

## RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS

No. 44

November 1984

- (1) Highlights: BBC documentary, "Bertie and the Bomb" (14). BR vs. Hook on unilateral disarming [11 1/2 pages] (16). 1984 BRS Award to Dora Russell (19). BRS newsletters in Library of Congress (35). Accidental war petition (10). Voting results (11). Why contribute? (33). 1985 BRS \$1000 Doctoral Grant announcement (22). Newsletter copyrighted (34). The index is at the end. An asterisk in the left column indicates a request.
- 

## COMING EVENTS

- (2) On Sunday, December 2nd, Al Seckel gives a talk (with slides) on BR, in Santa Barbara. For more, see (21)
- 

## ANNUAL MEETING (1985)

- (3) Washington, D.C. is the place, June 21-23 is the time, the next-to-last weekend in June. Mark it on your calendar; include it in your plans...and in your budget. Don Jackanicz, whose arrangements for the 1980 Chicago meeting made it an outstanding one, is again in charge of arrangements, so...expect a lot!. The programs for the annual meetings of the past 2 years were devised by the 2 Russell Conferences in Canada; the 1985 annual meeting will be the first in 3 years in which the BRS puts on its own program. More to come.
- 

## REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

(4) President Don Jackanicz reports:

The search for a new BRS Librarian has ended in the appointment of Tom Stanley. I would like to welcome him to this position while again thanking his predecessor, Jack Ragsdale, for a job well done these last several years. By making diverse and often rare materials more readily available, The BRS Library helps keep Russell's work and views known to the academic and general communities. Its activities have also been an important part of the BRS's aim of disseminating information on Russell to wider audiences. In the future I anticipate a growing role for the Library, and I invite all members to write to Tom and me concerning the Library's mission and how to foster its performance to an even higher level.

Work continues on planning the June 21-23, 1985 Annual Meeting to be held in Washington, D.C. The precise meeting place has not yet been chosen, though the likely site would be one of the area universities or hotels. Negotiations are now being conducted. Any member interested in making a presentation should write to me at the earliest convenience as the program is gradually being compiled. Suggestions for program items and agenda proposals for the Society Business Meeting should also be directed to me. And, of course, I very much hope each member is seriously considering attending. The next newsletter will contain further details on meeting plans.

Negotiations for the annual BRS Award and your views on the proposed 1986 BRS Annual Meeting in Britain are also welcomed. Now is the time for your input.

(5) Vice-President David Hart reports:

Lee Eisler has once again earned the gratitude of all BRS members, this time for his fine work in getting a videotape of the BBC's "Bertie and the Bomb". It is available from the BRS Library, and we might all think about how we could present it to various audiences. Many colleges have groups that work to promote a nuclear freeze. Student groups are always glad for any chance to hold a meeting; they would likely welcome someone who wants to show our videotape. In addition, even in this era of darkness, there are still a few colleges that have an ecology club. They too might have an interest in our videotape. Most

groups like to have outside visitors. So in thinking of prospective viewers, we need not limit ourselves to those groups to which we belong. Many churches have peace groups that do very good work; we ought not to ignore this potential source of interest.

In reading over the questionnaires returned by our new members, I am again and again surprised to learn how some casual event has set off a wholehearted interest in Russell. Russell is how own best advocate, if only people can be made aware of his work. Perhaps our videotape will be the small event that awakens curiosity and sends someone off to a bookshop or library, eager to read anything Russell wrote.

- (6) Vice-President/Special Projects Marvin Kohl reports. His review of Russell's Cambridge Essays 1888-99 appeared in Choice (April 1984, p 242). Here it is:

An extraordinary volume that should delight both the scholar and the general intelligent reader. For the scholar there are Russell's early and shorter writings on economics, epistemology, and logic; a bibliography and general index; and 127 pages of annotation and textual notes. For the general reader there are essays about the nature of ethics, politics and utilitarianism. In addition (and simply a delight to read), there is the diary of a 16-year-old arguing about the nature of religion and religious belief and, as a special bonus, a reading list containing 758 entries. The biographical material will be of special interest to those adolescent readers searching for a model or intellectual hero. A must for all college collections, and highly recommended for general libraries who wish to have the partial autobiography of a man who is clearly one of the greatest, if not the greatest, intellectual of our century.

[The reviewer's copy of this volume, furnished to us by the publisher, Allen & Unwin, is available from the BRS Library. Handle with care; it is a \$70 volume.]

Treasurer Dennis J. Darland reports:

- (7a) For the quarter ending 6/30/84:

Balance on hand (3/31/84).....	3053.60
Income:	
13 new members.....	246.45
62 renewals.....	1232.50
total dues.....	1478.95
contributions.....	75.00
sales of RSN, books, stationery, etc.....	18.25
total income.....	1572.20
	<u>4625.80</u>
Expenditures:	
Information and Membership Committees.....	1100.19
BRS Doctoral Grant.....	420.00
BRS Library.....	0.00
subscriptions to "Russell".....	0.00
bank charges.....	11.99
other.....	0.00
total spent.....	1532.18
	<u>1532.18</u>
Balance on hand (6/30/84).....	3093.62

- (7b) For the quarter ending 9/30/84:

Balance on hand (6/30/84).....	3093.62
Income:	
15 new members.....	285.00
18 renewals.....	332.70
total dues.....	617.70
contributions.....	115.72
sales of RSN, books, stationery, etc.....	60.83
unknown, to balance.....	2.28
total income.....	796.53
	<u>796.53</u>
Expenditures:	
Information and Membership Committees.....	785.40
BRS Doctoral Grant.....	0.00
BRS Library.....	203.28
subscriptions to "Russell".....	468.00
bank charges.....	7.50
other.....	0.00
total spent.....	1464.18
	<u>1464.18</u>
Balance on hand (9/30/84).....	2425.97

## REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

(8) Library Committee (Tom Stanley, Librarian):

The Library is in process of being shipped to Vermont. I expect it will be intact, and orders processed, by the time this issue arrives. Please excuse any delays that have occurred during the transition.

"Bertie and the Bomb", the BBC documentary, is our latest acquisition. We have four copies of this VHS cassette, three of which are on loan. If anyone has a specific date when they would like to view it, please notify me at once.

The Librarian's appeal (RSN43-27) has elicited a very generous donation of books from Al Seckel. Also worth noting, we have The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell, Vol 1 (Cambridge Essays, 1888-1899). [See (6)]

[For more news about the Library, see (12-15)]

(9) Philosophers' Committee (David E. Johnson, Chairman):

Program  
of  
THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.  
at the December 1984 Meeting  
of the Eastern Division of  
THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

TIME: December 28, 1984. 10:00 to 11:50 a.m.

PLACE: The New York Hilton Hotel, Nassau Suite A

PAPER: "Knowledge By Description"  
Russell Wahl, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, IN

COMMENTATOR: Justin Leiber, University of Houston .

CHAIRMAN: David E. Johnson, U. S. Naval Academy

\* \* \* \* \*

ABSTRACT OF RUSSELL WAHL'S PAPER, "KNOWLEDGE BY DESCRIPTION"

This paper examines Bertrand Russell's notion of knowledge by description and explores two questions: whether it is really correct to say a person can have merely descriptive knowledge of a thing, and whether truths can be known about things known only by description. I argue that Russell's original intention in introducing this notion was to account for the possibility that truths could be known about things with which one is not acquainted. This is the case despite some of Russell's later claims that such things as Piccadilly, physical objects and other things which are known only by description are really logical constructions of things known by acquaintance. Far from being a consequence of the position in "On Denoting" and "Knowledge by Acquaintance, Knowledge by Description," this more constructivist view actually conflicts with it in some respects.

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

Instead of a formal report, Alex submits (1) his article, "Accidental War", that appeared in a University of Arizona publication (Fall '84), and (2) a related petition about accidental war. We suggest that you photocopy the petition, get signatures, and mail it to the address given. Alex has drafted an "Accidental Nuclear War Prevention Act", which has been submitted to Congress, and your petitions with signatures might be helpful. The article and the petition are on the next page.

THE MEMBERS VOTE

- (11) Results of the vote: The Bylaws revised in June 1984 were approved. All candidates for Director were elected or re-elected for 3-year terms starting 1/1/85: JACQUELINE BERTHON-PAYON, BOB DAVIS, ALEX DELY, ALI GHAEMI, HUGH MOORHEAD, DAN WRAY. The ballots were tallied by Lee Eisler, and the count was verified by Secretary John Lenz, as required by Article 11, Section 2 of the new Bylaws.



## BRS LIBRARY

(12) New Librarian is Tom Stanley, book lover, book collector, and book seller (specializing, with his wife, in used and out-of-print books, as STANLEY BOOKS.) A 7-year BRS member, he says they "finally settled in Vermont where I had hoped to make a living selling books. After starving at this, I found employment selling [electronic equipment], and my wife took up teaching. Our business only allows us the luxuries, like buying a set of the Collected Papers." He is a member of two local "peace" groups, the Vermont Archeological Society, the Vermont Historical Society, and the Vermont Antiquarian Booksellers Association. In his free time, he enjoys Bach and hiking with his daughter. We welcome him warmly to his new post. His address is on Page 1, bottom.

(13) 7 Films for rent, listed below with rental prices, may be borrowed by BRS members and responsible non-members. All are 16mm. black and white. A \$75 deposit is required, to be refunded when the film is returned, less the cost of shipping and insurance. Films are rented for one week, except when other arrangements are made with the Librarian. When ordering, specify the date when the film is wanted. If you know of any other films in private collections, other libraries, or broadcasters' files, please tell Librarian Tom Stanley about it. His address is on Page 1, bottom. Here are the films:

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

Each of the above runs for 13 1/2 minutes. BR is interviewed by Woodrow Wyatt (1959). The interviews are transcribed in the book Bertrand Russell Speaks His Mind (Greenwood, publisher). The audio portion of #1 is available on LP "Bertrand Russell Speaking" (Caedmon TC-1149). Rental: \$25 plus \$75 deposit per film.

6. Bertrand Russell.

Runs 39 minutes. BR is interviewed by Romney Wheeler on his 80th Birthday (1952). A transcript can be found in Atlantic Monthly (August 1952, pp. 51-54). Rental: \$40 plus \$75 deposit.

7. The Life and Times of Bertrand Russell.

Runs 40 minutes. Produced by the BBC for BR's 90th Birthday Celebration (1962). BR is interviewed, and so are several prominent British figures. Main emphasis is on the threat of nuclear war and BR's efforts to diminish it. Rental: \$40 plus \$75 deposit.

(14) "Bertie and the Bomb". The BRS Library has acquired a VHS videotape of this 40-minute BBC TV program that was shown in Britain in April and very well received. (We've seen the laudatory press clippings. We've also seen "Bertie and the Bomb" itself. Not to be missed!) It has not been seen on US or Canadian TV, so we have something unique, at least for the moment. It deals mainly with BR's opposition to nuclear weapons. Two BRS Award recipients appear in it: Dora Russell and Joseph Rotblat.

You may wish to borrow it from the BRS Library to show to your group or organization. If you do this, mention that it has been provided by the Bertrand Russell Society; and anyone wishing information about the Society (by mail) should give you his name and address.

If you show it to a group, please send us brief report: name of group (if any), size of audience, how many asked for information about the BRS, and audience reaction.

One limitation on its use: don't get carried away and offer it to a local TV station. We do not have BBC's permission for that.

Technical note: the tape has been recorded at a slow speed. Some videotape players play it correctly, some do not. Try it out to make sure it plays on your player.

As reported last issue (RSN43-28), there is no charge for borrowing tapes. Borrower pays for postage and \$50 worth of insurance both ways, ordinarily. But in this case, if you are showing "Bertie" to a group, the BRS will share the cost, will pay it going out; you pay it coming back. If you are not showing it to a group, please send \$3 with your order for one-way postage and \$50 insurance; any excess will be refunded in stamps. Order from BRS Library, address on Page 1, bottom.

(15) Vidal on audiotape. Last issue, JACK RAGSDALE recommended a videotape (#260A) of Gore Vidal on the Donahue show (RSN43-29). Since many more people have audiotape players than have videotape players, we made an audio cassette copy of the video. The audiotape turns out to be excellent...like an unusually good radio show. Available from the BRS Library.

## BR ON UNILATERAL NUCLEAR DISARMING

(16a) In Sidney Hook's review of Volume I of Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell (RSN41-25), he quotes BR's statement, "I am for controlled nuclear disarmament, but if the Communists cannot be induced to agree to it, then I am for unilateral disarmament even if it means the horrors of Communist domination."

We wrote Professor Hook and asked for the source of the statement (RSN42-7), and he responded: "It was made to Joseph Alsop, the newspaper correspondent, and was the occasion of my exchanges with Bertrand Russell in the New Leader in 1958 which continued for some time... R. himself in the course of the correspondence acknowledges he made it but implies he was tricked into doing so and that I misunderstood his real intent."

We have read the 1958 newspaper article by Joseph Alsop from which Professor Hook extracted one sentence. It shows, we believe, that this one sentence, standing alone — taken out of context, the context being everything that BR said on that occasion — misrepresents BR's position. The part is not the whole.

Here it is; judge for yourself. (We are indebted to HARRY RUJA for telling us where to look for the Alsop article, and to the Hawaii Star-Bulletin for supplying it, from its issue of 2/21/58):

(16b)

## Bertrand Russell Gives an Opinion On How to Survive in Nuclear Age

By JOSEPH ALSOP

LONDON, Feb. 21—The room is colorlessly comfortable, without character except for the superb view of the Thames through the wide windows.

The room's inhabitant suggests a particularly spry bird. The nose is beaklike; the shock of white hair is a superb crest, and even the voice, high, dry and sometimes a little harsh, is decidedly avian.

Such is Lord Bertrand Russell, at the age of 85 and in the midst of his inexhaustible career's new phase as a most powerful influence on British and world opinion.

### STILL GOING STRONG

None with any sense of history can first encounter Bertrand Russell without a spasm of downcast incredulity.

There he still is, you say to yourself, yet he said his ABCs to the man who moved Britain's reform bill of 1832 and reached the Prime Ministership before Palmerston.

The grandfather, Lord John Russell, bore the largest single share of the responsibility for ushering England into the new democratic age; and in order to do so, he helped drive from office the men who beat Napoleon.

