

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS

No. 28

November 1980

- (1) BRS at APA, December 28 (4,5). 1981 meeting at Hamilton in June; 8 directors elected (6). Denonn's favorite Russell BR Memorial unveiled Historian wins 1980 BRS Travel Grant Religion makes trouble
 Los Angeles members meet New honorary member Collectors' Corner, Member's
 expulsion proposed A ballot is at the end The Index comes just before it An asterisk in the
 left column indicates a request.
-

(1.5)

COMING EVENTS

BRS at APA , December 28. The BRS will have a session, as usual, at the annual meeting of the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division), this year in Boston. This is the 7th consecutive year of these BRS sessions at APA. For the program, and abstracts of 2 papers, see (4) and (5). The exact date of the session is not quite certain, and should be verified; it will probably be December 28.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

- (2) Membership Committee (Lee Eisler, Chairman, P.K. Tuckers, Co-Chairman):

We will try to enlarge BRS membership to 500. At that figure, we expect to be financially independent; that is, we will be able to pay our own way, without depending on members for contributions to make up a deficit.

We now have between 250 and 300 members. (Renewals are still coming in, which is why we do not have an exact figure at this time.) We won't reach 500 overnight, nor even in a year or two. If we continue to grow at the same rate as in the past, we may make it by 1984 or 1985. This is a projection, and rests on several assumptions, some of which may turn out to be mistaken; we hope they won't.

To improve our chances, we are stepping up our advertising, with a view to speeding up the acquisition of new members. Chairman Peter Cranford has approved the idea of increasing the advertising appropriation; and he and Rick Hyman -- who recently made a very generous contribution to the BRS Treasury -- have approved of using some of the Hyman contribution to pay for the increased advertising.

If the BRS becomes economically self-supporting, it will have taken an important step toward the goal of long-term survival -- a goal worth working for.

* * * * *

- * In 1981 we will be advertising in HARPER'S, THE HUMANIST, INQUIRY, MENSA, THE NATION, THE NEW REPUBLIC, NEW YORK REVIEW OF BOOKS, THE PROGRESSIVE, SATURDAY REVIEW. We are interested in finding additional publications for our ads. If you know of one you think might be suitable, send us its name; we will investigate. Our address is at the bottom of this page.

- (3) Science Committee (Alex Dely, Chairman):

I received a very warm letter from Professor Paul A. Schilpp, who said, among other things, "I'm glad to see that this excellent and important paper, 'The Social Responsibility of Scientists and Laymen', is now available -- although it should be made available to tens of thousands more readers..."

(The paper had been scheduled for the 1980 BRS meeting, and was printed in RSN27-8.)

Although the praise was very generous, I do think the ideas are relevant. I would like to write several versions of it, to send out to popular magazines. However, I am pressed for time and I would appreciate it if some member would volunteer to help me rewrite one or more versions of my talk.

- * Any volunteers? Write Alex directly: Physics Dept., University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721

I also invite interested members to write me about becoming members of the Science Committee.

Alex also advises that he and Jerre Moreland are collaborating on an essay, "How to Avert Nuclear War", for entry in the Essay Competition in "The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists" (RSN27-19). The competition is in honor of the publication's founding editor, Eugene Rabinowitch.

PHILOSOPHERS' CORNER

(4) BRS at APA: the Program:

Time and Place: at the annual meeting of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association, this year in Boston, at the Boston Sheraton, December 27-30, 1980. The BRS session will probably be on December 28, at 10 A.M., but should be verified.

I. RUSSELL AND THE ATTAINABILITY OF HAPPINESS. Marvin Kohl, SUNY/Fredonia
Commentator: Mitchell Staude, University of Maryland

II. REFERENTIAL AND NON-REFERENTIAL USES OF DENOTING EXPRESSIONS. Richard Fumerton, University of Iowa
Commentator: Justin Leiber, University of Houston

Chairman: David Johnson, Naval Academy

This Program is presented by the BRS Philosophers' Committee, Edwin Hopkins, Chairman

(5) BRS at APA: Abstracts of the Papers:

Russell and the Attainability of Happiness, Marvin Kohl

Happiness depends partly upon external circumstances and partly upon oneself. It depends upon having and appreciating reasonably continuous success at satisfying one's basic needs and correlate interests. According to Russell, when understood in this way, happiness is attainable for most ordinary men and women. Two objections are considered: first, the charge that happiness is not attainable largely because of man's unavoidable fear of death and second, the charge that Russell's characterization is too rich, too loose, and that because of this, because the nature of the goal is unclear, happiness is generally less attainable.

Referential and Non-referential Uses of Denoting Expressions, Richard Fumerton

In "Reference and Definite Descriptions" Keith Donnellan attempted to draw distinction between what he called the referential and attributive (non-referential) uses of definite descriptions. While the distinction seems easiest to draw in terms of definite descriptions it may also be possible to extend it to predicate expressions (denoting properties) and proper names. In this paper I shall argue that the most natural way of explicating this distinction at the level of language involves appeal to epistemological concepts and that appeal to such concepts raises old epistemological problems that new philosophers of language ignore at their peril. I shall further argue that if the distinction between referential and non-referential uses of denoting expressions is to avoid becoming so vague as to be of little philosophical importance, it will involve a distinction Russell drew long ago between objects with which we can be acquainted and objects with which we cannot.

THE MEMBERS VOTE

(6) Results of the RSN27 ballot:

Part 1. Election of Directors. 8 candidates were elected for 3-year terms starting 1/1/81: PAUL ADAM BANNER, ALI GHAEMI, EDWIN HOPKINS, DONALD JACKANICZ, CHERIE RUPPE, WARREN ALLEN SMITH, KATHARINE R. TAIT, P.K. TUCKER.

Part 2. Time and Place of 1981 Meeting: Hamilton in June was chosen by a good margin when only "1st choice" was counted, and also when 1st and 2nd choices were combined and counted. We selected June 26-28 (from Friday evening through Sunday noon), as earlier June weekends encountered obstacles.

Part 3. Honorary membership for Paul Arthur Schilpp is approved all but unanimously. (Yes, there was one "disapprove"!)

Part 4. A future meeting in London? Of the 61 members who responded to Part 4, there were 6 yes, 7 probably, 34 possibly, and 14 no.

21% of the members voted, the same percentage as last year. We ought to do better.

ER ON PACIFISM

(7)

4 kinds of pacifists, 4 kinds of war. Last issue we reported briefly on the talk BOB DAVIS gave (at the 1980 meeting) on ER's pacifism (RSN27-2g). That brief report didn't satisfy us; we asked Bob for more. Here it is:

What follows is a shortened resume; I will leave out the part on World Government. I drew from a variety of sources, but my primary sources are "The Future of Pacifism", a 1944 article in "The American Scholar", vol. 13, #1, and Justice in Wartime, 1916 (difficult to obtain as it has not been republished except possibly in the scholar's reprint series.)

I agreed to give this talk at a college before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the hostage affair, but wrote it during the worst parts of these crises last winter. I was struck by ER's prescience in these matters. In 1916 he remarked: "The fact that the Persians -- the intellectual aristocracy of the Moslem world -- had freed themselves from the corrupt government of the Shah (in 1910) and were becoming Liberal and Parliamentary was not regarded as any reason why their northern provinces should not be devastated by Cossacks and their southern regions occupied by the British." (J.W.) ER often said that his first political memory was of the Second Afghan War of 1878; the British and Russians schemed over Afghanistan in the 19th Century much as they do today. ER's views are still in step with today's events.

ER makes several distinctions concerning types of pacifism. First, there is Absolute Pacifism. This means that no wars are justified for any participants. The pacifism of the Quakers and of Ghandi is of this sort, and is closely connected with the philosophy of non-violence. Among Christians this is generally rooted in the Commandment, "Thou Shalt Not Kill" and the Sermon on the Mount. Christians normally make exceptions only when self-defense, communists or fascists are involved. By the tenets of Absolute Pacifism, war against Nazi Germany was wrong.

The other form of pacifism is Relative Pacifism -- the general but not total disbelief in the acceptability of war. According to this, very few wars are worth fighting, and most wars produce worse results than other alternatives would have. By this theory, opposition to Germany in World War II was justified. The problem of "drawing the line" arises. All wars seem to be garbed in the rhetoric of self-defense

Pacifists may be further classified as belonging to one of two types, the individual pacifist and the political pacifist. The individual pacifist's concern is limited to his own activities; he refuses to fight. The political pacifist's concern is to prevent his government from fighting; and he attempts in various ways to influence the actions of his government. Many religious pacifists are of the individual sort. They are concerned with their own conscience or state of grace and not with society as a whole.

ER was a relative, political pacifist. He believed that most, but not all, wars are wrong, and he worked in the political arena for goals he felt would avoid war. Though he suffered imprisonment twice in his lifetime for his anti-war work, he did support World War II and repudiated his 1936 Which Way to Peace? (It is still worth reading.) Being against war sounds very much like conventional wisdom today, but we should remember that through most of history war has been glorified. During the first half of this century such views were still very strong, and supported intellectually by Social Darwinism. That ER's views are commonplace today is due in no small part to ER's own efforts.

It should also be noted that ER approached a position of Absolute Pacifism after the spread of nuclear weapons, on the basis that any war was likely to lead to the use of nuclear weapons and universal destruction. He felt that the imposition of any political system, no matter how horrible, was superior to universal destruction, because man could recover from a "new dark age" but not from annihilation. On the other hand, he supported North Viet Nam, presumably as a war of genuine self-defense, and he broadcast support to the Czechs in 1968. I personally have no doubt that he would do the same today about Afghanistan.

If one accepts Relative Pacifism, one must be able to decide which wars are acceptable. ER developed a way of classifying wars in the chapter, "The Ethics of War," in J.W.

The first type is Wars of Colonization, which ER felt were often justified. By this he meant wars where a people of superior culture occupied and drove out the indigenous people. "They have the merit, often fallaciously claimed for all wars, of leading in the main to the survival of the fittest, and is chiefly through such wars that the civilized portion of the earth has been extended from the neighborhood of the Mediterranean to the greater part of the earth's surface." He stressed that the differences between the peoples must be undeniable, and that "if we are to judge by results, we cannot regret that such wars have taken place." However, he stressed that these wars belong to the past as the world is fully peopled now.

His second category is Wars of Principle; these too are often justified. They are wars in which one side is genuinely supporting a principle of value -- such as religious toleration -- against a force that is attempting to destroy that principle. He felt that the U.S. Civil War, conceived as a war to end slavery, was therefore justified for the North. But he also said, "It is very seldom that a principle of genuine value to mankind can only be propagated by military force; as rule, it is the bad part of men's principles, not the good part, which makes it necessary to fight for their defense."

The third type is Wars of Self-Defense, which he says, surprisingly, are rarely justified. He means that most wars are called self-defensive by the participants, and usually incorrectly. A war that really was self-defensive by the rule of the Wars of Principle he might accept. However, submission by the party attacked might, in some cases, be preferable if judged by the final results. He thought that submission to Germany in World War I could have been preferable to the destruction caused by the war, despite the ultimate victory.

The final classification is Wars of Prestige, which he felt applied to almost all modern wars, and were never justified. "Rather than forego the triumph, rather than endure the humiliation, they are willing to inflict upon the world all those disasters which it is now suffering and all that exhaustion and impoverishment which it must long continue to suffer." This seems to me to sum up the U.S.A. in Viet Nam, Russia in Afghanistan, and the Iraq-Iran War.

At a later date, 1936, BR added revolution to his list. He observed that revolutions "are justified if supported by a majority of the people and do not serve to impose minority rule."

BR does not provide easy answers but to my mind there are no easy answers. Absolute Pacifism attempts to provide a complete answer, but I cannot accept that all wars for all participants have been bad. Resistance to Nazi Germany was certainly justified. On the other hand, almost all wars seem to be thought just by the participants. So we are left to sort it out, to inform ourselves about history, current events, other viewpoints, and logic. From this raw material we must make our judgments. In this process, BR's views, his classifications, can be of distinct help.

