THE INEVITABILITY OF PATRIARCHY

By Steven Goldberg

SEXUAL SUICIDE

By George Gilder

Reviewed by Riquí Leon

The Inevitability of Patriarchy was written by a sociologist at City College of New York. Prof. Goldberg has put together a cogent and internally logical argument for the biological source of male dominance over females. Claiming to respect the “feminist assumption” that human nature does not dictate inherent roles or tasks according to sex (except for giving birth and exerting “great strength”), he proceeds to build a case based on his own hypothesis: that the traditional establishment male/female roles stem from our differing genes. His protests notwithstanding, Goldberg has an axe to grind—and it’s a collective, anti-individualist axe if ever there was one.

A straw woman is set up; the feminist who promotes her desire for equality through the biological-versus-cultural-determinism debate. Whether or not Goldberg knocks over this straw woman is largely irrelevant—for feminists, libertarians or anyone else. The point is that he misses, or deliberately evades, the major issue: a society that classifies people according to biological factors over which they have no control or control is destructive of individual liberty. If men and women have different genes, so do different men and different women. We don’t need more excuses to label people; we need to think of ourselves and others as unique beings and not as group members.

Incidentally, while Goldberg claims to have nothing more than a hypothesis, in Sexual Suicide George Gilder refers to Goldberg’s book as having presented “conclusive evidence that the observable relative aggressiveness of males is biologically determined.” Sexual Suicide doesn’t even try to be scientific or logical. Its author’s qualifications: former editor of Ripon Forum magazine. (Ripoms are “liberal Republicans”—sometimes known as Ripoffs.) Suicide is the longest editorial I’ve ever read and the least respectable. Through ridicule and misrepresentation, Gilder takes on women’s lib, Masters and Johnson, open marriage, legalization of marijuana and whatever else his personal prejudices preclude. Everything that’s wrong with “society” is attributable to the disintegration of the family, which is attributable to the separation of love and sex, which is attributable to the aforementioned no-no’s.

What to do? “The first and most important step in restoring a sense of order and purpose and community is to reestablish the social pressures and cultural biases in favor of durable monogamous love and marriage... that the women’s movement and the Playboy philosophers find so ‘oppressive.’ It is women who will most benefit in the beginning, for their discomfort in the toils of male sexuality is already including a revulsion toward sex altogether.”

I haven’t noticed any revulsion toward sex, except in the writings of those misogynists whose potency is threatened by anyone with something more than a slave mentality. These “pressures and biases” Gilder wants to introduce, we are told, would lead toward a more “truant, orderly, creative, productive society.” And he may be right—at least about the tranquil part. Repressed individuals often appear tranquil. But Gilder’s anti-libertarian, value-laden vision of the future is pretty bleak. Who says life should be tranquil? Or orderly? Or that if he’s right, and the death of the family does lead to the extinction of the human race, it’s anything other than evolutionary progress?

These questions don’t arise. We are to take Gilder’s world-view as a given and “reason together” from there. It took me an hour to un-depress myself after reading this book, but it sure felt good when I stopped.

(Continued on page 9)

Reviewed by Murray N. Rothbard

It is easy to understand why left-wing egalitarians have embraced and aggrandized the new fashion of women’s lib. For to justify the destructive fantasies of an egalitarian Utopia, the egalitarian has to believe and proclaim that there are no, can be no, must be no, biological and genetic differences between individuals or between genetically identifiable groups of individuals. Biological and genetic differences stand like a rock in the face of the egalitarian leftist’s desire to mold every-one into a uniform, homogenized and proto-plasmic mass. In contrast, biological reality is one of the most vital arguments in favor of individual liberty. If, as the biologist Roger Williams has so strikingly shown, each individual is genetically unique, then his (or her) uniqueness and irreplaceability makes his liberty and the development of his potential a precious thing; if, on the other hand, every person or group were really the same (“equal”), then why should anyone care about their individual liberty or their life itself? Hence, Williams’ phrase, “free and unequal.” Furthermore, the individual’s genetic heritage must inevitably defeat all attempts by totalitarians to defy nature by molding everyone through manipulating their social environment. Egalitarianism, moreover, overlooks the vital economic importance—also in tune with genetic reality—of specialization and the division of labor.

If it is easy to understand the enthusiasm for women’s lib and other egalitarian doctrines among left-wing collectivists, it is far more difficult to explain the similar enthusiasm among all too many libertarians. It is hard to resist the conclusion that many people have embraced egalitarianism not from a tough-minded analysis of the nature of man and the universe, but from a mere desire to be left alone to pursue their infantile whims.

If individuals differ in their genetic endowment, it stands to reason that genetically different groups will also exhibit differing traits; and among identifiably different groups of human beings, it is hard to conceive of two groups whose genetic differences are as clear-cut or as clearly identifiable as males and females. Both Gilder and Goldberg—at last long—base their works on the inevitable biological differences between men and women.

The fact that it has taken so long for these anti-women’s-lib books to emerge gives the lie to the feminist contention that the striking social differences between men and women are purely the result of the “brainwashing” of women by an oppressive and male-dominated culture. If women have been suffering from male oppression, how come we have been deluged for years by hundreds of books, lectures and TV programs in favor of women’s lib, while—until Gilder and Goldberg—the only substantive critique of women’s lib has been leveled by a woman. Midge Decter? How come the “male oppressors” have been so silent? At any rate, the cause of truth and justice is indebted to the courage of Gilder and Goldberg for coming forward; perhaps their books will inaugurate a welcome “male backlash.”

While both Gilder and Goldberg have similar social and biological points of view, the books are very different. Where, for example, Gilder is flashy and provocative, Goldberg is careful and superbly scholarly. While Gilder, given to brash and broad overstatement, will sell far more copies, one hopes that Goldberg will not be neglected: for Professor Goldberg’s work is by far the most significant work on sex differences in decades.

While Gilder scores the debating points, Goldberg’s book will endure.

George Gilder’s extremely clever debating strategy is to use what might

(Continued on page 9)
THE BRANDEN TAPES: Discussions of Man-Woman Relationships
By Nathaniel Branden

"Everything you always wanted to ask Nathaniel Branden about "sex, man-woman relationships, marriage, and the two concepts that men and women encounter in the process of dealing with and relating to one another." This is what you will find on these interesting, informative and thought-provoking cassettes.

The first set of two cassettes has Branden fielding questions by the mail. The second set of four (whatever happened to equal time?!?) has him handling queries from a distaff assemblage. Throughout both, he deals with each issue in considerable depth, pulling no punches and offering wise counsel and stimulating insights. He approaches each question head-on, developing all the ramifications of the matter under consideration and delving into such related topics as necessary to explicate the points he is covering.

But Branden is not the only star of these fascinating recordings: his interlocutors offer up questions which, with rare exception, are as well made and thoughtful as Branden's responses. Most are questions we have all asked ourselves at one time or another and which are today at issue in virtually every public forum.

To repeat: most of us have considered the issues raised during these recorded sessions. Further, most of us have come up with answers—or rationalizations—which suit us. But how long has it been since you really thought about your answers? As you listen to Branden, you will find an objective, critical mind scanning your answers and challenging you to reexamine them.

My wife and I listened to most of the cassettes together. In the wake of each session we found ourselves engaged in some of the most interesting and spirited conversations we have had in many a moon. Both of us learned a little more about ourselves and each other in the process.

This is the way to use these tapes. They are ideal for husband and wife, discussion group, line marriage, commune, "just friends," lovers or whatever-tums-you-on togetherness listening. This is not to say that these recordings cannot and should not be listened to alone (for they can be), but rather that both their format and their subject are perfect for group listening by thoughtful people who care for each other.

Some of the things Branden discusses with the men are: the extremist women's liberation view of the male of the species as monomonal sexual predator, the importance of self-esteem in man-woman relationships, good and bad reasons for marrying, monogamy, male and female sexuality, and masturbation. But perhaps most important is his discussion of the problem of intellectual distance between man and wife which so often results when she stays home with kinder and cooking while he spends his days out in the world. This is a grave problem in a great many marriages today, and Branden's observations on what can be done about it are very worthwhile.

