

Brown (Continued from page 1)

New Mind, New Body covers the body systems involving the skin, muscles, heart, blood vessels, and brain waves, and describes the biological, physiological, and psychological bases of bio-feedback for each of these body systems. Brain-wave activity has received the most attention because of the "feel-good" state produced by the alpha wave and has been promoted as "instant Zen." Brown believes that the skin "talks about the mind" more than any other body system, telling us much more than just when we are lying. And through bio-feedback people can learn profound muscle relaxation fairly rapidly. She says that muscles express nearly every aspect of our physical and mental life. Living without excess muscle tension is the strongest known protection against the large family of psychosomatic disorders. And further, what the mind can cause to go wrong in the body, it can also reverse, restoring health.

Brown's answer to "how" the mind can control itself and the internal processes will surprise and delight you. Will power has lost nearly all significance in most laboratories dealing with the study of behavior, but it obviously rattles around Brown's lab like a loose bolt looking for something to do. "What else but human will causes a man to control his heartbeat when he sees it pulsing on an oscilloscope?" she asks.

She feels that the neglect of will power by the behavioral sciences has severely limited the goals and success rates of the Pavlov and Skinner operant-conditioning techniques, because it reduces the study of man to the elemental forces of physical nature shared by animals.

Only a young psychologist completely out of tune with his inner self would continue to administer electric shock to change the heart rate of a patient while his own heart is racing with the thought of returning home to a new

bride, she says. There are two fundamental assumptions here, she continues, "First, regarding his heart rate, a man is a dog; second, a man who is a subject in an experiment has no emotion, no thought, and no feeling about what is going on."

Brown points out that in Eastern cultures, yogis, Zen masters, and others have long devoted lifetimes to the art of physiological self-discipline, discovering that attention to the inner self could lead to awareness and fine control of physical and mental processes. This, in turn, produced better communion and unity with the self and the universe. In the West, the seekers of new mind states—the mind-control devotees, encounter-group enthusiasts, the drug-takers, the psychics, the meditators—have burgeoned only in recent years, causing alarm among those concerned with our social well-being. Why? Because "they are all on a journey into the interior universe, trying to burst the limits of the socially conditioned mind."

Barbara Brown is "tripping" on bio-feedback and showing a noticeable lack of concern about possible consequences to the social contract. She says "Survival tied to the group has not evolved to liberate the individual." Two things are astonishing here. One, that the idea that individuals should not be faced with choosing between society's welfare and their own should be expressed by a person whose research is supported by government funds, which Brown's is, and two, that the government would continue to support a promoter of such ideas.

But then there is a lot more to bio-feedback than learning how to generate enough brain-wave electricity to start the coffee perking without getting out of bed. What it is really all about sounds like the neatest trick of the week: having your head, heart, and gut saying the same thing at the same time. Reviewed by Ida Walters / Psychology / LR Price \$9.95

ESSAYS ON SEX EQUALITY

By John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor Mill

John and Harriet Mill anticipate many of the significant arguments of contemporary feminism, but in an elegant, carefully reasoned and logical style that is rarely matched in modern rhetoric. As would be expected from John Stuart Mill, the arguments are libertarian, emphasizing again and again that legal and cultural equality between the sexes is called for if one truly believes in the concept of individual liberty.

On the question of *psychological* equality, John Mill anticipates contemporary social psychology's emphasis on cultural determinants of sex roles. Mill dismisses the nineteenth century assumption (still common today!) that "natural differences" between men and women necessitate male dominance. He argues quite sensibly that "no one can know the nature of the sexes as long as they have only been seen in their present relation to each other—what women are is what we have required them to be."

One of the most conceptually useful arguments in the essay "The Subjection of Women" is Mill's analysis of terms of power. He sees marriage in its usual form as a way for those who are powerless to exercise power. Because of this, male dominance of women is the form most likely to outlast all other forms of unjust authority. To those who would object to his comparison between authoritarian government and male domination—objectors seeing the former as "bad" and the latter as "natural"—Mill makes a point which is of all too much general relevance: "But was there ever any domination which did not appear natural to those who possessed it?"

