

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS
No. 33
February 1982

- (1) New due-date for dues (2). Annual Meeting '82 (3,8b,41). BR "On the Evils Due to Fear" (11). BR, a "no good" author (12). The Beatles & BR (13). BR Award nominees wanted (14). Nuclear weapons peril (15,38,47). Museum of Philosophy, and Philosophy in High Schools (16). Creationists lose Round One (18). 3 Dora Russell items (21, 27b,42). BR performance, NYC, April 5-6(46). Letter from the Editor (47). Index (48). An asterisk in the left column = a request.

MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL

- (2) New due-date for dues: January 1st. We are not raising dues; we are changing the time they come due. For the past several years, dues have come due on July 1st, with a 2-month grace period. Now we are making a change for this reason:

Consider the case of someone who joined in 1980 and did not renew in 1981. Under the present (pre-1982) procedure, that person did not become an ex-member until September 1, 1981. He received the 4 newsletters of 1980, plus the February, May and August newsletters of 1981, a total of 7 newsletters -- nearly 2 year's newsletters for 1 year's dues. That is an expense to the BRS that we need to avoid. By moving the due-date up to January 1st, we will be able to identify our non-renewing members by March 1st (when the grace period ends), and achieve a saving.

If the 1982 procedure had been in effect in the above case, the non-renewing 1980 member would have received the 4 newsletters of 1980, plus the February 1981 issue, a total of 5 newsletters -- which is considerably better than the 7 that a number of non-renewing 1980 members actually did receive.

In future, we will give notice in the November issue that dues are due on January 1st. We are late in giving notice this year; to compensate, we will extend the grace period an extra 2 months for 1982.

Accordingly, your dues are due now, and we'd like to have them as soon as you can send them; but in any case, they should be received before May 1st if we are to send you the May newsletter.

This also applies to new members, who joined in 1981. No matter in which month you joined, you have all received the same BRS material: the 4 1981 newsletters and "Russell". The member who joined in December '81 has received just as much BRS material as the member who enrolled 11 months earlier, in January '81; the December member received it all at once, the January member received it over the course of a year.

We hope you will understand our need for this change. We also hope that that the shift to January 1st does not cause a money-problem for anyone; if it does, let us know.

Here is the dues schedule, in U.S. dollars: regular \$20, couple \$25, student \$10. Add \$7.50 outside the USA, Canada, and Mexico. Send dues to BRS, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036.

Thanks!

ANNUAL MEETING (1982)

- (3) June 25-27, Claremont, California is the time and place. For more, see (8b, 41).

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

- (4) President Bob Davis reports: see (8).

(5) Vice-President Harry Ruja reports:

The Vice-President of the BRS enjoys an Olympian detachment. The Bylaws assign him/her no functions as such whatever. That detachment was reinforced for me in 1981 by my stay in Israel from January through June. Moreover, I missed the Annual Meeting which this past year was again in Hamilton.

However, I was not so detached that I did not notice the turbulence around me. As a member of the Board of Directors, I was obliged to concern myself with the "Sutcliffe affair", which has been simmering since January 1977 and came to a boil in the fall of 1980 with Sutcliffe's expulsion. There have been aftershocks (to switch metaphors) all through 1981.

One good thing has come out of the controversy: a closer look at our Bylaws. A committee is giving thought to revising them, to enable the Society to deal more effectively with certain tasks whose procedures the present Bylaws do not explicitly or fully describe.

The work of the Society continues. The advertisements for members continue to appear and attract inquiries, the membership status is healthy, the newsletters continue to be informative and interesting, and planning for this year's Annual Meeting is already under way.

Here in Southern California, a number of us have met in informal and most congenial settings and have had opportunity to become better acquainted with one another and to discuss matters of common interest.

In a more academic vein, once again Ed Hopkins arranged a professional session on Russell's philosophy at the annual meeting of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association. Announcements of our Doctoral Grant have gone out to many universities and colleges, and we look forward to receiving inquiries from promising doctoral candidates.

Incidentally, things at McMaster are buzzing, and I have high hopes that the Blackwell-Ruja bibliography will appear before long. But no one says anything anymore about the lamented still-born Volume II of Mortals and Others, though I haven't given up hope on it.

All in all, despite some abrasiveness, the year has been a good one, and the Society is healthy.

Treasurer Dennis J. Darland reports:(6) For the quarter ending 12/31/81:

Balance on hand(9/30/81).....	965.16
Income: 43 new members.....	737.50
36 renewals.....	585.00
total dues.....	1322.50
Contributions.....	137.50
Sales of RSN, books,etc.....	149.01
total income.....	1609.01
	<u>2574.17</u>
Expenditures: Membership & Information Committees..	935.07
133 "Russell" subscriptions.....	465.50
BRS Library.....	12.75
Bank charges.....	24.08
total spent.....	1437.40
	<u>1437.40</u>
Balance on hand (12/31/81).....	<u>1136.77</u>

(7) For the year ending 12/31/81:

Balance on hand(12/31/80).....	2042.10
Income: new members.....	1795.00
renewals.....	3140.00
total dues	4935.00
Contributions	1437.50
Sale of RSN, books, etc	517.97
total income.....	6890.47
	<u>8932.57</u>
Expenditures: Info & Membership Committees.....	4844.62
"Russell" subscriptions	1064.00
Bertrand Russell Memorial (London)...	245.00
Library.....	952.74
1981 Annual Meeting.....	174.68
Incorporation fee.....	5.00
Bank charges.....	52.42
Other.....	457.34
total spent.....	7795.80
	<u>7795.80</u>
Balance on hand (12/31/81)	<u>1136.77</u>

(8a) President Bob Davis reports:

The tentative plan to hold the 1982 Annual Meeting at Oxford did not work out. Our contact there, Jack Lennard of the Wilberforce Council on Human Rights, was organizing primarily for us, and asked a commitment of at least 40 members. I of course could not make that commitment. However, he is now working on a more general meeting on the same theme of human rights, for the summer of 1983. I hope we will participate; let us discuss it at our June meeting. I hope those of you with views on the matter will communicate them to me. I will provide details on the 1983 gathering as I receive them.

(8b) I am pleased that the '82 Annual Meeting will be held at Scripps College, part of the Claremont Colleges, in Claremont, California, the last weekend in June (June 25-27). It has been five years since the last West Coast meeting. Los Angeles was discussed as the alternate spot for 1982 or 1983; Claremont is a suburb of Los Angeles. We have held a local meeting there, and I have also visited the campus on my own; it is beautiful and peaceful and should serve very well. See (41).

Details on how to get there, and other information, will be found in the May RSN. We will have meetings, room and board on campus. Room and board will cost about \$35 per day, pro-rated for the half-days of Friday and Sunday, which seems quite reasonable. I have appointed an Executive Committee for the meeting and for the BRS Award, consisting of Louis Acheson Jr., Jacqueline Berthon-Payon, Lee Eisler, Donald Hylton, Don Jackanicz, Harry Ruja, Dan Wray and myself. Anyone wishing to give a talk, or having a program suggestion or request, or a nominee for the BRS Award, please let me know about it soon as possible.

Some of the program is already lined up. Al Seckel will give a talk on Russell and the Cuban Missile Crisis, drawing on both published and unpublished sources. Dr. Gerald Larue, who spoke so well on the Moral Majority at the Humanist annual meeting in San Diego last spring, has agreed to talk to us on the subject. The program may also include these possibilities: a film dealing with BR's position on nuclear war; a talk or panel on disarmament; the celebrated Norman Lear film on the Moral Majority; a talk or panel on BR and the 1980s ("New Hopes for a Changing World" revisited). Dan Wray is planning to film parts of the meeting as well as interviews with members; a documentary film may result.

(8c) I plan to attend another Humanist meeting, in New York March 27-28. Not much has happened since the October AHA meeting; I hope to have some say on what should be done in a more concrete, activist way about the current climate of religious and moral intolerance. Anyone with ideas on this, please write me immediately.

My address and phone: 2501 Lake View Av., Los Angeles, CA 90039. (213)663-7485.

 REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES
(9) Membership Committee (Lee Eisler, Chairman; Jacqueline Berthon-Payon, Co-Chairman):

1982 ads for the BRS will appear about once a month in these publications: ATLANTIC MONTHLY, BOSTON MAGAZINE, FREE INQUIRY, HARPER'S, HUMANIST, MENSA, NATION, NEW REPUBLIC, NEW YORK REVIEW OF BOOKS, NOT MAN APART, PROGRESSIVE, SATURDAY REVIEW. FREE INQUIRY is a quarterly; THE HUMANIST appears 6 times a year; we are in all issues of both. We are in THE NATION (a weekly) about twice a month because of a special bargain rate. We are trying BOSTON MAGAZINE for 6 issues (Oct. 81 through Mar. 82). As you perhaps know, advertising is not an exact science. When advertising in a new publication, we cannot know in advance whether it will produce a sufficient number of inquiries to justify its cost. If the results are poor, we drop the publication, as we have done with INQUIRY (not to be confused with FREE INQUIRY). If you know of any publication that you think might be suitable for BRS ads, tell us, and we'll look into it.

(10) Science Committee (Alex Dely, Chairman):

"Almost exactly 2 years have passed since the statement was issued, signed by the late Albert Einstein, some other colleagues and myself, drawing attention to the dangers that would face humanity if another world war were to break out with the almost certainty of the widespread use of nuclear weapons.

"In fact, the stock piles of nuclear weapons have increased, new nations have joined the ranks of those producing those weapons...

"If this meeting could make clear the scientific facts with regard to such questions, and the place where certain knowledge ends, and hypothesis begins, it would perform a useful service... It follows that methods other than war, or the threat of war, must be devised for deciding questions as to which different nations disagree. The first step towards such methods must be the lessening of mutual suspicion."

In this way, Bertrand Russell opened the July 1957 Pugwash meeting of eminent scientists to discuss the elimination of the threat of nuclear war. After 25 years, the message retains its urgent validity.

The last 2 sentences deserve special emphasis regardless of whether you believe that the West is adequately or inadequately armed. Two projects gathering steam nationwide to establish alternative means of conflict resolution deserve the support of BRS members:

- 1) The movement to establish a National Peace Academy.
- 2) Establishment on many university campuses of "Committees for the Study of Peace and Conflict Resolution."

At the University of Arizona, a group of faculty as well as student organizations have met with the University President to obtain status as an academic program for a Master's degree. The prospects look excellent, and across the country, groups like this may finally bring facts and knowledge gathered from many branches of science into the defense debate. The goal is to achieve general conflict-resolution methods applicable at all levels of society. Many individual ideas have floated around for decades, but have not been integrated.

* I hope that the possibilities of these 2 projects will excite you as they do me, and that you may wish to promote similar community-based efforts. I can send you an extensive kit of materials, for doing so. Write me: Physics Dept., University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721. This way we may actually help implement Bertrand Russell's dream! How about it?

* Finally, a suggestion: at present most BRS committees are one-man committees, the one man being the Chairman. I suggest that every BRS member join some committee, and make suggestions to the Chairman as to what issues are of interest, and how they might be able to help. This could make committees more productive and effective in dealing with persons and organizations outside the BRS. If you agree with this, please send me a postcard saying so.

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL.

(11) "On The Evils Due To Fear", from If I Could Preach Just Once (New York: Harper, 1929) pp. 219-230:

On the Evils Due to Fear

By Hon. Bertrand Russell

IF I were about to be executed and were allowed twenty minutes in which to make a farewell address, what should I say? It would be necessary to be brief and simple, and I think I should concentrate upon one issue, namely the importance of eliminating fear. I do not imagine that mankind can be made perfect; whatever may be done, some defects will survive, but a great many of the defects from which adults suffer are due to preventable mistakes in their education, and the most important of these mistakes is the inculcation of fear. Parents, priests, and governments have despaired of maintaining their authority by an appeal to reason, and have preferred to produce abject, cowering slaves. I do not believe that any good thing is to be obtained through fear, and I hold that obedience not otherwise obtainable had better not be obtained. The objections to fear as a social force are of two kinds. There are the bad effects upon those who cause terror, and the bad effects upon those who suffer it. Both are grave, though the latter more so.

To begin with those who inspire terror. They inevitably become cruel and fond of thwarting others; they grow impatient of opposition and argument, and of every kind of reasoning tending to show that they have misused their authority. They come to prefer persons without self-respect and without principle. They are themselves inevitably filled with fears. They fear to lose their unjust authority; they fear to rouse merited resentment in their underlings; they fear that the world may be-

come more reasonable. These fears lead them to increase their cruelty, and every increase of cruelty increases their fear of reprisals. Thus there is a vicious circle tending to a perpetual intensification of the connected evils of tyranny and apprehension.

The effects of fear upon those who feel it are, however, very much worse. There are various kinds of fear; of these, physical fear, which alone is traditionally despised, is by far the least harmful. Moral and intellectual fears are far worse. All fear inspires a greater or less degree of rage, which, since it dare not vent itself upon the dreaded object, finds an outlet in tyranny over whatever is weaker. Just as in the holders of power cruelty begets fear, so in their slaves fear begets cruelty. Fear of social disapproval is probably one of the chief causes of meanness and unkindness in the modern world. People enjoy expressing social disapproval because they themselves have been thwarted by the fear of incurring it. When a man has sacrificed something of importance in order to retain the good opinion of his neighbors, he is naturally furious when some one else refuses to make the sacrifice, and he therefore becomes a fierce moralist, determined to punish the bold sinner. The sinners punished by social disapproval include almost all who are not hypocrites, all who have new ideas of a not purely scientific kind, and all who practice any morality more generous or less vindictive than that of their own herd. Fear of social disapproval is, therefore, a very dangerous quality to inculcate. Social cooperation should be voluntary and reasonable, not a craven submission of each to all.

One of the worst effects of fear is that it produces

stupidity. Intelligence requires a certain kind of intellectual fearlessness; it requires, at any rate, a capacity for intellectual independence, and intellectual independence will hardly be found where there is no degree of social independence. For this reason, societies which prize social cohesion unduly are almost sure to be composed of stupid individuals. They will, therefore, become incapable of progress, either scientifically or socially. Not even the most ardent feminist can deny that women have shown much less intellectual independence than men. I believe this to be mainly due to the fact that they have been more rigidly subjugated than men to a morality of fear. The recognized method of producing virtue in women has been the fear of social ostracism on earth, and hell fire hereafter. In order that these fears may acquire a firm hold, girls have been taught, from their earliest years, to be timid in their thoughts and to avoid following any argument to its logical conclusion, on the ground that all logical conclusions are unladylike. They have thus been left to practice the vices of the coward—envy, backbiting, and petty-mindedness. What the traditional moralist apparently fails to recognize is that the mental attitude leading to such vice causes infinitely more misery than a more fearless attitude which might sometimes lead to generous sins, but would never lead to ungenerous vices.

I regard with horror all those whose business is to keep the human spirit and the human intellect in fetters. I include among these almost all ministers of religion, a large proportion of school teachers, 90 per cent. of magistrates and judges, and a large proportion of those who have earned the respect of the community by their insistence on what is called a rigid moral standard. These different classes of men are all engaged in their several ways in endeavoring by means of social disapproval, or the criminal law, to produce belief in propositions which every candid inquirer can see to be at best doubtful, and which every student of statistics knows to be socially harmful. Take for example, the following facts from an American official publication: out of every thousand children born in America the number who die during the first year is: among the Portuguese 200.3, among the French-Canadians 171.3, among the Poles 157.2, among the native white population 93.8, and among the Jews 53.5. These figures show clearly that the infant mortality is proportional to the intensity of belief in the Christian religion. Herod caused nothing like such a massacre of innocents as is caused by Catholic dogma, and one of my reasons for publicly combating what I regard as superstition is to prevent this needless suffering of helpless children. And the

harm done by Christianity is very largely due to the fact that it has its psychological roots in fear.

When I say that fear is an evil, I do not mean that it can be adequately combated by conscious courage. Conscious courage does not eliminate fear, it merely prevents people from acting upon it; it thus involves a state of nervous tension which is almost sure to produce disastrous results. The right methods for avoiding fear depend upon the kind of fear involved. There are in the first place purely imaginary fears; such, for example, is the fear that eating ham or practicing birth control will be punished by an angry Deity. Such fears are instilled in youth with a view to producing certain kinds of conduct; they can be combated very simply by merely omitting to teach belief in false propositions to the young. I know it will be said that the young will not be virtuous unless they believe false propositions. This is a most curious attitude resting upon a twofold fallacy. There is first the belief that virtuous behavior is something in favor of which no rational argument can be given, and second the further belief that irrational and untrue arguments are going to be sufficient to lead to painful self-denials, which admittedly cannot be defended on any reasonable ground. To teach rational behavior is undoubtedly difficult, but it is certainly easier by rational than by irrational means. Accustom a child to suppose that there are good reasons for what you say; let him verify for himself that this is the case wherever such verification is possible to him. Tell him nothing whatsoever that you do not seriously believe to be true. Cultivate his scientific spirit, so that he will for himself test your assertions when he can, and you will produce in the end a human being capable of a degree of rationality entirely impossible to those who have been brought up upon a conception of sin derived from arbitrary theological prohibitions. If it be said that rational human beings will not conform to the whole of the ethical code that has been inculcated by the Church, so much the worse for that code.

There is another class of fears where danger is real but can be eliminated by sufficient skill. The simplest examples of this are physical dangers such as are incurred in mountain-climbing. But there are a large number of others. Take, for example, the danger of social disapproval. It is quite true that one man may steal a horse while another man may not look over the hedge; this difference depends mainly upon a certain kind of difference in instinctive attitude toward other people. The man who expects to be ill-treated will be, while the man who approaches his fellows in fearless friendliness will find this attitude justified by results. Boys who are

afraid of dogs run away from them, which causes the dogs to come yapping at their heels, while boys who like dogs find that the dogs like them. Exactly the same thing applies to our behavior in regard to other people, but the right result cannot be produced by screwing up one's courage to face what one believes to be hostility; it can be produced only by a certain genuine friendliness and expectation of friendliness.

