

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS

No. 54
May 1987

- (1) Highlights: Prize Contest: win a good book (32). Annual Meeting (23,34). Candidates for Director wanted (7). BR's awards and honors (5). Speak of the Devil (28). Farley reminisces (15). An asterisk in the left column indicates a request. The Index is at the end.

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

- (2) Ten. We are reprinting the following because we think it ought to be looked at every so often. 9 years have gone by since we found it in BR's Autobiography, Volume III (S&S:1969) and ran it (RSN20-14). It first appeared in the New York Times Magazine of December 16, 1951, where it was called "A Liberal Decalogue". This is how it appeared in The Humanist (July/August 1982). (Thank you, CHERIE RUPPE.)

BERTRAND RUSSELL'S TEN COMMANDMENTS

1. Do not feel absolutely certain of anything.
2. Do not think it worth while to produce belief by concealing evidence, for the evidence is sure to come to light.
3. Never try to discourage thinking, for you are sure to succeed.
4. When you meet with opposition, even if it should be from your children, endeavor to overcome it by argument, and not by authority, for a victory dependent upon authority is unreal and illusory.
5. Have no respect for the authority of others, for there are always contrary authorities to be found.
6. Do not use power to suppress opinions you think pernicious, for if you do the opinions will suppress you.
7. Do not fear to be eccentric in opinion, for every opinion now accepted was once eccentric.
8. Find more pleasure in intelligent dissent than in passive agreement, for, if you value intelligence as you should, the former implies deeper agreement than the latter.
9. Be scrupulously truthful, even when truth is inconvenient, for it is more inconvenient when you try to conceal it.
10. Do not feel envious of the happiness of those who live in a fool's paradise, for only a fool will think that it is happiness.

BR QUOTED

- (3) Better than victory, from Parade Magazine (2/1/87, p.2), -----> with thanks to WHITFIELD COBB and DON JACKANICZ.

Q Who is the author of this simply marvelous and unforgettable quotation: "There is something better than victory, and that is the avoidance of war"?—Adrian Thompson, Springfield, Ill.

A Those memorable words have been credited to the late Bertrand Russell—British philosopher, mathematician, writer and winner of the Nobel Prize in literature in 1950.

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

(4) My Impressions Of Australia is the title of BR's fourth talk over Australian radio, on August 23rd, 1950

At the end of my eight weeks in Australia I have formed some impressions, but, being gathered in so short a time, they are, of necessity, very superficial, and likely to be in many points mistaken. There is one thing, however, about which I am confident that I am not mistaken, and that is your great kindness to visitors. Everywhere I have received generous hospitality, and I have experienced every wish to make my tour a pleasant one. For this I wish to thank all who have contributed to so pleasant a result.

It is natural to an Englishman to compare Australia with the United States. I had expected to find great similarities, but, in fact, I have been more struck by the differences. It has seemed to me that Australians on the whole are happier than Americans. They do not seem to have the same restless itch to be always doing something else or being somewhere else. No doubt American restlessness is bound up with American energy and enterprise, and it is possible that if Australia were inhabited by Americans, its resources would be developed more rapidly, but if so, this result would be dearly purchased at the price of universal discontent. The possibilities of development in Australia seem to me to be enormous. I think that some of the inhabitants of your big cities are perhaps insufficiently aware of the possible importance of vast undeveloped rural regions. I am in no degree opposed to industrial development in Australia, but the importance of your continent in relation to world economy must be as a producer of food and wool, in regard to both of which there is likely to be an increasing world shortage. The very little that I have been able to see of your northern regions has persuaded me that by means of science and collective enterprise, they can be made immensely more productive than they are at present. It has been said by some that these regions cannot be developed by white labor alone. I do not believe this. White men living in your tropical north seem just as healthy, as well developed and vigorous, as those who live in the south.

I have been struck by a curious difference between individual feelings and technical necessities, particularly in your more sparsely populated areas. People's feelings are those of pioneers. They believe in individual enterprise, and in what they can achieve by their own energies. In America a hundred years ago when the West was being conquered, this mentality was largely adequate. There was abundance of timber and water; a man could build his own log house, and, as soon as the ground was cleared, he could raise crops. But in Australia the situation is different. Only by very great capital expenditure can its resources be developed. The Snowy Mountains irrigation project -- to take a well-known example -- requires an expenditure which is beyond that of private capital. Throughout the sparsely populated districts, road, rail, and air communications are vital, but cannot be expected to yield private profit. The admirable flying doctor service, which is mainly supported by those who use it, requires a government subsidy, which, I should have thought, ought to be larger than it is. The scientific study of possibilities is evidently a matter to be undertaken at Government expense, and while something is being done in that direction, I am sure that much more could be done with profit to the community. The individual Australian pioneer is in all these ways [more] dependent upon the Government than the pioneers of other regions in former times. He is more impressed by activities which the Government forbids than by those which it makes possible. I think perhaps this attitude is wholesome since it prevents unnecessary encroachments upon individual liberty, but it can be carried too far if it involves refusal to vote public money where public enterprise is essential.

If your resources are to be developed as they should be, you require, side by side with technical developments, a corresponding increase of population. This is necessary also on other grounds: if Australians are to hold their own as a white man's outpost on the borders of Asia, they can hardly hope to be successful while their population is no larger than that of London. From the point of view of defense, as well as from that of development, there should be energetic encouragement of immigration on a large scale, even though this may involve considerable capital expenditure. A European who has never been in your country does not easily realize the difficulties involved in your geographical position, and I count it among the benefits I have derived from my time among you, that I am more aware of your international problems than I was before. A long term solution of these problems is only possible by a parallel development of technical progress and large scale immigration.

No country is perfect, and you will, I am sure, bear with me if I mention some matters in which I think improvement is possible.

I have had some opportunity of studying the treatment of the aborigines in Australia, and while I am aware that this is rapidly improving, there seems to me to be still room for a considerable advance. Both popular feeling and the police seem unwilling to grant to the aborigines elementary rights of justice. Their tribal organization is largely dissolved, their best lands have been taken from them, and many of them are left helpless through no fault of their own. This places a heavy responsibility on white men, and those who are endeavoring to fulfill this responsibility deserve, I think, more cooperation from the general public than they are apt to receive.

Another thing in which I think there is much room for improvement is your sources of public information. There has been a general belief in Australia in recent years that England was in a bad way, and that people were suffering from an insufficiency of food. The truth is that the average inhabitant of England has been receiving more adequate nourishment during the last few years than at any previous period in history. This misinformation which has been disseminated in Australia has been part of a deliberate propaganda against the

Labour Party. The Labour Party in England, when it came to power in 1945, was faced with a very difficult situation, which it coped with vigorously and honestly without too much regard for popularity. I wonder how Australians who believe that England has been in a bad way account for the fact that so few of those who desire to settle in Australia are English? It is true that now, owing to the threatening international situation, England will be obliged to revert to a regime of austerity from which it had emerged, but there would certainly be no less austerity if a different Government were in power.

One of the most noteworthy characteristics of the modern world is increasing integration. It is less and less possible for communities to live to themselves. In old days a village could live on its produce with very little relation to the outside world; but now this sort of thing is impossible. In the early Eighteenth Century in England, roads were almost impassable, but were the only means of communication between different places. In such a community local feeling could develop without much harm, but few villagers needed a knowledge of world conditions. Now all this is different. The profit to be derived from sheep or cattle depends upon the export trade, and export depends upon complicated conditions of currency and trade agreements. Remote regions are utterly dependent upon means of communication, and will be more and more dependent upon large scale irrigation works and upon scientific research. Since watersheds have no respect for State boundaries, large irrigation works are likely to require action by the Commonwealth Government. Local feeling, whether in a city, a district or a State, is liable to become an obstacle to development, and the functions of the Commonwealth Government will, for technical reasons, almost inevitably increase. Beyond the confines of Australia, the fortunes and the very lives of Australians may depend upon distant events -- upon the fortunes of war in Europe or the Middle East. For good or for ill, the world has to be thought of as a unity. An atom bomb dropped on New York might be as fatal to Australia as an atom bomb dropped on Sydney. We have to learn to make our thoughts less parochial than they used to be -- not that we should cease to love our own country, whichever it may be, but that we should realize more fully than some of us do how the fate of our own country is linked to that of others. This is the sort of thing that could be taught in schools and in the course of instruction in history. I think all this could be taught in a way to give the Australians an increased sense of their individual and collective importance in the history of the human species. Civilizations which owe their origin to Western Europe have discovered a way of life in many ways better than any that former times have known, and this is especially notable in Australia. You have in Australia no great poverty. You have opportunities of enterprise for all who are energetic and vigorous. You have a vast country to be conquered. You have freedom and democracy, and a high level of general education. You have diffused throughout the population various good things which in former times were the privilege of a fortunate minority. If our Western way of life were to become general, these advantages could in time extend to all parts of the world. But if the world is to revert to a form of government in which the few can tyrannize over the many, as happens wherever the Russians have control, mankind would lose -- perhaps for centuries -- the possibility, which now exists, of making the whole world as happy as Australia is already. You Australians have a great part to play as pioneers, not only in the development of your continent, but in pointing the way to a happier destiny for man throughout the centuries to come. This is a noble ambition, and I should wish to see it inspiring your national life and the thoughts and hopes of the young. I am a firm believer in your capacity to play your part in this great work, and I leave your shores with more hope for mankind than I had before I came among you.

[Thank you, TOM STANLEY]

HONORS

- (5) O.M. As you may recall, we have at times past reported on honors awarded to BR. For the presentation speech that accompanied BR's Nobel Prize for Literature, 1950, see NL7-52. He received the Prize for being a "brilliant champion of humanity and free thought". BR's response on this occasion became a chapter, "Politically Important Desires," in his book, "Human Society in Ethics and Politics". BR received UNESCO's Kalinga Prize -- "for the interpretation and dissemination of science" -- in 1951. The presentation speech, and BR's response, can be found in RSN24-20. The Sonning Prize -- "for the advancement of European civilization" -- went to BR in 1960; the presentation speech, and BR's response, are printed in RSN25-21.

All this is prelude. We wanted to print the citation that accompanied BR's Order of Merit (O.M.).

No luck. There isn't any citation.

But the quest wasn't entirely fruitless. We learned that the Order was founded in 1902, is awarded "in recognition of eminent services rendered in the armed services, or toward the advancement of art, literature and science. It is open to both sexes. Except for honorary members from overseas, the Order is limited to 24 persons." Some current Members: Sir Isaiah Berlin, Sir William Walton, Professor Dorothy Hodgkin, Mr. Henry Moore. We found this information in an excellent 28-page booklet, "Honours and Titles in Britain" (1952), which was sent us by the British Information Services, NYC. The news that there isn't any citation was sent us by Sir Edward Ford, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., Secretary and Registrar, the Order of Merit. His address is Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood, St. James Palace, SW1A 1BG. Using the booklet, we found that K.C.B. is for Knight Commander of The Most Honourable Order of the Bath, and K.C.V.O. for Knight Commander of The Royal Victorian Order.

PUGWASH

(6)

The 14th Pugwash Workshop on Nuclear Forces was held in Geneva, Switzerland, on 13 and 14 December, 1986...specifically to explore ways to reduce the danger of accidental nuclear war. 34 scientists and public and military figures from 15 countries took part as individuals, not as representatives of their governments or other agencies. What follows are excerpts from the "Statement of the Pugwash Executive Committee", which was sent to us by the Pugwash office, and received on 3/8/87. [Most BRS members will recall that the Pugwash movement was started by BR in 1957.]

Starting a nuclear war would be likely to lead to national suicide and global catastrophe, and therefore could not be justified by any rational purpose or recommended by any responsible leader. Consequently, nuclear war is unlikely to be started by rational leaders who correctly perceive the consequences of their actions.

The most probable initiators of nuclear war are irrational acts, mistakes, and malfunctions. Irrational leaders or groups may come into control of nuclear weapons. Leaders who are ordinarily rational may act irrationally under the intense pressures of a crisis or simply may fail to correctly perceive the consequences of their actions. And mechanical or electronic malfunctions may precipitate chains of events leading to nuclear war in spite of corrective actions -- or in concert with irrational or mistaken actions -- by the human participants in the process. These are the dangers commonly combined under the heading of "accidental nuclear war".

The only way to eliminate completely the chance of nuclear war is to abolish nuclear weapons.

The systems employed by the major powers to maintain control over their nuclear weapons in peacetime and in war (denoted C³I, for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) are complex, sophisticated, and largely secret. It is difficult even for experts to understand all their facets -- and to discover and correct their weaknesses. Because they are largely secret, the peer review that roots out errors in other technical fields is absent in this one, and the dangers residing in the potential interactions of the C³I systems of different countries are unlikely to come to light at all.

Weaknesses in C³I systems are more dangerous during crises than when international relations are calm and stable. C³I components are known to have malfunctioned...but few if any [occurred] during a major international crisis. People in a crisis are likely to be rushed, frightened, tired, and confused. Layers of safety hardware may be peeled away deliberately to bring the weapons to a higher state of readiness for use on short notice.

Mutual fear of pre-emptive attack magnifies the danger. If either side believes its retaliatory forces are vulnerable to pre-emptive attack, it has an incentive to put those forces in a state of high alert, and, if an attack seems to be under way, to try to use them before they are destroyed... a hair-trigger posture.

The "modernization" of nuclear forces on both sides has aggravated the fears of pre-emptive attack, [which] has tended to increase the danger of accidental nuclear war. Development of nuclear weapons systems with high accuracy, short flight times, and numbers sufficient in theory to attack the retaliatory forces of potential adversaries, contribute to the fear that is so dangerous.

The ultimate dangers of this sort will ensue if countries decide that short-warning-time threats to their retaliatory capacity require that the response be completely automated, relying on computers and pre-programmed reactions with no time for significant human participation.

Space-based or pop-up "defensive" weapons would have to be activated almost instantly on detection of enemy launch, and their activation for defensive purposes could not be distinguished from their activities for suppressing the defenses of the adversary as part of a pre-emptive attack. These systems also would pose the threat of nearly instantaneous destruction of space-based and ground-based C³I systems. Their deployment therefore could hardly fail to stimulate the complete automation of the processes for starting a nuclear war, intolerably increasing the chance that such a war would start by electronic accident. Once such weapons were in place, it is hard to see how an automated hair-trigger posture could be avoided even in periods of international calm.

The most essential immediate steps toward reducing the danger of accidental nuclear war are: (1) stopping the nuclear arms race, which in the name of "modernizing" nuclear forces continues to lead to dangerous deployments; (2) initiating a process of deep reductions in nuclear arsenals, with emphasis on removing first those weapons with high capability for counterforce attack; (3) avoiding permanently the weaponization of space.

The proposals that emerged from the Reykjavik meetings -- combining deep and rapid cuts in strategic nuclear forces, removal of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range missiles from the European region, and recommitment of both sides to strict adherence to the Anti-Ballistic Missile [ABM] Treaty of 1972 for at least ten years -- offer a highly promising approach to the most fundamental problems...and do not require the Reagan Administration to give up research on strategic defenses.

ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

- (7) Nominations for Directors, please. We wish to elect 5 Directors this year, for 3-year terms starting 1/1/88, which will give us a total of 24 elected Directors. The August newsletter will provide a ballot for voting. In this (May) newsletter we seek candidates who will be on the ballot.

We are asking you to nominate candidates. Any member may nominate any other member to be a Director-candidate.

If you wish to be a candidate yourself, notify the Elections Committee and someone will probably nominate you.