MY FAVORITE RUSSELL

(8) By Lester E. Denonn:

My favorite of favorites among all of Bertie's works is The Amberley Papers, which I have just read for the sixth time. Although his parents died when he was very young, they had a marked influence on his beliefs. The Problems of Philosophy is my next choice. It was used as a text in an undergraduate course and again in a graduate course. Since I had already studied the work, I was the star of the graduate course.

I also like the rest!

BR QUOTED

(9) "Forbes" quotes BR quite often, as we have seen (RSN25-20, RSN26-15, RSN27-12). Here's another one, from several years ago (4/17/78):

Men who are unhappy, like men who sleep badly, are proud of the fact.

And a recent one (9/29/80):

It is possible, and authentic wise men have proved that it is possible, to live in so large a world that the vexations of daily life come to feel trivial, and that the purposes that stir our deeper emotions take on something of the immensity of our cosmic contemplations.

(Thank you, Whitfield Cobb)

BRS PROJECTS

(10) Short papers wanted. A long time ago KEN BLACKWELL suggested that we have a series of short papers (as part of BRS literature) giving BR's views on various subjects. They would be titled RUSSELL ON HISTORY, RUSSELL ON RELIGION, RUSSELL ON CENSORSHIP, RUSSELL ON PHILOSOPHY, RUSSELL ON POWER, RUSSELL ON HAPPINESS, RUSSELL ON EDUCATION, RUSSELL ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS, RUSSELL ON COMMUNISM, RUSSELL ON MARX, etc., etc. Each one would be brief; 2 sides of one page, maximum.

* Who will volunteer to write one? Advise the newsletter and mention the topic. Address on Page 1, bottom.

BERTRAND RUSSELL MEMORIAL

(11) The unveiling date is October 23rd. We recently received the following letter:

(See next page, please)

BERTRAND RUSSELL MEMORIAL

An Appeal made by Sir Alfred Ayer, Lord Brockway (Chairman of the Appeal Cttee), Peter Cadogan (Secretary), Lord Ritchie Calder, Frank Dobson MP, John Gilmour, Dora Russell, Lord Willis and Baroness Wootton.

c/o SPES, Conway Hall, 25 Red Lion Square, London WC.1. Tel: 01. 242. 8032/3.

TO ALL THOSE WHO HAVE DONATED TO THE APPEAL

8th October 1980

Dear Lee Gasler,

Many thanks for your donation of (amount deleted)

All has gone well and you are invited to attend the unveiling of the Memorial at:

12.00 mid-day, Thursday 23rd October 1980
in the Gardens of Red Lion Square, London WC.1

Lord Brockway will preside over the ceremony and Dora Russell will unveil the bust. The idea of the Memorial stemmed in the first place from Dora Russell. She took the matter up with Lord Brockway and the Appeal Committee was constituted. Sir Alfred Ayer, who knew the work of the sculptor Marcelle Quinton, introduced her to us and the work began. Marcelle Quinton also advised on the site, designed the plinth and arranged the installation.

Sir Alfred Ayer will also speak during the ceremony as will Peter Cadogan, the Honorary Secretary of the Appeal Committee (ex-Committee of 100 and currently the General Secretary of the South Place Ethical Society).

The Borough of Camden has been most helpful throughout and has contributed generously to the Appeal. We are glad to say that the Mayor of Camden, Councillor Ron Hefferman, will be present on the 23rd and will speak on behalf of the Borough.

After the ceremony all Donors are invited to a Reception in the Library of the adjacent Conway Hall - where Bertrand Russell once gave the Conway Memorial Lecture.

All Donors are cordially invited to the Reception. As this letter also constitutes the invitation will you please be good enough to bring it with you?

On behalf of the Appeal Committee,

Peter Cadogan (Honorary Secretary)

NOTE: We are still a few hundred pounds short of the target of £4000. Money is still coming in. If you would like to bring the Appeal to the notice of a friend who has not so far contributed, we hope you will do so. All new Donors will receive this acknowledgement and invitation by return.

Although it was on very short notice, Bob Davis and Don Jackanicz decided to be present at the unveiling.

The Appeal Committee had advised us (RSN27-34) that it would thank all donors individually, and would advise them (in advance) of the date and time of the unveiling. It didn't work out quite that way. Some donors were notified in advance; some were not; and some still have not been notified. But every donor will (sooner or later) receive the thank-you letter which is reproduced above.

To date the BRS has received a total of 1032.50 for the Bertrand Russell Memorial, from 53 donors, the great majority of whom are BRS members.

A report by BOB DAVIS on the unveiling appears toward the end of this newsletter (48c,d).

BR CELEBRATED

(12) For Doonesbury fans:

(Thank you, RICHARD SHORE)

ASSESSMENTS OF BR

(13) Baumgartner on Howard on BR. Walter Baumgartner thinks that Anthony Howard's reassessment of the life and work of Bertrand Russell ten years after his death (RSN26-10) needs to be reassessed itself.

Many of Howard's statements -- and the fact that some statements were made at all -- need to be scrutinized. Admirers of Russell admit that there were unusual aspects of this unusual man, but a reading of Howard's article does not provide a well-balanced picture. To be specific:

Howard: "It was certainly in the early part of his life that he wrote his most intellectually distinguished books." Howard goes on to name The Foundations of Geometry and 3 others.

This is what BR had to say, years later: "My first philosophical book, An Essay on the Foundations of Geometry, which was an elaboration of my Fellowship dissertation, seems to be now somewhat foolish... Apart from details, I do not think there is anything valid in this early book." (My Philosophical Development. London: Allen & Unwin, 1959. p. 39) Not exactly intellectually distinguished. Alan Wood, in his biography, does not mention The Foundations.

Howard: "The unkind -- or perhaps merely those endowed with his own sharp critical faculty -- were later to say that all of Russell's original work was done before he was 45." Apparently, then, we ought to write off the following:

- The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism (1920). Historian Walter Laqueur calls it the most brilliant essay ever written on the subject, including the way it forecasts future repression in the Soviet Union.
- Marriage & Morals (1929). It placed Russell with G.B. Shaw and H. G. Wells as the main spokesmen for a "new morality" which has had considerable influence. "Russell" No. 33/34, p. 25.
- The Conquest of Happiness (1930), an extremely helpful book. It has, for example, induced Dr. Peter Cranford to distribute several hundred copies to patients and friends. ("Russell" No. 12, p. 31)
- Power, A New Social Analysis (1938) is of enormous political importance, and a fascinating prototype for logical atomism. ("Russell" No. 33/34 p.25)

- A History of Western Philosophy (1945). The best written and most interesting history of philosophy ("Russell" No.35/36. P. 19), which also shows the connection of philosophy with political and social circumstances.
- Human Knowledge, Its Scope and Limits (1948). "...it seems to me that these later views of Russell's on perception and related matters are crucially important and, moreover, that they are the nearest thing to the truth about these issues that have been proposed to date." Grover Maxwell in Bertrand Russell: A Collection of Critical Essays, D.F. Pears, ed. Garden City: Doubleday (1972) pp. 110-111.

Howard, referring to the Beacon Hill School: "Russell himself hardly directed all of his energies to it -- even in September 1927, when the school first opened, he was away on a lecture tour in America."

Howard suggests the image of a man who shuffles out of his responsibilities; but the reason Russell was lecturing in America was to raise money for the school. "My father was off to America in pursuit of money again in 1929 and 1931 and when he was not in America, he was busy writing books to raise the necessary funds." My Father, Bertrand Russell by Katharine Tait. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich (1975) p. 100

Howard: "The by-products tended to be essentially potboiler books, one of which, Marriage & Morals, was to return to haunt him when he finally decided, in 1938, to embark on an academic career in America." This is slanted writing. "...was to return to haunt him ..." suggests that BR might have regretted writing Marriage and Morals, but there is no evidence of that, nor any reason to think he regretted it.

Howard: "The woman who brought the action (to stop BR from teaching at CCNY) succeeded -- the university, in the words of the judge who tried the case, having convicted itself of being interested in 'establishing a chair of indecency'." (Howard calls it a university, but in fact it was a college, City College.)

More slanted writing. The uninformed reader might well assume that BR had been unable to persuade the judge to decide the case in his favor. In fact, BR never participated in the case, though he wanted to. It was the City of New York, dominated by Catholic politicians, that defended the case, and did so with a view to losing it; and did lose it. The judge was Catholic. BR was never called to testify.

Howard: "Though he remained in America for the greater part of the war...he was luckier than, say, Isherwood or Auden in never having it held against him that he preferred the safety of exile to the perils of the home front."

A reflection on BR's integrity. He was in America when the war broke out, and was not allowed to travel to England. He was finally able to persuade the British Embassy in 1944 to let him return to England. (Autobiography III, p.342.) We only see the top of the iceberg, and can never be certain of the real motives behind human actions, but to claim, as Howard does, that BR sought nothing but safety does not fit BR's character, and is quite unfair.

Howard takes quite a lot of space to quote a hostile critic, A. J. P. Taylor of the Committee for Nuclear Disarmament: "When we set up the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament we wanted a distinguished figure, and there was Russell, who'd spoken out very frankly against nuclear weapons, and he was made President. Like any president of a society, he was meant to be a figurehead -- not to come to executive meetings, not to lay down policy, but just to give his benign blessing and there his name would be on top of the letter paper. But instead of that he thought he was much better fitted to run the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament than we were. I thought he was a frightful nuisance."

This contributes nothing to our understanding of BR. It merely tells us that Taylor didn't like Russell.

Howard: "By now" -- ie., after the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament had begun -- "there were those ready to say that Russell had become a publicity hunter."

BR sought publicity for the cause of nuclear disarmament, not for himself, which would have been out of character. Only a hostile or uninformed critic would suggest otherwise.

All in all, Howard seems to say that BR, though brilliant, could be irresponsible and lacking in moral fiber. What a pity that he chose to write this article without being better informed. There is enough misinformation about BR floating around -- e.g., many believe BR was a communist -- without adding still more.

BRS TRAVEL GRANT

(14) 1980 Travel Grant is awarded. For the second year in a row, the BRS Travel Grant has been awarded to a historian. He is Steven J. Livesey, doctoral candidate in History at the University of California, Los Angeles. The award pays up to \$500 for travel for purposes of research for a dissertation. Mr. Livesey's dissertation, "Metabasis: The History of a Concept from Greek Antiquity to the Renaissance," will be based in part on his research in libraries in England, France, Germany, and Italy.

(15) 1981 Travel Grant is announced. The announcement (a) of the conditions of the 1981 Travel Grant, and (b) of the winner of the 1980 Travel Grant was sent to 5 departments in some 15 major universities and a few others. The 5 departments are Philosophy, Psychology, History, English, Sociology.

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

- (16) A 25th Anniversary. From "The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists" (October 1980), with thanks to BOB DAVIS:

From Science Council of Japan

Statement from the Council in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the Russell-Einstein Manifesto.

A quarter of a century ago, on July 9, 1955, a Manifesto signed by the two distinguished scientists, Bertrand Russell, Albert Einstein and nine other Nobel Laureates, including Hideki Yukawa, was released as a call to the whole world.

The Manifesto faced and gave a warning against the actual peril arising as a result of the development of nuclear weapons, which confronts mankind with the possibility of annihilation. It appealed to the scientists of the world, irrespective of differences of political thinking, creed, nationality, socio-economic system, to assemble in conference to deliberate how to overcome this peril. The objectives were to adopt a resolution to urge the governments of the world to realize that their purpose cannot be furthered by a world war, to recommend that all matters of dispute be settled by peaceful means, and simultaneously to initiate a signature campaign subscri-

ing to this resolution among scientists and the general public all over the world.

