RESEARCH REPORTS

Reviews of new research at public agencies and private institutions

"The Urban Underclass."

Brookings Institution, 1775 Mass. Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. 490 pp. $34.95.
Editors: *Christopher Jencks and Paul E. Peterson*

The term *underclass* came into widespread use in the 1980s to denote that troubled fraction of the poor population that does not function in accordance with the larger society's basic norms. Inner-city neighborhoods had undergone "a profound social transformation," with increased rates of crime, joblessness, out-of-wedlock births, female-headed families, and welfare dependency, wrote University of Chicago sociologist William Julius Wilson in *The Truly Disadvantaged* (1987). The alleged "growth" of the underclass became a political football. Conservatives portrayed it as the result of cultural decay and misguided social policies; some liberals saw it as an indictment of Washington's stinginess and conservative economic policies. But most of his fellow liberals, Wilson complained, were reluctant to squarely confront "the sharp increase in social pathologies in ghetto communities."

That situation has changed somewhat, as this thick volume of essays edited by Jencks, a prominent Northwestern sociologist, and Peterson, a Harvard political scientist, attests.

The underclass is not really new, Jencks observes. The "lower-class" lives described in Elliott Liebow's 1967 book, *Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men*, for example, are "very similar . . . to the lives described in more recent writing on the underclass." But has this class of people been getting larger? Jencks's answer (contrary to news media reports) is equivocal, but it includes a qualified yes. In 1968, for example, 12.3 percent of impoverished adults were able-bodied, not students, not elderly—and not working; in 1987, the figure was 21.8 percent. However, Jencks warns, it would be wrong to conclude that everything has gotten worse for all poor people. "Economic conditions have deteriorated for workers without higher education, and two-parent families have become scarcer, but welfare dependency has not increased since the early 1970s, and illiteracy, teenage motherhood, and violence have declined somewhat."

Wilson, however, finds Jencks's discussion "not relevant." What distinguishes members of the underclass, he says, is the fact that "their marginal economic position or weak attachment to the labor force is uniquely reinforced by the neighborhood or social milieu." And the number of poor persons living in urban neighborhoods with overall poverty rates greater than 40 percent, according to Harvard political scientists Mary Jo Bane and Paul A. Jargowsky, increased between 1970 and 1980 by almost 30 percent—from less than 1.9 million to more than 2.4 million. New York City alone accounted for more than one-third of the increase; Chicago, Philadelphia, Newark, and Detroit accounted for another third. In small- and medium-sized cities in the South, the number shrank. The "massive industrial restructuring and loss of blue-collar jobs" in the Northeast and Midwest, Wilson maintains, caused the underclass increase.

Still, the 2.4 million underclass poor (two-thirds of them black) in 1980 constituted less than one-tenth of the nation's 27 million poor people. (A majority of the poor are white). Wilson's theory about the underclass "may still tell us important things about . . . blacks living in the largest central cities of the rustbelt," Peterson states, but it makes only "a modest contribution" to understanding why poverty persists in this affluent nation. The "main issue," he says, "is not so much a growth in the size of the underclass as the persistence of poverty decades after the country thought it had addressed the problem."

"The Electoral Origins of Divided Government: Competition in U.S. House Elections, 1946–1988."

Westview Press, 5500 Central Ave., Boulder, Colo. 80301. 152 pp. $38.50.
Author: *Gary C. Jacobson*

Voters have given Republicans the keys to the White House in seven of the last 10 presidential elections—and yet not since 1952 have Republicans been able to win a majority of seats in the House of Representatives. Is the popular will being frustrated, with divided

government the unhappy result? That is the implication of much recent scholarly research, which stresses the increased advantages of congressional incumbency. Jacobson, a University of California political scientist, disagrees. "Divided government reflects, rather than thwarts, the electorate's will," he contends.

The decline in voters' party loyalty in recent decades, he says, does help incumbent congressmen survive "contrary partisan tides." When voters bestowed the presidency on Republican George Bush in 1988, they also returned to the House all but six of the 408 incumbents (245 of them Democrats) who sought re-election.

But incumbents do die or retire, and that creates surprising turnover. Of the 260 Democrats who held House seats on Jan. 1, 1990, only 120 had more than 10 years of service under their belts. Republicans simply have not done as well as Democrats at taking advantage of the vacancies that occur. Between 1968 and '88, Democrats won 27.6 percent of the open seats formerly held by the GOP, while Republicans took only 19.9 percent of the open Democratic seats.

