THE CASE FOR A 100 PERCENT GOLD DOLLAR
By Murray N. Rothbard

Murray Rothbard has put us all in his debt not only by his long, masterly textbook, Man, Economy and State and other volumes, but by his no less masterly pamphlets, particularly his model of reasoning and exposition, What Has Government Done to Our Money? He puts us further in his debt by this new pamphlet.

We live in an era of unparalleled confusion of thought on monetary questions. The overwhelming majority of professional economists now advocate fiat paper money. But almost as bad, the handful of economists who do favor a return to a gold standard cannot agree among themselves about what kind of gold standard they want.

The gold-standard advocates may be roughly divided into four groups, with numberless disagreements within these:
1. Those who favor returning to the restricted gold-exchange standard prevailing under the IMF system from 1946 to 1971, with the dollar again made convertible into gold either at $35 an ounce or some indefinitely higher figure, but still convertible only by foreign central banks or official institutions.
2. Those who favor returning to a fractional-reserve gold standard, with dollars convertible into gold by anyone who holds them and with a specified minimum percentage gold reserve or maximum expansion of deposits or notes. This means those who would return to the pre-1933 form of the gold standard. This probably includes the majority of present gold-standard advocates. A few of them favor abolition of the Federal Reserve System or any central bank; most do not. There is no agreement among them on the gold conversion rate, the minimum percentage gold reserve or the maximum permitted expansion of bank deposits or notes.
3. Those who favor a “locked” gold standard, with no future increase in deposits or notes permitted except dollar-for-dollar for an increased domestic gold supply.
4. Those who favor a full gold standard, consisting only of gold coins or gold certificates 100 percent backed by gold.

Murray Rothbard puts himself in the last group—possibly its sole present member. This may look at first glance like the most extreme, deflationary and impractical position that could be imagined. But Professor Rothbard defends it brilliantly—not only with prodigious historical, legal, and economic scholarship, but with unrelenting logic.

He traces the origin of the fractional-reserve system back to the practice of the old goldsmiths who, he contends, simply perpetrated a fraud by in effect issuing and lending out warehouse receipts for far more gold than they actually held. Modern banks simply continued to practice this fraud, and modern states to sanction it. The truth, he asserts, is that “fractional-reserve banking is disastrous both for the morality and for the fundamental bases and institutions of the market economy.”

Rothbard’s conclusion, in sum, is that “the soundest monetary system and the only one fully compatible with the free market and with the absence of force or fraud from any source is a 100 percent gold standard. This is the only system compatible with the fullest preservation of the rights of property. It is the only system that assures the end of inflation, and with it, of the business cycle.”

There will be loud and angry answers to this conclusion, but Rothbard has anticipated most of them. He explains why, for example, there is never any need for a larger supply of money than that already in existence.

This reviewer agrees with practically all the recommendations that Professor Rothbard makes except those concerning when and how to get back to a full gold standard. Here I would classify myself with the tiny group I have labelled “3.” But what needs to be emphasized here is not detailed differences in opinion, but that Murray Rothbard has given us another provocative, informative, and elegantly reasoned economic tract. Reprinted with permission from the Inflation Survival Letter. Reviewed by Henry Hazlitt / Economics (43 pages) / LR Price $2

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH
AND THE BATTLE AGAINST
AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN WORLD WAR II
By Wayne S. Cole

Cole's Lindbergh is very well written and good reading. Beyond the historical details of the debate over American intervention into World War II, Cole brings to the fore very well the moral element in the opposition of Lindbergh and the other leaders of America First. It required a moral sense to leave the easy road of going along with the Establishment. Cole begins his study with the example of America First's attempt to bring anti-interventionism to the most rock-ridden interventionist and militarist section of the country, the South. In Oklahoma City, a Lindbergh speech was blocked by the American Legion which declared that “the time for freedom of speech is past.” Local thugs threatened to disrupt the meeting. But Senator Burton Wheeler, Democrat of Montana, volunteered to speak on the same platform with Lindbergh, while crusty former governor “Alfalfa Bill” Murray agreed to chair the meeting.

From the formation of the America First Committee in the late summer of 1940, Lindbergh became its leading speaker—from the Hollywood Bowl, where he shared the platform with Senator Worth Clark, Democrat of Idaho, to Manhattan Center, where he appeared with Massachusetts' Democratic Senator David Walsh and John T. Flynn, and Madison Square Garden, where he was joined by Flynn, Senator Wheeler, and Socialist presidential candidate, Norman Thomas. Behind this were the efforts of thousands of America First supporters, of whom three-quarters lived in the Middle West, with the rest located in the cities of the East and West coasts.

Returning in 1939 from Europe, where he had seen U.S. envoy encourages France not to come to an agreement with Germany and pressure France and England to negate the attempts of Poland to return the Corridor to Germany, Lindbergh was encouraged by Herbert Hoover's confidant, William R. Castle, to play a leading role in the battle against interventionism. The Roosevelt administration attempted to buy off Lindbergh with the offer of an appointment to a new cabinet position of air secretary; but encouraged by the Republican isolationist stalwarts in the Senate, Hiram Johnson of California and William Borah of Idaho, he rejected all New Deal offers and stuck to his principles.

Lindbergh saw the war as a civil war of western civilization, a war to
be ended as quickly as possible by a negotiated settlement. As Cole observes, “He was skeptical of the ideological and moral righteousness of the British and French…. His approach was, in effect, more understanding of the Germans [without approving of what they did] and more skeptical of the Allies than the conventional view in the United States. Lindbergh saw a divided responsibility for the origins of the European war, rather than an assignment of the total blame to Hitler, Nazi Germany, and the Axis States.”

Lindbergh had spent most of the 1930s in Europe. The actualization of that great fear of families—child kidnapping—and the treatment to which the Lindbergh family was subjected by the press had alienated Lindbergh from America. Thus, Lindbergh was in very few ways a typical leader of the American non-intervention movement. He was more a Europeanist than a non-interventionist but a Europeanist who saw the United States and the countries of Europe as a single people sharing an important civilization. Much more than the other leaders of the America First movement he was driven by the special desire to end the European civil war which had broken out in the practice of preventive intervention, which could only prolong the fratricide. This special drive, and its dangerous presence in the United States, explains the outspoken nature of the leading role he assumed in the anti-intervention effort.

The immediate influences on Lindbergh that activated his leadership were as varied as the diversity of the non-interventionist movement— which spanned the spectrum from Right to Left, from total free market to socialistic (the unifying element being the desire for intervention), and especially a commitment to justice and integrity. But the two most important influences were the group in Chicago (including Chicago Tribune publisher Robert R. McCormick, Robert E. Wood, Avery Brundage, and University of Chicago president Robert Hutchins), and three students of Yale Professor Edwin Borchard: R. Douglas Stuart, Sargent Shriver, and Kingsley Davis. Along with Sidney Hertzberg, John T. Flynn, William H. Regnery, and Chester Bowles, formed the active leadership of the America First Committee.