The Manifesto, from the standpoint of "human-beings, members of the species Man, whose continued existence is in doubt," emphasizes the special responsibility of scientists because they do know most about the formidable dangers of nuclear warfare and consequently they should endeavour more strenuously than anyone else to bring about the complete abolition of nuclear weapons. Indeed, the Manifesto ushered in the meeting of scientists at Pugwash in 1957, where distinguished scientists from various countries of the world, including H. Yukawa and S. Tomonaga, assembled and adopted a statement in line with the spirit of the Russell-Einstein Manifesto.

During the past 25 years, considering the opinions and movements of the peoples of the world, it is fortunate that no nuclear weapon has been used in actual warfare. Nevertheless, the possible danger of their use is growing stronger because of the recent developments of nuclear weapons systems which have

invalidated the theory of nuclear deterrence—the pretext for maintaining nuclear weapons in the past.

The final document unanimously approved at the Special Session for Disarmament of the General Assembly of the United Nations held two years ago clearly stated that "Mankind today is confronted with an unprecedented threat of self-extinction" because of the accumulation of nuclear weapons.

The pressing situation in which we now find ourselves proves that the aim of the Manifesto, which recommended that every government "find peaceful means for the settlement of all matters of dispute between them" has even greater significance than when it was issued.

The Science Council of Japan, at the time of its inauguration in 1949, declared its firm determination both within Japan and overseas that it would exert itself to make science provide the basis for a cultural nation and for world peace, indicating the attitude of self-reflection of Japanese scientists. Since then, particularly since the H-bomb tests at the Bikini Atoll in 1954, the Council has ceaselessly expressed serious con-

cern for the complete abolition of nuclear weapons and time and again has issued many recommendations, statements and appeals against testing, production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons.

It was only natural then, that the Council stood firmly behind the aims of the Russell-Einstein Manifesto, and adopted a resolution to give full support to the statement of the scientists meeting at Pugwash.

As this year marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Russell-Einstein Manifesto, the Council, recalling its consistent stand in support of nuclear disarmament through all these years, hereby re-confirms the spirit and significance of the Manifesto and simultaneously resolves to make even greater efforts to carry out the special responsibility of scientists to attain the most earnest aspiration of humanity for the still unrealized total abolition of nuclear weapons.

We therefore call upon all scientists and scientific organizations both in Japan and overseas to support this statement of our Council and to collaborate with us in the pursuit of these aims. □

RELIGION

- (17) Fundamentalism. We intend to give considerable space to the resurgence of fundamentalism -- the belief that the Bible is the word of God and therefore infallible -- because it perpetuates beliefs for which there is no evidence, many of which do great harm; because it is anti-democratic, in that it confers enormous power on those who interpret the Bible and claim to know what God wants people to do; because its approach to issues and problems is the antithesis of the scientific approach; because it seems to be achieving political power in the USA; and finally because it is the exact opposite of what Bertrand Russell stood for.

- (18) "Discover" reports on creationism. "Discover" is the new Time-Life "Newsmagazine of Science." This is from the October 1980 issue, pp. 92-93:

CREATIONISM ON THE RISE

In an all-out challenge to Darwin, the Scientific Creationists are more creative than scientific

The division in the ranks of the Darwinists has given comfort and new hope to the fundamentalists, who reject evolution out of hand. Foremost among them are the "scientific creationists," who cite what they claim is scientific evidence that Darwin was wrong; that the earth's plants and animals were created

more or less in their present forms; that people and apes, not to mention pickered and pigs, never had a common ancestor. In state after state, in all regions of the U.S., the anti-evolutionists are campaigning to have their beliefs included in public school science courses. Late in August they got some big-

league support when Republican presidential candidate Ronald Reagan told reporters, prior to a meeting of Christian fundamentalists in Dallas, that if evolution is taught in the public schools, the "Biblical story of creation" should also be taught.

The famous 1925 Scopes trial in

Tennessee, which pitted the Bible-thumping William Jennings Bryan against defense attorney Clarence Darrow, dealt with a comparatively simple argument. Schoolteacher John Scopes was haled into court on charges that he had violated state law by teaching evolution in the classroom. Bryan ar-

gued that man was created in just the way the Book of Genesis told it. But Darrow so brilliantly demonstrated that it was illogical to take the Bible literally that creationism never quite recovered, and the way was cleared for greater public acceptance of evolution. (Though they won the war, Darrow and Scopes lost the battle; Scopes was fined \$100.)

Today's creationists are considerably more sophisticated than Bryan; they go to painful lengths to emphasize the "scientific" over the "creationist," but in doing so they have become more creative than scientific. Much of their support comes from the Institute for Creation Research, in San Diego, an offshoot of the Baptist-oriented Christian Heritage College (enrollment 200). Richard Bliss, who holds a Ph.D. in education and is director of curriculum development for ICR, sounds the theme with a pithy statement of principle: "I believe that the Creator created man as man, the dog as dog, the different plants as different plants."

Bliss's colleague Gary Parker, a biology professor, elaborates. Design, he says, is a key to creationist thought. "The evolutionists would have us believe that all the living things are due to three factors—time, chance, and continuing process. But the creationists say that there is a level of order to life that couldn't possibly have come from pure chance." Parker says the evidence seems to show that all organisms were created from an inventory of common parts, and that each species is put together in a different arrangement. "It's just like having a big pile of cinder blocks," explains Parker. "You can make an armory from those blocks, or a warehouse, or a mansion. It depends on your design." Using another simile, he says that a pile of aluminum, electrical wire, rubber, and other materials dumped on the end of a runway would never arrange itself into an airplane, let alone fly. "But an intelligence external to that matter can design it and give it a function, can make it into an airplane." David Raup of Chicago's Field Museum, dismisses that argument: "It does not take into account two essentials of evolution—unlike cinder blocks, organisms reproduce themselves, and they are subject to natural selection."

For their evidence, the creationists exploit the quarrel among paleontolo-

ASPCA founder Henry Bergh chides Darwin in Thomas Nast's famous cartoon.



gists over the matter of gradualism in evolution. If Darwin was right, say the creationists, why are there gaps in the fossil record? They point to the sudden appearance of complex life forms in Cambrian rocks as evidence that the Great Flood occurred. Its waters, they say, drowned most existing life and quickly buried it in mud, which explains why so much of it was preserved in fossil form. To help make their point, they even cite some of the theories proffered by the paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould. Says Gould: "It's so utterly infuriating to find oneself quoted, consciously or unconsciously, incorrectly, by creationists. None of this controversy within evolutionary theory should give any comfort, not the slightest iota, to any creationist."

But it does. And partly for that reason, the creationists have ranged

throughout the U.S. to promote their cause. In state after state, legislation has been introduced that would require public schools to add creationist teachings to their biology classes. Wisconsin, Missouri, and South Dakota already provide such instruction. In Washington County, Virginia, teachers this fall will have to take brief note of creationism in biology and earth science courses, quoting from Genesis to give the basis of this viewpoint. School administrators in Tampa, Florida, have been ordered to provide extensive creationist instruction. Says one official: "The recommendation from our office was that scientific creation and other theories be taught in areas other than science, but the board of education chose to have them taught in science as well."

Creationist fervor is influencing the

textbook industry, as well. At least four major publishers now deal with the subject. Says Lois Arnold, senior science editor at Prentice-Hall, "We don't advocate the idea of scientific creation, but we felt we had to represent other points of view." Other publishers may soon do the same. Texas has decided that all texts dealing with evolution should "identify it as only one of several explanations of the origins of humankind." That requirement is the strongest pressure yet on the publishing industry, which is beginning to buckle under. Says one editor whose book presents the creationist position: "Creationism has no place in a biology text, but after all we are in the business of selling textbooks."

Here and there, opponents of creationism have gone to court to fight its inroads. A Tennessee law requiring the teaching of creationism was declared unconstitutional because the wording explicitly mentioned the Bible. The U.S. District Court rejected a suit brought against the Smithsonian Institution that would have required including creationism in a display on evolution. The American Civil Liberties Union successfully fought a decision by two Indiana school districts to adopt a creationist book as a biology text. That book was later rewritten to get around the court's objections. Says Lawrence Reuben, the lawyer who handled the ACLU's case: "Now I'm not sure I could win against the book, although it says essentially the same thing."

Scientists are disturbed by the burgeoning creationist movement. Niles Eldredge calls it "a return to know-nothingism." Wayne Moyer, executive director of the National Association of Biology Teachers, complains that the creationist campaign is "pure propaganda, a very serious delusion of the public." The Iowa Academy of Science has formed a special committee to combat creationist pressures.

Clifford G. McCollum, a committee member and past president of the Iowa Academy, summarizes what many scientists feel about the movement: "It's a contradiction in terms to speak of 'scientific creationism.' The basic premise, the basic dogma, is the existence of a divine creator. What they espouse as academic freedom to teach creationism is their academic freedom to teach the flatness of the earth."

—James Gorman

(19) Reagon favors creationism, according to the following portion of a report in The New York Times (8/24/80, p.28), headlined: "Anderson Attacks Reagan and Carter Foreign Policies." Anderson is being questioned, in the first paragraph:

Questioned by reporters, he also took sharp issue with Mr. Reagan over remarks the Republican nominee made yesterday about evolution and biblical history at a meeting of Christian fundamentalists in Dallas.

Identifying himself as an evangelical Christian, Mr. Anderson said "I put myself outside" any attempts to "politicize evangelical doctrine" or to say "what should be or should not be taught in the classrooms of America."

Mr. Reagan said he favored teaching the biblical theory of creation along with the scientific theory of evolution in public schools.

Mr. Anderson said he favored "the fullest freedom as far as scientific inquiry is concerned," and said he believed "we should not get into anything that smacks of censorship as far as textbooks are concerned."

(19)

"The Dial" reports on creationism. "The Dial" is a new monthly published by the Educational Broadcasting Corporation. The following is from the September 1980 issue, pp.44-51:

THE FOLKS WHO HATE DARWIN

When you saw the TV series *The Voyage of Charles Darwin*, it didn't occur to you that the ideas in it were controversial. You won't despair when the series is repeated, nor wince if you encounter the new British series, *Life on Earth*, nor gnash your teeth at the evolutionary assumptions of the *Cosmos* and *Nova* shows. But there are people who will, people who think evolution is wrong, if not evil. Meet four of them here. Read of the scope of their movement (page 51). Then read, overleaf, the advice of a scientist who tells you how to argue with these earnest and determined people.

Richard E. Bliss,
Institute for Creation Research,
San Diego, California

"I'll make a prediction: The scientific community to its own demise will ignore the creationist model. There is a grassroots strength for this movement that will cause it to spread fast. The explosion will come as soon as teachers know that creationism is good science. We have the data; the scientific data are with us."

Arthur S. Underland,
aerospace engineer,
Houston, New York

"Evolutionists make the assumption that evolution is true. But what does the fossil record tell us? No evidence for evolution. Cambrian rocks five hundred and seventy-five million years old contain fossils of the major phyla of the animal kingdom. Sudden! zap, just like that, every organism is complete. A clam is a clam, a jellyfish is a jellyfish. Not a single intermediate fossil has ever been found between an invertebrate and a fish."

William Ball,
mining developer,
Indianapolis, Indiana

"A lot of Christians accept evolution because it's all they've ever been taught. They believe God brought about life through an evolutionary process. I accepted this, too, until about four years ago, when I became a Christian. Now I see what an impossible situation God's evolutionary process would be. It's like calling black white."

Duane T. Gish,
Institute for Creation Research,
San Diego, California

"We believe those creatures discovered in East Africa called *Australopithecus* are distinctly apes and not related to man. The creationist view is that man has always been man. We say this because we've never seen anything created. No one has ever seen anything come into being - not stars, not plants, not animals. Things were created supernaturally by processes that are not operating in the world today. A dog always remains a dog, a fruit fly always remains a fruit fly, an onion always remains an onion."