This poor GOP performance in incumbent-free contests, Jacobson argues, indicates incumbency is not the main reason Democrats have dominated the House (266–165, currently). Republicans, he says, have "fielded inferior candidates on the wrong side of issues that are important to voters in House elections."

The divided government of recent years reflects voters' desire to enjoy government's benefits without paying for them, Jacobson maintains. Americans have been able to vote both for GOP presidential candidates favoring low taxes and a strong national defense, and for congressional Democrats who promise to preserve the other fruits of government their constituents enjoy.

What, then, is the best hope for House Republicans? A Democratic presidency, says Jacobson.

"Talking Trash: Municipal Solid Waste Mismanagement."

Center for the Study of American Business, Washington Univ., Campus Box 1208, 1 Brookings Drive, St. Louis, Mo. 63130-4899. 24 pp. $2.
Author: *Kenneth Chilton*

Despite the nation's enthusiasm for recycling in recent years, America's municipal solid waste problem remains. So, not by coincidence, does the need for new landfills, says Chilton, of the Center for the Study of American Business.

By 1993, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has projected, only about 3,300 of the 5,500 landfills in operation in 1988 will be open. By the end of the 1990s, over 1,000 more will be closed. The EPA has proclaimed the goal of reducing the proportion of waste put in landfills from 73 percent in 1988 to 55 percent in 1992. (Recycling would jump from 13 percent of all waste to 25, and incineration, from 14 percent to 20.) But landfills still will be overwhelmed before this decade is out.

The disappearance of landfills should not be news, Chilton notes. They are designed for just 10–20 years of use. The problem is in the shortage of new ones. Whereas 300–400 municipal landfills were opening annually in the early 1970s, only 50–200 were in the 1980s.

There is no shortage of geologically suitable sites: One survey of less than half of New York state found areas totaling 200 square miles. The big obstacle is NIMBY (Not In My Backyard) sentiment, strengthened by environmentalist opposition. Ironically, landfills' risk to the environment has declined significantly. Modern landfills, with impermeable liners and systems for collecting leachate and monitoring methane gas, are much superior to the open dumps of the past. But safety is not cheap: a single-lined landfill can cost almost $66 million, a double-lined one, $87 million.

Siting new landfills, Chilton says, is "virtually a must to avoid a solid waste crisis." Economic incentives, he suggests, can be used to overcome NIMBYness. There's no guarantee that this strategy will work, of course. When Waste Management, a large solid waste disposal firm, offered $25 million to residents of Lake Calumet, Ill., to expand a landfill, residents still said no. Eventually, however, some Americans somewhere are going to have to say yes.

COMMENTARY

We welcome timely letters from readers, especially those who wish to amplify or correct information published in the Quarterly *and/or react to the views expressed in our essays. The writer's telephone number and address should be included. For reasons of space, letters are usually edited for publication. Some letters are received in response to the editors' requests for comment.*

Tasteless at Best, Offensive at Worst

I wish to express my genuine disappointment with Malise Ruthven's essay, "The Mormons' Progress" [*WQ*, Spring '91]. As a non-Mormon historian, I found portions of the essay tasteless, misleading, and unfair. Moreover, many larger issues, especially relating to the reasons for the remarkable effectiveness of Mormon missionary activity and its changing emphasis, are left unilluminated. It is tasteless at best and offensive at worst to comment on how the name Moroni may be used as an adjective. For a professor of religion to rely on Mark Twain's comments on Mormon beliefs may seem clever, but in reality Ruthven indicates a rational secularism that is inappropriate in an honest discussion of someone else's faith. Moreover, at the risk of being accused of advocating politically correct speech, I believe it is tasteless in a pluralistic society to say of the founder of a church with even a handful of members, never mind 7.5 million, that "A martyred Prophet was much more valuable than a living impostor."

