

## RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS

No. 26

May 1980

- (1) Annual Meeting, June 20-22 (2). Science Committee's nuclear symposium (6). The BBC on BR 10 years later (10). BR Memorial contributions lag (17). JBN's Nobel Symposium talk (22). Dora's "Tamarisk Tree 2" reviewed (26). 7 BR films in BRS Library (27). Time to nominate Directors (31). Renewal dues are due (32). Tom Horne's choral manuscript sought (33). Amnesty International USA will petition on death penalty (34,43). Theory about elementary particles (40). Current members (41). Index (42). An asterisk in the left column indicates a request.

## ANNUAL MEETING

- (2) 1980 Annual Meeting will be held June 20 (8 PM) to June 22 (noon) at the Center for Continuing Education (of the University of Chicago) 1307 East 60th Street, Chicago, IL 60637. For lodging (at \$34 single, \$38 double, per night), write directly to the Center. For lodging at \$10 per night, write International House, 1414 East 59th Street, Chicago, IL 60637. A 4-page memo providing complete details was mailed (First Class) to all members on April 5th. If you have questions, write or phone Don Jackanicz, PO Box 1727, Chicago, IL 60690; (312)286-0676.
- (3a) 7 BR films to be shown at the June meeting. See (27) for a listing of the 7.
- (3b) Footnote on whiskey. Let DON JACKANICZ tell it in his own words:

Several members have asked whether it is possible to locate Red Hackle Blended Scotch Whiskey in the USA or Canada, and whether we will have an ample supply of it for our June Red Hackle Hour. I am pleased to report that Russell's favorite brand is still being produced, is available for retail sale here and there, and will be present at our Annual Meeting in plentiful supply.

In my attempt to locate Red Hackle, I was referred to BRS Newsletter (now Russell Society News) 11-29 and 12-41. These references listed wholesalers and retailers who handled Red Hackle. I wrote to some of them, and to Hepburn & Ross, Ltd., of Glasgow, Red Hackle's distiller, which finally led me to Armanetti's Liquor Stores of Chicago. I visited the one at 7324 N. Western Avenue (Chicago, IL 60645) and had a pleasant talk with Mr. Max Ponder, its manager. He plays racquetball with Saul Bellow, told me many things about the liquor business, and knew quite a bit about Red Hackle, though he was not aware of Russell's preference for it or, for that matter, of Russell. In a second conversation with Mr. Ponder, I found that he had looked up Russell and had been impressed by the fact that Russell, like his friend Bellow, had received the Nobel Prize for Literature. I have invited him to our meeting, and he may come, at least to our Red Hackle Hour.

Alcoholic beverages cannot be shipped across state lines. But anyone coming to Chicago this June, who has been seeking a source of Red Hackle, can acquire as much as he wants at Armanetti's.

## REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

- (4) Chairman Peter G. Cranford reports:

As the number of members approaches the 300 mark, it seems that the Society is now solidly established and should continue indefinitely. Its growth, which on the surface seems slow, parallels that of the American Association of Practicing Psychologists, which grew very slowly at first, but which is strong and useful.

Since the founding of the BRS in 1974, we have functioned informally, and indeed with some violations of the charter. Since this involves a danger to our non-profit status, I have culled from the bylaws what needs to be done.

Among the duties which the charter requires the board to fulfill are: determine the place and time of the annual general meeting; notify the members of it at least 30 days in advance; draw up agendas; elect directors (by the members) by mail ballot; appoint committees and their chairmen; elect the 5 officers — chairman, president, vice-president, treasurer, secretary — for a period of one year.

- \* The agenda is in the process of being drawn up. I will greatly appreciate suggestions from board members and the general membership.

In view of the world situation, I suggest as an "activist" project the promotion of BR's idea of compossibility. Shortly before his death, he had expressed to Lady Russell the hope that others would do something with it.

Members to whom the idea is new can get a quick understanding of his basic position on intra-personal, inter-personal and inter-group relationships by reading a few pages in Human Society in Ethics and Politics (paperback) Mentor Books, 1962, p. 121, last 12 lines; p. 123, lines 9-16; p. 127, first paragraph. Also Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, Vol. III (hard cover) p. 29, last paragraph.

In the light of past history and present world conditions, compossibility may be the most important of all of Russell's ideas.

- \* Please feel free to forward any comments on any of the above to me at 1500 Johns Road, Augusta, GA 30904. I am particularly interested in hearing from each board member, since the feasibility of a press conference needs to be discussed in advance.
- \* I should like to urge members to contribute about \$3 payable to the Society and designated for the Bertrand Russell Memorial. (We have had contributions of 352.50 up to this point.) It will take an average of that to fulfill a guarantee of \$1000 I made to the British Committee. Our part in the Memorial was to serve as a catalyst for Dora Russell's original idea.

\* \* \* \* \*

(4a) Here is the last paragraph of p. 29 of Autobiography III referred to above:

There is one approximately rational approach to ethical conclusions which has a certain validity. It may be called the doctrine of compossibility. This doctrine is as follows: among the desires that a man finds himself to possess, there are various groups, each consisting of desires which may be gratified together and others which conflict. You may, for example, be a passionate adherent of the Democratic Party, but it may happen that you hate the presidential candidate. In that case, your love of the Party and your dislike of the individual are not compossible. Or you may hate a man and love his son. In that case, if they always travel about together, you will find them, as a pair, not compossible. The art of politics consists very largely in finding as numerous a group of compossible people as you can. The man who wishes to be happy will endeavour to make as large groups as he can of compossible desires the rulers of his life. Viewed theoretically, such a doctrine affords no ultimate solution. It assumes that happiness is better than unhappiness. This is an ethical principle incapable of proof. For that reason, I did not consider compossibility a basis for ethics.

#### REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

- (5) Philosophy-in-High-Schools Committee. LEN CLEAVELIN undertook to be Acting-Chairman shortly before he entered law school last Fall. He says: "I grossly underestimated the amount of time law school would eat up. You might want to open the position up to someone as interested in the project as I am but who has a lot more time than I have in the present circumstances."
- \* Does someone wish to volunteer?

- (6) Science Committee (Alex Dely, Chairman):

The Science Committee has a continuing interest in the energy crisis and the environment, and the effect each has on the other.

At the June meeting, the Science Committee will sponsor a symposium on nuclear energy, with input from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, other government agencies, and many non-governmental energy-oriented organizations.

If there is time (at the June meeting), I will offer a paper on the social responsibility of the scientist, as I see it.

I am trying to get permission (for BRS members who are interested) for a tour of the Laboratory of Astrophysics and Space Research at the University of Chicago, where I worked last summer.

Finally (and perhaps rashly!) I am including in this newsletter a summary of an alternative theory of elementary particles that George Blam and I have been working on for ever a year(40). If you're wholly unfamiliar with elementary particles, it probably won't make too much sense to you. At least I can tell you that there's no mathematics in it. Just let your eye run gently down the page. Even though you don't understand every sentence, it may give you an idea of the process by which a theory is developed; and that, I suggest, you might find interesting.

#### PHILOSOPHERS' CORNER

(7) A report on the 1979 BRS/APA session, by David Johnson, who chaired the session:

The program of the Society was convened by the chair, David E. Johnson of the U. S. Naval Academy, at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, December 28, 1979 at the Sheraton Centre Hotel in New York City. The session was attended by about thirty philosophers, generating a lively discussion in the latter half of each session of the program.

Presenting his paper, "Definition and Description in Russell, 1900--1910", Mr. Thomas Barron of the University of Texas discussed the shift in Russell's ontology that occurs from Principles of Mathematics to Principia Mathematica. The key to understanding Russell's move from a lavish to a frugal ontology is to be found in a change in Russell's use of 'definition', a change rooted in Russell's development of his theory of descriptions in the 1905 "On Denoting". Barron argued that Russell moves from "direct definitions" (a rule for replacing one syntactical unit of a sentence by another expression belonging to the same grammatical category, without otherwise altering the sentence in which the replacement takes place) to "contextual definition" (a set of rules for paraphrasing entire sentences in such a way that no syntactical unit in the resultant sentence corresponds to the phrase defined). The latter sort of definition is seen by Barron as central to Russell's move to ontological frugality. Russell's use and interpretation of incomplete symbols (definite descriptions and other contextually definable signs) eliminates the ontologically misleading feature of these expressions in negative existential sentences, e.g., "The Queen of France does not exist", so that we need not be misled into holding "that the grounds for the truth of these sentences must involve entities correlated with these descriptions." In other words, since expressions for e.g., classes, similarity relations and some functions are all contextually defined, Russell can eliminate "the apparent need to posit the mysterious entities in the first place". Therefore, Mr. Barron's conclusion was, "Whereas the Principles endeavors to convince us that the numbers really are classes of classes, Principia quietly maintains that, ontologically speaking, there are no numbers, although the truths of mathematics are still truths."

Mr. Jon Fjeld, Duke University, commenting on Barron's paper, granted the accuracy of the interpretation of Russell. His questions focused first on the importance of the shift outlined by Barron for a discussion of Russell's logicism, and second on the actual frugality of Principia's ontology. Mr. Fjeld pointed out that in Principia, propositional functions still remain and the world is not reduced to one of individuals. That is, Fjeld questioned whether the Russell of the Principia is trying to be a nominalist.

The second portion of the program consisted of a paper by Mr. D.A. Griffiths, University of Hong Kong, "Russell and Ontological Excess" commented on by Mr. Tom Wartenberg, Duke University. The focus of Mr. Griffith's presentation was on the ontological excess in Principles of Mathematics. Thus, the two parts of this years session dovetailed effectively. Mr. Griffiths urged the following points: (1) there is no ontological excess in the Principles; (2) if there is ontological excess there, it can be handled by something other than the theory of descriptions; and (3) anyway, the theory of descriptions will not prune the ontological jungle.

Mr. Wartenberg argued that Mr. Griffiths had failed to clarify his use of 'excess', and that he, Wartenberg, would contend that Russell has an excess of ontological realms. In the lively exchange that followed with the audience, there was focus on whether or not denotations matter for the meaning of expressions, on the role of propositions in Russell's ontological excess, and on the distinction between truth-bearer and truth-maker in generating ontological excess. David, E. Johnson

Abstracts of the 2 papers discussed at this meeting — of the BRS at the annual convention of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association — were presented in the November issue (RSN24-9).

- (8) Want to comment at the 1980 BRS/APA session? ED HOPKINS, Chairman of the Philosophers' Committee, puts it this way:

Any member who wishes to comment on a paper presented at a meeting of the Society with the American Philosophical Association this December should contact me, giving qualifications and the specific area of Russell's philosophy on which he/she can best comment.

Ed's address: 6165 64th Avenue (#3), Riverdale, MD 20840.

BR, PUBLIC SPEAKER

- (9) More on the Warsaw Ghetto speech (RSN25-15), from KEN BLACKWELL:

A year or two before she died, Lady Russell copied her recording of BR's Warsaw Ghetto speech for the Russell Archives. It is considerably longer than the extracts you print, and will some day be published in The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell. In my opinion, this speech is the definitive rebuttal of those who see BR as an agent of anti-Semitism.

ABOUT BERTRAND RUSSELL

- (10) From "The Listener", 17 January 1980, published by the BEC, London:

17 January 1980

30p

# The Listener

USA AND CANADA: 90c



This is the front cover of "The Listener" reduced to one-fourth the area of the original.

Anthony Howard

## Bertrand Russell: the patrician rebel

Throughout my life I have imagined myself, in turn, a liberal, a socialist or a pacifist. But I have never been any of these things in any profound sense. Always the sceptical intellect, when I have most wished it silent, has whispered doubts to me, has cut me off from the facile enthusiasms of others and has transported me into a desolate solitude.

BERTRAND RUSSELL (1872-1970)

The words of Bertrand Russell, third Earl Russell, grandson of a prime minister, godson of John Stuart Mill, looking back at the end of his life on a career that made him—'desolate solitude' or not—probably the most celebrated private British citizen of his age. And, in longevity, what an age it was. When he was born in 1872 Queen Victoria still had almost 30 years left on the Throne; he was to live through six successive reigns—for most of the time the gaffly and goad of the British Establishment. Strangely, however, he himself was every inch a child of the Establishment. Both his parents were to die before he was four; and he was brought up at Pembroke Lodge, a grace-and-favour residence in Richmond Park, by his grandparents: Lord John Russell, then already in his eighties, who, 40 years earlier, had fought the 1832 Reform Bill through Parliament, and his much younger wife, Frances, herself the daughter of an earl.

By the time 'Bertie' was six, his grandfather was dead—and it was very much a women's household in which Russell grew up. He had an elder brother, Frank, but he was seven years older and, anyway, was away at school—an experience that 'Bertie' himself was never allowed to enjoy. Brought up instead by aunts, governesses and tutors, he did not leave home until at 16 he was sent to a 'crammers' at Southgate in North London just before going up as a mathematical scholar to Trinity College, Cambridge, at the age of 18 in 1890.

He was to remain attached to the college for the bulk of the next five years—becoming first a prize Fellow and then a lecturer (ironically, he was not to be elected to a full Fellowship until 1943 when he was over the age of 70). But it was this initial Cambridge period that really laid the foundation of Russell's academic reputation. It was certainly in the early part of his life that he wrote his most intellectually distinguished books: *The Foundations of Geometry* in 1897; *The Principles of Mathematics* in 1903; *Problems of Philosophy* in 1911; and, perhaps above all, jointly with A. N. Whitehead, *Principia Mathematica* in 1910.

The unkind—or perhaps merely those endowed with his own sharp, critical faculty—were later to say that all Russell's original work was done before he was 45. Certainly, he was to write many more books—nearly 50 in all; but his later works tended to be popular and polemical rather than scholarly and serious. It may, of course, have been that he simply tired of philosophy—he never, after all, was one for unchanging affections. But, in any case, the great watershed in his career was provided by his opposition to the 1914-18 war. In 1916, having been convicted under the Defence of the Realm Act and fined £100 for writing an anti-conscription leaflet, he was stripped of his lectureship by the Council of Trinity College. But the greatest drama was yet to come, for by 1918 Russell was again in court and this time was sent to prison. The sentence was six months

—though as it was eventually served in what was then known as the First Division, which meant having what books and newspapers you liked as well as enjoying your own food, the hardship was not great.

By the time Russell emerged from jail—just two months before the war ended—he had become a national celebrity. The years of the ivory tower were over; from now on, his forum was the political arena. Henceforth, the pattern of his life was to be combative and controversial rather than contemplative and collegiate. But it was not just fame—or notoriety—that Russell discovered in early middle age; he also embarked on what was to be an abiding interest in the opposite sex.