The duties of a Director are not burdensome. Directors are occasionally asked their opinion about something, by mail, and they are expected to make a reasonable effort to attend annual meetings, though not at great expense. The cost of attending meetings is (federal) tax-deductible for Directors.

We would like to have more than 5 names on the ballot, so as to give members a choice.

A brief statement about the candidate should accompany a nomination. If you are volunteering, include a brief statement about yourself.

Directors whose terms expire in 1987 are JACQUELINE BERTHON-PAYON, BOB DAVIS, ALI GHAEMI, HUGH MOORHEAD. They are eligible for re-election.

We urge last year's candidates who were not elected to try again this year.

- * TO NOMINATE SOMEONE -- or to volunteer yourself -- write the Election Committee, c/o the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.

BRS AWARD NEWS

- (8) Anthony T. Podesta, President and chief spokesman of People For The American Way, which won the 1986 BRS Award, will be stepping down in May 1988, according to this story -- sent us by DON JACKANICZ -- in the Washington Post (2/2/87). He accepted our Award in person, at our 1986 annual meeting in NYC, spoke briefly, and showed a videotape, "The 'People For' Story" showing the excesses of the religious far right. (That videotape is now in the Russell Society Library.)

Unusual Exit For Leader of Liberal Lobby

Anthony T. Podesta, who cultivates an unconventional approach as president of People for the American Way, is leaving the organization in characteristic style.

Podesta has given notice 16 months before a planned departure in May 1988, saying that he wants to give the liberal lobby enough time "to figure out what they want to do in the post-Podesta era."

Podesta, a Democrat who has run the media-oriented group since television producer Norman Lear founded it in 1980, gave no hint of what he would do next. "I'm by nature a nomad . . . I've never before stayed any place for more than 18 months," Podesta said. "I'll spend the next year figuring out what I want to do when I grow up. I don't have any particular game plan."

Art Kropp, a former staffer for the Republican National Committee and now the group's chief fundraiser, will take over day-to-day management of the group as executive vice president. Podesta will

concentrate on public speaking and long-range planning.

Under Podesta, People for the American Way has grown into the best-financed advocacy group on the left, one that frequently clashes with the Reagan administration. The group, which specializes in First Amendment and religious freedom issues, has raised record amounts of cash with letters attacking Attorney General Edwin Meese III and television evangelists Jerry Falwell and Marion G. (Pat) Robertson. Its budget has nearly doubled to almost \$10 million in the last two years.

Podesta, who worked for the

1980 presidential campaign of Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) and was a volunteer for 1984 vice-presidential candidate Geraldine A. Ferraro, said he has been approached by some 1988 White House aspirants, including former senator Gary Hart (D-Colo.) and Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr. (D-Del.), but does not plan a full-time job in politics.

Despite occasional reports of friction involving the excitable Podesta, staff members say the delayed departure was his idea. "I don't think it's good to have a permanent staff bureaucracy in public-interest groups," Podesta said.

OFFICERS OF THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.

- (9) Chairman, Harry Ruja; President, Marvin Kohl; Vice-President, John Lenz; Treasurer, Dennis J Darland; Secretary, Don Jackanicz; Vice-President/Information, Lee Eisler.

BOOK REVIEW

- (10) "Bertrand Russell" by PAUL G. KUNTZ (Boston: Twayne, 1986) is reviewed here by Flemish philosopher, William A. de Pater, of Katholieke Universiteit Leuven [Louvain]. This review will also appear in "Review of Metaphysics". For a brief review by MARVIN KOHL, see RSN52-32. It has also been recommended reading (RSN51-24.)

The main thesis of this book is that "we find in Russell more system than he is given credit for, and indeed more than he even knew he had" (p. 135). With this the author opposes the current interpretations, which chop Russell's philosophy in pieces without any connection. The basic notion is that of "order" (long Russell's preoccupation), defined in Russell's terms as asymmetrical and transitive connexity. This serial relation would be omnipresent for Russell: in thought and reality, both cosmological and political (pp.41-43). Yet the author is not blind to the fact that "not only did Russell constantly alter his theories of truth; at any period of development we can find him taking both sides to illuminate the problem in a dialectical way" (p. 28). Thus Russell's journey may have gone in different directions (p.12), but what incited him was always "his concern with objective truth and with the explicit virtues of the liberal humanitarian" (Preface). So the unity of his work may have to do also with Russell's staying faithful to himself.

Thus the first chapter sets out which were the rebellions which inspired Russell's writings and actions (rebellion against parental authority, against the identification of pleasure with evil, against military patriotism, inequalities created by birth, and religion as reinforcing these evils); it ends with Russell looking back on his long life, finding that he had made many mistakes, but still sticking to the ideals which motivated these rebellions.

The second chapter sketches Russell's quest for certainty; it contains sections on belief, universals, and truth (with a nice argument against the pragmatic theory of truth, p.26). In "The New Logic of Relations" the author points to the central place of Russell's otherwise neglected article in *Mind*, 1901: "On The Notion of Order": here the basis is laid for his achievements in mathematical logic. In this same chapter some technical terms, needed for the concept of "order", are explained. Thus "connexity" means that in a field, ordered by relation R , any two terms, say x and y , are related either as xRy or as yRx . In the case of order, this implies that for any term there must be one and only one place where it can occur (p.34). The difficulty with Russell's definition of order is, as Mr. Kuntz remarks, that it is too narrow: it applies to linear order only, not to the cyclical one (like that of the seasons, where in a sense winter is a successor of itself, such that besides asymmetry there is symmetry). Kuntz notes some other oddities as well: the basic disorder in the world as problematic for Russell's "order-realism" (he is not a substance-realist), and his neglect of the causal order (till in the forties he concentrated on the spatial and temporal orders). The first oddity can be overcome by defining order more broadly, namely in terms of "structure", i.e., as a pattern (or more specifically: as a similarity) of relations. So Chapter Four follows with an exposition of logical atomism, which is based on the structural similarity between language and the world (an inference Russell later thought fallacious). The stress is here on the method, namely that of "relational analysis" (p.60), and with this on paradoxes and their solutions, such as the theory of types and that of descriptions versus proper names. Chapter Five then fills in the metaphysical aspect; it turns out that Russell not only criticized all previous metaphysics, but also what is called "antimetaphysics". He did not succeed however in producing a metaphysics of cosmic order: he had too much of the Anglo-American inhibition for such an endeavor, he failed to unite after having distinguished, and he came too late to recognize the role of causality (pp.89-92). Yet he sometimes dropped his "anxiety for metaphysics", e.g., in 1928 when he came close to Whitehead's system (cf. pp.93 and 163 note 23).

The next two chapters are an exposition of Russell's ethics and political philosophy. Here again he is a victim of his dichotomizing, *in casu* between fact and value: only during some short periods he succeeded in giving more objective foundations than only desires for what he saw as the ideal life, summarized as "love guided by knowledge". Kuntz rightly spots the problem: how can one be an emotivist in ethics, and yet teach morality? Much of what Russell said in these areas (and the fact that he said it) can be explained by his Puritan upbringing and temper; but its fanaticism was most of the time (except his last years because of the lack of time left and the bigness of the dangers) mitigated by the skepticism which he professed as the first command of his "Liberal Decalogue": "Do not feel absolutely certain of anything" (p.11). For Russell the great evils were poverty, war, stupidity, annihilation, and bad religion (pp. 120 and 136); the main virtues are vitality, courage, sensitiveness and intelligence (pp.129-132 form pleasant reading about these virtues and what blocks them).

Chapter Eight, finally, tries to guide the reader through "the labyrinth of Russell's religion". His occupation with religion turns out to be more moral than theological. Being an austere intellectual, Russell could not arrive at an ultimate ground of order: God. Yet he was constant in holding that the most valuable aspect of any person is his personal religion, and that it is a grave defect to have none (p.135). Good religion is motivated by hope and love (p.150). His fighting is against bad religion, which he sees embodied in the churches, which, instead of making the world better, brought cruelty, timidity, and stupidity (*ib*). As a Puritan he had to denounce hypocrisy (p.140); that his wholesale attack on the churches was based on the fallacy of selecting instances should be explained from the same source (p.151).

Perhaps Kuntz has overemphasized the importance of order or structure, although Russell did make inferences from the structure of language to that of the world, thought of mankind as an organic whole, and replaced substances by bundles of properties. But except in the first case, the structures are not very specified, and I can scarcely see Russell's logic (and so his analysis) as "relational". Yet the author is right in

stressing the unity of Russell's thought. Thus the latter's revolt against monism and idealism is not only a question of real external relations, pluralism and the correspondence theory of truth: it is also a revolt against the idealist's metaphysical optimism, which led the Christian thinkers who adopted it to deny the existence or seriousness of evil (p.143). Already the subtitle of Russell's "History of Western Philosophy" ["And Its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to the Present Day] (making connection with political and social circumstances) should have made clear that his humanistic convictions are not that isolated from his ontology or even logic (p.117). Much of his ethics is dominated by epistemological questions (e.g., whether there can be truth in ethics) and vitiated by the same errors he committed elsewhere (notably in his dichotomizing). So although in my opinion Russell's political and ethical convictions do not follow from his metaphysics or logic, there is more coherence in his philosophy than scholars, blinded by the varying of Russell's standpoints, have thought. Kuntz has done well in introducing us into the whole of Russell (only the exposition on logical atomism should have been a bit more concrete). His book is relatively small, but extremely well documented, and yet not difficult to read. Perhaps because it is well ordered.

GOVERNMENT/POLITICS

- (11) NECLC continues to focus on Reagan Administration abuses, in _____ the New York Times (3/22/87, p.E6). (shown here reduced in size)

**THE AMERICAN PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW
NO MORE AMERICAN MONEY FOR MURDER,
DESTRUCTION AND TERRORISM!
REMOVE ALL U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL
AND BASES FROM CENTRAL AMERICA**

To President Ronald Reagan:

Since 1981, the U.S. has covertly constructed or developed in Central America nine military bases, fourteen airfields, a highly sophisticated intelligence apparatus and other military support facilities. Under environmental, climatic and terrain conditions similar to Nicaragua's, over 70,000 troops, Army Reservists and National Guard have been trained in continuous military maneuvers in Honduras. 7,500 more National Guard are scheduled to be trained in 1987.

We demand that you stop all covert activities throughout Central America and especially the C.I.A.'s secret war against Nicaragua through the savage and terrorist Contras, who have wantonly killed thousands of innocent civilians, nearly half of whom are children, and have destroyed schools, hospitals and medical units. Mr. President, your shocking hypocrisy is clearly seen in your pretense to oppose terrorism in Europe and the Near East, but to openly support it by giving all possible aid to the Contras.

In so doing you flout international law and the decision of the World Court condemning the American aggression against Nicaragua and the scandalous tactics of the C.I.A.

Now the United States faces another crisis with your calling on Congress to appropriate an additional \$105 million for the Contras to buy weapons. This unjustified and immoral plan must be halted.

We propose the following steps in response to the crisis:

1. — Abolish all U.S. covert actions.
2. — End the use of military solutions as substitutes for diplomacy and support the Contadora process for Central America.
3. — Strengthen Congressional oversight and control of Executive war-making powers.
4. — Cut off all military and economic aid to the Contra terrorists, and
5. — Abide by the principles of constitutional government, most importantly the strict observance of domestic and international law. This includes the still existent Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation between the United States and Nicaragua.

CORLISS LAMONT

Chairman

EDITH TIGER

Director

**NATIONAL EMERGENCY
CIVIL LIBERTIES
COMMITTEE**

**175 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10010
212-673-2040**

National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee

175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010

To the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

I want to help you continue the struggle for the American People's **Right to Know**. Enclosed is my contribution of \$_____

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

STATE _____

ZIP _____

- (12) "The Persecution of the Jews. What Can We Do?", by Bertrand Russell, appeared in The Berwick Mercury [Berwick-on-Tweed, England] on July 9, 1938. It had come to the Berwick Mercury from "a little known service that sent columns to provincial newspapers," says KEN BLACKWELL, to whom we are indebted for this article.

To understand our age, as it appears almost everywhere from the Rhine to the Pacific, it is necessary to go back to earlier times. At the end of the wars of religion, in the seventeenth century, men discovered that life is more agreeable if there is general toleration than if nations are divided into hostile factions bent on destroying each other. Christian sects gave up mutual persecution, the belief in witchcraft suddenly ceased, and in one nation after another, torture was abandoned as a recognized part of judicial procedure. Jews, like other minorities, profited by the decay of fanaticism, although they continued to suffer severe disabilities in Russia till 1917 and slighter ones in German till 1918. Everyone supposed that persecution was a thing of the past; the Spanish Inquisition roused retrospective horror even in the most devout Roman Catholics.

In the painful age in which we live, hardly anything is more horrible or more discouraging than the renewed persecution of the Jews. The sufferings which are inflicted on them wherever the Nazis have power are, in one respect, worse than those of former ages, for, in the past, it was, at least nominally, the religion, not the race, that was persecuted. Jews who outwardly became converts to Christianity escaped from oppression, except in Spain, where the Inquisition attempted by torture to prove the insincerity of conversions. But when, as now, it is the race that is persecuted, no escape is possible except by emigration. The German government professes to desire that German Jews should leave the country, but at the same time, it makes this impossible for most of them, since intending emigrants are first deprived of all their property, and then for permission to emigrate, are charged twenty-five percent of the property they no longer have. The result is that only those Jews can emigrate who have well-to-do friends or relations abroad, and then only by helping the finances of the State which is persecuting them.

Minorities abroad

Many Germans, perhaps a majority, no doubt, deplore the more extreme cruelties perpetrated against the Jews; nevertheless, most of them support the government which not only inflicts intolerable legal disabilities, but encourages unofficial sadistic outrages on the part of its criminal partisans. From what has happened in Austria, we know what would happen if Germany obtained control in the Sudeten district of Czechoslovakia. Whatever grievances the Germans in those districts may have, they are utterly insignificant in comparison with the misery which the Nazis would, if they could, inflict upon Jews, Socialists and Communists who now profit by the liberality of the Prague government. Such questions cannot be reckoned by counting heads. That millions should have put up with slight political disabilities is not so grave an evil as that hundreds should suffer the extreme of torture and agony. So long as Germans treat their Jewish minority as they do at present, they have no right to make demands on the behalf of German minorities in other countries. There is, from our point of view, no justification for treating such minorities badly; but from the point of view adopted by the Germans in dealing with their minorities, there is every justification.

Speaking historically, such liberties as are enjoyed by individuals and subordinate groups in countries which practice toleration were originally won by majorities in conflict with unpopular governments, especially kings. It was in order to combat the despotic acts of monarchs, that the doctrine of the Rights of Man was invented, and when governments became popular the doctrine was forgotten. But the oppression of a minority by a majority is no better, except numerically, than the oppression of a majority by a minority. The doctrine of the Rights of Man may be indefensible in its absolute theoretical form, but as a practical precept for the prevention of injustice and oppression it has been highly beneficial. It was forgotten when the evils against which it was directed appeared to have been overcome; but as soon as it was forgotten, the old evils reappeared.

A government which is enthusiastically supported by a large majority of the population is a great danger, particularly if it has won its popularity by an organized appeal to hatred. This is one of the chief merits of democratic government, that at all times not much less than half the nation are opposed to the men in power, and free to criticize them. In the hang-the-kaiser election of 1918, we saw what an appeal to hatred can do in our own country; but owing to free speech and parliamentary institutions the effect was temporary. There is no way of preventing occasional fits of insanity in nations, but it is only by a dictatorship that recovery can be prevented.