Lindbergh considered the central issue in the great debate to be that of integrity. He believed that there was no danger to America from abroad, but a great danger from within America, from its governmental leaders. He demanded that policy be made on the basis of openness with the American people. He then made good use of potent examples without becoming an advocate of the German way of life. Lindbergh insisted: “Subterfuge marked every step we made ‘short of war,’ and it now marks every step we are making ‘short of’ a dictatorial system in America. Our nation has been led to war with promises of peace. It is now being led toward dictatorship with promises of democracy.” But this a promise of democracy for people abroad, not Americans. Instead of the crusade “for freedom and democracy abroad, let us decide now how these terms are to be applied to the civil liberties of our southern states.”

FDR was especially spiteful toward Lindbergh. Probably it was Lindbergh’s exposure of Roosevelt’s lack of integrity which upset him. Roosevelt compared Lindbergh to those who, during the War for Southern Independence, had supported the national liberation struggle of the Confederacy. The label of Copperhead brought immediate responses from social liberal isolationists such as John T. Flynn, Oswald Garrison Villard, and Robert A. Taft. Taft supported Lindbergh’s foreign-policy statements and said, “[Roosevelt] lacks the courage to come out openly for a declaration of war, while taking every possible step to accomplish that purpose, and yet threatens those who oppose his policy, as if the country were at war.”

FDR set up the Office of Civilian Defense, which was charged to “sustain national morale” by, according to FDR, “effective publicity to counter the propaganda of the Wheelers, Nyes, Lindberghs, etc.” With the support of the Establishment media, the vast array of government power made it possible for Roosevelt to enter the Second World War. One reason was that the isolationists had no organizations which compared to the vast array of organizations that supported the interventionist position of the government. The realists found they were outsiders looking in. They had always been outsiders, but they had not wished to recognize it, even when the American business community and the middle class generally had been expropriated by the New Deal. (Many people do not recognize expropriation, or other forms of aggression, when it is done to them, due to an inability to recognize “sweet-talking” propaganda for what it is.)

Since there was no preexisting domestic opposition to Roosevelt, or government personnel available, businessmen and educators who were better at, and preferred to do, their real jobs had to try to substitute. It was a heroic effort.

The heroes of America First and of American isolationism in general deserve the attention and knowledge of today’s libertarians. Cole’s Lindbergh offers the most recent—and most readable—work on pre-World War II isolationism. REVIEWED BY LEONARD LIGGIO / History (290 pages) LR Price $10

THE ART OF DECEPTION

By Nicholas Capaldi

In my undergraduate and graduate days, the liberal left was still in firm command in academia. There was, of course, a pious homage paid to neutrality about ethical and political matters, for positivism was still very much at the helm, but the smugness with which its advocates presented it as a heroic effort, and its inability to recognize “sweet-talking” propaganda for what it is), has failed when used before, will interfere with other programs, and costs too much anyway. Side One, in defense of its proposal which has now been ripped to shreds, introduced the following red herring: you do not really understand and sympathize with the problem. Side One then proceeds to elaborate a lengthy presentation of the problem: the horror of the ghetto, the destruction of the children, their eventual destruction. By the end of this red herring the audience is in tears. If the audience does not think that Side Two is racist, it certainly thinks Side Two is insensitive. Moreover, Side One did not only approve of proposal X, they would probably approve of any proposal.

Capaldi’s work is balanced in many ways: his examples include dubious cases made for products in advertisement, how either advocates of leftist or rightist positions can be discredited by deceptive means, and how this has in fact happened in cases most readers will be acquainted with. He infuses very rigorous analysis with easy-going discussions, making these formidable, technical points about logic in a crystal clear manner. And he discusses instances of argumentation and conclusions, all the “informal” fallacies, face-to-face debating, winning arguments. Mills’ method, the formal analysis of arguments, and much more.

Cogito offers a work for those who are interested in the philosophy of logic, but I bet many whiz kids of propositional calculi would benefit from Capaldi’s book in ways they cannot from their own high powered expertise. The book would certainly do a world of good for students and other readers from junior high school and subsequent levels all the way to old age, for it facilitates coping with the problems of a community (and the life) of beings whose entire existence depends on how carefully they make use of their minds. REVIEWED BY TIBOR MACHAN / Philosophy (192 pages) / LR Price $3.95
Now to Russian music since Tchaikovsky. The recorded works of Rachmaninoff have already been reviewed by LR. Let me only remark that his Symphony no. 2, which I find the most inspiring of his works, has been recorded by Previn (on Angel 36954) in a performance so stunning that it would be a mistake to purchase any other recording. And do not forget Rachmaninoff's contemporary, Reinhold Gliere (1875-1956), whose Symphony no. 3 ("Ilya Murometz") is a marvel of colorful symphonic writing (and of colorful recording by Stokowski on Seraphim S-60009).

The most prolific, and in the opinion of many—myself included—the most important of contemporary Russian composers is Sergei Prokofiev (1891-1953). His Symphony no. 1 ("Classical"), a takeoff of Haydn and Mozart, is a delight (Kurtz on Seraphim 60172); but his surging gut-level power is best exhibited in the Symphony no. 5, performed by Ansermet, on "Prokofiev: Symphony No. 5 in B Flat." But this is only the beginning. The violin concerto is a vehicle in which few composers have excelled; Prokofiev wrote two of them, each in its own way a perfect gem—both beautifully played by violinist Isaac Stern and conducted by Ormandy on Columbia MS-6635. His Piano Concerto no. 3 is already a major classic designed for a full evening's listening and viewing, and it is a melodic instrument of the sea. Stokowski is at his best at this type of music, and now that the recording is available, you should listen to Ives' "Concord Sonata" on Columbia MS-7145 (next month: Song and Opera from the Beginnings through Purcell.).

The Russian-Armenian composer Aram Khatchadourian (1903- ) has written three great musical treatments of the Romeo and Juliet theme (if one ignores Gounod's opera by the same name): by Berlioz, [Ed. note: reviewed in this column last month.] by Tchaikovsky, and by Prokofiev. The only one, in my opinion, that compares with Berlioz is Prokofiev's; it lacks Berlioz' tremendous intensity, but it is after all a ballet designed for a full evening's listening and viewing, and it is a melodic instrument of the sea. Stokowski is at his best at this type of music, and now that the intractable rhythms of the sea and certainly conveys powerful images of the sea. Stokowski is at his best at this type of music, and now that the incomparable Toscanini recording is no longer available, Stokowski's on London 21059 is the one to get; it also has Maurice Ravel's almost equally evocative suites "Daphnis and Chloe" on the other side. (The same for Szel's fine performance of both on Odyssey Y-31928.) Debussy's "Images pour Orchestre" (including the famous "Iberia") is exquisitely rendered by Boulez on Columbia MS-7362. Stokowski's performance of "Nocturnes," on Seraphim S-60104, is equally exquisite.

