

Book Reviews

Vaccine: The Controversial Story of Medicine's Greatest Lifesaver, by Arthur Allen, 523 pp, hardback, \$27.95, ISBN 0-393-05911-1 and 978-0-05911-3, New York, N.Y., WW Norton, 2007.

A *New York Times* Editors' Choice, *Vaccine* drew the comment: "Allen sees the anti-vaccination impulse as largely fueled by ignorance of the past."¹ The main theme of *Vaccine* is that the side-effects are a small price to pay for the massive benefits of vaccines. "Vaccines were a victim of their own success—they had wiped out the diseases they were designed to defeat," (p 266) thus no longer thought by many to be necessary.

Beginning with the introduction, in which many useful definitions are given, Allen airs the adverse effects and occasional lack of effects of vaccines in an effort to seem impartial, which will probably succeed with semi-informed readers as noted above. Nearly 100 pages in three chapters are devoted to the ancient history of smallpox vaccinations, then Jenner's improvement in using cowpox, then later efforts to improve the vaccine.

The next section, "Golden Age," covers the history (with warts) of other immunizations, from Pasteur's chicken cholera vaccine, anthrax, and rabies, to diphtheria, typhoid, BCG, tetanus, typhoid, yellow fever, polio, influenza, measles, mumps, and rubella. To Allen's credit, the debacle of the World War II immunization of the U.S. military against yellow fever is clearly described as the fiasco it was. This episode, and the germ warfare efforts in Japan, the UK, and the U.S., are likely to be new to many readers, as they were to me.

Also to Allen's credit, he writes that the mass vaccination against smallpox in New York City in 1947 was a mistake (p 242), that the somewhat later decision to stop general vaccination against smallpox was reasonable (p 256), and that influenza vaccines have been worthless at times (pp 257-259).

While the details on the risks of many vaccines, or early versions of them, may appall some advocates of mandatory mass vaccination with ever increasing numbers of vaccines, the minimization of risks of recent vaccines is a glaring minus.

Allen dismisses concerns that vaccines themselves, and/or the thimerosal used as a disinfectant, could play any role in the current increases in the incidence of autism. He launches ad hominem attacks on authors such as Harold Buttram and David and Mark Geier, belittles the journals that have published their work, and ignores articles that support their thesis.

Acknowledging the possibility of vaccine-induced autism would seriously undermine his conclusion that: "...the public and politicians need to understand the threat that thoughtless actions pose to the great immunological commons we have built by decades of vaccination of children."

Vaccine has an excellent index, and employs using a high standard of academic referencing. Of 954 references, 165 (17 percent) are to papers in medical journals. However, the total lack of tables, charts, and graphs is inexcusable. At times, clear data are given for lives and hospitalizations saved by immunizations along with risks, but many other times the benefits are stated without the risks, or the risks are stated in ways in which they cannot be adequately judged.

One longs for a summary of what would make a passable vaccine, or a clear statement that each must be examined on its own merits, or even the platitude that the good intentions of dedicated researchers are not good enough to permit easy acceptance of every new vaccine.

The book contains a large number of errors, from the trivial to the perpetuation of outright frauds, such as Rachel Carson's groundless assertions against DDT, which led to the ban of the substance that has probably saved more lives than all vaccines combined.

A minor error is the statement that the first antibiotics resulted from the work of microbiologist Rene Dubos with bacteria from a New Jersey cranberry bog (pp 440-441). This work was done in 1939; the first drugs called antibiotics, the sulfonamides, were developed in France and Germany in 1936.

A very serious error is the statement that autism in the U.S. increased from 0.4 per 1,000 in 1968 to 4 per 1,000 in 2000 (p 372). According to an official report from the U.S. Department of Education, the 2000 rate was about 72 per 1,000.²

A few of the misstatements: Victory in World War II is attributed partly to the B-52 (p 118), which was not delivered until 1954. On Dec 26, 1942, the Surgeon General was said to have ordered all 11 million service members to be vaccinated against yellow fever (p 151), but at that time the total American military numbered only about 2 million. Allen gave the risk for death and serious injury from whole-cell pertussis vaccine as 1 in 100,000 (p 290)—or 180 serious events associated with 18 million annual doses of the vaccine. From that many doses, however, there were reports of 10,300 seizures, 164 cases of encephalitis, 60 cases of chronic disability, and possibly 2-4 deaths.³

Allen seems to think that all forms of mercury are interchangeable, including elemental mercury; inorganic mercury compounds such as calomel, which is mercury (I) chloride, and mercury (II) chloride; and organic mercury compounds. Thimerosal, by the way, is sodium ethylmercurithiosalicylate, not "ethyl mercury." It is much more toxic than inorganic mercury, particularly when injected rather than ingested orally.