Tolerance: Not Hatred

What, in actual fact, can we do to help the Jews who are victims of Nazi cruelty? In the first place, we can bring pressure to bear upon our own government to be hospitable to refugees, and not too niggardly in granting them permission to earn a living among us. In the second place, we can and should proclaim our horror of Nazi wickedness, and our contempt for Nazi stupidity, which is pursuing exactly the same course that brought Spain to grief in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But I do not think that our dislike of the Nazis should make us willing to risk a great war. It is war and its aftermath that has made Germany fierce, and the next great war is likely to have the same effect upon us. In the course of defeating the Nazis in war, we shall acquire much of Nazi mentality, and even if they are defeated, their philosophy will triumph. It is only in peace, by propaganda and by readiness for economic cooperation wherever possible, that the outlook of the Nazis can be defeated.

At the time of the Tokyo earthquake, the inhabitants of that city turned upon the Koreans living there and massacred them, not because they supposed those harmless folk had caused the disaster, but because terror and misery made them wish to massacre somebody. We and the French spread terror and misery throughout

Germany in the years after the armistice; they could not massacre us, so they turned upon the Jews. It was a gesture of insanity; but if, as I firmly believe, terror and misery caused the insanity, it will not be cured by another dose of the same poison.

NOTES ON NUTTINESS

- (13) [This is a new section in the newsletter. Members are invited to send in instances of nuttiness that they come upon.]

Martin Gardner on Shirley McLaine. Gardner has earned his scientific credentials. He edited a column in Scientific American for years, and has written many books including, recently, "The Whys of a Philosophical Scrivener", and, not so recently, "Fads and Fallacies in the Name of Science" (NY:Dover1957).

In "The New York Review of Books (4/9/87), Gardner writes about McLaine's recent book, "Out On A Limb" (Bantam):

In "Out On A Limb", it is David Manning, a young occultist, who initiates Shirley into a smorgasbord of fashionable paranormal beliefs. Shirley later disclosed that David is a composite of "four spiritual men", each claiming to have known extraterrestrials from the Pleiades. The book swarms with occult shibboleths: energy vibrations (of which love is the highest), Karma, other dimensions, auras, OBEs (out-of-body experiences), synchronicity, ESP, precognition, holism, Atlantis, Lemuria, UFOs, the Shroud of Turin, and a hundred others.

...

Shirley and David face the surf on a Malibu beach, arms outstretched like Jesus on the cross. They repeatedly shout in unison, "I am God!"

...

David, who never gets mad, quotes Mayan as saying that if you want to get to the fruit on a tree, you have to go out on a limb.

...

Back in the Big Apple, in a taxi with Bella Abzug, Shirley tells about asking Maria, a Peruvian psychic, whether Bella will get the Democratic nomination for mayor she is seeking. No, said Maria, it will go to a "tall man with no hair and long fingers." Oy Vey! Could this be Ed Koch?

...

But Shirley McLaine's obsession with herself is accompanied by a canny (and highly profitable) capacity to touch the same qualities in the America public. All four of her autobiographies are available in a boxed set, and she is now working on a fifth. Who can guess what new astral adventures she will have to report? What will she learn next from Ram and other friendly spooks, from the occult junk books she keeps reading? Miss McLaine is now on a tour through sixteen cities, giving weekend seminars (\$300 per person) on how to get in touch with your Higher Self. She is also teaching how to heal yourself by visualizing colors -- blue for throat problems, orange for the liver, green for the heart, yellow for solar plexus.

Rationality, where art thou?

Want more nuttiness? We've only scratched the surface. It's all there in that splendid issue of the New York Review of Books.

FOR SALE

- (14) 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.

BR RECOLLECTED

- (15) Christopher Farley reminisces, at the Bertrand Russell Centenary Celebrations at McMaster University, on October 12, 1972. Farley had been BR's secretary, and is a Director of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. Autobiography III (NY:Simon & Schuster, p. 228) reveals BR's high opinion of Farley. The following is taken from Humanist in Canada, No. 23, with thanks to TOM STANLEY:

Many pieces of advice and wisdom which, over the years, I gleaned from Bertrand Russell crowd into my memory at this time. Two of them, pointing in different directions, may be appropriate to this occasion. "Do not be solemn," he urged. "Observation of life shows one that solemn people are generally humbugs." On another occasion he advised: "In the company of foreigners, do not attempt a joke. It is sure to fail." And so I commence, not too solemnly and — alas! — not too humorously either.

When a man of Bertrand Russell's stature dies near the end of his 86th year, his centenary is not yet the occasion to attempt a definitive assessment of his life and influence. In Russell's case two particular problems remain. First, he was such a prolific writer over eight decades in many lands that his papers are still being discovered, collected, or made available. Secondly, we are still too close to his own lifetime to view impartially all the controversies in which he continued to engage at such an advanced age. The future of the nuclear arms race, the relationships of the superpowers, and the conflict in Indo-China continue to dominate world politics.

If I forego the temptation to offer an assessment of Russell's life, I must equally decline to present a biographical sketch. Russell's life was so long and full and varied, his vitality so great, that I could not begin to do justice to it. Russell himself faced something of this problem. On his 86th birthday he began to publish his Autobiography, and it soon became clear that three volumes would still leave much unstated, however often he could refer to at least 60 other books which he had already written. Here, therefore, I must settle for something very much less ambitious than an assessment or even a sketch.

Unlike the Renaissance, our own age conditions us to beware of excellence in diverse fields. Russell has staked such a large claim to enduring fame in mathematical logic and philosophy that there is a danger that the whole man may be overshadowed in history by one part of his achievement. My purpose here, then, is to introduce one or two facets of Russell's life and character which may help to suggest the full measure of his stature.

Disillusionment and isolation

At the age of 18, in 1890, Russell went up to the University of Cambridge. His adolescence had been preoccupied in considerable part with doubts about religion and the search for indubitable knowledge. "What I most desired," he explained of his hopes of Cambridge, "was to find some reason for supposing

mathematics true." In his second year he was invited to join a small discussion society, the Apostles. "We took ourselves perhaps rather seriously," Russell recalled, "for we considered that the virtue of intellectual honesty was in our keeping. Undoubtedly, we achieved more of this than is common in the world, and I am inclined to think that the best intelligence of Cambridge has been notable in this respect." Russell went so far as to claim for Cambridge that "the one habit of thought of real value that I acquired there was intellectual honesty." There was, however, earlier evidence of it in his childhood. At the age of 11, with his brother Frank as tutor, Russell was introduced to Euclid, but was disappointed to discover that Euclid started with axioms. "At first," Russell recalled, "I refused to accept them unless my brother could offer me some reason for doing so, but he said: 'If you don't accept them we cannot go on'. As I wished to go on, I reluctantly admitted them pro tem."

When the first world war broke out, shattering the Victorian liberal optimism which Russell had largely shared, one of his many sorrows was to discover that "even at Cambridge, intellectual honesty had its limitations." "I had supposed," he wrote about the war, "that intellectuals frequently loved truth, but I found ... that not ten per cent of them prefer truth to popularity." And he recalled one intellectual friend who "went out of his way to write about the wickedness of the Germans, and the super-human virtue of Sir Edward Grey."

In 1907 Russell had stood for Parliament, unsuccessfully, as a women's suffrage candidate, and encountered an irrational popular opposition which warned him of the gulf between pre-war Cambridge and political life. Soon afterwards, he had tried to be nominated as a Liberal candidate for Parliament, but it came to nothing when he informed his interrogators of the local Liberal Association that not only was he an agnostic, but he and his wife would not be willing to attend church occasionally.

Russell's honesty was fundamental to his character, and so it had to be, because throughout his life it lost him friends, comfort and recognition. By the time of the first world war, when he had completed the most demanding and financially unrewarding of his technical work, Russell gave away the last of his inherited income because he felt it inconsistent with his purposes. Thereafter he lived by his pen and by lecturing, though, at times, in conditions of great financial insecurity.

Near the end of his life, he one day received a letter which he felt con-

tained a dishonest proposition. At once he dictated a brief reply and having signed it immediately, he instructed me to take it straight to the post office. Unaccustomed to such a practice, I hesitated in the doorway. Russell became visibly distressed. It was clear that he did not think his house quite clean until the offending correspondence had been answered and filed away.

It is difficult to see how such a man could have endured the discipline, deceptions and hypocrisy of a life in politics. Repeatedly his honesty and scepticism led him into an isolation which no politician can afford, by making him unpopular with orthodox opinion or powerful interests. In the struggle for votes for women, the opposition he encountered was greater even than the hostility he met in World War I. In 1914 he lost overnight nearly all his Liberal friends, and despite his doubts on the effectiveness of opposition to the war, he felt that "for the honour of human nature those who were not swept off their feet should show that they stood firm." This road led to the loss of his lectureship at Trinity College Cambridge and finally to jail. In 1916 he wrote a leaflet published by the 'No Conscription Fellowship' and was alarmed to find that those who distributed it were sent to prison. He at once wrote to The Times to admit his authorship, and as a consequence was fined one hundred pounds. At the great meeting in Leeds to celebrate the Kerensky revolution of February 1917, Russell, always avoiding the easy speech, devoted his remarks not to Russia but to the men in prison at home. He visited Russia shortly after the revolution and immediately lost most of his socialist friends by publishing a book of balanced criticisms. In 1927 he founded a progressive school and suffered much misrepresentation of its aims and methods. For his writings on Marriage and Morals he was judicially hounded out of City College, New York, and, for a time during World War II was penitence and taboo throughout the United States. His agnosticism, often provocatively formulated, enraged established opinion, but he managed also to upset some agnostics by urging the need for more Christian love. His call for nuclear disarmament in the 1950s put him outside the mainstream of the NATO-dominated politics of his country. In his 90th year he was back in Brixton prison, trying to find some means to warn man of impending annihilation. Undaunted, early in 1963, when most people in the West had no knowledge of events in Indo-China, he started a public campaign against the policies of the United States in Vietnam. Four years later he launched his

International War Crimes Tribunal, whose cautious findings were soon overtaken by the publication of the Pentagon Papers and the admission of massacres.

In case we are tempted to dismiss lightly the public abuse which Russell suffered throughout most of his adult life, it is worth recalling the terms in which the *New York Times* attacked him in May 1967 in a feature article at the time of the War Crimes Tribunal. Entitled "Corpse on Horseback," the article likened Russell to a mediaeval Moorish king who died on the eve of battle, but whose stiffened corpse was dressed, bound astride a warhorse and led against the enemy to encourage the troops. The article went on to describe Russell as a "relic", "led into battle as a totem," "a decrepit symbol," surrounded by "several mediocrities playing the role of yes men." The Tribunal, "stagemanaged" in Russell's name, was a "pretence", a "shoddy farce" with "nonentities who nodded approval." "The great philosopher," the article continued, "simply outlived his own conscious ideas and became clay in... unscrupulous hands." Russell was "an automatic sounding board for Communist drumbeats," a hero who had become "his own tomb", talking "like a zombie", a "wasted peer whose bodily endurance outpaced his brain," and "an unthinking transmission belt for the most transparent Communist lies," who had "thrown over all objectivity."

Russell felt such wounds deeply, not because his vanity was affected, but because such abuse was a cheap and effective means of reducing the public significance of his work. About a year later, in the middle of conversation, he asked me suddenly what I should like to see in my obituary notice. When I protested that nobody was ever likely to read or write my obituary, he persisted "It's your duty," he explained. "If you believe in anything important, it's your duty to get a good obituary for it." This sense of public duty was very strong in Russell, as was to be expected from his Whig aristocratic ancestry: to be a Russell was to be a radical in public life. Russell received many visitors at his home in his later years. The most damning criticism I ever heard him make of any of them after their departure was: "A pleasant fellow, but utterly lacking in public spirit."

In his childhood, his Puritan grandmother, Lady John Russell, who was responsible for his upbringing, gave Russell a Bible and inscribed on the fly-leaf some favourite texts. One of these was: "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil." It was an admonition which Russell might have written himself. What has been less widely recognised, however, was that Russell was not a lot better at following a multitude to do good. Here, in a passage which tells us so much about Russell, is his description of London on Armistice night, 1918:

"Late into the night I stayed alone in the streets, watching the temper of the crowd, as I had done in the August days four years before. The crowd was frivolous still, and had learned nothing

during the period of horror, except to snatch at pleasure more recklessly than before. I felt strangely solitary amid the rejoicings, like a ghost dropped by accident from some other planet. True, I rejoiced also, but I could find nothing in common between my rejoicing and that of the crowd. Throughout my life I have longed to feel that oneness with large bodies of human beings that is experienced by the members of enthusiastic crowds. The longing has often been strong enough to lead me into self-deception. I have imagined myself in turn a Liberal, a Socialist, or a Pacifist, but I have never been any of these things, in any profound sense. Always the sceptical intellect, when I have most wished it silent, has whispered doubts to me, has cut me off from the facile enthusiasms of others, and has transported me into a desolate solitude. During the War, while I worked with Quakers, non-resisters and Socialists, while I was willing to accept the unpopularity and the inconvenience belonging to unpopular opinions, I would tell the Quakers that I thought many wars in history had been justified, and the socialists that I dreaded the tyranny of the state. They would look askance at me, and, while continuing to accept my help, would feel that I was not one of them. Underlying all occupations and all pleasures I have felt since early youth the pain of solitude."

I read aloud to Russell this passage from his *Autobiography*, for the reading aloud of anything that gave pleasure was a continuing part of his life. "Was it really so?" I asked. "Oh yes. A little voice would ask me: 'You don't really believe that, do you?' And I didn't."

Doubts

With a constant stream of visitors, and in the thick of unorthodox plans, Russell was in a peculiarly good position to observe some of the weaknesses of frailer men. These often took the form of excessive vanity — a little of which he thought to be normal — or cowardice, which he thought despicable. He received many promises of support for his public work which evaporated. One visitor went so far as to agree with his actions but excuse himself on the grounds of what his friends might think. Russell was never again able to bring himself to take that visitor seriously. Of course many came to see Russell to satisfy their own vanity, and he knew it. They dined out for months on stories of tea with Russell, and often the stories came back to him, sometimes in recognisable form. "Every man," Russell observed on human vanity, "would like to be God if it were possible: some few find it difficult to admit the impossibility."

What troubled Russell more than human frailty were doubts about the effectiveness of his own actions. By the time he had been sent to prison in World War I, he had come to feel that he had done what he could against the war and there was little point in continuing. In his later years, he saw his public work as "a puny effort against vast forces", and sometimes questioned its value.

When, on occasions, he told me he was not certain if such work had any value, I could only reply that if he really believed that, he would not be living as he did. "I suppose that is so," he would say, but something of the doubts lingered. Many strangers wrote to him from all over the world to thank him for writing his books. "They have changed my life," was a phrase which frequently recurred. This too encouraged Russell, and in case he overlooked the value of his writings, I moved all his own published works, which occupied five shelves in his library, from their modest place, tucked away behind his usual chair, and placed them opposite him.