There is yet a third class of dangers which cannot altogether be avoided, but which may be felt to be more or less terrible according to a man's outlook. Such, for example, is the danger of financial loss. A great part of many people's lives is overshadowed by the fear of poverty. Great poverty such as that of a wage-earner out of work is undoubtedly a very terrible evil, but the comparative poverty which well-to-do business men dread is only rendered a serious evil by misdirection of interests and tastes. The reasons for desiring wealth are luxury and ostentation. Luxury is the pleasure of lazy men who do not enjoy any form of activity, and ostentation is the pleasure of those whose principal desire is to be envied by fools. Neither of these pleasures will be strong in those whose active impulses have been allowed free play in youth, but a discipline based upon fear too often curbs these impulses, since virtuous parents fear that they will lead to sin, and fussy parents fear that they will lead to danger. Almost all sound education consists in providing opportunities for activities. An undesirable form of activity should not be directly checked, but should be replaced by creating an environment in which some more useful form becomes more attractive. The result will be the production of human beings who do not desire great wealth, and do not greatly fear its loss if they happen to acquire it. Fear of social disapproval should be met in the same way, not by teaching people to resist heroically the impulses to conformity, but by teaching them a certain kind of self-respect which will make them comparatively indifferent to the approval of the herd, so long as they have the approval of their own judgment and of those whose opinion is worthy of respect.

I do not wish to suggest that absence of fear is alone enough to produce a good human being; undoubtedly other things are necessary. But I do suggest that freedom from fear is *one* of the most important things to aim at, and is perhaps more easily achieved by a wise education than any other equally desirable quality. Freedom from fear confers physical, moral, and intellectual benefits. Miss Margaret McMillan points out that children who are

frequently scolded do not breathe rightly, and are thus more apt than other children to suffer from adenoids. Many other examples could be given of the way in which fear damages health, more especially through its interference with digestion. The moral damage that it does is even more important. This damage is partly a result of the injury to health, for, as is now well known, many of the gravest moral defects are connected with bad functioning of the digestive processes. Of this, avarice is a notable example. But the most important evil due to fear is the attitude of rage against the world. Dr. John B. Watson has demonstrated that the instinctive stimulus to rage in new-born infants is constriction of the limbs, or anything that interferes with freedom of movement. From this origin, through the process of conditioned reflexes studied by Pavlov, the rage reaction grows out gradually, so that it comes to be elicited by a number of other stimuli. When a man fears his fellows, he reacts in defense as he would react if they were actually interfering with his liberty of movement. At least he reacts in this way so far as his emotions are concerned, but the overt expression of rage is partly inhibited by his fears, and therefore he looks about unconsciously for some safe outlet. He may find this in religious or moral persecution, in love of war, in opposition to humanitarian innovations, in oppression of his children, or in all of these combined. All these vices are in nine cases out of ten a result of hidden fears.

Intellectually, also, fear has disastrous results. There is the fear of any unusual opinion which prevents men from thinking straight on any subject on which their neighbors have foolish opinions. Then there is the fear of death, which prevents men from thinking straight on theological subjects; and then there is the fear of self-direction, which leads men to seek some authority to which they can submit their judgment. These various forms of fear are responsible for quite half the stupidity in the world. Most of the stock of fear with which men and women go through life is implanted in them during the first six years of childhood, either with a view to making them "good" or by contagion from the fears of parents. For my part, I care nothing for the virtue which is rooted in fear, and I should seek everywhere, but more especially in early education, to produce human beings capable of social coöperation to the necessary extent for reasons with which fear should have nothing whatever to do. This is in my opinion the essential problem of moral education—a problem by no means insoluble, and only thought to be difficult owing to the weight of prejudice and cruel tradition.

(Thank you, KEN MYLOTT)

BR'S INFLUENCE

- (12) JOHN VAN WISSEN recently became a member. We sent him the usual Questionnaire, and got back some unusual answers.

What first made you aware of BR's existence or of his writings?

Bertrand Russell was one of those "no good" authors, translated into the Dutch language, my father used to read when I was very young. Emile Zola and a fellow named Diderot or something were others, like BR, whose black-listed books were put out of sight by my saintly mother whenever rumour had it that a Parish Priest was about to visit. Especially after Easter, when such a visit was predictable, father's books, together with the non-Catholic daily, the "Delftse Courant", were rounded up and hidden as soon as he left for work. Father read libraries. He was different. Very few aunts and uncles liked him. He did not go to church any more, which grieved my mother, and I sensed that those no-good books had something to do with it all. On many a Saturday, father made me do the rounds among the libraries, with a note: "Any NEW book by the following authors:..." Bertrand Russell was one of them, and I prayed a lot along the way that they wouldn't have any more books by those guys. So I knew that BR existed when I was perhaps ten, and I remember it well now that I'm fifty-five and a member of The Bertrand Russell Society.

What do you now value most about BR?

Well, now, let me see. BR was there when I needed a BR. I value BR because he helped me off the path of Righteousness. BR can still drag people out of the Cave causing them to get hit by lightning. BR helped me put my mixed-up head in order! BR was the event in the scheme of things that disturbed my mental frame of reference, thereby causing me to interpret experience differently. Unlike the True Believers (of the CCNY affair), I turned out to accept and admire BR, and that's because I'm smart. BR was one of my lucky stars. I like BR.

- (13) John Lennon. We are indebted to WILLIAM JARRELL for the following:

The magazine, "Beatlefan" (October/November 1981) prints a transcript of an RKO Radio interview with John Lennon on December 8, 1980, the day he was murdered. An excerpt:

"My whole generation was brought up with the bomb. I remember Bertrand Russell and the H-bomb, and the reason that we were rock-and-rollers in the 50s is because the bomb might go off any minute."

THE BRS AWARD (1982)

- (14) * Name your candidate for the 1982 BRS Award. A candidate should have done one of the following:
- . made an important contribution to Russell scholarship (as BRS Award Winner Paul A. Schilpp did);
 - . popularized important ideas, thus enlightening the public (as BRS Award Winner Steve Allen does in his TV program, "Meeting of Minds");
 - . worked closely with BR in an important way;
 - . acted to further a cause that BR believed in. M.I.T. Professor Henry W. Kendall, who heads the Union of Concerned Scientists, and who works against nuclear armaments (and nuclear power), would qualify;
 - . acted in ways that exhibit qualities of character (such as moral courage) reminiscent of BR.

Send your candidate's name to the BRS Award Committee, care of the newsletter (address on Page 1, bottom), and say why you think your candidate deserves the Award. If you name a well-known figure, it may earn publicity for the BRS, which is a plus. If you are not sure whether your candidate qualifies, don't let that stop you; let the Award Committee make that decision.

OK, start thinking!

ON NUCLEAR WAR

- (15) The danger of nuclear war preoccupied BR during the last portion of his life. This recent paper by BRS Science Committee Chairman ALEX DELY describes some current misperceptions.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS: PERCEPTIONS VS. REALITIES

Introduction. Andrei Sakharov, the father of the Soviet thermonuclear bomb, who is presently exiled in Russia, has recently called for Soviet and Western scientists alike to be faithful to their "special professional and social responsibilities" and take a public stand when nuclear warfare is the issue. No matter how painful it is to speak out for the truth when one out of every two physicists in this country is employed through Department of Defense grants, it is crucial that questions of peace and disarmament be given absolute priority

even in the most difficult circumstances.

The following observations are drawn from a talk at the Colloquium on Science Disarmament by Wolfgang Panofsky, Director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. Dr. Panofsky has for many years carefully mapped the many aspects of the nuclear war problem. He has arrived at the conclusion that defense policy makers simultaneously:

- 1) overestimate what technology can predict in certain areas, and
- 2) ignore scientific realities in other areas.

Recent statements by Reagan Administration officials indicate a belief in a winnable limited nuclear conflict. Yet Edward Anderson, a former missile guidance consultant at Honeywell, now at the University of Minnesota, publicly maintained that because of inherent aiming problems, no missile can be trusted to hit enough targets on a first firing to avoid massive retaliation. When a missile is fired along an untested trajectory, one cannot predict how large this "bias error" will be. In fact, the uncertainties, and the consequences of missing, are enormous. This example illustrates Panofsky's thesis, and its derivative, namely, that once nuclear war is initiated by any power, under any doctrine, in any theatre, for any tactical purpose, the outcome will be continued escalation of the conflict.

Physical vs. Political Reality. During the past two decades, a dangerous divorce has taken place between the physical realities of nuclear weapons and the perceptions of such weapons as a source of power, perceptions which have become a political reality. This role reversal, from physical carrier of destruction to political tool, has made impossible a rational assessment of a nation's "adequate nuclear weapon supply". This role reversal thus leads to an amplification of the arms race; and arms control agreements that focus on reduction in numbers (symbols of power) are doomed to failure, unless we consistently and insistently are mindful of the medical-technical realities of the use of these weapons. A distorted perception lies at the heart of the arms race. Unless this changes, arms control will fail. The message of groups such as Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the American Friends Service Committee will continue to stress this fact.

However, the history of the arms race suggests that non-scientific (political) factors overshadow technical or military factors as reasons for the arms build-up. Indeed, forces internal to each nation fuel arms acquisitions and exports (not related to the international situation) in these ways:

- 1) In capitalist and socialist countries alike, there are strong institutional pressures to increase the arms build-up (which takes 25% of the national budget), by the military sector. This is not a matter of ideology, but of pure institutional economics; any producer can give dozens of reasons why more of his product is needed.
- 2) The "we want it too" syndrome (childish!) is a powerful internal political factor. New technology such as the MX, particle beam and laser weapons (among many others) is especially sensitive to this. A perceived breakthrough is potentially too great an item of prestige for politicians to forgo, even if military significance is non-existent. And of course, the other side wants the same item, fueling another round of arms build-up (and resultant decrease in budgets for social services.)
- 3) The asymmetry of perception which causes fear is possibly the most serious driving force. Both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. claim that the other side has achieved superiority. Obviously, they cannot both be right. The problem here is that politicians engage in simplistic number manipulation, while publicly ignoring hard-to-quantify factors such as the reliability of allies, differences in geography, length of boundaries shared with potential adversaries, etc...etc...Especially at defense budget appropriations time, the simplistic political perception far outweighs objective reality.
- 4) The secrecy of military planning in itself causes fear and thus fuels the arms race, besides diminishing the feasibility of verifying any arms control agreement.
- 5) New technology generates its own momentum.
- 6) The "we must have more than they have" attitude. No defense analyst would claim that the outcome of a nuclear conflict depends on the number of weapons available, i.e., that the side with the most weapons will prevail. To claim that would be to ignore the history of military strategy. The linkage of arms control to national politics (as in the SALT II Senate ratification hearings), where numerology is king, actually impedes arms control.
- 7) Inherent political momentum can impede arms control. When a military system proves a useful bargaining chip, it becomes politically impossible to drop it after negotiations are completed. Salt I eliminated the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) system, yet neither the U.S. nor the U.S.S.R. have actually abandoned it.

In sum, nuclear weapons today serve primarily a political purpose, regardless of physical utility; and if ever used, the effects will be largely incalculable. One firm conclusion (as published in "Physics Today", June 1981) is that a nuclear conflict will be "offense-dominated", because a nuclear warhead does such extreme damage, the costs of "ensured" interception, missile silo defense, and limitation of casualties, render the total "defensive" costs astronomical compared to the costs of a first strike.

What can be done? Conventional non-nuclear military strategy maintains that one needs more bullets than targets, because many bullets may miss their target. Nuclear weapons, however, inflict enormous damage

whether the original target was hit or missed!

Until the political basis of the nuclear arms race diminishes in importance, there are still some options for the near future:

- 1) Unilateral action. A first step would be to eliminate clearly redundant weapons systems and those susceptible to first strike attack.
- 2) Sufficiency. Nuclear stockpiles should be solely evaluated in terms of a nation's need to counteract only those military and/or economic targets of importance, and not necessarily in kind. Such a strategy will lower the number of warheads required for a "sufficient" national defense.
- 3) Arms Control Negotiations. Linkage between arms control and other domestic or international issues of contention should be minimized, and negotiations must guarantee security for both sides.
- 4) Technical advice. Top policy makers should assign to their staff at least one scientist who has contact with military developments, and who can make known all the uncertainties in weapons technology.
- 5) Public education. An all-out effort is needed to stress the technical realities and minimize the political ones.

Let us hope that the reality of what would happen in a nuclear war is not so painful to most citizens that they will choose psychological denial, which is the route we are traveling today. That is the worst possible approach. It is time to speak out, in the best interest of all nations.

(Members who wish to become involved in BRS Science Committee activities related to defense policy are urged to contact me. Physics Dept., U. of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721)

(For a thoroughgoing and detailed examination of the calamity of nuclear war — along with the phenomenon of psychological denial that Alex refers to — see the 3-part article by Jonathan Schell in The New Yorker Magazine — February 1, 8, 15, 1982 — also mentioned in Item 47. Ed.)

PHILOSOPHY

(16) Philosophy for all. Pace University is bringing Philosophy out of the ivory tower and into the open. They have opened a Museum of Philosophy. They have scheduled a Congress — and a Contest — for students; and not just for college students, but also for those in high school and junior high school.

"The Museum's aim is to bring philosophical questions and concepts before the public, and especially children, in an enjoyable and understandable manner. There are programs designed for people of all ages and educational backgrounds, with a particular emphasis on programs for children. There should be something for everyone with a sense of wonder." (from their folder)

This is some of what The New York Times (10/31/81) said about the opening of "what the creators call the world's first Museum of Philosophy":

What are Locke's Socks? Some visiting students really did want to know. On one wall hung six socks. The first was a white cotton sweat sock. The next had a colorful patch on it, the third a couple of patches, and so on until the sixth sock was nothing but patches.

"Assume," said a guide, "the six socks represent a person's socks over time. This is the image John Locke used. Can we say that a sock which is finally all patches, with none of the original material, is the same sock?" In short, the principle of identity.

This is the announcement of the Congress and the Contest:

FIRST NATIONAL CONGRESS ON PHILOSOPHY FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE STUDENTS: 1982

NATIONAL ESSAY CONTEST IN PHILOSOPHY FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE STUDENTS: 1982

The Museum of Philosophy at Pace University has organized two major philosophy events for Junior High School, High School and College Students.

The first is a National Essay Contest in Philosophy for which scholarship awards will be given at each school level. Teachers in Junior High Schools, High Schools and Colleges around the country will be invited to submit essays by their students for the Contest. Students may also submit their entries directly.

The Museum of Philosophy has also organized the First National Congress on Philosophy for Junior High School, High School and College Students in which, for the first time, students will have the opportunity to present formal papers, some of which later will be published in book form. They will also have the opportunity to construct and present exhibits, dioramas, experiments and demonstrations on a wide range of topics in philosophy including: ethics, aesthetics, theory of knowledge, history of philosophy and the relation between philosophy and science.

Students are also invited to submit papers outlining original philosophical theories or theoretical viewpoints which they have developed. The principal aim of these events is to stimulate students' interest in philosophy and provide a forum for the top students in the United States to present their ideas and proposals, analyses and exhibits on human knowledge and the human condition.

Leading philosophers from around the nation, including specialists in philosophy for children, will be present to give lectures and run seminars and workshops.

For more information about any of this, write Museum of Philosophy, Pace University, NY NY 10038. Please mention that you read about them in Russell Society News.

HUMANISM

(17) WARREN ALLEN SMITH was surprised (and pleased) to see his article that appeared in "The Humanist" 30 years ago reappear in the March/April 1981 issue. Here are parts of it:

A. J. AYER: I do not know what distinction you wish to draw between atheistic humanism and naturalistic humanism. Is it that the atheistic humanists dramatize the fact that there is no God, whereas the naturalistic humanists assume it without being emotionally impressed by it? Or would you include theists and agnostics among your naturalistic humanists so long as their main interest was in the fortunes and activities of human beings independently of any matters of religious belief or disbelief? If this is the criterion of naturalistic humanism then I should classify myself as a naturalistic humanist, although I am in fact an atheist.

Naturalistic humanism seems to me, as I understand you to define it, essentially not a dramatic creed and I therefore doubt if it can properly be said to "spur literary imagination." On the other hand, I think that great works of literature may very well be written by naturalistic humanists. I should judge this to be especially true of novels. Dickens, Trollope, Balzac, Stendhal, and Turgenev are obvious examples, and I have no doubt that you can find many more. I cannot see any reason, either in logic or in fact, why the serious interest in his subject which is required by the imaginative writer should depend upon his holding any religious or metaphysical beliefs.

BERTRAND RUSSELL: You ask me whether I call myself a scientific humanist or a naturalistic humanist. I am not in the habit of giving myself labels, which I leave to others. I should not have any inclination to call myself a humanist, as I think, on the whole, that the nonhuman part of the cosmos is much more interesting and satisfactory than the human part. But if anybody feels inclined to call me a humanist, I shall not bring an action for libel.

ALBERT SCHWEITZER: I find the articles [in *The Humanist*] very interesting and my full sympathy is given to the movement which you represent: humanism. The world thinks it must raise itself above humanism; that it must look for a more profound spirituality. It has taken a false road. Humanism in all its simplicity is the only genuine spirituality. Only ethics and religion which include in themselves the humanitarian ideal have true value. And humanism is the most precious result of rational meditation upon our existence and that of the world.

ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, JR.: My own views on the problem are rudimentary. It seems to me that the most important thing for the preservation of civilization is a belief in moral standards. That belief is really most solid when it is founded upon a fervent belief in a supernatural order. For those of us who lack a belief in supernatural religion, we must base our standards as securely as possible on our own conception of man. For my own part, I find the Christian interpretation—as in Reinhold Niebuhr—of the incompleteness of merely human experience and the inadequacy of merely human resources entirely convincing; but I cannot go along with the belief that this incompleteness and this inadequacy are to be perfected by an infusion of the supernatural. I do not know where this puts me in your categories, but I do think that any great literature must be based on an understanding of the weakness and fallibility, the misery as well as the grandeur, of man.

RELIGION

(18) Scientific creationism, an oxymoron. First the good news, then the bad, all from The New York Times, on the dates shown:

(18a) The judge's decision (1/6/83, p. 1):

Judge Overturns Arkansas Law On Creationism

He Says It Violates Rule on Church and State

By REGINALD STUART

Special to The New York Times

LITTLE ROCK, Ark., Jan. 5 - A Federal district judge today overturned the Arkansas law requiring "balanced" classroom treatment for the theories of evolution and "creation science."

In stopping the state from carrying out the law, Arkansas Act 580, Judge William Ray Overton of the United

States Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas declared in a sharply worded 38-page opinion that "creation science" "has no scientific merit or educational value."

He ruled: "Since creation science is

not science, the conclusion is inescapable that the only real effect of Act 580 is the advancement of religion."

"It was simply and purely an effort to introduce the biblical version of creation into the public school curricula," he said. Since this would violate the Constitution's guarantees of separation of church and state, he said, the act therefore must be barred from execution. The law was to go into effect in the fall.

Bill Advances in Mississippi

Judge Overton's opinion, accompanying a permanent injunction, was issued in the case of McLean v. Arkansas Board of Education. Arkansas having enacted the law only in March, it was the first judicial test in the country of a state "creationism" law.

In Louisiana, the next state to adopt such a law, a court challenge has been filed by the American Civil Liberties Union, which fought the law in Arkansas. There were more than 20 plaintiffs in the case, including the Rev. Bill McLean, a Presbyterian minister in Little Rock, whose name is on the case.

Other state legislatures are weighing similar measures. The Mississippi State Senate, minutes after convening today, approved a creation science bill. It must still pass the state House and Gov. William Winter has not taken a position on

the issue.

At a news conference here in Little Rock after Judge Overton's order was filed, the Arkansas Attorney General, Steve Clark, said that it was "probable" that he would appeal. He said it would take several weeks for him to decide. An appeal would go to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Creation science is an account of the origin of life that closely parallels the first 11 chapters of the Book of Genesis in the Bible. The close resemblance prompted the opposition to the law and a court challenge on the ground that it was only a smokescreen for teaching religion in public schools. In his opinion, the judge concurred.

Date of Origin Is an Issue

The tenets of creation science include the creation of all things by a supernatural force, separate origins of human beings and animals, the recent origin of the world, thousands of years ago, and an origin that included a catastrophic flood. Evolution science, in contrast, holds that human beings evolved from lower forms of life millions of years ago.

These contrasting distinctions are set forth in Section 4 of the Arkansas law, with six definitions applied to each school of thought.

Opponents of the law, a group of clerics, teachers and scientists, argued that creation science was religion, not

science, and that its teaching would violate the First Amendment requirement of separation of church and state and the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment.

In the trial last month, the plaintiffs sought to prove that creation science had no scientific merit, that it could not be taught without involving the state in religious matters and would impede academic freedom. The state hinged its defense hopes on the contention that creation science was a science.

In a review of the history of the legislation, Judge Overton said that "creationism" was an offshoot of fundamentalism, which began in the 19th century in response to social change, new religious thought and Darwinism, the theory of evolutionary biology outlined by Charles Darwin 120 years ago.

"Creationists have adopted the view of fundamentalists generally," the judge wrote, "that there are only two positions with respect to the origins of the earth and life: belief in the inerrancy of the Genesis story of creation and of a worldwide flood as fact, or belief in what they call evolution."

"The creationist organizations consider the introduction of creation science into the public schools part of their ministry."

On the legislative history of the Arkansas act, he wrote that the proponents of the law were motivated solely by their religious beliefs and that the legis-

lature had conducted no "meaningful" fact-finding before it enacted the law.

But even if the court considered only the language of the law, Judge Overton wrote: "The evidence is overwhelming that both the purpose and effect of Act 580 is the advancement of religion in the public schools."

Inescapable Religiosity

"Both the concepts and wording of Section 4 (a) convey an inescapable religiosity."

As to the state's requirement that instruction on the origin of life follow a "two model" approach, evolution and creation, Judge Overton said:

"The two-model approach of the creationists is simply a contrived dualism which has no scientific factual basis or legitimate educational purpose. It assumes only two explanations for the origin of life and existence of man, planets and animals: it was either the work of a creator or it was not."

"Application of these two models, according to creationists, dictates that all scientific evidence which fails to support the theory of evolution is necessarily scientific evidence in support of creationism and is therefore creation science 'evidence' in support of Section 4 (a)," the judge said.

He assailed the law's definition of the theory of evolution as "simply a hodgepodge of limited assertions, many of which are factually inaccurate."

(18b) Excerpts from the ruling (1/6/82, p. B8):

LITTLE ROCK, Ark., Jan. 5 (AP) — Following is the text of the definitions given in Section 4 of Arkansas' Act 580, the creation science law, and excerpts from today's ruling in the case by Federal District Judge William Overton:

Section of Law

Definitions, As used in this act:

(a) "Creation-science" means the scientific evidences for creation and inferences from those scientific evidences. Creation-science includes the scientific evidences and related inferences that indicate: (1) Sudden creation of the universe, energy, and life from nothing; (2) The insufficiency of mutation and natural selection in bringing about development of all living kinds from a single organism; (3) Changes only within fixed limits of originally created kinds of plants and animals; (4) Separate ancestry for man and apes; (5) Explanation of the earth's geology by catastrophism, including the occurrence of a worldwide flood; and (6) A relatively recent inception of the earth and living kinds.

(b) "Evolution-science" means the scientific evidences for evolution and inferences from those scientific evidences. Evolution-science includes the scientific evidences and related inferences that indicate: (1) Emergence by naturalistic processes of the universe from disordered matter and emergence of life from nonlife; (2) The sufficiency of mutation and natural selection in bringing about development of present living kinds from simple earlier kinds; (3) Emergence by mutation and natural selection of present living kinds from simple earlier kinds; (4) Emergence of man from a common ancestor with apes; (5) Explanation of the earth's geology and the evolutionary sequence by uniformitarianism; and (6) An inception several billion years ago of the earth and somewhat later of life.

Excerpts From Decision

The evidence establishes that the definition of "creation-science" has as its unmentioned reference the first 11 chapters of the Book of Genesis. Among the many creation epics in human history, the account of sudden creation from nothing, or creatio ex nihilo, and subsequent destruction of the world by flood is unique to Genesis. The concepts are the literal fundamentalists' view of Genesis.

The ideas are not merely similar to the literal interpretation of Genesis; they are identical and parallel to no other story of creation.

The argument that creation from nothing does not involve a supernatural deity has no evidentiary or rational support. To the contrary, "creation out of nothing" is a concept unique to Western religions. In traditional Western religious thought, the conception of a creator of the world is a conception of God.

Indeed, creation of the world "out of nothing" is the ultimate religious statement because God is the only actor. As Dr. Langdon Gilkey noted, the Act refers to one who has the power to bring all the universe into existence from nothing. The only "one" who has this power is God.

The argument advanced by defendants' witness, Dr. Norman Geisler, that teaching the existence of God is not religious unless the teaching seeks a commitment, is contrary to common understanding and contradicts settled case law.

The approach to teaching "creation-science" and "evolution-science" is identical to the two-model approach espoused by the Institute for Creation Research and is taken almost verbatim from I.C.R. writings. It is an extension of fundamentalists' view that one must either accept the literal interpretation of Genesis or else believe

in the godless system of evolution.

"No Scientific Factual Basis"

The two-model approach of the creationists is simply a contrived dualism which has no scientific factual basis or legitimate educational purpose. The emphasis on origins as an aspect of the theory of evolution is peculiar to creationist literature. Although the subject of origins of life is within the province of biology, the scientific community does not consider origins of life a part of evolutionary theory.

The theory of evolution assumes the existence of life and is directed to an explanation of how life evolved. Evolution does not presuppose the absence of a creator or God and the plain inference conveyed by Section 4 is erroneous.

The essential characteristics of science are: (1) It is guided by natural law; (2) It has to be explanatory by reference to natural law; (3) It is testable against the empirical world; (4) Its conclusions are tentative, i.e., are not necessarily the final word; and (5) it is falsifiable.

Creation science as described in Section 4 (a) fails to meet these essential characteristics. First, the section revolves around 4 (a) (1) which asserts a sudden creation "from nothing." Such a concept is not science because it depends upon supernatural intervention which is not guided by natural law. It is not explanatory by reference to natural law, is not testable and is not falsifiable.

If the unifying idea of supernatural creation by God is removed from Section 4, the remaining parts of the section explain nothing and are meaningless assertions.

Section 4 (a) (2), relating to the "insufficiency of mutation and natural selection in bringing about development of all living kinds from a single organism," is an incomplete negative generalization directed at the theory of

evolution.

Section 4 (a) (3) which describes "changes only within fixed limits of originally created kinds of plants and animals" fails to conform to the essential characteristics of science for several reasons.

First, there is no scientific definition of "kinds" and none of the witnesses was able to point to any scientific authority which recognized the term or knew how many "kinds" existed.

Second, the assertion appears to be an effort to establish outer limits of changes within species. There is no scientific explanation for these limits which is guided by natural law and the limitations, whatever they are, cannot be explained by natural law.

The statement in 4 (a) (4) of "separate ancestry of man and apes" is a bald assertion. It explains nothing and refers to no scientific fact or theory.

Section 4 (a) (5) refers to "explanation of the earth's geology by catastrophism, including the occurrence of a worldwide flood." This assertion completely fails as science. The Act is referring to the Noachian flood described in the Book of Genesis.

A Supernatural Force

The creationist writers concede that any kind of Genesis flood depends upon supernatural intervention. A worldwide flood as an explanation of the world's geology is not the product of natural law, nor can its occurrence be explained by natural law.

Section 4 (a) (6) equally fails to meet the standards of science. "Relatively recent inception" has no scientific meaning. It can only be given meaning by reference to creationist writings which place the age at between 6,000 and 20,000 years because of the genealogy of the Old Testament. Such a reasoning process is not the product of natural law; not explainable by natural law; nor is it tentative. Individuals and groups who work inde-

pendently in such varied fields as biology, paleontology, geology and astronomy. Their work is published and subject to review and testing by their peers.

The journals for publication are both numerous and varied. There is, however, not one recognized scientific journal which has published an article espousing the creation-science theory described in Section 4.

Some of the state's witnesses suggested that the scientific community was "close-minded" on the subject of creationism and that explained the lack of acceptance of the creation science arguments. Yet no witness produced a scientific article for which publication had been refused.

Cannot Accept Argument

Perhaps some members of the scientific community are resistant to new ideas. It is, however, inconceivable that such a loose knit group of independent thinkers in all the varied fields of science could, or would, so effectively censor new scientific thought.

The methodology employed by creationists is another factor which is indicative that their work is not science. A scientific theory must be tentative and always subject to revision or abandonment in light of facts that are inconsistent with, or falsify, a theory. A theory that is by its own terms dogmatic, absolutist and never subject to revision is not a scientific theory.

The creationists' methods do not take data, weigh it against the opposing scientific data, and therefore reach the conclusions stated in Section 4 (a). Instead, they take the literal wording of the Book of Genesis and attempt to find scientific support for it.

An Unscientific Approach

The Creation Research Society employs the same unscientific approach to the issue of creationism. Its applicants for membership must subscribe

to the belief that the Book of Genesis is "historically and scientifically true in all of the original autographs."

The court would never criticize or discredit any person's testimony based on his or her religious beliefs. While anybody is free to approach a scientific inquiry in any fashion they choose, they cannot properly describe the methodology used as scientific, if

they start with a conclusion and refused to change it regardless of the evidence developed during the course of the investigation.

It is easy to understand why educators find the creationists' textbook material and teaching guides unacceptable. The materials misstate the theory of evolution in the same fashion as Section 4 (b) of the Act, with empha-

sis on the alternative mutually exclusive nature of creationism and evolution. Students are constantly encouraged to compare and make a choice between the two models, and the material is not presented in an accurate manner.

The "public school edition" texts written by creationists simply omit Biblical references but the content and

message remain the same.

Since creation science is not science, the conclusion is inescapable that the only real effect of Act 590 is the advancement of religion.

References to the pervasive nature of religious concepts in creation science texts amply demonstrate why state entanglement with religion is

inevitable under Act 590. Involvement of the state in screening texts for impermissible religious references will require state officials to make delicate religious judgments. The need to monitor classroom discussion in order to uphold the Act's prohibition against religious instruction will necessarily involve administrators in questions concerning religion.

(18c) Stephen Jay Gould comments (1/12/82, p.A15):

CAMBRIDGE, Mass. — Biblical literalists, this time masquerading under the nonsense phrase "scientific creationism," have just lost the first skirmish of round three.

In Little Rock, Ark., Federal District Judge William R. Overton has declared the Arkansas "balanced treatment" act unconstitutional because it forces biology teachers to purvey religion (and a narrow, sectarian concept of religion at that) in science classrooms.

Round one was lost in 1983 (also in Arkansas), when the United States Supreme Court, in *Epperson v. Arkansas*, threw out an anti-evolution statute much like the Tennessee law used to convict John T. Scopes. In the famous "monkey trial" of 1925. These laws specifically enjoined the teaching of evolution.

So creationists tried again (round two), asking not that evolution be excised from curricula but that their religious view be given equal time. These laws, passed in several states, were also invalidated as violating the First Amendment and its insistence on separation of church and state.

In round three, creationists have banished God from their legal language, and advocated equal time for the same antediluvian views, now renamed "scientific creationism" and supposedly free of religious content or motivation. Judge Overton saw through the ruse, and acted accordingly.

Arkansas Act 890 of 1981, now invalidated, patently displays the firm

mooring of "creation science" in the book of Genesis read literally. "Creation science" means, the act declared, in part, "[s]udden creation of the universe, energy and life from nothing. . . ; separate ancestry for man and apes; explanation of the earth's geology by catastrophism, including the occurrence of a worldwide flood; and . . . a relatively recent inception of the earth and living kinds."

One might wonder why creationists expose their biblical literalism so openly: Why do they not opt for more general language, thus obfuscating the sectarian source of their doctrine? They cannot, for they are boxed in by their own extremism. General language might permit such allegorical interpretations of creation as an equation of biblical "days" with millions of years — and a rough correspondence of Genesis with geology. Yet, to creationists, this "liberal theology" is as evil as evolution itself, and equally worthy of dogged attack. The issue is not religion vs. science, for no such opposition exists, but a particular, narrow sectarianism opposed to knowledge and learning in general. Thus, 12 of the 17 individual plaintiffs who sued successfully to invalidate Act 590 are ministers and bishops.

I testified for the plaintiffs. I only wish that the entire nation could have taken two weeks off and sat in Judge Overton's courtroom to witness the utter intellectual bankruptcy of "scientific creationism." It takes hour after hour to cut through clever rhetoric, and to discover, invariably, nothing underneath.

(18d) Clarence Darrow at the 1925 Scopes trial (1/12/82, p.A15):

Evolution, A 'Crime'

In March 1925, the Tennessee Legislature outlawed the teaching of "any theory that denies the story of the Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man has descended from the lower order of animals." That July, in a case that became known as the "monkey trial," John T. Scopes was tried in Dayton for teaching the theory of evolution and fined \$100 for the misdemeanor. Clarence Darrow was chief defense counsel. The prosecuting attorney was William Jennings Bryan. Following are excerpts from Mr. Darrow's remarks during the second day of the trial, in the circuit court of Rhea County. (In 1927, the Tennessee Supreme Court reversed the circuit court's decision.)

Here is the State of Tennessee, lying peacefully, surrounded by its beautiful mountains, each one of which contains evidence that the earth is millions of

years old. Here is a state going along in its own business, teaching evolution for years: state boards handing out books on evolution, professors in colleges, teachers in schools, lawyers at the bar, physicians, ministers — a great percentage of the intelligent citizens of the State of Tennessee, evolutionists, had not even thought it was necessary to leave their Church.

They believed that they could appreciate and understand and make their own simple and human doctrine of the Nazarene, to love their neighbors, be kindly with them, not to place a fine on and not to try to send to jail some man who did not believe as they believed. And they got along all right with it, too, until something happened.

They have not thought it necessary to give up their Church because they believed that all that was here was not made on the first six days of creation, or that it had come by a slow process of developments extending over the ages, or that one thing grew out of another.

They are people who believed that organic life and the plants and animals and man, and the mind of man, and the religion of man are the subjects of evolution, and they have not

got through, and that the God in which they believed did not finish creation on the first day, but that he is still working to make something better and higher still out of human beings, who are next to God, and that evolution has been working forever and will work forever — they believe it.

And along comes somebody who says we have got "to believe it as I believe it; it is a crime to know more than I know." And they publish a law to inhibit learning.

Now, your Honor, there is an old saying that nits are made of lice. I don't know whether you know what it makes possible down here in Tennessee. I know; I was raised in Ohio. It is a good idea to clear the nits — safer and easier.

To strangle puppies is good, when they grow up into mad dogs, maybe. I will tell you what is going to happen, and I do not pretend to be a prophet, but I do not need to be a prophet to know.

Your Honor knows that fires have been lighted in America to kindle religious bigotry and hate. You can take judicial notice of them, if you cannot of anything else.

Creationist "geology," the subject of my own testimony, may serve as an example of their general approach. Creationists face an acute dilemma because they believe that all creatures once lived together (as products of God's busy six days of precisely 24 hours), yet they must admit that fossils occur in an orderly stratigraphic sequence throughout the world — trilobites in lower strata, dinosaurs in the middle, and large mammals at the top.