This book is fascinating and exciting, but the great number of mistakes mean that no action should be taken based on statements in this book unless their accuracy is checked. I found 35 mistakes without even looking

carefully; clearly, no chemist reviewed the book before publication.

Joel M. Kauffman, Ph.D.
Berwyn, Pa.

¹ Oshinsky D. Preventive medicine. *New York Times*, Feb 4, 2007.

² Twenty-sixth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: *To Assure the Free Appropriate Public Education of All Children with Disabilities (Section 618)*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education; 2003.

³ Geier D, Geier M. The true story of pertussis vaccination: a sordid legacy? *J History Med Allied Sci* 2002;57:249-284.

The Privatization of Roads and Highways: Human and Economic Factors, by Walter Block, 381 pp, hardcover, \$119.95, ISBN-13: 978-0-7734-5841-3, ISBN-10: 0-7734-5841-7, Lewiston, N.Y., Edwin Mellen Press, 2006.

Walter Block is on a mission. His book sets out to prove that roads should be completely privatized. The author's first sentence informs the reader that he recognizes that his book will not be well received: "Most people who read this book will dismiss it as the ravings of a lunatic."

He knows that the vast majority of economists and political philosophers are wedded to the notion of market failure: that some goods and services are different from the rest, necessitating their provision by government. At core, that conviction provides the rationale for socializing a host of goods and services such as roads, medical services, education, old-age pensions, etc.

Block is cognizant that the human intellect is limited in its ability to comprehend universal abstract economic and philosophical concepts that conclusively demonstrate that all goods and services can be more justly and efficiently provided by a genuine free market than by any known alternative. Therefore, he has chosen roads, the quintessential example of so-called market failure, to prove that all goods can be privatized.

For doctors, the implications of Block's defense of free markets are not insignificant. If Block succeeds in his

quest, he will have laid the theoretical framework for the restoration of free-market medicine and of all other goods and services.

The book is divided into five parts: the free-market theory for privatizing roads, specific applications of the theory, the process of transitioning from a public to a private good, answering his critics, and an interview with the author.

The first part of the book explains the chasm between the dominant neoclassical school of economics and the Austrian school. Both schools use similar language to explain abstract economic principles. But the connotation of the words differs widely. The consequence is that the schools adopt very different views of how an economy works.

Is it any wonder that the adherents of each school talk past one another, even though they use the same words? Is it any wonder that both schools arrive at radically different solutions to the problem of scarcity and other complex economic problems?

For example, Block contrasts the definition of competition, which the neoclassical school teaches to be one of perfect competition, while the Austrian school rejects that notion to advocate the concept of rivalrous competition. In addition, each school has a different understanding of externalities, monopoly, and other basic terms.

Block repeatedly discusses the important distinction between the ultimate and the proximate cause of a problem. He correctly points out that the majority of scholars fail to address the ultimate cause, and focus instead on a multiplicity of proximate causes. He identifies the ultimate cause of the problem with roads to be the destruction of free-market prices.

The same problem confronts medical services, because they also lack free-market prices to transmit the encrypted knowledge required to rationally allocate resources. In short, if the goal is to prevent economic chaos, the only tool available to accomplish that task is real free-market pricing, because this precludes the possibility of having too much or too little of any good or service.

Because government prevents generation of real prices to guide provision of medical care, it must compensate for that

fundamental error by resorting to an array of bureaucratic solutions: Pay for performance (P4P), which is simply more micromanaged care; Information Technology (IT); the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA); Electronic Medical Records (EMRs), which are information-gathering tools required by government to micromanage medical care; and Evidence-Based Medicine (EBM), which is a euphemism for politicized science whose dangers have been exposed by several academics.

Readers who wish to delve into the proximate causes of the road problem should read Block's book.

Block thoroughly discredits public-private partnerships (PPPs). He calls PPPs "partnering with the devil." He states that PPPs are "an unholy alliance of public and private [that] tends to obliterate the crucial line between them. As there is no more important distinction in all of political economy than that which divides coercion and non-coercion, such combinations tend to blur this crucial difference."