Mill's analysis of the undesirable psychological consequences of male subjection of women is a particularly interesting libertarian argument. Male domina-

tion, he says, prevents the development of a sense of social justice and genuine love of freedom. "Sentiments of freedom" cannot exist in those "whose nearest and dearest intimacies are with those of whom he is absolute master." Proper moral training in the family requires equality between the sexes.

The other essays in this collection, which includes all of the writings of the Mills' on the subject, are "Early Essays on Marriage and Divorce" by John and Harriet and "The Enfranchisement of Women" by Harriet. While these two are a little more dated in their relevance, the rigorous and logical development of the arguments is certainly of interest to those concerned with feminist issues.

The excellent introduction by Alice Rossi examines Harriet's influence on John's intellectual and emotional development and their subsequent intellectual collaboration. Theirs was apparently a perfect meeting of the minds, a long friendship and eventually marriage that truly involved practice of what they preached. Of interest to libertarians is the fact that much of Rossi's introduction is based on correspondence between Mill and Taylor from a collection owned by F. A. Hayek.

Frankly, when I first began to read "The Subjection of Women" I was skeptical. How relevant and interesting would it be today? But upon reading it, I see that its fame as a feminist classic is well-deserved. Although one of Mill's more neglected essays, it is as significant as his other libertarian works. It deserves to be a libertarian classic as well as a feminist classic. Reviewed by Sharon Presley / Libertarianism-Psychology-Political Philosophy / LR Price \$1.95

WATERSHIP DOWN

By Richard Adams

I started *Watership Down* with a sense of extreme skepticism. I knew that it had been an astounding popular success—a number-one best-seller for almost a year—and that serious critics had given it almost unbelievably extravagant praise. Yet—I thought—a novel about rabbits? What possible depth, drama, or emotional power could there be in a story about a bunch of bunnies?

From the first page, however, I felt my absorption growing. By the fiftieth page, I was in love with the book. And when I finished the last page, I knew that this had been the most wonderful and, in some sense, the most profound novel I had read in years.

But why? The fact remained that author Richard Adams had started with material that seemed absurdly unpromising. Why—if his goal was to write a novel as exciting and moving as this one—had he chosen as his subject timid creatures that most people think of only as garden nuisances or, at best, as cuddly but rather unintelligent pets? Why not wolves, or elephants, or dolphins? And, given his material, how had Adams succeeded so well?

The answer, I think, is that, despite appearances, the material is essential to the success. *Watership Down* is a story about a profound paradox, a paradox arising from the very nature of conscious life. Every organism, against the backdrop of the whole universe, is terribly small: its lifespan is a flicker, its relative size is that of an atom. In this sense an individual life is utterly insign-

nificant. But most humans find this fact intolerably hard to accept; thus they invent gods and "higher purposes" to give them the feeling that, in some universal, permanent sense, they matter. The point of *Watership Down* is that no such higher purposes are necessary. Life is an end in itself. Conscious life matters because it is conscious life, because it offers experiences, excitements, beauties, meanings. Viewed from inside, every life—even that of a rabbit—is a thing of unutterable importance, and that is all the justification that any life ever needs.

Reading this novel, one is caught between two emotions: an aching sense of how *humble* these creatures are, how little the events of their life matter in any larger scheme of things—and a loving awareness of how much their lives *do* matter, simply *because* they are alive, and conscious, and struggling to remain alive.

Watership Down is a libertarian novel, both in the relatively minor sense that it gets in some effective satirical digs at the welfare state and militarism and in the far more profound sense that it is a litany to the importance of the individual life. This, I think, is the key to its strange and gigantic appeal.

