

Russell Society News  
No. 39  
August 1983

- (1) Highlights: Volunteer needed (32). 1983 Meeting, at McMaster (2,38,39). Using the BRS name (2c). Human Rights Committee request (4). Science Committee request (5). BR Editorial Project (9). BR misrepresented (10). BR on warmongers (11). BR Film Project (14). BRS Doctoral Grant awarded (17). 2 nuclear freeze letters (23). Page's good idea (29). Membership list (43). Index (44). Ballot (45). An asterisk in the left column indicates a request.

1983 MEETING, AT MCMASTER

- (2) This report on McMaster 1983 is in 3 parts. Part 1: the Conference. Part 2: the BRS Annual Meeting. Part 3: the BRS Board Meeting. It all occurred June 24-26.
- (2a) Part 1, the Conference. In all previous BRS meetings the programs — speakers, topics, films — have been arranged by the BRS itself; but in the '83 meeting, the program was arranged by the sponsors of the Conference. The Conference was on BR's early "humanist" writings (1888-1918). Here is the program:

Programme

The first of two conferences sponsored by the Bertrand Russell Editorial Project (McMaster University) and the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology (University of Toronto). Part II will be a conference on Russell's technical writings up to 1922 held in Toronto late in June 1984.		<b>Saturday</b>	<b>Sunday</b>
		9:00-10:00	9:30-10:00
		Andrew Brink Department of English and Russell Editorial Project McMaster University	Coffee
		<i>Bertrand Russell's Conversion of 1901</i>	10:00-11:00
			Peter Clarke St. John's College Cambridge University
<b>Friday</b>		10:00-10:30	<i>Bertrand Russell and the Dimensions of Edwardian Liberalism</i>
12:50	Richard A. Rempel, Coordinator Bertrand Russell Editorial Project		
		10:30-11:30	11:00-12:00
		Kirk Willis Department of History University of Georgia	Thomas C. Kennedy Department of History University of Arkansas
		<i>The Evolution of Bertrand Russell's Early Religious Beliefs, 1888-1914</i>	<i>To Nourish Life or Minister to Death: Bertrand Russell and the Twentieth-Century Peace Movement</i>
1:00-2:00	S. P. Rosenbaum Department of English University of Toronto	11:30-1:00	12:00
	<i>Bertrand Russell and the Bloomsbury Group</i>	Free time for lunch	Closing remarks and farewell
2:00-2:30	Coffee	1:00-2:00	
		Nicholas Griffin Department of Philosophy and Russell Editorial Project McMaster University	
2:30-3:30	Gladys G. Leithauser Department of English University of Michigan—Dearborn	<i>Bertrand Russell's Crisis of Faith</i>	
	<i>The Romantic Russell and the Legacy of Shelley</i>	2:00-2:30	
3:30-4:00	Coffee		
		2:30-3:30	
4:00-5:00	Carl Spadoni Bertrand Russell Archives McMaster University	Harry Ruja Department of Philosophy San Diego State University	
	<i>Russell and Aesthetics</i>	<i>Russell on the Meaning of "Good"</i>	
6:00	Barbecue at the Faculty Club	3:30-4:30	
		Brian Harrison Corpus Christi College Oxford University	
		<i>Bertrand Russell: The False Consciousness of a Feminist</i>	
Free evening: general meeting of the Bertrand Russell Society		7:00	Buffet banquet at Richard Rempel's home

The large audience, that filled the auditorium in Gilmour Hall, seemed to like what it heard. The applause that followed each talk confirmed that impression.

32 BRS members were there: KEN BLACKWELL, ANDREW BRINK, WHITFIELD & POLLY COBB, JACK COWLES, DENNIS DARLAND, BOB DAVIS, LEE EISLER, PAUL GARWIG, MARY GIBBONS, DAVID GOLDMAN, DAVID HART, DON JACKANICZ, JOHN JACKANICZ, MARVIN KOHL, GLADYS LEITHAUSER, JOHN LENZ, BOB LOMBARDI, STEVE MARAGIDES, JIM MCWILLIAMS, FRANK PAGE, PAUL PFALZNER, STEVE REINHARDT, HARRY RUJA, CARL SPADONI, TOM STANLEY, KATE TAIT, JOHN VAN WISSEN, HERB & BETTY VOGT, ROB WALLACE, CAROLYN WILKINSON.

If that looks like a record number (which it is), let us not puff up with pride too much; that number is not as good as it looks. Some of those BRS members are affiliated with McMaster, or participated in the Conference, and would have been there in any case.

We never have as many members at Annual Meetings as we would like. Attending meetings is never inexpensive, and can be quite expensive for members who have to travel far. All in all we can say that we had a pretty good turnout for the '83 meeting, a little better than average, including some long-time members who came to an Annual Meeting for the first time, and later told us they were very glad they had come.

(2b) Part 2, the BRS Annual Meeting. Here are highlights. More details are provided in the Minutes (38).

- . President Jackanicz voiced the BRS's feelings of great gratitude toward BOB DAVIS for 8 years of notable service as BRS President, 1975-1982. This was followed by great applause.
- . President Jackanicz reported that the BRS had moved from Georgia to Illinois.
- . Treasurer Dennis Darland reported that the present bank balance is \$3364.69.
- . VP/Information Lee Eisler asked members to remember to send him relevant items they come across in their reading, for possible inclusion in the newsletter.
- . President Jackanicz read Jack Ragsdale's letter asking the BRS to endorse a nuclear freeze. (The Board later took action on this. See (23,39))
- . VP/Information Lee Eisler asked that the BRS undertake to gather incidents in BR's life that would lend themselves to a movie on BR. This was approved.

(2c) Part 3, the Board of Directors' Meeting. Here are highlights. More details are in the Minutes (39).

- . The Board appointed (or re-appointed) the following officers: Donald W. Jackanicz, President; Marvin Kohl, Vice-President; Dennis J. Darland, Treasurer; Cherie Ruppe, Secretary; Robert K. Davis, Vice-President/Special Projects; Lee Eisler, Vice-President/Information.
- . The 1984 Annual Meeting will coincide with the 2nd year of the Conference, in June, at the University of Toronto. This Conference will be on BR's technical writings. The BRS will offer a program to provide BRS members with an alternative to the Conference's technical talks.
- . Jack Ragsdale, BRS Assistant Librarian, was named Librarian.
- . Bob Davis, VP/Special Projects, will investigate the possibility of an Annual Meeting in England in 1985.
- . Regarding use of the BRS name by members: BRS members' stationery may be used by members for any purpose, except that they are not to speak on behalf of the BRS unless authorized by the President or Board; members may say, when writing letters, that they are members of the BRS; official BRS stationery is to be used only for official BRS business.
- . A freeze resolution was adopted, to be sent to Presidents Reagan and Andropov (23).

#### REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

(3) President Don Jackanicz reports:

Those of you who attended the Annual Meeting at McMaster University need not be reminded by me of how successful and pleasant it was. The planning done by the Conference's sponsors at McMaster University and the University of Toronto resulted in a very rewarding weekend. I offer congratulations to all those responsible for this memorable occasion.

This would turn into a much longer account, were I to report fully on the actions taken at McMaster; but since they are covered elsewhere in this newsletter, especially in the Minutes (38,39), I will say no more — except to urge all members to try to come to next year's meeting, June 1984 in Toronto.

(3.5) Acting Secretary Steve Maragides' report consists of the Minutes of the Annual Meeting (38) and the Minutes of the Board of Directors' Meeting (39).

#### REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

(4) Human Rights Committee (Alex Dely, Chairman):

(Don Jackanicz recently appointed Alex Chairman of this Committee, which has been inactive for some time. Ed.)

I was shocked recently to get an American Association for the Advancement of Science report detailing how several thousand professionals were illegally detained last year alone in over 30 countries. This is not generally known; Sakharov's plight is one of the few well-known cases.

Early in June I wrote to about 25 human rights organizations. I also wrote to those who had contacted me last year in connection with a human rights packet offer. I suggested we might network, exchange newsletters, and possibly get more BRS members directly involved in heavy duty international politics. The returns are coming in. One kind aims to help individuals, as Amnesty International does. The other kind is more general and aims at influencing Congressional policies towards nations. I hope we can combine them. I'll be glad to compile a packet of information about 40 U.S. groups, from which BRS members can select a group they would like to work with in particular geographical areas.

I would like to call our Committee the "BRS Human Rights and International Development Committee". For about 3 years I have been associated with Volunteers in Technical Assistance (VITA), in Virginia, as well as

with similar efforts in the American Physical Society. The purpose is to act as consultant to Third World projects free of charge in areas of our expertise. VITA has 10,000 members but is still swamped. Most Third World projects are simple, and based on renewable energy technologies familiar to most hobbyists and Popular Mechanics readers. I thought the BRS could carve out a niche for itself by compiling a skills bank, and advertising its existence to trade/scientific groups, embassies, etc.

I took the liberty of writing to 40 embassies of the poorest nations of Africa, Asia and Central/South America, and announced the BRS International Development Group's (i.e., my) availability in areas of hazardous waste disposal, solar/wind/biomass energy, and similar alternative technologies in agriculture. I have University of Arizona friends who will help. I wrote late in June and already received responses from the Guatemalan Embassy and a detailed package from the World Bank. Any BRS hobbyist, educator, etc., who can write or translate manuals or instructional aids, who can design or find something already in the literature, who can serve as US representative to education/trade groups of Third World nations, or can help process paperwork necessary for many grants/services available from the U.S., the U.N., etc., can be of help.

Ultimately we can be part of a network of technical help to these countries, which will earn us good will and give us leverage when we demand human rights compliance.

- \* Please let Alex know about your skills, for listing in the skills bank. Write Alex Dely, 6150 E. 31st St., Tucson, AZ 85711

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

We have written 6 Congressional Briefing Papers in the past 6 months, four of them on ARMS/Accidental War. We have targeted about 50 key members of Congress (on the House Foreign Affairs, Senate Foreign Relations, House and Senate Armed Services Committees), the Pentagon, and scientific public interest organizations.

- \* We hope to persuade Congress to create a Congressional Assessment Center for Accidental War. Although we (Dean Babst and I) have received close to 100 replies, we would achieve a much greater result if BRS members would write their Senators and Congressmen. Here's how to do it:

On the next page is reproduced (in reduced size) our 4-page statement, CONGRESSIONAL ASSESSMENT CENTER FOR ACCIDENTAL WAR. It was prepared by the BRS Science Committee at Congressional request. We urge members to make 3 photocopies of it, to send to their 2 Senators and their Congressman, with a covering letter asking them to sponsor/support a motion to create an Assessment Center, and saying that the attached statement tells why it deserves their support.

When we read the 4-page statement, it shook us up. When you read it, we think you'll know why you won't want to put off writing your 3 people in Congress one day longer than necessary! It's scary.

- \* Alex would appreciate it if, after you send your letters off to Congress, you send him a postcard giving the names of the people you wrote to.

PHILOSOPHERS' CORNER

(6) BRS at APA, 1982. Philosophers' Committee Chairman, David E. Johnson, reports:

The winter meeting of The Bertrand Russell Society in conjunction with the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division) was held in Baltimore, Maryland, on December 28, 1982 at 10:00 A.M. in the new convention center. The session, consisting of 2 papers on the philosophy of Russell, with commentary and discussion, was chaired by David Johnson, the newly selected Chairman of the BRS Philosophers' Committee. Audience size fluctuated from 10 to 30. There was lively participation by those in the audience in the times allotted to discussion, and the overall reaction to the session was distinctly favorable.

Robert Ginsberg of the Delaware County campus of Pennsylvania State University delivered the first paper, entitled "The Social Contract in Bertrand Russell's Theory of Statehood and War." Ginsberg argued that although Russell criticized the contract theory of statehood in Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau as a rationalist distortion and myth, he adopts contract terms in his own analyses of anarchy and international relations. When Russell discusses the problem of eliminating war from the world, he projects a worldwide Social Contract. The commentator, Thomas Benson of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, pointed out that Russell was not a thorough-going pacifist and that what Russell had to say about world government was hardly philosophically dramatic or profound.

Stephen Nathanson of Northeastern University focused his paper — "Mysticism and Motivation in Russell's Philosophy" — on Ronald Jager's argument (in The Development of Bertrand Russell's Philosophy) that religious ideas and motivations were central to Russell's thought. Jager specifically claims that Russell's move toward a logical constructionist analysis of the physical world was motivated by a desire to overcome the hostile, overpowering image of nature put forward by Russell in "A Free Man's Worship". Nathanson argued that Russell found no religious consolation in the reduction of "omnipotent matter" and the "empire of chance" to logical constructions out of sense data. Rather, his motive was to render empirical

-1-

"The good life is one inspired by love and guided by knowledge"

## THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.

## CONGRESSIONAL ASSESSMENT CENTER FOR ACCIDENTAL WAR\*

The greatest danger to the security of the United States and the World is a nuclear war starting accidentally or unintentionally. Despite the increasing vast sums being spent on defense, the probability of our accidental destruction is growing. As weapons become more powerful, complex, numerous, accurate, widespread and time for error correction decreases, the probability of an accidental war increases. An intentional war is unlikely since in all probability it would be to commit suicide.

Since accidental destruction is our greatest peril, Congress needs an Accidental War Assessment Center to assess planned major weapons systems or policy changes. Congress needs to determine whether each planned change detracts more from our security than it adds.

There are many weapons policy questions that need answers. We raise only one issue to illustrate the type of assessment needed. If Pershing II missiles are placed in Europe at the end of 1983, as planned, the possibility of an accidental war will be greatly increased for the following reasons.

- The time allowed the Soviets for correcting for false alarms in their strategic warning system will be reduced to about 6 minutes, according to some sources.
- If the Soviet Union has false alerts that take longer than 6 minutes to clear, then we could be forcing them to destroy us and themselves by accident.

While no one doubts there is danger of a false alarm war, the extent of the danger is what needs to be carefully assessed. For example, if it develops that there is a very high probability of an accidental war in 1984, then much of our long-term \$14.5 trillion defense build-up may be not only irrelevant but counterproductive. This could be so, because we are misdirecting our prevention efforts in what little time we have left.

There is no reason why we should proceed in ignorance as to how high the probability of a false alarm war is because the issue can be broken down into answerable questions. The following questions and responses illustrate the type of service the assessment center could provide.

\*This statement was prepared for the record at the invitation of the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Wash., D.C., June 1983.

-3-

Joint Chiefs of Staff. Continued inability to correct these failings by the highest levels within the Department of Defense will continue to perpetuate past mistakes and will undermine any chance that an effective attack warning or command and communication system can be installed by 1990."

Other nations do not provide any information on their false alarms. This secrecy could be greatly contributing to a false sense of security.

5. Question: If Pershing II missiles are deployed in Europe, would U.S.S.R. go to launch-on-warning?  
Response: Does it make any difference, if the Soviets allow themselves only 6 minutes for error correction and one of their false alerts last longer?
6. Question: Why should Soviets become alarmed with our deployment of Pershing II in Europe since it does not represent a first-strike threat?  
Response: If their warning system indicates they are being attacked, they could be expected to respond. Why would we expect them to only respond to a first-strike? How would they know it is not the beginning of a first-strike?
7. Question: Would not Europe expect the U.S. to meet its commitments to deploy as planned?  
Response: If a thorough analysis shows that deployment of Pershing IIs means a high probability of a false alarm war, who would insist on deployment?
8. Question: What about false alarms in other nations' warning systems?  
Response: Considering the problems in the U.S. warning system, it is urgent we ask other nations to share with all nations their false alarm experience for their own safety. The security of all nations may be dependent upon the nation with the least accurate warning system. If a nuclear missile exchange occurs between any two nations it will be difficult to limit the number of nations involved, given the uncertainty in knowing from where the missiles come. This danger is increasing as the number of nations with nuclear weapons grows. How long can our luck last?

We are urging in our books on accidental war that the Soviets, for their own safety, irrespective of arms control talks, pull back their missiles allowing Western Europe more time for error correction. Since the French are only a few minutes away from the Soviets, they have little time for error correction. How error free is the French warning system?