Equally disappointing because they are left unanswered are questions raised by the statement that the Mormons had 30,000 members in England in 1850. Quoting Klaus Hansen starkly out of context and referring to Jacksonian democracy simply will not do. These Mormons did not exemplify the Jacksonian American "common man" who wanted to be God. I was taken aback, too, by the none-too-subtle innuendo that Brent Scowcroft's role in the decision to locate MX missiles in Wyoming in some way indicated that he sacrificed patriotism for Mormonism. That is a cheap shot, and even though I disapprove of the MX program in its entirety, to deal with it without making clear the impact of the above-ground nuclear testing program in southern Utah is grossly unfair. As for the author's unblushing certainty of the conservative political character of the Mormon community, how is it that former congressman Morris Udall (D.-Ariz.) was overlooked? Let me close by pointing out that Mormons were a countercultural force for many reasons in Jacksonian America and later in the 19th century, and they are, for very subtle reasons, a countercultural force today, even as they pay lip service to a traditional variety of patriotism. More's the pity that Ruthven failed to see this clearly and to emphasize the implications of this irony. Embracing Mormonism in the 19th century meant surrendering not only one's former religion but also one's whole culture—whether domestic or foreign—to become an entirely new kind of American, who was invariably subjected to harassment and persecution. Embracing it in the 20th holds no such risks, but it does expose one to some of the conspiratorial and nonsensical innuendo in Ruthven's piece. I hope readers of the *WQ* who want to understand Mormonism will avail themselves of the books discussed in Jan Shipp's excellent Background Books essay.

Martin Ridge
Director of Research
The Huntington Library
California Institute of Technology
San Marino, Calif.

A Church of Contradictions

Every other line, or every other paragraph, of "The Mormons' Progress" should infuriate Mormons. Every *other* line, or every *other* paragraph, in turn, will be useful to the Mormon public relations people. Conversely, half the material in Malise Ruthven's article will delight non- or anti-Mormons, and the other half, well webbed into the first, will antagonize or tantalize them.

If my reading of that apparently contradictory set of accents is accurate, Ruthven has done his job well: He has caught the genius and captured the guise of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. That church could be a model from which other religious groups would take lessons if they could.

On the one hand, Mormonism offers what religions must if they wish to hold adherents: the sense of being a "cognitive minority." This means that what believers know leads them to gather so that they can interpret the world distinctively. Some of this accounting strikes non-Mormons as bizarre, maybe even of fraudulent origin. But it has come to be believed, and it serves to do for Saints what not all faiths do for their adherents: It gives them more reasons to be in the group than outside it.

On the other hand, Mormonism in America offers what prophetic religions are nervous about doing: It sets its followers down, squat and settled and securely, in the American environment which it in-

terprets so differently. Ruthven's remarks about the congeniality of the Mormon way with the *Reader's Digest* imagery makes the point well. This "un-American" faith is, paradoxically and simultaneously, so "super-American." The best of both worlds!

One other clear sense comes from Ruthven's article and the books suggested in the essay by Jan Shipps: The Mormons are less a church than a people. It is easier to get a person out of Mormonism than to get Mormonism out of a person—even out of a rebel. So the Mormon impulse is going to be with us, a growing phenomenon among us, and it is good to have this fresh charting.

Martin Marty
Dept. of Divinity
University of Chicago

A Victim of Sources

In assessing the value of an article about religion, I find it useful to use a standard restated by David Brion Davis in a recent issue of *Religion and American Culture*. In commenting on an article by Jan Shipps, Davis suggested that "she presents the cultural and socioeconomic background of Mormon history but never uses this background to cast doubt on the authenticity of religious needs and religious beliefs."

In this regard, although Malise Ruthven's article contains some valuable insights such as the fact that the Book of Mormon "places the Western Hemisphere at the center of the plan of divine redemption," the general tone of his article is far too flippant and secular. He is, after all, writing about a religious tradition that nearly eight million people find spiritually enriching.

In part he is the victim of his sources. For instance, he relies for economic data on Heinerman and Shupe. In fact, their work belongs on the supermarket shelf next to those tabloids with headlines like "Woman Impregnated by Alien, Gives Birth to Cyclops."

In fact, most of the LDS "corporate" property consists of structures used for religious purposes that produce no wealth. As Gordon B. Hinckley, First Counselor to the First Presidency pointed out in an address in April 1991, the Church has "a few income-producing business properties, but the return from these would keep the Church going only for a very brief time."

Most important, perhaps, Ruthven's essay shows little understanding of religious experience. If he understood the phenomenon more, he would recognize that even in Third World countries most people convert to a church to fill spiritual needs. Some may join for economic or other secular reasons, but the demands of the LDS Church for activity, financial commitment, and personal worthiness quickly sift out the unconverted. Moreover, the large drop-out rate (estimated at between three- and four-fifths in underdeveloped countries) was characteristic of periods of rapid conversion in the 19th century as well. If those who join find spiritual fulfillment and a sense of religious community with the Mormons, they remain. If they do not, they move on to something else.