Block pointedly reminds the reader that PPPs require entrepreneurial subcontracting skills similar to those of a general contractor building homes. He asks the obvious question, "Is it written in stone somewhere that state bureaucrats have some sort of comparative advantage in such responsibilities?" The conclusion is clear. If government bureaucrats cannot competently subcontract to build homes, they cannot do so to provide roads, medical care, etc. Efforts to "fashion a better or more effective law" to correct the inadequacies of PPPs are futile.

Regrettably, physicians routinely leap at the opportunity to help government "fashion" counterproductive laws. The solution is simple. Everyone, including physicians, should adopt a strict policy of nonparticipation with government attempts to provide goods and services.

The fourth section of the book is most edifying because Block responds to his critics, including Gordon Tullock and Robert Poole. Even though the latter are reputedly staunch defenders of the free market, they do make an exception when it comes to roads. However, Block will have none of it.

In the last section, Block answers tough questions posed by libertarian students. For example, he is asked whether

he is optimistic or pessimistic for the future of liberty. He gives a two-pronged answer. He admits to being somewhat optimistic because, “[i]n the early days, if I didn’t know the person as a libertarian, they probably weren’t one [*sic*]. Now, there are entire libertarian organizations, let alone individuals, of whom I am entirely unaware.”

He is also pessimistic, for he contends, “humans are hard-wired, based on psychological considerations, to be anti-freedom.”

There is abundant evidence supporting Block’s pessimistic outlook. A small segment of the world’s population had a very brief flirtation with liberty in the 19th century after being shackled for millennia by kings, queens, and emperors. As a consequence, the world’s GDP grew 1,000 percent in less than 200 years, compared to a 50 percent growth rate in the prior 100,000 years.

Alas, liberty may not endure. The few countries that experienced a modicum of liberty have voluntarily donned the “secure” noose of the welfare state. These countries are at the crossroads. They must elect to tighten the welfare state’s noose, snuff out liberty, and return to the economic stagnation of their not-too-distant past, or discard it in favor of liberty and prosperity.

Walter Block’s uncompromising defense of liberty should be perused by all serious defenders of liberty, because he provides the intellectual ammunition required to discredit statist of every stripe.

Robert P. Gervais, M.D.
Mesa, Ariz.

The Business of Health: the Role of Competition, Markets, and Regulation, by Robert L. Ohsfeldt and John E. Schneider, 184 pp, paperback, \$25, ISBN 0-8447-4240-6, Washington, D.C., AEI Press, 2006.

Some “health policy experts” say there is a consensus that the United States is a prime example of the wrong way to finance a medical services delivery system. The World Health Organization (WHO) ranks the U.S. system 37th among 191 member countries (France ranks first and Italy second), citing the main reason for the low ranking as “lack of fairness.”

The book mentions several authors who start with the premise that only a single-payer system will work, and who then proceed to list the current deficiencies of American medicine, concluding that for-profit hospitals and insurance companies should be banned.

While the critics conclude that the substantially greater medical spending in the U.S. must be the result of waste and inefficiency, they totally overlook the fact that U.S. consumers, with greater incomes, are paying for discretionary services not available in the other countries under their health plans. They also neglect to consider the liability environment in the U.S., which adds roughly \$70 to \$140 billion per year in medical expenditures. Also, nothing is said about who provides the bulk of humanitarian medical care worldwide in disasters (hint: not France and Italy).

While the U.S. may be criticized for having excess capacity and, therefore, redundancy, the Canadian system has “queues for ‘free’ services.”

Ohsfeldt and Schneider discuss the frequently made comparisons of general population health metrics, which are presented in Tables 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3. Infant mortality and homicide rates in the black population of the U.S.—which have several possible explanations—contribute most to the abnormally high overall mortality rates of the U.S. compared to the other countries. “When more specific performance metrics are used,... more sensitive to health-systems differences,... the United States does, indeed, appear to outperform other, less expensive health systems. Even with the obesity of the U.S. population, the U.S. system outperforms the others.”

The “lack of universal access” is believed to be the most significant contributor to the underperformance of the U.S. system. Ohsfeldt and Schneider note that many of the “uninsured” choose not to buy insurance. Access is neither guaranteed by insurance, nor precluded by its lack. One can obtain magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) in the U.S. in three days, while the vaunted “universal” Canadian system provides the MRI only after a wait of 150 days. The Supreme Court of Canada recently ruled that “access to a waiting list is not access to health care.”

After reviewing the pros and cons of profit-seeking in medical care, Ohsfeldt and Schneider conclude that there is no significant difference in quality or value between tax-exempt and for-profit hospitals. Financing of single-payer plans would rely upon taxes, and then be controlled by bureaucrats and politicians rather than consumers and market forces. As a reporter for the *Ottawa Citizen* wrote, “For far too long Canada’s health care system has been treated like a political football by Canada’s politicians.... [T]he system has been used and abused for political attacks and political gains.”

