

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS

No. 36

November 1982

- (1) "Principia" & computers (5). '83 Doctoral Grant announced (7) Buchwald (10). Dora on "The Soul of Russia..." in 1921 and 1981 (16). 10 Directors elected (25a). All dues due January 1st (26). HASD's principles (33). "Guided Tour", Act I (36). Merv Griffin interview (38). BR on Gilbert Murray (39). Hofstadter on Godel (40). Membership list (41). Cousins on BR (42) An asterisk in the left column indicates a request.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

(1.5) President Don Jackanicz reports:

As we approach the mid-point in the BRS year -- between annual June meetings -- I would like to remind all of you of the June '83 Meeting, to be held in conjunction with the Russell Archives-sponsored symposium on Russell's non-technical philosophy. The BRS has met at the Archives before, and these meetings have been specially rewarding. If you have never attended an Annual Meeting or visited the Archives, here is an opportunity that deserves careful consideration. The symposium program will occupy much of the time. There will also be Society and Directors's meetings, the traditional Red Hackle Hour, the Banquet, and some specifically BRS-related activities. Any agenda proposals members may have should be addressed to me. I welcome suggestions. (3802 N. Kenneth Av., Chicago, IL 60641). The next RSN will contain details on the meeting.

From time to time, members ask what they can do to become more involved in BRS affairs. Here are some suggestions:

- .Nominate someone for the BRS Award. See RSN35-12c for the requirements. The Award honors a worthy individual and also provides publicity for the BRS.
- .Submit materials for the newsletter. The newsletter needs your help in acquiring Russell-related items of interest, both historical and contemporary: book reviews, articles, news about members (including yourself), opinions on public issues and BRS affairs, etc. If in doubt as to whether an item is suitable, send it anyway; if suitable, it will be used.
- .Vote in elections. Although more members voted than ever before -- in the recent balloting (by mail) for Directors -- fewer than 1 out of 3 voted, so there is plenty of room for improvement here. Your voice should be heard!
- .Make use of the BRS Library. It has much to offer -- books, films, tapes -- to borrow, rent or buy. Address on Page 1, bottom
- .Encourage local libraries and bookstores to stock Russell books. Introduce others to Russell's writings possibly with a short essay or your favorite among his writings.
- .Inform schools and students about the BRS Doctoral Grant, which aids a worthy doctoral student in his or her work on a Russell-related topic. Like the BRS Award, this recognizes excellence while creating publicity for the BRS.
- .Finally -- if you can -- make a contribution to the BRS Treasury. Membership dues do not cover expenditures; the deficit must be made up by contributions. Your contribution will help make possible the continued proper functioning of the Society. Send a contribution c/o the newsletter. (address on Page 1, bottom).

(2) Bob Davis, Vice-President/Special Projects, reports:

My activity this fall is centered primarily on two groups: Voice of Reason (VOR) and a November meeting of "The Open Society and its Friends".

I was co-organizer, with Gerald Larue (of the Ethical Culture movement and AHA), of an October 17th public rally to start a California VOR chapter. You may recall my report on the organizing meeting of VOR in New York last April (RSN34-4,37). The aim is to set up a grass-roots group to monitor and oppose the new right's political/social agenda. In Los Angeles, this seems to be taking the form of coordinating different existing humanist-oriented groups. The main speaker for the rally was Dr. Sherwin Wine, co-founder of VOR, who came from Michigan for this occasion.

"The Open Society and its Friends" is the title of a conference to be held November 22-24 in New York, to explore aspects of Karl Popper's philosophy (RSN35-24). Sir Karl is an honorary BRS member. The name is taken from his two-volume "The Open Society and its Enemies", which I feel every educated person should read at least twice. Speakers are people of eminence, including a Nobel Laureate (Frederick Hayek). At the final session, a new society based on Popper's philosophy will be organized. Since what they are doing parallels in many ways what the BRS has done, I have offered to make available to them what the BRS has learned from experience. I look forward to the existence of an interesting and vital new society.

I will also probably attend a late December "National Humanist Leadership Council" meeting in New York, but I have no details on this at the present time.

(3) Treasurer Dennis J. Darland reports:

For the quarter ending 9/30/82:

Balance on Hand(6/30/82).....	2125.13
Income: 19 new members.....	342.50
54 renewals.....	955.45
total dues.....	1297.95
Contributions.....	651.50
Sales of RSN, books, etc.....	450.56
total income.....	2400.01
	<u>4525.14</u>
Expenditures:Membership & Information	
Committees.....	1382.17
"Russell" subscriptions.....	609.00
Doctoral Grant.....	500.00
BRS Library.....	20.58
Annual Meeting.....	246.40
Bank charges.....	16.41
total spent.....	<u>2774.56</u>
Balance on hand (9/30/82).....	1750.58

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

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

(Alex and Dean Babst, also of the BRS Science Committee, have written a briefing paper, "Growing Probability of an Accidental Nuclear War", which they have sent to certain members of Congress and to organizations working to stop the nuclear arms race. The paper will be available from the BRS Library. The following press release is based on a portion of their paper.)

RISK OF NUCLEAR WAR BY ACCIDENT IS ONE MORE REASON TO SUPPORT THE FREEZE

"There's a definite chance that the two superpowers will exterminate each other, even though neither side wants that result nor initiates it," says Alex Dely, Chairman of the Science Committee of the Bertrand Russell Society and a member of the University of Arizona Physics Department and the staff of Puma Community College.

"It can happen by accident. That's why my Committee is supporting freeze Proposition 201 on the Arizona ballot this election," Dely continued. "The logic is simple. The greater the number of nuclear weapons, the greater the chance of accident. President Reagan has ordered 17,000 more nuclear weapons; that's 17,000 more chances of accidents."

An unwanted nuclear holocaust can be triggered by any of the following:

- . Human or computer error fires the first missile. (There were 32 nuclear-weapons-related accidents between 1950 and 1980.)
 - . Decreased time for error-correction. The Pershing II allows only 5-6 minutes.
 - . A 3rd country, or a terrorist, explodes a nuclear bomb, and the 2 superpowers suspect each other; a nuclear exchange results. To make this more likely, inaccurate plutonium-accounting by the U.S. and by the International Atomic Energy Agency permits the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries or groups.
 - . Existence of first-strike ("counterforce") weapons -- like the MX -- creates fear, interferes with rational decision-making, and may cause a strike...because of "use or lose".
 - . Increasing complexity of weapons increases possibility of misfiring.
-

ABOUT BR'S WRITINGS

- (5) "Principia Mathematica" and computers. From "The Making of the Micro" by Christopher Evans (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1981) pp.60-61:

Boole, you may recall, was an English philosopher living around the time of Babbage who showed that the rules and principles of logic were sufficiently well formalized for them to be expressed in mathematical terms. Thus you could use mathematical notation to state logical propositions and, by following the rules of mathematics, follow the various propositions to their ultimate, inescapable conclusions. The link between logic and mathematics had been made, but it had had curiously little impact and sat around in the way that these things sometimes do until somebody turned up who could see how to develop it. The "somebody" - or "somebodies" in this case - who pounced on Boole's great concept were a pair of awesome intellects: Alfred North Whitehead and Bertrand Russell, whose three-volume work *Principia Mathematica* (1910-13) is thought by some people to be one of the most influential scientific texts of all time. In it Whitehead and Russell argued that logic was not only inseparable from mathematics but was also the foundation of it, and they went on to develop a propositional calculus in which problems could be solved in terms of a series of statements that are either true or false. This means that problems other than those of a purely mathematical nature and concerned with matters in the "real world" - "Should I do this or that?" "What happens if?" etc. - can be converted into mathematical form and, in principle at any rate, could be put to a specially programmed computer for solution.

For a short sketch of BR by the same author, see (8)

BR SMEARED

- (6) BR quoted?

Socrates is greater than Christ because he did not have the cruel and sanguinary instincts of that hallucinating Jew.

An article in *La Patria* by Jose Velez Saenz says that a professor has written a book attributing the above statement to BR.

All of the above appears in a column in *El Espectador* (Bogota, 13 September '82), written by Antonio Panesso.

Mr. Panesso goes on to say that BR could not have made that statement -- it is not BR's style nor way of

thinking.

* Does someone at the Archives -- or anyone else -- want to comment on this kind of item?

(Thank you, ALBERTO DONADIO, of Bogota)

* * * * *

For those whose Spanish is better than ours, we reproduce the relevant part of the Panesso column.

*
En un artículo de José Vélez Sáenz en La Patria se afirma que un profesor estadounidense ha escrito un libro con frases célebres entre las cuales figura esta, atribuida a Bertrand Russell: "Sócrates es mucho más grande que Cristo porque no tuvo los instintos crueles y sanguinarios de ese judío alucinado."

Habría que advertirle al profesor autor del libro, cuyo título no se menciona, que lo han informado mal, que ha leído pésimamente, o que ha

inventado la frase. Russell no escribió ni dijo nunca esa tontería. No es ni su estilo ni su modo de pensar y expresarse.

El caso no tiene mucha importancia, sin duda. Pero corresponde a un hábito muy extendido de citar frases y atribuirlos a cualquiera, sin ton ni son. Se hace una afirmación ligera en un periódico y se repite en otro, lo vuelve a citar alguien y se constituye en una especie de depósito de frases, una verdadera casa de citas abierta a

todo el mundo y en la cual se saquea a todo el mundo. Las citas descuidadas corresponden a la irresponsabilidad intelectual. A los oradores les encantan las frases entre comillas, que dan ocasión de mencionar a gente ilustre como amiga de bolsillo. Es la tendencia que los ingleses llaman "dropping names", que se registra también en la vida social: dejar caer por ahí nombres propios ilustres como si fueran de casa, para cobijarse un poco con su gloria.

THE BRS DOCTORAL GRANT

(7) This 1983 announcement was sent to some 25 American, Canadian and U.K. universities, and to scholarly journals, in September and October:

Announcing
The Bertrand Russell Society's
1983 DOCTORAL GRANT
and the
1982 DOCTORAL GRANT RECIPIENT

1983: The Bertrand Russell Society will award a doctoral grant of \$500 to help defray expenses of a currently enrolled doctoral candidate in any field whose proposed dissertation best gives promise of dealing in a significant way with the thought, life, or times of Bertrand Russell.

The candidate is required to send to the Society:

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

Applications and supporting documents should reach Professor Hugh S. Moorhead, Chairman, Philosophy Department, Northeastern Illinois University, 5500 N. St. Louis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60625, by May 1, 1983. The recipient will be announced in June 1983.

* * * * *

1982: the recipient is Alejandro Garcíadiego, a doctoral candidate at the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology at the University of Toronto.

The main goal of Mr. Garciadiego's dissertation is to study the role played by Bertrand Russell in the origin and development of the paradoxes of set theory. It also aims to show that "the emphasis on the study of the foundations of mathematics is the result of a complex and interdisciplinary net of events and ideas, and not the simple product of the logical contradictions."

BR BIOGRAPHIES

(8) Short sketch of BR from Page 66 of "The Making of the Micro" (5):

Bertrand Russell, 3rd Earl (1872-1970), English philosopher and mathematician, was one of the greatest logicians of all time. Truly a Renaissance man, his was one of the most widely varied and persistently influential intellects of the twentieth century. For nearly all of his life he had 40 books in print ranging over philosophy,

mathematics, science, ethics, sociology, education, history, religion, politics and polemic, and in 1950 he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature. His work with his friend and former tutor, Alfred North Whitehead (1862-1947), *Principia Mathematica* (1910-13), demonstrated the indivisible link between logic and mathe-

matics -- to the benefit of the development of computers and data processing. Russell was a controversial public figure, married four times, and ardent social reformer: he was an anarchistic left-wing atheist, and was actively opposed in the last three years of his life to the manufacture of H-bombs and the war in Vietnam.

Did you notice any errors of fact? There were 3, all in the last sentence. See (37).

PROMOTING BR'S PURPOSES: NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

(9) From the New York Times (9/4/82), p. A3:

Nobel Scientists Ask Atom Freeze

GENEVA, Sept. 3 (AP) — Ninety-seven scientists who have won Nobel Prizes called today for a freeze on the deployment and development of nuclear weapons, warning that "time is fast running out" to prevent a nuclear holocaust.

The call was made through the council of the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs and was distributed by the organization here.

Today's declaration said that "monstrously high levels of deployed nuclear arms must be reduced as soon as possible" and endorsed a freeze of nuclear arsenals at prevailing levels.

More than half the signers were from the United States, according to the list provided by Pugwash, a disarmament

movement during the height of the cold war that was inspired by Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell and sponsored by the industrialist Cyrus S. Eaton. They include Linus C. Pauling, Hans A. Bethe, Konrad E. Bloch, Richard P. Feynman, Edward M. Purcell, Emilio Segre, William N. Lipscomb Jr., George Wald and Steven Weinberg.

The declaration was also signed by scientists from Australia, Canada, France, West Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Pakistan, the Soviet Union, Switzerland and Britain.

The Soviet winners who signed were identified as Nikolai G. Basov, Pavel A. Cherenkov, Ilya M. Frank, Piotr L. Kapitza, Aleksandr M. Prochorov and Nikolai N. Semenov.

(10) Buchwald in the Washington Post, sometime in September or October 1982:

'Cap's' Last Laugh: Winnable Nuclear War

By Art Buchwald

People are constantly asking me, "Who is the man with the most humor in the Reagan administration?" They are surprised when my response is "Cap" Weinberger, our secretary of defense. "Cap" says things with a straight face that make you want to roll on the floor.

Just the other day he told newsmen he is for a "protracted nuclear war." He doesn't want one of these hair-trigger wars which last 30 or 40 minutes. "Cap" said he has or-

dered everyone at the Pentagon to figure out not only how to keep a nuclear war going, but how to make sure the United States wins one when the missiles start flying.

Half the people in the Pentagon took "Cap" seriously. But those who knew what a deadpan comic "Cap" is just laughed and went back to doing the crossword puzzle.

The material for "Cap's" "protracted nuclear war" came out of a routine he did when he first took charge of the Defense Department and came up with a comic routine on

"limited nuclear war."

He tried this one out in front of an armed services committee last year and had everyone in stitches. "Cap," without cracking a smile, said he thought a "limited nuclear war" with the Soviets was not only feasible, but essential so the United States would have time to fight a conventional war.

"Cap" said if we let the Russians know that we were only going to fight a "limited nuclear war" then they would agree not to use their big stuff to attack us.