-2-

1. Question: What is the actual time allowed Soviets for error correction if Pershing II missiles are deployed?

Response: The Soviets say they would only be allowed five to seven minutes and some western analysts say 11 to 14 minutes (Newsweek 5-30-83). Other western analysts say 6 minutes, such as Arthur Cox in Russian Roulette. Robert Aldridge, a missile expert and author of First Strike, in a letter to us said, "Pershing -2s will reduce any resolution of their false alarms to 6 minutes." He also provided excellent supporting evidence.

Since the time for error correction is a key question, Alex Dely has asked the American Physical Society to help assess the issue further. He is a member of their study on the Vulnerability of Land-based Missiles Systems, which is considering the issue. Accurate information is essential to the security of all nations.

2. Question: What is the U.S.S.R.'s false alarm experience?

Response: According to Senator Gary Hart, "No one in the United States knows with any degree of confidence how reliable Soviet personnel and computers are."

3. Question: Can we estimate what the Soviet's false alarm experience is?

Response: If the Soviet's experience is similar to ours, there is a high possibility within one or two years that they will not have enough time to correct one of their false alarms if we only allow them 6 minutes. The most complete and systematic investigation of U.S. false alarms was made by Senators Gary Hart and Barry Goldwater in 1980. They discovered during an 18-month period that our strategic warning system had 147 false alarms, one of which lasted 6 minutes. It is generally agreed that the Soviet's system is not as accurate as ours.

4. Question: What is a reliable source of information on U.S. false alarm problems?

Response: According to the Department of Defense replies to our inquiry, they assure us that the U.S. false alarm problems are under control. Copies of these 1983 letters are available upon request. However, Jack Brooks chaired a Congressional investigation of this problem in 1981 which shows a different situation. Their 1982 report NOBAD Computer Systems Are Dangerously Obsolete says, "The severe and potentially catastrophic deficiencies found in the Nation's missile attack warning system are a result of significant and long-term management failings within the Air Force and the

-4-

There are many more accidental war questions that need to be assessed. Since there is a need to move quickly, Congress could set up a temporary Accidental War Assessment Center. As the Center proves its ability to provide meaningful help to Congress, eventually part of it could be placed in some agency such as the National Peace Academy.

Since the problem of an accidental war is far larger than any one agency, the Center should be a Congressional agency to provide an overview for the following reasons.

- In view of the large disparity between how the Department of Defense and Congressional Investigation assess the NOBAD false alarm problems, it is essential that Congress be assessing accidental war dangers independently.
- Pentagon officials asked Senator Gary Hart to hold off indefinitely having his proposed hearing (September 1983) on Accidental War as they are worried about a scare. The public needs to know accurately the dangers they face so that they can respond appropriately.

Senator Sam Nunn, in a letter (Feb. 15, 1983) to us, said the Secretary of Defense is expected to submit a study on initiatives to contain and control the use of nuclear weapons. The Senator said he "hopes that this will provide Congress and the Administration with a sound analytical framework to focus on ways to reduce the possibility of accidental war and thereby enhance stability." We are greatly pleased to learn of such a development and hope it proceeds rapidly. Congress still needs its own Assessment Center for reasons cited above.

It seems to us that the Assessment Center should be a small, sensitive, coordinating group. It could never hope to answer the many complex problems alone. The Center needs to work closely with other agencies as well as trying to obtain help from other nations in assessing common danger, e.g. what are other nations' false alarm and accident experiences. The assessment procedure should be operational in nature and must not stray from its focus on accidental war prevention.

The Assessment Center needs to provide quick answers with the best data available. It should share its reports widely and seek constructive criticism from all who are interested in order to achieve the utmost accuracy quickly. The reports need to be clear, concise and state limitations. The cost of the Assessment Center would be minuscule compared with defense costs. Does it make sense for Congress to be expending hundreds of millions of dollars annually for defense and not have its own continuous overall assessment of the greatest threat to our existence, accurate, war?

This position paper was prepared by The Bertrand Russell Society's Science Committee. Dean Babst, Research Scientist, N.I. State (Ret.), 7915 Alma Mesa Way, Citrus Heights, CA 95610. Alex Dely, Physics Dept., Univ. of Ariz., Tucson, AZ 85724. June 8, 1983.

knowledge as certain as possible. However, Russell did find two facets of mysticism which applied to him: first, an emphasis on viewing things impersonally, and second, a tranquility which arose out of achieving the impersonal view of reality.

Alfred Guy of the University of Baltimore, in commenting on Nathanson's presentation, noted that mysticism was a motivating factor in Russell's philosophy in that, prior to seeking certainty about the empirical world, he must first come to wonder about the world as a whole. "To assume that the pursuit of empirical certainty is itself a worthwhile quest is not in itself an empirical certainty," Guy argued. He concluded by suggesting that Russell's talk about mysticism and logic may simply be another way of talking about love and reason. According to Russell, if you feel love, you have "a motive for existence, a guide in action, a reason for courage, an imperative necessity for intellectual honesty." (from The Impact of Science on Society, 1951)

(7) Call for papers. The following is inserted here merely for the record, since its deadline is long past.

The Bertrand Russell Society announces a call for papers to be presented at its meeting at the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in December 1983. Papers may be on any aspect of Russell's philosophy. They should have a reading time of about one-half hour and should be submitted in triplicate, typed and double-spaced, with an abstract of not more than 150 words. The name of the author, with his address and the title of his paper, should be submitted on a separate page. The submission deadline is May 15, 1983 and the papers should be sent to David E. Johnson, Chairman, Philosophers' Committee, The Bertrand Russell Society, Sampson Hall, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD 21402. Those desiring the return of their papers should enclose a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

#### ON EINSTEIN

(8) ER & Popper on Einstein. "Einstein, the Man and his Achievement", G. J. Whitrow, ed., (New York: Dover, 1973) is a transcript of 3 BBC programs (uh, programmes) (1967). They grew out of the idea that there ought to be "a program about Einstein and his work while there were people [still] available who had known him personally and would no doubt be glad to record their impressions both of the man and his achievement."

Here is what ER and Karl Popper had to say (pp. 22-28):

*Whitrow:* We have seen that, as a young man in Berne, Einstein often discussed famous philosophical works with his friends. Few philosophers, however, have made any serious attempt to study Einstein's work. One who has is Bertrand Russell. Recently we asked him if he thought that Einstein was a scientist whom philosophers should study.

*Russell:* Einstein's stature as a scientist was, and remains, very high. He removed the mystery from gravitation which everybody since Newton had accepted with a reluctant feeling that it was unintelligible. If Einstein's reputation has appeared to diminish, that is only because recent work in physics has been mainly concerned with quantum theory. I do not think that the work of our century in either relativity or quantum theory has had any very good influence upon philosophy, but I regard this as the fault of the philosophers, who, for the most part, have not thought it necessary to master modern physics. I hope that an increasing proportion of philosophers will, as time goes on, become aware that ignorance of physics condemns any philosophy to futility.

*Whitrow:* I am afraid that Bertrand Russell's criticism is still true of all too many philosophers. There are, however, some exceptions; one of them is Sir Karl Popper. I asked him to tell us something about the influence that Einstein has had on his own philosophy.

*Popper:* Einstein's influence on my thinking has been immense. I might even say that what I have done is mainly to make explicit certain points which are implicit in the work of Einstein. I will try to sum up in four points what I have learned from Einstein directly and indirectly:

(1) Even the best-established scientific theory, such as Newton's theory of gravitation or Fresnel's theory of light,

may be overthrown, or corrected, as Einstein has shown. Consequently, even the best-established scientific theory always remains a hypothesis, a conjecture.

(2) The recognition of this fact can be and should be of outstanding importance for one's own scientific work. It certainly was so for Einstein's work. He was never satisfied with any of the theories he proposed. He always tried to probe into the weak spots in order to find their limitations. And he did find them: again and again did he criticize his own work in his papers. For example, he began his famous paper of 1915 in which he first proposed the field equations for gravitation with the statement that some of his previous papers were utterly mistaken; and similarly he wrote in 1918, while replying to some criticism, that he had so far failed to distinguish between two different principles, and that his failure had led to confusion.

(3) This attitude, which may be called the critical attitude, is characteristic of the best scientific activity.

(4) With Einstein's work it became very clear that this attitude of criticism was in science something fundamentally different from what philosophers consider and describe as the 'critical attitude', or the 'sceptical attitude', or the 'attitude of doubt'.

*Whitrow:* Could you elaborate the difference between the critical attitude of scientists and of philosophers?

*Popper:* Yes. When philosophers speak of criticism they have in mind something like this. A philosopher, say Mr Adam, proposes a philosophical theory and tries to give arguments which would prove it or justify the claim that it is a true theory. Thereupon another philosopher, Mr Baker, analyses Mr Adam's proof and shows that it is invalid. Mr

(Baker's destructive analysis of the claims of Mr Adam to have established his theory is what philosophers usually have in mind when they speak of criticism. Or to put it another way: philosophers usually mean by criticism an analysis that aims at showing the invalidity of some arguments which have been offered in justification of the claim that a certain theory is true.

Now, it seems to have been rarely recognized that criticism in science has a very different aim and character. It is not an attack upon the proof or the justification of a scientific theory, but an attack upon the theory itself; not an attack on the claim that the theory can be *shown* to be true, but an attack on what the theory itself tells us – on its content or its *consequences*. This is so because, especially since Einstein, scientists do not seriously hold that their theories can be true or 'verified'. Nowadays they will hardly claim more than that one theory can explain more facts than other known theories, or the same facts better; that it can be tested at least as well as these other theories or even better; and that it stands up to these tests at least as well as these other theories.

This attitude became particularly clear in the case of Einstein's criticism of Newton. Newton, in fact, had claimed that his laws of motion were not conjectural but true descriptions (if not explanations) of the facts, and that they were established by induction. But Einstein, who was a great admirer of Newton, did not criticize this mistaken claim. He did something more important; he revolutionized physics by producing an alternative to Newton's theory which not only passed all the tests which Newton's theory had passed, but also certain tests which it had failed to pass, and a few further tests which altogether went beyond the range of application of Newton's theory of gravitation. Nevertheless, Einstein regarded his own theory of gravitation merely as a step towards a better theory. Thus he wrote about his own field equations of gravitation that, as a matter of course, he never thought for a moment that his formulation of the field equations was more than a makeshift, designed to present provisionally the general principle of relativity in a concise form. And at the end of his last work, published in 1955, when discussing the pros and cons of the final results of his 35 years' search for a generalized relativity theory of a unified continuous field, he wrote that one could give good reasons showing that, and why, reality cannot be at all be represented by a continuous field.

*Whitrow*: Could you now tell us how this critical attitude of Einstein's which you have described has influenced your own work?

*Popper*: The Einsteinian revolution has influenced my own views deeply: I feel that I would never have arrived at them without him. In my view it is fundamental to science that it consists of theories which are tentative, or hypothetical, or conjectural. This means that any theory may be overthrown, however successful it may have been, and however well it may have been tested. There can be no theory more spectacularly successful than Newton's; but Einstein showed that even Newton's theory was only a conjecture. Thus, what Einstein's example may teach the philosopher is that science consists of bold speculative guesses controlled by merciless criticism which includes experimental tests.

One point about Einstein which impressed me perhaps more than any other was this: Einstein was highly critical of his own theories, not only in the sense that he was trying to discover and point out their limitations, but also in the sense that he tried, with respect to every theory he proposed, to find under what conditions he would regard it as refuted by experiment. That is, he tried to derive from each theory predictions, testable by future experiments, which he regarded as

crucial for his theory, so that if his predictions were refuted he would give up the proposed theory. Thus while he regarded all physical theories – not only Newton's but also his own – as tentative guesses which might always be superseded by better ones, and which therefore could never be verified, he made it clear that he found it most important to specify the conditions which would make him look at his own theories as refuted or as falsified. This attitude became the basis of my own thesis of the logical asymmetry between verification and falsification or refutation: of the thesis that theories cannot be verified, but that they can be falsified.

Following Einstein's example, I tried at once to find out the limitations of this doctrine, and I was able to show how it was always possible to evade a refutation. But I also showed that the possibility of such an evasion did not destroy the thesis of the logical asymmetry between verification and falsification. And I pointed out that the readiness to eschew such evasions and to accept falsification was one of the basic characteristics of the critical or scientific attitude.

*Whitrow*: Could you give us an illustration?

*Popper*: Yes. I may perhaps illustrate this point by an example from Einstein's own career. When D. C. Miller, who had always been an opponent of Einstein, announced that he had overwhelming experimental evidence against special relativity. Einstein at once declared that if these results should be substantiated he would give up his theory. At the time some tests, regarded by Einstein as potential refutations, had yielded favourable results, and for this and other reasons many physicists were doubtful about Miller's alleged refutations. Moreover, Miller's results were regarded as quantitatively implausible. They were, one might say, neither here nor there. Yet Einstein did not try to hedge. He made it quite clear that, if Miller's results were confirmed, he would give up special relativity and, with it, general relativity also.

This readiness to give up one's theory in accordance with the verdict of experiments is most characteristic of Einstein. It characterizes not only his critical or scientific attitude, but what may be described as his scientific realism. Although he knew that it was always possible to uphold one's theoretical constructions against unfavourable experimental evidence, he was not interested in doing so. He believed in some objectively existing reality which he tried 'to catch in a wildly speculative way', to use his own words: he was not content to find some equations fitting the observations, but he tried to grasp, to understand, this reality behind the phenomena. Yet he would have found this wild attempt uninteresting unless he could submit it to the discipline of rigorous experimental tests.

This attitude of Einstein is even today far from being generally accepted. Physicists and philosophers still speak of the verification of predictions, and even of the experimental verification of theories. But experiments have always to be interpreted in the light of theories, and theories can never be verified but remain always conjectures, wild attempts to grasp, or to understand, the hidden reality behind the phenomenal world.

Einstein's own views on the philosophy of science changed considerably during the course of his life. In his earlier writings there are many traces of positivist and conventionalist ideas. Especially noticeable is the influence of Ernst Mach, and also that of the great mathematician Henri Poincaré, who was, indeed, one of the fathers of the special theory of relativity. Einstein said things which contributed much to the positivistic doctrines of 'operational definitions' and 'meaning analysis' – doctrines that were largely based on his own famous analysis

of simultaneity. In his later years, however, Einstein turned away from positivism and he told me that he regretted having given encouragement to an attitude that he now regarded not only as mistaken but as dangerous for the future development of both physical science and its philosophy. He saw more and more clearly that the growth of knowledge consisted in the formulation of theories which were far removed from observa-

tional experience. I admit, of course, that we attempt to control the purely speculative elements of our theories by ingenious experiments. Nevertheless, all our experiments are guided by theory and they cannot be interpreted except by theory. It is our inventiveness, our imagination, our intellect, and especially the use of our critical faculties in discussing and comparing our theories that make it possible for our knowledge to grow.

Here is ER again (pp. 89-91):

*Whitrow:* On the occasion of Einstein's seventieth birthday one of the most moving tributes that was paid to him was in a broadcast on the Third Programme by Bertrand Russell. He concluded by referring to Einstein's attempts after the war to work politically with American nuclear scientists to seek international agreement for the control of atomic energy. But this problem, as Russell wryly remarked, is more difficult than that of relativity. Bertrand Russell has specially recorded for our programme on Einstein this further tribute to his memory.

*Russell:* Of all the public figures that I have known, Einstein was the one who commanded my most whole-hearted admiration. I got to know him fairly well at a time when we were both at Princeton in the early forties. He arranged to have a little meeting at his house once a week at which there would be some one or two eminent physicists and myself. We used to argue about moot points in the philosophy of physics in an attempt, sometimes vain, to reach fundamental agreement. We did not, in those days, talk much about international politics, chiefly because in such matters we all thought alike. There was, however, one exceptional occasion. I remarked at a meeting that, when Germany had been defeated, the victors would lend money to the German Government and would forget the German crimes. Einstein indignantly repudiated the suggestion, but subsequent experience proved that on this occasion he was mistaken.

