

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS

No. 27

August 1980

- (1) Last call for dues (37). The 1980 meeting (2). The first BRS Award (17). BRS Award candidates wanted (18). New series, "My Favorite Russell" (10). Schilpp's favorite Russell (16). BR on Iran (11). Time to vote for Directors (36,44), for 1981 meeting place (3,44). for Schilpp's honorary membership (26,44). BAS anti-war Essay Competition (19). "Faith and Fanaticism" (42). Index (43). An asterisk in the left column indicates a request.

THE 1980 MEETING

- (2a) The 7th Annual Meeting of the BRS was held on June 20-22, 1980 (from Friday evening to Sunday noon) at the University of Chicago's Center for Continuing Education.

The sessions were absorbing and the facilities (all under one roof) were excellent, credit for all of which belongs to DON JACKANICZ. He selected the site, planned the program, acquired the speakers, arranged the exhibits, provided Red Hackle, taped the sessions, and videotaped the presentation of the BRS Award. He also arranged to get feedback: a questionnaire asked members how they had liked various features of the weekend.

Films of BR were one feature of the sessions, as has been true of all recent BRS meetings. 7 BR films were shown; the BRS now owns all 7 BR films that are commercially available (RSN26-27).

All sessions were taped, and you may borrow the cassettes from the BRS Library (address below).

An attendance record was set. 33 members attended one or more of the 5 sessions: JERRY ALSPAUGH, GEORGE BLAM*, ROBERT CANTERBURY, LEN CLEAVELIN, JACK COWLES, PETER CRANFORD, DENNIS DARLAND, BOB DAVIS, ALEX DELY, LESTER DENONN, RON EDWARDS, LEE EISLER, MARY GIBBONS*, BARRY GOLDMAN, DAVID HART, ALVIN HOFER, DON JACKANICZ, JOHN JACKANICZ, ROBERT LOMBARDI, STEVE MARAGIDES, JIM MCWILLIAMS, JOE NEILANDS, JACK RAGSDALE, STEVE REINHARDT, HARRY RUJA, CHERIE RUPPE, GARY SLEZAK, CRAIG TISON, ELEANOR VALENTINE, ARNOLD VANDERLINDEN, HERB VOGT, CAROLYN WILKINSON, RON YUCCAS. (* became a member at the meeting)

Also present at one or more sessions were 16 non-member guests: Celeste M. Cassidy, Bess Denonn, James P. Gianickos, Richard J. Harris, Allen Jonassen, Gladys Krobil, Jean Nakhnikian, George Nakhnikian, Keith Peterson, Marian Roberts, Madelon Schilpp, Paul A. Schilpp, Amber Stelnicki, Miriam Targ, Lila Weinberg, Arthur Weinberg. (We don't vouch for the spelling; we had to decipher signatures.)

The following officers were elected (or re-elected) for one-year terms starting 1/1/81: Chairman: PETER CRANFORD; President, BOB DAVIS; Vice-President, HARRY RUJA; Treasurer, DENNIS DARLAND; Secretary, DON JACKANICZ.

- (2b) Lester Denonn's talk, "Characterizations of Bertie — Pro and Con", consisted of quotes selected from the 2100 books and articles in his great Russell Library. As the following samples indicate, many people had nice things to say about BR; but it was not unanimous:

- . Santayana: Bertie was small, dark, brisk...according to some people the ugliest man they had ever seen. But I did not find him ugly, because his mask, though grotesque, was expressive and engaging.
- . Laski: Did you ever read B. Russell's rather striking piece of rhetoric, "A Free Man's Worship"? I think that it is the religion of a sensible man.
- . Gellner: If humanism had saints, they would be the first to be canonised. (Said of Hume, J.S. Mill and Russell.)
- . Radhakrishnan: He has been a major force in the growth of liberalism in national and international affairs.
- . Berenson: For many years I have been reading what you published about things human, feeling as if nobody else spoke for me as you did.
- . Jager: His fiction...abounds in lucid intelligence and wit. In 1953 he published the first of two volumes, declaring that after devoting his first eighty years to philosophy, he planned to devote the next eighty to other forms of fiction.

*Russell Society News (Lee Eisler, Editor): RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036
 BRS Library: (to 8/31/80) Don Jackanicz, BRS Co-Librarian, 3802 N. Kenneth Ave., Chicago, IL 60641
 (starting 9/1/80) Jack Ragsdale, BRS Co-Librarian, P.O. Box 28200, Dallas, TX 75228

- . Willey: It was universally known that Russell despised titles, and insisted on being described and addressed as plain Bertrand Russell. After the lecture he came up to me and asked me to arrange for a taxi with the Trinity porter. "If you tell him it's for LORD RUSSELL it will be all right."
- . Durant: The bad boy of England, scandalizer of all continents, and prospective terror of the House of Lords...
- . Broad: As we all know, Mr. Russell produces a different system of philosophy every few years.

(2c) Peter Cranford spoke about "The Possibilities of Compossibility", summarized as follows:

Scattered in several of Russell's works is his idea of "compossibility" — a condition "when desires can be satisfied by the same state of affairs." He hoped that the idea would be expanded by others. Compossibility advises that we seek our good by providing for another what he feels is to his good.

The use of compossibility to satisfy our desires, to increase the total amount of good, and to exert influence can make tough decisions less difficult. For instance, Nations A and B have differing ideologies. Both A and B wish to satisfy their desires, one of which is to participate in the Olympic Games. The question is, should A punish B for its ideology by boycotting the Games?

Compossibility would say "No" in this and all other similar situations — between all people and all groups. It puts water on the flames instead of gasoline.

Antagonists can still continue to disagree in areas of conflict (generally pertaining to matters of self-preservation)

The advantages of compossibility are constructive action in the face of deadlocks, positive attitudes instead of negative ones, less acrimonious backgrounds, denial of "an eye for an eye" and "the meek shall inherit the earth"; and it does not leave the field to wariness gone mad — the certain prelude to universal destruction.

(2d) Don Jackanicz spoke about BR's stay in Chicago, 1938-39 (when BR taught at University of Chicago for a semester), and illustrated it with slides. His talk was based on a paper he and GARY SLEZAK had written ("The Town is Beastly and the Weather was Vile"), which was published in "Russell 25-28", p.5. Since most members have this issue of "Russell", we will say no more about it. (If you do not have it, you can borrow it from the BRS Library, address on Page 1, bottom.)

(2e) The nuclear panel of 6 speakers — 3 pro and 3 con — discussed nuclear energy. It is a serious subject. Their arguments were presented with considerable care and great conviction, on both sides. (Jim McWilliams said, later: "Next time give them knives.") We will not attempt to summarize; we doubt that we could.

(2f) The BRS Award was presented to Paul Arthur Schilpp. This was the highlight of the weekend. The citation read: "For opening a new path to a better understanding of the work of living philosophers." He was given a standing ovation. He responded with some interesting reminiscences about BR. For more about Professor Schilpp, see (16), (17), (26), (44).

(2g) Bob Davis spoke about BR's pacifism, noting that there are different kinds of war — wars of colonization, wars of principle, wars of self-defense, wars of prestige — and different kinds of pacifism — absolute and relative, individual and political. BR's pacifism was relative (for he favored World War II).

(2h) Some negatives. Excellent as the meeting was — it may have been the best one yet — we cannot say it was perfect. There were, in fact, 2 notable imperfections. Apparently under the mistaken impression that the BRS is a scholarly Society, Professor George Nakhnikian gave a professional philosopher's talk that was too scholarly for non-philosophers. And George Blam, pinchhitting for Alex Dely, with whom he is developing a theory about elementary particles (RSN26-40), talked about those particles and was too specific for non-physicists.

And while we're being negative: some members mentioned — on the feedback questionnaire — that in some of the BR films, it is difficult to understand what the people are saying — due, in part, to the U.K. accents. Perhaps transcripts should be available, in future.

Otherwise, all was lovely. If you missed the 7th Annual Meeting, you missed a good one!

For more about the meeting, see the minutes (40).

THE 1981 MEETING

(3) Where in 1981? Here is where we have met in the past: 1974, 1975, 1976 New York (Hotel Tudor); 1977 Los Angeles (Westwood Holiday Inn); 1978 Hamilton (McMaster University); 1979 New York (Hotel Tudor); 1980 Chicago (University of Chicago's Center for Continuing Education.) We have had the poorest facilities in New York, and the best

facilities when we have met in academic quarters (Hamilton, Chicago).

At the 1980 meeting, a number of cities were mentioned for 1981: Austin, Boston, Baltimore, Hamilton, Los Angeles, Washington. These are listed on the ballot (last page of this newsletter), along with a blank space where you can list some other city, if you wish to. Boston has a lot of academic institutions, and we might be able to locate in one of them. Hamilton has the Russell Archives, and McMaster's superb facilities. Washington has, well, it's Washington.

Bob Davis has some ideas about all this. See the next item (3.5).

A weekend in June seems to be the best time. June has several merits: it does not conflict with the academic year; and it does not have winter storms that gum up air-travel schedules.

Well, take your pick. We're going to vote for Hamilton.

* * * * *

Don's memo. Don Jackanicz has written a short (3-page) memo ("Some Annual Meeting Reminiscences") on the way he planned for the 1980 meeting and the way it turned out. Whoever is in charge of a future meeting might get some useful ideas from it. It is in the BRS Library.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

(3.5) President Robert K. Davis reports:

Elsewhere in this issue (44) you are asked to notify us as to your preference for time and place of the 1981 annual meeting. Since the meeting is one of the major responsibilities of the president, I would like to make a few remarks and solicit your suggestions.

Our meetings have gotten better, for the most part, with the passage of time. This year's meeting in Chicago was the best yet, and is due almost entirely to the work and ability of Don Jackanicz. The Chicago experience points out the fact that there are two basic conditions for a successful meeting. First, there must be a fairly large number of BRS members in the area to draw attendance from. Second, there must be a person on hand locally who will take charge — select a meeting-place and reasonable accommodations, solicit speeches, etc.

* We have not had a meeting in the South because neither of these conditions have been met. Washington, DC has been suggested for 1981. We do have membership in sufficient numbers in the Boston-Washington corridor to justify this, but we don't seem to have anyone in the area to organize it. If you have any suggestions to solve this problem or wish to volunteer to help, please so indicate on the ballot. My own feeling is, Washington would be the best choice for 1981, if (and only if) the organization problem can be solved.

Hamilton was mentioned quite often. So was California. That would presumably mean Los Angeles, because most of our California members live in this area. San Francisco was mentioned because it is a great place to visit, but unfortunately we have only 4 or 5 members in that area. Claremont was mentioned for its academic and wine facilities; it is in the L.A. area and certainly is a possibility.

* Please let us know your preference for the coming meeting, and also for later ones.

There is some interest in a meeting in London. It was suggested for 1981 (perhaps to be coordinated with the Memorial Bust Dedication) but prudence would suggest a later date. I personally like the idea and we could put together a good program, in all likelihood. However I think very few members would go (in '81), so it is probably not a good idea. Please let us know (via the ballot) whether you would attend such a meeting, later on.

Several of us in Southern California are thinking of having a purely social get-together in the immediate future. Interested So. Cal. members who have not received a letter on this should contact me immediately — as well as anyone else who is going to be in the L.A. area. (2501 Lakeview Avenue, Los Angeles, 90039.213-663-7485.)

(4) Treasurer Dennis J. Darland reports:

For the quarter ending 3/13/80:

Balance on hand (12/31/79).....	2716.10	
Income: 24 new members.....	364.22	
6 renewals.....	70.00	
	Total dues.....	434.22
Contributions.....	852.50	
sales of RSN, books, etc.....	130.35	
	Total income.....	1417.07
		+1417.07
		4133.17
Expenditures: Information & Membership Committees.....	857.17	
Subscriptions to "Russell".....	234.50	
Other.....	91.35	
	Total spent.....	1183.02
Balance on hand (3/31/80).....	2950.15	
		-1183.02

Unrestricted funds.....	1617.65
Special purpose funds: 1979 Scholarship Award.....	500.00
1980 Scholarship Award.....	500.00
Bertrand Russell Memorial(London).....	332.50
Total restricted funds.....	1332.50
Balance on hand (3/31/80).....	2950.15

(This report was presented at the 1980 meeting.)