Do specialty hospitals siphon off revenues from general hospitals, as is frequently argued? Specialty hospitals have the same effect as competition from other general hospitals in the same area, Ohsfeldt and Schneider conclude. The ability of the general hospitals to provide indigent care is not harmed. Additionally, physician self-referral does not seem to be significant.

On other subjects, Ohsfeldt and Schneider write that “many managed care regulations are costly, poorly designed, and of questionable value in terms of benefit.” They discuss the pros and cons of direct to consumer advertising, the ubiquitous “ask your doctor if _____ is right for you.” And they note that insurance increases the price of prescription drugs in comparison with other consumer products.

The book offers five steps to improve our current system: (1) the reduction, revision, or elimination of laws and regulations that inhibit the functioning of markets; (2) a more coherent strategy to evaluate new medical technologies and services; (3) transparency in contracts between health plans and enrollees; (4) redesigning insurance plans to have a greater degree of price sensitivity in transactions for medical services; and (5) improved marketing and coordination among existing public insurance programs.

On the continuum from cash practices to single payer, cash practice is clearly the most efficient. The more middlemen who receive a cut of the medical dollar, and the further the system moves toward single-payer, the more inefficient it becomes.

George R. Watson, D.O.
Park City, Kan.

Envy. A Theory of Social Behavior, by Helmut Schoeck, 436 pp, softcover, \$10, hardback available, ISBN 0-86597-063-7, Indianapolis, Ind., Liberty Fund, 1987 (originally published in German, copyright 1966).

Helmut Schoeck studied psychology, medicine, philosophy, and sociology, and has stamped this fascinating book with a definite scholarly tone, but without a boring word in it.

Schoeck brings to light a universal emotion, a fundamental psychological process of comparing oneself to others, one to which very little scholarly attention has been given, but which plays a huge role in human affairs. This is the deadliest of the seven deadly sins. Societies deal with envy in crippling or liberating ways. One of the most fascinating areas explored here concerns the way in which envy holds a society back, or how control of envy allows creativity in solving problems.

To envy is to feel displeasure and ill will at the perceived superiority of another person in happiness, success, pleasure, or the possession of anything desirable. An envious person has a conviction that the envied one's prosperity and success are somehow to blame for the envious one's deprivation and the lack he feels. One may notice another's envy like a skip in a car's motor—an event that leaves a vague feeling of lingering unease, and a suspicion that bigger problems lie behind it.

Schoeck shows that envy does not depend upon inequality of circumstance, and that it is an ineluctable given in human life. Socialism has not come to grips with envy, and instead of controlling the envious man, tries to wipe out any basis for envy—an impossible feat. Envy, unlike some phenomena noted by psychologists, has been recognized for millennia, and very well described.

Schoeck devotes some time to commenting on Melville's study of envy in *Billy Budd*, and on other, less well-known works. He shows that religion liberates the envious one from envy, and the envied from guilt and fear, by giving hope for the future to all. He also shows that many modern political ideas depend on a faulty, wishful assumption that human envy depends upon circumstance, rather than being inherent in human beings.

He has studied numerous cultures and the role envy plays in their success or failure; the role of envy in crime; and the concepts of luck, fortune, and witchcraft in the context of envy. He differentiates envy from jealousy so clearly that you will never confuse them. He examines how philosophers have treated envy, and the role of envy in revolutions. Schoeck indicts American behavioral scientists because they willfully evade facing the truth of the existence of envy, ignore it completely, or call it everything but what it is.

Schoeck unmasks politicians who claim they act for humanitarian and egalitarian reasons as people whose true motive is envy, and appeasement of envy. A wealthy politician may set himself up as a champion of the poor to deflect envy from himself and onto others.

Much of the book concerns the problem of the envious person, and the harm he can do if his envy is not controlled. Schoeck notes that envy of others is by its nature always "an unassuageable, negative unproductive feeling," and that successful cultures inhibit envy.

The process by which envy causes cohesion of groups and adherence to norms of behavior is given its due as a source of the feeling of justice and of indignation at certain behaviors. But Schoeck warns us of the social effects that arise when an envious man becomes a judge, legislator, or leader of a political party. Such effects justify our fear of envy.