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS)

When, in the early fifties, the danger of nuclear war began to seem likely to cause universal ruin, I began to feel that this was a risk far greater and far more terrible than any of those with which governments were concerning themselves. I expressed my fears in a BBC broadcast on 23 December 1954. I sent the text of this to Einstein asking him whether he thought it possible that we could get scientists on both sides of the Iron Curtain to sign such a statement. He replied that he was too ill to work himself, but would gladly join me in signing any appeal on the subject that I might draw up and would suggest names of scientists to whom it might be sent.

I adapted the broadcast into a form of an appeal from scientists which I sent to certain eminent physicists including Einstein. After I had obtained a number of signatures from men of the highest scientific eminence, but not from Einstein, I learnt of his death during a flight from Rome to Paris. When I reached Paris, I found his letter agreeing to sign, dated two days before his death and the last public act of his life. This manifesto, known as the Russell-Einstein Manifesto because of the dramatic circumstances of Einstein's signing it, was the origin of the Pugwash Scientific Conferences.

Einstein was not only a great scientist, he was a great man. He stood for peace in a world drifting towards war. He remained sane in a mad world, and liberal in a world of fanatics.

#### ABOUT BR'S WRITINGS

(9) The Bertrand Russell Editorial Project, we've known for some time, is a gargantuan publishing undertaking — they are going to publish everything that ER ever wrote (except his books) — but we've known it only in a vague way. Vague no longer! What brings home the enormity of the project are some details on the sheet below: 28 volumes; one every 9 months (the standard gestation period); anticipated completion date of the final volume, the year 2000.

#### Publication Details

McMaster University is custodian of the Bertrand Russell Archives and is directing this vast editorial project.

Each of the twenty-eight volumes listed below will be bound in an attractive navy-blue cloth, with a gold-embossed profile of Russell on the front. Each volume will be supplied with a protective dust jacket. The first volume, *Cambridge Essays 1888-99*, will be published in Fall 1983 and, due to methods of working adopted by the editorial team, this will be followed by Volume 2, Russell's *Theory of Knowledge: the 1918 Manuscript*, scheduled for publication early 1984. The *Collected Papers* (which will not appear in chronological order) will be published at the rate of approximately one volume every nine months. The anticipated completion date of the project is 2000.

Volume I special pre-publication price is \$70.00. After December 31, 1983 the price will be \$90.00. The ISBN number for the complete edition of 28 volumes is 0 04 920095 X.

Volume I	Cambridge Essays: 1888-99
Volume II	Philosophical Papers: 1898-1903
Volume III	Towards The Principles of Mathematics
Volume IV	Philosophical Papers: 1903-1905
Volume V	Philosophical Papers: 1906-1908
Volume VI	Philosophical Papers: 1909-1913

Volume VII	Theory of Knowledge: The 1913 Manuscript
Volume VIII	Philosophical Papers: 1914-1919
Volume IX	Philosophical Papers: 1919-1926
Volume X	Philosophical Papers: 1927-1946
Volume XI	Philosophical Papers: 1947-1965
Volume XII	Contemplation and Action: 1902-1914
Volume XIII	The Rights of the War: 1914-1917
Volume XIV	Revolution and Reconstruction: 1917-1920
Volume XV	China and Labour: 1920-1924
Volume XVI	Behaviourism and Education: 1925-1928
Volume XVII	Science, Sex and Society: 1929-1932
Volume XVIII	Fascism and Other Depression Legacies: 1933-1936
Volume XIX	The Man Who Stuck Pins in His Wife, and Other Essays: 1936-1939
Volume XX	The Problems of Democracy: 1940-1944
Volume XXI	Civilization and the Bomb: 1944-1949
Volume XXII	Respectability - At Last: 1950-1953
Volume XXIII	Man's Peril: 1954-1958
Volume XXIV	The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament: 1958-1960
Volume XXV	A New Plan for Peace, and Other Essays: 1960-1964
Volume XXVI	The Vietnam Campaign: 1965-70
Volume XXVII	Newly discovered papers
Volume XXVIII	Index

Special Pre-publication offer on the first volume of  
THE COLLECTED PAPERS OF BERTRAND RUSSELL.  
\$70.00

Offer closes December 31, 1983

For information concerning standing orders and/or single volume purchases, please contact your regular library supplier or

Allen & Unwin Inc.

Merely dividing it all up into 28 categories must itself have been an enormous job.

As the flyer mentions, you can get Volume I for \$70, if you don't wait too long.

#### ER MISREPRESENTED

(10) Example #1: Runes. In Dagobert Runes's "Pictorial History of Philosophy" (12) there is a photo of Joseph Stalin with the following caption:

*Joseph Stalin, the chief architect of Russian imperialism, who by admission of his own lieutenants executed three and a half million Russian peasants and thousands of his personal coworkers.*

*On frequent occasion Bertrand Russell deviated from his philosophical work into the realm of social idiosyncrasy and anti-American platitudes. He delighted in attacking the United States as a monger of atomic warfare, advocating a general acceptance of Soviet Russian world dominance*

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS)

It is a foolish misrepresentation to say that ER advocated "a general acceptance of Soviet Russian world dominance." That is a variation — a stepped-up variation — on the theme, "Better Red than dead."

Runes, a man of some learning, author of a number of books, and chief of the publishing house, Philosophical Library, should have known better.

Something needs to be said about "Better Red than dead."

"Better Red than dead" was a reaction to — a repudiation of — its opposite, "Better dead than Red", a slogan invented by U.S. hawks in the 1950s, the McCarthy period (NLL1-17). "Better dead than Red" is by no means obsolete today. It was voiced in 1983 by superhawk Ronald Reagan, the man with his finger on the button (RSN38-10).

"Better dead than Red" appears to be the equivalent of Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death." Here's what ER has to say on that:



PATRICK HENRY, an American patriot who rose to eminence during the War of Independence, is now chiefly remembered for his exclamation: "Give me Liberty, or give me Death." In the mouths of fanatical anti-Communists, this has become a slogan purporting to mean that a world without human beings would be preferable to a Communist world. As Patrick Henry meant it, however, it had a quite different significance. He was advocating a just cause, and, owing to British hostility, the cause could not triumph without the loss of American lives. Consequently, his death might promote liberty. In such circumstances, it is right and proper that his slogan should be approved.

When, however, this same slogan is used to justify a nuclear war, the situation is very different. We do not know what would be the outcome of a nuclear war. It might be the end of the human species. It might be the survival of a few scattered bands of anarchic plunderers in a world that had lost all social cohesion. It might, in the most favorable circumstances imaginable, result in very tight governmental despotisms with rigid rationing of all the necessities of life. Her-

man Kahn, who is concerned to justify nuclear war in certain circumstances, admits that, at the best, it would result in what he call "disaster socialism" (p. 438). The one thing in which it could not possibly result is ordered liberty such as Patrick Henry wanted and his modern admirers pretend to want.\*

To die for a cause is noble if the cause is good and your death promotes it. If it is practically certain that your death will not promote it, your action shows merely fanaticism. It is particularly obvious in the case of those who say explicitly that they would prefer the extinction of our species to a Communist victory, or, alternatively, to an anti-Communist victory. Assuming Communism to be as bad as its worst enemies assert, it would nevertheless be possible for improvement to occur in subsequent generations. Assuming anti-Communism to be as bad as the most excessive Stalinists think it, the same argument applies. There have been many dreadful tyrannies in past history, but, in time, they have been reformed or swept away. While men continue to exist, improvement is possible; but neither Communism nor anti-Communism can be built upon a world of corpses.

"Has Man A Future?" (NY:Simon & Schuster, 1962 pp.38-39)

BR mentions the origin of the slogan, "Better Red than dead:

There is a considerable amount of rhetoric, both on the warlike and on the peaceful side, which, whatever its intention, is not likely to lead to the desired result. We have formerly considered the rhetorical war propaganda embodied in the slogan "Liberty or Death," but there is an opposite slogan invented by West German friends of peace: "Better Red than dead." One may guess that in some sections of Russian public opinion there is an opposite slogan: "Better capitalists than corpses." I do not think it is necessary to inquire into the theoretical validity of either slogan since I think it

out of the question that the one should be adopted by Western governments or the other by the governments of the East. Neither slogan presents justly the problem which East and West alike have to face. Given that military victory by either side is impossible, it follows logically that a negotiated *détente* cannot be based on the complete subjection of either side to the other, but must preserve the existing balance while transforming it from a balance of terror to a balance of hope. That is to say, coexistence must be accepted genuinely and not superficially as a necessary condition of human survival.

(same source, p. 89)

Unfortunately, it does not seem to be out of the question that the slogan should be adopted by a Western government: the current U.S. President is reported to have said, "...it is better that children 'die now still believing in God, than have them grow up under Communism and one day no longer believing in God.'"(RSN38-10)

(10b) Example #2: Solzhenitsyn. From The Wall St. Journal (5/12/83, p.32):

#### *Covering the Spectrum*

Alexander Solzhenitsyn appeared in London yesterday to accept \$170,000 as the Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion, and quickly loosed critical blasts in all directions. At Bertrand Russell, for suggesting it's better to be Red than dead: "to be Red means

to become dead gradually." At last year's Templeton Prize Winner the Rev. Billy Graham, for making silly remarks about freedom of religion in the Soviet Union after a trip there. Anyone who can hit those two targets in one day has pretty well covered the philosophical and ideological spectrum.

Same story. Beating BR over the head with "Better Red than dead" has apparently become stock in trade with this unusual man. He did it in a BBC interview in 1976 (N111-17). And, as above, again in 1983 — and who knows how many times in between?

(Thank you, PAUL GARWIG)

(10c) Example #3: Hook (+ Solzhenitsyn). In a long article in the Los Angeles Times, Sidney Hook quotes Solzhenitsyn with approval:

In his famous 1978 address at Harvard, Solzhenitsyn said, "To defend oneself, one must also be ready to die"—and the context shows that he meant the defense of our free institutions as our ultimate concern.

There is a profound historical and psychological truth here. The lean and hungry

hordes ready to die have always triumphed over those who have sought primarily to save their goods or their necks. (Not infrequently, they lost both, and their honor as well.)

Deny Solzhenitsyn's proposition, and what conclusion must one draw? That

survival is the be-all and end-all of life, the ultimate value.

However, if we are prepared to sacrifice all of our basic values for mere survival, there is no infamy that we will not commit. The result would be a life morally unworthy of man's survival.

Later, Hook goes on to say:

So long as we keep our guard up and do not capitulate, as Kennan or Russell would have us do, perhaps someday totalitarian communist countries will (through internal development) democratize themselves without war.

Differing as profoundly as I do with Solzhenitsyn about so much, I am nonetheless confident that he would agree with a short answer that I have made to the

Kennans and the Russells of this world in the form of a thumbnail credo:

"It is better to be a live jackal than a dead lion—for jackals, not me. Men who have the moral courage to fight intelligently for freedom, and are prepared to die for it, have the best prospects of avoiding the fate both of live jackals and of dead lions. Survival is not the be-all and the end-all of a life worthy of man. Sometimes the worst thing

that we can know about a man is that he has survived.

"Those who say that life is worth living at any cost have already written for themselves an epitaph of infamy, for there is no cause and no person that they will not betray to stay alive. Man's vocation should be the use of the arts of intelligence in behalf of human freedom."

We can't avoid the thought that Hook is pleased at his own courage, his own bravery, in saying, "Survival is not the be-all and end-all of a life worthy of man." We, however, are less enthusiastic about his readiness to die; for, if he goes, we all go; and it is his kind of attitude that makes it more likely.

(Thank you, JOHN TOBIN)

#### BR ON NUCLEAR WARMONGERS

(11) What makes 'em tick — the nuclear warmongers? Here's how BR sized them up (and if it sounds like a description of the Reagan Administration, remember when it was written, 1961):

But it is not immorality which is the really novel feature of modern weapons. The really novel feature is the absolute certainty that, in a war, *both* sides will be defeated. It is this that makes all thought of modern war silly as well as wicked. The people, whether in East or West, who tolerate policies leading toward war are victims of delusion. Some, who advocate brinkmanship, persuade themselves that in a war of nerves the other side is sure to yield first. This is what Hitler thought after Munich, and his miscalculation led to his downfall. In the same situation at the present day it would have led also to the downfall of his enemies.

There is another group of even more dangerous warmongers. These are the people so filled with national or ideological pride that, in the face of all evidence,

they still believe that their side would "win." I think that this unfounded belief is widely prevalent in both Russia and America, and is encouraged by the governments of both countries as an asset in negotiation.

There is a third group, the group of sacrificial fanatics. This group holds that it is noble to fight and die in a good cause even if the result of your sacrifice is going to be a much worse world than that which would exist if you were less prepared for martyrdom.

Unfortunately, ever since Hiroshima, these three groups have acted together and have succeeded, hitherto, in preventing anything that might diminish the risk of nuclear war. There have been moments, it is true, when one side or the other showed some glimmerings of common sense, but never have both sides felt these glimmerings at the same moment.

"Has Man A Future?" pp. 96-97

#### BR, PHILOSOPHER

(12) Dagobert Runes, in "A Pictorial History of Philosophy" (NY: Bramhall House, 1959, pp. 268-9), offers this brief account of BR and his philosophical views:

RUSSELL, BERTRAND (1872- ). As late as 1940, the appointment of Bertrand Russell as professor of philosophy at the College of the City of New York has roused the fury of bigots of all denominations. It was denounced as "the establishment of a chair of indecency" and withdrawn by the Board of Education after a trial had ended with Russell's condemnation as "immoral" and a danger to the youth of the city.

The victim of this persecution has been accustomed to making sacrifices for his convictions. During World War I he had been imprisoned because of his radical pacifism. He had also been accustomed to having his opinions explained by radical leftists as being determined by his connection with the British aristocracy. His grandfather, Lord John Russell, who had been Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary, had tried to defend European solidarity against Bismarck's national egoism, and had brought about the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act which

barred from public office anyone not belonging to the established Church of England.

Russell is regarded as the most controversial figure of modern Anglo-Saxon philosophy, even by those who recognize him as one of the greatest thinkers of the twentieth century and who agree with Albert Einstein who has confessed that he owes "innumerable happiness to the reading of Russell's works." Russell's mind is uncompromising, not afraid of running risks, yet always ready to change and to admit errors. He always has maintained the independence of his thought and judgment although he underwent many influences. Russell is a prolific writer who attributes the clarity and fluency of his style to his absence from the influence of public school education. Conspicuous qualities of his books are the firm direction of the course of ideas, his ability to continue or check a discussion according to his principal intention, and particularly his easy humor and his devastating irony.

Russell has taken an outstanding part in the foundation of modern mathematical logic. Together with Alfred North Whitehead he has written *Principia Mathematica* (1910-13), one of the most comprehensive systems of mathematics. At first, Russell regarded mathematics as the ideal of philosophy. Then, abandoning Platonism, he thought of mathematics as an instrument of science, and finally declared that logic is not a part of philosophy but of a general theory of science.

To Russell, philosophy is a conception of life and the world which is the product of two factors. The one consists of inherited religious and ethical concepts, the other of investigations which may be called scientific. Philosophy is regarded as something intermediate between theology and science. Like theology it is concerned with speculations on matters concerning which knowledge has been unascertainable. Like science it appeals to human reason rather than to authority. Russell holds that all human knowledge remains uncertain, inexact and partial, and that scepticism, while logically faultless, is psychologically impossible. To obtain some results which may be useful for humanity, philosophy should take its problems from natural sciences, not from theology or ethics.