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

(5) Information Committee (Lee Eisler, Chairman):

The Information Committee's job is to communicate with members — and with non-members to the extent that we are able to. To communicate with members, we issue a newsletter 4 times a year. To communicate with non-members, that is, with the outside world, is difficult (on a small budget). Our efforts in this direction are modest. Mostly we try to reach the academic community. We would of course like to reach the general public as well, and let it know of our existence. Sooner or later we'll plan some event that the media will judge to be of interest to the public; then it will be reported in the newspapers, etc. Unfortunately the doings of philosophers are rarely judged to be of interest to the public.

We reach out to the academic community in 3 ways. (1) We have a BRS session at the annual meeting of the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division). The announcement of this session — and the call for papers — appear in the scholarly philosophy journals. (2) We offer the BRS Travel Scholarship. It began in 1979, and awards (up to) \$500 to a doctoral candidate, to enable him to travel, say, to the Russell Archives to do research for his dissertation. The announcement of the Travel Scholarship is sent to 5 departments in 15 large universities (Philosophy, Psychology, History, Sociology, and English). The announcement of the winner is sent to the same 75 departments. The winner in '79 was a historian. (3) The announcement of the BRS Award — given this year for the first time — is sent to the Philosophy Departments of 15 major universities, to philosophy journals, to The New York Times, etc.

(This report was presented at the 1980 meeting.)

(6) Membership Committee (Lee Eisler, Chairman; P.K. Tucker, Co-Chairman):

The Membership Committee's chief job is to recruit new members. To do this, we are advertising (this year) in 9 publications: APA MONITOR, THE HUMANIST, MENSA, THE NATION, THE NEW REPUBLIC, THE PROGRESSIVE, SATURDAY REVIEW, and UU WORLD. This produces about 50 inquiries — and about 8 new members — per month, on the average. It's a lot of work to handle these 58 responses each month, and I am very grateful to Co-Chairman Tucker for doing it. I'm also indebted to BEV SMITH, the previous Co-Chairman, who handled this assignment for 3 years.

(This report was presented at the 1980 meeting.)

(7) Philosophers Committee (Ed Hopkins, Chairman):

The papers for the meeting of the BRS with the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in Boston (December 1980) are in process of being chosen. My main problem is a dwindling supply of papers. I need to have more papers submitted. If you know of anyone who has a paper on Russell that he would want to read at our meeting, urge him to submit it to me. I intend to have a meeting, with papers on Russell, every year, but I do need help in getting those papers. I have not yet solicited papers from known Russell scholars, but will do so if necessary.

(This report was presented at the 1980 meeting.)

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

(Alex was unable to give his scheduled talk at the 1980 meeting, because of various complications. Here are excerpts from the talk he intended to give:)

The Social Responsibility of Scientists and Laymen

All of us are working and living in the year 1980, when the control over much scientific research and development is in the hands of a few people at large private institutions, corporations and government bureaucracies. These people often use scientific results in such a way as to fulfill their own institution's goals. Most often, such goals do not fit the broad parameters of international concerns for the environment, quality of life, resource scarcity or even the future of life itself. If we are all not soon to be regretful Einsteins, scientists and laymen such as yourselves have the enormous and pressing responsibility to speak out on social issues and scientific ones, as Russell did, so effectively and eloquently, not as a representative of an institution but as an educated human being...

No matter what our leaders pretend, the ugly reality is that massive sums of money and manpower are spent in the preparation for the most effective destruction. The U.S. federal budget creates a Faustian bargain for many activists and researchers — the risk of loss of integrity in return for those all too necessary funds to continue an endeavor, be it in pure science or the fight against pollution.

Government support (and control) at 15 leading American universities accounts for over 85% of monies in the biological sciences, 80% in physics and chemistry. Much too often, safe research is carried out with results either insignificant or a mere confirmation of well-known facts, merely to make sure the money will keep coming.

Let us discuss some areas in which everyone, especially that mythical creature, the "objective scientist", should act with discernment and tenacity:

First is the need to limit the apotheosis of irrationality — the threat of nuclear annihilation. The issue of disarmament and the consequences of even a limited nuclear war have been widely discussed. J. Moreland and I are developing an essay to be entered in the Essay Competition (of "The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists") on "How to Eliminate the Threat of Nuclear War". (Our essay will appear in the next issue of the newsletter. For a description of the Essay Competition, see Item 19.) (The theme of their essay is the technical and financial feasibility of developing the resources of the moon. Ed.) This is an area in which every citizen should participate, the scientist as information dispenser and organizer, everyone else as political and grassroots activist: The moon development program will extend over about 20 years.

A more immediate concern is the pollution of our planet. Are we going to stay at war with Nature? Nearly 20 million people participated in the first Earth Day in 1970. Since then, environmental concerns have become part of the political value system. Strong laws were enacted in the U.S. However, current economic problems tend to reduce effective enforcement of such laws. The web of life is enormously complex, and we still do not know its many synergistic relationships. Only intense citizen pressure can keep the environmental issues in the limelight, and force the development of satisfactory solutions. Again the scientist must do the research, disseminate the information in a coherent, comprehensive picture, and then the layman can spread awareness of problems and solutions.

The 1979 Council on Environmental Quality reports that the U.S. water resources (drinking water reserves, coastal fisheries, and wetlands) are in trouble. Industrial waste and land run-off are found difficult to legislate and control. The U.S. endangered species list grew from 89 in 1969 to 228 in 1980. In that same time span, the U.S. lost 17 million acres to roads, shopping centers and the like. Worldwide there are more than a billion more people to feed. With increased use of foodstuffs for gasahol production, food scarcities in parts of the world will probably worsen. Americans still squander resources as if there were no tomorrow. We rely more on foreign oil today than we did in 1973. Every person who calls himself "educated" must spread the word that Spaceship Earth is a finite resource. Either we go out into space or we cut back on attacks on the environment; I hope we will do both.

Scientists, as government consultants and experts, will need to learn to escape from the secrecy which so often covers inefficiency. If no one knows, it becomes much too easy to deal with troublesome advice, whether it is factual or not. Scientists cannot remain the professional diplomats they are today, building behind-the-scenes relationships based on reciprocal favors. Scientists or their representative groups must offer the public and government free and informed advice, whether the public or government asks for it or not!

Such action is beyond one man's powers, but the efforts of a concerned group can produce remarkable results. No science is a precious sanctuary where one can forget the woes of the world. As a start, each Congressman should be assigned a volunteer individual scientist or group of laymen, to provide advice on the many new problems in technology, which Congress must eventually vote on.

Science is not something beyond ordinary human affairs. Empire builders in science have promulgated that myth. Informed laymen — and only they — can destroy it, and ultimately help science, by enabling the rest of the world to understand its relatively simple findings — not the detailed studies, but the broad concepts and basic ideas.

Many scientists have been intimidated by threats to withhold grants, and by the knowledge that during a long fight, they will be drained emotionally, physically, and intellectually. Scientists cannot do it alone; laymen must help carry the burden.

The science of biology probably poses the gravest threat, yet holds the greatest promise, for human life. Historically, scientist and layman alike have contributed to the perversion of this science through loyalty to parochial patriotism rather than international or ethical tenets of a profession or world law. Chemical and biological warfare have been part of the U.S. weapons arsenal in Maryland since 1946. Gradually the sciences traditionally promoting human life (medicine, biology, and biochemistry) are being perverted for military applications. Part of the Hippocratic Oath reads, "Neither will I administer a poison to anybody, even when asked to do so, nor will I suggest such a course."

Biological warfare is more insidious than nuclear war. Without an overt declaration of war, countries can be ravaged by successive crop failures of unknown origin; epidemics of human disease and fertility can be caused. In Vietnam, the U.S. Army used defoliating and herbicidal chemicals, completely disregarding international law. The U.S. Department of Defense continually surveys major food crops in China and Russia, with emphasis on their susceptibility to known blights. Army training manuals show estimates on the introduction of blights into an unprepared country (80% cropless in a single attack), and one can conclude that anticrop warfare (in a period of food supply strain) will be a question of feasibility rather than morality. The chemical and biological ingredients used or planned for warfare are constructed so as to be non-biodegradable, thus threatening whole nations with disastrous ecological consequences.

In too many situations, scientists feel that to take a moral stance is outside their professional domain. Such a "hear no evil, see no evil" attitude is dangerous. Too often, the harmful effects of, say, insecticides, have not yet been studied. In such a situation — over 50% of all chemicals on the market are still untested! — the scientist must be vigilant as protector of the public health rather than as mere collector/evaluator of existing, incomplete data. Since most scientists are not trained to see and assess the total context, they must

be pressured from the outside, by knowledgeable and persistent laymen.

Small areas of science are often the basis of technology. The influences of such technology on daily life have not yet been widely studied; too often the scientist feels that these influences are beyond the reach of objective verification or other parts of "scientific method". Even in relatively common activities, such as food processing, many a biologist would discover food for a nightmare when reviewing the list of FDA-approved food additives. Consumers today are often the guinea pigs because scientists and technicians provide inadequate, falsified, or no evidence at all, to prove products safe. Scientists and laymen alike should press for legislation making companies liable for ill effects suffered by customers.

Research geneticists and recombinant DNA scientists have spoken out more pointedly about their concerns about hazards, especially those genetic in nature. Today we have the ability to change man's gene pool, and patents are awarded on living organisms. Yet most scientists have compartmentalized their thinking to such a degree as to become unable to grasp complex relations between chemicals and genetic damage.

There are thousands of scientific publications, millions of pages, from which fact one can easily conclude that most scientists cannot possibly be the experts in broad areas they would like or purport to be. Public understanding of what science can and cannot do is of paramount importance. The stakes are too high to permit knowledge without wisdom.

We urgently need a broad, ecological philosophy, a humility toward the complexities of nature and toward man's abilities and limitations. Man does not have the God-given right to extract from Nature every last bit of material, regardless of the cost to other organisms. Man cannot survive the loss of biological diversity. As competition for scarce resources builds, social stresses mount. We must find ways to change the most important aspect of man's world: his view of himself.

Our world is too quickly being reduced to a domesticated garbage heap; scientists have helped this come about. Some of them recognize the problems, fewer are constructing the "big picture" in which solutions can be found. But the world runs not by science alone; laymen must take over some of the load. Grass roots groups have done a great deal in spreading ecological understanding. But short-term economics and ecology don't seem always to go hand in hand; and time may not be on our side. Schools must teach all the facts of life, not just the ones which prevailing ideology allows. Scientists can discover the facts and start their dissemination; but laymen must keep pressuring them, to make them see the whole forest rather than single trees. Scientists should not be seen as experts or gods. They must be made to reject the secrecy which surrounds most work in areas of defense, biology, etc.

Nuclear war, insecticides, solar energy, weapons systems, etc., are not just scientific issues, but social, moral and economic ones as well. The public cannot judge till given the facts; that is the scientist's role. Then the public must assimilate the information, and make a collective judgment.

Many more problems could be mentioned — population growth, world food supply, etc. — but all discussion points to the unique role of the scientist: to inform the public about achievements and failures in science and technology, so that the public conscience can operate. This requires a continual feedback between scientist and layman, to assure reliability of information. We must all help build a composite picture of how the world runs, what it consists of, how the parts interrelate, what causes damage, etc. Education is the key. Scientists and educators must be required to transmit accurate and complete information about our world. No such information or knowledge can be considered "classified". The boundaries separating specialized areas of human affairs, and between science and the public, must be eliminated. Ultimately it is a matter of commitment that will make or break us.