### MANY FACETS

The grandson has been a dozen things—great philosopher, great logician, First World War pacifist, Second World War anti-Nazi and always a passionate libertarian

and a passionate anti-Communist.

But now his life and work are dedicated to a vigorous crusade to ban the nuclear weapons at all costs.

Age has not dimmed the power of his mind or increased his appetite for self-delusion, either.

What sets Bertrand Russell altogether apart from the vast majority of his fellow crusaders is mainly his honesty in facing hard facts and hard choices.

### SURVIVAL OF THE RACE

"I am for controlled nuclear disarmament," he says briskly, fixing his caller with an eye that is almost hypnotically sharp.

"I am for any negotiations, any first steps, any efforts that may promote understanding—anything, in short, that may bring controlled disarmament a little nearer."

What is at stake is simply the survival of the human race; for if we go on as we are going, we risk a nuclear war, and the human race will not survive such a war.

There is something in him—something perhaps of those "ancestral voices" prophesying war that Coleridge heard in his dream—that makes one reluctant to interrupt the flow of his explanation.

### THE HARD DECISION

But the question has to be asked: "What if the Soviets cannot be induced, by any imaginable effort, to agree to controlled nuclear dis-

armament?"

"Then," he says, with sharp emphasis, "I personally am for unilateral nuclear disarmament. It is a bitter choice. I have thought much about it, and I do not think I deceive myself about its nature."

"Unilateral disarmament is likely to mean, for a while, Communist domination of this world of ours."

"As you know very well how I feel about the Communist system, my choice may surprise you—and mind you, I speak only for myself, not for anyone I am working with, and with little hope of persuading others."

### ULTIMATE CHOICE

"But if the alternatives are the eventual extinction of mankind and a temporary Communist conquest, I prefer the latter."

"It would be inexpressibly horrible, but it would not endure, anymore than Genghis Khan's altogether horrible empire endured."

"And the end of the human race on earth is, after all, an absolutely irreversible event."

He mused for a while after stating his ultimate choice. Then he began to set forth his arguments that "sane men among the Soviets must be just as disturbed as sane men on our side to find themselves in this prison of the balance of terror."

### VARIOUS SCHEMES

We have not really tried, he kept repeating; we have

not really tried to reach agreement by sensible stages and equal concessions.

And so he fell to analyzing, in great detail and with much shrewdness, the various schemes for first disarmament steps, disengagement of Europe, closing the nuclear club, and all the other expedients now so much discussed.

At the close, he was asked another question: whether he did not think that it was better to maintain the "balance of terror" until the Kremlin gave stronger proof it was ready to negotiate.

And to this he replied again, "I tell you, if we go on as we are going much longer, we risk the end of the human race."

### CONTRASTING ERAS

As one left the simple room, the mind's eye held a vision of the grandfather's time—Wellington's dispatch rider driving furiously into London with the Waterloo standards of Napoleon's guards poked out of the carriage window.

And to make the contrast in time, the mind's ear held the echo of the dry, precise old voice of the grandson, setting forth his alternatives for the H-bomb age as he grimly perceives them.

You may think his advice altogether wrong, as does this reporter; but this was still a voice deserving to be heard and carefully considered in the final judgment.

- (16c) Hook's 1984 misrepresentation of BR's position on Communism, in his review of "Collected Papers", is not new. He has done it often. He recently said, "So long as we keep our guard up and do not capitulate, as Kennan and Russell would have us do..." (RSN39-10c). Hook accused BR of being a "spokesman for appeasement and surrender to Communism", in an article in Commentary (July 1976) (RSN41-6).

Let us look at the 1958 New Leader articles that Professor Hook refers to.

- (16d) A FOREIGN POLICY FOR SURVIVAL  
by Sidney Hook  
in The New Leader April 7, 1958

American foreign policy has been in a state of crisis ever since the end of World War II. The crises have been partly of this country's own making. It has made error upon error, all based upon the failure to understand the nature of the Communist threat. It sacrificed essential political principles in the military struggle against Nazi totalitarianism. It demobilized its troops in Europe too soon. It failed to use its monopoly of atomic power to effect world disarmament and international control of nuclear weapons. It withdrew its troops from Korea, practically inviting Communist aggression. It fought the Korean War against the Chinese under self-imposed limitations. It liquidated the war short of victory when the Communist Chinese were in retreat. It stood idly by when Soviet troops slaughtered the Hungarian freedom fighters, who were actually the allies of the West.

\* \* \* \* \*

Shortly after the first atomic bomb was exploded, Elmer Davis responded to the call for one world with the retort: "No world is better than some worlds." It is possible to panic the West by a picture of the universal holocaust a nuclear war would bring, to panic the West to a point where survival on any terms seems preferable to the risks of resistance. The pages of history show that moral integrity in extreme situations is often the highest political wisdom. The struggle against totalitarianism is not only a political struggle but also a moral one, which limits the extent to which we can carry appeasement. If Hitler had commanded the weapon resources of the Soviet Union, would we have yielded to one Munich after another until the world was one vast concentration camp? I hardly think so. Those who are prepared to sacrifice freedom for peace and for mere life will find after such sacrifice no genuine peace and life unfit for man. Paradoxical as it may sound, life itself is not a value. What gives life value is not its mere existence but its quality. Whoever proclaims that life is worth living under any circumstances has already written for himself an epitaph of infamy. For there is no principle or human being he will not betray; there is no indignity he will not suffer or compound.

Sometimes those who should know better seem to ignore this. Bertrand Russell recently declared in an interview with Joseph Alsop that, if the Communists could not be induced to agree to reasonable proposals for controlled nuclear disarmament, he would be in favor of unilateral disarmament even if this meant Communist domination of the entire world. Although he stated the view as only his own, the fact that he made it public is tantamount to an advocacy of a policy sure to be widely interpreted in the West and in the Kremlin as one of complete capitulation to Communist intransigence.

It is with a feeling of great personal sadness that I observe Bertrand Russell urge that, to avoid the risk of war, we in effect haul down the colors of freedom and moral decency to save mankind for Communist rule. After all, we cannot be certain that the terror of Communism will not endure or be followed by something worse. "Oh! what a noble mind is here o'erthrown!" The man who in The Free Man's Worship was prepared to defy the very cosmos and "the trampling march of unconscious power," in order to sustain the ideals of human freedom come what may, now sinks on unwilling but still bended knees before Khrushchev at the thought of the danger of universal destruction.

Bertrand Russell's career as a counselor to mankind, here as in some of his observations about the United States as a police state, proves that all the mathematical logic in the world is not a substitute for common sense. In so many words, he says: "I am for controlled nuclear disarmament, but, if the Communists cannot be induced to agree to it, then I am for unilateral disarmament even if it means the horrors of Communist domination." When they listen to sentiments like this, why should the Soviets consent to controlled nuclear disarmament? All they need do is wait and the world will be given to them on a platter to do with as they will. Why should they compromise? Not knowing whether they will survive our resolution to fight if necessary for freedom, they may be tempted to accept reasonable proposals. But words like Russell's tell them that all they need do is sit tight, make threats, and wait for us to come crawling to them disarmed. It is like saying to a ruffian or burglar: "You let me alone and I'll let you alone, but if you insist on not letting me alone, you can have your way with me. If you find my lock too difficult to force, be patient and I shall remove it." This is almost a provocation to the burglar to make the most extreme demands and reject any reasonable settlement. Russell's words express a dubious political morality and a bad strategy. They bring about the very intransigence among the Communists that he uses as the justification for capitulation.

[Hook's article continues, but without further reference to Russell. End of excerpt.]

\* \* \* \* \*

(16e)

WORLD COMMUNISM AND NUCLEAR WAR  
 By Bertrand Russell  
 in The New Leader May 26, 1958

Dr. Sidney Hook's article, "A Foreign Policy for Survival" (NL, April 7) contains much with which I am in agreement -- more, I think, than Dr. Hook realizes. Before embarking upon controversial matters, I will emphasize the extent of agreement by repeating a statement, the first three paragraphs of which were originally made by the American Nobel Anniversary Committee and subsequently published, with the addition of the last paragraph, in many countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain:

"Negotiations between East and West with a view to finding ways of peaceful coexistence are urgently desirable. Certain principles should govern such negotiations: (1) Any agreement arrived at should as a whole be not advantageous to either party; (2) it should be such as to diminish causes of friction; (3) it should be such as to diminish the danger of a more or less inadvertent outbreak of nuclear warfare.

"The procedure I should wish to see adopted would be, first, a meeting at the highest level between the governments of the U.S. and the USSR, not intended to reach binding agreements but to explore the possibility of a compromise which both powers would accept. The negotiations involved should be secret until the possibility of such compromise had been established. If such a compromise seems feasible, it should be recommended by both parties to the other powers of NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

"If an agreement is to be successful in averting the risk of nuclear warfare, it must provide for the destruction of nuclear weapons and the cessation of their manufacture under the guarantee of inspection by an agreed neutral authority. It must also provide for the removal of all alien troops from agreed territory including, as minimum, East and West Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary -- Germany not to remain in NATO or the above satellites in the Warsaw Pact. The Countries in Eastern and Western Europe must be free to adopt whatever form of government and whatever economic system they may prefer.

"I have been dealing with measures that are imminently necessary if the risk of a great war is to be diminished. But in the long run, the only solution which will make the world safe is the establishment of a World Government with a monopoly of the major weapons of war. The world is not yet ready for such an institution, but it may be hoped that experience will gradually convince men of its necessity."

It will be seen that the statement is very similar to the first part of Dr. Hook's article. Where he and I disagree is as to the advisability of an ultimate resort to nuclear war if the Communist powers cannot be contained by anything less. Both Dr. Hook and I are concerned with possibilities which we respectively think improbable. Dr. Hook maintains that even if his policy led to the extinction of human life, it would still be better than a Communist victory. I maintain, on the contrary, that a Communist victory would not be so great a disaster as the extinction of human life. He admits that his policy might lead to the one disaster, though he does not think that it would. I admit that the policy which I advocate might lead to the other disaster, though I, again, do not think that it would do so. We are agreed that both these extreme consequences are somewhat hypothetical, and we are also agreed that both of them would be disasters. We differ only as to which of them would be the greater disaster.

Before arguing this question in impersonal terms, there are some observations of a more personal kind that may help to clear the ground. Those who oppose the policy which I advocate insinuate that it is inspired by personal cowardice. A moment's reflection would show them that such a supposition is absurd. Neither universal Communist domination nor the extinction of the human race is likely to occur before I die a natural death. I do not, therefore, have to consider whether I should most fear my nuclear disintegration or my slow torture in an Arctic labor camp. At my age, views as to the not immediate future are necessarily impersonal.

Another thing with is insinuated is that I am surreptitiously favorable to Communism. One might as well accuse Dr. Hook of wishing to see the human race exterminated. Obviously he does not wish the one and I do not wish the other. We both admit that both would be disasters. We differ only, I repeat, as to which would be the greater disaster.

I cannot but deplore the passage in which Dr. Hook laments my supposed moral downfall. It is not by such arguments that difficult issues can be decided. He does not seem aware that it would be easy to make a retort in kind and to accuse him of being a super-Caligula. But argumentation in this vein is an obstacle to rationality. I shall, therefore, abstain from it, and I wish that he would do likewise.

I come now to an impersonal consideration of the issue. There are here two quite distinct matters to be discussed: First, what is the likelihood that the policy which I advocate would lead to the universal domination of Communism? And, second, if it did, would this be worse than the ending of human life? It is the second question that I wish to examine, since the first involves difficult political and psychological considerations as to which differences of opinion will inevitably persist.



Dr. Hook asserts that "Bolshevism is the greatest movement of secular fanaticism in human history." I will not dispute this, but is there not also fanaticism in the attitude of Dr. Hook and of the powerful men who agree with him? Human history abounds in great disasters. One civilization after another has been swept away by hordes of barbarians. The Minoan-Mycenaean civilization was destroyed by savage warriors whose descendants, after a few centuries, became the Greeks whom we revere. When the Mohammedans swept over the greater part of the Eastern Roman Empire, it seemed to Christian contemporaries that the civilization of the regions which they conquered was being destroyed, and yet, before long, it was the Arabs who mainly preserved the heritage of antiquity. Genghis Khan was quite as bad as Stalin at his worst, but his grandson Kublai Khan was a highly civilized monarch under whom Chinese culture flourished.

The men who think as Dr. Hook does are being un-historical and are displaying a myopic vision to which future centuries are invisible. A victory of Communism might be as disastrous as the barbarian destruction of the Roman Empire, but there is no reason to think that it would be more disastrous than that event. While the human race survives, humaneness, love of liberty, and a civilized way of life will, sooner or later, prove irresistibly attractive. The progress of mankind has always been a matter of ups and downs. The downs have always seemed final to contemporaries, and the ups have always given rise to unfounded optimism. Western Europe in the year 1000 gave no promise of the renaissance that began some centuries later. The human spirit throughout Western Christendom was as narrowly imprisoned as it was in Russia under Stalin. Any person who supposes that the evils of Communism, if it achieved a supremacy, would last forever is allowing himself to be so limited by the heat of present controversies as to be unable to see their similarity to equally virulent controversies in the past or to realize that a dark age, if it is upon us, like the dark ages of the past, will not last forever.

Dr. Hook says quite truly that life, in itself, is not of value. It gives, however, the only possibility of any value. I cannot applaud the arrogance of those who say: "If the next century or so is to be such as I (if I were alive) would find unpleasant, I shall decide that not only this period but all future time shall be destitute of life." Nor can I wholly admire the kind of "courage" which is advocated by Dr. Hook and others who think like him, which has, in large part, a vicarious character somewhat detracting from its nobility. I have nothing to say against the man who commits suicide rather than live under a regime which he thinks is evil, but I do not feel much approval of the man who condemns everybody else to death because he himself does not find life worth living.

I have tried to keep this discussion on a rational rather than an emotional plane, but I cannot resist giving expression to my final judgment, which is that to risk the end of human life because we regard Communism as evil is fanatical, defeatist and pusillanimous in the highest possible degree.