At least in its broad outline, scientific knowledge is to be accepted. But, against traditional concepts, Russell maintains that knowledge is an intimate, almost mystical

contact between subject and object by perception. Although perception is far more complicated than is generally supposed, common-sense realism comes closer to truth than idealism. Subjectivism is justified to ask how knowledge of the world is obtained but not to say what sort of world exists in which we live. Kant's claim to have effected a "Copernican revolution" is refuted by Russell who declares that Kant rather achieved a "Ptolemaic counter-revolution." Knowledge is characterized as a subclass of true belief, but not every true belief is to be recognized as knowledge. In *Human Knowledge* (1948) Russell deals with the problem of the relation between individual experience and the general body of scientific knowledge, and arrives at the result that science cannot be wholly interpreted in terms of experience. He demands that the description of the world be kept free from influences derived from the nature of human knowledge, and declares that "cosmically and causally, knowledge is an unimportant feature of the universe." Like Whitehead, he holds that the distinction between mind and body is a dubious one. It will be better to speak of organism, leaving the division of its activities between the mind and the body undetermined. What is true or false is a state of organism. But it is true or false in general, in virtue of occurrences outside the organism.

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS)

#### ER BUST

- (13) ER at the Hirshhorn. The Jacob Epstein bust of ER is currently being exhibited at the Hirschhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, Washington, DC. The Museum says it is 16½ x 10 x 10 inches, and is one of 6 cast. A photo of ER sitting as Epstein works on the bust (1953) is opposite page 116 of ER's Autobiography, Volume III (NY: Simon & Schuster, 1969).

#### BRS PROJECTS

- (14) Toward a film about ER. A motion to adopt a Film Project proposal was made, at the 1983 Annual Meeting, by Lee Eisler. The proposal was adopted. Here it is →
- This is a proposal that the BRS undertake to work up a presentation that might interest a movie-maker in making a movie on ER.
- I am not suggesting that we write a movie script. Let us leave that to the professionals.
- Rather, let us provide some of the raw material that a screen writer could make use of. For example:
- There are incidents in ER's life that are dramatic or that lend themselves to dramatic presentation. We should make up a list of these, giving a brief description of each incident (and cite the source).
- There are many quips, witticisms or verbal exchanges that are amusing or profound or both. We should make up a list of these, stating the essence (and citing the source).
- Some incidents come to mind: the CCNY affair, ER's thoughts on Marx and communism, the first jailing, the 2nd jailing, Ban the Bomb episodes, various debates, the 1907 election campaign, etc.
- As to procedure, I suggest that as many members as possible contribute to this presentation. Give us your ideas, in writing. The more, the merrier. The more suggestions we get, the better our final result will be.
- Finally, I'd like to make a bow to Jack Ragsdale. The idea of trying to interest someone in making a movie about ER originated with Jack.

Mail your ideas to Film Project, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036.

At the 1983 Meeting, the names of several movie-makers were suggested: Roman Polanski (BR was his hero -- N114-18), Attenboro (maker of Ghandi), Ken Russell.

THE BRS AWARD

- (15) 1983. Joseph Rotblat was the recipient, as mentioned last issue (RSN38-32). The press release, below, was sent to anti-nuclear organizations, large weeklies, scientific and technical publications, scholarly journals, and publications we advertise in. If you come across a mention of the BRS Award to Professor Rotblat in any publication, please tell us about it and, if possible, send a clipping or a photocopy.

Lee Eisler, VP/Information  
Bertrand Russell Society, Inc.  
RD 1, Box 409  
Coopersburg, PA 18036  
215-346-7687

For immediate release  
July 18, 1983

JOSEPH ROTBLAT RECEIVES THE 1983 BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY AWARD

The 1983 Bertrand Russell Society Award has gone to Joseph Rotblat, nuclear physicist, anti-nuclear advocate, Secretary General of the Pugwash Conferences for the first 17 years (1957-1973)...and currently active on the Executive Committee, also Chairman of the British Pugwash Group.

The Pugwash Conferences were a breakthrough in East-West relations. They brought scientists from both sides of the Iron Curtain together for the first time to discuss the nuclear peril. The Conferences led to the Salt Talks and to the partial Test Ban Treaty, that banned tests above ground (1963). As Bertrand Russell said: "...it showed that real cooperation could be achieved among scientists of extremely divergent 'ideologies' and apparently opposing scientific as well as other views."

The Conferences were Russell's idea. But Russell was 85, and in poor health, unable to attend the first Conference (in Pugwash, Nova Scotia). As a result, it was Joseph Rotblat who organized it, as well as the following 22 Pugwash Conferences.

The Award citation reads: "For presiding at the birth of the Pugwash Conferences, and nurturing their growth, to develop areas of agreement between East and West so as to diminish the nuclear peril."

It seems odd that anything as important as the Pugwash Conferences should be virtually unknown to the public. Professor Rotblat provides the explanation: "Anonymity is the price paid for bringing eminent scientists together and getting them to talk freely and without inhibition on matters which are of deep concern to them but on which they

are not necessarily expert. Such talks can be effective, and generate original ideas, only if the participants do not have to worry that what they say may be taken down and published..." Therefore the Press is excluded, and thus cannot write about Pugwash... and the public remains uninformed.

Only a few highlights of Professor Rotblat's long and productive career can be given here. He is, or has been, Professor of Physics (now Emeritus) in the University of London at St. Bartholomew's Hospital Medical College; Director of Research in nuclear physics at Liverpool University; atomic energy researcher at Los Alamos; member, Advisory Committee on Medical Research of the World Health Organization; President, British Institute of Radiology; member, Governing Body of Stockholm International Peace Research Institute; Honorary Foreign Member, American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Titles of some of his books indicate his major interests: Progress in Nuclear Physics; Radioactivity and Radioactive Substances; Atomic Energy, A Survey; Science and World Affairs; Aspects of Medical Physics; Pugwash, The First Ten Years; Scientists in the Quest for Peace; Nuclear Reactors, To Breed or Not To Breed; Nuclear Energy and Nuclear Weapons Proliferation; Nuclear Radiation in Warfare; Scientists, the Arms Race and Disarmament.

In Bertrand Russell's eyes, Professor Rotblat "...can have few rivals in courage and integrity... If ever the nuclear peril and allied evils are eradicated and international affairs are straightened out, his name should stand very high among its heroes."

The Bertrand Russell Society is a company of admirers of Bertrand Russell (1872-1970). It is not a scholarly society, though a number of scholars belong to it, and is open to anyone interested in Russell. For information, write BRS Information, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036.

In the Fall, the press release will go to universities, along with (to save postage) the announcement of the 1983 Doctoral Grant recipient (17) and the 1984 Doctoral Grant offer (18).

- (16) 1984. We encourage members to nominate candidates for the 1984 BRS Award. When you nominate, tell why you think your candidate deserves the Award. There should be a genuine connection between your candidate and BR. It can be someone who had worked closely with BR in an important way (like Joseph Rotblat); or who has made a distinctive contribution to Russell scholarship (like Paul Arthur Schilpp); or who has acted in support of a cause or idea that BR championed (like Henry Kendall); or whose actions exhibited qualities of character (such as moral courage) reminiscent of BR; or who in some way has promoted awareness of BR or BR's work (like Steve Allen).

\* Send your nomination to the BRS Award Committee, c/o the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom. Deadline: December 1st.

## THE ERS DOCTORAL GRANT

- (17) The 1983 recipient is Lois Pineau of the University of Toronto. (Last year's recipient, Alejandro Garciadiego, was also from the University of Toronto.)

Every year since 1979 the ERS has offered a \$500 award to a graduate student who has completed all requirements for a Ph.D. except the dissertation. The 1983 award is "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."

Ms. Pineau, in her dissertation, will argue that Russell's theory of reference "goes further toward solving some of the traditional problems of reference than has generally been appreciated...because they have not been properly understood,"...by Kripke, for instance.

- (18) The 1984 offer, as it will appear in a half-page ad in The Journal of Philosophy (September 1983):

## THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY'S 1984 DOCTORAL GRANT

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

The candidate is required to send to the Society: (1) an abstract of the theme of the dissertation and of the plan of study; (2) a letter from the chairman of the candidate's department which states that all work for the doctorate has been completed except the dissertation, and that the topic of the dissertation has received academic approval; (3) a letter from the dissertation advisor evaluating the applicant and the plan of study; (4) a 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 Prof. Hugh S. Moorhead, Chairman, Philosophy Dept., Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, IL 60625, by May 1, 1984. The recipient will be announced in June 1984.

The announcement of the 1983 Doctoral Grant recipient and 1984 Doctoral Grant offer will be mailed directly to chairmen of 5 departments of (mostly) large universities, as in past years (along with the Rotblat press release.)

## CREATIONISM

- (19) From Harvard Magazine (May-June, 1983, pp. 28-32):

## Only a theory

*Today's primitivists join a long line of political and religious dogmatists who have rejected the empirical observations of science. In the nuclear age, such a stance becomes inexcusably dangerous.*

by Philip Dunne

Earlier in this century, a Soviet geneticist named Trofim Lysenko earned the ridicule of the scientific world, and incidentally set back the study of genetics in the Soviet Union for decades, by forcing on his colleagues a pseudoscientific theory of heredity that was politically pleasing to Joseph Stalin and the rest of the Communist Party hierarchy in the Soviet Union.

In the fall of 1980, an American presidential candidate, Ronald Reagan, drew cheers from a partisan crowd by proclaiming that Charles Darwin's theory of evolution was "only a theory."

It would be easy to make too much of the similarity. Geneticist Lysenko's pseudoscience had a direct and

damaging effect on Soviet agriculture, while candidate Reagan's remark, however shocking to the scientific community, was clearly only a case of a politician telling his listeners what they wanted to hear.

What is disturbing is that as canny a politician as Ronald Reagan should have judged it politically profitable to cater to primitivist sentiment. His speech is perhaps an indication of the extent to which strident anti-intellectualism has gained support in America over the past few years.

It is also possible that candidate Reagan did President Reagan a disservice, for a president, as commander in chief of the armed forces, must depend on science for all the military power at his command: the atomic weaponry, the satellites, the carriers and submarines, the tanks and

artillery, the oil that fuels them, and the computers that direct them. All are the products of scientific inquiry, of physical, chemical, electronic, and geological discoveries that a few years ago could be dismissed as "only theories." Indeed, this particular president probably owes his election to the scientists whose theories led to the invention and development of television.

Modern industry and agriculture depend on science, on the freedom to inquire, to test, to prove and disprove, to venture, like Newton, Hutton, Darwin, and Einstein, on to new continents of scientific thought. When Reagan took his stand on the side of militant ignorance, he did more than encourage the primitivists who cheered him. Though many candidates for office may talk primitivist nonsense, the expression of such views by as important

a politician as Reagan at best could not possibly strengthen the nation's civilian economy or its military capability, and at worst might conceivably weaken both. In this nuclear age, Lysenkoism, the encroachment of politics or religion on scientific inquiry, is something no nation can afford.

**I**t is strange that this most militaristic of presidents—who recently has adorned his coat of mail with an ephod, and transcends his elective office to the extent of claiming that his escalation of the arms race is ordained by Scripture—should show such contempt for the sensibilities of the scientists on whom he must depend.

And it is strange that it is the Reagan Administration, with its plans for astronomical expansion of the military component, that simultaneously makes drastic cuts in funds for research, grants, and student loans, thereby severely limiting the number of trained scientists and technologists schools and universities can produce. Someone has failed to make an obvious connection.

Perhaps strangest of all is the fact that it is this same administration, usually so belligerently responsive to every Soviet move, that has cut the budget of our space program well into the bone, and thereby not only deprived us of the fruits of much invaluable scientific research, but virtually abandoned the peaceful exploration of space to other nations, including its great antagonist. The Soviet government may persecute individual scientists who are dissenters, but it clearly, in space and elsewhere, puts a high priority on pure scientific research, and has refrained, since Lysenko and Stalin, from forcing its scientists to accept political baby talk as valid theory.

But possibly we can make some sense of these anomalies when we consider that, in this country, it is often the rabid anti-intellectuals, the enemies of science and scientists, who are the most strident advocates of an expanded military and a proliferation of nuclear power plants, while they cheer the candidate who tells them that Darwin's theory is only a theory.

There is some irony in the probability that Ronald Reagan is the most uncompromising "Social Darwinist"

**Technically, of course, Reagan was quite correct. Evolution is only a theory, and so are special and general relativity, the Big Bang, quantum theory, plate tectonics, and all the other giant ideas conceived by our pygmy minds since the Renaissance first divorced science from religious dogma.**

ever to sit in the White House, if we accept definition of Social Darwinism as the economic equivalent of the doctrine of "the survival of the fittest." (That phrase, incidentally, was coined not by Darwin himself, but by Herbert Spencer, the great Victorian proponent of laissez faire, the Reaganomics of his time. But Spencer, no primitivist, was also an early and dedicated champion of the theory of evolution.)

Technically, of course, Reagan was quite correct. Evolution is only a theory, and so are special and general relativity, the Big Bang, quantum theory, plate tectonics, and all the other giant ideas conceived by our pygmy minds since the Renaissance first divorced science from religious dogma.

Ne modern anthropologist was present when the first half-brained protohuman decided that he or she preferred two feet to four, still those mute but eloquent historians, the fossils, suggest an approximate date, give or take a few million years—a mere blink of the eye in geological time—for this significant event.

Similarly, nobody has ever seen crustal plates rush apart to create an Atlantic Ocean, because such plates creep at a few centimeters a year, but we have seen the result of their movements, and matched to perfection not only the contours of continents, but geological structures from one side of an ocean to those from another.

Scientific theory is, after all, merely the most logical interpretation by the best-trained minds of the most per-

suasive data. Unlike political dogmatists in the Soviet Union and politico-religious fanatics in the United States, scientists love to question, test, and improve longstanding theories, including their own branchchildren.

Even Albert Einstein's dazzling theories of relativity have been challenged, but have stood fast against all assaults. Rather, quantum physicists have proved that relativity by itself gives an incomplete picture of reality, much as Einstein himself proved that Isaac Newton's purely mechanical physics inadequately described a relativistic cosmos.

Astronomer Edwin Hubble's exploding universe, once thought to be almost perfectly homogeneous, is now showing great gaps in its structure, and possibly is not as pleasingly uniform as we once believed.

Darwin's theory of evolution itself is undergoing the same scrutiny, not to disprove it, as the primitivists claim, but to refine it in light of recent research, which indicates that mutations may occur in quanta rather than slow increments. Rather than crawl like a tortoise, evolution may bound like an antelope.

Nor does any scientist claim to be infallible. The greatest of them can guess wrong. Majestic Lord Kelvin, doyen of nineteenth-century physicists, rejected Darwin's theory because he estimated the age of the earth at not more than a hundred million years, hardly long enough for species to evolve. His reasoning was spotlessly empirical: if the sun burned hydrogen chemically, which he believed, a body of its diameter would soon exhaust its fuel supply. He didn't live to learn the secret of the stars: that they don't burn their hydrogen; they fuse it, and enjoy long lives in an almost perfect balance of gravity and radiation.

Even Einstein, the nonpareil, wasted years of research because, in his love of order, he refused to accept the radical implications of the quantum theory to which he contributed so much. "God," he said in a famous dictum, "is subtle, but not malicious." He "does not play dice." Quantum research proves beyond doubt that God does.

Some intuitive theories, most notably Einstein's own, also have been proved beyond question. The hydrogen bomb bears terrible witness to the power of his thought. By observing the behavior of subatomic particles at relativistic speeds, we know that time itself, as he deduced, is not an absolute. We have even proved that a clock in the penthouse of a skyscraper ticks at a tiny but measurably faster rate than one in the basement. And (though in this particular case the proof is not quite so concrete) the discovery of primordial background radiation is accepted by most cosmologists as a strong indication that our universe originated in a single dimensionless point of infinite density and temperature: The Big Bang.

Recently I read an article in a small local newspaper in which the writer, reflecting a common primitivist view, denounced the Big Bang theory as somehow anti-religious, inimical to the God who created the beauty of birds and flowers, not to mention that lord of all he surveys on earth: Man. I wondered why the writer could not bring himself to credit his God with the even more miraculous feat of creating an entire cosmos from a single point of light. St. Thomas Aquinas, for one, believed that God created the universe out of nothingness—a vacuum—and many modern physicists think so too.