His first marriage—entered into at the age of 22—had not been a happy one and it broke up in 1911, when Russell launched on his celebrated 'Bloomsbury' five-year affair with Lady Ottoline Morrell of Garsington (the wife of an anti-war Liberal MP). His private life, which had been reasonably orderly and staid till early middle age, now became reckless, some might even say rascally. Lady Ottoline was eventually succeeded in his affections by an aristocratic actress called Lady Constance Malleson and she, in her turn, by a young Girton graduate, Dora Black, whom Russell married in 1921.

In 1920 Russell had visited the Soviet Union—and, remarkably, for an intellectual in the heady days that followed the Russian Revolution, was in no way taken in. For Michael Foot, who as an undergraduate at Oxford in the 1930s came to know Russell, the view that he then gave remains evidence not only of clear-sightedness but of considerable courage:

Many of the things he said that were anti-Soviet were legitimate. First of all, he was anti-Marxist—he did not accept the doctrines of Karl Marx in any sense at all, and indeed was highly critical of them from what I suppose you could call a liberal-democrat point of view. And he didn't believe in all the doctrines of the materialist conception of history—he was anti-Marx, anti-Hegel, anti-Plato, anti—a whole stream of semi-totalitarians, however you like to

describe them. So that was part of it. Then when he went to Russia in 1920 or so, I suppose that what he saw then helped to confirm his own judgments on the matter. When he came back from there and put these views in the atmosphere of the left of that time, I suppose that was considerably difficult. I don't remember the 1920s all that well myself, but I know that in Oxford in the 1930s most of the left were denouncing Russell for what he had said in *Roads to Freedom*. But if anybody reads it now—and I recommend anybody to go and do it—they will see that it's a pretty remarkable judgment on Marxism and on the Soviet state and on what has happened subsequently. He saw its dangers much earlier than anybody else, or pretty well anybody else, on the left.

In the interwar years Russell's voice certainly carried—especially to the younger generation. Part of the reason for that rested, of course, on the solid basis of his work as an academic philosopher. About his stature as a philosopher Sir Alfred Ayer is in no doubt:

One thing is his range and the second is the fertility of his ideas; in every field that he approached he came up with interesting and original ideas. For one thing he wrote what probably still is the best introductory book to philosophy, *The Problems of Philo-*

sophy, which came out in 1911. In some ways it is old-fashioned, and people, including myself have tried to write books which supersede it, but I don't think any-one so far has succeeded.

Why, then, did Russell's reputation as a philosopher suffer a decline even in his own lifetime? Partly perhaps it was that his own approach necessarily began to seem dated in the austere era of logical positivism.

It was always difficult to pigeonhole Russell into any normal human category. To his second wife, Dora, with whom he founded one of Britain's first progressive schools in the 1920s, it sometimes seemed as if he was, like Lloyd George, only a 'half-human visitor' from some 'magic and enchanted woods':

I can still see his profile silhouetted, you know, and his hair blowing back, his peculiar profile, his rather receding chin . . . he always looked rather like the Mad Hatter, you know. T. S. Eliot, in that poem he wrote about Bertie's coming to the United States, begins: 'When Mr Apollinax visited the United States, his laughter tinkled among the teacups'. And it goes on to represent him as being a sort of elfin person.

Hardly therefore the kind of individual normally entrusted with the education of the young. And, sure enough, Beacon Hill—the school the Russells started in Hampshire in 1927—soon ran into a blaze of notoriety. Free thought, free expression, free love—to the popular press it soon came to represent a trinity of sin. The attacks on the school particularly infuriated Dora Russell (or Countess Russell as she slightly embarrassedly became when her husband inherited his brother's earldom in 1931); it simply is not true, she insists, that the school had no discipline or control of any kind. Yet the school's faintly scandalous reputation was hardly helped when, in the early 1930s, Dora, having borne Russell two children, had two further children by another man, and Russell himself started yet another affair, with the children's governess—whom he was to marry as his third wife in 1936. By then, however, Russell had withdrawn from the school, leaving it to Dora to run by herself until, having moved to Essex, it finally closed after the end of the Second World War. In any event, Russell himself hardly devoted all his energies to it—even in September 1927, when the school first opened, he was away on a lecture tour in America.

America, in fact, in his middle age, became very much his sounding-board and stamping-ground: like other British celebrities after him, he made a dead set at the always lucrative American lecture circuit, touring it in 1924, 1927, 1929 and 1931. The by-products tended to be essentially potboiler books, one of which, *Marriage and Morals*, was to return to haunt him when he finally decided, in 1938, to embark on an academic career in America. He went first to Chicago and then to the University of California at Santa Barbara, but trouble only really arose when he was offered, in 1940, a visiting professorship at the state-funded City University of New York. It was an appointment that he was never allowed to take up, for the uncontrolled fury of that city's always influential Roman Catholic community broke over his head. Though the state's Board of Higher Education initially upheld his appointment, Russell soon found himself arraigned before the Bar of Public Opinion for his moral views—an experience about which, it must be said, he contrived to adopt a predictably lofty, disdainful view:

Civilised people didn't mind them, but there was a whole rabble in New York of uneducated Irish people, and they had completely, absolutely ignorant views. There

was a woman who was intending to send her daughter to the College of the City of New York, where her daughter was not going to study mathematical logic, which was the subject I was going to teach. Nevertheless, this woman professed to be afraid that I would rape her daughter or corrupt her in some way by my mere presence in other classrooms in the same university, and on that ground she brought an action.

The woman who brought the action succeeded—the university, in the words of the judge who tried the case, having convicted itself of being interested in 'establishing a chair of indecency'. At the age of 68, Russell with two ex-wives and three children to maintain (his third wife had provided him with a further child) found himself without visible means of financial support. It was probably, none the less, the luckiest break he ever had, for to his rescue there rode an eccentric American millionaire, Albert Barnes, who invited him to lecture at his personal foundation outside Philadelphia.

The relationship was not to be an easy one—indeed by the end of 1942 Russell found himself once again dismissed; but it was while working at the Barnes Institute that Russell wrote and prepared the bulk of the lectures that were later to form the corpus of far and away his most commercially successful book, *History of Western Philosophy*. On both sides of the Atlantic it had a tremendous sale and was to ensure for Russell what he had always previously lacked—financial security.

By now, in fact, he was even threatening to become a respectable person: in 1940 he made it clear through the columns of the *New Statesman* that he renounced his former pacifist convictions and had even gone on to give his active support to the war against Hitler's Germany.

Though he remained in America for the greater part of the war—returning to England only in 1944—he was luckier than, say, Isherwood or Auden, in never having it held against him that he preferred the safety of exile to the perils of the home front. In fact, when he ultimately returned to his native land, it was to take up the 'full' Fellowship at Trinity College, Cambridge, that had always been denied to him. The young man who had been court-martialled and stripped of rank by Trinity College in 1916 was now transmogrified by the unanimous decision of the College Council into its principal academic ornament and public trophy.

Nor was that all: in the whole of Russell's career there is no stranger episode than the five years that followed the ending of the Second World War. Whether it was a reaction against his treatment at the hands of the Americans—or simply joy at a sinner that repenteth—Russell became in effect the prodigal son for whom the fatted calf was prepared. There were official lectures for the British Council and the Foreign Office, the founding BBC Reith Lectureship, talks to schoolboys (including one which I myself heard at Westminster School in which he seemed to advocate preventive nuclear war against Russia); finally, in 1949, the ultimate Establishment accolade—the award of the Order of Merit, by King George VI at Buckingham Palace.

But if the British power structure thought they had finally lassoed and tamed the heir of the aristocratic nonconformist tradition they were soon to be disabused. Not only was Russell by 1952 divorcing yet another wife and marrying a fourth (this time an American), he was also soon reverting to type and rebelling against the conventional wisdom. Undeterred by the award of the Nobel Prize, he chose, though the prize was for literature and not for peace, to make his speech of acceptance into an impassioned plea for the banishing of nuclear fear from the world. Was there

not, though, a contradiction between his new position and that which he had publicly adopted at a time when the Soviet Union possessed neither the H-bomb nor even the A-bomb? Russell himself, with the aid of his logician's mind, remained totally unembarrassed. Had he, in fact, originally advocated a pre-emptive nuclear strike by the West?

It's entirely true and I don't repent of it; it was not inconsistent with what I think now. What I thought all along was that a nuclear war in which both sides had nuclear weapons would be an utter and absolute disaster. At that time nuclear weapons existed only on one side, and therefore the odds were the Russians would have given way. I thought they would and I think that still could have prevented the existence of two equal powers with these means of destruction which is causing the terrible disaster now.

Other members of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament found the evident contradiction harder to overlook. A. J. P. Taylor, for example:

I always regarded him as erratic. I remembered the saying in 1948 and had been very shocked by it. On the other hand, it was perfectly characteristic of Russell to go to the other extreme and say, which in this case I think was right, that atomic bombs should never be used, but it didn't impress me that he said it, because I remembered the opposite. . . . When we set up the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament we wanted a distinguished figure and there was Russell who'd spoken out very frankly against nuclear weapons, and he was made President. Like any President of a society, he was meant to be a figurehead—not to come to executive meetings, not to lay down policy, but just to give us his benign blessing and there his name would be at the top of the letter paper. But instead of that, he thought he was much better fitted to run the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament than we were. I thought he was a frightful nuisance.

By now, there were those ready to say that Russell had become a publicity hunter. He had perhaps first courted the charge when, in 1957, he addressed a joint open letter to Mr Khrushchev and President Eisenhower in the columns of the *New Statesman*. Even in the world of 1957 it was a remarkable initiative for a private citizen to take—but the sequel was even more remarkable. Paul Johnson, then on the editorial staff of the *New Statesman*, describes what happened:

I very well recall looking through the box which was full of all the letters that had come in, and the top letter was about 50 pages long—all in Russian. And I said to the editorial secretary: 'Well, at least we've got one reader in Russia!' She replied: 'If you look carefully, you'll see that that letter is from the Kremlin.' So I did and I went to the end of the letter and there it was signed N. Khrushchev—Nikita Khrushchev.

An answer eventually came, too, from John Foster Dulles, President Eisenhower's Secretary of State. And it was perhaps the success of this original exchange that persuaded Russell, or at least those around him, that he had only to speak for world leaders to listen. At the time of the Cuban missile crisis in October 1962 no fewer than five long cables were dispatched from his remote home in North Wales, including ones to Mr Khrushchev, President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan (even though the latter two figures had only a year earlier been described by Russell as men 'much more wicked than Hitler').

On 12 September 1961 Russell, at the age of 89, found himself once again in court. He was charged under a Criminal Statute of 1361 with inciting the public to

civil disobedience following a sit-down demonstration in Trafalgar Square by members of the breakaway group of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, the Committee of 100, of which Russell was President. He and his fourth wife were sentenced to two months' imprisonment, but such was the outcry that the sentences were both almost immediately reduced to one week, served in each case in a prison hospital.

Next it was the turn of the Labour Party, to which Russell had belonged for nearly 50 years, to resort to punitive measures: in the summer of 1962 his expulsion from the party was recommended by the National Executive.

In 1965 Russell voluntarily tore up his Labour Party card, anyway, at a public meeting, as a protest against the Labour Government's passive acquiescence in American actions in Vietnam. It was his last great public fling. From the age of 93 he spent almost all his time at his home near Portmeirion. Sir Alfred Ayer visited him there a year or two before his death.

Both his hearing and his eyesight were failing a little bit, so that he was a bit confused in company, but if you talked to him alone he was still absolutely lucid and made jokes and understood what was being said, and retained, I think, until the end a very powerful mind.

A powerful mind, but still a prejudiced one? Paul Johnson is in no doubt:

My last contact with Bertrand Russell was in 1968 when the Russians invaded Czechoslovakia and various people got together to sign a letter to *The Times* which I had to organise. Bertrand Russell signed it, along with a lot of other well-known, famous people, but *The Times* people got on to me and said: 'Don't you think that this ought to be signed Bertrand Russell, and others?'—in other words, bring his name to the top of the list. So I said yes. The next thing I knew was Bertrand Russell ringing me up in a tremendous fury. He said: 'Why should my name be at the head of the list? Why am I not in alphabetical order, like everybody else?' I replied: 'Do you mean you didn't want to sign the letter, Bertie?' And he said: 'Yes, of course I wanted to sign the letter, but why should my name be at the head of the list?' I replied: 'Bertie, I have detected you in a logical error because you were prepared to sign the letter but you're not prepared to sign at the head of the letter!' 'Logical, fiddlesticks!' he replied. I think the truth of the matter was that he wanted to sign an anti-Russian letter but he didn't want to sign a pro-Western letter, because he was so anti-West, and I think that therein lay the origins of his logical dilemma.

Not that Russell was ever one to deny that dilemmas existed even in the world of logic. Indeed as a philosopher he never ruled out the possibility that his own deductions could be wrong, as Sir Alfred Ayer confirms:

Russell was a man, I think, of religious feeling—he had a kind of sense of the mystery of the world and at one time had almost a religious attitude towards mathematics; he was a man of religious temper, but he rejected the ideas anyhow of a transcendent deity, an other-worldly deity, a Christian god or anything of that sort, simply on intellectual grounds. There is a famous story that when at one meeting somebody asked him: 'What will you do, Lord Russell, when, after your death, you are confronted by the Deity?' and Russell replied: 'I shall say to him, "God, God, why did you make the evidence for your existence so insufficient?"'

Anthony Howard wrote and presented 'Bertrand Russell: A Reassessment' (Radio 4). The producer was Michael Gandon.

Author Anthony Howard is the Editor of "The Listener".