Ottorino Respighi (1879-1936) also wrote some interesting impressionistic orchestral suites; "The Fountains of Rome," and "The Birds"—all available together on one record by Kertesz. London CS-6624 (though Munch's performance, without "The Birds," on London 21024, has even more élan). But the pick of the crop is the "Ancient Airs and Dances" (which I recommend with Karajan on DG-2330247, because it also contains the lovely "Pachelbel Kanon." However, once you listen to these airs in their original form on Turnabout 34195 [recommended in Part I of this series], you will see that in their original form they have more charm than Respighi's adaptation of them for modern orchestra.

A highly original composer is Francis Poulenc (1899-1963), much of whose work contains more "cuteness" than inspiration. Until we get to choral music later in this series, I shall recommend only his Concerto in G-minor for Organ, Strings, and Tymp-pani (Angel S-35993) and his Concerto for Two Pianos and Orchestra (Angel S-35993).

Another French composer, Olivier Messiaen (1908- ), wrote the tremendously colorful "Turguillala Symphonie" (Ozawa on RCA LSC-7051), which some have found an overwhelming spiritual experience and others a crashing bore. But his "L'Ascension" ("Four Meditations") for string orchestra (Stokowski on London 21060) is, at the very least, a "different" listening experience. The more charmed symphonies in the last section, leaving the choral progression unresolved at the end, is a powerful and unique pleasure-pain music experience.

Igor Stravinsky (1882-1971) is perhaps the most fertile contemporary composer, and enormously influential, though often leaving one un­moved. His "Sacre de Printemps" ("Rite of Spring"), even before it became programatized and celebrated in Disney's film Fantasia, was clearly a powerful gut-level musical innovation and the "primal scream" quality comes out best in the earlier of two Bernstein recordings, Columbia MS-6010. (There is a more structurally lucid, "intellectual," performance by Boulez on Columbia MS-7293.) Stravinsky's "Firebird" suite is performed withisty intensity by Stokowski on London 21026, and his ballet "Petruchka" by Ansermet on London 6009. You can get the two suites, "Firebird" and "Petruchka," together on one excellent recording by Ozawa, RCA LSC-3167.

Bela Bartók (1881-1945) writes in a modern idiom with great power and conciseness. His best orchestral works seem to me to be the "Concerto for Orchestra," carefully yet passionately rendered by Bernstein on Columbia MS-6140; the "Music for Strings, Percussion, and Celeste," brilliantly done by the Boston Symphony (on Columbia MS-6751), and the three ballets "Appalachian Spring" by Aaron Copland (1900- ), as well as works by American composers (the "Six Bagatelles" for Organ, Strings, and Tympani (Angel S-35953) and his Concerto for Two Pianos and Orchestra (Angel S-35993).

The American composer Samuel Barber (1910- ) has a large output, but only occasionally forgoes contrivance for inspiration. In his "Adagio for Strings" (Columbia M-30066), moving in its simplicity, the inspiration comes out, and for a moment it is almost Mahler. A fine collection of recent American orchestral music, including the Barber "Adagio" and the fine ballet "Appalachian Spring" by Aaron Copland (1900- ), as well as works by American composers (the "Six Bagatelles" for Organ, Strings, and Tympani, is conducted by Bernstein on a two-record set, The American Album."

The most controversial of American composers, and by many consid­ered the most important, is Charles Ives (1874-1954). In spite of the ultra­modern harmonies and the intricate complexity of his work, you will appreciate the "symphony" if you are acquainted with the revival, hymn-tunes, passages from which (often in sardonically distorted form) bespeak his work. His interesting Symphony no. 1 is well performed by Ormandy on Columbia MS-7145, with Ives' "Three Pieces in New England" on the other side. The Symphony no. 4 is played simultaneously (part of the time) by two orchestras in different tempos (Stokowski does it brilliantly on Columbia MS-6773), and in spite of its raucous cacophony it can be a rewarding experience. Those who prefer modern music in a quieter idiom should listen to Ives' "Concord Sonata" on Columbia MS-7192. (Next month: Song and Opera from the Beginnings through Purcell.)
The Virtue of Selfishness
By Ayn Rand

Rational Man:
A Modern Interpretation of Aristotelian Ethics
By Henry B. Veatch

When David Hume argued that “vice and virtue” have no basis in fact, but are mere “perceptions in the mind”—that the condemnation of murder, for example, is a matter of feeling, not of reason—ethical theory was placed on a still raft and cast adrift upon the ocean of opinion and the business of living. Its lifeline to reason and reality thus severed, ethics has since floundered on the waves of subjectivism and emotivism.

Many philosophers, notably linguistic analysts, have abandoned any hope of rescuing ethics in its classical, Aristotelian sense—as the discipline that seeks to gain knowledge of the good life for man. Instead, these philosophers have lost themselves in the labyrinth of contemporary “meta-ethics,” where they ponder such monumental issues as whether the act of uttering a moral judgment is “locutionary,” “illocutionary,” or “perlocutionary.” Moreover, the analysts have given notice that their excursion into meta-ethics is the only legitimate function of moral philosophy. The philosopher may analyze what we mean by moral terms, or how ethical judgments function in discourse, but any defense of a system of precepts, especially if that defense is impassioned, is strictly forbidden.

The analysts thus obliterate, in a single ex cathedra pronouncement, what has been the central focus of ethical theory for over 2,000 years. And our fragile raft seems more doomed than ever.

Fortunately, there is more to ethical theory than one encounters in the typical university classroom, and there are still philosophers who, at the risk of heresy, run against the grain of contemporary thought in their insistence that ethics is nothing less than the application of reason and knowledge to human life. To fail to arrive at moral precepts, in their view, is a shortcoming of the ethical, not of ethics itself. And to divorce values from facts, to drive a wedge between what “is” and what “ought” to be, is tantamount to the dissolution of ethics as a rational enterprise.

Two extremely articulate defenses of this rational approach to ethics are The Virtue of Selfishness by Ayn Rand, and Rational Man by Henry Veatch. Despite their disagreement over specific points, both Rand and Veatch fall squarely within the Aristotelian, natural-law conception of ethics.

Generally speaking, natural law theory, as it has passed from Aristotle through Thomas Aquinas, has eschewed any radical dichotomization of values and facts; indeed, it has maintained that values are a kind of fact. Using this criterion, Rand and Veatch qualify as natural-law theorists. “The validation of value judgments,” argues Rand, “is to be achieved by reference to the facts of reality.” And, in a similar vein, Veatch contends that “values are simply facts of nature.”

There are many other areas of basic agreement between Rand and Veatch. Ethics, according to Rand, is a science based on evidence and... is a matter of knowledge.” Rand concurs. “Ethics,” she writes, “is an objective, metaphysical necessity of man’s survival,” and falls within “the province of reason.”

Rand and Veatch also agree that happiness is properly the purpose of ethics. In accordance with Aristotle, who held that “whatever creates or increases happiness or some part of happiness, we ought to do.” Rand argues that “the task of ethics is to define man’s proper code of values and thus to give him the means of achieving happiness”; and Veatch maintains that “moral rules are more in the nature of counsels of perfection or instructions as to what one ought or ought not to do in order to attain happiness.”