With the ladies, in addition to covering from different and complementary angles some of the same issues raised by the men, Branden deals with the disastrous impact of stereotypic sex roles, bisexuality, the importance of privacy in marriage, male "menopause," bad reasons for breaking a marriage, the fear of some women that a romantic relationship will kill their creativity, women and careers, why some women hate their own gender, sexual game playing, the vagina as a "tool," jealousy, how to cope with impotence, and much more.

On one of the cassettes, Branden advises: "Know who you are, know what you are trying to achieve, and make sensible predictions of the consequences of your actions, don't kid yourself, and don't lie to your mate. After that...[follow] the Spanish proverb which says, "Take what you want," quot God, and pay for it." These tapes will be very useful to anyone who wishes to follow this advice in their relations with the opposite sex. REVIEWED BY KARL T. PELLOCK / Cassette Tapes / Discussion with Men [84 minutes] / BFL Price $15 / Discussion with Women [157 minutes] / BFL Price $30 / Both Sets $40

A NEW ISOLATIONISM
By Robert W. Tucker

The events of the last few years have brought about many changes in American intellectual life, not the least of which has been a rapid and radical reconsideration of the desirability and possibility of isolationism as a proper basis for American foreign policy. This work, when it was first published in mid-1972, was a pathbreaking one in that respect; it was written by Dr. Robert W. Tucker, who holds a joint position as Professor of Political Science at the Johns Hopkins University and at the University's School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, D.C.

"In this essay," writes Tucker, "I argue that a new isolationism for the United States is quite possible in the sense that is could be undertaken without sacrifice of or jeopardy to physical security, material well-being, or a national identity of our own making. This is the essential meaning of what isolationism would mean: 'Isolationism is not to be identified with 'quitting the world,' something we have never done and will never do. It is not to be identified with the absence of all significant relationships but, rather, with the absence of certain relationships. As a policy, isolationism is above all generally characterized by the refusal to enter into alliances and to undertake military or economic interventions. This was the essential meaning of an isolationist policy in the past, and it remains the essential meaning of an isolationist policy today.'"

Moreover, Tucker's thoughtful analysis is opposed to the analysis of the New Left, which holds that without imperialism or interventionism, American institutions would collapse. On the contrary, Tucker holds that "sustained foreign involvement—and particularly one holding out the constant prospect of military intervention—poses a grave threat to America's institutions and well being." He mentions the isolationism of Robert Taft and points out that to Taft, "a war to preserve democracy elsewhere meant the destruction of democracy in the United States and the creation of a socialist dictatorship."

But this resurrection and identification of the true isolationist tradition is not Tucker's only contribution. A New Isolationism is, in fact, a well-thought-out work examining most of the major problems which confront those who advocate isolationism. His analysis is in six sections: "Fears of a New Isolationism," "The Meaning of Isolationism," "The Possibility of a New Isolationism: Strategic Realities and Economic Necessities," "The Broader Dimensions of Security," "The Price of Isolationism" and "Prospects for a New Isolationism." He analyzes the effects of nuclear weapons on alliances and deterrence, the alleged necessities for alliances with other nations and the dependence of America on foreign raw materials and markets. In this last respect Tucker shows that American dependence on other nations is not as great or fundamental as it is often thought to be, and that, in any case, there is no reason to assume that foreign trade would be, on net, adversely affected by a policy of non-interventionism. Tucker argues that neither Asia nor Europe are essential to American prosperity as is usually thought; he argues in favor of gradual withdrawal of American troops from Europe, coupled with "substantial American efforts to aid in the establishment of a credible European nuclear force."

Tucker's defense of isolationism is a sharp and tough-minded one, a useful supplement to both left-and-right revisionism and the a priori isolationism of the Rothbardian school. But I want to recommend it to libertarians for a stronger reason: so far there have been two great conflicts dividing libertarians in our tiny movement, the anarchism/limited government debate and the dispute over foreign policy. Of the two, the dispute over foreign policy is far more important, for it gravely affects the political positions which libertarians will take over the next few crucially important years. Yet there has been virtually no written done by any libertarians on this issue. I am tempted to add: no one has bothered to read much on the issue, either, except for some of the more scholarly associates of Rothbard and the libertarian-oriented Anthony Sutton.

So these are the gr.-st. advantages of this tiny book: it carefully sets out the context and defends one side of the debate, the position of isolationism. It asks what the economic effects would be, what the political and strategic results are likely to be, and if isolationism has a promising future or not. You needn't have to read many books to find the book useful, nor with the left-revisionists on foreign policy. The book makes its own case in a clear and pointed way that cannot be ignored. Read it if for no other reason than that it contains a defense of isolationism—already so dear to the hearts of libertarians on a theoretical level—as a practical possibility, as a desirable direction for American foreign policy to take. And I remind our readers that this is not merely an abstract issue: as Vietnam showed, it can be a matter of life and death. The issue deserves careful consideration; A New Isolationism accordingly deserves a careful reading. REVIEWED BY R. A. CHILDES, JR. / Political Philosophy [127 pages] / BFL Price $2.25
THE YOUNG MENKEN
Collected by Carl Bode

"Yes," said the veteran Washington correspondent Arthur Kroek, speaking of The Alternative, "it has a Menkenian touch." Meaning, of course, that its reverences and irreverences are set forth in a saucy vocabulary ("tony dole," "patheticosis," "moron ACLU lawyer") that would have delighted the Baltimore denigrator of the gelehrten whose early works have been exhumed by Carl Bode from newspaper and magazine files to make up a beautiful book called The Young Mencken.

It is fitting that a new Menkenian organ exists in the land to give hospitality to this book which exposes, in a leisurely unfolding, the growth of a great original. Before the coming of Mencken there was only academic criticism in the United States, and it was dull, dull, dull. The academics of my youngest years sneered at people who, as the saying had it, got their education in public, but if it had not been for a whole generation of newspapermen who took to book reviewing, building up their backgrounds as they went, it is doubtful that over-Boswell New Dealism and the literatures of the twenties and thirties would have been so popular. Have the newspaper critics been forgotten? Burton Rascoe, Floyd Dell, Francis Hackett, Harry Hansen, all out of Chicago? Mencken's Smart Set sidekick, George Jean Nathan? The ebullient steak-jack of the Seven Arts, James Gibbons Huneker? These and many others lacked formal credentials, but they brought gusto to criticism, created readers by the dozen, and gave that miraculous impetus to the Knopfs, the Hueschies, the Pat Covics, the Albert Bonis, and the Horace Liveright of the new publishing companies that sprang up in the earliest twenties like flowers in Baja California after a rain.

Mencken was the best of the newspaper-trained critics, and I think, in my estimation, of gallopping liberalism, that it was he who saved my generation from the perils of turning politicians into gods. We read him in the anarchistic years just after Versailles, when one laughed at Cal Coolidge. When Mencken praised Coolidge for turning the White House into a peaceful dormitory, we thought it a superb piece of satire. Little did we note that Mencken meant every word of it when he created the Silent Cal with reviving the lost world of Thomas Jefferson. Appreciating Mencken for his manner more than for his libertarian matter, we went on into the thirties, actually voting for the planners who planned us into the forty-year inflation that shows no signs of abating. But something of Mencken's distrust of the politico stuck, and when Albert Jay Nock, Rose Wilder Lane, Isabel Patterson, and the New Jewish chums with their reasoned variations on the theme of Our Enemy, the State, we were ready to recover our nerve and, along with it, our tradition.

Mr. Bode's collection of the young Mencken's news articles, Sunday features, Baltimore Sun "Free Lance" columns, epigrams, Smart Set reviews, Kiplingesque poems, Dreiserian fiction, and essays on American manners and morals makes us privy to the evolution of a style. Also of an education. Mencken was always good-humored, feisty, and beery, but his latter-day trick of delivering the most outrageous statements as if they were the soberest truth had to be cultivated. Talking about Nietzsche in 1908, Mencken is just a competent neophyte. But when he writes an essay for the Atlantic Monthly in 1914 called "The Mailied Fist and Its Prophet," using Nietzsche as an excuse to get into the subject of post-Bismarck Germany, the prose moves with a zing and a zest that shows Mencken has finally mastered his medium. Mencken, a German by ancestry and by a genuine passion for gemütlichkeit, rather hoped the Kaiser would win his war. Well, the Kaiser, unlike Hitler, was at least a gemütlichkeit lover, and the end of the war can only mean the end of the literature of the twenties and thirties.

