

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS

No. 32

November 1981

- (1) BR on Marriage, 1928 (3), on Pacifism in Wartime, 1919 (4), on Freedom in America, 1963 (5). Humanist Summit Conference statement (7b). Oppressed physicists kit (9c). The CCNY Affair, by Heckscher (11). A short book on BR by Clark (12). BRS '82 Doctoral Grant announcement (13). On nuclear disarmament (16-18,41). 8 Directors elected (32). Ray Plant's disclaimer (43). Index is at the end (45). An asterisk in the left column indicates a request.

COMING EVENTS

- (2) The World Congress of Philosophy, August 21-27, 1983, will meet in Montreal. The theme will be culture. RAY PLANT suggests that it might offer an opportunity for presenting a paper on some relevant aspect of Russell.
A circular gives details of events, fees, lodging, and deadlines. Here is a statement from the circular:

The World Congresses of the Fédération internationale des sociétés de philosophie (FISP) are held every five years. Some previous congresses have dealt with a variety of questions while more recent ones have tended to seek unity in a common theme. Many participants, though recognizing the advantages of greater unity and coherence, realized that much good philosophical work had been excluded because it was unrelated to the theme. The

Montréal World Congress will, for these reasons, combine both approaches.

One part of the program will bear on a central theme which will be elaborated in four plenary sessions, and four special sections. In addition, general sections devoted to the major areas of philosophy, colloquia, symposia and so on, will be scheduled.

We mean by culture that which human intelligence and feeling have accomplished

through the ages: values, symbols, myths, language, religion, arts, sciences, technology, laws, philosophy, social and political structures... Culture, however, amounts to more than an accumulation of material and spiritual accomplishments; it is a complex and dynamic reality, in and through which the individual gives substance to his aspirations, and transforms himself and his environment. The Congress will attempt to ask, in a strictly philosophical perspective,

radical questions about the nature of culture; the diversity of its aspects, the adequacy of its responses to the most profound expectations of individuals and groups, and its capacity to provide a better future for humanity.

This theme will be elaborated in four plenary sessions, each comprising three invited papers, and in sessions of four special sections, under the same titles as the plenary sessions, consisting of contributed papers.

If interested, write for information to: Secrétariat du XVII^e Congrès mondial de philosophie, Université de Montréal, C.P. 6128, succursale A, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3C 3J7

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

- (3) Russell on marriage, in "The Outlook", March 7, 1928. Marriage & Morals was published the following year, 1929.

My Own View of Marriage

THE subject of marriage is a much more complicated one than seems to be generally thought by those who write about it. There are, broadly speaking, two views, both of which are widely held but neither of which appears to me to have any validity. There is the romantic view, embodied in fairy tales, according to which the prince and princess marry and live happy ever after; this is the view which has led to the frequency of divorce, for as soon as the couple are not living happy ever after he comes to the conclusion that it was not the princess and she that it was not really the prince; then each makes another experiment, probably equally unsuccessful. And the reason of the repeated failures is that both have had an entirely impossible conception of what the relation between two people can be.

Then there is the view, expressed with brutal frankness by St. Paul, that "it is

better to marry than to burn;" in this view, sexual pleasure is wholly regrettable, but human nature is so weak that few will forego it wholly; marriage, however, can be relied upon to reduce the pleasure to a minimum and to turn husband and wife into mutual policemen. This view describes itself as the belief that marriage is a sacrament.

Each of these opposing views is too extreme, the one in that it regards pleasure as the end of life, the other since it thinks the name of the prevention of pleasure. Pleasure in itself is a good, but not a very important good, and it cannot satisfactorily be made the end of life because it does not entail progressive activity. To achieve happiness it is necessary to have some end never completely realized, but always in process of realization. Ambition, parental affection, scientific curiosity, artistic creativeness, supply such activities; a man or woman who is absorbed in one of these

and is not wholly unsuccessful can achieve a measure of happiness, but a man or woman who lives for pleasurable moments is certain, ultimately, to be the prey of unendurable boredom.

It is in this respect that marriage is distinguished from temporary extramarital relations. Marriage is complicated, owing to the fact that it involves two very diverse elements—the relation of the man and woman to each other, and the relation to their children. (Where there are no children the essence of marriage is absent.) In a happy marriage the husband and wife love each other and their children, and their love for each other is fulfilled, not merely in sex, but in co-operation for their children; this is a motive which in decent people survives at moments when mere pleasure has lost its vividness, or when perhaps some psychological strain has introduced difficulties into the merely personal aspects of the relation. But

when marriage is wholly successful, the satisfaction which it affords is extraordinarily complete, since the sexual and parental instincts co-operate to reinforce each other.

It is at the production of such marriages that law and morals ought to aim. This end is certainly not achieved by the conventional ethics which maintain that two wholly inexperienced people should enter upon an indissoluble relation; to find a person with whom one can live harmoniously through life is not easy, and is all but impossible to the totally inexperienced, who cannot distinguish sex hunger from the deeper affection which will survive satisfaction and be intensified by it. There should, therefore, be experience before marriage, both for men and women; there must also be the possibility of dissolving marriage for grave cause. The conventional view, however, as to what constitutes grave cause is, to my mind, wholly mis-

taken. Occasional adultery on either side is quite compatible with deep and lasting affection, and if this were generally realized jealousy would not nearly so often wreck the happiness of married people, as it does at present. Jealousy is, of course, rooted in instinct, but the occasions which bring it into play depend very largely upon beliefs and social conventions. What is expected does not cause the same jealousy as what is unexpected, and jealousy becomes far more terrible when it is reinforced by the belief that a sin has been committed. I do not say that the control of jealousy is altogether easy, but it is certainly not more difficult than lifelong faithfulness to one person. It would be absurd to pretend that a happy or decent life is possible without self-control, but I maintain that a large part of the necessary self-control should go into the curbing of jealousy, whereas conventional morality regards jealousy as wholly admirable. I am not, however, advocating unfaithfulness; I am merely advocating a tolerant attitude to it when it occurs.

There are, however, other causes sufficiently grave to call for the dissolution of a marriage in spite of the harm that may be done to children; among the more obvious of these I should mention insanity, crime, and habitual drunkenness. Where such things exist in one partner to a marriage, it is better for the children that that partner should not have access to them. There are other situations in which divorce might be desirable, but they are very difficult to define with legal precision. When the parents hate each other, they are apt to institute a competition for the children's affections; this produces an atmosphere which is almost bound to create grave nervous disorders in the children, for whom, therefore, divorce is as desirable as it is for their parents. I do not quite know how such cases can be brought within the purview of the law except through the vague idea of incompatibility, which amounts, in effect, to divorce by mutual consent. Probably in fact divorce by mutual consent, given a right public opinion, would do less harm than the continuance of a marriage which has become nothing but a legal bondage. It should, however, be recognized that wherever there are children it shows a failure of self-control and a lack of parental responsibility in one, if not both partners, when they cannot so adjust their differences as to co-operate in regard to the welfare of their children. What is of real importance in a suc-

cessful marriage is the merging of the ego in a wider unit. That man and wife are one flesh should be something more than a mere phrase; there should be an instinctive physical sympathy as the substratum upon which mental companionship is built. Modern men and women are much too much inclined to a certain hardness and completeness of the ego. In a great many marriages, even when they are not unhappy, there is no profound interpenetration, no merging of the individual life into a wider, more satisfying common existence. This is in this merging that the real excellence of marriage consists, and where it is absent no profound happiness can exist. Although many people resist this breaking down of the walls of self, it is nevertheless a profound human need, and where it is not corrected there will be a sense of dissatisfaction, of which the causes will very likely remain unknown. But where this complete union has been achieved it extends also to the children, towards whom parental love will be free and spontaneous and not tainted with jealousy. This result is not to be achieved without generosity, fearlessness, and passion, three things at which the traditional moralist looks askance. There must be no attempt to fetter one's partner, no fear of the possible pain to which one exposes one's self by a complete abandonment to love, no inhibition of passion as the result of a niggardly morality.

One of the difficulties in all modern civilization is the association of well-regulated and orderly conduct with personal prudence. Personal prudence carried beyond a point is death to all the finer qualities and all the spiritual joys that life has to offer. It is for this reason that all the great mystics have inveighed against it; "cast thy bread upon the waters;" "take no thought for the morrow;" "he that loseth his life shall find it"—all these are condemnations of prudence. Yet it would be impossible to carry through marriage and the care of young children without prudence. I think there is, however, a distinction to be made between the prudence which is personal and concerned with avoiding hurt to one's self, and that other prudence which springs from love and is concerned with avoiding hurt to the object of affection. Personal prudence in marriage means the certainty of missing all that gives importance to marriage as an enrichment of the individual life; but prudence in regard to the welfare of one's children is clearly one of the most imperative duties, though even this may

be overridden by some great public need.

The psychological difference between the two kinds of prudence is clear, since one has its root in fear, the other in love; unfortunately, the prudence which is rooted in fear has been much reinforced by conventional morality. We think better of a man who grows rich than of a man who grows poor, of a woman incapable of love than of a woman seduced. In all this our outlook is lacking in courage and magnanimity, and this is at the basis of a very large number of matrimonial troubles. Not infrequently husband and wife begin their married life with a determination on each side to preserve as much privacy as possible, the wife aiming at privacy chiefly in physical matters, the husband in matters concerned with his business; in this way an attitude of mutual antagonism grows up and there is never that complete surrender to a common life out of which alone a true marriage can grow. People have some strange notion that there is something sacred about their individuality, and so they tend to make the sex relation trivial and purely physical instead of being a profound and fructifying union of two whole persons. This may be connected with the individualism that has grown up from the Christian doctrine of personal salvation as opposed to the more primitive belief in the family.

MAN is a complex creature, but his life should be built upon a basis of instinct, using this word not in its technical sense, but in the broader sense common in popular usage. Sex, parenthood, and power are the chief instinctive passions, and much harm has come through confused mixtures of the three as well as from an intellectual simplification of each. Each has its penumbra in the emotional life, and, as a source of profound satisfaction, none brings its full possible contribution to human happiness unless it comes with the right surroundings. The impulse to power is obviously the source of political activity, also of the business activities of men who are already rich. It is the source also of the intellectual life; the impulse to knowledge comes primarily from the feeling that knowledge is power.

Parenthood is an impulse quite distinct from sex, as any one may see who will take the trouble to read the Old Testament. It is mainly a desire to escape from death, to leave some portion of one's ego functioning in the world after the death of the rest of the body;

but in order for it to be developed to its full extent in women it requires the physical care of the child, and in order to exist in men in any satisfying form it requires certainty as to paternity. This is, of course, the crux in all theories which would relax the rigidity of the marriage bond on the side of women; this also is the justification for male jealousy; but in the practical working out of this problem men have found in their marriage relations an outlet for their impulses to power rather than for their feelings of affection. The psychological problem to be faced, and I do not pretend that it is an easy one, is this: can a man retain any certainty of paternity if marriage is an equal partnership instead of a slavery involving in fact if not in form a more or less Oriental seclusion; or, if this is impossible, will women's demands for freedom lead to a return to the matriarchal system?

I do not think the psychology of modern marriage has as yet been at all worked out, and I foresee a considerable period of difficulty before civilized mankind arrives again at an institution as solid and lasting as the old patriarchal family. Perhaps this stage will never be reached until the state assumes the economic rôle of the father and the family, as we know it, ceases to exist. I sincerely hope not, for marriage and the family supply elements in life which are very valuable and which nothing else in the modern world can give. Life in its biological aspect is a continuous stream in which the division into different individuals is incidental and unimportant; to realize this aspect of life is to leave the prison of self by one of the many gates into a larger world, and for ninety-nine men and women out of one hundred it is the easiest of these gates.

Sex alone does not have this merit, but only sex in connection with parenthood, for then it becomes something transcending the emotion of the moment and forming part of the stream of life from the beginning to the unknown end. The true education in sexual morality would consist of giving to young people a sense of the importance and dignity of marriage so conceived. The old-fashioned morality had a basis which was not rational, while the newer absence of morality tends to sweep away all that has real value in the relations of men and women; to preserve this we need a new morality, not less serious than the old, but based upon a truer psychology and a just appreciation of human needs.

(Thank you, TOM STANLEY)

(4) "Reflections on Pacifism in Wartime (1914-1918)", reprinted in The Past Speaks, Walter L. Arnstein, editor, (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1981) pp. 322-324:

BERTRAND RUSSELL, *Reflections on Pacifism in Wartime (1914-1918)*

Just as the declaration of war on Germany in August, 1914, won the support of most but not all British leaders so did the prosecution of the war that followed win the support of most Britons but rouse the objections of a small but distinguished group of conscientious objectors. Of these, the philosopher Bertrand Russell was one of the most eminent.

The most difficult period in which to keep one's head was the very beginning, before the battle of the Marne. The rapid advance of the Germans was terrifying; the newspapers, and still more private conversations, were full of apparently well-authenticated atrocity stories; the stream of Belgian refugees seemed to strengthen the case for defending Belgium. One by one, the people with whom one had been in the habit of agreeing politically went over to the side of the war, and as yet the exceptional people, who stood out, had not found each other. But the greatest difficulty was the purely psychological one of resisting mass suggestion, of which the force becomes terrific when the whole nation is in a state of violent collective excitement. As much effort was required to avoid sharing this excitement as would have been needed to stand out against the extreme of hunger or sexual passion, and there was the same feeling of going against instinct.

It must be remembered that we had not then the experience which we gradually acquired during the war. We did not know the wiles of herd-instinct, from which, in quiet times, we had been fairly free. We did not realise that it is stimulated by the cognate emotions of fear and rage and blood-lust, and we were not on the look-out for the whole system of irrational beliefs which war-fever, like every other strong passion, brings in its train. In the case of passions which our neighbours do not share, their arguments may make us see reason; but in war-time our neighbours encourage irrationality, and shrink in horror from the slightest attempt to throw doubt upon prevailing myths.

The great stimulant to herd-instinct is fear; in patriots, the instinct was stimulated by fear of the Germans, but in pacifists fear of the patriots produced a similar result. I can remember sitting in a bus and thinking: "These people would tear me to pieces if they knew what I think about the war." The feeling was uncomfortable, and led one to prefer the company of pacifists. Gradually a pacifist herd was formed. When we were all together we felt warm and cosy, and forgot what an insignificant minority we were. We thought of other minorities that had become majorities. We did not know that one of us was to become Prime Minister, but if we had known we should have supposed that it would be a good thing when he did.

The pacifist herd was a curious one, composed of very diverse elements. There were those who, on religious grounds, considered all warfare wicked; there were many in the I.L.P.¹² who came to the same conclusion without invoking the authority of the Bible; there were men who subsequently became Communists, who were cynical about capitalist wars but were quite willing to join in a proletarian revolution; and there were

men in the Union of Democratic Control,¹³ who, without having definite opinions about wars in general, thought that our pre-war diplomacy had been at fault, and that the belief in the sole guilt of Germany was a dangerous falsehood. These different elements did not easily work together. The

cynicism of communists-to-be was painful to Quakers, and Quaker gentleness towards the war-mongers was exasperating to those who attributed everything evil to the wickedness of capitalists. The Socialism of the I.L.P. repelled many Liberal pacifists, and those who condemned all war were impatient with those who confined their arguments to the particular war then in progress. And so the pacifist herd split into minor herds. In some men, the habit of standing out against the herd became so ingrained that they could not co-operate with anybody about anything.

The atmosphere was very inimical to intelligence. At first, I tried not to "lose, though full of pain, this intellectual being." I observed — or thought I observed — that, in the early months, most people were happier than in peace-time, because they enjoyed the excitement. This observation produced indignation among my pacifist friends, who believed that virtuous democracies had been tricked into war by wicked governments. Arguments as to the origins of the war were thought unimportant by those who were opposed to all war, and were brushed aside as irrelevant by the great bulk of the population, to whom victory was the only thing that mattered. For the sake of unanimity among pacifists, it became necessary for the different sections to suppress all but the broadest issues. We all had to avoid all subtlety, and practice a kind of artificial stupidity.

And gradually the hysteria of the outer world invaded the pacifist herd. I remember hearing a woman at a meeting state, with passion, that if her son were wounded in the war she would not lift a finger to nurse him. The logic was clear, since nursing was war-work; but her position was not calculated to recommend pacifism to waverers. Some pacifists, out of opposition to the patriots, made out such a good case for the German Government that they embarrassed German pacifists, who were trying to persuade their public that the faults were not all on our side. At intervals, the German Government made peace offers which were, as the Allies said, illusory, but which all pacifists (myself included) took more seriously than they deserved. Having, with great difficulty, disbelieved what was false in war propaganda, it was impossible to believe what happened to be true.

I remember one evening when I came away from a pacifist meeting with Ramsay MacDonald. He was depressed, and as we walked up Kingsway he said he was afraid of acquiring what he called the "minority mind." Some may think that he has since been only too successful in avoiding this danger, but it cannot be denied that it is a danger. It does not do to think that majorities must be wrong and minorities must be right.

In times of excitement, simple views find a hearing more readily than those that are sufficiently complex to have a chance of being true. Nine people out of ten, in England during the war, never got beyond the view that the Germans were wicked and the Allies were virtuous. (Crude moral categories, such as "virtuous" and "wicked,"

revived in people who, at most times, would have been ashamed to think in such terms). The easiest theory to maintain in opposition to the usual one was the Quaker view, that all men are good at heart, and that the way to bring out the good in them is to love them. Christ had taught that we ought to love our enemies, and few people cared to say straight out that He was mistaken. Those who genuinely held the Quaker view were respected, and the Government disliked having to send them to prison.

The class-war opinion, that capitalist wars are wicked but proletarian wars are laudable, could be preached with success to working-class audiences; it had the advantage of giving an outlet for hatred, of which many persecuted pacifists felt the need. Frequently, in meetings nominally opposed to all war, the threat of violent revolution was applauded to the echo. This view was, of course, the one of all others most hated by the authorities, but it was psychologically capable of being held by a majority.

The view which I took, and still take, was that, while some wars have been justified (for instance the American Civil War), the Great War was not justified, because it was about nothing impersonal and raised no important issue. This view required too much argument to be effective in such a violent time; it could be put forward in books, but not at meetings. It was also impossible to get a hearing for the view that a war cannot be justified by its causes, but only, if at all, by its effects. A "righteous" war was supposed to be one which had the correct diplomatic preliminaries, not one in which victory would bring some benefit to mankind. One of the most surprising things about the war, to me, was its power of producing intellectual degradation in previously intelligent people, and the way in which intellectual degradation always clothed itself in the language of a lofty but primitive morality.

