

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS

No. 49

February 1986

- (1) Highlights:. Brainwash, American style (19). BR on civil disobedience (10); on atomic energy control, 1947 (9); on Israel's use of force in Palestine (37). Plot Hatch hatched unhatched (17). Nobel Laureates on the nuclear peril (14). The Index is at the end. An asterisk in the left column indicates a request.
-

COMING EVENTS

- (2) The Conference on the Danger of Accidental Nuclear War... May 26 - 30, 1986...at the University of British Columbia. For information, write Prof. Michael D. Wallace, Chairman, Organizing Committee, Dept. of Political Science, The University of British Columbia, #472-1866 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1W5.
- (3) IPPNO. International Philosophers for the Prevention of Nuclear Omnicide will hold its First International Conference in St. Louis, MO (April 30-May 4, 1986). The 5-day Conference will be held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the American Philosophical Association (Western Division). The general theme is "Philosophy and the New Problem of Nuclear Omnicide." The organization's aim is to promote international co-operation among philosophers, irrespective of their political viewpoints, in theoretical discussions and agreed practical actions directed toward the prevention of nuclear homicide. IPPNO is open to professional philosophers and all others interested in the contribution of philosophy to the cause of peace. Contact: IPPNO, 1426 MERRITT DRIVE, EL CAJON, CA 92020 U.
[From the Disarmament Newsletter, published by the Dept. of Disarmament Affairs of the United Nations, United Nations, NY NY 10017, with thanks to TOM STANLEY.]
-

MONEY

If we seem to be talking a lot about things that involve money -- like renewal dues and contributions to the BRS Treasury -- it's because we don't have enough of it to be able to afford the luxury of not talking about it.

- (4) Last call for dues. Everyone's dues are due (except those who joined in December 85.) If you haven't yet renewed, please do so without delay. Remember, non-renewers become non-persons. Ugh!

Dues: \$25, regular; \$30, couple; \$12.50, student under 25; \$12.50, limited income. Plus \$7.50 outside USA, Canada and Mexico. Plus \$2 for Canada & Mexico. US dollars only.

If you are in position to make an extra contribution when you renew, see the higher membership categories in RSN48-4

Please mail dues to 1986, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036.

- (5) Renewal Honor Roll. As you know, renewal dues are due on January 1st; but for one reason or another, many members miss that due-date. This creates uncertainty and concern. It also causes the extra work and expense of mailing renewal follow-up notices. So we'd like to express our thanks to some early-bird renewers.

We salute the following members. They all renewed before 1986. We call this our Renewal Honor Roll: JEAN ANDERSON, TRUMAN ANDERSON, JAY ARAGONA, RUBEN ARDILA, ADAM PAUL BANNER, WALTER BAUMGARTNER, FRANK BISK, HOWARD BLAIR, MICHAEL BRADY, JAMES BUXTON, ROBERT CANTERBURY, DENNIS CHIPMAN, DONG JAE CHOI, GLENNA CRANFORD, PETER CRANFORD, STEVE DAHLBY, DENNIS DARLAND, ROBERT DAVIS, RONALD EDWARDS, LEE EISLER, ALBERT ELLIS, GRAHAM ENTWISTLE, RICHARD FRANK, FRANK GALLO, ALEJANDRO GARCADIIEGO, PAUL GARWIG, SEYMOUR GENSER, ALI GHAEMI, ARTTIE GOMEZ, DONALD GREEN, JOHN HARRISON, CHARLES HILL, JAMES HOOPES, OPHELIA HOOPES, ARVO IHALAINEN, RAMON ILJUSORIO, DONALD JACKANICZ, JOHN JACKANICZ, DAVID JOHNSON, MARVIN KOHL, KENNETH KORBIN, CORLISS LAMONT, HERBERT LANSDELL, PHILIP LE COMPTE, JOHN LENZ, ARTHUR LEWIS, DON LOEB, JONATHAN LUKIN, JOHN MAHONEY, MICHAEL MALIN, STEVE MARAGIDES, GLENN MOYER, SANDRA MOYER, ERIC NELSON, DANIEL O'LEARY, PAUL PFALZNER, NAGABHUSHANA REDDY, STEPHEN REINHARDT, VERA ROBERTS, MICHAEL ROCKLER, JOSEPH RODERICK, KERMIT ROSE, HARRY RUJA, CHERIE RUPPE, PAUL SALTMARSH, ROBERT SASS, GREGORY SCAMMELL, LEONARD SCHWARTZ, JOHN SCHWENK, RICHARD SHORE, JOHN SHOSKY, WARREN SMITH, WAYNE SMITH, JOHN SONNTAG, PHILIP STANDER, THOMAS STANLEY, THOMAS STENSON, ROLAND STROMBERG, RAMON SUZARA, JUDITH TOUBES, LLOYD TREFETHEN, RICHARD TYSON, CLIFFORD VALENTINE, ELEANOR VALENTINE, TOM WEIDLICH, CALVIN WICHERN, JOHN WILHELM, VINCENT WILLIAMS, RONALD YUCCAS.

And incidentally -- or perhaps not so incidentally -- 38% of the Honor Roll Renewers made an extra contribution to our beleaguered Treasury at the same time that they renewed, by selecting a membership category. See (6).

- (6) Our warm thanks to the following members for making an extra contribution to the BRS Treasury. In most cases, they did so by their selection of a membership category. JAY ARAGONA, DONG-IN BAE, ADAM PAUL BANNER, HOWARD BLAIR, DENNIS CHIPMAN, STEVE DAHLBY, DENNIS DARLAND, BOB DAVIS, LEE EISLER, GRAHAM ENTWISTLE, ARTIE GOMEZ, DONALD GREEN, CHARLES HILL, JAMES HOOPES, OPHELIA HOOPES, DON JACKANICZ, JOHN JACKANICZ, DAVID JOHNSON, MARVIN KOHL, CORLISS LAMONT, HERBERT LANSDELL, PHILIP LE COMPTE, JOHN MAHONEY, STEVE MARAGIDES, GLENN MOYER, SANDRA MOYER, DANIEL O'LEARY, PAUL PFALZNER, STEVE REINHARDT, MICHAEL ROCKLER, HARRY RUJA, SIGRID SAAL, PAUL SALTMARSH, and RONALD YUCCAS.

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

- (7) House of Lords discuss Atomic Energy Control (April 30, 1947). [Recall that in 1947, America had a monopoly on the atomic bomb.] The discussion starts with The Lord Archbishop of York asking (at 2:58pm) what progress has been made toward securing international control of atomic energy, mentioning the enormous damage done by a single atomic bomb at Hiroshima. Several other members speak, and (at 4:33pm) BR speaks:

Earl Russell: I listened with the most complete and absolute agreement to the speech of the most reverend Primate, so much so that I nearly decided not to speak at all, because it seemed there was not much left that I wanted to say, but in the course of the debate some points have arisen about which I would like to speak. Like the most reverend Primate and the noble Viscount Lord Samuel, I read the verbatim report of Mr. Gromyko's speech, but I must confess that I did not draw from it quite such optimistic conclusions as those drawn by the noble Viscount opposite. It seemed to me that Mr. Gromyko was trying to make the most of certain concessions, although he was aware throughout that the concessions he was making were not such as would serve the purpose we have in view, and that he would make concessions only if he knew they would not do any good. That was the impression I received from his speech, and that raises the whole essential problem, which seems to me to be so extraordinarily difficult.

I must say that I am surprised at the paucity of interest in this question in this country, because, after all, it is perhaps more vital to this country than to any other in all the world. The interest in this subject in America is very much greater than it is here. I suppose that is partly because the Americans feel a sense of responsibility in the matter; but at any rate they are very much more alive to all the issues than the general public in this country. Here I find, for instance, even the Council of British Atomic Scientists prepared to acquiesce or so it seems to me in an attitude which is one of hopeless pessimism. They say, in a Report issued last January:

"It must be admitted that an effective system of control acceptable to all concerned is a very doubtful proposition in the present state of distrust between nations, since it must contain, at least in embryonic form, a measure of world government. It is felt by some of our members that we can scarcely expect any effective agreement on the control of atomic energy at the present time."

If that really is the last word to be said in the matter, then I think our situation is entirely hopeless, because so far as there is peace in the world at the present time it only exists because one nation has atomic bombs. As soon as a number of nations have them, there will no longer exist the only motive for peace which, in the absence of the idealism we should all like to see, is fear. Fear is the one thing that is preserving us at the present time. If we are to preserve the peace of the world beyond the time when America ceases to have a monopoly of the bomb, which is not very distant, it must be done by having the bomb completely controlled by some one authority, and it cannot then be a national one. The period during which it can be a national authority is necessarily brief, and if the control does not pass straight from a national authority to an international authority, then we shall inevitably get an atomic war. We all know what that involves, and it is not necessary to go into it. It seems to me, therefore, that we have only this brief time in which somehow or another to establish international control of atomic energy. I entirely agree that controlling atomic energy alone is not enough, and that ultimately we must have an international authority which can prevent war. But it is a step, and the machinery that's required in the one case is similar to the machinery needed in the other.

It could grow, and it would be an object lesson, showing what could be done in the way of international control. But, and this is a question to which I should very much like to know the answer, what is to be done, in view of the objections that Russia seems to have to any kind of international control? Are we simply to sit down under those objections? Presumably we should try every method of persuasion that we can, and make every concession that is not a concession of something vital, in the hope of producing some agreement. But if all that fails, as I am inclined to think it will, and Russia, for example, still continues to object to any adequate or sufficient inspection, what are we then to do? Are we to do what I think would have to be done in that case, namely to try to organize all the nations of the world which are in favour of international control into a somewhat tight alliance, giving them all the advantages that America at present possesses, and trying then to frighten Russia into joining that association, with all the privileges it would entail? Or are we to go on leaving Russia outside, with the certainty that if we do so an atomic war will result. It is a very difficult choice.

I should very much like to know both what is the attitude of our own Government, and what is the attitude of the American Government. I cannot here and now find out the attitude of the American Government but one does see that they seem to be drifting very fast towards an attitude which will lead towards coercion. In fact, I was told only recently by a man just returned from America that in that country any person who favours the United Nations is labelled as a dangerous "Red." That is going very far, but it seems to be happening. I confess that I cannot have much faith in the United Nations, and never have had since the veto was decided upon, because so long as you preserve the veto it is nothing but a debating society where you can meet and exchange opinions. What people's opinions are does not matter, because they go on as if they had not met. I think it would be necessary to create a tighter organization of nations who are prepared to forego the veto, an organization which should be open to anybody, which might gradually bypass the veto and arrive at the same results as if the veto had been abandoned. I do not see what else is to be done if we are to establish a real international government; and if we do not establish an international government then it is the end of everything.

We have only a few years in which this can be done, and I think it would involve something rather like an attempt to coerce the Russians, because I do not believe that they would willingly submit to inspection. From all we know of Russia, inspection is the one thing they cannot stand, and I do not think they will accept it willingly. They allow inspection of a factory which is dubbed a factory for the creation of atomic energy, but not a factory which is dubbed something else. That is what Mr. Gromyko said, and it does not amount to very much. It only means one has to put a different label over the factory and it is safe from inspection. Do you think you will get the Russians to acquiesce at all easily in what is necessary? I hope with all my heart that they will, but I do not expect it.

Then the question arises, how much pressure of one sort or another it will be proper to use against them in order to compel them to act in a way which, quite clearly, is as much to their interest as to ours, because I am persuaded that they are completely mad and foolish in their opposition to this scheme. This is in the interests of mankind and ought not to be measured in national terms at all. Can man go on existing in the way he has, or is he to become a hunted animal? That is not a nationalist question; it is not a question of Russian interests, American interests or British interests. It is a question of human interests. If only the Russians could see it in that light we might be able to get some agreement with them. But I have very grave doubts as to whether it will be possible. In the absence of that, I think the question will arise as to what degree of coercion it would be right and proper to apply.

And, as we now know, BR was in favor of using "any degree of pressure that may be necessary", which could well include the atom bomb. (RSN45-5)

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

(8) From The New Statesman (February 17, 1961, p. 245), with thanks to TOM STANLEY:

Civil Disobedience

BERTRAND RUSSELL

This week-end Bertrand Russell and other demonstrators who accept the tactic of civil disobedience will take part in an unlawful protest against the Polaris missile in particular and nuclear policy in general. For reasons stated at length in this journal last week we do not believe that either his assumptions or the tactics he advocates are correct in present circumstances, but we believe that he should have a full opportunity to explain his position.

There are two different kinds of conscientious civil disobedience. There is disobedience to a law specifically commanding an action which some people profoundly believe to be wicked. The most important example of this case in our time is conscientious objection. This, however, is not the kind of civil disobedience which is now in question.

The second kind of civil disobedience, which is the one that I wish to consider, is its employment with a view to causing a change in the law or in public policy. In this aspect, it is a means of propaganda, and there are those who consider that it is an undesirable kind. Many, however, of whom I am one, think it to be now necessary.

Many people hold that law-breaking can never be justified in a democracy, though they concede that under any other form of government it may be a duty. The victorious

governments, after the Second World War, reprobated, and even punished, Germans for not breaking the law when the law commanded atrocious actions. I do not see any logic which will prove either that a democratic government cannot command atrocious actions or that, if it does, it is wrong to disobey its commands.

Democratic citizens are for the most part busy with their own affairs and cannot study difficult questions with any thoroughness. Their opinions are formed upon such information as is easily accessible, and the Authorities can, and too often do, see to it that such information is misleading. When I speak of the Authorities, I do not think only of the politicians, whether in office or in opposition, but equally their technical advisers, the popular press, broadcasting and television and, in the last resort, the police. These forces are, at present, being used to prevent the democracies of western countries from knowing the truth about nuclear weapons. The examples are so numerous that a small selection must suffice.

I should advise optimists to study the report of the committee of experts appointed by the Ohio State University to consider the likelihood of accidental war, and also the papers by distinguished scientists in the proceedings of Pugwash Conferences. Mr Oskar Morgenstern, a politically orthodox American defence expert, in an article reprinted in *Survival*, Volume II, Number Four, says: 'The probability of thermonuclear war's occurring appears to be significantly larger

than the probability of its not occurring.' Sir Charles Snow says: 'Speaking as responsibly as I can, within, at the most, ten years from now, some of those bombs are going off. That is the certainty.' (*The Times*, 28 December 1960.) The last two include intended as well as accidental wars.

The causes of unintended war are numerous and have already on several occasions very nearly resulted in disaster. The moon, at least once, and flights of geese, repeatedly, have been mistaken for Russian missiles. Nevertheless, not long ago, the Prime Minister, with pontifical dogmatism, announced that there will be no war by accident. Whether he believed what he said, I do not know. If he did, he is ignorant of things which it is his duty to know. If he did not believe what he said, he was guilty of the abominable crime of luring mankind to its extinction by promoting groundless hopes.

Take, again, the question of British unilateralism. There is an entirely sober case to be made for this policy, but the misrepresentations of opponents, who command the main organs of publicity, have made it very difficult to cause this case to be known. For example, the Labour correspondent of one of the supposedly most liberal of the daily papers wrote an article speaking of opposition to unilateralism as 'the voice of sanity'. I wrote a letter in reply, arguing that, on the contrary, sanity was on the side of the unilateralists and hysteria on the side of their opponents. This the newspaper refused to print. Other unilateralists have had similar experiences.