Our Enemy the State
By Albert Jay Nock

Sympathizers with libertarianism are often unfamiliar with two very different strands within the tradition: what might be called the "radical" and the "conservative" libertarian. The better-known conservative libertarian (e.g. Milton Friedman) regards the State as a bumbling, generally inefficient instrument of society. As such, the conservative libertarian generally opposes State action and intervention; but his analysis is cool, relatively dispassionate and concentrates on the social inefficiency of governmental measures. Furthermore, every so often, the conservative libertarian cranks his data into his "cost-benefit" computer and grinds out the conclusion that, on this particular issue or another, the State should intervene. Areas of accommodation to government differ from one conservative libertarian to the next, but range from massive military spending, to voucher plans for government payments to education, to municipal parks.

The first thing one notices when turning from conservative to radical libertarian works is the different "feel," or tone of the writing. The radical libertarian is forth with his hatred of government and he holds the whole State apparatus, to the government and all its works. Instead of a bumbling and inefficient tool of society, the radical sees the State itself, in its very nature, as coercive, exploitative, parasitical and hence profoundly anti-social. The State is, and always has been, the great single enemy of the human race: its liberty, happiness and progress.

Nowhere has the "radical libertarian" position been presented with more insight, clarity, brilliance and stylistic beauty than in the works of Albert Jay Nock, and in particular his little gem, Our Enemy the State. Long out of print, this work has now been reprinted in a beautifully bound paperback edition by the new Free Life publishers. Here is the book to turn to for a superbly written understanding of the radical libertarian viewpoint.

The most systematic of Nock's works, Enemy, published in the 1930's, under the impact of the Hoover-Roosevelt New Deal focuses on applying the radical libertarian ideology to American history. In the course of the work, Nock makes clear how and why the State is the enemy, how State Power has always been the crippler and poisoner of Social Power (Nock's happy term for all the voluntary arrangements and interactions, economic, cultural and social, that individual people have created). All history, according to Nock, is really a struggle between the selfish and greedy forces of Social Power—the peace, prosperity and harmony fostered by voluntary arrangements—and the blight, destruction and impoverishment brought on by coercive State power, in taxing, controlling and regulating individuals and their voluntary inter-relations.

Nock, in short, saw clearly that the State is organized predation and loot, and therefore that the State apparatus and its minions constitute an organized criminal band of predators and looters. Furthermore, through their power of taxing, regulating and spending, the State and its rulers constitute an organized exploiting group or class, in effect a "ruling class," while the rest of us rule and exploited by the State constitute a class of the ruled. The great libertarian tradition of ruling class theory far antedated and is much sounder than the Marxian tradition: but it has unfortunately been virtually forgotten, so that the mere mention of such words as "ruling class," "imperialism," etc., seems to the reader or listener to be Marxian and hence an indictment of Big Business per se. Read Our Enemy the State, and all the other benefits, you will find what the very different, libertarian tradition of ruling class theory is all about. It is, for one thing, a ruling class that only comes about through its achievement of power in the State and never arises through business or voluntary activities on the free market.

Now Our Enemy the State is, in short, a superb book—perhaps the most important single book for learning about the radical libertarian position. It is greatly enhanced this edition by an introduction by Professor Walter Grinder, as well as a brilliant annotated bibliography by Grinder of libertarian writings that constitutes the best libertarian bibliography available anywhere. The bibliographical index alone is worth the price of admission. REVIEWED BY MURRAY N. ROTHbard / Political Philosophy (118 pages, indexed) / BFL Price $2.95
PANIC AND CRASHES
AND HOW YOU CAN MAKE MONEY OUT OF THEM
By Harry D. Schultz

Panics and crashes make the frightening prediction that, within the next several years, the United States will experience a major financial crisis of 1929 dimensions. In anticipation of the disaster which he foresees inevitable, Harry D. Schultz, a former economic consultant, has written a supremely readable and enormously informative guide to surviving the consequences of America's progressively irrational economic policies. No extensive background in economics is necessary to understand and profit from this book; the author speaks explicitly to the layman and provides any essential theoretical groundwork himself—in simple, illuminating terms.

Schultz offers vital intellectual ammunition against the economists who shudder at the mention of “Business Cycle” and who propose to “correct” it by ever-tightening the stranglehold of government on the economy. He demonstrates that periodic mild recessions serve as a necessary pressure valve, a means of regaining an economic balance after flurries of unwarranted investment. It is only when this overspeculation is agitated out of all proportion by rampant credit and galloping inflation that the periods of economic readjustments prove increasingly painful and become genuine cause for alarm. “The money becomes a narcotic which is asseded in ever-increasing amounts to keep up the expansion; and then one day things collapse.”

Concise histories of American and various foreign recessions, panics and crashes are presented; and, in every instance, an explicit causal relationship is shown between government meddling (either directly, through insane monetary policies, or indirectly, by protecting monopolies in crucial industries from healthy competition) and the ensuing financial disasters. The parallels between the “booms” enjoyed before each of the crashes Schultz describes and America’s present false “prosperity” (brought to an end by wage and price controls and the ensuing “energy crisis”) becomes alarmingly self-evident. He states that the warning signals of imminent financial catastrophe are quite clear to those who know what to look for and who have the courage to understand them. Schultz lists these crucial signs for the reader and outlines the inevitable measures he can take immediately to protect his pocketbook and perhaps even realize a profit while others are being wiped out. He discusses in detail the vital topics of gold, liquidity, foreign currency, criteria for judging a bank’s stability and the expected reactions of the rest of the world when the crisis bites even harder than it has during recent international fluctuations and turmoil.

Schultz reiterates, “knowledge itself is power.” Panics and Crashes offers a powerful arsenal of information necessary to judge the world economic situation and to act on this judgment—frequently in direct violation of the standard recommendations of conventional financial authorities. (But, as Schultz points out, the last people to be trusted in such matters are “bankers, brokers and bureaucrats.” A “panic,” as the word implies, is as much a psychological state as it is a financial crisis. The knowledge with which this book arms the reader will enable him to act calmly and rationally in a situation which the majority of his contemporaries will find horrifying and incomprehensible—and with which they will be totally unable to cope.

Harry Schultz is one of the most knowledgeable and influential financial consultants in the world—and, as a welcome surprise (in contrast to the majority of his professional fellows) is explicitly pro-free-enterprise. He has written this book for a wide audience—$7.95 an hour. At that rate, Panics and Crashes is a bargain you can’t afford to pass up! Speaking very seriously, it is an essential addition to everyone’s economic survival kit. REVIEWED BY CAMILLE IBBOTSON / Economics (249 pages, indexed) / BFL Price $7.95

WORLDS IN COLLISION
By Immanuel Velikovsky, M.D.

What has been called “the Velikovsky affair” began with the publication in 1950 of Worlds in Collision, the first of a series of books by Dr. Immanuel Velikovsky compiling investigations and re-evaluations of some of the most fundamental modern beliefs concerning human history and the geological record—books thoroughly researched and carefully compiled which, whatever their faults or errors, should easily have qualified as objective analyses. But they got a far different reception: an academic storm and scientific outrage, scorn, rebuke and irrational hostility completely in contradiction to the character and impartial objectivity that modern scholars and scientists claim to possess. And this outrage and abuse was not directed against some bumbling amateur; Dr. Velikovsky is well qualified to participate in scientific and academic circles at the highest levels, not just in one narrow specialty, but in most every legitimate field of professional expertise. At the very least he should have been accorded a hearing and reasoned consideration—instead he got the heretic treatment. He had not made factual errors—he had sinned—he had blasphemed against some of science’s most sacred cows.

There are first the basic issues: Is Velikovsky (as well as the ancients and a considerable number of independent modern investigators) correct with regard to some fundamentals of human history and the geological record; and, has the scientific academic community discredited itself by its subjective, vitriolic, and vindictive response to what is at least a reasonable and well documented thesis, worthy of the kind of rational consideration? Was modernism wrong in rejecting all previous history, religious and secular, describing repeated catastrophes on a global scale both previous to and within the historical epoch? Velikovsky-the-heretic claims that the ancients were right—that there were repeated disasters of a global scale, of fire and ice and a sundered earth with its orbit disrupted until (to earthly observers) the sun stood still, then set a new course, both solar and lunar calendars had to be revised—that the Exodus and the Trojan War and folkish “fables” of all peoples describe, in mythical terms, actual historical events.