(Thank you JACK PITT and JOHN SUTCLIFFE)

\* \* \* \* \*

- (11) Inaccuracies. Last issue we reproduced some popular accounts of BR (RSN25-16,17), and invited you to let us know if you noticed any inaccuracies. BOB DAVIS found some; he also agrees with (and adds to) some of the statements. In the following, the original statements are underlined, Bob's comments are not.
- (11a) In "Anatomy of Some Celebrated Marriages", a section in "The People's Almanac #2" by David Wallechinsky and Irving Wallace (1978) (RSN25-16b):
- Lord and Lady Russell hit the roof when he told them about the engagement.  
Lord (John) Russell could hardly have objected to the engagement to Alys, as he was dead. He died when BR was 6.
- To dissuade him further, they called the family doctor...to tell Bertie about the history of insanity and instability in the Russell family. His aunt was subject to hallucinations, his uncle was mad, and his own father had been an epileptic.  
Apparently all those nasty thing were said, and were correct. BR's first son, John, has the hereditary schizophrenia, as do John's daughters, one of whom killed herself by setting herself on fire.
- Bertie agreed to go to Paris. The family sent his older brother along to keep tabs on him.  
I'm not positive but I don't think Brother Frank was sent to keep tabs on BR. Frank was off on his own career, which included several marriages — a British court later found him guilty of bigamy — and he was too self-centered for that kind of assignment.
- After the wedding, Lady Russell notified her grandson in a pleasant but cool letter that he had been disinherited. Lady Russell did not disinherit BR, but he was treated coldly after this.
- Though Alys had in theory defended free love whenever she had the opportunity...she considered sex dirty... She believed that intercourse was strictly for propagation...and they had already decided to remain childless... But Bertrand wasn't having any of that nonsense... He reported later that they caught on fast.  
They caught on so fast that BR says he suffered from sexual fatigue at the end of 3 weeks.
- (11b) In "Inside The Nobel Prize Awards", a section in "The People's Almanac #2" (RSN25-16c):
- ...the orphaned infant was brought up by his grandfather (twice Prime Minister under Queen Victoria.)  
BR was raised by his grandmother, because, as mentioned above, his grandfather had died when BR was 6.
- ...he wrote over 40 books...  
He wrote over 70.
- This activist's activities were always getting him into trouble and even into jail (for opposing conscription in 1918...)  
BR was sent to prison, not for opposing conscription (which he did oppose) but for writing an article in which he said the American Army was accustomed to intimidating strikers. The war was on, and the British Government felt that BR's statement might prejudice relations with America; BR was sentenced to 6 months.
- In 1940 New York's City College went to court to annul his appointment (to teach at City College.)  
City College did not go to court. The lawsuit (which annulled the appointment) was a private action brought by a mother whose daughter was going to attend City College.
- (11c) In "Atheists and Agnostics", a section in "The People's Almanac", same authors (1975)(RSN25-16d):
- Lost Labour Party support when he stood for Parliament in England and a Fellowship at Trinity College because of religious beliefs.  
He lost Liberal Party support (1910). And he lost the Fellowship because of his 1916 conviction (for writing the "Everett Leaflet" against conscription) and for his pacifist work.
- (11d) In "The 100 Most Important People in the World" by Donald Robinson (1970)(RSN25-17):
- He was so rabid at times that many people felt he had become a captive of the Communists in his very old age, and it may well have been true.  
I don't think the idea that BR was a captive of the Communists is credible.
- ... "The Problems of Philosophy", in which he laid the groundwork for the evolution of modern realism;...  
I don't think it can be said to have laid the foundation for modern realism. It is simple and popular. BR called it his shilling-shocker.
- But in his last decades he came under the influence of an unsavory pro-Communist American who turned him into an apologist for the Soviet Union and her allies.  
He was never a Soviet apologist.

She (Alys) divorced him...  
He divorced her.

Upon his brother's death in 1931, the philosopher became the Earl Russell of Kingston Russell. He doesn't use the title.

He didn't use the title professionally, that is, on his books and articles, but he used it socially. In the Wyatt interviews, he is addressed as "Lord Russell". Ayer's autobiography reports on ER defending the title.

There are also some slightly incorrect dates:

- . "History of Western Philosophy" was published in 1945, not 1946.
- . BR was sent to jail (a second time) at age 89, not 88.
- . The 3rd divorce (from Peter) was in 1949, not 1952, though it may have taken till then before it became final.

#### BR POPULARIZED

- (12) Instant philosophy. The American Association of Retired Persons' bi-monthly publication, "Modern Maturity" has — in its April/May 1980 issue — a 5-page article, "Introduction to Philosophy. The Meaning of Life" by Graham Berry. In 5 pages it covers all of philosophy from Thales ("636? -546?") to Wittgenstein (1889-1951). Actually the text is even shorter than 5 pages, since the pictures of 10 philosophers — ER is one of the 10 — are included in the 5 pages. This is what it says about BR:

Continuing the preoccupation of British philosophers with science, Bertrand Russell (1872-1970), Nobel prizewinner in literature and a noted mathematician, set out to translate philosophy into the clear-cut language of mathematics. He found that Christianity could not be phrased in mathematical equations and abandoned all but its moral code.

Says JOHN TOBIN, who told us about all this: "I do not believe it sizes up Russell correctly." We agree.

In fairness, let it be said that the article is a sort of philosophy sampler for senior citizens. It aims to induce them to read books on philosophy — it names several — or to take a course at the Institute of Lifetime Learning.

#### BR QUOTED

- (13) In "The San Francisco Chronicle" (3/29/80), in L. M. Boyd's column, "Grab Bag":
- "A happy life must to some extent be a quiet life," observed Bertrand Russell, "for it is only in an atmosphere of quiet that joy can live."
- (Thank you, TERRY ZACCONI)
- (14) In "The Los Angeles Times' Home Magazine" (3/30/80), in Alfred Sheinwold's column on bridge:
- Bertrand Russell defined mathematics as the science in which you don't know what you're talking about nor whether what you say is true. Mathematicians make good bridge players.
- This is BR quoted and misquoted. ER didn't define mathematics this way; rather, he made an observation about mathematics. His remark is both funny and true, i.e., witty.
- (Thank you, JOHN TOBIN)
- (15) In "Forbes Magazine" (3/17/80). This is the 2nd month in a row that Forbes is quoting BR. Clearly BR's star is rising in the world of business!
- The secret of happiness is this: let your interests be as wide as possible, and let your reactions to the things and persons that interest you be as far as possible friendly rather than hostile.
- (Thank you, WHITFIELD COBB)
- (16) In a "Unitarian Universalist" newsletter. We thank OPHELIA HOOPES for this one, which she says comes from "Sceptical Essays" (1928):
- William James used to preach the Will to Believe. For my part, I should wish to preach the Will to Doubt. What is wanted is not the will to believe, but the wish to find out, which is the exact opposite.



## BERTRAND RUSSELL MEMORIAL

- (17) The appeal for funds from London -- to help pay the cost of the memorial bust of BR to be placed in the gardens of Red Lion Square, London -- was distributed by us to about 25 publications. "The New York Review of Books" ran the appeal in its April 17th issue; "The Humanist" will run it; and one or more scholarly journals have run it. The results to date have been pretty thin.

Nor have BRS members responded in great numbers. Consider this situation:

Here is Russell, a man who inspires the most intense devotion. We know (because you have told us) that many of you feel greatly indebted to him...are grateful that he lived, and acted, and wrote...and liberated you from something or other...or opened your eyes...or fortified you...or untangled things...or gave you a new vision...and reassured you, by his own example, about the human spirit.

And here is an opportunity to pay homage to this man you owe a lot to, by translating your feelings of gratitude into concrete action.

Philip Stander is one who has done so, and he summed it up well when he made a contribution; he said it was made "with gratitude for all that Russell has given on behalf of humankind."

Act now, so that when the bust is unveiled in Red Lion Square, you will know that you helped put it there, with your contribution.

You can send your contribution directly to London (RSN25-22), made out to "Bertrand Russell Memorial".

To make your contribution tax-deductible, send it -- made out to "The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc." -- to RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036. A BRS check will be sent to London, and all contributors will be named.

Peter Cranford has suggested a contribution of \$3 (4), but some members will no doubt wish to do more than that.

There will never be another opportunity quite like this one, to pay your respects to Russell's memory.

Act!

- (17a) Some members have already acted. We are glad to report that the following members have already contributed to the Russell Memorial: ADAM PAUL BANNER, LEN CLEAVELIN, PETER CRANFORD, BOB DAVIS, LEE EISLER, DON JACKANICZ, CORLISS LAMONT, JOE NEILANDS, BILL PASTOR, PHILIP STANDER.

## NUCLEAR AFFAIRS

- (18) "Nuclear Disaster in the Urals"? Yes. No. Yes. First, there was a book by this title, by Zhores A. Medvedev. A review of the book, in "Publishers Weekly" (6/28/79) and Medvedev's letter to Joe Neilands are reproduced in RSN23-14. Second, there was a science article in "The New York Times" (10/30/79) disputing Medvedev's claim that a nuclear disaster had occurred in Russia (in 1956) (RSN24-6). Third, a later story in "The New York Times" (3/8/80) says Medvedev was right. We reproduce it at the top of Page 10. (Thank you, JOE NEILANDS)

- (19) A Sunday newspaper-magazine shocker that really shocks. The following appeared in "Parade", in the Allentown (Pa.) Call-Chronicle of 3/9/80:

### Frightening Quotation

From Dr. George Kistiakowsky, emeritus professor of chemistry at Harvard, former head of the explosives division of the Manhattan Project (atom bomb), science adviser to President Dwight Eisenhower, and one of the world's most knowl-

edgeable scientists on nuclear weapons:  
 "Given the present geopolitical trends and the quality of political leaders that burden mankind, it would be a miracle if no nuclear warheads were exploded in anger before the end of this century and only a bit smaller miracle if that did not lead to a nuclear holocaust."



Science adviser George Kistiakowsky with President Eisenhower in 1960

Item 18 continued. From "The New York Times" (3/8/80):

## The Editorial Notebook

# The Lesson of the Poisoned Urals

While Americans argue over the odds of a nuclear accident, the Russians already know what such an accident can be like. They apparently suffered one more than two decades ago — an explosion of nuclear wastes at a weapons production complex in the Ural Mountains.

The incident was first revealed in 1976 by Zhores Medvedev, an exiled Soviet geneticist living in London. His story was promptly denounced as a fraud by Western nuclear and intelligence experts who noted, correctly, that it was based on rumors. Yet everything learned since suggests that Dr. Medvedev was essentially right.

Discovering the truth has required scientific detective work. Superficial confirmation came quickly: other exiles said they knew of a large area in the Urals contaminated by radioactivity. Documents pried loose from the C.I.A. by Ralph Nader reported rumors of major accidents at a secret weapons complex there. Then Dr. Medvedev, determined to clear his reputation, combed through Russian scientific journals and found scores of articles about heavy radioactive contamination of land, water, plants and animals. He deduced that they actually described the aftermath of an explosion of nuclear waste that killed hundreds, hospitalized thousands and poisoned hundreds of square miles.

### Nuclear Accidents Really Can Contaminate Large Areas

Experts still disagree with him over the cause and extent of the accident. But two recent studies by American laboratories confirm that the Ural accident almost certainly occurred. One argues (rather implausibly) that the area was contaminated by fallout from a nuclear weapons test in the far-away Soviet Arctic. The other, conducted by environmental scientists at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, agrees with Dr. Medvedev that nuclear waste was the problem.

It suggests that a powerful chemical explosion ruptured one or more waste storage tanks, spewing a radioactive plume 40 or more miles in one direction and releasing liquids that contaminated lakes and rivers in another. At least 40 square miles were poisoned, and perhaps 400 square miles were affected. A comparison of maps made before and after the accident indicates that the Soviets evacuated some 30 small communities and built a reservoir and canal system to hold back contaminated water.

How many people died is uncertain.

Dr. Medvedev had cited reports of thousands, dead or injured; the Oak Ridgers doubt there were severe injuries beyond the site of the accident.

Is any of this relevant to America's nuclear safety debate? The waste storage techniques that blew up on the Russians have apparently never been used here. Nor, almost certainly, did the accident involve reactors, the chief concern here after Three Mile Island. Yet the scientists at Oak Ridge do not completely dismiss the accident as a freak, with no chance of recurring.

Radioactive discharges *can* contaminate large areas and require long evacuations and vast engineering projects to limit the damage. The accident in the Urals thus underscores the wisdom not only of careful emergency planning but also of locating any future nuclear facilities — whether civilian reactors or weapons factories — far enough out in the hinterland that no accident can do much damage.

The C.I.A. knows more than it has revealed about the accident; it could assist emergency planning by releasing the pertinent documents. But only the Soviets know exactly what happened and which corrective measures worked best. Their knowledge, which could help other nations avoid a similar disaster, is worth bargaining for.

PHILIP M. BOFFEY

## RELIGION AND ITS ADVERSARIES

(20)

Evolution vs. Creation. The Campus Crusade for Christ is sponsoring a "debate-like panel discussion", scheduled for March 19th, at San Diego State University. The crusade people would like the Biblical story of Creation taught in high school science classes along with the theory of evolution.

There will be speakers from the Creation Science Research Center (sic) as well as from the AHA, etc.

"The contention of the pro-creationist speakers will probably be that evolution is the religion of secular humanism in the public schools and so should be balanced with the religion of the creationists," says "The San Diego Humanist" of March 1980 — which is published by the Humanist Association of San Diego (953 Eighth Avenue, Suite 208, San Diego, CA 92101.)

We'll report on the "debate" in a future issue.

Query: Would a dedicated creationist (is there any other kind?) be willing to have the Biblical story of Creation taught as theory (a possibility) rather than as fact (a certainty)?

(21)

Lavanam. From "The Humanist Quest for Truth", March 1980 (which is published by the Brighton, Colorado chapter of the AHA, PO Box 625, Brighton, CO 80601):

Lavanam is anxious to visit the United States again this year to promote the World Atheist Center. Donations towards his fare should be sent to Dr. George Willoughby, 4722 Baltimore Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19143. If you would like Lavanam as a speaker, phone Dr. Willoughby at 215-727-2671. He is a force for uniting non-believers and an extremely interesting man. We are happy to report that his Atheist sister has been elected to India's Parliament.

## THE SCIENTISTS AND THE REST OF US

(22)

Joe Neilands was one of the speakers at a Nobel Symposium on "Ethics and Science Policy" held in August 1978 at the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences (RSN19-12). He spoke on the scientist's responsibility to communicate with those outside the scientific community. We reproduce his talk, next page. For the benefit of new members:

Joe — Professor of Biochemistry at UC Berkeley — is a founding member of the BRS, and was Chairman of the BRS Science Committee for its first 5 years.

## COMMUNICATION WITH OTHERS— THE SCIENTISTS' RESPONSIBILITY

J. B. NEILANDS

Biochemistry Department, University of California, Berkeley, California, USA

### Introduction

There are many reasons why I have looked forward to this Symposium with keen anticipation. Within the United States, public support of scientific research appears to be entering another crisis in which people are questioning the value of the money spent. At least this is true of cancer research, an activity which up until now has been well funded, as epitomized by the statement 'more people are living off cancer than are dying from it'. I have looked forward to this opportunity to exchange ideas with social scientists and with other natural scientists, since I have often wondered if my chosen profession has been of any net value to humanity. Finally, this meeting has provided a forum at which I can describe some of my own experiences in working at the interface between science and society.

California is perhaps an overdeveloped corner of the globe, and hence my report will be a 'burp from the belly of the beast'.

At a symposium of this type we should be satisfied if we can define the problems, make contacts with others, and evaluate any plans or suggestions for remedial action.

It will be assumed in what follows that the research scientist has a special responsibility for misdirected technology, simply because it is we who preside over the wellsprings of knowledge in this arena.