To stand out against a war, when it comes, a man must have within himself some passion so strong and so indestructible that mass hysteria cannot touch it. The Christian war resister loves his enemies; the Communist war resister hates his government. Neither of these causes of resistance was available for me; what kept me from war fever was a desire for intellectual sobriety, for viewing matters involving passionate emotion as if they were elements in a formula of symbolic logic. I found it useful to think of nation *x*, nation *y*, and nation *z*, instead of England, France and Germany. But the effort was considerable, and hardly left me the mental energy to apply the same process when *x* was the British Government and *y* was the imprisoned pacifists. I still think, however, that intellectual sobriety is very desirable in war time, and I should wish all who, in anticipation, expect to stand out against the next war, to practise the habit of translating concretes into abstracts, so as to see whether their reasonings still seem convincing when the emotion has been taken out of them. In theory, we all know that this is essential to scientific thinking, but the war showed that it is more difficult than many people suppose.

SOURCE: From Bertrand Russell, "Some Psychological Difficulties of Pacifism in Wartime," in Julian Bell, ed., *We Did Not Fight: 1914-18: Experiences of War Resisters* (London: Cobden-Sanderson, 1935), pp. 329-335. By permission of The Bertrand Russell Estate.

¹² The Independent Labour Party, a relatively small socialist group affiliated with, but not identical to, the parliamentary Labour Party

¹³ An organization founded during the war to work for a negotiated peace. It anticipated Woodrow Wilson in its advocacy of a postwar League of Nations.

(Thank you, DON JACKANICZ)

THE MYTH

OF

AMERICAN "FREEDOM"

By Bertrand Russell

A reprint from the May, 1963 issue of *The Minority of One*.

The Minority of One is an independent monthly published at 77 Pennington Avenue, Passaic, N. J.

BOARD OF SPONSORS:

Dr. Günther Anders
 Prof. Daniel M. Berman
 Dr. Jerome Davis
 Rev. Clarence E. Duffy, D.D.
 W. H. Ferry
 Prof. D. F. Fleming
 Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman
 Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester, U.S.A.(Ret.)
 Ava Helen Pauling
 Prof. Linus Pauling
 Bertrand Russell
 Dr. Albert Schweitzer
 Prof. Pitirim A. Sorokin
 Prof. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi
 T. H. Tetens
 Prof. Ernest B. Zeisler †
 (1960-1962)

EDITOR: M. S. Arnoni

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 1 yr. 2 yrs. 3 yrs.
 U.S.A. \$5.00 \$9.00 \$12.00

By Bertrand Russell

The active presence of freedom in American life is vanishingly small. Words and slogans are used for long periods after they have been emptied of content by events. Those who know within themselves that to challenge their society fundamentally is a dangerous thing to do deceive themselves by clinging to such hollow slogans until they have been sufficiently corrupted to have lost interest in them. The next step for the absence of vital life is for the conceptions to be acknowledged as something desirable anyway. "National interest" is the replacement term most preferred.

I consider that there are three large developments in American society which have made talk of freedom and individual liberty empty talk which satisfies the diminished consciences of those who want to believe that they are motivated by these values at the same time that they embrace a society which despises freedom and individual liberty.

These three developments are: 1) Overt and unabashed police-state techniques; 2) the evolution of institutional life incompatible with freedom and liberty, and 3) the power-struggle between two authoritarian giants, America and Russia, which has introduced the concomitant threat of annihilation for mankind. These three developments act upon and reinforce one another.

Since the end of World War II, the way to political power in the United States has been characterized by the crudest persecution of dissident opinion. The object of this persecution has been to impose upon the United States an acceptance of capitalism and of the power of large industry. To further this end, any potential critics of such a power arrangement have been hunted down and declared subversive. One of the tragic aspects of this development has been

the willingness on the part of liberals to swallow the dishonest assumptions, seek to dissociate themselves from those under attack, and to allow the perpetrators to establish their power and their values as beyond question. Questions have been decided to be incompatible with patriotism.

"Subversives" are those who pose such questions. They are called Communists because it was also a purpose of men who hold American power to discredit alternatives to Capitalism by equating support of a foreign power with domestic dissidence.

Communists were a convenience and all who retained an independent mind were obligated to denounce Communism if they were to remain free and employed. Communism, however, was an issue created as a conscious hoax. The power of the Soviet Union was real and the power-conflict with the Soviet Union was real. Espionage, as old as nation-states, was also real. None of these facts had any bearing on the use to which they were put by cynical addicts of power. Communists had no political significance within American life. It is not clear why it is illicit for Communists to play a role in the political life of a free country.

It was soon clear, however, that Communists would be hunted, for that enabled the hunters to accuse all with whom they had political differences of being this new form of devil, carefully cultivated as a domestic "menace".

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is a secret political police. It has frequently fabricated evidence to frame innocent people and any who dared suggest that this had been done were themselves subjected to the same treatment. The Justice Department undertook to pay for a posse of terrified perjurers who, upon losing their terror, found official lying a lucrative way to live. American political life centered in the late forties and fifties upon the intimidation of all men of integrity prepared to criticize their country.

Investigating committees have also used the paid informer and instructed liar. Many individuals have been jailed and many thousands more deprived of livelihood. The effect of this systematic and pervasive program of intimidation has been to eliminate political alternatives from the public discourse in the United States.

Opportunist politicians such as Joseph McCarthy and Richard Nixon patterned their careers on the national pastime of inquisiting men with independent minds. The press has entirely cooperated in this. The press, like all media of communication, is controlled by large economic interests. These very economic interests have nurtured the attack upon civil liberty and the "concentration camp for the mind" which characterizes the United States of America.

The Justice Department assisted with loyalty boards, subversive lists, and prosecutions of individuals for their political views. The F.B.I. persisted in fabricating evidence and even the existence of Communists to be hunted in order to continue to drain public funds.

The case of Alger Hiss illustrated the proposed fate of all foolish enough to defy; and the F.B.I. constructed a typewriter to secure a false conviction.

The atmosphere of hysteria so sedulously cultivated by the press and the Government of the United States was sufficient to murder the Rosenbergs who were accused of espionage on the evidence of a perjurer. Even the law under which they were tried was substituted for the one under which they were accused because the former carried the death penalty. The Rosenbergs were incapable of having copied the documents they were said to have copied because, as Einstein pointed out, they lacked the essential training necessary to have done that of which they were accused. The peacetime death penalty showed how far the persecutors would go in the United States and

helped to diminish the danger of intellectual independence.

Espionage, however, was only the guise, for political views of a radical kind would hardly be cultivated by an intended spy. The continued object was the man who disagreed. After a time, however, the persecution of dissidents (called ferreting out Communists) became a career in itself and more and more victims were necessary to feed the inquisition and its victim-hungry administrators.

The case of Morton Sobell, illegally kidnapped, convicted on non-existent evidence, sentenced to thirty years, is one of the more obvious examples of "freedom" in the United States.

The Attorney-General's list includes today many hundreds of organizations which are declared subversive. The Feinberg Law of New York requires teachers to report on the political beliefs of their colleagues. Those who are friends or associates of political dissidents are themselves subject to and in danger of overt persecution.

The system of terror which I am describing and which, I am certain, is familiar to Americans, has worked in an informal way as devastating as its more exhibitionist aspect. Private industry does not employ the politically suspect. The right to travel is a consequence of holding dependable views. A great blackmailing industry emerged with journals such as "Red Channels," destroying careers by smearing men as Communists. The important fact is that a free society would not be one in which a political view could constitute a danger to the holder. Nor could someone be "smeared". Smears betray the absence of freedom.

The result of this pervasive and systematic terror has been that Americans first respond to political discussion by seeking to attach labels to ideas, the better to dismiss them without having to consider them.

It is not possible to have such an environment for fifteen years without profound effect. Americans prefer to say that the witch-hunt was a passing phase of hysteria created by nasty men such as McCarthy. On the contrary, the persecution which America has witnessed and largely embraced was created by men of power to destroy political opposition. McCarthy was an excrescence upon this fact.

The second development to which I have referred earlier is an institutional one. The nature of a large industrial society is bureaucratic and impersonal. The individual is submerged in vast collective units. Individuals who are created for such institutions are without features marking independence of mind. Adlai Stevenson said:

"Technology, while adding daily to our physical ease, throws daily another loop of fine wire around our souls".

This statement is one full of insight. It reveals that the United States is as collectivized as the Soviet Union in the sense that both societies are characteristically large and are dominated by bureaucracies. The private or public character of these institutions does not determine the extent to which people are cogs. It is technology and size which do that. Ideology is largely irrelevant.

For this important reason, the persecution of men of independent mind is not the only source of tyranny in America. The daily lives of people are incompatible with freedom. They no longer have real control over decisions which affect them and this is a fundamental fact.

Part of this second development is the nature of power itself within American political life. The corporate community constitutes a private Government. Industries are interlocked and the economic and political life of the United States can not seriously be separated. So it is with economic and political power. The corporate community finances both political parties, provides the

millions necessary for both candidates in Senatorial elections, owns and controls the media of communication and, in effect, exercises the power of decision-making. For this reason formal political democracy in the United States is largely a sham and "freedom" is a convenient myth at the disposal of faceless bureaucrats. The overwhelming political power of the corporate community is private in character only insofar as there is no public awareness of its role, let alone knowledge of its decisions or control over them. The two political parties operate within this system and the formal political institutions—the Congress and the Executive—merely serve to administrate for the corporate community. After fifteen years of persecution, systematic conditioning and the eradication of political opposition, the American public accepts national interest as defined by corporate capitalism. For these elementary reasons, the political democracy of which Americans speak is, for me, largely without serious meaning.

Intimately related to these two developments which I have sought to describe has been the power struggle between the Soviet Union and the United States—the Cold War. The elimination of dissent was achieved by identifying dissent in the popular mind with support of the "enemy", the "devil" the inconceivably wicked Russians. The nice thing about this was that it also became impossible to question the power-struggle itself. Russia was the means of ending American radicalism and the means itself was sacred. I am utterly convinced that if the conflict with the Soviet Union had never existed a different menace would have been adopted for the purposes of political persecution.

Nonetheless, the struggle for power with Soviet Russia has enabled American politicians to sanctify every oppressive act in the name of national security and to label every appeal for freedom as sympathy for the Russians.

In the course of the struggle it has become apparent that neither side is concerned about anything except dominating the other. The Russians may proclaim hostility to Capitalism and the Americans to Communism. Yet the two systems, under the very pressure of their own conflict, have become remarkably alike. The bureaucratic and impersonal character of these two countries has taken them in very similar directions. Stalin, it was true, was exceptionally cruel. Since Stalin the cruelty has diminished apace with the growth of intolerance in America.

The United States has created and supported tyrannical regimes around the world. The sole criterion for support has been subservience to American military needs and willingness to allow the resources and peoples of the respective countries to be exploited by American industry.

This pattern in America has made the question of freedom directly relevant to the unlikely hope of human survival. Unless it becomes possible not only to question in isolation the holders of American power, but to mobilize effective political opposition to their power and their policy, survival is in doubt.

If friendship with the Soviet Union is treasonable, if the power of the military-industrial complex is unchallengeable, if the insane struggle between the Soviet Union and the United States is not halted, then the absence of freedom will lead to the end of life on our planet.

I believe that until a radical analysis of this kind is made by Americans and acted upon, regardless of the consequences, we must all live through the suffering of semi-literate paranoids with their fingers on buttons.

(Thank you, JOHN TOBIN)

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

(6) Chairman Peter Cranford reports:

(6a) (Editor's note: Chairman Peter Cranford and President Bob Davis disagree as to whether expelled BRS Member John Sutcliffe should be allowed to appeal his expulsion.)

Peter says that, at the '81 Board meeting in June, he appointed a committee to consider that question.

Bob maintains (and says the minutes will confirm) that no such committee was appointed; that the Chairman does not have the power to appoint any committee (for it is the Board, not the Chairman, that has that power, according to the Board's Bylaws); that, in any case, it is the Society (the members) and not the Board (the Directors) that has the responsibility of dealing with expulsion, according to the BRS Bylaws, and that the Board has no power to overrule a Society vote; that Peter's belief that Sutcliffe should be allowed to appeal was supported by advice Peter got from BRS Director Ray Plant, an attorney, but that Ray's advice was mistakenly based on the obsolete BRS Constitution instead of the current BRS Bylaws. (The obsolete Constitution does not provide for expulsion by mail ballot; the Bylaws do so provide. Sutcliffe was expelled as the result of a mail ballot.)

There are many aspects of the Sutcliffe matter. To provide all details might fill much of this newsletter; briefly this is what has happened:

Peter polled the Directors and asked for their "reactions" to Sutcliffe's request for an appeal, and later said that a majority (9 to 7) had "voted" in favor of appeal. In response to that, several Directors who had given favorable "reactions" said they had not meant to have them counted as "votes" -- and changed their position.

Bob now questions whether a majority of the Board does in fact favor allowing an appeal.

To answer this question, BRS Secretary Don Jackanicz (who is also Board Secretary) has mailed ballots to all Directors, asking them to vote on whether to allow Sutcliffe to appeal, and we should know the answer by the end of this month. That should settle the matter one way or the other.

Bob -- though he believes there is no way under the Bylaws that the Sutcliffe case can be reopened -- has nevertheless said he would abide by the result of Don's poll, as a contribution to bringing this matter to a conclusion. Now here is Peter's Chairman's Report:)

(6b)

The society is in the process of re-assessing its methods and goals as the aftermath of the Sutcliffe case. At the last board meeting Dr. Alvin Hofer argued that the by-laws, particularly as they pertain to expulsion, needed revision. Dr. Hofer was then appointed chairman of the committee to do so. He will be assisted by Cherie Rupee, Steve Reinhardt, Ray Plant and myself.

Robert Lombardi then challenged the method used in the Sutcliffe case. As a result I appointed Cherie Rupee and Ray Plant to assist me in an investigation of the procedure. The chief points at issue were that Mr. Sutcliffe had written that no charges had been transmitted to him and that he had had no opportunity to formally argue in his defense. I wrote him in January of 1981 to the effect that he could present his case to the board. I did not hear from him again. It then occurred to me that he might not have received my letter written some eight months previously, and decided I should write to him to see if he had. A very short letter was written making this inquiry, and since it had no other substance I did not send copies to the board.

In the meantime, Ray Plant sent me the enclosed letter (dated August 28, 1981) indicating that there were several weaknesses in the procedure and John Sutcliffe should be informed that he could appeal either by written statement or in person. Sutcliffe then sent a letter requesting the right to appeal. I sent his letter to all board members asking for their reaction. A majority of the seventeen responding wrote letters giving various reasons why an appeal should be allowed. The minority, led by the BRS president and the editor of the BRS newsletter, argued that since Sutcliffe was expelled in accordance with the by-laws (see attached opinion by Ray Plant dated September 22, 1981), no appeal should be granted. Both have also argued that the board has no power to re-open the matter.

The president seems self-contradictory at this point since he is working in behalf of Amnesty International which seeks to have people released who were convicted in accordance with the laws of their country. Bertrand Russell was similarly punished on several occasions.

Since the sub-committee and the board were in agreement, I communicated our decision to Sutcliffe granting his request to appeal. I expect a formal appeal within the next few weeks.

(6c) Here are Ray's 2 letters that Peter refers to:



THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF HAMILTON-WENTWORTH

Regional Solicitor
Century 21, 100 Main Street East
P.O. Box 910 Hamilton Ontario L8N 3V9 526-4248 or
526-4232



THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF HAMILTON-WENTWORTH

Regional Solicitor
Century 21, 100 Main Street East
P.O. Box 910 Hamilton Ontario L8N 3V9 526-4248 or
526-4232

August 28th, 1981.

Mr. Peter G. Cranford, Ph. D.,
Chairman,
Board of Directors,
The Bertrand Russell Society,
1500 Johns Road,
Augusta, Ga., 30904,
U. S. A.

Dear Peter:

Re: John Sutcliffe.

Thank you for your letter of August 10th re John Sutcliffe's appeal against expulsion. Your letter just arrived owing to the recent Canadian mail strike.

My advice would be for you to notify Mr. Sutcliffe that his appeal will be considered and to inquire whether he wishes to conduct his appeal by way of correspondence to the Board then if upheld, by mail to the members at large, or whether he wishes to conduct his appeal in person or by agent at our next Annual Meeting.

As you know, there is no explicit procedure for appeal in the Society's By-laws. These are being reviewed and I will be recommending that the affected member may have a choice of conducting his appeal by correspondence or by appearing in person or by agent at the next Annual Meeting of the Board and membership.

I hope to have my comments to you on a proposed expulsion procedure by letter in the near future.

Kind regards.

Yours sincerely,

Ray Plant
R. M. Plant,
Regional Solicitor.

RMP:mb

September 22nd, 1981.

Dr. Peter G. Cranford,
1500 Johns Road,
Augusta, Georgia,
30904, U.S.A.

Dear Peter:

Further to the efforts of the Sub-committee, I have reviewed the Society's Constitution which I have available. Section 3 of Article II of the Constitution covers the subject of expulsion in a cursory way. The aims of the Society as set out in Section 1 of Article II are sufficiently general that I doubt very much whether Mr. Sutcliffe could be expelled for violation of them.

His conduct was personally abusive but did not contravene the stated aims of the Society. It is for this reason that I suggest that the Constitution of the Society be amended to reflect that expulsion may occur for any reason deemed sufficient by the Board of Directors and membership of the Society where such reason is related to the conduct of the member in public or private life which would bring the Society or its office holders into disrepute. In this connection, is there further word on Mr. Sutcliffe's Appeal from the other members?

To assist in the Sub-committee's evaluation of the By-laws, it would be of value if a set of By-laws were distributed to the members of the Sub-committee for perusal and recommendations.

Yours sincerely,

R. M. Plant
R. M. Plant,
Regional Solicitor.

RMP:mb

C.C. Mr. Alvin D. Hofer, Ph. D.
Mr. Stephen J. Reinhardt
Ms. Cherie Ruppe

(7) President Bob Davis reports:

(7a) First, I would like to offer these observations on the Sutcliffe matter:

1. The letter from Ray Plant is based on the old Constitution which is not in force rather than on the Bylaws that we now operate under, and which -- unlike the Constitution -- provide for expulsion by mail ballot.
2. There is no committee to investigate the Sutcliffe expulsion. The Board Bylaws state that committees are appointed by the Board, not by the Chairman, and the Board appointed no such committee.
3. I received Peter's original letter, that he sent to the Board, 6 weeks later than the other Directors. (It did not call for a "vote", but merely for a "reaction".) I immediately wrote to the Directors, opposing appeal on constitutional grounds and also because Mr. Sutcliffe is not good for the Society. But by this time, many Directors had already responded to Peter's letter, and Peter announced the result as a "vote" in favor of appeal. Since then 3 Board members have notified me that they object to having their "reaction" treated as a "vote" (which they did not intend) and have changed their minds, which I believe nullifies Peter's majority.
4. Ray Plant, in his letter of September 22nd fails to mention that the principal charge against Mr. Sutcliffe was his refusal to stop acting as our official representative; such behavior is grounds for expulsion. The abusive behavior he exhibited toward others -- including non-members, apparently as our representative -- is secondary.
5. Finally, Mr. Sutcliffe's recent letter of appeal shows no regret and no promise to stop the activities for which he was expelled.