(20)

WHAT TO SAY TO THESE PEOPLE

BY GARRETT HARDIN

The seven-part TV series *The Voyage of Charles Darwin* ended in a reenactment of the 1860 Huxley-Wilberforce debate, in which Dr. Samuel Wilberforce, bishop of Oxford, attacked Thomas Henry Huxley for upholding Darwin's views, but was thoroughly trounced. A television viewer might well have concluded that Darwinism had triumphed. How

wrong he would have been!

Among scientists, it is true, the Darwinian theory did pass from triumph to triumph in the years after the debate to become the only view seriously entertained by professional biologists. The idea of natural selection now suffuses every branch of biology. There, Darwin has won.

But in the public arena, things are quite otherwise. Sixty-five years after Huxley-Wilberforce, the trial of John T. Scopes, a high-school teacher, revealed an enormous resistance to Darwin's ideas among Fundamentalist Protestants. To the dismay of both parties in the dispute, this celebrated 1925 "monkey trial," in which Scopes was accused of teaching the theory of

evolution in Dayton, Tennessee, was ultimately decided on purely technical grounds. Scopes was first convicted and fined \$100, but on appeal he was acquitted on the technicality that the fine had been excessive. Within a few years, other trials around the country determined that state laws could not mandate the teaching of the biblical story of creation nor forbid the teaching of evolution in the public schools. Both violated the First Amendment of the Constitution, which established the separation of Church and State.

In the 1860 debate, evolutionists won the battle; in the following century, they nearly lost the war. By the time of the centenary of the *Origin of Species*, in 1959, the vast majority of high school biology texts had resolved the dispute simply by suppressing both special creation and evolution. The word "evolution" was usually omitted, with the flabby word "development" standing in its place. Natural selection was scarcely touched upon. A high school student in 1960 would generally have had no inkling of the importance of Darwin in the intellectual history of humanity.

The public resurrection of Darwinism came, curiously, from space. In October 1957, the Soviet Union launched *Spunik I*, the first artificial earth satellite. By beating us out in the race to space, the Soviets shattered American complacency about our technological superiority. There arose an immediate outcry for greater emphasis on the teaching of science in the high schools. As biologists took up their portion of the educational burden, they became aware of how disastrously school administrators and textbook publishers had sabotaged biology. A feisty geneticist, Nobel Prize winner H. J. Muller, protested in an article entitled "One Hundred Years Without Darwin Is Enough." In response, the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study, the official arm of the biology teaching profession, put out five different high school textbooks, each of them assigning a major role to evolution and natural selection. When the state board of education in Texas asked for a special edition that would mitigate these frightening ideas, BSCS refused to compromise.

In human affairs as in Newtonian physics, action provokes reaction. Within a few years, Fundamentalists had developed a new attack, which ran around the end of the First Amendment. Knowing that they could not insert an explicitly religious view into the school curricula, they called their view scientific, christening it "scientific creationism." Their plea that it be included in the curricula had a surface plausibility. No human being *was* present at the origin of life on earth, nor did anyone actually observe and record the evolution of one species into another millions of years ago. Therefore (said the creationists), it is just as scientific to believe that all existing species were created in an instant in exactly the same forms that they now appear as it is to suppose that they evolved. Scientific creationists do not ask that their theory displace Darwin's in the schools. They ask only for equal time.

Are scientific creationists concerned primarily with science or with religion? In a presentation to the California Board of Education, one of their spokespersons said, "Creation in scientific terms is *not* a religious or philosophical belief." At the same time, an appeal for funds made by the Creation Science Research Center, in San Diego, bragged that it intended "to take advantage of the tremendous opportunity that God has given us . . . to reach the 63 million children in the United States with the scientific teaching of Biblical creationism."

Even at the religious level the creationist view is a biased one. The only creation story they mention is the one in Genesis (in which there are actually two stories—the version in the first chapter being

so different from that in the second chapter that biblical scholars believe they were written hundreds of years apart). Why do they not mention the belief of Hindus that the world began with the creation of the cosmic egg? What about the Babylonians' belief that there was not a single creationist god but two cosmic parents?

Many outsiders see the creationists' call for fair play as little more than a legal ploy. A close reading of Fundamentalist literature by social scientist Dorothy Nelkin, of Cornell University, led her to believe that these earnest people are most deeply disturbed by what they regard as the moral disintegration of our society—rising crime rates, profligate sexuality, breakdown of the family, undermining of authority, and so on. Darwin may be only the scapegoat.

Because many of the views of Fundamentalists are widely shared, creationists have considerable support among those who couldn't care less about the creation-versus-evolution argument. During the past generation, Americans have become ever more concerned about fair play toward minorities. Protecting minorities increases diversity, which is regarded as a positive good. Scientists have long insisted that truth cannot be determined by majority vote; Galileo, after all, was in his day a minority—or "a majority of one," to use Thoreau's inspired phrase. We worship fair play; we are intolerant of dogmatism.

So in town meetings and in public debates, scientific creationists have proved formidable opponents. Scientists have not found it easy to explain to creationist supporters why a view held by a sizable minority should be forcibly excluded from the public schools.

To see what is involved, let us adopt a tactic discovered long ago by the mathematicians: When one question stumps you, ask another. That is, ask a related question whose answer throws light on the first.

Let our other question be this: Why don't we teach astrology in the schools? Astrology holds that the course of each human life is determined to a considerable degree by the position of the stars in the sky at the exact moment of the individual's birth. Belief in it, in one variant or another, has probably been held by most of the people on earth. Even today, some universities in India offer degrees in the subject. Yet American believers do not pressure boards of education to add their subject to the curriculum. If believers in astrology became as well organized as the creationists, it is hard to see how their demands could be withstood. Our emotions concerning this issue have not been aroused; we can objectively examine the issues. On what grounds might scientists object to the inclusion of astrology in the public schools?

The reason for not calling astrology a science is simple: Its assertions cannot be proved false.

There is a widespread belief among the public that the statements of science are *provable*. Scientists and philosophers now agree this is wrong. No scientific statement is ever fully proved. Science is made up of statements that *may* be proved false but that have not, in fact, been proved false by the most rigorous tests. Those that are not falsifiable are *waterproof hypotheses*, and they are beyond the pale.

Let's see why astrology is not science. Over 1,500 years ago, Saint Augustine cited what he regarded as a definitive disproof of astrology. He knew of two babies who were born at the same time, one to a wealthy couple and the other to a slave woman. When these babies grew up—surprise!—the child born to wealth became wealthy, and the slave's child became a slave. Since they had been born at the same instant, it was obvious, said Saint Augustine, that the astrological hypothesis was nonsense.

Did Saint Augustine prevail? He did not. Astrolog-

gers had a very simple response to his "disproof," which they continue to repeat to the present day. It is this: No two babies are ever born at *exactly* the same instant. Therefore, their astrological signs are different, and their futures must differ as well. Insistence on the word "exactly" converts the astrological position into a waterproof hypothesis.

Should astrology be taught in public schools? Not as science. On this scientists must be adamant. The total exclusion of doctrines based on waterproof statements is one of the few dogmas of science. If the public wants to have astrology taught as part of some other course—history? sociology?—that is a matter about which a scientist, *as a scientist*, has nothing to say.

Having shown that astrology is not scientific, we can return to our principal question: Is scientific creationism scientific? Curiously, a complete answer to this question was worked out more than a century ago in a brief dispute that has, by a quirk of history, been almost completely forgotten. The idea of evolution is much older than Darwinism. What Darwin contributed was a believable mechanism to account for evolution. Fifteen years before the *Origin of Species*, an anonymous volume, *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*, espoused the evolutionary view. Scientifically, *Vestiges* was, in the opinion of scientists both then and now, a poor thing, but it was very popular; it went through ten editions before the *Origin of Species* was published.

Many religious people saw evolution as a threat to morality and religion. One of the most disturbed of these was Philip Gosse, a minister in the Fundamentalist group called the Plymouth Brethren. Gosse was not only a minister but also a naturalist (a common combination in Victorian England). During the 1850s, Darwin consulted him on many matters, though without ever revealing the heretical trend of his thought.

Gosse, upset by *Vestiges*, set out to demolish completely all theories of evolution. He began with geology. Geologists explain the strata of the rocks by physical principles, deducing that it must have taken millions of years to deposit layer upon layer of sedimentary rocks. There is no way to reconcile this deduction with the religious belief that the world began in the year 4004 B.C., so proclaimed in the seventeenth century by James Ussher, archbishop of Armagh. But Gosse thought he had found a way. His book, published two years before the *Origin*, was entitled *Omphalos*. The name is significant: It is Greek for "belly button."

Consider Adam and Eve, said Gosse. Did they have navels? Since the navel is a vestige of the link between the fetus and the placenta, one could argue that they had no navels, since Adam was created from dust and Eve was created from Adam's rib. But one could also argue that the first human had to have a navel; it is inconceivable that God (a perfect being) would create imperfect creatures. Adam's and Eve's navels were not evidence of a preexisting being (namely a mother) but were merely what one would expect in God-created creatures.

Gosse explained the stratification of the rocks by the same logic. Strata are not evidence of processes occurring over millions of years; they are merely what one would expect to find in a perfect world. The strata and their fossils were all created on day three (see Genesis) as a materialization of God's thought. The fossils are merely artifacts that God was pleased to place among the strata when he created the world. The deductions of the geologist and the biologist fall to ground, and the Bible stands supreme as the revelation of truth. So said Gosse.

Gosse expected *Omphalos* to be attacked by scien-

tists. It was. He was not prepared for the bitter denunciation by the religious community. Asked to write a review of *Omphalos*, his friend Charles Kingsley, a minister and the author of *Westward Ho!*, refused. He wrote a letter to Gosse explaining why.

"You have given," Kingsley said, "the 'vestiges of creation theory' the best shove forward which it has ever had. I have a special dislike for that book; but, honestly, I felt my heart melting towards it as I read *Omphalos*."

"Shall I tell you the truth? It is best. Your book is the first that ever made me doubt [the doctrine of absolute creation], and I fear it will make hundreds do so. Your book tends to prove this—that if we accept the fact of absolute creation, God becomes God-the-Sometime-Deceiver. I do not mean merely in the case of fossils which *pretend* to be the bones of dead animals; but in . . . your newly created Adam's navel, you make God tell a lie. It is not my reason, but my *conscience* which revolts here . . . I cannot . . . believe that God has written on the rocks one enormous and superfluous lie for all mankind."

"To this painful dilemma you have brought me, and will, I fear, bring hundreds. It will not make me throw away my Bible. I trust and hope. I know in whom I have believed, and can trust Him to bring my faith safe through this puzzle, as He has through others; but for the young I do fear. I would not for a thousand pounds put your book into my children's hands."

Gosse, abandoned by churchmen, gave up theorizing and returned to merely observing nature. As a popularizer of nature, his position in science education is an honorable one. His *Evenings at the Microscope* persuaded many an English gentleman to take up the microscope as a hobby.

Returning to the present, we note that there has been no improvement in the arguments for creation since *Omphalos*. Of course we now have the ingenious "radioactive clock" method of dating strata and fossils, but this can be explained away as easily as Adam's belly button. If an Archeozoic crystal has more lead and less uranium than one formed during the Cenozoic Era, it is merely because God set the two clocks at different times when he started both of them ticking in 4004 B.C. So say the creationists.

Neither scientist nor scientific creationist can suggest any deduction from the creation hypothesis that can be proved false, now or in the future. But the hypothesis of evolution is falsifiable by a thousand conceivable observations, for example, finding *Australopithecus* bones in strata from the Mesozoic Era. Evolution, therefore, might be a false hypothesis. But creationism can never be proved false.