### The problems

It is inherent to the nature of basic research that its ultimate impact on society cannot be predicted with any degree of accuracy. Consider, for example, the work of the organic chemists of the previous century who first extracted from plant sources and characterized the simple chemical substance styrene. As the years went by, other chemists found out how to polymerize this molecule into a plastic, polystyrene. This polymer enjoys very wide application in industry. The delicate apparatus which arrives at the loading dock of our building is usually packed in it to prevent breakage, and it is used on a massive scale as an insulator and for numerous other domestic purposes. Apart from a general objection to the industrial way of life, there is no really serious quarrel with these uses. On the other hand, when the Second Indochina War began in earnest, there was a sudden requirement for a large volume of napalm<sup>1, 2</sup>. Polystyrene was examined and found to be well-suited for the manufacture of napalm. In the formulation known as napalm B, the type commonly used in Indochina, it constitutes fifty percent of the bulk of the material. So much polystyrene was diverted to napalm in

those years that there was a shortage of certain other items, among which were certain small dishes which we use for the culture of bacteria.

Should we hold the early organic chemists responsible for the development of that hideous weapon, napalm? Naturally not; but the point is well made here that it is impossible to peer into the future and to predict the ultimate uses of *any* piece of fundamental research. The basic research I have in mind is not to be confused with that concerned with applied aspects of weapons development, experimentation on human subjects without consent, etc.

Since we cannot foresee the eventual uses of the knowledge which we create it would seem incumbent upon all natural scientists to devote at least a portion of his/her time to the humanization of the profession. There are so many problems in our contemporary society that one must perforce be selective, and I have hence concentrated on two aspects which I believe to be of overriding significance, namely, *militarism* and *environmental degradation*. Alternatively, this hierarchy of priorities could be restated as *survival* and the *quality of life*.

### Militarism

A study of the history of arms development teaches us that those weapons which are made are eventually used on the battlefield. This includes the atomic bombs of the type deployed at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which, as we all know, were really primitive weapons by the standards of today. Strong pressures were undoubtedly applied for the use of nuclear weapons in the recent Indochina wars. Only the combination of a diffuse, unsuitable target and excessive international political costs appear to have deterred this ultimate obscenity on the part of the Johnson-Nixon regimes.

Over the past three decades, nuclear weapons development has 'progressed' through the atomic and hydrogen bombs, to exotic delivery systems, to the latest refinement, the enhanced radiation (neutron) bomb. The nuclear arms race seems, in general, to have

been initiated by the USA, with the USSR playing the game of 'catch-up'<sup>3, 4</sup>. Other nations, for less than obvious reasons, have felt compelled to join in this race to extinction. Nuclear power reactors, designed for the generation of electricity, have been instrumental in the dissemination of fissionable material around the globe.

The life-threatening hazards of atomic weapons can be relegated to two classes, i.e. instant devastation or a more gradual extermination based on the after-effects of ionizing radiation.

An equally important reason for ending the arms race is connected with its social cost. A recent report by the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACD) reveals that world expenditures for military purposes in 1976 touched 400 billion dollars. This can be calculated to be the better part of a million dollars per minute. *In the USA, the size of the military budget determines, by difference, the budgetary allocation for all other departments and programmes.* The US ACD report also contains the distressing news that arms exports and imports are on the increase and that spending for military purposes in the Third World is rising sharply.

After he assumed office, President Carter told the world that one of his objectives would be to rid the earth of nuclear weapons. However, he did not appear personally at the recent special session of the United Nations on disarmament, which concluded:

'The time has come to abandon the use of force in international relations and to seek security in disarmament. . . . The hundreds of billions of dollars spent annually on the manufacture or improvement of weapons are in sombre and dramatic contrast to the want and poverty in which two-thirds of the world's population live. . . . Mankind is confronted with a choice; we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation.'

Since the tentacles of the military budget extend to every hamlet in America and account for the employment of large numbers of workers, it is futile to call for an immediate reduction in spending *per se*; rather, some of the money should be allocated to research and development in benign technologies, such as solar energy. This was the thought behind the Transfer Amendment to the Military Appropriations Act, an initiative promoted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and other groups. While it failed of passage this year, the amendment received substantial support in the Senate and will undoubtedly be tried again in future years.

### Environmental degradation

While the insane weapon systems and the exorbitant expenditures for arms that can never be used and which only enhance the insecurity of nations must be the primary target for elimination, we should not lose sight of another process by which the human race and its civilization could be terminated. I refer to the industrial mode of life, with its attendant, inevitably negative impact on the integrity of the biosphere and the quality of the life-support system of the planet<sup>5, 7</sup>. Industrialism is a disease which is rampant in our society, east and west. Thus, man persists in searching for new sources of energy, such as fusion reactors, apparently without considering that the process itself may result in excessive heating of the earth and a radical change in climate, to say nothing of the accelerated rate of depletion of the natural resources connected with the use of such large reservoirs of energy. Just as with a thermonuclear exchange on a large scale, the unremitting pursuit of industrial development will, with equal certitude, bring us to the same level of degradation—only the timetable is different.

Ultimately, the sun will have to be accepted as the sole energy source for all domestic and industrial needs. The particular type of political organization adopted will be predicated in the first instance by its environmental compatibility. This means a decentralized, fully recycling sun-driven economy based exclusively on bio-elements and materials.

### The response

Both of the salient problems which I have outlined above; namely, militarism and environmental deterioration, arise from technology, which, in turn, is rooted in scientific research. It is part of the inevitable 'peril and promise' of science. The basic researcher cannot escape responsibility for this situation, since, as we have seen, even the most obscure investigation can lead in the end to negative applications. However, at least within the USA, the academic researcher, if properly motivated, has recourse to an alternative behaviour which may perhaps help to redress the balance. Herewith some personal examples, drawn from the three sectors of our duties; namely, teaching, research and public service.

### Teaching

In drawing attention to weapon systems, I have naturally stressed the nuclear variety as pre-eminent in their possible and probable impact on the biosphere and the works of man. Here the physicist has an opportunity to bring the bomb into the classroom, at least to the extent of describing both the principles of its operation and the biological and physical consequences of its use. This is not difficult to do at my own institution, the

University of California, From the time of the Manhattan project, there has been an intimate relationship between the Berkeley campus and the bomb. Every nuclear device designed in the USA bears the *imprimatur* of the University of California via our administration of the federally-owned facilities at Livermore, California and Los Alamos, New Mexico. For this, the University receives a few million dollars; in return, a thin veneer of academic gloss has been applied to the weapons programme of the Pentagon. My colleague in the physics department, Charles Schwartz, has given vigorous leadership to a movement seeking to end the alliance between the University and the Defense Department.

The biological scientist has a corresponding opportunity and responsibility to impart the correlation between biology and the needs of the military, a connexion which did not escape the attention of industry. Thus, nerve gas weapons can be demystified by pointing out their mode of action and by using them, in biochemistry, to help explain the catalytic activity of enzymes of the proteolytic variety.

Since the student revolution, beginning at Berkeley in 1964, very few changes have been instituted into the academic structure. However, it has become easier to initiate courses and to teach controversial subjects. Thus, in biochemistry we have a course, 'Biochemistry and Society', which is concerned with herbicides, pesticides, food additives, drugs, etc. I have taught this course for a number of years and have made it a strict rule to have at least one lecture on weapons or on some aspect of the military infrastructure.

### Research

It is perhaps more difficult to orient a basic research programme in an applied direction but, according to Bruce Ames, who developed a simple bacterial test for mutagenesis-carcinogenesis, with a little imagination it can be done. My own research is concerned with the mechanism whereby microbial cells take up the inorganic nutrient, iron. One would anticipate, *a priori*, that the societal impact of this particular research theme would be very slight. Not so. Let me give a few examples.

It turns out that when microbes are starved of iron they fight back by elaborating special chemical substances, called siderophores, which have an outrageously high affinity for iron. Over two decades ago we discovered how to induce microbes to make practical quantities of these substances, with the result that several dozen have been thoroughly characterized as chemical entities and a few have found their way into the clinical laboratory. In certain types of anaemia, the patient can be kept alive by constant, periodic transfusions with whole blood. Eventually, however, since there is no biological mechanism for eliminating the accumulated iron, the individual dies of iron poisoning. Thus, the siderophores of microbial origin show promise as drugs for the treatment of transfusion-induced siderosis. The National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, have an active programme of support for the development of suitable drugs of this type, and my laboratory has been the beneficiary of such support for a number of years.<sup>8</sup>

By a quirk of coordination chemistry, ferric ion and plutonium (and related transuranium elements) prefer to bind to the same type of organic molecule (ligands). As expected, siderophores display a very high affinity for plutonium and may be useful for the excoorporation of this element, which is, on a weight basis, the most toxic inorganic substance yet discovered. Since siderophores are generally produced by microbes living in the water and soil of the surface of the earth, and since the presence of siderophores in such sources can readily be demonstrated by applying sensitive biological tests, the movement of the transuranium elements through the food chain may be promoted by these microbial ligands, which are intended for iron. Recently, I have become a consultant to Batelle Northwest, a contractor for the Department of Energy located near the Hanford Reservation on the Columbia River, which is investigating the role of siderophores in the transport of plutonium in the soil.

### Public service

In addition to teaching and research, the usual American academic person is expected to perform in another, vaguely defined, frequently ignored category designated 'public service'. This has sometimes been interpreted to be consulting to government or industry. In any controversy with a major scientific or technological dimension, the public often goes unrepresented because the experts have been hired away by the special interests.

In the early 1960s I became aware of the plans of a local utility company to place a nuclear reactor on a particularly scenic stretch of the California coast in Sonoma County, some fifty miles north of San Francisco. The site was to have been taken over for the construction of a marine laboratory by the University of California, but the latter, which had close ties with both the power company and the Atomic Energy Commission, promptly abandoned the site to industrial development. Together with Harold Gilliam, a local writer, Joel Hedgpath, a marine biologist, and Karl Kortum, curator of a maritime museum, I organized an association to preserve the area, known as Bodega Head and Harbor, in its native form. It was remarkable that at Berkeley, the epicentre of nuclear knowledge, we could find not a single reputable scientist to testify to the hazards of the nuclear process as a means of generating electricity. Eventually, the

project was scrapped, ostensibly on the grounds that the site was too close to a major earthquake fault line (San Andreas), but in reality, I believe, because of public indignation. The old Atomic Energy Commission, later Research and Development Agency and now Department of Energy, was supposed to be neutral in the matter but was, in reality, a vigorous advocate of the reactor behind the scenes.

The University has since built its marine laboratory on Bodega Head and has pledged itself to resist industrial encroachment on the area. However, at one point the power company and University had planned joint development of the site, the latter claiming that heated water from the reactor would attract fish!

Our struggle to preserve the scenic values of the California coast convinced me that the means of communication in our society were defective. I and others spent a great deal of time and effort trying to establish a cooperative, community-owned newspaper. The paper was to be independent of advertising and to be owned entirely by the readers by virtue of holding a \$5 share. We sold a large number of shares of this denomination and managed, after a year or two of intense effort, to raise a modest sum of capital. It was not enough, in my judgement, to sustain the paper through the initial lean years while it sought to establish circulation. The paper, called *The Citizen*, lasted for about a year and went bankrupt. The problem of disseminating information, the latter being the very basis of a democratic society, is one which is still in need of solution.

Although the environment and the promulgation of information are important problems, our primary attention, as I have already intimated, should be the military establishment and its activities.

Following a visit to Hanoi in 1967 as an investigator for the Bertrand Russell War Crimes Tribunal and noting the large-scale use in the war of 'riot control' agents and 'weed killers', I decided that, as a biochemist, I was in a unique position to become an expert on chemical warfare and so to make a contribution to public understanding of this aspect of the war.

At the December 1968 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) in Dallas, Texas, E. W. Pfeiffer and I organized a group called Scientists' Committee on Chemical and Biological Warfare. Others who joined the group and who were listed on the letterhead included Philip Siekevitz, Rockefeller University, David Baltimore, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, John T. Edsall, Harvard University, A. W. Galston, Yale University, E. James Lieberman, National Institutes of Health, Michael McClintock, University of Colorado, Richard Novick, Public Health Research Laboratory of the City of New York, Gordon Orians, University of Washington, Robert Rutman, University of Pennsylvania and Susan Zolla, New York University Medical Center. We announced our first annual meeting by an advertisement in *Science*, the organ of the AAAS; this cost us about \$100 each and said in part:

'As a result of recent accidents and disclosures the American public has become aware of our substantial program of research and development in chemical and biological weapons. In Vietnam a form of chemical warfare—the use of herbicides and antipersonnel gases—has been in progress for many years. These developments are of far-reaching importance and have grave implications for the future of US military and foreign policy. They require the closest scrutiny; those who are aware of the dangers involved should bring the issues to public attention, and press for suitable action.

'The Scientists' Committee on CBW was established at Dallas in December 1968. We propose to gather and disseminate information, and to work for certain specific actions.

'The information program is based on the following principles: (1) every effort will be made to obtain and publish information with traditional scientific objectivity; (2) all information will be made public; (3) the Committee will promote, and assist in, a comprehensive study of the ecological and sociological effects of the military uses of chemical agents in Vietnam; (4) technical information will be assembled on research and development of CB weapons in the United States and other countries; (5) the policies of various countries in the area of CBW will be brought to public attention.

'We ask for action by our Government to ratify the 1925 Geneva Protocol on CBW, without reservations or restrictive amendments. We intend to campaign for ratification.'

The war had radically affected academic life in the USA, and so most of the major professional societies that we approached readily complied with our request for symposia or for the use of facilities at our annual conventions. We organized evening lectures and films on the topic of chemical warfare, the Geneva Protocol and other matters deemed capable of bringing home the full horror of the war. Besides the AAAS, the American Chemical Society, often accused of pro-industry bias, the smaller American Society of Biological Scientists, and many other science organizations sponsored events or adopted resolutions urging ratification of the 1925 Geneva Protocol banning first use of chemical and biological agents in war. In the end, organizations that advocated ratification of this instrument represented not less than 250 000 scientists.

In this connexion I wish to salute the metamorphosis of the American Chemical Society. Back in 1926 it had joined with industry spokesmen, the military and veterans groups to defeat ratification of the Protocol. In the ensuing years most countries ratified this treaty but not, conspicuously, the USA. President Nixon announced in 1969 that he was sending the measure back to the Senate with a request for advice and consent to

ratification. He sought at that time to exempt tear gas and herbicides, a move which stalled action for several years. The Board of Directors, reversing its previous stand, called for ratification. At last the treaty was signed by President Ford in a form which does not completely rule out the deployment of chemicals but restricts their use to very special circumstances. In recent years, at its national meetings in Los Angeles and in San Francisco, the American Chemical Society has arranged forums on chemical warfare and has made available verbatim reprints of the proceedings of these symposia<sup>10, 11</sup>.

