the Right nor these libertarians on the Left had much in common with their allies. The Carlists—in their hatred of centralization and fierce devotion to their fueros or regional liberties and their self-sacrificing fanaticism—were so far Right they almost met in some places above historical event the anarchists. The anarchists—in their hatred of government and devotion to local roots and militant abandon—were so far Left they almost turned the bend, although it’s beyond expectation that these reactionary Catholics and millenial atheists could ever have cooperated. These bloody romantics shared kindred fates, and what happened to them is symbolic somehow of what the civil war meant, and would have meant even had the Republicans won. Franco yoked the Carlists to the Fascist Falange, thereby politically neutralizing Spain’s most radical traditionalism. The increasingly powerful Communists exterminated as many anarchist leaders as they could get their hands on, thereby neutralizing (?) Spain’s most traditional radicalism. At war’s end Spain became España! instead of las españitas as it had been in truth through most of its craggly history. It was no more an imperfect accommodation of restless regions and villages, of Basques, Catalans, Galicians, and Spanish subcultures. In a curious way Spain entered the twentieth century in 1939 by ceasing to exist. We’ll soon find out whether or not the curiosity is permanent.

Here to Stay: American Families in the Twentieth Century by Mary Jo Bane

(Basic Books: 195 pp.; $11.50)

Brigitte Berger

Mary Jo Bane argues, as the title suggests, that the American family is alive and well; all indicators point to its being around for some time to come. The message may further confuse the confused reader of the avalanche of published rubbish on the related themes of family and females. The family is clearly out of favor with the opinion-makers. Predictions of the ultimate demise of the family have contributed profoundly to the mood of societal decline rampant in America today. In Here to Stay Mary Jo Bane dissects such prophesies with the cold, impartial knife of the experienced researcher. In the process she exposes as myth much of what is widely accepted to be the “new reality.” These myths in turn, she demonstrates, serve as a basis for public policy. The astounding misconceptions underlying present policymaking processes on the family, women, and children motivated Bane to undertake this study. It is good to have this book at a time when the country presses toward a national family policy.

Bane’s credentials are impeccable. As an associate director of the Center for Research on Women at Wellesley and coauthor (with Christopher Jencks) of Inequality and The Inequality Controversy, she can hardly be accused of conservative bias. As an experienced survey researcher, she relies heavily on demographic indicators and the interpretation of quantitative data. Contrary to her own initial expectations—as she reports in the introduction to the book—it soon became evident that the staying power of the family has been grossly underestimated. Men, women, and children continue to be committed to the family; marriage as an institution continues to be central to Americans; wider family ties have not weakened; and American families are no more or less isolated from communities and wider society than at other times in history. Since these findings are contrary to what we have been told for so long, it is worth considering in some detail those widely held convictions about the sad state of the modern American family that Bane succeeds in debunking as “myths.”

Myth 1. The Disrupted Family. There is wide agreement that the structure of the American family has been fundamentally transformed during the past century, and that this transformation had very negative effects. For example, the home has become little more than a boarding place for individual family members; the family is unable and increasingly unwilling to care for its young; parent-child relationships have been disrupted, and perhaps are beyond repair. Bane’s demographic data show there is little foundation for believing the American family is breaking up. To the contrary, although there has been a significant decrease in the size of the family, the structure has not changed much over the past century. What structural change there has been would seem to go in the opposite direction. That is, there is an intensification and prolongation of the bonds between parents and children. More children than ever live in their own families and do so for longer periods, under parental care and watchfulness. Although many more mothers have joined the labor force, there is no evidence that this has materially affected parent-child relationships, nor has the quantity or quality of mother-child interaction been basically altered.

Myth II. The Decline of Marriage. It is currently argued that America’s young are increasingly unwilling to enter into the “oppressive relationship” of marriage. Increasingly, it is said, they prefer a single life to that of a permanent state of degradation, exploitation, and unhappiness. Those who are caught in the marriage “trap,” the argument goes, are with increasing frequency trying to break free of it. Against this persuasion Bane demonstrates that marriage continues to be a perduing part of American life. Ninety to 95 per cent of Americans marry at least once, and those who divorce (and one could reasonably expect that they at least have learned their lesson) tend to remarry promptly. Although the proportion of singles has risen slightly, this proportion remains, in historical perspective, very small. What is more, married men and women are in general (to the extent this can be measured) “happier” than the single, divorced, or widowed. The death rates for married men and married women are significantly lower than for their unmarried counterparts at all ages. Undoubtedly, the divorce rate is up, and there are clear indications of increased conflict and tensions between husband and wife, but
marriage as an institution endures.