\* \* \* \* \*

(16f)

A FREE MAN'S CHOICE  
by Sidney Hook  
in the New Leader May 26, 1958

It is a debater's stratagem, unworthy of Bertrand Russell's great gifts, to assert that I called his personal courage into question in criticizing the policy he advocates as one of surrender to Communism. It was his political judgment I criticized, not his character. Indeed, despite his praiseworthy declaration that arguments in the impersonal mode will best clarify our disagreements, it is he who descends to the use of personal epithets. I shall not follow him. I ask only that he stop pretending that anyone is charging him with cowardice or that any politically literate person believes he favors Communism. He no more favors Communism than that democratic Western statesman who appeased Hitler, out of fear of war, favored Fascism. Nonetheless they were the assisting architects of the ruin of millions.

The issues between us are two. The first Russell wholly avoids, even though it is my main point and by far of greater political weight. Russell has declared to the entire world that, if the Soviet Union refuses to accept reasonable proposals for international disarmament, the West should disarm unilaterally -- even at the cost of the universal reign of Communist terror. I criticized this view as helping to produce the very situation in which we may have to choose between capitulation to Communist tyranny or war.

I find bewildering Russell's claim that the four paragraphs he cites in his rejoinder are "very similar" to the first part of my article. These paragraphs are worth precisely nothing when coupled with his present advice. They flatly contradict it. The first principle he recommends to govern negotiations between East and West is: "Any agreement arrived at should as a whole be not advantageous to either party." Excellent! Then he broadcasts to the world: If the Kremlin refuses to make such an agreement, the West should disarm unilaterally. Why, then, should the Kremlin enter into any such agreement or abide by it if it does? Russell's position today constitutes positive encouragement to the Communist leaders to be unreasonable and thus inherit the world without a struggle.

Let us not deceive ourselves: It is obvious that the leaders of the Soviet Union are keeping a sensitive watch on the pulse of public opinion in Western countries. It is not for nothing that the man whom they called "the running dog of imperialism," and who still despises their tyranny, is now built up in their controlled press as the "true friend of peace." Throughout the world, Communists are infiltrating into the pacifist

movement whose non-pacific demonstrations they often spark. I am convinced that the growth of pacifist and neutralist sentiment in the West was at least partly responsible for the Soviet Union's withdrawal from the sessions of the UN Disarmament Commission, where reasonable proposals along the lines of Russell's paragraphs could be considered; its hardening attitude along the political front; its repudiation of the Geneva agreement on Germany; its recent UN veto of the proposal for Arctic inspection. Such actions may also be based on the hope that a position like Russell's will undermine the West's resolution to resist aggression.

Arguments from history are rarely decisive, but I think it is fairly well established that the appeasement of Hitler — not only Munich but the mood that nothing could be worse than war — encouraged Hitler in his aggression. I go further. Even if in my heart I agreed with Russell (as I do not) that in the ultimate event, capitulation to Communism was a lesser evil than the risks of war, I should regard it as a piece of unmitigated political foolishness to proclaim it. We live in a contingent world. What we do, even sometimes what we say, counts. Especially important are the policies we advocate. For, to the extent that they influence human action, they influence future events. Russell's proposal is tantamount to playing with all the cards face up against a shrewd and ruthless gambler with a hidden hand. When the stakes are human freedom, it is irresponsible to play a game which invites the Kremlin to bluff us into submission with threats of atomic blackmail. The Soviets are just as vulnerable to us as we are to them.

The Soviet leaders belong to the human race, too. For them survival is an even more important value than for many in the West. That is why I am convinced that ultimately they are more likely to consent to reasonable proposals for a peaceful settlement once they are persuaded that we will fight rather than surrender, than if they are persuaded by Russell and others that we will surrender rather than fight. This is the crucial point which Russell has completely ignored.

Santayana somewhere defines a fanatic as one who, having forgotten his goal, redoubles his efforts. Among my goals are freedom and peace. That's why I believe that all nations should freely choose their economic and political systems. That is why I have never advocated a preventive war for the sake of peace, as Russell did in 1948, when the West had a monopoly on atomic power. He was wrong then in urging that the Soviet Union be forced, by atomic bombs if necessary, to yield to a world government. (Many A-bombs could have the effect of a few H-bombs.) He is wrong now in urging capitulation on the West because the Soviet Union has the hydrogen bomb. He went too far in one direction; he now goes too far in the other, as if he were atoning for his earlier extremism. In both cases, he underestimated the political and psychological elements in the situation and overestimated the technological ones.

I do not see why a policy which seeks to confine the fanaticism of Bolshevism by taming it with the fear of failure should be called fanatical. As well say that a man who believes in tolerance and is therefore intolerant of those who manifest intolerance is himself intolerant. On the contrary, assuming belief to be a habit of action, a person who is tolerant of a show of intolerance does not really believe in tolerance. If the West follows the foreign policy I have advocated, it will not have to choose between capitulation to Communism or war. This is the choice Russell's proposal forces us into. It seems to me today that the probability of Communism destroying human liberty everywhere is considerably greater than the probability, if it comes to war, of human life being destroyed everywhere — particularly if we keep up scientific inquiry into defense.

After all, just a few short years ago, Russell declared that the destruction of the whole of Europe was not too great a price to pay in order that "Communism be wiped out." There were some who regarded this position as "fanatical, defeatist and pusillanimous," since such a war if prolonged might have had a disastrous effect on the human race. It may be that today, if the scientists of the free world rally to the cause of freedom's defense and not to the cause of Russell and unilateral Western disarmament, discoveries will be made which will counteract some of the lethal after-effects of weapons. In that case, even if the Kremlin forces a war on the West, it may be repelled without the destruction of all human life or even the whole of Western Europe. It is an error to assume that a balance of armaments or even an armaments race inevitably makes for war. There is a risk, of course. The important thing, therefore, is to see to it that the potential aggressor never is certain that he can win. But this is precisely what Russell's policy prevents us from doing.

Suppose now we were confronted with the limiting case: choice between the horror of Communism for some hundreds of years and the end of human life. Here every lover of freedom and of life is on uncertain and tragic ground. One cannot be sure that at the decisive moment the situation will look the same. Yet every compassionate person, including Russell, feels that there is a limit in suffering and ignominy beyond which the whole human enterprise comes into moral question. The problem is where to draw the limit. At present, I cannot, like Russell, find grounds in history for reconciling myself to the first of the above alternatives. Some of my reasons are:

- 1) In the past, the triumphs of barbarism were local, not universal. Today, a Communist world would be a tightly knit despotism of fear without sanctuaries, without interstices to hide, without possibilities for anonymity.

- 2) In the past, tyrants ruled with a primitive technology. The possession today of refined scientific techniques increases immeasurably the extent and intensity of terror ruthless men can impose on those they rule. A Communist world could easily become a scientific Gehenna — something incomparably worse than the destruction of the Roman Empire by the barbarians.

- 3) I cannot regard the achievement which in the past has sometimes followed the triumph of cruel tyrants as worth the price in torture and agony that preceded it. To me, the splendor and glory of the court of

Kublai Khan were not worth even one of the many pyramids of human skulls his grandfather, Genghis Khan, heaped up in carving out his empire. And a few years ago I believe Bertrand Russell would have agreed with me. If the triumph of Hitler were a necessary condition for a new renaissance, what anti-Fascist would be willing to pay the price?

4) It is not at all unlikely that factional struggle will break out again either at the Communist center or periphery among the political gangsters who rule the Communist world. In such an event, thermonuclear weapons of even more destructive power than those we know may be used to end men's miserable lives, and all the additional agony and terror would have been in vain.

5) It is no arrogance on my part to propose to the generation of the free that they follow a policy of resistance rather than surrender, any more than it is arrogant for Russell to propose surrender rather than resistance. But perhaps he means it is arrogant for any generation of men to make a decision which will prevent the future generations of the yet unborn to have their chance and make their choice. I must confess that I have some difficulty with this notion of obligation, as if it implied there were millions of souls extending into eternity waiting to be born. I do not share this theology. If there are such souls, they may perhaps become embodied elsewhere.

Communists have always argued that it is justified to bury several generations, if necessary, in order to fertilize the soil of history for a glorious future to be enjoyed by the still unborn. In some respects, Russell's argument is similar except that, as an opponent of Communism, he puts the glory much further into the future. Cosmic optimism, however, seems no more credible to me than historical optimism.

Morally, those who are unborn cannot reproach us for denying them the bliss of birth in a Communist world but those who already exist, our children and grandchildren, may curse us for turning them over to the jailers of a Communist 1984 in which, brainwashed and degraded, they are not even free to die until their masters give them leave. There are more horrors in the Communist heaven or hell than Russell seems aware of.

There is an air of unreality about this phase of the discussion. It is improbable that Englishmen who refused to knuckle under to Hitler and his V-2 bombs will seriously consider doing so to Krushchev and his more powerful bombs. If they did, the United States and Canada would still remain staunchly opposed to Communist tyranny. The discussion seems fanciful, almost bizarre, because only if we accept Russell's position or one similar to it will the enemies of freedom be emboldened to confront us with the momentous choice of total surrender or total war. Human life may be destroyed by accident or by the maniacal whim of a dictator, against which there is no safeguard -- even by surrender. But, if it is destroyed by war, it will be because our foolishness will tempt the enemy to forget his mortality.

In conclusion, I wish to repeat that nothing I have written is intended in any way as a reflection on Bertrand Russell, a man and philosopher whom I have usually admired even when I have strongly disagreed with him. I impugn only his political intelligence in this grave crisis of human freedom. I lament the fact that he has capped a lifetime of gallant opposition to despotism with the unsound recommendation that we unconditionally surrender to the cruellest tyranny in human history.

\* \* \* \* \*

(16g)

FREEDOM TO SURVIVE  
by Bertrand Russell  
in The New Leader July 14, 1958

My discussion with Sidney Hook in your pages has not given a clear picture of what my position is. I do not blame Dr. Hook for this. I have been led into a purely academic issue as if it were one of practical politics. Everybody knows that neither the U.S. nor the USSR will disarm unilaterally. The question of whether either would be wise to do so is, therefore, no more than an exercise in theoretical ethics. Speaking practically, and not theoretically, what I advocate is that methods should be sought of, first, lessening the East-West tension and then, negotiating agreements on vexed questions on the basis of giving no net advantage to either side. Such negotiations, if they are to be satisfactory, must include the mutual renunciation of nuclear weapons with an adequate system of inspection.

It is true that I advocate practically, and not only theoretically, the abandonment of the H-bomb by Britain and the prevention of the spread of H-bombs to powers other than the U.S. and the USSR. I do not consider that unilateral renunciation of British H-bombs would have any measurable effect upon the balance of power, and I do consider that the acquisition of H-bombs by many powers will greatly increase the danger of nuclear war. This makes the question of British renunciation of H-bombs quite distinct from that of general unilateral disarmament by one of the two camps.

The question at issue between Dr. Hook and myself arises only if all attempts at negotiation fail. Dr. Hook speaks as though I wished the United States Government to announce that it is prepared to give way at all

points and suggests that I have no such wish as regards the Soviet Government. I think this question is quite unreal since, whatever might be the part of ideal wisdom, it is certain that neither side will surrender completely to the other. However, since the question is considered important, I will do my best to restate my opinion more unmistakably.

To eliminate emotional factors I shall speak of two power blocs, A and B, leaving it completely undetermined which of them is Communist and which anti-Communist. The argument proceeds on the hypothesis that, if there is a war between the two blocs, the human race will be exterminated. It further supposes a situation in which one of the two blocs is so fanatical that it prefers the ending of mankind to a rational compromise. In such a situation, I think that the less fanatical bloc, if it had the welfare of mankind in view, would prefer concession to warfare. I should say this equally to both sides.

There are those in both camps who think that the extermination of the human race would be a smaller evil than the victory of the "enemy". I regard this view, whether held by A or by B, as insane. Dr. Hook and some of Mr. Krushchev's supporters agree when it is held by one side, but not when it is held by the other. The opinion which I have expressed that it would be better to yield than to indulge in a nuclear war is addressed to both parties equally, and I do not think it likely to have any more influence on the one side than on the other.

The argument that you cannot negotiate successfully if you announce in advance that, if pressed, you will yield, is entirely valid. If I were the government of either A or B, I should make no such announcement. But this has no bearing on the purely academic question of what it would be wise to do if the completely desperate situation arose. I must, however, once more insist that the view in favor of avoiding nuclear warfare even at great cost is one which applies to both sides equally and which, as far as I can judge, is no more likely to be adopted by one side than the other. It is entirely unjust to regard the opinions that I have expressed as more useful to the one side than to the other.

So much for defense. I pass now to attack.

Dr. Hook begins his rejoinder by a lofty rejection of personalities to which, his readers are led to suppose, I was the first to descend. He relies on their forgetting his crocodile tears expressed in his lament, "Oh! What a noble mind is here o'thrown!" I am compelled to think that criticisms of him are "personalities," whereas criticisms of me are impersonal declarations of Truth.

Throughout his article, he gives his readers to understand that it is only to the West that I proclaim the view that submission would be better than nuclear war. In fact, I proclaim this to both sides equally, and my advocacy of this view has been published as widely in Communist countries as in the United States. He will retort: "Bah! You don't suppose the Communists will listen to you." I reply: "Pshaw! I don't suppose that America will listen to me either."

He points out that "the leaders of the Soviet Union are keeping a sensitive watch on the pulse of public opinion in Western countries." Of course they are; and of course the West keeps an equal watch on opinion in Communist countries. He supposes that my advocacy of peace, though it may have some influence in the West, can have none in the East. This is contrary to all the evidence I have been able to obtain. I do not attribute any very great influence to my efforts to diminish East-West tension, but I have reason to think that this influence has been quite as great in the East as in the West.

Dr. Hook says: "If the West follows the foreign policy I have advocated, it will not have to choose between capitulation to Communism or war." This is at least equally true of the foreign policy which I advocate. I do not believe that either side wants a nuclear war, and I think a modicum of sanity on both sides will prevent it. The question at issue between Dr. Hook and me would arise only if one side lacked this modicum of sanity.

Dr. Hook's reasons for supposing that, if Communism conquered the world, its bad features would persist indefinitely are, to my mind, completely untenable. The worst features of Communism have been developed under the influence of fear and would almost certainly grow less if fear were removed. He points out that "in the past, tyrants ruled with a primitive technology." But it was no less effective for being primitive. He alludes to Genghis Khan's pyramids of heads, which were just as thoroughgoing as Auschwitz. It is an example of his slippery methods of controversy when he says that "the splendor and glory of of the Court of Kublai Khan were not worth even one of the many pyramids of human skulls his grandfather, Genghis Khan, heaped up." I had never maintained that they were. What I had said was that they gave reason for hope that a bad regime might improve — which is a very different thing.