All of us who see this need are obligated to work for its resolution. Each individual, scientist and layman, must choose the area in which his efforts will be most fully felt. Our efforts, whether in science, in education, in business, or in politics may help save mankind from a perilous and unsavory future. Bertrand Russell made that effort. Let us try to follow his example.

(9) Universal Human Rights Committee (David Paul Makinster, Acting Chairman):

(David regrets that he has to step down as Acting Chairman. Other demands on his time make it impossible for him to do the job the way he would like to. He offers these observations:)

The inclusion in RSN26 of the Amnesty International USA petition is exactly the sort of action by which, in my estimation, the Human Rights Committee can be most useful. I have mentioned before the idea of an "information clearinghouse for Human Rights groups." To publicize, assist, and help to coordinate the activities of capable, established Human Rights groups is far more valuable than merely duplicating efforts with limited resources.

Whoever chairs the Committee would do well to subscribe to the HUMAN RIGHTS BULLETIN of the International League for Human Rights, 236 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017 — a fine source of information and general resources.

We should consider exchanging mailing lists with other organizations interested in promoting human rights. Individuals who object to this should be given time to request by mail that their names be excluded from such an exchange.

The meaning of "human rights" should be made specific, based, as far as possible, on what Russell believed, although I am not aware that he made any outright definition or enumeration of human rights. Here is a start, based on my own understanding of Russell:

Every individual has a right to develop his or her character and talents free from persecution or the threat

of persecution arising from intolerance concerning ideas, private lifestyle, personal conscience, or any other unconventionality that does not actually deprive others of their similar personal liberty. To deprive a person of life, health, property, means of livelihood, or freedom -- of personal association, thought and its expression, or unrestricted movement -- on the basis of that person's failure to conform to prevailing ideologies and social mores, is to treat that person as less than fully human. That is the basic characteristic of a "human rights violation," which, as I see it, makes it impossible for one to live a life "inspired by love and guided by reason." If we are to be concerned with Human Rights the way Russell was (as I understand him), we must not reject concern for issues as diverse as child abuse, the arms race, ERA, the poisoning of the environment with chemicals and nuclear waste, the jailing of Soviet Jews, and the wholesale firing of homosexual teachers, to name just a few items.

Finally, I would like to say that I am more than willing to devote whatever time I can spare to the Committee's activities.

A SPECIAL REQUEST

(10) "My Favorite Russell" -- a new series in the newsletter -- starts in this issue.

The series will consist of responses (by various members) to the questions: Which of Russell's writings is your favorite, and why?

* Members, please send us your answers.

* Honorary members, we'd be specially interested in knowing what your favorite Russell is, and we hope you will wish to tell us.

Please send your response to the newsletter (address on Page 1, bottom.)

The series is off to an excellent start: the first installment is by Paul Arthur Schilpp, who just received the first BRS Award (17). His essay appears as Item 16.

BR ON THE WORLD SCENE

(11) BR on Iran:

I propose to take Iran as a case study of what the West means by the "free world"... I hope citizens of the West will begin to inquire as to why their taxes and armies have been given over to support tyranny and corruption the world over... When the national uprising occurs, will the United States protect Iranian "freedom" as in Viet Nam by seeking at immense human cost to suppress the rebellion? (Bertrand Russell, 1966)

We thank DENNIS DARLAND, who advises that he found this quotation in a piece of literature he acquired at the University of Iowa in 1978. It was put out by the Iranian People's Support Committee.

BR QUOTED

(12) In "Forbes" (again!) Last issue we mentioned that "Forbes" had quoted BR 2 months in a row. Now, in the May 12th issue, they're at it again:

Whenever one finds oneself inclined to bitterness, it is a sign of emotional failure.

Looks like BR has achieved complete respectability.

(Thank you, Whitfield Cobb.)

(13) In "Today", "Florida's Space Age newspaper, a Gannet newspaper published in Brevard County, Florida". The date is some time in February 1980:

(next page, please)

Russell, Lincoln Among Atheists

By TOM ATKINSON
Merritt Island

I read the history of the Spanish conquistadores in Mexico, and Central and South America — how these Catholic Christians would take Indian babies to a priest or monk, have them baptized, then bash their heads on the rocks. The

(Thank you, Herb Vogt.)

history of the scandals behind the pope's robes will convert any thinking person to atheism.

To those who have labeled me a Communist, I suggest they read *Why I Am Not a Christian* by Bertrand Russell. Lord Russell was also labeled a Communist, and he was a Nobel Prize winner. Thanks for putting me into his company. I repeat one of his last statements: "There has been a rumor in recent years that I have become less opposed to religious orthodoxy than I formerly was. This rumor is totally without foundation. I think all the great religions of the world — Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity, Islam and Com-

munism — both untrue and harmful. . ." etc. (This Clarion book is available at most bookstores.)

Last Friday morning on TV 2 news, I heard a young man singing a song praising Abraham Lincoln as a man of God. The truth is, Christians have been claiming America's most respected president as one of their own for decades. Honest Abe said: When I find a church that practices what it preaches, that church I will join. Read *Lincoln the Atheist* by Joseph Lewis, P.O. Box 2117, Austin, Texas 78768.

ABOUT BERTRAND RUSSELL

- (14) Nero Wolfe's creator is scared (for once), as told in Rex Stout, A Biography by John McAleer (Boston: Little Brown, 1977) pp. 192-193:

As soon as she got back from Russia, Ruth resumed her duties as Scott Nearing's secretary. One of the first things she did was to arrange for Scott to debate Bertrand Russell at Carnegie Hall, on 25 May 1924. For moderators, she rounded up Samuel Untermyer and Benjamin A. Javits, brother of Jacob Javits. The topic was "Can the Soviet Idea Take Hold of America, England, and France?" Scott took the affirmative side.

Rex had an aversion to staged debates and avoided them as a matter of principle. Yet he wanted to meet Russell. Ruth handled that too. She brought Russell around to Rex's apartment, on Perry Street, for high tea. In Rex Russell found a lively intellectual sparring partner. Over the next five years, until Rex went to Europe, whenever Russell was in New York, he came by regularly for dinner and conversation. One night when they were having dinner together, their minds ranged over English literature. They talked of the Mediterranean origin of the usual Gothic villain in English novels. Rex asked: "Why is it that whenever there is a character of Latin extraction in a novel by an Englishman, even if the novelist is obviously sympathetic with the character, between the lines there is always a note of condescension?" Russell's brow corrugated. "They gesticulate," he announced, "and we can't bear it." Of Russell, Rex told me: "In 1926 he was fifty-four and world-famous;

I was forty and merely an American businessman who could answer his thousands of questions about my country and fellow citizens, and could (and did) supply vast quantities of fresh caviar, which he loved. And apparently he liked me. There wasn't much we never talked about. Once he spent hours trying to define and describe to his satisfaction, precisely, the difference between the operation of his mind and mine that made me incapable of understanding the general theory of relativity."¹¹

Russell was one of the few men in the world who could hold Rex in awe. Years later, in the spring of 1940, he was Rex's dinner guest at High Meadow. Of that occasion Egmont Arens afterward reported: "I'd known Rex more than twenty years and never saw him at a loss for words. He was informed and intelligent and he showed it. But that night he was like a little mouse at a feast of cats — silent and attentive and bright eyed and quietly pleasant. And all of a sudden I realized, By God, Rex is scared! He really was scared. I was surprised and kind of touched."¹²

During World War II, when Russell sent his children to America, on his instructions they visited Rex.

Though best known as the author of the Nero Wolfe mysteries, Stout was also a founder of "The New Masses" (a Marxist periodical of the 20s), a board member of the American Civil Liberties Union, and president of Vanguard Press. Ruth is Rex Stout's sister. The Russell-Nearing debate was published by Allen & Unwin as Bolshevism and the West and by Haldeman-Julius as Soviet Form of Government: Little Blue Book No. 723.

We are indebted to TOM STANLEY for all of the above.

- (15) Blanshard on Russell Brand Blanshard is "a philosophical rationalist"... "perhaps the most distinguished living proponent of that great tradition," according to Paul Arthur Schilpp. Schilpp edited The Philosophy of Brand Blanshard (La Salle, IL.: Open Court, 1980), which is Volume 15 in "The Library of Living Philosophers". Here is what Blanshard had to say about BR in that just-published volume, pp. 86-90:

During Moore's period at Swarthmore, Russell and his wife were living not many miles away in a fine stone house at Malvern, bought for him by my former employer, A. C. Barnes. One day a note came from Lady Russell inviting the Moores and ourselves to tea. Moore declined, on the ground that he was indisposed, which was true, I think, in more senses than one; the two men, whose names are so often joined, and who owed so much to each other, were not temperamentally congenial. But Dorothy Moore accepted, and Frances and I drove her to the house, which was in the neighborhood of Bryn Mawr. I recall only two things about this visit. Russell was in a jovial mood, and taking me into his study, pointed to an old silhouette on the wall. It was the likeness of a philosopher, he said; could I tell who it was? I have a fair eye for philosophic physiognomies, but this had me baffled. "That," said Russell, "is my godfather, John Stuart Mill." It was the strange and unlikely truth. Russell was born in 1872; Mill died in 1873; Russell's parents, the Amberleys, had been devoted admirers of Mill; and though none of them had any clear religious beliefs, Mill had consented to serve as godfather and had sent the infant an inscribed silver cup. The other fragment of memory from that visit is a remark of Russell's about James. He had evidently been engaged on the

chapter on James for his *History of Western Philosophy*, and had been rereading the essay on "The Will to Believe." "Isn't it immoral!" he exclaimed.

I did not know Russell nearly as well as I did Moore, but I read far more of him, partly because there was so much more of him to read; between forty and fifty of his volumes are on my shelves. He came to Ann Arbor in the early twenties to lecture on the structure of the atom, and kept his audience amused with such comparisons as that between the behavior of electrons in passing from orbit to orbit and the behavior of fleas in hopping unseen from one place to another. With a few other young philosophers, I took him to a basement café in the Michigan Union and plied him with food and questions. I asked what ground he had for believing in Occam's razor. He replied that it was incapable of proof but that we could not help believing it, and that experience appeared to confirm it. I sent him a copy of *The Nature of Thought* in 1942, and though it contained a sharp criticism of his *Analysis of Mind*, he wrote me a pleasant letter about it, reminding me that Joachim, to whom the book was dedicated, was a relative of his who had drawn up for him, when he was eighteen, a list of readings, including the *Logics* of Bradley and Bosanquet;

"they started me on philosophy," he said. In October 1968 I went to McMaster University in Canada to give an address at the opening of the Russell Collection to the public. This collection of Russell's books and manuscripts, which had been acquired earlier that year, will undoubtedly be a Mecca for students of his work. He must have had a larger volume of correspondence than any other philosopher in history, including Voltaire, for the collection contains more than 120,000 letters, with "a few thousand" temporarily reserved; and more than 4,500 correspondents are listed by name. His library also was acquired by McMaster, including Wittgenstein's library, which Russell bought from him in 1919. I was happy that I could add one small item to the collection myself. Moore had written part of his essay on Russell's theory of description in our house in Peacham, Vermont, and had left the manuscript with me. I sent it to the Russell Collection.

Russell was as ready as Moore to change his views with changing evidence. He started with Hegelian idealism; from this he shifted to one of the most extreme realisms on record; and toward the end of his life he shifted back to a Berkeleyan position regarding all that is immediately experienced. It will be recalled that according to Montague the chief difficulty with the New Realism was that it could not deal with error. Russell boldly met this difficulty, not by withdrawing from realism but by defiantly becoming more realistic still; he was prepared to regard all the strange shapes seen as one walks round a table and all the bats' heads seen by the alcoholic as members of an independent physical order. This position was examined by Lovejoy in *The Revolt Against Dualism*, and when he finished, not much was left of it. Russell, alive to the force of such criticism, beat a slow retreat. By 1948, when *Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits* appeared, he was writing, "if percepts are 'mental,' as I should contend, then spatial relations which are ingredients of percepts are also mental."¹³ Indeed the space and time of common life with all their contents were now regarded as mind-dependent, and the problem of the theory of knowledge was to find some way of correlating items in the realm of sense with the events in the realm of physics that gave rise to them. Our "real" world, the plain man's world of tables and chairs, of green grass and blue skies, is a panorama in the minds of its beholders. In comparison, the physical world was a ghostly affair that lay at the end of a precarious inference, and matter had resolved itself into "a wave of probability undulating in nothingness."

