

reflect, self-effacingly, the biographee's talents rather than his own, Knapp succeeds well. His chronicle of the life of Edwin Nourse has the further merit of constituting a commentary on the fledgling discipline—and profession—of agricultural economics.

Knapp's last recounting is of Nourse's "unfinished symphony" (Nourse's prophetic term, for it was not completed), which, says Knapp, promised "rich insights into the applicability of social science to the major problems of our times" (p. 491). Knapp gives the gist of the "symphony" as his Appendix B. Certain it is that our times can use counsel from the kind of social science intellectual that Edwin Nourse was.

Harold F. Breimyer
University of Missouri-Columbia

Socolofsky, Homer E. *Landlord William Scully*. Lawrence: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1979, xiii + 182 pp., \$15.00.

In his prefatory remarks the author declares that the "intent of this book is to narrate for the general reader, as carefully and completely as possible, the life of William Scully." If this were all that the author had accomplished, it is doubtful that the book would be of academic interest to agricultural economists. Even though he disclaims any intent to do so, Socolofsky has woven into his account of the life of William Scully sufficient information about the Irish land tenure system and the development of the Scully leases on his U.S. property that serious students of land economics will find this book rewarding as well as entertaining.

The life of William Scully, a scion of the landed gentry in Ireland, from his birth in 1821 to his death in 1906 spans a period of enormous change in the institutions and attitudes that govern man's relationship to land. Scully is portrayed as an active participant in this process of change, at times resisting it with all his power, and at other times incurring the ill will of his contemporaries because he was too early and too impatient with his own innovations.

Through all this Socolofsky manages to present the evidence available as even-handedly as possible. He refrains admirably from filling in with surmises and judgments where evidence is lacking. Neither does he attempt an evaluation of the life of William Scully or to pass personal judgment on him. The evidence is too fragmentary and already too much tainted by value judgments in the accounts drawn from available media sources. Therefore, the reader is free to draw his own conclusions.

Much of what William Scully achieved, whether for good or for evil, was the result of his own strong will and determination. How many of us would, at thirty years of age, leave a comfortable existence and place a fortune (then) of \$85,000 at risk in an alien land? On the other hand, should Scully be

credited with a peculiar wisdom in selecting what is today some of the most productive and valuable farmland in the entire U.S. midwest? After all, this was almost the only choice available to him in 1852 prior to the technological developments that later permitted this swamp land to be drained and used intensively in grain production.

Scully's dealing with his tenants ran the gamut from that of a harsh, unfeeling rent-collector, to an advocate of progressive farming who made voluntary rent abatements in years of poor crops and low incomes. Tracing, through Socolofsky's account, the prudence, care, conservatism, and foresight, together with a stubborn insistence on his legal rights, reveals how the purposeful behavior of William Scully, combined with the fortuitous events of his time, resulted in his accumulation of an estate in U.S. farmland that aggregated at one time about 225,000 acres.

Those who would gain a useful historical perspective on policy questions being voiced today about alien ownership of U.S. farmland and about concentration of farmland ownership will find this book enlightening. Unfortunately, they will also find it a bit frustrating in that the author did not choose to write a more comprehensive volume that would have included, among other things, a fuller exposition of the English land tenure system that formed the context for Scully's problems with his Irish tenants. And one could wish for a more complete coverage of the American taxing system as it may have and is now impacting on the Scully estate.

It is quite clear that throughout his life William Scully was strongly motivated by his own self-interest and that of his immediate heirs. Whether this pursuit of his own self-interest also served the interests of society, à la Adam Smith, is an open question.

Franklin J. Reiss
University of Illinois

Walinsky, Louis J., ed. *Agrarian Reform as Unfinished Business: The Selected Papers of Wolf Ladejinsky*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977, xi + 601 pp., \$22.00, \$10.95 paper.

Wolf Ladejinsky was a brilliant observer of Asian rural life whose articles, reports, and dispatches were colored by an obsessional fear of communism. His early articles were rather workmanlike summaries of agricultural conditions produced without the benefit of firsthand knowledge. Although they lacked the vivacity of his later field studies, they won him a reputation as an expert in land reform.

His postwar studies seemed to come to life, perhaps as a result of his contact with the lives of the Asian peasant. We can readily see why they won Ladejinsky the support of General MacArthur, who had himself earlier come to recognize the political

necessity of land reform. In part inspired by Ladejinsky, McArthur was convinced that enlightened reform could draw support away from the communists.