Or consider the question of American bases in Britain. Who knows that within each of them there is a hard kernel consisting of the airmen who can respond to an alert and are so highly trained that they can be in the air within a minute or two? This kernel is kept entirely isolated from the rest of the camp, which is not admitted to it. It has its own mess, dormitories, libraries, cinemas, etc., and there are armed guards to prevent other Americans in the base camp from having access to it. Every month or two, everybody in it, including the Commander, is flown back to America and replaced by a new group. The men in this inner kernel are allowed almost no contact with the other Americans in the base camp and no contact whatever with any of the inhabitants of the neighbourhood.

It seems clear that the whole purpose is to keep the British ignorant and to preserve, among the personnel of the kernel, that purely mechanical response to orders and propaganda for which the whole of their training is designed. Moreover, orders to this group do not come from the Commandant, but direct from Washington. To suppose that at a crisis the British government can have any control over the orders sent from Washington is pure fantasy. It is obvious that at any moment orders might be sent from Washington which would lead to reprisals by the Soviet forces and to the extermination of the population of Britain within an hour.

The situation of these kernel camps seems analogous to that of the Polaris submarines.

It will be remembered that the Prime Minister said that there would be consultation between the US and the UK governments

before a Polaris missile is fired, and that the truth of his statement was denied by the US government. All this, however, is unknown to the non-political public.

To make known the facts which show that the life of every inhabitant of Britain, old and young, man, woman and child, is at every moment in imminent danger and that this danger is caused by what is mis-named defence and immensely aggravated by every measure which governments pretend will diminish it - to make this known has seemed to some of us an imperative duty which we must pursue with whatever means are at our command. The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament has done and is doing valuable and very successful work in this direction, but the press is becoming used to its doings and beginning to doubt their news value. It has therefore seemed to some of us necessary to supplement its campaign by such actions as the press is sure to report.

There is another, and perhaps even more important reason, for the practice of civil disobedience in this time of utmost peril. There is a very widespread feeling that the individual is impotent against governments, and that, however bad their policies may be, there is nothing effective that priv to people can do about it. This is a complete mistake. If all those who disapprove of government policy were to join in massive demonstrations of civil disobedience, they could render governmental folly impossible and compel the so-called statesmen to acquiesce in measures that would make human survival possible. Such a vast movement, inspired by outraged public opinion, is possible; perhaps it is imminent. If you join it, you will be doing something important to preserve your family,

Friends, compatriots, and the world.

An extraordinarily interesting case which illustrates the power of the Establishment, at any rate in America, is that of Claude Eatherly, who dropped the bomb on Hiroshima. His case also illustrates that in the modern world it often happens that only by breaking the law can a man escape from committing atrocious crimes. He was not told what the bomb would do and was utterly horrified when he discovered the consequences of his act. He has devoted himself throughout many years to various kinds of civil disobedience with a view to calling attention to the atrocity of nuclear weapons and to expiating the sense of guilt which, if he did not act, would weigh him down. The Authorities have decided that he is to be considered mad, and a board of remarkably conformist psychiatrists have endorsed that official view. Eatherly is repentant and certified; Truman is unrepentant and uncertified. I have seen a number of Eatherly's statements explaining his motives. These statements are entirely sane. But such is the power of mendacious publicity that almost everyone, including myself, believed that he had become a lunatic.

In our topsy-turvy world those who have power of life and death over the whole human species are able to persuade almost the whole population of the countries which nominally enjoy freedom of the press and of publicity that any man who considers the preservation of human life a thing of value must be mad. I shall not be surprised if my last years are spent in a lunatic asylum - where I shall enjoy the company of all who are capable of feelings of humanity.

"...the report of the committee of experts appointed by the Ohio State University to consider the likelihood of accidental war..." referred to/above, is the Mershon Report of 1960. It was published in England the same year, with an introduction by BR. The introduction is reproduced in RSN38-8.

- (9) An Introduction to "Freedom Is as Freedom Does: Civil Liberties Today" by Corliss Lamont. It was written for the book's first English edition and the second American edition (1956).

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity of introducing to the British public Mr. Corliss Lamont's book Freedom Is as Freedom Does. The book is an admirable epitome of the various forms of attack on personal liberty that have been taking place in America in recent years. So far as I am able to judge, Mr. Lamont is wholly reliable as to facts, and he has shown good judgment in selecting from an enormous mass of material. Every friend of freedom ought to lay to heart what he has to say. This applies not only to Americans, since there is no country where liberty may not be endangered.

All countries (except perhaps Holland and Scandinavia) are liable to waves of hysteria, though the extent of the damage caused by such waves differs greatly in different places. France had such a wave in 1793 and in a lesser degree, during the Dreyfus case. German had it in the worst possible form during the time of Hitler. Russia had it under Stalin. And America has had it three times, in 1798, in 1919-20, and since the outbreak of the Korean War. Let us not flatter ourselves that Britain is exempt. From the accession of Charles I until the Revolution of 1688, hysteria of all kinds -- left wing, right wing, religious and economic -- was rife. In reading what has happened in America since 1950, I constantly feel as if I were reading about England under the Stuarts. Congressional committees are the counterpart of the Star Chamber, and Senator McCarthy seems like a reincarnation of Titus Oates, who invented the Polish Plot. Nor is it necessary to go back so far. In the days of the French Revolution, when the mob sacked Dr. Priestley's house and the Government employed spies and agents provocateurs to ferret out sympathizers with the Jacobins, England was not unlike what America has been lately. The younger Pitt, if he found himself now in Washington, would feel quite at home. I think it important that English readers should remember such facts and should not react to what is amiss in America by smug complacency. I think it also important to remember, in protesting against loss of liberty in America, that the loss in Russia was very much greater and that the defects of the American system afford no argument in favour of the Soviet dictatorship.

In spite of these provisos I cannot deny that some of the facts about the anti-Communist hysteria in America are utterly amazing. Who would have guessed that the "Girls Scouts Handbook," a work intended to instruct what we should call Girl Guides in their duties, was savagely criticized because it praised the United States Public Health Service and spoke favourably of the United Nations, "the handiwork of that arch-traitor, Alger Hiss"? So severe was the censure that a correction had to be immediately issued omitting the

offending matter.

Perhaps the most valuable chapter in Mr. Lamont's book is the one called "Police State in the Making." The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has been steadily building up its power and spreading terror far and wide. It has 130 million finger-print cards and a system of indexing them of which it is enormously proud. Only a minority of the population do not appear in a police dossier. Members of the FBI join even mildly liberal organizations as spies and report any unguarded word. Anybody who goes so far as to support equal rights for coloured people, or to say a good word for UN, is liable to be visited by officers of the FBI and threatened, if not with prosecution, at least with black-listing and consequent inability to earn a living. When a sufficient state of terror has been produced by these means, the victim is informed that there is a way out: if he will denounce a sufficient number of his friends as Communists, he may obtain absolution.

As in Ancient Rome and modern Russia, this system has produced its crop of professional informers, mostly men who once were Communists and who now denounce others at so much a head. These are generally men over whom the Government holds the threat of prosecution for perjury for having at some time denied they were ever Communists. They are safe so long as they continue to do the dirty work demanded of them, but woe betide them if they repent. One of them, Matusow, after securing the conviction of a number of innocent people, went before a Federal judge and recanted. For this the judge said he would give him three years in prison. Although Matusow won this case on appeal, the Government currently is prosecuting him on another charge, that of perjury, for statements he made in his general recantation.

The police have, for many years, shown a complete disregard for the law and, so far as I can discover, no Federal policeman has ever been punished for breaking the law. The whole terrorist system would break down if one simple reform were adopted: namely, that criminals should be punished even if they are policemen.

The evils of the system have not failed to be condemned by some who cannot be accused of subversive opinions. This is true especially of the Federal judiciary. For example, as Mr. Lamont relates, The Federal Court of Appeals in San Francisco objected to the Government's "system of secret informers, whisperers and talebearers" and went on to say: "It is not amiss to bear in mind whether or not we must look forward to a day when substantially everyone will have to contemplate the possibility that his neighbours are being encouraged to make reports to the FBI about what he says, what he reads and what meetings he attends." On the whole, however, such protests from "respectable" citizens are distressingly rare. The persecution of minority opinion, even when not obviously connected with Communism, is a thing which has not been imposed from above but suits the temper of most men and receives enthusiastic support from juries.

At first sight, it seems curious that a great and powerful country like the United States, which contains only a handful of Communists, should allow itself to get into such a stage of fright. One might have expected that national pride would prevent anything so abject, but such a view would be one which could only be suggested by a false psychology. We are all of us a mixture of good and bad impulses, and it is almost always the bad impulses that prevail in an excited crowd. There is in most men an impulse to persecute whatever is felt to be "different." There is also a hatred to any claim of superiority, which makes the stupid many hostile to the intelligent few. A motive such as fear of Communism affords what seems a decent moral excuse for a combination of the herd against everything in any way exceptional. This is a recurrent phenomenon in human history. Whenever it occurs, its results are horrible. There is some reason to hope that Russia is past the worst in this respect. When McCarthy fell into disfavour, it seemed as if persecution in the United States might diminish. So far the improvement has been less than one might have hoped. But improvement has begun, and it would be no excess of optimism to think that it will continue, and reach a point where men of intelligence and humane minds can once more breathe an atmosphere of freedom. If this comes about, books such as Mr. Lamont's will have served an immensely important purpose.

(With thanks to CORLISS LAMONT and BOB DAVIS.)

[This item originally ran in RSN30-9, where it was not very legible.]

ABOUT BERTRAND RUSSELL

- (10) Mary Berenson: A Self Portrait from Her Life And Letters, edited by Barbara Strachey (New York: Norton, 1983) is the source of these excerpts (for which we are indebted to TOM STANLEY):

To Alys Pearsall Smith · 8 November 1894 Paris
 He [Bertie Russell] certainly has an A no 1 'Thinker', and I consider it is an immense thing for thee to marry such a truly intellectual, thoughtful man. He has an *all round* brain, that works well on every subject. I look forward to years of real joy in his companionship, of genuine 'stimulation'. Higher praise I could scarcely give, because I consider a really fine brain implies a fine character. He is a brick. And *such* a dear.

To Bernhard Berenson 26 August 1898 Friday's Hill

I had an amusing talk with Alys and Bertie last night. Alys says she hates men and despises conversation as a waste of time and thinks smoking is a 'filthy habit'. But she adores Bertie, and so has fashioned her life to be occupied chiefly in these three things. But it is quite true, I fancy, and it accounts for the queer icy streaks one comes across in her every now and then. She even prefers sewing to whist. I wonder if, *à la longue*, even Love can bridge over such fundamental differences between her and Bertie. Bertie says that he has resigned himself to being *always bored* after he is about 30. 'At home, even?' Alys asked. 'Especially at home' Bertie answered remorselessly.

To Bernhard Berenson 17 July 1900 Friday's Hill

Bertie is teaching them Euclid, but alas my beautiful dream of their coming in contact with a 'first-class mind' is upset by the sordid fact that this first-class mind doesn't know how to impart its knowledge, and the poor things are in a perfect maze of miserable bewilderment. For their first lesson he gave them *fifteen* propositions, and they scarcely understood one, poor things! Mother tried to speak to Alys about it, because of course it is an *awful* way to teach, and it makes the children hate the subject. But Alys wouldn't listen to a word, and it was useless.

To Bernhard Berenson 22 March 1908 Oxford

We were talking about Val*, and his utter abhorrence of the 'intellectual' and 'moral' milieu in which he finds himself, Val being merely a stupid commonplace normal boy. Alys said she felt the incongruity very much and wished she and Bertie could 'sometimes relax from their high intellectual and moral tension'. 'But we never do' she said. Ray and Karin and I, and even Mother, exchanged appalled glances.

* Val Worthington, a cousin whose education was being paid for by Bertie Russell.

BR QUOTED: A SUPPLEMENT

- (11) George Seldes provided an interesting collection of BR quotes in his recent book, "The Great Thoughts," which we ran in our last issue (RSN48-17). Here is a supplement, in the form of a letter from HARRY RUJA to Ballantine Books:

Your publication, The Great Thoughts by George Seldes, has no doubt attracted much favorable attention, not the least reason for which is that its compiler celebrated his 95th birthday last month!

The section on Bertrand Russell was of special interest to me since Russell has been my chief research interest for 25 years. I met some beloved friends among Seldes' choices as well as some new acquaintances. I noticed, however, a few problems with the citation of sources. Some of the information was too skimpy to be of much help to those who might want to read in its entirety the essay from which the extract was taken, and some was in error.

I provide you, for what value it might have, with the relevant supplementary information:

The extracts from Marriage and Morals come, in sequence, from Chaps. 3, 19, 11, and 5.

The extract from Portraits from Memory comes from the essay, "From Logic to Politics".

"Men fear thought..." and "But if thought is to become..." are not from Education and the Good Life but rather from Why Men Fight, 1916, Chap. V.

The extracts from Sceptical Essays are from Chaps. XIV and XII.

The title is not Understanding Human History but Understanding History, 1957.

The extract from Mysticism and Logic is from the essay, "The Study of Mathematics."

What I Believe is found in its entirety in The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russell, 1961.

"The Faith of a Rationalist" was published in The Listener, 29 May 1947.

"The Ten Commandments" appeared in The New York Times Magazine, 16 December 1951, and is reprinted in The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, vol. III, 1969, Chap. I.

"The Place of Science..." , which was first published by The New Statesman in 1913, appears also in Mysticism and Logic, 1918.

"Why I Am Not A Christian", 1927, is reprinted in the book by the same name, 1957.

The letter to Lowes Dickenson appears in Autobiography, vol. I, 1967, Chap. VI

The full text from which "Only Protest..." was taken is in Unarmed Victory, 1963, Chap. 2.

"Patriotism..." is from Chap. XIII of Sceptical Essays, 1928.

"My own view..." is from the essay, "Has Religion Made Useful Contributions to Civilization?" in Why I Am Not A Christian, 1957.

"There is therefore..." is from The Nation, 18 June 1955.

Sincerely yours,

Harry Ruja, Ph.D.
Professor of Philosophy, Emeritus

THE NUCLEAR PREDICAMENT

- (12) The clear and present danger, as expressed by the two 1985 Nobel Peace Prize Laureates (The New York Times, 12/11/85, p.A10):

Speeches By Two In Oslo

Special to The New York Times

OSLO, Dec. 10 — Following are the speeches here today by Dr. Yevgeny I. Chazov and Dr. Bernard Lown, accepting the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize on behalf of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War:

Chazov Address

Ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues, I am convinced that today is a great and exciting day not only for the members of our international movement but also for all physicians on our planet, regardless of their political and religious beliefs. For the first time in history, their selfless service for the cause of maintaining life on earth is marked by the high Nobel Prize.

Trial of the Hippocratic oath, we cannot keep silent knowing what can the final epidemic — nuclear war — bring to the humankind. The bell of Hiroshima rings in our hearts not as funeral knell but as an alarm bell calling out to actions to protect life on our planet.

We were among the first to demol-

ish the nuclear illusions that existed and to unveil the true face of nuclear weapons — the weapons of genocide. We warned the peoples and governments that medicine would be helpless to offer even minimal relief to the hundreds of millions of victims in nuclear war.

However, our contacts with patients inspire our faith in the human reason. Peoples are needful of the voice of physicians who warn them of the danger and recommend the means of prevention.

Prescription for Survival

From the first days of our movement we suggested our prescription for survival, which envisaged a ban on tests of nuclear weapons, a freeze, reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, non-first-use of nuclear weapons, ending the arms race on earth and preventing it from spreading to outer space, creation of the atmosphere of trust between peoples and countries, promotion of close international cooperation.

