

# Michigan Law Review

---

Volume 47 | Issue 4

---

1949

## Lauterbach: ECONOMIC SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM: CAN WE HAVE BOTH?

Michigan Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr>



Part of the [Law and Economics Commons](#), and the [Military, War, and Peace Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Michigan Law Review, *Lauterbach: ECONOMIC SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM: CAN WE HAVE BOTH?*, 47 MICH. L. REV. 600 ().

Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr/vol47/iss4/25>

This Regular Feature is brought to you for free and open access by the Michigan Law Review at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Michigan Law Review by an authorized editor of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [mlaw.repository@umich.edu](mailto:mlaw.repository@umich.edu).

ECONOMIC SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM: CAN WE HAVE BOTH? By  
*Albert Lauterbach*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1948. Pp. iv, 178.  
\$2.50.

Albert Lauterbach is chairman of the social science faculty at Sarah Lawrence College, and was educated at the University of Vienna in the period between the two world wars. Armed with an insistent belief that the major evils threatening mankind in the twentieth century are the result of mass feelings of economic

insecurity, Mr. Lauterbach suggests broad and purposive long-term national economic planning as a necessary solution. Deprecating trust "busting" as a hopeless attempt "to turn back the wheels of history," and New Deal "Interventionism" as a feeble outgrowth of a "society that could no longer do without genuine planning and yet could not make up its mind to establish it," the author makes a dispassionate appeal for the adoption of a combination of the best attributes of several types of long-term planning that he feels are best suited to the needs of western nations. Considerable effort is made to explode what the author treats as a fallacy blocking widespread acceptance of the solution offered—namely, the fear that national economic planning would result in a loss of individual freedom. Familiar examples from history are set forth to demonstrate that there is no necessary connection between the attitude of government toward business, on the one hand, and the existence of individual freedom, on the other. Of interest to the lawyer is the placing of emphasis on the theory that a mass shift in property titles is not necessary to accomplish the proposed objective. In line with this theory is a suggestion of a preference for an extension of the doctrines of Keynes over complete allegiance to those of Marx. Regardless of the personal beliefs of the reader, he will find in this book a challenge to analyze an area of economic thinking that is all too often obscured by emotional appeals.