The only ones who didn't laugh were our NATO allies who figured out that if a "limited nuclear war" was going to be waged it would be on their turf, and even after Al Haig tried to explain to the Europeans that "Cap" was only joking, they still didn't find the secretary of defense's war routine very funny.

So "Cap" got his writers together and said, "I think my jokes are losing something in the translation. We're going to have to come up with a new monologue, and throw the 'limited nuclear war' stuff out."

One of the writers said, "I got it! What if you just stand up at the microphone and say you're no longer for a 'limited nuclear war,' but you've opted for a 'protracted' one instead? Say we're going to build offensive weapons that will make the U.S. prevail no matter what the Russians throw at us."

"That's pretty funny," "Cap" said. "Let's work on it. But keep it quiet or Johnny Carson will hear about it, and use it on his 'Tonight' show first."

The writers all went to work and came up with some memorable lines.

One was "you show me a secretary of defense who is not preparing to

win a nuclear war, and I'll show you a secretary of defense who should be impeached."

Another one which was a real crowd-pleaser: When he was asked if a nuclear war was winnable, "Cap" replied, again with a straight face, "I just don't have any idea; I don't know that anybody has any idea.

But we're certainly going to give the armed forces everything they need to win one."

These are just a few samples of "Cap" Weinberger's humor. They may not sound as funny on paper, but when you see him standing up in front of the mike, looking like Woody Allen, delivering them, you could die laughing.

PHILOSOPHY

- (11) The Museum of Philosophy, which started out at Pace University (RSN33-16), has moved to Hunter College. "The Museum's aim is to bring philosophical concepts and questions before the public, and especially children, in an enjoyable and understandable manner. There are programs designed for people of all ages and education and backgrounds, with a particular emphasis on programs for children. There should be something for everyone with a sense of wonder."

"Tours for groups and individuals of all ages introduce you to the world of ideas."

The Museum of Philosophy, Hunter College Teacher Center, 695 Park Av., at 69th Street, NY NY 10021. (212) 795-3737.

CREATIONISM

- (12) From the New York Times (8/29/82) p.22:

Poll Finds Americans Split on Creation Idea

By RICHARD SEVERO

The American public is almost evenly divided between those who believe that God created man in his present form at one time in the last 10,000 years and those who believe in evolution or an evolutionary process involving God, according to the Gallup Poll.

George H. Gallup Jr. said his organization had not previously polled Americans on the same questions regarding creation and so no comparisons could be made with beliefs in years past.

The findings dismayed some prominent religious leaders, who said, among other things, that human existence on earth is much older than 10,000 years, but the results came as no surprise to a leading anthropologist.

Of the participants in the the poll, 44 percent, nearly a quarter of whom were college graduates, said they accepted the statement that "God created man pretty much in his present form at one time within the last 10,000 years."

Four statements were offered to respondents on a card and they were

asked to select the one that came closest to describing their views "about the origin and development of man."

Nine percent agreed with the statement: "Man has developed over millions of years from less advanced forms of life. God had no part in this process." Thirty-eight percent said they agreed with the suggestion that "man has developed over millions of years from less advanced forms of life, but God guided this process, including man's creation." Nine percent of those interviewed simply said they did not know.

The views of Roman Catholics and Protestants were divergent, with Protestants more likely to believe in the biblical account of creation and Catholics more likely to believe in evolution guided by God.

Fundamentalist beliefs were not confined to the South and Middle West. The Gallup organization reported that Southerners and Middle Westerners "are slightly more likely to accept creationism" than those living elsewhere.

The results, according to the poll, were based on personal interviews con-

ducted last month with 1,518 adults, 18 years of age and older, in more than 300 areas of the nation. The Gallup organization said that in a sample of that size, the margin of error could be three percentage points in either direction.

Bishop John S. Spong, the Episcopal Bishop of Newark, said he did not know of a single reputable biblical scholar who would say that God created man in the last 10,000 years, "since there is an enormous amount of evidence to the contrary." He called the poll's findings a "sorry reflection" on academic achievement in this country.

However, he said that quite possibly, the numbers of Americans holding this view suggested that modern people could not cope with the enormous amount of change that had occurred in their lifetimes. As a result, they "tend to retreat into yesterday's security systems," he said. He said that such fears about the future had thus strengthened the simple answers offered by what he called "the right-wing reactionary people" in organized religion.

Dr. Ashley Montagu, an anthropolo-

gist at Princeton University, said he was not surprised at the high number of Americans espousing the creationist view, including those with college training. He said Henry Noble McCracken, the late president of Vassar College, "once observed that college has ruined many a good truck driver."

Bishop Kenneth Hicks of the United Methodist Church in Arkansas said it seemed "almost incredible" to him that 44 percent of those questioned believed that creation occurred in the last 10,000 years. Bishop Hicks, who opposed recent efforts to introduce the teaching of creationism in Arkansas public schools, said the Gallup findings suggested that some religious organizations had done a poor job in teaching the meaning of Scripture.

Another Methodist official, the Rev. Jeanne Audrey Powers, who is on the staff of the Commission on Christian Unity and Interreligious Concerns, called the phrasing of the questions offensive because they referred not to the creation of humankind or of men and women, but to the "creation of man" only.

- (13) NYC says yes to evolution, as reported in the New York Times (6/24/82), p.1:

New York Schools Bar 3 Textbooks As Poor on Evolution Explanation

By GENE I. MAEROFF

Three high school biology textbooks have been rejected for use in the New York City public schools because of what Board of Education officials say is an inadequate treatment of the Darwinian theory of evolution.

The publishers of two of the three books have been told that their books are additionally unacceptable because of what school officials termed an uncritical endorsement of the creationist theory, which is based on the Bible.

Darwin's theory states that organisms developed from earlier forms by hereditary transmission of slight variations over successive generations. The creationists, on the other hand, hold that species were created as they now appear.

In taking such action at a time when school systems throughout the country are under pressure to acknowledge the creationist viewpoint, New York City has become one of the first large districts to put publishers on notice that it will not accept such teachings in biology classes.

"This is a very important stand, and every community concerned about the honest teaching of science ought to take a similar stand," said Wayne A. Moyer, executive director of the National Association of Biology Teachers in Res-

ton, Va.

Issue in 11 Legislatures

National efforts to promote the creationist view in teaching about human origins have led legislators in 11 states to introduce bills in the last 12 months that would require the inclusion of the creationist approach. None of those bills have yet been approved.

Two other states, Arkansas and Louisiana, previously passed such laws. The Arkansas law, however, was declared unconstitutional last January by a Federal District Court, and the Louisiana law is being challenged in a case that is to begin next month.

As the controversy has spread, some publishers have de-emphasized the treatment of evolution in their textbooks to try to blunt possible criticism by proponents of creationism. In 17 states, not including New York, a textbook must be cleared by state authorities before a local district can buy it.

One of the books that the New York board rejected was "Life Science," published by Prentice-Hall of Englewood Cliffs, N.J. In a letter to the publisher explaining the rejection of the book, a school system official said, "This book does not state that evolution is accepted by most scientists today, and presents special creation without characterizing it as a supernatural explanation that is outside the domain of science."

The official, Charlotte Frank, executive director of the system's division of curriculum and instruction, sent the letters to the publishers of the three books in recent days.

The other rejected books were "Experiences in Biology," published by Laidlaw Brothers of River Forest, Ill., and "Natural Science: Bridging the Gap," published by Burgess Publishing Company of Minneapolis.

In one of the passages deemed objectionable by school officials, the Burgess book stated:

"Another hypothesis about the creation of the universe with all its life forms is special creation, which gives God the critical role in creation. In some school systems, it is mandated that the evolution and special-creation theories be taught side by side. That seems a healthy attitude in view of the tenuous nature of hypothesis."

The third book won approval more than a year ago, but was rejected upon re-examination. It completely omits the word evolution and makes no mention of Darwin, according to the Board of Education reviewers.

"We deleted the term evolution from the textbook because we wanted teachers to be permitted to teach biology without being forced to face controversy from pressure groups," said Eugene Frank, director of publications at Laidlaw Brothers. He added that concepts about evolution were contained in the book even though the word evolution

was not used.

"We are developing a supplementary chapter on evolution for this book, and it will be available in the fall for those school districts that want it," Mr. Frank said.

Spokesmen for the two other publishers declined to comment.

Automatic Re-examination

All new books and revised editions of older books must be approved by a three-member committee to be eligible for use in the city's public schools. State curriculum requirements and city guidelines enter into the consideration. Publishers request the reviews in order to sell their books in the district.

The committee is made up of the subject area director for the school system and teachers or supervisors who work in the particular subject area. Each book that is rejected is automatically re-examined by a second committee.


Among the passages in the Prentice-Hall book that the reviewers said accounted for its rejection were these:

"Some people believe that evolution explains the diversity of organisms on earth. Some people do not believe in evolution.

"These people believe that the various types of organisms were created as they appear. No one knows for sure how the many different kinds of living things came to be. But many people have developed theories to explain how this diversity may have come about."

(14) Creationism-Lysenko parallel, from an ad in the New York Times Review of the Week (8/1/82) p. E9:

ADVERTISEMENT



Where We Stand

by Albert Shanker President American Federation of Teachers

Schools Should Reject Texts That Distort Science

Are Creationists Aping the U.S.S.R.?

The Soviet Union once had many of the world's leading geneticists. But within a short period of time during Stalin's regime, genetics was killed in the U.S.S.R. How and why did this happen? The political leaders of the Soviet Union wanted genetic theories to conform to the official state "religion," Marxism. They thought that the prevailing genetic theory that many biological characteristics were inherited contradicted their egalitarian Communist philosophy. With the power of Stalin, they had no trouble changing the theory to fit their ideology.

World-renowned geneticists were removed from the leadership of scientific societies and from their jobs if they did not accept as science the theories of Trofim Lysenko that traits acquired through environmental changes could be inherited. . . . a theory more in conformity with the state "religion." *The Death of a Science in Russia*, published in 1949 by the University of Pennsylvania, presented transcripts of speeches delivered at the Lenin Academy of Agriculture barely a year earlier which revealed "the quackery which was to replace genetics." Said Conway Zirkle, the book's editor: "The winning clique acted with totalitarian thoroughness. Five geneticists found it expedient to recant, to discard their scientific knowledge, and to adopt the Communist orthodoxy. Nothing remotely like this has happened in the last three centuries."

The result of using political pressure and power to determine scientific conclusions was devastating. A generation of students was brought up on this new state-imposed theory. But what the students really learned was that scientific theories are not the products of research, experimentation and critical thinking within the scientific community, but the result of who controls the tools of power and terror. Soviet agriculture was ordered to operate on the basis of "Lysenkoism," with disastrous results in crop and animal production. Ultimately Lysenko was removed and the Soviet powers admitted that their effort to impose scientific views through political power had been a failure.

Now in the United States there is pressure to teach creationism, or at least to give it equal treatment as a "theory" alongside Darwinism. Of course, the United States is not the Soviet Union. There is no Stalin to arrest and jail our Darwinists or to install a creationist as the head of the National Institute of Science. But the pressures are there. Textbook companies have been told by some school boards that unless there is

something in the science texts on creationism, they won't buy the books. So, many textbook publishers have capitulated, presenting evolution and creation as if they had equal scientific weight and were accepted as scientific fact by equal numbers of informed people.

Textbook publishers will argue that they only give a little space to creationism and that they only say that some people reject the theory of evolution and accept instead the Biblical narrative of creation. But that just won't wash. What if a textbook in medicine were to describe the standard cure for a given disease and then go on to say that some people believe it is more effective to cure this disease by using leeches or reciting a specific prayer three times a day?

Those who are pushing creationism will not like the comparison, but if they succeed, they will have the same impact on American science that Stalin and Lysenko had on Russia's.

Because textbook companies are yielding to pressure, the action taken recently by the New York City Board of Education is very important. It should serve as a model to school boards across the country. The Board's Division of Curriculum has disapproved several texts in biology and general life sciences because they do not adequately cover evolution or because they give equal treatment to creationism. One book says: "Some people believe that evolution explains the diversity of organisms on earth. Some people do not believe in evolution." On another page the same text says: "Each species may have been created separately. . . ." A second book declares: "Another hypothesis about the creation of the universe with all its life forms is special creation, which gives God the critical role in creation. In some school systems, it is mandated that the evolution and special creation theories be taught side by side. That seems a healthy attitude in view of the tenuous nature of hypothesis."

The Board of Education told the publisher of the latter book that it was "unacceptable" because "the theory of evolution is not a 'tenuous hypothesis.'" And to the publisher of the first book, the Board wrote the following:

"This book does not state that evolution is accepted by most scientists today, and presents special creation without characterizing it as a supernatural explanation that is outside the domain of science. In addition, the concepts of evolution are temporized to the extent that what is already known and scientifically substantiated is treated merely as 'possible,' and not as an accurate appraisal of the results of scientific investigation. . . . Since one of the objectives of a sound science education is the accurate interpretation of observable data, we cannot approve a book that distorts, negates, or minimizes the import of those concepts and principles which are accepted by most of today's scientists as the cornerstones of modern biological theory."

Wise words. Creationism has no place in a science curriculum, and school boards across the country ought to take the lead of the nation's largest school system . . . exert the necessary counter-pressure . . . and put some backbone into those publishers who have abandoned science under religious and political pressure.

Mr. Shanker's column appears in this section every Sunday. Reader Correspondence is invited. Address your letters to Mr. Shanker at United Federation of Teachers, 200 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10003. © 1982 by Albert Shanker.

(15) Book derides creationism. See book review (20).

DORA

(16a) "The Soul of Russia and the Body of America" was written by Dora Black (soon to become Dora Black Russell) in 1921, when she was 26. It is now printed for the first time, as a pamphlet, by the Open Head Press (2 Blenheim Crescent, London, W11), with a 1982 introduction by Dora.

Here is the 1982 introduction:

I am not and never have been a communist but, like John Reed, I wanted to know what the Soviet Revolution was about. As one of the witnesses to the very early days of the revolution I offer some of my comments which unaccountably do not appear in the film.

In the summer of 1920, at the age of twenty-five, I managed to get in to Russia when such journeys were still being forbidden by the British Government. Travelling by pleasure steamer round the North Cape to see the midnight sun, by getting off at a small fishing village, Vardo, in Norway, from there with others I put across to Murmansk in a fishing boat.

There seemed to be not only coming and going between the two ports, but fraternisation. The customs men were amiable. Our Soviet passports were small squares of linen stamped with the red hammer and sickle. The captain was taking his children to spend some of the summer in Murmansk.