But both writers view happiness objectively, within the total context of one’s life, and not merely as momentary satisfaction or pleasure derived from any random, unthinking action. “Happiness,” Rand contends... “is possible only to a rational man.” Similarly, Veatch argues that any so-called “happiness” that comes from something other than “living intelligently” has “somehow become perverted and corrupted.”

In other words, both Rand and Veatch see happiness as a concomitant of the good life, which consists of pursuing rational goals in a rational manner. Writes Veatch, “Man’s true good, his natural end or goal, and his only possible one, is to do as he pleases.” Rather, the principle that man ought to be the primary beneficiary of his own actions “is derived from his nature as man and from the function of moral values in human life—and, therefore, is applicable only in the context of a rational, objectively demonstrated and validated code of moral principles which define and determine his actual self-interest.”

This is in direct contrast to the subjective, voluntaristic kind of egoism found in Stirner and Nietzsche, and it is perhaps best described as “natural-law egoism.” It is interesting to note that, although most explicit Aristotelians, such as Henry Veatch and Mortimer Adler, do not label themselves egoists, there is a strong current of egoism in their approach nonetheless, stemming from the belief that the purpose of moral principles in human life is to attain the good, and that the good consists of the development of man’s potential powers and capacities as a human being. Thus considered, ethics, as Veatch puts it, instructs man in the “art of living.”

Indeed, on several occasions, Veatch makes it clear that “learning how to live,” which is what ethics teaches us, is “no more than [learning] what is in one’s own best interests.” As for the view that the goal of ethics is self-sacrifice, Veatch maintains that any such identification of ethics with altruism is radically at variance with the sort of ethics of the rational man that we have been trying to defend in this book. Aristotle’s eyes the ethics does not begin with thinking of others, it begins with oneself. The reason is that every human being faces the task of learning how to live, how to be a human being, just as he has to learn how to walk or to talk.

Although the terminology differs, this passage is clearly in alliance with the following excerpt from Rand:

A being who does not know automatically what is true or false, cannot know automatically what is right or wrong, what is good for him or evil. Yet he needs that knowledge in order to live.... And this... is why man needs a code of ethics.

The above parallels, of course, deal only with those basic issues where The Virtue of Selfishness and Rational Man overlap. Each book, however, contains lucid discussions of various topics not treated by the other, and were Rand and Veatch to deal with precisely the same areas, they would undoubtedly disagree in many instances.

In addition, some of the subjects treated in common by these works contain significant differences. I shall narrow the field to three, which, in my opinion, are among the most important.

First, although Rand does not rely on belief in God for his ethics, he plainly believes theism and a rational ethics to be compatible. Here there is no rapprochement with The Virtue of Selfishness. Rand, an atheist, holds belief in the supernatural to be irrational and unfounded, and therefore inimical to any discipline, such as ethics, that requires uncompromised rationality.

Second, although Rand and Veatch agree that values are grounded in facts, they disagree as to precisely what those facts are. According to Rand, “it is only the concept of ‘Life’ that makes the concept of ‘Value’ possible.” This statement is partially derived from a prior assertion that values require goal-directed behavior—“Value is that which one acts to gain and/or keep”—and that goal directedness is a characteristic applicable only to living organisms. Rand explicitly denies “the existence of any telenological principle operating in inanimate nature.”

Veatch, on the other hand, bases his concept of value on the Aristotelian distinction between potency and act. “The good of any thing,” he writes, “is to that thing as the actual is to the potential.” Operating from a teleological view of nature, and from a stricter adherence to the metaphysics of Aristotle, Veatch argues that “the whole of nature is permeated with values”—this extending the idea of value to inanimate nature.

Finally, Rand and Veatch differ in their expressed indebtedness to Aristotle and the natural-law tradition. Whereas Veatch, who subtitled his book “A Modern Interpretation of Aristotelian Ethics,” is quite aware of the historical tradition in which he falls, Rand seems curiously oblivious to historical precedents. In fact, referring to Aristotle, Rand says that “‘rational man’ is a technical term, somewhat vaguely defined, which men of his time chose to do, leaving unanswered the question of: why they chose to do it and why he evaluated them as noble and wise”—which is scarcely a judicious interpretation of the Nicomachean Ethics. Without wishing to belittle the many respects in which Rand is brilliantly original in her moral theory, it is simply untrue that her general conception of ethics—is its nature, scope, and function—is unheard of in the history of Western philosophy. On the contrary, as we have seen, it comprises a major school of thought.

(Continued on page 5)
THE GESTALT APPROACH AND EYE WITNESS TO THERAPY
By Fritz Perls

The Gestalt Approach is a description of the most advanced form of Fritz Perls' Gestalt therapy, drawing on his experience with Eastern religions, meditation, psychedelics, body work and, most importantly, a long and highly successful therapeutic career. Eye Witness to Therapy comprises a set of transcripts of actual therapy sessions, illustrating and applying the principles explained in The Gestalt Approach.

The Gestalt Approach is unquestionably the simplest and clearest of all of Fritz Perls' statements of psychotherapeutic theory. Based upon Gestalt concepts of closure and figure/ground, Perls regards neurosis as the chronic failure to complete life tasks, to determine what is important and arrange one's needs in a hierarchy, to proceed with the business of living.

Disowning awareness, the neurotic fantasizes and manipulates through substitutes for his failures. The solution to the neurotic's problem is not to ask why he behaves as he does, which merely opens the door to more fantasy, evasion, and manipulation. Rather the solution lies in uncovering how the neurotic acts as he does and in making him face his nameless fears. Perls emphasizes that while neurotic problems may have their roots in the developmental past of the individual, the neurotic problem exists in and must be solved in the present, in the here and now. Accordingly, Perls relies heavily on Moreano's technique of psychodrama, in which the patient becomes (in fantasy) the various elements of his dreams, wishes, and fears. Through his behavior (non-verbal as well as verbal) while acting out these dramas, the patient's awareness of his desires, needs, and problems is gradually increased.

Eye Witness to Therapy shows how these principles work in practice. A variety of individuals and couples explore their frustrations, inhibitions, and fears, and in the process become more self-aware. In one beautiful sequence, a young girl imagines herself as the various elements in a recurring dream. Progressively she is a lake, a statue in the middle of the lake, a vase, and water in the vase. This half of the book ends on a paradoxical note, with Fritz Perls assuming the role of a patient and a patient assuming the role of Fritz Perls.

Observing Perls in action, his great ability becomes clear. He has the uncanny knack of saying and doing exactly the right thing at the right time to make his patients ever more self-aware and ever more focused on their own realties.

The Gestalt Approach and Eye Witness to Therapy is a valuable contribution to the literature of Gestalt therapy. Its chief value lies in the clarity with which it presents and illustrates the principles of this important therapeutic technique. 