The Scientists' Committee on Chemical and Biological Warfare is now more or less defunct. However, in view of renewed interest in chemical agents on the part of the Pentagon, we may need to revitalize the organization. The problem of binary nerve gases is one of perennial concern to all parties interested in disarmament. The military has had considerable difficulty in shipping, decontaminating and decommissioning the nerve gas arsenal. Many of these problems would be solved by adoption of the binary type of agent, in which the two halves, relatively harmless in themselves, are kept separate and only combined after the projectile is in flight to the target. For several years, the Pentagon has requested an appropriation which would be sufficient to enable conversion of the entire nerve gas inventory into the binary type agent. Thus far, Congress has declined to approve this item in the budget.

I conceived the idea of publishing a book comprised of eyewitness reports of American scientists who had actually visited the chemical warfare battlefields in Vietnam. A number of publishers were approached with the idea; none showed any interest, apart from the Free Press Division of Macmillan Company. That publisher, after a long delay, brought out a full report by G. Orians, E. W. Pfeiffer, A. Vennema, A. H. Westing and myself on the use of anti-personnel gas and chemical herbicides. The book, which contains some pertinent remarks in a foreword by Gunnar Myrdal, was entitled *Harvest of Death*<sup>12</sup>. While it never became a 'best-seller', it is a historical documentation of the illegal use of chemical agents in modern war.

#### Disincentives

I was cautioned by my colleagues that my public activities would cause me to lose my grants and that my career as a researcher would come to an end. I did lose my support from the Office of Naval Research, which had underwritten the costs of my work on microbial iron transport since the early 1950s. Since just at that time it became unpopular for the military to support basic research, it is not clear that this was an act of retribution. I do think that the Navy had in mind a public relations effort to contain criticism and to cultivate the goodwill of the scientific community. They were among the first dependable sources of support for basic research and were on the scene before the National Science Foundation was created.

This episode highlights the virtue of the Mansfield Amendment to the military budget, a measure which restricts support only to those projects that have a direct military application. The quality and objectivity of the science bought by military dollars may be untainted by the source of the funds; however, the public service duties of the investigator may well be in conflict when agencies with a controversial mission are a significant source of funding.

Evidence that the academic scientist still has a public image of being objective can be seen in the endorsements to an advertisement promoting nuclear power. Many of the scientists who signed the statement gave their academic but not their industrial affiliations<sup>13</sup>.

I was improperly taken off the payroll of the University of California during my trip to Hanoi; I was on vacation at the time. I also lost the use of my passport for about a year. Eventually my salary was restored, and, following a suit in the federal court for the northern district of California, my passport was revalidated. (Recently, President Carter removed all restrictions on the freedom of travel.) These were very small penalties, but they are apparently enough to deter some members of the scientific community from public activity.

We are living in a technological age, and we need to devise some means of encouraging the participation of scientists in public affairs. In my opinion, the average research scientist is too oriented toward awards and professional esteem.

#### Proposal for action

Professional societies, at least within the USA, are constitutionally dedicated to public service. This dedication usually nets some kind of privilege, such as a tax concession or a postal subsidy. I suggest that professional science societies around the world form a council, which would publish a newsletter and perhaps eventually operate a short-wave radio network. The information content would be divided between recent advances in the pure research aspect of some branch of science and a discussion of the societal impact of the entire science enterprise. Science organizations in the eastern bloc countries seem to be as enchanted with the 'technological fix' as their counterparts in the west, so we would probably have to go ahead without the participation of those who feel that science is fine if developed under socialist auspices<sup>14</sup>. Scientists enjoy frequent contacts across international boundaries, but usually only on a strictly professional basis. The Pugwash group does good work but is essentially elitist in composition. The World Federation of Scientific Workers in the eastern bloc countries and the Federation of American Scientists are both vitally concerned with disarmament, but the two organizations operate independently of each other. Societies for social responsibility in science exist in several countries but suffer from lack of a broad appeal to most scientific workers. What I am proposing is an association of scientists in a world-wide federation with a constitutional dedication to peaceful and ecologically sound uses of scientific knowledge.

#### Notes

1. Takman, J., ed. (1967) *Napalm*, Stockholm, Raben & Sjogren.
2. SIPRI (1975) *Incendiary Weapons*, Stockholm, Almquist & Wiksell.
3. Epstein, W. (1976) *The Last Chance—Nuclear Proliferation and Arms Control*, New York, Free Press.
4. Myrdal, A. (1976) *The Game of Disarmament*, New York, Pantheon.
5. Heilbroner, R. L. (1974) *An Inquiry into the Human Prospect*, New York, Norton.
6. Schumacher, E. F. (1973) *Small is Beautiful*, New York, Harper & Row.
7. Lovins, A. (1977) *Soft Energy Paths: Toward a Durable Peace*, San Francisco, Friends of the Earth.
8. Anderson, W. F. & Hiller, M. C. (1976) *Development of Iron Chelators for Clinical Use*, NIH Publication 76-996, Bethesda, Md., National Institutes of Health.
9. *Science*, 166, 950, 1969.
10. American Chemical Society (1977) *Chemical Weapons and US Public Policy, Report of the Committee on Chemistry and Public Affairs*, New York.
11. American Chemical Society (1977) *Binary Weapons and the Problem of Chemical Disarmament, Report of the Committee on Chemistry and Public Affairs*.
12. Neilands, J. B., Orians, G., Pfeiffer, E. W., Vennema, A. & Westing, A. H. (1972) *Harvest of Death*, New York, Free Press.
13. Schwartz, C. (1975) *Science for the People*, New York, p. 30.
14. Medvedev, Z. A. (1978) *Soviet Science*, New York, Norton.

#### NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

- (23) Joe Neilands: "I've enjoyed my sabbatical, but must go back to work (appropriately?) on April 1st. In February the whole family visited Washington, D.C., toured Monticello and had good luck with the weather. Then I made a solo lecture tour through Ohio, Oklahoma, and Southern California. I've been a little active in the local chapter of the Citizens Party and may offer myself as a candidate for the post of Interior Secretary in the shadow cabinet of Barry Commoner."

#### NEW MEMBERS

- (24) We welcome these new members:

BRUCE T. ANDERSON/PO Box 644/Minneapolis, MN 55440  
 RUBEN ARDILA, PH.D./Apartado Aereo 52127/Bogota, Colombia  
 THOMAS BARKER/929 East 3rd Avenue/Escondido, CA 92025

WALTER BAUMGARTNER, Ph.D./Clos de Leyterand/1806 St. Léger, Switzerland  
 PASCAL BERCKER/484 Lake (Apt. 7)/St. Louis, MO 63108

MICHAEL DAVIS, M.D./226 Linden St./Dresden, TN 38225  
 PATRICK DEVANE/562 Holly, #301/St. Paul, MN 55102  
 JOHN HARPER SR./1509 W. Piru St./Compton, CA 90222  
 VIVIAN HARPER (Mrs. JH Sr)/same address  
 JOHN KISSELL/823 No. Vista St./Los Angeles, CA 90046

ERNEST PINTARELLI/Route 1, Box 50A/Wausaukee, WI 54177  
 CHERIE RUPPE/17114 N.E. 2nd Place/Belleview, WA 93008  
 ALMA STUART/275 Bonita Drive/Merritt Island, FL 32952  
 GEORGE SWIRE/3681 San Simeon Way/Riverside, CA 92506  
 DANIEL TITO/Box A, F9296/Bellefonte, PA 16823

ARNOLD VANDERLINDEN/108 Cameron Crescent/Pointe Claire, Quebec/Canada H9R 4E1  
 PAUL WALKER/2324 W. 4 (#2)/Cedar Falls, IA 50613  
 RONALD H. YUCCAS/641 Sunset Drive/Naperville, IL 60540

#### ADDRESS CHANGES

(25)

ADAM PAUL BANNER/PO Box 1733/Midland, MI 48640  
 THOMAS BARKER/PO: "Moved. Left no address."  
 JAMES BERTINI/346 State St. (Apt. 6A)/Albany, NY 12210  
 LINDA BLITZ/822 S. Taylor/Arlington, VA 22204  
 ROBERT K. (BOB) DAVIS/2501 Lakeview Avenue/Los Angeles, CA 90039

DAVID ETHRIDGE/320 Alexander St. (Apt. C)/Jackson, MS 39202  
 LARRY SANTONI/405 E. Thomas/Fresno, CA 93728  
 GLENNA STONE/1102 Sherman, Apt. 19/Levelland, TX 79336  
 DAN WRAY/2131 Cahuena Blvd. (#22)/Hollywood, CA 90028

#### BOOK REVIEWS

(26)

"The Tamarisk Tree 2" by Dora Russell, reviewed in *The Times* (London), March 30, 1980:

## Progressive lady

DORA RUSSELL is the perfect Progressive Lady of the early 20th century, successor to Ibsen's New Woman, and predecessor of yesterday's bra burners. In 1919, when first living with Bertrand Russell, she was perfectly willing to bear his children but disappointed that they were settling down like a married couple. On being told by Russell that he would get a divorce from his first wife and marry her, she burst into tears.

Naturally she felt that education, like sex, should be free of restriction, and she may well have been the driving force behind the setting up of Beacon Hill School, that school as the popular press called it, where games were not compulsory or competitive, the aesthetic emphasis was on do-it-yourself art, and children were left to decide whether or not they would come into class. There was a School Council run by the children, nakedness in good weather was encouraged, adults were addressed by their first names.

Did it work? Russell, who retired from the enterprise after five years, says no. There were rarely more than twenty children, so that money was always short. Problem children were sent to the school, and had to be under constant supervision to stop bullying. Lack of order and routine made the children bored and destructive. "A school is like the world: only

THE TAMARISK TREE 2  
 by Dora Russell/Virago £8.95  
 pp 218

Julian Symons



Dora Russell: distinctly authoritarian

government can prevent brutal violence." So far Bertie. It is not surprising that Dora, who continued the school for another eleven years, thinks otherwise, playing down problems and viewing things through honey-tinted spectacles. The differences between them are neatly encapsulated in what one child said in defence of bullying. "The bigs hit me, so I hit the smalls, that's fair." "Hit" is Bertie's word.

Dora tells the same story, but changes the word to "tease."

Her book is an account of the struggle to continue the school, in different places, and at times with desperately little money. Bertie removed two of their children to Dartington, and then withdrew support from the school. Later he is glimpsed occasionally, behaving badly or ungenerously. Bernard Shaw, appealed to for money, offered "the utmost sympathy and kindness" and a bank guarantee—but no cash. In 1937 there were twenty pupils, three years later the number was down to ten. At times Dora was the only teacher. She went bankrupt, but continued the school.

This second volume is about Beacon Hill almost to the exclusion of the author's personal life. Nearly half the book is taken up by the poems and plays of the children, and no doubt the plays were livelier in performance than they are in reading. Glimpses of a personality do come through, however, glimpses not wholly agreeable. The dedication and persistence shown in running the school are little short of heroic, but the character of this lover of freedom comes through as distinctly authoritarian. Can it be purely accidental that two other schools which merged with Beacon Hill at different times quickly ended the collaboration? And what would have happened to teachers who questioned Russell tenets like: "As soon as books are introduced, you are at one remove from direct reality," or rejected the determination to concentrate on

nature study projects, avoiding "nationalist and chauvinist teaching of history"?

In the hidebound educational Twenties and Thirties one would have been on the side of this Progressive Lady. Today the educational rigidity she shows is apparent. What kind of teacher is it who fails to understand that to ignore "nationalist and chauvinist" reading of history is to take children dangerously far from the real world and its motives? Or who does not know that the ability to read gives immense joy to children and enlarges tenfold their understanding of "outer reality"? In a final chapter called "Was It All Worthwhile?" the author contrasts her conception of education with that of those who at present clamour for emphasis on purely vocational training. But an educational choice isn't an either/or between the Beacon Hill "freedom" to learn about pond life and cavort naked on lawns, or to be trained as a computer operator. It should embrace academic skills, the awareness of competition, the reality of power. Those children who thought that it was natural for the bigs to hit the smalls had a better understanding of reality than Dora Russell shows.

(Thank you, DAVID HART)

## BRS LIBRARY

(27) Films available from the BRS Library, as reported by Librarian Don Jackanicz:

The entire collection of films housed in the BRS Library will be presented at the June 20-22, 1980 Annual Meeting in Chicago. These include two new titles recently acquired thanks to contributions from several members. Each of these films is available for rental from the Library. The modest fee collected is earmarked for the future purchase of films. (Two CBS films from the 1950s may be our next purchases, but they must first be viewed to determine their exact content and visual quality.) Our seven films are:

1. Bertrand Russell Discusses Philosophy.
2. Bertrand Russell Discusses Power.
3. Bertrand Russell Discusses Mankind's Future.
4. Bertrand Russell Discusses The Role of the Individual.
5. Bertrand Russell Discusses Happiness.

-----No. 1-5 are black and white, 16 mm., 13½ minutes in length each. A transcript for each can be found in the book Bertrand Russell Speaks his Mind (Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1960). Rental cost: \$10.00 per film plus a refundable \$50.00 deposit per film.

6. Bertrand Russell.

-----No. 6 is black and white, 16 mm., 30 minutes in length. A transcript is available in "A Life of Disagreement", Atlantic Monthly, v. 190, August 1952, pp. 51-54. This is a general interview dealing with autobiographical, philosophical, and political topics. Rental cost: \$20.00 plus a refundable \$50.00 deposit.

7. The Life and Times of Bertrand Russell.

-----No. 7 is black and white, 16 mm., 40 minutes in length. This film was produced by the BBC as part of the 90th birthday celebration for Russell in 1962. A documentary, it uses a biographical format which, for better or worse, concentrates on the threat of nuclear war and Russell's work to prevent such folly. Included are interviews with Russell and several prominent British intellectuals.

To order a film or films write to Don Jackanicz, BRS Library, 3802 N. Kenneth Ave., Chicago, IL 60641 stating the title or titles desired and about how long it or they will be kept. Full payment must be made after which the film or films will be shipped via U. S. Mail or United Parcel Service. The renter must pay postage (and for U. S. Mail shipment insurance) both ways--the Chicago to renter postage will be recovered by withholding an equal amount from the deposit which will be refunded upon receipt of the returned film or films.

## CONTRIBUTIONS

(28) We need contributions from more members! Please remember that dues do not cover our operating costs. Contributions make up the deficit. Contribute what you can when you can. Send a contribution c/o the newsletter, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036.

(29) We thank JOHN TOBIN for his contribution, and PETER CRANFORD and KATHY FJERMEDAL for their continuing, regular, monthly contributions.

## RECRUITING

(30) Know any potential members? From time to time members send us names of people they know who might be interested

in joining the BRS. If you know any such people, send their names and addresses to P.K. Tucker, Co-Chairman, BRS Membership Committee, PO Box 1537, North Platte, NE 69101. She will see to it that they receive information about the BRS.

#### ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

- (31) Time to nominate Directors. As you know, the Bylaws now permit a Board of 24 Directors. 8 Directors are to be elected this year (and every year) for 3-year terms.

