and the inherent problems with a system of education that prepares people for a job market that cannot sustain their needs. The university system requires greater diversity of thought and practice, despite the fact that those who represent the system increasingly think alike. Menand leaves his readers with a dire diagnosis and few solutions.

Jeffry C. Davis
Wheaton College


John D. Mueller wants to launch a revolution through *Redeeming Economics*. Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) recognized four human economic actions: to produce, exchange, distribute, and consume goods. Aquinas synthesized the economic thinking of Aristotle and Augustine to develop a complete theory known as Scholastic economics. Mueller wants to restore appreciation of all four elements in what he calls “neo-Scholastic” economics. Adam Smith oversimplified economics, keeping production and exchange, but dropping the other two elements. This is the essence of classical economics, which prevailed for a century following the publication of *The Wealth of Nations* (1776). Neo-classical economics emerged in the 1870s as economists grappled with explaining rising standards of living. They reintroduced Augustine’s theory of utility which describes consumption, and made other advances. However, something was still missing, because “even if we knew the total value of goods that can be produced, and everyone’s preference for these goods, the description would not be complete” (86).

The missing element is a theory of final distribution, which deals with “personal gifts (and crimes) and distributive justice in the family, business firm, charitable foundation, and government” (107). Mueller takes the developments in economics over the past two centuries, incorporates the element of distribution, and calls this synthesis “neo-Scholastic” economics. He claims that this is a revolution as important as the emergence of classical and neo-classical economics.
Lacking a theory of final distribution, both classical and neo-classical economics assume that all people act selfishly in making economic choices. This is empirically false. The best that these theories can do is to assume that sharing with family members consists of exchanges in which the wage-earner gets some hidden utility from the rest of the family. Augustine noticed that every human acts with some person as the ultimate end of one’s action, even if that person is only oneself. Everyone’s life is defined by that person’s loves: “If I love several people equally with myself, I will divide my property or income equally among all such persons, including myself… . If I consider another person to be half as significant as myself, I will divide my income or wealth into three parts and allocate to myself two-thirds and to the other person one-third” (143). All economic action involves a gift, even if given only to oneself. Each person’s “distribution function” describes the relative significance of the self compared to other persons. Love therefore is a weighing of persons. Pure selfishness is simply a special case in which self gets a weight of one, and all others get a weight of zero.

In Parts 2-4, Mueller applies neo-Scholastic economics to Personal Economy, Domestic Economy, and Political Economy, respectively. Mueller refutes Steven Levitt and John J. Donohue, who published an article in 2001, claiming that legalized abortion accounted for much of the 1990s drop in crime. Mueller points out that most violent crimes are committed by men who are the same age as the fathers of aborted children. Mueller shows that, in fact, the contemporaneous abortion rate is related to the murder rate, not the abortion rate of 15 to 20 years earlier. Neo-Scholastic theory suggests that people have children because they love the children for their own sakes, or the parents love themselves and expect some benefit from the children. The former motive is correlated with the rate of weekly worship. The latter motive is negatively related to per capita social spending and national saving, which provide for parents in their old age. From this, Mueller builds a statistical model that predicts very well the total fertility rate of 50 countries. To avoid European-style high unemployment and low fertility, Mueller advises that the U.S. must end legalized abortion or else keep social benefits from surpassing their 2001 proportion of national income. Our political system is capable of choosing this, rather than simply following current trends.

In the final chapter, Mueller lays out the worldviews behind the classical, neo-classical, and neo-Scholastic paradigms. Smith, the father of classical economics, embraced Stoic pantheism. In this view, people are God’s puppets, with both ends and means driven by “sentiments.” The neo-classical view is built on Epicurean materialism. The human is a clever animal, a “slave of passions,” free to choose means but not ends. Neo-Scholastic economics rests on natural law. The human is a rational animal, free to choose both means and ends. Mueller seems to be writing for an audience that is economically literate, but not necessarily professional economists. In particular, not a single equation is in sight in any of the 15 chapters.
BOOK REVIEWS

The book has some equations, but Mueller puts them all in the endnotes. This is acceptable for a book that focuses on an idea rather than a technique. Mueller makes up for it by including lots of charts, many of which convey a clear quantitative message at a glance. Mueller served as an economist for Congressman Jack Kemp. In the chapters on political economy, in some places, it is hard to distinguish between inferences based on neo-Scholastic economics and standard Republican policy prescriptions. Also, he shows lots of correlations, but often it is unclear whether the variables are causally connected.

Will this book usher in a revolution in economics? That is a lot of weight for a single book to bear. Mueller himself acknowledges that the revolution may take decades. Mueller is right about something missing from current economic theory, and his idea seems to fill that gap. Current economic theory assumes *homo economicus* who is, *inter alia*, thoroughly selfish. Economists, social scientists, and biologists view altruism as a puzzling phenomenon—some sort of survival of the fittest applied to groups rather than individuals. The neo-Scholastic notion of distribution offers a more plausible explanation of altruistic behavior. People can, and do, value other people to some extent as ends-in-themselves. To be sure, a lot of economic activity is selfish, but a non-trivial share is not, and the gift-giving and sharing is neither an aberration nor selfishness masquerading as something else. The book is a good read for a non-technical perspective on the history of economics and its possible future.

William E. Dean
Sacramento, California


John Pottenger’s *Reaping the Whirlwind* seeks to clarify the nature of the “turbulence of religion and politics in the public sphere,” referring both to Hosea’s Old Testament aphorism and to the “Ten Commandments Judge” Roy S. Moore’s warning that the U.S. is reaping the whirlwind from divorcing its founding legal documents from religiously inspired foundational principles. The book ranges from the insightful, useful, and informative—the decline of the Universal Christian Commonwealth, the Age of Reason, individual conscience, and personal liberty, whose consequences are manifested in America’s foundational experience—to the less persuasive application of the term “liberal democracy” to such political systems as 1970s Brazil and contemporary Uzbekistan.

Pottenger’s thesis is that modern liberal democracies embrace “three commitments,” characterizing a new “religious axis,” and contributing to “the turbulent intermingling of religion and politics” (3). These include an *epistemo-