THE FELLOW TRAVELLERS
By David Caute

"Readers of Alexandr Solzhenitsyn's novel, The First Circle," writes David Caute, "may remember the icy depicted scene where a big whitewash is put on for the benefit of an important lady, Mrs. R. (Mrs. Roosevelt?). The Prison Governor deliberately infuriates the prisoners, causing them to shout and swear; then he translates their oaths as a unanimous protest against the oppression of the Negroes in the USA. To dismiss this episode as farfetched is to forget the bitterness felt by Russian convicts towards the bland, benevolent smiles of the Western progressives who came for an afternoon to inspect New Harmony, Soviet model. Solzhenitsyn closes the novel with a cruel metaphor for the long line of professional foreign dupes. The Moscow correspondent of the Paris fellow-travelling paper, Liberation, is driving to a hockey match when he sees a neat, clean van with the word "MEAT" written on it in four languages. He makes notes for an article on the high standards of hygiene prevailing in Moscow food transport. But the van is in fact packed with political prisoners.

This meeting point between David Caute's The Fellow Travellers and the works of Alexandr Solzhenitsyn is a particularly good one from which to launch a review of the Caute book, for two reasons: The first is that Solzhenitsyn's works are, taken together, a brilliant, if tortured, exposure of the true nature of the Soviet system, of the mountains of bodies, the rivers of blood, and the torrents of human suffering which form the skeleton that supports socialism. Solzhenitsyn gives us a record of brutal terror, torture, and death—and shows us how it has been the underpinning of the Soviet system from the time of Lenin until the present. But during these same years, in the West we have witnessed a veritable parade of what Caute calls "fellow travellers," who have, time and time again, apologized for and heaped praise upon the Soviet system. These intellectuals have yet been called upon to pay for their intellectual crimes; Caute exposes them, and holds them up to the light of reality where, suddenly, they seem infinitely smaller. Such luminaries as G. B. Shaw and Anatole France turn out, under cross examination, to have been pimps for a gang of murderers who heaped upon them precisely the same privileges which these worthies—and their numerous allies—scoffed as "corruption" in the West.

But what is the second reason why the Solzhenitsyn quotation is so appropriate? It is an ironic point: one of the most prominent American fellow travellers during this time was none other than Upton Sinclair, whose concern with the human suffering in America's meat industry expressed in his book The Jungle—all other vanished when he cast his gaze on the Soviet system. Suddenly, all seemed right. And there is a parallel case, too, in the unceasing apologetics of none other than Lincoln Steffens, one of the biggest fellow travellers of all—and one of the most disgusting—who also pretended to be concerned with suffering—in America's cities, but not in Soviet slave-labor camps. Steffens' work The Shame of the Cities is well known, but his praise for the Soviet system—pouring forth for several decades—is not so well known; returning from one of his many guided tours of the Soviet Union, Steffens declared, breathlessly, "I have been over into the future, and it works."

Who were the fellow travellers? They included some of the most illustrious intellectuals of our time. And, they heartily welcomed the torments and upheavals inflicted on the Russian peasants during collectivization, arguing that only by such drastic social engineering could these backward illiterates be herded, feet first, into the modern world. Admittedly, the primitive aspects of Russia, and the彼得格勒的光显示，俄罗斯的政府残酷地对待囚犯，使他们大声呼喊和咒骂。然后，他把他们的咒骂翻译成一个统一的抗议，反对美国的黑人。如果要认为这个事件是虚假的，那就是忘记了俄罗斯囚犯对这些西方进步人士的残酷的愤怒。莫斯科《解放》的巴黎记者，在去观看冰球比赛的路上，看见一辆干净整洁的货车，上面写着“肉类”的字样，用四种语言。他做了笔记，准备写一篇关于莫斯科食物运输的卫生标准的文章。但是，这辆货车实际上装满了政治犯。

这场会议点之间的结合，是大卫·考特的《旅行者》和亚历山大·索尔仁尼琴的作品之间的一个特别好的一点。原因有两个：首先，索尔仁尼琴的作品，无论是单独还是整体，都是一个出色、如果说是被扭曲的，对苏联体系的真实性的揭露。索尔仁尼琴给我们呈现了一个残酷的恐怖、折磨和死亡的记录，并且展示了它是如何成为苏联体系从列宁时代到现在的支撑骨骼。但是，在这些相同的年份里，在西方，我们见证了一个真正的游行队伍的出现。考特称之为“旅行者”，他们一次又一次地，为苏联体系辩护并给予赞扬。这些知识分子还没有被要求为他们自己的罪行付出代价；考特揭露了他们，并把他们暴露在现实的光芒下，突然间，他们显得无比渺小。这样的名人，如G.B.肖和阿纳托尔·法朗士，在受到交叉质询时，被揭露为是“腐败”的接班人。

但是，还有一个原因，那就是索尔仁尼琴的引语是如此地合时宜。这是一个讽刺的点：其中一个最著名的美国“旅行者”在那个时期并不是别人，正是尤顿·辛克莱，他对美国肉类工业的关心，他在《屠场》一书中所表达的，当他在苏联体系上投射他的目光时，一切似乎都对了。而且还有一个平行案例，也是在无休止的阿诺德·斯泰芬斯的无耻中，他是所有“旅行者”中最大的一位，并且也是最令人厌恶的，他也假装关心痛苦——在美国内的城市，但不是在苏联的苦役劳动营。斯泰芬斯的《屠场的耻辱》这本书是众所周知的，但他的赞美苏联体系——从几十年前就开始了——并不是如此的众所周知；他在参观苏联的许多指导性旅行后，用喘息声宣布道，“我已经进入未来，它工作了。”

谁是这些“旅行者”？他们包括一些最杰出的我们时代的知识分子。他们心甘情愿地欢迎对俄罗斯农民所施加的折磨和混乱，他们认为，只有通过这样的严厉的社会工程，这些落后的文盲才能被赶到现代化的世界。诚然，俄罗斯的原始方面，和彼特格勒的光显示，俄罗斯的政府残酷地对待囚犯，使他们大声呼喊和咒骂。然后，他把他们的咒骂翻译成一个统一的抗议，反对美国的黑人。如果要认为这个事件是虚假的，那就是忘记了俄罗斯囚犯对这些西方进步人士的残酷的愤怒。莫斯科《解放》的巴黎记者，在去观看冰球比赛的路上，看见一辆干净整洁的货车，上面写着“肉类”的字样，用四种语言。他做了笔记，准备写一篇关于莫斯科食物运输的卫生标准的文章。但是，这辆货车实际上装满了政治犯。