At least that is my hypothesis. Read the book and see if you agree. Whether or not you do, I guarantee you won't regret the experience. Reviewed by Robert Masters / Fiction / LR Price \$2.25

JAZZ: THE GOLDEN AGE

By Neil McCaffrey

PART I: TO BOOTLEG OR NOT TO BOOTLEG

I am sitting here breaking the law, sort of. I'm listening to a bootleg recording of Benny Goodman playing in the Madhattan Room of New York's old Hotel Pennsylvania on October 30, 1937. How come I don't feel guilty?

As the record business boomed in the sixties, record piracy boomed right along with it. It's no great trick to pirate a record, and even easier when you pirate it on tape or cassette. So free enterprise flourished—*really free* enterprise, since the pirates paid nobody.

They were taking advantage of a loophole in the outdated copyright law of 1909, which gave no protection to recordings. The record companies, with their enormous royalties and selling costs and overhead, found themselves undersold by parasites who simply copied every hit record. Artists and composers got no royalties. Correcting a manifest injustice, Congress made record bootlegging a criminal offense in 1972.

But, perhaps because of inhibitions about *ex post facto* justice, Congress applied no sanction to copiers of pre-1972 records. Subsequent legal decisions seem to open the door to prosecution of the latter, but the situation is fluid at the moment. Up until now, it hasn't deterred the pre-1972 pirates.

While pop and rock hits were attracting pirates who peddled albums and tapes in the hundreds of thousands, the same *methods* were available to, and used by, aficionados of opera, and classical, jazz, and show music. Though the profit motive was hardly absent from their reckoning (despite the pretensions of a few who are always prepared to nominate themselves as Altruists of the Month), devotion to a favorite kind of music figured prominently in their motivations. More to the point, their bootlegging filled a need. Why not, they reasoned, turn a profit for providing a service—and, not so incidentally, for taking some risks, financial and otherwise?

So another brand of record bootlegging has emerged over the past decade, and it poses tricky legal and ethical questions. Since I'll be dealing with jazz records in this column, many of them bootleg, it might be interesting to *LR*

GEORGE HALL AND HIS TAFT HOTEL ORCHESTRA 1933-1937
(2 records) / LR Price \$7.98

WILLIE BRYANT AND JIMMIE LUNCEFORD AND THEIR
ORCHESTRAS 1930-1936 (2 records) / LR Price \$7.98

readers to explore why the bootleggers now dominate jazz issues of the twenties through the fifties—in my judgment, the golden age.

A bit of history will help explain what gave the bootleggers their opportunity. Record companies mushroomed after World War I. Then the Depression and the rise of radio staggered the industry. Only three companies survived the shakeout: RCA, Columbia, and Brunswick, the last two merging in the mid-thirties. Decca, launched in 1934 and now absorbed by MCA, soon established itself as one of the Big Three. Thus, three labels took care of virtually all recording from the early thirties till the mid-forties—essentially, the classic period of jazz and dance music.

Note that this was also the era when you heard the big bands on late-night radio over all four networks—every night, as regular as the 11 o'clock news today. At the same time, home recording appeared: not tape, but discs on which you could cut radio broadcasts, or even family arguments. This, in fact, was the source of Benny Goodman's famous Carnegie Hall concert album. The results were usually listenable but sometimes atrocious; I have more than a few on which an eloquent sax solo gets interrupted by a blast of static. Two selections from the Goodman concert recorded so badly that they had to be left out of the Columbia album.

RCA, Columbia, and Decca thus own most of the popular recordings from the golden age. Individuals own the airchecks they laboriously recorded on their primitive home equipment. All but a handful of the recordings have long since vanished from the catalogs of the Big Three, victims of changing tastes and the "latest hits" plague. Are these records to be lost forever, save to the dwindling band who collect old 78s? The thought offends: we are talking about the golden era of the most creative popular music the world has ever known (unless, perhaps, you count opera in its creative years as popular music).

So think the bootleggers, and their customers. It still isn't a big business. It's a crew of entrepreneurs with offices in their basements. As the business grows, if it grows much more, it may become big enough to attract lawsuits calculated to discourage all but the manically litigious.