Let us recall the words of the remarkable French author Antoine de Saint-Exupéry who said: "Why should we hate each other? We are all in one, sharing the same planet, a crew of the same ship. It is good when dispute between different civilizations gives birth to something new and mature, but it is outrageous when they devour each other."

Confrontation is the road to war, destruction and end of civilization. Even today, it deprives the world's

peoples of hundreds of millions of dollars which are so badly needed for solving social problems, combating hunger and diseases. Cooperation is the road to increased well being of peoples and flourishing of life.

Medicine knows many examples when joint efforts of nations and scientists contributed to successful combat against diseases such, for instance, as smallpox.

The five years of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War were not all roses. We had to cope with mistrust, skepticism, indifference and sometimes animosity.

Physicians' Role

Our aspirations are pure: (from times immemorial the physician was and remains the one who dedicates his life to the happiness of fellow men. And we are happy that today broad public and, what is specially important for the cause of peace, the Nobel Committee show high appreciation of the noble and humane endeavors of each of the 140,000 physicians persistent in their work to prevent nuclear war.

For this, we are grateful to the committee. The award of the Nobel Peace Prize to our movement invigorates all the forces calling for the eradication of nuclear weapons from earth.

We are thankful to numerous public, political, state and religious figures all over the world for their support of our movement and our ideas.

It was physically impossible to

reply in writing to everyone; therefore, I use this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to all who sent their warm congratulations.

At this moment I recall the telegram I received at the time of our first congress in the U.S from an ordinary woman in Brooklyn. It was short: "Thank you on behalf of my children."

As adults, we are obliged to avert transformation of the earth from a flourishing planet into a heap of smoking ruins. Our duty is to hand it over to our successors in a better state than it was inherited by us.

Therefore, it is not for fame, but for the happiness and for the future of all mothers and children, that we, the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, have worked, are working and will work.

Lown Address

Your majesty, your royal highness, Mr. Chairman, colleagues in the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, friends, distinguished ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Aarvik's remarks are deeply moving and focus profoundly on the essential problems of our age.

Dr. Chazov and I are filled with deep emotions of gratitude, of humility and of pride as we accept this most prestigious prize on behalf of our movement.

We are both cardiologists and usually speak about the heart. Today, we speak from the heart.

If we are to succeed in our goal of ridding military arsenals of instruments of genocide, we need the extraordinary energizing strength that comes when mind and heart are joined to serve humankind.

We physicians who shepherd human life from birth to death have a moral imperative to resist with all our being the drift toward the brink. The threatened inhabitants on this fragile planet must speak out for those generations yet unborn, for posterity has no lobby with politicians.

The official announcement of the Nobel Committee on Oct. 11th commended I.P.P.N.W. for performing "a considerable service to mankind by spreading authoritative information and by creating an awareness of the catastrophic consequences of atomic warfare."

The statement continued, "This in turn contributes to an increase in the pressure of public opposition."

The distinguished award honors physicians of our movement, who are responsible for such noteworthy accomplishments. It empowers more than 135,000 members worldwide with a new élan and determination to prevent what cannot be cured.

This new-found inspiration is demonstrated by the presence here in Oslo of more than 200 members, many of whom have traveled from halfway around the world, from far-away Australia, Latin America, Bangladesh and Japan, representing 38 of our 41 national affiliates.

The enormous prestige of the Nobel Prize provides a unique opportunity for further mobilizing and educating a still larger public. Thus, the reason for awarding this prize will be enhanced by receiving the prize.

The committee's citation took note of the "awakening of public opinion," and the thought was expressed that this new force can "give the present arms-limitation negotiations new perspectives and new seriousness."

Much has transpired since to provide reason for guarded optimism. At the meeting in Geneva three weeks ago, the leaders of the two great powers affirmed their determination to prevent nuclear war. They have expanded Soviet-American exchange to promote a wide-ranging dialogue essential to foster understanding and to build trust. Cooperation on any scale is far preferable to relentless confrontation.

Summits like those in Geneva promote hope. But hope without action is hopeless. Our enthusiasm for the positive spirit in these deliberations must not blind us to the absence of genuine progress toward disarmament.

Holding the World Hostage

Seventy nuclear bombs are being added weekly to world arsenals. We physicians protest the outrage of holding the entire world hostage. We protest the moral obscenity that each of us is being continuously targeted for extinction. We protest the ongoing increase in overkill. We protest the expansion of the arms race to space.

We protest the diversion of scarce resources from aching human needs.

Dialogue without deeds brings the calamity ever closer, as snail-paced diplomacy is outdistanced by missile-propelled technology. We physicians demand deeds to implement further deeds, which will lead to the abolition of all nuclear weaponry.

We recognize that before abolition can become a reality, the nuclear arms race must be halted. At our fourth congress in Helsinki 18 months ago, I urged a policy of reciprocating initiatives, the process compelled by popular understanding and public pressure.

As the first medical prescription, the I.P.P.N.W. endorsed the cessation of all nuclear testing. Our analysis leads to the inescapable conclusion that nuclear testing has a central role in the development of new, more sophisticated and ever more destabilizing weapons.

From this world podium, we call upon the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union to agree to an immediate mutual moratorium on all nuclear explosions, to remain in effect until a comprehensive test ban treaty is concluded.

A moratorium is verifiable, free of risk to either party, simple in concept yet substantive, has wide public support and is conducive to even more dramatic breakthroughs.

On Nov. 21, an overwhelming majority of members of the United Nations favored amending the limited test ban treaty to make it comprehen-

sive. If enacted, a moratorium will begin unwinding the potential doomsday process.

Right to Survival

We physicians have focused on the nuclear threat as the singular issue of our era. We are not indifferent to other human rights and hard-won civil liberties. But first, we must be able to bequeath to our children, as Mr. Aarvik so passionately and poetically expressed, the most fundamental of all rights, which preconditions all other: the right to survival.

Alfred Nobel believed that the destructiveness of dynamite would put an end to war. He deeply believed that the tragic reality of mass carnage would achieve results which all the preachments of peace and good will had so far failed to achieve. His prophecy now must gain fulfillment.

Recoiling from the abyss of nuclear extermination, the human family will finally abandon war. May we learn from the barbaric and bloody deeds of the 20th century and bestow the gift of peace to the next millennium. Perhaps in that way we shall redeem in some measure respect from generations yet to come.

Having achieved peace, in the sonorous phrase of Martin Luther King, who spoke from this very podium here 21 years ago, human beings will then "rise to the majestic heights of moral maturity."

PUGWASH

(13) Pugwash Jr., as reported in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists (December 1985), with thanks to BOB DAVIS:

Student Pugwash 1985

by Sumit Ganguly and David Hart

CONCERN FOR the larger social good is alive and well on campus, especially among the group of talented and articulate young people who came together for the Student Pugwash International Conference last June 23-29 at Princeton University. Carrying the theme of "Science, Technology, and Individual Responsibility" from its 1985-1986 program's focus on careers and responsibility into its fourth biennial meeting, the student-run organization drew 90 participants from 25 countries, carefully selected for their interest and previous work on conference topics, to explore individual decision-making on complex issues.

Student Pugwash draws its inspiration from the Russell-Einstein Manifesto and the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, and, like the "senior" Pugwash, works to shed light on critical issues by creating dialogue that transcends national and disciplinary boundaries. National Student Pugwash offices are now operating in Canada, the United Kingdom, West Germany, Finland, and Bulgaria. U.S. activities are coordinated from Washington, D.C., with 22 campus chapters. Groups at MIT and Cornell have already undertaken ambitious alternative-jobs fairs in keeping with the current theme of careers and individual responsibility. The Washington Center recently published the *Technology and Society Internship Directory* to provide stu-

dents with access to opportunities for hands-on experience in the world of science and technology decision-making.

While student papers formed the agendas for small working groups which met throughout the conference week, the students were joined by senior participants from government agencies, universities, international organizations, and corporations. The working groups focused on the following issues:

- individual rights in the information age;
- setting priorities for agricultural genetic engineering;
- energy and poverty;
- toxics in the world's workplaces; and
- making choices about the military uses of space.

As might be expected, the last topic generated the most heated discussions, not only on technical feasibility and strategic implications of the Strategic Defense Initiative, but also on the ethical dimensions of the project and the responsibilities of the scientists involved.

The individual's role in the arms race, in fact, emerged as a central issue for all conference participants. The debate

Sumit Ganguly is an assistant professor of international relations at Michigan State University in East Lansing. David Hart is the conference director for Student Pugwash in Washington, D.C.

was stimulated especially by a showing of the film *The Day*.

After *Trinity* and the ensuing discussion on the lessons of the Manhattan Project for SDI researchers, Henry D. Smyth, the first U.S. ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency, argued that modern researchers, like those who dissented during the project's final days, should make their opinions known to political and military leaders. Josephine Stein, a graduate student from MIT, noting that many young weapons researchers lack the broad background and international understanding that benefited the nuclear pioneers, urged scientists and technicians to broaden their education and to educate others.

MIT physics professor Philip Morrison established an intriguing framework for these issues in his keynote address, contending that the universalizing force of science is incompatible with the parochial influence of national loyalty. With the threat of nuclear annihilation sharpening this tension, Morrison urged students to take responsibility for "the shared tasks of preservation." Jerome Wiesner reinforced this message: "The human soul cannot prepare for extinction and focus on creative social evolution simultaneously—and that is what so many of the professionals fail to understand."

Not everyone agreed. Herbert Leifer of Rockwell International argued that "good technology, carefully used, can help us to reach political solutions that would not other-

wise be available." Mark Rabinowitz of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization administered "reality therapy" in the form of a standard SDI briefing.

Openness in science, in both corporate and university settings, was chief among the other issues explored in conference plenary sessions. Carl Etnier, a Cornell undergraduate, revealed startling preliminary findings of a survey of Cornell's science and engineering faculty indicating that nearly one-third would agree to limit access to, delay, or alter publications at the request of a sponsor. Etnier pointed out that while such practices violate university policies, the policies are little known or enforced, and he called on students to exercise vigilance and encourage continuing public debate on the issue.

The international diversity of the students—Soviet students attended this year for the first time—and the intensity of their personal contacts are important to the larger aim of building a network of leaders committed to considering the ethical and social dimensions of scientific and technical decision-making. Student Pugwash alumni are already finding their way into policy-making institutions. As the movement grows, such conferences may have great long-term effects on the formulation of institutional, corporate, national, and international policies. □

(14) Pugwash Jr. multiplies, as reported in this ad in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists (February 1986):

Student/Young Pugwash

The first Student/Young Pugwash conference was held at the University of California, San Diego in 1979. Attended by students from other parts of the world, this conference led to the establishment of Canadian Student Pugwash in 1979, and the formation of Student Pugwash USA and the Bulgarian Young Pugwash Group in 1982. Student Pugwash groups were then set up in Finland (1983), and in the FRG and the UK (1984).

Aims

Student/Young Pugwash groups, which are structured along the same lines as Pugwash in the form of national groups, have several purposes. One objective is to complement 'senior' Pugwash efforts by fulfilling a primarily educational role in alerting the academic community on university campuses and the public to important issues surrounding the impact of science and technology on society, notably in the prevention of nuclear war and of armed conflicts in general. Other social issues of concern to students and young professionals involving science and technology also receive attention. In addition, these groups create a source of potential young recruits for Pugwash.

Activities

Following the 1979 conference in San Diego, USA Student Pugwash held conferences at Yale University (1981), the University of Michigan (1983) and Princeton University (1985), with some 90 national and international students and high level senior experts attending each conference. In 1985, national conferences were also held by the Bulgarian and Canadian groups on questions of peace and war and science and society. Local chapters on a dozen campuses in the USA and Canada have sponsored meetings in their respective universities on related issues. The task of encouraging the formation of young Pugwash groups in various countries is actively pursued and coordinated by the Pugwash office in Geneva. One occasion for assisting this endeavour is provided during the annual Pugwash conferences to which a dozen or so representatives from present and prospective young Pugwash groups are regularly invited.

Helping Young Pugwash

Pugwash needs your assistance in order to help create a peaceful future we are all striving for. Contributions on any level will be most welcome. Become a Friend of Pugwash by filling out the form below today and help us in this vital work.



Please enroll me as a friend of Pugwash and send me summaries of its major meetings. I enclose \$100 as my 1986 contribution.

Please enroll me as an associate member of Friends of Pugwash and send me digests of its important meetings.

I enclose \$ _____

Make check payable to AEPPF, Pugwash and mail to William M. Swartz (Chairman, Finance Committee, Pugwash Conferences on Sciences and World Affairs), 1430 West Wrightwood Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60614. All contributions are tax deductible.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State/Zip code _____

EMBOSOGRAPH DISPLAY MGF. CO. VISUAL AIDS DIVISION CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60614

SECULAR HUMANISM

- (15) Plot Hatch hatched unhatched. As you may recall, Senator Hatch doesn't like secular humanism, and he hatched a plot against it: he tacked Section 509 onto the Education for Economic Security Act; it prohibited school districts from spending certain funds on courses that teach "secular humanism". Secular humanism was not defined; each school district could define it as it pleased. Right wing fundamentalists could use "the charge of 'secular humanism' to oppose anything they don't like about public education," according to Anthony T. Podesta, Executive Director of People for the American Way. (RSN45-13) (RSN47-21)

Happy ending. The National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (CORLISS LAMONT, Chairperson) tells us that:

NECLC's lawsuit against the Federal Government and the Department of Education maintained that this prohibition, specifically sponsored by Senator Orrin Hatch, constituted a violation of the First Amendment by federally mandating the censorship of a particular set of ideas.

We are pleased to inform you that the offensive language has been deleted from the 1986-1987 Magnet School Bill.

The Secular Humanist Bulletin (January 1986), published by Free Inquiry, tells it this way:

SECULAR HUMANIST VICTORY

Hatch's Anti-Humanist Law Dies with Whimper

Utah Senator Orrin Hatch's amendment to the Education for Economic Security Act, which bars federally funded magnet schools from teaching secular humanism but never defines the term, is dead. Congress quietly excised Section 509 -- all 17 words of it -- from the bill before voting to renew it for another year. President Reagan signed the revised bill into law on November 26.

Hatch forced inclusion of the anti-humanist clause in 1984. A 1985 news story made the amendment public and precipitated a flurry of opposition, including a lawsuit brought by Isaac Asimov and a coalition of other humanists. The government responded to the pressure by dropping the language with almost no public comment.

DISSENTING OPINION

- (16) Brainwash, American style. We are rightly proud of the free press in America. It can print (or broadcast) whatever it wishes to, and report on whatever it sees. But does it see what it observes?

Noam Chomsky doesn't think so, and says so in *The Progressive* (October 1985). Who is Chomsky? This is how *The Progressive* identifies him:

Noam Chomsky is Institute Professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Among his many books is "The Fateful Triangle." This article is adapted from a speech he delivered last December at the Community Church of Boston. A similar article by the author, "1984: Orwell's and Ours," appears in a recent issue of *The Thoreau Quarterly* (Department of Philosophy, University of Minnesota).

Chomsky gave the first Russell Lectures -- in honor of Bertrand Russell -- at Trinity College, Cambridge in 1971. The lectures were published in the *Cambridge Review*, Cambridge, England, in 1971, and in book form as Problems of Knowledge and Freedom (New York: Pantheon Books, 1971).

Those are some of Chomsky's credentials. Here is the *Progressive* article, which is titled, "The Bounds of Thinkable Thought":

In May 1983, a remarkable incident occurred in Moscow. A courageous newscaster, Vladimir Danchev, denounced the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in five successive radio broadcasts. This aroused great admiration in the West. *The New York Times* commented accurately that this was a departure from the "official Soviet propaganda line," that Danchev had "revolted against the standards of double-think and newspeak."