Moore was the very type of a Cambridge specialist; Russell was a Renaissance universalist. Russell wrote on every branch of philosophy except aesthetics. When I asked him once why he had not written on that too, he replied, "because I don't know anything about it," though he added characteristically, "that is not a very good excuse, for my friends tell me that it has not deterred me from writing on other subjects." He has been charged with turning out potboilers which were loosely and hastily thrown together, and no doubt in the vast volume of his writing one does find a wide variation in quality. His *History of Western Philosophy* is not the place to go for accurate philosophic reportage; his views on religion seem to me too unsympathetic and negative; and his later anti-Americanism, which led him to range an American president alongside Hitler, embarrassed many of his admirers. But even in second-grade Russell there are the trenchancy and force of a remarkable mind. If one does not get Aristotle quite as he was from the *History*, one gets at least the enlightening impression that one great logician formed of another. The defects of Christianity pointed out in *Why I Am Not a Christian* are real defects, even if the virtues are too largely ignored. And though Russell's indictment of American policy was too much like a prosecutor's brief, what he loved above all—rationality—and what he hated above all—cruelty—were surely the right things, whether he found them in

the right places or not.

How many philosophers, one wonders, have succeeded in being readable through thousands of pages? Russell's success is the more striking because he was in one sense not a stylist at all. He did, to be sure, fall under the influence for a time of his literary brother-in-law, Logan Pearsall Smith, whose gods were Flaubert and Walter Pater; and he showed what he could do in the rhetorical vein when he wrote *A Free Man's Worship*. "a work," he said later, "of which I do not now think well." Until he was twenty-one, he wanted to write like John Stuart Mill. But he came to think that, for him at least, imitation involved insincerity, and that the true ideal was one derived from mathematics; "I wished to say everything in the smallest number of words in which it could be said clearly."¹⁴ The result is a style dominated by simple declarative sentences, and so nicely adjusted to his way of thinking that he could write without revision. He had another mode of economizing his energies in writing, namely a strategic use of the subconscious. When he had to write an article, or essay, he would give intense attention long beforehand to defining the issues he wanted to deal with and summoning up such relevant knowledge as he had. He would then commit the matter to his subconscious until two weeks or so before the article was due, when he usually found that he could write it straight off with very little effort. What led him to rely on this method, he said, was his experience in preparing his Lowell Lectures on *Our Knowledge of the External World*. The lectures were to be given in Boston at the beginning of 1914. He struggled with the problem through most of the preceding year, only to reach the end of the year in frustration and despair. Since the time was short, he arranged to dictate to a stenographer what straggling ideas might come. "Next morning, as she came in at the door," he recalled, "I suddenly saw exactly what I had to say, and proceeded to dictate the whole book without a moment's hesitation."¹⁵ When I was writing the chapter on "The Subconscious in Invention" for *The Nature of Thought*, I found many instances of such use of the subliminal mind, but I doubt if there is any philosopher for whom it has proved such a cornucopia as for Russell.

What I admire most about Russell, however, is not his writing but his rationalism. Not rationalism in the technical sense, for he abandoned that when his pupil Wittgenstein convinced him on a walking trip in Norway that mathematics was only a vast tautology. By rationalism here I mean the rational temper, the habitual appeal to reason as the only ultimate arbiter of men's differences of view. Russell was involved almost continuously in political and moral controversy; he lost his Trinity fellowship and went to jail over the First World War; he was refused the right to teach in New York because of his views on marriage and morals; he was bitterly attacked for his opinions on Hiroshima and Vietnam. But he was always ready to present reasons for his beliefs, and to reconsider them if these reasons could be shown unsound. Most persons are much worse in theory than in practice, but Russell's practice was sometimes better than his theory. From middle life on, he was prey to the unfortunate doctrine, which for a while even Moore found seductive, that moral judgments are only expressions of feeling or desire, and, as incapable of truth or falsity, cannot be made out by evidence. But neither in controversy nor in practice did he behave as if he took this seriously. He never ceased to argue on moral issues, to assume that where men differed there was an objective truth to be found, or to believe that the highest human goodness lay in acting rationally. He acted himself like an eighteenth-century rationalist, and the man whom he regarded as "the noblest and most lovable of the great philosophers"¹⁶ was that archrationalist Spinoza. It can hardly be doubted that in the annals of practical rationalism Russell will rank high.

(Thank you, Don Jackanicz.)

"MY FAVORITE RUSSELL"

(16)

By Paul Arthur Schilpp:

The Society has asked me to say in a more or less abbreviated statement which one of Bertrand Russell's writings I would choose as my first preference and why. I am happy to comply with this request although I am all too aware that no scholar should respond to a specific request like that without having read everything that the respective author had written and published. And, with all my regard and respect for Lord Russell, I simply can make no such claim. As over against my good friend, Mr. Lester E. Denonn, I do not even begin to own a small proportion of Russell's writings which are in his possession. Consequently, in undertaking this assignment, I must in advance plead guilty to unprofessional procedure.

On the first half of this assignment, that is, naming a specific Russelian writing, I must admit that among those I do know I have no hesitancy whatsoever in picking his "A Free Man's Worship" of 1902. At that point

in his life Russell was barely thirty, certainly far from famous, whether in philosophy, mathematics, science, or even politics. It may seem strange, therefore, to pick such an early writing in his career. But, in all honesty, I can make no better choice.

Which brings me to my reason for this selection. In a way this may be easily and succinctly stated: "A Free Man's Worship," in my humble judgment, is a literary masterpiece of the first magnitude. No other scholar, certainly no philosopher in the English-speaking world in the twentieth century, can, at least from my point of view, match the stylistic beauty of this literary piece. It isn't a matter of agreeing or disagreeing with its content; with much of which I do in fact agree. But that is, as I have just indicated, quite beside the point. The magnificent phrases, each followed by many others, just come sweeping along until one feels almost breathless by the time one reaches the end. Who, who has ever read it, can forget such paragraphs as the following (I shall only select two):

"That Man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and his beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought or feeling, can preserve an individual life beyond the grave; that all the labors of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and that the whole temple of Man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a universe in ruins — all these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain, that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand. Only within the scaffolding of these truths, only on the firm foundation of unyielding despair, can the soul's habitation henceforth be safely built."

* * * * *

"Brief and powerless is Man's life; on him and all his race the slow, sure doom falls pitiless and dark. Blind to good and evil, reckless of destruction, omnipotent matter rolls on its relentless way; for Man, condemned today to lose his dearest, tomorrow himself to pass through the gate of darkness, it remains only to cherish, ere yet the blow falls, the lofty thoughts that ennoble his little day; disdaining the coward terrors of the slave of Fate, to worship at the shrine that his own hands have built; undismayed by the empire of chance, to preserve a mind free from the wanton tyranny that rules his outward life; proudly defiant of the irresistible forces that tolerate, for a moment, his knowledge and his condemnation, to sustain alone, a weary but unyielding Atlas, the world that his own ideals have fashioned despite the trampling march of unconscious power."

It really does not matter how many times one reads or has read such passages. At each renewed time of reading, they grip the reader anew. Is there anything else I can say?

THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY AWARD

(17) The first ERS Award, as told in a ERS press release:

FIRST BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY AWARD GOES TO PHILOSOPHER PAUL ARTHUR SCHILPP

Paul Arthur Schilpp, Distinguished Research Professor of Philosophy at Southern Illinois University is the recipient of the first Bertrand Russell Society Award. The Award was presented on June 21st, during the Society's 7th annual weekend meeting, held this year in Chicago, at the University of Chicago's Center for Continuing Education.

This first Award has been given for an important innovation in philosophical scholarship, which benefited not only Russell, but quite a few other contemporary philosophers as well, and will no doubt benefit many more in the future.

The Award's citation reads: "For opening a new path to a better understanding of the work of living philosophers." The new path is The Library of Living

Philosophers, which Professor Schilpp conceived and edited. The Library consists of a series of volumes, each one dealing with a single philosopher, but with a difference.

Most philosophical studies in the past have been about philosophers who are dead. Professor Schilpp asked scholars to write about philosophers who were still living, and who could respond to what the scholars had written about them. Thus, the volume on Russell, for example, contains "critical or descriptive essays" by eminent scholars, each examining some aspect of Russell's work. Then Russell replies to these essays, agreeing with some and disagreeing with others. In the process much light is shed.

In all there are 14 volumes, on 14 philosophers — including Dewey, Whitehead, Santayana, Einstein and Popper — and several more in preparation. The majority were published during Professor Schilpp's 29 years in the Philosophy Department of Northwestern University, where he is Professor Emeritus of Philosophy.

Only a few highlights of Professor Schilpp's long and productive career can be mentioned here. Besides being an editor, he is or has been: an author and philosopher (The Crisis in Science and Education, Human Nature and Progress, Kant's Pre-Critical Ethics, The Quest for Religious Realism); a Methodist clergyman, like his father; a consultant in philosophy to Encyclopedia Britannica; President of the American Philosophical Association (Western Division); Co-Chairman of the recent Einstein Centennial Commemoration Festival in Carbondale, Illinois; a visiting professor at the University of Munich; a lecturer in India and Ceylon; and a representative of the State Department at the Pakistan Philosophical Congress.

Bertrand Russell (1872-1970) wrote for 2 entirely distinct audiences: Philosopher & Mathematician Russell wrote for his fellow philosophers and mathematicians; Citizen Russell wrote for his fellow citizens around the world. The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc., is not a scholarly society, though one of its aims — as its first Award indicates — is to promote Russell scholarship. It also aims to promote ideas and causes that Russell championed. Most of the Society's members live across the USA and Canada; about a dozen foreign countries are also represented on the membership list. For information about the Society, write RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036.


- (18) * The second BRS Award? We are asking for your suggestions, for the next recipient of the BRS Award. Whom would you like to see get it? Send us your nominations.

There should be a genuine connection between the person you nominate and BR. It might be someone who had worked closely with BR, in an important way. Or someone who has made a distinctive contribution to Russell scholarship. Or someone who has acted in support of a cause or idea that BR championed, or whose actions exhibited qualities of character (such as moral courage) reminiscent of BR.

Send your BRS Award nominations c/o the newsletter (address on Page 1, bottom) and tell why you think your nominee deserves the Award. If the winner is a well-known figure — or at least, not unknown — it may earn publicity for the BRS, which would be desirable.

PROMOTING BR'S PURPOSES

- (19) Against the threat of nuclear war, from "The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists":



THE BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS



ANNOUNCES

An International Essay Competition

In honor of its founding Editor, Eugene Rabinowitch, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and the Albert Einstein Fund offer a \$5000.00 prize for the best essay on

How to Eliminate the Threat of Nuclear War

Thirty-five years after the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the danger of nuclear war is greater than at any other time. Five nations have nuclear arsenals and many more are on the threshold.

The Editors and Directors of the Bulletin believe that once these weapons are used the ensuing war will be mankind's last and will mark the disappearance of our civilization. We appeal to those individuals born after Hiroshima to address the issues of peace and survival.

Competition Requirements

The Competition is restricted to individuals born on or after August 6, 1945.

Contestants must submit an original and three copies of an English language essay not to exceed 4000 words.

A self-addressed envelope and return postage must be included with each entry.

The contestant must submit a statement giving the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists first and exclusive publication rights for one year from date of submission.

Entries must be postmarked by September 15, 1980.

Review Procedures

The Bulletin Editors and Editorial Council will review all essays. The final decision will be made by an international and independent jury whose members will be selected by the board of directors.