The idea that the objects of envy are to blame for the envious person's feelings arose recently in Western history, according to Schoeck—along with the idea that such feelings should call for the leveling downward of whatever anyone has that might make another feel envy. This legitimizes the feelings of envy. It is an attempt to deny the sin of envy, recognized from time immemorial, and to create a new human psyche by fiat.

I found it difficult at first to grasp the concept that envy functions in some ways as an organizing and innovating principle in society, and would have liked more examples of this function. The author emphasizes that for the envier, envy is destructive until it is sublimated, and causes the envied to feel fearful and threatened. He also ventures into subtle nuances of the human psyche with eye-opening examples that buttress and embellish his argument.

This book is a seminal work of genius. I could not lay it down.

Tamzin A. Rosenwasser, M.D.
Lafayette, Ind.

Pain in America—and How Our Government Makes It Worse!, by John P. Flannery II, 159 pp, softcover, \$14.95, ISBN-13: 978-0-9791246-0-0, ISBN-10: 9791246-0-3, Leesburg, Va., Ithaca Manor Press, 2007.

Brilliant attorney and former federal prosecutor John Flannery wrote this book because he is outraged at the misguided attempts to criminalize patients who have chronic pain, as well as those physicians who come to their rescue.

The book tells the stories of various chronic nonmalignant pain sufferers and their physicians, people whose lives have been permanently changed by an overzealous prosecutorial system.

Is it not natural for these sufferers to seek out methods that will alleviate such pain? Why, then, should their suffering be compounded by prosecutorial attacks, fines, incarceration, etc.?

For those physicians attempting to treat such chronic pain, should their medical licenses be on the line for using legitimate and accepted methods of pain treatment? Has America become so jaded that we have become devoid of empathy toward chronic pain sufferers? Is it really possible for a physician to be branded a "drug dealer" for simply prescribing pain-relieving medications?

When one thinks of dealers, such as car dealers and coin dealers, one usually thinks of those who buy or sell merchandise for a profit. Yet, physicians are being labeled "drug dealers" for merely exercising their legal right, as holders of a medical license, to prescribe medications.

Perhaps you don't have chronic unremitting pain, or perhaps you are a physician who seldom, if ever, finds a need to prescribe pain-relieving medicines. Why should this concern you?

The reason is that many of us will sooner or later experience severe pain. Do we really want our treating physicians to be shackled by mandates originating from nonphysicians who are not at all concerned about pain and suffering?

When my son Christopher was 9 or 10, he confided in me that he would like to be a doctor, but then wondered whether the “risk of going to jail was too high?” If the current trend of prosecuting pain patients and their doctors continues, I fear that intelligent, caring, law-abiding young people will be dissuaded from entering medicine.

Mr. Flannery points out that the federal government has interfered with the medical use of marijuana in states where such use is lawful. He notes that the government’s “war on drugs” has resulted in collateral damage that “obliterates notions of fair play and individual rights.” Have idealistic Americans become so committed to their “war on drugs” that we willingly accept such collateral damage as “necessary,” even though individual rights are trampled and unrelieved pain and suffering are increased?

This book shows how the government “actually manufactures crime,” and how federal agents “pose as chronically ill patients.”

Where else would one find such deceitful activities to be acceptable behavior? Why should physicians be held to impossible standards of evaluating, diagnosing, and treating pain, while being able to divine the lies of the federal agents posing as bogus pain patients? Why aren’t there laws against federal agents who lie?

Read this book. I am reasonably certain that you too will be incensed by the novel prosecutorial definition of “drug trafficking,” and that you will be inclined to declare war on overzealous prosecutors and their trampling of the Constitution, rather than to declare “war on drugs.”

Kenneth D. Christman, M.D.

Dayton, Oh.

America Alone: the End of The World as We Know It, by Mark Steyn, 214 pp, hardcover, \$27.95, ISBN 978-0895260789, Washington, D.C., Regnery, 2006.

Surprise! “Global warming” is not the biggest threat to civilization.

“...[T]he Western world will not survive the 21st century, and much of it will effectively disappear within our lifetimes...” is Steyn’s shocking prediction in *America Alone*, and his careful documentation shows he’s not a Chicken Little or an Al Gore.

The “clash of civilizations” he describes between Islam and the West is a battle between a world that has everything material it needs—wealth, armies, industry, and technology—and a world of ignorant death cultists, one that has nothing but pure ideology and plenty of believers. No Islamic nation, for example, could have gone to the moon or invented the Internet.