Any member can nominate another member, to be a candidate for the office of Director.

Also, if you wish to be a candidate yourself, notify the Election Committee. Someone will nominate you.

The duties of a Director are not onerous. Directors are occasionally asked their opinion on something or other, by mail; and they are expected to make a reasonable effort to attend annual meetings.

We would like to have more than 8 names on the ballot, so that members are given a choice.

We need candidates. Don't be reluctant to nominate someone else. Don't be reluctant to volunteer yourself.

The names of the candidates will appear on the ballot, next issue (RSN27). Directors elected will serve for 3 years, starting 1/1/81. Directors whose terms expire on 1/1/81 are ED HOPKINS, DON JACKANICZ, JACK PITT, WARREN SMITH, and KATE TAIT. Directors may succeed themselves; that is, they may be re-elected.

\* To nominate someone — or to volunteer yourself — write the Elections Committee, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, Pa 18036.

#### MEMBERSHIP RENEWALS

- (32) Everyone's renewal dues are due now (except members who joined in 1980).

(This is a repetition of the DUES ARE DUE notice, printed on a separate sheet that accompanied this newsletter.)

If you joined the BRS any time in 1979, you have received all 4 issues of "Russell Society News", and your renewal dues are due now.

If you joined the BRS any time before 1979, your renewal dues are due now.

Strictly, your dues are not due till mid-year — July 1st; but it might slip your mind if you wait till July 1st. The prudent thing to do is to send us your membership-renewal check now — while you have it in mind — and date the check July 1, 1980

Dues are \$20 (regular), \$25 (couple), \$5 (student); plus \$5 if outside the USA and Canada.

By responding promptly, you also avoid possible delays in mailings of "Russell Society News" and "Russell".

Please mail dues to RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036.

Are you reaching for your checkbook?

#### BULLETIN BOARD

- (33) Tom Horne needs his music-manuscript returned. He writes:

At the Russell Society meeting a couple of years ago, I brought copies of a musical setting I wrote to the introduction of Russell's autobiography. By accident, I gave out all my copies, and had none left to submit to a publisher. I would be grateful if someone would return a copy to me, so that I can copy it.

It was at the Los Angeles meeting in 1977 that Tom gave out the copies of his 8-part choral work, "Three Passions".

\* If you've got a copy, please lend it to him. His address: 2824 East Mission Lane, Phoenix, AZ 85028.



## ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

(34)

Amnesty International USA is collecting signatures for a petition to President Carter on the death penalty.

The petition does not ask for the abolition of the death penalty. It asks that a Presidential Commission on Capital Punishment be appointed, to gather data on various aspects of the death penalty. These aspects are mentioned in the petition itself, which is reproduced on the last page (43).

We have included the petition in this newsletter because it provides an opportunity for the HRS to help AIUSA collect signatures.

We urge you to sign this petition, and also to get others to sign. You — and others — can sign the petition whether you are for or against the death penalty, because the petition does not take a stand for or against: It merely asks for fact-finding.

After you have collected as many signatures as you can, put a 15¢ stamp on the petition, fold it, seal it, and mail it. It is already addressed.

Thanks!

(35)

The International League for Human Rights is collecting signatures on behalf of Andrei Sakharov. Here is their letter, and the statement on Sakharov:

National affiliates and correspondents around the world.

In consultative status with the United Nations, UNESCO, ILO and Council of Europe.

Executive Director  
Maureen R. Berman

# The International League for Human Rights

(formerly The International League for the Rights of Man)

236 East 46th Street, 5th floor  
New York, N.Y. 10017  
Tel. (212) 972-9554  
Cable HUMRIGHTS, N.Y.

Dear Member:

In this period of international tension, it is more urgent than ever that we work to keep human rights an important factor in American foreign policymaking, and that we support those whose rights are threatened in other parts of the world.

As you know, Andrei D. Sakharov, Honorary Vice President and Board Member of the International League, was forced into internal exile by Soviet authorities. Since 1971, when the Moscow Human Rights Committee of which Dr. Sakharov is a founding member became an affiliate of the League, we have worked closely with him. We have undertaken our efforts on his behalf with a special commitment.

We are cooperating with Dr. Sakharov's stepchildren who reside in the United States, Tanya and Efrem Yankelevich. You may have seen reports of the press conference we organized for the Yankeleviches which was covered on five New York television stations and broadcast worldwide.

The League is now coordinating a petition campaign on behalf of Dr. Sakharov and needs your help.

If you are willing to sign the enclosed statement, please indicate so on the enclosed card.

In this first letter as the League's President since Jerome Shestack resigned in order to accept President Carter's appointment as the new United States Representative to the United Nations Human Rights Commission, you will not be surprised to find me asking for your continued financial support. This is a time of increased League activity -- and increased need.

If you support our efforts on behalf of Dr. Sakharov -- and our other efforts to help those who suffer from government repression in every region of the world -- please help us by again making a generous contribution. We will be most grateful.

Sincerely,

Harris L. Wofford, Jr.  
President



Honorary Presidents  
Roger N. Baldwin  
Gunnar Myrdal

Honorary Vice Presidents  
Fenner Brockway  
Jan Papanek  
Andrei D. Sakharov

Board of Directors  
President  
Jerome J. Shestack

Vice Presidents  
Robert L. Bernstein  
José A. Cabranes  
Frances R. Grant  
Harris Wofford

Secretary  
Nina Ferrero Raditsa

Associate Secretary  
Adamantia Pollis

Treasurer  
Maxwell Dane

Associate Treasurers  
Jack David  
Barbara L. Greenfield

Counsel  
Bruce Rabb

Morris Abram  
Patricia Barnes  
Marjorie Benton  
William J. Butler  
David Carliner  
Valery Chalidze  
Eugenio Chang-Rodriguez  
Lung-chu Chen  
John G. Clancy  
Roger S. Clark  
Samuel Dash  
Richard A. Falk  
Douglas Fraser  
Donald M. Fraser  
Jack Greenberg  
Felix Gross  
Rita Hauser  
Dorothy Hibbert  
Philip Hoffman  
Benjamin Hooks  
John P. Humphrey  
Florence Kandell  
Sylvia Kaye  
Winthrop Knowlton  
Sidney Liskolsky  
Suzanne Massie  
Thomas P. Melady  
Alva Myrdal  
Set Mornjian  
Leo Nevas  
George Obiozor  
Heinz Pagels  
Antonio Maria Pereira  
Bogdan Raditsa  
Luis A. Reque  
Andrei D. Sakharov  
Alexander Salzman  
Lee Traub

## STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF ANDREI SAKHAROV

THE FORCED EXILE OF NOBEL LAUREATE DR. ANDREI SAKHAROV, WHOSE COURAGEOUS DEFENSE OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE SOVIET UNION HAS BEEN A SOURCE OF HOPE FOR HIS COUNTRY AND FOR ALL THE WORLD, IS AN INTOLERABLE ACT. TO PROTEST THIS GRAVE INJUSTICE, WE WILL WORK TOGETHER IN OUR INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITIES, TO EXERT AS MUCH PRESSURE AS POSSIBLE ON THE SOVIET LEADERS TO RELEASE DR. SAKHAROV AND ALLOW HIM TO EXPRESS HIS VIEWS WITHOUT CONSTRAINT. WE CALL ON OTHERS TO JOIN US IN DEMONSTRATING THAT DR. SAKHAROV'S FRIENDS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD WILL ACTIVELY AND TIRELESSLY OPPOSE THE SILENCING OF THIS GREAT DEFENDER OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

If you wish to work on behalf of Sakharov, write to the League and tell them so. (236 East 46th St., 5th Floor, New York, NY 10017). Mention that you learned about their efforts through The Bertrand Russell Society's newsletter.

(36)

The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation "profoundly concerned by the acute worsening of international tension, the renewed arms race, and the growing danger of nuclear proliferation"...has..."proposed the creation of a European Nuclear-free Zone as a feasible middle-term goal."

They are canvassing for signatures in Great Britain (in support of their proposal) and would like to see similar efforts launched in the USA. Here is how they state their case:

## STATEMENT ON A EUROPEAN NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

We are entering the most dangerous decade in human history. A third world war is not merely possible, but increasingly likely. Economic and social difficulties in advanced industrial countries, crisis, militarism and war in the third world compound the political tensions that fuel a demented arms race. In Europe, the main geographical stage for the East-West confrontation, new generations of ever more deadly nuclear weapons are appearing.

For at least twenty-five years, the forces of both the North Atlantic and the Warsaw alliances have each had sufficient nuclear weapons to annihilate their opponents, and at the same time to endanger the very basis of civilized life. But with each passing year, competition in nuclear armaments has multiplied their numbers, increasing the probability of some devastating accident or miscalculation.

As each side tries to prove its readiness to use nuclear weapons, in order to prevent their use by the other side, new more "usable" nuclear weapons are designed and the idea of "limited" nuclear war is made to sound more and more plausible. So much so that this paradoxical process can logically lead only to the actual use of nuclear weapons.

Neither of the major powers is now in any moral position to influence smaller countries to forego the acquisition of nuclear armament. The increasing spread of nuclear reactors and the growth of the industry that installs them reinforce the likelihood of world-wide proliferation of nuclear weapons, thereby multiplying the risks of nuclear exchanges.

Over the years, public opinion has pressed for nuclear disarmament and detente between the contending military blocs. This pressure has failed. An increasing proportion of world resources is expended on weapons, even though mutual extermination is already amply guaranteed. This economic burden, in both East and West, contributes to growing social and political strain, setting in motion a vicious circle in which the arms race feeds upon the instability of the world economy and vice versa: a deathly dialectic.

We are now in great danger. Generations have been born beneath the shadow of nuclear war, and have become habituated to the threat. Concern has given way to apathy. Meanwhile, in a world living always under menace, fear extends through both halves of the European continent. The powers of the military and of internal security forces are enlarged, limitations are placed upon free exchanges of ideas and between persons, and civil rights of independent-minded individuals are threatened, in the West as well as the East.

We do not wish to apportion guilt between the political and military leaders of East and West. Guilt lies squarely upon both parties. Both parties have adopted menacing postures and committed aggressive actions in different parts of the world.

The remedy lies in our own hands. We must act together to free the entire territory of Europe, from Poland to Portugal, from nuclear weapons, air and submarine bases, and from all institutions engaged in research into or manufacture of nuclear weapons. We ask the two superpowers to withdraw all nuclear weapons from European territory. In particular, we ask the Soviet Union to halt production of the SS-20 medium range missile and we ask the United States not to implement the decision to develop cruise missiles and Pershing II missiles for deployment in Western Europe. We also urge the ratification of the SALT II agreement, as a necessary step towards the renewal of effective negotiations on general and complete disarmament.

At the same time, we must defend and extend the right of all citizens, East or West, to take part in this common movement and to engage in every kind of exchange.

We appeal to our friends in Europe, of every faith and persuasion, to consider urgently the ways in which we can work together for these common objectives. We envisage a European-wide campaign, in which every kind of exchange

takes place; in which representatives of different nations and opinions confer and co-ordinate their activities; and in which less formal exchanges, between universities, churches, women's organizations, trade unions, youth organizations, professional groups and individuals, take place with the object of promoting a common object: to free all Europe from nuclear weapons.

We must commence to act as if a united, neutral and pacific Europe already exists. We must learn to be loyal, not to "East" or "West", but to each other, and we must disregard the prohibitions and limitations imposed by any national state.

It will be the responsibility of the people of each nation to agitate for the expulsion of nuclear weapons from European soil and territorial waters, and to decide upon its own means and strategy, concerning its own territory. These will differ from one country to another, and we do not suggest that any single strategy should be imposed. But this must be part of a trans-continental movement in which every kind of exchange takes place.

We must resist any attempt by the statesmen of East or West to manipulate this movement to their own advantage. We offer no advantage to either NATO or the Warsaw alliance. Our objectives must be to free Europe from confrontation, to enforce detente between the United States and the Soviet Union, and, ultimately, to dissolve both great power alliances.

In appealing to fellow Europeans, we are not turning our backs on the world. In working for the peace of Europe, we are working for the peace of the world. Twice in this century Europe has disgraced its claims to civilization by engendering world war. This time we must repay our debts to the world by engendering peace.

This appeal will achieve nothing if not supported by determined and inventive action, to win more people to support it. We need to mount an irresistible pressure for a Europe free of nuclear weapons.

We do not wish to impose any uniformity on the movement nor to pre-empt the consultations and decisions of those many organizations already exercising their influence for disarmament and peace. But the situation is urgent. The dangers steadily advance. We invite your support for this common objective, and we shall welcome both your help and advice.

BOB DAVIS finds their statement reasonable and balanced, and would like to work on behalf of it in the USA. If you \* would like to join Bob in this effort or if you have any suggestions as to how to further this cause, notify Bob (2501 Lakeview Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90039.)

(37) Stanford Against Conscription (SAC) says it "is a coalition of individuals who, for a variety of reasons, believe that President Carter's call for registration should be opposed." They sent a packet of literature. Their address: c/o Jon Bower, 667 Marion Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301.

(38) American Atheists held their annual convention in Detroit, April 4-6. For information, write PO Box 2117, Austin, TX 78768

#### PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(39) "Islamic Revolution", subtitle: "Dimension of the Movement in Iran". Published by Research and Publication, Inc., PO Box 2556, Falls Church, VA 22042. \$10 per year. Volume 1, Number 7, October 1979 is a 30-page slick paper Time-size publication. Contents include "an eyewitness account of Kurdistan", polygamy in Iran, and "Propaganda Devices used by the Media".

#### REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES (CONTINUED)

(40) Elementary particles. This is Alex Dely's summary, mentioned in (6):

#### AN ALTERNATIVE THEORY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF MATTER The Expanding-Contracting Particle Play

By George Blam and Alex Dely

(The following sketchy notes of our continuously evolving theory came out of consideration of the missing neutrinos supposed to be emanated from the sun.)

What if a positron is really a central core constantly attracting quanta of energy to a central point in spacetime, and an electron is a core expelling such quanta from a central point? These expanding and contracting cores, because of their extremely small size, would have little influence on the basic nuclear, subnuclear

and electromagnetic forces, but would render a point in spacetime where gravity is effected. As such they would fulfill the same role as the virtual particles in other now standard theories...

What if such an expanding "particle" meets a contracting one? The result is a particle vastly reduced in size because of mutual annihilation, but where the cores remain to become neutrinos, whereas the contracting and expanding clouds around the cores become scattered and are manifested as gravitational waves or gravitinos. We have not yet found sufficient data to obtain numerical results as to how much contribution this process yields in the case of the sun. The neutrino would be neither contracting nor expanding, the resulting pulse of gravitinos can become redshifted or blueshifted, thus changing in frequency and thus energy, which accounts for the vast output of X-rays, gamma rays and other electromagnetic radiation from the stars, instead of Einstein's gravitational waves. It also accounts for the fact that our laboratories are at a very limited position relative to the rest of the universe, thus explaining why in electron-positron collisions only gamma rays are consistently observed.