Fame

But this is to see Russell out of perspective. He survived years of abuse with amazing resilience, and lived to see almost all his unconventional views become widespread or conventional — from support for women's suffrage to opposition to the war in Indo-China. His influence was worldwide, making him a legend in his own life-time. This he achieved without once holding political office, and usually without even the help of a university chair. On different occasions, Russell sent me to Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Auschwitz and Hanoi. I found there that the school children talked of him, while their parents saw him as some secular saint who might deliver 20th century man from his tormentors. In many nations without civil liberties or dominated by powerful neighbours, Russell was regarded as a national hero. I saw something of this in Greece at the funeral of the murdered Member of Parliament, Gregory Lambrakis. Political demonstrations were forbidden, but a quarter of a million Athenians turned out for the funeral procession with prolonged cries of "Russell, Russell." In 1968, with his usual foresight, he had appealed publicly to Brezhnev weeks in advance not to intervene militarily in Czechoslovakia. When the tanks rolled into Prague, his name became a household word there, and during the censorship was used as a form of shorthand to reveal what the Czech speaker really wished to say. The first day I arrived in Hanoi, in 1964, I found myself in a reception of many hundreds of foreign visitors. Almost immediately the Prime Minister came through the crowd and I learned later that he had asked to be informed of the arrival of Russell's emissary. For 20 minutes Pham Van Dong discussed in perfect French his study of Russell in Paris in his youth, and of his gratitude that such a man should tell the West what was happening to his people. Russell indeed corresponded with dozens of heads of state, and was far better known than many of them. In all such activity he was sustained by his hopes for the future, his vision of man's potential dignity, the love of his family and friends and the gratitude of strangers.

Throughout his life Russell frequently gave great alarm to those who imagined superficially that he held with them an identity of views in a given

field. We may see this clearly from his writings on socialism.

He accepted the orthodox socialist view of the alienating and dehumanising nature of capitalism, and of the need for economic justice. "Except slavery," he said, "the present industrial system is the most destructive of life that has ever existed." And he made much fun of the sanctity of private property under capitalism:

"We may distinguish four chief sources of recognised legal rights to private property: (1) a man's right to what he has made himself; (2) the right to interest on capital which has been lent; (3) the ownership of land; (4) inheritance. These form a crescendo of respectability: capital is more respectable than labour, land is more respectable than capital, and any form of wealth is more respectable when it is inherited than when it has been acquired by our own exertions." Russell's advocacy of social change was scarcely moderate. "What our modern society needs," he urged, "is not a little tinkering here and there, nor the kind of minor readjustments to which the existing holders of power may readily consent, but a fundamental reconstruction, a sweeping away of all the sources of oppression, a liberation of men's constructive energies, and a wholly new way of conceiving and regulating production and economic relations." He saw the chief defect of the capitalistic system in its denial not of economic justice but of any outlet for the creative impulse.

Justice as an end in itself, he argued, "contains no source of new life". He wrote mockingly of the "old type of Marxian revolutionary socialist" who ignored problems of life after the inauguration of the millennium, and who "imagined that, like the prince and princess in a fairy story, they would live happily ever after." "While I am," he explained, "as convinced a socialist as the most ardent Marxian, I do not regard socialism as a gospel of proletarian revenge, nor even primarily as a means of securing economic justice. I regard it primarily as an adjustment to machine production demanded by considerations of common sense, and calculated to increase the happiness not only of proletarians, but of all except a tiny minority of the human race." The continuation of large-scale industry, which Russell saw as inevitable, need not hinder the growth of industrial democracy: "there is no reason why their government should be centralised and monarchical." State socialism without industrial democracy led straight to the tyranny of bureaucracy. In a socialist society, what was important was to give the largest measure of freedom to initiative and vitality, to emphasize creativity and reduce concern about possessions. To ignore such considerations was to ignore the danger to liberty from the State. It was in part his prediction, before the October revolution, of the disaster of state socialist forms of organisation, which led him to welcome so enthusiastically the Czechoslovak "Spring" of 1968, the concept of "socialism with a human

face" was reasserted as the objective.

Education

Russell's concern for liberty and creativity similarly informed his approach to education. In the Twenties, when he began to have children and consider their education, he could find no school of which he wholly approved. With typical thoroughness he gave up almost everything to found his own school where prudery and religious instruction were absent; restraints on freedom were minimal but scholastic instruction was held to be important. Unfortunately, he recalled, his school had more than its fair share of problem children and far more than its fair share of problem parents.

The ideal character, he held, was based on four characteristics: "vitality, courage, sensitiveness, and intelligence. I do not suggest," he added, "that this list is complete, but I think it carries us a good way. Moreover, I firmly believe that, by proper physical, emotional and intellectual care of the young, these qualities could all be made very common."

The task of a liberal education was "to give a sense of the value of things other than domination, to help to create wise citizens of a free community, and through the combination of citizenship with liberty in individual creativeness to enable men to give to human life that splendour which some few have shown that it can achieve."

This led Russell to his key to happiness: "A life lived in ... the spirit that aims at creating rather than possessing has a certain fundamental happiness, of which it cannot be wholly robbed by adverse circumstances. This is the way of life recommended in the Gospels, and by all the great teachers of the world. Those who have found it are freed from the tyranny of fear, since what they value most in their lives is not at the mercy of outside power." Such unorthodox views did not allow Russell to be a great respecter of many educational institutions which he frequently assailed with his wit. As an undergraduate at Cambridge, he was persuaded that lecturers were "a wholly unnecessary part of the university." He claimed to derive no benefit from lectures, and vowed to himself that when he became a lecturer he would not suppose that lecturing did any good. "I have kept this vow," he added.

But he went far further than this, "Men who allow their love of power to give them a distorted view of the world," he wrote, "are to be found in every asylum: one man will think he is the Governor of the Bank of England, another will think he is the King, and yet another will think he is God. Highly similar delusions, if expressed by educated men in obscure language, lead to professorships of philosophy; and if expressed by emotional men in eloquent language, lead to dictatorships."

Reading Russell's letters and essays gives enormous satisfaction and joy. First there is the beauty of his prose. In

his youth he had been strongly influenced by the style of his lay godfather, John Stuart Mill. He soon found that he could write with scarcely any revision by contemplating his subject and then allowing it a period of "sub-conscious incubation". In time "it would germinate underground until, suddenly, the solution emerged with blinding clarity, so that it only remained to write down what had appeared as if in a revelation." This made him a most lucid writer and populariser of scientific ideas. He had one favourite example of execrable prose which he dreamed up for a work on sociology:

"Human beings are completely exempt from undesirable behaviour patterns only when certain prerequisites, not satisfied except in a small percentage of actual cases, have, through some fortuitous concourse of favourable circumstances, whether congenital or environmental, chanced to combine in producing an individual in whom many factors deviate from the norm in a socially advantageous manner."

This Russell translated as follows:

"All men are scoundrels, or at any rate almost all. The men who are not must have had unusual luck, both in their birth and in their upbringing."

Russell added, typically, that any professor who used his translation instead of the original would be dismissed.

But there is far more to Russell's essays than his Nobel prizewinning prose style and clarity. He allowed himself the broadest canvas, stood conventional ideas on their head, illustrated his themes with the widest range of knowledge; he leaves his reader confident that he could have written with authority, interest and wit on almost anything. He also had almost uncanny predictive abilities which preserve much of his writing from becoming dated; his books continue to be much in demand. Here is a sentence from 1916 which sounds far more like a contribution to the debate on the defence of the environment a full half-century later: "Our present system is wasteful of human material ... The same is true of material resources—the minerals, the virgin forests and the newly developed wheatfields of the world are being exhausted with a reckless prodigality which entails almost a certainty of hardship for future generations."

As a writer, Russell continues to make a memorable impression on readers in many lands. But it was as a conversationalist that he was most convincing that one was in the company of genius. When he died in 1970, the Prime Minister of the day, Harold Wilson, whom Russell had criticised so severely in office, found himself faced with the problem of what to say, just as King George VI before him had done when awarding Russell the Order of Merit. Wilson's speechwriter saved the day by pointing to Russell's brilliance in conversation. One is tempted to ask how Wilson knew of this, for he met

Russell only once for some 10 seconds. It was in the summer of 1964 when Wilson was looking for votes. Since Russell as a member of the House of Lords was debarred from voting, the conversation was necessarily brief.

Russell's conversation when he relaxed at home was the delight of all who shared it. His vast knowledge of literature, much of which he had committed to memory, and of history reflected a lifetime's reading and his appreciation of both beauty and knowledge. Shakespeare's sonnets, Gibbon, Milton, Shelley and Dante flowed with particular fulness in the company of hundreds of poets, essayists and playwrights. Then there was always the hope that Russell would produce a portrait from memory. These were not so frequent, because he was never a name-dropper, but if the conversation turned naturally to a personal friend, one could be treated to a dazzling recollection. William James, John Dewey, Moore, Gilbert Murray, D.H. Lawrence, Conrad, the Webbs, Shaw, Wells, Keynes, Toynbee, Einstein — Russell knew them all, and so many more. He could also produce the most unusual pieces of information, and long quotations from the Old Testament (complete with verse numbers) or from childhood hymns. But he was also a good listener. Many were the times I complained that he was reckless with the hours he gave to listen to strangers, but he would have none of it, for this was his means of keeping up with public opinion, and he kept up uncommonly well. Russell remained shy throughout his life, but once he got to know a person he would regale him with his wit, which gave enormous pleasure, not least to Russell.

One wide misunderstanding of Russell's life is that thousands of people through the press came to think of him as a distant, aloof, Cassandra-like figure, forecasting in solemn tones nuclear doom for the human race. The truth was very different: he was always joking. His love of irony, his sense of the absurd and his hatred of humbug combined with the amazing speed of his brain to produce a flow of brilliant epigrams and aphorisms which often left the listener reaching for his notepad or at least content to make the conversation a monologue. The extraordinary part of it was that, although he also had a fine stock of well-worn jokes, both they and his instant epigrams were always relevant to the discussion. Here are a very few which I noted over his last 10 years:

"To win the Nobel Peace Prize, one must make statements which are at least 10 years too late to be useful."

"The difference between machines and human beings is that machines are subject to error."

"The Prime Minister is preserving the House of Lords as a first step to making the Premiership hereditary."

"Sir Moses Montefiore retired in 1824, and I later came to know him."

"I cannot think how anyone who has had anything to do with education can believe that all men are equal."

"The lady's father ruined himself by the pursuit of fast women and slow horses."

"There is a very fine passage in Gibbon which refers, I believe, to St. Thomas. Gibbon enumerates his vast wealth acquired after taking his vow of poverty, and adds 'I forget the consequences of his vow of chastity'."

Finally, a note I made only nine days before Russell's death:

"People's opinions are not dictated by their virtues but by their circumstances."

Often I felt that there was more of the poet than the politician in Russell. On the eve of his departure to Russia in 1920 he wrote to Lady Constance Malleson:

"I know that no good thing is achieved without fighting, without ruthlessness and organisation and discipline. I know that for collective action the individual must be turned into a machine. But in these things, though my reason may force me to believe them, I can find no inspiration. It is the individual human soul that I love — in its loneliness, its hopes and fears, its quick impulses and sudden devotions. It is such a long journey from this to armies and states and officials, and yet it is only by making this long journey that one can avoid a useless sentimentalism."

Russell's reluctance to make that "long journey" was in part because he felt it to be a journey to a spiritual death, to a world of politics dominated by acquisitiveness, vanity, rivalry and love of power. It was a dilemma he never resolved satisfactorily, though he found many ways of stating it: "Only kindness," he wrote in 1924 in reply to Haldane's optimism on the future of science, "can save the world, and even if we knew how to produce kindness, we should not do so unless we were already kindly."

Seven years later Russell returned to these themes: "The lover, the poet and the mystic," he wrote, "find a fuller satisfaction than the seeker after power can ever know, since they can retain the object of their love, whereas the seeker after power must be perpetually engaged in some fresh manipulation if he is not to suffer from a sense of emptiness. When I come to die I shall not feel that I have lived in vain. I have seen the earth turning red at evening, the dew sparkling in the morning, the snow shining under a frosty sun; I have smelt rain after drought, and have heard the stormy Atlantic beat upon the granite shores of Cornwall. Science may bestow these and the other joys among more people than could otherwise enjoy them. If so, its power will be wisely used. But when it takes out of life the moments to which life owes its value, science will not deserve admiration, however cleverly and however elaborately it may lead men along the road to despair."

Russell's character was dominated by his courage, vitality and wit. He was gentle, shy, modest, even vulnerable. Cruelty he hated, and he felt deeply the pains of others. He himself radiated that "kindly feeling" which he held to be the hope of the world, and received

affection because he gave it so fully. He clearly loved every minute of life, and gave his time and money, when available, with an almost reckless generosity. "Psychologists," he once told me, "would say that's proof of how much I love money." Liberated from the Puritanism of his childhood, he was happy but self-disciplined and highly productive. He took great joy in impulse and mental delight, and was uncomfortable when not close to nature. He would stop anything to watch the slow setting of the sun, and insisted on living in houses with wide horizons. He was genuinely tolerant, not in any paternalistic manner, and delighted in the company of the young. Strikingly he practised what he preached, so that there was no dichotomy between his public and private lives. He was not a man to guard secrets from the world, when he came to hold beliefs or approve practices, his impulse was to publish them. In the preface to his book *The Conquest of Happiness* he wrote: "All that I claim for the recipes offered to the reader is that they are such as are confirmed by my own experience and observation, and that they have increased my own happiness whenever I have acted in accordance with them."

The life of Bertrand Russell was of epic proportions. His maternal grandmother took tea regularly in Florence with the widow of the Young Pretender, Bonnie Prince Charlie, whose cause failed in 1746. His grandfather visited Napoleon on Elba. History, it was said in the family, ended in 1815; after that it was gossip. Russell grew up at the centre of public affairs, expecting to meet the politicians and men of letters of his day. He had friendships and debates with hundreds of the most eminent literary, scientific and political figures of his lifetime. In his chosen fields he achieved fame at an early age, becoming a Fellow of the Royal Society when only 36. In Moscow he interviewed Lenin and Trotsky after their revolution, and he lectured to the young Mao Tse-tung in Peking. His vitality as a traveller, controversialist, writer and friend of the oppressed, were prodigious and enduring; he published more than 20 books after his 80th birthday. If men continue to walk this planet much of his work will be read with benefit a hundred years from now. The prescience of much of his general writing, constantly reprinted without alteration, shows him far ahead of his times.

Throughout his life he sought not only to clarify his ideas but to gain their acceptance by publics and by men of power. He intervened repeatedly in public affairs. No sacrifice was too great, whether it invited ignominy or imprisonment, to further the cause of reason, to diminish cruelty, or to increase the happiness of his fellow men.

For those who knew him well, the totality of his life was greater than the sum of its parts. He gave his friends a memory of a life of genius which they treasure. The dignity and beauty of his life followed closely his own definition of the good life: one "inspired by love and guided by knowledge."

BR, LETTER WRITER

- (16) A thank-you note. A friend of ours, Jean Hollyman, who had taken pictures of BR IN 1947, for a magazine, afterwards received this note:

27, Dorset House,
Gloucester Place,
LONDON, N.W.1.

21st January, 1947.

Dear Friend (whose name I cannot decipher),

It was very kind of you to send me some pipe cleaners, and you are right in thinking that they are very difficult to get in this country. You were also right to employ a typewriter rather than handwriting, if I may judge by your signature, which completely baffled me.

I enjoyed the occasion on which we met more than I usually enjoy being "shot".

Yours sincerely,

Bertrand Russell

ASSESSMENTS OF BR

- (17) RAMON CARTER SUZARA spent the Marcos years in the USA, and is now back in Manila. This is an article by him as it appeared in Manila's Chronicle Magazine of September 11, 1962:

"**EVERYBODY** knows," wrote Bertrand Russell in *The ABC of Relativity*, "that Einstein did something astonishing, but very few people know exactly what it is that he did." The same can be said of Lord Russell himself. Widely acclaimed as a world renowned mathematician and one of the greatest of living philosophers, he is also one of the most misunderstood and bitterly maligned. Many of those who are familiar with his mathematical and philosophical works and appreciate his prolific contribution to that body of knowledge have joined the multitude of mediocres and philistines in degrading his political attachment to world peace, democracy, and socialism. Their attitude seems to stem from either of two basic assumptions: that Russell the mathematician and philosopher is competent, while Russell the political thinker is amateurish; or, that Russell the political thinker is the product of old age.