但是，还有一个原因，那就是索尔仁尼琴的引语是如此地合时宜。这是一个讽刺的点：其中一个最著名的美国“旅行者”在那个时期并不是别人，正是尤顿·辛克莱，他对美国肉类工业的关心，他在《屠场》一书中所表达的，当他在苏联体系上投射他的目光时，一切似乎都对了。而且还有一个平行案例，也是在无休止的阿诺德·斯泰芬斯的无耻中，他是所有“旅行者”中最大的一位，并且也是最令人厌恶的，他也假装关心痛苦——在美国内的城市，但不是在苏联的苦役劳动营。斯泰芬斯的《屠场的耻辱》这本书是众所周知的，但他的赞美苏联体系——从几十年前就开始了——并不是如此的众所周知；他在参观苏联的许多指导性旅行后，用喘息声宣布道，“我已经进入未来，它工作了。”
Recent war, the resulting threat to American oil supplies, and the growing strength of the Palestine Liberation Organization as a sole spokesman for the Palestinian people, have once again drawn attention to the Middle East crisis. The conflict, which began with the creation of the state of Israel in 1948, then spread to the surrounding Arab countries, is now having repercussions all around the globe. Irving Stone recently described the explosive situation as potentially the most dangerous in the world. The Middle East problem threatens to lead to World War III, particularly since the Israelis have acquired the means to make nuclear weapons, according to a recent admission by Israeli President Ephraim Katzir.

Unfortunately the situation has been distorted by the American media, which present the strife between Israel and the Arabs in black and white terms, the good guys and the bad guys, with Israel as the democratic, progressive power, and the Arabs as wild-eyed, backward fanatics (even anti-Semitic), ever ready to push the little Jewish state into the sea. These simplistic views should be mitigated by a growing public awareness of America’s vital interests in the region.

American military support for Israel, greatly exceeding the terms extended to any other ally, is admirably documented by Dale R. Tahtinen in The Arab-Israeli Military Balance Since October 1973. In his concise booklet, Tahtinen provides figures showing just how overwhelming Israeli military superiority is, how dependent Israel is upon the United States, and how expensive this will become for Americans as time goes on and as the conflict escalates. The best available weapons from the U.S. arsenal are supplied to Israel, which in turn forces the Arabs to go to the Soviet Union for effective weapons. But the high danger and the very great cost of this American policy have not been appreciated.

The conflict, which raises the specter of a nuclear war, is upon the United States, and how expensive this will become for Americans as time goes on and as the conflict escalates. The best available weapons from the U.S. arsenal are supplied to Israel, which in turn forces the Arabs to go to the Soviet Union for effective weapons. But the high danger and the very great cost of this American policy have not been appreciated.

Massive immigration into Palestine during the British Mandate (1918-1948) resulted in the influx of European Jewish settlers and then in the ousting of the original inhabitants after the creation of the Israeli state. This was regarded by the Arabs as aggression, and it generated a violent response. Even the documents reprinted in Laqueur’s reader makes this crystal clear. Abba Eban’s speech to the United Nations on 17 November 1958, which is given ample space, does not deal with this question. Eban tried to blame the problem of the displaced Palestinian refugees on the Arabs, and reiterated the suggestion that the other Arab countries should take them in. But nothing Israeli leaders can say alters the fact that the people of Palestine, who were ejected from their rightful home, wish to return—and will not be placated by their rightful home, wish to return—and will not be placated by resettlement elsewhere. The Palestinian Arab is not the Egyptian Arab, is not the Syrian Arab, et cetera. The growing strength at the Palestine Liberation Organization is a threat to the Israeli state. Any recognition of the Palestinians as an entity means an acknowledgement of the wrong that was done in 1948—an admission which the Israeli establishment still finds it impossible to make.

There have been many histories dealing generally with the Middle East crisis. Frank Epp’s Whose Land is Palestine? is as comprehensive as possible, beginning with the situation five thousand years ago. His work, written in Canada and the United States, seeks to avoid “a historical view that is too short and a theological stance that is too narrow.” A Mennonite from Canada, Dr. Epp has no personal bias toward either Arabs or Israelis, and his articulate account considers the prominence of the concept of God or gods in the long history of the Middle East. He believes that Christian theology has not only been a factor contributing to Jewish persecution, but more recently has contributed to the persecution of the Arabs, particularly the Palestinians. The old anti-Semitism has become “a new anti-Semitism directed against the Semitic Arabs. As the old anti-Semitism terribly wronged the Jews so the new anti-Semitism terribly wronged the Arabs.”

A NEW LOOK AT THE ZIC?

WHOSE LAND IS PALESTINE? / By Frank H. Epp / 283 pages / LR Price $3.95
THE ISRAEL-ARAB READER / By Walter Laqueur (ed.) / 511 pages / LR Price $1.65
THE ARAB-ISRAELI MILITARY BALANCE SINCE OCTOBER 1973 / By Dale R. Tahtinen / 43 pages / LR Price $2.00

Where is Palestine?

Recent war, the resulting threat to American oil supplies, and the growing strength of the Palestine Liberation Organization as a sole spokesman for the Palestinian people, have once again drawn attention to the Middle East crisis. The conflict, which began with the creation of the state of Israel in 1948, then spread to the surrounding Arab countries, is now having repercussions all around the globe. Irving Stone recently described the explosive situation as potentially the most dangerous in the world. The Middle East problem threatens to lead to World War III, particularly since the Israelis have acquired the means to make nuclear weapons, according to a recent admission by Israeli President Ephraim Katzir.

Unfortunately the situation has been distorted by the American media, which present the strife between Israel and the Arabs in black and white terms, the good guys and the bad guys, with Israel as the democratic, progressive power, and the Arabs as wild-eyed, backward fanatics (even anti-Semitic), ever ready to push the little Jewish state into the sea. These simplistic views should be mitigated by a growing public awareness of America’s vital interests in the region.

American military support for Israel, greatly exceeding the terms extended to any other ally, is admirably documented by Dale R. Tahtinen in The Arab-Israeli Military Balance Since October 1973. In his concise booklet, Tahtinen provides figures showing just how overwhelming Israeli military superiority is, how dependent Israel is upon the United States, and how expensive this will become for Americans as time goes on and as the conflict escalates. The best available weapons from the U.S. arsenal are supplied to Israel, which in turn forces the Arabs to go to the Soviet Union for effective weapons. But the high danger and the very great cost of this American policy “make it essential that the American commitment? Will the United States always assist Israel in any war, even if this should antagonize her NATO allies? What controls does Washington have over the Israeli nuclear capacity?
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After a brief discussion of Palestine and its history, Epp considers the various claims to that little country. The Jews, he recalls, push their claim back to the patriarch Abraham; when settled in Canaan early in the second millennium. They also claim identification with Melchizedek, priest and king of Salem, who was recognized by Abraham as priest of the highest God; Abraham offered the tenth of his possessions to him (Genesis 14:18-20). The Arabs also claim possession through Abraham and his descendants, saying that Ishmael and Esau, who were born before the Jewish patriarchs Isaac and Jacob, respectively, the Palestinians were there long before any of the Israelis, most of whom are recent immigrants. Individual Arab families can recall their location in a particular place. For example, Dr. Rouhi Khatib, exiled mayor of Arab Jerusalem, told Epp that his family had lived in the holy city for 700 years before the Israelis exiled him in 1968.