There we were greeted warmly by Russian comrades who took us to some quite spacious huts which had been erected and left by the recently withdrawn British Expeditionary Force against Russia. Midsummer Eve was being celebrated; there were also gatherings of the local comrades at which, after every speech, sounding brass would strike up the Internationale, a practice which I found wherever I went. I had a bathe in the Arctic, which was made very disagreeable by hordes of mosquitoes.

In a train with an engine whose boiler had holes stuffed with sticks and rags we proceeded to Petrograd. On the way, at a large junction, some Red Army men got into the train. With Madge Newbold, my travelling companion, I spent the whole night talking to them, using German, translated back and forth.

For the first time, I learned all the theory as to how international revolution was to take place. They knew all about the class war and 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. They offered us Russian tea and jam out of tins which, as they said with glee, had been left behind by the British troops. One very handsome blond young officer with a page-boy haircut pinned his Red Army badge onto my dress.

When I walked into the Astoria Hotel in Petrograd the first person I met was John Reed. 'Where did you get that?' he asked, pointing to the badge. 'A Red Army officer gave it to me,' I said. At

that time it was alleged that the Red soldiers raped all women and that Soviet women were nationalised. 'How brutal of him!' laughed Reed.

He talked with enthusiasm of his Russian comrades and with some doubt about the British Labour Party and trade unions. As I recalled in my autobiography: 'He was tall and broad and typical of the intransigent and generous American who supports an unpopular cause; they seem to act with greater commitment and less reserve than their English counterparts.'

Whatever we may think of the climate of opinion or purpose in the Russia of today, it might help to recall the mood of the early days of the Soviet Revolution, when it inspired great ideals in the Russian people and greatly stirred up the hearts and minds of the peoples of the West.

In 1917 I had had occasion to be in the British War Mission to New York just as America came into the war. American women, who came to Europe on the Ford 'Peace Ship', were actually trying to stop the war: they became the founders of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

It was my first contact with the American way of life. Through our negotiation on oil supplies, I became aware of the immense power of great industrial corporations and impressed by the extension of technological invention. We regarded the Americans as our cousins, we spoke the same language. Yet, coming from European culture and habits, I felt this to be a foreign civilisation. Though so far totally unpolitical and not even a convinced pacifist, I knew what was said about capitalism and socialism. Yet it was the industrial machine and the way of life it engendered that troubled me, not either of the ideologies. I already began to perceive that it would lend itself to dictatorship and even make an end to democracy as we understood it. Was it also destined to carry continually at its heart the bitter class conflict between workers and owners?

The failure to recognise and promote friendly relations with Soviet Russia after the 1917 Revolution was one of the greatest blunders of history. It was perhaps the last chance of taming and controlling the industrial machine in the interests of life and human well-being.

Still worse was the immediate war waged against Russia on all fronts, sowing the wind whose whirlwind the entire world now reaps. As Phillip

Knightley remarks in his book *The First Casualty*, it was perhaps the greatest act of folly the Allies committed in the First World War, an act that poisons relations with Russia to this day: 'Historically, this is a period of immense importance, yet little is generally known about it.'

'No full understanding of the Cold War is possible without taking it into account; yet when Khrushchev said, in Los Angeles in September 1959, "Never have any of our soldiers been on American soil, but your soldiers were on Russian soil," most of his listeners did not know what he was talking about. Their ignorance can be forgiven. In 1943,

E.M. Halliday, a reporter for *Yank*, the American army magazine, tried to write a story about the fighting between American and Russian troops during the Allied intervention in 1918-19. He found little about it in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and the *Columbia Encyclopaedia* stated flatly: "American forces did not participate in the fighting between the Allies and the Bolsheviks."

Do the brute facts of today differ very greatly from the brute facts of more than sixty years ago? Only that they have become more brutal. We came through another war, which happened precisely because we did not learn the lesson of how a dictator, almost a maniac, could take hold of and enslave a people to the industrial machine, thereby inventing that 'Total War' the machine now imposes on all advanced industrial nations. Statesmen, both West and East, have followed the example of Hitler. Conflict is still the core of their being.

It may still not be too late to save ourselves from final disaster. Today even military leaders, such as the late General Eisenhower and Lord Mountbatten, admit the mistakes and issue a warning to us. The eminent scientist Lord Zuckerman, former adviser to the Government, recently on television blamed the scientists themselves more than the politicians as responsible for our predicament, in that they insist on continuing to devise ever more deadly and subtle means of killing people. They then frighten the statesmen on both sides into ordering the adoption and production of these new horrors.

I use the world 'soul' to express the aspiration of one person or a whole people towards an ideal goal. It is now vital for us to recognise that the soul of peoples for peace is active both sides of that barrier called the Cold War. We must break through the censorship that is

imposed by the great powers. So much emphasis is laid on secrecy and spying that each side fears the emissaries of peace as if they were a Trojan horse.

Especially is this true of the many and constant efforts and appeals of women. A recent congress in Prague of women from 132 countries, and hundreds of national and international organisations, opposing the arms race and nuclear war, went unreported. An appeal from fourteen of the most eminent Soviet women scientists addressed on these issues to their colleagues and university women of the West was virtually ignored. Nor do similar efforts in the West find place in the Soviet press. Thus each side, wanting

peace, believe that the other is planning war.

Yet the creative genius of man and woman is as always still there within us. Men and women in Russia, indeed in all countries, still exist who are inspired by great ideals of peace and harmony, of a creative life full of fresh flights of the imagination, of fresh insights into those mysteries of what is called the domain of science.

In that year of 1920 I felt that the one hope of the machine serving rather than dominating mankind was that it must be administered cooperatively for human needs. Many workers and thinkers in the West were already striving for such an

ideal. Here in Russia was an entire people forming a nation who were prepared to stake all on this ideal purpose. On my return I planned to write a book outlining the prospects for the future as I saw it. What follows was to have been the first chapter. I have now completed the book, titled *The Religion of the Machine Age*.

Those days of revolution were truly, in ways that John Reed never lived to see, Ten Days That Shook the World.

Dora Russell
Porthcurno
Cornwall
February 1982

(16b) This is what Dora wrote in 1921:

It is not difficult to define what is meant by the body of America. As one writes the words, the imagination conjures up visions of skyscrapers with swift elevators; vast factories where materials can be seen travelling fantastically on moving platforms to emerge at the exit as finished products; huge freight cars thundering their way from one busy town to another; immense liners ploughing the Atlantic; wide fields of cotton, followed by great expanses of ripening corn. America stands, in fact, for the most complete example of the mechanism of industrial production on which the whole economic life of the West is based. It is an impressive mechanism, so impressive that quite three-quarters of those involved in, or in contact with it, forget that it is but a mechanism and nothing more. They come to imagine that this organisation of economic life, this speed, this comfort, are in themselves civilisation and the goal of human endeavour, that all the best creative energy of man should be turned to developing resources producing goods, inventing processes to speed up production.

They endow this machine with a soul and a message which is to be carried to the uttermost parts of the earth, to be taught if need be, by bullying, or at the point of the sword. To those who, despite

every effort to the contrary, cannot bring themselves to accept such a primitive notion of civilisation, this machine worship is as horrible and superstitious as the adoration of the savage for his painted block of wood or stone. There have been, in the past, many of these ~~DISSENTERS~~. And one sees them now, in America, enquiring distressfully what is the matter with their country, feeling dimly that the trouble lies in her barrenness of ideals and emptiness of soul, and, looking round from one party to another, and one class to another, seeking a possible source of regeneration.

In Europe, too, idealists are trying to find some motive for building prosperity anew, and the disgust and despair in which the war has left them, are but

heightened when they look across and see in America the image of what they may become, of what America is capable of making of the whole world. They see this excellent body, this shell of a State, and the soul of man walking mournfully through it, as though a wilderness, seeking an oasis where it may perchance rest for a moment, not hoping to find a home.

It is not from America that regeneration can come. There is every sign that her people, like the industrial peoples of Europe, will first seek relief from the intolerable mechanical burden of their lives in the worn-out pastime of imperial conquest. Yet all that America could give to a subservient world would be her body, her industrial efficiency, a valuable gift in days gone by, and still needed in the present and the future, but not enough. America can give us no new ideals, and it is for new ideals that the whole world, from the East Atlantic to the West Pacific, is hungry. Thinking Europe has become conscious at last that it cannot live with the industrial machine unless new ideals can be found to control and govern it. In China, also, the question on the lips of all intelligent people is: "Since it seems we must follow in the path of the industrial nations, how shall we do so without becoming as horrible and degraded as they?"

One nation in the world has set out to answer that question in practice, and that is Russia. For this reason the most cynical have turned to her in joyful surprise; even her bitterest and blindest opponents are conscious that she has found something new which she is trying to expound to the world and, while they do their utmost to destroy her in the act of realisation of her ideals, they yet have a sneaking hope that they may not succeed. So desperate has the need for hope become in our blackened and ruined world.

It is not easy to give a clear picture of the soul of present day Russia. Not only has it been so much misrepresented by friends and enemies alike, but those who

should express it, the Bolshevik leaders themselves, do not convey their meaning to us, because they speak through old Western formulae, which no longer fit Russia's thought. Then too, many of the leaders are not alive to the miracle that is happening, they are still thinking in old categories; such are those who have returned from America and are dominated by admiration for the industrial machine in itself and out of touch with the peculiar genius of their people.

The prestige of that America, which was to Russia the Land of Liberty, plays a great part in influencing their outlook. To these men — as perhaps to Americans in general — the epithet of Wellsian Martians recently hurled at the Bolsheviks in general — may justly be applied. If they become dominant, Russia may develop on American lines. But their point of view is neutralised by that of the Russian people, the rank and file, still confused and stammering and unable to express clearly the ideals by which they are moved. And Lenin, in his policy for Russia, though not in his polemics, seems to me the most coherent expression of Russia's beliefs. When the Russians, through Lenin and their propagandists, profess themselves orthodox disciples of Marx and denounce the West as heretical, one cannot but smile at their perversity.

To me every fibre of the Russian's being is opposed to the Marxian determinist outlook. If only they would recognise this, they would make it their glory and their pride that they are splendid heretics to Marx, and thereby do the whole world a magnificent service. Not only are they heretics to Marx, but to the entire Western outlook. Western visitors to Russia (such orthodox Marxians) exclaim at the "breakdown of civilisation" by which they mean the terrible material suffering and disorder that prevail. Yet Russia to-day is perhaps the most civilised country in the world. Where does civilisation lie if not in the designs and purposes, the ideals of men?

And where, except in Russia, is an ideal

that fits modern life to be found? Russia's communism is not "the guardian of Western civilisation", it is a new ideal of civilisation, which, if we could but be induced to listen to it, could re-civilise our own barbarous and hateful lives.

This is to me the supreme fact about Russia, that she is a country just emerging from the medieval ages of faith into the valorous adolescence of the Renaissance. Her thought is burning and her courage high. Honour and glory, faith, are for her words still charged with meaning, scepticism has not yet dimmed her ardour, nor materialism blurred her soul. Russia's instinctive belief is in a heroic figure of man, demi-god, Promethean, grappling with and subjugating a hostile universe, or triumphing over it, even in material defeat, by the indomitable courage of his spirit. She still breathes the air of Shakespeare and has not known the caustic age of Voltaire.

A nation that approaches the latest developments of sophisticated political science in this mood is apt to be puzzling. Scientific thinkers denounce her as romantic, romantic thinkers hail her short-cuts to communism as the quintessence of science. Both agree that the term "scientific" is the highest that could be bestowed. But to me the very merit of Russian communists is that, with some exceptions, they are quite *unscientific*, if we take scientific in its popular sense, that of dispassionate materialism, indifference to human values. Russia, by dint of having escaped a process of complete capitalist development of industry, which has taken place in England, Germany and America, has escaped the background of thought associated with it — and which Marx claims to arise directly out of it.

But she has not escaped all contact. She has skimmed the cream of advanced thought and, blending with this her own heroic and artistic outlook, has produced communism, the ideal which could animate our Western industrial system, that is still enslaved to a worn out philosophy. Just because she had not a tradition of developed industry, her thoughts and hopes have been free to soar. Now she maintains that she will develop her industry, ideally, in the service of man, giving him not only comfort, but leisure, art and science. The West points to her disorganised railways, her ignorant, unskilled people, her mere handful of intelligent workers, and urges that the spirit of communism is useless without the industrial body, that first the body must be created, then the soul. Russia assents — she wants the body, but her counterthrust is unanswerable: "You have the body, but where is the soul?"

This question comes as a challenge to the determinism of the West. For two centuries we have first tacitly assumed, then openly declared, that we are, down

to the minutest action of our lives, the

creatures of habit, moulded by economic circumstances, or scientific laws over which we have no control. We have visualised our development, not only as physical, but as a moral evolution. We have therefore been content to wait and allow economics to mould us. We have risked no "rough hewing" of our ends, confident of their shaping by some methodical deity — or force of science. The only result is that we are to-day bankrupt of living thought puerile in action, the puppets of the huge material forces that we have allowed to grow at random, and that now, so far from contributing to our moral and intellectual advancement, threaten to engulf us in hideous destruction. It seems as though this cannot continue; we must stop short and re-awaken the slumbering human spirit to assume control and reassert the dignity of man and his sovereignty over the earth.

The Russians believe themselves to be against capitalism only, but the study of Russian writers before the Revolution shows that it is the whole fabric of our life that they despise. I think they are right to condemn it, but in error when they imagine, as their present leaders do, that the fabric of our life is the creation of capitalism only. Life in any period of history appears to me as a fabric of economic forces and ideas inseparably woven together, of ideas engendered by economic forces and economic forces that

owe their origin to, or are directed by, ideas and scientific thought of the past. The journey from cause to effect in political life is not so easy as the economic interpretation of history would have us believe. The fabric of life changes, but I doubt if it changes more because of the movement of matter than because of the movement of ideas.

All that can be safely said is that new ideas are present beside new economic factors, without risking the establishment of a causal relation either way between the two factors. The whole texture of and shape of a human body and face can change under the influence of a change of character or outlook; it can change also by material habits or occupations. What we see is neither the expression of the thought and emotion produced by some material circumstances, nor the effect of thought and emotion on the body. The two things are the same, the matter in movement is the idea, the idea is the matter in movement. Both are aspects of a change or event.