The Reverend Charles Kingsley was closer to the truth than perhaps he knew when he said it was not his reason but his conscience that made him reject the waterproof belly button argument. In some abstract sense, science may (as some claim) be value

free, but the practitioners of science often become very emotional when they are confronted with waterproof hypotheses. They exhibit what can only be called moral indignation—or the sort of contemptuousness a professional gambler would express if he were asked to play poker with twos, threes, fours, fives, and one-eyed jacks wild. Grown men don't play such games.

There is a paradox in the present Mexican standoff between scientists and scientific creationists. Bible supporters want Genesis taught because (they say) it is scientific; evolutionists want waterproof hypotheses excluded because (they feel) they are intellectually immoral. Small wonder for confusion.

Actually, all of the arguments given here could be included in public schools and with considerable educational benefit. That such material is not included has many explanations. The principal one is

no doubt this: It is always easier to teach facts than arguments. It is particularly difficult to examine for an understanding of arguments. Teachers—some of them—are lazy. So are some students. Classes—

most of them—are large; this militates against teaching subtle arguments. A pluralistic society like ours makes it easier to run away from a controversy than to deal with it fairly and openly.

One wonders: When the second centenary of the *Origin of Species* rolls around, in the year 2059, will the theory of evolution through natural selection be universally accepted? Evidences of natural selection are everywhere: in the unwanted appearance of DDT-resistant insects and antibiotic-resistant disease germs as well as in the wanted development of domestic plant and animal varieties in response to breeding programs in which man defines the selective criteria. But these evidences are nothing to a person who does not reject waterproof hypotheses.

Our social world is a chaotic one. It is understandable that many sincere people should seek emotional refuge in a waterproof hypothesis like that of instantaneous creation. Broadening the support for Darwin's view depends not so much on accumulating more scientific evidence as it does on getting more people to understand the nature of science itself. □

Garrett Hardin, a former biology and human ecology professor at the University of California, Santa Barbara, now writes and lectures.

THE CREATIONISTS' CLOUT

No one knows how many scientific creationists there are, but since the late Sixties, they have managed to have bills introduced in at least fifteen states that would force public schools to teach, alongside evolution, that a supreme being made us. So far, none of these bills has been passed, although some have met only narrow defeat. The Georgia legislature passed different versions of a bill but could not agree on a final form.

Creationists have done their most persuasive wooing in the twenty-two states where school board committees choose textbooks. Now in California, many high school students use a biology book that does not even mention Darwin. In New York, Luther Sunderland persuaded the state board of education to reassess the biology text used in its public schools.

The movement's best-known organization is the Institute for Creation Research, in San Diego. It is funded by individuals who learn of its work through a monthly newsletter and receives, officials say, an average of 1,000 donations each month, the average amount being \$20. ICR's seven staff scientists all have doctoral degrees and spend most of their time promoting creationism on college campuses. They also write books. Many of these are published by Creation-Life Publishers, near San Diego. One recent children's book has modern man and dinosaurs living side by side.

Christian Heritage College, also in San Diego, offers courses in creationism to 400 students and holds special courses for teachers.

Creation Science Research Center of San Diego is the legal activist among the creationist groups. It recently sued the California Board of Education for not making it clear that creationism may be taught in biology classes. CSRC says it helped force changes in texts at least six times in California during the last decade.

The Bible Science Association, in Minneapolis, sold, until recently, radio spots to many midwestern stations. It publishes weekly readers for schools and a monthly newsletter with a circulation of 18,000. The Creation Research Society, in Ann Arbor, Michigan, with a membership of 700, publishes the *Creation Research Quarterly*, a journal of record containing the latest "scientific" findings to substantiate the cause.

Only recently are school boards and teachers learning how to argue effectively against creationists. An issue of *The American School Board Journal* published an article advising readers of how to mobilize in defense of science. Several counties in Georgia defied decrees by local boards to include creationism in the school curricula.

—C.H.

(21) From The New York Times (10/15/80, p. A18):

Secular Humanists Attack A Rise in Fundamentalism

By KENNETH A. BRIGGS

A group of 61 prominent scholars and writers have attacked the recent rise of Christian fundamentalism by issuing a declaration that denounces absolutist morality and calls for an emphasis on science and reason rather than religion as a means of solving human problems. Called "A Secular Humanist Declara-

tion," the statement warns that "the reappearance of dogmatic authoritarian religions" threatens intellectual freedom, human rights and scientific progress. It expresses skepticism toward "supernatural claims," doubt about "traditional views of God," and rejection of the "divinity of Jesus."

The group assails "fundamentalist, literalist and doctrinaire Christianity; a rapidly growing and uncompromising Moslem clericalism in the Middle East and Asia; the reassertion of orthodox authority by the Roman Catholic papal hierarchy; nationalistic religious Judaism; and the reversion to obscurantist reli-

gions in Asia."

Affirming the need for moral standards that are based on logic and empirical experience, the declaration opposes "absolutist morality" and says that it is immoral to "baptize infants, to confirm adolescents, or to impose a religious creed on young people before they are able to con-

sent."

U.S. and Foreign Signers

Among the American signers are Dr. B. F. Skinner, the retired Harvard psychologist, Isaac Asimov, the author, Dr. Walter Kaufman and Dr. Sidney Hook, both philosophers, and Francis Crick, the Nobel laureate cited for his work in the discovery of DNA. Dr. Paul Kurtz, a member of the faculty at the State University of New York at Buffalo, drafted the basic document and gathered the signatures. The declaration appears in the first issue of a secular humanist magazine, "Free Inquiry," edited by Dr. Kurtz.

The list of foreigners who joined in the statement includes Baroness Barbara Wootton, deputy speaker of the British House of Lords; Kai Nielsen, the Canadian philosopher, and Dora Russell, widow of Bertrand Russell.

Dr. Kurtz said that the "growth of fundamentalism that is a vociferous critic of secular humanism as a scapegoat" had prompted him to issue the counterattack.

Secular humanism, as a philosophy that favors exclusion of religion in making moral and political decisions, has been frequently attacked by many Roman Catholics and Protestants as the chief factor in what they see as a sharp decline in the nation's morals. According to this view, the secular humanists have succeeded in removing God from schools and government deliberations and among the results has been a tendency to regard morals as man-made.

Role in Political Campaign

The attack on humanism has been a key element in the effort by conservative evangelicals to gain political influence in the present American election campaign. Preachers on the stump and on television repeatedly rail against what they see as an atheistic plot to stamp out religion. Most are working for causes and candidates who espouse moral positions that are believed to be grounded in the divine authority of the Bible. These morals, which include opposition to homosexuality, premarital sex, abortion and divorce, are viewed by the evangelicals as immutable and those who do not heed them

are seen as subject to God's judgment.

"The moving force behind humanism is Satan," writes H. Edward Rowe, an evangelical leader, in a new book, "Save America." "Humanism is basically Satan's philosophy and program. Certain features of it may sound reasonable, but it always leads to tragedy, simply because it ignores the guidance of God."

The secular humanists trace their heritage to classical philosophy, the worldly focus of the Enlightenment of the 18th century and the emergence of the scientific method. Among those who are said to stand in this tradition are Lucretius, Spinoza, Darwin and Einstein. Though humanists reject divine authority over morality, most believe sound ethical standards can be derived from human reason.

In the declaration, the group asserts that secular humanists "may be agnostics, atheists or skeptics." The statement contends that "men and women are free and are responsible for their own destinies and that they cannot look toward some transcendent Being for salvation."

Reflecting elements of two earlier humanist manifestos, in 1933 and 1973, the declaration depicts supernatural religion and divine revelation as enemies of the rational process that leads to progress. "We are apprehensive that modern civilization is threatened by forces antithetical to reason, democracy and freedom," the statement says.

Reliance on Scientific Method

"Although not so naive as to believe that reason and science can easily solve all human problems," the declaration continues, "we nonetheless contend that they can make a major contribution to human knowledge and can be of benefit to mankind. We know of no better substitute for the cultivation of human intelligence. We believe the scientific method, though imperfect, is still the most reliable way of understanding the world."

Dr. Kurtz asserted that the scientific method continues to be the "dominant model" for the modern world, despite attacks from some religious groups. "The critics want to turn the clock back to the pre-modern world, to repeal the modern, scientific world," Dr. Kurtz said.

Though empirical, rational methods appear to be the most common means of exploring human problems, the declaration complains that secular humanists do not have sufficient opportunity to explain their views. It says the media are "inordinately dominated by a pro-religious bias" and that the "views of preachers, faith healers, and religious hucksters go largely unchallenged."

"Secular humanism places trust in human intelligence rather than divine guidance," the declaration says. "Skeptical of theories of redemption, damnation, and reincarnation, secular humanists attempt to approach the human situation in realistic terms; human beings are responsible for their own destinies."

The other United States signers were: George Abell, professor of astronomy, UCLA; John Anton, professor of philosophy, Emory University; Khoren Arisian, minister, First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis; Paul Beattie, minister, All Souls Unitarian Church, president, Fellowship of Religious Humanism; H. James Birx, professor of anthropology and sociology, Canisius College; Brand Blanshard, professor emeritus of philosophy, Yale University; Joseph L. Blau, professor emeritus of religion, Columbia University; Arthur Danto, professor of philosophy, Columbia University; Albert Ellis, executive director, Institute for Rational-Emotive Therapy; Roy Fairfield, former professor of social science, Antioch College; Herbert Feigl, professor emeritus of philosophy, University of Minnesota; Joseph Fletcher, theologian, University of Virginia Medical School; Sidney Hook, professor emeritus of philosophy, New York University, fellow at Hoover Institute; George Hourani, professor of philosophy, State University of New York at Buffalo; Marvin Kohl, professor of philosophy, medical ethics, State University of New York at Fredonia; Richard Kostelanetz, writer, artist, critic; Joseph Margolis, professor of philosophy, Temple University; Floyd Matson, professor of American Studies, University of Hawaii; Ernest Nagel, professor emeritus of philosophy, Columbia University; Lee Nisbet, associate professor of philosophy, Medaille College;

George Olincy, lawyer; Virginia Olincy; V. W. Quine, professor of philosophy, Harvard University; Robert Rimmer, novelist; Herbert Schapiro, Freedom from Religion Foundation; Herbert Schneider, professor emeritus of philosophy, Claremont College; George Tomashovich, professor anthropology, Buffalo State University College; Valentin Turchin, Russian dissident, computer scientist, City College, City University of New York; Sherwin Wine, rabbi, Birmingham Temple, founder, Society for Humanistic Judaism; Marvin Zimmerman, professor of philosophy, State University of New York at Buffalo.

From Canada: Henry Morgenthaler, physician, Montreal.

France: Yves Galifret, executive director, l'Union Rationaliste; Jean-Claude Pecker, professor of astrophysics, College de France, Academie des Sciences;

Britain: Sir A. J. Ayer, professor of philosophy, Oxford University; H. J. Blackham, former chairman, Social Morality Council and British Humanist Association; Bernard Crick, professor of politics, Birkbeck College, London University; Sir Raymond Firth, professor emeritus of anthropology, University of London; James Herrick, editor, The Free Thinker; Zhores A. Medvedev, Russian dissident, Medical Research Council; Lord Ritchie-Calder, president, Rationalist Press Association; Harry Stopes-Roe, senior lecturer in science studies, University of Birmingham, chairman, British Humanist Association; Nicholas Walter, editor, New Humanist.

India: A. B. Shah, president, Indian Secular Society, director, Institute for the Study of Indian Traditions; V. M. Tarakunde, Supreme Court Judge, chairman, Indian Rationalist Humanist Association.

Israel: Shulamit Aloni, lawyer, member of Knesset, head of Citizen's Rights Movement.

Norway: Alastair Hannay, professor of philosophy, University of Trondheim.

Yugoslavia: Milovan Djilas, author, former vice-president of Yugoslavia; M. Markovic, professor of philosophy, Serbian Academy of Sciences & Arts and University of Belgrade; Sveta Stojanovic, professor of philosophy, University of Belgrade.