* * * * *

(7b) Don Jackanicz and I attended the Humanist Summit Conference in College Park, Maryland (in University of Maryland facilities) on October 30-31. The purpose of the meeting was to draw together "humanistically oriented groups" to organize for combatting Moral Majorityism. Whether or not the BRS is such a group (I think it is) depends on definitions, and I will rely on BR's statement that though he did not use the label ("humanist") himself, he would not be inclined to "bring an action for libel" if someone applied it to him.

There were interesting talks by Paul Kurtz, Jerry Larue, N.F.I.Schwarz of Utrecht, Holland -- Co-Chairman of the International Humanist and Ethical Union -- and others. There were also group planning sessions. It was a successful conference. We passed a group affirmation-resolution, and will start "networking" among groups -- humanist, religious, and establishment -- who are threatened by or dislike the Moral Majority and its allies. Don and I both signed the affirmation (and contributed to it.) I am presenting it to the BRS Board to consider for official BRS endorsement. Here is the statement:

Affirmation of American Freedom by the Humanist Summit Conference

We, representatives of humanistically oriented groups, deplore the attack upon us by intolerant religious forces. We believe that this simplistic attack is not only upon humanism but is an all-out assault upon the open and pluralistic character of American society and upon the Constitution and traditional American freedoms. By their repeated assaults upon the separation of church and state, these zealots undermine the very foundation of our democratic society and religious freedom. We hold that no one group, religious or secular, has an exclusive claim to patriotism in America nor an inherent right to force its values and ideology upon the rest of us. Rather, we believe that it is through open discussion and debate that we as Americans can arrive at intelligent decisions on the ethical, social and political issues facing us. As humanists we accept both our right and obligation to participate in determining the future of our society without threats of intimidation or censure. This, we believe, is the essence of being an American and is of central importance to humanism.

To follow this up, the Ethical Union is sponsoring another conference in March '82 which I shall try to attend. Also the International Humanist and Ethical Union is having a World Conference in Hanover, Germany, August 1-5, '82, which I have been invited to attend and hope to be able to. It dovetails with our proposed '82 meeting at Oxford.

(8) Treasurer Dennis Darland reports:

For the quarter ending 9/30/81:

Balance on hand (6/30/81).....	1395.93	
Income: 41 new members.....	697.50	
89 renewals.....	1555.00	
Total dues.....	2252.50	
Contributions.....	120.00	
Sale of RSN, stationery, books, etc.....	205.13	
Total income.....	2577.63	+2577.63
		3973.56
Expenditures: Information & Membership Committees.....	1612.81	
"Russell" subscriptions.....	339.50	
Bertrand Russell Memorial (London).....	90.00	
BRS Library.....	891.65	
Annual Meeting (1981).....	50.00	
Bank Charges.....	24.44	
Total spent.....	3008.40	-3008.40
Balance on hand (9/30/81).....	965.16	

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

(9) Science Committee (Alex Dely, Chairman) reports:

(9a) (1) The following, on the '81 Pugwash Conference, supplements the New York Times article of 9/4/81 reproduced below (16).

The 31st Pugwash Conference (August 28-September 2, 1981 at Banff, Alberta, Canada) had as its theme, "Avoiding Nuclear War". The group concluded that an ominous spread of concepts making nuclear war thinkable is coupled to strivings to get rid of all arms control agreements (SALT, NPT...)

The group agreed that nuclear weapons' only real use is as deterrents, not as weapons, and reaffirmed that it is impossible to limit a nuclear war in quantity and/or quality. The Pugwash group, consisting of U.S., U.S.S.R. and other scientists, unanimously rejected any doctrine legalizing limited nuclear war.

They deplored the defeat of SALT II in the U.S. Senate, and want the U.S. and U.S.S.R. to refrain from any

action that could jeopardize important provisions of SALT II (which were agreed upon) so that future negotiations would not start in a vacuum.

They agreed that the most useful step in stopping the U.S.-U.S.S.R arms race would be to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries, as well as a mutual freeze on nuclear forces to current numbers and characteristics. Most importantly, destabilizing systems (such as the MX, which can be perceived as having first-strike capabilities) must be avoided; in this case, when both sides have similar systems, the situation is much worse than if only one nation does. Trying to match such systems adds to the instability; rather first strike targets should be dismantled, leaving first strike weapons nothing to attack.

They also endorsed a nation's withholding its supplies of fissile material for weapons purposes. The situation in Europe was thought to be deteriorating rapidly. A "zero proposal" was suggested, in which non-deployment of NATO weapons (such as the neutron bomb) would be coupled to a reduction in U.S.S.R. SS-20 missiles. It was suggested that, in each power bloc, political action be taken to ban training in the use of these new weapons at military maneuvers. To gather such public support, it was agreed to contact all scientific organizations, and scientists of high prestige, to undertake massive public outreach projects.

(9b) (2) A letter was sent to Congressman John Rhodes and others, opposing efforts (such as H.R. 4400) to weaken the Clean Air Act, and indicating the harm to Arizona that would result from the proposed weakening of the Act. The Clean Air and Clean Water Acts are up for renewal, and letters of support to your Congressman and Senators would be useful.

(9c) (3) A 7-page package of material was sent to 40 BRS members who in some way are connected with a university, as part of the Science Committee's dissident scientists effort. It describes the treatment given Soviet physicist Vladimir Kislik, a Jewish refusenik (who was refused a visa to join his family in Israel), jailed on a charge of having attacked a woman; and includes a petition for his release. A free 16-page kit, "Suggestions for activities in support of oppressed physicists" is available from Kurt Gottfried (Chairman, American Physical Society Committee on the International Freedom of Scientists), Newman Laboratory, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853.

PHILOSOPHERS' CORNER

(10) A call for papers for December 1982 was sent to scholarly journals by the BRS Philosophy Committee Chairman Ed Hopkins:

The Bertrand Russell Society announces a call for papers to be presented at its meeting at the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in December 1982. Papers may be on any aspect of Russell's Philosophy. They should have a reading time of about one half an hour and should be submitted in triplicate, typed and double spaced with an abstract of not more than 150 words. The name of the author, with his address and the title of his paper, should be submitted on a separate page. The submission deadline is May 15, 1982 and the papers should be sent to Edwin Hopkins, Chairman, Philosopher's Committee, The Bertrand Russell Society, 6165 64th Ave., #3, Riverdale, Md. 20737. Those desiring the return of their papers should enclose a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

ABOUT BERTRAND RUSSELL

(11) The CCNY Affair, as reported in When LaGuardia Was Mayor by August Heckscher with Phyllis Robinson (New York: Norton, 1978) pp.269-275:

The Case of the Noble Earl

On October 1, 1939, the Board of Higher Education of New York City named as professor at City College an erudite, disconcertingly witty Englishman who was to teach the philosophy of mathematics. Nobody took much notice of it at the time, and those who did saw nothing inappropriate in the choice. The *Sun*, bellwether of the conservatives and guardian of conventional standards, commented editorially on the new appointment. "He thinks so clearly, and writes with so much sparkle and gusto, that business should boom in the philosophy department." It did indeed, but in

a quite different way from what the editorialist had anticipated.

The Englishman in question was Bertrand Russell, world-renowned mathematician, but also expounder of views upon social and political questions that often astounded and shocked his contemporaries. In particular, he held views on the relations between men and women which even today, though they are widely followed, are rarely expressed so lucidly and frankly. In a book, *Marriage and Morals*, published ten years before his New York appointment, he had written: "I am sure that university life would be better, both intellectually and morally, if most university students had temporary childless marriages that would afford a solution to

the sexual urge neither restless nor surreptitious, neither mercenary nor casual, and of such nature that it need not take up time that should be given to work." All sex relations that do not involve children should be regarded as a purely private matter, he urged; adultery was permissible and even desirable, and as for Christianity: "Through its whole history it has been a force tending toward mental disorders and unwholesome views of life."

That was strong language. The book was attacked at the time but in due course was forgotten; at the start of the war Russell accepted a teaching appointment at the University of California. But there was one man, Bishop William T. Manning of New York, who did not forget and carried on in the press and elsewhere a continuing crusade against the English earl. The issue as it was posed by the bishop, and as it was seen by most others who took up the fight, was not quite the one we would expect today: not civil liberties and the right to teach, but the right to speak unpopular views. It was, in short, the old issue of toleration, and Bishop Manning was one of those who could not bear to put up with views so different from his own and so personally offensive.

In the volatile community of New York the Russell appointment was not likely to be passed over in silence. When the mathematical operation of adding one to one was performed—when the opinions of Bertrand Russell were set in conjunction with the post of City College professor—the ensuing controversy reached through all levels of public opinion, shook up the Board of Education, the courts, and the City Council, and posed a crisis for the LaGuardia administration. The mayor himself was in an acutely embarrassing position. He did not, it must be said, emerge with honors from this trial. His battles for the rights of minorities and the oppressed, his stand against the suppression of free thought in the European dictatorships, seemed to be ignored when highly unpopular opinions were expressed in his own backyard.

LaGuardia at this time and later was much influenced by the religious hierarchies, both Catholic and Episcopalian. Bishop Manning, who referred to Russell as "an ape of genius," had enlisted the mayor's aid in various church matters and was in regular communication with City Hall. In fairness it must be added that the mayor, as a sensitive politician, was aware of the repercussions throughout his New York constituency likely to be aroused by Russell's views on sex and religion. When the chips were down, the liberals and the defenders of toleration were but a small group within the city complex, and by no means the most powerful. Finally, the mayor's own views on sexual morality, orthodox and conventional as they were, made him susceptible to being genuinely shocked by the writings of the noble earl.

"I am not a prude," the mayor stated, with the kind of innocence which made people think he very probably was. He added, to prove his point, that he had been an aviator in the war and had traveled "all over Europe." His attitude toward women was certainly old-fashioned. When his secretary, Anna Clark, visited Washington on official business, he insisted she stay at a hotel which demanded of its residents that they check in by midnight. When, at the end of a day's work, he suggested to Mitzi Somach that she ride home with him in his city car, he made sure that a third person in addition to the driver accompany them. All this might have been set down as one more of the mayor's amiable eccentricities. But when the Bertrand Russell appointment divided true believers from the bigots and the nervous nellys, it placed LaGuardia on the wrong side of the line.

Between October and March the Bertrand Russell affair boiled along below the surface of public opinion, but enough discontent was aroused to cause the council on March 14 to adopt a resolution ordering the Board of Higher Education to rescind the appointment. The St. Patrick's Day Parade that year was held under a driving snow; one can imagine that among the notables on the platform (several of whom stayed like the mayor until the end) the case was fully discussed. Here were leading representatives of the religious and political establishment, and the Russell appoint-

ment had grown as heated as the weather was cold. "Why is it we always select someone with a boil on his neck or a blister on his fanny?" LaGuardia had grumbled a few days before, and his sentiments at the grand Irish tribal rite must have been expressed in similar vein. Two days after the parade, the Board of Education was to meet to reconsider the appointment.

On the eve of the meeting the mayor received from Charles H. Tuttle, a respected member of the board, a somber letter warning that the appointment, if carried through, would do harm to City College and would be an affront to the religious people of the city. "I lay the facts before you so that you may take such action as your judgment dictates." With the letter was a memorandum setting forth lengthy quotations, most of them from Russell's controversial *Marriage and Morals* of a decade earlier. At the same time the mayor was receiving advice from Burlingham. "I hope you will keep out of the Bertrand Russell mess," wrote that wise mentor. "If Bishop Manning had kept his fourteenth-century trap shut, the noble earl would have come and gone without notice." At about the same time, in a letter addressed to "My dear and good hishop," LaGuardia was extending to Manning profuse apologies for the appointment and promising to act "within the limits of such powers as I have."

These powers included pressure on the Board of Higher Education. One member, having resisted such pressure, appealed later for LaGuardia's "forgiveness," saying that his vote could only be laid to "conscience or human fallibility." Others, though less penitent, were suffering from the same debilities. The board at its March 19 meeting voted eleven to seven against reconsideration of the appointment. A taxpayer's suit started court action, while in Albany an inquiry was voted into the activities of reds and other subversives in the New York City schools.

The decision of the court came rapidly, on March 31, in the form of an opinion delivered by Justice John E. McGeehan. McGeehan was a Catholic who had once tried to have the portrait of Martin Luther expunged from a city mural depicting the history of religions. Not surprisingly he now found Russell unfit for the post of professor. Russell's attitudes toward sex were "immoral and salacious"; besides, he was not a United States citizen. The next move was the mayor's. On April 6, when the LaGuardia budget was presented, it was noted that funds for the Bertrand Russell post had been dropped. This was in keeping, it was blandly explained, "with the policy to eliminate vacant positions." On the same day two thousand students at City College left their classes at noon in protest. At Carnegie Hall a rally urged restoration of the \$8,800 budget item and called for an appeal of the McGeehan decision.

At this point LaGuardia's course becomes least comprehensible. He set himself rigidly against appeal, and Chanler, the corporation counsel, announced under evident pressure that his office would not take the Russell case to a higher court. Chanler's face-saving defense of this position was that it was a poor case on which to base an appeal; there was "the gravest danger" that it might be affirmed. He refused also to permit other counsel to take over. The Board of Higher Education thereupon flouted the mayor by naming special counsel of its own, top lawyers from the conservative law firm of Root, Clark, Bushby, and Ballantine. At the University of California, meanwhile, Russell found his post barred to him when he sought to continue there rather than to subvert New Yorkers.

The strains resulting from the mayor's stand were intense, both within and outside his official family. John Dewey, the noted educator, wrote LaGuardia a letter which must have hurt. After expressing shock at the mayor's refusal to allow an appeal, he stated, "I have regarded you as a person who could be counted on to do the straightforward thing independent of political pressure." Burlingham was deeply dismayed. His letter of April 18 is worth quoting at length:

I strongly urge you to direct Chanler to consent to appeal. I seriously

doubt his right to tell the Board of Education they cannot appeal and I regard this refusal . . . as high-handed. . . .

You know how foolish I think the Department of Philosophy and the Board of Higher Education were in nominating and appointing Russell, and how abhorrent Russell's doctrines are to me. But why should a man with your record in a free country do to the CCNY what the Nazis have done to Heidelberg and Bonn?

Your attempts to dispose of the case while it was in the courts was bad enough; but to prevent the Board appealing to higher courts is far worse. . . .

It is not like *you*.

To this cry from the heart LaGuardia's reply was a disingenuous brush-off. "The pressure groups are certainly bearing down on you," the mayor wrote. "A lawyer has advised his client (the mayor) not to appeal, and the client has accepted. . . . That is all there is to that."

The actual relations between "the lawyer" and "the client" are suggested by a letter of April 27 to Chanler. Referring to a "memo *re* the Russell case," evidently suggesting some means to placate the liberal groups, LaGuardia thus addressed his corporation counsel:

In reference to your memo *re* the Russell case, it might be becoming to a scrivener in the office of a barrister in the 18th century, but utterly unworthy of a law officer in the greatest city in the world. . . . The city's law department is pettifogging on technical procedural matters. The city provides third-grade clerks for that purpose. . . . I fear you are under a misapprehension as to the duties of your office and the responsibilities which go with these duties. Further correspondence will not be helpful; nor is it desirable.

Avoidance of an open break with the corporation counsel was fortunate for the LaGuardia administration. Chanler evidently was

(Thank you, JOHN JACKANICZ)

(12) Another by Ronald Clark, as reported in...

PUBLISHERS' WEEKLY

BERTRAND RUSSELL AND HIS WORLD

Ronald Clark. Thames & Hudson (Norton, dist.). \$14.95 ISBN 0-500-13070-1

Clark wrote an earlier extended biography of Russell (1975, "The Life of Bertrand Russell"), but this present compact life story is an excellent rendering of the 98 years of his subject's very active life and packs much information into less than 100 pages of text. Russell's childhood in Richmond Park was a tranquil one, his years at Cambridge were active and his work as a mathematician resulted in "Principia Mathematica." It was in 1918, as a war protester, that he served his first prison term and his career as a gadfly of the Establishment began. He lectured widely in the U.S., married four times and won a Nobel prize for literature. The 105 black-and-white illustrations have been carefully selected, and they illuminate the text perfectly. They include rare photos of T. S. Eliot, D. H. Lawrence and Wittgenstein—as well as of Russell's wives and children. A model of popular biography.

[September 28]

(Thank you, PETER CRANFORD)

BERTRAND RUSSELL AND HIS WORLD

By Ronald Clark

Thames and Hudson, \$14.95

To accomplish great things and create an individual style, it is probably no hindrance to issue from a ruling class line and spend 98 years sentient upon the earth. Godfathered by John Stuart Mill, Bertrand Russell arrived in 1872, was orphaned early, and was subsequently brisk-walked into manhood by his austere and formidable grandparents. Next there was Cambridge, and soon after that lasting fame from his collaboration with Alfred North Whitehead on the monumental *Principia Mathematica*, published between 1910 and 1913.

Russell proved that certain ancient logical paradoxes were fundamental to mathematics, generating roughly the same seismographic shock wave in mathematical logic as Einstein's Relativity Theory was to produce in physics. "It is passion that has made my intellect clear," Russell wrote, "absolute unbridled Titanic passion . . . that has made me never stop to ask myself if the work was worth doing . . . [or] care if no human being ever read a word of it." It was also a passion for avoiding first wife Alice.

There would be four marriages and many affairs—those with Ottoline Morrell and Colette Maleson were the most important and

able to adjust his conscience to the mayor's interpretation of "the duties of his office." No doubt he did believe that in the hysterical atmosphere of the moment an appeal would risk confirmation. He must have understood, too, the physical strain under which the mayor was laboring. Dr. George Baehr, the mayor's personal physician, was forbidding him to make any appointments at night. Mitzi Somach found the mayor's conduct of office affairs too burdensome to endure further; she left quietly at this time, realizing only afterward that he had been an ill man. Unchanged in his affection, Burlingham wrote *LaGuardia* in May, "I am so worried that you are not taking proper care of yourself. Here you are, when you should be resting, in so many activities and giving so much of yourself to each of them."

The Russell affair came to its conclusion in the fall. Russell had by then accepted a teaching post with the Barnes Foundation in Merion, Pennsylvania, and the Board of Higher Education at its October meeting voted fifteen to two to drop the case. A final word in this inglorious episode may be left to Russell himself, who broke a dignified silence to answer a letter in the *Times* charging that he ought to have withdrawn voluntarily from the City College appointment:

If I had considered only my own interests and inclinations, I should have retired at once. But it would have been cowardly and selfish. . . . I'd have tacitly assented to the proposition that substantial groups shall be allowed to drive out of public office an individual whose opinions, race, or nationality they find repugnant. . . . In a democracy it is necessary that people should learn to endure having their sentiments outraged. Minority groups already endure this. . . . If it is once admitted that there are opinions toward which tolerance need not extend, the whole basis of toleration is destroyed.