Another example of his dubious controversial methods is his argument that we owe no obligation to generations that, if his policy is followed, will never be born. He says: "I do not share this theology." There is, as he perfectly well knows, and knows that I know, no question of theology involved. The question involved is whether it is likely to be worth-while that future generations should exist. It is not a question of "rights," since obviously the non-existent have no "rights". But I am sure Dr. Hook, in his calmer moments, will admit that "rights" are not a fundamental ethical conception.

Dr. Hook is guilty of curious inconsistencies which are an indication of his fanaticism. He says: "Communists have always argued that it is justified to bury several generations, if necessary, in order to fertilize the soil of history for a glorious future to be enjoyed by the still unborn." His own position is that it is justified to bury not several generations but all future generations, not in order that they may enjoy a glorious future but in order that they may have no future at all. This is an immeasurable exaggeration of the

very fault for which he criticizes the Communists.

I should like to correct a misunderstanding promoted, I think, by a report of an interview in which only a small part of my thought was expressed. I think that, with wise statesmanship on the part of the West, it will not be at all difficult to avoid both nuclear war and surrender. What I advocate in practice, and not as the outcome of an artificial logical dilemma, is a conclusion of agreements between East and West admitting the inevitability of co-existence and the disastrous futility of war. I wish both sides to realize that war cannot achieve anything that either side desires, and that, in consequence, points in dispute can only be settled by negotiation.

Dr. Hook is in the habit of proclaiming that he values freedom. On this point, however, he deceives himself. He does not think that those who prefer life under Communism to death should be free to choose the alternative they prefer. Not only the inhabitants of Communist nations but the inhabitants of all the uncommitted nations, are denied by him the most elementary freedom, which is freedom to choose survival. The view that No World is better than a Communist World, or that No World is better than a Capitalist World, is one that is difficult to refute by abstract arguments, but I think that those who hold it should question their right to impose their opinion upon those who do not hold it by the infliction of the death penalty upon all of them. This is an extreme form of religious persecution, going far beyond anything that has been advocated in previous human history.

\* \* \* \* \*

BERTRAND RUSSELL RETREATS

by Sidney Hook

in The New Leader July 7-14, 1958

(16h)

The attentive reader will have observed that Bertrand Russell has retreated from the position he took in his interview with Joseph Alsop. This was the occasion of my original criticism. He was not talking into the wind. His words were reported all over the world. They came with an impact of brutal intellectual and political shock in democratic countries. Nevertheless, although the wire services were always available to him, he neither retracted nor qualified what he said until this discussion began. Nor, as is obvious from his tone, has he welcomed the opportunity to clarify his stand.

Normally I should have been content to leave his reply unanswered. It is in effect an admission that it was politically foolish to have declared that, in the event the Kremlin refuses to negotiate on reasonable terms, the West should disarm unilaterally "even if it means the horrors of Communist domination." The issues, however, are so momentous and Russell's recent views about them have done so much harm to the free world, that I feel I must continue the discussion. Perhaps if I eschew poetry (the line from Hamlet was directed only at his political judgment) and irony (the reference to theology!), he will understand me better even if he agrees with me less.

First of all, it is disingenuous for Russell now to maintain he was not advising the West, including the U.S. Government, to disarm unilaterally and risk the triumph of Communism, and that he was merely engaging "in no more than an exercise in theoretical ethics." The very language of his interview with Alsop, as well as his first reply to me in THE NEW LEADER of May 26, shows how false this is. In the former, he proposed "unilateral disarmament" if the Kremlin continued to be unreasonable. What has this got to do with theoretical ethics? In the latter he stated that there are two matters at issue: First, what is the likelihood that the policy I [Russell] advocate would lead to the universal domination of Communism? He refused to discuss it but admitted it involves "political and psychological considerations." These, indeed, are of the very essence. The matter at issue is certainly not one merely of theoretical ethics.

Even if it were, Russell would still be wrong. Whatever does he imagine "theoretical ethics" to be? All theoretical ethics has an indirect bearing on practical life and conduct. For it is concerned not only with the nature of the right and the good but with what actions are right and what things are good and which should be preferred when they conflict. Russell would be the first to point out that the theoretical ethics of certain groups -- e.g., which teach that if it is impossible to save the life of both the pregnant mother and the child, the mother should be sacrificed -- sometimes has important and fateful bearings upon practice. Similarly, is there any doubt that belief in Russell's "theoretical" proposition, that capitulation and the risk of Communist domination with all its barbarity should be preferred to war and the risk to human survival, tends to undermine the will to resist Communist aggression? Russell is so absolutely convinced of the validity of his proposition in theoretical ethics that he believes that only the insane can disagree with him. Why, then, does he not accept the responsibility for its practical effects?

Second, Russell asserts that "The question at issue between Dr. Hook and myself arises only if all attempts at negotiation [between the West and the USSR] fail." He is wrong again. The primary issue between us is whether Russell's position will contribute to the failure of those negotiations and whether mine will contribute to their success. Russell's belated second thoughts indicate that he, too, now believes it was not practically

wise to declare what he did in his interview. The inferences I and others drew from his interview were perfectly legitimate. Further thought, I hope, will convince him that the Kremlin is less likely to risk aggression if it believes the West will resist to the end than if it is persuaded that Russell's proposition in "theoretical ethics" will guide the West's actions. Only if Russell admits this are our remaining differences minor.

In this connection, I wish to challenge the truth of Russell's contention that he offered his "ideal wisdom" to both sides impartially. He has emphatically not addressed the Communists and advised them that, if the West refused to be reasonable in its negotiations, the Kremlin should unilaterally disarm even if it meant the triumph of the free world. What has been published in Communist countries and the neutralist world on this particular choice has been only his advice to the West, as expressed in his Alsop interview, with no corresponding specific advice to the Communists. As I read the evidence, Russell's recent efforts to diminish East-West tensions have helped disarm psychologically only the West and strengthened the position of the Communist world as well as the resolution of the Kremlin to pursue its present tack. Some of the atomic scientists of West Germany have cited his position as justifying their abandonment of defense research in nuclear weapons. Russell should know that the absence of a free press and of any possibility of freely expressed dissent makes it impossible for him to have any appreciable influence in the Communist world the Kremlin is not willing to let him have. He refers to public opinion in the Soviet Union on which "the West keeps an equal watch." There is no public opinion in the Soviet Union except the opinion of the Kremlin.

That Russell can believe that his influence has been "quite as great in the East as in the West" is simple wishful thinking. Without intending it, he has made more difficult the tasks of the Western governments which fear that the Kremlin desires renunciation of all atomic weapons, even of defense, so that it can overwhelm the free world with seas of Soviet and Chinese soldiery. Without intending it, he has made easier the campaign of propagandistic deception by Communist regimes which play off, whenever they can, politically naive men of intellectual distinction, as well as mindless millionaires like Cyrus Eaton, against the policy of the West. That policy has been weak but it has been genuinely peaceful.

This is ignored in the Olympian intellectual posture taken by Russell toward the hypothetical case of the two power blocs. It is a fundamental mistake to treat the problem as if it merely involved abstract mathematical relationships between two anonymous blocs, instead of the historical relations between the Communist bloc and the Western bloc only one of which threatens the peace of the world. The foreign policy of the West, and of the U.S. in particular, has been deficient in many respects and I have been among its unremitting critics. But all we need do is call the roll of aggression in East-West relations — Eastern Europe, Czechoslovakia, the blockade of West Berlin, Korea, Hungary — to determine who threatens whom. It is unrealistic in the extreme therefore to draw a simple equation between two power blocs in the abstract if we wish to predict their behavior or propose a reasonable policy.

Third, Russell's illustration of the two power blocs supposes, as he says, that one of them is fanatically insane. This removes it still further from any relevance to the present situation. The rulers of the Kremlin are not insane. They are determined men with nerves of steel, wonderful actors of surpassing skill in duping the politically unwary. "Agreements are like pie-crusts. made to be broken" is one of their maxims. But they have never taken an aggressive move until they thought that victory was surely in their grasp. Their basic doctrine, their operational code and their historical behavior all confirm this. To be sure, they are ruthless and fanatical and can play a waiting game. Their cat-and-mouse gambit toward Tito shows they will never stop trying to destroy the slightest deviator. Just because they are sane, however, they must never be encouraged to think that the West will not resist. Despite his intent and present disavowal, this is precisely what Russell's "ideal wisdom" encourages them to think. The greater the number of people in the West who accept and proclaim this piece of "ideal wisdom," the greater grows the danger of appeasement and war. I do not fear Krushchev's insanity but his shrewdness, made all the more formidable by the foolishness of those who underestimate it.

I come now to Russell's "ideal wisdom" — the "purely academic issue" he believes has no practical consequences. Russell's wisdom comes into play, he repeatedly reminds us, only if one side lacks "a modicum of sanity." If the Communists attack, shall we resist and probably go down fighting, or shall we surrender?

In my rejoinder I said: "Here every lover of freedom and of life is on uncertain and tragic ground. One cannot be sure that at the decisive moment the situation will look the same [as now]." I believe I am open to argument on this point, but at present I am not persuaded that a choice of resistance, even if it threatens the probable destruction of the human race, is morally worse than a surrender to those who lack, in Russell's own supposition, even a modicum of sanity. Indeed, if they lack a modicum of sanity I fear all the more the tortures and cruelties they can impose on the living generations — the only ones who count — in weighing the scales of joy and pain, dignity and human degradation whose balance determines basic moral judgment.

Russell impugns my sanity because I do not agree with him. But surely in principle everyone can imagine a situation in which to prefer the non-existence of mankind to its continued torture would be to choose a lesser evil. For example, if as a result of some mutational change, a universal and incurable ailment caused men to die in slow agony, would it be wrong to prefer a world without man? I vaguely recall a conversation with Russell or a passage from his writing in which he expressed the view that a world without human beings sometimes seemed preferable to him than one in which bloodthirsty sadists ruled. Such preferences, like my own, may be irrational. I am not so fanatical as to have closed my mind on the subject.

It is at this point that Russell brings in the hope of the future and reminds us that the agony of present

generations may be followed by improvement. "Genghis Khan," he wrote, "was quite as bad as Stalin at his worst, but his grandson Kublai Khan was a highly civilized monarch under whom Chinese culture flourished."

In my criticism I did not contest the possibility of improvement, I denied, what is essential to Russell's argument, that it was necessarily worth the price. To which Russell retorts with indignation: "[Hook] says that 'the splendor and glory of the Court of Kublai Khan were not worth even one of the many pyramids of human skulls his grandfather, Genghis Khan, heaped up,' I had never maintained they were. What I said was that they gave reason for hope that a bad regime might improve — which is a very different thing."

Of course it is a very different thing. But Russell misses my point, which is that it is not enough to sustain his position. For unless it is believed that these possible improvements are worth the price paid in suffering and submission to Genghis Khan, there would be no justification for choosing to endure his tyranny rather than ending human history. It is not enough for Russell to believe that no dark age lasts forever, that after Communism triumphs for some hundreds of years, there may be improvements.

He must also believe that the anticipation of these possible improvements is worth to the living the agony and, to use his own words, "the horrors of Communist domination." Otherwise his recommendation makes no sense, even as a proposition in theoretical ethics!

This argument is solid and straightforward: if Russell finds it "slippery," it is only because of the burden of the position he is defending. I am puzzled to explain Russell's failure to see that in order to justify submission to Moscow, he cannot stop short with believing that there may be improvements in the distant future but must also believe that the expectation of these improvements is worth the cruelties and indignities which will follow submission in the present. (*Mutatis Mutandis*, the same logic holds in relation to Genghis and Kublai Khan.) I suspect his lapse at this point flows from a natural and creditable reluctance to drain the cup of appeasement to its bitter dregs.

Russell may retort (1) that in time Communism may be followed by much greater glories than those of the Court of Kublai Khan, and that these glories are worth the price of submission to Moscow; and (2) that, as he actually says, "the worst features of Communism have been developed under the influence of fear and would almost certainly grow less if fear were removed."

Let us consider the second point first. If the worst features of Communism have developed under the influence of fear of the outside world, how account for the fact in the early years, when seven invading armies stood on Soviet soil, political and cultural terror was not as widespread or severe as when the Soviet Union was subsequently free of invaders and at peace? The entire history of Communist Russia (and China!) makes Russell's generalization dubious. Cruelty and arbitrariness are indigenous to the very system of totalitarian Communism, and the fear in the hearts of the Soviet rulers is not so much of the free world as of their own oppressed people. Further, Russell ignores my argument that it is likely that future Titos and Maos and Stalins will war on each other and use the existence of differences in Communist states as pretexts for their organized cruelties. I grant that some things may grow better, but I am not sanguine that the worst features of Communism will grow less, or sufficiently less to justify Russell's recommendation to surrender to universal torture rather than to resist. Perhaps under Communism, in time, greater glories will develop than those of the court of Kublai Khan. But the probability is just as great that greater infamies will also develop.

Russell taxes me with inconsistency where there is none. I criticized the Communist view which cruelly sacrifices existing generations for a glorious future to be enjoyed by the still unborn. To which Russell retorts: "His own position is that it is justified to bury not several generations but all future generations, not in order that they may enjoy a glorious future but in order that they may not have any future at all. This is an immeasurable exaggeration of the very fault for which he criticizes the Communists."

This contains a serious misstatement and another logical lapse. The misstatement conceals the fact that I justify my choice of resistance rather than of surrender only in terms of the experiences of the existing generations, not future generations. And the ground of my choice is not that existing generations will escape any future but that they will escape a future of torture and infamy which Russell admits will be theirs if they submit to "the horrors of Communism." The error in logic arises from Russell's failure to note that, since on my argument there are no future generations whose desires need be considered, I cannot sensibly be criticized for trying to bury them. I have not returned to the ontology of Plato and the early Russell. My argument is addressed only to the present generations. They must make the choice — only their desires, wishes, fears and hopes count. This is as far away as anyone can get from the Communist position, Russell to the contrary notwithstanding.