Thomas G. Alexander
Dept. of History
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

A Bag of Tricks

With all the good material written about the American religious movement called Mormonism, it is hard to understand why this article saw light. It introduces no new ground of understanding and makes no pretense of understanding the many good and gentle people who espouse this conviction. The author does not reveal a single skeleton which has not already been bleached white with exposure.

I have been around the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (RLDS) community for more than 50 years, but I have yet to hear anyone express the view that "their Prophet's progeny were cheated of the leadership." Such a statement is ridiculous and reflects the author's ignorance of Mormonism as a wide community.

Such misstatements might be understandable from an author of a tour guide, maybe even from a historian who had ventured out of his own field. But an author who is a professor of religious history should be more scholarly in his investigations and more academic in his comments.

Professor Ruthven has dipped into his bag of "éxposé, accusation, and quick cliché" and identified the standard charges against the Mormons: connections with the CIA (based, it seems, on their parallel dress codes), buyers of forged documents, "one of the wealthiest and most powerful institutions in the United States," and, of course, the Mormons as "super-capitalists."

He also manages to get almost every known cliché into this article: "barbarism's 'twin relics'" (used three times), "Disneyland version of the Joseph Smith story," the "voice of God [expanded] to 15,000 megawatts," and Mark Twain's favorite "chloroform in print."

Along with this he manages to make some really silly assumptions, for example, assuming that the

number of subscribers to *Dialogue* and *Sunstone* gives you an accurate account of the intelligentsia of Mormonism.

Save us from another scholar who suddenly discovers the world of Mormonism and thinks he has found an untapped source for exposure. The study has been going on a long time and Professor Ruthven should check it out before he attempts to describe it.

Paul M. Edwards
President, Temple School
Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints
Independence, Mo.

The Mormon Work Ethic

Both Malise Ruthven and Jan Shipps suggest that understanding Mormonism is contingent on understanding Mormonism's place in American culture. But, as Ruthven points out so well, placing Mormonism in the context of American culture is not easy since that religion seems both to defy and exemplify characteristics of middle-class American culture. It occurs to me that some of Max Weber's ideas about the relationship between Protestantism and capitalism may be useful in sorting out this conundrum.

Weber argued that the Protestant commitment to self-distancing mastery of the material world made that world an "iron cage." The truth of this argument is born out in the religious, artistic, and intellectual expressions of middle-class American culture, insofar as those expressions reflect a Protestant-tinged awareness of the ironic relationship between having a calling to master the world and feeling at home in that world. The Mormons' distinctiveness within American culture can be described in terms of their ability to accept the Protestant work ethic while avoiding its existential pain. Although in their sobriety and dedication to work, Mormons display the religious asceticism that Weber associated with Protestantism, they seem to enjoy a happier materialism, a greater sense of belonging to community, and perhaps also a lack of a sense of irony.

While Mormons have inherited only half of Protestantism, they are full-fledged, exemplary capitalists. The efficiency, productivity, and reliability of industries headed by Mormons, such as UPS, Marriott, and Eastman-Kodak, seems to bear out Weber's prediction that a "victorious capitalism" could flourish on soil earlier tilled unsuccessfully by other entrepreneurs. Thus some of the characteristics of Mormonism fit Weber's understanding of the advanced cultural development of capitalism. But if Mormonism lacks a certain intellectual depth, as Weber's theory of development predicts, its moral earnestness discredits Weber's sour estimate of the last stage of capitalism: "Specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart; this nullity imagines that it has attained a level of civilization never before achieved."

Amanda Porterfield
Dept. of Religion
Syracuse University
Syracuse, N.Y.

Environmental Hype and Hoax

Stephen Klaidman ["Muddling Through," *WQ*, Spring '91] does a commendable job of tracing the history of modern environmental activism. Three case studies—Love Canal, the EDB controversy, and greenhouse warming—illustrate how activists, bureaucrats, politicians, journalists, and scientists themselves use or misuse scientific data in order to advance a politically correct environmental agenda.

"Environmental advocacy, . . . meant to serve the public interest, has gotten out of hand," Klaidman says. Credibility is lost as science has repeatedly exposed hype and hoax. Yet America is likely to continue lurching from environmental crisis to environmental crisis—largely because of the way scientific evidence is used.