VILLAGE VOICE Literary Supplement October 1981

enduring couplings. There would be late-in-life children, a school for tots, treatises on sexual freedom, and, in 1940, a disgraceful ruling by the N.Y. State Supreme Court outlawing Russell's City University appointment on the grounds of immorality and atheism. That sexual desire was both ecstatic and evanescent was a paradox with which Russell never fully made peace. To explain his appetites, he theorized that he could not remain physically attracted to a woman for more than seven or eight years and then spent his life proving it—a bit of casuistry he would never have permitted himself in logic.

Russell stood (and lost) in the Wimbledon by-election of 1907 as a candidate supporting the Women's Suffrage Society. He was a pacifist during World War I and went to jail for his views. And although a Socialist (sometimes), by the 1950s Russell had become an ardent Russiaphobe, at one stage even advocating "preventive war" with the Soviets. But as the cold war continued, Russell returned to his pacifist stand, his white mane becoming a symbol of the British movements to ban the bomb and end intervention in Vietnam. Explaining why he devoted the later part of his life entirely to politics, Russell said, "What is the truth on logic does not matter two pins if there is no one alive to know it."

Russell's enormous productivity—he wrote and wrote and wrote, usually 3000 words a day,

earning the majority of his income as a journalist and freelancer—and the grand sweep of events in which he participated are always thrilling to read about in Ronald Clark's vigorous narratives. The present volume distills his consistently juicy 700-page biog of 1975 (Knopf, \$15), into a 100-page aperitif with generous side order of illustration. Pheromone-chocked Russell looks, of all things, like Jimmy Cricket. And in an Augustus John portrait, Ottoline Morrell is positively predatory, her menacing tongue peeking out beneath long incisors. Ottoline was the original of D. H. Lawrence's venomously penned Hermione in *Women In Love*, and one sort of gets a feel for what he saw.

Clark's new book alters two aspects of his earlier story: Ralph Schoenman, Russell's enigmatic (maybe sinister) secretary, now appears to have had less influence over Russell, and the discord between Russell and Colette Maleson is presented as arising from her infidelity rather than his insatiableness. But clear-headed and engaging as this volume is, it's much too meager for such an expansive life as Russell's. "I do so hate to leave this world," he said a few days before his death. One is loathe to leave this vital and various life too. I recommend the '75 book for better and more.

—Laurie Stone

(Thank you, WARREN SMITH)

(12a) ...and as recommended by DON JACKANICZ:

At perhaps the height of Russell's fame and public acceptance, a picture biography, Bertrand Russell, O.M. by H. W. Leggett appeared in 1950. Although difficult to locate today, this book served as the only biography of Russell until Bertrand Russell, The Passionate Sceptic by Alan Wood was published in 1957. Now, Bertrand Russell And His World by Ronald Clark, author of the immense The Life of Bertrand Russell (1976), has arrived, owing much to both the Leggett volume in terms of format and the earlier Clark volume in terms of content. Format: Bertrand Russell And His World consists of about two-thirds text and one-third photographs; the illustrations, many of them never before published, complement the text excellently. Content: obviously based on research which yielded the first, longer Clark volume, this book distills the author's earlier, perhaps overly detailed, narrative to provide an engaging sketch of Russell's public and private lives. This is not a "coffee table book", which might well apply to The Life of Bertrand Russell in Pictures and his own Words (compiled by Christopher Farley and David Hodgson). It offers a reader new to Russell a pleasing way of gaining introductory biographical knowledge. And it offers more knowledgeable Russell readers a reinforcing review of facts already known, plus perhaps overlooked incidents and details and wonderful photographs.

BRS DOCTORAL GRANT

(13) The following announcement was sent to some 25 American, Canadian and U.K. universities in September and October:

Announcing
The Bertrand Russell Society's
1982 DOCTORAL GRANT

The Bertrand Russell Society will award a doctoral grant of \$500 to help defray expenses of a currently enrolled doctoral candidate in any field whose proposed dissertation best gives promise of dealing in a significant way with the thought, life, or times of Bertrand Russell.

The candidate is required to send to the Society:

- (1) an abstract of the theme of the dissertation and of the plan of study;
- (2) a letter from the chairman of the candidate's department which states that all work for the doctorate has been completed except the dissertation, and that the topic of the dissertation has received academic approval;
- (3) a letter from the dissertation advisor evaluating the applicant and the plan of study;
- (4) a signed statement saying that if the candidate is awarded the grant, he/she will provide the Society, at its expense, with a copy of the complete dissertation as approved by the candidate's department.

Applications and supporting documents should reach Professor Hugh S. Moorhead, Chairman, Philosophy Dept., Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, IL 60625, by May 15, 1982. The results of the competition will be announced in June 1982.

HUMAN RIGHTS

(14) Dyson on involvement. He is Professor of Physics, School of Natural Sciences, at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. He is the author of Disturbing the Universe. From The New York Review of Books (4/30/81) p. 43:

Winner

The following essay will appear as an introduction to Mark Ya. Azbel's book Refusenik: Trapped in the Soviet Union, to be published at the end of April by Houghton Mifflin.

Freeman J. Dyson

Mark Azbel is one of the genuine heroes of our time, worthy to stand on the stage of history with Andrei Sakharov and Alexander Solzhenitsyn. I met him first in Moscow in 1956 when he was shy and thin, a brilliant young physicist

rising rapidly through the ranks of the Soviet scientific establishment. He and I had worked independently on the same problem in solid-state physics. His solution was more general and more powerful than mine. I knew then that he would become an important scientist. I had no inkling that he would become a

famous dissident. His book describes the human background of his life: the hardships of childhood in wartime Siberia, the joys and sorrows of becoming a full member of the privileged Soviet intelligentsia, the gradual growth of awareness of his Jewish roots, the transfer of his loyalties from Russia to

Israel, the decision to emigrate, the drama of his five-year leadership of the group of Jewish dissidents in Moscow, and the final safe arrival in the promised land with wife and daughter and cat.

Two aspects of the book make it unique as a historical document. In Book I, Azbel gives us an authoritative record of the vicissitudes of Soviet science during the post-Stalin era. The record is based primarily on his first-hand knowledge of the leading physicists and of the Party hacks with whom they had to struggle. But his interests and his knowledge extend far beyond physics, into all areas of Soviet intellectual life. And his understanding of the hidden sources of power and influence give his record a depth that is lacking in accounts written by outsiders.

In Book II we have a record of the duel that was fought, in the secret chambers of the KGB, between Azbel and the various KGB interrogators who tried to break down his resistance. This duel is similar in many ways to the duel described in Arthur Koestler's novel *Darkness at Noon*, forty years earlier. Koestler's hero, Rubashov, is one of the old Bolshevik leaders of the 1917 revolution. Stalin's policemen succeed in breaking his spirit and persuade him to incriminate himself and his friends before they execute him. Azbel was given the same treatment. He tells me that he has never read *Darkness at Noon*, and I therefore accept as accurate his memory of the many details of his interroga-

tions, which faithfully echo the interrogations of Rubashov. There is only one essential difference between Rubashov's duel and Azbel's. Rubashov lost and Azbel won.

How could it have happened that Azbel won? There are two main reasons. In the first place, Azbel is gifted with superhuman courage and presence of mind. When, in the course of his interrogations, he is brought before a group including a full general of the KGB and the Prosecutor-General of Moscow, his immediate reaction is to think: "I suppose it was not until this confrontation with such a formidable array of top-ranking authorities that I fully realized what a threat we posed to them." Which of us ordinary mortals would entertain such a thought at such a time?

The final turning point of his duel comes when he is interrogated by an official of even higher rank, Sergei Ivanovitch Gavrillov, the liaison man between the KGB and the Central Committee. Here Azbel takes the offensive. "You'll encounter some new troubles, which, I assure you, you don't anticipate. Either you'll have to let me go, or you'll have to imprison me for a long term; you won't have any other choice. You seem to know a lot about me, Sergei Ivanovitch. You probably realize that I'm not lying... So there are the alternatives for you. Which do you prefer: simply to let me go, or to create another martyr to arouse the sympathies of the scientific community? It seems to me that in this case our interests coin-

cide."

The second reason Azbel won is that the Soviet establishment has in some sense lost its nerve. Forty years ago, the interrogators of Rubashov would not have been intimidated by Azbel's defiance. They would not have hesitated to add one more martyr to the millions they had already made. They would have replied to his recalcitrance by sending him down to be shot in the cellar or sending him away to rot in a labor camp. Now, forty years later, things have changed. The Soviet regime, even in the innermost recesses of the KGB, is unsure of itself. Azbel prevailed over his enemies because he was prepared to die and they were unprepared to kill. This is a historical development of profound importance, not only for the future of Soviet society but for the future of all mankind.

We in the West have a double responsibility, which we cannot evade. In the first place, as Azbel's story makes clear, we have a responsibility to give practical and moral support to individuals who are fighting for their lives and their freedom within the Soviet system and who call to us for help. In the second place, we have an even greater responsibility to avoid doing harm to the millions of loyal Soviet citizens who do not ask for our help and can only be endangered by it. In particular, we must think of the plight of the multitude of Jews who are striving to build a future for themselves and their children in the Soviet Union and for whom any action tending to identify Jews in general as

Western protégés represents a deadly threat. Above all, we must avoid repeating the mistakes of 1918-1920, when the well-meaning but blundering attempts of the United States and other Western countries to help the opponents of the Soviet regime ended in the strengthening of our enemies and the massacre of our friends.

Confronted with this double responsibility, what should we do? Whether we decide to involve ourselves or not to involve ourselves in the struggle for human rights in the Soviet Union, we are gambling with other people's lives. I have generally believed that it is wise for us to avoid involvement, remembering the words of Solzhenitsyn: "I put no hopes in the West—indeed, no Russian ever should. If we ever become free it will only be by our own efforts." But now Mark Azbel has convinced me that there are occasions when Western involvement is practically effective and morally justifiable. I regret now that I gave no help to Azbel during his years of struggle. I still am afraid that our impatient attempts to force the Soviet regime to adopt our alien standards may result in halting the slow internal evolution of the regime toward more humane patterns of behavior. We must weigh the consequences of intervention in each case as best we can, never acting in a spirit of self-righteous ignorance, giving help only when we can clearly see that the people we help are like Mark Azbel, people who have the strength and the courage to become free by their own efforts. □

(15)

The Prime Minister supports the Wilberforce Council's campaign.

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS)



Mr. Jack Lennard, co-ordinator of The Wilberforce Council, presents the Prime Minister, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, with a copy of "Freedom Call" during his visit to No. 10 Downing Street.

Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister, has expressed her support for the worldwide campaign launched by The Wilberforce Council, to reunite Soviet Jews with their families who have settled in Israel. She was briefed on the plight of some of the 500 split families by Mr. Jack Lennard, when he was invited to Number 10 to discuss the reunification campaign. The Prime Minister said "This campaign is one which deserves the support and encouragement of all who attach importance to the humanitarian principles underlying the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. It is important that the efforts of government in this field are paralleled by those of voluntary organisations and individual men and women. Only in this way can the depth of feeling in the United Kingdom about abuses of human rights be brought home to those responsible."

Please help The Wilberforce Council for Human Rights, Salisbury Hall, Park Road, Hull HU3 1TD, England.

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

(16) Pugwash 1981, as reported by The New York Times(9/4/81) p. A3:

Scientists From 40 Nations Urge Freeze on Nuclear Arsenals

By HENRY GINGER

Special to The New York Times

BANFF, Alberta, Sept. 3 — Alarmed over the intensification of the arms race, scientists from the United States, the Soviet Union and 38 other countries appealed here today for a freeze on the present levels of nuclear arsenals by the two major powers.

The scientists urged "an immediate moratorium on new weapons deployment," followed quickly by agreements on weapons production and testing, a ban on all nuclear tests and a cutoff in production of fissile material. This so-called strategy of suffocation was first proposed by Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau of Canada three years ago.

Members of the Pugwash movement, a 24-year-old meeting ground for scientists seeking to find ways to limit the arms race and reduce international tensions, talked here in private for close to a week in one of the most pessimistic moods since the movement began in the little Nova Scotia town of Pugwash in 1957.

The Nuclear War Fallacy

The 133 experts in the natural and social sciences who gathered here on Friday for the 31st conference of its kind declared that in 12 months since last year's meeting in Amsterdam "the nuclear arms race has become still more sav-

age."

The group noted that strategic arms limitation talks had been interrupted and other disarmament negotiations "have stopped completely or are at an impasse." Alarm was also expressed over what the group saw as the growing notion that limited nuclear wars can be fought and won.

"It is a fallacy to believe that nuclear war can be won," the scientists said, adding that there was a wide feeling among them that "the leaders of the nuclear powers should explicitly deny military doctrines which legitimize limited nuclear warfare."

The group continued, "The Soviet and American Governments should reaffirm their intention to maintain equal security at more stable and lower force levels."

Much of the anxiety appeared to stem from moves by the Reagan Administration toward an arms buildup at home and in Europe, and the nine Soviet scholars who attended did nothing to discourage this view. At a public forum in Calgary on Sunday, Georgi A. Arbatov, head of the Soviet Institute for United States and Canadian Studies, declared that "the only obstacle on the way to arms control is the position of the United States."

Senator Charles Percy, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Commit-

tee, pointed out that the atmosphere created by the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan had made Senate approval of the most recent arms accord with the Soviet Union impossible. He stressed, however, the Administration's commitment to arms control and reduction.

Prof. Herbert York of the University of California at San Diego, who was the American negotiator for a comprehensive test ban treaty until the talks were suspended last November, said in an interview that the toughening of American policy "did not take place in a vacuum," and he pointed to events in Iran and Afghanistan. Nonetheless, he said there was a perception in the Pugwash group that the Reagan Administration was "not sufficiently informed about or interested in" disarmament questions and had placed a relatively low priority on them.

The group expressed particular concern over the threatened arms buildup in Europe and said "it is essential that serious negotiations on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe begin soon before it is too late to set low limits." But when proposals were made to dismantle the Soviet SS-20 missile system in exchange for an American pledge not to deploy American Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Europe, the Soviet participants resisted this as unbalanced. They were

understood to have insisted that the West's present forward-based systems had to be involved in any accord on mutual reductions in Europe.

'Rough Parity' With Soviet

The scientists agreed that at present there was "rough parity" in the deterrent capacities of the United States and the Soviet Union and warned against efforts to "destabilize" this balance. They were particularly concerned about the introduction by both sides of missile systems that threaten each side's deterrent ability and provided "incentives for starting a nuclear war."

The group said that the highly accurate counterstrike missile systems "are particularly dangerous since they create mutual fears of a first strike."

There was general resistance by the Soviet scientists to any direct or implied criticism of actions by the Soviet Union or of countries allied to it. Participants in the Pugwash movement nominally represent only themselves, but some Western scientists acknowledged that the Soviet contingent is answerable to officials at home. In particular, there is a Soviet commitment to publish Pugwash statements without change and the Soviet representatives were therefore sensitive to any Pugwash statement that could run counter to official policy.

(17) From Pugwash 1980, a talk by Hideki Yukawa, as it appeared in The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, January '81:

The absolute evil



Hideki Yukawa, Nobel laureate, is emeritus professor of physics at Kyoto University, Japan (606). He presented this address to the 30th Pugwash Conference.

A quarter of a century has passed since I signed the Russell-Einstein Manifesto. I am now deeply worried about the present world situation which has not improved in the intervening years, but has rather entered a more tragic phase.

For a short period tension between the East and the West seemed to be relaxed and dialogues on peace between the United States and the Soviet Union became more active. Recently, however, there has been a retrogressive move to Cold War times. This is obviously against the spirit of the Manifesto. It is not only short-sighted but also dangerous for scientists to try to close the way to international dialogue. Clearly, free exchange of opinion internationally

and domestically is vitally important for peace as well as for the progress of science itself. If we give up our efforts for mutual understanding, there remains only confrontation through military power.

It is now quite evident what will come of military confrontation between the major powers, or mutual deterrence based on nuclear weapons. A balance of terror with huge and highly sophisticated nuclear weapon systems, far beyond comparison with the state of the world 25 years ago, seems to have reached an almost intolerable stage. Recently, horrible accidents surrounding nuclear strategic systems have repeatedly been reported. I believe this to be the sternest warning that the danger of the nuclear annihilation of human beings by an unintended major war has now become a reality.

Why are we human beings still treading such a foolish and pernicious path? What can we gain from the spiralling arms race? With much regret I have to state that even sci-

entists gathering at Pugwash Conferences in pursuit of world peace cannot avoid some responsibility for this matter. One of the fundamental causes for the present awful situation of the arms race, I think, is that we have rejected as unrealistic the original idea of Bertrand Russell that nuclear weapons are an absolute evil and must be eliminated. In the process, we have accepted the illusion of keeping peace with nuclear weapons. This is in principle wrong and is unintentionally or intentionally affected by vested interests with respect to possession of nuclear weapons. I am afraid that any peace design based on vested interests of nuclear weapon states cannot be persuasive to many of the non-nuclear weapon states.

Another fatal cause may be that we have been so indolent, if not rather timid, in pursuit of a new world order where one can live without armaments, while we have been supporting complete and general disarmament. Designing such a new world order is indeed a difficult

task, because it will be associated with some change of the present political status. I believe, however, short-sighted technical manipulation without a future prospect will not be able to resolve the present tragic situation.

A future scenario is not explicitly depicted in the Manifesto. Insofar as I know, however, Russell and Einstein were considering this problem. In fact, in order to control the sovereignty of states both were thinking of a world federation, an idea with which I am also sympathetic in principle. This idea may still be premature, but it should be elaborated upon in collaboration with experts from different fields. At the Pugwash Conferences in the past decades, even discussing such a problem has been put aside in favor of detailed arguments regarding the technical aspects of arms control.

I therefore appeal to all of you to make a fresh start based on the original idea of the Russell-Einstein Manifesto and cooperate to implement it however difficult it may be. □

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS)

(18) The CND is alive and well -- and living in London and on the Continent.

Here's what BR said about the CND -- the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament -- in 1969:

The CND was publicly launched at a large meeting at the Central Hall, Westminster, on February 17, 1958. So many people attended this meeting that there had to be overflow meet-

ings. It seems now to many people as if the CND has been part of the national scene from the beginning of time, and it has lost its lustre and energy through familiarity.

But if the CND had "lost its lustre and energy" 11 years after its founding, it certainly snapped back in 1981 ...and into the headlines. This is from the New York Times (10/25/81) p.3:

150,000 in London Rally Against Bomb

By WILLIAM BORDERS

Special to The New York Times

LONDON, Oct. 24 — About 150,000 people marched through the heart of London today in a peaceful demonstration demanding nuclear disarmament.