(Thank you, STEVE REINHARDT and BEV SMITH)

(22)

Page A24

THE NEW YORK TIMES, MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1980

Against Creationism

By Ben Bova

We may laugh at the quaintness of the 1925 monkey trial in Tennessee, when teacher John T. Scopes was threatened with fine and imprisonment for teaching Darwinian evolution to his high-school students. Yet it wasn't until 1970 that the last anti-evolution laws in our country were wiped off the books. Even then the battle did not end. It goes on today, more subtle, and in some ways more bitter, than ever before.

Creationists, who believe that the world and the human race were created out of nothing by some divine fiat, no longer insist on banning every mention of evolution from the classroom. Instead, they pressure school boards to give Creationism "equal time" with evolution in science classes. As a result, in many biology texts the origin of the human species is illustrated by Michelangelo's Adam from the Sistine Chapel ceiling. It's fine painting, and Genesis is an inspired bit of writing. But it isn't biology. To insist that Genesis be inserted into biology texts and to



pretend that religious mythology can explain biological phenomena is about equivalent to believing that straw can be woven into gold.

The Creationists claim that scientists still refer to evolution as a "theory"; therefore, the scientists don't accept

Darwin's ideas as proved. In science, the word "theory" indicates "a systematic statement of principles; a formulation of apparent relationships or underlying principles." A hypothesis is an unproved idea. A theory, in science, is a structure of logic that brings

together many diverse observations (and welds them into an understandable whole. Really powerful theories, such as those of Darwin and Einstein, also predict phenomena that haven't been observed before.

The Creationists retort: "But scien-

tists themselves don't agree on Darwin's theory." True. God forbid that they should.

Science is a process of discovery. Darwin's ideas are some five generations old now. Much new information has been uncovered. Biologists argue about the details of evolutionary processes, just as physicists argue about subatomic particles. This does not mean that physicists don't believe atoms exist.

Evolution, as described by Darwin and others, is the cornerstone of the biological sciences. No serious scientists dispute this, even though they will haggle fiercely over minute details.

Recently the concept of "scientific creationism" was raised, with scientists or engineers — usually not biologists — saying that evolution stands at

best on shaky intellectual ground. To prove that Creationism is correct, the Creationists try to find flaws in evolution. This is an intellectual shell game, in which you don't prove your point but instead try to demolish the opposing point of view and then pretend that this proves you're correct.

So far not one shred of evidence has ever been found to support the Creationist point of view. Not a fingerbone, not a leaf, not a shard of evidence exists. We may have been created by some deity or other unfathomable force, but there is no evidence whatsoever that it happened in this way. And if it did happen this way, the creating force went to incredible trouble to litter this planet with the evidence of evolution: from dinosaur fossils to hominid teeth, from the elegant

speciation Darwin found during his voyage on H.M.S. Beagle to the stages of development a human fetus undergoes during its nine-month gestation.

There is a dark element of catechism thinking among the Creationists. They don't need evidence, because they know they're right. Their mode of thought, straight out of medieval times, leads not to understanding but to acceptance of Authority. Make no mistake about it. Those who are convinced of the truth will never stop merely with demands for "equal time." They inevitably move toward taking political control, just as they inevitably gravitate toward the most conservative positions on issues. Already the Creationists are using political clout to tamper with biology teaching. Give them the political power and

they will outlaw any ideas they do not agree with: Evolution is merely one of many ideas that these zealots attack.

The preceding paragraph is hypothesis, an unproved idea. We can test this hypothesis in good scientific fashion. Are the Creationists fair-minded people who want only to present conflicting ideas in an equitable, reasonable manner? Ask the next Creationist you meet whether he or she would be willing to have a chapter explaining Darwinian evolution inserted into the Bible alongside Genesis. Then you'll learn what "equal time" really means to them.

Copyright © Omni Publications International Ltd.

Ben Bova is executive editor of *Omni* magazine, a monthly, from which this is adapted.

(23) From The New York Times (10/15/80, Op Ed page):

WASHINGTON — Columnists, political commentators, and editorialists have been writing a great deal lately about the emergence of religion-oriented political organizations, even suggesting that this is the most important issue in the Presidential election — more important than inflation or foreign policy or unemployment.

Religion is indeed important in the 1980 elections, but it is apt to be more so in future ones.

Many have written of this issue as if it concerned simply the question of church-state relations, and as if the separation between church and state is threatened. In fact, not one of the religion-oriented political organizations wants to lower the barrier between church and state. All of us do want the nation's laws and policies to reflect the values, beliefs, and principles of America's Christian majority. What justification is there for our seeking that?

First of all, there is the point that the majority of Americans are Christian — that is, ours is a Christian nation. Consider just the Catholics. The church in the United States claims 49 million members, but a few years ago the Gallup poll found 11 million more of us — 60 million in all. That is more than a quarter of the population. Add the nation's Protestants and Eastern Orthodox and you get an overwhelming majority. Why should not a nation's laws, policies, and even public ceremonies reflect the values, beliefs, and principles of the majority of its people? Those of such nations as Ireland and Israel do. Ours used to. They should again.

Leaving aside the matter of numbers, they should. That is because laws and policies and the politics that bring them into being are not abstract. They have to do with how men live — men, not simply citizens, but living, breathing, hurting, playing, working, worshipping, dreaming men. It is not sim-

A Christian America

By Gary Potter

ply that these men, including the women among them, need and want homes, jobs, education for their children, social stability and a secure and peaceful future — all matters on which politics touch. They are also creatures created in the image of God, they are His children, and they are entitled to the dignity and freedom befitting their station. Who is more likely to secure their entitlement than Christians, those who recognize they are God's children?

I spoke of freedom. Am I free because I can see a pornographic movie, or sell one, or make one, or recruit my neighbor's daughter to perform in one? Is that freedom?

Christian political activists have another idea. They have the idea that it is the business of politics to ensure for men the freedom to do their duty. Every man's first duty is to win salvation. This is a way of saying that there are things that matter more than mere politics and should precede them in importance. Good politics, like good economics, depend on good morals. Good morals depend on religion.

Every really serious political issue is finally moral. When Humberto Cardinal Medeiros urged voters in Massachusetts to elect pro-life candidates he was not speaking as a politician. He spoke as the quintessential moralist, a man of religion. It is for a man of religion to instruct us morally even as it is for a man of politics to seek a public order annealed to the highest concep-

tion of the public good: a society of free men bent on doing their duty. That would be a Christian society.

What about men, Christian and otherwise, who are unmindful of their duty? What about the non-Christians in a Christian society? Would they be oppressed? It is the rule of the secularist that is oppressive. The secularist has no vision of anything beyond the here and now. He does not believe in eternal life, or at least he acts as if he does not. The here and the now are all he has. So his compulsion is to make an imperfect world perfect. To do it he regulates, controls, manipulates, dictates and, in the end, tyrannizes. Tyranny is a substitute for government. There is nothing that prevents our having a tyranny, except the growing awareness of the nation's Christians that it is dangerous for their values, beliefs, principles, and morals to be disregarded in the political process and in the formulation of public policy. So they are beginning to weigh candidates and issues in the light of their faith.

Commentators disturbed by this development are not consistent. They argue that "private" moral views inspired by religious beliefs should not infuse public actions, but they never argue that persons who believe in nothing beyond themselves and their ability to perfect the world should fail to vote their views.

Men who believe in nothing beyond themselves and their ability to perfect the world are liberals by definition. It was inevitable that Christians should be in conflict with them. That is not because Christians necessarily are conservatives, but because liberalism is a sin.

Gary Potter heads Catholics for Christian Political Action, which he describes as "an independent national laymen's political-education and action organization."

(Thank you, BEV SMITH)

CURRENT PUBLIC ISSUES

(24) Nuclear Power opponents who don't happen to know about the Union of Concerned Scientists would do well to write them and ask about their activities. They are mostly MIT professors who know what is risky (and what is not) about nuclear power. They are the group that Governor Thornberg of Pennsylvania consulted in connection with the venting of radioactive gas at Three Mile Island. Their current concern is that the U.S. is about to embark prematurely on a radioactive waste disposal plan that is inadequate and that will probably have dangerous and irreversible consequences. Their address: 1384 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02238.

LOCAL CHAPTERS

- (25) L.A. A group of BRS members met, for the fun of it, on September 19th at a Hollywood restaurant, and enjoyed good company, good conversation, and (for all we know) good food. We don't have a complete list of who was there, but we know it included BOB DAVIS, KATHY FJERMEDAL, JOE GORMAN, JIM HAUN, and HARRY RUJA. They decided to meet again, on Sunday, November 16th, at 1 P.M., at Bob's house, where they will look over his Russell collection, discuss a book, and drink tea and/or Red Hackle. (The book: Why I Am Not A Christian, chosen because most of them had read it.) There may also be 2 short BR films.
- If you think you may go, write Bob a note (2501 Lakeview Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90039) or phone (213-663-7485). His house is very small, and he wants to have enough chairs on hand.
-

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

- (26) Dong-In Bae writes from Germany: "Although I cannot attend the annual meeting, my heart and mind will be with you in Chicago. I have only one wish: I think it would be desirable to print the scholarly addresses in the next newsletter, on the following grounds: (1) as a documentation of a feature of BRS activities; and especially (2) for the benefit of the members who did not attend the meeting. I wish you great success in your meeting. With warm regards."
- (27) Whitfield & Margaret Cobb have an oil portrait of BR hanging over the fireplace in their living room. It is "imaginatively colored -- cool blue head of reason, hot orange flames of irrationality -- from a black and white photograph of BR on one of his ban-the-bomb protest marches (published in Life), and was painted by Sylvia Wilkinson, then an art major at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, where I used to teach math."
- (28) Peter Cranford is, as we know, interested in promoting the concept of "compossibility". It was the subject of his talk at the 1980 meeting (RSN27-2c). His new book, just completed, may help, at least indirectly. "I had planned to use the title, 'Compossibility: The Art and Skill of Influencing People (Including Yourself)' but this ran into resistance. The book owes a debt to Russell, and should help the cause. The new title will probably be, 'How To Be Your Own Psychologist', self-published in four to five months."
- (29) Dora Russell, as reported in "World Press Review" (August 1980), and originally reported in The Times, London: Pessimistic Educator. As an early champion of such causes as progressive education, Socialism, and global peace, Dora Russell finds today's world less hopeful than that of the 1920s, when she and her husband, Philosopher Bertrand Russell, founded Britain's "discipline-free" Beacon Hill School. Bemoaning the advance of technology in modern schools, she says, "I don't believe it would be possible to educate children now as I once believed they could be educated. Who cares about the human race anymore?"
- Mrs. Russell, now eighty-five, lives in Cornwall, in the house she and Lord Russell bought sixty years ago. She recently published the second volume of her autobiography and is continuing work on a book about the technological age. "Either we turn our planet into a machine," she says, "or we return to some form of civilization. It is a savage, difficult choice." (Thank you, BOB DAVIS)
- (30) Paul Arthur Schilpp was planning to retire (again!) and move to the gentler climate of California this year. This summer, he and his wife, Madelon, made a house-hunting trip to California. He writes: "We did not find what we were looking for -- and I do not feel confident that we ever will (they want \$210,000 for just a chicken coop -- or outhouse). We may be forced to stick where we are. In any case, after officially retiring emeritus status on July 1, I was reappointed on September 1: no rest for the wicked; which, I suppose, shows just how terribly wicked I must be."
-

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

- (31) 2 + 2 = ? JACK RAGSDALE had wondered what BR meant when he said something like, "Two and two are about four." Jack also wondered where the remark occurred (RSN27-25).
- KEN KORBIN offers this: "Wittgenstein said something like this: 'If there are two apples on a table and two more apples are put on the table, then there are probably four apples on the table.' This may be the source of BR's remark, although I do not know what Wittgenstein means."
-

HONORARY MEMBERS

(32) We welcome a new honorary member:

PAUL ARTHUR SCHILPP/Emeritus, Philosophy/Southern Illinois University/Carbondale, IL 62901