Klaidman puts most of the blame on the media for not educating the public. It seems to me, however, that attention should also be given to the feedbacks and reinforcements among the media, activist groups, and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Journalists have become unabashed advocates of environmental regulation rather than objective reporters of the issues. Their uncritical coverage of environmental scare stories puts pressure on politicians and EPA bureaucrats. At the same time, bureaucrats with vested interests in regulation and politicians with vested interests in legislation have developed intimate ties with the media, which enables them to influence stories and advance their agenda. Environmental groups routinely sue the EPA to force the strictest interpretation of federal environmental laws; EPA staffers often work hand-in-glove with these groups and encourage such lawsuits. Policies begin to outrun scientific facts and assume a momentum of their own. In the process, of course, rationality is lost and scientific evidence discarded.

A recent example is the acid rain legislation, which was passed in 1990 with hardly a glance at the scientific evidence accumulated by the feder-

ally conducted National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program (NAPAP). The 10-year, $600 million NAPAP study demonstrated that acid rain damage had been vastly exaggerated and that the costs of the control program would overwhelm any benefits derived.

It seems increasingly difficult to design policies that can be amended if the underlying science should change. Klaidman presents some relevant examples. Other examples could be cited—the dioxin scare or the asbestos scare—where the EPA has adjusted established policy to accommodate new scientific facts. On the other hand, the radon issue is an instance where scientific facts have not yet brought about a change in existing policies.

The nation is paying a huge price for environmental protection, now well over $100 billion a year. But even though opinion polls show the public saying that "no price is too great to pay in the name of environmental quality," the truth is that the nation lacks the basic information for a "rational ordering of risks." What is needed, and what Klaidman recommends, is not resolution of all scientific uncertainty—an unattainable goal—but "enough investigation to separate facts and reasonable beliefs from half-truths and misleading constructions, and enough information for a reader . . . to make an informed judgment." He might have added: to recognize hype and hoax.

S. Fred Singer
Guest Scholar, Wilson Center
Dept. of Environmental Sciences (on leave)
University of Virginia

The Changing Landscape

I find myself less concerned about the occasional warping of rational priorities that comes about because of public fondness for crises—real or perceived—or about the only gradually evolving philosophical conceptions about our proper relationship to the natural environment than I am about our ability to get usable handles on the most pressing long-term problems.

I believe it is true that the public and politicians tend to focus on the latest crisis and that some of the perceived dangers have much less substance than others. However, it is equally the case that our political system in general fails to operate unless goaded by crises. At such times, action long thought desirable becomes possible. The challenge, for politicians, the media, scientists, and public interest organizations, is to focus the attention generated by unfolding events into meaningful, cost-effective policy decisions.

As we try to shape the degree and nature of our intervention in natural processes, new approaches and new measures of success will aid our decisions. Setting aside small parcels of land without recognition of natural boundaries will no longer be judged sufficient. We must now "manage" entire landscapes, with a focus on protecting biological diversity, landscapes that include areas that are left relatively undisturbed as well as land in which some human activities are allowed.

As we lurch from one crisis to another, doing our best to develop sensible public policy and to avoid the pitfalls of undesirable anthropomorphic views of our relationship to nature, we must find ways to focus sufficient energy on bringing human population size back into balance with available resources. This challenge will come to occupy human endeavors for the next several generations and must include major changes in political, economic, and religious institutions.

Susan Merrow
President, Sierra Club
San Francisco, Calif.

Swim Suit or Overcoat?

I was amused by the following paragraph on page 67 of your Spring 1991 issue:

"So by the early 1860s, anxieties about artificially induced climatic changes and species extinction had reached a climax. The subsequent evolution of the awareness of a global environmental threat has, to date, consisted almost entirely of a reiteration of a set of ideas that had reached full maturity over a century ago. The pity is that it has taken so long for them to be taken seriously."

What has happened to global climatic change over the past century and a quarter? Nothing. Don't you think it's amusing that the same alarmist clichés should be taken seriously after 125 years in spite of the historical evidence?

From time to time during that period the alarmists have assured us that the Ice Age is back; in between such solemn assurances we've been told the earth is getting warmer. The warmer assurances are popular in some pseudo-scientific circles, but presumably the fashion will change.

Determining true global temperatures has been impossible until recently, when orbiting satellites have been able to do the job. The results obtained by such a satellite, orbiting in the 10-year period 1979–88, were reported in *Science* on March 30, 1990. It was found that although there were changes from year to year, no discernible change in global temperature had occurred during the 10 years. This is the only fact about global temperature that has turned up yet; all else is theory, and

it's a great pity that costly "remedies" should be urged based on only a theory contradicted by the satellite and by a century and a quarter of history.