The Award

\$5000.00

The Rabinowitch Award Essay will be published in the January 1981 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists

Mail Your Essay to

The Rabinowitch Essay Competition
The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists
1020-24 East 58th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637 USA

Additional copies of this announcement are available at the above address.

(Thank you, Bob Davis.)

RATIONALITY
and its adversaries

- (20) Evolution vs. Creation, continued. Last issue we reported that the Campus Crusade for Christ people were trying to get the Biblical story of creation taught in highschool science (sic!) classes, along with the theory of evolution. (Incidentally we reported it under the heading, RELIGION AND ITS ADVERSARIES, but RATIONALITY AND ITS ADVERSARIES seems more appropriate.)
- Fundamentalism seems to be on the march these days — see Martin Marty's article (42) or the current Republican platform — and the Humanist Association of San Diego is taking the threat (to the teaching of science) seriously. They are publishing a quarterly journal, called "CREATION/EVOLUTION". "Its aim will be to answer, in simple but correct language, all the major 'scientific' arguments creationists usually use in their publications and debates." \$8 for one year (4 issues). \$2.50 for the current issue. Send your check to CREATION/EVOLUTION, 953 Eighth Avenue (208), San Diego, CA 92101.
-

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

- (21) Herb Campbell was planning to come to the 1980 meeting, but got taken to the hospital instead. There they gave him a pacemaker, and he reports that he's coming along fine. He has provided all of us with A NEW APPROACH TO PEACE by Bertrand Russell, that accompanies this newsletter. Some of you may recall that he and BR traded rivers some years ago (NL3-65). Herb has been a river pilot at scenic Wisconsin Dells, a tourist attraction. If any BRS member wanders up that way, Herb could be very helpful, and that would please him very much. Write him (P.O. Box 231, Wisconsin Dells, WI 53965) or phone (608-254-8468).
- (22) Lee Eisler had an experience similar to one of BR's. He was due to enter the hospital for a minor operation last year. A hospital employee phoned him at home and asked a few routine questions, one of which was, "What is your religion?" The question is asked for the benefit of local clergymen, who regularly come to the hospital to visit patients of their various faiths. Lee answered, "I'm an agnostic." The next question was, "Do they have a church in Coopersburg?"
- (23) Ed Hedemann is spokesman for the War Resisters League, one of the antidraft groups planning to protest draft registration, according to a story in The New York Times, June 15, 1980, p. 19. Here are 2 excerpts from the Times story:
- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Some antidraft organizers are toying with what Dan Ebener of the pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation called "all sorts of creative ideas to disrupt the system."</p> <p>These include legally tying up business at the post offices where registration is expected to take place by forming lines of dozens of people to buy one-cent stamps and registering thousands of noneligible or false names with the Selective Service System. "We'll register Carter and maybe some generals," said Ed Hedemann of the War Resisters League.</p> | <p>Mr. Hedemann said that the war Resisters League might urge those who registered to wait until the last two days before signing up, while Susar Hadley said that the Fellowship of Reconciliation would distribute cards on which those of draft age would be asked to register their opposition to the draft at the same time that they registered with the Government.</p> |
|---|--|
- (24) Conrad Russell made a lightning trip to McMaster, to lecture to the History Department, on March 11th. (Thank you, WARREN SMITH and KEN BLACKWELL.)
-

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

- (25) $2 + 2 = ?$ "Some time in the middle 30s," writes JACK RAGSDALE, "I came across something of Russell's that read something like 'two and two are about four', and that has always intrigued me. Does anyone know where in BR's writings it occurs...and what it means?" Write Jack c/o the newsletter (address on Page 1, bottom.)
-

HONORARY MEMBERSHIP

- (26) Paul Arthur Schilpp has been proposed for honorary membership. He received the first BRS Award for his contribution to Russell scholarship, as described in (17). Honorary members must be approved by two-thirds of the members voting. Please vote (last page).

NEW MEMBERS

(27) We welcome these new members:

MRS. E. DEWEY BENTON/1324 Palmetto St./Clearwater, FL 33515
 GEORGE BLAM/20 Arlington Ave./St. James, NY 11776
 DECIO A. CALDERON/31-76 51st (5A)/Woodside, NY 11377
 A. J. CARLSON, JR./274 Saxer Ave./Springfield, PA 19064
 RICHARD D. CHESSICK, M.D., Ph.D./2622 Park Place/Evanston, IL 60201

DEWEY DANIELSON/ P.O.Box 2000 FPC/Lompoc, CA 93438
 JACK H. DORWART/1735 Costada Court/Lemon Grove, CA 92045
 PHILLIPS B. FREER/3845 Mt. Vernon Drive/Los Angeles, CA 90008
 MARY M. GIBBONS/211 Central Park West/New York, NY 10024
 STEVEN A. HISS/2337 SW Archer Road (#401)/Gainesville, FL 32608

JAMES LLOYD HOOPES/250 Avalon Ave./Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308
 MR & MRS RICHARD HYMAN/99 Pond Ave.(D 617)/Brookline, MA 02146
 MICHAEL R. INGRAM/Box 1010 - 43629/Canon City, CO 81212
 GERALD L. JACOBS/Rt. 7, Box 710, RCV/Cleveland, TX 77327
 CHRISTOPHER B. LISTON/34 University Ct./Normal, IL 61761

ROBERT LOMBARDI/285 Winspear Ave./Buffalo, NY 14215
 P.KARL MACKAL/7014 W. Mequon Road (112N)/Mequon, WI 53092
 DOUGLASS MAYNARD/3342 Yale Station/ New Haven, CT 06520
 PETER MEDLEY/1835 N. 51st St./Milwaukee, WI 53208
 MARY LOU MOORE/414 5th Ave. SW/Puyallup, WA 98371

EVA PREISS/138 High St./Brookline, MA 02146
 BRUCE A. ROMANISH/420 Conklin Hall/Rutgers University/Newark, NJ 07102
 ROCCO G. TOMAZIC/15050 Pine Valley Trail/Middleburg Heights, OH 44130
 ROB & ANN WALLACE/1905 Meadowbrook Ave./Tampa, FL 33612
 JULIUS F. WERNICKE, JR./Route 4, Box 55/Pensacola, FL 32504

JOSEPH C. WILKINSON/2717 25th Ave./Gulfport, MS 39501
 DR. ROGER WOODRUFF/501 Phoenix Av./Elmira, NY 14904

ADDRESS & OTHER CHANGES

(28) New addresses or corrections. Corrections are underlined>.

TRUMAN E. ANDERSON, JR./1776 Lincoln/Denver, CO 80203
 PASCAL BERCKER/2123 Salisbury/St. Louis, MO 63107
 ROBERT C. BERGEN/2605 Bridgeport Way/Sacramento, CA 95826
 JAMES BERTINI/346 State St.(6A)/Albany, NY 12210
 TOM BOHR/c/o House Subcommittee on Science, Research & Technology/ Rayburn House Office Bldg. 2319/
 Washington, DC 20515 (through August 1980)

TOM BOHR/Office of Student Affairs/UC School of Medicine/San Francisco, CA 14143 (starting September 1980)
 ROBERT S. CANTERBURY/415 S. Verlinden Ave./Lansing, MI 48915
 RICHARD CLARK, Ph.D./1707 Chalcedony (#5)/San Diego, CA 92109
 E. B. COCHRAN/deceased
 ALBERTO DONADIO/Apartado 16914/Bogotá, Colombia

WILLIAM EASTMAN, Ph.D./Dept. of Philosophy/The University of Alberta/Edmonton, Canada T6G OW4
 GAIL EDWARDS/1807 Mimosa Drive/Greensboro, NC 27403
 DAVID ETHRIDGE/P.O.Box 1453/University, MS 38677
 DAVID S. HART/56 Fort Hill Terrace/Rochester, NY 14620
 THOMAS HAW/1711 N. Sang Ave./Fayetteville, AR 72701

ALVIN HOFER, Ph.D./9952 S.W. 8 St.(#118)/Miami, FL 33174
 FRANK E. JOHNSON, M.D./11941 Claychester Drive/Des Peres, MO 63131
 CALVIN R. MCCAULAY/470 Dundas St. (701)/London, Ont./ Canada N6B 1W3
 SARAH PRIMM/706 Prospect Lake Drive/Colorado Springs, CO 80910
 BRAD ROBISON/420 Bellevue Ave.(302)/Oakland, CA 94610

CHERIE RUPPE/17114 N.E. 2nd Place/Bellevue, WA 98008
 PHILIP STANDER, Ed.D./7 Seabreeze Lane/Bayville, NY 11709
 DANIEL TITO/PO:"address unknown"
 PAUL WALKER/306 S. 6th St./Marshalltown, IA 50158

BOOK REVIEWS

- (29) "The Case of the Philosophers' Ring" by Randall Collins is a new (1978) "Sherlock Holmes" detective story in which a fictional BR plays an important role. We spoke rather highly of it in RSN22-34.

But now along comes a professional philosopher, who takes a sterner view. He is HARRY RUJA (our new Vice-President-Elect, incidentally), Professor Emeritus, Philosophy, at San Diego State University, and this is what he says:

Recently I read this work, which is one of an expanding series of "Sherlock Holmes" tales purporting to be by "Dr. Watson".

We read of Russell's mathematical work, of his association with Wittgenstein, his connection with Trinity, and of his friends, Keynes, Whitehead, Strachey, and Moore. The mystery in the novel is who, or what, caused the death of a brilliant young Hindu mathematician, found lifeless without a mark on him but with a taut abdomen. There is more mystical mumbo-jumbo than ratiocination in the solution, though Holmes is shown "deducing" a stranger's history on first meeting, in typical "Astounding, Holmes," "Elementary, my dear Watson" fashion.

The facts about Russell and his circle of acquaintances are, however, sadly garbled. Collins has Russell participating in demonstrations against the war (World War I) even before England got involved, when in fact Russell's opposition took active form only after the war was well under way. Moreover, BR was not on the streets protesting but in his study writing Why Men Fight and editorials for The Tribunal. Collins has Russell in prison for having urged the munitions workers to strike, whereas the more prosaic reason was that he had expressed scepticism as to the help American troops could offer the Allies.

Collins even retells Russell's jokes wrong: as for instance, the one in which BR is asked by the jailer what his religion is and replying "agnostic," not "atheist" as Collins has it, is reassured with the remark, "Well, there are many religions, but I suppose they all worship the same God."

Even on trivial matters, Collins bungles, as when he refers to Arthur Balfour, who had arranged for Russell to have a somewhat more comfortable cell, as "Lord" Balfour, a title Balfour did not acquire until 1922.

There are some interesting moments in the mystery as it unfolds, but all in all, this book will appeal more to mystery-fiction lovers than to friends of Russell, for whom the distortions will prove painful, if not downright offensive.

BRS LIBRARY

- (30) 2 Co-Librarians. Beginning September 1, 1980, Jack Ragsdale and Don Jackanicz will each assume the title of Co-Librarian of the BRS Library. Jack will take physical possession of the Library's holding, and will answer members' requests to borrow, buy or rent. (Films are for rent.) Contributions to the Library (of books, etc.) should be sent to him. Don will continue to work on a variety of Library projects, including the acquisition of material and bibliographic research.

For some time, Don had been trying to interest another BRS member in taking over part of the Library's work. "A few members expressed interest, and I thank all of them warmly for their ready willingness to help." Don and Jack discussed the Library at the 1980 Meeting, and Don concluded that Jack was the volunteer in best position to do the job. Don is now in process of closing out all outstanding Library accounts. If you have ordered books and have not yet received the complete order, you will hear from Don in due course.