Epp goes on to discuss the claims of Islam, of Christianity, of Zionism, the British, the Arabs, the U.S., the Palestinians, and finally the claims of God Himself. He challenges Western Christians to redress the wrongs that have been inflicted on the Arabs without further wrongdoing or persecuting the Jews. He thinks Christians should really accept their Messiah and make an important contribution to peace. He points out that the Palestinian struggle for the homeland which was taken from them in the establishment of a Jewish state is at the heart of the problem. For the Palestinian Arabs, security for the Jews and sovereignty for Israel were separate questions; they had no objection to Jewish settlement in Palestine, but they opposed a dominant, exclusivist Jewish state. Christians, who know many Jews and tend to sympathize with Israel, must recognize this if they are to approach the problem fairly. Although Israel can and will continue to win “six-day wars,” it cannot crush the Arabs any more than the Arabs can crush Israel. And he rightly concludes that an “international disaster will indeed be the end of the Middle East conflict, if peace is not established soon.”

Terrible as the injustice against the Arabs was, Epp does not entirely blame the Zionists who dispossessed them. Arab absentee landowners disregarded the rights of tenants in selling their lands to Zionist Jews for gain, and ambitious Arab rulers failed to live up to their responsibilities. But the greatest offenders have been the Zionists, the British, the Americans, the French, and the Russians. He adds that even now many Zionists deny the possession of the 650,000 Palestinian Arabs at the time of the Balfour declaration, or ignore them as “homeless Bedouins without territorial rights or as bastard descendants of the previous conquerors.” In 1969 Premier Golda Meir asked, “How can we return the occupied territories? There is nobody to return them to. . . . There is no such thing as Palestinians.”

Consequently, Epp believes it is wrong to say that the Palestinians are terrorists who only understand the use of force. They were relatively passive for 20 years, and took up arms in 1967 when neither the Arab states nor the United Nations did anything to help them in their plight. Their struggle dominates Arab politics, and it has won the support of most of the world. First and foremost, the West must acknowledge and recognize the injustice that has been done. Epp appeals to Christian people to help the Palestinian Arabs, who have never been able to explain their case, tell their story. “If Christians would give a fair hearing and fair telling to the Palestinian story, the Palestinians would feel less need to communicate with hijackings and bombings.” There must be no further expulsions. Arabs in the West Bank should not be driven out of their homes, and the Jews who are being made homeless while Jewish immigrants arrive at the rate of 150 a day. He points out that although the return of the Palestinians is a difficult task because the country is no longer the same and many of their homes are no longer in existence, they should at least have the right to return to or receive reparations, as has been constantly reaffirmed in continuous resolutions of the United Nations. The commandos should be stopped, both on the West Bank and in Lebanon, and the Palestinians should be absorbed into the Arab homeland of more than one hundred million, leaving the Jews and the Israeli Arabs in their little country. Chomsky sees it as a measure “of the bias and irrationality of American opinion” that Quaddafi is regarded as a fanatic, whereas his counterparts are considered moderates. Because he thinks a socialist society is “egalitarian and just,” Chomsky praises the Yishuv, or Jewish settlements, in western Palestine which establish such forms, but he observes the contradiction. They were constructed on lands purchased by the Jewish National Fund from which Arabs were excluded on principle, and this was admitted by some of the Zionist settlers. In 1907, one of them wrote in the Hebrew periodical Ha Shiloah that “unless we want to deceive ourselves deliberately, we have to admit that we have thrown people out of their miserable lodgings and taken away their tenure.

Chomsky would like to see a Palestinian established on “socialist” principles, and believes that the creation of a free, democratic, socialist society might create a common bond between Arab and Jewish left-wing forces. He believes that the sharp national boundaries will crumble as the struggle for this society takes place on an international scale, but he does not say what will happen to the non-socialist elements who may not wish for this. Chomsky maintains that the Jews and Arabs might cease to see themselves as nations in conflict and begin to act as participants in a common effort to achieve social justice, an end which he views as “not impossible.”

Chomsky also knows that although Israel has succeeded in crushing the Palestinian guerrillas to date (militarily) and in improving technologically, she cannot in the end secure herself by such methods. However, he argues, her policies have left her with sterile alternatives for the future. He thinks it would be best to try to obtain Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories, but he dismisses this as an impossible attainment for the present, and sees any immediate hope of the establishment of a Palestinian state on the West Bank as “illusory.” A second possibility is that the West Bank will become a protectorate of Israel and reservoir of cheap labor, as advocated by General Dayan. Another is the expulsion of the Arab population and its recolonization by Israelis.

Israel’s dependence on a single superpower is leading to her increasing isolation and increasing the possibility of great-power confrontations in the area. Although these varying accounts of the Middle East crisis agree about its seriousness, the authors vary widely about what should be done. It is most likely now that a solution will have to be imposed from the outside, but this requires the decisive and impartial action of the United States. Unfortunately, the U.S. under its present leadership seems to lack the will to act responsibly here, even as there is a general paralysis in other vital directions, too. Reviewed by Alfred M. Lilienthal
CAUSATION AND THE TYPES OF NECESSITY
By Curt John Ducasse

Contemporary discussions of causation often center around the objections raised initially by David Hume. Where, asked Hume, is the necessary connection between causal events? Nowhere, he answered, except in the mind: "necessity is something that exists in the mind, not in objects."

With causation thus stripped of objective necessity, many philosophers adopted the view that causation is nothing more than observed uniformity of sequence; i.e., if A regularly precedes B in time, we simply call A the cause of B. But as Thomas Reid pointed out, Hume's staunchest critic—pointed out, since day is followed invariably by night, the above position would commit us to the view that day is the cause of night. Clearly, causation is something more than invariable sequence.

One of the most significant attempts to return necessity to causation was made by H. W. J. Joseph in An Introduction to Logic (1906). To deny causal necessity, argued Joseph, is tantamount to denying the law of identity: "to say that the same thing acting on the same thing under the same conditions may yet produce a different effect, is to say that a thing need not be what it is. But this is in flat conflict with the law of identity."

A few philosophers, such as Brand Blanshard and Ayn Rand, accepted this basic approach, but it was largely ignored in philosophical and scientific communities. This is what "makes C. J. Ducasse's Causation and the Types of Necessity particularly interesting. Originally published in 1924, it remains one of the most detailed and fruitful discussions of causation from a perspective broadly similar to that of Joseph.

In the first five chapters, Ducasse examines the views of causation developed by Hume, Mill, Kant, Shopenhauer, and Russell. These criticisms, although brief, are quite telling. The remainder of Causation is concerned with the author's own views, some of which are defended more successfully than others.

Ducasse argues that causal necessity is a logical corollary of the law of identity: "By strictly the same thing," he writes, "... we mean one which in strictly the same circumstances would behave in strictly the same way, (Continued on Page 9)
Second, some of Ducasse’s problems are due to his contention that only events, never things, can properly be spoken of as causes. This is important because, as Nathaniel Branden demonstrates in The Psychology of Self-Esteem, only a recognition of causation as a relation primarily between entities and actions can lay the groundwork for a theory of human volition.