**A**nd it's all completely beside the point. A little thought should uncover a strange and usually overlooked truth: There is no fundamental conflict between science and religion.

Science is not concerned with the "why" of natural phenomena, nor even the "how." As Niels Bohr said: "It is wrong to think that the task of physics is to find out how nature is. Physics concerns what we can say about nature." The enemies of science—which after all is only another word for knowledge—make the mistake of believing that scientists infringe on God's patents by inventing the laws of nature, when in fact they hope only to discover what those laws are.

Unfortunately, every religion, including Soviet Marxist-Leninism in Stalin's day, has created its own cos-

mology, based on metaphysical speculation rather than empirical observation. Conflict arises when religious or political dogma masquerades as science, as in the case of today's "scientific creationists." They offer nothing new under the sun. For century after century, their kind have bound reason with the shackles of dogma.

Worse, the dogmatists have often used lethal methods. Throughout the Dark and Middle Ages, overindulgence in scientific inquiry could be dangerous to life and limb. In A.D. 415 Hypatia, philosopher and teacher at the Alexandrian library, was murdered by a mob incited by Archbishop Cyril, who was duly canonized for such service to his church.

For fear of religious dogmatists, Copernicus delayed publication of his theory of earth's heliocentric orbit for many years. His fears proved justified when his champion, Giordano Bruno, was burned at the stake for heresy. The great Galileo escaped a similar fate by recanting that which he knew to be true.

Is this the record of a running battle between science and religion? On the contrary, many of the persecuted scientists were themselves men of the cloth. Copernicus was canon of the cathedral at Frauenburg. Bruno was originally a Dominican friar. One of the fathers of modern cosmology and the Big Bang theory so deplored by the primitivists was a Belgian cleric, the Abbé Georges Lemaitre.

Nevertheless, the conflict is usually described as one between the godly and the ungodly, and American primitivists have identified their enemies with some historical accuracy: they call them "secular humanists." In a sense, they are right.

It was, after all, the humanists of the Italian Renaissance who, in the fifteenth century, first questioned the authority of religious dogma in the realms of science, and thereby paved the way for the triumph of skepticism, materialism, industrialism, and capitalism in the modern world.

In the beginning, to be sure, "humanist" meant little more than "classical scholar," but it was the rediscovery of Greek and Roman "pagan" knowledge, married to the growing interest in physical phenomena, that inspired the scientific and industrial revolutions, which eventually swept the world.

Since most educated men of the time took clerical orders, the majority of the early humanists were themselves clergymen. Two of them, Poggio Bracciolini and Lorenzo Valla, were papal secretaries.

And some were as religious as they were scholarly. The deeply devout Erasmus did not scorn the name of "humanist," nor did the saintly Sir Thomas More, a humanist who celebrated another in his *Life of John Picus, Earl of Mirandola*. "Picus," of course, was that extraordinary Renaissance man, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, who tried to reconcile Greek and Arabic science with Hebrew and Christian theology, and was so in

**When a secular humanist looks at a human skeleton, he (or she) doesn't see a clone of God, but only a highly specialized primate, and wonders why anyone would believe that an omnipotent God would choose for himself the male form of a mammal that may soon become extinct.**

love with learning that he hoped to assimilate all human knowledge in his own prodigious brain.

From its early humanistic roots, the great tree of science grew and flowered, developing so many branches in such exquisite detail that any claim by a modern Pico della Mirandola to universal knowledge would be patently ridiculous. There is truth as well as wit in the old saw that a scientific specialist is one who learns more and more about less and less.

There is no school of philosophy or science calling itself "secular humanism." Fundamentally, the so-called secular humanist is merely an empiricist who rejects

divine revelation as a source of knowledge. Secular humanists come from Missouri: they need to be shown. When a secular humanist looks at a human skeleton, he (or she) doesn't see a clone of God, but only a highly specialized primate, and wonders why anyone would believe that an omnipotent God would choose for himself the male form of a mammal that may soon become extinct.

Secular humanists (another strike against them) are seldom nationalists. Jefferson and Franklin, Priestley and Condorcet, Bacon and Voltaire, though all held strong political views, and some held offices, were at bottom citizens of the world.

And so, to some extent, were their antagonists. Archbishop James Ussher, whose application of what he thought was scientific method to the chronology of the Old Testament produced 4004 B.C. as the date of the creation, was an Irishman, while John Lightfoot, vice-chancellor of Cambridge University, who refined Ussher's date by specifying the day and hour (October 16, at 9 a.m.), was an Englishman. Even today, there are some who accept their dates as fact. The ludicrous Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, who earned his place in history by demanding to know if Darwin's champion, Thomas Huxley, traced his descent from a monkey in the paternal or maternal line, spoke for the entire obfuscatory wing of mankind.

Primitivism is not only international, but also nonpartisan. William Jennings Bryan was a Democrat; Ronald Reagan is a Republican.

Somehow, the notion has taken root among the primitivists that science per se is evil. Actually, it is not

subject to any moralistic definition: it is neither "good" nor "bad"; it simply is. The good and evil lie in the uses we make of it. The fire of Prometheus was destroyer as well as boon. The Wright brothers probably never dreamed that their invention would bring the horrors of war directly home to Mom and Pop and the kid sister. The hydrogen bomb was, *ab initio*, the creation of that most gentle and pacifistic of men, Albert Einstein.

It is possible that such lethal inventions have subtly encouraged the anti-intellectualist mood in this country. The beneficent science of the Victorians has proved that it can be a wholesale killer. Or it may be that modern primitivism is a natural reaction to the dethronement by science of humankind as the direct creation in his own image of a personalized God. Some people dislike being told that they are cousins to a chimpanzee and descendants of a fish, or that their personal atoms were forged billions of years ago in the centers of exploding stars.

If science is a killer, so the history of religion has been written in blood, and not only that of martyrs. The Aztec and the Inca were murdered on their own blood-stained altars by a Spaniard invoking the merciful name of Jesus Christ. Catholic and Protestant happily slaughtered each other in the Thirty Years' War. Religion has been so much of a comfort to so many that sometimes we ignore its darker side. Even today we have only to look to Tehran and Belfast or the borders of Israel to see that our so-called modern civilization has not quelled sectarian passions, nor wiped the mark of Cain from our brows.

If science can be a passive tool of evil, it is religious man, nationalist man, patriotic man who wields it. The evil is not in what we can learn of nature, but in the

political and religious excesses to which our own contentious natures prompt us.

As to what we can learn of God, perhaps Charles Darwin said it best, in a letter to the American naturalist Asa Gray: "I feel most deeply that the whole subject is too profound for human intellect. A dog might as well speculate on the mind of Newton."

And so a great scientist teaches us a lesson in humility. It is a text that some preachers and politicians would do well to study. I can't help wondering what would have happened if candidate Ronald Reagan, rather than call the theory of evolution "only a theory," had chosen to shed light instead of murk, and asked his partisans to consider what awesome power had created the continuing miracle of the evolutionary process. It might not even have cost him any votes.

As for the secular humanists, let Pico della Mirandola make the case for all. In his celebrated "Oration on the Dignity of Man" he thought that he discerned his God's design for our species: "Nor have we made thee either heavenly or earthly, mortal or immortal, to the end that thou, being, as it were, thine own free maker and moulder, shouldst fashion thyself in what form may please thee best. Thou shalt have power to decline unto the lower or brute creatures, Thou shalt have power to be reborn unto the higher, or divine, according to the sentence of thine intellect." —

*Philip Dunne '29 is a writer-director of motion pictures who lives in Malibu. His memoir, Take Two: A Life in Movies and Politics, was published in 1980.*

From The New York Times Book Review (5/15/83, pp.16-18):

### SCIENTISTS CONFRONT CREATIONISM

Edited by Laurie R. Godfrey.  
Illustrated, 324 pp. New York:  
W. W. Norton & Co. \$19.50.

Since 1968, when the Supreme Court struck down an Arkansas law forbidding the teaching of evolution in public schools, conservative Christians who oppose the idea of evolution have altered their strategy. In school districts and state legislatures across the nation, they are now calling for a "two-model" approach: Schools would emphasize that evolution is only a theory, neither more nor less

valid than the fundamentalists' own theory, known as scientific creationism.

They add that their version of creationism is fully supported by the data used to support evolutionism and is therefore a science. It is this claim, more than constitutional or social positions, that is criticized in this informative, if uneven, collection of essays.

The editor, Laurie R. Godfrey, is a physical anthropologist whose own essay deals with gaps in fossil records. Because such gaps have led evolutionists to disagree among themselves about the rate and pattern of evolutionary change, the crea-

tionists feel justified in drawing their own drastically different conclusions. But as Mrs. Godfrey makes clear, they do this through falsification and distortion, not scientific reasoning.

Mrs. Godfrey's is one of several essays that analyze the creationist argument while presenting sufficient background for the nonscientist reader. Unfortunately, some of the other essays become too technical, as contributors shift from the errors of the creationists to those of scientific rivals. And too many contributors make sweeping pronouncements about religion versus science, construed in the 19th-cen-

tury sense of dogmatic belief versus positivistic skepticism.

The reader who seeks an understanding of the motives and circumstances of fundamentalist parents who dislike the way their children are being educated will not find it here. The book contains little about the recent social history of antievolutionism, focusing instead on the ways in which its ideas are a throwback to earlier attacks on science, such as the flat-earth movement. As a reasoned response to the scientific pretensions of the antievolutionists, "Scientists Confront Creationism" lives up to its title.

### NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

- (21) Dan McDonald has been reading "Maugham: A Biography" by Ted Morgan, and was amused to notice points of similarity between Maugham and Russell, 2 very dissimilar people: both born in the 1870s, orphaned as children, became professional writers, had large numbers of readers, disliked D. H. Lawrence, had unconventional views about sex and religion.

- (22) Ramon Carter Suzara had the following in the Philippine News (San Francisco, June 22-28, 1983):

### Capitalism or Godless Communism

By RAMON SUZARA  
Member, Bertrand Russell Society

Bertrand Russell asked: "Is our race so destitute of wisdom, so incapable of impartial love, so blind even to the simplest dictates of self-preservation, that the last proof of its silly cleverness is to be the extermination of all life on this planet? — for it will be not only men who will perish, but also the animals, whom no one can accuse of Communism or anti-Communism."

President Reagan in addressing the National Association of Evangelicals in Orlando last March 8, revealed the truth of his religious sentiments. He said that it is

better "our children die now, still believing in God, than have them grow up under Communism and one day die no longer believing in God."

One wonders, in reply to equal fanaticism, whether the Russian leaders are also saying that it is better Russian children too should die now, disbelieving in God, than have them grow up under Capitalism and one day die believing in God?

As the nuclear arms race insanity continues, as its allocated budget now entails \$1.2 billion dollars a day, everyday, as we shall all die in a nuclear war tomorrow, let us also ask: what does it really matter whether Capitalist countries believe in God, but it turns out that

God no longer believes in them? After all, Capitalist countries of which the USA is its greatest power have never stopped bothering God asking Him for His forgiveness!

But then also, what does it really matter whether Communists disbelieve in God, but it turns out that God is beginning to believe in them? After all, Communist countries of which the USSR is its greatest power have stopped molesting God asking Him for anything!

And yet, who is to say and what is the difference? The Revealed Truths of God are still revealed, for, if they are, then God's Mystery will cease to be mysterious.

Perhaps, a better alternative will be found to replace both the evils of Communism and the evils of anti-Communism. As to what exactly that better alternative

is — only God knows. In the meantime, obviously, the ways of Communism and the ways of anti-Communism are both ways not of God, but in fact — ways of the devil. After all, God has yet to decide, in His Kingdom and Glory, whether to bless or to curse — Man's destructive powers which will eventually destroy all life on this earth including the devil himself finally — at last!

But as Bertrand Russell suggested: "There lies before us, if we choose, continual progress in happiness, knowledge, and wisdom. Shall we, instead, choose death, because we cannot enlarge our quarters? I appeal as a human being to human beings: remember your humanity and forget the rest! If you can do so, the way lies open to a new paradise; if you cannot, nothing lies before you but universal death."

## FREEZE

- (23) Going to the top. The 2 letters, below, result from action taken at the 1983 Board Meeting. They were mailed on the date shown. They grew out of a suggestion made by JACK RAGSDALE.

"The good life is one inspired by love and guided by knowledge"

## THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.

Donald W. Jackanicz, President  
3802 N. Kenneth Ave.  
Chicago, IL 60641 U.S.A.

11 July 1983

President Yuri Andropov  
Central Committee of the  
Communist Party  
4 Staraya Ploshchad  
Moscow, USSR

Dear Mr. President,

The Board of Directors of the Bertrand Russell Society has adopted the following resolution which I am now respectfully submitting to you. An identical letter has been sent to President Reagan.

The Bertrand Russell Society, believing that any use of nuclear weapons will lead to unlimited use of nuclear weapons and probable end of the human race, is in favor of a mutual, verifiable nuclear freeze, leading to a gradual reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, and urges the leaders of the major nuclear powers to pursue this path.

Sincerely yours,

*Donald W. Jackanicz*

"The good life is one inspired by love and guided by knowledge"

## THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.

Donald W. Jackanicz, President  
3802 N. Kenneth Ave.  
Chicago, IL 60641 U.S.A.

11 July 1983

President Ronald Reagan  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President,

The Board of Directors of the Bertrand Russell Society has adopted the following resolution which I am now respectfully submitting to you. An identical letter has been sent to President Andropov.

The Bertrand Russell Society, believing that any use of nuclear weapons will lead to unlimited use of nuclear weapons and probable end of the human race, is in favor of a mutual, verifiable nuclear freeze, leading to a gradual reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, and urges the leaders of the major nuclear powers to pursue this path.

Sincerely yours,

*Donald W. Jackanicz*

## NEW MEMBERS

- (24) We are very glad to welcome these new members:

LUCIA ADAMS/535 N. Michigan Av./Chicago, IL 60611  
CARRIE BARTELL/Box 131/Palmer Lake, CA 80133  
GRAHAM BETTS/1164 Emerald St. (1)/Madison, WI 53715  
ROBERT W. BURGHART/Reynrock Plaza (403)/Perry at 4th/Castle Rock, CA 80104  
GAYLE CAMPBELL/65 Longwood Dr./Waterloo, Ont./Canada N2L 4B6

RICHARD A. FRANK/6309 Hollywood Blvd. (171)/Los Angeles, CA 90028  
RONALD GERLICH/4625 Troy Lane/La Mesa, CA 92041  
STEVEN DARRELL GOINS/2934 Princeton Av./Jacksonville, FL 32210  
MONNYE R. GROSS/37 E. Montgomery Av./Ardmore, PA 19003  
STEVEN HOFFMAN/3768 Ashworth Dr. (8)/Concinnati, OH 45208

KENNAN A. HUTCHINS/Badstr. 1A/8500 Nürnberg 1/West Germany  
ARVO IHALAINEN/6322 Colbath Av./Van Nuys, CA 91401  
ERIC KANTOR/811 Oakland Av./Mamaroneck, NY 10543  
VIVIEN LEONE/52 Gramercy Park/NY NY 10010  
MARY ELIZABETH MCADAMS/1020 S. Sherburne Dr. (205)/Los Angeles, CA 90035



DR. GAYLAN K. ROSS/368 S. Walnut St./Blairsville, PA 15717  
 NANCY ROSS/368 S. Walnut St./Blairsville, PA 15717  
 MIRON SKY/1137 Cortez Av./Burlingame, CA 94010  
 WAYNE D. SMITH/( Box 295/Williamsburg, VA 23187-0295  
 KENNETH SOLOMON/37 E. Montgomery Av./Ardmore, PA 19003

---

#### NEW ADDRESSES & OTHER CHANGES

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

MICHAEL BALYEAT/2321 Dwight Way(102)/Berkeley, CA 94704  
 OWEN CHARLES/2 E. Terrace Circle/Great Neck, NY 11021  
 LT. LEONARD R. CLEAVELIN, JAGC, USNR/General Delivery/Newport, RI 02840  
 TAMULA C. DRUMM/110 Corson Av./Karon, OH 44302  
 JUDITH ANNE GIVIDEN/General Delivery/Newport, RI 02840

ANDRES KAARIK/Reslagsgatan 40 C, 3tr./113 55 Stockholm, Sweden  
 HERBERT C. LANSDELL, Ph.D./4977 Battery Lane(115)/Bethesda, MD 20814  
 KARIN E. PETERSON/2323 31st St./La Crosse, WI 54601  
 VERA ROBERTS/PO Box 34/Frobisher Bay/N.W.T., Canada X0A 0H0  
 VERA SCHWARCZ/Dept. of History/Weslayan University/Middletown, CT 06457

JOHN C. WILHELM/4736 Lenore Drive/San Diego, CA 92115  
 KATHLEEN WINSOR/Baxtertown, Rd./Fishkill, NY 12524  
 RONALD H. YUCAS/812 Morven Ct./Naperville, IL 60540  
 KEITH W. YUNDT/2976 Congress Lake Rd./Mogadore, OH 44260

---

#### FROTH

- (26) Vanity Fair (May 1983, pp.141-144) has a section, "FLASHBACKS 1928, Celebrated Couples in the pages of Vanity Fair"...where" both partners are workers in the same art..." The 10 couples pictured include Douglas Fairbanks and Mary Pickford, Lynn Fontanne and Alfred Lunt, Bertrand and Dora Russell. The caption under the Russells reads: "The Russells are both keen sociologists, audible liberals and (unless choked off by some such panic as recently frightened Wisconsin) inordinate lecturers."