Thus, the Library now has 2 addresses: Jack Ragsdale/P.O. Box 28200/Dallas, TX 75228
Don Jackanicz/3802 N. Kenneth Ave./Chicago, IL 60641

At the 1980 Meeting, the entire Library collection, supplemented by materials from Don's personal library and the Library of the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, was assembled for display and reference. The BRS Library is indebted to The Open Court Publishing Co., of La Salle, IL, which lent an exhibit set of "The Library of Living Philosophers" (edited by Paul Arthur Schilpp, who was guest of honor at the 1980 Meeting.) There is a special discount price for BRS members on volumes in "The Library of Living Philosophers". See below.

- (31) Open Court discount. Open Court Publishing Company has offered BRS members a 20% discount on the 11 in-print volumes in "The Library of Living Philosophers". Take 20% off of the following list prices: Albert Einstein, 27.50; C. D. Broad, 27.50; C. I. Lewis, 25.00; Ernst Cassirer, 30.00; G. E. Moore, 25; Karl Popper (in 2 vol.) 35.00; George Santayana, 25.00; Karl Jaspers, 30.00; Martin Buber, 27.50; Rudolph Carnap, 35.00; Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, 27.50. Paperbound: Albert Einstein, 6.95; Ernst Cassirer, 12.00; G. E. Moore, Vol. 1, 6.95, Vol. 2, 5.95; Karl Jaspers, 12.00.

The Russell, Dewey, and Whitehead volumes are out of print, and are available (only) from University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PARADOXES

(32) Jerry Alspaugh writes:

My 31 fourth-graders are enjoying the paradoxes in Russell Society News.

I told them about the one I found more than 20 years ago, in my Introduction to Philosophy course. It comes from BR's Human Knowledge (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1948), which I quote (p.180):

I once received a letter from an eminent logician, Mrs. Christine Ladd Franklin, saying she was a solipsist, and was surprised that there were no others. Coming from a logician, this surprise surprised me.

Back then I wrote my own paradox: "I'm going to kill myself, or die trying."

I remember an old cartoon which had one lady telling another: "Let's get several boxes before the hoarders come."

James Fixx offers this poser about a smart explorer captured by savages, who say to him: "Make a statement. If it is true, you will be hanged. If it is false, you will be shot." He says: "I will be shot," and is released.

My last paradox concerns me. Now that I have a free mind, I feel as I did when I was a "sanctified" Nazarene.

EXPENSES/CONTRIBUTIONS

- (33) Deductible expenses. This is a reminder to those members who are entitled to treat the cost of attending the 1980 meeting as a deductible expense on their federal income tax. That includes, as we understand it, members whose presence is essential to the conduct of the meeting — officers, directors, chairmen and committee members. If you are one of those members, and you take the deduction (as you are entitled to), there is one more thing you must do: you must notify the BRS Treasurer, and tell him the total amount you are deducting. The BRS is required to report that amount as a contribution to the BRS, on the BRS's tax return. (The BRS is not required to pay taxes, but it must file a return when its income exceeds \$5000.)
- * So please be sure to do your part in enabling the BRS to conform to the requirements. Notify BRS Treasurer Dennis J. Darland (1406 26th St., Rock Island, IL 61201) of the amount you will claim as a tax-deductible expense. Better not wait till 1981; better do it now.
- (34) Russell Memorial (London). We are pleased to report that 21 more BRS members have aided the plan to place a memorial bust of BR in the gardens of Red Lion Square, London, through their contributions: ROBERT CANTERBURY, WHITFIELD & MARGARET COBB, JACK COWLES, DENNIS DARLAND, LESTER DENONN, WILLIAM EASTMAN, PHILLIPS FREER, BARRY GOLDMAN, CHARLES GREEN, CONNIE JESSEN, FRANK PAGE, JACK RAGSDALE, CHERIE RUPPE, CAROL SMITH, GLENNA STONE, JOHN TOBIN, HERB VOGT, RONALD YUCCAS, TERRY & JUDITH ZACCONE. They, and all other donors, will hear from the Appeal Committee of the Bertrand Russell Memorial (London), thanking them for their contributions, and advising them (in advance) of the date and time the bust is to be unveiled. If you haven't yet sent a contribution, there is still time to do so. Send your (tax-deductible) check, made out to "The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc." to the ER Memorial, c/o the newsletter (address on Page 1, bottom).
- (35) BRS Treasury. We thank the following members for their contributions to the BRS Treasury: DENNIS DARLAND, PHILLIPS FREER, RAY PLANT, HARRY RUJA, DONNA WEIMER, and — for her continuing, regular, monthly contributions — KATHY FJERMEDAL.

BRS BUSINESS

- (36) Time to vote. The last page of this newsletter consists of a ballot for voting on the following:
- (1) Election of 8 Directors, for 3-year terms starting 1/1/81
 - (2) Time and place of 1981 meeting. Discussed in (3, 3.5)
 - (3) Honorary membership for Paul Arthur Schilpp. Discussed in (26).
 - (4) Feasibility of a future meeting in London. Discussed in (3.5)

Here are some facts about the Director-Candidates:

ADAM PAUL BANNER, age 59, was born in Chicago and graduated from the University of Evansville, Indiana in 1949 with a degree in Chemistry and Physics, followed by unfinished graduate studies at George Washington University. He has spent in excess of five years, not counting military service, outside the United States, serving in: Japan, Thailand, Korea, and Turkey as a civilian government employee and as a volunteer executive for the International Executive Service Corps of New York City. Presently semi-retired, he is a carbon and graphite chemist and has been known to write a fair poem.

ED HOPKINS, present Board member, Chairman of the Philosophers Committee. Originated and organizes the annual BRS Symposium at the APA (Eastern Division).

DON JACKANICZ, present Board member, BRS Secretary, BRS Co-Librarian. Planned and brought off the successful 1980 meeting.

S. ALI MOHAMMAD GHAEMI, of McLean, VA. Entering Junior year in highschool Member: Amnesty International, Int'l League for Human Rights, Clergy & Laity Concerned, United Nations Ass'n of the U.S., Palestine Congress of North America, Society for Iranian Studies, Thoreau Society, Thoreau Fellowship, various national and international Islamic groups, many philatelic groups. Interested in politics, history, writing, poetry, Islamic and Socialist philosophies, historical perspectives of philately. The "S" stands for "Sayyed", title of verification of descent from Holy Prophet Mohammad through his cousin and son-in-law, Emam (or Imam --- religious leader) Ali.

CHERIE RUPPE, Associate Member: Pugwash, Federation of American Scientists, Union of Concerned Scientists. Fellow of Endangered Wildlife Trust of So. Africa. and Member of The Whale Protection Fund. Member of Pacific Northwest Ballet Ass'n and PNWB League. Interests: skiing, sailing, hiking, photography & travel.

WARREN ALLEN SMITH, present Board member, BRS Vice-President (until 1/1/81). Member: American Humanist Ass'n, British Humanist Ass'n, Mensa. Former book review editor, "The Humanist" (USA), high school teacher (English), recording studio owner.

KAT TAIT, present Board member, founding member, honorary member, first BRS Treasurer, author of "My Father, Bertrand Russell," (New York: Harcourt Brace 1975).

P.K. TUCKER, Co-Chairman, Membership Committee; Research Psychologist in health care and law enforcement, Youth Services Coordinator of Lincoln County Youth Services.

Please vote. There are 8 candidates for 8 openings. There would have been more candidates if more members had nominated candidates, or had volunteered themselves. Next year, let us have more than 8 candidates, so that we give the member-voters a choice; with your cooperation, we can do it.

Even though all the candidates are going to be elected, we ask you to vote anyway, in order to (a) indicate your interest in BRS affairs, and (b) show your approval of the slate of candidates.
Vote.

MEMBERSHIP RENEWALS

(37) Last call for dues. As we reported last issue (RSN26-32), everybody's dues were due July 1st (except members who enrolled this year). There is a 2-month grace period, which extends the time to September 1st. If your dues have not been received by September 1st, you will be excommunicated and will probably spend the rest of time in Dante's 7th circle of hell.

We suggest you mail your dues check right now, while you have it in mind. You wouldn't want to risk excommunication, would you? Please send dues to BRS Membership Committee, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036. Regular member, \$20; couple, \$25; student, \$5. Outside USA and Canada, add \$5.

OBIT.

(38) We regret to report the death of BRS Member Edward B. Cochran, of Tiburon, California, after a short illness.

PERIODICALS RECEIVED

(39) "Flashpoint" is an 8-page publication (page size 11½ x 17) that "defines itself in the broad tradition of 'libertarian socialism', of which anarchism is one variety." "Libertarian socialism holds that the 'means of production', the workplaces, machines, etc., should be democratically controlled by all who work with them. Unlike the Communists or social democrats, we don't want to replace a private boss with a government boss." \$4 for 12 issues. Box 7702, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada.

1980 MEETING (CONTINUED)

- (40) Minutes of the 1980 Meeting. The Seventh Annual Meeting of The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc., was held Friday, June 20, through Sunday, June 22, 1980, at the University of Chicago Center for Continuing Education, 1307 E. 60th Street, Chicago. Except as noted, the events took place in the Center's Conference Room 2BC.

Friday, June 20. From 6:00 to 8:00 P.M. people registered in the Center's first floor lobby. At 8 P.M. Chairman Peter Cranford called the first session to order. After introductory remarks, he asked all present to stand up, one at a time, and say a few words about themselves. President Bob Davis then took the chair. Two films, Bertrand Russell and Bertrand Russell Discusses Happiness, were shown, after which Professor George Nakhnikian (of Indiana University) read "Reason and Self-Love", an excerpt from his forthcoming book on ethics. Following some discussion of this paper, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 P.M. The Board of Directors then met in Room 215. All members were welcome to attend the Directors' Meeting, and many did.

Saturday, June 21. The morning session was called to order by Bob Davis at 8:30 A.M. After presentation of the film, Bertrand Russell Discusses Power, Don Jackanicz spoke on "Bertrand Russell in Chicago, 1938-39" (see 2d). Bob Davis turned the chair over to Peter Cranford, who presided over the General Business Meeting which, for convenience, included the 2nd session of the Directors' Meeting. For details see (41). Bob Davis again took the chair. Next, Lester Denonn presented his talk, "Characterizations of Bertie — Pro and Con — from L.E.D.'s Russell Library." (2b). The session was adjourned at noon.

At 1:30 P.M. the afternoon session was called to order by Bob Davis. The film, The Life and Times of Bertrand Russell was presented, after which Peter Cranford delivered his paper, "On Compossibility" (2c). Then came another film, Bertrand Russell Discusses the Future of Mankind. The next event was a panel discussion, "Nuclear Energy and the Responsibility of Scientists." (2e) The panel, chaired by Bob Davis, consisted of 3 pro-nuclear speakers — John R. Honekamp, A. David Rossin, and George S. Stanford — and 3 anti-nuclear speakers — Lawrence R. Knobel, William Martin, and Amber Steinickl. Each panelist presented an introductory statement, after which they discussed the issue as a group. The audience posed questions and expressed individual viewpoints. The session was adjourned at 6 P.M.

Members and guests were then invited to the Red Hackle Hour, in the Center's second floor lobby. Next came the banquet, from 7 to 8:30 P.M., in a private Center dining room.

The evening session began with the film, Bertrand Russell discusses Philosophy. Then Don Jackanicz presented the first Bertrand Russell Society Award to Paul Arthur Schilpp, "for opening a new path to a better understanding of the work of living philosophers" (as the inscription read, on the Award plaque.) It was Professor Schilpp's turn to speak: he discarded his prepared speech on ER's philosophy — because, as he said, we had just heard from the master himself, on film — and ad-libbed a series of recollections, mostly about BR; the results were quite delightful. After a lively discussion period, the sessions was adjourned at 11:30 P.M.

Sunday, June 22. Session called to order by President Bob Davis at 9 A.M. The film, Bertrand Russell Discusses the Role of the Individual, was shown. Chairman Peter Cranford took the chair and presided over the third and final General Business Meeting, which again included a Directors' Meeting. See (41) for details. Again taking the chair, Bob Davis spoke on "Bertrand Russell's Pacifism." (2g). Science Committee Chairman Alex Dely then briefly reported on his Committee's work, and introduced a colleague, George Blam, who reviewed a technical research topic in physics (RSN26-40). The session was adjourned at 12:45 P.M.