Fourteenth-century hordes are spreading throughout our world, armed with 21st century weapons. In the West, native populations are aging and fading, and are being supplanted by young Muslims. In the United Kingdom, more Muslims than Christians attend religious services each week. Mohammed is the most popular boy’s name in Brussels and Amsterdam, and the most common name for terrorists and murderers. Islam is now the principal supplier of new Europeans, and the second biggest supplier of new Canadians. The Muslim world’s high birth rate by mid-century will give tiny Yemen a higher population than that of Russia.

Islamism, where faith is the mother of hatred, presents us with a unique danger. It exists to destroy. All infidels are to be converted to Islam, subjugated, or killed. As a former leader of Hezbollah stated, “We are not fighting so that you will offer us something. We are fighting to eliminate you.” Since we share no common humanity, our cultural and intellectual accommodations to faith place us especially at risk. As Steyn notes, “co-exist” is a Western progressive sentiment, designed to enhance liberals’ moral superiority, but it is “one long soothing express elevator to cloud-cuckoo land.”

He offers a few examples. A 21-year old Palestinian woman who received kind treatment at an Israeli hospital packed herself with explosives and set off to blow up the hospital. In the 2004 Beslan massacre, more than 150 innocent schoolchildren were murdered, many of them shot in the back as they fled. In Afghanistan under the Taliban, halftime entertainment at every soccer match was the butchering at centerfield of suspected fornicators, adulterers, and thieves. Our friends, the Saudis, behead folks on a daily basis, some two-thirds of whom are foreign nationals. In 2005 they beheaded six criminals for auto theft.

Last year Iran’s leaders issued a new fatwa (holy order) sanctioning the use of atomic weapons against its enemies. America alone can prevent this impending disaster. But if we cannot summon the will to respond, then it’s the “end of the American moment,” and the Great Plague of Islamism will usher in the collapse of Western Civilization and the dawn of a new Dark Age. The wealthiest and most advanced civilization in human history will have opted for self-liquidation in favor of the world’s most impoverished and backward culture.

Steyn worries that war and conversation are our only options, but that conversation is precluded because, in Muslim jurisdictions, there is no culture of inquiry. It is a closed world that is intellectually stagnant. For example, more books are translated into Spanish in a single year than have been translated into Arabic in the last thousand years. In Freedom House’s 2005 rankings of personal liberty around the world, five of the eight countries with the lowest score were Muslim, while only three of the 46 Muslim majority nations were free.

Steyn notes that we have only two options: submit to Islam or destroy the Islamist ideology. He has no hope for reform—that has already occurred in the form of martyrdom and jihad. He believes that fighting the symptoms—the terror plots—will be ineffective, unless we destroy the ideology that inspires them.

Steyn is not confident of our ability to do this, since our response to this impending catastrophe has been inadequate so far. He believes the key factors that endanger our survival are: (1) demographic decline; (2) the ineffectiveness of the welfare state; and (3) “civilizational exhaustion,” which he attributes to cultural relativism—America’s suicidal, irrational culture. Steyn labels the big government of our welfare-warfare state a national security threat, and proposes smaller government, with a return to the citizens of the primal responsibilities previously taken from them.

His third factor is the key, and correcting it will be difficult, if not nearly impossible. It will require us to change our subjective culture to one that relies on the values of reason, individual rights, and individual freedom. When we abandon reason in dealing with our problems, then we have

left only the use of force. As Steyn laments, the death of a great nation (or civilization) not through war or devastation but through its inability to correct its own suicidal tendencies, will be a remarkable event.

Mark Steyn is the funniest writer alive, and his humorous style makes *America Alone* entertaining and easy to read. Read it and weep. Or read it and give it to friends and colleagues—along with a copy of *Atlas Shrugged*.

Jerome C. Arnett Jr., M.D.
Helvetia, W.Va.

The Professors—The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America, by David Horowitz, 448 pp, hardcover, \$27.95, ISBN 0-89526-003-4. Washington, D.C., Regnery, 2006.

Nearly 100 years ago, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) established principles of academic freedom to be used to “train students in the processes whereby truth is to be made known.” These principles were endorsed by all our colleges and universities and can be found in their official faculty guidelines.

But today the principles have been compromised. For the first time in our history our institutions of higher learning—public and private, small and large—have become havens for extremists who have inflicted enormous damage on our educational system, which in turn has dangerously degraded America’s popular culture.

A recent survey of faculty members reveals that over the past 15 years, while the ratio of liberals to conservatives in the general population remained relatively constant, the same ratio in college faculties increased from a slight plurality to a 5-to-1 majority. At the University of Colorado it is 31 to 1.