Are we talking about a nonissue, a few intrepid Robin Hoods ripping off big bad General Motors? Not quite. First of all, I can't buy the notion that big bad General Motors, or RCA, is fair game. Moreover, the musicians and composers may also be getting shortchanged.

The composers are easily disposed of. Most of the best are organized as the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP), the rest as Broadcast Music, Inc. (BMI). These groups negotiate performance fees with broadcasters, record companies and such for the use of compositions by their members. Some bootleggers pay these fees. Those who don't, should.

The matter of bandleaders and sidemen is more complicated. Where leaders were paid a flat fee for a record, there's no problem. They sold all rights to the record company. Where they had a royalty deal, surely the bootleggers have an obligation to honor it.

The sidemen are no problem as regards record dates. They were paid for them. But what about the rash of aircheck LPs? These were originally broadcasts, for which the musicians were paid. Nobody dreamed they would one day be issued as records.

The nabobs at the musicians' union have no doubts on this issue. They say that every musician must be paid union scale for these airchecks, just as if the sidemen had gathered in a recording studio last week. Not only that, but they want the boys paid at today's scale. The rate for a three-hour session, once \$30, is now up around \$100. The union allows four tunes per session. For a typical album of 12 songs, that's \$300 per man: for a big band, \$4000 to \$5000.

Can you picture some little guy who bootlegs a pressing of maybe 500, even 5000 records contemplating artists fees of that size? They are formidable enough to discourage even the industry giants from issuing airchecks of anyone more obscure than Glenn Miller. A classic case of union greed killing the goose that lays the golden egg. Union rates make it all but impossible for the visible companies, those vulnerable to union reprisal, to issue aircheck albums. Result: the albums are bootlegged, and musicians get—zilch.

The plot thickens. We now come to the cultural dimension. Should the Big Three be allowed to sit on perhaps 99 percent of the material they recorded during the golden years? They are not interested in reissuing most of it (or find it unprofitable, which comes to the same thing). Ah, you say, why don't they *license* the little guys to do these reissues? Why indeed. I've tried to get licensed. Friends of mine have tried. You're lucky if they talk to you long enough to say no. (I have a theory about why this happens, and it may be worth a footnote in *The Organization Man*. The big boys make little or nothing on jazz reissues, what with their big overhead and all. They are budgeted for blockbusters. But if they license the humble 500-10,000 sellers, and a little guy does modestly well with them, somebody upstairs is sure to ask why the hell they are "giving away the company product." So they don't "give" it away. In a perverse way, the frightened organization men probably *prefer* bootlegging to licensing. Bootlegging spares them the anguish of Making Decisions.)

Is this, then, a classic confrontation between property rights—those of the Big Three—and what might be called, ever so loosely, the cultural rights of society? So it seems, at first. But I think the union and the Big Three have boxed themselves into a false dilemma.

The union, quite simply, shouldn't be so greedy. It should accept a simple royalty payment for the musicians on aircheck albums, a modest cost that the entrepreneur can figure into his price and work off *as he sells his albums*. In other words, the *consumer* would pay. And should.

The record companies might adopt the rights provisions that are conventional in book publishing. When an author signs over book rights to a publisher, the contract provides that the author may recover his rights if his book goes out of print for longer than, typically, six months or a year. Surely this is fair all around. If a publisher (record company) wants to retain rights to a book (record), he owes it to the author (artist) to keep it in print. Why should RCA retain rights to thousands of recordings they haven't made available for thirty or forty or fifty years? Does an entrepreneur have the right to suppress a significant part of a cultural heritage?

Whatever the answer, there is no prospect for a solution that makes any effort to reconcile the several interests. The music business, never a haven for the ethically sensitive, is reverting to the jungle; and to pursue the metaphor, I would cast the musicians' union as the wild boars. All of which leads to a logjam of snarling selfishness—which, predictably, the free market rushes in to break. People want this music, and if they can't buy it from legitimate com-

(Continued on page 4)