To separate a single creation into this invariable order, they call upon Noah's cataclysmic flood and its consequences. They invoke three mechanisms, all invalid: hydrodynamic sorting, with densest fossils in the lowest strata; ecological separation, with inhabitants of mountaintops in upper strata; or differential intelligence permitting the most resourceful reptiles to postpone their inevitable demise until the latest possible moment.

At its core, "flood geology" is not science because it calls explicitly upon divine and miraculous suspension of natural laws to gather the waters together, bring animals to the ark, and care for them during a year in extremis. When flood geology does make testable predictions in scientific form, they have been conclusively falsified. The lower strata are filled with delicate creatures that would not settle first from a universal flood; advanced fishes and whales are in upper strata that record their time of evolution, not their oceanic environment.

We professional evolutionists are obviously concerned and angry about the creationist resurgence, but why should anyone else view it with more than mild amusement?

First, although the etymology of the argument pits creation against evolution, the attack is directed against all science; if the earth is but 10,000 years old, then most of physics falls with the invalidation of radioactive decay as a method of dating, and nearly all of astronomy goes in rebutting the claim that light from distant galaxies takes millions of years to reach us. Creationism can only flourish in an ambience of unquestioning authoritarianism. Second, the growth of creationism reflects no increased force of argument but the successes of a larger political program (identified with the Moral Majority and other rightist groups), that include defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment and a total ban on abortion. Jesters often prepare the way for heavy roles.

This political setting also guarantees that creationism will not quietly recede after this recent, rousing defeat. I wish that the sports metaphor of my first sentence could have been baseball and strike three, but I chose boxing and round three for a reason, and the fight will continue for many more rounds.

Eternal vigilance, to quote the old cliché, is indeed the price of liberty.

Stephen Jay Gould, a paleontologist and professor of geology at Harvard University, is author, most recently, of "The Mismeasure of Man."

If today you can take a thing like evolution and make it a crime to teach it in the public schools, tomorrow you can make it a crime to teach it in the private schools, and next year you can make it a crime to teach it to the husbands or in the church. At the next session you may ban books and the newspapers. Soon you may set Catholic against Protestant, and Protestant against Protestant, and try to foist your own religion upon the minds of men.

If you can do one, you can do the other. Ignorance and fanaticism are ever busy and need feeding. Always they are feeding and gloating for more. Today it is the public school teachers, tomorrow the private, the next day the preachers and the lecturers, the magazines, the books, the newspapers.

After a while, your Honor, it is the setting of man against man and creed against creed, until with flying banners and beating drums we are marching backward to the glorious ages of the sixteenth century when bigots lighted fagots to burn the man who dared to bring any intelligence and enlightenment and culture to the human mind.

(18e) H. L. Mencken on the Scopes trial (1/12/82, p. A15):

Scopes: Infidel

The Baltimore Evening Sun sent H. L. Mencken to Dayton to cover the case of *The State of Tennessee v. John Thomas Scopes*, in 1925. Following are excerpts from various dispatches.

The town, I confess, greatly surprised me. I expected to find a squalid Southern village, with darkeys snooping on the horseblocks, pigs rooting under the houses and the inhabitants full of hookworm and malaria. What I found was a country town full of charm and even beauty. . . .

Nor is there any evidence in the town of that poisonous spirit which usually shows itself when Christian men gather to defend the great doctrine of their faith. I have heard absolutely no whisper that Scopes is in the pay of the Jesuits, or that the whisky trust is backing him, or that he is egged on by the Jews who manufacture lascivious

moving pictures. On the contrary, the Evolutionists and the Anti-Evolutionists seem to be on the best of terms and it is hard in a group to distinguish one from the other.

There is an almost complete absence in these pious hills of the ordinary and familiar malignancy of Christian men. If the Rev. Dr. Crabbe ever spoke of bootleggers as humanely and affectionately as the town theologians speak of Scopes, and even Darrow. . . . his employers would pelt him with their spyglasses and sit on him until the ambulance came. . . . There is absolutely no bitterness on tap. But neither is there any doubt. It has been decided by acclamation, with only a few infidels dissenting, that the hypothesis of evolution is profane, inhumane and against God, and all that remains is to translate that almost unanimous decision into the jargon of law and so have done.

To call a man a doubter in these parts is equal to accusing him of cannibalism. Even the infidel Scopes himself is not charged with any such infamy. What they say of him, at worst, is

that he permitted himself to be used as a cat's-paw by scoundrels eager to destroy the anti-evolution law for their own dark and hellish ends. There is, it appears, a conspiracy of scientists afoot. Their purpose is to break down religion, propagate immorality, and so reduce mankind to the level of the brute. They are sworn and sinister agents of Beelzebub, who yearns to conquer the world, and has his eye especially upon Tennessee. Scopes is thus an agent of Beelzebub once removed, but that is as far as any fair man goes in condemning him. He is young and yet full of folly. When the secular arm has done execution upon him, the pastors will tackle him and he will be saved.

In brief this is a strictly Christian community, and such is its notion of fairness, justice and due process of law. . . . Its people are simply unable to imagine a man who rejects the literal authority of the Bible. The most they can conjure up, straining until they are red in the face, is a man who is in error about the meaning of this or that text. Thus one accused of heresy among them is like one accused of boiling his grandmother to make soap in

Maryland. He must resign himself to being tried by a jury wholly innocent of any suspicion of the crime he is charged with and unanimously convinced that it is infamous. Such a jury, in the legal sense, may be fair. That is, it may be willing to hear the evidence against him before bumping him off. But it would certainly be spitting into the eye of reason to call it impartial.

The trial, indeed, takes on, for all its legal forms, something of the air of a religious orgy. . . . The courthouse is surrounded by a large lawn, and it is peppered day and night with evangelists.

The Scopes trial. . . has been carried on in a manner exactly fitted to the anti-evolution law and the simian imbecility under it. There hasn't been the slightest pretense to decorum. The rustic judge, a candidate for re-election, has postured before the yokels like a clown in a ten-cent sideshow, and almost every word he has uttered has been an undisguised appeal to their prejudices and superstitions. The chief prosecuting attorney, beginning like a competent lawyer and a man of

self-respect, ended like a convert at a Billy Sunday revival. It fell to him, finally, to make a clear and astounding statement of the theory of justice prevailing under fundamentalism. What he said, in brief, was that a man accused of infidelity had no rights whatever under Tennessee law.

Darrow has lost this case. It was lost long before he came to Dayton. But it seems to me that he has nevertheless performed a great public service by fighting it to a finish and in a perfectly serious way. Let no one mistake it for comedy, farcical though it may be in all its details. It served notice on the country that Neanderthal man is organizing in these forlorn backwaters of the land, led by a fanatic, rid of sense and devoid of conscience. Tennessee, challenging him too timidly and too late, now sees its courts converted into camp meetings and its Bill of Rights made a mock of by its sworn officers of the law. There are other States that had better look to their arsenals before the Hun is at their gates.

Reprinted by permission of The Baltimore Sun

(18f) The bad news is that textbook publishers are watering down or eliminating references to evolution, in order to make their textbooks acceptable to states like Arkansas and Tennessee (1/5/82, p. C1):

By FRED M. HECHINGER

THE court challenge of an Arkansas law that defines creationism as a science has done more than focus on what most scientists consider a silly issue. It has exposed the vulnerability of the public schools to noneducational, political pressures.

However judges may rule in Little Rock and in the many states that are considering similar laws, the impact of "scientific creationism" on science teaching in many American classrooms will be felt for years. Textbook publishers are already revising science books to insure that the controversy will not reduce sales and profits.

"Creationism" is a theory based largely on the first 11 chapters of Genesis. It maintains that the universe and the earth are 6,000 to 10,000 years old and that all current and extinct forms of life were created in six days, as stated in the Bible.

But, by denying that their theory is based on religion, the creationists try to circumvent the prohibition of religious instruction in public schools. They ask that their theory, which they call "creation science" — as opposed to "evolution science" — be given equal time with the teaching of evolution.

Scientists point out that acceptance of the creationist "theory" would not just contradict everything the schools know and teach about biology but would scrap many other scientific theories; in geology, astronomy, archeology, anthropology, physics and so on. In the December issue of *Science* '81, for example, Allen Hammond, a geophysicist and mathematician, and Lynn Margulis, a microbiologist, wrote that most stars in our galaxy and in all other observable galaxies are more than 10,000 light-years away. Therefore, they say, "Either those objects are more than 10,000 years old, or totally new astronomical hypotheses are needed." All the accepted and tested methods of measuring time, they add, give an age for the universe of 10 billion to 20 billion years.

Why, against so much expert testimony, are the schools nevertheless subjected to such strong pressure to give creationism equal time?

Creationist pressures are taken seriously for reasons that tell much about schools and society. In a conservative era, theories that appeal to some vocal conservative groups cannot

readily be ignored by elected representatives, even if they fly in the face of scientific and pedagogical knowledge. It is worth noting that the Arkansas law was enacted last year and signed by Governor Frank White, who said later that he had not read all of it.

The concept of "equal time," moreover, has great popular appeal. It has the ring of democratic fairness. It suggests the absence of compulsion, giving pupils a chance to examine both sides of a question and then make up their minds. Of course, this approach presupposes that there are two sides to such issues, just as it would have presupposed two sides to the question whether the earth is flat or round.

An additional factor is the popular view of the term "theory." When creationists say that evolution is "only a theory," they play on the popular interpretation of the word as an educated guess rather than the scientist's understanding of the word as a formulation of basic principles in a particular area, supported by empirical evidence and open to confirmation — or refutation — by evidence yet to be discovered. Taking the semantic byplay a step further, the creationists try to put their "science" on an equal footing with evolution by citing specific, often legitimate, examples of incomplete and yet to be explored aspects of evolution.

Since all but the best teachers lean

heavily on textbooks, the effect of the controversy on textbooks regardless of any court rulings, becomes vital and for a long time ahead irreversible. In the last 10 years, according to Henry P. Zuidema, a paleontologist and science writer, many textbooks have already been revised, reducing space given to evolution and presenting the subject in more tentative terms. The index of a 1979 text, "Biology: Living Systems," by Charles Merrill, contains only three lines of page references under "evolution," compared to 17 lines in a 1973 edition.

Two editions of a text published by Allyn & Bacon in 1974 and 1977 included materials on the Genesis account of creation. Two Harcourt Brace Jovanovich texts, "Biology: Patterns in Environment" and "Biology: Patterns in Living Things," omit Charles Darwin entirely.

Some publishers, says Mr. Zuidema, have added creationism to their science texts but in private conversation try to rationalize their actions by saying that they put it in the last chapter, which most teachers rarely reach.

He quotes Lois Arnold, senior science editor at Prentice-Hall: "We don't advocate the idea of scientific creationism but we felt we had to represent other points of view."

A case can, of course, be made for teaching creationism as part of the history of science — the evolution of

biological thought itself. The problem arises when political pressures on teachers and textbook publishers make it appear to be part of, or in some sense equal to, modern science.

How does the specific legislative intrusion into the school curriculum differ from a host of previous mandates — driver education, teaching about alcohol and drugs or about local or state history? A crucial difference is that those other mandates, undesirable as they, too, may be, at least merely diminished the time available for the teaching of what school administrators may consider more appropriate subjects. Creationism, if given equal time with science and presented as science, distorts the substance of education. It tries to compel the majority of science teachers to give the imprimatur of scholarship to something they know is not so.

Frank Press, president of the National Academy of Sciences, in a letter to the January/February issue of *Science* '82, writes: "We simply cannot afford to teach pseudo-science in the guise of science. And creationism, which, arguably, may have a place elsewhere in teaching and comparative religion, is not science. . . . I can only hope that in once again confronting this issue, seemingly resolved years ago, we gain by improving both science education and the public's understanding of science."

- (18g) We'd like to end this with a quote from a column by Ellen Goodman in the Washington Post (12/2/81):

As Anthropologist Ashley Montague wrote, the difference between science and creationism is that "science has proofs without any certainty; creationists have certainty without any proofs."

DEMOCRACY

- (19) The people's choice, according to "The Best Man" by Gore Vidal, Act One, Scene One:

Reporter: Do you think people mistrust intellectuals in politics?

Observer: Bertrand Russell seems to think so. He once wrote that the people in a democracy tend to think they have less to fear from a stupid man than from an intelligent one.

Reporter: Wasn't Bertrand Russell fired from City College of New York?

Observer: Yes, he was fired. But only for moral turpitude...not for incompetence as a philosopher.

(Thank you, BEV SMITH)

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

- (20) Justin Leiber is one of the authors included in The Mind's I, "composed and arranged by" Douglas R. Hofstadter and Daniel C. Dennett (New York:Basic Books, 1981), both of whom are here trying to discover the meaning of "self", the meaning of "I". (It is an aspect of their interest in artificial intelligence.) The excerpt from Justin's science fiction novel, Beyond Rejection, (New York:Random House, Ballantine Books, 1980) deals with mind tapes (where everything in your mind is put on tape, and then into a blank brain, which is then implanted in another body -- and possibly rejected, whence the title -- so that one day "you" may find yourself in another body.) Dennett has nice things to say about this excerpt.

- (21) Dora Russell writes a Letter to the Editor of The Guardian (British) (11/8/81):

Your Leader-writer (October 25) appears to have discovered at long last that Americans are not our "dear cousins" -- a fact which was already apparent to me in 1917 when, at the age of 23, I accompanied my father, Sir Frederick Black, on a war-time mission to the United States which had just come into the war. We were, in consequence, seeking some help about oil supplies.

I found there a foreign, even alien, nation, shaping its own values, which spelled pride in its machines and advanced technology with a sense of its own growing power and what this might achieve.

Unknown to me then, some courageous young American women had been striving might and main to keep their country from involvement in Europe. My own experience also made me dubious about this, but more so about the future effects of industrialism, because I found in America no moral purpose to control it.

Three years later, in Bolshivik Russia, I found -- as did the then Guardian correspondent Arthur Ransome -- as sense of a good moral purpose that might have been helpful. I dreamed of an understanding between what I perceived to be two potential great powers. Still unpublished, I have the script of that dream: The Soul of Russia and the Body of America.

Since 1920 I have never ceased to campaign like many others, fruitlessly, against the cold war, and to believe that because America's Monroe Doctrine excludes Europe from the Western Hemisphere, we should have one for Europe to safeguard our own affairs.

But as you suggest, why don't the Americans and Russians get together to learn something about each other's characters and ways. After all, we tolerate Bob Hope on our golf courses.

- (22) Bill Young did some traveling last fall. Here are excerpts from the way his trip was reported in the Des Moines Register of 11/3/81, p. C1:

"We evangelists travel light on clothing," noted William Henry Young as he paused during a bus terminal interview to fish out papers from his suitcase filled mostly with literature.

One supposed that Jerry Falwell might have a few more clothing changes aboard his Learjet than Young displayed, as he waited in Des Moines for the Greyhound bus. It was to take him to Chicago, the next leg on his cross-country "evangelical pilgrimage".

But then, Young doesn't quite fit the mold of the high-powered evangelistic stars.

...

The bus-riding soft-spoken Young doesn't have a gimmick that tugs at the heartstrings and the pocketbooks. He continues "to preach the gospel of agnosticism" as founder, chief and sole staff of the Society of Evangelical Agnostics (SEA).

The very word "evangelical" conveys the idea of zealous efforts to convert others. Hardly a word to use in connection with agnosticism.

In common parlance, an atheist is one who believes there is no God, a theist believes there is, and an agnostic

doesn't know and cautiously avoids taking sides. Historically, that hasn't been seen as a cause to promote evangelistically.

As Young, 53, tells it, he grew up as a fundamentalist and did a bit of teen-age revival preaching. Then came a conversion to Mormonism, followed by two years of formal theological training.

He taught mathematics, switched to library work and is now head of library services for the Fresno, California, public school system.

He said his "conversion experience" came as he was driving through the Colorado mountains. "The realization struck me as a gentle theistic lightning bolt that if God had wanted his creatures to have answers to the big questions about 'Ultimate Reality', the purpose of the universe, the meaning of life and death for man, He would have provided more definite and convincing information.

"This brought a deep realization of, and resignation to, the reality of not knowing. From that moment on, I was an agnostic."

He got so enthused about it that a friend said he was evangelical about his agnosticism. He rolled that idea around for a while and, in 1974, formed SEA.

He explains evangelical agnosticism as being based on these principals:

- . "That one should study and investigate with an open mind all sides of the issues that claim one's interest and concern.

- . "That is is morally wrong to come to final conclusions based on inadequate evidence.

- . "That one should accept living with the realization that one does not have, and probably never will have, the final solutions to the problems of existence."

Waiting for his bus, Young insisted that agnosticism isn't "a halfway house between atheism and theism." He sees it as a positive acceptance of uncertainty in ultimate matters.

Thus he sees militantly atheistic Madalyn Murry O'Hair and militantly Christian Falwell as equally "immoral" for accepting as absolutes concepts that Young believes have inadequate evidence.

During SEA's first 6 years, Young says he gained more than 600 members. They get his quarterly publication of free-thought writings, membership cards and the SEA logo of a circle divided by a wavy line.

Recently he came on the idea of a cross-country tour to visit SEA members and give talks where invited. He calls the bus trip "Overland -- By Sea". The destination before the return trip to California was the "Humanist Summit Conference" in College Park, MD.

His Des Moines-area stop included an overnight stay with John Patterson of Ames, an Iowa State University faculty member noted for his outspoken and unorthodox religious views.

Young wanted to make clear that his organization was not one of those tax dodge outfits with phony "ordinations" that have sprung up around the country. He said he hasn't applied for tax exemption as a religious organization, doesn't ordain anyone as an agnostic minister, and no one can expect to deduct his meager membership fees -- \$1 the first year and not much more thereafter -- from his income taxes.