Often while in Russia and since returning, I have wondered whether we are right or they. We, who have conceived of communism as budding and blossoming like a flower on the sturdy plant of competent and organised indus-

try, or they, who see it as a whirling heart of fire that must consume ancient evils and then cooling transmute itself into the crust of material expression, creating industrialism anew, a thing, it may be, of undreamed of power and beauty. To us, tutored in determinism, economic circumstances is the decisive factor in politics. We think of the industrial machine as having an irresistible momentum, we imagine Russia in its grip, changing ideals and character, assimilating rapidly to the industrial nations of the West. But when we do so, we forget how far the industrial system, as we conceive it, is the product of the thought of our past, how it perpetuates old prejudices, how it bears like every thought or institution in the world, the unmistakable stamp of its origin and date.

Two visions came repeatedly before my eyes. In the one the machine in America grew increasingly rapacious and cruel, while in Russia it triumphed over human forces and Europe and Asia were sucked into its maw. There were long hours of mechanical slavery, black and ugly factories, fatuous towns and futile luxuries. Thought and art were dead; the populations petulant and trivial.

In the other the spirit of communism in Russia had leapt like a great wave to meet the West, and Western science and skill — its twin brother — had reared its head and sprung to the meeting with an exultant roar. So they met at last, soul and body, and went springing skywards in a clear, green pyramid of joy. The filth of factories and the grime of poverty were washed away and everywhere there emerged a new and smiling world. Human life was restored to harmony; men were no longer cramped and twisted to serve as wheels and cogs; they found that leisure to savour the whole life of man is better than empty luxury that cogs cannot enjoy. The power of the machine was broken forever; it served instead of commanding, and everywhere the bright roofs of lovely hamlets, the spacious factories, the grassy tree-girt spaces where children and students met to chatter and play, and workers to dance and sing after their easy labours; the quiet arbours where the artist would seek loneliness to brood, or the men of science peace for arduous discussion or complicated thought — all these testified to what life might be, not for the few, but for all, if the spirit of man in justice and humanity would but conquer and yoke the mechanical monster to his will.

Our Western industrial body can give birth to this vision, but can it unfold the spirit that could achieve its realisation? But I am confident that communism, cutting out from the industrial system the motives of profit and exploitation, and administering it in terms of humanity and justice, could so transform industrialism as to make of it a thing of beauty, not of terror.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

- (17a) Leonard Cleavelin -- more formally ENS Leonard Cleavelin, JAGC, USNR -- is stationed at the Naval Legal Services Office, Great Lakes, Illinois, in the claims department. He will take the Missouri Bar Exams in February, attend Naval Justice School, Newport, RI next summer, and hopes to get to our June '82 meeting at McMaster.
- (17b) Judith Anne Gividen married Leonard Cleavelin a few months ago and is retaining her maiden name. She is in the personnel department of a chemical company, and will accompany Leonard to Newport next summer, and (we hope) to McMaster.

NEW MEMBERS

- (18) We're very pleased to welcome these new members:

DEAN V. BABST/7915 Alma Mesa Way/Citrus Heights, CA 95610
 PRISCILLA F. CALLAWAY/400 Mansion House (712)/St. Louis, MO 63102
 ALICE LETITIA DARLINGTON/Avenida Toluca 537-8/Mexico 20,D.F.,Mexico
 LT. ROBERT J. DELLE/1st FSSG H&S BN SERV CO DISBO/Camp Pendleton, CA 92055
 PRADEEP KUMAR DUBEY/19 Prince House/University of Massachusetts/Amherst, MA 01003

THOMAS FRINK/85 29th St. (T-2)/Newport News, VA 23607
 ANNA B. KEELING/2319 Preston/Pasadena, TX 77503
 JONATHAN LAX/154 Harvard St./Brookline, MA 02146
 JOHN MONTGOMERY/810 White/Grand Junction, CO 81501
 ROBERT PATRICK/1405 N. Main (247)/San Antonio, TX 78212

MATTHEW ROSA/3000 SW 81st Av./Miami, FL 33155
 JOSEPH P. RUSSELL/55 Strawberry Lane/Nordland, WA 98358
 ANTHONY ST. JOHN/Apartado 51357,Sabana Grande 1050/Caracas Venezuela
 LIZ SCHLEGEL/14 Kingsbury Road/Garden Ciety, NY 11530
 JOHN STAMPER/1856 Westbrook Road/Dayton, OH 45415

RAMON CARTER SUZARA/666 Ellis St. (102)/San Francisco, CA 94109
 KEITH THOMPSON/905 W.Franklin (14)/Minneapolis, MN 55405
 JOAN M. TINSLEY/PO Box 1168/St. Petersburg, FL 33731
 T. S. TRIMURTI/567 18th St.,TNBH Korattur/Madras 600080, India
 HAMID UMER/360 E. 72nd St. (2202)/NY NY 10021

NEW ADDRESSES AND OTHER CHANGES

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

PASCAL BERCKER/1907 Hebert St. (1)/St. Louis, MO 63107
ENS LEONARD CLEAVELIN, JAGC, USNR/ 1036 N. Clark St. (812)/Chicago, IL 60614
 FRANK GALLO/1736 19th St.,NW/Washington, DC 20009
 JUDITH ANNE GIVIDEN/1036 N. Clark St. (812)/Chicago, IL 60614 (wife of Leonard Cleavelin)
 JAMES E. MCWILLIAMS/624 Ceylon/Eagle Pass, TX 78852

VERA ROBERTS/105,Ridgeview North/1200 Gitzel St./Yellowknife,NWT,Canada X1A 2C6
 DR. CARL SPADONI/Assistant Archivist/
 CAPT. MICHAEL H. TAINT/2025 Shroyer Rd./Oakwood, OH 45419
 DANIEL TORRES/c/o J.C.Wilson/27 Oakwood Dr./Wayne, NJ 07470
 RICHARD TYSON/R4 Box 83/Greenville, KY 42345

STEPHEN W. VISK/2638 11th St./Rockford, IL 61109
 PAUL WALKER/RR Box 181/Blaisburg, IA 50034
 DENISE WEILAND/11,rue Constantin/13100 Aix-en-Provence/France

BOOK REVIEWS

- (20)
- On creationism, from the New York Times (9/7/82) p.C3:

Abusing Science: The Case Against Creationism

By Philip Kitcher 213 pages. The M.I.T. Press. \$15.00.

Remember when Clarence Darrow, or perhaps Spencer Tracy playing Clarence Darrow, walked out of that hot Tennessee courtroom after winning the big one for John T. Scopes, scientific reason, and the theory that man evolved from lower life forms?

If you do, remember again, because Clarence Darrow failed. Mr. Scopes was convicted of breaking Tennessee's law forbidding the teaching of evolution. The conviction was overturned on a legal technicality, not on the facts and not on the Constitution.

Decades later, such outfits as the

Moral Majority and the Institute for Creation Research seem to have inherited the hot air waves, if not the wind. And this has alarmed Philip Kitcher, a philosopher of science at the University of Vermont, enough to give us this thoughtful and witty attack on "scientific creationism," which, he says, exploits intellectual tolerance while charging that evolution is intolerable "because it is inimical to religion and morality" and to the literal reading of Genesis.

The resurgent anti-evolutionary uproar of late would be great fun were it not that a good case can be made for the proposition that the creationists exert enormous influence in the society at large, to the harm of all scientific inquiry and in the face of overwhelming evidence for evolution. So

Dr. Kitcher has mixed a great deal of cold logic and history into his case, thereby creating a book that is as valuable as it is fun to read for scientists and nonscientists alike.

In his introduction, he tweaks creationists' noses with a bit of organic history, from photosynthesis "inventing" blue-green algae, which dominated life on earth for half the planet's history, to us.

"My aim is to mention a few important incidents that can provide a context for later discussions," he writes. "I am also out to set a new record: 4 billion years of history in under three pages." This indeed he accomplishes, then goes on to show, in the following chapters, that scientific reasoning does not have to be immoral, or even anti-Bible, to be fun.

JAMES P. STERBA

- (21)
- "American Freedom and the Radical Right"
- by Edward Erickson (NY:Ungar 1982), reviewed by BOB DAVIS:

With the rise of the new radical right and the so-called Moral Majority, many individuals have found themselves in a predicament; they don't like what's happening, but they are short on facts and arguments for dealing with it. Now books are beginning to appear, to remedy that situation. One such book, "American Freedom and the Radical Right" by Edward Erickson, just published, should be of great help. It is brief -- 117 pages -- but comprehensive and very readable. Erickson is Chairman of the Board of Leaders of the New York Ethical Culture group and was Director of the Center for Moral Democracy, which has now merged with the Voice of Reason. He has been active in this area for about 30 years.

The book is organized into 9 chapters and an "Afterword". Essentially it performs 3 functions. First, it provides a history and current description of the radical right, its leaders, and their use of religion to further their political ends. Second, it describes the attack on "secular humanism" as a device for attacking pluralistic democracy and modernism in general. Third, it discusses new right behavior and positions on various current controversial issues.

The third function takes up most of the book. There are chapters on "The Politics of Intolerance," "Sex as a Political Weapon: Abortion, Homosexuality and Theocratic Law", educational issues, the arms race, anti-communism -- in short, the whole new right program.

I have both praise and blame for the book. The praise is for Erickson's clear distinction between traditional, individualistic conservatism and the new right's authoritarian brand. He points out that traditional conservatives are allies in the fight against the radical right. My criticism is that Erickson is uncritical about contemporary liberalism. He seems unaware that liberalism's fund of ideas seems exhausted, and that it has failed to analyze correctly society's current problems, or propose viable solutions to them. This creates a vacuum which the new right aims to fill. What we need now are new perceptions and new ideas with which to approach our problems.

But if Erickson does not offer anything in the way of new politics or a new synthesis with which to guide America, he does offer a good critique of the dark forces of reaction, and I highly recommend the book for that purpose.

At bookstores, or direct from the publisher: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 250 Park Avenue South, NY NY 10003. \$9.95 cloth, \$4.95 paper.

BOOKS WANTED, TO BORROW

- (22)
- Want to borrow
- a book that you can't find in a library or bookstore? (Many BR books are out of print, alas.) Maybe a BRS member owns it and will lend. Tell us which book, and we will list it here next newsletter. Write the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.

CONTRIBUTIONS

(23) We thank these members for their contributions to the BRS Treasury (most welcome!): TIMOTHY CISSNER, DENNIS DARLAND, KATHY FJERMEDAL, FRANCISCO GIRON, CHARLES HILL, DON JACKANICZ, JIM MCWILLIAMS, JAN COORBURG, FRANK PAGE, JACK RAGSDALE, STEVE REINHARDT, CAROL SMITH, RAMON SUZARA, JOHN WILHELM

(24) We solicit contributions from members who have some money to spare.

The closing balance shown on the Treasurer's Report (3) would be a lot smaller if we had not received an unusually large (and wholly unexpected) contribution from one member. But we cannot rely on the unusual to provide a comfortable margin of financial safety. We'd like to see a number of you help to provide that margin. Won't you consider it?

You could do it -- you could help provide a margin of financial safety for the BRS -- by making a contribution when you can. Probably you can't do it every month -- as one member does -- but perhaps you can do it occasionally...from time to time...as you find you have a bit of money to spare.

Please do what you can. Any amount is welcome. No amount is too small to be useful.

* Send it c/o the newsletter (address on Page 1, bottom). Thanks!

ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

(25a) Elected (or re-elected) for 3-year terms starting 1/1/83: LOUIS ACHESON JR., KENNETH BLACKWELL, LESTER DENONN, DAVID HART, MARVIN KOHL, JIM MCWILLIAMS, STEVE REINHARDT, CAROL R. SMITH.

Elected to fill unexpired terms of former members, starting immediately and ending 1/1/84: PAUL ARTHUR SCHILPP and STEVE MARAGIDES.

We liked all of the candidates, and we hope that those who were not elected this time will consider standing again next year.

The votes were tallied by Lee Eisler. The count was verified by Bob Davis.

* * * * *

(25b) The proposal to increase dues by \$2.50 was approved by a wide margin. See (26).

MEMBERSHIP RENEWALS

(26) Dues are due January 1st. Please pay without delay; it saves work and expense.

Please note that all dues have been raised \$2.50, by vote of the members on the August ballot, to cover the increased cost of the McMaster publication, "Russell".

The January 1st date also applies to new members who joined in 1982, no matter in which month they joined. The member who joins in December '82 will have received as much BRS material -- the 4 '82 newsletters, and "Russell" -- as the member who joined 11 months earlier. The December member receives it all at once, the January member over the course of the year.

This is the '83 dues schedule, in U.S. dollars: regular \$22.50, couple \$27.50, student \$12.50. Outside the USA, Canada, and Mexico, add \$7.50. Please send dues to: 1983, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036.

If you want to make our life a bit easier, send your dues soon. Thanks!

VOLUNTEER WANTED

(27) Can you volunteer to be the new Co-Chairman of the Membership Committee?

We need someone who can spare several hours a week to handle inquiries and enrollments.

The present Co-Chairman, Jacqueline Berthon-Payon, does a superb job. But her regular full-time job at the Claremont Colleges -- the one that pays for her groceries -- has become more demanding. As a result, she has reluctantly decided to give up the post of Co-Chairman, as soon as we find a successor.

The record-keeping routines have been worked out and seem satisfactory (but if you find a way to improve them -- fine!)

The work is not difficult but it does take time. It is essential work without which the BRS could not thrive. Even though it has become routine, it has always been found interesting. Inquiries come in from all over the country, and from foreign countries (with foreign stamps, of course), often with comments or anecdotes. We send our current "information packet" to the inquirer.

Our classified ads produce inquiries, which would be forwarded to you.

This is a job for someone who has worked in an office and has enjoyed doing paper-work.

You would need some space for storing the printed material that you would send to inquirers and to new members.

We won't go into details here, but if you might be interested, let us know.

Do not volunteer unless you are prepared to stay with it for at least a year.

Does it appeal to you? Volunteer! Write: Volunteer, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036.

"RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS" MATTERS

(28) Pages missing? Several members reported that Pages 3&4 were missing from their August newsletters (RSN35). If something like this ever happens to you, let us know (address on Page 1, bottom), and we'll send you what's missing.

FOR SALE

(29) 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.

(30) BR postcard. 4¼ x 6. Philippe Halsman's handsome 1958 photo of BR with pipe. 50¢ each + 25¢. RSN30-44 shows it slightly reduced in size. Order from the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.

(31) From Spokesman Books, two titles listed as out-of-print and not available from the BRS Library:

"Into the Tenth Decade: Tribute to Bertrand Russell", 1962. 40 pps, ills. \$1.50

"Appeal to the American Conscience" by Bertrand Russell, 1966. 8-page fold-out, ills. 50p

Order from Spokesman Books, Bertrand Russell House, Gamble Street, Nottingham, England NG7 4ET. Spokesman Books is the publishing arm of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, same address.