The second assumption derives mainly from an insufficient familiarity with the man and his ideas. Before the First World War, Russell produced books on which his intellectual reputation

was based: *The Foundation of Geometry*, *The Philosophy of Leibniz*, *The Principles of Mathematics*, and, in collaboration with Alfred North Whitehead, *Principia Mathematica*, which consumed most of Russell's intellectual energy.

Militant Pacifism

But as early as the First World War, Russell had recognized that a lot of his "rational ideas" were wrong and that most men were not so rational as he believed. The War plunged him into a shock of despair and horror. But his mood passed from passive despair into active opposition to the war: he enlisted as a member of the "No-Conscription Fellowship," the main organization of the pacifist and anti-war propaganda. Rather than prove sheer animal courage in the battlefield of the unjustifiable "war of prestige" among nations, he chose to demonstrate moral courage by his refusal to enlist and made a public appeal to his countrymen to do so. He took up the banner of militant pacifism and thus had his first open clash with the homicidal instincts of those who ran his

country's Government. Amidst the ridicule of the mob, he was sent to jail for his beliefs.

But those who do not know and deliberately ignore this episode in Russell's life are unable to understand why, at the height of his academic fame, he should lend his prestige to the struggle against political persecution and belligerent policies. Using as the absolute measure of "reasonableness" their own moral cowardice and herd mentality, Russell's detractors have called him senile in order to diminish his appeal to the conscience of the civilized world.

There is a gross misconception in the first assumption that Russell the mathematician and philosopher is competent, while Russell the political thinker is amateurish. The fact is, Russell abandoned mathematics for philosophy because his philosophy was always and is related with politics and social life.

Shaking the Foundation

Having lived from childhood in the realms of abstract thought and incessantly in search of "certainty" in knowledge, he began to question certain principles in mathematical laws. In *Principia Mathematica*, Russell fulfilled his wishes, for the calculated result of that book was that it shook the foundation of mathematics accepted ever since the time of Pythagoras. Russell pointed out existing mathematical and philosophical "contradictions" and succeeded in reducing mathematics to logic. In logic he showed that there are many more forms of "inferences" than Aristotle had taught. Thus Russell became a world renowned mathematician. But, when people also ask why Russell is also one of the greatest logicians, the simple reply is that he also showed how little logic can do.

Before the War, Russell's attitude to mathematics was expressed in an article called "The Study of Mathematics": "Mathematics, rightly viewed, possesses not only truth, but supreme beauty—a beauty cold and austere, like that of sculpture, without appeal to any part of our weaker nature, without the gorgeous trappings of painting or music, yet sublimely pure, and capable of stern perfection such as only the greatest art can show. The true spirit of delight, the exaltation, the sense of being more than man, which is the touchstone of the highest excellence, is to be found in mathematics as surely as in poetry."

But after shaking the foundation of mathematics, he was disappointed at not finding "certainty," partly because of technical reasons but precisely because of his political thoughts.

Farewell to Math

In later years, in *My Philosophical Development*, he wrote:

"Mathematics has ceased to seem to me non-human in its subject matter. I have come to believe, though very reluctantly, that it consists of tautologies. I fear that, to a mind of sufficient intellectual power, the whole of mathematics would appear trivial, as trivial as the statement that a four-footed animal is an animal. I think that the timelessness of mathematics has none of the sublimity that it once seemed to me to have, but consists merely in the fact that the pure mathematician is not talking about time... One effect

of [the First World] War was to make it impossible for me to go on living in a world of abstraction. I used to watch young men embarking in troop trains to be slaughtered in Somme because generals were stupid. I felt an aching compassion for these young men, and found myself united to the actual world in a strange marriage of pain.

All the high-flown thoughts that I had had about the abstract world of ideas seemed to me thin and rather trivial in view of the vast suffering that surrounded me. The non-human world remained as an occasional refuge but not as a country in which to build one's permanent habitation."

An author of more than sixty books, Russell wrote on subjects ranging from mathematics, logic, and philosophy to religion, ethics, war, economics, and politics. He wrote a book in 1917 called *Political Ideals*, and most probably the assumption that he is an amateurish political thinker derives from it.

Quotable Russell

Undoubtedly, the homicidal maniacs will judge it as amateurish. But let us see its validity in the light of the following quotations from the book:

"Political ideals must be based upon ideals for the individual life. The aim of politics should be to make the lives of individuals as good as possible. There is nothing for the politician to consider outside or above the various men, women and children who compose the world... The world is full of preventable evils which most men would be glad to see prevented. Nevertheless, these evils persist, and nothing effective is done toward abolishing it."

"The [First World] War has come as a challenge to all those who desire a better world. The system which cannot save mankind from appalling disaster is a fault somewhere, and cannot be amended in any lasting way unless the danger of great wars in the future can be made very small."

"But war is only the final fruit of an evil tree—Even in times of peace, most men live lives of monotonous labour, most women are condemned to a drudgery which almost kills the possibility of happiness before youth is past, most children are allowed to grow up in ignorance of all that would enlarge their thoughts or stimulate their imagination. The few who are more fortunate are rendered illiberal by their unjust privileges, and oppressive through fear of the awakening indignation of the masses. From the highest to the lowest, almost all men are absorbed in the economic struggle: the struggle to acquire what is their due or to retain what is not their due. Material possessions, in fact or in desire, dominate our outlook, usually to the exclusion of all generous and creative impulses. Possessiveness—the passion to have and to hold—is the ultimate source of war, and the foundation of all ills from which the political world is suffering. Only by diminishing the strength of this passion and its hold upon our daily lives can new institutions bring permanent benefit to mankind."

On Nationalism and Internationalism

In the same book, he wrote about national independence and internationalism:

"A man does right, as a rule, to have his

thoughts more occupied with the interests of his own nation than those of others, because his actions are more likely to affect his own nation. But in time of war, and in all matters which are of equal concern to other nations and to his own, a man ought to take account of the universal welfare, and not allow his survey to be limited by the interest, or supposed interest, of his own group or nation."

... "The matter in which the interest of nations are supposed to clash are mainly three: tariffs, which are a delusion; the exploitation of inferior races, which is a crime; pride of power and dominion, which is a schoolboy folly."

... "So long as hatred, suspicion, and fear dominate the feelings of men toward each other, so long we cannot hope to escape from the tyranny of violence and brute force. Men must learn to be conscious of the common interests in which the nations are divided. It is not necessary, or even desirable, to obliterate the differences of manners and customs and traditions between different nations. These differences enable each nation to make its own distinctive contribution to the sum total of the world's civilization."

... "The international spirit which we should wish to see produced will be something added to love of country, not something taken away. Just

as patriotism does not prevent a man from feeling affection for his own country. But it will somewhat alter the character of that affection. The things which he will desire for his own country will no longer be things which can only be acquired at the expense of others, but rather those things in which the excellence of any one country is to the advantage of all the world. He will wish his own country to be great in the arts of peace, to be eminent in thought, to be magnanimous and just and generous. He will wish it to help mankind on the way toward that better world of liberty and international concord which must be realized if any happiness is to be left to man. He will not desire for his country the passing triumphs of a narrow possessiveness, but rather the enduring triumph of having helped to embody in human affairs something of that spirit of brotherhood which Christ taught and which the Christian churches have forgotten. He will see that this spirit embodies not only the highest morality, but also the truest wisdom, and the only road by the nations, torn and bleeding with the wounds which scientific madness has inflicted, can emerge into a life where growth is possible and joy is not banished at the frenzied call of unreal duties, whatever pain and self-sacrifice they may involve. Life and hope for the world are to be found only in the deeds of love."

THE RUSSELL SOCIETY LIBRARY
Tom Stanley, Librarian

(18) Books to lend:

When no author is indicated, the work is by Bertrand Russell. The doner's name appears at the end.

1. History of Western Philosophy. Jack Ragsdale.
2. Mysticism and Logic.
3. Bertrand Russell's Best. Ramon Suzara.
4. An Outline of Philosophy. Ramon Suzara.
5. Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, Vol.1. Ramon Suzara.
6. Let Me Die Before I Wake. by Derek Humphery.
7. Essay on Bertrand Russell. edited by E. D. Klemke. Bob Davis.
8. Morals Without Mystery. by Lee Eisler. Author.
9. Authority and The Individual. Don Jackanicz.
10. Autobiography of Bertrand Russell (in 1 Vol.). Don Jackanicz.
11. Bertrand Russell 1872-1970. Don Jackanicz.
12. Bertrand Russell - A Life. by Herbert Gottschalk. Don Jackanicz.
13. Education and the Social Order. Don Jackanicz.
14. Effects and Dangers of Nuclear War. Don Jackanicz.
15. Essays on Socialist Humanism. Don Jackanicz.
16. German Social Democracy. Don Jackanicz.
17. Icarus or The Future of Science. Don Jackanicz.
18. The Impact of Science on Society. Don Jackanicz.
19. An Inquiry into the Meaning of Truth. Don Jackanicz.
20. In Praise of Idleness. Don Jackanicz.
21. Has Man a Future. Don Jackanicz.
22. Justice in Wartime. Don Jackanicz.
23. National Frontiers and International Cooperation. by Zhores Medvedev. Don Jackanicz.
24. My Philosophical Development. Don Jackanicz.
25. Political Ideals. Don Jackanicz.
26. Principles of Social Reconstruction. Don Jackanicz.

27. The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism. Don Jackanicz.
28. Roads of Freedom. Don Jackanicz.
29. Sceptical Essays. Don Jackanicz.
30. Secrecy of Correspondence Is Guaranteed By Law. by Zhores Medvedev.
Don Jackanicz.
31. The Tamarish Tree. by D. Russell. Don Jackanicz.
32. Mr. Wilson Speaks "frankly..." Don Jackanicz.
33. Marriage and Morals. Don Jackanicz.
34. Dear Bertrand Russell. Jack Ragsdale.
35. Education and The Good Life. Jack Ragsdale and Lee Eisler.
36. Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits. Jack Ragsdale.
37. Why I Am Not A Christian. Jack Ragsdale.
38. The Evolution of Conscience. Ralph Newman. Jack Ragsdale.
39. The Conquest of Happiness. Lee Eisler.
40. The ABC of Relativity. Lee Eisler.
41. Bertrand Russell, The Passionate Sceptic. by Alan Wood. Don Jackanicz.
42. Mortals and Others. Don Jackanicz.
43. Unarmed Victory. Don Jackanicz.
44. The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation its aims and its work.
45. Yes to Life, by Corliss Lamont. The Author.
46. Russell. by A.J. Ayer. Ramon Suzara.
47. The Will to Doubt. Ramon Suzara.
48. The Life of Bertrand Russell. by Ronald Clark. Ramon Suzara.
49. The Problems of Philosophy. Ramon Suzara.
50. Unpopular Essays. Ramon Suzara.
51. Human Society in Ethics and Politics. Don Jackanicz.
52. Principles and Perplexities: Studies of Dualism in Selected Essays and Fiction of Bertrand Russell. by Gladys Leithauser.
The Author
53. Photos, 1983 BRS Annual Meeting at McMaster University, June 24-26, 1983. Jim Mc Williams.
54. The Art of Fund Raising. by Irving Warner. Bob Davis
55. The Grass Roots Fundraising Book. by Joan Flanagan. Bob Davis
56. Dear Russell-Dear Jourdain. by I. Grattan-Guinness. Bob Davis
57. Why Men Fight. Bob Davis
58. Grants. by Virginia White. Bob Davis
59. Fund Raising for the Small Organization. by Philip Sheriden. Bob Davis.
60. The Grantsmanship Center Training Program. Bob Davis
61. Nonprofit Organization Handbook. by P.V. and D.M. Gaby. Bob Davis
62. Successful Fundraising Techniques. by Daniel Conrad. Bob Davis
63. The Foundation Directory. Bob Davis.
64. Great Americans Examine Religion. by Ralph de Sola. Jack Ragsdale.
65. But For The Grace of God. by Peter Cranford. Jack Ragsdale.
66. Godel, Escher, Bach. by Douglas Hofstadter. Lee Eisler.
67. The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell, Vol. I. Cambridge Essays, 1888-99. Edited by Blackwell, et al. Allen & Unwin.
68. The Right to Be Happy. by Mrs. Bertrand Russell. Al Seckel.
69. Power, A New Social Analysis. Al Seckel.
70. Bertrand Russell, A Bibliography of his Writings, 1895-1976
Compiled by Werner Martin. Al Seckel.
71. Satan in the Suburbs. Al Seckel.
72. My Father, Bertrand Russell. by Katharine Tait. Al Seckel.
73. A Matter of Life. Edited by Clara Urquhart. Al Seckel.
74. Essays In Skepticism. Al Seckel.
75. The Problem of China. Al Seckel.
76. Russell On General Facts by Ausonio Marras and Russell, Frege, and The "Meaning" of The Theory of Descriptions. Papers read at the 1976 Meeting of the A.P.A.
77. Acquaintance and Naming: A Russellian Theme in Epistemology by Augustin Riska and Russell on the Essence of Desire by Raymond Frey. Papers read at the 1977 Meeting of the A.P.A.
78. On Russellian Clusters by Eugene Schlossberger and Repression in Bertrand Russell's "On Education" by Howard Woodhouse. Papers read at the 1978 Meeting of the A.P.A.
79. Definition and Description in Russell, 1900-1910 by Thomas Barron and Russell and Ontological Excess by D.A. Griffiths. Papers read at the 1979 Meeting of the A.P.A.
80. Russell On Logical Truth, by Nicholas Griffin. The Author
81. Bertrand Russell and the Origin of the Set-Theoretic Paradoxes by Alejandro Ricardo Garcadiago Dantan. The Author.
82. Bertrand Russell, America, and the Idea of Social Justice by Roland Stromberg. The Author.