Finally, Ducasse adopts a linguistic view of philosophy, which mars his treatment of causation in metaphysical ways. He dismisses the notion that philosophy seeks the most general knowledge of reality possible, on the basis that scientific laws may also be perfectly general in the sense that they apply to everything. But Ducasse—as most other philosophers—misses the central point: philosophy’s primary concern is not generality but fundamentality, and the former is a consequence of the latter.

Ducasse’s linguistic approach leads him inevitably to proclaim that the ultimate character of physical systems is a matter of taste, not truth, and that philosophers with different metaphysical viewpoints should henceforth “dislike each other in peace,” just as they do in all matters of taste. This is surely an ignoble end for a noble book.

Causation and the Types of Necessity is a rather technical work, and is best suited to the serious student. Despite my disagreements with it, I cannot help admire it as a fine specimen of clear, sober philosophical analysis. There is much to be learned from this book, and I recommend it. Reviewed by George H. Smith / Philosophy (156 pages) / LR Price $2
A Word to Our Readers

From time to time, we learn of job opportunities with employers who are specifically seeking libertarian-inclined individuals. These range from clerk-typist jobs to foundation directors, from editorial positions to shipping clerks. Jobs in all sections of the country have come to our attention. In addition, LR on occasion has job openings, both full time and part time, in our Washington offices, which we would of course prefer to offer to qualified libertarians. If you are seeking work now, or plan to be in the future, and would like to send us a brief resume of your qualifications, we will hold it on file and attempt to match it with job opportunities as they come to our attention in the future. All correspondence will be held in confidence, of course.

In conjunction with F. A. Hayek's Nobel Prize and the consequent renewal of interest in his works, the Libertarian Review Book Service is pleased to offer Roads to Freedom, the festschrift honoring Professor Hayek. Edited by Erich Streissler, this superb collection includes essays by Karl Popper, Michael Polanyi, Jacques Reuff, Gottfried Haberler, and others. A review by Murray N. Rothbard appeared in our June 1973 issue. The LR price for Roads to Freedom is $15.

Collectors of Hayek's works will not want to miss his essay in Beyond Reductionism, edited by Arthur Koestler and available from the LR Book Service for $3.95. We still have a few copies of this title, but unless demand for it grows, it will soon disappear from our back list.

The California Libertarian Alliance is an educational organization interested in contacting libertarian activists throughout California. Interested readers can reach them by writing PO Box 1202, Free Venice, CA 90291.

FREE CATALOG: Those of you who do not have a BFL catalog—which describes over 200 books, records, and tapes available through our mail-order service—may receive one free with any order placed from this month's LR. If you would like to have one of these handy references, just write "catalog" on your order form.

If you need a speaker for your club or social meetings, seminars, university forums, or whatever, contact the Society For Individual Liberty Speakers Bureau, P.O. Box 1147, Warminster, Pa. 18974. Don Earnsberger and David Walter have put together a roster which includes Jerome Tuccille, David Friedman, Murray Rothbard, Robert LeFevre, Leonard Liggio, John Hospers, Toni Nathan, Fran Youngstein, Tibor Machan and D. T. Armentano.

Paul Varnell and Robert H. Meier have launched an excellent new quarterly journal, The Libertarian Scholar. (PO Box 394, DeKalb, Illinois 60115; $4.00 per year.) Messrs. Varnell and Meier explain the purpose of the Scholar in their first issue (Autumn 1974): "As interest in the academic and scholarly side of libertarianism grows, there is an increasing need to provide information about the scholarship produced both by libertarians and by others whose work is, or should be, of interest and value to libertarians. To fill this need is the purpose of the Scholar. Each quarter it will list and sometimes comment upon the best and most interesting of such books and articles in the several fields of the humanities and social sciences."

In addition to over 150 annotated bibliographic listings, the Autumn Scholar contains reviews of Hayek's Laws, Legislation and Liberty, Vol. I (available from the LR Book Service); Yoder's The Politics of Jesus; and Veatch's Aristotelian Contemporary Appreciation (available from the LR Book Service); as well as a very nicely done bibliographical essay on the question of restitution.

Joining the editors as regular Scholar contributors are: J.M. Cobb, John V. Cody, Douglas Den Uyl, William Dennis, Karl Eldridge, Allen J. Harder, Tibor R. Machan, Eric Mack, Paul Michelson, Douglas Rasmussen, and Mary Sirridge.

A study group for libertarians who work in the legislative branch of our burgeoning State is now being formed. For further information, please call Chris Grieb at (301) 449-5646 (evenings).

The Center for the Study of Social Systems is sponsoring the "Libertarian Dinner Series for Greater Boston Libertarians." The first dinner, featuring Professor Robert Nozick, author of Anarchy, State, and Utopia, will be held 19 February, 7:30 P.M., at the Hong Kong Restaurant, 1236 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass. The cover charge is $2 in advance ($3.50 per couple) or $3 at the door. Reservations are strongly advised. Make checks payable to Center for the Study of Social Systems, PO Box 920, Boston, Mass. 02103.

The LR Book Service has on hand a couple of titles it would be happy to sell at cost. These are Martin Gray's For Those I Loved reviewed by Edward Regis in the April 1974 Books for Libertarians, and R.J. Herrnstein's I.Q. in the Meritocracy, reviewed by H.J. Eysenck in the December 1973 BFL. The prices are $5.28 and $4.69 respectively, and are subject to our regular discounts. Watch this column for similar offers in the future.

REVIEWS FOR THIS ISSUE: R.A. Childs, Jr. is an LR associate editor. Henry Hazlitt, the distinguished economist and writer, is author of Man Versus the Welfare State, Failure of the New Economics, and the classic Economics in One Lesson, among many others. His review of The Case for a 100 Percent Gold Dollar is reprinted with permission from the Inflation Survival Letter. John Hospers is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Southern California and an LR associate editor. Leonard P. Liggio teaches history at City College of New York. Alfred M. Lilienthal, editor of the monthly newsletter Middle East Perspective, is author of What Price Israel?, There Goes the Middle East, and The Other Side of the Coin. Tibor R. Machan is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at S.U.N.Y., Fredonia, an editor of Reason magazine, and an LR associate editor. George H. Smith is a student of philosophy and the author of Atheism: The Case Against God. He lives in Tucson, Arizona. Jarret B. Wollstein studied psychology at the University of Maryland and is now in the investment business in Washington, D.C.
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COGITATIONS FROM ALBERT JAY NOCK

"Here is a small book full of Nock's thoughts, as fresh as they were when first minted. It is not all of Nock, and the effect is less than the sum from which they came. But it is a man thinking, which the republic needs more than it thinks—ambiguity intended."

—JACQUES BARZUN

(Purchase additional copies @ $1 ea.)