That is the basic issue: modern uniformitarianism versus ancient catastrophism, now revised and given scientific support by Velikovsky and others. But this basic issue has been submerged in a petty controversy and sorry affair that leaves one wondering if today’s leading scientists are really any more enlightened or reasonable or rational than those Establishmentarians who condemned Galileo, or presided over the worst terrors of the Inquisition. It clearly indicates that we have not advanced so far from medievalism as moderns choose to believe, and the actual liberal and scientific advances are far more limited and narrow than the pretensions.

Yes, there has been progress; Dr. Velikovsky has not been forced to recant, or imprisoned, or burned at the stake, but you do get the impression that some of the world’s foremost scientists, who claim impartial scientific objectivity, very much regret this progress where it frustrates their revenge against heretics like Velikovsky. These high priestesses of science pressured a major publishing house into abandoning publication of Worlds and got supporters of it summarily fired from prominent positions without regard for their civil rights or tenure. And now, as the space probes consistently support the “sensational claims” of this “erudite charlatan,” revisions and accommodations are made to long established “facts” and theory without proper credit being given. Typical is the curious anomaly of Velikovsky having predicted the presence and extent of the “Van Allen” Belts several years before their discovery by Van Allen. There are other curious contradictions emerging from the controversy and from the continuing investigations being conducted by competent scholars independent of the scientific Establishment. They occasionally get published in independent journals, the attempted suppression appears to have failed, and a reckoning now seems imminent.

When church and state shared power and maintained an extensive and exploitative bureaucratic to spy and pry and order the lives of their hapless subjects, it brought suffering and decline, and, ultimately, ruin. Modernism ended all that and made dramatic advances, but now modernism, even at the highest levels of scientific inquiry and technical advance, is dominated by a similar bureaucracy and Establishment-authority and doctrine. Moderns find this difficult to believe. In addition to its past wonders science now provides rockets to the moon and filter cigarettes; it has worked for the past few centuries and it obviously works today. But there is a growing awareness that science has become misdirected, and has lost sight of its original purpose of improving the human condition. Even within the most relevant investigations science is now state subsidized and bureaucratic, and guided by a dogma of limited relevance.

The evidence clearly indicates that a total re-appraisal of modern versus ancient belief is required to set the record straight, and the Establishment response here is but a counterpart of bureaucratic pollution in politics and economics and society generally. “The Velikovsky Affair” is but a part of a broad pattern that needs to be understood in its entirety before it can be understood in any special study, as economics or politics or indi.

(Continued on page 5)
THE BETRAYAL OF THE BODY
LOVE AND ORGASM

By Alexander Lowen, M.D.

In an age in which both man and society are increasingly fragmented it is heartening to find a psychologist who affirms the fundamental psychological unity of the individual. Dr. Alexander Lowen is an apostle of the integrated person, the antithesis of the mind/body dichotomy. His fundamental truths are that the needs of the body are basically good and proper; that their denial or repression results in psychological, physical and emotional illness; and that in fact mind and body are one—their (partial) disassociation or opposition are the consequences of neurosis.

Betrayal Of The Body is an exploration of the psychology of schizophrenia: a split in the mind/body unity of the individual. Dr. Lowen explains that in the normal individual mind and body are complementary: the body generates impulses; the mind interprets and adapts them to reality. In the schizoid individual, however, bodily impulses are rigidly controlled and logical thought is substituted for feeling as the motivation for action.

Dr. Lowen traces the roots of schizophrenia to parental ignorance or condemnation of childhood needs. The result is a conflict between the innate needs of the body and the pain of being continually frustrated or punished when they are expressed. The result of the conflict is a repression of bodily feeling and personalities divided against themselves in which feelings become antagonistic to psychic "values," sensuality is manifested without satisfaction, rigid bodies camouflage meek egos, and a host of other psycho-physiological conflicts appear.

Dr. Lowen shows how such neuroses can be overcome through a combination of psychological insight and physical reawakening. The Betrayal Of The Body is a manual for reclaiming that unity which has been lost.

Love and Orgasm focuses upon a particular aspect of the self: the relationship between sexuality and personality. Written from a Freudian and Reichian base, it is a combination of poetic insight, perverse Freudianism, profound discussion and sophisticated rationalization. In brief, it is a mixed bag of virtues and faults, well worth reading, but only with care.

Two key distinctions made by Dr. Lowen are between sexual maturity and sophistication and between sensuality and sexuality. He explains that to the "sophisticate" sex is distorted to an instrument of power and egotism, while the "sensualist" seeks sexual excitement, rather than drive fulfillment, impoverishing his innate sexuality.

Following Wilhelm Reich, Dr. Lowen describes the sexually healthy person as the orgasmatotically potent individual, capable of total discharge of bodily energy in sex. This is only possible, Dr. Lowen maintains, to the person who has fully accepted his body and his sexual nature.

That sexual nature is fundamentally different for man and woman. Dr. Lowen contends. Because penile-vaginal sex is impossible without the arousal of the male, woman is dependent upon a man in a way that is not true of man upon woman. Consequently man is the pursuer, woman the pursued; men dominate, women are subordinate.

Clearly this is the most controversial area of Dr. Lowen's thought, and to a great extent it affects his entire sexual theory: penile-vaginal intercourse is exalted over other forms of copulation, heterosexual sex becomes a requirement for psychological health, and homosexuals and lesbians are regarded as tragic figures.

To say the least, Dr. Lowen overstates his case. Unwittingly he bases his model of good human sexuality upon the stereotypes of the aggressive male and feminine victim, even though he later rejects such simplistic distinctions. Nevertheless, Dr. Lowen makes the best attempt I have seen to derive male and female psychological differences from physical ones, and Love and Orgasm is worth reading for this discussion alone.

WHAT MARX REALLY SAID

By H. B. Acton

The principle of the division of labor does not operate automatically. While different persons can have different occupations or expertise of potential benefit to all, the benefit is not guaranteed. Each person involved must still make sure that he gets the best available information about where the best goods and services may be acquired.

All of this holds for the principle as it applies to the realm of the intellect. We cannot all be scholars in all fields; nor can everyone study all the important people who have contributed to the field in which one wishes to make some creative advance. So we need to find out who can best tell us what is most important about some set of ideas.

Although I have read a good deal of Marx and Engels, I have always been interested mainly in their philosophical writings. I wanted to know what are the philosophical underpinnings of Marx's thought. How much, for example, did Marx believe in the area of economics, world history or the future of the working class. True, with Marx, as with most systematic thinkers, the entire position is more of a spider's web than an edifice, so it isn't always clear just what is basic to the viewpoint as a whole. It is in that area that others may teach us most.

Everyone concerned with political problems will have occasion to face Marx's ideas. And everyone concerned with political problems needs a clear guide to Marx's thought. H. B. Acton's book What Marx Really Said is one of the best available to gain a concise but very well-balanced account of Marx's views. Acton moves from a consideration of the origins of Marxism through chapters on Marxist materialism, historical materialism, profit and exploitation, revolution, the state and the communist ideal, to a conclusion that may surprise some; that for Marx, "social revolution by the working class under the correct leadership was the aim to which everything else was subordinated.

In the process, through these several stages, the reader is offered a clear account of Marxism, one that is well supported by quotations and historical sketches, helpful to Marx's ideas where Marx himself is cumbersome and even riddled through with pitfalls. Acton's writing is fresh, without any of the contortions that one generally finds in commentaries on Marx, and far more honest than what one finds on most bookshelves today. The emphasis is not on Marx's "early manuscripts," papers that Marx himself never saw through publication, but on Marxism as a whole.

H. B. Acton is one of those writers whom I respect—I reviewed his more recent book The Morals of Markets some months ago for BFL. There are a few points in his interpretation of Marx which I would criticize in a more detailed discussion—e.g. that Marx was in fact analyzing laissez-faire capitalism and the claim he makes in his conclusion that "individualistic atheism was Marx's starting-point, the background to all he strove to achieve." But these are secondary considerations. It is the book itself, which is worthy of award and of discussion in the work, hardly worth concern. Certainly they do not mar the excellent exposition of Marx's ideas which the book contains.