(Thank you, TOM STANLEY)

(32)

From the BRS Library:

BOOKS FOR SALE FROM THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY LIBRARY

Prices include postage. "H" indicates hardbound. No notation: softbound. Prices shown are in U. S. funds. Please remit by check or money order, payable to THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, in U. S. funds or the equivalent. Orders are filled promptly. Send orders to Jack Ragsdale, BERTRAND RUSSELL LIBRARY, 4461 23rd St., San Francisco, Ca. 94114.

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

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

BY OTHER AUTHORS

BERTRAND RUSSELL 1872-1970, cartoons, pictures, articles, etc.....	1.25	
BERTRAND RUSSELL, THE PASSIONATE SCEPTIC, by Alan Wood.....	1.75	
NATIONAL FRONTIERS AND INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION, Medvedev...4.00		
SECRECY OF CORRESPONDENCE IS GUARANTEED BY LAW, Medvedev.....	3.50	
THE TAMARISK TREE, Dora Russell, an autobiography.....	5.00	H
MR. WILSON SPEAKS "FRANKLY AND FEARLESSLY" ON VIETNAM.....	1.25	
EFFECTS AND DANGERS OF NUCLEAR WAR (16 pages).....	.75	
BERTRAND RUSSELL, A LIFE, by Herbert Gottchalk.....	1.50	

ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

(33)

HASD.What do you believe in? What principles guide you in life (and in politics)?

We like the statement of principles adopted by the Humanist Association of San Diego:

We, the members of the Humanist Association of San Diego, a Chapter of the American Humanist Association, affirm the following Principles:

1. We support the use of reason and the scientific method in the pursuit of knowledge and understanding, and reject blind faith in dogmatic doctrines as being without value for these purposes.
2. We are not aware of any evidence for the existence of anything supernatural, and we are therefore

skeptical of such claims as those for a deity or an afterlife.

3. We believe that human beings are the source, the definers, and arbiters of values and ethics. We recognize that values change and develop in response to the continuing experience of the human community.

4. Human welfare is our highest concern, and every person's welfare is of equal value. We are convinced that the human community must be responsible for humane and cooperative interaction among all members of the species, and with the biosphere in which we have evolved.

- (34) Humanist Fellowship of San Diego — which apparently is the same as the Humanist Association of San Diego — held a rally on BR's birthday (May 18). Notice of the noon rally (at Third and B, Downtown) had appeared in Frank Mortyn's Humanist Calendar. Here's how he describes the event:

Our Bertrand Russell birthday rally consisted of an open-air meeting downtown in front of City Hall. We handed out 100 copies of a specially-prepared flyer. Your officer, Professor Harry Ruja, was present and was introduced. We read the moving introduction to Russell's autobiography. To gain attention, we opened and closed the event with a few minutes of a recorded Beethoven symphony. We were pleased to get spontaneous applause at the conclusion of the presentation.

- (35) Hemlock, "A Society Supporting Active Voluntary Euthanasia for the Terminally Ill" — whose principles and objectives were described RSN34-35 — has issued a pamphlet, "Assisted Suicide: The Compassionate Crime". Also "Hemlock Quarterly". Hemlock seeks members (\$15 per year) and tax-deductible contributions. PO Box 66218, Los Angeles, CA 90066.

BR CELEBRATED

- (36) "Guided Tour of Intellectual Rubbish" (Act I), based on BR's writings, was presented at the Bruno Walter Auditorium of the New York Public Library at Lincoln Center, on November 8 & 9, 1982. It was directed by Marvin Kaye, who also dramatized it...and performed by members of The Open Book (of which Marvin Kaye is a co-founder) — a non-profit organization "dedicated to presenting new and little-known literature to the public..."

We saw it with JACK COWLES, and enjoyed it thoroughly. Afterwards we spoke with Marvin Kaye. If "Guided Tour" is repeated, we will report it, and recommend it highly to BRS members.

See RSN34-14 for our report on the presentation of Act II last April — the 2 Acts are independent of each other — and for more about The Open Book and the cast.

MISINFORMATION

- (37) The 3 errors in the brief sketch of BR (8) are these: BR was not an anarchist, he was a socialist. He was not an atheist, he was an agnostic (though he did say, that in practice, there was little difference.) He opposed the H-bomb not merely during the last 3 years of his life, but during the last 25, starting with his 1945 speech in the House of Lords (RSN35-14).

BR INTERVIEWED

- (38) 1965, Merv Griffin. From "Merv" an autobiography by Merv Griffin with Peter Barsocchini (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1980), pp. 114-119:

The opportunity for my first big political interview came while we were in England doing a location show with Bob Hope. Hope was there shooting a movie and I did an interview with him on the set. But I felt, since we were over there, we should try to get an English perspective on current events. Someone suggested Bertrand Russell, the

Nobel Laureate and world-renowned philosopher. We found him simply by looking in the phone book. Russell's personal assistant, a young American named Ralph Schoenman, informed us Lord Russell would consent to the interview on condition that I would not ask questions about his personal life; Russell was wary of American inter-

views, because he was often asked more about his four marriages (two to American women) than about his political opinions. Lord Russell's political opinions were what I was after. He had indicated to the press a dislike of American foreign policy, so when he greeted me at his modest home in Chelsea I asked him if he could possibly be as anti-American as the press painted him to be. The ninety-three-year-old philosopher smiled and said, "How could I be? Fifty percent of my wives have been American."

I began the interview by asking him if the cold war between America and the Communist bloc countries would ever be settled.

"Yes, it will be settled, one way or another. Probably the most likely way will be by the extermination of all combatants on both sides. Then somehow it will be settled."

Then I asked the question which caused Lord Russell's eyes to start flashing: "What *would* be the necessary steps toward world peace?"

"Of course, the first thing would be for Americans to give up aggressive war, give up the habit of invading peaceful countries and torturing them. I think that is a first step."

He caught me off guard. Nineteen sixty-five was a time when most Americans felt there was a right side to the war in Vietnam and a wrong side, and clearly we were on the side of right; this was before the weekly death toll underscored color films of bloody battles on the six o'clock news.

"Is that what you believe, Lord Russell, that we are conducting aggressive wars?"

"Yes, you are. It's not that I believe it; it's plain fact. You're conducting an aggressive war in Vietnam. And you're on your way to conducting a similar war in the Congo."

I was stunned, on America's behalf, at the charge.

"Aren't they protective skirmishes?"

He slapped his fist on his chair's armrest.

"No! Now, look, ordinary Americans believe that they are conducting a protective war, protecting non-Communists against these wicked Communists. And that is not the case. They're conducting a war against people who were, until they were attacked, entirely in favor of neutrality. And now they've learned what American troops are. . . ."

Russell's eyes were fiery, his voice increasingly sharp.

". . . The Geneva Congress decided, I think very sensibly . . . that Vietnam, north and south, as one, should have a general election and should have whatever government the general election showed the country wanted. The Americans were not part of the Geneva Conference but did announce when it arrived at its decisions that they would support it on the whole. They sent, first, advisers to South Vietnam, and the advisers sent back word to America that the country was not in a state where a general election was possible. . . . They [Americans] then sent troops to advise the advisers, and they made friends with the tiniest minority of people in Vietnam. They set them up as a puppet government, and about nine-tenths of the population disliked this puppet government. So they put the peasants into strategic villages where they were prisoners, where they were exposed to forced labor, where they had *no* freedom, where they had to do as they were told, and where they were from time to time murdered whenever a soldier felt like it. Now, Sir Robert Menzies, in sending off troops to support this regime, said they were going to defend one of the 'frontiers of human freedom.' Well, now what do you think happens in South Vietnam? What sort of human freedom do you think there is? Who gets the freedom? *Well*, I'll tell you. This is a quotation from a paper in Dallas. Dallas is generally not considered

in the forefront of revolution. . . .

"It says: 'Supposedly the purpose of the fortified villages is to keep the Viet Cong out. Barbed wire denies entrance and exit. Vietnamese farmers are forced at gunpoint into these virtual concentration camps. Their homes, possessions and crops are burned. In the province of Cantong some villagers were led into the town square, their stomachs were slashed, their livers extracted and put on display. These victims were women and children. In another village expectant mothers were invited to the square by government forces to be "honored." Their stomachs were ripped open and their unborn babies removed.'

"I could read you any number of extracts from any number of newspapers, saying *this* (he slaps the newspaper article) is what America is doing. *This* is the action of America. *This* is its war for liberty. And I think it's the most disgraceful thing I've ever heard of. Horrible! That they should take these innocent people who don't care a damn what government there is, as long as they're left alone, and torture women and children. . . . Apart from these sorts of things, they drop Napalm and other defoliants on people. They issue notices at the villages saying, 'Don't let your children run out, because if you do our helicopters will kill them.' That sort of thing. Most Americans don't *know* that's the sort of war that's going on. If they knew, I think well enough of America to think at least some of them would think it was perhaps rather regrettable. . . ."

"They drop Napalm on a *child*. Napalm eats into you. You can't stop it. The children die of it in great agony, terrible agony. That sort of thing is going on all the time."

I sat stunned and sickened by the extract he'd read from the Dallas newspaper; I couldn't believe such an article hadn't caused a national scandal.

"I'm amazed that there was an investigation and this was printed in the Dallas paper . . . Americans have great conscience about that, sir."

"I don't remember that anybody was punished."

"They should have been."

"They should have been, yes, but I don't think they were."

I asked Lord Russell if he didn't admire America for our freedoms of speech and religion. He bristled once again.

"Those things were commonplace until America took to infringing them. When I was young everyone took them for granted. But since America has come in, it's quite different. Freedom of religion? Well, Communism is a religion. You don't allow freedom to Communism. You made it a criminal act to be a Communist in America [in reference to Senator McCarthy's investigation].

"Communism is a religion?"

"Certainly."

"It's a godless religion, though."

"Yes. So is Buddhism. Everybody admits Buddhism is a religion."

My mind kept flashing back to the atrocities he talked about in Vietnam; I turned the conversation again to the subject of world peace. "The peoples of every country, I am sure, desire nothing but peace."

"That's a slogan," he said, "and I think you should get rid of that slogan. They desire peace, but they desire peace on *their* terms. You see, this recent offer the Prime Minister is making . . . he won't meet the Viet Cong. He wants peace, no doubt. But he wants peace on his terms. That is, he wants the enemy, if you call him the enemy, to give up all his own demands and simply accept the demands of America. That is the sense in which he wants peace."

"On what terms *can* we have peace? Peace at any price?"

"Peace at any price only encourages the other folks who don't want peace. So that is not peace at any price. You've got to have a government, *one* government, for the world. That's the only way you can secure peace. One government for international affairs. The national affairs would have a national government. You shouldn't insist on all national governments being of the same sort. If some people want a monarch, let them have it. If some people want a dictatorship, let them have it. You must let them have whatever they like."

I decided to ask about the CIA. It wasn't a subject many Americans were aware of in 1965, but I asked Russell his feelings about it.

"It's a band of organized assassins. That's what I think about it."

Again he caught me short. I had sought the interview to get a unique perspective on America, but by this time I realized the tape I was bringing back would be shocking to my audience.

"Do we, as mankind," I asked Lord Russell, "deserve to survive?"

"If you use God as judge, *that* God [of the Old Testament] judged at the time of Noah. He thought only eight people deserved to survive. A definite exaggeration." [Laughter.]

". . . But I don't think anybody *deserves* to survive, or hardly anybody. . . . We don't want to be dealt with according to our sins. We should have a very bad time, if so. I'd like to say just a little about how glorious the world might be if only the people would forget that they hate each other."

"That's what we want to hear."

"I think this is a matter where science comes in. Science has made it possible for everybody to be happy, unless they have some incurable disease. It only requires that people should stop hating each other. They should aim at their own happiness and not at the unhappiness of others. You see, all of us spend the bulk of our income and the bulk of our energies on making other people miserable."

"Lord Russell, let me leave you with one quote—of Thornton Wilder's. He was the one who said, 'Governments should be small and funny.' Do you agree?"

"Yes. And I should point out that the whole armed might of Monaco is on my side."

Immediately upon our return to the States we checked out the article in the Dallas newspaper Russell had quoted from. It turned out to be a "letter to the editor" written by a Vietnamese businessman, and not a piece by an investigative journalist. Still, the effect of Lord Russell's reading it on the air was devastating.

We played the interview into our show, and the studio audience was grumbling when it was over; some booed. I read a prepared statement: "Many of you, I'm certain, disagree with what Lord Russell had to say. I know I did. You are perhaps shocked and angry, not only at him but at me for providing him the platform of this show on which to make his remarks. But nothing would be easier for me than to book this show with people who have ideas that are carbon copies of my own, or no ideas at all. But I don't think it's an easy world or that my primary responsibility on this program is to take it easy. You'll continue on this show to see people of every persuasion who have hard things to say, and I don't think you can get at any truth without hammering out on the anvil of everyone's right to disagree. I believe the vast majority of Americans are committed to that principle."

As soon as the show aired I heard from hundreds of Americans who *weren't* committed to the principle of free speech. I received letters and telegrams labeling me a Communist, traitor and antireligious crusader. Even members of the national press lashed out at me, including my old friend Bob Considine, who contended I shouldn't provide a platform for such outrageously anti-American statements at a time when our country faced an internal struggle because of the war. It was as if I had attacked America. (The funny part about Bob Considine's article was that Bob's son, who worked as a cameraman on my show, caught hell from his dad, too.)

Bertrand Russell's allegations about atrocities in Vietnam and the use of assassination by the CIA as a political tool, which sounded so inflammatory and unsubstantiated to us in 1965, proved in later years to be sadly close to the truth.

Page 122

Page 146

Because everyone, from Shakespearean actors to rock stars, was frothing with issues during the sixties, one of the toughest parts of our job was presenting a balance of opinion. When too many guests spoke out against the war, we heard about it, as I said earlier. Network lawyers sent me memos: "In the past six weeks 34 antiwar statements have been made and only one pro-war statement, by John Wayne. . . ." I shot a memo right back. "Find me someone as famous as Mr. Wayne to speak in favor of the war and we'll book him." The irony of the situation wasn't wasted on me; in 1965 I'm called a traitor by the press for presenting Bertrand Russell, and four years later we are hard-pressed to find *anybody* to speak in favor of the Vietnam war.