Submitted by Donald W. Jackanicz, Secretary.

- (41) Minutes of the 1980 Directors' Meeting. The Board of Directors of The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc. met in 3 sessions — on Friday, June 20, on Saturday, June 21, and on Sunday June 22 — at the University of Chicago Center for Continuing Education, 1307 E. 60th St., Chicago.

Friday, June 20. Chairman Peter G. Cranford called the meeting to order at 10:50 P.M. in Room 215. These Board members were present (as well as many members who were not Directors): Peter Cranford, Robert Davis, Lester Denonn, Lee Eisler, Don Jackanicz, Joe Neilands, Steve Reinhardt, Harry Ruja, and Gary Slezak. Secretary Jackanicz read the minutes of the 1979 Directors Meeting; their acceptance was MSC. Discussion turned to Jack Pitt, now in England, who had submitted a letter of resignation (from the BRS) to Bob Davis. Peter Cranford stated that the resignation was not in effect, since letters of resignation must be sent to the Board Chairman. The Travel Scholarship project, conceived and directed by Jack Pitt, was reviewed and praised. His letter of resignation was related to changes in the Travel Scholarship proposed by others. Harry Ruja advised postponing any action on the Travel Scholarship and on the resignation until Jack Pitt returned to the USA later this year. Peter Cranford will contact Jack Pitt in an effort to determine what problems exist and how to attend to them.

It was moved by Bob Davis, and unanimously carried, that an ad hoc Officer Nominating Committee be formed — consisting of Lester Denonn, Lee Eisler, and Harry Ruja — to submit a slate of officers (for the year 1981) by Sunday, on which the Directors could then vote. Don Jackanicz asked whether "Inc." had to be included on BRS stationery; Lester Denonn and Steve Maragides, both lawyers, advised that the answer is "yes", because "Inc." is legally part of the Society's corporate title. Lee Eisler expressed dissatisfaction with the design of the current BRS stationery; he will attempt to redesign it. Don Jackanicz suggested that the BRS issue membership cards to all members. Peter Cranford suggested establishing the post of Finance Chairman, to analyze the budget and determine whether money is being well spent. The session was adjourned — on Gary Slezak's motion — at 11:58 P.M.

Saturday, June 21. The joint Directors/General Business Meeting began — in Conference Room 2BC — at 10:17 A.M., as Chairman Peter Cranford was handed the gavel by President Bob Davis, who chaired the General Meeting. Board Members present were: Peter Cranford, Bob Davis, Lester Denonn, Lee Eisler, Don Jackanicz, Joe Neilands, Harry Ruja,

and Gary Slezak. Treasurer Dennis Darland submitted a financial report, stating that on March 31, 1980, \$2950.15 was the balance on hand (details in Item 4). The Bertrand Russell Memorial bust, to be permanently displayed in London, was discussed; members were urged to make contributions — and to do it through the BRS, in order to show that the BRS is participating in the fund-raising efforts and also to make the contributions tax-deductible. President Bob Davis reported on his recent activities, including work with Peter Cadogan on the memorial bust, the search for a permanent site for Lester Demom's Russell Library, and correspondence with the owner of a portrait of BR that the owner would like to present to a suitable organization or institution.

Lee Eisler, Chairman of the Information Committee and Membership Committee, reported on his work with "Russell Society News", advertising, and other related topics. (Details in Items 5 & 6.) He made 3 requests of all members: (1) to send in items for inclusion in the newsletter; (2) to make contributions to the BRS Treasury, as membership dues are insufficient to cover expenses; and (3) to make a contribution through the BRS to the Russell Memorial (London). Don Jackanicz spoke about the Awards Committee, commenting that no chairman now exists and that it is highly desirable that there be one. The Chairman handed the gavel back to the President at 11 P.M. and the meeting was adjourned.

Sunday, June 22. The final session began at 9:30 A.M., with Peter Granford presiding. Board members present were Peter Granford, Bob Davis, Lee Eisler, Don Jackanicz, Harry Rujaj, and Steve Reinhardt. Lee Eisler reported on the recommendations of the ad hoc Officer Nominating Committee: Chairman, Peter Granford; President, Bob Davis; Vice-President, Harry Rujaj; Treasurer, Dennis Darland; Secretary, Don Jackanicz. He moved that the entire slate be elected, and it was carried unanimously.

The site of the 1981 meeting was discussed; a number of cities were proposed; a newsletter poll of members will be taken (see Items 3 & 4.) A committee consisting of Bob Davis, Lee Eisler, Don Jackanicz, and Harry Rujaj was formed, to work on a possible 1982 or 1983 BRS trip to Britain, which might be the site of an annual meeting.


Peter Granford told of a \$900 gift from BRS Member Ricky Hyman for the promotion of the concept of "compatibility." Lee Eisler read a letter from Herb Campbell (see Item 21) who had been ill and who would enjoy hearing from members (PO Box 231, Wisconsin Dells, WI 53965.) Dennis Darland moved that he be empowered to open a BRS bank account at the First National Bank of Rock Island, Ill; approved. Peter Granford mentioned Joe Neilands' idea of arranging an orderly succession of officers. The meeting was declared adjourned by the Chairman at 10:25 A.M.

Submitted by Donald W. Jackanicz, Secretary

RATIONALITY and its adversaries (continued)

(42)

From SATURDAY REVIEW, May 1980:



FAITH AND FANATICISM

by Martin E. Marty

AMERICANS KNOW that in the modern world religion is of no account—and yet there was the television picture, relayed from Teheran, telling a different story altogether. United by fanatic loyalty to fierce Shi'ite Islam, millions of Iranians, led by a scowling Ayatollah, toppled the hated Shah, thereby embarrassing the United States. Ten months later embarrassment turned to terror as Iranian students and militants stormed the American embassy and took more than 50 members of the staff hostage.

Many of the images that reached screens here were, of course, familiar. Burnings in effigy, snipers, and street demonstrations have been nightly news fare for years. But other signs of the revolution evoked only incomprehension. Why would Teheran women leave behind the modish dress they wore in their offices and take to the streets in black garb and the *chador*, the veil from preliberation days? How could people today wage war in the name of the *Qur'an*, an ancient scripture? And why would anyone want to turn war, which is always evil enough, into a *jihad*, a "struggle," or holy war? To get the phenomenon into focus, the media and the nation settled on a term: fundamentalism—Shi'ite Islam was so remote from experience as to seem useless—with the word "militant" often preceding it.

Soon fundamentalism became a buzz-

word, just as a year earlier, after Jonestown, every intense religious group was tagged as a "cult." Everyone from the *hare krishna* chanters to the amiable Amish came to be cults, and none of them liked it. Similarly, American Protestant fundamentalists resent being pushed into the same camp with the Moslems, whom they regard as infidels. For their part, Islamic scholars protest that to borrow a term from the American experience—"fundamentalism" comes from *The Fundamentals*, a group of mild-mannered tracts published in the U.S. after 1910—and apply it to Moslems half a world away is a sign of imperialism, as if America had to provide a model for every movement, even those in other nations.

Now such disclaimers have some justification. Not everyone labeled a fundamentalist is one, nor does only one kind of fundamentalism exist. Nevertheless, there is no denying that in the 1980s religion is back with a vengeance—and not just in Iran. Most of the burgeoning movements around the world are militantly antimodern, fanatical, and hold in contempt the separation of church and state. Every day, it seems, brings forth new evidence of the growing power and determination of the religious recalcitrants. While millions of individuals, thousands of congregations, and hundreds of movements may be moderate in outlook, I know of no place where

wide-scale and aggressive liberalism is holding its own against the spiritual opponents of the modern impulse.

In the Islamic world, besides Iran, there is the example of Saudi Arabia, where around 200 Moslem fanatics (said to call themselves the New Kharajites) invaded the Grand Mosque at Mecca because they considered the Saudi regime unworthy of representing the true faith. According to reports, about 300 people were killed before Saudi troops retook the mosque. Ayatollah Ruholla Khomeini's charge that the incident was backed by the U.S. and "Zionists" incited an attack on the U.S. embassy in Pakistan, where General Zia-ul-Haq is trying to forge an Islamic republic.

In Japan, the most literate and technologically advanced society on earth, people are not behaving as had been predicted. Instead of becoming completely private about religion, the way moderns normally are, or dropping faith entirely, many of them are joining new religions like Soka-gakkai and Rissho-koseikai. Members of these Buddhist sects do not completely fit the Khomeini mold, and would resent being tarred with the same brush. They have been more supple than the Iranians in adapting to urban styles, and the salvation they offer, unlike that of Islam, is this-worldly. But as uprooted moderns they seek authority, discipline, a kind of earnest religious experience. As at home with the media as the Ira-

nians are, the Soka-gakkai people have chosen to go political and work through the highly nationalistic Komeito, or Clean Government party. With its less political but ideologically more conservative partner, this religion has to be reckoned with.

Militancy reappeared on Indian soil, where some once-gentle Hindus have been roused to battle over—and please pardon what sounds like a cliché but is literal—sacred cows. In West Bengal and Kerala, where Western modernism is powerful, thanks to Communist dominance, the Moslem and Christian minorities fear Hindu fanatics who object, sometimes violently, to the eating of beef. The cows are only one of many symbols of tension between religious communities in that nation.

In Israel, the Bloc of the Faithful, or Gush Emunim party, cherishes the reputation but not the name of militant fundamentalism. Operating on the West Bank as an annexationist no-compromise group, its followers take literally the ancient scriptural covenant between God and Abraham, and are ready to go to war for their beliefs.

In the USSR, while moderate religion complies with the state, fundamentalist Baptists and Pentecostals remain belligerent in their dissidence. Even Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, whose criticisms of the West have cheered many masochists here, is fired by a rigid Eastern Orthodox outlook and Slavophilia. It is his fundamentalist style that gives the novelist such power and eloquence. The last thing he wants to understand is Western pluralism and its tolerance.

Meanwhile, over in the Catholic Church, militants are rallying around leaders like French Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, who insists on clinging to Latin liturgy and rejecting most of the policies adopted by the Second Vatican Council. Even Pope John Paul II, because he is cracking the whip on progressive theologians like Hans Küng, is sometimes lumped with religious right-wingers. What spares him is his sometimes radical view of world politics, an expansive personal mien, and his embrace of Vatican Council reforms.

Finally, there are those American Protestant militants whose distinguishing characteristic is meanness; they are mean and want to be seen as mean. The scowl is as much a part of their image as it is that of Khomeini or the Pittsburgh Steelers' defensive line. Their view has been propounded by George W. Dollar in his *A History of Fundamentalism in America*. True believers, he writes, must "both expound and expose ... because of new form of middle-of-the-roadism, worldliness, and friendliness to apostate church activities." Translate: Billy Graham and his kind. Doubt never crosses the minds of people like Dollar.

His book breathes the spirit that Finley Peter Dunne put into the mouth of his Mr. Dooley: "A fanatic is a man that does what he thinks th' Lord wud do if he knew th' facts in th' case."

People who do not turn their TV dials to the right channels may still think of fundamentalists as apolitical. With good reason. Only a dozen years or so ago, the rightists attacked moderate and liberal religious leaders in the mainline denominations and in the National Council of the Churches of Christ and the World Council of Churches and the Vatican for "speaking out" on such issues as the war on poverty, civil rights, and peace. Fundamentalists said this violated the law of God in the scriptures.



Young Iranian militant—around the world, 'religion is back with a vengeance.'

But who says fundamentalists cannot change? Today it is hard to picture a candidate for office trembling because the ecumenical councils or the boards of social concern of United Methodist Church or the United Church of Christ or the United anything else have advocated policies contrary to his own. But before 1980 ends not a few candidates will have ducked for cover to escape the fundamentalist barrage.