Myth III. The Isolation of the Nuclear Family. From the Extended Family. Historians and sociologists alike have emphasized the emergence of the isolated, nuclear family. They have argued that the American family has been increasingly deprived of wider family ties, has become isolated and turned inward on a self-centered and often destructive course. Using recent historical studies and a skillful analysis of demographic material, Bane shows that the change from extended to the nuclear family system—at least in America—is also a myth. There never seems to have existed in this country an extended family pattern. Far from the contemporary nuclear family being isolated from its kin, Americans maintain close ties with many of their relatives. Although more young as well as old people live in independent households, a high proportion still live in their families. Nor does the increase in independent household units imply necessarily a disruption or decline of family ties and interaction. In sum, whatever changes have taken place in the past century, in all likelihood these are less catastrophic than most analysts make them out to be.

Myth IV. The Isolation of the Nuclear Family From the Community. Not only is the modern family bereft of ties with the wider family, its loneliness is also expressed in increasing isolation from the community, particularly in the urban setting. This widely deplored new “reality” has been instrumental in the emergence of the commune movement of the past decade. In sorting out the scattered data underlining this assumption, Bane comes to the conclusion that despite greater (though limited) geographical mobility and architectural and bureaucratic obstacles, Americans are amazingly resourceful in finding friends and forming new relationships. Americans continue to be moved by altruistic motives in assisting each other, and an astonishingly high proportion of Americans today are involved in community and other cooperative activities.

These findings about marriage, child rearing, and family ties have a major bearing upon U.S. public policy, the major concern of Mary Jo Bane. Dilemmas of moving from an extended family to a nuclear family to the wider family, its loneliness is expressed in increasing isolation from the community, particularly in the urban setting. This widely deplored new “reality” has been instrumental in the emergence of the commune movement of the past decade. In sorting out the scattered data underlining this assumption, Bane comes to the conclusion that despite greater (though limited) geographical mobility and architectural and bureaucratic obstacles, Americans are amazingly resourceful in finding friends and forming new relationships. Americans continue to be moved by altruistic motives in assisting each other, and an astonishingly high proportion of Americans today are involved in community and other cooperative activities.

These findings about marriage, child rearing, and family ties have a major bearing upon U.S. public policy, the major concern of Mary Jo Bane. Decisions affecting the family are being made regularly, and the public debate about abortion, divorce, sexual equality, welfare, taxation, as well as public services for children and families, is gaining momentum. On these and other issues an accurate diagnosis of the family’s current condition is imperative. Bane argues: “Assuming that the family is dead or dying may lead to policies that, in their desperate attempt to keep the patient alive, infringe unnecessarily on other cherished values and prove once again that the cure can be worse than the disease…. [T]oo hasty concern for replacing the ‘dying’ family may in fact bring about its untimely death.” The policymaker who recognizes the continued viability of the family, however, will necessarily be influenced by that recognition in approaching specific family-related issues. The second part of Here to Stay concerns such current policy issues.

In this regard both Bane and the policymakers are confronted by a basic dilemma resulting from a conflict in values. In recent decades public values have emerged that are at odds with persisting family commitments. For instance, the social values of sexual equality, protection of children against abuse and neglect, provision of equal opportunities to children, and more seem in many situations to require governmental invasion of the much cherished value of family privacy. These invasions are not easily justified or easily implemented. In view of the continuing family loyalties established in the first part of the book, in a detailed analysis of such issues as mandatory day-care for all (which she opposes), the Equal Rights Amendment (which she favors), and Aid to Families With Dependent Children (which she proposes be relocated through different mechanisms) Bane tries to work out some of the contradictions between the new public values and the continuing values of family commitment. “The tensions between family privacy and other values are to some extent resolvable by a public stance that emphasizes the rights of individuals and leaves family roles to be worked out…. For example, the most workable approach to sexual equality is probably to enforce the political and economic rights of women, and to rely on family to work through the power shifts and changing division of labor that political and economic equality imply. The protection of children, a more complicated task because of children’s inherent dependency, may be partially dealt with by emphasizing the individual rights of children and...
designing mechanisms for articulating them. Yet another kind of tension, between family privacy and equal opportunities for children, may also be resolvable within an individualistic framework. "Lifetime insurance"—which would make individuals responsible not only for their old age but also for their own childhood care—is a mechanism for equalizing opportunity with minimal intrusion on family privacy."