Danchev was taken off the air and sent to a psychiatric hospital. He was returned to his position last December. A Soviet official was quoted as saying that "he was not punished, because a sick man cannot

be punished." In the West, all of this was understood as a glimpse into the world of Orwell's 1984. Danchev was admired for his courage, for a triumph of the human will, for his refusal to be cowed by totalitarian violence. In Paris, a prize was established for a "journalist who fights for the right to be informed."

What was remarkable about Danchev's radio broadcasts was not simply that he expressed opposition to the Soviet invasion and called for resistance to it, but that he called it an "invasion." In Soviet theology, there is no such thing; rather, there is a Russian *defense* of Afghanistan against bandits operating from Pakistani sanctu-

aries and supported by the CIA and other warmongers.

Implicit in the coverage of the Danchev affair by Western media was a note of self-congratulation: It couldn't happen here. No American newscaster has been sent to a psychiatric hospital for calling an American invasion "an invasion" or for calling on the victims to resist.

We might, however, inquire further into just why this has never happened. One possibility is that the question has never arisen because no American journalist would ever mimic Danchev's courage, or could even perceive that an American invasion of the Afghan type is in fact an in-

vasion or that a sane person might call on the victims to resist. If this were the case, it would signify a stage of indoctrination well beyond any achieved under Soviet terror, well beyond anything Orwell imagined.

Consider the following facts: In 1962, President Kennedy sent the U.S. Air Force to attack rural South Vietnam, where more than 80 per cent of the population lived, as part of a program intended to drive several million people to concentration camps (called "strategic hamlets") where they would be surrounded by barbed wire and armed guards and "protected" from the guerrillas whom, we conceded, they were willingly supporting.

The direct U.S. invasion of South Vietnam followed our support for the French in their attempt to reconquer their former colony, our disruption of the 1954 "peace process," and a terrorist war against the South Vietnamese population that had already left some 75,000 dead. In the following years, the United States resisted every attempt to arrive at a peaceful settlement. In 1964 it began to plan a ground invasion of South Vietnam which took place in early 1965, accompanied by bombing of North Vietnam and intensified bombing of the South. The United States also extended the war to Laos, and then to Cambodia.

The United States protested that it was invited in, but as the London *Economist* recognized in the case of Afghanistan (never in the case of Vietnam), "an invader is an invader unless invited in by a government with a claim to legitimacy," and outside the world of newpeak, the client regime established by the United States had no more legitimacy than the Afghan regime established by the Soviet Union. Nor did the United States regard this government as having any legitimacy; in fact, it was regularly overthrown and replaced when its leaders appeared to be insufficiently enthusiastic about U.S. plans to escalate the terror, or when they were feared to be considering a peaceful settlement.

The United States openly recognized throughout that a political settlement was unacceptable, for the simple reason that the "enemy" would win handily in a political competition. The conflict had to be restricted to the military dimension, where the United States could hope to reign supreme. In the words of Douglas Fike, now head of the Indochina archives at Berkeley and much revered in mainstream journalism as one of a new breed of "non-ideological" scholars, the South Vietnamese enemy "maintained that its contest with the [U.S.-installed government and the] United States should be fought out at the political level and that the use of massed military might was in itself illegitimate" until forced by the U.S. "to use counterforce to survive."

For the past twenty-two years, I have been searching for some reference in mainstream journalism or scholarship to an American invasion of South Vietnam in 1962 (or ever), or an American attack against South Vietnam, or American aggression in Indochina—without success. There is no such event in history. Rather, there is an American *defense* of South Vietnam against terrorists supported from outside (namely, from Vietnam), a defense that was unwise, the doves maintain.

In short, there are no Danchevs here. Within the mainstream, there is no one who can call an invasion by its proper name, or even perceive the fact that one has taken place. It is unimaginable that

any American journalist would have publicly called upon the South Vietnamese to resist the American invasion. Such a person would not have been sent to a psychiatric hospital, but he would surely not have retained his professional position and standing. Note that here it takes no courage to tell the truth, merely honesty. We cannot plead fear of state violence, as followers of the party line can in a totalitarian state.

It is common now to deride any analogy between the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the U.S. invasion of Grenada, and indeed they differ radically in scale and character. A comparison with the U.S. invasion of South Vietnam would be more appropriate, but is inconceivable within the mainstream.

A kind of opposition to the Vietnam war did develop in the mainstream, of course, but it was overwhelmingly "pragmatic," as the critics characterized it, distinguishing themselves from the "emotional" or "irresponsible" opponents who objected to the war on principled grounds. The "pragmatic" opponents argued that the war could not be won at an acceptable cost, or that the goals were not clear, or that errors were made in execution. On similar grounds, the German general staff was no doubt critical of Hitler after Stalingrad.

How has this remarkable subservience to the doctrinal system been achieved? It is not that the facts were unknown. The devastating bombing of northern Laos and other attacks were suppressed by the media—these are called "secret wars," meaning that the Government keeps them secret with the complicity of the press—but in the case of the American assault on South Vietnam, sufficient information was always available. The realities were observed, but not seen.

American scholarship is particularly remarkable in this respect. The official historian of the Kennedy Administration, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., regarded as a leading "dove," does, indeed, refer to aggression in 1962. "1962 had not been a bad year," he writes in his history *A Thousand Days*, "Aggression [was] checked in Vietnam." That is, the year in which the United States undertook direct aggression against South Vietnam was the year in which aggression was *checked* in Vietnam. Orwell would have been impressed.

Another respected figure in the liberal pantheon, Adlai Stevenson, intoned at the United Nations that in Vietnam we were combating "internal aggression," another phrase that Orwell would have admired; that is, we were combating aggression by the Vietnamese against us in Vietnam, just as we had combated aggression by the Mexicans against us in Mexico a century earlier. We had done the same in Greece in the late 1940s. Stevenson went on to explain, intervening to protect Greece from "the aggressors" who had "gained control of most of the country," these "aggressors" being the Greeks who had led the anti-Nazi resistance and whom we succeeded in removing with an impressive display of massacre, torture, expulsion, and general violence, in favor of the Nazi collaborators of our choice.

The analogy was, in fact, more apt than Stevenson—apparently a very ignorant man—was likely to have known. As always, the American posture is defensive, even as we invade a country half way around the world after having failed to destroy the political opposition by large-scale violence and terror.

A closer look at the debate that did develop over the Vietnam war provides some

lessons about the mechanisms of indoctrination. The debate pitted the hawks against the doves. The hawks were those, like journalist Joseph Alsop, who felt that with a sufficient exercise of violence we could succeed in our aims. The doves felt that this was unlikely, although, as Schlesinger explained, "We all pray that Mr. Alsop will be right," and "we may all be saluting the wisdom and statesmanship of the American government" if the U.S. succeeds (contrary to his expectations) in a war policy that was turning Vietnam into "a land of ruin and wreck." It was this book that established Schlesinger as a "leading war opponent," in the words of Leslie Gelb.

There is, of course, a possible position omitted from the fierce debate between the hawks and the doves which allegedly tore the country apart during these trying years—the position of the peace movement, which saw the war not merely as a "mistake," but as fundamentally wrong and immoral. To put it plainly, war crimes, including the crime of launching aggressive war, are wrong, even if they succeed in their "noble" aims. This position does not enter the debate, even to be refuted.

In mainstream academic circles, it would have been difficult to find a more committed critic of the war than John King Fairbank of Harvard, the dean of American Asian scholars, who was considered so extreme as to be a "comsymp" or worse in McCarthyite terminology. Fairbank gave the presidential address to the American Historical Society in December 1968, almost a year after the Tet offensive had converted most of the corporate elite and other top planning circles to dovemod. He was predictably critical of the Vietnam war, in these terms: This is "an age when we get our power politics overextended into foreign disasters like Vietnam mainly through an excess of righteousness and disinterested benevolence."

The doves felt that the war was "a hopeless cause," we learn from Anthony Lake, who resigned from the Government in protest against the Cambodia invasion. All agree that it was a "failed crusade," "noble" but "illusory" and undertaken with the "loftiest intentions," as Stanley Karnow puts it in his best-selling companion volume to the PBS television series on Vietnam, highly regarded for its critical candor. Those who do not appreciate these self-evident truths, or who maintain the curious view that they should be supported by some evidence, simply demonstrate thereby that they are emotional and irresponsible ideologues, or perhaps outright communists. They are outside the spectrum of thinkable thought.

All of this illustrates the genius of democratic systems of thought control, which differ markedly from totalitarian practice. Those who rule by violence tend to be "behaviorist" in their outlook. What people may think is not terribly important; what counts is what they do. They must obey and this obedience is secured by force. The penalties for disobedience vary depending on the characteristics of the state.

In the Soviet Union today, the penalties may be psychiatric torture, or exile, or prison, under harsh and grim conditions. In a typical U.S. dependency such as El Salvador, the dissident is likely to be found in a ditch, decapitated after hideous torture; and when a sufficient number are dispatched, we can have elections in which people march toward democracy by rejecting the Nazi-like D'Aubuisson in favor of Duarte, who presided over one of the great mass murders of the modern period (the necessary prerequisite to democratic

lections, which obviously cannot proceed while popular organizations still function).

Democratic systems are different. It is necessary to control not only what people do, but also what they think. Since the State lacks the capacity to ensure obedience by force, the threat to order must be excised at the source. It is necessary to establish a framework for possible thought that is constrained by the principles of the state religion. These need not be asserted; it is better that they be presupposed.

The critics reinforce this system by tacitly accepting these doctrines and confining their critique to tactical questions. To be admitted to the debate, they must accept without question the fundamental doctrine that the State is benevolent, governed by the loftiest intentions, adopting a defensive stance, not an actor in world affairs but only reacting—though sometimes unwisely—to the crimes of others.

If even the harshest critics tacitly adopt these premises, then, the ordinary person may ask, who am I to disagree? The more intensely the debate rages between the hawks and doves, the more firmly and effectively the doctrines of the state religion are established. It is because of their notable contribution to thought control that the critics are tolerated, indeed honored—that is, those who play by the rules.

These distinctions between totalitarian and democratic systems of thought control are only rough approximations. In fact, even a totalitarian state must be concerned about popular attitudes and understanding. And in a democracy, it is the politically active segments of the population, the more educated and privileged, who are of prime concern. This is obvious in the United States, where the poor tend not even to vote, and more significant forms of political participation—the design and formulation of political programs, candidate selection, the requisite material support, educational efforts, or propaganda—are the domain of privileged elites.

Three-quarters of the population may support a nuclear freeze, and some may even know that this is official Soviet policy as well, but that has no impact on the policy of massive government intervention to subsidize high-tech industry through a state-guaranteed market for armaments, since no serious alternative is available in the system of political economy. Popular resistance to military aggression does serve as an impediment to the planners, as has been evident in the last few years with regard to Central America. But such resistance, while sometimes effective in raising the costs of state violence, is of limited efficacy as long as it is not based on understanding of the forces at work and the reasons for their systematic behavior, and it tends to dissipate as quickly as it arises.

At the same time, a frightened and insecure populace, trained to fear Soviet demons and Third World hordes, is susceptible to jingoist fanaticism. This was shown dramatically by the Grenada invasion. The United States is again "standing tall." President Reagan proclaimed after 6,000 elite troops managed to overcome the resistance of a handful of Cubans and Grenadians, and the reaction here could not fail to awaken memories of popular response when other great powers won cheap victories not too many years ago.

The more subtle methods of indoctrination just illustrated are considerably more significant than outright lying or suppression of unwanted facts, though the latter are also common enough. Examples are legion.

Consider, for instance, the current debate as to whether there is a "symmetry" between El Salvador and Nicaragua, each confronted with rebels supported from abroad who are attempting to overthrow the government. The Reagan Administration claims that in one case the rebels are "freedom fighters" and the government is an illegitimate tyranny, while in the other case the rebels are terrorists and the government is a still somewhat flawed democracy. The critics question whether Nicaragua is really supporting the guerrillas in El Salvador or whether Nicaragua has already succumbed to totalitarianism.

Lost in the debate is a more striking symmetry. In each country, a terrorist military force is massacring civilians, and in each country we support that force—the government of El Salvador and the *contras*. The significance of this symmetry is lost as we debate the accuracy of the government case, meanwhile continuing to labor under the mysterious collective amnesia that prevents us from seeing that there is little here that is new.

Or, to turn to another part of the world, consider what is universally called "the peace process" in the Middle East. Israeli-sponsored polls reveal that the population of the territories under Israeli military occupation overwhelmingly oppose the "peace process," regarding it as detrimental to their interests. Why should this be so? Surely of all the people in the region, they are among those who must be yearning the most for peace. But no journalist seems to have inquired into this strange paradox.

The problem is easily solved. The "peace process," as was evident at the time of the Camp David Accords and should be transparent in retrospect, was designed in such a way as to remove the major Arab military force, Egypt, from the conflict, so that Israel would be free to intensify settlement and repression in the conquered territories and to attack its northern neighbor. It is hardly a cause for wonder that the victims of the "peace process" overwhelmingly condemn and reject it.

In this case, too, it would be salutary to overcome our mysterious collective amnesia about the facts of recent history. Anyone who troubles to review the diplomatic record will quickly learn that there have been possibilities for peace with a modicum of justice for about fifteen years, blocked in every instance by U.S.-Israeli rejectionism. In the early 1970s, this rejectionist stance was so extreme as to block even Arab initiatives (by Egypt and Jordan) to attain a general peace settlement that entirely ignored Palestinian rights.

Since the international consensus shifted to adherence to a two-state settlement a decade ago, any such possibility has consistently been barred by the United States and Israel, which persist in rejecting any claim by the indigenous population to the rights that are accorded without question to the Jewish settlers who largely displaced them, including the right to national self-determination somewhere within their former home.

Articulate American opinion lauds this

stance, urging the Palestinians to accept the Labor Party program that denies them any national rights and regards them as having "no role to play" in any settlement, as Labor dove Abba Eban has said. There is no protest here, or even mere reporting of the facts, when the U.S. Government blocks a U.N. peace initiative, stating that it will accept only negotiations "among the parties directly concerned with the Arab-Israeli dispute," crucially excluding the Palestinians, who are not one of these parties.

Analogous rejectionist attitudes on the part of Libya and the minority PLO Rejection Front are condemned here as racist and extremist; the quite comparable U.S.-Israeli stance, obviously racist in essence, is considered the soul of moderation.

I will not proceed with further examples. The crucial point is that the pattern is pervasive, persistent, and overwhelmingly effective in establishing a framework of thinkable thought.

More than sixty years ago, Walter Lippmann discussed the concept of "manufacture of consent," an art that is "capable of great refinements" and that may lead to a "revolution" in "the practice of democracy." The idea was taken up with much enthusiasm in business circles—it is a main preoccupation of the public relations industry, whose leading figure, Edward Bernays, described "the engineering of consent" as the essence of democracy.

In fact, as Gabriel Kolko notes, "From the turn of the century until this day [the public mind] was the object of a cultural and ideological industry that was as unrelenting as it was diverse: ranging from the school to the press to mass culture in its multitudinous dimensions." The reason, as an AT&T vice-president put it in 1909, is that "the public mind . . . is in my judgment the only serious danger confronting the company."

The idea was also taken up with vigor in the social sciences: The leading political scientist Harold Lasswell wrote in 1933 that we must avoid "democratic dogmatism," such as the belief that people are "the best judges of their own interests." Democracy permits the voice of the people to be heard, and it is the task of the intellectual to ensure that this voice endorses what far-sighted leaders know to be the right course.