On page 78 it is stated that "Greenhouse gases . . . do trap heat in the earth's atmosphere and do increase the planet's air temperature" but no scientific data can be cited supporting this statement; we are expected to have faith in "computer models." But some people believe that greenhouse gases will increase cloud cover and have a cooling effect on the earth.

William T. St. Clair
Naples, Fla.

Don't Blame Environmentalists

Stephen Klaidman is right that Americans are deeply confused about the environment, that we have environmental consciousness aplenty but no real vision or shared ethic to use to sort out priorities, that scientists will never have all the answers in time to avert problems, and that scientific uncertainty need not paralyze policy. But on two counts I take exception.

First, Klaidman contends that environmentalists manufacture and thrive on crises. Perhaps some do, but at bottom his critique of made-for-TV politics applies to our whole governing culture, and to focus on business-as-usual in Washington and the national media is to miss important international and local environmental gains. The worldwide groundswell of grassroots efforts to save remaining tropical forests is just one example. It's also easy to forget the day-in, day-out research and trends-tracking performed by conscientious environmentalists hoping to avert crises.

Second, Klaidman's hope that environmentalists will in the future stick to the facts is misplaced. Greater accuracy and less selective use of the facts are more important than ever as environmental ills grow increasingly complex and interrelated. Devoting more time, as Klaidman suggests, to "separat-[ing] facts and reasonable beliefs from half-truths and misleading constructions" certainly makes sense. But environmental education is a long-term affair that has just begun, and the conviction that the facts alone will prompt policy change is naive. For both reasons, environmentalists must continue to do their best to put "the facts" into perspective for the public and policymakers.

Like the system in which they work, environmentalists are not above reproach, and Klaidman raises important issues of judgment and credibility. But he might be less pessimistic about our environmental future if he could better separate environmentalism's faults from those of the American media and political system.

Kathleen Courrier
Publications Director
World Resources Institute
Washington, D.C.

The Galileo Illusion

The premise of Thomas D. Gilovich's fine article ["The 'Hot Hand' and Other Illusions of Everyday Life," *WQ*, Spring '91] was exemplified by his own statement concerning Galileo and "The Inquisition." This hoary old story is a dearly held bit of scientistic folklore. In his article he states, "The stifling dogma of the 17th-century clergymen who, doubting Galileo's claim that the earth was not the center of the solar system, put him under house arrest for the last eight years of his life."

In fact, such a statement is not borne out by the contemporary evidence of those *four* days in June of 1633 when Galileo was examined by the Holy Office ("The Inquisition"). The questions concerned his theology, not his astronomy, neither of which was his strong point.

The heliocentric theory of Copernicus was in print and well accepted by 1633. History shows us that Copernicus sent *De Revolutionibus Orbium Celestium* to the printers in Nuremberg in 1543, which was 90 years before Galileo's "trial."

Galileo's main work was in mechanics and dynamics, and his greatest contribution to science was his *Dialoghi delle Nuovo Scienze*. This was published in 1636, while he was in seclusion in his villa at Arcetri near Florence. Perhaps the penalty given by the Holy Office in 1633, which amounted to his saying the Seven Penitential Psalms once a week for three years and his removal from public life and theological controversy, permitted him to complete his greatest work.

Galileo's interest in theology led to a conflict concerning some of the discrepancies between the Copernican heliocentric theory and certain passages in the Scriptures as early as 1613. He kept up a running dispute with ecclesiastical authorities over these matters for the next 29 years.

A close examination of these years of this "theological" conflict shows us that the Holy Office exhibited great patience in dealing with a brilliant and somewhat querulous Italian, who, at the time, was the world's greatest maker of telescopes.

Enjoying Gilovich's article as much as I did, I felt obligated to point out that it gives us solid empirical evidence that the commonly held "persecution of Galileo" illusion is still with us.

Edward R. Donohoe
West Southport, Maine

Idle Thoughts

In reading George Watson's essay ["The Decay of Idleness," *WQ*, Spring '91], I thought at first that, despite the title, here was an apologist for the lifestyles of such types as Bertie Wooster and Algernon Moncrieff. We are, after all, currently involved in a reassessment of what went on during the "Reagan '80s" when to be anything but motivated and upwardly mobile was unpatriotic. Yet polls now show that those on the fast track are feeling a need to pursue a more meaningful way of life. While it isn't implied that elitist indolence is returning to vogue, we may face a future, conceived in these frenetic, achievement-oriented times, in which busy, driven people will be as uncommon as a gentleman's gentleman is today.