Carrying placards depicting the horrors of nuclear war and chanting "Ban the bomb!" the marchers wound their way from the north bank of the Thames, near Trafalgar Square, to Hyde Park for a three-hour rally, blocking automobile traffic all along the route.

The rally, like a similar one in Bonn two weeks ago, reflected rising antinuclear feeling that is spreading across Europe, especially among the young.

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, which sponsored the protest here, says that its membership in Britain has increased tenfold — from 3,000 to 30,000 — since early 1980.

Michael Foot, the leader of the Labor Party and a longtime campaigner for nuclear disarmament, said at the Hyde Park rally that the goal was to recapture in the 1980's the fervor of the huge peace rallies in Britain 20 years ago.

"This time we must carry it through to the end and get rid of all nuclear weapons everywhere," he said, speaking from a platform decorated with a sign that read, "Together We Shall Stop the Bomb."

Although the rally was not specifi-

cally anti-American, there was an anti-American tone in many of the signs and speeches, including that of Mr. Foot, who said:

"Ronald Reagan says there can be a limited nuclear war. But any idea of limited nuclear war in Europe is an insanity and an outrage. We will take this message from one corner of Britain to the other, from one corner of Europe to the other, from one corner of the world to the other until we rid the world of nuclear weapons."

At its annual convention last month, the Labor Party formally committed itself to nuclear disarmament, although that policy is opposed by a substantial faction within the party.

Several of the speakers today, expressing a fear that is basic to the recent resurgence of antinuclear feeling in Europe, said that when Americans speak of a limited nuclear war they mean a nuclear war that is "limited to us, the Europeans," excluding the two superpowers.

The protesters, most of them apparently middle class and under the age of 40, came from all over Britain on special trains and buses. Many brought babies or young children, their carriages bearing such slogans as "Let Me Be Allowed to Grow Up" and "I Want to Live."

The crowd estimate was made by Scotland Yard, which had a helicopter hovering overhead all afternoon.

There were reports of similar anti-nuclear demonstrations from Rome, Bonn and Paris.

HUMANISM & ITS ADVERSARIES

(19) From the New York Times Review of the Week (9/6/81) p. 18E:

Humanists Begin to Rally In Ancient Battle of Creeds

By WRAT HERBERT

Several volunteers at the Natchitoches Parish Hospital in Louisiana surprised the hospital administration last year by resigning in protest against the hiring of a philosopher from nearby Northwestern State University as "humanist-in-residence." At the same time in Maine, the federally funded State Humanities Council was fending off attacks on its activities by *The Maine Paper*, a conservative weekly tabloid. Somewhat earlier, in Virginia, Prof. Robert S. Alley abdicated the chairmanship of the Religion Department of the University of Richmond at the urging of the administration; Mr. Alley had come under fire from the local Baptist community, which condemned his biblical scholarship as heretical.

Such incidents are part of an increasingly visible campaign, conducted by the new Christian right and spearheaded by Moral Majority, against a force they label "secular humanism." Last week, Yale University's president, A. Bartlett Giamatti, formerly professor of a humanistic discipline — literature — counterattacked with a speech to incoming freshmen, in which he excoriated the activities of the religious right as a threat to traditions of free intellectual inquiry.

Just who are these humanists who have become the target of such displeasure? There is, in fact, an organized group of secular humanists, the American Humanist Association, which traces its origins to the 1933 Humanist Manifesto. The humanist credo has evolved since then, but the basic tenets of the organization, which includes notable academics and intellectuals, remain intact: a belief in

rational man as the source of his own salvation and a rejection of the supernatural. According to Sidney Hook, professor emeritus of philosophy at New York University and a long-time humanist, "In rejecting the supernatural, humanism maintains that moral judgments are valid independent of revelation. That is what Moral Majority is attacking." The latest statement, the Secular Humanist Declaration, issued by the kindred Council for Democratic and Secular Humanism in Buffalo last October, is explicitly critical of fundamentalist religions.

Aside from such associations, "humanist" is a gelatinous word. It could identify organized agnostics in New York, one of the liberal Christian world views, or a humanities professor who might or might not be a religious believer. Indeed, Moral Majority spokesmen concede that the quarrel extends far beyond card-carrying humanists.

In his book, "The Battle for the Mind," Tim LaHaye, a San Diego Baptist Minister and Moral Majority board member, argues that 275,000 secular humanists now control public debate by controlling the media, government, schools, colleges and universities. Moral Majority further contends that humanism constitutes a civil religion in the United States. Paul Kurtz, professor of philosophy at the State University of New York in Buffalo and author of *Humanist Manifesto II* (1973) and the *Secular Humanist Declaration*, agrees that humanist attitudes dominate American life, but only in the sense, he says, that humanism is committed to intellectual tolerance. "The fundamentalist attack is directed toward the idea and values of the university, which they view as a secular institution,"

he said. "What they object to is modernity."

Roots in the Renaissance

To the extent that humanism stands for skepticism and open inquiry, Professor Kurtz and others argue, today's cultural skirmish is the latest in an ancient battle of creeds. Humanism traces its roots to the Renaissance and the rediscovery of the secular Greek and Roman texts that ultimately led to the enlightenment and scientific revolution. But Jaroslav Pelikan, Yale University professor of Christian history, argues that humanism and religious faith are not incompatible.

Professor Pelikan also observes that the position of the Christian right has many historical antecedents and can itself be traced to the Renaissance. "We call it the Reformation," he said. Suspicion about rational discourse must always be troubling to a university, he added, because the university depends on rational discourse and the possibility of examining and re-examining the fundamentals. "The unexamined life is not worth living," Socrates said. He, by the way, also ran into this."

Such sentiments are widely shared in the academic community, but there's no consensus on whether fundamentalist attitudes undermine intellectual inquiry. Martin Marty, professor of Christian history at the University of Chicago, notes that the brunt of the attack from the Christian right "will be felt in the elementary schools and local libraries." In 1980, he said, 1,200 communities reported citizen pressure for censorship, in contrast to 300 communities in 1979.

More to the point, Professor Marty said, is that the Christian right is fostering a general anti-intel-

lectual climate. "Giarmatti sees liberals in the academy as unwilling to defend pluralism and the free marketing of ideas — and he's right," he said. "Why is America so willing to forgo the diversity out of which so much good has come?"

Henry G. Yost, president of the American Association of University Professors, also said that the university cannot be divorced from the rest of society and that the A.A.U.P. has for this reason

taken a stand against state legislation requiring the teaching of "creationism" alongside evolution in the schools. "Students don't arrive at college out of the womb," he said. "They come out of the public school system, and if they come with the idea that science is something which it is not, they're going to have trouble with higher education."

But the acid test, Mr. Yost and others argue, will

come in the humanities themselves — the disciplines traditionally concerned with values. "We teach our students to be critical, and if we succeed, they will be critical of all values and will ultimately develop their own set of values," Mr. Yost said. "If one begins with the fundamentalist assumption that there is one demonstrable set of values, one is not free to question."

Also see (7b).

LOCAL MEETINGS

- (20) A picnic in the park -- planned by BOB DAVIS for Southern California members and guests, in Brand Park, Glendale, on August 30th -- was well-attended and well-liked, reports KATHY FJERMEDAL. Members present -- besides Kathy and Bob -- included LOU ACHESON, NORM & LYN BAKER, JACQUELINE BERTHON-PAYON, PHIL FREER, JOE GORMAN, MARK HARRYMAN, DON HYLTON, HARRY RUJA, and DAN WRAY.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

- (21) Joseph Nechvatal exhibited 8 drawings on "The Occult Power of Technology" at The Drawing Center, 137 Green St., NYC, Sept. 16 - Oct. 28. Another exhibit, "The Occult Power of Technology, Part II" will be held at P.S.1, 46-01 21st St., Long Island City, NY, Oct. 18 - Dec. 13. He is fabricating a large mural on the horrors of nuclear war to be permanently installed in Baltimore, with sound track and theatrical lighting, when fully funded. About half the funding has been raised; he'd like help in funding the rest. If you help, you will receive, * in appreciation, an original drawing, etc. His address: 18 No. Moore St., New York, NY 10013

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

- (22) ER and Husserl? Did ER have any contact with, or opinion about, the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl? A Polish student, Bogdan Tadzik, working on his thesis, would like to know. Please respond c/o the newsletter, address * on Page 1, bottom. We will forward your response to Poland.

DORA

- (23) From The Outlook, March 7, 1928:

Mrs. Bertrand Russell vs. the University of Wisconsin

MRS. BERTRAND RUSSELL, wife of Bertrand Russell, whose article appears in this issue of The Outlook, has found the open sesame to the front page. She has been denied, she says, the right to appear on a public platform by those who are in disagreement with her views. President Glenn Frank, of the University of Wisconsin, whom she holds responsible for this denial, presents a different version of the incident from that of her own. In a despatch to the New York "World" he says:

Neither the present existence nor the future guaranty of free speech for students and teachers at the University of Wisconsin is in any way involved in the Dora Russell episode.

My advice in the matter, which I declined to give until after members of the student committee had expressed their own doubt and reluctance respecting the lecture, rested

upon one consideration and one only—that the discussion and advocacy of free sexual relations both before and after marriage is an enterprise that good taste and a sense of propriety suggest should be staged elsewhere than before a mixed audience in a co-educational institution.

President Frank goes on to draw a not very happy comparison between taking a bath in a glass bath-tub and lecturing on sex before a mixed audience.

This is the way in which Mrs. Russell views the situation:

This insult to my personal integrity is unpardonable, especially as Frank's references to taking his bath in public show that his own mind is tortured by a sense of impropriety where the human body is concerned.

The younger generation do not feel this, but are besmirched by the attitude of their elders and forced to poisonous secrecy by prohibitions.

The younger generation was never so much in need of honest and sincere discussion of these problems. It is absolutely necessary to give them new values, as I am trying to do in speech and writing.

It may be debatable whether the hindsight of the student

council and of President Frank was justified by the character of the lecture which Mrs. Russell proposed to deliver. Certainly it is not debatable that the University would have avoided a great deal of unpleasant notoriety and Mrs. Russell's ideas would have been deprived of a great deal of publicity if it had permitted her, when once invited, to appear as scheduled. The decision to invite her would have been a question of good taste or a question of whether or not she had anything really valuable to offer. The invitation, once withdrawn, immediately made her a martyr in the cause of free speech—a distinction to which she is not entitled.

It is rather amusing to find that while the controversy over Mrs. Russell rages in the press and while President Glenn Frank is defending his exclusion of Mrs. Russell from the University halls, Columnist Glenn Frank, who writes a syndicated daily feature for the press, takes occasion to quote with

(Thank you, TOM STANLEY)

approval the following phrases of Thoreau:

The wisest man preaches no doctrines; he has no scheme; he sees no rafter, not even a cobweb, against the heavens. It is clear sky.

No way of thinking or doing, however ancient, can be trusted without proof.

How vain to try to teach youth or anybody truths. They can only learn them after their own fashion, and when they are ready.

If I were consciously to join any party, it would be that which is the most free to entertain thought.

Fresh air is the surest poison that has yet been discovered for half-baked ideas. In fact, it is more than a poison, for it exercises a selective power between half-baked and well-baked ideas which the wisest of any generation cannot individually possess.

POPPER

(24) From World Press Review, August 1981, pp.33-34:

The Statesmen's Philosopher

Karl Popper's formula for minimizing political error

—PAUL HEINZ KOESTER—

Paul-Heinz Koester is Editor of the weekly "Stern" of Hamburg, from which this is excerpted.

British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher is refreshed by the teachings of economist Adam Smith, and France's Giscard d'Estaing gets spiritual nourishment from the writings of Voltaire. When Germany's Helmut Schmidt goes on vacation he carries books by Vienna-born philosopher Karl Popper.

Karl Raimond Popper, once a construction worker and carpenter's apprentice, is the West's most important living political thinker. Some of his works have been published in twenty-two languages. He is revered almost as a political philosopher, and some assert that the influence of this scholar, who lives in England, extends "even into contemporary German political issues and party policies."

Popper considers himself a theoretician of science rather than a political thinker, and he is far more interested in natural sciences than in the social sciences. He is the founder of critical rationalism, a theory of knowledge that is also a "critical method for eliminating error"—a method that, through the attempt to refute theses and theories, discovers their errors. He destroyed the century-old notion that scientific knowledge is unassailable.

Induction, which is used by scientists for arriving at knowledge, means the observation of separate, recurring facts and events to derive universally valid laws of Nature and theories. A universal statement gains validity by the number of observations on which it is based. Popper

showed that inductive reasoning from the particular to the universal does not work. An observation that ten swans are white tells us only that ten swans are white, not that all swans are.

Popper's critical rationalism teaches that however much an endeavor fails to prove the truth of an assertion, we nonetheless come closer to the truth by seeking our errors and attempting to eliminate them. In doing so it is even possible to discover the truth. We simply can never be entirely certain of it.

Popper's teaching applies equally to political theories. In contrast to the natural scientists, who abandon a theory once it has failed, politicians tend to adhere dogmatically — uncritically, according to Popper—to a theory known to be unusable. The consequences are repression, suffering, and war. Popper therefore demands, "We should let our erroneous theories, instead of people, die."

Sir Karl, who was knighted by the Queen of England, supports the concept of a democracy in which political ideas compete with one another. In this "open society" only "reasonable" reforms should be possible—only those that can be tested for their success or failure. We can never predict all the consequences of our actions, Popper says, but we can correct many errors if we proceed in small, comprehensible steps.

He formulated a series of principles that should be heeded by every political reformer. For example, he believes in eliminating specifically deplorable conditions such as housing shortages and unemployment, rather than making decisions in the name of an abstract goal such as that of

"general well-being."

His vision of an ideal politician is a "social technician" who attacks problems like an engineer. The engineer's task is to construct a machine that functions and then to keep it going. The social technician has a similar task: "to design social institutions and to reshape or preserve already existing social institutions."

The social engineer may have a conception of the ideal society, but he guards against "the new planning of society as a whole." His critical reason tells him that such a complex undertaking would unavoidably lead to a situation in which causes could no longer be distinguished by effects and in which the consequences of actions could no longer be known.

The main cause of deplorable social conditions and political injustice in democratic States, in Popper's view, is lack of insight into the piecemeal nature of political action. "Avoidable evils often are not avoided," he says, "because most politicians do not realize that to err is human and that it is only possible to learn from self-criticism and the correction of one's mistakes."

Popper's message has been received in Bonn. Years ago German Foreign Minister Ralf Dahrendorf, a former Popper student, introduced some of his teacher's philosophy into party politics. And Helmut Schmidt, always endeavoring to cast ideological ballast overboard, advised politicians in the foreword to his book *Critical Rationalism and Social Democracy* to read not only Marx but also Popper.

The Chancellor and the thinker met last December. They discussed how critical rationalism might be applied to international policy, especially in areas of tension. Their meeting took place in the village of Penn, in Buckinghamshire, England. Popper has lived there for thirty years with his wife Hennie, rarely venturing from his modestly furnished home.

Popper's interest in contemporary politics is astonishingly slight. He neither owns a television set nor subscribes to a newspaper. He pays as little attention to the many articles and books preoccupied with his thinking. Otherwise, he explains,

he would get excited about them and "spend the whole day writing letters."

Popper's father, who was a lawyer, heightened his social conscience at an early age. Popper inherited a love of music from his mother. While still in public school, he browsed in his parents' library through works that would soon become decisive for him—the writings of John Locke, David Hume, Charles Darwin, Immanuel Kant, and Schopenhauer.

Popper endured "hours of hopeless boredom" in secondary school, which he left at seventeen without graduating. He enrolled at the University of Vienna, becoming a Marxist until he witnessed the shooting of several young, unarmed workers who were goaded by Communists into a clash with police. "It became clear to me that as a Marxist I bore some responsibility for the tragedy, at least in principle," he says in his autobiography.

"It was terrible to presume to knowledge which, on the basis of an uncritically accepted dogma, made it a duty to endanger the life of another person for a dream that possibly could never be realized. One may surely risk one's own life for such a thing but never another's."

The young philosopher, who worked in construction and carpentry before graduating from Vienna's Pedagogical Institute in 1928, had been preoccupied with questions of science theory following his rejection of Marxism. He found his way to critical rationalism mainly through involvement with the works of Isaac Newton and of Albert Einstein, who contradicted part of Newton's theory of gravitation.

The partial incompatibility of the two scientists' theories was confirmation of what the young thinker had long suspected: that no theories can be certain to be true; that inductive conclusions based on separate observations are not applicable to general laws of nature; and that the gathering of supportive data does not suffice to document the truth of a theory.

However, Vienna's school of logical positivists proposed verifiability of statements by experience as the distinction between sense and nonsense. A heated dispute evolved, for Popper declared re-

futability by observable facts to be the criterion for truth. In his view a theory that is claimed to be scientific must be testable. The more clearly it is restricted, the better it can be tested—indeed, there is no other way.

In 1934 Popper's book *Logic of Scientific Discovery* brought invitations to lecture in England, where he met the influential liberal economist August von Hayek and the renowned Bertrand Russell, whom Popper calls "the greatest philosopher since Kant." He later took a teaching position in New Zealand.

In London in 1945 he published *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, whose argu-

ments for democracy have a logical and polemical sharpness rare in philosophical literature. His shorter but equally important work, *The Poverty of Historicism*, which attacked "historicists" such as Hegel and Marx, appeared a year earlier.

Popper considers predictions about the future course of history "pure superstition." His most important counterargument: "The course of human history is strongly influenced by the growth of human knowledge." A prediction would have to take into consideration the growth of knowledge—for example, in atomic and energy research—but that is not possible, because no scientist can state

today what he will know only tomorrow.

In *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Popper tested Marx's explanation of the development toward a classless society. Marx asserted that tensions develop between the wealthy and the working class that lead to revolution, to the triumph of the proletariat, and eventually to a classless society. Popper counters that the last point above all cannot necessarily be concluded: After post-revolution disintegration of working-class solidarity, new classes can form—such as the party elite of the Soviet Union and the suffering class of the Gulag Archipelago.

With publication of *The Open Society*

Popper was invited to join the faculty of the famous London School of Economics and Political Science, where he taught logic and scientific methods for more than twenty years. Among his most important recent writings is *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*.

In this book he describes three worlds: the objective world of matter, the subjective world of consciousness, and the similarly objective world produced by the human spirit—ideas, theories, problems, and arguments. "The task of our consciousness," he says, "is to create a connection between the first and the third worlds."

As some recent BRS members may not know, Sir Karl is an Honorary Member of this Society.