Even more misleading is Russell's statement that I am denying to those who prefer life under Communism, whether in Communist or neutralist countries, freedom to choose the alternative they prefer. I have no quarrel with those who live in Communist countries — only with their dictators who seek to impose the yoke of bondage on other peoples. To say that because I urge resistance to aggression I do not believe in freedom for those who wish to live under Communism, is as absurd as to charge Russell, because he urged resistance to Hitler, with not believing that those who preferred a peaceful life under Fascism should be free to make their choice. Hitler was morally responsible for the fate of the victims of the resistance against him. The rulers of the Kremlin are morally responsible for the consequences of the resistance to their aggression.

Russell's argument would make every rebel in history who believed in resistance to injustice a fanatic who

wanted to deprive others of their freedom of choice. Of course, it is the barest tautology that if two choices are mutually exclusive, where one is taken the other cannot be. By the same token, should not those who prefer to resist aggression be free to choose the alternative they prefer? Russell's choice excludes theirs as much as theirs excludes his.

It is from this tautology that Russell derives the remarkable conclusion that I am guilty of "an extreme form of religious persecution" because, forsooth, resistance to the Kremlin will deprive those who want to live under Communism of their chance to do so. This is a surprising comment from one who, like the rest of us, supported a war against Fascism in which the victims of Allied air raids were deprived of "their freedom to choose survival." Was this religious persecution? Was Russell guilty of "religious persecution" in advocating a preventive war against Russia and declaring that the destruction of the whole of Western Europe was not too great a price to pay in order that Communism be wiped out? Would he not have deprived the victims of their freedom to choose survival?

Russell, of course, does not believe in religious persecution. Nor do I. That he can make the charge betrays the atrophy of his sense of proportion.

In my article, "A Foreign Policy for Survival," I advanced a policy of military disengagement in Central Europe and other troubled areas of the world under certain guarantees. Although I believe we were remiss in not making proper political use of the atom bomb when we enjoyed a monopoly, I have never advocated an aggressive or preventive war. "If we can keep the free world," I wrote, "from falling into the trap set by the Kremlin and preserve peace by increasing its power and readiness, we can then rely upon the processes of education, the force of example, the contagion of free ideas, the gradual osmosis of the great traditions of the West gradually to soften, to liberalize, to round off the edges of the totalitarian regimes of the world until their own people rally their energies to overthrow their oppressors and establish the democratic governments necessary to establish one free world republic."

I am convinced that most of the people behind the Iron Curtain deplore the position taken by Russell in his interview with Alsop and which Russell himself has now modified. Despite this, and his earlier statement that he agrees much more with my article than I think, I am under no illusion that, with all his hedging and tacking, Russell's position on foreign policy is like mine. Granted the need for continuous effort to negotiate a reasonable settlement with the Kremlin, the troublesome questions arise when we ask: If the Communists seize West Berlin, should the free world resist? Or if West Germany is invaded? Or the rest of Western Europe? Or England? As distinct from Russell, I believe the free world should declare it will resist wherever the Communist world resorts to force, and to declare it in such a way that the Kremlin has no doubt it will resist. There will then be no war.

No man can win freedom and peace unless he conquers his fear of death. No nation can preserve its freedom unless it is willing to risk destruction in its defense. To do otherwise is to break faith with those who died to keep it free.

The free society, from Pericles to the present, has survived because it has valued some things more than survival, because its vision of human excellence, dignity and joy has made some kinds of life unworthy of man. Bertrand Russell is one of the great moulders of the traditions of the free society. In disagreeing with him strongly on a matter of policy, we nonetheless honor the values and visions he has served during a long life and which he has taught us to cherish.

[End of article]

\* \* \* \* \*

- (161) The year of these exchanges, 1958, came just one year after the first Pugwash Conference -- Russell's great idea and great achievement in the real world of nuclear weapons. Pugwash, as you recall, was a breakthrough; it brought together for the first time eminent scientists from both sides of the Iron Curtain, to discuss ways to diminish the nuclear peril. The 1958 Conference was the first of many Pugwash Conferences. They paved the way for the Salt Talks and the Limited Test Ban Treaty that banned nuclear tests above ground (1963). The Pugwash idea has not died; Pugwash Conferences continue to take place on a regular basis.

Cyrus Eaton, Hook's "mindless millionaire", financed the first Conference, which met in Pugwash, Nova Scotia, Eaton's' birthplace.

We have given a lot of space to these exchanges between Hook and Russell because we thought them important and interesting.

Were you persuaded by Sidney Hook? By Bertrand Russell? Tell us your reactions to these articles, for possible inclusion in a future newsletter.

Here is our reaction, for what it's worth: We think that BR just couldn't bear the thought that the human enterprise might come to an end. That all of man's great achievements in the arts and sciences, the inspiring examples of certain lives, the prospect of a happy and exciting future for all mankind that enormous advances in knowledge could bring into being...that all this might disappear forever, along with all human beings, and all other living things...might disappear into thin air...vaporized...leaving no trace... He just couldn't bear it. He refused to give up; he fought for survival, constantly seeking ways to make his fellow human beings become aware of the nuclear danger, and do something about it. And he did this at a time in his life -- his 80s and 90s-- when most men are content to take things easy.

\* \* \* \* \*



- (16j) It appears that our hunch about what motivated BR -- in his exchanges with Hook -- was not too far off the mark, as we discovered later, on reading Page 147 in BR's Autobiography III (New York:Simon & Schuster, 1969), which BOB DAVIS had sent. Here it is:

I had a controversy with an American philosopher named Sidney Hook at this time that was one which both of us found difficult to conduct on logical lines. He was a Menshevik who had become apprehensive of Russia ruling the world. He thought this so dreadful that it would be better the human race should cease to exist. I combatted this view on the ground that we do not know the future, which, so long as Man survives, may be immensely better than the past. I instanced the times of Genghiz Khan and Kublai Khan, separated by only a generation, but one horrible, the other admirable. But there were plenty of contrary instances that he could have adduced, in view of which a definite decision was impossible. I maintained, however, that any chance of a better world depended upon hope, and was on this account to be preferred. This was not a *logical* argument, but I thought that most people would find it convincing. Several years later, Hook again attacked me publicly, but this time in such a manner that no comment from me was necessary. It amused me, however, that for his defence of "freedom" and his attack on my views on Vietnam, he chose as his vehicle a journal later admitted to be financed by the Central Intelligence Agency.\*

\*The *New Leader* received \$3,000 from Chiang Kai-shek's treasury for publishing an article hostile to China. Later it prepared the book *The Strategy of Deception: A Study in World-Wide Communist Tactics* and was secretly paid \$12,000 by the U.S. Government. When the U.S. Information Agency asked a House Appropriations Sub-Committee to increase its allowance for "book development" from \$90,000 to \$195,000, the Agency assured the legislators that the funds would go for books "written to our own specifications" and having "strong anti-Communist content" (*The New York Times*, May 3, 1964).

---

BR QUOTED

- (17) Parents and Teachers for Social Responsibility (Moretown, VT) pamphlet has this lovely quote on its front cover:

"...the world has sprouted a weird sense of security and a warped sense of morality. Weapons are sheltered like treasures while children are exposed to incineration."

Bertrand Russell

(Thank you, TOM STANLEY)

---

THE BRS AWARD

- (18) 1985. Award nominations wanted. Please nominate the person you think should receive the 1985 Bertrand Russell Society Award, and state your reasons. Candidates for the Award should satisfy at least one of the following conditions:
- . worked closely with BR on an important project (Joseph Rotblat 1983)
  - . furthered some cause or idea that BR thought important (Henry Kendall 1982)
  - . promoted Russell scholarship (Paul Arthur Schilpp 1980)
  - . enhanced the public's appreciation of BR (Steve Allen 1981)
  - . exemplifies some quality of character that distinguished BR
  - . closely related to BR (Dora Russell 1984)

Please send your nomination(s) c/o the newsletter (address on Page 1, bottom), for forwarding to the BRS Award Committee.

- (19) 1984. Dora Black Russell is the recipient of the 1984 BRS Award. The press release, shown below reduced in size, was mailed 9/15/84 to about 25 American, Canadian and U.K. universities, U.S. scholarly journals, and in the U.K.: The New Statesman, The Tribune, The Listener, The Times, The Guardian, The Observer.

<p>Lee Eisler, VP/Information The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc. RD 1, Box 409 Coopersburg, PA 18036 215-346-7687</p> <p style="text-align: right;">For immediate release September 15, 1984</p> <p style="text-align: center;">DORA RUSSELL RECEIVES THE 1984 BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY AWARD</p> <p>The 1984 Bertrand Russell Society Award has gone to Dora Black Russell, social critic, champion of women's and children's rights, campaigner for liberal causes for more than 60 years.</p> <p>The Award is given to a person who in an important way is linked to Bertrand Russell or to a cause he took great interest in. Dora Russell qualifies abundantly. She was Russell's second wife, mother of their two children, co-author with him of "<u>The Prospects of Industrial Civilization</u>", co-founder with him of the Beacon Hill School, and much, much more. In the early 1920s, she gave up a Fellowship at Girton College, Cambridge, to go to China with him; and on their return, she helped him in 2 election campaigns when he was Labour candidate for Chelsea. In October 1980 a memorial bust of Russell was unveiled in Red Lion Park, London; it was her idea, she promoted it, and underwrote its cost.</p> <p>The Award plaque reads: "For sharing Bertrand Russell's concerns, collaborating in his work, and helping to preserve his legacy".</p> <p>The light that emanates from the lady is of her own making and is not the reflection of someone else's. If she had never met Bertrand Russell we still would have heard from her. Along with Margaret Sanger and Marie Stopes, she</p>	<p>was in at the beginning of the fight for birth control, underwriting the startling fact that it was "four times as dangerous to bear a child as to work in a mine... man's most dangerous trade." 60 years ago, she campaigned for 6 weeks paid maternity leave before and after childbirth.</p> <p>She has written books about public affairs and social attitudes that needed changing: <u>Hyppatia: Or Women and Knowledge</u> (1925) was written in reply to an attack on feminists. One reviewer said it should be banned because it said that women should enjoy sex. <u>The Right To Be Happy</u> (1927) said that the social basis of society should rest not on abstractions but on the biological needs of human beings. <u>In Defense of Children</u> (1932) was primarily on the status and rights of children, they being, like women, an oppressed class. <u>The Religion of the Machine Age</u> (1961) is a study of the dangers of the mechanical and technological society. <u>The Tamarisk Tree</u> is her autobiography, Volume I (1975), Volume II (1980). Many of her earlier writings are collected in <u>A Dora Russell Reader</u> (1983).</p> <p>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 about the Society, write BRS Information, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036, USA.</p>
--	---

If you see this Award mentioned in any publication, please let us know about it.

#### SPREADING BR'S VIEWS

- (20) English teachers spread the word. A number of BRS members have told us that they were first introduced to Bertrand Russell's writings in college courses in English. An essay by Bertrand Russell -- contained in an anthology -- would be assigned reading.

We asked GLADYS LEITHAUSER, who teaches English at University of Michigan-Dearborn, if she could give us the names of some anthologies containing essays by BR. She obliged with these recommendations:

. A World of Ideas: Essential Readings for College Writers. Ed. Lee A. Jacobus. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983. Contains "A Free Man's Worship"

. The Conscious Reader: Readings Past and Present. Ed. Caroline Shrodes, Harry Finestone, Michael Shugrue. New York: Macmillan, 1978. Contains "If We Are To Survive This Dark Time..."

. Fields of Writing: Readings Across the Disciplines. Ed. Nancy R. Comley et al. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984. Contains "Touch and Sight: the Earth and the Heavens."

. The Little Brown Reader, 3rd ed. Ed. Marcia Stubbs and Sylvan Barnet. Boston: Little, Brown, 1983. Contains "Work".

Gladys writes: "I have other anthologies on the shelf with selections from BR, but some of the volumes are older. I was looking for up-to-date anthologies to recommend." Anyone wanting more anthologies may write Gladys Leithauser, Humanities Dept., University of Michigan-Dearborn, 4901 Evergreen Road, Dearborn, MI 48128 .

Incidentally, she has used not only essays by BR, but also whole books, "Power" and "Education and the Social Order". She reported on her experiences with these in RSN23-16. She has also used "The Rise of Science" from History of Western Philosophy, "The Mathematician's Nightmare" from Collected Stories, and the opening essay from Autobiography III (the three forces that shaped BR's life).

- (21) Al Seckel spreads the word. Al, who gave an absorbing talk, "BR and the Cuban Missile Crisis", at the BRS 1982 annual meeting in Los Angeles, often appears before groups, talking about BR.

He will give a talk, "The Life and Wisdom of Bertrand Russell", illustrated with slides, on Sunday, December 2nd, at the Unitarian Society, 1535 Santa Barbara Street, Santa Barbara, CA at 7:30 pm.

Al gave a talk on October 25th, at a meeting in Los Angeles sponsored by the Humanist Society of Friends (an AHA affiliate.). His talk served as an introduction to a showing of the BBC's "Bertie and the Bomb," which Al described as "a 40-minute documentary, featuring film clips and interviews with Bertrand Russell, including his debates with Edward Teller, father of the 'H-bomb'." He told the audience that the videotape had been made available "through the generosity of the BRS." 7 persons signed a sheet of paper headlined FOR INFORMATION ABOUT THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY SIGN HERE. The BRS sent them information by mail.

At a June meeting in San Diego, sponsored by the First Unitarian Church, the Humanist Fellowship, and the BRS, Al gave a slide-lecture, "The Life and Wisdom of Bertrand Russell". By the end of the meeting, 8 persons had signed up for information about the BRS.

Al is not only spreading the word, he is also helping the BRS acquire new members.

#### THE 1985 BRS DOCTORAL GRANT

- (22) This 1985 announcement was sent to some 25 American, Canadian and U.K. universities, and to scholarly journals, in September.

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

**THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.**

Please post September 15, 1984

Announcing  
The Bertrand Russell Society's  
\$1000  
1985 DOCTORAL GRANT

The Bertrand Russell Society will award a Doctoral Grant of \$1000 to 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 Grant is unrestricted. It might, for instance, be used for travel to the Russell Archives (in Canada), or for typing the dissertation.

The candidate is required to send 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 adviser evaluating the candidate 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.