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

(39) On Gilbert Murray, from "An Unfinished Autobiography" by Gilbert Murray (London, Allen & Unwin, 1960) pp. 205-211:

A FIFTY-SIX YEAR FRIENDSHIP

by Bertrand Russell

MY FRIENDSHIP with Gilbert Murray began rather suddenly in February 1901. I had known him slightly for many years as the husband of my cousin Mary, but it was only when he came to Newnham to read part of his translation of the Hippolytus that my admiration led to a rapidly growing intimacy. I wrote him a letter (February 26, 1901) in the course of which I said:

'Those of us who love poetry read the great masterpieces of modern literature before we have any experience of the passions they deal with. To come across a new masterpiece with a more mature mind is a wonderful experience, and one which I have found almost overwhelming. It had not happened to me before, and I could not have believed how much it would affect me. Your tragedy fulfils perfectly—so it seems to me—the purpose of bringing out whatever is noble and beautiful in sorrow; and to those of us who are without a religion, this is the only consolation of which the spectacle of the world cannot deprive us.'

My praise gave him pleasure, and he wrote:

'I will not say that I feel pleased or delighted by your great enjoyment of my Hippolytus, because my feelings are quite different from that. It is rather that your strong praise makes a sort of epoch in my life and in my way of regarding my work. Of course I have felt great emotion in working at the Hippolytus; I have been entranced by it. And then the thought has always come to me, that there were dozens of translations of the Greek Tragedians in all the second-hand shops; and that I could not read any of them with the least interest; and that probably the authors of nearly all of them had felt exactly as I was feeling about the extraordinary beauty and power of the matter they were writing down. A translator, if he takes pains, naturally gets nearer to understanding his author than an ordinary reader does; and every now and again the poem means to him something approaching that which it meant to the poet.

'Of course all authors—in different degrees, but all enormously—fail to convey their meaning. And translators, being less good writers and having a harder task, fail even more deplorably. That is the normal state of the case. But what seems to have happened in our case is that you have somehow or other understood and felt the whole of what I meant to convey.

'I do not mean that I had anything mysterious or extraordinary to say; but merely that, even in the case of a bad poet or the man-in-the-street when in certain moods, if you could really understand what was in his mind it would be something astonishingly beautiful compared with what one ordinarily gets from reading a very good poem. When I am bored with poetry, I constantly have the feeling that I am simply not understanding the man or he is not expressing himself, and that probably something very fine indeed is going on inside him; and in some moment of special insight one might see inside him and get the fine thing.'

This inaugurated a correspondence which continued for fifty-six

years and ended only with his death.

We met most frequently during the years 1901 to 1905. At this time we were neighbours during a large part of the year: he at Churt; and I, first at Fernhurst, then at Churt and then at Tilford. He was a delightful companion and a very amusing talker. Alys, my first wife, and I intended to build a house at Churt in order to be near the Murrays, and the plans for this project were well advanced when the Murrays decided to leave Churt because it was thought not to suit Mary's health. In consequence of this move I saw rather less of him than I had been doing.¹

Most of the letters that passed between us are rather solemn, but our conversation did not by any means usually have this serious character. He was full of amusing fancies which were apt to puzzle his wife and his younger daughter Agnes. One day when I came to see them, he greeted me with the remark: 'I have found a school for Denis. The Headmaster is the Rev V. Ermin, of the Creepers, Crawley Down.' At this point Mary exclaimed indignantly, 'Oh, Gilbert! He's not Reverend.' The only substratum of fact in the story was that the school was at Crawley. He told Agnes, then aged about six, a long fantastic story of something that had happened to a train at a junction. 'Is it true?' she asked, with wide eyes. 'Quite true,' he replied very solemnly. 'Honour bright?' she asked again. 'Yes. On a bright railway track.' The poor girl retired completely bewildered. One day when the parlour maid answered my ring at the front door, and I inquired whether Professor Murray and Lady Mary were at home, she replied, 'Well, Sir, I think they're *probably* in—unless they're out.' It turned out that they were in; and I said, 'Mary, your parlour maid is of opinion that the laws of thought should not be applied to empirical material except with great caution.' Mary remarked, 'Oh, what an unkind thing to say!' And Gilbert said, 'I am glad to know that she has such just views.'

Many of his most amusing fantasies probably live now only in my memory. I would find, when I reminded him of them forty or fifty years later, that he had entirely forgotten them. He assured me once that there was an Oxford Don who had reduced all jokes to thirty-seven proto-Aryan originals and, when any-

¹ The Murrays moved to Oxford in 1905 when G.M. was elected to a teaching Fellowship at New College.

body made a joke in his presence, he would say, 'Yes. There is that joke.' Many years later, I asked Gilbert if he remembered this story. He hesitated for a moment, and then said, 'I think he was a *Cambridge Don*'.

A great deal of our conversation, however, was on a more serious plane. We were both liberal, humanitarian pacifists. We were both profoundly impressed by the cruelty and wickedness to be found in the world, but with a confident hope that these things would gradually diminish. A caricaturist might have compared us to the two curates in the *Bab Ballads*, each determined to be 'the mildest curate going'. But in this rôle, Gilbert was much more successful than I was. I would have outbreaks of savage indignation in which I wished to give pain to those whom I hated. When Massingham said in print that I would not hurt a fly, I was indignant. But Gilbert's kindly feelings were less liable to lapse into savagery. He remained reasonable and gentle even under great provocation. I admired this quality though I knew that I could not emulate it. I could not sympathize when he spoke in a kindly fashion even about Rudyard Kipling¹ after a walk round Beachy Head with that, to me, detestable man. I felt as the orthodox did when Origen declared that even Satan would be saved at the last.

It was not only in politics, but also in philosophy that he and I

were broadly in agreement. He had steadfastly adhered to British Empiricism in the style of Mill. I reverted to it after a brief excursion into German Idealism. This agreement led him to invite me to write on Philosophy for the Home University Library of which he was one of the editors. One of the most amusing of all his letters to me is one purporting to come from the publishers, Williams and Norgate, justifying themselves against my supposed complaints: for instance, I had remarked in my book that I was not acquainted with the Emperor of China, and he makes the publishers say that, if I desired an introduction to that Potentate, I should have mentioned it before signing the contract.

When the First World War broke out in 1914, he and I took different sides. He supported Sir Edward Grey, whose policy I passionately repudiated. I thought, and still think, that Britain ought to have remained neutral. He published a pamphlet in defence of the Government, and I published a polemical attack on his pamphlet. Subsequent events raised doubts in his mind. On August 20, 1955, he wrote to me: 'It is quite possible that the effects would have been less disastrous if we had stayed out and allowed Germany to become complete master of western Europe, on more or less equal terms with USA and Russia.' But, at the time, as we both felt very strongly, our differences of opinion caused a certain estrangement. However, I wrote to him: 'I feel our friendship still lives in the eternal world, whatever may happen to it here and now.' And he replied in a similar tone.

At the time when I was imprisoned in 1918 he took the liberal view that the expression of opinion ought to be free. He worked hard on my behalf and was largely instrumental in my being put in the First Division. For his help at this time I owe him a deep debt of gratitude.

In later years, our opinions no longer diverged acutely, though he remained a Liberal and I had joined the Labour Party. We both, like many men of our generation, felt lost and bewildered by the outbreaks of barbarism which were making nineteenth century optimism look shallow. We had ventured forth in a frail skiff on calm and sunny seas, but wild tempests were threatening to sink our little bark, and hopes grew gradually more difficult and more remote. In these later years, a more dignified comparison than that of the Two Curates would be appropriate. Our mood was like that of St Jerome and St Augustine watching the fall of the Roman Empire and the crumbling of a civilization which had seemed as indestructible as granite. A letter from him of July 27, 1953, expresses part of his feeling about this development:

'I think I started from an Irish Rebel background, and gradually learned to believe in the English Liberals, partly through Mr G's championing Home Rule, partly because of the enthusiastic Radicalism of Castle Howard.

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS)

'You started from an atmosphere of Whig Prime Ministers, and distinguished Radicals, and found in 1914 that their gospel wasn't enough. Of course this is only one element, but it explains some things.'

It has been a difficult time for those who grew up amid Victorian solidities. To the very end, Gilbert did everything that lay in his power to salvage civilization, and for this he deserves to be honoured by all who care for the things that he valued.

After the dinner in his honour of the Philosophical Society of England in September 1951, he wrote to me (September 12, 1951):

'I was greatly touched by that letter you wrote to the Philosophical Society Dinner about our fifty years of close friendship. It is, I think, quite true about the fundamental agreement; I always feel it—and am proud of it.

'I had explained that I preferred you to other philosophers because, while they mostly tried to prove some horrible conclusion—like Hobbes, Hegel, Marx &c, you were, I believed, content if you could really prove that $2+2=4$, and that conclusion, though sad, was at least bearable. ("To think that two and two are four, and never five or three the heart of man has long been sore and long is like to be.")' . . .

'Yours ever, and with real thanks for your letter, which made me for a moment feel that I was not completely a failure.'

In my Message (September 11, 1951) to the Society, I had summed up the reasons for my admiration of Gilbert Murray:

¹ From A. E. Housman's *Last Poems*, No. xxxv, which Gilbert Murray here slightly misquotes.

'I greatly regret my inability to be present at this dinner in honour of Gilbert Murray, who has been my close friend for over half a century. Throughout that period, I have hardly known whether to admire most his wit or his wisdom. Of his erudition it is not for me to speak, since it is in a field of which I am exceptionally ignorant.

'He and I have not always agreed on public issues, but we have, I think, throughout whatever divergences on this or that question been conscious of a deep underlying agreement on fundamentals.

'Gilbert Murray is a great and steadfast humanist, who adheres to liberal beliefs, now, alas, not so common as they were when he and I were young. As growing darkness descends upon the world, stars shine more brightly, and of these stars Gilbert Murray is among those of the first magnitude.

'If the international world could listen to him, many of our troubles would quickly end, and the sombre fears that rob our age of hopefulness would be dissipated.'

ABOUT BR'S WRITINGS

(40) More on Gödel. Several years ago we ran part of a review (by Brian Hayes) of "Gödel, Escher and Bach" by Douglas Hofstadter (New York: Basic Books, 1979) (RSN23-17.) Hayes said that Russell and Whitehead, in "Principia Mathematica" "invented a formal language... simple and powerful"... that until 1931 "appeared to have the satisfying quality of completeness." They believed that "any true property of the whole numbers could be demonstrated in their language and that no false proposition could be proved."

In 1931 Gödel demonstrated that this was not so, that "any system of formal logic powerful enough to describe the natural numbers is intrinsically incomplete," as Hayes puts it.

We think the story of how all this came about is an exciting one, the way Hofstadter tells it... so we are going to let him tell it:

But if *Principia Mathematica* was the first victim of this stroke, it was certainly not the last! The phrase "and Related Systems" in the title of Gödel's article is a telling one: for if Gödel's result had merely pointed out a defect in the work of Russell and Whitehead, then others could have been inspired to improve upon *P.M.* and to outwit Gödel's Theorem. But this was not possible: Gödel's proof pertained to *any* axiomatic system which purported to achieve the aims which Whitehead and Russell had set for themselves. And for each different system, one basic method did the trick. In short, Gödel showed that provability is a weaker notion than truth, no matter what axiomatic system is involved.

Therefore Gödel's Theorem had an electrifying effect upon logicians, mathematicians, and philosophers interested in the foundations of mathematics, for it showed that no fixed system, no matter how complicated, could represent the complexity of the whole numbers: 0, 1, 2, 3, ... Modern readers may not be as nonplussed by this as readers of 1931 were, since in the interim our culture has absorbed Gödel's Theorem, along with the conceptual revolutions of relativity and quantum mechanics, and their philosophically disorienting messages have reached the public, even if cushioned by several layers of translation (and usually obfuscation). There is a general mood of expectation, these days, of "limitative" results—but back in 1931, this came as a bolt from the blue.

Mathematical Logic: A Synopsis

A proper appreciation of Gödel's Theorem requires a setting of context. Therefore, I will now attempt to summarize in a short space the history of mathematical logic prior to 1931—an impossible task. (See DeLong, Kneebone, or Nagel and Newman, for good presentations of history.) It all began with the attempts to mechanize the thought processes of reasoning. Now our ability to reason has often been claimed to be what distinguishes us from other species; so it seems somewhat paradoxical, on first thought, to mechanize that which is most human. Yet even the ancient Greeks knew that reasoning is a patterned process, and is at least partially governed by storable laws. Aristotle codified syllogisms, and Euclid codified geometry; but thereafter, many centuries had to pass before progress in the study of axiomatic reasoning would take place again.

One of the significant discoveries of nineteenth-century mathematics was that there are different, and equally valid, geometries—where by "a geometry" is meant a theory of properties of abstract points and lines. It had long been assumed that geometry was what Euclid had codified, and that, although there might be small flaws in Euclid's presentation, they were unimportant and any real progress in geometry would be achieved by extending Euclid. This idea was shattered by the roughly simultaneous discovery of non-Euclidean geometry by several people—a discovery that shocked the mathematics community, because it deeply challenged the idea that mathematics studies the real world. How could there be many different kinds of "points" and "lines" in one single reality? Today, the solution to the dilemma may be apparent, even to some nonmathematicians—but at the time, the dilemma created havoc in mathematical circles.

Later in the nineteenth century, the English logicians George Boole and Augustus De Morgan went considerably further than Aristotle in codifying strictly deductive reasoning patterns. Boole even called his book "*The Laws of Thought*"—surely an exaggeration, but it was an important contribution. Lewis Carroll was fascinated by these mechanized reasoning methods, and invented many puzzles which could be solved with them. Gottlob Frege in Jena and Giuseppe Peano in Turin worked on combining formal reasoning with the study of sets and numbers. David Hilbert in Göttingen worked on stricter formalizations of geometry than Euclid's. All of these efforts were directed towards clarifying what one means by "proof".

In the meantime, interesting developments were taking place in classical mathematics. A theory of different types of infinities, known as the *theory of sets*, was developed by Georg Cantor in the 1880's. The theory was powerful and beautiful, but intuition-defying. Before long, a variety of set-theoretical paradoxes had been unearthed. The situation was very disturbing, because just as mathematics seemed to be recovering from one set of paradoxes—those related to the theory of limits, in the calculus—along came a whole new set, which looked worse!