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS)

NEW MEMBERS

(25) We welcome these new members:

NORMAN & LYN BAKER/403 S. Mesita Place/West Covina, CA 91791
 MICHAEL BALLYEAT/2923 Fulton St./Berkeley, CA 94705 (former '78 member #312 rejoins)
 PROF. ROBERT H. BELL/152 Ide Road/Williamstown, MA 01267 (English Dept., Williams College)
 MARY JO BLASCOVICH/352 N. George St./Millersville, PA 17551
 RICHARD L. BRADLEY/14912 Dickens St.(13)/Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

MICHAEL EMMET BRADY/9426 Flower St./Bellflower, CA 90706
 FRANK M. CAPUTO/503 Sherwood Road/Pittsburgh, PA 15221
 TIMOTHY CISSNER/1215 Harvard Blvd./Dayton, OH 45406
 CHARLES R. COCHRAN/PO Box 23422/Emory University/Atlanta, GA 30322
 ABE. M. COHEN, M.D./560 N St., S.W. (N904)/Washington, DC 20024 (former '79 member #387 rejoins)

DANIEL H. COHEN/3264 NE 158th/Portland, OR 97230
 PROF. EDNA DeANGELI/Maginnis Hall (9)/Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA 18015 (Classics Dept.)
 PASCAL DIETHELM/Possy/74380 Lucinges, France
 RICHARD FALLIN/153 W. 80th St. (4A)/New York, NY 10024
 WILLIAM FORD/87 Clearwater Drive/La Grange, CA 30240

JOSEPH & DIANE FREY/666 Spadino Av. (2205)/Toronto, Canada M5S 2H8
 JULIA GERMAN/601 W. 110 St. (5K6)/New York, NY 10025
 FRANCISCO GIRÓN/Preystr.20/2 Hamburg, 60, FRG/(West Germany) (full name, Spanish way: Francisco Girón Batres)
 J. D. A. GMELOCH/3971 Worthmor/Seaford, NY 11783
 JAMES L. GRIGGS/PO Box 965/Arcata, CA 95521

THOMAS GRUNDBERG/Utsättaregr. 149/S-222 47 LUND, SWEDEN
 MARK R. HARRYMAN/4457 Euclid Av./San Diego, CA 92115
 WILLIAM F. HONER/22480 West Road (108)/Woodhaven, MI 48183
 KEVIN R. JENKINS/102 Timber Lane/Collinsville, CT 06022
 IRENE S. KAUFMAN/1614 9th Av. West/Seattle, WA 98119

THOMAS LUCIA/103 Cogswell St./Haverhill, MA 01830
 JOSEPH MENNEN/Tulane Medical Center/1430 Tulane (Box A-51)/New Orleans, LA 70112
 MIRON POLIAKINE/23, Guatamala St./Jerusalem, Israel
 MARCUS & EVA POMICE/641 Fifth Av./New York, NY 10022
 JOHN B. SIKES, JR., M.D./c/o Overland Post/PO Box 0/2150 N. Main (6)/Red Bluff, CA 96080

CHARMAINE SOLDAT/653 N. Caswell (5)/Pomona, CA 91767
 JAMES V. TERRY/PO Box 7702/Stanford, CA 94305
 BILL TESTERMAN/518 East Main St./Rogersville, TN 37857
 JIMMIE A. TUCKER/PO Box 46587/Pass-A-Grille Beach, FL 33741
 JOHN VAN WISSEN/RR2/Alliston, Ont/Canada L0M 1A0

LINDA M. WEBB/RR 3, Box 7585/Farmington, ME 04938
 JAMEE MARIE WILLIAMS/PO Box 5283/Augusta, GA 30906 (daughter of BRS Member Olive Williams)

(26)

NEW ADDRESSES & OTHER CHANGES

When something is underlined>, only the underlined part is new (or corrected).

ADAM PAUL BANNER/PO Box 1733/Midland, MI 48640
 ROBERT V. BARBER/RR 2/Lyndon, KS 66451
 THOMAS BARKER/1670 E. El Norte Pkwy (77)/Escondido, CA 92027
 VINCENT BATTI, JR./5631 Elgin/Pittsburgh, PA 15206
 GEORGE BLAM/20 Arlington Av/St. James 11780

ERIC CARLEN/400 Kendrick Rd (410), Rochester, NY 14620
 Robert K. Davis/ 2501 Lake View Av./Los Angeles, CA 90039
 R. S. J. DAWSON/Treemont Apt. F304/2501 Westerland Dr./Houston, TX 77063
 BARRY GOLDMAN/225 Merton (203)/Detroit, MI 48203
 JOHN HAILU/Stonehaven Estates Rt-312/Brewster, NY 10509

DR. STEPHEN HAMBY/Rt. 1, Woodville, AL 35776
 STEVEN HISS/125 NE 39 Pl/Gainesville, FL 32601
 DONALD E. M. HYLTON/2040 Sherbourne (1)/Los Angeles, CA 90034
 GARY JACOBS/ ACD/KF (PA) /Scott AFB, IL 62225
 DR. VALERIE JANESICK/923 Mercer (8)/Albany, NY 12208

PROF. MARVIN KOHL/Philosophy Dept./State University College, Fredonia, NY 14063
 ROBERT LOMBARDI/209 Hutchinson Av.(1)/Buffalo, NY 14215
 DAVID MAKINSTER/329 E. Univ. Apts./Bloomington, IN 47401
 PIETER D. MASTERS/235 N. Cherry Av./Tucson, AZ 85719
 PETER MEDLEY/2247 S. 15th St./Milwaukee, WI 53215

KENNETH J. MYLOTT/817-2 Arkansas St./Tallahassee, FL 32304
 KARIN E. PETERSON/2323 S. 31 St./La Crosse, WI 54601
 JACK RAGSDALE/4461 - 23rd St./San Francisco, CA 94114
 BRAD ROBISON/501 Forest St./Oakland, CA 94618
 RICHARD SHORE/1502 Dakota Drive(34)/Fargo, ND 58102

JOSEPH SLATER/335 S. Negley Av./Pittsburgh, PA 15232
 CHARLES M. SPENCER/PO Box 4686/Modesto, CA 95352
 DAVID SUSMAN/6115 Wildwood (203)/Westland, MI 48185
 DENISE WEILAND/College Internationale/1, Avenue du Dr. A. Pascal/06400 Cannes, France
 MIKE WILLIAMS/UVM MSH #53/Winooski, VT 05404

RECOMMENDED READING

(27) Ludwig Wittgenstein: Personal Recollections, Rush Rhees, ed. (Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1981), is recommended by DON JACKANICZ. He says this:

The philosophical and personal relationships of Russell and Wittgenstein are discussed in considerable detail in Russell's own writings and in biographical studies of Russell. L. W.: P. R., although not including much on Russell, does broaden greatly our knowledge of Wittgenstein the man, that is, the man whom Russell claims to have prevented killing himself on a number of occasions, the man whose work made Russell wonder for a while whether he, Russell, had anything more to contribute to philosophy, the man who said to Russell and Moore -- referring to his work, on the day they examined him for a Ph. D. -- "Don't worry, I know you'll never understand it." Wittgenstein the writer is often perplexing, and his character and actions were sometimes even more so. The reminiscences given by the six contributors to this volume -- one of Wittgenstein's sisters, the woman who taught him Russian just before his Soviet Union trip, and four of his students and friends -- overflow with detail and anecdotes. Some of the material is comic, some deeply moving, all of it worth reading for anyone wanting to understand more fully one of the great philosophers who took from and gave to Russell.

BOOK REVIEW

(28) Davis reviews Cranford. Bob Davis has read Peter Cranford's new book (RSN30-51) and likes it. His review:

Peter Cranford's new book, How To Be Your Own Psychologist, is one that many of you may wish to own and perhaps give to a friend. Non-technical, "it can easily be read by an intelligent highschool student", and is geared to help people without an academic background in psychology. It is one of the better of the "How To" genre. It avoids the crackpotism of much popular psychology -- he doesn't once recommend that you lie down on the floor and scream!

The book aims to help the reader help himself, to make his life more fulfilling and help others do the same.

As one might expect, Russell appears in the text a great deal. Much of the book advocates Russell's "compossibility" — the entire first section is devoted to it. Compossibility uses mutual interests or agreements — "what a person feels is to his good" — to achieve cooperation in life. Russell quotations pepper the book, and his "The good life is one inspired by love and guided by knowledge" — the motto of the BRS — is part of the preface.

Other sections describe "Direct Influence", "Self-Influence" and "Altruistic Influences". Some chapters are devoted to handling problems such as nervous breakdowns, anxiety, depression, suicide, influencing children, teen-agers, and the elderly, and achieving happiness.

I found some of the later chapters most interesting. I particularly liked Chapter 8 — "Great Maxims of Self-Interest". Here Cranford lists 30 maxims — from an original list of 150 — that he feels are a guide to successful living. Some of my favorites are: "the guide to life is probability", "Act on what is probable", and "Assume that you are responsible for everything that goes wrong in your life (even if you are not)." This is followed by advice on how to program the maxims into your life

Programming or influencing yourself — your subconscious — is an important feature of the book. I have used such techniques in dealing with smoking and dieting. There is also advice on self-hypnosis. Meanings are made clear by examples from real life.

A lot of books on psychology are not accessible to the non-expert. A lot that are accessible are irresponsible. Cranford's book is neither. Many will find it useful.

"MY FAVORITE RUSSELL"

(29) Hugh Moorhead's favorites come from Sceptical Essays (New York: Norton, 1928), pp. 11, 113-114.

Introduction: On the Value of Scepticism

I wish to propose for the reader's favourable consideration a doctrine which may, I fear, appear wildly paradoxical and subversive. The doctrine in question is this: that it is undesirable to believe a proposition when there is no ground whatever for supposing it true. I must, of course, admit that if such an opinion became common it would completely transform our social life and our political system; since both are at present faultless, this must weigh against it. I am also aware (what is more serious) that it would tend to diminish the incomes of clairvoyants, bookmakers, bishops and others who live on the irrational hopes of those who have done nothing to deserve good fortune here or hereafter.

The Harm that Good Men Do

We all know what we mean by a "good" man. The ideally good man does not drink or smoke, avoids bad language, converses in the presence of men only exactly as he would if there were ladies present, attends church regularly, and holds the correct opinions on all subjects. He has a wholesome horror of wrongdoing, and realizes that it is our painful duty to castigate Sin. He has a still greater horror of wrong thinking, and considers it the business of the authorities to safeguard the young against those who question the wisdom of the views generally accepted by middle-aged successful citizens. Apart from his professional duties, at which he is assiduous, he spends much time in good works: he may encourage patriotism and military training; he may promote industry, sobriety, and virtue among wage-earners and their children by seeing to it that failures in these respects receive due punishment; he may be a trustee of a university and prevent an ill-judged respect for learning from allowing the employment of professors with subversive ideas. Above all, of course, his "morals," in the narrow sense, must be irreproachable.

It may be doubted whether a "good" man, in the above sense, does, on the average, any more good than a "bad" man. I mean by a "bad" man the contrary of what we have been describing. A "bad" man is one who is known to smoke and to drink occasionally, and even to say a bad word when someone treads on his toe. His conversation is not always such as could be printed, and he sometimes spends fine Sundays out-of-doors instead of at church. Some of his opinions are subversive; for instance, he may think that if you desire peace you should prepare for peace, not for war. Towards wrongdoing he takes a scientific attitude, such as he would take towards his motor-car if it misbehaved; he argues that sermons and prison will no more cure vice than mend a broken tire. In the matter of wrong thinking he is even more perverse. He maintains that what is called "wrong thinking" is simply thinking, and what is called "right thinking" is repeating words like a parrot; this gives him a sympathy with all sorts of undesirable cranks. His activities outside his working hours may consist merely in enjoyment, or,

worse still, in stirring up discontent with preventable evils which do not interfere with the comfort of the men in power. And it is even possible that in the matter of "morals" he may not conceal his lapses as carefully as a truly virtuous man would do, defending himself by the perverse contention that it is better to be honest than to pretend to set a good example. A man who fails in any or several of these respects will be thought ill of by the average respectable citizen, and will not be allowed to hold any position conferring authority, such as that of a judge, a magistrate, or a schoolmaster. Such positions are open only to "good" men.

Hugh is not alone in admiring the first excerpt. James Reston used it in a column in 1977. See N116-17.

CONTRIBUTIONS

- (30) We thank these members for their contributions to the BRS Treasury: KEVIN BOGGS, ALEX DELY, HARRY RUJA, OLIVE WILLIAMS...and KATHY FJERMEDAL, who never misses a month!
- (31) Non-contributors, please consider making a contribution. Any amount. If we can double our membership -- which we are trying to do -- we may no longer need contributions to cover our operating deficit; but till then, we will need whatever help you can give. Please send what you can spare c/o the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.
-

ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

- (32) Elected: JACQUELINE BERTHON-PAYON, PETER CRANFORD, BOB DAVIS, ALEX DELY, LEE EISLER, HUGH MOORHEAD, JACK RAGSDALE, and HARRY RUJA.
- What was new and different about this election was that, for the first time, there were more candidates than openings, which gave members a choice. All 13 candidates were well qualified. We hope that those who were not elected will agree to be candidates again next year.
- The votes were tallied by Lee Eisler. The count was verified by BRS Secretary Don Jackanicz.
-

NEWSLETTER MATTERS

- (33) Changing your address? Please notify us promptly when you move. That will save us the nearly \$2 it costs when your newsletter is returned to us and we then re-mail it to your new address.
-

FOR SALE

- (34) Members' stationery, 8½ x 11 white. Across the top: "The good life is one inspired by love and guided by knowledge.* Bertrand Russell" On the bottom: "*Motto of The Bertrand Russell Society". \$5 postpaid for 90 sheets (weighs just under a pound, travels Third Class). Order from the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.
- (35) BR postcard, 4¼ x 6. Philippe Halsman's handsome 1958 photo of BR with pipe. 50¢ each plus 25¢. RSN30-44 shows it reduced in size. Order from the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.
- (36) Haldeman-Julius Blue Books, from Bob Black, Box 23, Pittsburgh, Kansas 66762. A 10-page list of approximately 200 paperback books "for atheists, anarchists and other friends" includes these by BR: AM I AN ATHEIST OR AN AGNOSTIC? CAN MEN BE RATIONAL? THE FAITH OF A RATIONALIST. IDEAS THAT HAVE HARMED MANKIND. IS SCIENCE SUPERSTITIOUS? ON THE VALUE OF SCEPTICISM. STOICISM AND MENTAL HEALTH. HAS RELIGION MADE USEFUL CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION? WHAT CAN A FREE MAN WORSHIP? The last 2 are Little Blue Books (3½ x 5), 50¢ each. The others are Big Blue Books (5½ x 8½), \$1 each. Add \$1 handling charge for orders under \$10.

(37) Books from the BRS Library, at the discounted prices shown:

- This list and prices are current as of August 1, 1981 and supersede previous lists and prices. From time to time market changes require title deletions, allow for title additions, and force price increases. But the discounts given provide considerable savings, especially for certain titles which are often difficult to locate.
- Prices include postage and other shipping costs.
- "H" indicates a hardbound edition. No notation indicates a paperbound edition.
- Prices shown are in U.S. funds. Please remit by check or money order, payable to The Bertrand Russell Society, in U.S. funds or the equivalent.
- Your order will be promptly filled, although occasionally an out of stock item may cause a brief shipment delay.
- Send orders to Donald W. Jackanicz; 3802 N. Kenneth Ave.; Chicago, IL 60641; U.S.A.

By Bertrand Russell

AUTHORITY AND THE INDIVIDUAL.....	\$ 3.75
THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BR (in one volume).....	7.50
THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BR, Volume I.....	16.00 H
THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BR, Volume II.....	13.00 H
THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BR, Volume III.....	11.00 H
EDUCATION AND THE SOCIAL ORDER.....	4.25
GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.....	9.00 H
HAS MAN A FUTURE?.....	8.00 H
HISTORY OF THE WORLD IN EPITOME.....	1.00
HUMAN SOCIETY IN ETHICS AND POLITICS.....	16.00 H
ICARUS OR THE FUTURE OF SCIENCE.....	3.00 H
THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON SOCIETY.....	2.75
IN PRAISE OF IDLENESS.....	2.75
AN INQUIRY INTO MEANING AND TRUTH.....	16.00 H
AN INQUIRY INTO MEANING AND TRUTH.....	6.00
JUSTICE IN WARTIME.....	8.00 H
MORTALS AND OTHERS, edited by Harry Ruja.....	14.00 H
MY PHILOSOPHICAL DEVELOPMENT.....	2.75
AN OUTLINE OF PHILOSOPHY.....	16.00 H
POLITICAL IDEALS.....	3.75
THE PRACTICE AND THEORY OF BOLSHEVISM.....	9.00 H
THE PRACTICE AND THEORY OF BOLSHEVISM.....	3.75
PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION.....	7.00 H
PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION.....	3.75
THE PROSPECTS OF INDUSTRIAL CIVILIZATION, with Dora Russell.....	15.00 H
ROADS TO FREEDOM.....	4.00
SCEPTICAL ESSAYS.....	4.00
UNARMED VICTORY.....	11.00 H

By Other Authors

BERTRAND RUSSELL, 1872-1970.....	1.25
ESSAYS ON SOCIALIST HUMANISM IN HONOUR OF THE CENTENARY OF BR, edited by Ken Coates.....	9.00 H
ESSAYS ON SOCIALIST HUMANISM IN HONOUR OF THE CENTENARY OF BR, edited by Ken Coates.....	4.00
THE LIFE OF BR IN PICTURES AND HIS OWN WORDS.....	4.00
MR. WILSON SPEAKS 'FRANKLY AND FEARLESSLY' ON VIETNAM TO BR.....	1.25
NATIONAL FRONTIERS AND INTD. SCIENTIFIC CO-OP, by Z. A. Medvedev....	4.00
SECRECY OF CORRESPONDENCE IS GUARANTEED BY LAW, by Z. A. Medvedev...	3.50
THE TAMARISK TREE, MY SEARCH FOR LIBERTY AND LOVE, Volume I, by Dora Russell.....	5.00 H

ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

- (38) "The Moral Minority" is an 8-page newsletter put out by Moral Minority/The Real Majority, Inc., a non-profit organization "dedicated to preserving the separation of church and state, defending human and civil rights, and eliminating prejudice based on sex, race, religion or national origin." The Moral Minority doesn't like the proposed Human Life Amendment or the Family Protection Act, and does like Senator Goldwater (who doesn't like the Moral Majority or its fund-raiser, Richard Viguerie.) Membership and subscription, \$10. They will probably send a sample copy on request: Moral Minority, Inc, #1068, PO Box 22557, Denver, CO 80220.

CORRECTIONS

- (39) David Hart WAS there, at the June meeting, at McMaster. What's more, he was one of the speakers (see RSN30-2), and — in his quiet, understated way — gave one of the more enjoyable talks of the weekend (on how British Labor failed to follow BR's advice.) Omitting all mention of David from our report on the '81 meeting was undoubtedly the worst error we've made in 31 newsletters, and we regret it very much.
- (40) André Bacard's correct address is Box 5121, Stanford, CA 94305. He would like to hear from members who live in, or plan to visit, the Bay Area.