It is not a requirement that the candidate be a member of the Bertrand Russell Society, as some have thought. Most past recipients have not been members.

The application and supporting documents should reach Professor Hugh S. Moorhead, Chairman, Philosophy Department, Northeastern Illinois University, 5500 N. St. Louis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60625, by May 1, 1985. The candidate selected will be notified in June 1985.

If you see this Grant announcement mentioned in any publication, please let us know about it.

## ON NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

## British Laborites back nuclear disarmament

(23) AP, in the San Diego Union (10/11/84)----->

What is interesting about this item is that it is exactly what BR had advocated for years, for these reasons:

. British nuclear capability, small when compared with that of the superpowers, makes no significant contribution to the armaments of the West; it merely serves to make Britain a target for Russian missiles.

. Britain, unarmed, could use her very considerable experience in diplomacy to help bring about peaceful solutions to conflicts.

. British reluctance to give up nuclear weapons is based on pride, on reluctance to believe that Britain is no longer a major power on the world stage.

(Thank you, HARRY RUJA)

### Associated Press

BLACKPOOL, England — The opposition Labor Party voted overwhelmingly yesterday to unilaterally scrap Britain's nuclear weapons, expel U.S. cruise missiles and close U.S. nuclear bases if the party wins power.

The vote came on the third day of the socialists' annual conference in this northwest England resort and marked the party's most radical commitment yet to unilateral nuclear disarmament.

The conference rejected a resolution that would have committed Labor to closing all U.S. bases in Britain, where 25,000 U.S. troops and scores of planes, ships and submarines are based.

Party defense spokesman Denzil Davies told cheering delegates that the unilateral disarmament policy was "both morally right and militarily sound."

Former Prime Minister James Callaghan and other party moderates pleaded in vain for the conference to reject a policy plank

they said would rupture the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

"What is proposed, however laudable, can have the impact of destabilizing the present situation ... by opening up a Pandora's box," said Callaghan, whose 1976-79 administration lost power to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's Conservatives. Callaghan made a similar appeal on the eve of the vote.

"We are not Holland, we are not Belgium, we are not Denmark. We are one of the main pillars of the alliance," said Callaghan.

But Labor Party leader Neil Kinnock and most labor union leaders and party activists supported the commitment to dismantle Britain's nuclear arsenal.

The Labor party suffered its worst defeat in 50 years in June 1983, when it ran on a platform of scrapping Britain's Polaris nuclear missiles, canceling Britain's order to update them with the U.S. Trident system, and banning U.S. nuclear weapons from Britain.

### NEW MEMBERS

(24) We take pleasure in welcoming these new members:

DAVID AVILA/6613 W. 55th St./Mission, KS 66202  
 JACK E. BEBINGER/13139 S. Greenway Av./Chicago, IL 60633  
 FERNANDO BOJERA, M.D./4085 N. Tamiami Trail (B203)/Naples, FL 33940  
 GLENN R. CLOUGH/467 Tuck St. (213)/San Francisco, CA 94102  
 MONIKA DEPPEN/101 Tiffany La./Willingboro, NJ 08046

KENNETH I. DIAMOND/720 West End Av. (603)/NY NY 10025  
 DAVID J. GORNIK/4112 N. Crogan St./Port Clinton, OH 43452  
 GREGG W. HILL/25 Dunkirk Road/Toronto, Ont./Canada M4C 2M1  
 TERRY LOCKHART/5460 Walton Road/Richmond, B.C./Canada V7C 2L9  
 GRAHAME E. MAISEY/463C Olde Bridge, Salem Harbour/Bensalem, PA 19020

DAVID MARTINEZ/1304 Hansen Av./Pomona, CA 91766  
 FRANK MCCHRISTIAN/PO Box 955/Melville, NY 11747  
 ERIC PASSAGLIA/644 MASS. AV. NE (502)/Washington, DC 20002  
 JOHN FLOURD/255 Lisbon Av./Buffalo, NY 14215  
 JOSEPH M. RODERICK/Center City One (901)/Philadelphia, PA 19107

KEN B. SCHWEDA/403 E. White 12A/Champaign, IL 61820  
 PROF. RUSSELL WAHL/312 Union St./Crawfordsville, IN 47933  
 CALVIN WICHERN/3852 S. Olathe Circle/Aurora, CO 80013

NEW ADDRESSES OR OTHER CHANGES

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

ADAM PAUL BANNER/2143 Medford(11)/Ann Arbor, MI 48104
LCDR JOSEPH F. BOETCHER/SJA, Naval Medical CMD, NW Region/Oakland, CA 94627
DENNIS C. CHIPMAN, M.D./PO Box 2092/Hickory, NC 28603
PRADEEP KUMAR DUBEY/3700 Lillic Dr. (123)/Santa Clara, CA 95051
LELA ELLIOTT/1617 Fannin (2508)/Houston, TX 77002

CHRISTOPHER FULKERSON/1249 4th Av. (29)/San Francisco, CA 94122-2640
ALEJANDRO R. GARCIADIEGO/Jose Ma. Velasco #71/Del. Benito Juarez 03900/Mexico, D.F.Mexico
DR. LARRY HERSH/Harvard Club of Boston/Nova Scotia, B1A 5V4
PROF. PAUL KURTZ/EOX 229/BUFFALO, NY 14215
DANIEL J. O'LEARY/95 N. 4th St./Old Town, ME 04468

PROF. NATHAN U. SALMON/Dept. of Philosophy/University of California/ Santa Barbara, CA 93106
JOHN S. SCHWENK/RR2, Box 42/Sherman, CT 06784
JOHN SHOSKY/214 12th Place NE/Washington, DC 20002-6302
JOHN E. SONNTAG/c/o Commanding Officer/USCG Training Center/Governors Island, NY NY 10004
CAPT. MICHAEL H. TAINT/2025 Shroyer Rd./ Dayton, OH 45419

LLOYD N. TREFETHEN/16 Upland Road/Cambridge, MA 02140
KEITH W. YUNDT/310 Bowman Hall/Kent, OH 44242-0001

ON EAST-WEST TENSIONS

134 Scientists from 40 countries

Eastern bloc, Western and third world scientists meet and talk in Sweden

The 34th Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs met in Björkliden, Sweden this summer. The conference came at a crucial time. As the statement issued after the conference made clear:

The Conference took place at a time of rising tensions in international relations and seemingly poor prospects for halting and reducing the worldwide build-up of nuclear and conventional weapons. At such times -- with official East-West and, in many respects, North-South relations at a dangerous low point -- the Pugwash approach of building understanding and seeking solutions through off-the-record discussions among influential scientists and public figures takes on increased importance.

Statement claims an erosion of security

In its statement put out following the conference, the Pugwash council stressed that recent deployments of nuclear weapons by the US and the USSR increase the danger to everyone and decrease our security. Not only are we threatened by the increase in the numbers of weapons deployed, "far in excess of those needed to guarantee devastating retaliation", but the risk of catastrophe is heightened by the qualitative characteristics of these weapons: combinations of multiple warheads, short flight time, and ease of concealment from verification.

The scientists also pointed out that these trends were undermining what had already been achieved with such great difficulty: a worldwide realization that deterrent forces are adequate and attention must be turned to reversing the nuclear arms race.

How to stop these threatening trends

As always at Pugwash meetings, the scientists worked to identify the nature of the dangers we face, and the trends which, if unchecked, will lead to disaster. They also turned their attention towards concrete solutions: steps which might be taken by the nations from which these scientists come, and which would help resolve the current crisis.

The Pugwash scientists are uniquely placed to do such work. They are eminent men and women of science, respected by their peers. As well, most are in positions which allow them to communicate their ideas and their views, and the views of their Pugwash colleagues to their own governments. This unique combination provides both for fruitful talks in an atmosphere of trust among member scientists, and for communication of what has been learned to powerful government leaders at home. All this can be achieved without the public posturing and political manoeuvring which are currently hindering arms talks.

In the report issued after the meeting at Björkliden, Sweden, the Pugwash Council sets out concrete measures which, if implemented, could lead to a great improvement in the current situation.

These measures, you can be sure, are now being discussed at the highest levels of government in the countries from which the members come. Thus the influence of the Björkliden conference may be one of the key factors working to mitigate against the dangers of the current situation.

If you would like to be involved in the Pugwash movement your help would be most welcome. In fact, your involvement could make a real difference.

As a Pugwash supporter, you will receive the Pugwash Council statement so you can read for yourself the non-public conclusions and recommendations of the Björkliden meeting. And in the future, you can receive reports of the workshops and meetings held regularly, where the real, concrete breakthroughs frequently occur.

In order to get these reports, and to help Pugwash, you need only become a Friend of Pugwash. Your support will make a significant difference to a movement which is now crucial to our survival. And you will be kept informed, month by month, of events as they develop.

Simply fill out the form below, and become part of Pugwash -- today.

(26). Pugwash. Here is the October issue of the monthly "Inside Pugwash Newsletter", which describes itself as the "Special newsletter for 'Bulletin' readers on the Pugwash conferences". "Bulletin" is "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists". The Newsletter is not part of the editorial content of the "Bulletin"; it is an advertisement.]

We repeat what we said in February (RSN41-10):

Since BR was probably the first person of some eminence -- outside the scientific community -- to speak out against the nuclear danger, it is highly appropriate that BRS members who wish to further BR's purposes support Pugwash activities. The coupon below shows how to do so.

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS)

Form with fields for Name, Address, City, State/Zip code, and checkboxes for enrollment as a Friend of Pugwash or an associate member. Includes a logo and the text 'EMBOSOGRAPH DISPLAY MFG. CO. CHICAGO ILLINOIS 60614'.

## BRS BUSINESS

- (27) Directors, please note. 4 kinds of reports/papers are available to you. Let us know which ones interest you. They would be routed to you, and you, in turn, would mail them to the next person on the list.

These are the 4 items:

- A. MEMBERSHIP STATUS REPORT. Gives the names of new members, of renewing members, of ex-members. Also gives new addresses, the number of current members, and the number of inquiries and enrollments during the past month. Monthly.
- B. ADVERTISING SCHEDULE. Tells which publications we advertise in, and the dates of the issues. Twice a year.
- C. RESULTS OF CURRENT YEAR'S ADVERTISING and Proposal for Next Year. Yearly.
- D. MEMBERS' QUESTIONNAIRES. Issued as accumulated during the year.

To get any or all of the above, send a postcard with your name and any or all of the letters (A,B,C,D) to the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.

---

## DUES ARE DUE

- (28) TO ALL MEMBERS: Everybody's renewal dues are due January 1, 1985 (with one exception; see below). The January 1st due-date applies to all members, including those who joined recently.

TO NEW MEMBERS -- members who joined the BRS anytime during 1984: the rest of this memo is for you.

We know from experience that new members sometimes feel put upon when asked to pay dues again after less than a year of membership. We understand that. We will explain why we use the present system, and we hope that our explanation will be found persuasive.

In the previous system, a new member's dues covered 12 full months of membership. That was good for the member but bad for the BRS. It required us to notify each member individually -- on the anniversary date of enrollment -- that the next year's dues were due. And we had to follow up on each member individually, to see whether dues had in fact been paid. This went on throughout the whole year. It was cumbersome to administer. It provided many chances for errors. And it took a lot of time. In fact, it took more time than we had available. That's why we had to make a change.

The present system is easier to administer, produces fewer errors, and takes less time. Everyone's dues come due on the same date, January 1. Simple!

We don't think that the new member whose first year of membership is less (sometimes considerably less) than 12 months has been short-changed in any important way. He/she has received just as much BRS material (and after reading it, knows just as much about the BRS) as the member who joined in January.

Granted, the system is not perfect. For instance, a member who joins after June, and who might want to attend the BRS annual meeting the following June, cannot do so in his first year of membership, though he could have under the old system. However, since this member could attend the June meeting in his 2nd year of membership, and since about 90% of the members do not attend meetings anyway (because, unfortunately, it costs money to go to meetings), this kind of shortcoming is not likely to carry much weight.

All new members (except those who enroll in January) have an initial membership period that is shorter than a year. This happens only once -- in the first year. Thereafter, dues come due every 12 months, on January first.

There is one exception to all the above: members who join in December 1984 (they do not receive the 1984 newsletters) will not pay their first renewal dues till January 1, 1986. It's virtually the same as if they had enrolled the following January (1985).

Here is the 1985 dues schedule: Regular 22.50, Couple 27.50, Student 12.50, Limited Income 12.50; plus 7.50 outside USA, Canada and Mexico; plus 2.00 for Canada and Mexico. In US dollars.

Please mail your dues to 1985, RD 1, Box 409 Coopersburg, PA 18036.

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

---



## RECOMMENDED READING

- (31) Adam Paul Banner greatly admires Deschooling Society and Medical Nemesis by Ivan Illich, which he says are "well worth your time. The footnotes on each page of [of Medical Nemesis] are the equivalent of another book...and are very revealing."
- 

## THE BRS BOOK AWARD

- (32) 1985 nominations wanted. Please nominate any recent book you feel has considerable merit, and tell why you think so. The book should deal with some aspect of BR's life, work, times, or interests. The Book Committee will evaluate the nominations, and recommend a book to the members for their approval. For a few more details, see RSN43-8. 3 nominations have already been received. Please send your nomination(s) soon, c/o the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.
- 

## ON FINANCES

- (33) Please consider making a contribution to the BRS Treasury.

Why? Because we need to acquire many more new members in order to become secure financially. To acquire many more new members, we need to do more advertising (so that more people will know of our existence.) And to do more advertising, we need more money.

Furthermore, our costs are going up.

So it's not hard to understand why we have a need for extra money.

And when we do become secure financially, it will greatly increase the probability of our long-run survival.

Help if you can. Send us some extra money, whatever you can afford to. No sum is too small to be useful, but send as much as you can spare.

Send it c/o the newsletter: RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036

And accept our thanks!

---

## NEWSLETTER MATTERS

- (34) Copyright. This issue and all future issues of Russell Society News will be copyrighted.
- (35) The Library of Congress has accepted a complete set of back issues of the BRS newsletter, and will receive future issues as they are copyrighted. The newsletter will be listed in the Library's serials catalog, so that Russell scholars will know that it exists and is available.
- 

## FOR SALE

- (36) Members' stationery. 8 1/2 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. Order from the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.
-



BOOK REVIEWS

(37) From The New York Times:

# Book Review

October 7, 1984

## Washington's War Over Arms Control

### DEADLY GAMBITS

*The Reagan Administration and the Stalemate in Nuclear Arms Control.*  
By Strobe Talbott.  
380 pp. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. \$17.95.