One piece of advice which I often give my students is that although obviously they won't have time to answer all the questions that pop into their minds while confronting some issue, they will do well to refrain from concluding that they cannot be answered simply because they do not choose to go after the answer. Instead, they would do better to decline forming conclusions on the topic at hand. Accordingly, I might simply say here that while Marx is not among the most important thinkers in human history (where truth, goodness or beauty are concerned), he is significant enough that we should not be misinformed about him. If you must offer judgements on Marx, but do not choose to do the research yourself, Acton's book is among the best short, clear and eminently accurate introductions you could read. It is good enough to rely on—and we do need to find reliable information to make the many choices which can benefit us in all aspects of our lives. Reviewed by TURK MACHAN / Political Philosophy (148 pages, indexed) / BFL Price $1.95
It is ten years since the appearance of Brand Blanshard's book, Reason and Analysis. That such a book should have been a marked event in both British and American philosophy is something that one would have thought was only to be expected; but that it should have turned out to be a book rather less well remarked than it might have been by professional philosophers is something that one can do little more than wonder at and bemoan. But why? Why should so superior a book have enjoyed so comparatively inferior a reception? Unhappily, the only answer is that Blanshard's book, being a sustained and vigorous defense of human reason and rationality, and a defense conceived largely in the mode and manner of traditional Western thought from Plato right down to the beginning of the present century, it is little wonder that both book and author should have had to swim dead against the current of our latter-day, new-fashioned philosophy which has come to dominate almost the entire Anglo-American philosophic scene in the last several years. It is what is called analytical philosophy. In fact, in terms of this latter sense of "analysis," Blanshard's book might well have been entitled, not so much "Reason and Analysis," as "Reason vs. Analysis."

Nor is that all, for perhaps the metaphor of Brand Blanshard's having to swim against the current of contemporary philosophy is almost too bland. Instead, it is much more a case of the man's having planted himself like a rock in the midst of the many currents and winds and tides of irrationalism in our time, settling down firmly against them all. As he himself marks early in his book, it is not just contemporary philosophy that seems to have lost respect for reason, but contemporary art, contemporary literature, contemporary theology and perhaps even contemporary life as well. And so it is that Blanshard's book continues to loom large on the horizon today—and yet unfortunately with all-too-many people paying it all-too-little heed—as a sustained and sound attack on them all. For as he himself puts it in his introduction and in the prologue and epilogue, Blanshard's book is an attempt to explore and expose an entire variety of irrational ills in contemporary thought.

Still, may there not be something of paradox here, thus to characterize Blanshard's book as being but one long and relentlessly detailed critique of the anti-reason of contemporary analytic philosophers? For it is these very philosophers whose stock in trade is no less than what they themselves would designate as being logical or linguistic analysis. How, then, can they of all people be accused of being the supreme irrationalists? To this question the answer must needs turn on an understanding of Blanshard's notion of reason and of what he would regard as being the long-term reign of reason in Western thought.

As he sees it, reason is just that power by which we human beings are raised above the condition of mere animals. And what it is about reason that carries us beyond the mere trappings of sensory perception and memory and imagination is just reason's capacity to discern the necessities and necessary connections of things. Thus it is as rational creatures and only as rational creatures that we are able to recognize not merely that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, but that it must be so, and why it must be so. Or again, to take still another rather crude example, it is one thing merely to become habituated to expecting heavy objects, when unsupported, to fall to the ground; but is a very different thing to see that this must happen and why it must happen. In other words, it is reason that enables us to understand the very nature and essentials of things, in terms of which it becomes intelligible why such things should be as they are and do the things that they do. Or again, it is reason that acquaints us with the causes in terms we can go beyond a mere recognition of the fact that various occurrences or events have taken place or do take place to a comprehension of why they take place.

Enter now the analytic philosophers, and, as Blanshard interprets them, what do they do but promptly set about to deflate all of man's lofty pretensions to understand either himself or his world in terms of reasons, causes and purposes? Nothing in their milieu seems to have like resources of intelligibility! Thus we do imagine—to revert to our earlier example—that necessarily and in the very nature of the case a straight line is the shortest distance. Ridiculous, the analysts would say, for what is involved here is no more than a convention or stipulation as to how the word "straight line" is to be used. It is no more reflects a real necessity embedded in the very formal and structural reality of the world than do such mere verbal truths as "A bachelor is an unmarried man" or "A brother is a male sibling.

Nor is the supposed necessity attaching to the principle that all unsupported bodies must fall in any better case. For so far from there being any rational necessity involved in this or in any other more sophisticated laws of falling bodies, it would rather seem to be no more than a case of repeated occurrences of certain phenomena, the reason or necessity for which we do not see, and which we then but dupes ourselves into believing are intelligible in terms of various imagined and suppositional grounds or necessary causes.

Accordingly it is to just such scepticism regarding reason's capacity to disclose the meaning and the intelligibility of things and events in the world, and in ourselves no less, that Blanshard undertakes in this book to mount a most detailed and devastating rejoinder. For the book is long—nearly 500 pages of closely reasoned discussion and argument. And although Blanshard in no wise pretends to anything exhaustively new or alarming, he has managed to carve out of the course of the last 50 years and more of analytic philosophy he does single out with an unerring acuity the major trends and the major thinkers representative of these trends, and he subjects them to a detailed and searching analysis—or perhaps since it is with analysts that he essays to deal, one had better say that his procedure is one of counter-analysis and refutation.

It is true that due to its very length, as well as to the intricacies and technicalities of its philosophical subject matter, Reason and Analysis is not exactly easy reading, and one sometimes wonders whether in the very thoroughness of Blanshard's expositions and refutations one may sometimes lose sight of the woods for the trees. At the same time, the prose style in which the book is written is nothing if not superb, almost majestic, and yet not without its being frequently and refreshingly interspersed with sallies and asides that it but a single deft phrase or so serve to unmask both the pretensions and often the reputations of some of his more recent contemporaries. For Blanshard's book is hard at the early and at the passing judgment made on Ludwig Wittgenstein's Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, a work which in the early days of the analytic movement was regarded invariably with awe and cited only with bated breath:

"In this curious work, it is as if a set of Sibyline oracles, scattered on flying leaves which had been gathered together, some of them extremely sage, some of them absurd, and many of them too dark to be classified as either. It is full of apophantic pronouncements, introduced abruptly and left without explanation or defence; the reader is puzzled whether its 'take-it-or-leave-it' manner is due to willfulness or expository ineptitude, and is only likely to throw the book impatiently aside. I share the reader's impatience with this way of writing philosophy. But the book remains an important one..." (pp. 120-121)

Warsaw ghetto where, at the constant risk of his life, he was a member of the Jewish resistance and daily smuggled flour and food into the Jewish sector from the "Aryan" part of the city, to his escape from Treblinka concentration camp where, to keep alive, he became a kapo, one into the Jewish work force who dragged the bodies of his fellows out of the gas chambers, stripped them of anything valuable, from their hair to their gold teeth, shoveled their corpses onto stretchers, and then dropped them into mass graves, which had been prepared first through the gas chambers.

On escaping from Treblinka at the age of eighteen, carrying out a plan which must be read in full to be believed, Gray joined the Soviet Army to fight Germans. At nineteen he had become a decorated officer.

The war over, he came to America where, teaching himself English, he slowly amassed a great fortune as a businessman. But the best, and at the same time the worst, events of his life were to follow: his marriage and the subsequent death by fire of his wife and children.

Throughout, Gray's driving purposes were: to live, and to understand. The fact that he is still living today is a declaration of the power of these
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Blanshard

Needless to say, this sort of thing is devastating. And yet, unfortunately, the very virtues of Blanshard’s style—and Blanshard himself in one place seems rather usefully to recognize as much—may have become something of a disability when it comes to his appreciation by contemporary philosophers. For now-a-days the current fashions in philosophical prose call for something of a different stamp. Sometimes, it is Wittgenstein’s mode of the cryptic pronouncement with no explanation and minimal supporting argument that contemporary philosophers seem bent on imitating. Or sometimes, it is the painstaking and seemingly belabored analysis of individual points and particular questions, in the manner of Moore or Malcolm, that is the norm. Or still more recently, one tends to encounter the chopped and broken style in which the writer’s philosophical exposition is constantly interrupted by strings of symbols, presumably indicating how “hardcore” his point is. Blanshard’s clear, fixed and precision characteristic of the rigour mortis of modern logic. In contrast, Blanshard’s flowing sentences, with their magnificent lucidity and finely turned argument, seem to come across, in the current philosophical scene, as strangely old-fashioned and unhappily dated. For which more’s the pity?

