

third paper analyzes the work done on macroeconomics and business cycle by a group of economists at the International Labour Organization in the 1920s, showing that the monetary policy strategy envisaged by them anticipated some of the main recommendations of the Macmillan Committee (p. 215).

Finally, the last paper presents a carefully drafted portrait of Beveridge's attitude to Keynes. I found particularly fascinating the account of Beveridge's "recantation" of the view of *The General Theory* "as the exemplar of theory without facts" (p. 226), (in his farewell Address as Director of the LSE, in 1937, and never published), which is implicitly embodied in his 1944 book, *Employment in a Free Society*.

All in all it is an interesting collection that will be particularly useful to those who wish to be acquainted with the intellectual history of Keynesianism in various and still largely unexplored cultural environments.

Maria Cristina Marcuzzo
Università di Roma, La Sapienza

REFERENCES

- Keynes, John Maynard. 1936. *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*. London: Macmillan.
- Stein, H. 1969. *The Fiscal Revolution in America*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Mark Blaug, ed., *Who's Who in Economics* (Cheltenham and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 3rd edition, 1999) pp. xx, 1237, \$350. ISBN 1 85898 886 1.

If, as Blaug attests, "citations are the coinage of reward in academia," then this long-awaited third edition of his who's who (and who was who) of economics is the raw material to produce academic economics' hall of fame. I do, however, stress raw material, for its format and the lack of a detailed analytical introduction means that while we have a wealth of essential biographical and bibliographical data about each individual enumerated, we have no easy means of transforming these data so as to obtain dynasets to test particular hypotheses (for example, on the very topical Americanization/internationalization of economics thesis). Nor are we provided with basic summary statistics of the characteristics of the "more than" 1,600 economists who are included (as, for example, in the proportion of living economists, non-U.S. born and resident with a U.S. doctorate). Indeed, we are not told the exact number of economists in this latest edition; nor can we easily infer it from Blaug's all too brief preface which informs us that 1,082 living economists are included together with "over 400" dead economists carried over from the second edition plus a further "about 100" deceased economists who have died since the second edition.

The fact that we are not told the precise number of entries for dead economists—I make the figure 558, giving a total for the volume of 1,640—is significant and

indicative of a tension inherent in the project. On the one hand, Blaug quotes approvingly the quantitative work that was undertaken on the first (Blaug and Sturges 1983) and second editions (Blaug 1986), by DeLorme and Kamerschen (1987) and Frey and Pommerehne (1988) respectively, and entertains the hope that the new edition “will lead to further quantitative work along similar lines.” On the other hand, by not providing the basic summary statistics, the task of undertaking that further quantitative work has been made needlessly more difficult. To help the venture, therefore, here are some basic statistics that place the latest edition in context and are also relevant to the Americanization thesis:

Edition	No of pages	No of economists			% of global living economists	Country of residence of living (%):			
		Dead	Living	Total		US	UK	Other	Total
1st	449	397	674	1,071	5	69.6	12.9	17.5	100.0
2nd	959	437	877	1,314	6	67.7	13.9	18.4	100.0
3rd	1,257	558	1,082	1,640	4	65.5	15.4	19.0	100.0

I suspect one reason why Blaug does not provide such material is that the entries are stored as text files and not in a relational database, their obvious home for analytical purposes. Blaug notes that “New developments in IT will make it much easier to produce subsequent editions,” and it is to be hoped that the publisher finds a commercially tolerable means of publishing the dataset in a more useable form for the variety of purposes that the profession wishes of it (the *JEL*’s EconLit CD-ROM, which is updated annually, provides one possible model although it is essential that researchers can get at the underlying data tables).

As is clear from the above statistics, this project has grown enormously in size, but such has been the global expansion of the economics profession that a smaller sample of living economists are now being enumerated. Who are these economists, and how are they identified? A common methodology (with one important caveat) has been used since the original edition, namely that of citations counts from the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI). This has a smaller and more U.S.-focused journal coverage than EconLit (and its antecedent, the AEA’s index of economic articles since 1886). In sequence the SSCI enumeration periods were 1970–80 for the first edition, yielding 640 living economists most frequently cited; 1972–83 for the second edition, yielding 877 living economists (actually the top 1,000 citations less 123 economists who did not respond to mailings); and 1984–96 for this edition, yielding 1,082 living economists (based on the top 1,400 citations less “just over” 250—detailed in Appendix 4—who did not respond to mailings). The definition of an economist as somebody who publishes articles in a tightly defined group of roughly 200 economics journals has thus been maintained throughout, although the coverage has been extended. Indeed, it was so tight for the first definition that Blaug, who ranked 641st between 1970–80, was excluded from the first edition as “Clearly, 641 is the natural break

between major and minor economists!” (Blaug and Sturges 1983, p. ix). The first edition was noteworthy also because the original SSCI counts were supplemented by an “informal count” of citation frequencies in missing European and Asian journals together with a “sprinkling of other names whose works may be rarely cited but whose achievements in advice to policy-makers ... are generally recognised by their peers.” These lapses from the purity of the SSCI exercise were not repeated thereafter, as the editor found himself assailed by lobbying for those who should be included/excluded, although no doubt there was also a *schadenfreude* effect.