NEW MEMBERS

(33) We welcome these new members:

KEVIN BOGGS/1111 S.W. 16th Ave.(101)/Gainesville, FL 32601

ANNE L. BUTCHER/1203 6th Ave.(1)/Tacoma, WA 98405

R. S. J. DAWSON/3733 Robinhood Drive/Houston, TX 77005

MIKE EYAYLA/608 N. Cummings/Los Angeles, CA 90033

ZEN C. HANGER/3317 Murl Ave./Muskegon, MI 49442

MIKE HOWARD/422 W. Upsal St./Philadelphia, PA 19119

DR. H. W. LESSING/50 F, Cornwall Gardens/London S.W. 7, England

PIETER D. MASTERS/1200 N. 7th Ave.(125)/Tucson, AZ 85705

FRITZ MOELLER/1561 Machado Ct./Concord, CA 94521

PROF. HUGH S. MOORHEAD/Dept. of Philosophy/Northeastern Illinois University/Chicago, IL 60625

PAMELA MOORHEAD/3 Washington Square Village(11R)/New York, NY 10012

PAUL K. MOSER/2016 Terrace Place (107)/Nashville, TN 37203

SHAWN NEWMAN/303 St. Joseph's Hall/University of Notre Dame/Notre Dame, IN 46556

KARIN E. PETERSON/Grinnell College/Grinnell, IA 50112

FRANKLIN ROSELL/4290 SW 138 Ct./Miami, FL 33175

WAYNE E. SANGSTER/7325 Booth/Prairie Village, KS 66208

WILLIAM L. STOUGHTON/1609 N. Mar Les Drive/Santa Ana, CA 92706

MR/MRS JOE WINSTON/610 Clymar St./Compton, CA 90220

ADDRESS & OTHER CHANGES

(34) New addresses or corrections. Corrections are underlined.

JAMES BERTINI/155 E. 2nd St. (4A)/New York, NY 10009

DAN BOND/St. Mary's Seminary & University/5400 Rolland Avenue/Baltimore, MD 21210

PROF. ANDREW BRINK/Dept. of English/McMaster University/Hamilton, Ont./ Canada L8S 4L9

ALEX DELY/ Physics Dept./University of Arizona/Tucson, AZ 85721

ALBERT ENGLEMAN/PO Box 32586/Oklahoma City, OK 73123

GRAHAM ENTWISTLE/126 Westbourne Lane(B-10)/Ithaca, NY 14850

SAMMY FRENCH/8412 Oak Ridge/North Little Rock, AR 72116

CHARLES D. HARRIS/201 E. Green St./Mascoutah, IL 62258

RICHARD & IRIS HYMAN/99 Pond Ave.(D617)/Brookline, MA 02146

WILLIAM MCKENZIE-GOODRICH/77 Pine St.(110)/Portland, ME 04102

EVA PREISS/514 W. 33rd St./Baltimore, MD 21211

SARAH PRIMM/PO Box 195/Colorado Springs, CO 80901

BRUCE A. ROMANISH/420 Conklin Hall/Rutgers University/Newark, NJ 07102

PHILIP STANDER,ED.D./Dept Behavioral Sciences/Kingsborough Community College,Brooklyn, NY 11235

REGINA STUMBER/Memelstr. 9/5802 Wetter/West Germany

DANIEL A. TITO/463 Main Road (rear)/Hanover Green/Wilkes Barre, PA 18702

WILLIAM VALENTINE/315 S. Main/Eaton Rapids,MI 48827

COLLECTORS' CORNER

(35) This new section is for members and non-members who wish to buy, sell, or trade books, letters, photographs,

etc. that have some connection with BR. We will also list the names and addresses of collectors.

- (36) Book Collector DAVIS. Bob Davis/ 2501 Lakeview Avenue/ Los Angeles, CA 90039
- (37) Book Collector LENZ. John R. Lenz/305 Riverside Drive (2B)/New York, NY 10025
- (38) Book Collector LESSING. Dr. H. W. Lessing/50 F, Cornwall Gardens/London S.W.7/England. He would like to be in touch with other collectors and with people interested in selling books by BR.

CONTRIBUTIONS

- (39) Russell Memorial (London). The following have each made a contribution to help pay the cost of the memorial bust of BR that was unveiled in the gardens of Red Lion Square last month: JACQUELINE BERTHON-PAYON, GRAHAM ENTWISTLE, DOUGLAS F. FRASER, DAVID S. HART, ALVIN HOFER, RICHARD HYMAN, GLADYS LEITHAUSER, WILLIAM MCKENZIE-GOODRICH, ERNEST L. SNODGRASS, WILLIAM VALENTINE. Our thanks go to all of them.
- (40) BRS Treasury. We thank these members for their contributions, which help pay our annual operating deficit: JACK COWLES, DENNIS DARLAND, KATHY FJERMEDAL, RICHARD HYMAN, CORLISS LAMONT, GLADYS LEITHAUSER.

BRS BUSINESS

- (41) Expulsion of member proposed. The BRS has never expelled a member; there has never been reason to. But now, alas, there is good reason, at least in our opinion. The members will be the final judges; they will vote on it. Here are some facts:
- John Sutcliffe, who lives in England, has been a member since September 1975. He has taken a lively interest in BRS affairs, and his writings have often appeared in the newsletter.
- * * * * *
- NL11-8 (8/76) reports that he is "in process of setting up a BRS in Britain." That is, he intended to form a BRS-BRITAIN COMMITTEE of the BRS, and recruit new members in Britain. For this purpose, he ran ads at his own expense in "The New Humanist" (Britain).
- NL13-8 (2/77): Bob Davis reports, after a lengthy visit with Sutcliffe in England, that "England does not lend itself to our style of organization, but John is a valuable member to have in England." That is, the plan to have a BRS-Britain Committee was dropped, and Sutcliffe continued as a regular member.
- * * * * *
- Sutcliffe had a letter published in "The Listener". He sent a copy to us for possible inclusion in the newsletter. The letter said highly derogatory things about an unnamed organization that -- obviously and unmistakably -- was The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. The letter was signed this way:
- John Sutcliffe
The Bertrand Russell Society
- Sutcliffe had every right to write this letter in his own name but no right whatever to say it was coming from the BRS or represented the BRS view, which it does not. We wrote him as follows on July 19, 1980:
- I am distressed to see that your published letter, which you identify as having appeared in "The Listener" of 7/2/80, is signed with your name and "The Bertrand Russell Society".
- That is a misappropriation of the BRS name. You are not authorized to speak for the BRS.
- Nor are you the "England Representative" of the BRS, although your stationery claims that you are. The BRS does not have an England Representative or any representatives other than elected ones. Calling yourself an England Representative is a misrepresentation, and should stop.
- I don't wish to be entirely negative. You have made a number of useful contributions to the BRS. That is why I am not going to recommend that you be expelled as a member.
- I don't expect you to like what I have said here, but I hope that when you think it over, you will decide that you can live with it, and this will enable you to continue to make useful contributions to the Society.

On July 26th he responded to our letter this way:

Dear Lee,

How could I ever be annoyed with so petty and patronising an individual as you? Does my tolerance level of feels appear so low to you?

May I apologise -not for my action- but for the silly man you obviously are. Loyal to the letter of Bertie Russell you are totally ignorant of the spirit of the man and his work.

Your bureaucratic mentality so eager to cross every "t" and dot every "i" is alien to any organisation that represents Bertie and his work. The discussion of compossibility at the BRS meeting was most interesting, why dont you try it sometime. But it makes me wonder how much of Davis "compossibility" with the Peace Foundation prompted your letter and its rather amusing attempt to impose its pathetic authority.

Note that he does not say he will stop calling himself "England Representative", nor does he say he will stop writing letters to publications as if coming from the BRS. To say nothing of the abusive tone.

* * * * *

Bob Davis had had similar problems with Sutcliffe earlier. Here are relevant excerpts from Bob's letter to Sutcliffe of January 5, 1978:

I am writing you about a matter of procedure. Lee Eisler sent me a copy of the entry in the English Association handbook for this year with an attached letter. In the letter he pointed out that having a British Representative, as you are listed, implies a British chapter and that violates the express intention of the Board not to have foreign chapters. That was decided last February, and I notified you of that in my letter of February 16th. I feel that Lee is correct in this matter and that when it is time for the 1978 book to be compiled, you should tell them to drop mention of us completely as we are not a British group.

Here is how Sutcliffe answered on January 15th:

As ever you match the charm of the well oiled machine with the tact of an air-raid. As one who is supposed to inspire an organisation they lead your indelicacy is inspirational only to every narrow minded bureaucrat. Your letter was insensitive timed as it was, and this reply may seem to you over sensitive, but you demonstrate a serious deficiency in your ability to administer anything but the most slavish machine or a dedicated bunch of acolytes. I think and I hope I have proved my worth to the BRS and its collective effort of many diverse individuals contributing to a common commitment in Bertie's work and its aims. But I deplore the efforts you and Lee Eisler seem to be making to institutionalise our freely united work. You are, I feel, making the same error of judgement as the Foundation, and you may (as I think you desire to do) overcome your difficulties with them, so that you can gain access to his work, only to fall into their trap of reducing it to a single authoritative interpretation. Consequently in order to show you mean business you have keep the rank and file under control so as not to rock the boat and thus threaten future relations with the Foundation. Dissent from corporate decision has thus to be sat on. Is my crime so terrible in and by itself? It just may regardless of so major an error as to transgress so mighty a policy bring in new members who wont know that in you and your committee lies the true authority of all our effort and the only True word of Bertie Russell, and I suppose that would be unforgivable.

I hope Peter Cranford's creation has not fallen into the hands of so many petty minded bureaucrats. We do not need celestial time servers dotting every 'I' and crossing every 'T'. We are a group of individuals acting together with initiative, not a stereotyped commercial organisation looking for profitable success. Such a view is alien to Russell and his work.

* * * * *

HARRY RUJA --BRS Vice-President elect, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at San Diego State University -- offered these comments, in a letter to Bob dated September 30, 1980:

I have worked through the correspondence on the Sutcliffe matter. On the basis of this correspondence alone, I would have to agree to expulsion, if only for the tone of contempt he has adopted in his letter to you and Lee. I know nothing of the source of his dislike of the two of you, but certainly the perfectly reasonable request you made of him, in a completely non-accusatory manner, should not have provoked the abuse and hostility in his replies. I assume that the decision not to have foreign chapters, or, more specifically, an English representative, was made with due deliberation by the Board, not "rammed through" for some sinister motive. If so, Sutcliffe's resentment of the decision seems utterly uncalled for.

You acted properly in asking the English Association to delete their listing of us in their Handbook of Societies after Sutcliffe made it clear he had no intention to do so. Since apparently S. intends to

continue to do what we have asked him repeatedly not to, I suggest you send a letter to The Times of London and to The Observer, and perhaps also to The Manchester Guardian to the effect that the BRS is an American society, incorporated under the laws of Georgia, with no foreign chapters or foreign representatives, though open to all persons everywhere who accept the goals of the society. If Lee did not write to The Listener as soon as he received a copy of Sutcliffe's letter published in the Feb 7 issue of The Listener in which the signature implied that S. was representing the BRS, you (or Lee) should do so now, even at this late date, informing The Listener that that was a fraudulent identification.

* * * * *

That is the case against John Sutcliffe.

According to the Bylaws (Article II, Section 3), "Any member...may be expelled...by a two-thirds majority of those members voting by mail in a referendum occasioned by the issue."

* Please vote, using the ballot at the end of this newsletter.