May we nevertheless be permitted to conclude this review with but one note of criticism, or at least with an indication of a possible shortcoming in this otherwise admirable book? For when one puts the book down after having gone through its page after page of analysis and criticism of the irrationalism of the analysts, one may well be inclined to ask, “But what is Blanshard’s own position? Where, after all, does he himself stand philosophically?” Of course, he stands for reason, both in philosophy and in human affairs generally. And yet that is hardly a particularly distinguishing philosophical characteristic, when one considers the history of Western philosophy. For it could not be said that thinkers as different from one another as Aristotle and Kant, Aquinas and Descartes, Plato and Hegel, were all defenders of reason and the power of human reason to recognize the rational necessities and necessary connections in things and in the world? What more specifically, then, is the character of Blanshard’s irrationalism, and what, more fully and concretely, is it that Blanshard would offer as an alternative to the prevalent analytic philosophy of which he is so critical?

From a reading of Reason and Analysis, as well as from what one knows of Brand Blanshard’s general philosophical outlook, one senses that his critique was mounted largely from the standpoint of that Absolute Idealism that so largely dominated Anglo-American philosophy at the turn of the century and against which recent analytic philosophy has been largely a reaction. Not only that, but in his comparatively brief concluding chapter, he does suggest that his rationalism leads him to subscribe to a doctrine of the necessary interconnection of each and every event or happening in the world, and even to a doctrine of the essential inescapable necessity and inevitability of everything that we do and everything that happens to us in the course of our lives. Such views, however, are hardly developed in detail, nor would it seem entirely clear how a repudiation of analytic philosophy on the grounds that Blanshard addsuce would necessarily lead to a rationalism of these particular consequences.

Nor is this omission in Blanshard’s book entirely without significance, when one takes into account the rapidity in which contemporary philosophy has developed in philosophy just in the ten years or so since the publication of Reason and Analysis. For one thing, the philosophic world has witnessed a sudden flowering of so-called modal logic, which represents an apparently striking departure from the logic of Principia Mathematica, this latter having been not just the instrument, but in many ways the very cornerstone of the entire program of the logical positivists, the logical atomists and the other analysts of a generation ago. Indeed this new logic is one which is apparently quite tolerant of the sort of things that Blanshard on the other hand is prejudiced against. And it is also one of the logics that is so strikingly artificial and essence of essential attributes—yes, of the very things which Blanshard is so critical of the analysts for having repudiated. Yet ironically enough, this newer type of logic is one born and bred of analytic philosophy, and is being cultivated today as the very darling of a new generation of analysts. But what must Blanshard say to a development such as this? Could it be that his diagnosis of the irrationalism of the analysts was mistaken? Or would he say that this new-found rationalism is not a genuine rationalism; or if genuine, then perhaps not a rationalism of his, Blanshard’s, kind? Alas, to questions of this sort it would seem that even a most careful rereading of the book will yield scarcely any answer.

Very well, then supposing that both phenomenologists and latter-day analysts have, either consciously or unconsciously, all tended to fall back on something like this Kantian device as a means of guaranteeing the relevance of reason to experience, what would Blanshard say to this? So far as the phenomenologists are concerned, Blanshard does not design so much as even to mention them in his book; and existentialism he dismisses out of hand as being a hopeless irrationalism. And yet is it possible that in this very day we are witnessing a resurgence of a kind of rationalism from out of what Blanshard would appear simply to have written off as but so many existentialist and phenomenological ashes? Was Blanshard’s diagnosis, then, all wrong? Or would he say that what would appear to be a newly found Kantian or transcendental rationalism in the contemporary philosophic situation is no more than a bogus rationalism? Doubtless, though, critical questions of this sort may seem unfair and out of place with respect to Blanshard. For why should a man who professes to deny all that is more than a reductio ad absurdum of the rationalism of his contemporaries be chided for not giving us much in the way of a good philosophy of his own? Or why should a work that was published in 1962, and that undertook to say what’s wrong with certain philosophic movements up to 1960, at the same time be expected to be prophetic of what would happen in philosophy in the year 1970? To ask such a question is only to confound the fact that one may think of the pertinence or impertinence of such criticisms, there is no denying that Reason and Analysis is a great book and a remarkable one, and a notable achievement in American letters no less than in American philosophy. REVIEWED BY HENRY VEATCH / PHILOSOPHY / BFL Price $8 (cloth, 505 pages, indexed) / $3.95 (paper, 505 pages, indexed)

THE RISE OF RADICALISM

By Eugene H. Methvin

The Rise Of Radicalism is a panoramic study of totalitarians from Plato, Rousseau and Robespierre to Marx, Lenin, Hitler, Mao and prominent figures of the New Left. Beginning with Plato, who taught that man “should teach his soul, by long habit, never to dream of acting independently, and to become utterly incapable of it,” Eugene Methvin traces the development of the totalitarian ideology and tactics to such contemporary “revolutionaries” as Huey Newton. Referring to those who disagree with him, Long declared: “We’ll change their minds or else in the people’s name we’ll have to wipe them out thoroughly, wholly, absolutely and completely.”

This book is more than a simple history of persons and events; it is an exploration of the totalitarian mentality. Methvin examines the life history and philosophy of each of his subjects, and he attempts to explain themselves lurking behind the desire to rule others. Rousseau, for example, wrote that “Fear and shame rule me to such a degree that I should like to hide from everyone’s sight,” and he went on to advocate the subjugation of the individual to the “general will”—an idea that Methvin attributes to “a bruised ego needing self-esteem.” The Rise of Radicism, in the author’s words, “is a kaleidoscopic drama of messiahs in search of followers and followers in search of messiahs.”

Although Methvin appears more conservative than libertarian, his book contains strong libertarian sentiments. For instance, again referring to (Continued on page 9)
THE CLASSIC ERICH WOLFGANG KORNGOLD
Ulf Hoelscher, Violin/South German Radio Symphony Orchestra/Willy Matteis, Conductor

All in all, this has been a pretty dismal season for record enthusiasts. The energy crisis, with its attendant petroleum shortages, has caused a world-wide shortage of vinyl, delaying many expected releases from major record companies and inhibiting the adventurous innovations of others. Only the flood of releases of new recordings honoring Sergei Rachmaninov has stood out.

But now Angel Records has released a very unusual record, an inspiration. In fact, it is a recording of the best-known classical musical of Erich Wolfgang Korngold, best known for his film scores. Contained on this album are the first stereo recordings of three of Korngold’s best works: his Violin Concerto in D Major, the “Much Ado About Nothing” Suite and the Theme and Variations, Op. 42. All are brilliantly successful works, particularly the Violin Concerto, which rivets the best of the great conductors in the Romantic tradition. The Concerto has been recorded once before, by Jascha Heifetz, with Alfred Wallenstein conducting the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra, but that two-decade old recording obscures the masterly orchestral parts of this work of art. Despite the brilliance of Heifetz’ performance on that earlier version, this new recording must be deemed superior—if for no other reason than its gorgeously recorded sound.

Hoelscher is a young German violinist, and this is his American premiere recording. His rendition of the Korngold work is superb; his style of playing is suitably perfect to the mood of the work.

UNION POWER AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST
By Emerson P. Schmidt

In one of the most carefully documented and fact-packed books ever devoted to the subject, Emerson Schmidt analyzes the realities of union power and “collective bargaining” and the tremendously harmful role they have played in obstructing and reducing production, causing unemployment and instigating inflation. “Trade unionism, as it presently operates in the United States,” he concludes, “has made workers as a whole powerless, while inflation has made monopolists very rich.”

Mr. Schmidt begins by defining the union problem. He contends that the central aim of the unions is to take labor out of competition. One of the myths he exposes is that, especially in an inflation period, wages increase persistently lag behind increases in the cost of living. Between 1960 and 1970, for example, the consumer price index increased by 31 per cent; in the same period, gross average hourly wages in manufacturing increased from $2.20 to $3.36, or 48 per cent.