The Wisconsin incident, as we recall it: the University of Wisconsin cancelled Dora's invitation to speak there, presumably because of her immoral character or views or something. Would Dora kindly amplify?

(Thank you, JOHN SCHWENK)

---

#### CONTRIBUTIONS

- (27) We thank these members for their contributions to the BRS Treasury: JEAN ANDERSON, POLLY & WHITFIELD COBB, KATHY FJERMEDAL, DON JACKANICZ, JOHN TOBIN. Much appreciated!

- (28) We ask those members who can afford to, to contribute money to the BRS Treasury. The need is considerable.

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

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

---

#### PROMOTING THE BRS

Frank Page's good idea. Here is a way to invite inquiries about the BRS -- inquiries are the essential prerequisite to acquiring new members -- and at very little cost.

There is good reason to want to acquire more members: we are now not self-supporting. Dues do not cover the cost

of operating. We are dependent on contributions (which are often slim) to make ends meet. The number of BRS members hovers between two- and three-hundred. If we can get that figure up to 500, we will no longer need to think of ourselves as on the endangered species list.

This is Frank's good idea:

Public Libraries usually have a bulletin board or wall on which public notices may be posted (with the Librarian's permission, of course.)

If BRS members were to post the BRS Fact Sheet in their local libraries, we think it would surely produce inquiries. That is decidedly worth doing.

The BRS Fact Sheet appears on the next page (Page 19). If you will photocopy it and install it in your local library, you will be taking the first step toward moving us up to sound financial ground...for the modest cost of a photocopy.

As we know, a journey of a thousand miles begins with the first step.

Won't you take the first step?

You will?

Thank you very much!

#### ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

(31)

We vote for Directors. Please use the ballot at the end of this newsletter. We are to elect 9 Directors, to bring the total number of Directors up to 24, the maximum allowed under our current Bylaws. There are 12 candidates. You need not sign your ballot, if you prefer not to. These are the candidates:

JACK COWLES (NY), member since 1976, retired naval officer. Served in Pentagon, with co-finger on the button. Anti-war informant to Senator Fulbright, after Tonkin Gulf incident, which caused Navy to blacklist him. Took BR's lecture course in Philosophy at UCLA, 1940. BRS Director 1979-1981.

ALI GHAEMI (Virginia), member since 1979, BRS Director, law student, with a degree in political science. He is Iranian; interested in applying BR's political philosophy to the current state of affairs. Member of AI, US Ass'n of the US, Society for Iranian Studies, various national and Islamic groups, etc. A published author; also interested in philately, reading and tennis.

DAVID GOLDMAN, M.D. (NY), member since 1979. Clinical Assistant Professor of Psychiatry at NYU Medical School, Lecturer in Psychiatry at the Columbia University Psychoanalytic Center. Notes false psychologizing in current nuclear strategies...and, influenced by BR, served on Executive Board of NY Chapter of Physicians for Social Responsibility, organized their 1982 symposium "Preparing for Nuclear War", recently published.

DONALD W. JACKANICZ (Illinois), member since 1974, BRS Director, present BRS President, former BRS Secretary, former BRS Librarian, student of history (Ph.D. Candidate); employed by Social Security Administration.

STEVE MARAGIDES (Illinois), member since 1976, BRS Director, attended 6 of the last 7 Annual Meetings. Attorney; moved the BRS from Georgia to Illinois, donating his legal services. Degrees: Journalism (Northwestern), Law (University of Illinois).

FRANK PAGE (Ohio), member since 1977. CPA. A dedicated Russellite since the 1920s. "Since Russell has been a great influence on my intellectual and social outlook, I would consider it a duty as well as a privilege to serve on the Society's Board."

CHERIE RUPPE (Washington), member since 1980, BRS Director, BRS Secretary. Associate member: Pugwash, Federation of American Scientists, Union of Concerned Scientists; Fellow of Endangered Wildlife Trust of So. Africa; Member, Whale Protection Fund, Northwest Ballet Association.

PAUL ARTHUR SCHILPP (Illinois), BRS Director, BRS Honorary Member, recipient of the first BRS Award (1980), creator and editor of "The Library of Living Philosophers", Distinguished Research Professor of Philosophy (Emeritus) at Southern Illinois University, and much more.

WARREN ALLEN SMITH (Connecticut), member since 1977, BRS Director, former BRS Vice-President. Member: American Humanist Association, British Humanist Association, Mensa. Former book review editor, "The Humanist" (USA), high school teacher (English), recording studio owner.

TOM STANLEY (Vermont), member since 1977, salesman of electronic wares and antiquarian bookseller, collector of first editions. Active in local peace movements for the past 5 years. Interested in support for the gifted child.

Continued on Page 20.

Fact Sheet  
THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.

(30)

General aims: to foster a better understanding of Russell's work, and to further his purposes by promoting ideas and causes he believed in.

Some specific areas of interest: promoting Russell's writings; encouraging new scholarly and popular writings on Russell; presenting Russell's ideas as attractive, rational alternatives to alienation, cynicism, and mysticism; opposing misuses of science and technology; spreading Russell's views, which deal with virtually all the problems facing modern, from how to be happy to how to work for nuclear disarmament.

Why people join: most members join (they have told us) for one or more of five reasons: to learn more about Russell; to be in touch with other admirers; to work for things Russell worked for; to discuss Russell's work with others; to do something useful for others via the BRS.

Academia: Although the BRS is not a scholarly society, one of its aims is to encourage Russell scholarship. A number of professional philosophers are BRS members. A BRS symposium is held each year at the annual meeting of the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division). A BRS grant is awarded annually to a doctoral candidate. Symposia papers and the grant-recipients' dissertations are available from the BRS Library.

BRS Library lends films and tapes of Russell, as well as books by and about him. A limited number of books are offered for sale.

How the BRS functions: the BRS meets once a year. Other contacts between members are usually by mail or phone. Committees are formed to work in specific areas (see below). Four BRS newsletters, "Russell Society News", go to members, as does the periodical, "Russell", published by the Russell Archives at McMaster University (Hamilton, Ontario).

Committees: the Science Committee keeps members informed about selected scientific issues. The Philosophers Committee promotes scholarly writings by professional philosophers through its annual symposium at APA. The Human Rights Committee is specially interested in the plight of professional people abroad. The Awards Committee selects recipients for the annual BRS Award (see next item).

BRS Award. Past recipients: PAUL ARTHUR SCHILPP (1980), creator and editor of "The Library of Living Philosophers". STEVE ALLEN (1981), creator of the PBS-TV series, "Meeting of Minds"... "in the service of public enlightenment." HENRY W. KENDALL (1982), Chairman, Union of Concerned Scientists, for combatting unbridled technology, including nuclear. JOSEPH ROTBLAT (1983), organizer of the first 23 Pugwash Conferences, bringing East and West together, to diminish the nuclear peril.

Degree of member-activity: members may be as active or as inactive as they wish to be. Some are very active; some wish merely to be kept informed. No matter. Anyone interested in Russell will be welcome as a member.

For more information, write to:

Dept. FP  
The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc.  
RD 1, Box 409  
Coopersburg, PA 18036

KATHARINE TAIT (Massachusetts), BRS Founding Member, BRS Director, Honorary Member, first BRS Treasurer, author of "My Father, Bertrand Russell" (NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975).

DAN WRAY (California), member since 1975. Playwright and filmmaker (with Master's degrees in English and Theatre), his plays have been produced in NY, Los Angeles, and in the mid-West. Interested in history, especially in the effect of modern ideologies on states in conflict.

Please vote! Why not right now? Use the ballot on the last page. Results will be announced in the November newsletter.

VOLUNTEER NEEDED

To all BRS members in the USA:

The BRS needs someone who can help with paperwork.

We are dividing it, so that two members will now do what formerly one member did.

Formerly, one member answered inquiries (asking for information) about the BRS, and also enrolled new members when they applied for membership.

Now these 2 jobs are split up. One person (Carol Smith, Co-Chairman of the Membership Committee) will answer inquiries, and the new volunteer will enroll new members.

The work, though not difficult (the procedures have been worked out) is absolutely essential. In sum, the job is simple but important.

This is probably a job for someone who has worked in an office and enjoys doing paperwork.

If you decide to volunteer, you will become a Co-Chairman of the Membership Committee.

You will need some shelf-space (or floor-space) to store printed material that is sent to new members.

The work should not take much more than an hour a week, on average, after becoming acquainted with it, and after processing a backlog of new member applications.

You should not volunteer unless you are prepared to stay with it for at least 2 years.

We need you! How about it?

Please reply to Volunteer, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036

(We are limiting this appeal to members in the USA. Outside the USA, postage costs are considerably higher.)

ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

FFRF. The Freedom From Religion Foundation offers some books.

Their address: PO Box 40, Ashbury, NJ 08802

☆☆☆☆☆ FOOD FOR THOUGHT ☆☆☆☆☆

<p><b>NOT THE BIBLE</b> Dr. Anthony Horowitz and Professor John H. Cooney of the New York University Had The Bible Invented? <i>Scandalizing Satire</i> \$12.95 + 1.00 Postage &amp; Handling</p>	<p>If you think religion is no laughing matter, this large collection of hilarious cartoons by Kirby will change your mind. The perfect gift for that closet Canel. \$8.95 + \$1.00 Postage &amp; Handling</p>
<p><b>A Different Point of View</b> Debunking Religion by Bernard Katz \$6.95 + 1.00 Postage &amp; Handling</p>	<p><b>THE BORN AGAIN SKEPTIC'S GUIDE TO THE BIBLE</b> By Ruth Hummance Green <i>A Brilliant Eye-Opener!</i> \$9.95 + 1.00 Postage &amp; Handling</p>

**All 4 Books \$30.00** (tax deductible)

I want to contribute to the cause of state church separation and the right to be free from the intimidations, the coercion by religious forces, and from the demands for tax support of their beliefs.


Freedom From Religion Foundation

1979-1983

(33)

(34) Friends of Robert G. Ingersoll advise that the dates of the Ingersoll Sesquicentennial Festival and Freethought Fair in Peoria (RSN38-37) are August 11-13. Participants in the Freethought Fair will include the Freedom From Religion Foundation, The American Humanist Association, Religious Freethinkers from California, 2 state chapters of The American Atheist Association, American Rationalists, and The American Civil Liberties Union. Prometheus Press will show a new reprint of "Ingersoll: Immortal Infidel" by Roger Greeley (1977). The Lyceum at Bradley University will offer talks by Gordon Stein, David Anderson, Raymond Fischer, among others. Two downtown hotels offer special Ingersoll Sesquicentennial rates of \$30: Continental Regency, down from \$55, Ramada Inn, down from \$45. The Friends' address is: PO Box 5082, Peoria, IL 61601.

(35) Hemlock — which we reported on at some length last issue (RSN38-39) — seeks members. →



(36) The Institute of International Education offers internships:

#### INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

The Institute of International Education has been provided with funding for a 1984-85 continuation of the International Human Rights Internship Program. The internship program was formerly based at the University of Minnesota.

Purposes of the Program: 1. To provide individuals with practical training in international human rights implementation; 2. To support the efforts of international human rights organizations; and 3. To strengthen the network of trained human rights activists.

The program has in the past arranged internships with such organizations as the International Commission of Jurists, Amnesty International, U.S.A., the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the OAS and more than two dozen other organizations in Geneva, London, New York, Washington, D.C. and other cities. The renewed program will endeavor to arrange placements with similar organizations. A description covering the activities of several organizations will be provided to applicants.

Qualifications of Interns: The primary criterion for selection of applicants will be their interest and expected ability to pursue international human rights efforts during the internship period and beyond.

Applicants should be in graduate school or have received a graduate degree, although applicants with an undergraduate degree only will be considered in exceptional circumstances. It is expected that most, if not all, of the interns will have previously received some practical experience or academic training in international human rights—regardless of the field of such work, e.g., law, international relations, journalism, political science, history, anthropology, etc. The program is not limited to individuals from the United States, and persons from other countries are encouraged to apply.

Internship Grants: The actual amounts of the internship grants will take into account such factors as the length of the internship, the cost of living in the organization's locale, and expected travel expenses. Because of the limited funds available, the individual grants will be of a subsistence nature, averaging approximately \$10,000 per year. Between ten and twelve internship grants will be awarded.

Applications and Information: The deadline for completed applications is September 30, 1983. Final decisions on internship grants will be made by the Board of the internship program. Grants will be announced during December 1983. Internships will begin in January 1984 or during the months following. The internships will ordinarily be of a year's duration, although in exceptional cases, shorter internships will be considered.

Requests for application forms and other inquiries should be sent to:

International Human Rights Internship Program  
918 16th Street, N.W. (8th Floor)  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
U.S.A.

(Thank you, ALEX DELY)

FOR SALE

(37) 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." \$6 for 90 sheets, postpaid (weighs just under a pound, travels 3rd class). Order from the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom

## 1983 MEETING (CONTINUED)

(38) Minutes of the Annual Meeting →

(39) Minutes of the Board's Meeting ↓

The Annual Meeting of The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc., an Illinois corporation, was convened at 8:10 P.M., June 24, 1983, at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. Members present were MARGARET COBB, WHITFIELD COBB, JACK R. COWLES, DENNIS J. DARLAND, ROBERT K. DAVIS, LEE EISLER, PAUL GARNIG, MARY W. GIBSON, DAVID GOLDMAN, DAVID S. HART, DONALD W. JACKANICZ, MARVIN KOHL, STEVE MARAGIDES, JOHN R. LENS, ROBERT LOMBARDI, STEVE MARAGIDES, JAMES E. MCWILLIAMS, FRANK V. PAGE, PAUL M. PFALZNER, STEPHEN J. REINHART, THOMAS J. STANLEY, JOHN VAN WISSEN, ELIZABETH VOGT, HERBERT G. VOGT, ROB WALLACE.

President DON JACKANICZ, presiding, informed the members of what had happened since the 1982 Annual Meeting in Los Angeles, including changing The Bertrand Russell Society from a Georgia corporation to an Illinois corporation, revising the Bylaws (still in process), and planning for the 1983 meeting.

DENNIS DARLAND gave the Treasurer's Report, showing the present balance to be \$3,364.69.

LEE EISLER, Vice-President/Information, asked the members to send items of interest to him, for possible publication in the newsletter.

DON JACKANICZ stated his thanks to BOB DAVIS for eight years of outstanding service as President of the BRS. The statement was followed by resounding applause. LEE EISLER asked that the minutes mention the applause.