One may not be in complete agreement with Mary Jo Bane’s arguments and solutions, but I do agree with her that it is time to accept the persisting tension between family and public values and to design more creative ways of living with both.

Genocide in Paraguay
edited by Richard Arens
with an epilogue by Elie Wiesel
(Temple University Press; 171 pp.; $10.95)

David N. Weisstub

Richard Arens has undertaken to document and analyze the genocidal practices of the Paraguayan Government and its corporate confederates with respect to its indigenous Indian populations. In doing this he has transformed what might at first appear to be a moral problem of only regional significance into a challenge to the international conscience. During the past two decades Arens has, in his writing and advocacy, persisted in uncovering violations of human dignity both in theory and practice. His book Insanity Defense pursued the logical outcome of psychiatric permissiveness and legal rhetoric as they affected the treatment of the mentally ill. In the present review of the plight of an Indian tribe isolated in the eastern jungle regions of Paraguay he invites us to use this occasion to reflect on the phenomenon of the human conscience itself.

Arens’s task was not to produce a statistical brief that would inflict itself upon the reader as further evidence of the range of atrocities permitted and committed in the name of democratic progress. Informed persons likely to read this text will already have been overwhelmed by the transnational genocidal drifts that have been part of the daily ingestion of media-watchers in recent years. What is compelling about Arens’s testimonial is that he has chosen an unlikely group—small in number and indeed unimportant in historical and cultural status—and has demanded that we draw moral and psychological conclusions that will test the extent of the dehumanization that has become a corollary of postindustrial progressive civilizations. The book contains thorough accounts of eyewitnessed events, which have been publicly exposed by scholars in Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, and the United States. We are confronted with the realities of men, women, and children being mowed down by hunting parties, sold into slavery, raped, and fatigued by a racist culture. The book also underscores the disquieting silence of the international press, particularly in North America. The journalistic appetite for balanced judgment and respect for national interest has fostered a tendency to rely on the convenient second and third-hand commentaries of official bureaucrats. Almost no publicity has been given the demands of anthropological researchers, Catholic priests who have lived among the Indians, and political dissidents who have experienced the tortures of Paraguayan jails.

The policy of Indian management in Paraguay has been to exploit the vulnerability of Indian tribesmen to the degradation of their own culture. The government distorts those ingredients of culture that fashion authority roles, manhood, materialism, and the experience of childhood. With meticulous precision the Stroessner regime, for the sake of mineral and oil explorations, has turned chiefs into pathetic victims, fathers into symbols of impotence, and young warriors into hunters of their own fathers. This process of ethnocide has involved the creation of reservation plots where Indians have been photographed in the most squalid of circumstances and denied minimum food and medicine. In such places the population alters according to the needs of the mixed-blood neighbors and city dwellers for slave-hands, and according to the whims of punitive, sometimes perverted, overseers. The Ache Indians have dwindled to approximately a thousand, and are on the verge of both physical and cultural extinction. It is shocking to read that a fundamentalist Protestant group has participated in the raids on these forest Stone Age natives, and it is implicated directly in the management of the infamous "Bantustand" camp at Cecilio Baez.

There is, of course, a long-standing tradition of mistreating the nomadic tribal populations of Latin America. Although there have been brief interludes, on occasion under the watchful eye of benign Christian missionaries, administrators of Indian affairs, from the days of Cortes on, have gone along with the distorted "natural law" that fundamental rights are reserved for men of reason and inapplicable to the heathen primitives. Although they are sentient beings, the latter deserve at best the pity owed to animals and at worst the caretaking that is appropriate to wild beasts. In light of this history it is not surprising to read Norman Lewis’s description of various tourist visits to the Ache concentration camp. In October, 1974, Lewis, a journalist with the London Sunday Times, traveled to Paraguay to discover the truth about Cecilio Baez. Missionaries, discreetly placed there at the behest of the Paraguayan authorities, have no apparent religious function to perform. Instead, they participate in stripping the inhabitants of the vestiges of human dignity, likely deriving financial benefits in the bargain to sustain their outposts.

The eminent moral philosopher Monroe C. Beardsley treats willful assault against a culture as tantamount, in specified circumstances, to an act of genocide. It is also, he says here, tantamount to a distinct and different wrong, ethnocide. In confronting possible moral reactions to genocidal practices Beardsley avoids repeating the well-worn debates surrounding the is/ ought distinction and relativistic ethics.