By McGeorge Bundy



A Trident submarine.

If you think that Ronald Reagan has been serious about nuclear arms control, or that he has understood his own decisions, or that the prospect for a good agreement with the Soviet Union in a second Reagan Administration will be bright, then you owe it to yourself to examine with care Strobe Talbott's "Deadly Gambits," a masterly account of the Reagan record on this subject. If you think the Soviet Government is not a major part of the problem, or that American error began only in 1981, or that good agreements

wait only on Mr. Reagan's defeat or retirement, you should read the book a second time and think again.

Mr. Talbott, the diplomatic correspondent for Time magazine, has had a seat in the club enclosure of the Washington policy-making arena throughout the Reagan years. It is evident from his account that just about everyone in the Government has talked with him privately about the bureaucratic intrigues, the White House compromises and the false fronts of seriousness that have passed for policy making on arms control under Mr. Reagan. People hoping for a good press like to talk to the man from Time, and Mr. Talbott has been able to get through to the realities behind the Reagan screen of slogans. The result is an account of

McGeorge Bundy is a professor of history at New York University and was Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, 1961-1966.

CONTACT/ALON REINIGER  
A Pershing II missile.

recent events that historians will be using for years to come. Even when the official documents are published, Mr. Talbott's work will remain important because he persistently and skillfully addresses the very issue that internal documents so often fail to illuminate: who is trying to do what to whom and why? His account is richly detailed; his heroes and antiheroes live and breathe, and the book has a splendid index. The people in the Reagan Administration will find it easy to look themselves up, and not many will like what they read, but it all rings true, and nearly all of it comes from them.

Mr. Talbott has two main tales to tell. The first concerns the negotiations on new American missiles for Europe — the intermediate-range nuclear forces talks (INF). The notion that there should be a new land-based force with expanded ability to reach Soviet targets was developed by the Carter Administration, reacting with foolish cleverness to exaggerated European concerns that could have been met in much less divisive ways by a stronger and more self-confident Administration. President Reagan inherited a difficult double commitment — to deploy 572 warheads beginning late in 1983, and in the meantime to negotiate with Moscow for an agreement that might allow a smaller deployment or perhaps none at all. It is not surprising that the newly installed experts of the Reagan Administration found themselves divided on the choice of tactics. The dominant view, from start to finish, was that no good agreement with Moscow was likely, and most of the major battles within the Administration were contests over what would or would not look good enough to sustain the Western alliance in its decision for deployment.

The two assistant secretaries principally involved, Richard Burt of the State Department and Richard Perle of the Pentagon, differed fiercely on tactics, Mr. Burt preferring an

Continued on page 34



A B-52 bomber.

appearance of responsiveness and Mr. Perle eternally fearful that by some soft-headed blunder an agreement might actually be reached. Mr. Talbott's account shows us how Mr. Perle won most of the skirmishes in this contest while Mr. Burt won the war, successfully obtaining a sufficient show of flexibility to sustain European support for the initial deployment when and where it counted most — in 1983 in West Germany, Great Britain and Italy.

Much more important, and told in "Deadly Gambits" with extraordinary sympathy and authority, is the story of the lonely effort of Paul Nitze to reach a real agreement. As our chief negotiator on this issue in Geneva, Mr. Nitze went a country mile beyond his instructions and single-handedly framed a proposal which in essence offered the Soviets the abandonment of the American weapons they disliked most — 103 Pershing II ballistic missiles with ranges not far short of Moscow and a delivery time of less than 10 minutes — in return for (1) Soviet acceptance of some 300 American cruise missiles, subsonic in speed, and (2) a considerable reduction in existing levels of Soviet deployment. This proposal, refined with his Soviet counterpart,

Yuli Kvitsinsky, in the famous walk in the woods near Geneva in July 1982 and taken by each of them to his Government as a possible package deal, has been the one moment of bilateral seriousness in the Reagan years.

**B**UT the very forces in Washington that had driven Mr. Nitze to the bold and even arrogant choice of negotiating without instructions shot him down when the bureaucratic battle was joined. After Washington's rejection came Moscow's, which may well have been foreordained in any event by the reluctance of Soviet leaders to agree to anything that would give Soviet sanction to any American deployment at all. Those whose main concern all along was simply to hold the alliance together owe a great debt to Soviet rigidity and heavy-handedness. The Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko forgets nothing but he learns very little. Mr. Talbott's account does not leave us astonished at Mr. Nitze's failure, only at both the imaginative force and the unrealistic optimism of his effort.

If the negotiation on Euromissiles was inher-

ed, the posture of the Reagan Administration on reduction of strategic weapons in the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) has been all its own work. Here again the bureaucratic battles were clamorous, but Mr. Talbott demonstrates plainly that no one of any rank ever dared to put forward where Ronald Reagan could see it a proposal that the Soviet Government might conceivably accept. Everyone in the Administration appears to have found it necessary to make it a basic premise that the only desirable strategic agreement would be one that forced major reductions in the two largest Soviet intercontinental forces, while leaving all the new strategic programs of Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger essentially unconstrained. Nothing approaching a negotiation ever took place.

The Administration has its share of dumbbells and doctrinaires on these matters, but it also has many members bright and honest enough to recognize that, in the words of Mr. Reagan's most nearly independent adviser, Brent Scowcroft, "START is a non-starter." After making this remark, General Scowcroft did his best to produce some improvements by the unlikely process of bargaining be-

tween members of Congress and the President, but Mr. Talbott correctly notes the wholly marginal character of the complex and ill-defined changes that resulted.

Given the general mind-set of the Reagan Administration, these results are less surprising than the extraordinary intensity of the bureaucratic contest among Mr. Burt and Mr. Perle and others for their preferred versions of what was never negotiable. When Mr. Burt says, "I really want to win this one," he is not talking about a victory over the Russians or over nuclear danger; he is talking about winning the President's approval for the particular unworkable proposal he prefers. And Mr. Perle says triumphantly, "We're going to zero-out [Soviet] heavies," he is not talking about a real reduction in Soviet forces but about his success in pushing a proposal that he knows the Soviets will never accept; he wants a paper victory. The difference between the two men is that for Mr. Perle it is a clear sign of softness to ask whether any proposal is negotiable, while for Mr. Burt, on START if not on INF, negotiability does remain an unconfessed — and in these years unachievable — objective.

Why, one may ask, is Mr. Talbott so intent on the result-free bureaucratic warfare between these two determined intriguers? Partly, of course, it is Washington's fascination with political gossip, and indeed gossip on nuclear policy is seldom trivial. Read all about it. Read how Richard Burt joined forces with the Joint Chiefs of Staff to get approval of a proposal for keeping missile-launchers few and vulnerable on both sides, a proposal that correctly seemed preposterous to both Paul Nitze the hawk and Paul Warke the dove from the Carter years. Read how Richard Perle regularly enlisted the underinformed but fervent advocacy of his chief, Caspar Weinberger, to win the President's nod for a stiffer stand — "Cap has a point."

Above all, read how Ronald Reagan himself repeatedly betrayed his ignorance of the most elementary issues. His first START proposals would have required the Russians to reduce their two principal missile forces by two-thirds, but when he put them forward he did not know that the Soviets might think them unbalanced; no one had told him. He was also unable at any time to say just what was good about missiles on submarines. In a press conference in 1982 he said these missiles could be recalled and to Congressmen in 1983 he said they didn't have nuclear warheads. At one level, this is a riveting account of infighting for the approval of "a detached, sometimes befuddled character."

At a second level, the book teaches larger lessons. Mr. Talbott shows us just what happens to nuclear arms control when the interest and attention of the President are concentrated not on the substance of the matter but on what will sound good to Americans. On sounding good, Mr. Reagan is a certified expert, and on his own terms it cannot be said at this writing that he has failed. To most Americans over the last three years, his public proposals have seemed fair enough. Why not propose, late in 1981, a zero option for the Euromissiles — zero for both sides? In the judgment of Alexander Haig, then his Secretary of State, the proposal was "absurd" because it called for the Soviets to abandon hundreds of weapons already deployed in return for the cancellation of a smaller American force that was only on the drawing boards. But it sounded all right to the public. Moreover, when you want to make a plausible pitch for a bad position with a clear conscience, it probably helps not to understand things very well. If way down deep you prefer

arms to arms control, it is a presentable appearance and not a negotiable reality that you want.

In this sense, the nasty little struggles that Mr. Talbott recounts may have led to just the barren but presentable postures that Mr. Reagan really wanted. When he insists on keeping the Pershing II missile against Mr. Nitze's advice, is it not because he truly does believe in these American "fast-flyers"? When he keeps the fine print deeply secret in his first START proposals, so that their imbalance will not show, is it not plain that he is governed by how things look? When he later begins to use changes in the START proposals as the political shield in Congress for his MX-in-Minuteman, is it not because he really does prefer what he calls the Peacekeeper (this name for MX is the only one he can't make stick) to any particular posture in Geneva? Is he not really quite content that START should be a non-starter, as long as he can put the blame on Moscow? Is that not exactly what we see him doing in October 1983, a month before the Soviet walkout: "The door to an agreement is open. All the world is waiting for the Soviet Union to walk through." It was palpable nonsense, but it sounded good at the time.

When the Soviets did walk out in November, the President did look good by comparison. Nor can anyone make that Soviet action mainly Mr. Reagan's fault. The Soviet Government had accepted with a vengeance the invitation to make trouble that was issued by the Carter two-track decision, and unless Mr. Kvitsinsky's walk with him meant more than Mr. Nitze now believes, they never made up their minds to accept any arrangement but the one Mr. Reagan skillfully described as one-half of his zero option — zero for the Americans. While Moscow's bitter rejections of the Reagan offers in START are more defensible, they themselves offered nothing much better in reply. The Soviet Government we encounter in this book is not an easy partner; its negotiators are shrewd, secretive, tricky and loyal to their country's "habit of defining its security in a way that makes other states feel insecure." They are no more interested than Americans in giving up advantages bought and paid for. They are real Russians, and Mr. Talbott, the translator of Nikita Khrushchev's memoirs, understands them well.

No matter who is President in 1985, these difficult Russians will be there, and it will not be easy to make agreements with them that the American people and the Senate will approve. Anyone who thinks that Ronald Reagan's is the only way to fail should remember the fate of SALT II under his three predecessors.

Mr. Talbott attempts no comparison of Mr. Reagan and his present challenger; Walter Mondale is not mentioned, and the wholly different approach to arms control that he advocates is not examined. So this book alone is no guide to a comparative judgment of the candidates. The best it can do for us in this election season is to help us consider what Mr. Reagan himself might do about arms control in a second term. Would he still insist on concessions the Russians simply will not make? Or might he decide to bargain in earnest, as he has so often in the past with domestic opponents? We know that our last two-term President, Dwight Eisenhower, changed course in just this way on just this subject in his last four years. Some of Mr. Reagan's more zealous supporters are said to fear that he too may change in this same way.

But other observers reach an opposite conclusion, noting the threat posed by his programs to the

limits of the SALT II treaty — unratified but still observed — and still more the potential for direct conflict between his Star Wars program and SALT I, which directly prohibits the defensive systems for which he has called.

On the evidence of Mr. Talbott's book, the fears of the zealous seem excessive. Mr. Reagan's words have been the words of an ardent advocate of arms control, but in his heart he seems to be most in sympathy with the men who mistrust the whole notion. To Richard Perle and Caspar Weinberger (who should be listed in this order on this subject), the path to safety is in competition, not agreement, in widening the arms race and not limiting it. Mr. Reagan does not seem to share their intense passion or their deep mistrust of the bargaining process, and I do not find it hard to believe that he would very much like a good agreement with his name on it; Presidents do. But there is a good agreement in relatively easy reach right now — on antisatellite weapons — and I doubt if the President knows it or has anyone nearby to tell him plainly what is wrong with the objections of the Perles and the Weinbergers. In his recent speech at the United Nations he continued to tie the discussion of this opportunity to the reopening of the dead-ended talks on strategic weapons; a serious diplomacy could do better.

Indeed, the U.N. speech, on the evidence so far, conforms to the pattern exposed in "Deadly Gambits": it is more forthcoming in appearance than in reality. The rhetoric is that of a man of peace, and Mr. Talbott's book allows us to recognize the use of the word "framework" as a victory for Secretary of State George P. Shultz and the State Department's believers in real negotiations. But the President's specific proposals remain those of the hard-liners. It is most unlikely that Soviet leaders will think him forthcoming when he insists on adding to the unratified treaty on underground nuclear testing a requirement for on-site inspection that was correctly seen as unnecessary by that old softie Richard Nixon when he signed that treaty in Moscow 10 years ago. It is a safe bet that the internal bureaucratic battle over the eventual content of the "framework" still lies ahead, and so far there is no reason to suppose that Mr. Shultz will win.

ONE final lesson is more clear-cut. A President who truly wants progress in arms control cannot have it by living above the bureaucratic fray. If Mr. Reagan wins a second term and decides to take arms control seriously, he will have to change his way of work. Without strong and determined executive leadership, no Administration has ever reached any arms control agreement. The internal conflicts that inescapably beset this topic in the Pentagon and elsewhere are too strong to be resolved into negotiable proposals by merely bureaucratic bargaining, especially when the most determined infighters are also the most ardent enemies of agreements. Either the President himself, or some senior colleague to whom he clearly gives his trust, must take the lead, and on substance, not slogans. If a re-elected Ronald Reagan should choose this path, he would have many formidable advantages. What he approved the Senate would endorse, and he could survive the anger of the most determined superhawk.

But can he truly change his way of work as well as his priorities? Or is it more likely that we will get another four years of plausible flimflam at the top and ruthlessly effective resistance to all remotely negotiable proposals at lower levels? Read this book and decide for yourself. □

#### CORRECTIONS

- (38) Dan McDonald was inadvertently left off of the June 1984 membership list (RN43-51). Dan is a 1974 member — there aren't many! — and we don't think that's a proper way to treat a 10-year member. Or any other member. Our apologies.

## ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

- (39) Americans for Religious Liberty is the new name of The Voice of Reason. Their literature includes a fact sheet about ARL, "Which Vision for America?", an article by Edd Doerr, "Will Religious Liberty Survive the 1980s?" reprinted from Religious Humanism (Spring 1984), and "A New Constitutional Convention: Threat to the Bill of Rights". Their address: PO Box 6656, Silver Spring, MD 20906. (Thank you, BOB DAVIS)

- (40) Greenpeace. From the New York Times (9/2/84, p. 7):

## Greenpeace: Global Gadfly For Ecology

By JO THOMAS

Special to The New York Times

LONDON, Sept. 1 — When the French cargo vessel Mont Louis sank a week ago off the Belgian coast with a cargo of uranium, authorities initially announced that the ship was carrying only medical supplies. The first indication the ship was carrying radioactive material came from the French office of Greenpeace, the environmental group.

The announcement grew out of a continuing effort by the group to gather information about the production and international trading of uranium, which Greenpeace believes is best left in the ground.

According to Peter Wilkinson, a member of the board of Greenpeace International, the discovery of what was actually aboard the Mont Louis grew out of a hunch. When the organization's French office realized the Mont Louis was the sister ship of the Borodine, which regularly carries radioactive products between France and the Soviet Union, "we made some inquiries," Mr. Wilkinson said. "One person admitted the ship was carrying nuclear material."

### Looking for Another Shipment

He said he is hoping for as much luck in detecting a forthcoming shipment, approved by the United States, of plutonium from France to Japan.

"If it went by sea, which looks likely, imagine a worst case in which the ship could sink on a rocky coast and break up," he said. "There are 600 pounds of plutonium — enough to kill 270 billion people," he said. "We've announced that we are going to try to stop it."

In the 13 years since Greenpeace was formed in Vancouver, Canada, it has been called the Don Quixote of environmental groups, tilting at toxic waste dumpers and at whaling ships from small rubber boats, dyeing baby seals green to make them unfit for slaughter, releasing balloons in Leningrad urging, "Soviet Union: Stop the Atomic Tests!"

### An Active Summer

This is what Greenpeace protesters did this summer:

They dressed up as penguins and climbed the front of the offices of a French organization that is promoting an airstrip in a particularly sensitive part of the Antarctic.

They climbed the highest chimney in Europe, part of a coal-fired power plant complex near Helmstedt, West Germany, in a protest over acid rain.

They partially blocked the discharge pipe of the Ciba-Geigy chemical company at Toms River, N.J. in protest over discharges of organic compounds into Barnegat Bay.

They tried to plug a pipe discharging sulfuric acid into the St. Lawrence

River in Quebec.

They climbed the Statue of Liberty to hang a banner saying, "Give Me Liberty from Nuclear Weapons — Stop Testing."

The protesters had their difficulties. The French police arrested and beat up the penguins, and the Canadians were arrested on charges of committing mischief. But they had garnered the publicity that Greenpeace feels is essential.

### After Attention, Lobbying

"We use action," said David McTaggart, a founder and chairman of the organization, "and once there's attention, we move into lobbying."

In 1972 Mr. McTaggart and two other men sailed 3,000 miles from New Zealand to the Pacific atoll of Mururoa, where the French planned a series of atmospheric atomic tests. They sailed inside the 200-mile security zone and floated within sight of the balloon that was to carry the bomb, until their boat was rammed by a French minesweeper and towed to shore.

Mr. McTaggart returned a year later, when the French boarded his boat. "They beat me up," he said. "I was blinded in one eye for a long time. I went back to Canada and sued the French Government." At the same time, he recalled, New Zealand began patrolling the area in protest at the tests, and the French discontinued them.

Greenpeace International, which has its headquarters in Britain, has 30 offices in 15 countries. It has four boats and employs its own crews and scientists. This year's budget will be about \$12 million.

### Private Donations

"All our support comes from the public," Mr. McTaggart said, adding that most donations are \$5 and \$10. "We don't get any grants. We have to be absolutely nonpolitical. We attack the left, the right, and the center, and no one with the organization is allowed to run for political office."

"We attempt to bridge the gap between the Audubon Society and the Sierra Club and the more radical grass-roots groups," said Steve Sawyer, an American. "But we're hardly a middle-of-the-road group."

"We draw the line at violence," Steve McAllister, another American, said. "We don't fight cops, break things up, or blow things up. In the case of whales, we get between the whales and the harpoon. Or we plug a pipe and maintain a vigil. We force the issue to the public's eyes."

Mr. McTaggart's confrontation with the French authorities in the South Pacific led him to believe the approach would work. "There was an image of a big nuclear bomb and a little wooden boat," he explained. "You can talk of Gandhi and all that. But if you can see this huge steel navy grinding along, a little piece of sand can get caught in the machinery and bring it to a halt. Our philosophy is to put yourself between the problem in a nonviolent way."

"We're not suicidal," he said. "We want to draw attention to something, and we know what our plan is years in advance. It's easy to say, 'I want to clean the whole world up,' but all our goals are just possible and can be got to."

- (41) North American Committee for Humanism met in NYC at the N.Y. Society for Ethical Culture August 24-46, 1984. BOB DAVIS attended. There were reports and papers by NACH President Sherwin Wine (Society for Humanistic Judaism), Edward Ericson, (former Leader, New York Society for Ethical Culture), John Hoad (Leader, St. Louis Ethical Society), David Clarke (Student, Humanist Institute), Roger Greeley (Minister, Peoples Church of Kalamazoo), Maxine Greene (Professor, Teachers College, Columbia University), Robert Hemstreet (Minister, Flushing Unitarian Church, Queens), Joseph Fahey (Director, Peace Studies Institute, Manhattan College).

Roger Greeley punctured several "pervasive and pernicious myths, long regarded by millions as guideposts in American life: that most early American settlers came to enjoy religious freedom; that the founding fathers were god-fearing Christians; that religious freedom reflects the will of the majority. "Most of the religious dissidents came to the New World to escape British tyranny and created a new tyranny of their own." And most of the founders were "highly individualistic men who hardly fit any Fallwellian stereotype of the good Christian." To inquire about Conference papers, write Editor-Elect Gordon Stein, 2114 Marine Street, Santa Monica, CA 90405.

- (42) Palestinian Human Rights Committee. We now get regular mailings from this organization. The latest mailing, of October 17th, starts off "Dear PHRC ACTION ALERT NETWORK..." and deals with 3 issues: (1) the Al-Jnaid Prison ("Israel's new high tech prison"), where conditions are said to be unsatisfactory; (2) the closed An-Najah University, that they wish to see re-opened; and (3) alleged distortions of Palestinian issues in the American press. It tells its readers whom to write to, in the Amnesty International manner, and also lists coming events. The 5-page mailing, complete with visual symbol of an upraised hand, is put together with skill. It could achieve some results. Their address: 220 S. State St., One Quincy Court (1308), Chicago, IL 60604

- (43) World Affairs Bookstore calls itself "The Largest Unknown World Affairs Bookstore in the Midwest". It is a project of the World Without War Council -- Midwest, with offices in Berkeley, New York, Seattle, and Portland. Its August 1984 order form lists 33 books on "Nuclear Weapons, Nuclear War, and U.S. National Security Policy". Their address: 421 S. Wabash Av., Chicago, IL 60605.

- (44) People For The American Way ran a full-page ad in the (Sunday) New York Times Review of the Week (9/23/84, p. 24E). Three-fourths of the page pictured a stone tablet with the words: "Thou shalt not mix Church and State. THE CONSTITUTION. CHAPTER 1, VERSE 1." Here is the accompanying text:

*"The Constitution of the United States is a marvelous document for self-government by Christian people. But the minute you turn the document into the hands of non-Christian people and atheist people, they can use it to destroy the very foundation of our society. And that's what's been happening."—Televangelist Pat Robertson. Founder, The Freedom Council*

*"The idea that religion and politics don't mix was invented by the Devil to keep Christians from running their own country."—Televangelist Jerry Falwell. Founder, The Moral Majority*

For 200 years, our Constitution has guaranteed religious freedom. But today there is a spectre of powerful voices arguing that they have a divine mandate to mix church and state and destroy the freedom guaranteed by the wall of separation between church and state.

Religious bodies demand that their sectarian beliefs, dogma and doctrine become the law of the land. For everyone.

Political organizations claim to speak for God. Ultra-fundamentalists declare that only born-again Christians should be elected to

public office. Those who dare to disagree with their political platform are branded anti-God, anti-family, satanic, infidels, or secular humanists.

Leading public officials claim a biblical mandate to govern. They debate faith instead of policy. They confuse disagreement with sin and evil. To favor separation of church and state is to be "intolerant of religion" or "anti-religionist."

Debate, dissent and diversity have become un-American activities. The result: Moral McCarthyism.

We must not remain silent. We must fight back to preserve freedom.

America is about freedom of speech and belief. The separation of church and state. Our country was started by people who fled here from lands where religious diversity was restricted, not respected.

America is about respecting our different religious and political beliefs. In America, there are no religious tests for public office.

Political leaders can speak about religion and religious leaders can speak about politics. The First Amendment guarantees both.

But when politics is transformed into a theological battle between the "sinners" and the "saved," open

debate and religious liberty are jeopardized.

Religion has flourished in America because of the separation of church and state. Religion is a matter of private conscience. But freedom of religion is a constitutional commandment.

-----  
People For The American Way  
1424 16th Street, NW, Room 605  
Washington, D.C. 20036

I BELIEVE THAT THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE IS WORTH FIGHTING FOR.

- Here is my contribution of \$\_\_\_\_\_ to join People For The American Way in its battle to protect religious freedom in America.  
 Please send me a free pamphlet on ten rules for maintaining the separation of church and state.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_

STATE \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

  
Don't take your freedom for granted.

© 1984, People For The American Way

#### OPPORTUNITIES

- (45) Summary of opportunities. Here are 11 things to do that would benefit the BRS. All have been mentioned in this issue of the newsletter. Can you do some of them? Please look over the following list and lend a hand wherever you can.

- . Mark the date of the 1985 annual meeting on your calendar. (3)
- . Offer suggestions for Library activities. (4)
- . Offer to do something on the program, at the '85 annual meeting. (4)
- . Select a group you can show "Bertie and the Bomb" to. (5,14)
- . Notify Librarian Tom Stanley, if you want "Bertie and the Bomb" for a specific date. (8)
- . Photocopy the petition (Page 4), get signatures, and mail it off. (10).
- . Nominate someone you think worthy of the 1985 BRS Award. (18)
- . Notify us if you see the Dora press release (19) or the Doctoral Grant announcement (22) in any publication.
- . Send money to Pugwash, if you can. (26)
- . Pay your dues! (28)
- . Check the zipcode list for nearby BRS members. (29)
- . Nominate a recent book for the 1985 BRS Book Award. (32)

And know that we appreciate your help.

## CONTRIBUTIONS

- (46) Our thanks to these members for for their recent contributions to the BRS Treasury: ADAM PAUL BANNER, CHRISTOPHER BOYLE, BOB LOMBARDI, JERRY DEAN PEARSON.

(47)

## INDEX

- "Accidental War" by Dely.....10  
 Annual Meeting, 1985.....3  
 Award. See BRS Award  
 Banner's recommended reading (Illich).....31  
 "Bertie and the Bomb" (BBC videotape).....14
- Book Award. See BRS Book Award  
 Book review: "Deadly Gambits".....37  
 BR quoted.....17  
 British Labor wants nuclear disarming.....23  
 BRS Award, 1984, to Dora Russell.....19
- BRS Award, 1985, nominations wanted.....18  
 BRS Book Award, 1985, nominations wanted.....32  
 BRS Doctoral Grant announcement, 1985.....22  
 BRS finances. See Contributions needed  
 Contributions needed.....33
- Contributors thanked.....46  
 Copyright.....34  
 Correction: McDonald.....38  
 Directors' reports available.....27  
 Doctoral Grant. See BRS Doctoral Grant
- Dues are due .....28  
 English teachers spread BR's views.....20  
 Films for rent.....13  
 For sale: members' stationery.....36  
 Highlights. See Newsletter highlights
- Index.....47  
 Librarian Stanley reports.....8  
 Librarian. See New Librarian  
 Library of Congress now holds all RSNs.....35  
 Meeting 1985. See Annual Meeting
- Members' stationery. See For Sale  
 New Librarian: meet Tom Stanley.....12  
 New addresses.....25  
 New members.....24  
 Newsletter highlights.....1
- Opportunities (to assist the BRS).....45
- Other organizations:  
 Americans for Religious Liberty.....39  
 Greenpeace.....40  
 North American Committee for Humanism...41  
 Palestine Human Rights Committee.....42
- People for the American Way.....44  
 World Affairs Bookstore.....43  
 Petition on accidental war concern.....10  
 Philosophers Committee; Chmn Johnson reports..9  
 President Jackanicz reports.....4
- Pugwash, October newsletter.....26  
 Science Committee: Chmn Dely reports.....10  
 Seckel's slide-lecture 12/2/84.....2  
 Seckel's talks spread BR's views.....21  
 Spreading BR's views. See English teachers
- Spreading BR's views. See Seckel's talks  
 Treasurer Darland reports, 2nd quarter.....7a  
 Treasurer Darland reports, 3rd quarter.....7b  
 Unilateral nuclear disarming:  
 .Hook misrepresented BR's Alsop interview...16a  
 .BR's Alsop interview 2/21/58.....16b  
 .Hook frequently misrepresented BR.....16c  
 .Hook, in New Leader 4/7/58.....16d  
 .BR responds, in New Leader 5/26/58.....16e  
 .Hook attacks again, New Leader 5/26/58.....16f  
 .BR responds again, New Leader 7/7-14/58....16g  
 .Hook attacks again, New Leader 7/7-14/58....16h  
 .BR's achievement (Pugwash).....16i  
 .BR's summation, in his Autobiography.....16j  
 Vice-President Hart reports.....5
- Vice-President/Special Projects Kohl reports...6  
 Vice-President Hart. See next item  
 Vice-Presidential expectations.....30  
 Vidal on audiotape.....15  
 Voting results.....11
- Why make a contribution? See Contributions  
 Zip code sleuthing.....29

P.S.

One more opportunity:

- . Tell us your reactions to the BR vs. Hook exchanges. (16i)