DON JACKANICZ read JACK RAGSDALE's letter which asked the BRS to endorse a nuclear freeze. There were arguments for and against the proposal. Arguments against it: it would politicize the BRS; this would endanger the BRS's tax-exempt status; the Ragsdale letter was vague and unclear, not specifying unilateral or bilateral, verifiable or non-verifiable; the small number voting should not presume to speak for the entire BRS; members favoring the freeze should speak as individuals rather than have the BRS take a position on the issue. Arguments for it: whatever other resolutions might be inappropriate for the BRS to endorse, the nuclear freeze resolution was certainly one that BRS would have endorsed, and a society bearing his name should endorse it; endorsement would not jeopardize the BRS's tax-exempt status (according to DAVID GOLDMAN), if the BRS educates the public rather than lobbies Congress; the issue of nuclear war is too important to ignore. The members did not vote on the nuclear freeze resolution. (However, at a later Board meeting, a newly worded freeze resolution was approved. See 39.)

LEE EISLER moved that the BRS undertake to collect suitable information about BR, with a view to interesting a movie-maker in making a film on BR. Many incidents in BR's life are dramatic, and might provide material that a screen-writer could use in writing a good script, incidents such as the CONY affair, the Vietnam era peace activities, the going to jail, etc. The plan is to invite all BRS members, through the newsletter, to participate in this project by sending in incidents they think suitable for film treatment. (See 14). The motion carried.

The 1983 Annual Meeting of The Bertrand Russell Society was adjourned.

Submitted July 17, 1983  
Steve Maragides, Acting Secretary  
for Cherie Ruppe, Secretary

The Board of Directors of The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc., an Illinois corporation, met at 10:00 A.M. Friday, June 24, 1983, at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. Directors present were DENNIS J. DARLAND, ROBERT K. DAVIS, LEE EISLER, DAVID S. HART, DONALD W. JACKANICZ, MARVIN KOHL, STEVE MARAGIDES, and JAMES E. MCWILLIAMS. In the absence of HARRY RUJA, the Board elected DON JACKANICZ as Acting Chairman. In the absence of CHERIE RUPPE, the Board elected STEVE MARAGIDES as Acting Secretary.

The location of the 1984 Annual Meeting was discussed. Part II of a 2-year Conference — jointly sponsored by the Bertrand Russell Editorial Project (at McMaster University) and The Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology (at the University of Toronto) — is scheduled for late June 1984 at the University of Toronto. It will be on BR's technical writings. It was thought appropriate that there be a BRS presence at the Conference. Therefore BOB DAVIS moved (and MARVIN KOHL seconded) that the BRS hold its 1984 Annual Meeting in Toronto to coincide with the Conference. The motion carried.

Since BR's technical writings might not be of interest to all BRS members, who are not professional philosophers, it was also decided that the BRS would mount a separate program (including BR films) for that weekend, to provide BRS members with an alternative to the technical talks.

[The 1984 Program Committee will consist of Don Jackanicz, Marvin Kohl and Bob Davis. Ed.]

HARRY RUJA recommended that the BRS Doctoral Grant offer be made more widely known through ads in "The Journal of Philosophy" (USA) and "Mind" (UK). The Information Committee will look into this.

DON JACKANICZ advised the Board that the Bertrand Russell Society was now an Illinois corporation (the Georgia corporation having been dissolved) with federal tax-exempt status.

DON JACKANICZ moved that JACK RAGSDALE be named BRS Librarian. LEE EISLER seconded. Jack Ragsdale was named BRS Librarian by acclamation.

BOB DAVIS has, for a long time, been trying to get 3 BR essays published together in an inexpensive edition: "Why I Am Not A Christian", "What I Believe", and "What Is An Agnostic". Bob reports that it now seems likely that Prometheus Press will publish it, though the price may not be as low as Bob would have liked. MARVIN KOHL offered to help with the project.

BOB DAVIS informed the Board the Professor Joseph Rotblat would not be present to accept the 1983 BRS Award because of a foot injury. Bob showed the Board the Award plaque that Professor Rotblat will receive.

DON JACKANICZ expressed the opinion that the general membership of the BRS should be encouraged to nominate candidates for the annual BRS Award, and that the deadline should be December 1st for the Award of the following year.

JACK RAGSDALE's letter to the Board, advocating that the Bertrand Russell Society endorse a nuclear freeze, was read by Don Jackanicz.

The Board of Directors turned to the election of officers. DON JACKANICZ was re-elected President. MARVIN KOHL was elected Vice-President. DENNIS DARLAND was re-elected Treasurer. BOB DAVIS was re-elected Vice-President/Special Projects. LEE EISLER was re-elected Vice-President/Information.

The meeting was recessed until the evening of Friday, June 24, 1983.

The Board of Directors of The Bertrand Russell Society reconvened Friday evening, June 24, 1983. Directors present were JACK R. COWLES, DENNIS J. DARLAND, ROBERT K. DAVIS, LEE EISLER, DAVID S. HART, DONALD W. JACKANICZ, MARVIN KOHL, STEVE MARAGIDES, JAMES E. MCWILLIAMS, and STEPHEN J. REINHART.

LEE EISLER moved that members be forbidden to use the BRS name in correspondence with the media or with prominent persons without the permission of the BRS President or Board. The motion failed to carry.

The Board re-elected CHERIE RUPPE Secretary.

The Board recessed until Saturday, June 25, 1983.

The Board reconvened on Saturday, June 25, 1983. HARRY RUJA assumed his duties as Chairman. The Board continued to discuss the use of the BRS name by members.

LEE EISLER moved that official BRS stationery be used only for official business. The motion carried.

LEE EISLER moved that members be allowed to use unofficial (members') BRS stationery for all unofficial purposes. The motion carried.

A motion was made to allow any member to say, in a letter, that the writer is a member of The Bertrand Russell Society. The motion carried.

STEVIE REINHART moved that no member shall represent himself as speaking on behalf of The Bertrand Russell Society unless he has been authorized to do so by the President or the Board of Directors of The Bertrand Russell Society. The motion carried.

Attention was again focused on JACK RAGSDALE's request that the BRS endorse a nuclear freeze. DON JACKANICZ moved that the BRS endorse a nuclear freeze. KEN BLACKWELL seconded. STEVE REINHART moved to table the motion; BOB DAVIS seconded. The motion to table carried. The meeting recessed to noon, Sunday, June 26, 1983.

The Board reconvened at noon, Sunday, June 26, 1983 to consider endorsing a nuclear freeze. LEE EISLER moved that the following be adopted: "The Bertrand Russell Society, believing that any use of nuclear weapons will lead to an unlimited use of nuclear weapons and probable end of the human race, is in favor of a mutual, verifiable nuclear freeze, and urges the leaders of the major nuclear powers to pursue this path." DON JACKANICZ seconded. The motion carried.

The Board asked DON JACKANICZ, BRS President, to send a copy of this resolution to the leaders of the two major nuclear powers. The meeting of the Board of Directors of The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc., an Illinois corporation, was adjourned.

Submitted July 17, 1983  
Steve Maragides, Acting Secretary  
for Cherie Ruppe, Secretary

## REPORTS FROM OFFICERS (CONTINUED)

Treasurer Dennis J. Darland reports:

(40)	<u>For the quarter ending 3/31/83:</u>	
	Balance on hand (12/31/82).....	521.35
	Income: 22 new members.....	347.50
	151 renewals.....	2977.48
	total dues.....	3324.98
	contributions.....	293.69
	sale of RSN, books, etc.....	87.71
	total income.....	3706.38
		<u>4227.73</u>
	Expenditures: Information & Membership Committees.....	129.55
	"Russell" subscriptions.....	668.00
	ERS Library.....	6.89
	bank charges.....	51.69
	other.....	40.00
	total spent.....	896.13
		<u>896.13</u>
	Balance on hand (3/31/83).....	3331.60
(41)	<u>For the quarter ending 6/30/83:</u>	
	Balance on hand(3/31/83).....	3331.60
	Income: 17 new members.....	330.00
	36 renewals.....	682.50
	total dues.....	1012.50
	contributions.....	195.00
	sale of RSN, books, etc.....	157.81
	total income.....	1365.31
		<u>4696.91</u>
	Expenditures: Information & Membership Committees.....	998.66
	"Russell" subscriptions.....	0.00
	ERS Library.....	0.00
	bank charges.....	1.00
	other.....	134.56
	total spent.....	1134.22
		<u>1134.22</u>
	Balance on hand (6/30/83).....	3562.69

## SUMMARY OF OPPORTUNITIES

- (42) Attention, you members who want to DO something. Here are 7 things to do that you've read about in this newsletter:
- . Write your 2 Senators and Congressman on the need for a Congressional Assessment Center for Accidental War.(5)
  - . Act on Frank Page's good idea for getting inquiries about the ERS. (29)
  - . Volunteer for the Membership Committee's Co-Chairman's job (32)
  - . Send us your ideas for the Film Project (14).
  - . Tell Alex Dely about your skills, for his skills bank.(4)
  - . Ask Alex for his packet on US human rights groups, one of which you might wish to join. (4)
  - . Suggest candidates for the 1984 ERS Award. (16)

## MEMBERSHIP LIST

- (43) The list is in 2 parts. Part I lists those who were members on June 1, 1983. (This list was distributed at the 1983 meeting at McMaster.) Part II lists members who have joined since June 1, 1983. Please check your name and address, and notify us of any errors. This list is provided solely for your personal use, and is not to be given to non-members.

List of members: Part I

\*honorary member

+director

- +Louis E. Acheson, Jr., Ph.D./17721 Marcello Pl./Encino, CA 91316  
 Fred W. Allendorf, Ph.D./Dept. of Zoology/University of Montana/Missoula, MT 59812  
 J. M. Altieri/PO Box 1781/Old San Juan, PR 00903  
 Jean Anderson, Ph.D./92600 West Fork, Indian Creek Road/Swishhome, OR 97480  
 Truman E. Anderson, Jr./1200 Denver Center Bldg./Denver, CO 80203
- Stephen E. Andrews/English Village Apts. (20-04)/North Wales, PA 19454  
 Ruben Ardila, Ph.D./Apartado Aereo 52127/Bogotá, Colombia  
 \*Professor Sir Alfred J. Ayer, F.B.A./51 York St./London W.1, England  
 Dean V. Babst/7915 Alma Mesa Way/Citrus Heights, CA 95610  
 Dong-In Bae, Ph.D./Wuellnerstr. 100/D-5000 Koeln 41/West Germany
- Jerry Baker/1811 So. Buchanan/Little Rock, AR 72204  
 Lt. Col. Don C. Baldwin (ret)/28 Crescent Drive/Plattsburgh, NY 12901  
 Michael Balyeat/2321 Dwight Way (102)/Berkeley, CA 94704  
 John Bastone/3460 S. Bentley Av./Los Angeles, CA 90034  
 Walter Baumgartner, Ph.D./Clos de Leyterand/1806 St. Léger, Switzerland
- Prof. Robert H. Bell/152 Ide Road/Williamstown, MA 01267  
 Osmane Benahmed/651½ W. 30th St./Los Angeles, CA 90007  
 Vivian Benton-Rubel/1324 Palmetto St./Clearwater, FL 33515  
 +Jacqueline Berthon-Payon/463 W. 10th St./Claremont, CA 91711  
 Frank Bisk, D.D.S./2940 Mott Av./Far Rockaway, NY 11691
- +Kenneth Blackwell, Ph.D./Archivist/Russell Archives/McMaster University/Hamilton, Canada L8S 4L6  
 Howard A. Blair/135 N. Wilmoth Av./Ames, IA 50010  
 Lt. Joseph F. & Laurie W. Boetcher/Box 1 -- ADMIN/FPO San Francisco, CA 96654  
 Dan Bond/St. Mary's Seminary & University/5400 Rolland Av./Baltimore, MD 21210  
 Lucy M. Borik/5211 Dumaine Dr./La Palma, CA 90623
- Dean T. Bowden/8283 La Jolla Shores Dr./La Jolla, CA 92037  
 Michael Emmet Brady/9426 Flower St./Bellflower, CA 90706  
 Max Braverman/PO Box 105/Hope NJ 07844  
 Prof. Andrew Brink/Dept of English/McMaster University/Hamilton, Canada L8S 4L9  
 Barbara Busca/18, Ch. François-Lémann/1218 Grand Saconex/Genève, Switzerland
- James Haley Buxton/3735 Orange St./Norfolk, VA 23513  
 Robert S. Canterbury/415 S. Verlinden Av./Lansing, MI 48915  
 Dr. Thanos Catsambas/3003 Van Ness St., N.W. (S-418)/Washington, DC 20008  
 Owen Charles/PO Box 3-18/Grinnell College/Grinnell, IA 50112  
 Timothy Cissner/1215 Harvard Blvd./Dayton, OH 45406
- Lt. Leonard R. Cleavelin, JAGC, USNR/General Delivery, Newport, RI 02840  
 Harry W. Clifford/275 Prospect St./East Orange, NJ 07017  
 Whitfield & Margaret Cobb/800 Cupp St., SE/Blacksburg, VA 24060  
 Norman F. Commo/Box 1459/Fulton, TX 78358  
 Eugene Corbett, Jr., M.D./PO Box 267/Fork Union, VA 23055
- Una Corbett/1223 Woodbourne Av./Baltimore, MD 21239  
 Nat P. Corner/1122 Manzanita St./Los Angeles, CA 90029  
 Jack R. Cowles/392 Central Park West (6C)/NY NY 10025  
 Peter & Glenna Cranford/1500 Johns Rd./August, GA 30904  
 Jim Curtis/15 Elizabeth Dr./Fonthill, Canada LOS 1E0
- Steve Dahlby/265 Calusa Av./Citrus Springs, FL 32630  
 +Dennis J. Darland/1406 26th St./Rock Island, IL 61201  
 Alice L. Darlington/Avenida Toluca 537-8/Mexico 20, D.F./Mexico  
 +Robert K. Davis/2501 Lake View Av./Los Angeles, CA 90039  
 Daniel J. De Amaral/94 Salisbury St./Rehoboth, MA 02769
- Prof. Edna S. DeAngeli/Maginnis Hall (9)/Lehigh University/Bethlehem, PA 18015  
 Lt. Robert J. Delle/3969 Adams St. (208B)/Carlsbad, CA 92088  
 +Alex Dely/Physics Dept./University of Arizona/Tucson, AZ 85711  
 Arthur L. de Munitiz/4121 Wilshire Blvd. (516)/Los Angeles, CA 90010  
 +\*Lester E. Denonn/135 Willow St./Brooklyn, NY 11202
- Pascal Diethelm/Possy/74380 Lucinges, France  
 Alberto Donadio/Apartado 16914/Bogotá, Colombia  
 Paul Doudna/10644 Jesskamp Dr./Ferguson, MO 63136  
 Sheila Dreckman/PO Box 244/Kieler, WI 53812  
 Tamula C. Drumm/110 Corson Av./Akron, OH 44302
- Pradeep Kumar Dubey/E.C.E. Dept./University of Massachusetts/Amherst, MA 01003  
 William Eastman, Ph.D./Dept. of Philosophy/The University of Alberta/Edmonton, Canada T6G 0W4  
 \*Prof. Paul Edwards/390 West End Av./NY NY 10024  
 Ronald Edwards/605 N. State St./Chicago, IL 60610  
 +Lee Eisler/RD 1, Box 409/Coopersburg, PA 18036
- Albert Ellis, Ph.D./Institute for Rational Living/45 E. 65th St./NY NY 10021  
 Albert Engleman/PO Box 32586/Oklahoma City, OK 73123  
 Graham Entwistle/70 Commons Dr. (5)/Shrewsbury, MA 01545  
 Don I. & Lynda Evans/2175 Mallul Dr. (116)/Anaheim, CA 92802  
 Richard Fallin/153 W. 80th St. (4A)/NY NY 10024
- Mark E. Farley/302 S. Masters Dr./Dallas, TX 75217  
 Paul Figueredo/2929 Roldo Dr. (167)/Houston, TX 77063  
 Kathleen Fjermedal/1555 Princeton St./Santa Monica, CA 90404  
 Phillips B. Freer/3845 Mt. Vernon Dr./Los Angeles, CA 90008  
 Thomas Frink/321 A 72nd St./Newport News, VA 23607
- Frank Gallo/1736 19th St., N.W./Washington, DC 20009  
 Alejandro R. Garcadiago, Ph.D./Inst. for the History and Philosophy of Science & Technology/University of Toronto/Toronto, Canada M5S 1A1  
 Paul Garwig/228 Penn Valley Terrace/Yardley, PA 19067  
 Seymour Genser/2236 82nd St./Brooklyn, NY 11214  
 +Ali Ghaemi/PO Box 427/McLean, VA 22101
- Mary W. Gibbons/211 Central Park West (7G)/NY NY 10024  
 Francisco Girón B./171 Chesters House/University of Strathclyde/Glasgow, Scotland G61 4AF  
 Judith Anne Gividen/General Delivery/Newport, RI 02840 (married to Leonard Cleavelin)  
 Jeffrey D. A. Gmelch/3971 Worthmor/Seaford, NY 11783  
 David Goldman, M.D./35 E. 85th St./NY NY 10028
- Artie Gomez/1674 Stephen St. (1R)/Flushing, NY 11385  
 Charles Green/307 Montana Av. (301)/Santa Monica, CA 90403  
 Bill Gregory/505 Oakway Road/Eugene OR 97401  
 Thomas Grundberg/Uardavägen A 63/S-223 71 Lund/Sweden  
 Stephen Hamby, Ph.D./Center for Rational Living/500 Lowell Dr. S.E./Huntsville, AL 35801
- Tim Harding/454 Wellington 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