Young comes across as a gentle, compassionate man who enjoys gentle gibes at all "true believers" but is seriously devoted to agnosticism as a way of life, not just an absence of belief.

He puts it this way in an article:

"I continue to feel that the agnostic insight is both valid and viable in pointing to the directions that mankind's thinking should take. The more I read and reflect on the matter, and the more life experiences that take place, the more I realize that the principles of agnosticism are important in all aspects of life, not just the initial acceptance of agnosticism about religious matters."

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

- (23) Husserl. A Polish doctoral candidate asked whether ER had any contact with, or opinion about, the Phenomenology of Edmund Husserl (RSN32-22). HERB LANSDELL came across the following footnote on Page 93 of "The Phenomenological Movement" by Herbert Spielberg (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960):

¹ Much to Husserl's disappointment, the *Logische Untersuchungen* were never reviewed in the Anglo-American magazines of the time. However, Bertrand Russell, in his survey of "Philosophy in the Twentieth Century," published first in *The Dial* in 1924, referred to it as "a monumental work"; also, in a spontaneous letter to Husserl of April 19, 1920, now in the Husserl Archives at Louvain, he mentioned the fact that he had the second edition with him in prison during his term for pacifist activities in 1917.

NEW MEMBERS

- (24) We welcome these new members:

ANGELA ARVIDSON/Box 10008/Stanford University/Stanford, CA 94305
 LT. COL DON C. BALDWIN (ret)/28 Crescent Drive/Plattsburgh, NY 12901
 RICHARD N. BERNSTEIN/300 W. 53rd St. (5H)/NY NY 10019
 LT. JOSEPH F. & LAURIE W. BOETCHER/Box 1 - ADMIN/FPO San Francisco, CA 96654
 MAX BRAVERMAN/PO Box 105/Hope, NJ 07844

FREDERICK A. CLARK/941 Sherwood Av./Los Altos, CA 94022
 TAMULA C. DRUMM/Box 136/Lake Erie College/Painesville, OH 44077
 BADR A. FAROOQUI/Box 803/Lomita, CA 90717
 ALEJANDRO R. GARCIA DIEGO/Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology/ University
 of Toronto/Toronto, Canada M58 1A1
 JOHN M. GOWDY/10 Dyer Drive/Clifton Park, NY 12065

BERNARD GROSSMAN/250 E. 65th St./NY NY 10021
 GERALD LEITH HALLIGAN/1282 Ellicott Creek Road/Tonawanda, NY 14150
 TIM HARDING/454 Wellington St./Clifton Hill/ Vic.,Australia 3068
 DOUGLAS HUTCHISON/254 S. Langa Court/Saddle Brook, NJ 07662
 ED JACOBSEN/2127 Walters Av./Northbrook, IL 60062

WILLIAM JARRELL/208 Glenwood Trail/Southern Pines/ NC 28387
 KENT M. KOPROWICZ/1161 Washington St./Denver, CO 80203
 PROF. PAUL KURTZ/Box 5, Central Park Station/ Buffalo, NY 14215
 MICHAEL H. MALIN/2235 Line Lexington Road/Hatfield, PA 19440
 DIETRICH R. MOELLER/272 Beechlaw Dr./Waterloo, Ont.,Canada N2L 5Wt

JAN OORBURG/23 Grote Markt/9712 HR Groningen/The Netherlands
 GREGORY POLLOCK/School of Social Science/University of California/Irvine, CA 92717
 RALPH J. RICHARDSON, JR./PO Box 1997/Wichita, KS 67201
 CONNIE ROBBS-SUNDAY/446 E. Pastime (25)/Tucson, AZ 85705
 EILEEN SALMON/82 N. Stanworth Dr./Princeton, NJ 08540

CLARK M. SHERMAN/PO Box 1857/Nacogdoches, TX 75961
 JOHN SHOSKY-Communication/Box 3341 University Station/University of Wyoming/Laramie, WY 82071
 LARAIN STILES/3001 California St./San Francisco, CA 94115
 GLENN W. SUNDERLAND/Elderberry Road/RR 1 - Box 275/Newton, IL 62448
 ROY E. TORCASO/3708 Brightview St./Wheaton, MD 20902

RICHARD TYSON/R#L/Utica, NY 42376
 ARMANDO VALENTIN/487 Carlton Av.(23C)/Brooklyn, NY 11238
 STEPHEN W. VISK/2620 11th St./Rockford, IL 61109
 VINCENT DUFAUK WILLIAMS/PO Box 1197/San Antonio, TX 78294
 THOMAS WINGATE/PO Box 365/Salt Lake City, UT 84110

NEW ADDRESSES & OTHER CHANGES

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

PROFESSOR SIR ALFRED AYER F. B. A./51 York St./London W.1, England
 VINCENT BATTS, JR./1720 Jamestown Place/Pittsburgh, PA 15235
 JULIE BAXTER/2121 Burton Dr. (106A)/Austin, TX 78741
 JOHN J. DE MOTT/162 Laverne Av./Long Beach, CA 90803
 WILLIAM FORD/503 Alford St./La Grange, GA 30240

MARY W. GIBBONS/211 Central Park West(7G)/NY NY 10024
 DOUGLAS HINTON/1305 Moisant Av./Kenner, LA 70062
 KARIN E. PETERSON/Grinnell College/Grinnell, IA 50112
 BRAD K. ROBISON/5471 Vicente Way (22)/Oakland, CA 94609
 GARY M. SLEZAK/750 N. Dearborn St. (2108)/Chicago, IL 60610

DR. CARL SPADONI/Acting Archivist/Russell Archives/McMaster University/Hamilton, Ont./Canada L8S 4L6

RECOMMENDED READING

(26) "Yes to Life" by CORLISS LAMONT (New York: Horizon Press, 1981), reviewed by BOB DAVIS:

This is an enjoyable, informative book that I heartily recommend to all BRS members, by a distinguished American Humanist philosopher and BRS member, who has led a life of involvement and controversy that lends itself well to autobiography. Lamont's skill as a writer creates a book that is difficult to put down. I read it in two sittings over over a weekend.

The book contains personal information, of course, but is organized around themes such as humanism, the myth of immortality, democratic socialism, civil liberties, and other topics of importance in his life. Accordingly,

there is much in the book that is instructive on these topics; that is part of the reason the book is so good. I found the recapitulation of humanist philosophy, for example, to be very valuable.

He is a scion of a leading American capitalist family; his father was Chairman of the Board of J. P. Morgan; yet Lamont is a convinced democratic socialist. I was always rather curious about this and wondered what problems it had created for him and his family. Was there a great deal of conflict about this at the time? Did his family disown him? O, to have been a fly on the ceiling during conversations in the Lamont household 60 years ago! But it appears to have been a much more civilized and tolerant affair than I had supposed; perhaps my prejudices formed in the 1960s were showing.

I liked the chapter on "The Philosophy of Humanism" best, perhaps because of the Moral Majority attacks. It provides the non-theistic basis of humanist belief. In it, Lamont also discusses his contacts with Russell, Santayana and Dewey, all of whom he thought well of. Lamont devotes several pages to BR, and includes 3 short letters from BR. See the excerpts (45).

There are 3 chapters on civil liberties in which Lamont discusses his beliefs and his fights. He ran afoul of Senator Joseph McCarthy and others like him, and the State Department too. He sued the government for infringements on his civil liberties, and won his lawsuits, enlarging freedom for all of us.

There are chapters on recreation (including sports), travel, and his two marriages. Those interested in poetry will enjoy the full chapter on John Masefield, the British Poet Laureate, a long-time friend of the Lamont family. I particularly enjoyed his interests that I happen to share, such as the theatre. I was glad to learn about the Lamont Conservancy, a wilderness area near Manhattan that his family donated to the public and that he maintains, and uses for nature hikes.

There are also items that some BRS members may disagree with: his positive attitude towards the Soviet Union, and Communist China; and perhaps his views on Viet Nam. I suggest that you get the book and see for yourself.

RECOMMENDED

- (27a) "Reds" is a film — with Warren Beatty and Diane Keaton — about John Reed's adventures, chiefly with the Russian Revolution, which Reed described in his book, "Ten Days That Shook The World". DORA RUSSELL appears briefly several times as one of the many elderly "witnesses" who give their recollections of the events or personalities of the time. The New York film critics called it the best picture of 1981.

* * * * *

- (27b) Here is a letter from Dora Russell to DON JACKANICZ, dated 1/9/82:

Thank you for writing about my appearance in the film Reds. I am glad to know that it has really been made, and seems to be a success. When I was in London helping with publicity for my second Tamarisk Tree book, the film people got in touch with me, having realized, from my first book, that I had met John Reed. I spent a whole day at Pinewood Studios with Warren Beatty and camera team, talking much of the time into camera. He was anxious to get the spirit of the period, and I was much impressed with the amount of time and trouble they were taking and must have gone on taking, to judge by the list of people contacted. And only just in time; some are now dead.

What grieves me is that so much of the truth comes out too late as history. And even more when the climate changes so that one sees moves being made to destroy even what little pioneers in my generation achieved. From its very start I was against the war, hot then cold, against Soviet Russia, not because I was, or ever have been, a communist, but I saw it as a great blunder of history. It sowed the wind of which the nuclear generation reaps the whirlwind, and Jack Reed was right indeed when he called his book, "Ten Days That Shook The World". I saw at that time and tried vainly to make people, including Russell, understand, that the industrial system must either be socialist and cooperative or it will be run by a dictator or oligarchy. This was, in effect, what the Bolsheviks were saying. It was then, and remains true now, at a period when competitive overproduction still prevails both nationally and internationally. It is not a matter of communism versus capitalism, but simply of how to deal with the growth of the industrial way of life. I did persuade Russell to write, with many of my ideas, and with me, "The Prospects of Industrial Civilisation". Men of that generation, like our first socialists, and Mao, Chou en Lai, Ho Chi Min, Lenin saw the problems. I was astounded to hear Alistair Cooke the other day call Mao a "monster".

PARADOXES

- (28) Well, hardly ever. To avoid a dogmatic approach in any of his work, a philosopher tacked the following memo on his office wall:

1. Never use the word, "always". 2. Always avoid the word, "never".

(Thank you, KEN MYLOTT)

FUN

(29) THE PHILOSOPHY CIRCLE

SINCE early this morning I have been taking propositions from various treatises by Wittgenstein, typing them onto neat white squares of paper, and then gluing the squares in a column on a large sheet of cardboard. I have also glued an "anti-square" adjacent to each square, in which I have typed the same proposition with all the verbs negated. Here is a sample:

The world is everything that is the case.
The world is not everything that is not the case.

If there were no connection between the act of expectation and reality, you could expect a nonsense.

If there were a connection between the act of expectation and reality, you could not expect a nonsense.

Language must speak for itself.
Language must not speak for itself.

And so on.

Tonight the Philosophy Circle is meeting at my house. Last week we met at Alice Dodd's apartment. The subject was "Alternatives to the Law of Excluded Middle." Alice Dodd's middle has been excluded, at least to me, ever since she started sleeping with Herbert Feist, the department chairman. Before she took up with Feist she was a logical positivist. Feist is a Kantian idealist—*Ding-an-sichlich*, and all that. I am a logical positivist, and during the meeting I insisted that the law of excluded middle was either true or it was not true. Tonight's subject is "Does the Philosophy of Wittgenstein Have a Content?" This is why I have been gluing my little squares. My idea is that if Wittgenstein's statements and their negations both seem equally true or equally untrue, then they have no content and we can go on to something else—anything else. I have also prepared the cheese and wine.

The doorbell rings. It is old Professor Lash. His main claim to fame is that he studied for a term in Cambridge when Wittgenstein was still alive. Once, when old Lash was drunk, he confided to me that while he was there Wittgenstein refused to talk with him. For some reason, Wittgenstein couldn't stand him. I tried to console him by telling him that if Wittgenstein were still alive he would be appearing constantly on the Johnny Carson show. "Here's Ludwig," I said.

Old Lash was scandalized. "Wittgenstein hated interviews," he muttered.

"But that was before television," I pointed out.

I helped him home, and before he got out of my car he recited a limerick that he said he had heard from G. E. Moore. I have always liked Moore's comment after reading Wittgenstein's thesis: "It is my personal opinion that Mr. Wittgenstein's thesis is a work of

genius; but, be that as it may, it is certainly well up to the standard required for the Cambridge degree of Doctor of Philosophy." The limerick, though, was not much good.

Pith! That's what it takes to get ahead in this world. There's no such thing as too much pith. Take the last maxim in Wittgenstein's "Tractatus": "Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent." Have you ever read such pith? Tonight that will be the password. No more disruptive remarks like the one I made at the last meeting, when I said that our meetings reminded me of the partial inverse of Lord Acton's maxim.

"What ever do you mean?" old Lash was good enough to inquire.

"It's that absolute lack of power corrupts absolutely—if you take my point," I explained.

Feist, who was presiding, looked a little liverish but didn't say anything. Alice Dodd's eyes began to flash the way they do when she gets angry. There will be none of that tonight. Let bygones be bygones. Water over the dam. Tonight I am going to be as pithy as the grave.

"White or red, John?" I say after I have taken Lash's coat. Once he has decided on a color for his evening's wine, he likes to stick with it.

"Red, if you don't mind," Lash replies.

The doorbell rings again. It is Alice Dodd. Her

cheeks are a healthy rose, and her long blond hair is neatly tied in a ribbon. She is wearing a tartan wool skirt in deep reds and greens. I think it is new. She looks around my living room. "George, you seem to be doing interesting things with your furniture," she comments.

"Yes," I reply. "I have sold most of it."

Before she can say anything, old Lash, who has already begun working on the wine, asks, "How is the book coming?" She and Feist are "bringing out"—or perhaps "bringing up"—a monograph on Kant's last major essay, "The Conflict of the Fac-

ulties." When Feist mentioned this to me I told him that I had never read that essay, because I had always assumed that it was a discussion of academic politics.

"While I have always admired Kant's sense of humor," I added, "I have never been entirely certain that it would lend itself to a pastiche on academic life. Did he ever write any light verse? You can tell so much about a philosopher from his light verse. Hegel had a wonderful touch." Feist did his thesis on Hegel.

The doorbell rings again. It is Albert Backen. Poor Albert is not tenured. Alice Dodd and I, in the days when she was still a logical positivist, once made up a plainsong that began with the verse

Poor Albert hath no tenure,
No ten-y-ure hath he.
No ten nor ure no ten nor ure hath he.

I am fond of Albert, but I worry about him. He wears his lack of tenure on his sleeve like a black band of mourning. "Come in, Albert," I say. "I am pleased you could come. We need young minds like yours." (Actually, Albert has never missed a meeting.) He looks up at me brightly. Perhaps I have heard something from the promotion committee. Old Lash interrupts, "Once, when I was visiting with Wittgenstein in his rooms in Trinity, he confided to me that—"

"John," I say before he can get any further, "I read recently that the only films Wittgenstein would see were Westerns. He felt a special affinity with Tom Mix. Did he ever mention that to you?"

The doorbell rings again. This must be Feist. Warren Drake, the only other member of the department to come to our meetings, has gone to Nevada for a divorce. I open the door. Bless my soul—it is Feist, and what a nice new sports jacket he is wearing. "A present from your wife?" I inquire loudly, so that Alice Dodd will hear. "We were just discussing Wittgenstein's obsession with Tom Mix. I think John was about to point out that this may have had something to do with Wittgenstein's sexual preference." (I have always liked the phrase "sexual preference." It conjures up in my mind an image of one of those Korean greengrocer's where the dear legumes are all tarted up in colors so bright that they look as if they have just come fresh from the embalmer. "What is your preference in lettuce?" asks the kindly grocery person.)

"Wittgenstein had no sexual preference," Lash remarks.

Before anyone has a chance to inquire further, Feist says, "Sorry I'm late. I've just come from the Dean's. Burning the midnight oil, you know."

"Well put, Herbert," I remark, noting out of the corner of my eye that at the mention of the Dean poor Albert

has turned white. "Is there anyone here that you haven't met?"

Feist arches his eyebrows slightly but does not say anything. He greets Alice a little formally and poor Albert hardly at all.

Feist takes a chair across the room from Alice. I am about to bring out my sheet of cardboard with its squares and anti-squares, but before I have a chance to do so Albert begins to talk. "There is a passage in Wittgenstein's 'Philosophical Remarks,'" he says, smiling winningly at Feist, "which has been giving me a good deal of trouble. Professor Feist, perhaps you could elucidate it for me?"

Oh, Albert, you poor bastard, I think. Feist couldn't elucidate the meaning of a telephone bill.

"I would be pleased to," Feist says condescendingly.

Albert reads, after pointing out that the passage is on page 110 of the little blue paperback edition we all have in front of us, "'I haven't got stomach-ache' may be compared to the proposition 'These apples cost nothing.'" He hesitates, expecting that Feist will have something to say. Nothing is forthcoming.

Albert continues, "The point is that they don't cost any money, not that they don't cost any snow or any trouble." He hesitates again. In fact, he has come to a dead stop and is peering intently at Feist. I can see that Feist has been taken completely off guard and is stalling for time, in the hope, perhaps, that old Lash will say something and rescue him. But Lash has now drunk nearly a full bottle and is not to be counted on.

"I should have thought—" Feist begins.

"Quite so," I interject.

"I should have thought," he goes on, "that within the general Hegelian warp and woof—"

Suddenly old Lash sits up and says, "I believe that the expression is 'Wurf und Woof,'" after which he subsides seraphically back into his corner.

Alice tries to come to the rescue. "I think there is a misprint in the text. It should read, 'They don't cause any snow or any trouble.'"

"I am not sure that will wash," I say, "unless you are prepared to change the second proposition so that it reads 'These apples cause nothing.'" By now I can see that I have tossed pith to the winds.