The bulk of labor shifted in the 1980s from manufacturing to the service industries. Agriculture, manufacturing, and services have consecutively occupied the bulk of human workers. But what is there after the service sector? Because of increasing labor costs, and the shortage of people willing to work in many service-sector jobs, business managers again face the problem of increasing productivity, which means that fewer people will have to do more of the work. If this scenario should materialize, then indolence is the future for at least 85 percent of our population. Where Professor Watson sees a dead, fossilized lifestyle, I see one that could be poised for a glorious resurrection.

Most people would regard the Trollopeian-Wildeian-Wodehouseian "Idles" as contemptible because their lifestyle was underwritten by other persons who did work. This is still common today, though idleness appears more acceptable when independently wealthy people give the impression that they are adding to the economic pie. But no one thinks it is immoral to live off of wealth produced by machines. Visualize a society 85 percent of whose members are endowed with shares in the machine-owning economic institutions that produce the wealth. All of these idle people would receive quarterly dividend checks providing income to them. Unemployment would cease to be a problem and the consuming society would retain all of its consumers. But just in case the Devil really does find work for "idle" hands, a concerted effort could be made to make sure this future is one of stylish gentility. Schools would instruct in the social graces and develop an appreciation of art, music, literature, nature, and charitable concerns. Transgressors of the social order would of course be dealt with by the police, whose members would be part of the working 15 percent.

Peter S. Whyte
Napa, Calif.

Corrections

In a review of a *Scientific American* article about aspirin [*WQ*, Spring '91, p. 129], it was stated that when the Rev. Edward Stone found the bark of a willow tree to be, as he wrote in 1763, "a powerful astringent, and very efficacious in curing anguish and intermitting disorders," he had unknowingly "discovered salicylic acid—better known today as aspirin." That is an oversimplification. What Stone discovered, although he didn't know it, was the power of *derivatives* of salicylic acid, one of which is acetylsalicylic acid or "aspirin."

On p. 94 of that issue, in a review of *Making Sex* by Thomas Laqueur, it was stated that Aristotle had refined a theory first proposed by the Greek anatomist Galen. The review should have stated the opposite; Aristotle died in 322 B.C., some 450 years before Galen was born.

Credits: Cover, 18th-century Indian miniature, *Shiva et la Gange*, copyright © Roland and Sabrina Michaud, courtesy of Woodfin Camp & Associates, New York, N.Y.; p. 8, Frank Cammuso for the *Syracuse Herald-Journal*; p. 12, The Bettmann Archive; p. 14, Courtesy, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, National Museum of American History; p. 16, Theodore de Bry, *Historia Americae sive Novi Orbis* (1596), Courtesy, National Archives of Canada; p. 20–21, *The Gopis Search for Krishna*, from a *Bhagavata Purana* series, 30.84, Indian Painting, Rajput, ca. 1780, 22.4 X 30.5 cm, Courtesy, Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution; p. 23, B. Picart, *Cérémonies et coutumes religieuses des tous les peuples du monde*, vol IV, pt 2 (1734), by permission of the Syndics of the Cambridge University Library; p. 27, Magnum Photos, photograph by Bernard Pierre Wolfe; p. 30, *Siva and Parvati Enthroned*, Kangra, Pahari, Rajput, Ross-Coomaraswamy Collection, Courtesy, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; p. 32, Courtesy, American Institute of Indian Studies; p. 35, Magnum Photos, photograph by Marilyn Silverstone from the Nancy Palmer Agency; p. 37, *Kali Attacks an Army of Demons*, Indian, Punjab Hills, Guler School, Keith McLeod Fund, Courtesy, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; p. 38, Excerpt from *Banaras: City of Light* by Diana L. Eck. Copyright © 1982 by Diana L. Eck. Reprinted by permission of Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.; p. 39, Photograph courtesy of Diana L. Eck.; p. 40, *Ganesh* comic cover, publisher, IBH Publishers, Bombay, Courtesy, The Living Arts of India, Smithsonian Institution; p. 43, Courtesy, *India Today*; p. 48, © Bruno Barbay/Magnum; p. 52, Courtesy of the Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.; p. 55, *Adam Smith*, unknown artist, Scottish National Portrait Gallery; p. 62, Mike Valeri/FPG International; p. 65, photograph by William Coupon; p. 71, David Kalosta for the *Houston Post*; p. 74, AP/Wide World; p. 79, From *School is Hell* © 1987, by Matt Groening, all rights reserved, reprinted by permission of Pantheon Books, a division of Random House, N.Y.; p. 83, Reproduction from the collection of the Library of Congress; p. 91, Stayskal for the *Tampa Tribune*, reprinted by permission, Tribune Media Services; p. 96, *The Muezzin*, by Jean-Léon Gérôme, Francis T.B. Martin Collection, Omaha, Nebraska; p. 99, Chicago Historical Society, ICH: 19106; p. 100, *Self-Portrait*, by Picasso, Museo Picasso, Barcelona, in John Richardson, *A Life of Picasso*, Volume I: 1881-1906 (1991), Random House, illustration © 1991 ARS N.Y./SPADEM; p. 102, UPI/Bettmann; p. 107 © 1960 by Stanley Productions, Inc. and Paramount Pictures Corporation; p. 109, Courtesy of Douglas Gomery; p. 110, Bernard Hoffman, *Life* Magazine © Time Warner Inc.; p. 115, Alfred/SIPA Press; p. 121, Bob Gorrell for the *Richmond News-Leader*; p. 125, © 1990 Peter Menzel; p. 128, Culver Pictures, p. 130, *Composition*, by Mondrian, 1933, The Sidney and Harriet Janis Collection, and *Chrysanthemum*, by Mondrian, 1906, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Armond P. Bartos, from the collections of the Museum of Modern Art, New York; p. 132, Reuters/Bettmann Newsphotos.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