Militant fundamentalists control a large percentage of the 1,400 radio and 35 television stations that make up the Protestant media network; it currently claims 47 million devoted hearers who turn to religious TV for entertainment, conversion, healing, positive thinking, and political signal calling. Moreover,

fundamentalist leaders like the Reverends Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson—who take in more money than the Republican and Democratic parties—are mastering the mails. Along with direct-mail wiz Richard Viguerie, they work through fronts with names like Religious Round Table, the Moral Majority, and Christian Voice to spread their views. They have helped unseat former Senators Thomas J. McIntyre and Dick Clark, and they have the power to send other legislators whom they have targeted to political oblivion.

But their larger enemies are humanism, liberalism, and immorality. "Fifteen years ago," says Falwell, "I opposed what I'm doing today, but now I'm convinced this country is morally sick and will not correct itself unless we get involved." Involvement means, for him, "fighting a holy war.... What's happened to America is that the wicked are bearing rule. We have to lead the nation back to the moral stance that made America great." The echoes of the Iranian militants are loud and clear.

Why fundamentalism now? After all, on no calendars but their own were militant fundamentalists supposed to have power in the 1980s. Already in the 1780s people of the Enlightenment foresaw the end of irrational religion in the face of the rise of reason. By the 1880s religious liberals seemed to be adapting to modernity so suavely that the obscurantists seemed to be heading for obscurity. And although militant fundamentalism has a long history in the U.S., America seemed to be on a thoroughly modern course after 1964. The mainline and moderate churches had prospered during the Protestant-Catholic-Jewish suburban boom in the Eisenhower era. John Kennedy, Pope John XXIII, Martin Luther King, Jr., Paul Tillich, and the remembered Pierre Teilhard de Chardin were heroes to the upbeat religionists. In his best-seller of 1965 Harvey Cox wrote that *The Secular City* was no less than a transcription for our times of "the Biblical image of the Kingdom of God." It would be "the commonwealth of maturity and interdependence."

What went wrong? The curious but correct answer is "modernity and modernization." In his *The Ordeal of Civility*, John Murray Cuddihy argues that victims of modernization experience life as being all chopped up, too full of choice. Modernity, they know, separates church from state, ethnicity and region from religion, fact from value. It cruelly sunders and rarely supports. People in its wake experience "hunger for wholeness." On this scene the Ayatollah is almost a pure demodernizer. He would counteract the differentiations and diffusions that make religion so flexible, that cause it to be such a thin spread in the life of dispersed moderns. Fortunately for him,

there was a villain of modernization: the Shah, who imported but hoarded the best features of technology and left the oppressed of Iran with nothing except trampled customs and a disintegrating culture. Like all fundamentalism, then, the Shi'ite version is reactive; it repeats trends and wants to recover what has been lost.

This brings us to the crucial point: fundamentalism and traditionalism are far from the same thing. Tradition comes from *traditio*, "handing over," and refers to what God hands over to the Church in Jesus Christ and the succession of believers. But such tradition, as the great scholar Yves Congar reminded fellow-Catholics, is a flowing stream, not a still and stagnant pond. Motion, development, flow—these are precisely what the fundamentalist world-view cannot tolerate.

So with conservatism. It can be supple, absorptive, and empathic. Western, chiefly biblical, faith is grounded in history. It has to do less with Platonic ideas than with Mosaic realities. This faith celebrates remembered events such as exodus and exile, or for Christians, the words and ways of Jesus. Conservatives do not freeze everything back in biblical times. They conserve or save what they find of value in the inherited intuitive wisdom of subsequent people, whether saints or martyrs or sinners. The fundamentalist codifies everything.

The sociopsychological underpinnings of fundamentalism and other such phenomena were eloquently described by the late Talcott Parsons. In one of his few eloquent passages, the sociologist wrote that moderns, like their ancestors, must still endow their good fortune and their suffering alike with meaning. They cannot let these occur as something that "just happens." But modernity calls forth ever more human initiative in the search for meaning. Greater demands call for greater daring. So the human "takes greater risks. Hence the possibility of failure and of the failure being his fault is at least as great as, if not greater than, it ever was." The firm ground is gone. If the venturer is on the high-wire, he asks for a secure net.

During such tense periods, fundamentalists seek high-intensity religious experiences in order to find meaning. Then, to channel and rein these experiences, they need strong authority. The "kids" found it in "the cults," where a master stated all Truth and a surrogate family provided all support. As long as people are unsure of their identities, mistrustful of strangers, threatened by erosive creeds, and wary of conspiracies, some of them will huddle into fundamentalism. Through such movements around the world they seek to ward off the devils, the shahs abroad, or the humanists at home. They will find com-

pany with other true believers and remake or unsettle their part of the world before the End. As long as there are potential followers for such movements, there will be no lack of leaders to exploit their impulses.

In America, fortunately, pluralist democracy and an affluent society provide counterforces and many benefits to pass around, thus keeping fundamentalists from forming armies. Still, militants will attract people to the notion that if Russia has its atheistic creed and Iran its Moslem ideology, both of which work because they allow for no doubt or ambiguity, then "we" need equally fierce dogmas to match theirs. Religious counterparts to the SALT treaties falter, and



Reverend Jerry Falwell—'The enemies are humanism, liberalism, and immorality'

interfaith or ecumenical strivings seem to be nothing but foolish memories.

Will the fundamentalists win? Some who answer yes to that question foresee the end of the age of Enlightenment, the decline of liberalism, the demise of dialogue. Certainly the fundamentalist and tribalist outbreaks have checked empathic or responsive instincts in many cultures. Moderate church people are envious of the growth among authoritarian groups. No one today writes about massive outpourings of understanding between people. The new prophets envision an age in which religiosity fuses with weaponry to produce upheavals in Iran, unsettlements in America, and statist creeds and faiths.

Yet prophets have been wrong before.

As surprising as the survivals and reappearances of militant fundamentalisms have been, so also has the presence of people who combine faith with openness. Even if it is not their half of the inning, there are still those who believe that one can combine deep commitment with urgent civility. They refuse to accept the argument that all would be well if only religion would go away. Whatever one wishes, most people are going to continue their search for meaning, whether in benign or malign company and spirit. When they desert religious symbols, they often transfer their fanaticism to nationalist or totalitarian ideologies. The civil, committed believers, meanwhile, urge an end to distinctions between kinds of religious faith.

They need but are not finding alliance with the other intended victim of holy wars, currently named humanist. Mr. Falwell has found his scapegoat: "255,000 secular humanists," he said in January, "have taken 214 million of us out to left field." He wanted to lead the crowd back to right field. The Moral Majority wants "the vast majority of Americans" to ally against what they call, along with Falwell, "humanism."

Previously, academic humanists were of little help. Historically uninformed as some of them were; reacting against their childhood faith as were others; unwilling to recognize the varieties of historic religious experience, writers like Joseph Wood Krutch, Harry Elmer Barnes, and Walter Lippmann decided that all religious certainty had to be murderous, all religious tolerance heretical, and fundamentalist faith alone had integrity. Such twitting of liberals was a luxury in 1925. It helped humanists keep their distance from open-minded theists who stood in developmental traditions of faith.

Today when Ayatollah fundamentalism violates the rules of diplomatic games or adopts the weapons of terror, such luxuries are less attractive. If "the fundamentalists are coming," it is important, this time, to understand both their grievances and their impulses. Some reconnaissance, to determine who is in their camp and who is not, is strategically wise. Most of all, after the appearance in our century of people like Pope John XXIII, Mohandas Gandhi, Abraham Joshua Heschel, and Martin Luther King, Jr., it no longer seems necessary to equate faith with certainty and both of them with murder. There are happier alternatives, even if they are less visible than ever, less favored than fanaticism in today's world of conflict.

Martin E. Marty is Fairfax M. Cone Distinguished Service Professor at the University of Chicago, associate editor of The Christian Century, and author of, among other books, A Nation of Behaviors.

INDEX

- (43) Introductory (1). 1980 meeting (2a); Denoni's talk (2b); Cranford's talk (2c); Jackanizer's talk (2d); nuclear panel (2e); BRS Award (2f); Davis's talk (2g); some negatives (2h). 1981 meeting, where? (3). President Davis reports (3.5). Treasurer Darland reports, 1st quarter (80 (4)). Reports from Committees: Information (5); Membership (6); Philosophers (7); Science (8); Human Rights (9). New series, "My Favorite Russell" (10). BR on Iran (11). BR quoted: in "Forbes" (12); in Florida's "Today" (13). Rex Stout, scared of BR (14). Blanchard on BR (15). Schlipp's Favorite Russell (16). First BRS Award (17). Second BRS Award? (18). BAS anti-nuclear-war essay competition (19). Creation vs. Evolution (20). News about members: Herb Campbell (21); Lee Eisler (22); Ed Hedemann (23); Conrad Russell (24). 2 + 2 = ? (25). Honorary Membership Candidate Schlipp (26). New members (27). New addresses or corrections (28). Book review: "The Case of the Philosophers' Ring" (29). Two Library Co-Chairmen (30). Open Court book discount (31). Alapaugh's paradoxes (32). Deductible expense reminder (33). Russell (London) Memorial contributors (34). BRS Treasury contributors (35). Time to vote: Director-Candidates (36). Last call, membership renewals (37). E. B. Cochran dies (38). "Flashpoint" (periodical) received (39). Minutes of 1980 Meeting (40). Minutes of 1980 Directors' Meeting (41). "Faith & Fanaticism" (42). Index (43). Ballot (44).



BALLOT

(4) This ballot is in 4 parts. Please participate in all parts.

Part 1. Election of Directors

8 Directors are to be elected, for 3-year terms starting 1/1/81. Make checkmarks next to those candidates, below, for whom you wish to cast your votes. Remarks about the candidates are provided in (36).

<input type="checkbox"/> Paul Adam Banner	<input type="checkbox"/> S. Ali Mohammad Ghaemi	<input type="checkbox"/> Katharine R. Tait
<input type="checkbox"/> Edwin W. Hopkins	<input type="checkbox"/> Cherie Ruppe	<input type="checkbox"/> P. K. Tucker
<input type="checkbox"/> Donald W. Jackanicz	<input type="checkbox"/> Warren Allen Smith	

Part 2. Time and Place of 1981 Meeting

If there is a chance, however slight, that you may attend the 1981 Meeting, please vote your choice of time and place. If, however, you are certain that you will not be able to attend, then do not vote Part 2 and go directly to Part 3.

Write "1" next to your first choice, and "2" next to your second choice, for time and place.

Time: <input type="checkbox"/> December 1980	Place: <input type="checkbox"/> Austin
<input type="checkbox"/> January 1981	<input type="checkbox"/> Baltimore
<input type="checkbox"/> February 1981	<input type="checkbox"/> Boston
<input type="checkbox"/> March 1981	<input type="checkbox"/> Claremont, CA
<input type="checkbox"/> April 1981	<input type="checkbox"/> Hamilton (Russell Archives)
<input type="checkbox"/> May 1981	<input type="checkbox"/> Houston
<input type="checkbox"/> June 1981	<input type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles
	<input type="checkbox"/> Washington, DC
	<input type="checkbox"/> other _____

I will not be able to come on the following weekend(s) _____

Part 3. Honorary Membership Proposal

Professor Schilpp is the subject of several items in this newsletter: (2f)(16)(17)(26). Please make a checkmark below to indicate your approval or disapproval of conferring honorary membership on Candidate Schilpp.

Paul Arthur Schilpp Check one: Approve
 Disapprove

Part 4. A future meeting in London?

Would you attend a meeting in London in, say, 1982 or 1983?

Please check one: Yes Probably Possibly No

Your name _____ date _____

Please remove this page and fold it according to instructions on the other side; follow the 3 steps. It is addressed, and needs no envelope. Must be postmarked before October 1, 1980.

.....
1st, fold along this dotted line

FIRST CLASS

Place
15¢
stamp
here.

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

.....
2nd, fold along this dotted line

3rd, staple or tape sheet closed here 