Albert, who appears to be entirely oblivious of what is going on, and who, poor sod, really wants to understand Wittgenstein, adds, "I have gone through the 'Philosophical Remarks' with some care, and I have underlined all of Wittgenstein's references to apples. Here is one on page 132."

We all turn to page 132 and Albert reads, "If I have 11 apples and want to share them among some people in such a way that each is given 3 apples, how many people can there be?" Once again he looks to Feist and

draws a blank. He reads on: "The calculation supplies me with the answer 3."

I can see that Lash is collecting his thoughts and is about to say something. "I think that John wants to make a point," I interrupt.

"Wittgenstein was very partial to fresh vegetables," Lash explains. "But only in season."

There is a dead silence.

Albert, who somehow has the idea that it is his responsibility to say something, begins again. "When I was at Harvard . . ."

"Oh, Christ, I think, the doomed son of a bitch really has a death wish. Doesn't he realize that Feist hates Harvard? The graduate school turned him down, and he had to do his graduate work in the Midwest.

Feist's right fist is clenched white. As dense as Albert is, he does appear to notice that something has gone terribly wrong.

"When I was in graduate school," he continues hesitantly, "Quine once told us—"

Before he can bury himself, old Lash comes unexpectedly to the rescue. "Young man," he says, gesturing with a half-filled wineglass, "it's very much like comparing apples and oranges."

God knows what old Lash has in mind, but Albert interprets this sibylline comment as a request for more passages dealing with fruit. He seems to have made a horticultural reading of Wittgenstein's entire opus. "Professor Lash," he says respectfully, "here is something about oranges in Wittgenstein's 'Philosophical Remarks' that you might find interesting. On page 276, toward the bottom of the page . . ." We all turn our blue books to page 276. "Wittgenstein writes, 'Admittedly it's true that we can say of an orange that it's almost yellow, and so that it is "closer to yellow than to red" and analogously for an almost red orange. But it doesn't follow from this that there must also be a midpoint between red and yellow—'"

"Exactly the sort of thing I had in mind," Lash comments.

I sneak a glance at Alice Dodd. In the days when she was still a logical positivist we would come back after a

session like this to my house, collapse on what was then my sofa, and laugh until we were in tears. "This, too, shall pass," I would say, echoing a comment I once made about a group of sophomores who were taking my survey course in modern philosophers. Now she is sitting upright in her chair. Her face is a mask. God knows what she is thinking. Feist is staring intently at the ceiling.

Albert goes on, "Here is something I came across last night in the 'Philosophical Grammar.'" He takes a fat red paperback volume out of his briefcase and opens it to a page he has marked with a thin sliver of paper. "What does the process or state of wanting an apple consist in," he begins.

What does the state of wanting Alice Dodd consist in, I think.

"Perhaps I experience hunger or thirst or both, and meanwhile imagine an apple, or remember that I enjoyed one yesterday . . . perhaps I go and look in a cupboard where apples are normally kept. Perhaps all these states and activities are combined among themselves and with others."

Feist has shifted his stare from the ceiling to his carefully polished left shoe. I am sure it has been polished by his wife.

Albert continues inexorably, "On page 140 of the 'Philosophical Remarks,' just above the diagram, Wittgenstein asks, 'Can I know there are as many apples as pears on this plate, without knowing how many? And what is meant by not knowing how many? And how can I find out how many? Surely by counting . . .'"

We all stare uncomprehendingly at the diagram. It resembles the skeletal structure of an especially rigid fish, and seems to have wandered onto the page by accident.

"Do you happen to have any apples?" Albert asks.

"Yes," I reply. "I think there are a few in the kitchen, but they are a bit past their prime." I was planning to give them to the department secretary.

"I need them to illustrate the next example, which is rather abstract," Albert explains.

I go into the kitchen and am rummaging about in a heap of uncertain

fruit, attempting to locate the remaining apples, when the kitchen door opens and then closes. It is Alice Dodd.

"Look at this curious hole," I say, pointing to a perforation in one of the apples I have managed to unearth. "Do you think that whatever made it was going from the inside out or the outside in?"

"Why did you sell your sofa?" Alice Dodd asks.

"I found it distracting," I reply. "The pattern on the slipcover was much too busy."

"I rather liked it," Alice Dodd remarks.

My, my, I think. What have we here? Perhaps Alice Dodd is finding that Kantian idealism is wearing a bit thin. But before I can explore the matter in more detail the kitchen door opens again. It is Feist. When he catches sight of the two of us his face turns the color of those extraordinary *asperges* that the French manage to grow entirely underground. When they dig them up they look like little shrouds.

"Herbert," I say affably, "Professor Dodd and I were just ducking for apples. Perhaps you would like to join us."

"I . . ." Feist begins.

"No need to apologize, Herbert," I say. "Take a handful."

We return to the living room, apples in hand. Old Lash is now dozing lightly. That is the last we will hear from him. I will have to ask Albert to take him home. The four of us divide the apples into little piles, and Albert begins to read: "If I say: If there are 4 apples on the table, then there are 2 + 2 on it, that only means that the 4 apples already contain the possibility of being grouped into two and two, and I needn't wait for them actually to be grouped by a concept . . ."

At this point we each take four apples and group them into two and two. Feist is staring intently at his apples, although from time to time he sneaks an anxious look at Alice Dodd.

Albert continues, "This 'possibility' refers to the sense, not the truth of a proposition. 2 + 2 = 4 may mean 'whenever I have four objects, there is the possibility of grouping them into 2 and 2.'"

"Albert," I ask, "do you think the logic would work equally well with six apples? Are four apples absolutely essential to the argument?"

"I haven't tried it with six," Albert acknowledges.

I glance at Feist. He looks as if he is about to explode. The thought crosses my mind that perhaps he is going crazy. It would do wonders for the department.

He suddenly gets up to leave and, with a desperate look in the direction of Alice Dodd, announces that he has an early-morning appointment with the Dean.

"Before you go, Herbert," Alice Dodd says evenly, "we should settle on our next meeting. I propose that we have it at my place again and that the subject should be 'Do We Exist?'"

"Of course, of course," Feist says, and he leaves without saying goodbye.

WELL, they are all gone now. Alice Dodd and I helped Albert pack old Lash into Albert's car. Alice gave me an affectionate wink when she got into hers. Now, alone among the shards of decaying apples, I can take stock of the evening. On the minus side, I was never able to display my little tableau of Wittgenstein and anti-Wittgenstein propositions. No matter—I will use it in my course next spring. On the plus side, there is clearly a marked softening in Alice Dodd's Kantian idealism. Perhaps I can repurchase my sofa from the Japanese mathematician to whom I sold it. The slipcover can always be changed to a somewhat less aggressive pattern.

As I am collecting the last of the apples, I notice that Albert has forgotten to take with him his annotated copy of Wittgenstein's "Philosophical Remarks." In fact, he has left it opened to page 64. Sure enough, near the top of the page there is another reference to apples. Wittgenstein writes, "If I wanted to eat an apple, and someone punched me in the stomach, taking away my appetite, then it was this punch that I originally wanted."

What an odd thought. What could Wittgenstein possibly have had in mind? I must ask Albert in the morning.

—JEREMY BERNSTEIN

FINANCES/CONTRIBUTIONS

- (30) Fat cats! And not-so-fat-cats: we welcome your contributions to the BRS Treasury. We are receiving fewer contributions than a year ago, and we have use for the money. Perhaps we have been negligent in not reminding you that the BRS does not (yet) pay its way on dues alone. In '81 dues covered only 2/3 of our expenses; we depend on contributions to make up the deficit. So, when you have some spare money, please consider sending some to the BRS. Any amount is welcome, in one, two, or three digits. Send it care of the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom. Thanks!
- * (31) We thank these members for their contributions to the needy BRS Treasury: FREDERICK CLARK, STEVE DAHLBY, CAROLYN WILKINSON...and KATHY FJERMEDAL, who never forgets.

BRS BUSINESS

- (32) The Board votes on Sutcliffe's appeal. We mentioned last issue that the Directors were being polled on whether Sutcliffe should be allowed to appeal his expulsion (RSN32-6a). The Board voted "no".

FOR SALE

- (33) 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, Inc." \$5 postpaid for 90 sheets (weighs just under a pound, travels 3rd Class). Order from the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.
- (34) BR postcard. 4¼ x 6. Philippe Halsman's handsome 1958 photo of BR with pipe, 50¢ each plus 25¢. RSN30-44 shows it slightly reduced in size. Order from the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.

BRS LIBRARY

- (35) Films. The 7 Russell films listed below, each acquired through member contributions, may be borrowed by BRS members and responsible non-members. Each is 16mm. black and white. Rental prices are given below. A \$75 deposit is also required, per film, which is refunded when the film is returned, less the cost of shipping and insurance. Film rentals have a one week limit, except in unusual instances. Contact the Library as soon as a definite use-date is known. The Library would appreciate hearing about any other Russell films in private collections, other libraries, or broadcasters' files.

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

-----Nos. 1-5 are 13½ minutes each. Russell is interviewed by Woodrow Wyatt. A transcript for each can be found in Bertrand Russell Speaks His Mind (Cleveland:World Publishing Co.,1960). The audio portion of No. 1 is also available on the LP "Bertrand Russell Speaking" (Caedmon TC-1149). Rental: \$25 per film plus \$75 deposit per film.

6. Bertrand Russell.

-----No. 6 is 39 minutes long. Interviewed by Romney Wheeler, BR deals with autobiographical, philosophical, and political topics. A transcript is available in "A Life of Disagreement" in "Atlantic Monthly", v. 190, August 1952, pp.51-54. Rental:\$40 plus a \$75 deposit.

7. The Life and Times of Bertrand Russell.

—No. 7 runs 40 minutes. Produced by the BBC, for Russell's 90th Birthday Celebration, in 1962, this documentary uses a biographical format. It interviews several prominent British figures as well as Russell, and concentrates on the threat of nuclear war and BR's work to prevent such folly. Rental: \$40 plus \$75 deposit.

Please send orders or inquiries to Jack Ragsdale, address on Page 1, bottom.

OBITUARIES

(36) Will and Ariel Durant. "I am sure that all our North American members know that this distinguished couple died this past fall," writes BOB DAVIS. He continues:

She was 83, but died first. He died 2 weeks later, shortly after his 96th birthday. This is a brief memoir of my experiences with them.

I made my first contact with their minds as a teen-ager when I read The Renaissance, part of their series, The Story of Civilization. Over the years I read all 11 volumes of that series, as well as their earlier and later books not part of the series, some 19 volumes in all. In 1976 I wrote them, saying how enjoyable and valuable I found their books. I mailed the letter to their publisher and scarcely expected a reply. Ten days later I received a reply, which said that my "kind comments were a precious boost to our egos", and I discovered that they lived only a few minutes away. We exchanged a number of brief letters, mostly about history and Russell. Durant advised, when reading The Decline and Fall, to "enjoy your Gibbon slowly. What a lordly style! I will forgive you if you skip some of the pages about the theological disputes of the early Christian centuries." He also gave some advice on Welsh history, and told about his visit to BR at his Welsh hideout" in 1949.

I invited the Durants to the 1977 BRS banquet -- we were not, alas, giving our annual BRS Award at that time -- and they accepted. Some of you recall that banquet and their recollections of BR. I drove them to the banquet, and in the car I got some extra (mischievous) details. Later that evening, I wrote this memo to myself:

On Saturday, February 5, 1977, the Durants attended the ERS banquet. I called for them. In the car, and later at the banquet, they told stories from the 1920s about BR. He visited them several evenings, during his lecture-tours in this country, and he debated Will on several occasions. The following stories are an amalgamation of what was told in the car and at the banquet. There were more details at the banquet, but more risqué ones in the car.

The first story was Will's, about the time BR visited them in New York for the evening. BR asked Ariel to take him to his hotel. BR did not know that the driver of the car was her brother. In the car, he took her hand and tried to persuade her to go for a ride in Central Park, as he worked his way up her arm. He told the driver to go through the park; the driver turned around and told him firmly that he was taking him to his hotel. BR never did figure out why the driver was so impertinent. In the car, Will told this with great zest and humor -- sort of teasing Ariel. She teased back, saying, "If I had gone, where would that leave you?" He replied: "I would have lost my front row seat."

Ariel obviously liked BR. At one point Will said no woman was safe with BR. Ariel protested that that cheapened her, that BR liked women but had taste.

Later I got the famous Ariel Durant "quick shuffle" when I called at their house to discuss a business proposition. I had what I thought was a good idea; noting how effectively BR had used film and TV to further his ideas and influence, I felt that Durant should do the same. Their "The Lessons of History" (1968) contains discussion of 12 questions of importance in historiography, such as "Race and History", "Morals and History", "Economics and History", etc. I was going to propose a TV series for PBS based on the 12 questions.

Here is how the quick shuffle worked. (It was a method she had perfected over 60 years, to minimize interruptions of his time. The details are in their autobiography.) She meets you at the door in what appears to be a very bad mood, and with evident distaste, and grudgingly takes you in to Will, who is all warmth and smiles. While I explained the idea to him, she repeatedly interrupted with comments like, "Why don't they just read the books?" Unfortunately they were both insensitive to film as an educational medium. I realized he had last been a full-time teacher in 1911, well before the advent educational film. There was a bit more conversation, and then I was escorted out by Ariel, who then turned on the charm (as per her method) which was considerable. And so I found myself on the doorstep in a bit of a haze at the speed of it all: total elapsed time 10 minutes!

Their house is old Spanish style in the California manner. I would love to own and remodel it, as it has great potential for elegance and ease of living. Will's room, at that time, was off of the front door and was extraordinarily stark. I felt I knew what a monk in a cloister felt like and was chilled by its effect. The room was bare except for an army cot, and a desk at which he sat. This is basically the way he had lived in order to put out all those books. It's what Ariel meant when she said he was "Catholic from the neck down." His eating habits (he had told me on another occasion) were of the same sort: simple food, and very little. He didn't eat much meat but was not a vegetarian. I mentioned Schopenhauer's remark that he had tried

vegetarianism and had lost vigor and had had to re-write everything he had written while on the diet. Durant said the same thing had happened to him.

At the banquet I was embarrassed by a student who discussed their impending deaths with them, saying what a waste it would be. Durant must have experienced a lot of this because, in his infrequent appearances around town, he raised the subject himself -- saying how he did not fear death, and that death was a part of life. Death makes life complete, he said, and offers a necessary discipline to get on with our work. It makes way for the fresh and new, and renews our world.

A remarkable man, and a remarkable couple.

ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

(37)

END Campaign criticism continues. To review the situation: The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation campaigns for European Nuclear Disarmament (END) (RSN26-36); the Campaign is endorsed by "The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists" (RSN29-20); Elizabeth Young objects to the campaign and to the endorsement (RSN30-45); the Peace Foundation responds to Young's arguments (RSN31-48). Now Young responds to the Foundation, in the "Bulletin" (Nov. '81, pp. 58-60):

Young's response: Ken Coates dislikes and disputes my mild suggestion that the naivetes of END are "not quite innocent." He also disputes three statements of fact I made in that brief letter. Let me deal with these first.

• The END appeal states "over the years public opinion has pressed for nuclear disarmament . . . this pressure has failed." I commented that this statement is quite untrue; there has been public hope that detente will come about but there has been virtually no public pressure for disarmament.

Between the partial test ban of 1963 and the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament in 1978 there was indeed pressure from some parties other than "public opinion"—the words used in the END appeal; from public opinion there was no pressure at all and it is, I think, quite invidious for END to claim there was and that it failed. In the last two years public pressure has emerged in Western Europe and it is the nature and purpose of this recent pressure that we are discussing, *not* the desirability or necessity of general and comprehensive disarmament, which I take to be self evident.

• The appeal states "We must act together to free the entire territory of Europe from Poland to Portugal from nuclear weapons." I commented: "the entire territory of Europe" goes as far as the Urals. Coates suggests END/CND has "answered" this point elsewhere. It isn't really a point you can answer; it's just a fact which you either know or don't. Even Leonid Brezhnev recognized this, by agreeing in his February Report to the Sixteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that Europe-wide confidence building measures should now reach to the eastern frontiers of Russia, that is, to the Urals. (The Minister for Defense and others are now trying to withdraw this "concession"!)

Certainly Europe's best hopes lie in the negotiated extension of confidence building measures, binding, verifiable, militarily significant, throughout our continent, as has been proposed by the West with neutral support at the Madrid Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, followed by a European disarmament conference that their successful operation would allow.

END's belief in a nuclear free zone in Europe "from Portugal to Poland" is nonsense, not because of the U.N. Special Session on Disarmament Final Document's welcome to nuclear free zones, but despite it. "Nuclear free" is not "nuclear safe," and Soviet pledges and signatures on documents are not particularly binding: consider Soviet military activity in the internationally demilitarized Svalbard archipelago, its passing of aircraft carriers through the straits from the Black Sea in defiance of the Montreux Convention, its military invasions of East European countries and of Afghanistan despite the U.N. Charter. And, of course, its apparent contempt for "Basket Three" undertakings at Helsinki—those on Human Rights.

Europe is not some distant peninsula, insignificant and militarily unimportant. Europe is where a match lit in the wrong place can blow up the world. The superpowers as military entities are not and cannot be indifferent to Europe. In any war between them, a neutral Western Europe would be fought for and conquered in the earliest stages. It is a fact of geography that the desirable aircraft carrier consisting of Western Europe—and particularly Britain—would be boarded or shot out of the water at the earliest moment possible in any war, nuclear or conventional. Were we neutral and unarmed, the process would be all the quicker and all the bloodier, as each side sought to prevent the other from setting up its missiles on our land.