Schmidt is correct, also, in his analysis of the most important of the role that union-wage demands play in exacerbating inflation. Inflation is always finally a monetary phenomenon: only an increase in the money supply in relation to the production of goods and services can raise the average level of prices. But if we ask what, in turn, causes the monetary managers to increase the monetary supply, we find that a main purpose is to avert the unemployment that excessive money-wage increases tend to bring about.

In one of his most powerful chapters, Schmidt concludes that “violence and the threat of violence are an integral part of collective bargaining.” He proves this with a wealth of detailed evidence. Yet the overwhelming majority of so-called labor experts even today remains blandly oblivious to the intimidation and latent violence inseparable from the strike weapon.

What is to be done about excessive union power? The main part of the cure has long been obvious to sober students of the problem. It is to repeal practically all of the federal labor legislation passed in the last forty years—the Norris-LaGuardia Act, Davis-Bacon Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Wagner-Taft-Hartley Act, minimum wage laws—and the mass of state and local legislation that imitates and supports them. We should repeal, in short, all the special immunities, exemptions and privileges that have been granted to unions and their officials. Locally, we should enforce the common or statute law against mass picketing and all forms of union intimidation, harassment and violence.

Mr. Schmidt, I take it, agrees with all this; but in some respects he would apparently go farther and draft, for example, “a body of antitrust laws appropriate to the labor markets.” In view of the arbitrariness, uncertainty and contradictions in our present antitrust laws as applied to corporations, this proposal must be viewed with misgivings. But whatever differences one may have with some of Schmidt’s conclusions, he has written one of the most informative and cogently-argued books on the union problem that has appeared in the last decade. REVIEWED BY HENRY HAZLITT / Economics (204 pages, indexed) / BFL Price $49

KARATE: the Art of “Empty Hand” Fighting
By Hidetaka Nishiyama and Richard C. Brown

The devotees of the martial arts in the United States, particularly Karate, now number in the hundreds of thousands. While rising concern about violent crime undeniably accounts for some of this interest, the main reason can be found in the nature of the martial arts themselves. Emphasizing discipline, speed and grace of movement, the martial arts have their historical and kinesthetic roots in both combat and dance. Of the many unarmed martial arts, Karate is both the most popular and most effective. Its techniques of combat and ritualized formal exercises are an excellent method of mental and physical self-development and also an enjoyable form of recreational exercise.

KARATE: The Art of “Empty Hand” Fighting is probably the best single introductory book available on the subject. Not to be confused with cheap paperback “courses” guaranteed to make you an expert overnight, this is a professionally produced text, written by authors both literate and of unquestioned competence in the martial arts. Through hundreds of dramatic photographs, all basic kicks, strikes, blocks and stances are clearly depicted. The accompanying written explanation is also exceptionally clear. Also, virtually unique among such works, most techniques are photographed from several different angles at each stage of execution, leaving little doubt how to perform them. Common errors are also described and photographed.

In addition to basic technique, a wealth of other material is provided: a brief history of Karate, warm-up exercises, sparring, throws, a complete form (Heian 4), and defenses against holds, and knife, club and pistol attacks. For those wishing to train on their own, a complete 66-lesson program is included.

For either the beginning or advanced student, Karate: The Art of “Empty Hand” Fighting provides invaluable material. For the person merely interested in “what Karate is all about,” the text and hundreds of accompanying photographs make for informative and exciting reading. REVIEWED BY JARRET B. WOLLSTEIN / (251 pages, indexed) / BFL Price $8.75
(Continued from page 1—LEON)

My initial reaction when asked to write reviews of these books was election: finally a libertarian would say something in print against sexism. I prepared a 150-word bull, which I administered to 38 friends who are "good and true" believers—23 men and 15 women. Libertarians—at least these 38—don’t seem to be caught up in the "argument from biology." To wit: 30 of them believe that men are no more innately aggressive than women; 22 didn’t accept the idea of maternal instincts; only one thought that men are innately more creative than women. Only one disagreed that most non-physical differences stem from learned behavior, rather than inherited traits. Nine said that women have less economic value than men, which is why they don’t earn equal pay for equal work. Yet most of them (26) agreed that in present society, women are more oppressed than men.

You may wonder why I would take a survey in the first place. Well, we at the Cato Institute have had many discussions about libertarian literature on sexism and feminism. There isn’t any. The only major libertarian who has ever written on the subject by a libertarian was Rothbard’s travesty in an old issue of The Individualist. I don’t even want to comment on—that not publicity—except to say that it did serve to alert libertarian women to their voice, or lack of one, in the "movement."

So I polled my friends in the hope of proving to myself, if to no one else, that libertarians can be somewhat consistent. I found their opinions reassuring. I can’t imagine them finding Inevitability or Suicide even marginally worth reading.

My basic quarrel: read: against those books which are their implicit assumption that male and female are the basically valid divisions between human beings. Yes, I know, vive la difference; I can tell one from the other and I like it that way. So what?

What I want to know is, didn’t these men ever hear of individual differences (as opposed to class/categorical ones)? How does one account for the passive men, the aggressive woman and the mixture of both traits to be found in the majority of humans? And, finally, what is the purpose of making such distinctions, if not to maintain a status quo that acts against an open social system?

What do women want?

From Freud onward, no one has come up with a satisfactory answer. Because there isn’t any. There aren’t "women who want..."—any more than there is a "common good" or a "general welfare." These are phrases that obliterate clear thinking and sensible understanding. What exists is the individual, and it doesn’t help our ability to remember that fact, when we’re bombarded with terms that trap us into viewing each other collectively rather than separately. Being self-directed and self-responsible, each of which is by nature, means we don’t have to play a part written "by society"; we can write our own script.

Recommended reading: Betty Friedan’s The Feminine Mystique, which deals with the need for self-esteem and independent purpose in women and men alike.

(Continued from page 1—ROTHBARD)

be called "judo tactics." Yes, he says to the feminists, women are the superior sex, and men are weak and frail creatures, given to crime and rampant aggression. But upon further reflection, he concludes, that women should abandon destructive women’s lib and allow men to be superior in work, status and power. Roughly, Gilder argues as follows: women are superior in all things related to sex, superior both in sex itself and in all the life-roles embodied in maternity. Furthermore, in order to maintain her maternal and nurturing role, in order to maintain civilization itself, women must use feminine wiles and social pressure to force men into becoming good providers for their families, to mold them away from their promiscuous and random criminal instincts. But in order to do that, men have to be allowed some compensations, and these are superiority in power, status and jobs. Take that satisfaction away from them and men will disappear from the check on irrational and anti-social role. In short: for heaven’s sake, girls, let the men have some sphere of attainment; if not, society and civilization will collapse.

It is amusing to observe the reactions of feminist reviewers toward Gilder’s Sexual Suicide. When they don’t simply rant and rave, they have to concede Gilder’s argument, since it confirms their assumed contempt for the male gender. Their argument then boils down to: but who needs those blankety-blank stereotypes anyway? In luring the feminists into this stance, I am forced to point out that Gilder induces them to expose the bankruptcy of their position. For while feminists may enjoy the absurd analogy of women with blacks, and while black separatism may be a cogent if not a very practical doctrine, the idea of female separatism is too idiotic to be entertained seriously.

While it is pleasant to see the feminists hoist by their own petard, it is surely true that men are not all that frail; in the march of civilization and in the great division of labor by gender, each sex plays a necessary and vital role. The idea, furthermore, that men have to be drummed into line and into civilization by women is to put libertarianism at its flimsiest.

