By Andrew Bard Schmookler

I was delighted that a review of my book, "The Turnable of the Tribes: The Problem of Power in Social Evolution," appeared in the New York Times. This was a sign of the passion that inspired the writing of my book is the same as the passion that is shared in your pages.

I was pleased also that your reviewer, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., would take a species akin to my own, the mis-named Homo sapiens, taught as highly as the did of The Turnable of the Tribes. How- ever, there are a few statements in the review that did give your readers an inaccurate understanding of these I present in my book. I'd like here to correct such misunderstandings.

The review says that I find capitalism basically decent. In fact, while I do find many of the usual left-wing criticisms of the market economy misguided, my purpose in the part of Chapter 1 entitled "The Market as a Power System" was to spell out the critique possible of the workings of the capitalist economy. My conclusion with respect to the market exemplifies my thesis throughout the book: that the market, like other social systems regulated by power, cannot be trusted to rule our way in an orderly and humane way. The market accepts wealth at a rate that is determined by the market and that is always to the advantage of the wealthy and the disadvantage of the poor.

Nor was I writing our species when I wrote that "there is some people being people about the animal human." By special means, I mean a people who, as one might also say, that the genome committed to the Nazi was unique. Indeed, I introduce the book with a story of the ongoing battle to remove a stain from the book's history in order to help remove our remaining prideful illusions about ourselves as a species.

The book explored the fact that human beings have always been society, and that society is the driving force in evolution. He was right that if we were ever to be able to control the evolution of humankind, we must first control the evolution of this process. The whole process of human evolution is the process of self-organization, and in the modern industrial society, it is the process of self-organization of the human species. The human species is the society. Whereas we can control the evolution of power among the species at any other time, we cannot control the evolution of any life-serving order.

Since cultures begin to invent their own way of life, it might be that their societies would be free to develop in a manner that would give them the freedom for a single society is an anomaly in an intersecting system of these societies. Anarchy, which Hobbes regarded as the state of nature, is in- deed a state of anarchy — for in it we never before existed in the history of life. This is the Anarchic Time from which we arose to escape the struggle for power and the in- gibility of the ways of power that our book described.

Finally, I'd like to respond to the review's dissection of the 1000-year view, which I do not have more to say about how to escape from the various crises I have encountered since the book was published a year and a half ago, this has been the most frequent and the most disturbing to me. The turnable of the Tribes shows that the essence of our problem lies in the overarching anarchy within which human action takes place. So long as that anarchy persists, the democratic rule of power will permit. The general nature of the solution is clear: we must create a life-serving order that both al- lows and requires us to act consistently with the needs of human beings and of other living things. If we are to survive for much longer, our present anarchy — a recent development of only some 10,000 years — must be made but a brief interval between two systems that em- body wholesome: the pure order of nature from which we emerged, but to which we cannot return; and another frame- work of human beings who work to limit and human activity.

It is true that those general notices, even if accepted, do not offer detailed guidance on how to get there. Still less do they provide a quick solution to the destruction that plagues us. But that, unfortunately, is the human condition. We will not reach the promised land any time soon; and we are required to grope our way toward it without adequate guidance, in the frightening, demanding task of discovering us resources of courage and faith. What dis- only one can see, but one can do.

ReVIEWERS REEED: Most of my doubts about Schmookler's book have been dispelled. This is an excel- lent book. I was impressed, as I am by Schmookler's review, by Mr. Adams, "I'm glad I did this book a good deal to reinforce my conviction that the idea of anarchy is well worth- while. When anarchy is rejected by the negative use of the term "anarchy." Anarchy as advocated by most thinkers as Murray Bookchin and others, seems a very positive and ecologi- cal political alternative to the systems that we have perhaps, not. What do you think of Bookchin's advocacy of anarchism, Mr. Schmookler?"