Coates says "the call for a nuclear free zone is directed against the threat of limited" nuclear war. END/CND seems to be alone, with a few crazy theorists, East and West, in believing that nuclear war can be limited. Certainly, neither the United States nor the Soviet governments do, nor does anyone who has any idea of the effects of nuclear weapons. Indeed, the mind boggles at the idea that declaring Europe or Western Europe "nuclear free" could somehow make us all safe in a war between the United States and the Soviet Union. Non-Soviet Europe will be safe only when the process of general and comprehensive disarmament is well on its way: perhaps quite long after other parts of the world will be able to feel safe.

• The appeal states: "We offer no advantage to either NATO or the Warsaw Alliance." I commented that "by excluding European Russia from 'Europe' the Soviet Union would have a monopoly of nuclear weapons in Europe. They would also retain their conventional superiority."

Of course if END *could* operate equally in Eastern and Western Europe, it no doubt *would*. The deduction is impeccable but the premises are faulty because it cannot operate in Eastern Europe. The idea of END operating in Eastern Europe can be entertained only by those who haven't noticed or don't care that the Soviet presence in Eastern Europe is different in kind and purpose from the American presence in Western Europe. Not only have I already "pinpointed" this "fallacy"; so have East Europeans in commenting on END, both exiles and pseudonymous dissidents from inside Eastern Europe.

E.P. Thompson, guru of the campaign, has said a CND badge was recently seen in Warsaw; hardly, one would suppose on a *bona fide* member of Solidarity. The evolution of Poland's new-found freedoms depends entirely and utterly on keeping stable

the precarious balance between the risks the Soviet government perceives: on the one hand, the risk of intervening and being opposed by the Polish armed forces, thereby perhaps starting World War III; and on the other, the risk of not intervening, and seeing the collapse of "proletarian internationalism" as well as of "irreversible socialist achievements" and all sorts of other Leninist claims and doctrines. Solidarity knows only too well on what a knife edge it is performing its revolution; it seeks to curtail all possible signs of anti-Sovietism. The least we can do for them now is to refrain from inviting them to leave the Warsaw Pact. Massive Soviet deployments all around them, on land and sea, show clearly enough that it would be war if they tried it.

As long as it is confined to Western Europe, END's neutralism is very welcome to the Soviet government and it is no "innocent naivete" on the part of END's leadership tacitly to imply that it does not enjoy wholehearted Soviet approval and the unqualified support of Soviet-supported bodies. It is not the support that is culpable but the implication that it does not exist, and the pretense that all the riders on the END/CND bandwagon are straightforward, evenhanded believers in multilateral disarmament, in democratic process, in the freedom of the press, freedom of information, and so on. Some are; others, and they appear to be the more effective, are not.

"Objectively," to use an appropriate Marxist term, END's aims are not even-handed as between East and West. The disarmed and neutral Europe they seek would not be a haven of liberal achievement and enterprise, but a westward extension of the Soviet glacis, enjoying certain licensed liberties in the shadow of overwhelming military power and "proletarian internationalism." It is small wonder that END's leadership

tends to avert its eyes from the Soviet Union's totalitarian doctrines and practices. It is infinitely more critical of the United States, forgetting that the American people were able to force their government to withdraw from Vietnam and to get rid of a corrupt President.

END/CND has had its considerable popular success in Western Europe in

the last two years, because there has been no other leadership available for the thousands who are deeply — and rightly — offended and frightened by the arms race.

This period may now be ending. In France, the undeniably Socialist President François Mitterand is no appeaser or unilateral disarmament: to the Soviet government's alarm, he is em-

phasizing that verifiability is the cornerstone of arms control and disarmament in Europe. Helmut Schmidt's determination that there shall be East-West negotiations on Euro-strategic missiles is at last beginning to pay off. In Britain, the Left has split, in part on the issue of "unilateral" — one-sided — disarmament, which the old Labour Party appears to be adopting. The newly-founded Social Democrat

Party is multilateralist; in alliance with the Liberal Party, it is now running away with the opinion polls and by-election votes.

Their doctrine is likely to be, "Neither red nor dead; on with disarmament!"

ELIZABETH YOUNG
London W2 3HJ
United Kingdom

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS)

(38)

The Fellowship of Reconciliation and the American Friends Service Committee remind us of "man's peril", and urge us to support the steps they propose in the following open letter:

OPEN LETTER TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

For the past thirty years, a major proportion of our country's resources, technical skills and scientific expertise have been devoted to weapons of mass destruction. The nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union have grown and the sophistication of the weapons on both sides has increased dramatically.

Prominent scientists now warn that the "balance of terror" is unstable. Nuclear war, until now considered unthinkable, could occur within this decade.

The arms policies of Ronald Reagan threaten to bring our nation to the brink of economic ruin and nuclear war. A total of \$1.5 trillion will be spent over the next five years on a buildup of strategic and conventional forces unprecedented in peacetime. This radical pursuit of the goal of military superiority is committing us to build hundreds of new bombers, missiles and submarines with a first-strike capability.

The Reagan plan pushes us headlong through a window of real vulnerability, as a nation and a planet. The administration claims it has a "mandate" for this risky and expensive arms buildup in the face of an ominous Soviet threat. Yet it was the United States which failed to ratify the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty. At this point, the two superpowers have achieved a rough parity in their nuclear forces. The Reagan politics of fear and parallel Soviet attitudes are driving the arms race forward in ways that divert attention from growing economic problems in both countries.

There is no mandate for nuclear war. The opposite is true: polls show that Americans overwhelmingly favor nuclear disarmament. Half of those polled favor a total ban on the building of new weapons and destruction of all nuclear weapons already built. (Gallup Poll, June 21, 1981.)

To fund the Reagan arms budget, severe cuts have been made in social programs providing basic necessities such as food, health care, and education. Growing unemployment — especially among minorities and the young — and ever-higher inflation and interest rates pose more of a threat to the average citizen than any foreign power. Proposed increases in military spending will only deepen the economic trap into which we are moving.

The Reagan government tells us that people in other nations look toward the United States to maintain a "margin of safety" over the Soviet Union. Yet our allies in Europe are reluctant to serve as the surrogate battlefield for the next war, and instead urge arms negotiations and a maintenance of detente. In West Germany over 1½ million people have signed petitions against the stationing of American Pershing II and cruise missiles on their soil. There have been serious concerns raised about U.S. plans to build the neutron bomb, and the heightened risks of a so-called "limited" nuclear war.

It is time for Americans from all walks of life to unite in opposition to the mean-spirited and dangerous domestic and military policies of the Reagan administration. It is time for us to join together in favor of genuine security, built on a healthy economy and global framework of peace and disarmament.

We urge all those who refuse to be swept along by the tide of fear and militarism that has become the mark of U.S. policy in the 1980s to join this movement. We urge our fellow citizens actively to support vigorous and visible efforts to reverse this trend and support the following:

- **Substantial cuts in the proposed U.S. military budgets** for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 and a commitment to economic conversion, redirecting resources and technology towards solving urgent social and urban problems, and re-funding essential human needs programs now being cut or eliminated.

- **A declaration** by the United States that it would never initiate a nuclear war nor be the first to use nuclear weapons in a future conflict, abandoning the building and deployment of first-strike weapons systems.

- **Confidence-building measures**, such as an immediate ban on all flight-testing of new strategic delivery systems like the MX missile and cruise missile and B-1 bomber.

- **An immediate cut-off** on the production of fissionable materials for bombs and a pledge not to use civilian reactors to produce materials for nuclear weapons.

- **A freeze on underground nuclear explosions** and a renewal of negotiations with the Soviet Union and other nations for a comprehensive test ban treaty.

- **Suspend all plans to deploy** ground-launched cruise and Pershing II missiles in Western Europe while negotiations for reductions in theatre forces on both sides are underway.

Finally, we urge our fellow citizens to mount a **public appeal** to President Reagan and Soviet Premier Breshnev to announce at the **United Nations Second Special Session on Disarmament** in June 1982 a **moratorium** of 2-3 years on the production and deployment of any new weapons systems or additional warheads as a first step toward significant reductions in current strategic systems. Only such creative action on the part of the superpowers can offer a way out of the nuclear trap.

The arms race poses a challenge to which we must respond with foresight, courage and hope. Together we can work to halt and reverse the arms race and, in the best tradition of American democracy, take back control of our nation, its economy and foreign policy.

SPONSORS

Kenneth Boulding
Distinguished Professor Emeritus
University of Colorado

Lloyd J. Dumas
Associate Professor
Political Economy and Economics
University of Texas at Dallas

Bernard T. Feld
Professor of Physics
MIT

Randall Forsberg

Michael Jendrzeczyk
Fellowship of Reconciliation

Coretta Scott King
President, Martin Luther King, Jr.
Center for Nonviolent Social Change

Robert Jay Lifton, M.D.
Foundation's Fund Professor of
Psychiatry

Yale University

Joseph E. Lowery
President, Southern Christian
Leadership Conference

Everett Mendelsohn
Professor, History of Science
Harvard University

Levi A. Olan
Rabbi Emeritus
Former President of Central Conference
of American Rabbis

Adelle Simmons
President, Hampshire College

Pam Solo
American Friends Service Committee

Joseph Weizenbaum
Professor, Computer Sciences, MIT

I agree to be listed as a signer of the open letter to be made public at the American Association for the Advancement of Science meeting.

Name.....Phone.....

Address.....

Identification.....

To help cover the cost of publicizing the open letter, I enclose a contribution of \$10, \$20, \$.....

(Make checks payable to the Fellowship of Reconciliation or to the American Friends Service Committee. Contributions made within the U.S. are tax-deductible.)

Please sendcopies of the open letter for me to circulate to friends and associates.

Return to: FOR/Nuclear Weapons Facilities Project, Box 271, Nyack, NY 10960 (914) 358-4601
or AFSC, 1660 Lafayette St., Denver, CO 80218 (303) 832-4508

(Thank you, ALEX DELY)

PERIODICALS RECEIVED

- (39) "Adelante" (Ano II,#3), all in Spanish, 16 pages, 25¢, is published by the Partido Cubano Democratica Socialista. The address of this anti-Castro group is PO Box 350805, Miami, FL 33135.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

- (40) A Socialist Calendar is quite beautiful. It is large, 23 x 15 inches; one month per page; top half of each page reproduces a painting in handsome color. Most of the paintings show workers working; one shows them striking. Days of the calendar commemorate events in socialist history. (January 14, "Independent Labour Party formed in Bradford, England, under Keir Hardie." September 21, "10,000 Filipinos defy government order and hold 'freedom march'. Eight people killed.") Published by the Boag Foundation, Ltd., 576 Keith Road, West Vancouver, BC, Canada V7T 1L7. Price not known.

An amusing sidelight: some very prominent American capitalists not known for their socialist leanings have apparently lent a hand to this socialist undertaking. The acquisition of one of the paintings— The Cotton Pickers, by Winslow Homer — "was made possible through the Los Angeles County Museum Trustees." The Trustees are listed and include Robert O. Anderson (head of Arco), Justin Dart (Pres. Reagan's friend and head of Dart & Kraft), and Dr. Armand Hammer (head of Occidental Petroleum).

LAST MINUTE ITEMS

- (41) Room reservations, '82. To reserve your room for the June 25-27 BRS Annual Meeting, at Scripps College, Claremont, California, send \$70 to Jacqueline Berthon-Payon, 463 W. 10th St., Claremont, CA 91711. That covers room and board for 2 days ($\frac{1}{2}$ day Friday, full day Saturday, $\frac{1}{2}$ day Sunday). There may be an extra charge for a single room (if available) and for air-conditioning (if available), and for the Saturday night banquet.

Notice that we, as individual members, are not making our reservations directly with the College. We make them through one of our own members, Jacqueline, who will tell the College how many rooms (and meals) will be needed.

In the May issue, we expect to provide additional information: *Deadline for making reservations. *Deadline for cancelling reservations, for full refund. *Costs of single room, air-conditioning, and banquet. *Cost of meals only (for those who don't need rooms). * How to get there from airports, bus terminals and railroad stations. *Where to register, when you first arrive. *Where to go for Friday night dinner.

- * If you plan to attend, it will be helpful if you make your reservation soon.

BRS Annual Meetings are enjoyable events, and rewarding in many ways. Try to make this one, if you can.

Dora Russell on Humanism today, in "The Freethinker" (U.K.) (January 1982) pp.8,9,15:

(12)

The dangers facing humanity in the nuclear age cannot be underestimated. Is it surprising that a generation that has grown up in the age of "the balance of terror" is highly critical of science, an attitude that is encouraged, for the wrong reasons, by religious fundamentalists. Dora Russell, a veteran campaigner for peace, women's rights and social reform, examines these questions.

As *The Freethinker* enters its second century, it and the National Secular Society meet challenges by antagonists who are likely to prove as daunting as the enemies faced by 19th-century pioneers like Charles Bradlaugh, Annie Besant and G. W. Foote.

The human race is confronted not only by the old struggle for freedom of thought but, under nuclear threat, for sheer physical survival. Humanity is now locked in a grim conflict that is being waged at all levels; in politics, economics, ideologies, religion, philosophy, science, ecology. Yet so departmentalised are our minds and our social structure, that contenders involved in one field are too often unaware that the same struggle, on precisely the same issues, is going on in all the others. Are humanists fully awake to what threatens us all, and how important it may be to give a lead, seek allies and sound the alarm to arouse the sleepers?

In the issue of *The Freethinker* for November 1981, some articles indicate the directions from which the attack is coming. There is the usual entrenched faith of the established Christian churches, observing, in the customary Armistice Day ceremonial, their adherence to the doctrine of just wars. Today there are many sincere Christians, already pacifists, who are joining CND. But despite their creed of brotherly love they would still not subscribe to the sentiments of John Lennon's song: "Imagine there is no heaven, no separate countries, no religions to die for."

On the contrary, President Reagan's "twice born" evangelical Protestants are out to crush the humanists and sweep the country in a vast conversion to faith in America as god's favoured nation, destined to rule the world. For these "creationists" the scientists' theory of man's evolution is so much nonsense, but science is splendid when devoted to preparations for war.

The non-Christian religions of the Middle East are newly athirst for killing and dying and persecuting; direct opposition to all that America stands for. Then there are the Marxist-Leninist believers with their varying sects in Russia and China.

In Britain, politicians, economists and trade unionists are split on the dilemmas of disarmament; querying whether to spend money on nuclear weapons or welfare, war or peace, death or life. The clash between these two claimants on the national wealth is not new. It has merely reached its present critical stage because of the immense growth of the contending claimants. On the one side the hungry millions of the world (as well as our own now more demanding citizens); on the other, a vast number of ever more diabolical, scientifically ingenious and horribly expensive weapons with which wars may now be waged.

No country or people can now escape that ultimate war, to which persistence in our way of life and belief has brought the pursuit of rivalry, prosperity and power, supported by the expansion of scientific discovery and the resultant industrial technology.

Revolt by the younger generation against science is the natural outcome of the bomb on Hiroshima, followed by the mounting tension of the so-called "balance of terror". In addition, the young now realise that the boosted technology, with automation, is rendering human labour redundant; consequently not only they, but even their fathers and mothers, are out of work. In such times people tend to turn to the comforts of religion. And the holders of power are well satisfied that the populace should

be distracted from the subversion that might otherwise result from their frustration and discontent.

Some believers return to the neglected churches. The religious teaching in the schools (to which agnostics and atheists justly object) may still indoctrinate, but it no longer has an emotional appeal that inspires the young.

The Failure of Religion

Strenuous efforts are being made on television and radio to reclaim their parents. The BBC is very active. Three pages a week in the *Listener* offer to teach us about the remission of our sins, salvation and the mysteries of theology. Television provides us with the unedifying spectacle of masses of grown men and women bawling about Jesus while prancing and stamping like pop groups.

We are also shown the orgiastic antics (significantly blindfold) of those who follow a new religious practice taught by a guru, which for younger people appears to be a more popular outlet for the emotions and a means of saving your own soul.

It is with these young men and women, above all, that we should be concerned. What do their elders offer them but religions in which they can no longer believe, or faith in that rationalism and science which, in their view, have brought them to the edge of destruction and do not even offer the minimum security of employment?

It is no use talking to young people about the wonders of electronics, or the splendid technology that is going on, to make some people, but probably not them, exceedingly prosperous. What they see is a society in which the best scientific brains—and the most money—are devoted to research and industry for war purposes, and an education increasingly concentrated on the limited amount of manpower that will be needed to serve the scientific elite. They may well ask the one vital question: "Since the statesmen and scientists are so clever, why do they not put an end to war?"

The young, and to some extent also their parents, are starved of expression of feeling, of creative outlets, colour, adventure, variety, change. With nothing but small subsidies from the State, how are they to fill their days of enforced leisure? Sex (for the most part perforce without parenthood), and the new style religions are all that they have left. Some, in desperation, take to violence in the streets; some take their own lives.

Fanny Cockerell, of the Progressive League, in her article (*A Dormitory of Bishops*, November 1981), touches on this problem of the need to have something to believe in and for the comfort of fellowship with other human beings. As one who supported the foundation of the League, who were welcomed for their conferences at my school, I am glad to know that *Plan* still lives and the League is still active. They, among those of us who are humanists, know well enough that we had to fight for our causes; free speech, birth control, divorce and abortion law reform—against brutal opposition from organised religion. We know too of the great benefits brought by science, however much overshadowed by the prostitution of science to war. We have consistently campaigned against armaments, and longed to see science in alliance with peace. All that we strove for is now clearly under attack by the organised religious hierarchies who will use every device of propaganda and repression to reimpose their authority, attributing all the world's evils to man's sinfulness and disobedience to god.

Ignoring Reality

The new religions—while perhaps some avoid postulating god, and discard sin—offer instead an almost sexual adoration of their human leader. They retreat into personal isolation, expressed in the quietism of meditation, or else in the deliberate discarding of all inhibitions and the fulfilment of the personality with a degree of self-indulgence which resembles—is perhaps attributable to—the

intensely selfish individualism that is characteristic of the Western so-called free world. In that free world, even now, moves against democracy endeavour to repress and outlaw strikes, whilst in that so-called unfree world, the democratic right to strike is being asserted and defended.