Professor Goldberg’s work, in contrast, is a fully honed and scholarly blockbuster. Goldberg has many important insights on gender differences that are in all probability biologically and genetically based: ranging from estrogen and the “maternal instinct” through the many scientific studies as well as human history that demonstrate overwhelming male superiority in those disciplines that require great ability in abstract logic. The latter includes: mathematics, physics, philosophy, moral concepts and practical play (Where are the female Aristotles, Einsteins, Bachs, Rembrandts, Bobby Fischers?) He also offers a brilliant defense of social “stereotypes.” But Goldberg devotes most of his book to the one area where he demonstrates the male for “superiority” to be absolutely unchallengeable and completely rational: both anthropological and physiological evidence. First, Goldberg demonstrates that, in every one of the several thousand cultures in human history, every one has been marked by male dominance and “patriarchy.” In short, males have been the authority in every one of several thousand cultures. Taking the time to refute every alleged instance where male dominance supposedly did not exist, Goldberg asks: if the environmentalists are right and this dominance was the result of cultural “brainwashing,” then how come the males were able to dominate each and every culture in the first place? For such domination simply proves the anti-feminist point. That the dominance was due to physical strength for arduous labor Goldberg refutes by showing that even in those primitive cultures, where the women were not fed and worked relatively idle, men still possessed the positions of authority. Furthermore, he points out that in the modern industrial society which requires a more extensive division of labor than in primitive tribes, male dominance becomes necessarily more pervasive and significant. Also Goldberg points out that even those societies which have adopted women’s lib and egalitarianism as their official credos (e.g., Continental China and the Israeli kibbutzim) are thoroughly dominated by males.

But while Goldberg sees that this unanimous anthropological evidence develops an overwhelming case for a biological groundwork for male dominance and patriarchy, Goldberg does not simply rest there. For he presents us with very recent scientific evidence for the biological cause of male “aggression” (defined not just as coercion but broadly as initiative, drive for status, etc.). That evidence points to the enormously greater presence of the hormone testosterone in males (averaging ten times as much as in the female), and also the evidence that testosterone leads physiologically to such “aggression.” Specifically, the neo-natal male baby receives a jolt of testosterone which sensitizes his brain and central nervous system, so that the next massive jolt of testosterone at puberty is translated into a permanently more “aggressive” being. If, then, girls are "socialized" away from competitive and high-status occupations in the market place, and boys are socialized toward them, this is not arbitrary and oppressive brainwashing; but a reasonable way in which girls and boys are influenced in the direction of biological normality. For if this socializing process did not take place, then men would be permanently handicapped in the fighting of themselves as failures in the competitive race. The analogy, as Goldberg points out, is to ponder what would happen if girls were not socialized away from any possible interest in professional boxing. Social roles and “stereotypes,” here as in many other areas, conform to biological reality. And if our liberal philosophy has taught us, there is no higher test for a valid ethic for humanity.

Of the two authors, Professor Colberg in particular rests on the high ground of scientific truth. The only “arguments” against him are the whims and fantasies of egalitarians who foolishly yearn to play God with the universe.

(Continued from page 7)

Rousseau, he writes: "his ideological descendents—Robespierre, Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao—erected out of his general will a great god, ‘The People’—upon whose backs the weight of the general will have in the name of the state slaughtered millions of people.

Unfortunately, The Rise of Radicialism contains numerous flaws, the most serious of which is its title. Methvin’s use of the term “radical” is severely restricted and refers specifically to one who advocates violent revolution and the establishment of a “revolutionary dictatorship.” This use of “radical” is tragic, indeed the moral confusion and the playing of itself by the term, but also because it lends support to the notion that radicalism of any kind, regardless of its ideals and methods, is destructive—which, of course, is plainly false. For my part, I would like to have seen this book called The Rise of Totalitarianism, because this is its actual theme.

Despite these reservations, however, I strongly recommend this book. Vividly written, it contains an enormous amount of information concerning the methods, and motives, of various authoritarian personalities. And it lays to rest, once and for all, the myth that the New Left has any fundamental ideological kinship to libertarian principles. Reviewed By GEORGE H. SMITH / POLITICS (544 pages, indexed) / BFL Price $11.95
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A GREAT LIBERTARIAN CLASSIC
Free With Every $10 Purchase

A HUMANE ECONOMY
By Wilhelm Roepke

Before his death, Wilhelm Roepke was one of the world's most influential free-market economists. In the eyes of F. A. Hayek, he was "a man of great courage who exposed the illusions of the Sixth Decade of the Twentieth Century with the same candor he fought against the illusions of the Twenties."

Henry Hazlitt wrote of Roepke: "Among the world's economists, (he) is outstanding not merely for the acuteness of his analysis, but for the breadth of his learning and the breadth of his views...he stands with Ludwig von Mises and F. A. Hayek as one of the three most influential leaders of the neo-liberal movement."

A Humane Economy was Roepke's greatest achievement: his argument for an ideal society in which wealth would be widely dispersed; where people's lives would have solid foundations; where genuine communities, from the family upward, would furnish moral support to the individual; and in which there would be a broad middle class and a healthy balance between town and country, industry and agriculture.

BFL is pleased to have secured a supply of A Humane Economy, and we will send you a free copy with every order from this issue totaling $10 or more.

(Purchase additional copies at $1)

A WORD TO OUR READERS

Beginning this month, BFL increases its content by 50%—to twelve pages. This will allow for several additional features long under discussion by the editors. For one thing, we are inaugurating, with Professor Henry Veatch's review of Reason and Analysis, an essay review by a distinguished scholar to appear in each future issue. The additional room now available for longer analytical reviews will make it possible to attract some of the world's top scholars and writers to our pages. Next month: Professor Arthur Etkin will review James J. Martin's massive American Liberalism and World Politics.

Beginning next month, we will begin to print letters to the editor, and, in some cases, the reviewer's or author's comments on the letters. Naturally, space limitations will not permit publication of every letter we receive, nor will the limitation of time even permit a personal reply. But the editors will read incoming correspondence and will in many cases pass it along to our reviewers.

Nathaniel Branden presents an "Introduction to Biocentric Therapy" on April 18 at 7:30 P.M. in Plainfield, N.J. Registration fee: $5 per person. For further details, write the Plainfield Consultation Center, 631 Madison Ave., Plainfield, N.J. 07060.

Again available: Szasz' Myth of Mental Illness ($2.45); Hosper's Libertarianism in hardcover ($10); Heinlein's Time Enough For Love in paperback ($1.95); Third Force, a limited quantity available at half price—$3.95 while they last; Discovery of Freedom by Lane ($12); Bound Volumes of Libertarian Forum 1966-1971, ($11); Who is Ayn Rand?, by Branden and Branden ($7.50).

We occasionally encounter books or issues on which opinion within libertarian ranks is divided—sometimes irreconcilably so. Such an issue seems to be that of Women's liberation. So when we elect to review books which we believe raise important questions that should be of interest to serious and objective persons on both sides of the issue, we do so with some equanimity, knowing that regardless of how we may handle the review, we are certain to offend nearly everybody. But in keeping with H. L. Mencken's famous maximum, unless somebody is offended we haven't done our job properly. In an attempt at fairness and objectivity, we try in these cases to publish reviews of differing viewpoints in the same issue. Hence the juxtaposed reviews by Riqui Leon (con) and Murray Rothbard (pro) on the Glider and Goldberg books. Please include your zip code when canceling your subscription.


REVIEWERS FOR THIS ISSUE: John Chamberlain is the distinguished writer and syndicated columnist and former editor of Fortune. His review is reprinted by permission of The Alternative (© 1974). R. A. Childs, Jr., is editor of Books for Libertarians. Henry Hazlitt is one of the world's best known and most respected free-market economists, whose latest book is Conquest of Poverty. His review is reprinted from the Freeman by permission. Camille Ibbotson is a student at the University of Colorado. Riqui Leon is a director of Rampart College in Santa Ana, California, and a free-lance writer. Tibor Machan is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at S.U.N.Y. College, Fredonia, N.Y. He is an editor of Reason magazine and author of the forthcoming Libertarian Alternative, Karl T. Ploock is an editor with a Washington, D.C., research organization, and a free-lance science fiction writer and essayist. Edward Regis, Jr., is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Howard University, Washington, D.C. Robert E. Sagehorn is editor of the journal Western World Review. Murray N. Rothbard is editor of Libertarian Forum, associate editor of BFL, author of For A New Liberty and many other books, essays and reviews about everything under the sun. His review of Our Enemy the State is reprinted in a slightly revised form by permission of Reason magazine. George H. Smith is a free-lance writer living in Arizona. His book, Atheism: The Case Against God is to be published before summer, if one is to believe his publisher. Henry B. Veatch is among the world's best-known Aristotelian philosophers, Professor of Philosophy at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., and the author of Rational Man and many other titles. Jarrett B. Wollstein studied psychology at the University of Maryland and is now in the investment business in Washington, D.C. He holds a second degree Black Belt in Korean Karate and has 13 years experience in the martial arts.
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