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT
continued

- (41) END. A lot of Europeans want nuclear weapons kept out of Europe, and have been demonstrating in large numbers to say so (18). The founder of the movement for European Nuclear Disarmament (END) is E. P. Thompson, says *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*.

In the *Bulletin's* words (January 1981) p. 6 →

The *Bulletin* invited Professor Thompson to comment on a few of the many books on nuclear holocaust. In this article the author does so, and then moves on to a comprehensive and challenging assessment of the nuclear menace in Europe.

This is how the *Bulletin* identifies Thompson, p. 8 →

E. P. Thompson, historian and writer, founder of the Center for the Study of Social History at the University of Warwick (U.K.), is currently a visiting professor, Brown University, Providence, R.I. 02192. He is the author of *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963) and *Writing by Candlelight* (1980). He is the founder of the movement for European Nuclear Disarmament (END), and co-editor of *Protest and Survive* (1980).

And here is the Thompson article, pp. 6-13:

The END of the line

Nigel Calder is a most able practitioner in the "high popularization" of science and technology, and his work demands respectful attention.¹ *Nuclear Nightmares* is an instant party-stopper, and a book to press into the hands of your flippant nephew or giddy niece. More seriously, it deserves a general readership, as a brisk and informed run-through of the technological and strategic infrastructure of World War III. We are provided with several chilling scenarios as to its probable occasion, and if the book is not supplemented with further (and very different) reading, it will lead readers only into the immobility of despair.

The Military Balance, published annually by the International Institute of Strategic Studies, acquires in Calder's pages a biblical authority. Europeans in the past year have come to look skeptically (even sourly) upon the reputed objectivity of that "International" Institute. They have noted that the public interventions of some of its staff and council in the debate surrounding the decision to "modernize" NATO's nuclear forces have been indistinguishable from those of NATO apologists, and that a large advance

in weaponry in favor of the Warsaw powers was registered in the 1980 *Balance* by the expedient of changing the rules and counting in new ways.² This alarmist evidence was eagerly blown up in the U.S. press on the eve of the election. Many of us in Europe these days tend to turn for evidence to institutes in Stockholm (SIPRI), West Berlin, the Sussex Armament and Disarmament Information Unit and, in the United States, to such sources as this *Bulletin*.

What Calder does is to show the massing of weaponry, its sophistication, the logic of interlocking strategies, and the several points where "deterrence" may pass swiftly into war in a compulsive process in which peoples and governments have become "the servants rather than the masters of that which they have created." Those words are George Kennan's, and Calder's book might be taken as a densely-observed extended illustration of Kennan's more general summary:

"... that immensely disturbing and tragic situation in which we find ourselves today: this anxious competition in the development of new armaments; this blind dehumanization

of the prospective adversary; this systematic distortion of the adversary's motivation and intentions; this steady displacement of political considerations by military ones in the calculations of statesmanship; in short, this dreadful militarization of the entire East-West relationship in concept, in rhetoric, and in assumption, which is the commanding feature—endlessly dangerous, endlessly discouraging—of this present unhappy day."³

Yet I cannot disguise my view that Calder's book, as well as others in this growing genre, are also symptoms of this unhappy day. They neither challenge nor, in any fundamental way, do they diagnose. Rather, they exhibit precisely "the steady displacement of political considerations by military ones." The sophistication of the technological reportage masks an inadequacy in the treatment of political process. The brisk bravura of Calder's style presses always toward the exotic and exclamatory mode of science fiction: it has no terms for graver meditation on our predicament, and no space for the measured analysis of the actions of states. Louis René Beres's *Apocalypse* prompts the same reflections: carrying some useful information, and also more

positive proposals than Calder does, its analysis of political process is nevertheless sadly defective.⁴

What happens in these cases is that analysis is forced, unwittingly, into the parameters of a self-fulfilling argument. Founded upon the evidence of weapons and strategies, whose rationale is always that of "deterrence," there is no space in which the validity of any alternative rationale can be allowed or examined. We are inside the rationale which has led us to this unhappy day, and which will shortly lead us to worse, and we can never get out. Whether the balance of evidence or perception is tilted towards the West or East (how many systems?, what worst case expectations?), the analysis is confined *within the same parameters*: that is, within the leap-frog logic of deterrence. Within this logic the hawks of each side feed to each other arms and provocations. They strive for "parity," envisage "gaps" and "windows of opportunity." Through never-ending negotiations at the highest level they adumbrate elaborate devices of "control" and trade-off, which their clever games-players then seek to evade or to turn to new advantage, and thus generate more thrust in the course toward collision.

Operating within such parameters,

Calder, at the end simply gives up. Disarmament conferences are dismissed as the background croaking of frogs beside the silos at Grand Forks; any reversal of the collision-course could be more dangerous than going on as we are. Beres, willing himself to be more positive, offers new proposals for arms control negotiators at the very topmost level, some of which are neat and deserve attention. Yet none of these proposals will be worth a dime unless there are profound, worldwide modifications in public consciousness, which bring their thrust to bear in the realm of active, operative politics—modifications for which the paradigm of deterrence offers no terms.

I find that many North Americans these days are profoundly pessimistic about any such utopian expectations: the well-informed are despairing, and they hope, at the best, only to slow down the leapfrog logic. Europeans have become in the past year a shade more desperate, and they are in increasing numbers despairing of the logic of deterrence. They are looking outside the old parameters of "balance" to the long-neglected processes of political discourse and cultural expression. Across the widening Atlantic we send you greetings, but also our storm signals of despair.

Arguments founded upon weaponry and strategy are enclosed within a determinism whose outcome must be war. All that doves can do within these parameters is check or decelerate a thrust which (next month, next year, next crisis, next election) accelerates once more. If there is anywhere any hope, we must search for it outside this determinism. I will proceed by defining certain areas of concern which Calder's book, and others of this genre, do *not* discuss. Those I select (for there are many others) are:

- the ultimate location of the upward "creep" of weaponry;
- ideological problems relating to the control and manipulation of information; and
- a particular case of the politics of weaponry, illustrated by NATO "modernization."

Weapons do not, as yet, invent and make themselves. There is a human decision to make them. Who takes such decisions? How?

This is a question more important than those of throw-weight or circular error probable, yet it is assumed unanalyzed in deterrence theory. From the time of Eisenhower and Khrushchev, the leaders of the superpowers have shrugged off personal responsibility.⁵ But so also have some of the highest scientific and even military advisors to these leaders. I need not mention the distinguished line of arms control, sci-

entific and defense advisors to U. S. administrations who have candidly signalled their profound disagreements with the decisions of government. In the Soviet Union, blanket official secrecy makes the record less clear: we must go back as far as Khrushchev's memoirs for a similar account of the rejection of prime scientific advice, in the encounters between Khrushchev and Andrei Sakharov.

In Britain the Official Secrets Acts are so heavy that we learn a little of the process only some years after the event, and then only from advisors so eminent that they are immune from prosecution. Three notable cases can be cited from 1979 to 1980: Lord Louis Mountbatten, Lord Zuckerman, and Field Marshall Lord Carver. Mountbatten, in a concise and humane speech delivered at Strasbourg two months before his murder, signalled his extreme anxiety at the nuclear arms race and indicated the specific advice he had given, when Commander-in-Chief of the British General Staff, against any strategy which entertained the possibility of limited or theater nuclear war.⁶ Carver, another outgoing Commander-in-Chief, and a conventional proponent of NATO deterrence theory, has signalled in a succession of interviews and letters to the Times his long-standing opposition to an independent British nuclear weapons system. Zuckerman, who was Chief Scientific Adviser to the British Government from 1964 to 1971, has surveyed, in a lecture of outstanding importance, the record of two decades in which "the views of the Killians, the Wiesners, the Kistiakowskys, the Yorks"—and (by implication) the Zuckermans—were consistently overruled.⁷

We are faced here with an extraordinary situation, although not a situation for which a historian is altogether unprepared. Not only the nominal leaders of states but also their chief scientific advisors and chiefs of general staff disclaim responsibility for the most central decisions of state policy. All gesture toward an ulterior process to which they themselves became captive. It was Eisenhower who warned of the "danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite." Zuckerman, the scientist, passes the buck down the line to technology. The "military chiefs, who by convention are the official advisors on national security, merely serve as a channel through which the men in the laboratories transmit their views," and "chief scientific advisors have proved to be no match for the laboratory technicians":

"The men in the nuclear weapons laboratories of both sides have suc-

ceeded in creating a world with an irrational foundation, on which a new set of political realities has in turn had to be built. They have become the alchemists of our times, working in secret ways which cannot be divulged, casting spells which embrace us all."

We have at last identified the human agent of our doom, concealed within a secret laboratory, casting malevolent spells. And this brings us close to the findings of experts on arms control who have identified the ulterior thrust toward weapons innovation in such terms as "technology creep."⁸ Undoubtedly this directs us to a significant moment of process, which appears to its own actors in this way. Yet there is still something unexplained. For this traces the most significant tendency of our times to a source, either in a laboratory conspiracy, or in an inexorable technological determinism of a kind for which historians (or, I should say, historians whom I consider to be reputable) do not find any historical precedent. That is, some vulgar practitioners of determinism apart, historians do not find that technology (or inventors), unaided, created industrialization or capitalism or imperialism. Nor can technology creep, unaided, bring us to extermination. Historians find, rather, a collocation of mutually-supportive forces—political, ideological institutional, economic—which give rise to process, or to the event. And each of these forces exists only within the medium of human agency.

I see no reason why this historical finding must now, in 1980, undergo drastic revision. But this need not lead us toward any optimistic conclusions. We may be led to an even more pessimistic finding: that technology creep is indeed supplemented by a host of collateral and mutually supportive forces which, taken as a set, constitute the process which has led us to Kennan's "this present unhappy day." And if we read Zuckerman with care, we find that the men in the laboratories did not do all this alone. They also "knew how to respond to the mood of the country, how to capture the attention of the media, how to stir the hearts of generals. They have been adept . . . in creating the climate within which political chiefs have to operate."⁹

The cast has now become larger: it takes in public opinion, the media, the military, the politicians. In sum:

- the weapons systems—and their "laboratory" technicians, lobbyists and public relations operators—
- attract a large concentration of the resources and scientific skills of the host society and are then transformed into huge inertial forces within that society, whether bureau-

cratic or private in expression:

- they are interlocked with the government bureaucracy (exchange of personnel with Defense ministries and with Party bureaucracy, and so forth), and become adept at lobbying in the media and in the organs of the state;

- there is generated around them a large supportive and protective security and policing apparatus, which, in its turn, enhances the control of information and the inhibition of opposition, and which actively furthers the crystallization of a supportive ideology.

Politicians then rise in influence from the weapons system and security apparatus themselves (Brezhnev, Bush). As in all long-term historical processes—and imperialisms provide clear examples—now one and now another of the collateral forces may attain dominance; now the "alchemists in the laboratories," now the generals, now the media, now the politicians, may appear to be calling the tune. But this is only as it seems to the actors at a particular moment within the process, for in truth alchemists, politicians, generals and ideologists are all part of one set. Technology can creep only because ideology is creeping alongside it and because politicians are creeping away from any decisive control. And behind the politicians is the pressure of those hundreds of thousands of electors who "are making their livings doing things which were promoted years before by their political predecessors. It is the past which imbues the arms race with its inner momentum."¹⁰

That is a pessimistic conclusion indeed.¹¹ It leads reflective persons within the system to suppose that there may be only one remote possibility of staying off the end. By some wizardry at the highest level of diplomatic engineering between the superpowers—SALT XIII?—the plug will at the last moment be pulled, and the waters of nuclear menace will drain out of the rival baths just before they overflow onto the floors of the world. This most momentous political action will be taken, by the leaders of states and their advisors, without any of the normal preliminaries of general political agitation and discourse. It is supposed that the very same political forces which have made these insane structures will suddenly unmake them: the weapon systems and their political and security support systems will de-weaponize themselves.

This will not happen. And what this analysis should indicate is that it is precisely at the top of both opposed societies that agreement to de-escalate is *most* impossible. It is here that inertia and "creep" have their uncontested reign. It is here that the advice of scientists and even

of rational military minds is jammed by a concatenation of competing interests and bureaucracies. It is here that the maintenance of cold war becomes an actual *interest*, and an instrument of policy in the subjection and control of client states, the legitimation of other kinds of adventure, and the suppression of dissent. It is here that the futile exercises of "balance," of contests for "face," of "posture," of endlessly protracted negotiations about minutiae, and of worst case hypotheses, govern every encounter.

The conclusion is evident. If we are to develop a counterthrust to the inertia of the weapons systems, then we must do this first of all, not at the top, but at the bottom, in the middle, and on the margins of both opposed state structures. Only here is there space for the insertion of any rationality. We can destabilize the weapons systems only from below. The means must include those of political discourse and agitation; of lateral exchanges of many kinds between the middle ranges of society in the opposed blocs; of detaching client states from their dependency on either bloc and adding to the sum of influence of non-aligned powers; of pressing measures of conversion to peaceful production within the weapons system itself;¹² and of contesting, with every surviving resource of our culture, the enforcement of security and of information control.

I have written: "with every *surviving* resource of our culture." But survival can no longer be assumed. Calder, Beres and other writers in this genre carry warnings about the dangers of nuclear terrorism.¹³ The point should be taken, although it is low on the list of the most probable occasions of disaster. What they say very much less about is the danger that the weapons states will themselves become terrorist, and turn their terror against their own peoples.

The evidence is disquieting. The essential information about weapons and strategy (without which no democratic counterforce can possibly be mounted) already comes through to us from only a few channels. The Soviet Union and its client states are governed by the strictest rules of military secrecy. Persons employed at any level in the weapons system must renounce travel (for holiday or other purposes) to the West, unless under exceptional and authorized conditions. Similar controls are enforced in several Western states. While public opinion in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe is anxious about weaponry and war (and, in the most general sense, is "peace loving"), the level of information available to citizens on

weaponry and strategy is very low. There is almost no public controversy about what options are available to their own statesmen; even the names of weapons (SS-6, SS-20, the Backfire bomber) are unknown.¹⁴

In Britain the Official Secrets Acts operate with a rigor which surprises many Americans. Even members of successive British cabinets were not informed of the Chevaline program for the sophistication of the Polaris warhead—a program which was pressed forward over a period of nearly ten years, at a cost of £1,000 million, without budget sanction and without any mention in the House of Commons.

What is even less widely known in the United States is that the last British government, under the Labor Party, mounted a full state prosecution, based on the Official Secrets Acts, of an ex-corporal who had divulged some low level and very stale information about signals interception to two radical investigative journalists. (They were also prosecuted—not for publishing but simply for *listening* to "secrets.") This prosecution, the "ABC trial" of 1978, was pressed forward by the Security Services, and was accompanied by devices to fiddle or "vet" the ancient and much-lauded safeguard of British liberties, the jury system.¹⁵

Margaret Thatcher's Conservative government, shortly after entering into power in 1979, rushed forward a new Official Information Bill. This measure, designed by Security, was heralded by a public relations lobby, presenting it as a rationalizing and lenient revision of the law. On inspection—and only after the Bill had been steered by Lord Hailsham through the House of Lords—it was found to be the most draconian measure of thought control presented to the British legislature since 1820. New clauses were aimed directly at journalists and at peace researchers, enabling Security to break open their offices and files; and if researchers had accumulated materials, *from legitimate open public sources*, which, when pieced together like a jigsaw, revealed an "official secret," then they were liable to prosecution. An official secret in Britain has been defined as any information on the operation of the state which the state has not officially released.

Thatcher's Bill was aborted, in the face of opposition. We can expect a "reformed" Bill to be re-introduced at any time, although the existing Acts are heavy enough. In the past year some very effective investigative journalism has been going on, notably by Duncan Campbell (one of the defendants in the ABC trial) in the *New Statesman*, which has revealed, among other things, the large

extent of telephone tapping and surveillance of British citizens, and the fact that the United States has some four or five times more military bases and installations in Britain than has ever been admitted to the British Parliament. There has also been a "leakage" of regional Civil Defense contingency plans, which include measures for the internment or execution in the event of war of suspected secessionists. British Security is now itching for a spectacular and successful State trial.

I know less about the immediate situation in other Western states, although the outstanding independent European newspaper, *Le Monde*, has come under state prosecution, in part (it is said) in consequence of its severe criticisms of the new French Security Law. And in Australia a book and two national newspapers are now under prosecution, in the first exercise of Official Secrets Acts since World War II, for revealing details of secret ANZUS (Australia, New Zealand, and the United States) agreements.

The object of these operations is, of course, not to conceal information from an enemy, but to conceal it from their citizens. Sometimes, as Zuckerman has noted, "the rules of official secrecy are exploited, not because of the need for security, but to promote partisan policies" as between competing interests within the state bureaucracies. More generally it is part of the overall exercise in manipulating domestic public opinion. I find these political developments to be greatly more threatening than are scenarios of nuclear terrorism or of war by accident (through a snarled computer. The essential precondition to any counterthrust to the inertia of the weapons systems must be the ever-widening communication of fuller and more objective information about these systems.

In the European Nuclear Disarmament (END) movement we are laying increasing stress on *lateral* communication, on transcontinental (as well as transatlantic) exchanges between specialist groups: universities, scientists, doctors, religious bodies or trade unions. We owe, and the entire world owes, a debt of gratitude to those members of the U.S. scientific, intellectual and arms control community who have steadily held open the channels of information and communication for so many years. They have been the prime providers of whatever information the world now has. The significance of this work is too great to be measured.

Among so many scenarios of the occasions of nuclear war, there is a failure to discuss an actual, immediate and possible occasion of war going on beneath our noses. I

refer to the NATO decision to "modernize" its nuclear armory.

What so many overlook is that these assumptions preempt examination of the most far-reaching political issues, now coming to occupy the center of European discourse. There have emerged, not two but *three* opposed perceptions of the situation:

- the United States plus NATO perception;
- the Soviet perception; and
- growing European perception, hostile to both.

I need not rehearse the official NATO view here, since it was summarized in the October 1980 *Bulletin*.¹⁶ In this view, which emerged not in common West European perception but from within the defense bureaucracies of NATO powers, a menacing unbalance or gap was discovered in the European theater. Its agents were identified as the Soviet SS-20 missiles and Backfire bombers. It was necessary to match these with Pershing IIs in West Germany and with cruise missiles across the Western board.

The other side to the coin of Official Secrecy is that all information on defense matters is Official Information: that is, it is served up to the public ready-cooked, with ideological dressing, on an official plate. The defense correspondents of the media duly attended Official Briefings and handed these on. Public opinion was manufactured in these ways: the American public was informed that Europeans were crying out for cruise missiles, the European public was informed that the United States insisted upon sending them, and both were informed that NATO was working in the best interests of all.

