

Invited Response to the Review by Terence Hines of Lowen's *Dichotomies of the Mind: A Systems Science Model of the Mind and Personality*:

I do not consider Professor Hines' angry tirade a review. No one can have the slightest idea what *Dichotomies of the Mind* is all about probably because Professor Hines did not understand the explicit perspective stated in the subtitle of the book: *A Systems Science Model of the Mind and Personality*. Systems Science is a relatively new field interested in models and structures of complex systems. Certainly the mind is such a system and is of interest to systems scientists as a rich example to explore possible organizational structures underlying organized complexity. It is unfortunate that a reviewer for a journal that claims to be interdisciplinary is so intolerant to a different approach and perspective.

Model building is fundamentally different from research in a narrow discipline. An example from a discipline other than his own may help Professor Hines to see differences in approach. To gain insight into the *behavior* of automotive engines, a model known as the *air standard analysis* became the basic tool for analyzing engine designs. This model described a simply computable engine as running on pure air (no gasoline) with no heat loss from the cylinder (adiabatic) and so free of internal friction and turbulence that it was insensitive to delays in real time. A reviewer of the air standard analysis, with the myopia of Professor Hines', could have written a review something as follows: "Clearly the author is ignorant about the most basic facts concerning automotive engines. He did not even know that engines run on gasoline, that we have radiators to remove the heat lost by the cylinder and if he had at least driven a Model T he would know how sensitive engines are to ignition delays."

But we no longer live in the age of the Model T. Even Professor Hines will have to accept that the reality of new tools such as computer simulations and structural analysis provided by mathematics and systems science, will impact his field of expertise and thereby alter his selfrighteous vision.

Walter Lowen, SUNY at Binghamton

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

I earn my living as a policy analyst, examining scientific issues, and I like to think that my analyses are objective. So I say, with ten years of analytical work behind me, that this is not a book review, it's a tirade, pure and simple.

And now for a bit of stereotyping. We expected at least one vicious attack, and predicted it would come from a psychologist. Thank you for the confirmation.

The reviewer also claims to speak for all disciplines by concluding that "the book makes no contributions and offers no insights, profound or otherwise, to any field of study. It is a disgrace to the publisher." I am willing to state for the record that time will tell who is the fool.

Lawrence Miike, Co-Author

In the interest of the unconstrained exchange of ideas, as well as the free expression of uncommon or minority viewpoints, the editors of JMB refrain from the exercise of undue control over the content of book reviews. Consequently, the opinions expressed in book reviews do not necessarily reflect those of the editors. The Journal invites and welcomes responses to the reviews; authors of books reviewed are encouraged to reply.

Steven E. Connelly, Book Review Editor