Propaganda is to democracy what violence is to totalitarianism. The techniques have been honed to a high art, far beyond anything that Orwell dreamt of. The device of feigned dissent, incorporating the doctrines of the state religion and eliminating rational critical discussion, is one of the more subtle means, though more crude techniques are also widely used and are highly effective in protecting us from seeing what we observe, from knowledge and understanding of the world.

There are no Danchevs here, except at the remote margins of political debate.

For those who stubbornly seek freedom, there can be no more urgent task than to come to understand the mechanisms and practices of indoctrination. These are easy to perceive in the totalitarian societies, much less so in the system of "brainwashing under freedom" to which we are subjected and which all too often we serve as willing or unwitting instruments. ■

THE USA ON THE WORLD SCENE

THE NEW YORK TIMES, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1985

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S ASSAULT UPON THE WORLD COURT AND THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

On January 18, President Reagan directed that our government take no further part in the World Court proceedings dealing with Nicaragua's suit against the United States for violating international law by supporting rebel paramilitary attacks and mining Nicaragua's harbors. This dishonorable boycott of the World Court was a betrayal of America's historic ideals of international peace and of the rule of law.

In October the Reagan Administration took another step backward, announcing that it will refuse to litigate any "political" cases before the World Court, a term our government will define as it pleases, from case to case. All disputes between nations are by their very nature political cases. Ours is the first nation therefore to radically undercut the Court's jurisdiction in international disputes.

The Administration's unilateral withdrawal from World Court jurisdiction in the Nicaragua case and the recent statement generally abrogating its jurisdiction flout the rule of law, and are attempts to avoid accountability to world opinion and to deny the American people's right to know.

- What are the real reasons underlying these extreme measures effected by our President?
- Are they but the prelude to further aggression?

Corliss Lamont, *Chairperson*
Edith Tiger, *Director*
Leonard B. Boudin, *General Counsel*

NATIONAL EMERGENCY CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMITTEE

175 Fifth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10160 • (212) 673-2040

- (17) Advertisement. ----->
The ad was 10.25 x 6.25 inches. We have reduced its size somewhat.
(Thank you, BOB DAVIS).

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

- (18) Gladys Leithauser has been editing "The Scientific Vision: A College Reader", soon to be published by Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Two BR pieces are included: "The Rise of Science" from "A History of Western Philosophy" and "The Expanding Mental Universe."
- (19) Richard Johnson will be working toward a teaching degree in Political Science and German at University of Utah, after he leaves the Army this Fall. Now with Army Intelligence (as a German Linguist), in Berlin. He generously says: "Please let the members know that if they need anything checked out (research) at Berlin's libraries, I am more than willing to do the footwork."
- (20) Paul M. Pfalzner was elected President of the Humanist Association of Canada/Association Humaniste du Canada in June '85.

- (21) Cherie Ruppe had been planning -- as reported here last issue (RSN48-27) -- to go to Borneo as a volunteer researcher at the Orangutan Research and Rehabilitation Center. She went. This is what happened, in her own words:

On October 4, 1985, I landed at Pankalun Buun Airport in Kalimantan Province, Borneo; part of a team of nine Earthwatch volunteers coming for the privilege of working with Dr. Birute Galdikas at the Orangutan Research and Conservation Project in the Tanjung Puting Nature Reserve. Another 5 1/2 hours up the Sekonyer River from the village of Kumai via a single cylinder African Queen style boat would find us at Camp Leakey, the center of the project.

The Professor, as Dr. Galdikas is called, is a warm woman with a soft smile and gentle laugh, who has been living with her "men of the forest" (orang-utans) for over fourteen years. She loves sharing her knowledge of the rainforest and orang-utans, and has an uncanny gift for assessing our strengths and turning a blind eye to our weaknesses.

Our days were spent working on the research project, usually by either searching for or following wild orangutans. Two of us with a Dayak assistant would go into the rain forest and search until we found a wild orangutan. After finding one, we would follow it for three days taking the specific notes the Professor requested. On a "following" day we would get up at four a.m. and head into the rain forest in the dark to be at our orangutan's nest before she left it at daybreak. We would follow her, keeping our notes, until she nested at dusk, then make our way back to camp, marking our way to be followed in the dark the next morning. The assistants were uncanny in their ability to follow the markings in the dark. Shre enough, as day broke, we were always right under our orangutan's nest.

Some days were quite easy. Those were the days she stayed on dry ground, (or, more accurately, when she stayed in the trees that kept us on dry ground) and found a tree that was a particularly good food source. Then we would string up our hammocks under her tree for as much as an hour or two, and have a rest and bite to eat while keeping an eye on her. Other days she would rest very little, and spend most of her time over the swamps, which could be extremely fatiguing.

Fortunately, in the midst of a downpour she usually didn't care to move about any more than we did, so we could string up our hammocks and make a bit of a tent under our ponchos. The nice thing about the rain was the fact that it was so warm that getting wet wasn't particularly uncomfortable.

Operating concurrently with but separately from the research project is the conservation project. This mainly consists of providing a home for about 30 ex-captive orangutans and their offspring. The Professor's goal is not to rehabilitate the ex-captives back to the forest, as she estimates the rainforest already supports about the maximum number of orangutans that it can maintain. Her ultimate goal is to halt the poaching of orangutans, which her program has been very successful in doing. Though capturing wild orangutans (which is accomplished by killing a mother in order to take the baby) has been illegal for some time, the Indonesian government tended to turn its back on it, as once they confiscated one, they had no place to take it. They asked the Professor if she would take them in, and she agreed. Now that the government knows there is a home for the captives, they actively pursue the poachers, and confiscate the victims. As a result, the poaching has almost completely stopped.

The ex-captives nest in the rainforest at night and forage with various degrees of success during the day. Most of them return for at least one of the two (7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.) feedings a day. Some of them spend more time than others around camp during the day foraging for whatever treats they can either beg or steal.

They also love to lather up with soap and shampoo, and several of them were always "hanging around" at the end of the dock waiting for their chance to steal one or the other from us when we went down for our daily mandi (bath). However, they were also quite content when we were willing to share a bit with them. They would get all lathered up, then lick off the bubbles. The main goal seemed to be a mouthful of bubbles.

The adolescent Supinah, by far the most mischievous, but irresistibly loveable and adorable ex-captive of the lot, has a beautiful thick coat of lustrous red hair, unusually long, graceful, tapered fingers, and a sweet face with distinctive pale circles around her eyes. She also has a distinctive way of hanging off of whatever she is holding onto that makes her easy to recognize even from a distance. She tends to seek out human companionship and attention more than most of the others, and is by far the gentlest one to play with. The males

also seem to find her attractive, and she is most receptive to their attentions. Like the jealous, ugly stepsisters, the other females, particularly Sisweyo, tend to chase and bite and ostracize her.

Brook, Patty, and Apollo Bob are three juveniles that had been brought in shortly before our arrival. Apollo Bob was very thin and sickly with diarrhoea. He sought only human companionship, and looked like a shriveled old man with his bald head and the way he always sat all hunched over with his head down and his arms folded over his belly. He tugged at all our hearts, and the Professor was not at all sure he was going to survive. However, by the time we left, he was much stronger, so feisty as to be a problem, and was starting to play in the trees like an orangutan.

Usually when a new infant comes in, one of the established females will adopt it and care for it as her own. However, no one would adopt Brook (male) and Patty, so they have adopted each other, and Mr. Mursiman sees to their separate feeding and makes sure they nest successfully at night. When we arrived they still had to be babysat, but by the time we left they were quite independent. Watching Mr. Mursiman with them was a joy. It was obvious these were his babies, and he took great pride in them.

Another most interesting adoption was Barbara. She was brought in about a year ago. No matter how hard they tried to get one of the females to adopt her, none of them would have a thing to do with her. The feeling was mutual. Barbara seemed to hate female orangutans, and male humans, and always latched onto the women in camp. Finally she and Rombe found each other. Rombe is an adolescent male who loves to wear things on his head. He picked her up and put her on his head, and they have been inseparable ever since. He cares for her as if he had given birth to her, even allowing her to suckle him. Her presence doesn't seem to hinder his sexual activities, but we all figure he may have a bit of trouble establishing his male dominance with a kid on his head!

Rombe is also a grabber, and loves to grab us as we walk down the pier to our mandi. He starts playing quite gently, but almost all of us have the bruises to prove that his "play" always disintegrates into a dominance test, and he has the strength of a sumo wrestler. One of his favorite dominance tests is a french kiss!

Curly is a 200 - 250 pound adult wild male who has been treating the camp to the pleasure of his company of late. Since the death of Achmad's baby, she has become receptive, and Curly is in hot pursuit. Not only was it a thrill to be so close to him, but also to hear his long calls. The long call is a most impressive call made by adult males to mark their territory, establish their dominance, and pursue a female. Sometimes it can last as long as four minutes, and is a sound one never forgets. We all shuddered at the thought of what Rombe will be like when he is Curly's size.

Two Indonesian words I will never forget are "rawa" for swamp, and "mandi" for bath. The main trail into the rain forest went right through the rawas, so we always started the day with a balancing act trying (usually unsuccessfully) not to fall off the striplings that were laid across it. We also spent much time pleading "No rawa!" to our orangutans as they led us into thigh deep water. At those times we would dream of the nice, cool mandi in the river awaiting us back at camp. The mandi was rather the social event of the day. One evening when I was having my mandi at the end of the dock with some of the assistants and other volunteers, one of the assistants suddenly looked up very puzzled, and said, "In North America when the rivers freeze, how do you have your mandi?" Now, tell me, how in the world do you explain indoor plumbing to someone whose only source of running water has been a river?

The first morning we were there Supinah raided the guest house while we were all at breakfast. She only took two things: my calculator, and my entire rubber bag full of food! What a haul: twenty-four meusle bars, a kilo of licorice, a kilo of nuts, and a kilo of dried fruit. It was the best haul she had ever made, and after that she was completely out of control. She just started ripping her way through the screening and there was no stopping her. Once she tore the handle off the door, and another time she ripped through the screen by the door, reached through, and removed the key from the lock. There she was in the trees with the key, and there we were locked in the guest house. The Professor finally had to put a dawn to dusk guard on her, MUCH to Supinah's displeasure. She could hardly get away with anything after that.

I only saw one snake while I was there, and it was busy swallowing a big frog. (Not to say that THEY didn't see ME.) The only real hazards seemed to be the Malay Sun Bears and the wild boars. A Malay Sun Bear had attacked a member of the previous team, so when we were searching we avoided the area near her den. However, the pigs were an entirely different matter. They hung around camp and were perfectly capable of attacking any one of us. Mr. Bobby was the biggest and most brazen of the group, and they are quite positive he is the one that killed ex-captive Achmad's baby. He constantly terrorized us, and one night at 2:00 a.m. he caught me at the latrine. I can tell you he stopped me mid-stream, and I went flying back to the guest house pulling up my knickers on the way!

Mr. Bobby had become enough of a threat that the Professor was finally driven, against her will, to request permission from the PPA (Park Authority) to kill him. Pak Bohap waited up for him one night and slew him at 1:00 a.m. with one thrust of his spear.

Our third night in camp it poured rain all night long, and poured off and on through the next day. It was the first of the rainy season, and must have flooded several varieties of critters out of their homes. I came home from the jungle feeling pretty smug that I had already become blasé about all the leeches crawling up my legs - only to find the guest house

overrun with flying termites. I thought the termites were a nuisance until we came back from the dining hall to find the guest house had been invaded by fire ants! These are nasty little beasts that sting like bees and move in armies of tens of thousands. Several of us got our share of bites on our feet as we were doing a ST. Vitus' dance around the guest house. The assistants came scurrying over with a pail of kerosene and some brooms, and proceeded scrubbing the place down with kerosene - smoking all the while, of course! The minute the assistants would leave, the ants would start pouring back through the crevasses. Four scrubbings of kerosene finally convinced the ants to take a different route to wherever they were going.

By the time the rats invaded we were so exhausted, and they seemed such a minor problem compared to the fire ants, (our perspective was changing by the minute) that we decided they could share our humble home. We fell asleep to the sound of their gnawing, scratching, and scampering.

By the time we had been there for a week or so, our perspective had changed enough that when Miss Sally sat up in bed in the middle of the night and shouted, "Holy Christ!" no one even woke up. The next day she told us a rat had fallen off the rafter and landed on her face and got tangled in her hair trying to right himself. When no one responded to her shout, she decided she may as well lie back down and go to sleep!

Cherie and friend----->



NEW MEMBERS

(22) We welcome the following new members:

MS. PATRICIA A. HESS 86 7840 E. CAMELBACK ROAD/SCOTTSDALE/AZ/85251//
 MR. JONATHAN H.B. LOBL 86 33-44 91ST ST. (APT. 6L)/JACKSON HEIGHTS/NY/11372//
 MS. MARJORIE MIGNACCA 86 5548 BEAR ROAD / APT.10C/NORTH SYRACUSE/NY/13212//
 DR. EDWARD L. PRICHARD 85 2993 S.W. FAIRVIEW BLVD./PORTLAND/OR/97201//
 DR. CARL REITERMAN 85 2329 EUNICE ST./BERKELEY/CA/94708//
 DR. JOHN D. ROCKFELLOW 86 1350 WASHINGTON ST. #7/SAN FRANCISCO/CA/94109//
 DR. THEODORE W. SCHICK, JR. 85 PHILOSOPHY/MUHLENBERG COLLEGE/ALLENTOWN/PA/18104 5586//

(23)

NEW ADDRESSES

REV. DAN BOND/76/1112 WEST AV./RICHMOND/VA/23220
 MR. LEO CASEY/84/517 E. BROADWAY #3/SOUTH BOSTON/MA/02127-4415
 MR. STEVE DAHLBY/78/9115 N. CARESSA WAY/CITRUS SPRINGS, FL/32630
 MR. BERNARD DAVIS/85/100 HIGH ST./WESTERLY/RI/02891
 MR. CHARLES M. GRIFFITH III/84/13524 LULL ST./VAN NUYS/CA/91402

MR. JOHN W. HARPER/78/571 S. CORONADO ST. #601/LOS ANGELES, CA/90057
 MR. RAMON K. ILUSORIO/85/PO BOX 130 MCC, AYALA AV./MAKATI, METRO MANILA/PHILIPPINES
 MR. SAMUEL H. MILLIGAN/84/ 665 S. JENNINGS /FORT WORTH/TX/ 76104 3210
 MR. P. DAVID MONCRIEF/83/BOX 240191/ MEMPHIS/TN/38124-0191
 MS. PAT ROBINSON/85/PO BOX 2010/SPARKS/NV/89431

MR. JOSEPH M. RODERICK/84/1326 SPRUCE ST./APT. 901/PHILADELPHIA/PA/19107
 MR. WAYNE D. SMITH/83/PO BOX 6527/VIRGINIA BEACH/VA/23456-0527
 DR. PHILIP STANDER/76/7 SEABREEZE LANE/BAYVILLE/NY/11709
 CAPT. MICHAEL H. TAINT/82/PO BOX 4014 DSMC PMC 85-2/BELVOIR/VA/22060- 5426

RECOMMENDED READING

(24) Richard Johnson's Ten-Best has been honed down to seven:

1. The Brothers Karamazov
2. Of Human Bondage
3. Portrait of an Artist as a Young Man.
4. Crime and Punishment
5. The Magus (Fowles)
6. Stories of John Cheever
7. Stories of W. Somerset Maugham

For previous lists of Ten-Best, see RSN46-20, RSN47-28,29,30, RSN48-30.