In an obliterating and highly orchestrated propaganda campaign (funded out of our own taxes) the NATO redefinitions were imposed.¹⁷ It suddenly appeared that, in this European theater only ground-launched missiles might be counted; sea-launched missiles might not. The British government issued an official White Paper of astounding mendacity, in which Poseidon, Polaris and countless lesser delivery systems simply disappeared.¹⁸ Pentagon charts, fed into the Western media immediately prior to the NATO decision (at Brussels, December 12, 1979), did much the same.¹⁹

The television obligingly supplied rushes of monstrous carrier-mounted SS-20s crashing through bushes in their advance upon the Free West. Expert slobs (Silver-Lipped Operators of Bullshit) perfected new means of moral lobotomy upon the public: normative and moralistic attributions entered into the very vocabulary of weapons technology, so that menacing missiles of similar destructive power be-

came "monsters" (if Soviet) and "deterrents" (if NATO).²⁰ Thus the pre-packaged NATO perception.

In Soviet perception the notion of this European theater is a NATO invention, and probably a Pentagon trick. Since cruise and Pershing II missiles are to be owned and operated by U. S. personnel, these are seen as forward-based U.S. strategic missiles which reach some 500 miles deeper into Russia than do the F-111 and the Vulcan—and, indeed, take Moscow and Kiev within their arc. Both missiles are highly accurate, but the Pershing II is speedy also, and can hit targets in Western Russia in anything between four and ten minutes from launch.

Taken together with U.S. Presidential Directive # 59, it is now possible to see the Soviet nightmare. Pershing IIs will make a preemptive strike, in five minutes flat, taking out Western Russian ICBM silos and, at the same time, an Alaskan-based strike will take out ICBMs in Asiatic Russia. The cruise missiles will saunter along behind, smelling their way over the terrain, and take out control, communications and political centers, as well as half the Russian population. Apart from the few surviving ICBMs, "the only response open to the Russians would be the launching of their own medium-range missiles against the NATO European allies."²¹ No doubt the opportunity would be taken.

My quotation is from the distinguished East German scientist, Robert Havemann. And it may be necessary to assure Western readers that, so far from being anyone's stooge or apologist, Professor Havemann is an outstanding defender of civil liberties (what West-erners call "a dissident"), who has been pushed around and held under house arrest by the oafish East German security police for several years.

That Havemann should issue this grave warning is a matter to take into grave account. For what he makes clear is that NATO weapons modernization is nothing less than a slow-playing Cuban missile crisis in reverse. Putting Pershing IIs in West Germany is an exact analogy with Khrushchev's freighter steaming toward Cuba. Seen in this light, the response of the Soviet political leaders has been rather cooler than that of President Kennedy. Brezhnev's finger has not yet moved toward the button. There are still two years of Western second thoughts, and perhaps for Soviet concessions on the SS-20. But Havemann warns us that these will be very dangerous years: "How long can the Soviet Union simply observe this process of preparation for a sudden attack which threatens its very existence? Can they afford . . . simply to watch

passively?"

I am not quite sure how the third, European, perception so suddenly emerged, although we did something about it ourselves. It is this. We are pig-in-the-middle while an interminable and threatening argument between born-again Christians and still-born Marxists goes on above our heads. Today there are supposed to be superpower negotiations (or preliminaries to preliminaries to negotiations) going on about European theater weapons—a matter which could scarcely concern us more—and there is no European seat at the table.

U.S. scenarios for a limited war in the European theater do not amuse us: this is where we happen to live. And where we will very certainly die in any nuclear exchange (however "limited"), since, whichever superpower claims itself as the scorched and radiation-stricken "winner," all of Europe will certainly be devastated. We are clear also that the first consequence of the importation of cruise missiles will be even denser Soviet targeting plans on the recipient nations.²² Already England's still green but not-so-pleasant land may carry a greater density of nuclear weapons launching bases (airfields, submarine depots) and ancillary military installations than any part of the world. We are not amused by parliamentary assurances that missiles, owned and operated by foreign personnel, will only be launched after "consultation" and in our national interests.

Other matters also have become clear. One is the tendency for both military alliances—NATO and the Warsaw Pact—to become instruments of superpower political control, reducing the lesser states to abject clienty. This is as true in the West as in the East of Europe. Another is the fact that Eastern and Western Europeans live in the same theater, are subject to the same menace, and are rediscovering common interests. It has occurred to us that if the West leaned a little less heavily upon the East with missiles, then self-activating democratic processes (as in Poland) might have greater room to move; and that the Western peace movement and the Eastern movement for democratization might make common cause.

The new movement for European Nuclear Disarmament has grown with astonishing rapidity. It commenced, long before December 1979, with the refusal of Norway and Denmark even to entertain cruise missiles. In Norway the movement was initiated by a few concerned citizens who organized a telephone-bombardment of the Norwegian Assembly. It moved on to Holland, where in a remarkably successful

alliance which stretched from the Dutch churches through the Radical and Labor parties to the far left, a campaign was initiated—of petitioning, of discussion, and of torch-light processions. This culminated in the defeat of the Dutch government in the Assembly on December 11, 1979—the day before the NATO meeting. Under these pressures both Holland and Belgium have delayed their decision on the missiles.

The British hibernated all through that winter, while the falling leaves of "official information" choked up all entries to their burrows. But, coming out into the daylight last spring, they looked around at the changing scene and did not like it. There has been a swift change in perception. Anti-missile groups have sprung up across the country, thickest in East Anglia and Berkshire (around the nominated missile harbors). The long-standing Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament has been rejuvenated. Trade unions and the Labor Party have adopted uncompromising policies rejecting both the cruise and Trident missiles. On October 26 there assembled in Trafalgar Square some 80,000, representing Liberals, Labourists and ecologists, Welsh Nationalists and far leftists, church men and women and academics. It is becoming increasingly unlikely that the introduction of cruise missiles into Britain is politically viable. And if Thatcher introduces them, Michael Foot—the newly-elected Leader of the Labor Party—has promised that he will send them back.

The contribution of European Nuclear Disarmament to this has been one of putting together movements and individuals, in East as well as West Europe, behind a common platform and a common strategy.²³ Our Appeal was issued at the end of April over a transcontinental list of signatories. It calls upon NATO and the United States to halt plans for cruise missiles and Pershing IIs and upon the Soviet Union to halt the SS-20. It calls for an expanding nuclear-weapons-free zone in Europe, and envisages the gradual loosening of allegiances to either bloc. It calls on individuals, East or West, to act for common survival without regard for the interests or prohibitions of national states. It sets forth a strategy of lateral exchanges across the continent, from Poland to Portugal, and it demands freedom of communication and exchange of information, East and West.

There are now strong END committees in France, West Germany, Greece, Finland, and Portugal, and active supporting movements of groups in most other European countries. In Eastern Europe much quiet, off-the-record, discussion is taking place, but we find it hard still

to get through to Soviet citizens. In Britain END groups have been set up in most universities, and the movement is far from cresting yet.

The thrust to final war continues. But we have, at least, generated a small counterthrust. And what we have discovered is that, even in "this unhappy day," the process is not finally determined by technology or strategy; there is still a space in which people and opinion can move. Even the British media which, a year ago, seemed impermeable to rationality, have opened new spaces here and there, revealing in their midst not only STOBs but also concerned citizens, themselves anxious that democratic discourse should be resumed.

We could have done none of this without the channels of objective information which the *Bulletin* among others has helped to hold open. We have now been able to hand on this information to a growing European public. Our strategy is neither against the United States nor against the Soviet Union. If successful, we hope that a nuclear weapons-free zone in Europe might take some of the sting out of the Cold War's venom, and provide a shield or space between the superpowers in which tensions would lessen. It might help to save both giants from themselves. □

1. Nigel Calder, *Nuclear Nightmares: an Investigation into Possible Wars* (New York: Viking Press, 1980).

2. See Mary Kaldor, "Misreading Ourselves and Others," *European Nuclear Disarmament Bulletin*, No. 3 (Oct. 1980), pp. 10-13; Ulrich Albrecht, Alain Joxe and Mary Kaldor, "Gegen den Alarmismus," in *Studiengruppe Weltropolitik Auftritten ein Abrüstung* (Hamburg: Rowalt, Sept. 1980). For a brief appraisal of USSR, see U. Albrecht, A. Eide, M. Kaldor et al., *A Short Research Guide on Arms and Armed Forces* (London, 1978).

3. George F. Kennan, "Politics and the East-West Relationship," *Just for the Press*, III, No. 5, Nov.-Dec. 1980 (American Committee on East-West Accord).

4. See Louis René Beres, *Apocalypse: Nuclear Catastrophe in World Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

5. The classic statement is, of course, President Eisenhower's valedictory address: D. D. Eisenhower, *Public Papers of the President, 1960-1961*, p. 1038.

6. Earl Mountbatten's speech is available (with addresses by Lord Philip Noel-Baker and Lord Zuckerman) in *Apocalypse Now?* (Nottingham, U.K.: Spokesman Books, 1980), and also in leaflet form from the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, 29 Great James Street, London WC1N 3EY, U.K.

7. Lord Zuckerman, "Science Advisers and Scientific Advisers," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 124, No. 4 (August 1980). (Offprints of this essential text available at \$2 from the Menard Press, 23 Fitzwarren Gardens, London N19 3JR.)

8. See Deborah Shapley, "Arms Control as a Regulator of Military Technology," *Dialectics*, 109 (Winter 1980).

9. Zuckerman, "Science Advisers," p. 13, who also calls on the evidence of H. Scoville, *Missile Madness* (Boston, 1970): "The guilty men and organizations are to be found at all levels of government and in all segments of society"—and a formidable list of officers, persons and motivations is then given.

10. Zuckerman, "Science Advisers," p. 13.

11. My own most pessimistic conclusions are in "Notes on Extremism, the Last Stage

of Civilization," *New Left Review*, 121 (May-June 1980), 3-31.

12. See Mary Kaldor, "Disarmament: the Armament Process in Reverse," in Dan Smith and E. P. Thompson (eds.), *Protest and Survival* (London: Penguin Books, 1980).

13. Calder conjures up "freedom fighters," p. 64. Beres treats the problem extensively. See also Mason Willrich and Theodore Taylor, *Nuclear Theft: Risks and Safeguards* (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1974).

14. These are, of course, U.S. intelligence code-names for Soviet missiles.

15. My fuller comments on this episode are in E. P. Thompson, *Writing by Candlelight* (London: Merlin Press, 1980).

16. C. D. Blacker and F. Hussain, "European Theater Nuclear Forces," *Bulletin*, 36, No. 8 (Oct. 1980), 32-37.

17. See my "The Doomsday Consensus" in *Writing by Candlelight*.

18. *Defence in the 1980s, Statement on the*

Defence Estimates, Commd. 7826-1. (London: HMSO, April 1980).

19. See Christopher Paine's admirable study, "Pershing II: the Army's Strategic Weapon," *Bulletin*, 36, No. 8 (Oct. 1980), esp. p. 30.

20. Such exercises appear to be not unknown on this side of the Atlantic also. See the letter in the New York Times purporting to come from a professor of "political science" at M.I.T. (although this must surely be a hoax?). Oct. 8, 1980. The author refers to Bernard Feld's "allegorical request" (meaning?) to readers to consider U.S. missile planning (including the MX system) as they appear in Soviet perceptions. He continues:

"With respect to building potential silo-killers, those familiar with the approach and style of Soviet military research and development can point to the SS-18 and SS-19. By 1990, these two systems will at least equal MX's alleged counter-silo capabilities. The

difference is that MX is still a paper missile while the SS-18s and SS-19s are already deployed and undergoing steady improvement. Moreover, possible fifth-generation follow-ons to these Soviet missiles might well eclipse MX's ability to destroy hardened military targets."

Thus a Soviet missile is a "potential silo-killer" whereas a U.S. missile system has only "alleged counter-silo capabilities": a projected U.S. system is only "a paper missile" whereas projected and even wholly hypothetical ("possible fifth-generation follow-ons") Soviet missiles are perceived as hideous and immediate threats. The author caps his argument by placing "the arms race" in inverted commas, as if it was only a suspect concept of long-haired liberals (but what *else* is going on now?). See Stephen M. Meyer, "The Folly of Unilateral Arms Restraint," *New York Times* correspondence, Oct. 8, 1980. It is possible that the human species is

more gravely threatened by the silos of both sides than by the silos.

21. Robert Havemann, "After the Thirty Minutes War," in *END Bulletin* No. 3 (Oct. 1980).

22. This perception is shared by Paul C. Warnke: "If I were a European, the last thing in the world I would want would be to have more theater nuclear forces, because I would think that would make me all the more certain to be the first target at the beginning of a war": interview in the *Guardian* (London), Sept. 28, 1980.

23. The European co-ordinating center for END is at the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, Gamble Street, Nottingham NG7 4ET, U.K. The British END office (which handles subscriptions for *END Bulletin*) is at 6 Endsleigh Street, London WC1E, U.K. Universities END can be reached through Jolyon Howorth, University of Aston, Birmingham, U.K.

To sum up:

U.S. scenarios for a limited war in the European theater do not amuse us; this is where we happen to live.

There are supposed to be superpower negotiations going on about European theater weapons, but there is not a European seat at the table.

While an interminable and threatening argument between born-again Christians and still-born Marxists goes on above our heads, we are the pig-in-the-middle.

A nuclear weapons-free zone in Europe might take some of the sting out of the Cold War's venom, . . .

. . . and provide a shield or space between the superpowers in which tensions would lessen. It might even help to save the giants from themselves.

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS)

(42) A 1962 foreword.

The Warfare State

Fred J. Cook

FOREWORD BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

MR. FRED J. COOK'S *The Warfare State* is one of the most important and also one of the most terrifying documents that I have ever read. His thesis is that the "military industrial complex" has become so powerful in the United States that it dominates the Government and is, at the same time, so insane that it is quite ready to advocate what is called a "pre-emptive" war against the Soviet State. The evidence which he adduces is massive and unanswerable except by plain abuse.

There was a time when American authorities assured us that they would not initiate a nuclear war. This time is past. It may be that the President and the State Department still cling desperately to the hope that they can prevent a pre-emptive war, but fresh evidence to the contrary continues to pile up. Much new evidence has appeared since Mr. Cook's first publication of *Juggernaut: the Warfare State* in *The Na-*

tion's supplement of October 28, 1961. The force of this evidence has been recognized, not only by nuclear disarmers, but by such orthodox physicists as P. M. S. Blackett in an article in the *New Statesman* of March 2, 1960. He points out that during the campaign preceding the presidential election there was supposed to be a "missile gap" which, for the moment, was thought to give superiority to the Soviet military power. As soon as the presidential campaign was ended, it turned out that there had never been any missile gap.

More shameful than this has been the campaign to persuade the American public that almost all Americans could survive a nuclear war by means of shelters. At first individual shelters were advocated. Of these, *Life* said: "You could be among the 97 per cent to survive if you follow the advice on these pages." This was such a stupid lie that the American public refused to believe it. The campaign for individual shelters having failed (as it was probably intended to fail), the policy of deep communal shelters is now advocated. These, if constructed, would constitute an even more ghastly death trap than individual shelters. With the very large bombs introduced by the Russians in their recent series of tests, the greatest danger is no longer fall-out, but fire-storms. In a fire-storm, the misinformed refugees in deep shelters would either be incinerated or die for lack of oxygen. All this has been set forth, clearly and scientifically, by Gerard Piel, editor of the *Scientific American*. But so blinded by its own ferocious prejudices is the military industrial complex, that it is successfully preventing the great majority of Americans from becoming aware of the death that supposed patriots are preparing for them.

It is obvious that the determined men who control the armed forces of the United States can, at any moment, create an incident which will appear to be proof of Russian aggression and will be met by full-scale nuclear "retaliation." I am old enough to "Remember the Maine" in 1898. Macmillan, in dogmatic language, has assured the world that there will be no war by accident. U Thant, who, unlike our Prime Minister, has no axe to grind, has told the world that the danger of accidental war is great and increasing.

There is only one way of reversing the trend towards pre-emptive war. It is to make the truth known to the American

public. This is a difficult task, since the military-industrial fanatics have a large measure of control over the major means of publicity. Mr. Cook's work is an immensely important contribution to this gigantic task. If there are human beings in the world at the end of the present century, Mr. Cook will be one of the men whom they will have to thank for their existence. I earnestly hope that his extraordinarily valuable work will be widely read and pondered, and that in many minds it will penetrate the barriers of intolerant hatred which is being built up by powerful but irresponsible interests.

Paperback from Collier Books, New York, 1964, hardcover from Macmillan, New York.

(Thank you, JACK RAGSDALE)

LAST MINUTE ITEM

- (43) Disclaimer. Two of Ray Plant's letters appear in this newsletter (6c). Ray would like it known that (1) these letters were based on the obsolete Constitution, and that he intends to write a new letter to replace them; and (2) his advice to Peter in these letters -- supplemented by phone calls and apparently clearly understood by Peter -- was that nothing should be communicated to Sutcliffe until and unless (a) the new expulsion procedure had been worked out, and had been approved by the Society, and (b) the Society had then decided that it wished to allow Sutcliffe to appeal. None of this has yet occurred. Thus Peter, in telling Sutcliffe that he was allowed to appeal, was not following Ray's advice.

- (44) The unidentified quotation about the CND in (18) is from The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, Volume III (New York:Simon & Schuster, 1969), p.140.

INDEX

- (45) Introductory (1). World Congress of Philosophy, '83 (2). BR on marriage, 1928 (3), on pacifism in wartime, 1919 (4), on freedom in America, 1963 (5). Chairman Cranford's Report: Editor's note (6a); the Report (6b); Ray Plant's letters (6c). President Davis's Report (7). Treasurer Darland's Report (3rd 1/4) (8). Science Committee's Report on Pugwash '81 (9a), on Clean Air threat (9b), on dissident scientist efforts, and free kit (9c). Call for Philosophy papers for '82 (10). The CCNY Affair, by Heckscher (11). Reviews of Clark's "BR and his World" (12). BRS '82 Doctoral Grant (13). Human rights: Dyson (14), Thatcher supports Wilberforce campaign (15). Nuclear disarmament: Pugwash '81 (16), Yukawa at Pugwash '80 (17), CND campaign (18), END (41). Humanists rally (19). L.A. August picnic (20). Nechvatal exhibits (21). Q&A: BR & Husserl? (22) Dora, 1928 (23). Popper (24). New Members (25). New addresses (26). Book on Wittgenstein recommended (27). Davis reviews Cranford's book (28). Moorhead's "Favorite Russell" (29). Contributors thanked (30). Contributions solicited (31). 8 Directors elected (32). Changing your address? (33). For sale: members' stationery (34), BR postcard (35), Haldeman-Julius Blue Books (36), books by and about BR (37). The Moral Minority (38). Corrections: David Hart (39), André Bacard (40). END (41). "The Warfare State" foreword by BR (42). Ray Plant's disclaimer (43). Source of CND quotation (44). Index (45).