Given the unprocessed nature of the data, a conventional book review, which reports on its conclusions, is not possible here. By what objective criteria, therefore, should such an exercise be judged? Applying those of a dictionary suggests that we focus on the criteria for inclusion/exclusion, the suitability of the data fields for the tasks set and the accuracy of entries. On the first, we have a solid criterion for the living, although a contentious one given the possible geographical/subfield biases of the SSCI and—pace the Americanization of economics debate—the deep-seated European reservations that the output (and thus eminence) of a professional economist should be defined by much more than just journal article output. For readers of this journal, the interest may be much more the 558 dead than the 1,082 living, and upon the former Blaug has never expanded upon a statement in the first edition that they were selected “by a critical comparison of the names appearing in the indices of leading histories of economic thought” (Blaug and Sturges 1983, p. viii). The latest edition adds nothing to this, but from the quantitative work done on the first two editions and a little work by myself on this edition, we can comment on the Americanization thesis where we might expect that the move forward of the enumeration period increases the proportion of living and dead economists domiciled in the U.S. In fact, this has not been the case for the living (see above table), this perhaps an effect of the larger sample. But for the dead, the rise to prominence of the U.S. and the decline of the UK is clear with respective shares of 19.1 and 37.3 percent in the first edition, 22.9 and 35.5 percent in the second and 29.4 and 34 percent in the third.

Our next criterion relates to the appropriateness of the data fields. For each entry we have the following: names, dates and birthplace, current posts (living economists only), past posts, degrees, offices and honors, principal fields of interest (three *JEL* classes, living economists only), chief publications (limited to ten books and ten articles), principal contributions (written by Blaug if dead), secondary literature (generally, if dead, but sometimes if alive—for example, for Nobel laureates and a few others such as Hirschman, Kindleberger, and other equally eminent figures). Clearly, no obvious omissions here and Blaug is to be congratulated on the fullness of entries for both the living and the dead. As someone who has recently tried to gather biographical and bibliographical details for thirty-six exemplary economists, I know full well the problems that Blaug confronted, and to have produced what he has for 1,640 persons is a tremendous achievement.

Assessment against our third criterion, however, proves a little more problematic as I have noticed a number of errors but, for obvious reasons, have no means

of determining an overall error rate. I focus here entirely upon the 558 dead economists, for the 1,082 living is too much of a challenge for this reviewer. First, I picked up on Kondratieff whose dates should be 1892–1938, not 1892?–1931. I wondered about John Wheatley’s dates—are they really 1722–1830? If not, and Fetter’s entry for him in the *New Palgrave Dictionary* (1987) has 1772–1830, then the longest living economist should be Adolph Lowe (1893–1996) (birth date confirmed in *New Palgrave*). Secondly, and treading carefully in this sensitive area, I wondered whether some economists recorded as being deceased are actually still alive but professionally inactive. If so, the current (October 2000) Fellows lists of at least two Oxbridge colleges are wrong, as is the British Academy. For such detail Blaug has been dependent upon personal contacts—and few can call upon such a network and fund of goodwill as this editor—but I wonder whether the time has now come for some more organized network (perhaps mediated through a web site) if this venture is to continue to prosper and to be as reliable as is possible.

Finally, although this latest edition still lacks as detailed an introduction as the quantitatively minded might wish, the editor has produced two appendices that contain the results of some useful queries on the dataset. Appendix 1 provides an index of the first of the *JEL* classifications selected by each living economist, and since these are not recorded in alpha-numerical order in the individual entries, it is to be assumed that it does indicate the principal sub-field of research interest. Proceeding on this basis, disciplinary specialization is such that the following three areas now dominate: class D (microeconomics), 16.1 percent; E (macroeconomics and monetary economics), 12.5 percent; and C (mathematical and quantitative methods) 11.4 percent. Class B (methodology and history of economic thought) sums to 4.1 percent, some 44 individuals (Blaug included), although it should be observed that in the field entries B does appear in second and third rank (the precise number is, of course, uncertain until the whole dataset has been compiled into a suitable relational database). Appendix 2 provides an index of the country of residence if not the U.S., showing that nearly one-third of the living economists are non-U.S. residents, and with the UK the most significant (167) at approximately twice the figure of all other EU countries combined. This suggests, as a number have argued, that British economics has become more like American economics than has that of continental Europe. But, to really explore hypotheses about the profession and its activities we must await someone developing this dataset. Meanwhile, as one reviewer said of the second edition, what was an interesting experiment became a standard work of reference. With this third edition it is now a vital resource for the profession; what we lack is a twenty-first century means of using it.

Roger Middleton
University of Bristol

REFERENCES

- Blaug, Mark, ed. 1986. *Who's Who in Economics: A Biographical Dictionary of Major Economists*, 2nd edition. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.

- Blaug, Mark and R. Paul Sturges, eds. 1983. *Who's Who in Economics: A Biographical Dictionary of Major Economists, 1700–1981*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.
- DeLorme, Charles D. and David R. Kamerschen. 1987. "What *Who's Who in Economics* Tells Us about the Economics Profession." *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business* 27 (Winter): 65–79.
- Frey, Bruno S. and Werner W. Pommerehne. 1988. "The American Domination Among Eminent Economists." *Scientometrics* 14 (1–2): 97–110.