BOOK REVIEW

(25) "RUSSELL" by Clive William Kilmister, St Martin's Press, 1985 (c 1984), as reviewed by MARVIN KOHL, in "Choice" (October 1985).

This work, intended to complement D. F. Pear's Bertrand Russell and the British Tradition in Philosophy (1967), describes the development of Russell's early thought and the intellectual context of his work on the foundations of logic and mathematics. It contains detailed and important analyses, including A Critical Exposition of the Philosophy of Leibniz (1900), An Essay on the Foundations of Geometry (1897), and Principia Mathematica (3v., 1910-13). Despite the title and the jacket blurb, little is said of Russell's less technical work, and only one chapter (and that the shortest) is devoted to the period from about 1927 to 1970. Kilmister maintains that there is an essential unity to Russell's thought, that once his early work is clearly set in its context and understood, all the rest falls into place as applications to general philosophy of mathematics. The other, perhaps less controversial, threads of argument running through the book are that Russell was primarily devoted to establishing the truth of foundations and that the most important ingredient of his later thought was the idea of basing a metaphysic on logic. Notes; no bibliography; a very short index. This book should be welcomed by graduate students and scholars interested in the development of Russell's thought or in the history of the foundations of logic.

["Choice" is published by the American Library Association and the Association of College and Research Libraries.]

NEWSLETTER MATTERS

(26) Please note: Typographical, grammatical and other errors are inserted in the text of this publication at the discretion and pleasure of the editor, occasionally assisted by the printer.

[From the Japos Bulletin, Gustav Detjen, Jr., Editor, 154 Laguna Ct., St. Augustine Shores, FL 32086.]

BOOK REVIEW

(27) "ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD, The Man and His Work," Volume 1:1861-1910 by Victor Lowe. Reviewed by Anthony Quinton in The New York Review of Books (December 5, 1985). The following portions of the review are mostly those that deal with Russell. The review is titled, "The Right Stuff." (Thank you, BOB DAVIS.)

Alfred North Whitehead rumbles around in the intellectual history of the English-speaking world in the twentieth century like a loose bolt in a machine. He was made of the right stuff: a professional mathematician who turned into a professional philosopher who was also magnificently equipped with a general fund of humane learning in history (particularly church history) and in literature. He was in the right place: at Cambridge at the beginning of one of that great university's greatest periods, which was to run on until about 1950. He had the right connections: most of all in the form of his collaboration with his pupil Bertrand Russell in the ten years during which they worked on *Principia Mathematica* (1910-1913), the most influential work on formal logic since Aristotle's *Organon*. He was, particularly when he was between his late fifties and his mid-seventies, highly productive, publishing nine substantial books in that period.

* * * * *

Victor Lowe makes it clear that although Whitehead and Russell were in constant and fruitful touch during the composition of *Principia Mathematica*, a pronounced division of labor prevailed. Whitehead did the mathematics; Russell did the philosophy. Since the book excited philosophers but left mathematicians cold, it is not surprising that it has come to be thought of as primarily Russell's work, for all his counter-alphabetic position on the title page.

* * * * *

Whitehead's own writing is enlivened with some admirable epigrammatic flashes of perceptiveness and is as forceful and lucid as Russell's, but without the metallic super-

ficiality that often characterizes Russell's writing on the history of thought. But when he writes about philosophy itself, it is for the most part exceedingly turgid and obscure, a torrent of puzzlingly amorphous neologisms like "prehension" and "conrescence" and of ordinary words like "event," "occasion," and "object" used in some novel and greatly extended sense.

* * * * *

The chief intellectual interest of the early part of Whitehead's life is his association with Bertrand Russell, which began in 1889, when Whitehead persuaded his fellow examiners to give Russell a better scholarship than they had intended to. He arranged for people to get to know Russell when he arrived as a student the following year and revived his interest in mathematics when he had turned from it to philosophy in disgust at its current Cambridge form as the acquisition of a capacity to perform high-speed deductive tricks. In 1900 they went to a conference in Paris together. In their joint excitement at meeting the Italian mathematician Giuseppe Peano, the partnership was cemented that led thirteen years later to the last published of the volumes of *Principia Mathematica*. Peano, dissatisfied with the lack of rigor in much of mathematics, showed that its fundamental part, the arithmetic of natural numbers, could be set out as a rigorous axiomatic system, derivable from five axioms, and he devised a vastly more perspicuous notation than that of the still largely unknown Frege. This enchanted Whitehead, with his passion for generality, and Russell, with his passion for certainty.

The rest of this aspect of Whitehead's career is familiar from Russell's numer-

ous autobiographical accounts of it. The first decade of the century was an unhappy one for Russell, even if that of his greatest intellectual achievements. The paradox in set theory which he discovered in the summer of 1901 led to a long struggle, which continued until 1907, and to a version of his theory of types which was incorporated in *Principia Mathematica*. This intellectual travail was carried on in circumstances of deep personal unhappiness. At the time of his discovery of the paradox he realized he could no longer stand his wife Alys, and soon fell deeply in love with Evelyn Whitehead. Lowe does not believe either that Evelyn led Russell on or that they became lovers. Certainly the matter never seems to have come out into the open for the four people involved. But it must be part of the explanation of the drifting apart of the two collaborators.

Throughout these years, Whitehead, true to form, was constantly praising and encouraging Russell, while with equal constancy adjuring him not to go too fast. Russell was certainly annoyed by Whitehead's unwillingness to show him the preparatory work he had done on the projected fourth volume of *Principia*. Whitehead's explanation of his secretiveness was that he did not want Russell to run off with his ideas and develop them in all sorts of half-baked and precipitate ways. That fear, which was not of theft but of misuse, was not unreasonable. Toward the principle of biding one's time Whitehead and Russell took directly opposite attitudes. Lowe's final comment on their collaboration is admirably just. "A wonderful thing about their collaboration," he says, "is the perfect preservation of the individuality of each partner, made possible by their mutual respect and affection."

RUSSELL SOCIETY LIBRARY
Tom Stanley, Librarian

(28) Books for sale:

By Russell:

Appeal To The American Conscience	\$ 2.00
Authority And The Individual	3.75
The Autobiography Of B.R. (in one volume)	7.50
The Autobiography Of B.R., Volume 1	16.00 H
The Autobiography Of B.R., Volume 2	13.00 H
The Autobiography Of B.R., Volume 3	11.00 H
Education And The Social Order	4.25
Has Man A Future?	8.00 H
History Of The World In Epitome	1.00
Icarus Or The Future Of Science	3.00 H

The Impact Of Science On Society	2.75
An Inquiry Into Meaning And Truth	6.00
Justice In Wartime	8.00 H
My Philosophical Developement	2.75
Political Ideals	3.75
Power: A New Social Analysis	5.50
The Practice And Theory Of Bolshevism	5.75
Principles Of Social Reconstruction	3.75
Roads To Freedom	4.00
The Scientific Outlook	5.50

By Other Authors:

Bertrand Russell And His World by Clark	12.00 H
Bertrand Russell, 1872-1970	1.25
The Life Of Bertrand Russell In Pictures And His Own Words	4.50
Bertrand Russell, A Life by Gottchalk	1.50
Bertrand Russell, The Passionate Sceptic	1.75
Mr. Wilson Speaks "Frankly and Fearlessly" On Vietnam To B.R.	1.25
Essays On Socialist Humanism In Honor Of The Centenary Of B.R.	4.00
Essays On Socialist Humanism In Honor Of The Centenary Of B.R.	9.00 H
The Incompatible Prophecies: Bertrand Russell On Science And Religion by Greenspan	4.00
Into The Tenth Decade: A Tribute To Bertrand Russell	3.00
The Tamarisk Tree, Volume 1 by Dora Russell	5.00 H
Secrecy Of Correspondence Is Guaranteed By Law	3.50
National Frontiers And International Scientific Cooperation	4.00

Prices are postpaid. Paperback unless otherwise indicated. Please remit by check or money order, payable to the Bertrand Russell Society,
The Russell Society Library, Box 434, Wilder, VT 05088

(29) Books for sale elsewhere:

Greenwood is selling their 1984 reprint of HAS MAN A FUTURE? for 27.50. The Library's copies are the Allen & Unwin first editions, in the dust jackets and with the errata slip tipped in. Only 8.00 Postpaid!

The Scholar's Bookshelf, 51 Everett Drive, Princeton Jct., N.J. 08550 is offering these volumes until April 30, 1986:

No. 70197 Bertrand Russell Memorial Volume, edited by Roberts. An analysis and assessment of the intellectual core of Russell's lifework in 26 major essays. 1979; 448 pages List price: 49.50 Sale Price: 16.95

No. 70317 Russell In Review; The Bertrand Russell Centenary Celebrations at McMaster University. An interdisciplinary selection of 20 papers on Russell's life and personality, his views on religion, education, and politics, his logic and his philosophy. List price: 40.00 Sale: 9.95

Minimum Order: 10.00 A flat rate of 3.00 Handling for any order.

(30) New books to lend:

DEWEY AND RUSSELL: AN EXCHANGE, edited by Samuel Meyer. 1984 Philosophical Library. 9.95

As Martin Gardner recently observed, "The two men frequently attacked each others views, each presenting such a caricature of the other's opinions that it was easy to make them seem absurd. An entire book could be devoted to this battle." Meyer has carefully selected representative writings from each philosopher's published responses and presented them as a debate.

Russellphiles will have already read and enjoyed Russell's remarks; They may be surprised to find Dewey just as witty (and occasionally unfair):

"This view is a repetition of a position he took long ago when, in 1922, he said that he found the "love of truth obscured in America by commercialism of which pragmatism is the philosophic expression." I remarked that the statement seemed to me to be "of that order of interpretation which would say that English neo-realism is a reflection of the snobbish aristocracy of the English and the tendency of French thought to dualism an expression of an alleged Gallic disposition to keep a mistress in addition to a wife; and the idealism of Germany a manifestation of an ability to elevate beer and sausage into a higher synthesis with the spiritual values of Beethoven and Wagner!"

BERTRAND RUSSELL, edited by Ann Redpath. 1985 Creative Education 8.95 In a commendable publishing venture, Creative Education is reprinting some of the contributions to Schuster's Living Philosophies, 1931. Russell outlines the forces which he believes have molded his

character, the social philosophy that developed from these forces, and his reasons for believing a world government is necessary. A short biography, rather hagiographic, rounds out an attractively produced volume.

The publishers have contributed copies of both volumes for our Lending Library. The Philosophical Library also donated a copy of their 1983 paperback edition of THE WILL TO DOUBT.

(31) Cassettes for sale and to lend:

Pacifica Radio Archive Educational Services, 5316 Venice Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90019 is offering these titles:

No. BB0597 ON NUCLEAR MORALITY. Russell brings his philosophical genius to bear on the nuclear question, discussing his famous letter to Einstein and evaluating the Pugwash meetings. 1962 32 Minutes 11.00

No. BB4013 BERTRAND RUSSELL'S WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL. Russell outlines his plans for the Tribunal and appeals to Americans to take an active roll in support of the people of Southeast Asia. No date 29 Minutes 11.00

Add 3.00 for U.P.S. delivery for both cassettes. Copies will be available for loan from the Library.

(32) Special request:

I'd like to have a display of books and articles by members for our next annual meeting. If you have not sent a copy of your published work to the Library, now is the time! They need not deal with Russell or, necessarily, philosophy.

ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

(33) Humanist Association of Minnesota (Asociacion Humanista de Minnesota) held a public meeting on December 5, 1985 at the David Jurgensen Residence, 806 West Lake Street #10, Minneapolis, MN. The subject was Part 2 of "Introduction to Humanism".

(34) PHRC, the Palestine Human Rights Campaign, sends newsletters and bulletins at monthly or bi-monthly intervals. It is interested in the indignities and pain allegedly inflicted on the Palestinians by the Israelis. It says it wishes to "reach out and educate the American public about attacks on Palestinian human rights carried out by Israel, a state supported and funded by the United States government." It is currently fund-raising to set up a system "to counter the Israeli government's [allegedly] powerful network of misinformation and cover-up..." The PHRC has a West Coast Office (811 North 45th, Seattle, WA 98107), an East Coast Office (PO Box 43344, Washington, DC), and a National Office (220 South State Street, One Quincy Court, Suite 1308, Chicago, IL 60604).

* * * * *

(35) We recall that, according to a full-page ad in The New York Times 16 years ago (2/23/70, p.21), BR sent a message to the delegates at the International Conference of Parliamentarians on the Middle East Crisis, meeting in Cairo on February 2, 1970.

Sending the message apparently was the last public act of BR's life. BR died on February 3, 1970.

The ad in the Times was signed by the Arab States Delegation, 405 Lexington Avenue, Suite 3711, New York, NY 10017.

Here are excerpts:

For over 20 years Israel has expanded by force of arms.

The aggression committed by Israel must be condemned...

The tragedy of the people of Palestine is that their country was "given" by a foreign power to another people for the creation of a new state. The result is that many hundreds of thousands of innocent people were made permanently homeless.

How much longer is the world willing to endure this spectacle of wanton cruelty?

It is abundantly clear that the refugees have every right to the homeland from which they were driven, and the denial of this right is at the heart of the continuing conflict.

PUBLICATION RECEIVED

- (36) "The Churchman", describes itself as "an independent journal of religious humanism, under the sponsorship of The Churchman Associates, Inc. It is edited in the conviction that religious journalism must provide a platform for the free exchange of ideas and opinions; that religion is consonant with the most advanced revelations in every department of knowledge; that we are in a fraternal world community; and that the moral and spiritual evolution of man is only at the beginning."

Two items in this newsletter -- "Why I am a Secular Humanist" (39) and "They Want War" (37) -- originally appeared in the January 1985 issue of The Churchman.

We are indebted to OPHELIA HOOPES for introducing us to The Churchman. Subscription \$10. Churchman Co., 1074-23rd Av. North, St. Petersburg, FL 33704.

ON WAR

'They Want War'

UNDER THE DISTRESSING influence of the Reagan landslide I went compulsively to the attic and picked up a book I read years ago, Erich Fromm's *Beyond the Chains of Illusion*. Like a man hypnotized I turned to a red-lined passage in which Fromm describes an indelible memory of World War I Germany: "My Latin teacher, who in his lessons during the two years before the war had proclaimed as his favorite maxim the sentence, 'Si vis pacem para bellum' (if you want peace prepare for war), showed his delight when the war broke out. I recognized that his alleged concern for peace could not have been true. How was it possible that a man who always seems to have been so concerned with the preservation of peace should now be so jubilant about the war?" (Bertrand Russell noted the same phenomenon on the streets of London: mass jubilation when World War I was declared.)

Any relatively unbiased observer can see that most members of the present administration and many congressmen are dead ringers for Dr. Fromm's Latin teacher. They WANT war.

Walker Percy wrote, "War is better than Monday morning." Every-dayness and boredom are the enemies men hate worst of all. That's what crushed Mr. Mondale: Americans associated him with Monday morning. They know Reagan is bound for war but they don't care. Especially happy are the twice-born who see themselves holding a first-class cabin to heaven with tickets on the 50-yard line. There they can cheer gleefully as they watch the once-born writhe in agony beneath the nuclear fires of Armageddon.

As long as he has money in his pocket, the American man does not care where he's going. That means only a handful of congressmen (and a few concerned Americans) stand between "Monday morning" and Armageddon. Let us pray that we are able to hold off the raging hordes of war-lovers.

CHARLES C. WIGGIN

Mr. Wiggin served as a Naval officer in the '60s. He lives in Fortson, Ga.