83. The Relevance of Bertrand Russell To Psychology and Bertrand Russell's Conception of the Meaning of Life by Peter Cranford. The Author.
84. Dictionary of the Mind, Matter, and Morals. Edited by Lester Dennon. Tom Stanley.
85. Bertrand Russell Speaks His Mind. Tom Stanley
86. The Bertrand Russell Library of Lester Dennon. Tom Stanley
87. The Analysis of Mind. Tom Stanley
88. Religion and Science. Tom Stanley
89. Portraits From Memory. Tom Stanley.
90. The Scientific Outlook. Tom Stanley.
91. Wisdom of the West. Tom Stanley.
92. The Principles of Mathematics. Tom Stanley.
93. Bertrand Russell: Philosopher and Humanist by John Lewis. Tom Stanley
94. The Good Citizen's Alphabet. Whitfield Cobb.
95. War Crimes in Vietnam. Whitfield Cobb.
96. Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy. Whitfield Cobb.
97. The Prospects of Industrial Civilization. Whitfield Cobb.
98. Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus by Wittgenstein. Introduction by Russell. Whitfield Cobb.
99. Freedom Versus Organization. Whitfield Cobb.
100. Bertrand Russell and His World by Clark. W.W.Norton.
101. The Final Epidemic: Physicians and Scientists on Nuclear War edited by Adams and Cullen. P.S.R., N.H. chapter.
102. Photographs, Kalinga Prize Award Ceremony. Paris, January, 1957. UNESCO
103. Theory of Knowledge: The 1913 Manuscript, Volume VII of the Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell. Allen & Unwin.
104. Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare. Philip LeCompte.
105. Late Night Thoughts on Listening to Mahler's Ninth Symphony by Lewis Thomas. Dan McDonald.
106. Six Men by Alistair Cooke. Craig McGee.
107. Bertrand Russell and the Pacifists in the First World War by Jo Vellacott. St. Martin's Press.
108. Russell by Kilmister. St. Martin's Press.
109. Contemplation and Action, Volume XII of the Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell. Allen & Unwin.
110. Bertrand Russell's America 1945-1970 by Feinburg and Kasrils. The South End Press.
111. Dewey and Russell: An Exchange edited by Samuel Meyer. The Philosophical Library.
112. Philosophical Essays. Ramon Suzara.
113. Bertrand Russell: A Classified Bibliography by Harry Ruja. Offprint. The Author.
114. Principles of Polemic in Russell by Harry Ruja. Offprint. The Author.
115. Bertrand Russell edited by Ann Redpath. Creative Education, Inc.
116. Bertrand Russell by Paul Kuntz. G.K. Hall (publisher).
117. Noam Chomsky: A Philosophic Overview by Justin Leiber. Bob Davis.
118. ABC Broadcasts. Transcripts of Russell's 1950 broadcasts in Australia. Document Archivist, Australian Broadcasting Company.
119. The Philosophy of Logical Atomism and Other Essays, Volume VIII of the Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell. Allen & Unwin.
120. Bertrand Russell on Compossibility by Peter Cranford. The Author.
121. The Dora Russell Reader. Methuen, Inc.
122. The Religion of the Machine Age by Dora Russell. Methuen, Inc.
123. Who Wrote Bertrand Russell's 'Wisdom of the West?' by Carl Spadoni. Offprint. The Author.
124. The Philosophy of Logical Atomism edited and with an introduction by David Pears. Open Court
125. The Development of Bertrand Russell's Philosophy by Ronald Jager. The Author.
126. Burali-Forti's Paradox: A Reappraisal of its Origins by Moore and Garciadiego. Offprint. Alejandro Garciadiego.
127. Russell's Earliest Reactions to Cantorian Set Theory and Russell's Problems with the Calculus by Irving Anellis. Offprints. Together with abstracts of papers on logic and mathematics by Anellis. The Author.
128. Bertrand Russell's Library by Spadoni and Harley. In "The Journal of Library History". Tom Stanley.
129. Bertrand Russell's Early Approaches To Literature, Bertrand Russell's First Short Story: The Perplexities of John Forstice As "Spiritual Autobiography" and "The World As It Can Be Made": Bertrand Russell's Protest Against The First World War by Margaret Moran. Offprints. The Author.
130. The Importance To Philosophers of The Bertrand Russell Archive, Bertrand Russell-The Radical and "Perhaps you will think me fussy...": Three Myths In Editing Russell's "Collected Papers" by Kenneth Blackwell. The Author.

131. The Concept Of Growth In Bertrand Russell's Educational Thought by Howard Woodhouse. In "The Journal Of Educational Thought". The Author.

There is no charge for borrowing books. The borrower pays postage both ways. Please note the one-way postage shown below, and remit that amount when returning the books.

39¢ #11, 14, 32, 44, 64, 82, 83, 93, 94, 95, 113, 114, 123

69¢ #2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 39, 40, 41, 46, 47, 49, 50, 54, 55, 57, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 111, 112, 115, 117, 118, 120, 121, 124

94¢ #1, 5, 10, 22, 31, 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 45, 51, 53, 56, 58, 59, 67, 99, 103, 106, 107, 108, 110, 116

\$1.19 #48, 52, 62, 81, 91, 122

\$1.62 #60, 61, 63, 109, 119

Books for sale: these are listed in the February newsletter (RSN53-32). Add the pamphlet, BERTRAND RUSSELL AS A PHILOSOPHER by A. J. Ayer (his 1972 British Academy lecture.) Limited supply. 2.95 postpaid.

- (19) New Library member:

New member Irving Anellis has offered to serve on the Library Committee. Irving studied with Morris Weitz, wrote his doctoral thesis under logic historian Jean van Heijenoort, and has worked as a research associate at the Russell Project. In addition to informing us of new work on Russell's technical philosophy and obtaining offprints for the Library, Irving will occasionally review books for the NEWS. Look for his review of The Philosophy of Logical Atomism and Other Essays in a future issue.

HUMANISM

- (20) ROY TORCASO answers Rev. Pendley's questions, in the Free For All page of the Washington Post (4/4/87, A19)... with thanks to DON JACKANICZ.

No, Humanists Don't Have a 'Clergy'

The Rev. Howard V. Pendley III raises some worthwhile questions in his tract ["Who Are Secular Humanism's Clergy? How Are They Ordained?" Free for All, March 28]. As a member of the Humanists' "clergy," I will endeavor to provide information that, apparently, has eluded Pendley all these years.

Although we do not use the term clergy, the Humanists do, in fact, have individuals duly appointed to serve the pastoral needs of all persons, not alone Humanists, atheists or other groups of Freethinkers. The title used is "counselor," and we perform rituals for all rites of passage, naming ceremonies, weddings (one scheduled soon) and memorial services. We do not use the term ordained, preferring, instead, the word "invested," and counselors are appointed by the Division of Humanist Counseling, a department of the American Humanist Association.

Applications are examined by a committee, and those selected to be counselors are appointed on the basis of their education, knowledge, special training and experience. They are chosen for their capability, talent and willingness, their care, concern and compassion for their fellow human beings. Counselors have a wide variety of skills

and experience, including PhDs. There are several AHA counselors in the area.

Where are the Humanists' houses of worship? In our hearts. It is not necessary to enter a church to be reverent. Go forth into the cathedral of open sky and "list to Nature's teachings." What hymns do Humanists sing? None. Since a hymn is usually a song of praise or adoration (of God), and because most Humanists do not believe in God, Humanist music consists of songs and compositions that excite the human spirit and give joy, encouragement or solace, as the occasion requires.

What holy books are read by Humanists? We ponder the writings of great thinkers, such as Robert G. Ingersoll, Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Julian Huxley, Bertrand Russell, Corliss Lamont (and thousands of other authors dedicated to the enrichment of the lives of people). Also, The Humanist magazine has many thought-provoking articles dealing with practically every problem facing humanity.

So what is Humanism? First, it is far older than Christianity. It is a philosophy or way of life whose followers conduct their lives with a very high degree of individual and personal responsibility, and this without any fear of hell or any

thought of reward in heaven. Humanists are persons of moral character. You will never find an atheist or a Humanist threatening or trying to intimidate Christians or attacking their places of business due to a difference of opinion. On the contrary, Christians have harassed unbelievers unmercifully for endeavoring to protect the "wall of separation." Also, Christians have destroyed thousands of dollars' worth of property and placed at risk dozens of lives, even murdered those with whom they disagreed.

There are a great number of people in this land and across the whole world who have escaped from the chains of superstition of conventional religion, but they dare not "come out of the closet" lest they be shunned, ostracized or even subject to physical attack by the pious.

There is a continuing debate among Humanist members as to whether Humanism is a religion. If any inference is drawn from these words that it is, that is in the mind of the reader. It is not my intent to reclassify the philosophy of Humanism.

—Roy R. Torcaso

The writer is president of the Humanist Association of the National Capital Area.

THE ORIGIN

- (21) Senator J. Bennett Johnston, of Louisiana, addressed the Senate at some length on this occasion. Here is just a little of what he had to say, from the Congressional Record of August 4, 1986 (p.S10238):

Mr. President, I think the situation is much clearer now than it was when star wars burst upon the consciousness of people in the U.S. Senate and across America.

The first question I think we sought to ask, Mr. President, is: How did it come about? How do we find ourselves today debating the question of the level of funding of star wars, debating this new issue about whether we make nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete? Did it begin with a group of our best scientists who came up with this great idea or did it start somewhere else?

Interestingly, Mr. President, star wars began not with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, not with DARPA, or the Research and Development Assistant Secretaries, or with the scientists at Lawrence Livermore Lab or elsewhere. Star wars began with Ronald Reagan.

Mr. President, on March 4, 1985, Newsweek did an interview of the President of the United States. They asked him where star wars came from. The President said:

It kind of amuses me that everybody is so sure I must have heard about it, that I never thought of it myself. And the truth is, I did.

Mr. President, I like President Reagan. The American public likes President Reagan. I think he is the most, for whatever else you can say about President Reagan, he is the most personally successful President, perhaps, in the history of this country; if not the greatest communicator, then he ranks up there with Roosevelt in the two or three best communicators we have ever had. He is a man of strong principle and ideology and there are a lot of other things you can say about President Reagan that are

good, much of which I agree with.

But, Mr. President, anybody who says that the President of the United States is noted for his technological process, for his ability to understand and make judgments in weapons systems, if that man is here in this Senate then I would like to see him and hear him and talk to him. I have never heard that charge or that accusation made. And yet it was the President himself who made this great decision about star wars.

Mr. President, he thought up the basic concept but with whom did he consult in writing the momentous star wars speech, the speech that launched a thousand contracts?

Now, Richard Perle, the top nuclear strategist in the Pentagon, heard about it 2 days—2 days—before it was televised. Paul Nitze, the chief arms control adviser, learned of the speech the very day it was given. The Secretary of State, Mr. President, was not consulted at all. George Keyworth, the chief science adviser to the President, received 5 days' warning. We are told that Keyworth would have gotten less notice but someone cautioned: "How can the President go on the tube directing a major, high technology initiative and tell his science adviser nothing?" based upon which he received 2 days' notice.

Mr. President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff received 2 days' notice of the star wars speech—the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Pentagon's chief scientist, Assistant Secretary of Defense for RDT&E, Dick DeLauer, learned of the

speech 9 hours before it was delivered.

The reporter who interviewed the participants noted: "Both proponents and opponents of star wars agree that it was not carefully considered."

George Keyworth, the President's Science Adviser, described his immediate reaction to notice of the impending speech in these words. If I may quote, this is the President's Science Adviser George Keyworth:

Give me time. It's big. Give me time.

Most people saw the speech very close to [the time of] delivery, and most—myself included, incidentally—had the same reaction: My god, let's think about this some more. Let's think about the implications for the allies. Let's think about what the Soviets are going to think. Let's think about what's technically feasible. Let's think about what the scientists are going to think. Let's think about the command and control problems.'

But, then, of course, Mr. President, there was not time, when George Keyworth was given only a couple of hours, the Joint Chiefs only 2 days, Dick DeLauer no notice at all, and so it goes, there simply was not time. The strategy, Mr. President, was very simple: Most top officials would not learn of the proposal until they had no choice but to support it.

What it came down to, Mr. President, was if you supported President Reagan, you supported SDI. And if you did not, you did not support SDI, which meant you would not be around in the administration. So it has been very clear, Mr. President, that star wars came down as a proposal full-blown, risen from the ashes of quick consideration and was presented to those in the administration on the basis of "take it or leave it."

ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

- (22) Church of the Larger Fellowship. We don't ordinarily give space to church news. (Did someone say, "Thank God!"...?) But we think there are good reasons to lend support to the Unitarian Universalists. We think they'd be on the same side as we -- they would be our allies -- on most issues. Neither its ministers nor its members are required to hold any particular doctrine; the Church has adopted no creed; and differing opinions on religion are tolerated.

They are starting something new: the Church of the Larger Fellowship (CLF)... "organized to minister to religious liberals who are isolated for geographic or other reasons." A piece of their literature has the headline, HOW DOES IT FEEL TO BE THE ONLY UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST IN TOWN? The titles of some of the cassettes in their lending library give an indication of their openness, their lack of rigidity: Bertrand Russell; Why I Am Not A Christian; Dialogue (Beattie - Kurtz); Dialogue (Beattie - Wine); Happy Birthday, Copernicus; Humanism in the New Testament; Why I Am A Humanist; Prospect for Humanism/Bertrand Russell; Religion Without God is Possible; Secular Humanist Declaration; Communicating the Humanist Message (Kurtz); six cassettes of Robert Ingersoll; and much more.

For information, write Church of the Larger Fellowship, Unitarian Universalist, 25 Beacon St., Boston, MA 02108. (Thank you, TOM STANLEY)

ANNUAL MEETING (1987)

- (23) The time and place: June 19-21, at El Conquistador, a residence hall at San Diego State University (not the University of San Diego, as was incorrectly stated in the Feb newsletter.)

It would be well to have eaten supper before registering (at 6:30pm) because the program (34) does not mention supper on Friday.

And now for the commercial, by HARRY RUJA:

- * The program promises to be an interesting one. If you send in your reservation early enough, I can send you a flyer issued by the Visitors Bureau illustrating some of San Diego's attractions. Plan to come. I think you'll find it worthwhile. [Or double your money back.]

How to get there. We will sleep and eat at El Conquistador (locally known as El Conk), located at Montezuma Av. and 55th St...next to the San Diego State University campus...and about 15 miles east of the major SD airport (Lindbergh). It has no official connection with SDSU.

BY BUS:

Friday. Bus #2 to 30th St. & Adams Av. Transfer to Bus #11 going east, to 55th & Montezuma. Fare \$1, 50¢ with Medicare card. (Driver will not make change but will accept paper dollar.) Last #2 Bus leaves airport East Terminal at 10:06pm; last #11 leaves at 10:55pm, arriving El Conk at 11:06pm

Saturday. Bus #2 to 11th Av. and Broadway. Take Bus #15 or 15A to College Av. and El Cajon Blvd. Take #36 or 36A to San Diego State University Transit Center, corner Campanile Drive and Hardy Av. Walk 2 short blocks south to Montezuma, and 1 long block west to 55th St. Last #36 leaves College Av. and El Cajon at 9:56pm.

Sunday return to airport: Bus #43 from SDSU Transit Center to 5th Av. and Broadway. Walk across street and transfer to #2 going west on Broadway. Last #43 leaves at 5:37pm.

Lost? Call bus company (233-3004) or El Conk (286-2030) or (as last resort) HARRY RUJA (469-4887.)

BY CAB:

Fare about \$20. Fare varies from cabbie to cabbie; inquire! Yellow Cab permits dividing fare among passengers.

BY CAR:

From the North: Take I 5, to I 805, to I 8 (eastbound), to College Av. offramp, to Montezuma. Right on Montezuma, and on to 55th St. Free parking in lot behind El Conk (tall bldg. S side of Montezuma.)

From the East: I 8 west to College Av. offramp, etc.

From the South: I 5 north to I 8 east, etc.

From the West: use your water wings.

RECOMMENDED READING

- (24) "The Space Of One Breath" by Brad Leithauser discusses chess, computer chess, and artificial intelligence, in an article in The New Yorker (3/9/87, p. 41). You don't have to play chess — or know anything at all about chess...or about computers, for that matter — to find it engrossing. It deals with technical matters with great dexterity from an cultured layman's point of view. As articles go, it is a long one — about 16 full pages of text, net, after deducting the space taken up by ads — and it isn't a bit too long, in the opinion of Lee Eisler, who recommends it highly. Incidentally, the author, who recently wrote a highly praised first novel, happens to be the son of a BRS member, Gladys Leithauser.

BRS BUSINESS

- (25) Contributions welcome. Enjoy the satisfaction of knowing that you are helping to keep the wolf from the BRS door. Send a few bucks to the BRS Treasury (c/o newsletter; address on Page 1, bottom). No amount is too small; or too large, for that matter. Send what you can. Thanks.