Since however a very small particle with small mass remains, it is subjected to gravity, which may explain the neutrino scarcity near earth as due to the strong fields near the sun. The resulting neutrino will inherit some of the characteristics of the electron and positron, to obey conservation laws such as mass-energy, momentum, etc... but the distribution of the latter contributions, besides symmetry, depends in large measure on the model of the electromagnetic interaction used, as well as even more on synthetic models combining all known forces.

In the presently popular Weinberg-Salam model, we are checking their predictions and the available literature to adjust our parameters.

The theory also explains paircreation: a neutrino splitup into electrons and positrons.

In the big bang theory of the origin of the universe, an enormous explosion yielded an immeasurable amount of radiation. This radiation should theoretically produce equal amounts of matter and antimatter. Cosmologists have long worried about the missing vast amounts of antimatter. We explain the situation as follows: It is likely that the universe did not expand totally uniformly. In that event the radiation may have pairproduced electrons and positrons which may have bunched together and, because of different energies, the resulting particles occupied different energy levels, thus able to share their clouds of virtual particles without violating any known physical laws. Similarly, the outward pressure of the positron cloud would prevent other positrons in the same energy level, yet would also allow the electron cloud to come so close as to balance the positron pressure and gravitational forces. By combinations of the above mechanisms, positrons and electrons could coalesce to form the heavier-than-electron particles.

At present we are working on the most likely layout of each of the known elementary particles. However, one bonus of our theory is that it neatly incorporates a persistent but fringe concept in elementary particle physics, namely the bootstrap theory, which in summary states that there are no families of privileged elementary particles, but that all particles except maybe one, are formed, and given their full and everchanging characteristics (such as their quantum numbers) by their interaction with the whole of the universe. This somewhat Eastern idea has profound and beautiful philosophical implications.

Anyhow, our theory predicts that the big bang radiation at each energy level can give rise to that energy equivalent of an electron positron pair. Then by their interaction, bunching, coalescing wholly or partly, new and everchanging particles can be created, so that our everexpanding zoo of particles (over 200 have now been observed) may never come to an end; indeed, physicists, by experimentally changing the magnetic field configuration, and especially as a result of the tremendous increase in energies in the world's accelerator facilities, may be insuring the constant manufacture of "artificial" particles, which rarely form in nature ordinarily. But that remains an item for further study and reflection.

However, preliminary results indicate our ability to obtain the experimentally observed masses, charges, and other particle properties within statistical bounds of the accepted values. Presently we are studying the makeup of atomic nuclei in our framework. Presently we are trying to resolve a discrepancy between the constituent particle masses in a nucleus and its observed values. However we hope to arrive at a reasonable explanation, which presently seems to be that some of the missing mass is converted into energy of motion during the nuclear assembly. Thus, varying decay schemes with measurable effects can be forecast which hopefully will coincide with predictions of the traditional beta-decay, the newly predicted proton decay, and many others...

The above is a short summary of our work. Recent experiments (some of them described in a May 1978 "Scientific American" article as well as in recent scientific journals) have found jets emanating during particle interactions. Present day quantum chromo dynamics has not been able to fully explain them. We think our expanding-contracting particle cloud hypothesis may soon become an attractive alternative. In the next few months we hope to apply more sophisticated mathematical modeling to obtain quantitative results which can then be checked against observed data. We hope to present some preliminary findings in an informal session at the Chicago 1980 annual meeting.

(41) Members of The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc., on May 1, 1980. An asterisk indicates an honorary member.

- Louis Acheson, Jr./17721 Marcello Place/Encino, CA 91316  
 Fred W. Allendorf, Ph.D./Dept. of Zoology/University of Montana/Missoula, MT 59812  
 Gerald Alspaugh/PO Box 2111/Elkins, WV 26241  
 J. M. Altieri/PO Box 1781/Old San Juan, PR 00903  
 George Altomare/Box 1332, FDR Station/New York, NY 10022
- Bruce T. Anderson/PO Box 644/Minneapolis, MN 55440  
 Jean Anderson, Ph.D./92600 West Fork, Indian Creek Road/Swisshome, OR 97748  
 Truman E. Anderson, Jr./1200 Denver Club Bldg./Denver, CO 80202  
 Ruben Ardila, Ph.D./Apartado Aereo 52127/Bogota, Colombia  
 Helen Asbjornson/6442 Margaret's Lane/Edina, MN 55435
- Irvin & Eleanor Ashkenazy/1435 Avenue 64/Pasadena, CA 91105  
 \*Professor Sir Alfred Ayer F.B.A./New College/Oxford, England  
 Dong-In Bae/Wuellerstr. 100/5000 Koeln 41/ West Germany  
 Adam Paul Banner/PO Box 1733/Midland, MI 48640  
 Robert Barber/1425 Fillmore/Topeka, KS 66604
- Thomas Barker/awaiting new address  
 Walter Baumgartner, Ph.D./Clos de Leyterand/1806 St. Léger, Switzerland  
 Fred Bechtold/7421 Avenue W/Brooklyn, NY 11234  
 Pascal Bercker/484 Lake (Apt. 7)/St. Louis, MO 63108  
 Robert Bergen/2605 Bridgeport Way/Sacramento, CA 95826
- Jacqueline Berthon-Payon/463 W. 10th St./Claremont, CA 91711  
 James Bertini/346 State St. (Apt. 6A)/Albany, NY 12210  
 Frank Bisk, D.D.S./2940 Mott Avenue/Far Rockaway, NY 11691  
 Kenneth Blackwell/Archivist/Russell Archives/McMaster University/Hamilton, Ontario/Canada L8S 4L6  
 Linda Blitz/822 S. Taylor/Arlington, VA 22204
- Amy P. Block/1820 Euclid (#8)/Berkeley, CA 94709  
 Raymond Blum/1309 N. Spaulding Ave./Los Angeles, CA 90046  
 Tom Bohr/PO Box 9318/Stanford, CA 94305  
 Dan Bond/1112 West Avenue/Richmond, VA 23220  
 Alex Bonfiglio/663 Wendy Drive/Newbury Park, CA 91320
- Tom Brandt/1833 Kalakaua (Ste. 300)/Honolulu, HI 96815  
 Charles & Jeanne Branson/PO Box 216/Seahurst, WA 98062  
 Professor Andrew Brink/Dept. of English/McMaster University/Hamilton, Ontario/Canada L8S 4L6  
 Kendall Brink/RR 2, Box 258/Lawson, MO 64062  
 Randall Brunk/Box 369/College Park, MD 20740
- Rebecca A. Burkart/411 North 29 St./Battle Creek, MI 49015  
 John Burton/208 Bowerstown Road/Washington, NJ 07882  
 James Haley Buxton/3735 Orange St./Norfolk, VA 23513  
 Isham Byron, Jr./1108 Berwick Trail/Madison, TN 37115  
 Capt. Herb A. Campbell/PO Box 231/Wisconsin Dells, WI 53965
- Robert Canterbury/415 S. Verlinden Ave./Lansing, MI 48915  
 Eric Carleen/12 Cross St./West Newton, MA 02165  
 Leonard Carlson/2160 Holland Ave./Bronx, NY 10462  
 George Carter/3655 Pruneridge Ave. (Apt. 249)/Santa Clara, CA 95051  
 Bruce Christian/6800 Rockledge Cove/Austin, TX 78731
- Richard Clark, Ph.D./2061 Albatross St./San Diego, CA 92101  
 Leonard Cleavelin/Abbott Hall (807)/710 N. Lake Shore Drive/Chicago, IL 60611  
 Harry W. Clifford/275 Prospect St./East Orange, NJ 07017  
 Whitfield & Margaret Cobb/800 Cupp St., SE/Blacksburg, VA 24060  
 Edward B. Cochran/Box 1071/Tiburon, CA 94920
- Norman Commo/Box 1459/Fulton, TX 78358  
 John Cook, Jr., M.D./Stevens Clinic Hospital/U.S. 52 South/Welch, WV 24801  
 H.R. Cooke, Jr./Geological Survey of Greenland/Oster Volgade 10/DK-1350 Copenhagen K, Denmark
- Dusty Cooksey/c/o Sue Murphy/Rt. 1, Box 233/Harrah, TX 73045  
 Eugene Corbett, Jr., M.D./PO Box 267/Fork Union, VA 23055
- Una Corbett/1223 Woodbourne Ave./Baltimore, MD 21239  
 Jack R. Cowles/392 Central Park West (6C)/New York, NY 10025  
 Peter G. Cranford, Ph.D./1500 Johns Road/Augusta, GA 30904  
 Robert Croyle/Dept. of Psychology/Princeton University/Princeton, NJ 08540  
 Jim Curtis/15 Elizabeth Drive/Fonthill, Ont./Canada LOS 1E0
- Steve Dahlby/265 Calusa Ave./Citrus Springs, FL 32630  
 Laurence Dalton/17147 Owen St./Fontana, CA 92335  
 Dewey Danielson/PO Box 2000 FPC/Lompoc, CA 93438  
 Dennis J. Darland/1406 - 26th St./Rock Island, IL 61201  
 Michael Davis, M.D./226 Linden St./Dresden, TN 38225
- Robert K. Davis/2501 Lakeview Avenue/Los Angeles, CA 90039  
 Alex Dely/Physics Dept./Illinois State University/Normal, IL 61761  
 \*Lester E. Denonn/135 Willow St./Brooklyn, NY 11202  
 Patrick Devane/562 Holly, #301/St. Paul, MN 55102  
 Alberto Donadio/Int'l Commission of Jurists/109, route de Chêne/1224 Geneva, Switzerland
- Ray Donley III/5410 Hunters Glen/Austin, TX 78745  
 Paul Doudna/10644 Jesskamp Dr./Ferguson, MO 63136  
 George Durakovich/15722 Taft Lane, #1/Huntington Beach, CA 92649  
 William Eastman, Ph.D./Dept. of Philosophy/The University of Alberta/Edmonton, Canada T6G 2E5  
 Gail Edwards/1848 Villa Drive/Greensboro, NC 27403
- \*Professor Paul Edwards/390 West End Avenue/New York, NY 10024  
 Ronald Edwards/605 N. State St./Chicago, IL 60610  
 Lee Eisler/RD 1, Box 409/Coopersburg, PA 18036  
 Albert Ellis, Ph.D./Institute for Rational Living/45 East 65th St./New York, NY 10021  
 Albert Engleman/PO Box 23/Solana Beach, CA 92075
- Graham Entwistle/207 Kelvin Place/Ithaca, NY 14850  
 David Ethridge/320 Alexander St. (Apt. C)/Jackson, MS 39202  
 Gene L. Evans/4908 Delbrook Rd./Mechanicsburg, PA 17055  
 Rodney C. Ewing/821 Solano, NE/Albuquerque, NM 87110  
 James Few/Rt. 6, Box 709/Hot Springs, AR 71901
- Kathleen Fjermedal/1130 20th St., #7/Santa Monica, CA 90403  
 Gary Flynn/437 Pershing Road/Zanesville, OH 43701  
 Steven Foster/341 E. Loula (#4)/Olathe, KS 66061  
 Sammy French/813 1/2 W. 20th/North Little Rock, AR 72114  
 Maria Joy Friedenberg (#709)/4500 Connecticut Ave., N.W./Washington, DC 20008
- Martin A. Garstens, Ph.D./Dept. of Physics/University of Maryland/College Park, MD 20742  
 Paul Garwig/228 Penn Valley Terrace/Yardley, PA 19067  
 Bernard Gbur/1510 N. Blair/Royal Oak, MI 48067  
 Seymour Genser/2236 82nd St./Brooklyn, NY 11214  
 Ali Ghaemi/PO Box 427/McLean, VA 22101
- Ralph (O.D.) & Arlena Gilbert/107 Center St./Elgin, IL 60120  
 Steve Giordano/103 Fraley St./Kane, PA 16735  
 Barry Goldman/16260 Fairfax/Southfield, MI 48075  
 David Goldman, M.D./333 East 79th St./New York, NY 10021  
 Walter A. Goodpastor/12207 Rock Oak Place/Woodlands, TX 77380
- W. McKenzie Goodrich/77 Pine St. (110)/Portland, ME 04101  
 Joe Gorman, Ph.D./1333 Mountain Ave./Claremont, CA 91711  
 Charles Green/307 Montana Avenue/Santa Monica, CA 90403  
 Nicholas Griffin, Ph.D./Dept. of Philosophy/McMaster University/Hamilton, Ont./Canada L8S 4K1  
 Steven Grigoreas/321 S. Precinct St./East Taunton, MA 02718
- Kenneth Grundmann/2374 Sheridan Road/Salt Lake City, UT 84108  
 John Hallu/Hogan Hall (5D2)/Columbia University, New York, NY 10027  
 Stephen Hamby/Dept of Psychology/Mount Saint Mary College/Newburgh, NY 12550