Fresh from his initial success in Japan, Ladejinsky was sent to Taiwan and to Szechwan, the last remaining nationalist province on the Chinese mainland. Although reform came too late in Szechwan, on Taiwan a newly arrived force which was free from undue pressure from landlords was able to reap political profit through land reform. During a short trip to Kashmir, Ladejinsky was pleased to discover a roughly similar instance in which the Muslim government was able to expropriate the land from mostly Hindu landlords. In the rest of the Asian continent, the will for land reform was lacking.

National elites whose wealth was mostly based upon land holdings were reluctant to see it redistributed or even to lessen their earnings from the land. Ladejinsky called upon the Ford Foundation to use its resources to subtly prod the Indian government in the right direction before it was too late. But to little avail.

It was already too late in Vietnam, his next assignment. The Viet Minh had successfully preempted the issue of land reform. Reading Ladejinsky's reports from as early as 1955, one can see that the war was already lost. Nonetheless, until 1961, Ladejinsky doggedly espoused the cause of his employer, President Diem.

I have the feeling that the Viet Nam period may have been a turning point for Ladejinsky. Previously, he seemed to exhibit an attitude as if through land reform one could keep "the sheep alive and the wolves happy" (p. 259). Faced with the bloody conflict in Viet Nam, he seemed to plead for effective land reform only as a holding action against the Viet Minh.

The Viet Nam experience might have prepared him to expect the worst in India, but it did not. Afterwards, in his employment with the Ford Foundation and the World Bank, he repeated his fears of imminent communist revolution, but without the same conviction. It seemed to him as if poverty in India was more conducive to patience than revolution (pp. 452, 528-29).

I believe that the reason for Ladejinsky's vision of the future can be understood in terms of his attitude toward peasants. He was undoubtedly a superb listener when he met them. He respected their innate abilities, but the movers and shakers of the world were the elites (pp. 197, 395). To Ladejinsky, Viet Minh were astute politicians who could effectively manipulate the people; the Indian left was to be held up for ridicule. Consequently, he was prepared to see India embark on a process of capital accumulation which would dispossess workers from the land; but he warned that the utmost caution was required. Accordingly, he attempted to teach the naive Green Revolutionaries not to make a fetish of new technology.

His brilliant field notes on India were an attempt to bring the technocrats and politicians into contact with conditions in the village. This role exposed the fundamental weakness of Ladejinsky's vision of land reform. His verdict of Indian land reform could be extended to Japan and Taiwan as well: "... the people in whose behalf the reforms were designed ... are the *objects* of reforms, but never the *means* of helping formulate and carry them out" (p. 401; italics in original).

To discover what land reform by the people might mean, one must turn from Ladejinsky to other sources. William Hinton's *Fanshen*, the story of a Northern Chinese village's land reform, for example, illustrated what such land reform would mean.

Michael Perelman,
California State University, Chico

Reference

Hinton, William. *Fanshen*. New York: Vintage Press, 1966.

Waterbury, John. *Hydropolitics of the Nile Valley*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1979, xii + 301 pp., \$20.00.

The Nile is the lifeblood of two countries, Egypt and the Sudan. Egypt, with its dense population confined to the irrigated lands along the Nile, and the Sudan, with a small population but vast potential for irrigation development, are locked into total development of the river. Both countries currently rely heavily on the Nile for irrigation and each plans expansion of water use to meet the needs of rising expectations and population growth. This book expertly outlines the plans and problems that must be faced in such development. Egypt, being a downstream user, long has been aware of its insecurity with respect to water supply should the Sudan lay claim to larger quantities of water. Various schemes have been proposed to alter and increase the flow of the Nile, all of which lie within the Sudan. As long as Great Britain controlled the Sudan and maintained a presence in Egypt, planning for projects to increase the flow of the Nile moved fairly smoothly, although funding was short and progress slow.

With the coming of independence from Colonial rule, some of the stability and cooperation between the two countries has slipped away. No longer is Egypt the stronger voice in development of Nile water supplies. Sudan is beginning to assert its claims on the Nile. Nor is this all; other countries at the head waters are beginning to show an interest in the use of the head water of the Nile. Kenya, Uganda, Zaire, and especially Ethiopia are planning projects for irrigation within their own boundaries.