The most famous is Russell's paradox. Most sets, it would seem, are not members of themselves—for example, the set of walruses is not a walrus, the set containing only Joan of Arc is not Joan of Arc (a set is not a person)—and so on. In this respect, most sets are rather "run-of-the-mill". However, some "self-swallowing" sets *do* contain themselves as members, such as the set of all sets, or the set of all things except Joan of Arc, and so

on. Clearly, every set is either run-of-the-mill or self-swallowing, and no set can be both. Now nothing prevents us from inventing R: *the set of all run-of-the-mill sets*. At first, R might seem a rather run-of-the-mill invention—but that opinion must be revised when you ask yourself, "Is R itself a run-of-the-mill set or a self-swallowing set?" You will find that the answer is: "R is neither run-of-the-mill nor self-swallowing, for either choice leads to paradox." Try it!

But if R is neither run-of-the-mill nor self-swallowing, then what is it? At the very least, pathological. But no one was satisfied with evasive answers of that sort. And so people began to dig more deeply into the foundations of set theory. The crucial questions seemed to be: "What is wrong with our intuitive concept of 'set'? Can we make a rigorous theory of sets which corresponds closely with our intuitions, but which skirts the paradoxes?" Here, as in number theory and geometry, the problem is in trying to line up intuition with formalized, or axiomatized, reasoning systems.

A startling variant of Russell's paradox, called "Grelling's paradox", can be made using adjectives instead of sets. Divide the adjectives in English into two categories: those which are self-descriptive, such as "pentasyllabic", "awkwardnessful", and "recherché", and those which are not, such as "edible", "incomplete", and "bisyllabic". Now if we admit "non-self-descriptive" as an adjective, to which class does it belong? If it seems questionable to include hyphenated words, we can use two terms invented specially for this paradox: *autological* (= "self-descriptive"), and *heterological* (= "non-self-descriptive"). The question then becomes: "Is 'heterological' heterological?" Try it!

There seems to be one common culprit in these paradoxes, namely self-reference, or "Strange Loopiness". So if the goal is to ban all paradoxes, why not try banning self-reference and anything that allows it to arise? This is not so easy as it might seem, because it can be hard to figure out just where self-reference is occurring. It may be spread out over a whole Strange Loop with several steps, as in this "expanded" version of Epimenides, reminiscent of *Drawing Hands*:

The following sentence is false.
The preceding sentence is true.

Taken together, these sentences have the same effect as the original Epimenides paradox; yet separately, they are harmless and even potentially useful sentences. The "blame" for this Strange Loop can't be pinned on either sentence—only on the way they "point" at each other. In the same way, each local region of *Ascending and Descending* is quite legitimate: it is only the way they are globally put together that creates an impossibility. Since there are indirect as well as direct ways of achieving self-reference, one must figure out how to ban both types at once—if one sees self-reference as the root of all evil.

Banishing Strange Loops

Russell and Whitehead did subscribe to this view, and accordingly, *Principia Mathematica* was a mammoth exercise in exorcising Strange Loops from logic, set theory, and number theory. The idea of their system was basically this. A set of the lowest "type" could contain only "objects" as members—not sets. A set of the next type up could only contain objects, or sets of the lowest type. In general, a set of a given type could only contain sets of lower type, or objects. Every set would belong to a specific type. Clearly, no set could contain itself because it would have to belong to a type higher than its own type. Only "run-of-the-mill" sets exist in such a system; furthermore, old R—the set of all run-of-the-mill sets—no longer is considered a set at all, because it does not belong to any finite type. To all appearances, then, this *theory of types*, which we might also call the "theory of the abolition of Strange Loops", successfully rids set theory of its paradoxes, but only at the cost of introducing an artificial-seeming hierarchy, and of disallowing the formation of certain kinds of sets—such as the set of all run-of-the-mill sets. Intuitively, this is not the way we imagine sets.

The theory of types handled Russell's paradox, but it did nothing about the Epimenides paradox or Grelling's paradox. For people whose interest went no further than set theory, this was quite adequate—but for people interested in the elimination of paradoxes generally, some similar "hierarchization" seemed necessary, to forbid looping back inside language. At the bottom of such a hierarchy would be an *object language*. Here, reference could be made only to a specific domain—not to aspects of the object language itself (such as its grammatical rules, or specific sentences in it). For that purpose there would be a *metalanguage*. This experience of two linguistic levels is familiar to all learners of foreign languages. Then there would be a meta-metalanguage for discussing the metalanguage, and so on.

It would be required that every sentence should belong to some precise level of the hierarchy. Therefore, if one could find no level in which a given utterance fit, then the utterance would be deemed meaningless, and forgotten.

An analysis can be attempted on the two-step Epimenides loop given above. The first sentence, since it speaks of the second, must be on a higher level than the second. But by the same token, the second sentence must be on a higher level than the first. Since this is impossible, the two sentences are "meaningless". More precisely, such sentences simply cannot be formulated at all in a system based on a strict hierarchy of languages. This prevents all versions of the Epimenides paradox as well as Grelling's paradox. (To what language level could "heterological" belong?)

Now in set theory, which deals with abstractions that we don't use all the time, a stratification like the theory of types seems acceptable, even if a little strange—but when it comes to language, an all-pervading part of life, such stratification appears absurd. We don't think of ourselves as jumping up and down a hierarchy of languages when we speak about various things. A rather matter-of-fact sentence such as, "In this book, I criticize the theory of types" would be doubly forbidden in the system we are discussing. Firstly, it mentions "this book", which should only be mentionable in a "metabook"—and secondly, it mentions *me*—a person whom I should not be allowed to speak of at all! This example points out how silly the theory of types seems, when you import it into a familiar context. The remedy it adopts for paradoxes—total banishment of self-reference in any form—is a real case of overkill, branding many perfectly good constructions as meaningless. The adjective "meaningless", by the way, would have to apply to all discussions of the theory of linguistic types (such as that of this very paragraph) for they clearly could not occur on any of the levels—neither object language, nor metalanguage, nor metametalanguage, etc. So the very act of discussing the theory would be the most blatant possible violation of it!

Now one could defend such theories by saying that they were only intended to deal with formal languages—not with ordinary, informal language. This may be so, but then it shows that such theories are extremely academic and have little to say about paradoxes except when they crop up in special tailor-made systems. Besides, the drive to eliminate paradoxes at any cost, especially when it requires the creation of highly artificial formalisms, puts too much stress on bland consistency, and too little on the quirky and bizarre, which make life and mathematics interesting. It is of course important to try to maintain consistency, but when this effort forces you into a stupendously ugly theory, you know something is wrong.

These types of issues in the foundations of mathematics were responsible for the high interest in codifying human reasoning methods which was present in the early part of this century. Mathematicians and philosophers had begun to have serious doubts about whether even the most concrete of theories, such as the study of whole numbers (number theory), were built on solid foundations. If paradoxes could pop up so easily in set theory—a theory whose basic concept, that of a set, is surely very intuitively appealing—then might they not also exist in other branches of mathematics? Another related worry was that the paradoxes of logic, such as the Epimenides paradox, might turn out to be internal to mathematics, and thereby cast in doubt all of mathematics. This was especially worrisome to those—and there were a good number—who firmly believed that mathematics is simply a branch of logic (or conversely, that logic is simply a branch of mathematics). In fact, this very question—"Are mathematics and logic distinct, or separate?"—was the source of much controversy.

This study of mathematics itself became known as *metamathematics*—or occasionally, *metalogue*, since mathematics and logic are so intertwined. The most urgent priority of metamathematicians was to determine the true

nature of mathematical reasoning. What is a legal method of procedure, and what is an illegal one? Since mathematical reasoning had always been done in "natural language" (e.g., French or Latin or some language for normal communication), there was always a lot of possible ambiguity. Words had different meanings to different people, conjured up different images, and so forth. It seemed reasonable and even important to establish a single uniform notation in which all mathematical work could be done, and with the aid of which any two mathematicians could resolve disputes over whether a suggested proof was valid or not. This would require a complete codification of the universally acceptable modes of human reasoning, at least as far as they applied to mathematics.

Consistency, Completeness, Hilbert's Program

This was the goal of *Principia Mathematica*, which purported to derive all of mathematics from logic, and, to be sure, without contradictions! It was widely admired, but no one was sure if (1) all of mathematics really was contained in the methods delineated by Russell and Whitehead, or (2) the methods given were even self-consistent. Was it absolutely clear that contradictory results could *never* be derived, by any mathematicians whatsoever, following the methods of Russell and Whitehead?

This question particularly bothered the distinguished German mathematician (and metamathematician) David Hilbert, who set before the world community of mathematicians (and metamathematicians) this challenge: to demonstrate rigorously—perhaps following the very methods outlined by Russell and Whitehead—that the system defined in *Principia Mathematica* was both *consistent* (contradiction-free), and *complete* (i.e., that every true statement of number theory could be derived within the framework drawn up in *P.M.*). This was a tall order, and one could criticize it on the grounds that it was somewhat circular: how can you justify your methods of reasoning on the basis of those same methods of reasoning? It is like lifting yourself up by your own bootstraps. (We just don't seem to be able to get away from these Strange Loops!)

Hilbert was fully aware of this dilemma, of course, and therefore expressed the hope that a demonstration of consistency or completeness could be found which depended only on "finitistic" modes of reasoning. These were a small set of reasoning methods usually accepted by mathematicians. In this way, Hilbert hoped that mathematicians could partially lift themselves by their own bootstraps: the sum total of mathematical methods might be proved sound, by invoking only a smaller set of methods. This goal may sound rather esoteric, but it occupied the minds of many of the greatest mathematicians in the world during the first thirty years of this century.

In the thirty-first year, however, Gödel published his paper, which in some ways utterly demolished Hilbert's program. This paper revealed not only that there were irreparable "holes" in the axiomatic system proposed by Russell and Whitehead, but more generally, that no axiomatic system whatsoever could produce all number-theoretical truths, unless it were an inconsistent system! And finally, the hope of proving the consistency of a system such as that presented in *P.M.* was shown to be vain: if such a proof could be found using only methods inside *P.M.*, then—and this is one of the most mystifying consequences of Gödel's work—*P.M.* itself would be inconsistent!

The final irony of it all is that the proof of Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem involved importing the Epimenides paradox right into the heart of *Principia Mathematica*, a bastion supposedly invulnerable to the attacks of Strange Loops! Although Gödel's Strange Loop did not destroy *Principia Mathematica*, it made it far less interesting to mathematicians, for it showed that Russell and Whitehead's original aims were illusory.