PROMOTING BR'S PURPOSES

Beyond War: To Whom We Are Beholden

What has evolved on our planet is not just life, not just grass or mice or beetles or microbes, but beings with a great intelligence, with a capacity to anticipate the future consequences of present actions, with the ability even to leave their home world and seek out life elsewhere. What a waste it would be if, after four billion years of tortuous biological evolution, the dominant organism on the planet contrived its own annihilation.

No species is guaranteed its tenure on this planet. And we've been here for only about a million years, we, the first species that has devised the means for its self-destruction. I look at those other worlds, cratered, airless, cold, here and there coated with a hopeful stain of organic matter, and I remind myself what an astonishing thing has happened here. How privileged we are to live, to influence and control our future. I believe we have an obligation to fight for that life, to struggle not just for ourselves, but for all those creatures who came before us, and to whom we are beholden, and for all those who, if we are wise enough, will come after us. There is no cause more urgent, no dedication more fitting for us than to strive to eliminate the threat of nuclear war. No social convention, no political system, no economic hypothesis, no religious dogma is more important.

Carl Sagan, in *Ethical Weekly* (3/8/87) of the Ethical Society of St. Louis, with thanks to STEVE MARAGIDES.

CREATIONISM

- (27) The Louisiana Statute and its implications, as described AL SECKEL in "The Skeptical Inquirer" (Winter 1986-1987, pp.147-158)...with thanks to TOM STANLEY.

SCIENTIFIC EDUCATION in the public schools of the United States is once more under attack. The Supreme Court is about to consider the constitutionality of a Louisiana statute that would require public schools to vitiate their presentation of modern science by presenting a thinly veiled religious construct as a comparably scientific approach to explaining nature. In discussions of the history of the universe or of the earth or of life or human beings, any consideration of "evolution science" (as the statute calls it) would have to be offset by a presentation of "creation science." The latter is a concoction, based on religion, that offers "scientific" justifications for belief in the literal truth of the creation stories of the Bible.

The case is of great importance for science education not only in Louisiana but throughout the country, and it therefore has great import for science itself. The statute represents a bald attempt to bring the content of science

under ideological control and to warp the presentation of information developed in a score of scientific disciplines, from cosmology and astrophysics to paleontology, biochemistry, and even linguistics.

The Southern California Skeptics (SCS), the largest local group associated

Al Seckel is executive director of the Southern California Skeptics.

with the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (CSICOP), has led a highly effective effort to inform scientific organizations and individual scientists about the nature and urgency of the case and to enlist their participation in an *amicus curiae* brief that asks the Court to declare the Louisiana statute invalid. The brief includes among its signatories 24 scientific organizations (including CSICOP) and 72 winners of

the Nobel Prize in the fields of Physics, Chemistry, Medicine or Physiology. It attacks the statute's mischaracterization of creationism as science and represents the largest group of Nobel laureates ever to support a single statement on any subject. Furthermore, this is the first time that so large and respected a group of scientists has joined together to publicly challenge the constitutionality of a statute, making this brief a document of historical importance.

First, some background. The creationist movement is closely aligned with what has been called "evangelical fundamentalism." For example, the Creation Research Society, a leading association of creationists, requires its members to subscribe to an explicitly fundamental "statement of belief." The Louisiana statute marks the culmination of decades of fundamentalist efforts to change the way science is presented in the public schools.

Certainly the most famous battle in the ongoing struggle took place in the 1920s, when Tennessee prosecuted John Scopes for teaching evolution in the public schools. Despite the renowned efforts of defense attorney Clarence Darrow, Scopes was convicted. His conviction was later overturned on a technicality, but the Tennessee law prohibiting the teaching of evolution remained on the books for another forty years. During that period, creationists maintained a strong influence over the content of public school textbooks. Rather than inviting confrontation with creationist activists, many textbook publishers chose to ignore or minimize the importance of evolutionary theory and its power as a scientific theory.

In the 1960s, the Supreme Court was finally called upon to evaluate several practices of critical significance to the creationists. In 1962 and 1963, an almost unanimous Court held that the Establishment Clause prohibits state-sponsored school prayer. And, in 1968, the Court struck down an Arkansas statute that prohibited the teaching of evolution—a statute very similar to the one in Tennessee under which Scopes had been convicted.

During the 1960s, in response to the clarification of constitutional law, the creationists—under the leadership of Henry Morris and Duane Gish—accelerated the dissemination of what is variously known as "scientific creationism" or "creation science." The objective was to describe the Genesis account of creation in a way that might appear sufficiently "scientific" to be usable in the public school classroom. Primarily through the efforts of the San Diego-based Institute for Creation Research, a vast literature of "creation science" emerged.

A number of states then considered whether the new form of creationism ought to be incorporated in public school education. Legislators in at least 17 states have introduced bills calling for the teaching of creationism. In 1977, the Indiana Textbook Commission adopted a creationist biology textbook. However, when the religious content of the book was brought to light, a local court held that its use would violate the Establishment Clause.

Creationist efforts to obtain legislation requiring "balanced treatment" of creationism and evolution in public schools later came to fruition in the passage of an Arkansas statute. After a lengthy and expensive trial featuring numerous expert witnesses, that statute, too, was held unconstitutional.

In 1981, the Louisiana legislature passed a law requiring "balanced treatment" of evolution and "creation science" in the public schools. The law provides that both evolution and creation be taught as "theory" rather than as "proven scientific fact." A group of parents, teachers, and organizations immediately challenged the law as a violation of the Establishment Clause. "In other cases, the so-called Establishment Clause has been construed to forbid the teaching of religion in the public schools.

The Louisiana case came before a federal district judge in that state who ruled that creationism is a religious belief and that teaching "creation science" in the public schools would therefore violate the Constitution. (Technically the judge ruled on a motion for summary judgment, deciding that he did not need to hold a trial since there were no disputed issues of fact and the only questions for decision were purely legal ones.) Louisiana appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, which affirmed the district court's decision. Louisiana asked the entire Fifth Circuit to rehear the case, but the request for rehearing was denied by a vote of 8 to 7. Louisiana then exercised its right to have the United States Supreme Court review the Fifth Circuit decision, and on May 5, 1986, the Court announced that it had taken jurisdiction over the appeal.

The Supreme Court ordinarily has a fair amount of discretion in deciding which cases it will hear, but has much less discretion when a federal court strikes down a state law. In those cases, the Court can decline to review the decision only if there is "no substantial question" about its correctness. In this case, at least four of the nine Justices concluded that Louisiana had raised a "substantial" question, but the Court does not disclose which four Justices or

their arguments. It is reasonable to speculate, however, that the Justices who voted to hear the case were concerned about why the District Court had ruled "creation-science" to be religious without holding a full-blown trial.

When the newspapers published the Supreme Court's decision to hear this case, I contacted my friend Jeff Lehman, who had recently clerked for a Supreme Court Justice and now works for the Washington law firm of Caplin & Drysdale, to find out more about the decision and what SCS could do to help. After learning that an *amicus* brief is the proper way for independent outsiders to present their views to the Supreme Court, I went to the SCS Board of Directors, and they agreed to help put together and fund a brief on behalf of the scientific community on the issue of the teaching of evolution and "creation science." Meanwhile, Jeff approached fellow Caplin & Drysdale lawyer Beth Kaufman (knowing of her expertise on the Establishment Clause) and together they got Caplin & Drysdale's agreement to provide its legal services gratis. SCS board member and Nobel laureate physicist Murray Gell-Mann (a CSICOP Fellow) agreed to send letters to the U.S. Nobel laureates in science and medicine, and to other scientific organizations, asking for their participation and support of the brief. The SCS *amicus* brief thus began to evolve.

To help familiarize the lawyers with the past works of "creation science" groups, I put them in touch with SCS member William Bennetta, who has spent several years investigating and writing about "creation science." Bennetta, armed with boxes of material, flew to Washington. In short order, he was able to give Kaufman and Lehman the flavor of the entire controversy.

An *amicus* brief may articulate any particular view its supporters wish to express; it need not and should not make all of the possible arguments in the case. Since the ACLU would be discussing the Establishment Clause decisions and their bearing on this case, it was decided to focus on the issues that scientists would consider important in order to make a meaningful contribution with the *amicus* brief.

Ultimately, the brief focused on two issues. First, drawing on the wealth of "creation science" writings now available, the brief sought to prove to the Court that "creation science" embodies certain religious ideas that come from Genesis: that a divine Creator created the universe and life from nothing; that all the "kinds" of plants and animals were created at once and no "kinds" have ever evolved into other "kinds"; that a worldwide flood caused the formation of fossils and all other geological and paleontological phenomena; and that the universe and life are less than 10,000 years old.

In the Louisiana law that the Supreme Court will assess, "creation science" has been fully sterilized. The law prescribes "balanced treatment" for "evolution science" and "creation science," but it does not describe "creation science" at all. It says only that "creation science" comprises the "scientific evidences for creation"; it says nothing to suggest what "creation" may mean. The state of Louisiana denies that the "creation science" of the statute is linked to religion, denies that it corresponds to orthodox "creation science," and denies that it is anything more than a preoccupation with "origin through abrupt appearance in complex form." That phrase, or some variation of it, appears in affidavits that were devised for the state after the statute had been passed and had been challenged in a lower federal court. The state asserted that "creation science" did not involve these concepts; the SCS brief shows that the "creation science" of the statute can be nothing but the "creation science" of fundamentalists, the state's representations notwithstanding. Furthermore, the brief argued that the "abrupt appearance" construct is not a sufficiently well defined alternative to orthodox "creation science." It fails to define a concrete alternative to evolution; accordingly, it is implausible that the Louisiana legislature intended the Act to embody it rather than orthodox "creation science." Therefore, the sterilized "abrupt appearance" construct can only be understood as a post hoc explanation created for the purpose of defending this unconstitutional Act.

The second argument proceeds by offering the Court a careful distinction between scientific fact and theory. Facts are properties of natural phenomena; theories are naturalistic explanations for a body of facts. The brief explains that this distinction permeates *all* of science, not merely those areas governed by the theory of evolution. By requiring that evolution be taught as "theory," while permitting *other* scientific theories to be taught as "proven scientific fact," the statute deprecates evolution. By singling out one topic of science (so-called "origins") for special treatment, the legislature conveyed the false message that the prevailing theory of "origins"—evolutionary theory—is less robust than all other theories in science. If the Court can understand this distinction between fact and theory, it will understand that the act could not have been intended to promote academic freedom, but rather was intended to

disparage evolution because of its conflict with certain religious beliefs.

Because of the historic importance of this brief and of the case itself, it was decided to hold a news conference in Washington at the National Press Club on the date of filing. Representing the brief and the issue of "creation science"/evolution were 1972 Nobel laureate biochemist Christian Anfinsen; Harvard paleontologist and CSICOP Fellow Stephen Jay Gould; geneticist Francisco Ayala, chairman of the National Academy of Sciences Section of Population Biology, Evolution, and Ecology; and SCS Executive Director Al Seckel. Beth Kaufman and Jeff Lehman were also present. Gell-Mann, Gould, and Ayala read prepared statements. (See texts.) Approximately 70 members of the press attended: reporters from all the major wire services, television and cable news networks, major newspapers, and news magazines, as well as representatives from the major scientific, legal, and educational publications. The story was widely reported all over the United States and was front-page news throughout the state of Louisiana.

The purpose in holding a news conference was not simply to advertise the brief but also to focus public attention on how important proper scientific education is to the welfare of this country. In their statement of interest in the brief, the scientists explain that, while it is important that science education accurately portray the current state of substantive scientific knowledge, it is even more important that science education accurately portray the premises and processes of science. They contend that teaching religious ideas mislabeled as "science" is detrimental to scientific education: "It sets up a false conflict between science and religion, misleads our youth about the nature of scientific inquiry, and thereby compromises our ability to respond to the problems of an increasingly technological world. Our capacity to cope with problems of food production, health care, and even national defense will be jeopardized if we deliberately strip our citizens of the power to distinguish between the phenomena of nature and supernatural articles of faith."

The range of scientific expertise found among these Nobel laureates indicates that they perceive more than just the theory of evolution to be at stake. As even the creationist writings reveal, evolutionary biology is intertwined with other sciences, ranging from nuclear physics and astronomy to molecular biology and geology. Therefore, although the creationist campaign is advertised as merely an assault on evolution, it is in fact an attack on the full sweep of scientific knowledge. Moreover, by challenging the methodology of evolutionary biology, the creationists also challenge the methodology of all of modern science.

It is because of the creationists' broad attack on science that the brief was able to attract such wide support in the scientific community. Earlier attempts to rally these scientists against the Reagan Administration's Strategic Defense Initiative, often called the Star Wars program, failed miserably. Arno Penzias, who shared a Nobel Prize in 1978 for his work in discovering cosmic radiation, supporting the "big bang" theory of the universe, called the

unified action on creationism unusual and said that he could not imagine any other issue receiving support from such a broad range of Nobel laureates. Among the other Nobel signers of the friend-of-the-court brief were people with whom he often had violent arguments on other issues, Penzias said.

According to Val Fitch, who won the prize in Physics in 1980 for helping to explain the predominance of matter over antimatter in the universe, the action was a defense of the integrity of science. "When scientific method and education are attacked, the laureates close ranks and speak with one voice," he said. The Louisiana law earned this unprecedented opposition because "it defies all scientific reason," Fitch said.

The brief was filed on August 18, 1986. Oral arguments will be heard around January, but a decision may not be issued until June or July 1987. As usual with cases involving religion, this case will have impact far beyond the state lines of Louisiana. If the Supreme Court affirms the lower courts' decisions in this case, other states will know that similar statutes would be considered unconstitutional. If it were to reverse, the creationists would enjoy a devastating propaganda victory (even though the case itself would continue in the lower courts).

Both sides in the controversy admit that the SCS brief will receive more attention than the many other friend-of-the-court briefs that flood court clerks' offices. "It's got to make the Supreme Court sit up and take notice," said Martha Kegel, executive director of the ACLU's Louisiana chapter. "I think it shows the impact of the case to the scientific and academic communities," she said. "There's the realization that this law, if allowed to stand, will have a detrimental effect on scientific education and academic freedom."

Kendall Vick, the Louisiana assistant attorney general, said it is difficult to gauge how much effect the brief will have. But in most cases, he said, "unless it is a very significant brief by a group like this or the solicitor general or attorney generals of all the states, [one of these briefs] doesn't have much impact."

If next summer the Supreme Court rewards our efforts with a victory, we should not be lulled into complacency. Often school boards or even individual teachers institute religion in the classroom either in ignorance of or in spite of its unconstitutionality. These actions are far less visible than a state statute; they will continue unless involved parents and community members complain about them. It is the responsibility of each of us to ensure that the Constitution is not thwarted in this way.

Postscript: A tremendous amount of effort was spent in preparing this brief; we thank the many volunteers who made this effort successful in so short a time (two and a half months). We would also like to thank those individuals and groups who made contributions to help defray the expenses, including CSICOP, which generously donated \$2,750.

CURRENT ATTITUDES

(28) Meet some fellow Americans, courtesy of the New York Times (4/13/87, B9 [benign?]):

By DENNIS HEVESI

The Devil is not only responsible for the fall of the Rev. Jim Bakker and the troubles facing the nation's television ministry; he is an active, negative force at work in the universe who is constantly tempting human beings, many followers of the television evangelists believe.

And while the Devil is not the horned and pitchfork-bearing caricature of evil, most of those followers say, they believe he is a spirit created by God so humanity can struggle through great tribulation toward the coming of heaven on earth.

Those views were expressed in a follow-up to a New York Times-CBS News Poll conducted two weeks ago in response to the adultery scandal involving Mr. Bakker and his PTL Ministry.