- (37) From The Churchman (1/85)----->

(38)

DIRECTORS OF THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.
elected for 3-year terms, as shown

1984-86: JACK COWLES, DAVID GOLDMAN, DON JACKANICZ, STEVE MARAGIDES, FRANK PAGE, CHERIE RUPPE, PAUL SCHILPP, WARREN SMITH, KATE TAIT

1985-87: JACQUELINE BERTHON-PAYON, BOB DAVIS, ALEX DELY, ALI GHAEMI, HUGH MOORHEAD

1986-88: LOU ACHESON, KEN BLACKWELL, JOHN JACKANICZ, DAVID JOHNSON, JUSTIN LEIBER, GLADYS LEITHAUSER, STEVE REINHARDT, CARL SPADONI, TOM STANLEY.

SECULAR HUMANISM (CONTINUED)

From The Churchman (January 1985):

(39)

WHY I AM A SECULAR HUMANIST

FOR IDENTIFICATION purposes only, I am a Baptist minister (Southern and American Conventions) whose career is summed up in four eastern North Carolina pastorates. I am also a secular humanist. And I don't wear two hats!

Please note that I said humanist. The "ism" messes things up. I am an American, but I do not believe in Americanism. I admire a scientist, but I will have nothing to do with scientism. I believe profoundly in Creation (God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth), but I reject creationism, and especially scientific creationism, as a contradiction in terms!

But if anyone calls me a secular humanist, I will reward him with blessings and not curses. Whatever opprobrium may be intended, I will not allow this to be an epithet of godlessness and infidelity. For my part, the Moral Majority is not going to get away with putting together two wonderful words that I regard as a thing of beauty and a joy forever and making them a witches' brew.

Consider the word "secular." In its original meaning it pertained to the age, the times, the world. Long before "secular" was used to distinguish the temporal from the eternal, the spiritual from the material, it denoted "this goodly frame, the earth." Thus the opening chapters of the Bible tells us that in the beginning God was involved in creating the secular, and we read that each time He caused something to come to be, He found that it was good. The psalmist therefore could sing that the "earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof," and the Fourth Evangelist announce that God so loved the world that He sent His son into the world. Is there some way to remind the anti-secularists, who are so selective in their use of Scripture, of another text at this point: "For God sent not His son into the world to condemn the world but that the world through him might be saved"? We might all become born-again environmentalists if we pondered deeply the warning from the last book in the

By W. W. FINLATOR

"I proudly identify myself with civil liberties, social welfare, and environmental groups, and to my scandalized brethren of the faith, I am prepared blithely to reply: 'If this be secular humanist, make the most of it.'"

Bible: "Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees."

And consider the word "humanist." Why are so many religionists afraid of it, and why should we abandon it to good people who write humanist manifestos? Humanist is biblical to the core. There is no better way to understand the stupendous doctrine of Incarnation ("The Word became flesh and dwelt among us") than the simple statement that the Divine became human. Why else would Jesus call himself "Son of man"? From an infant he grew in stature and mind, in favor with God and man, that is to say, in humanity. And there are far more references in his teachings to mercy, forgiveness, unselfishness, loyalty, humility — the things that make us fully human — than to prayer, heaven, hell, angels, and devils. In the universal prayer he left with us is the petition that the kingdom of heaven shall be enacted "on earth."

Few things have so shaped the direction of my ministry as reading the statement years ago by William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, that of all major religious faiths, Christianity was undoubtedly the most materialistic. It is a bold and unapologetic affirmation of the secular and the human, reminding us that what we do to and for another we do to God and that unless we love human beings whom we see, we cannot love God whom we do not see. This radical enlightenment came at a time when we were distancing ourselves from the Russians by calling their system atheistic and materialistic. Since then I have sung with increased

fervor and faith, "This is my Father's world."

Such liberating experiences as this have made me free to reach out to groups beyond the church that I regard as humanizing our life and time. I have therefore become a member of what the church in earlier ages designated the "secular clergy" in addition to the more officially sanctioned regular or "spiritual" clergy. I have never entertained a notion of forsaking religious observances, but I have often found that what Jesus called the "weightier matters of the law," justice, mercy, equity, are more espoused by groups outside the church. Hence I proudly identify myself with civil liberties, social welfare, and environmental groups, and to my scandalized brethren of the faith, I am prepared blithely to reply: "If this be secular humanist, make the most of it."

There is a final dimension in my secular humanist profession which I find so exciting, so relevant and so in need of, well, preaching today. That has to do with the Constitution of the United States which is a totally secular humanist document in spite of all the asseverations of the fundamentalists that our government is founded on Christian principles. Nowhere are God, Jesus, Christ, heaven, hell, forgiveness, creation, etc., mentioned in the Constitution. Religion is mentioned twice, and both times negatively, meaning it is out and that the new government would be religiously neutral. As a Baptist believing profoundly in church-state separation, how I love this!

But on the other hand, how gloriously humanist is this secular document. The new government was instituted with a solemn commitment to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, promote general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty. All this was to be the prime business of the government, and it sounds so

Dr. Finlator recently retired as minister of the Pullen Memorial Baptist Church, Raleigh, N.C.

numane. Furthermore, the people were guaranteed free speech and assembly and press, due process, equality under the law, privacy, protection from cruel and inhuman punishment, and all discrimination based on color or race or creed, and as to their reli-

gion, or non-religion, neither help nor hindrance from the government. Dear God in Heaven, what a wondrous secular humanist document for all Americans!

There is that inspiring story of one of the Founding Fathers in

Philadelphia replying to the question what kind of new government had he and his colleagues forged: "A Republican form, if we can keep it." My paraphrase, so poignant for our day, would be: "A secular humanist form, if we can keep it." *

PUBLICATION RECEIVED

- (40) Middle East Review is sponsored by the American Academic Association for Peace in the Middle East, "academicians teaching in colleges and universities throughout the United States." Its purpose is "to utilize the special skills and talents of the academic community to elicit new ideas and approaches for the solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict and to reach a just and lasting peace in the region." The members of its Editorial Board teach at the following universities: BRANDEIS, COLUMBIA, CUNY, GEORGETOWN, MCGILL, NOTRE DAME, ILLINOIS-URBANA, NAVAL WAR COLLEGE, RUTGERS, SAN FRANCISCO STATE, SWARTHMORE, UCLA, YESHIVA. The Winter 84-85 issue is on "American Foreign Policy in the Middle East." The Spring 85 issue is about "Turkey and the Middle East." It is a 64-page quarterly, \$12 per year, from AAAPME, 330 Seventh Avenue (606), NY NY 10001.

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

- (41) 1938. From "Dare We Look Ahead?" (NY:Macmillan, 1938), with thanks to TOM STANLEY:

SCIENCE AND SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

★

THE EFFECTS of science on Social Institutions are only beginning. Science has been important in human life for three hundred years, and according to the astronomers life is to continue on this planet for about a billion years. If, therefore, I were to treat my subject in due proportion, I should spend the first millionth of a second on the effects of science hitherto, and the rest of the hour on its future effects. I will, however, make a somewhat less equitable division, and spend as much time on the past and present as on the future.

We may consider the effects of science under four heads: (1) Its effect on beliefs; (2) on war; (3) on production; and (4) directly on the minds and bodies of human beings.

The effect on beliefs, apart from certain effects on war, was the earliest of these. Science began to have recognized social importance at about the time of Charles II. The Merry Monarch founded the Royal Society as a cure for what was in those days called "enthusiasm," that is to say, fanatical religious belief. The world had had a considerable experience of creed wars, and Charles II, unlike his brother, was not prepared to suffer for any creed. He hoped that the scientific habit of mind would have the effect of making people less cocksure and less willing to endure martyrdom for their convictions. In this, on the whole, he was justified. All the different sects became milder at this time. Those Jesuits who were ardent disciples of Descartes were much less interested in persecution than the Jesuits of an earlier generation. Anglicans became bland and lost the fierceness of Laud. Nonconformists, having failed in their bid for supremacy, rapidly diminished in fanaticism. The kind of way in which Swift satirized the wars of religion would have been totally impossible before the accession of Charles II. In this change of the general temper science was, of course, only one factor, but it was an important one, as anybody may see in reading Pepys. In France science had, at first, the same kind of effect upon men's tempers

as in England, but after the suppression of the Jansenists Cartesianism fell out of favour in ecclesiastical circles, which, moreover, for a long time looked askance at Newton as a Protestant innovator. The consequence was that science became anti-clerical, and ultimately revolutionary. Napoleon cured it of this by giving it pensions, and from his time onwards science has been everywhere a recognized element in the social system. I must, however, make one exception; the third Reich, like revolutionary France, has decided that it has no need of *savants*. A few tame professors survive to perform the correct mumbo-jumbo, but, in the main, the scientific intellect of Germany is in exile.

The effect of science on belief is not now what it was at first. Originally, it was discoveries rather than inventions that were felt impressive, and the discoveries, since they disproved what had previously been supposed known, diminished rather than increased the amount of knowledge men believed themselves to possess. Now, on the contrary, it is inventions that cause the popular respect for science, which has come to be felt as a reliable kind of magic, by which our feeling of power is immeasurably increased. Originally, science fitted into the traditional contemplative conception of knowledge; now, conversely, it has caused knowledge to be conceived as essentially an instrument in practice.

The effect of science on war has been hitherto, perhaps, its most important effect. Persons who dislike war are apt to underestimate the importance of military technique in history, although at all times it has been a vital factor in great events. Men of science, from the beginning, have always recommended themselves to rulers by their power of being useful in war. Everybody remembers what Plutarch has to say about Archimedes at the siege of Syracuse. Leonardo, in applying for a job under the Duke of Milan, wrote at great length about his skill in the art of fortification, and added in a postscript that he could also paint a bit. Galileo occupied himself considerably with artillery, and it was probably cannon balls that caused him to work out the trajectory of a falling body. In the French Revolution all the scientists whose heads remained upon their shoulders occupied themselves feverishly with the problem of the manufacture of explosives. During the Crimean War, Faraday was appealed to by the War Office on the subject of poison gas. And in the present day,

as everyone knows, even the most pacifistic physicist or chemist can hardly avoid contributing something to the art of war.

At every stage, changes in the art of war have had important political repercussions. The invention of gun-powder destroyed chivalry and the impregnability of castles. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the profession of the private soldier required more skill than it does at present; this was, therefore, the period of small professional armies, which could be recruited by monarchs without the need of any popular appeal. As the skill required in the private soldier became less, it became possible and therefore important to have large armies. For this purpose popular enthusiasm was a help, and the victories of the French Revolution are largely attributable to this cause. Modern war requires not only huge armies, but enormous numbers of munition workers. It cannot, therefore, be successful unless the nation is at one with the Government. This is the chief reason which has caused so many Governments to become more or less democratic. There are signs, however, of a new development, in which victory will depend upon scientific skill rather than upon numbers. Victory will go to the Government which can most successfully spread its poison gas and bacteria among the enemy. This is a problem rather of technical ingenuity than of man-power, and suggests for the future an oligarchy employing scientific experts. This change will facilitate the holding of power by minority dictatorships, whether Fascist or Communist.

Looking a little further ahead, it is to be expected that new-style tyrants will come to depend, like those of Greece and Rome and Bagdad, upon bands of mercenaries, but the mercenaries will be men of science. Sooner or later, as in those historical precedents, the mercenaries will see no reason to serve tyrants, and will seize power themselves. Whether the resulting scientific oligarchy will be pleasant or unpleasant, I do not venture to predict.

One of the difficulties of warfare in modern times has been that the generals and admirals, through being conservative in politics, have acquired a conservative outlook upon other matters also, and more particularly upon the technique of war. The Duke of Wellington objected to rifles as an innovation. The British Admiralty continued to construct men-of-war of wood, and to view steam with disfavour, for about half a century longer than they should have done. It was the American Civil War, conducted in the main by people who were not professionals, which led the way to the modern type of battleship. If I were conducting a war, I should insist that all the generals must be business men and all the admirals civil engineers; I should confine professional soldiers and sailors entirely to the lower ranks.

It is likely that during the next fifty years the importance of air warfare will exercise a decisive effect on politics. Owing to the fact that the aeroplane moves in three dimensions instead of two, attack is easy and defence hardly possible; moreover, the importance of the sea is enormously diminished, since it is probable that sea communications could not be kept open in time of war. For these reasons, war, if it occurs, will be more destructive than it used to be. It may therefore be assumed that in the

next war all the belligerents will destroy each other, with the result that the whole world will fall under the domination of the largest neutral, provided any important country has the sense to remain a spectator. In this way a world government may be brought about, and civilization may survive.

Modern war depends so much upon science, and science changes so quickly, that victory is likely to be more dependent upon scientific skill than upon any other single factor. It is scarcely possible that science, even on the purely technical side, can long flourish in the atmosphere of Nazi Germany. At present Germany still has the benefit of the scientific skill built up in past times, but it is to be expected that within twenty years, at latest, the lowering of the intellectual level since the accession of Hitler will cause a loss of military efficiency as compared with countries where intelligence remains more or less free. The very widespread belief that a totalitarian state is more efficient in war than one with a more liberal régime is, I believe, as complete a delusion as the analogous belief in absolute monarchy which existed in the time of Louis XIV.

The effect of science on production is such a hackneyed theme that I propose to say almost nothing about its more familiar aspects. There are, however, two matters in which science has not yet exercised its full effect, as to which I wish to say something. First: under the influence of nationalism, every state wishes to be as far as possible economically self-supporting. This is becoming increasingly feasible through the substitution of synthetic for natural products. Artificial silk is familiar; synthetic rubber, synthetic wood, synthetic wool, and so on, will follow in due course. There was a time when tropical countries were needed for the production of sugar; they are still needed for tea and coffee. But probably new drinks could be made out of the produce of the temperate zone, which advertisers could persuade us are just as nice as tea and coffee. International commerce is rapidly losing its importance, and is likely, unless nationalism loses its force, to have even less importance in the future than it has now. This is to be regretted, since, speaking historically, almost all intellectual and moral advance has been connected with commerce, which has a liberalizing effect, both by involving contact with foreign customs and because it is conducted on a basis of mutual advantage rather than of force. The Greeks, the Renaissance Italians, the Dutch, and the English owed their merits to commerce. The Japanese owe their merits to the two and a half centuries during which all intercourse with foreigners was prohibited.

Secondly, the possibilities of science in relation to food production have, as yet, scarcely begun to be exploited. With existing knowledge, it would be possible, if it were desired, to produce all the food required in Great Britain on a small part of the soil of Great Britain. The Sahara, so I am informed by my friend Mr. Bernal, could be made fertile by the simple expedient of preventing the evaporation of dew. I suppose that something of the sort could be done in the interior of Australia. In a slightly more distant future there is the possibility of synthetic food, which would destroy the necessity for agriculture, and thus transform politics and social life.

One effect of science in relation to production has been made familiar by Marx, and that is the growth

in the size of economic organizations. But it is not only economic organizations, it is organizations of every kind that increase in size as a result of scientific technique. There is, it is true, one apparent exception. Since the Great War, states have tended rather to diminish than to increase in size, but this is due to nationalism, which cuts across the effects of science. If science could operate unchecked, it would soon produce a single world state.