The Professors profiles 101 of these college professors, in the humanities and social sciences. Included are department heads, directors of academic institutes, and heads of large professional associations. By a conservative estimate, about 30,000 of the 600,000 U.S. professors hold views similar to those profiled. Three million students pass through their classrooms annually. The intellectual guide of these professors,

Horowitz writes, is Marxism, which leads to a religion of hatred for economic liberty and for America. Many professors are anti-Semitic and promote class warfare. They condemn capitalism and believe that it and private property are the root causes of war. They blame poverty on “globalization” and privatization. They believe that science is just an instrument of the ruling class and that their minority status confers the privilege of interpreting the law as they please.

Horowitz explains how all this came about. In 1965, Brandeis University professor Herbert Marcuse, a follower of the famed “Frankfurt School” of European Marxism, wrote a famous essay, “Repressive Tolerance,” that was used during the 1970s to justify blacklisting of conservative faculty and repression of conservative viewpoints. Also in the 1970s, the Italian Communist Antonio Gramsci led an academic cult of professors and urged them to acquire control of hiring and tenure committees as a means to effect cultural change.

Around this same time many Vietnam anti-war radical activists, including the principal leaders of our first terrorist cult, the “Weatherman” faction of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), stayed in school to avoid the draft and became tenured radical professors. These faculty minorities expanded the university curriculum by creating new departments and new ideological interdisciplinary fields of study, such as ethnic studies, cultural studies, peace studies, “queer studies,” women’s studies, black studies, and social justice studies.

Virtually all English and history departments and law schools now have these, and they have transformed the educational philosophy of the institutions. Scholarly standards have been sacrificed for political ends. For example, the Social and Justice Policy Program at Brandeis indoctrinates students to become advocates for expanding the welfare state.

The following are a few examples that Horowitz gives:

Bill Ayers, a distinguished professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago, is a former leader of the SDS. He once summarized its ideology as: “Kill all the rich people. Break up their cars and apartments. Bring the revolution home, kill your parents.”

Kathleen Cleaver, senior lecturer in law at Emory University, has no qualifications to teach at a major law school. A former communications secretary for the Black Panther Party, she has never written a scholarly book or article.

Angela Davis, former Black Panther and an active member of the Communist Party until 1991, is a professor at the University of California, Santa Cruz, where Black Panther rapist, crack addict, and murderer Huey P. Newton was awarded a doctorate. She received the International Stalin Peace Prize from the Soviet police state in 1979, but never has made a scholarly contribution or written a serious academic work.

Bernardine Dohrn, another former SDS leader, is a professor of law at Northwestern University. She was on the FBI’s Ten Most Wanted list in the 1970s, but now sits on important committees of the American Bar Association and the American Civil Liberties Union.

Paul Ehrlich, author of *The Population Bomb* (1968), is a professor at Stanford University. He predicted that hundreds of millions of people would starve to death in the 1970s, and that an impending Ice Age would produce a “global tidal wave that could wipe out a substantial portion of mankind” with sea levels rising 60 to 100 feet. He later predicted that global warming would shrink the U.S. population from 250 million to 22.5 million because of starvation. He believes that population should be controlled by force, if necessary, that there are “too many rich people,” and that “economic growth in rich countries... is the disease, not the cure.”

Former SDS leader Tom Hayden, with no training beyond a bachelor of arts degree, and no scholarly publications, is adjunct lecturer in politics at Occidental College, Los Angeles.

Leonard Jeffries, professor of black studies at City University of New York, a black supremacist and anti-Semite, has stated, “Jews are a race of skunks and animals that stole Africa from the Black Man.”

Mark LeVine, associate professor of history at the University of California, Irvine, believes that capitalism is the only cause of global evil.

Gayle Rubin, assistant professor of anthropology at the University of Michigan

at Ann Arbor, is a proponent of pedophilia, an advocate of “queer theory,” and teaches that there are no natural differences between men and women.

Professor Suzanne Toton of Villanova University promotes liberation theology, a form of Marxism disguised as Christianity.

As David Horowitz pointed out in his earlier book, *Left Illusions*, “progressives” have used good intentions to commit massive crimes during the last century. In *The Professors*, he documents how our American popular culture has been changed by their unreal subjective beliefs and failed utopian ideologies.

All who read this book will learn one change we must make in education to allow us to return our cultural philosophy to a more objective one, and to prevent the progressive destruction of America, and possibly of Western Civilization.

Jerome C. Arnett, Jr.
Helvetia, W.Va.

Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 Years, by S. Fred Singer and Dennis T. Avery, 260 pp, paperback, \$24.95, ISBN 978-0742551176, Lanham, Md., Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.

Global warming has been touted as the “greatest opportunity to bring about justice and equality in the world,” but the president of the Czech Republic has described it as a religion and a myth: “green ideology and environmentalism, which can be identified as the incarnation of leftism.” The prime minister of Canada has labeled it as a “socialist scheme designed to suck money out of rich countries.” Others call it the greatest deception in the history of science and the greatest scam of modern times.

Activists in the cause have publicized frightening but baseless scenarios. Sea levels will surge 20 feet, flooding cities and displacing 100 million people. It will become too hot to grow crops, and killer weather will cause massive storms and droughts, so that millions will starve. The resulting nuclear conflict and widespread rioting will kill millions more. More than a million species of plants and animals will become extinct. The Antarctic likely will be the only habitable continent by century’s end.

But the facts don’t support the theory. Here are a few that Singer and Avery highlight:

The six major theoretical computer climate models used to predict warming are inaccurate. They disagree among themselves by 400 percent. Not one of them agrees with the temperatures observed.

- Temperatures were much warmer 1,000 years ago.
- Water vapor, not CO₂, is the most important greenhouse gas, and solar activity acting via clouds best explains the climate cycles.
- The CO₂ changes don’t cause the warming periods, but instead follow the warmings by 800 years.
- Nearly every wild species alive today has been around for more than 1 million years and thus has survived 600 global warming cycles, some much warmer than the present.
- The Arctic and Antarctic continents are not warming as predicted, but instead are cooling.

To top it all off, there is no evidence that humans can alter the natural climate cycles. As Singer notes, stopping continental drift may be an easier task.

By the mid-1980s the Greenhouse Theory, that human industries were powerful enough to change the planet’s climate by “polluting” the atmosphere with CO₂ emissions, had become widely accepted. The Kyoto Protocol was created by an alliance between environmental organizations and appointed functionaries of the United Nations. It specified a decrease in fossil fuel use of up to 80 percent in order to “stabilize” CO₂ levels and decrease the earth’s temperature by a mere 0.05 percent by 2050. The U.S. would bear two-thirds of the total costs.

But Kyoto will devastate the world’s economy, and the poorest countries will suffer the most. Eighty-five percent of the world’s energy is provided by hydrocarbon fuels (“fossil fuels”), and future energy needs are projected to increase by a factor of two to three over the next 50 years. Solar and wind power, in spite of decades of heavy subsidies, provide only 0.5 percent of our electricity. The only cost-effective alternative is nuclear power. It’s the safest and cheapest form of power generation, it produces no CO₂, and uranium fission reactors can supply our energy needs for thousands of years. But Kyoto activists oppose this rational solution, partly because of another myth—that low-level radiation causes cancer.

A natural 1,500-year climate cycle was first discovered in 1984 by a study of oxygen isotopes in ice cores from Greenland. Numerous studies since then have confirmed that 600 of these have occurred over the past million years, and that they correlate with solar activity.

It turns out that the sun’s intensity varies by a fraction of a percentage point, which could not even be measured until recently. But this variation produces a powerful effect on the earth’s climate. A “solar wind” normally protects the earth from background cosmic rays. When the sun is weak, more cosmic rays hit the atmosphere. These create clusters of ionized particles that condense into droplets that form dense clouds, which cool the earth by reflecting solar radiation back into space.

“Global warming” is a fraud that has been perpetrated by unethical environmentalists, by activists with no credentials, by climate scientists using wildly inaccurate computer models, by government bureaucracies, and by irresponsible liberal news media. It has become a religion, and scientists who question it have even received death threats.

One reason for this may be that the climate research establishment, along with the entire field of epidemiology, has become heavily dependent on billions of dollars a year in government research grants. Hundreds of new climate research projects have been undertaken, and dozens of new scientific journals have been created to publish the results. Absent the global warming scare, many environmental groups, as well as whole divisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), would be decimated.

The global warming myth is reminiscent of our ancient beliefs in witches, demons, and dragons. That Al Gore won an Oscar for producing a misleading ideological “documentary” about this myth highlights the sad state of our irrational popular culture.

Our climate will continue to change slowly over the coming centuries. But if we will use our faculty of reason, our increasing wealth—along with better scientific knowledge and ever-improving modern technology—will allow us to slay this dragon in good order.

Jerome C. Arnett Jr., M.D.
Helvetia, W.Va.