That survey indicated that the 505 respondents who said they "made a point of watching" one or more of seven well-

known evangelists were evenly divided about whether "the Devil was responsible for the troubles" of Mr. Bakker. Forty-three percent said the Devil was responsible and 43 percent said he was not.

For example, Carlos Velez, a 46-year-old claims agent for the Long Island Rail Road who lives in Rockville Centre, L.I., believes the Devil "took possession" of Mr. Bakker.

"I do believe that there is a Devil," said Mr. Velez, a Catholic. "When the Devil takes somebody's mind and he has no willpower, the Devil can control him."

"Here's a man running this, you can call it an empire," Mr. Velez said of Mr. Bakker. "He has everything going for him. All of a sudden this young woman comes along. He sees an opportunity. I believe the Devil took possession of him. It can happen to anybody."

Janeé Holdaway, 27, who works in a

foam rubber factory in High Point, N.C., concurs. "I feel, like any person who reads their Bible, that the Devil tempts people," she said.

But Mrs. Holdaway, a member of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, voiced ambiguity about where to place responsibility, and in doing so raised the theologically critical issue of free will.

"I feel he was tempted by her," Mrs. Holdaway said of Mr. Bakker and the secretary with whom he had the affair. "But he wasn't made to do anything he didn't want to do. He could either sleep with her or walk away. He's responsible."

Mr. Bakker has contended that the woman, Jessica Hahn of West Babylon, L.I., seduced him in a Florida hotel in December 1980. Miss Hahn has said through an adviser that she yielded only after drinking drugged wine.

Mrs. Holdaway wondered whether the Devil wasn't ultimately to blame.

"He is a spirit that can make you do things that you normally wouldn't do," she said. "So, here we are back to square one. Who is responsible?"

And if God created everything, including the Devil, then is God responsible for evil?

For Rod Sladek, 31, a real estate salesman from Albany, the answer — seen as part of a higher plan — is yes.

"God creates everything and gives us all free will," said Mr. Sladek, who is Catholic. "And He allows us to be individuals, as opposed to robots. He could have created us as slaves that would only worship. But he gave us options."

"Right now, we're in the midst of a spiritual war between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan," Mr. Sladek continued. "And we're losing. I think that if you look into the prophecies of Jesus you'll find that the events happening today have been foretold, and this is the beginning of the birth pangs of the great tribulation, which will eventually usher in the kingdom of Christ."

Mike Bell, 26, a communications systems analyst from Decatur, Ga., sees the Devil in terms of an "opposing force, a negative spirit."

"God created the Devil as being a good force," said Mr. Bell, a Baptist. "But the Devil wanted too much power and, as a result, he ended up, turning against God."

Satan's Personal Reality

Such a "personalized" interpretation of the Devil as a negative spirit or force — independent of, though influencing,

human action — is valid, according to Dr. Carl F. H. Henry, a theologian at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Deerfield, Ill.

"There has been insistence in evangelically orthodox circles on the personal reality of Satan," Dr. Henry said. "You've got to say that Jesus affirmed the reality of the personal Satan as a rebellious angelic creature, as did the Old Testament prophets, the New Testament apostles and the greatest Christian theologians."

"If the moral principle of 'the good' can be grounded in a personal, invisible spirit — that is God — why cannot the principle of evil likewise be grounded in a personal demonic spirit?"

The Rev. Ronald Thiemann, dean of the Harvard University Divinity School, however, sees limitations to such personalizations.

Dr. Thiemann said he sees evil existing on three levels: As "personalized evil, as natural evil, such as earthquakes, and as a kind of structural evil, which is spawned by human activity but somehow takes on a life of its own and infiltrates organizations and systems. Nazism, of course, is the classic case."

"If we limit our view to talk of the Devil," he said, "then we're going to fail to identify some of the most terrifying expressions of evil. The danger of focusing on the Devil is that we personalize and thereby trivialize the enormous social power of evil."

Bob Cash, 55, of Oklahoma City, holds to the personalized view of the Devil. "He's a spirit, and he's real," he

said.

Mr. Cash has difficulty coming to terms with the incapacitating pain he still suffers from an automobile accident 16 years ago.

When asked if the Devil caused the accident, he replied: "I wouldn't be a bit surprised. He's probably behind it."

"If I had a choice to go to heaven right now," Mr. Cash said, "I'd rather be where all that peace is instead of all this pain. Why didn't I get to go on? That's what I've always wondered; what's the lesson I was supposed to learn?"

In the end, the only answer for Mr. Cash is faith. "I'm not going to question God," he said.

And that is how he views the Jim Bakker affair. "There surely is some kind of good to come out of it," he said. "Somebody will get the right experience or the right answer."

The right answer for Lydia Mayo is summed up in one word: Forgiveness.

"Of course, it's wrong when you do these things," said Miss Mayo, a Baptist who is 65 and lives in Newport News, Va. "But I think some people just use this as an alibi: 'The Devil made me do it.'"

"It's not like I can see the Devil walking down the street. Just like I can't see God. To me, the Devil comes in people, in our actions. Actions that God is not pleased with. We have all come short of the glory of God. Some people said that Jim Bakker, because he is a minister, shouldn't have done it. But I can forgive him, if the Lord can."

WANTED TO BUY

- (29) "Essay on the Foundations of Geometry" by Bertrand Russell, any edition in reasonably good condition at a reasonable price. Dr. Irving H. Anellis, 110 McDonald Drive, #8-B, Ames, IA 50010-3470.

INVITATION TO WRITE

- (30) Sailor. "Because of making my living at sea and seldom being home, most of my relationships are maintained through letters. To a sailor, one of the most important things in life is mail: people to write to and receive mail from; especially people with whom you have a common bond and interest." So writes a new member who enjoys reading Science, History, Philosophy and Theology. He is: QM2 Thomas Bollin, USN; USS Arthur W. Radford (DD-968); FPO New York 09586-1206. [QM2 = Quartermaster 2nd Class]

ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

- (31) Free Inquiry, the publication, will hold its annual conference on September 11-13, 1987 in Washington, D.C. It will focus on "The Roman Catholic Church and Humanism." To find out more: Box 5, Buffalo, NY 14215-0005.

(32)

PRIZE CONTEST

Win a good book, a Russell book

10 books, 10 winners

5 copies of each of the following:

Bertrand Russell on God and Religion

edited by BRS Member Al Seckel

published in 1986 by Prometheus Press of Buffalo, NY

Five copies donated by them to the BRS
in support of this contestBertrand Russell

by BRS Member Paul Grimley Kurtz

published in 1986 by Twayne Publishers of Boston

Five copies donated by them to the BRS
in support of this contest

Purpose of the contest:

to help the BRS acquire new members

How to enter the Contest:

1. Talk with people you know about the BRS, and if they seem interested in the possibility of joining, send us their names and addresses and we will send them several pages of information about the BRS. Also state which of the two books you would prefer, if you should be one of the winners.
2. When one of your people enrolls, we will credit you with one point.
3. When the contest ends, each of the 10 members with the most points wins a book. We will ship the books according to the stated preference, to the extent possible.
4. The contest will end December 31, 1987.

Send your new-member-prospects to the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.

You help the BRS
by winning a book

Stay with it!

If you like this contest, credit MARVIN KOHL. It was his idea. He arranged for the books, too.

(33)

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

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

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

1987-89: JACK COWLES, WILLIAM FIELDING, DAVID GOLDMAN, STEVE MARAGIDES, FRANK PAGE, MICHAEL ROCKLER, CHERIE RUPPE, PAUL SCHILPP, WARREN SMITH, RAMON SUZARA

The 6 BRS officers are also directors, ex officio,

PROGRAM (ANNUAL MEETING)

(34) The Program: (tentative)

Friday, 19 June	6:30 p.m.	Registration. Informal Reception	
	7:30	Call to order. Announcements	
	7:45	DON JACKANICZ, "Bertrand Russell: the San Diego Connection"	
	8:15	Film: CBC Close-Up Interview	
	9:00	Break	
	9:30	Board of Directors meet. All members welcome. RICHARD WILK's proposal for a Russell Prize	
	10:30	Recess	
	Saturday, 20 June	8:00 a.m.	Breakfast
		8:30	MARVIN KOHL, "Locating the Primary Good"
		9:30	Break
9:45		MICHAEL ROCKLER, "Russell on Education"	
10:30		Break	
10:45		Talk	
11:30		Business Meeting of the Society	
12:30		Lunch	
		2:00 p.m.	AL SECKEL, "Bertrand Russell on Ethics, Sex and Marriage"
		2:45	Break
		3:00	MICHAEL CARELLA, "Mysticism and Logic, a Second Look"
	4:30	Break	
	5:00	Red Hackle Hour	
	6:30	Banquet	
	9:00	Board Meeting. All members welcome	
Sunday, 21 June	8:00 a.m.	Breakfast	
	9:00	JOHN LENZ, "Russell and the Greeks"	
	10:00	Film: Bertie and the Bomb	
	11:00	SAM LABSON, "Russell on the Scientific Spirit"	
	12:30	Checkout	

P.S. To reserve a room for the June 19-21 Meeting, send your check to El Conquistador, 5505 Montezuma Road, San Diego, CA 92115, for 48.50 for single room with all meals; or 42.50 (per person) for double room with all meals; or 18.50 for meals only (all meals including banquet.) "All meals" means 3 meals Saturday, breakfast Sunday.

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

(35) How to oppose Apartheid, from "Dear Bertrand Russell", Feinberg and Kasrils, eds. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969. pp. 53-54):

Russell replies to a correspondent who is opposed to the Apartheid regime in South Africa but who is equally opposed to violent forms of struggle.

27 November 1964

DEAR MR. HOUGHAM,

Thank you very much for your letter which I read with care. I think it probable that non-violent action will not succeed in altering the regime in South Africa. As with most industrial totalitarian countries, organized revolution is extremely difficult and non-violent resistance even more so. The regime in South Africa makes open opposition impossible and, therefore, minimises the opportunities of organized non-violent opposition. Having said this, however, I should point out that it is very difficult to stop violence once it begins. The Algerian revolution cost one and a half million lives out of a population of 8 million. Comparable disaster in Britain would involve the lives of 6 million people and a devastation of the entire country. The end result is a government dependent upon its army and it is because victorious revolutions invariably succeed through the discipline of a determined guerilla army that they soon enter a Bonapartist phase. To answer your queries specifically:

1. It is presumptuous for those of us not faced with conditions such as those which obtain in South Africa to determine the form of struggle. I believe our efforts in Britain should be concentrated on making known the nature of the regime and on mobilising

public opinion so that the British Government can be induced to apply pressure. I do not believe anti-apartheid organisations should dissociate themselves from nationalist movements advocating violence.

2. In the event of outbreak of violence in South Africa, the campaign for external pressure of an economic order should be stepped up. United Nations intervention is rarely beneficial because the U.N. itself is so much the centre of Cold War power politics. Until this ceases to be true, intrusion of the U.N. will mean little more than the introduction of American power into the area concerned. This was evident in the Congo. If Nationalist movements seek assistance from Cold War powers, it will, without doubt, increase the danger of world war. There is no remedy other than seeking economic sanctions against the offending governments. The longer pressure against the government of South Africa is delayed, the more dangerous and violent the explosion will be. There is no escaping this. Western investments in South Africa are colossal. If the government is tolerated by those who hold these investments until the final explosion of violence, the situation will be even more grave.

In short, the task of those seeking to oppose apartheid is to work for the maximum pressure against the regime from the outside. There is no way to remove the spectre of violence short of that. Violence is endemic where governments of this order hold sway.

Yours sincerely,
BERTRAND RUSSELL

(36)

INDEX

Accidental nuclear war studied by Pugwash.....6	Jews, persecution of: BR's 1938 column.....12
Anellis (Irving) on Library Committee.....19	Johnston (Senator) on the origin of Star Wars..21
Annual Meeting, June 19-21, 1987.....23	
Annual Meeting Program.....34	Kuntz's "Bertrand Russell" reviewed.....10
Apartheid: BR on how to oppose it.....35	Kuntz's "Bertrand Russell" a contest prize.....32
Australian radio talk #4.....4	
Awards to BR.....5	
	Leithauser (Brad): article on computer-chess...24
Bakker (Rev. Jim): the Devil made him do it...28	Library (of Russell Society): books to lend....18
Belief in the Devil is not inconsiderable.....28	Library (of Russell Society): new member.....19
"Bertrand Russell" by Paul G. Kuntz reviewed...10	Louisiana statute on creationism (Seckel).....27
"Better than victory".....3	
"Beyond War" by Carl Sagan.....26	McLaine (Shirley), her odd beliefs.....13
Book review: "Bertrand Russell" by Kuntz.....10	Meeting (Annual), June 19-21, 1987.....23
Books to lend (Russell Society Library).....18	
BR on how to oppose Apartheid.....35	Nat'l Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ad...11
BR, as Christopher Farley remembers him.....15	NECLC ads continue to hit Reagan abuses.....11
BR: Ramon Suzara's 1962 article.....17	Nominations for Directors wanted.....7
BR's "better than victory".....3	Notes on nuttiness (Shirley McLaine's).....13
BR's column on persecution of the Jews (1938)..12	
BR's honors, including the O.M.....5	Officers of the BRS.....9
BR's Impressions of Australia (4th radio talk)..4	O.M.....5
BR's Ten Commandments.....2	Origin of Star Wars.....21
BR's thank-you note.....16	
BRS Directors.....33	People For the American Way's Director leaving..8
BRS Library: books to lend.....18	Persecution of the Jews, 1938; BR's column....12
BRS Library: new Committee Member Anellis.....19	Podesta, of People For, will step down.....8
BRS Officers.....9	Prize contest: win a good book.....32
BRS Treasury welcomes contributions.....25	Program (Annual Meeting).....34
	Pugwash on accidental nuclear war prospects....6
Chess by computers: Brad Leithauser's article..24	
Church of the Larger Fellowship (UU) formed...22	Reagan (Ronald): Star Wars was his own idea....21
Computer-chess: article by Brad Leithauser....24	Religion vs. Science remark: source wanted....37
Contest: win a good book.....32	Russell Society Library: books to lend.....18
Contributions to BRS Treasury sought.....25	Russell Society Library: new Committee member..19
Creationism: the Louisiana statute (Seckel)....27	
	Sagan (Carl): "Beyond War".....26
de Pater (William A.) reviews Kuntz book.....10	Sailor invites correspondence.....30
Devil (The) gets his due.....28	Science vs. Religion remark: source wanted....37
Director-candidates wanted.....7	Seckel (Al): Louisiana creationism statute....27
Directors of the BRS.....33	Seckel's "BR on God & Religion" a contest prize.32
	Star Wars, where the idea originated.....21
Farley (Christopher) reminisces about BR.....15	Stationery for members, for sale.....14
For sale: members' stationery.....14	
Free Inquiry holds annual conference 9/11-13...31	Talk #4 on Australian radio.....4
	Thank-you note by BR to a photographer.....16
Gardner (Martin) on Shirley McLaine.....13	Torcaso (Roy) describes aspects of Humanism....20
Geometry, BR's essay on its foundations wanted.29	
	UU forms Church of the Larger Fellowship.....22
Hilites.....1	Wanted: BR's Essay on Foundations of Geometry..29
Honors awarded to BR.....5	Wanted: nominations for Directors.....7
Humanists don't have a clergy, says Torcaso....20	Wanted: sailor seeks mail from members.....30
	Wanted: source of Science vs. Religion remark..37
Index.....36	

SOURCE WANTED

- (37) Science vs. Religion. "Science provides evidence without certainty. Religion provides certainty without evidence." Can you tell us who said it?