With such social issues, with poverty, with the threat of nuclear war, the followers of the new religions are not at all concerned. Their argument that the self must first be fulfilled before feeling or showing concern for others is no more than pretence. In actual fact, relatives and friends soon find that absorption in the new religions is destructive of all other sympathy and ties.

What seems to me important is that we are, after all, social animals, and it is only by knowing and helping and being helped by others, that we ourselves realise what, in modern jargon, is called our potential. Religious communities, like convents and monasteries, have always existed for those who prefer to retire from the tumult of the secular world. But the soul-seekers of today should realise that the nuclear world is not like that of the dying Roman Empire. If, by chance, some survive the nuclear holocaust, on a tiny islet, the destroyed and poisoned land will be unproductive and uninhabitable. There is no escape.

God alone, the religious might say, can and will resolve the intolerable confusion which human beings have brought upon themselves. We might reply that the very notion of a god was evoked by men and women in order to evade their own responsibilities. It is time for humanity to reach maturity and at long last assume responsibility—as far as it in us lies—for creating a tolerable existence for everything that lives on our planet.

Humanity's Opportunities

In humanism I have always felt the warmth of association with all organic life, with our roots in the productive soil of our earth. My dissent from god and religion arose from its denial of this very life which animates plants, birds, animals and humans. If god created all this, then why are his worshippers commanded to reject it all, as savage, bestial, lust and sin?

Human beings have developed remarkable gifts of imagination and rational thought. These come from the living organisms that are ourselves and the energy that moves us, as it moves everything else, to grow, create, reach old age and die. With all our faculties we shape our image of the external world. Imagination serves our dreams and aspirations; it may also serve our fears, reason, our curiosity as to what is really real, which may also act as a bridle on our imagination. If we, and our statesmen, were to apply to international politics the long-suffering patience, imagination and honesty of purpose of the artist or scientist in their work, we could save our world from disaster and bring about some tolerance, harmony and peace. At this time this is more important than detailed argument about our origins, or from where the force of creative life comes.

It seems to me as if, at present, fear is driving many to evade the issue. Radio and television provide another escape. The people seen and heard on the interminable television serials have become more real to those who watch them than their fellow citizens, or fellow travellers on this planet. We live in a real world, which is in great danger from our ignorance and foolish mistakes.

Humanism should be active. It has much to contribute. Above all it is not a new religion with doctrines, merely the plea that customs and beliefs are personal and never justify persecution or indifference to others. If we examine ourselves and reflect on what power-seeking, killing and fear have done to a world of plenty and great beauty and its peoples, we may learn how it is possible to live as human beings, and take courage to do so.

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS)

(43)

"Free Inquiry" will examine the Bible, April 16-17. Here are excerpts from the news release:

"Science, the Bible, and Darwin" a symposium to be held at the Amherst Campus of the State University of New York at Buffalo on April 16-17, will mark the centennial of the death of Charles Darwin. . . . distinguished scientists and scholars will discuss the relationship between science and religion. . . . The conference is sponsored by Free Inquiry magazine in cooperation with the University's departments of Philosophy, Anthropology, Sociology, and Biology. Among questions to be explored at the conference are:

1. What is the relationship between science and biblical revelations?
2. To what extent can the Bible be used as an authority for knowledge about nature, ethics, and politics?
3. What do modern Biblical scholars and scientists have to say about the origins of the Bible?
4. In what ways is the Bible contradicted by scientific evidence?
5. What is valid and what is invalid in Darwin's work in the light of modern science?
6. How do Biblical accounts of creation stand up when compared with the scientific evidence for evolution -- as drawn from geology, anthropology, biology, and other disciplines?

Let Free Inquiry know if you plan to attend, or if you want more information, 716-834-2921; 1203 Kensington Av., Buffalo, NY 14215. Reserve rooms at the Marriott Hotel, 1340 Millersport Highway, Amherst, NY 14221; 716-689-6900.

(44)

Humanist Essay Contest is announced:

NORTH AMERICAN ESSAY CONTEST

For Young Men and Women of Good Will *TELL A FRIEND*

IF YOU ARE AGE 29 OR UNDER AND HAVE SUBSTANTIAL CONCERN FOR HUMANS AND THE FUTURE, YOU ARE INVITED TO SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS AND VISION.

SUGGESTED TOPICS

Insights on:

- Steps Toward Humanizing the World
- Using Science for Human Goals
- Ways to Surmount the Divisiveness of World Religions
- Bringing Inspirational Aspects of Evolution, Biology, Astronomy, or Other Sciences into Classroom Courses
- Methods I Have Used in My Teaching Which Encouraged Consideration of Others and Thinking About Ethical Problems
- Developing a Scientific and Humane Personal Philosophy
- Self-Fulfillment Through Service to Others
- or other related topics will be welcomed.

The purpose of this contest is to encourage thinking which can help bridge the gap between the practices of established institutions and the practical creative insights of the oncoming generation. The future will be shaped by what is in process. Here is an opportunity to provide your input.

Winning essays of not more than 2,500 words will be published in THE HUMANIST and other media.

PRIZES

FIRST PRIZE — \$1,000

SECOND PRIZE — \$500

THIRD PRIZE — \$100

If with your submission you mention a teacher, librarian, dean, or adviser (with address) as instrumental to your having entered your essay, and if you are one of the winners, we will recognize that individual with a special award including \$100.

PROCEDURE

Contest Procedure:

- Manuscripts must be typed and double-spaced
- Entries must be postmarked before July 15, 1982
- Send to: THE HUMANIST, 7 Harwood Drive, Amherst, NY 14226
- A panel of distinguished judges, to be announced later, will review the entries
- Winners will be notified by November 15, 1982
- THE HUMANIST reserves the first right of publication
- Entries will not be returned.

Each entrant will receive a complimentary one-year subscription to

THE HUMANIST

(45)

Lamont on BR. Some excerpts from Corliss Lamont's recent autobiography, Yes To Life (NY:Horizon Press,1981), mostly about BR:

Neuroses and radicalism (p. 43)

When I asked myself how the happiness of humanity could be achieved and evils such as war and poverty overcome, I used my intellect as best I could and came to certain conclusions, such as the necessity of democratic Socialism, for the actualization of those ends. I thought it absurd to attribute Oedipus hatred of my father and guilt feelings about his wealth as the main causes of my loving humanity and supporting Socialism.

I dearly loved and greatly admired my father. We argued about the important issues of the day, but I argued just as much with my mother; our family dinner table, as I have said, was a free-for-all in which everyone participated in a friendly and tolerant spirit. In any case, it is a social good that children should to some extent disagree with their parents. This is the key to progress in any community or country; and it stimulates constructive criticism by each new generation.

In the 1930's, in the middle of the Great Depression, Socialism as the way out was widely discussed and proposed by thousands of middle-class intellectuals and proletarian workers with nobody claiming that they had Oedipus motives and other psychoanalytic rigamarole, frequently used by the Establishment to try to show that radical proposals are irrational and merely emotional outpourings of suffering and discontented people.

Regrettably two eminent British radicals contributed to the psychoanalytic attack on radicals. Philosopher Bertrand Russell stated that while he himself believed that the rational arguments for radicalism are overwhelming, the fundamental incentives that lead persons, especially "educated men," toward the Left are non-rational and emotional. "Rubbish!" say I, to use a favorite British expression. Author John Strachey recounts that at his first meeting with Russell, the latter greeted him with the words: "What's the matter with you? I had a neglected childhood." And Strachey goes on to say, "Many and deep, I am sure, are the personal neuroses which have made me into a Communist."

I have never accepted the Freudian idea of an Oedipus complex that affects all children. I grant that some children develop antagonism or hatred toward one or both parents: others may suffer from different sorts of neuroses, resulting from social unpopularity or sexual maladjustment. Such troubles are important stimuli in thought and action, but do not in themselves determine the direction in which a person may turn in order to solve personal dilemmas. Individuals subject to such pressures do not necessarily land in the Socialist camp; they may enter the Catholic Church, become storm-troopers of Fascism, commit suicide, join encounter groups, develop into alcoholics, support the labor movement and Socialism, or become conservatives or radicals or apolitical.

The 3 greatest (p.80)

Three men whom I consider the greatest philosophers of the twentieth century were all essentially Humanist, although they did not choose that word to describe their position. John Dewey preferred to call himself a humanistic Naturalist; Bertrand Russell termed himself a Rationalist; and George Santayana wished to be known as a Materialist. While these thinkers differed on technicalities, their comprehensive philosophy was definitely that of naturalistic Humanism.

Civil liberties & Vietnam (pp.83-84)

Like Dewey, Bertrand Russell took a Humanist stand on the main issues in philosophy and was active in public affairs, especially in the struggle for peace and the eventual abolition of nuclear weapons. His literary style was eminently readable and often caustic in criticism of some philosopher or other. He was one of the few philosophers who ventured into the precarious realm of sex relations. His notable book on the subject, *Marriage and Morals* (1929),¹⁴ advocated a liberal and rational approach.

During his last decade I had the privilege of visiting Russell twice at his home in Wales. In his eighties, though somewhat spare physically, his mind seemed as acute as ever as he discoursed on the burning issues of the day. I was much gratified when he wrote a foreword to my book on civil liberties, *Freedom Is As Freedom Does* (1956).¹⁵

In December, 1962, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee presented its annual Tom Paine Award to Earl Russell in absentia at its yearly

dinner to celebrate the ratification of the Bill of Rights by Congress. I made a brief presentation speech of appreciation on behalf of the Committee, and Russell sent me a gracious acknowledgment:

Civil liberties & Vietnam
(continued)

Dear Dr. Lamont,

It was a great pleasure to receive your kind letter of December 13 and to read your presentation speech for the Tom Paine Award.

My disappointment at not being present at your dinner was more than matched by my delight in noting both the generosity and the wisdom of your remarks.

I once wrote of Paine that "... he set an example of courage, humanity and single-mindedness." I am indebted to the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee for the honour it has conferred by associating me with the memory of Tom Paine.

With warm good wishes for the New Year,

Yours sincerely,
Bertrand Russell

Active in public affairs to the end, Bertrand Russell died in February, 1970, at the extraordinary age of ninety-seven. Some years earlier he had written: "Three passions, simple but overwhelmingly strong, have governed my life: the longing for love, the search for knowledge and unbearable pity for the suffering of mankind." In June, 1970, I flew to London to represent the American Humanist Association, of which Russell had been an honorary member, and the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee at a Memorial Meeting for Russell. I spoke briefly, saying that "American Humanists long have regarded Bertrand Russell as the world's outstanding representative of the Humanist philosophy. He was a modern Socrates continually challenging the Establishment and outworn traditional beliefs. . . . He was one of the few philosophers of the twentieth century who stepped out of the study to put ethical ideals into action."

During the last decade of his life I had a voluminous correspondence with Lord Russell covering his support of civil liberties, his unceasing campaign for international peace and the abolition of nuclear weapons, and his opposition to the American aggression in Vietnam. Here is a short note from him in answer to my letter of November 14, 1967, in which I mentioned my contribution of \$2,000 toward his activities in opposing U.S. atrocities and other war crimes in the Vietnam war:

Dear Dr. Lamont,

I was very pleased to receive your good letter of November 14th and to learn of your further generous gift to our work. This is not only a great encouragement to me personally, but is also, of course, of great practical importance.

The final public session of the International War Crimes Tribunal is now being held in Copenhagen and I am hopeful that it will help in a small way to make more widely known the full horror of the war in Vietnam.

With all good wishes,

Yours sincerely,
Bertrand Russell

Free will (pp.84-85)

Turning to the realm of philosophy, I had a very important exchange of letters with him on the issue of freedom of choice or free will. I had set him down as a determinist until I read in Erich Fromm's essay, "Prophets and Priests" (1968),¹⁶ that Russell "is not a determinist who claims that the historical future is already determined; he is an 'alternativist' who sees that what is determined are certain limited and ascertainable alternatives." Now this fits in precisely with my own viewpoint on freedom of choice. Opposing the extremes to which Sartre goes on this question, I claim that free choice is *always* limited by one's heredity, environment, economic circumstances—all deterministic elements in the picture. But beyond them, though established by them, are real alternatives between which a man can choose. That is where free choice comes in.

Russell answered me on August 16 with a noteworthy letter:

Dear Dr. Lamont,

Many thanks for your letter of August 3, I am in broad agreement with what you say about the free will question. Anything that one says on this is sure to be wrong! It is difficult to find a form of words, and the difficulty is due to linguistic problems. There are no laws of nature which make the future certain. Any scientific investigator would always have to assume determinism as a working hypothesis, without complete belief or complete denial. I cannot be described as a determinist, and my views are closer to yours than to Sartre's.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,
Bertrand Russell

I have called Russell's letter "noteworthy" because for the first time in his long career he subscribed to the idea of limited freedom of choice. This question is of such great significance in philosophy, religion and our day-to-day life that an outstanding philosopher's opinion on it is most persuasive.

(Thank you, WARREN SMITH and JOHN TOBIN)

VERY LAST MINUTE ITEM

(46) "Guided Tour" performance, NYC, April 5-6. Marvin Kaye writes:

Unless the Estate indicates otherwise, THE OPEN BOOK will be presenting the second act of my script, "Bertrand Russell's Guided Tour of Intellectual Rubbish" on April 5 and 6 at the Bruno Walter Auditorium in the Lincoln Center Library & Museum of Performing Arts, 111 Amsterdam Avenue, NYC. Admission will be free.

This is a five-person adaptation from the original one-man show I did for Bob Rounseville (NL3-33, NL6-32, RSN29-9). The material is essentially the same, and consists of sections (in order) entitled: "On Education", "On Sex and Marriage", "Mr. Bowdler's Nightmare", "On Old Age", "On Religion", "On Comets", and "On the Future of Mankind." We hope to stage the first act in the late fall, after which we hope we'll be able to begin touring the show.

(47)

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

February 18, 1982

Dear BRS Members:

You probably know about BR's speech to the House of Lords in 1945 in which he pointed out the danger to the survival of all mankind in the recently developed atom bomb.

As I was preparing this issue of the newsletter, I received the February 15th issue of The New Yorker magazine, which contains the third of Jonathan Schell's 3 pieces on The Fate of the Earth.

These are factual, well-documented articles (which I imagine will become a book.) They set forth convincingly why nuclear war is suicidal. It is suicidal not because millions and millions will be blasted to bits, burned alive, or irradiated dead or dying. It is suicidal because it will destroy the earth's capacity to support life. This is explained very clearly and explicitly.

And it could happen any second, because of the existence of nuclear weapons. The danger is immediate. It is essential that every one of us take immediate

steps to understand the danger, and to make others aware, in order to stop the production of nuclear weapons that will inevitably lead to the destruction of the entire earth. Does this sound melodramatic? It isn't. It's real.

I hope you will all read the Jonathan Schell articles. I hope you will begin today to start putting your efforts to saving this planet.

Since this Society carries Bertrand Russell's name, it behooves us more than others to carry on his work. It is particularly appropriate for us to do so. We hardly have the right to continue using his name if we do less.

Before you go to sleep tonight, talk to a few people about the danger of nuclear war. Write a letter to your Congressman, your Senator. Try to set up some discussion group. Write a letter to your local newspaper. Do not put it off. Be absolutely determined. As BR said, when reproached for being fanatical about the subject: it is hard not to be fanatical about it, the issue is so great.

The danger is real. It is immediate. Let us begin today to do everything we can. Nuclear weapons have got to go!

Sincerely,


Lee Eisler

(The 1945 House of Lords speech was the first of BR's many efforts to alert the world to the danger. Other efforts include: his BBC broadcast ("Man's Peril", 1954), the statement on the peril signed by eminent scientists from both sides of the Iron Curtain (1955), and the many Pugwash Conferences, which BR was responsible for starting in 1957, and which were the ancestors of the Salt talks.)

INDEX

- (48) Introductory (1). Dues due January 1st (2). Annual Meeting '82 (3,8b,41). President Davis reports (4,8). Vice-President Ruja reports (5). Treasurer Darland reports: quarter ending 12/31/81 (6); the year '81 (7). Committee reports: Membership (9); Science (10). BR's "On the Evils Due to Fear" (11). BR influenced John Van Wissen (12), John Lennon (13). BRS Award candidates wanted (14). "Nuclear Weapons: Perceptions vs. Realities" (15). Museum of Philosophy, etc., at Pace (16). Ayer, BR, Schweitzer, Schlesinger Jr. on their Humanism (17). "Scientific Creationism": loses Round One (18); comments by Gould (18c); Clarence Darrow (18d) and H. L. Mencken (18e) on Scopes trial (1925); bad effect on textbooks (18f); Ashley Montague quote (18g). Vidal quotes BR in "The People's Choice" (19). News about members: Justin Leiber (20), Dora Russell (21), Bill Young (22). BR on Husserl (23). New members (24). New addresses (25). Davis recommends Lamont book (26) "Reds" (film) recommended (27a); Dora Russell's letter (27b). Always-never paradox (28). "The Philosophy Circle" (29). Contributions solicited (30). Contributors thanked (31). Board votes: no Sutcliffe appeal (32). For sale: members' stationery (33), BR postcard (34). The Library's 7 BR films (35). Davis remembers Will & Ariel Durant (36). Eliz. Young criticizes END campaign (37). Open Letter on nuclear weapons (38). "Adelante" (periodical) (39). Socialist Calendar (40). Room reservations '82 (41). Dora Russell, "Challenge to Humanism" (42). "Free Inquiry" symposium on the Bible (43). Humanist Essay Contest (44). Lamont autobiography excerpts (45). "Guided Tour", NYC, 4/5-6 (46). Letter from the Editor (47). Index (48).