- Tim Harding/454 Willington St./Clifton Hill, Australia 3068
 John Harper, Jr./571 S. Coronado St.(412)/Los Angeles, CA 90057
 John W. Harrison, Jr./22411 Beech/Dearborn, MI 48124
 #David S. Hart/56 Fort Hill Terrace/Rochester, NY 14620
 John L. Harwick/39 Fairway Av./Delmar, NY 12054
- Charles W. Hill, Ph.D./Rte 5, Box 61/Covington, LA 70433
 Robert Homa/213 Barnum Terrace/Stratford, CT 06497
 Ophelia & James Lloyd Hoopes/250 Avalon Av./Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308
 Thomas Horne/2824 E. Mission Lane/Phoenix, AZ 85028
 Mike Howard/3417 Baring St./Philadelphia, PA 19104
- Douglas Hutchinson/254 S. Langa Ct./Saddle Brook, NJ 07662
 Donald E.M.Hylton/9602 Mines Av./Pico Rivera, CA 90660
 Richard & Iris Hyman/6697 No. Grande Drive/Boca Raton, FL 33433
 +Donald W. Jackanicz/3802 N. Kenneth Av./Chicago, IL 60641
 John A. Jackanicz/3802 N. Kenneth Av./Chicago, IL 60641
- William Jarrell III/208 Glenwood Trail/Southern Pines, NC 28387
 Ann Jepson/167 Mimosa Dr./Dayton, OH 45459
 Connie Jessen/2707 Pittsburgh St./Houston, TX 77005
 Edward M. Johnson/743 North Rush St./Chicago, IL 60611
 Frank E. Johnson, M.D./11941 Claychester Dr./Des Peres, MO 63131
- Andres Kaarik/Sorakersvagen 15/S 122 47 Enskede, Sweden
 M. Javed Khan/560 Riverside Dr. (2N)/NY NY 10027
 #Prof. Marvin Kohl/Dept. of Philosophy/State University College/
 Kenneth Korbin/1 Charles St./NY NY 10014
 Henry Kraus/5807 Topanga Canyon Blvd.(K202)/Woodland Hills, CA 91364
- Scott Kurhan/44 Cottontail Rd./Norwalk, CT 06854
 Prof. Paul Kurtz/Box 5, Central Park Station/ Buffalo, NY 14215
 Corliss Lamont, Ph.D./315 W. 106th St./NY NY 10025
 Herbert C. Lansdell, Ph.D./8412 Harker Dr./Potomac, MD 20854
 Harry P. Larson/1550 Tenth Av./San Diego, CA 92101
- Philip M. Le Compte, M.D./125 Jackson St./Newton Centre, MA 02159
 Herman Lefkowitz/49 Kingsland St./Nutley, NJ 07110
 Justin D. Leiber, Ph.D./Dept. of Philosophy/U. of Houston/
 Cullen Blvd./Houston, TX 77004
 Gladys Leithauer, Ph.D./122 Elm Park/Pleasant Ridge, MI 48069
 Jon Leizman/St. John's College/Annapolis, MD 21404
- John R. Lenz/317 W. 100th St.(4F)/NY NY 10025
 Dr. H. W. Lessing/50 F.Cornwall Gardens/London S.W.7 England
 Martin Lipin/7724 Melita Av./N. Hollywood, CA 91605
 Christopher B. Liston/34 University Ct./Normal, IL 61761
 John M. Liston/805 Verde Vista/Visalia, CA 93277
- Don Loeb/1738 Murfin Av.(8)/Ann Arbor, MI 48105
 Robert Lombardi/209 Hutchinson Av.(1)/Buffalo, NY 14215
 George S. Lulos, Jr./Temple Team/APO NY 09090
 Susana Ida Maggi/Room 1457/United Nations/PO Box 20, NY NY 10163
 John M. Mahoney/Dept. of Psychology/Virginia Commonwealth
 University/Richmond, VA 23284
- Michael H. Malin/2235 Line Lexington Rd./Hatfield, PA 19440
 +Steve Maragides/2438 Pine St./Granite City, IL 62040
 Calvin F. McCaulay/470 Dundas St.(701)/London, Canada N6B 1W3
 Richard A. McCoun/56 Oak Meadow Dr./Yorba Linda, CA 92686
 William McKenzie-Goodrich/77 Pine St. (110)/Portland, ME 04102
- #James E. McWilliams/624 Ceylon/Eagle Pass, TX 78852
 Peter Medley/2571 N. Humboldt Blvd./Milwaukee, WI 53212
 Theo Meijer/Box 93/Abbotsford, B.C./Canada V2S 4N8
 Joseph Mennen/Tulane Medical Center/1430 Tulane(Box A-51)/
 New Orleans, LA 70112
 Scott Miller/140 Ocean Parkway (5B)/Brooklyn, NY 11218
- Dietrich R. Moeller/272 Beechlawn Dr./Waterloo
 Canada N2L 5W7
 Mary Lou Moore/414 5th Av SW/Puyallup, WA 98371
 +Prof. Hugh S. Moorhead/Northeastern Illinois University/
 Dr. Frank L. Muehlmann/5240 N. 2nd St./Philadelphia, PA 19120
 Kenneth J. Mylott/1380 SW 4th St./Boca Raton, FL 33432
- Kazuyoshi Nagaki/1252 Warner St. (6)/Chico, CA 95926
 Joseph Nechvatal/18 N. Moore St./NY NY 10013
 Philip Watson Obika/Caixa Postal 7540/Sao Paulo CEP 01000
 Brazil
 Jan Oorburg/23 Grote Markt/9712 HR Groningen/The Netherlands
 Frank V. Page/19755 Henry Rd./Fairview Park, OH 44126
- Robert Patrick/1405 N. Main (247)/San Antonio, TX 78212
 *Prof. David Pears/Christ Church/Oxford, England OX1 1DP
 Karin E. Peterson/Grinnell College(Box 5.4)/Grinnell, IA 50112
 Prof. Richard P. Pharis/Biology Dept./University of
 Calgary/Calgary, Canada T2N 1N4
 Gregory Pollock/School of Social Science/University of
 California/Irvine, CA 92717
- *Sir Karl R. Popper/Fallowfield, Manor Close/Manor Road/
 Penn, Buckinghamshire, England HP10 8HZ
 Sarah Primm/PO Box 195/Colorado Springs, CO 80901
 Richard W. Pyle/475 Sherwood Dr.(305)/Sausalito, CA 94165
- +Jack Ragsdale/4461 23rd St./San Francisco, CA 94114
 +Stephen J. Reinhardt/2401 Pennsylvania Av.(202)/
 Wilmington, DE 19806
 Don Roberts, Ph.D./Dept. of Philosophy/University of
 Waterloo/Waterloo, Canada N2L 3G1
 Vera Roberts/105 Ridgeview North/1200 Gitzel St./
 Yellowknife, NWT, Canada X1A 2C6
 Thomas F. Rolfsen/306 Diamond St./San Francisco, CA 94114
- +Prof. Harry Ruja/4664 Troy Lane/La Mesa, CA 92041
 +Cherie Ruppe/17114 N.E. 2nd Place/Bellevue, WA 98008
 *Conrad Russell/History Dept./Yale University/New Haven,
 CT 06520
 *Dora Black Russell/Carn Voel nr. Penzance/Cornwall, England
 *The Earl Russell/Carn Voel nr. Penzance/Cornwall, England
- Janet M. Russell/18 E. Bridge St.(A)/Dublin, OH 43017
 Joseph P. Russell/55 Strawberry Lane/Nordland, WA 98358
 Sigrid Saal/939 Timber Trail Lane/Cincinnati, OH 45224
 Anthony St. John/Apartado 51357, Sabana Grande 1050/
 Caracas, Venezuela
 Timothy S. St. Vincent/240 W. Emerson St./Melrose, MA 02176
- Nathan U. Salmon, Ph.D./Dept of Philosophy/University of
 California/Riverside, CA 92521
 Wayne E. Sangster/7325 Booth/Prairie Village, KS 66208
 Matthew Santoro/43-10 49th St./Sunnyside, NY 11104
 Robert Sass/3067 Retallack St./Regina, Canada S4S 1T3
 Gregory J. Scammell/Colonial Crest/Markland Road/
 Lafayette, NY 13084
- *+Prof. Paul Arthur Schilpp/Dept. of Philosophy/Southern
 Illinois University/Carbondale, IL 62901
 Leonard S. Schwartz/4520 Sendero Place/Tarzana, CA 91356
 John S. Schwenk/RD 2/Garrison, NY 10524
 Richard Shore/1502 Dakota Dr.(34) Fargo, ND 58102
 John Shosky/Communication/Box 3341 -- University Station/
 University of Wyoming/Laramie, WY 82071
- David Shulman/7 Arnold Av./Somerville, MA 02143
 Beverly Smith/74 Montaine Park/Rochester, NY 14617
 #Carol R. Smith/10427 - 67th Av.S./Seattle, WA 98178
 +Warren Allen Smith/1435 Bedford St.(10A)/Stamford, CT 06905
 John E. Sonntag/101 G St., SW(A313)/Washington, DC 20024

Carl Spadoni, Ph.D./Assistant Archivist/Russell Archives/
McMaster University/Hamilton, Canada L8S 4L6
Dr. Paul A. Spengler/146 Cloverside Dr./West Seneca, NY 14224
Herbert A. Stahl, Ph.D./7307 Montidello Blvd./Springfield, VA 22150
John Stamper/1856 Westbrook Rd./Dayton, OH 45415
Philip Stander, Ed.D./Dept. Behavioral Sciences/Kingsborough
Community College/Brooklyn, NY 11235

Thomas J. Stanley/Box 366/Hartford, VT 05047
Vaughn C. & Dolores J. Sterling/15615 Hilliard Rd./Lakewood,
OH 44107
Joyce R. Strassberg/664 Radcliffe Av./Pacific Palisades, CA 90272
Prof. Roland N. Stromberg/7033 Fairchild Circle/Fox Point,
WI 53217
Jack B. Suconik/115 Linden/Elmhurst, IL 60126

Glenn W. Sunderland/Elderberry Road/RR 1 - Box 275/Newton,
IL 62448
Ramon Carter Suzara/666 Ellis St. (102)/San Francisco, CA 94109
Capt. Michael H. Taint/2025 Shroyer Rd./Oakwood, OH 45419
+Katharine Tait/46 Dunster St./Cambridge, MA 02138
W. Bruce Taylor/8103 Eastern Av. (B-307)/Silver Spring, MD 20910

James V. Terry/PO Box 7702/Stanford, CA 94305
Bruce Thompson/82 Topping Drive/Riverhead, NY 11901
Keith Thompson/905 W. Franklin (14)/Minneapolis, MN 55405
John R. Tobin/867 E. Howard St./Pasadena, CA 91104
Roy E. Torcaso/3708 Brightview St./Wheaton, MD 20902

Daniel Torres/c/o J.C. Wilson/27 Oakwood Dr/Wayne, NJ 07470
T. S. Trimurti/567 18th St., TNBH Korattur/Madras 600080, India
Jimmie A. Tucker/PO Box 46587/Pass-A-Grille Beach, FL 33741
Patricia Turner/1022 S. Crescent Heights/Los Angeles, CA 90035
Roy L Twiddy/PO Box 138/Coinjock, NC 27923

Richard Tyson/R4 Box 83/Greenville, KY 42345
Hamid Umer/360 E. 72nd St. (2202)/NY NY 10021
Rudolph Urmersbach/Bldg. I, Apt. 12/140 Camelot/Saginaw, MI 48603
Armando Valentin/487 Carlton Av. (23C)/Brooklyn, NY 11238
William & Elizabeth Valentine/315 S. Main/Eaton Rapids, MI 48827

(41b) Additions to the above list:

Priscilla F. Callaway/400 Mansion House (712)/St. Louis, MO 63102
Alice L. Darlington/Avenida Toluca 537-8/Mexico 20, D.F. Mexico
Lt. Robert J. Delle/1st FSSG H&S BN SERV CO DISBC/Camp
Pendleton, CA 92055
Pradeep Kumar Dubey/19 Prince House, U. of Massachusetts,
Anna B. Keeling/2319 Preston/Pasadena, TX 99503

Eleanor Valentine/5900 Second Place, N.W./Washington, DC 20011
Arnold Vanderlinden/108 Cameron Crescent/Pointe Claire,
Canada H9R 4E1
John Van Wissen/RR 2/Alliston, Canada L0M 1A0
Fernando Vargas/130 W. 42nd St. (551)/NY NY 10036
Norman Veve/G.P.O. Box G-1960/San Juan, PR 00936

Stephen W. Visk/2638 11th St./Rockford, IL 61109
Major Herbert G. (ret) & Elizabeth Vogt/2101 S. Atlantic
Av./Cocoa Beach, FL 32931
Paul Walker/RR Box 181/Blaisburg, IA 50034
Rob & Ann Wallace/1502 S. Oregon Circle/Tampa, FL 33612
Mark Weber/229 Pueblo Dr./Salinas, CA 93906

Denise Weiland/11, rue Constantin/13100 Aix-en-Provence, France
Donna Weimer/327 Harris Dr./State College, PA 16801
Charles L Weyand/17066 Los Modelos/Fountain Valley, CA 92708
John A. Wilhelm/4600 71st St./La Mesa, CA 92041
Carolyn Wilkinson, M.D./1242 Lake Shore Dri/Chicago, IL 60610

Mike Williams/UVM MSH #53/Winooski, VT 05404
Vincent Defaux Williams/PO Box 1197/San Antonio, TX 78294
Jeffrey & Janet Wilson/1318 Wesley/Evanston, IL 60201
Rabbi Sherwin T. Wine/555 South Woodward/Birmingham, MI 48011
Mike Wirth/33 Park Av./Dansville, NY 14437

Dan Wray/2131 Cahuenga Blvd. (22)/Hollywood, CA 90028
Hobart F. Wright/Route 2, Box 38/Rural Retreat, VA 24368
Ronald H. Yuccas/641 Sunset Dr./Naperville, IL 60540
Keith W. Yundt/3716 Ranfield Rd. (1)/Kent, OH 44240
Terry & Judith Zaccone/13046 Anza Dr./Saratoga, CA 95070

Please check your name and notify us of any errors.

This list is only for the personal use of members
in communicating with one another.

RR VIEWED BY CONTEMPORARIES

(42) Norman Cousin's not-exactly-favorable assessment, in his book "Human Options" (New York: Norton, 1981) pp. 124-5:

BERTRAND RUSSELL: spare, crusty, pipe-smoking. He climbed the heights of mathematical and philosophical abstractions as did few other intellectual figures of his time. He leaned heavily on the work of Alfred North Whitehead and Ludwig Wittgenstein, or at least that portion of their work that broke with traditional thought. He became deeply involved in political and moral issues and had even more influence outside England than in his own homeland. Personally, he could be playful and even impish. Those of his friends who expected him to be quixotic and inconsistent were seldom disappointed. In the company of other eminent intellects he could be uncommunicative at times to the point of inarticulateness. When he met Albert Schweitzer for the first time at the home of a mutual friend in London, what was expected to be an historic intellectual encounter turned out to be an epic non-event. Russell commented on the weather, which in London has seldom made for

exciting conversation. Schweitzer nodded affably. Absolute silence and small talk alternated for the next few minutes, then Russell looked at his watch and said it was time to leave for the country. If Schweitzer felt deprived because the discussion did not turn on Russell's favorite themes—agnosticism, equality of the sexes, non-totalitarian socialism, and free love—he carefully concealed his loss. Russell's antipathy to orthodoxy and his talent for intricate grammar were perhaps never better demonstrated than in his *Our Knowledge of the External World*, when he wrote: "The one and only condition, I believe, which is necessary in order to secure for philosophy in the near future an achievement that surpasses all that has hitherto been accomplished by philosophers, is the creation of a school of men with scientific training and philosophical interests, unhampered by the traditions of the past, and not misled by the literary methods of those who copy the ancients in all except their merits."

LAST MINUTE ITEMS

- (43) Volunteer NOT wanted, in spite of what we said in (27). The new Co-Chairman of the Membership Committee will be Carol R. Smith, of Seattle.

Carol had volunteered for the job in 1981 shortly after it had gone to Jacqueline Berthon-Payon. So, while we were preparing the "volunteer wanted" item (27) for this newsletter, we also wrote to Carol asking if she still wanted the post. She did (and does), we are happy to say.

We are most grateful to Jacqueline, who handled the responsibilities with speed and sensitivity. We doff our hat! We are greatly indebted.

INDEX

- (44) Introductory (1). President Jackanicz reports (1.5). Vice-President Bob Davis reports (2). Treasurer Dennis Darland reports (3). Science Committee report (4). "Principia Mathematica" and computers (5). BR smeared (6). '83 Doctoral Grant announcement (7). Short sketch of BR (8). Nobel scientists ask atom freeze (9). Buchwald on winnable nuclear war (10). Museum of Philosophy moves (11). Creationism: Americans split (12); NYC bars anti-evolution textbooks (13); creationism-Lysenko parallel (14); book derides creationism (20). Dora: "The Soul of Russia..." (1981 (16a), 1921 (16b)). News about members: Cleavelin (17a), Gividen (17b). New members (18). New addresses (19). Erickson's book on radical right reviewed (21). Books wanted, to borrow (22). Donors thanked (23). Donations solicited (24). Result of ballot: directors elected (25a); \$2.50 dues hike carries (25b). All dues due 1/1/83 (26). Volunteer wanted (27). RSN pages missing? (28). For sale: stationery (29), BR postcard (30), from Spokesman Books (31), from BRS Library (32). HASD credo (33), BR birthday rally (34). Hemlock's "Assisted Suicide" (35). "Guided Tour", Act I (36). 3 errors in Item 8 (37). Merv Griffin interview (38). BR on Gilbert Murray (39). Hofstadter on Gödel and "Principia Mathematica" (40). Membership list (41a, 41b). Norman Cousins on BR (42). Volunteer NOT wanted (43). Index (44). BRS at APA, Baltimore, December 28 (45).
-

PHILOSOPHERS' CORNER

- (45) BRS at APA, December 28, Baltimore. The BRS session at the annual convention of the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division) is scheduled for 10 A.M. The convention is spread over 3 hotels, all near each other in downtown Baltimore: Hyatt Regency, Baltimore Hilton, and Lord Baltimore. We don't know which one will house the BRS session. It will be listed in the lobbies. (It will also be listed in the November issue of "Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association", not available at this writing.) BRS Philosophy Committee Chairman ED HOPKINS suggests getting there at about 9 A.M. to pick up literature and find out where to be at 10 A.M. Our previous issue provided the BRS program (RSN35-8).