For information on an ad in the Wilson Quarterly *Classified Section, please write to Advertising,* The Wilson Quarterly, *370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20024, or call (202) 287-3000, ex. 223.*

HOME STUDY COURSE in economics. A 10-lesson study that will throw light on today's baffling problems. Tuition free—small charge for materials. Write Henry George Institute, 121 E. 30th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016.

BOOK ASSOCIATES: Specialists in out-of-print books. World-wide search—No fee. Contact: Bob Snell, P.O. Box 687, Orange, Conn. 06477. (203) 795-3107. Catalogs issued.

If you are a serious reader who wants to stay informed, subscribe to THE WILSON QUARTERLY today. One year/$24, two years/$39. Use the postage-paid card in this issue or write to THE WILSON CENTER, Membership Department, P.O. Box 52211, Boulder, Colo. 80321.

BOOKLOVER'S SMORGASBORD for a pittance! Tempting book bargains to enrich your library. Write for free catalog. IRON KETTLE BOOKS, 85 Hancock Road, Williamstown, Mass. 01267.

MODERN BELGIUM, edited by Marina Boudart, Michel Boudart, and Rene Bryssinck, is a definitive reference work of sixty essays for general readers, specialists, and members of the international business and diplomatic communities alike. 592 pages. 1990. Cloth. $45.00 USA, $48.00 elsewhere. Order from SPOSS Inc., 4139 El Camino Way, P.O. Box 10139, Palo Alto, Calif. 94303-0897.

A limited number of back issues of THE WILSON QUARTERLY are available at a cost of $7.00 each. Contact: Business Manager, THE WILSON QUARTERLY, 370 L'Enfant Promenade S.W., Washington, D.C. 20024.

ATTENTION WILSON CENTER ASSOCIATES: Are you aware that as a subscriber to the *Wilson Quarterly* you are entitled to many exciting benefits? Write to the addresses listed below to obtain the desired items. Please include your membership number or a copy of your membership card.

The Wilson Center Calendar of Events, The Wilson Center Reports, Publishing Program, Calendar/Reports, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20024.

Smithsonian Foreign and Domestic Study Tours, Associates Reception Center, Department WCA, Smithsonian Institution Building, Washington, D.C. 20560.

Smithsonian Gift Catalog, Smithsonian Institution, Gift Catalog, Department 0006, Washington, D.C. 20560.

A FEW COMPELLING REASONS FOR DOUBLE-HULLED OIL TANKERS.

Last year, Du Pont announced that its energy unit, Conoco, would pioneer the use of new double-hulled oil tankers to help safeguard the environment.

Estimates indicate that they'll cost 50 million dollars each– about 15% more than conventional oil tankers. And, they'll carry about 10% less oil.

But estimates also indicate they could eliminate or significantly reduce the damage from oil spills, saving thousands of sea birds, otters, sea lions, dolphins and other sea life.

The reaction has been overwhelmingly positive.

DU PONT

BETTER THINGS FOR BETTER LIVING.