- Terry L. Hildebrand/17802 Clark St./Union, IL 60180  
 Charles W. Hill, Ph.D./Rte 5, Box 61/Covington, LA 70433  
 Robert Homa/213 Barnum Terrace/Stratford, CT 06497  
 Ophelia & James L. Hoopes/250 Avalon Av./Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308  
 Thomas Horne/2824 E. Mission Lane/Phoenix, AZ 85028
- Douglas Hutchison/254 S. Lanza Ct./Saddle Brook, NJ 07662  
 Richard & Iris Hyman/6697 N. Grande Dr./Boca Raton, FL 33433  
 +Donald W. Jackanicz/3802 N. Kenneth Av./Chicago, IL 60641  
 John A. Jackanicz/3802 N. Kenneth Av./Chicago, IL 60641  
 Gustave Jaffe/844 Stanton Av./Baldwin, NY 11510
- William Jarrell III/208 Glenwood Tr./Southern Pines, NC 28387  
 Ann Jepson/167 Mimosa Dr./Dayton, OH 45459  
 Connie Jessen/2707 Pittsburgh St./Houston, TX 77005  
 Prof. David E. Johnson/Sampson Hall/U.S. Naval Academy/Annapolis, MD 21402  
 James M. Jones/Rt. 8, Box 294/Hickory, NC 28601
- Andres Kaarik/Roslagsgatan 40 C, 3tr./113 55 Stockholm, Sweden  
 +Prof. Marvin Kohl/Philosophy/State University College/Fredonia, NY 14063  
 Victoria Kokoras/20 Greenwood Rd./So. Peabody, MA 01960  
 Kenneth Korbin/300 Jay St.(914)/Brooklyn, NY 11201  
 Jack Krall/113 No. Lambert St./Philadelphia, PA 19103
- Henry Kraus/5807 Topanga Canyon Blvd.(K202)/Woodland Hills, CA 91364  
 Scott Kurhan/44 Cottontail Rd./Norwalk, CT 06854  
 Prof. Paul Kurtz/1203 Kensington Av./Buffalo, NY 14215  
 Corliss Lamont, Ph.D./315 W. 106th St./NY NY 10025  
 Herbert C. Lansdell, Ph.D./4977 Battery Lane(115)/Bethesda, MD 20814
- 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. University of Houston/ Houston, TX 77004  
 Gladys Leithauser, Ph.D./122 Elm Park/Pleasant Ridge, MI 48069
- John R. Lenz/317 W. 100th St.(4F)/NY NY 10025  
 Dr. H. W. Lessing/50 F, Cornwall Gardens/London S.W.7, U.K.  
 W. Arthur Lewis/PO Box 23/Fishers, NY 14453  
 Martin Lipin/7724 Melita Av./N. Hollywood, CA 91605  
 John M. Liston/805 Verde Vista/Visalia, CA 93277
- Don Loeb/423 S. Seventh St.(2)/Ann Arbor, MI 48103  
 Robert Lombardi/209 Hutchinson Av.(1)/Buffalo, NY 14215  
 Susana Ida Maggi/Room 1457/United Nations/PO Box 20/ NY NY 10163-0020  
 John M. Mahoney/208 South Blvd./Richmond, VA 23220  
 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  
 Daniel T. McDonald/PO Box 566/Laurinburg, NC 28352  
 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/PO Box 93/Abbotsford, Canada V2S 4N8  
 Joseph Mennen/Tulane Medical Center (Box A-51)/New Orleans, LA 70112  
 Scott Miller/140 Ocean Parkway (5B)/Brooklyn, NY 11218  
 +Prof. Hugh S. Moorhead/Dept. of Philosophy/Northeastern Illinois University/Chicago, IL 60625
- Dr. Frank L. Muehlmann/5240 N. 2nd St./Philadelphia, PA 19120  
 Jan Oorburg/23 Grote Markt/9712 HR Groningen/The Netherlands  
 William R. Ostrowski/1441 W. Thome Av./Chicago, IL 60660  
 Frank V. Page/19755 Henry Rd./Fairview Park, OH 44126  
 +Prof. David Pears/Christ Church/Oxford, England OX 1 1DP
- Karin E. Peterson/2323 S. 31st St./La Crosse, WI 54601  
 Paul M. Pfalzner/380 Hamilton Av./Ottawa, Canada K1Y 1C7  
 Gregory Pollock/1501 Farmers Av./Tempe, AZ 85281  
 \*Sir Karl R. Popper/Fallowfield, Manor Close/Manor Road/Penn, Buckinghamshire/England HP10 8HZ  
 Adelaide Projan/3653 N. 6 Av./Phoenix, AZ 85013
- +Jack Ragsdale/4461 23rd St./San Francisco, CA 94114  
 +Stephen J. Reinhardt/2401 Pennsylvania Av.(202)/Wilmington, DE 19806  
 Lela Marie Rivenbark/2615 Waugh Dr. (233)/Houston, TX 77006  
 Don Roberts, Ph.D./Dept. of Philosophy/University of Waterloo/Waterloo, Canada N2L 3G1  
 Vera Roberts/105, Ridgeview North/1200 Gitzel St./Yellowknife, Canada X1A 2C6
- Matthew Rosa/3000 SW 81st Av./Miami, FL 33155  
 +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  
 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
- Matthew Santoro/43-10 49th St./Sunnyside, NY 11104  
 Robert Sass/121 Spruce Dr./Saskatoon, Canada S7N 2J8  
 Gregory J. Scammell/Markland Rd./Lafayette, NY 13084  
 +\*Prof. Paul Arthur Schilpp/Dept. of Philosophy/Southern Illinois University/Carbondale, IL 62901  
 Vera Schwarcz/Dept of History/Wesleyan University/Middletown, CT 06457
- Leonard S. Schwartz/4520 Sander 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  
 +Carol R. Smith/10427 - 67th Av. S./Seattle, WA 98178
- +Warren Allen Smith/1435 Bedford St.(10A)/Stamford, CT 06905  
 Ludwig Slutsky/3939 Apache Trail(D12)/Antioch, TN 37013  
 Oswald Sobrino/401 28th St./New Orleans, LA 70124  
 John E. Sonntag/101 G St., S.W.(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  
 William H. Sperber/5814 Oakview Circle/Minnetonka, MN 55343  
 Philip Stander, Ed. D./Dept Behavioral Sciences/Kingsborough Community College, Brooklyn, NY 11235  
 Thomas J. Stanley/Box 366/Hartford, VT 05047  
 Prof. Roland N. Stromberg/7033 Fairchild Circle/Fox Point, WI 53217
- Jim Sullivan/1103 Manchester Dr./South Bend, IN 46615  
 Glenn W. Sunderland/Elderberry Rd./RR 1, Box 275/Newton, IL 62448  
 Ramon Carter Suzera/666 Ellis St. (102)/San Francisco, CA 94109  
 +\*Katharine Tait/46 Dunster St./Cambridge, MA 02138  
 Capt. Michael H. Taint/2025 Shroyer Rd/Oakwood, OH 45419
- W. Bruce Taylor/8103 Eastern Av.(B-307)/Silver Spring/MD 20910  
 James V. Terry/PO Box 7702/Stanford, CA 94305  
 Hugh B. Thomas/105 Swigert Av./Lexington, KY 40505  
 Richard H. Thomas/#141882/POB E/Jackson, MI 49204  
 Keith Thompson/905 W. Franklin(14)/Minneapolis, MN 55405
- John R. Tobin/867 East Howard St./Pasadena, CA 91104  
 Kouji Tomimori/195 Dan, Akame-Cho/Nabari City, Mie-Ken/518-04 Japan  
 Roy E. Torcaso/3708 Brightview St./Wheaton, MD 20902  
 Lloyd N. Trefethen/4 Washington Sq. Village (75)/NY NY 10012  
 Richard Tyson/R4 Box 83/Greenville, KY 42345

Rudolph Urmsbach/Bldg. I, Apt. 12/140 Camelot/Saginaw,  
MI 48603  
Eleanor & Clifford Valentine/5900 Second Place,N.W./  
Washington, DC 20011  
John Van Wissen/RR 2/Alliston, Canada L0M 1A0  
Fernando Vargas/130 W. 42nd St.(551)/NY NY 10036  
Major Herbert G. (ret) & Elizabeth Vogt/2101 S. Atlantic  
Av.(307)/Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

Paul Walker/RR Box 181/Elairsburg, IA 50034  
Rob & Ann Wallace/1502 S. Oregon Circle/Tampa, FL 33612  
Mark Weber/229 Pueblo Dr./Salinas, CA 93906  
Michael J. Weber/229 Pueblo Dr./Salinas, CA 93906  
Denise Weiland/11,rue Constantin/13100 Aix-en-Provence,  
France

Donna Weimer/327 Harris Drive/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 Dr./Chicago, IL 60610  
Robert E. Wilkinson/2425 Sharon Rd./Charlotte, NC 28211

Mike Williams/UVM MSH #53/Winooski, VT 05404  
Vincent Dufaux Williams/PO Box 1197/San Antonio, TX 78294  
Rabbi Sherwin T. Wine/555 South Woodward/Birmingham, MI 48011  
Kathleen Winsor/8115 El Paseo Grande/La Jolla, CA 92037  
Janis Yakopovic/8344 Vassel Dr./St. Louis, MO 63123

Ronald H. Yuccas/812 Morven Ct./Naperville, IL 60540  
Keith W. Yundt/3716 Ranfield Rd.(1)/Kent, OH 44240  
Terry & Judith Zaccone/13046 Anza Dr./Saratoga, CA 95070  
Harold W. & Lucille B. Zarse/1417 Columbia St.(2)/Lafayette,  
IN 47901  
James D. Zeithaml/Box 21025/Emory University/Atlanta, GA 30322

#### List of members: Part II

Lucia Adams/535 N. Michigan Av./Chicago, IL 60611  
Carrie Bartell/Box 131/Palmer Lake, CO 80133  
Graham Betts/1164 Emerald St. (1)/Madison, WI 53715  
Robert W. Burghart/Reynrock Plaza (403)/Perry at 4th/  
Castle Rock, CO 80104  
Gayle Campbell/65 Longwood Dr./Waterloo, Canada N2L 4B6

Richard A. Frank/6309 Hollywood Blvd. (171)/Los Angeles,  
CA 90028  
Ronald Gerlich/4625 Troy Lane/La Mesa, CA 92041  
Steven Darrell Goins/2934 Princeton Av./Jacksonville,  
FL 32210  
Monnye R. Gross/37 E. Montgomery Av./Ardmore, PA 19003  
Steven Hoffman/3768 Ashworth Dr. (8)/Cincinnati, OH 45208

Kennan A. Hutchins/Badstr. 1A/8500 Nürnberg l/West Germany  
Arvo Thalainer/6322 Colbath Av./Van Nuys, CA 91401  
Eric Kantor/811 Rockland Av./Mamaroneck, NY 10543  
Vivien Leone/52 Gramercy Park/NY NY 10010  
Mary Elizabeth McAdams/1020 S. Sherburne Dr. (205)/  
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Dr. Gaylan K. & Nancy Ross/368 S. Walnut St./Blairsville,  
PA 15717  
Miron Sky/1137 Cortez Av./Burlingame, CA 94010  
Wayne D. Smith/PO Box 295/Williamsburg, VA 23187-0295  
Kenneth Solomon/37 E. Montgomery Av./Ardmore, PA 19003

#### INDEX

- (44) Highlights (1). 1983 Meeting (2). Officers report: President Jackanicz (3), Acting Secretary Maragides (3.5,38,39), Treasurer Darland (40,41). Committee reports: Human rights (4), Science (5). BRS at APA: report on 1982 (6), call for papers for 1983 (7). ER & Popper on Einstein (8). BR Editorial Project (9). BR misrepresented by Runes (10a), Solzhenitsyn (10b), Hook (10c). BR on nuclear warmongers (11). Runes's brief biography of ER (12). ER bust at the Hirschhorn (13). Film Project (14). BRS Award: 1983 (Rotblat) press release (15), 1984 candidates wanted (16). BRS Doctoral Grant: 1983 recipient (Pineau) (17), 1984 offer (18). Creationism: "Only a Theory" (19), "Scientists Confront Creationism" (20). News about members: McDonald (21), Suzara (22). Letter to Reagan, Andropov (23). New members (24). Address changes (25). Vanity Fair's couples, 1928 (26). Contributors thanked (27). Contributions solicited (28). Page's good idea (29). BRS Fact Sheet (30). Candidates for Director (31). Volunteer needed (32). Other organizations: Freedom From Religion Foundation (33); Friends of Ingersoll (34); Hemlock (35); Institute of International Education (36). For sale: members' stationery (37). Minutes: Annual Meeting (38), Board's Meeting (39). Treasurer's Reports: 1st quarter '83 (40), 2nd quarter '83 (41). 7 opportunities to act (42). Membership list (43). Index (44). Ballot (45). Call for papers for 1984 (46).

#### LAST MINUTE ITEM

- (45) Call for papers for 1984 Annual Meeting, on the topic, "Was Russell Religious?" The papers will be read and discussed at the 1984 BRS Meeting at Toronto, as part of the BRS's own program for that weekend. If you'd like to submit a paper, send 3 copies of it — typed, double-spaced — to Bob Davis, 2501 Lake View Av., Los Angeles, CA 90039, for review by the Program Committee.

Another thing scheduled for the BRS's own program in June 1984 will be a workshop on "Russell and Your Own Views of Marriage", chaired by Marvin Kohl. Sounds good!

BALLOT

Election of Directors

9 Directors are to be elected for 3-year terms, starting 1/1/84.

Make a checkmark next to each of the 9 candidates for whom you wish to cast your vote. If you vote for more than 9, it disqualifies the ballot. Information about the candidates is provided in (31).

- Jack Cowles
- Cherie Ruppe
- Ali Ghaemi
- Paul A. Schilpp
- David Goldman
- Warren Smith
- Donald Jackanicz
- Tom Stanley
- Steve Maragides
- Kate Tait
- Frank Page
- Dan Wray

Your name (optional) \_\_\_\_\_ date \_\_\_\_\_  
please print

Please remove this page and fold it according to instruction on the other side. It is addressed, and needs no envelope. It does need a stamp (20¢ in the USA). Must be postmarked before October 1, 1983

\* \* \* \* \*

Comments are welcome. What, for instance, did you think of the freeze resolution (23)? Anything else in this newsletter that you'd like to say something about?

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---