582-3139

- Raan Marie & Ronald Handlon/PO Box 970221/Miami, FL 33197  
David Bruce Harley/33 Hollywood St. W./Hamilton, Ont./Canada L8S 3K7
- John Harper, Jr./571 S. Coronado St. (#412)/Los Angeles, CA 90057  
John Sr. & Vivian Harper/1509 W. Piru St./Compton, CA 90222  
Charles D. Harris/NAVSECSTA -S30/3801 Nebraska Ave. N.W./Washington, DC 30490  
David Hart/300 Kendrick Road/Rochester, NY 14620  
John L. Harwick/39 Fairway Avenue/Delmar, NY 12054
- Jim Haun/16540 Akron St./Pacific Palisades, CA 90272  
Thomas Haw/C622E Butterfield/Wesleyan College/Middletown, CT 06457  
Linda Hayley/212 East B St./North Little Rock, AR 72116  
Ed Hedemann/123 Garfield Place/Brooklyn, NY 11215  
Bruce Hedges/12 Z Manzanita Park/Stanford, CA 94305
- Stanley Heinricher/205 Cherry Drive/Melbourne Beach, FL 32951  
William Herman/3227 Hewitt Ave. (203)/Wheaton, MD 20906  
C. L. Harrington/1907 W. Oakland Ave./Sumter, SC 29150  
Charles W. Hill, Ph.D./Rte 5, Box 61/Covington, LA 71433  
Alvon Hofer/9952 S.W. 8 St. (#118)/Miami, FL 33174
- Robert Homa/213 Barnum Terrace/Stratford, CT 06497  
Ophelia Hoopes/250 Avalon Ave./Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308  
Edwin E. Hopkins, Ph.D./6165 64th Ave. (#3)/Riverdale, MD 20840  
Thomas Horne/2824 E. Mission Lane/Phoenix, AZ 85028  
Peter Houchin/26 Saxe-Coburg Square/Edinburgh, Scotland
- William J. Hulet/PO Box 480140/U. Centre, U. of Guelph/Guelph, Ont./Canada N1G 2W1  
Donald W. Jackanicz/3802 N. Kenneth Ave./Chicago, IL 60641  
John A. Jackanicz/3802 N. Kenneth Ave./Chicago, IL 60641  
Keith Jackson/31470 John R (243)/Madison Heights, MI 48071  
Gary Jacobs/104 Offutt Road/Bedford, MA 01730
- Valerie Janesick, Ph.D./School of Education, SUNY/1400 Washington/Albany, NY 12222  
Connie Jessen/2707 Pittsburgh St./Houston, TX 77005  
Frenk E. Johnson, M.D./Dept. of Surgery/St. Louis School of Medicine/1325 S. Grand Blvd./St. Louis, MO 63104  
Mark O. Johnson/Weld Hall 37/Harvard College, Cambridge, MA 02138
- Adam Kasanof/1349 Lexington Ave./New York, NY 10028  
Robert Katz/PO Box 240/Rockport, MA 01966  
Bruce Keith/1865 Laurinda Drive/San Jose, CA 95124  
John Kissell/823 N. Vista St./Los Angeles, CA 90046  
Kenneth Korbin/1 Charles St./New York, NY 10014
- Henry Kraus/5807 Topanga Canyon Blvd./Woodland Hills, CA 91364  
Arlyn Kravig/17008 Hartland St./Van Nuys, CA 91405  
Bruce Kuzmanich/10114 Homan Ave./Evergreen Park, IL 60642  
Corliss Lamont, Ph.D./315 W. 106th St./New York, NY 10025  
Herbert C. Lansdell, Ph.D./8412 Harker Drive/Potomac, MD 20854
- Douglas Lawson/23 Westerly Drive/Fredonia, NY 14063  
Syd Leah/21746 125 Ave./Mapleridge, B.C./Canada V2X 4L7  
Philip M. Le Compte, M.D./125 Jackson St./Newton Centre, MA 02159  
Richard Lee/PO Box 398/Morgantown, WV 26505  
Herman Lefkowitz/49 Kingsland St./Nutley, NJ 07110
- Justin D. Leiber/Dept. of Philosophy/University of Houston/Cullen Blvd./Houston, TX 77004  
Gladys Leithauser, Ph.D./122 Elm Park/Pleasant Ridge, MI 48069  
John R. Lenz/305 Riverside Drive (2B)/New York, NY 10025  
Janet Lewis/80 Salisbury St. (#910)/Worcester, MA 01609  
Martin Lipin/14442 Hamlin St./Van Nuys, CA 91401
- John M. Liston/805 Verde Vista/Visalia, CA 93277  
Don Loeb/1738 Murfin Ave. (Apt. 8)/Ann Arbor, MI 48105  
Andrew Lynn/73 Margaret St./Box Hill Nth, 3129/Victoria, Australia  
Susana Ida Maggi/Pueyrredón 391/Piso 3º Dep. 14/Cap. Fed. (1032) Argentina  
John M. Mahoney/Dept. of Psychology/Virginia Commonwealth University/Richmond, VA 23284
- David Makinster/645 Hawkeye Drive/Iowa City, IA 52240  
R. N. Malatesha, Ph.D./777 S.W. 15th St./Corvallis, OR 97330  
Steve Maragides/2438 Pine St./Granite City, IL 62040  
Ed Martinez/10-2 Westbrook Hills Drive/Syracuse, NY 13215  
Calvin McCaulay/470 Dundas St. (#708)/London, Ont./Canada N6B 1W3
- Michael McQuire/107 S. Mary Ave. #5/Sunnyvale, CA 94086  
Professor James E. McKeown/1469 N. Sheridan Road/Kenosha, WI 53140  
Hugh McVeigh/311 State St./Albany, NY 12210  
James E. McWilliams/Box 34/Holly Ridge, MS 38749  
Theo Meijer/Box 93/Abbotsford, B.C./Canada V2S 4N8
- James B. Milne/1126 Agincourt Road/Ottawa, Ont./Canada K2C 2H7  
William T. Moore/711 S. Main St. (D-3)/Blacksburg, VA 24060  
Ibrahim Najjar/46 Panorama Court (Apt. 1603)/Rexdale, Ont./Canada M9V 4A4  
Professor J. B. Neilands/Dept. of Biochemistry/University of California/Berkeley, CA 94720  
Kevin Norton/5562 Bear Road (H-1)/N. Syracuse, NY 13212
- James P. O'Connor/377 W. 23rd Ave./Eugene, OR 97405  
Stanley R. Ordo/8626 Flower Ave. 3/Takoma Park, MD 20012  
Frank V. Page/19755 Henry Road/Fairview Park, OH 44126  
Bill Pastor/Box 1475/Philadelphia, PA 19105  
\*Professor David Pears/Christ Church/Oxford, England OX1 1DP
- Susan Short Peddie/PO Box 25084/Portland, OR 97225  
Ernest Pintarelli/Route 1, Box 50A/Wausaukee, WI 54177  
Raymond Plant/29 Undermount Ave./Hamilton, Ont./Canada L8P 3Z7  
\*Sir Karl Popper/Fallowfield, Manor Close/Manor Road/Penn., Buckinghamshire/England HP10 8HZ  
Kathryn Powell/4430 Macomb St. N.W./Washington, DC 20016
- Leland Pratsch/1195 Collette Place/St. Paul, MN 55116  
Sarah Primm/2420 W. Kiowa St./Colorado Springs, CO 80904  
Jack Ragsdale/PO Box 28200/Dallas, TX 75228  
Stephen J. Reinhardt/2401 Pennsylvania Ave. (202)/Wilmington, DE 19806  
Professor Richard Rempel/Dept. of History/McMaster University/Hamilton, Ont./Canada L8S 4L6
- Don (Ph.D.) & Lorraine (Ph.D.) Roberts/Dept. of Philosophy/University of Waterloo/Waterloo, Ont./Canada N2L 3G1  
Edmund Roberts, Jr./950 Long Pond Road/Rochester, NY 14626  
Vera Roberts/Box 34/Frobisher Bay/Nunavut, Canada X0A 0H0  
Brad Robison/3001 College Ave. (Apt. C)/Berkeley, CA 94705  
Luis Rubio, Ph.D./Goldsmith 140 Altos/Mexico 5, D.F./Mexico
- Harry Ruja, Ph.D./Dept. of Philosophy/San Diego State University/San Diego, CA 92182  
Cherie Ruppe/17114 N.E. 2nd Place/Belleview, WA 93008  
\*Conrad Russell/Dept. of History/Bedford College/Regents Park/London, England NW1 4NS  
\*Dora Russell/Carn Voel nr. Penzance/Cornwall, England  
\*The Earl Russell/Carn Voel nr. Penzance/Cornwall, England
- Sigrid Saal/939 Timber Trail Lane/Cincinnati, OH 45224  
Larry Santoni/405 E. Thomas/Fresno, CA 93728  
Matthew Santoro/43-10 49th St./Sunnyside, NY 11104  
Robert Sass/3067 Retallack St./Regina, Sask./Canada S4S 1T3  
Irene Saylor/Commonwealth Nat'l Bank/PO Box 3389/Lancaster, PA 17604
- Kenneth Schei/12652 Gibraltar Drive/San Diego, CA 92128  
Mary Ann Schmidt/215 5th St./Dravosburg, PA 15034  
Rev. Michael Scott/43 King Henry Road/London, England  
Jay Seckels/5134 S.E. Ogden/Portland, OR 97206  
George S. Sessions/Philosophy Dept./Sierra College/Rocklin, CA 95677
- Betsy Shaffer/172 Essex St./Bangor, ME 04401  
Arshad Sherif/150 - 38 Union Turnpike (10K)/Flushing, NY 11367  
Richard Shore/59 Hespeler Ave./Winnipeg, Manitoba/Canada R2L 0L2

Don Short/PO Box 25084/Portland, OR 97225  
Mitchell Simmons/7 W. 7th St. (#4)/Weldon, NC 27890

M. T. P. Simon, M.D./United Christian Hospital/130 Hip Wo  
Street/Kwun Tong, Kln./Hong Kong  
Joseph & Della Slater/436 Taylor St./Pittsburgh, PA 15224  
Gary M. Slezak/215 E. Chestnut St. (206)/Chicago, IL 60611  
Beverly C. Smith/74 Montaine Park/Rochester, NY 14617  
Carol R. Smith/10427 - 67th Ave. S./Seattle, WA 98178

Warren Allen Smith/1435 Bedford St. (10A)/Stamford, CT  
06905  
Peter Sokaris/542 Myrtle Ave./Albany, NY 12208  
Carl Spadoni/26 Thorndale St. N./Hamilton, Ont./Canada  
L8S 3K4  
Jon Spring/3488 Via Golondrina/Tucson, AZ 85716  
Herbert Adrian Stahl, Ph.D./7307 Monticello Blvd./  
Springfield, VA 22150

Philip Stander, Ph.D./Chmn, Behavioral Sciences/Kings-  
borough Com. College, CUNY/Brooklyn, NY 11235  
Thomas Stanley/Box 366/Hartford, VT 05047  
Wilton Stiegmann/5939 Dewey Drive/Alexandria, VA 22310  
Glenna Stone/1102 Sherman (19)/Levelland, TX 79336  
Ira L. Straus/1215 Wertland St. (B33)/Charlottesville,  
VA 22903

Alma Stuart/275 Bonita Drive/Merritt Island, FL 32952  
Regina Stumber/Memelstr. 9/4802 Wetter, West Germany  
Suresh Sundarajan/Box 7844/Ole Miss, MS 38677  
David Susman/15075 Lincoln (432)/Oak Park, MI 48237  
John Sutcliffe/9, Naseby Ave./Higher Blackley/  
Manchester, England M9 2JJ

George Swire/3681 San Simeon Way/Riverside, CA 92506  
\*Katharine Russell Tait/46 Dunster St./Cambridge, MA 02138  
W. Bruce Taylor/8103 Eastern Ave. (B-307)/Silver Spring,  
MD 20910  
Dorothy Tengood/11919 Parklawn Drive (302)/Rockville,  
MD 20852  
Bruce Thompson/82 Topping Drive/Riverhead, NY 11901

Craig Tison/30626 Hathaway St./Livonia, MI 48150  
Daniel Tito/Box A, F9296/Bellefonte, PA 16823

John R. Tobin/867 E. Howard St./Pasadena, CA 91104  
Kouji Tomimori/195 Dan, Akame-Chō/Nabari City, Mie-Ken/518-04 Japan  
Duke C. Trexler/1399 W. Wellington Drive/Deltona, FL 32725

John Truckenbrod/Rt. 1/West Brooklyn, IL 61378  
P. K. Tucker/PO Box 1537/North Platte, NE 69101  
John Uhr/Box 458, New College/5700 N. Tamiami Trail/Sarasota, FL 33580  
Rudolph Urmsersbach/Bldg. I, Apt. 12/140 Camelot/Saginaw, MI 48603  
Eleanor Valentine/5900 Second Place, N.W./Washington, DC 20011

William Valentine/2205 Arch Road/Eaton Rapids, MI 48827  
Arnold Vanderlinden/108 Cameron Crescent/Pointe Claire, Quebec/  
Canada H9R 4E1  
Fernando Vargas/Suite 551/130 West 42nd St./New York, NY 10036  
Major Herbert Vogt/Marko Villas Apt. 307/2101 S. Atlantic Ave./  
Cocoa Beach, FL 32931  
Judy Wald/110 E. 59th St./New York NY 10022

Norman Walker/7353 S. Clyde Ave./Chicago, IL 60649  
Paul Walker/2325 W. 4 (#2)/Cedar Falls, IA 50613  
Bernard Wehlte/946 Fairview Ave. (#8)/Arcadia, CA 91006  
Donna Weimer/PO Box 226/Washington, PA 15301  
Charles L. Weyand/17066 Los Modelos/Fountain Valley, CA 92708

Kelly Whalen/Georgia Tech., Box 36332/Atlanta, GA 30332  
Bernard L. Wheeler/PO Box 744/Anchorage, AK 99510  
Carolyn Wilkinson, M.D./1242 Lake Shore Drive/Chicago, IL 60610  
Olive Williams/PO Box 5283/Augusta, GA 30906  
Larry Wood/1504 Gordon St./Redwood City, CA 94061

Dan Wray/2131 Cahuenga Blvd. (#22)/Hollywood, CA 90028  
William H. Young/Cedar Springs Retreat/42421 Auberry Road/  
Auberry, CA 93602  
Ronald H. Yuccas/641 Sunset Drive/Naperville, IL 60540  
Terry & Judith Zaccone/13046 Anza Drive/Saratoga, CA 95070  
Jozsep Zelena/PO Box 5043/La Salle Postal Station/Windsor, Ont./  
Canada N9J 2L3

Michael Zygmunt/347 Hewett Road/Wyncote, PA 19095

(Please advise us of any errors:  
RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036)

Note: the above membership list is for the personal use of members only, in communicating with other members.

(42)

#### INDEX

Introductory (1). 1980 Annual Meeting (2,3a,3b). Chairman Cranford reports (4). Committee Reports: Philosophy-in-High-Schools (5); Science (6). Philosophers' Corner: report on BRS at APA, 1979 (7); commentators invited (8). Comment on Warsaw Ghetto speech (9). "The Listener" on BR (10). Inaccuracies in popular accounts of BR (11). Instant philosophy (12). BR quoted in: San Francisco Chronicle (13), Los Angeles Times (14), Forbes (15), UU Newsletter (16). BR Memorial: contributions lag (17); contributors thanked (17a). "Nuclear Disaster in the Urals" continued (18). "Parade" shocker (19). Creation vs. evolution (20). Lavanam (21). Neiland's Nobel Symposium talk (22). News about members: Neilands (23). New members (24). Address changes (25). Dora's "Tamarisk Tree 2" reviewed (26). 7 BR films in BRS Library (27). Contributions needed (28). Contributors thanked (29). Know any potential members? (30). Time to nominate Directors (31). Renewal dues are due now (32). Tom Horne needs his music-manuscript back (33). Amnesty International USA's death penalty petition (34). Int'l League for Human Rights' petition to liberate Sakharov (35). BR Peace Foundation's drive for a European Nuclear-free Zone (36). Stanford Against Conscription (SAC) (37). American Atheists' convention (38). "Islamic Revolution", a periodical (39). A developing theory about elementary particles (40). List of current BRS members (41). Index (42). AI petition (43).

The Amnesty International petition on the last page of this newsletter is intended for mailing, and is already addressed. Please refer to (34).