I come now to what will almost certainly, in the future, be the most important of all the effects of science, namely, its direct operation upon man himself. Hitherto we have accepted man with his desires and capacities as a datum, and have used science to further the satisfaction of his desires, but we are beginning to understand how to treat man himself as a product which can be indefinitely modified by science. A man's character is formed by a great variety of causes: his congenital characteristics, his diet, his education, his social circumstances, and the social traditions in which he lives. It is clear that by diet and bio-chemical treatment a man's character can be completely transformed. If Carlyle's dyspepsia had been cured, how different his opinions would have been! If Luther had not suffered from constipation, he would have been less obsessed by the works of Satan. What can be done mentally to alter man is not less important than what can be done physiologically. We are beginning to understand the art of manufacturing opinions wholesale as we manufacture pins. The technique is not yet quite perfect, but it may be confidently hoped that within another hundred years almost every citizen of a state will have, on almost every subject, the opinions which the Government of that state wishes him to have. Education, the press, the cinema, and the radio are already being used to this end, but as yet they cannot be used so effectively as they soon will be. There is still a liberal tradition which has not died out, even in the most authoritarian states. There are older men who remember days of comparative liberty, and who may instil doubts into their children. The hypnotic technique is not yet perfect, and does not yet begin at a sufficiently early age.

The ritual is not yet so impressive as that of the Catholic Church. And Christianity is still able to offer some opposition to the new paganism. Moreover, economic circumstances as yet make it difficult to give people that degree of happiness which is necessary to ensure that they shall not become rebels. All these, however, are temporary difficulties. If the authoritarian state survives long enough, and if it has the good sense to listen to the advice of educators and advertisers, we may confidently expect that it will achieve a degree of uniformity of opinion among its subjects to which there has been nothing analogous in past history.

The congenital part of man is as capable of scientific manipulation as the part which is due to education. As yet the laws of heredity are not sufficiently ascertained to make eugenics completely reliable, but no doubt the necessary knowledge will be acquired before long.

In connection with eugenics, it is natural to consider a question which raises a doubt as to the stability of a scientific society. Throughout the last sixty years, education and industrialism have led to a fall in the birth-rate wherever they have reached a certain level,

and it is now clear that, even if there are no wars, the most civilized nations will rapidly dwindle in the next half-century, unless some revolutionary measure is taken to counteract this tendency. There is nothing mysterious about this. Some people like children, but there are other ways of spending men's money and women's time which most men and women prefer to school bills and pregnancy. Even the minority who would like a large family are apt to find the expense prohibitive. The more education is prolonged, and the more the life of the childless is made agreeable, the stronger become the reasons of self-interest against having children. Yet with the progress of science and technique the prolongation of education becomes increasingly important.

Such mild measures as the French Government, for instance, has been willing to adopt with a view to arresting the fall of the birth-rate, have proved totally ineffective. The German Government hopes to achieve the result by means of ignorance and poverty. But this method will not replenish the numbers of the governing class, which must sooner or later be submerged by a rising flood of semi-barbarous slaves. To preserve a scientific society, the supply of men who combine education with ability must be kept up. It is not at all clear that civilized communities will think this worth the necessary sacrifices, not only of money, but of ethical convictions. If they do not, our present level of scientific culture is biologically unstable, and must be expected to give place to a less sophisticated society.

We may, I think, if scientific societies survive, expect a change in ethical outlook, which has already begun, but is likely to proceed much further. Christianity allowed certain rights to the individual, and most of us still feel that there are some things which ought not to be done to a man for the sake of some public advantage. It might be said, for example, that the purpose of hanging murderers is to discourage murder, and that this effect is produced so long as it is believed that murderers are hanged. It does not matter, therefore—so it might be argued—whether we hang the right man or somebody else, so long as the public can be made to believe that we have hanged the right man. Such a point of view we feel to be shocking, but with the decay of the ethic we inherit from Christianity it may cease to be thought shocking by rulers. They will have a tendency to arrogate to themselves the characteristics of the Calvinist God, who was not guided by justice in His selection of the elect from among the reprobate. They may even find a justification of the *agent provocateur* in the theology of the supralapsarians, who held that God placed man in circumstances which made it certain that he would sin, in order that his Creator might have the opportunity of exercising the virtue of justice by punishing him. The psychology which the Calvinists attribute to God is that of absolute power devoid of benevolence, and unfortunately this is the very psychology which the opportunity of scientific manipulation tends to produce in the rulers of authoritarian states. And with this psychology goes a ruthless ethic.

The social effects of science applied to human beings may be expected to depend upon the form of government. As we have seen, this kind of science gives immense powers to rulers, and there is no reason to suppose that, where democracy does not exist,

rulers will use their powers benevolently. On the contrary we must expect that, as in the past, they will use their powers to make their own rule secure and to make its benefits to themselves as great as possible. This will apply to all States where there is not democracy, and it may be expected to be just as true in Russia as in Germany. On the other hand, where there is democracy the scientific power in relation to human beings is likely to be used for the general welfare, that is to say, to promote health and intelligence and the kind of education that leads to happiness without subservience. The more the manipulative powers of science are increased, the more important it becomes that government should be democratic, for the authoritarian state, if it continues, will almost inevitably develop a distinction of an upper and a lower caste, the upper caste having all the power, all the initiative, all the intelligence, and all the rewards above bare subsistence, while the lower caste, like domestic animals,

has a life of unrelieved toil, which it endures because of an artificially produced acquiescence. Such a society is politically possible, and could be stable. I think the chief reason for expecting it not to prevail is that it would probably be inferior to a free society in military efficiency, but this is a doubtful matter, and the danger is very real.

Men who think about a scientific society are apt to assume in its rulers the kind of benevolence which is found in many individual men of science. This, however, is a mistake. History shows that, in the main, governments are only benevolent when self-preservation compels them to be so, and not always even then. In any case, benevolence is a dangerous frame of mind, since it implies superiority to its object. The benevolent ruler will give to his subjects what he thinks they ought to want, not what, in fact, they do want. And it will be an axiom with him that respect for himself is an essential condition of their happiness. The power of manipulation which science gives thus involves psychological dangers which can only be guarded against by making a government sensitively responsive to public opinion. Science, since it makes life more organized and society more organic, necessarily increases the extent to which government interferes in the life of individuals. It therefore makes government a matter of greater importance than it has ever hitherto been, and also makes the avoidance of tyranny more difficult. It tends to encourage the manipulative outlook, which is a dangerous one. Science tends to transfer God-like attributes from heavenly to earthly rulers, and an increasing number of powers formerly attributed to God are placed by science in the hands of human beings. The result is an intoxication of power, which is very dangerous to sanity and stability. The man who finds himself transformed into a god has something of the mentality of a beggar on horseback; humility disappears, and, with it, wisdom.

Professor Joad has recently said (*New Statesman*, Oct. 2, 1937): "Dominated by science, men have come to believe that the understanding of causes will in itself enable them to alter results. The belief, so far at least as human beings are concerned, is a delusion. To understand why one is jealous, ill-tempered, or sadistic does not prevent one from being jealous, ill-tempered, or sadistic. It is not by

knowing more that men and women will be saved, but by becoming virtuous. Unfortunately, the recipe for the production of virtue is not known."

This is only a part of the truth. If you have defined virtue, the scientist, not perhaps at the present day, but before long, will be able to give you the recipe for producing it in other people. He will also give you the recipe for producing vice. What the

scientist cannot do is to define virtue and vice. Everything that has to do with values is outside the province of science. Given the power conferred by science, without a just estimate of values, the power will be used to produce bad effects. But what is a "just" estimate of values, and what are "bad" effects? Can I say anything more than that a "just" estimate is my estimate, and that "bad" effects are those which I dislike? To such questions, science as such can offer no answer. We may take a democratic view, according to which, in estimating values, all men count equally; or we may take an aristocratic view, according to which only a favoured minority are to count. I do not know of any way of proving that the democratic way is the right one. But as a matter of politics, it is clear that the aristocratic view must involve indefinite strife, since no one is going to concede willingly that he belongs to the negligible portion of mankind. It follows that, if the aristocratic view were general, it would involve the disappearance of the great majority of its adherents, and unless you are sure that you will not yourself belong to this majority, you will be unwise in adopting it. But such arguments are outside the realm of science.

The conclusion of this matter is comparatively simple. Science immensely increases the power possessed by governments of realizing their desires. If power is in the hands of a minority, science enables this minority to realize its desires. If it is in the hands of the majority, it gives the same facility to the majority. It cannot be assumed that power in the hands of a minority will be used to further the interests of the community as a whole, for all experience shows that oligarchies, unless under the influence of fear, tend to ignore the interests of their subjects. Therefore the more science enables governments to realize their desires, the more vital it becomes that government should be democratic.

There is one other matter, in connection with science and social institutions, on which something should be said, and that is the rate of change. Science hitherto, ever since it began to influence daily life, has produced a continually increased rapidity of change, and it is sometimes assumed that this is likely to continue indefinitely. I do not myself think so. There have been in history a few periods of rapid progress, interspersed with long periods of stagnation or retrogression. There was the prehistoric period when agriculture was invented, the early period of Egypt and Babylonia, the great age of ancient Greece, and the time from the Renaissance to the present day. At these various times certain portions of the human race made rapid progress, but progress is exceptional and stagnation has been the rule. I think it very doubtful whether science will ever permanently change this. It seems more likely that, after a revolutionary ferment, from which we are now suffering, some new stability will be achieved, and new science will almost cease to be

produced. One may expect, as the result of increasingly destructive wars, the establishment of a world government, which, in view of the horrors of the epoch immediately preceding its establishment, is likely to care more for stability than for anything else at all. One may assume that it will be able, from a military point of view, to ensure governmental stability for itself, and that it will set to work to inculcate a conservative outlook in the population of the world.

In the absence of the dangers of war, and assuming that economic competition has been done away with, there will not be the same practical stimulus to new inventions that there is at present, and the world may settle down as the Roman Empire did in the time of the Antonines. No doubt such immobility will not last for ever, but it is easy to imagine its lasting for a very considerable time. Or, alternatively, if no world government results, wars may so lower the level of civilization that men will no longer be able to master the scientific technique of our time, and that, as in the Dark Ages, they will look back upon the past with ignorant awe. But I cannot believe that, throughout the billion years which Sir James Jeans allows us, we shall continue the rate of scientific change which has been characteristic of the past hundred years. Sooner or later mankind will need a period of rest and recuperation, but I doubt whether any of us will live into that period.

In any attempt to forecast the future of scientific societies, we are met, as I have tried to show, by

two reasons for doubting their stability. The first is war, the second the declining birth-rate. It is fairly clear that mankind cannot remain scientific and survive unless large wars are altogether prevented; it is also obvious that wars can only be prevented by the creation of a single world State with a monopoly of armed force. As for the declining birth-rate, that can only be checked by measures which are financially unattractive and which also involve a considerable shock to our ethical convictions. Whether both those sources of instability can be eliminated is very questionable. But if they can be eliminated, there remain two forms of possibly stable scientific society, one democratic and the other oligarchic. Both will demand the control of all important economic matters by the State, but politically they will differ widely. In the democratic form, education will be general, and all will have equal economic opportunities. In the oligarchic form, political and economic power will belong to a governing minority, whose comfort and security will be the main purpose of the State, while the subject majority will be kept acquiescent by the combined operation of force, propaganda, and bio-chemistry (i.e. drugs). At the present moment, it is impossible to guess which of these two forms of scientific society will prevail, or even whether science will not prove self-destructive, and be replaced by a new barbarism. In the latter event, science will, no doubt, arise again in due course. Perhaps next time its victims will show more wisdom than our century appears to possess.

(42)

WE THANK

We would like to acknowledge our great debt to Tom Stanley, BRS Librarian and RSN well-wisher. He has been sending us excellent items for the newsletter for the past year and a half or more. A book lover and book dealer, Tom gets to see a lot of books; luckily for us, he keeps us in mind. This would have been a lot thinner newsletter, and we would have missed much good reading, but for Tom. Another reliable contributor to the newsletter is BOB DAVIS; no issue ever lacks one or more items from Bob. To Tom and Bob, we say: Many thanks! Vielen Dank! Grazie! Merci! Gracias!

(43)

OFFICERS OF THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.

Chairman, Harry Ruja; President, David S. Hart; Vice-President, Marvin Kohl; Treasurer, Dennis J. Darland; Secretary, John R. Lenz; Vice-President/Information, Lee Eisler.

(44)

FOR SALE

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.

(47)

INDEX

Baptist Minister is a Secular Humanist.....	39	News about members (continued):	
Berenson, Mary:impressions of BR.,.....	10	Paul Pfalzner.....	20
Book Reviews:		Cherie Ruppe.....	21
Kilmister's "Russell": Marvin Kohl's review..	25	Nobel Laureates (1985) on the nuclear peril....	12
Lowe's "Whitehead"vol 1: Quinton's review....	27	Nuclear peril, according to Nobel Laureates....	12
Brainwash, American Style (Chomsky).....	16		
		Officers of the BRS.....	43
BR on Civil Disobedience (1961).....	8	Orangutan adventure (Cherie Ruppe).....	21
BR on atomic energy control,Hse of Lords(1947)..	7	Other organizations:	
BR's Introduction to Lamont's book(1956).....	9	Humanist Association of Minnesota.....	33
BR on Israel's use of force in Palestine(1970)..	35	Palestine Human Rights Campaign (PHRC).....	34
BR on "Science & Social Institutions"(1938)....	41		
BR visits U Thant (photo, 1962).....	46	Palestine Human Rights Campaign (PHRC).....	34
		Pugwash Jr.....	13
"Churchman",an independent journal	36	Pugwash Jr. multiples.....	14
"Churchman" articles:			
Why I Am A Secular Humanist.....	39	Reagan snubs the World Court (NECLC ad).....	17
They Want War.....	37	Recommended reading:	
Chomsky's "The Bounds of Thinkable Thought"....	16	Richard Johnson's Ten-Best.....	24
Conference on Danger of Accidental Nuclear War..	2	Renewal Honor Roll.....	5
Contributors to the BRS Treasury thanked.....	6	"Russell" by Kilmister,reviewed by Kohl.....	25
		Russell Society Library:	
Dennis Darland, Treasurer, reports.....	45	Books for sale.....	28
Directors of the BRS.....	38	Books for sale elsewhere.....	29
Dues, last call.....	4	New books to lend.....	30
		Cassettes for sale and to lend.....	31
Finances: Treasurer's Report,4th Quarter 85....	45	Special request.....	32
For sale: member stationery.....	44		
		"Science & Social Institutions" by BR.....	41
Hatch's plot, hatched last year, unhatched.....	15	Secular humanism:	
Highlights	1	Plot Hatch hatched unhatched.....	15
Honor Roll of early-bird renewers.....	5	Baptist Minister is a secular humanist.....	39
Humanist Association of Minnesota.....	33	Seldes' quotations: a supplement.....	11
		Senator Hatch's plot unhatched.....	15
Index.....	47	Stationery for sale.....	44
IPPNO, Philosophers Conference vs. Nuclear War..	3		
Israel's use of force in Palestine.....	35	Thanking Bob Davis and Tom Stanley.....	42
		"They Want War." article in The Churchman.....	37
Kohl reviews "Russell" by Kilmister.....	25	Treasurer Darland's Report, 4th Quarter 85....	45
		Typographical and other errors:statement.....	26
Member stationery for sale.....	44		
Middle East Review.....	40	United Nations photo of U Thant and BR.....	46
Money.....	4	U Thant with BR, in photo.....	46
New addresses.....	23	War:"They Want War,"article in The Churchman..	37
New members.....	22	"Whitehead" Vol I, reviewed by Quinton.....	27
News about members:		"Why I Am A Secular Humanist"(Baptist Minstr)..	39
Gladys Leithauser.....	18	World Court snubbed by Reagan (NECLC ad).....	17
Richard Johnson.....	19		