CORRECTIONS

- (42) He WAS there. When we listed the members who attended the 1980 meeting (RSN27-2a), we inadvertently omitted HUGH MOORHEAD's name. When we mentioned it to him, he replied, "Leaving my name out is of no matter — so never mind" — which reminded him of the joke that BR got sick of hearing, at home, in his youth: What is mind? No matter. What is matter? Never mind.
- (43) How to order LOLP. Last issue, we reported the discount, for BRS members, on books in the series, "The Library of Living Philosophers" (RSN27-31). We meant to include the following paragraph, which tells how to order:
- To order, write Ms. Mary McNelis, Open Court Publishing Co., La Salle, IL 61301, and state that this is a "BRS Order". Enclose exact discounted price plus \$1 handling charge. If any questions, phone (toll free) 800-892-6831.
- (44) It was Bob Davis's idea. And we should have mentioned that fact when we introduced the new series, "My Favorite Russell". The series began last issue with Paul Schilpp's favorite Russell (RSN27-16), and continues in this issue with Lester Denonn's favorite Russell. We expect this idea to produce a lot of interesting reading.

PERIODICALS RECEIVED

- (45) Die Fackel/The Torch/Le Flambeau is published by the Korean Bertrand Russell Society. As some of you know, it was founded in 1977 by BRS Member Dong-In Bae. It is located in Koeln, West Germany. Dong-In, a Korean, has been given political asylum there.
- We have just received Issue No. 12, August 15, 1980; 44 pages, page size 6 x 8½. It is mostly in Korean; 5 pages are in German. Page 38 is Dong-In's letter, in English, to President Carter, expressing concern over the fate of Kim Dae Jung and over many other human rights violations in South Korea, whose government the USA supports.
- Earlier we had received Issue No. 1 (NL13-55) and Issue No. 2 (NL15-42). All 3 issues are available from the BRS Library (Jack Ragsdale, BRS Co-Librarian, PO Box 28200, Dallas, TX 75228.)
- (46) "Islamic Revolution" We reported receiving this periodical in RSN26-39. ALI GHAEMI has some views on it. If interested, write him directly: PO Box 427, McLean, VA 22101

COLLECTORS' CORNER (CONTINUED)

- (47) Walter Craig Davidson (805 Marinel Lane, Mission, TX 78572) writes:
- I own a copy of The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, 1872-1914, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Montreal, First Canadian Edition, that was autographed for me by Bertrand Russell. It is in perfect condition. I also have a typewritten, short letter to

me, signed by Bertrand Russell in ink. The letter is on Bertrand Russell's Plas Penryn, Penrhyndeudraeth, Merioneth letterhead and dated 14 January, 1957.

The letter is in response to one I wrote Bertrand Russell concerning my understanding of his views on determinism and free will. The letter is in perfect condition. I also have a copy of Bertrand Russell's Wisdom of the West, editor Paul Foulkes, Rathbone Books, Ltd., London, 1959, printed in Great Britain by L.T.A. Robinson Ltd., London, with Doubleday & Company, Inc., Garden City, N.Y. on the title page. This was personalized to me as follows: "With good wishes to Craig Davidson/Bertrand Russell July, 1960." This book is in perfect condition.

Inasmuch as I am retiring shortly and would not like to see these items lost eventually, I will accept the highest bid for either or both of these items. I had thought to contact Sotheby's but will not do so until your members have had an opportunity to acquire these items.

THE UNVEILING

(48a)

The Times, October 24, 1980



Photograph by Jonathan Player

Mrs Dora Russell with Marcelle Quinton's bust of her husband after yesterday's unveiling.

Bertrand Russell commemorated

By Michael Horsnell

About 100 Humanists gathered to pay homage to the late Bertrand Russell in London yesterday when a bronze bust of the philosopher was unveiled.

Lord Russell, who died in 1970 aged 97, will gaze in effigy through the plane trees of Red Lion Square, by Conway Hall, the cultural cathedral of the humanist movement in Bloomsbury where he lectured.

In an emotional appeal to her former husband as she unveiled the bust, Mrs Dora Russell, aged 85, asked: "Bertie, do we live and labour in vain? You

wrote that the good life is inspired by love and guided by knowledge. Well, there is far too much knowledge in the world at the present time and far too little love."

It was Dora Russell who conceived the idea of the memorial. She took it up with Lord Russell's lifelong friend, Lord Brockway, and an appeal committee raised most of the £4,000 needed. Sir Alfred Ayer, a member of the committee, introduced the sculptor, Marcelle Quinton, who took six weeks to produce the bust at what she calls an "idealized 60 years of age".

Lord Brockway, who presided at the ceremony, said: "He began his active life in opposition to war. He ended his active life in opposition to war and the danger of nuclear bombs. I very much hope if this country suffers a nuclear attack that the bust of Bertrand Russell will be left standing as a warning to us."

He added: "Bertrand Russell was a complete man, a great philosopher and great mathematician, a great sociologist. In each of those spheres he will be remembered."

(48b) Dora Russell, October 23, 1980:

First of all I want to thank all those who have helped in any way to make the placing of this memorial and our presence here today possible. If I do not enter into details it is simply to save making a long speech. Thank you all very much, very much. We are most grateful.

Bertie used to enjoy saying that he came of a family whose members were expected so to live as to have equestrian statues erected to them after their deaths. He felt he could not aspire to that honour, but must therefore try to live in some way to deserve being remembered. Of course those of us who knew and loved him will always remember him; those, too, who enjoy reading will enjoy reading his books. His wit and wisdom stay in the mind.

None the less, I felt that those of us who were with him in his first campaign for peace in 1916 should, before we also disappear, make some actual and visual sign and place of remembrance, to which those who will follow him in the age-long struggle for peace and liberty may come and think about him, as about the still suffering world. Many of us have known martyrs in that struggle — these too we will remember here today and hereafter.

Peace-makers are comrades of danger, poverty, and scorn. Did Bertie, do we, live and labour in vain? The world of nuclear weapons seems to be in a worse state than ever. Bertie wrote that the good life is one inspired by love and guided by knowledge. There is far too much knowledge in the world today and precious little love. I have never been able to see other peoples as my enemies, even as competitors. Surely now we realize that we have only this world and must learn to love one another. Peace on earth is not spelt in ideologies...**

And to young people I say, why are you running to other countries and other gurus, when you have this marvelous one here of your very own. From Bertie's book, which I hold as almost his finest, the History of Western Philosophy, you can learn to understand our past and present and so how to think clearly about the future.

And may everyone of you who can walk march this very Sunday with that CND* for which he did so much.

Bertie, thou shouldst be living at this hour, we still have need of thee. But while we live, the cause you espoused will not be abandoned, nor will you be forgotten by generations to come.

*CND: Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

**Several words are undecipherable on our copy

(48c) Bob Davis's report:

Don Jackanicz and I managed to attend the October 23rd dedication of Bertrand Russell's memorial bust by the skin of our teeth. The invitations were mailed on October 8th to all donors from London but seem to have been lost in the mails. Don received his on the 20th and immediately phoned me. We decided to go. We both flew out on the 21st and arrived on the 22nd for the following day's dedication. One more day of delay in the mail and we would not have been able to make it.

The dedication was at noon in Red Lion Square, which is very close to the British Museum. I urge you all to visit the bust if ever you get to London. It is very well done. I refer you to the reprint of the London Times story and picture. (We will try to have a better picture in the next issue. Ed.) Though not mentioned in the Times story, Sir Alfred Ayer, Peter Cadogan, and I also spoke briefly.

After the ceremony, there was a reception in Conway Hall, which adjoins the Square. Among those present were BR's son, the Earl Russell, a granddaughter, Sarah Russell, and a number of British humanists, artists, and intellectuals. Of special interest to me were Sir John and Lady Russell; he was formerly British Ambassador to Argentina and is a son of the famous "Russell Pasha" — the Cairo police commissioner of some 70 years ago. I also met Georgiana Blakiston, a Russell, who has recently published Woburn and the Russells, which I promptly procured and read. It is a history of the Russell family, centered around the Dukes of Bedford and the family home of Woburn Abbey. Incidentally, it is appropriate to have BR's bust in this section of London as it was developed by the Russell family over several hundred years. There are many reminders of this; the British Museum fronts on "Great Russell Street", for example.

I also discussed the sculpture with the sculptress, Marcelle Quinton. She is prepared to have 7 more editions made at a minimum of \$7000 each, so perhaps one in North America is not an impossibility. I may contact the Getty Museum people here, via Sir John and Lady Russell, on the matter. I suggested to Mrs. Quinton that small reproductions, with a price within reach of average people, might be desirable, and she promised to explore the possibility.

I called a new member. Dr. H. W. Lessing, on my arrival and told him about the dedication, so that he was able to attend. I had supper with him and Mrs. Lessing on Friday, and we discussed collecting BR items -- an activity we hope to expand through the newsletter. He is interested also in a British BRS group. I met two other people similarly interested -- Jack Black, once a lawyer for BR, and G. N. Deodheker, Secretary of the National Secular Society, and we will pursue this idea with them. They are also very interested in an eventual London (or Oxford) BRS meeting.

David Hart, a BRS member who teaches mathematics in Rochester, NY, is on leave in Cambridge. His wife called him on the trans-Atlantic phone the day of the dedication and he managed to arrive for the event. Don and I spent the following Monday with him in Cambridge seeing the sights and talking Russell. He is doing well there, and has promised to send a report to the newsletter..

Don and I also spent Saturday in Oxford where I acquired many old books, including a number of Russell items and a 1724 biography of Cardinal Woolsey.

Sunday we attended the 11 A.M. Lecture at Conway Hall, on logic. Conway Hall usually has a humanist service -- ie, a lecture -- at this hour on Sundays, and I recommend it, if you find yourself in London. In the afternoon we attended the CND anti-nuclear rally in Trafalgar Square -- a rally similar to the ones the CND and BR had put on in the 1960s. Both Peter Cadogan and I feel that the official estimates of 50-60,000 were conservative, and that it looked more like 100,000. It was much like our demonstrations here on the same subject.

On Tuesday I spent the afternoon with Peter Cadogan exploring the possibilities of a British BRS chapter, a London BRS meeting, and an approach to Sakharov by an American equivalent to work for peace and disarmament. The question is: who should make the approach? We have several ideas but nothing definite at the moment.

The rest of our trip was personal. We attended several good concerts and plays, and Don was dashing around Britain and France on a rail pass when I flew home on the 29th.

(48d) Bob Davis says a few words.

Here is a rough recollection of my remarks at the dedication, after I was introduced by Lord Brockway:

I am very glad to be here to lend an international touch to the dedication of Bertrand Russell's bust. I have come 6,000 miles on very short notice precisely because I feel the importance of this occasion.

The Bertrand Russell Society is a small organization, but international. Most of our members are in North America, but there are members on all continents -- in England and the Continent, Latin America, Africa, Asia, and Australia.

This is testimony to the fact that Russell was not only a great Englishman but also a great international figure, a great human. Indeed, I would say that in the last 25 years of his career he was primarily an international figure. He was quite aware that his outlook had become international, as evidenced in his great 1954 BBC speech when he concluded with his famous appeal -- "Remember your humanity and forget the rest."

So it is appropriate that we have some international representation at this dedication of the bust of a great Earthian.

Thank you.

INDEX

- (49) Introductory (1). Coming event: BRS at APA 12/28/80 (1.5). Reports from Committees: Membership (2); Science (3). BRS at APA: the Program (4); 2 abstracts (5). Results of the vote (6). Davis on BR's pacifism (7). Denonn's favorite Russell (8). Forbes quotes BR (9). BRS project: short papers wanted (10). BR Memorial: date is set (11); reports on the event (48). Doonesbury cartoon (12). Baumgartner on Howard on BR (13). BRS Travel Grant: 1980 Grant awarded (14); 1981 Grant announced (15). Science Council (Japan) on nuclear disarmament (16). Religion: Fundamentalism (17); "Discover" on creationism (18); Reagan favors creationism (19); "The Dial" on Darwin-haters (20a) and what to say to them (20b); secular humanists to the defense (21); Bova against creationism (22); "A Christian America" (23). UCS vs. nuclear power (24). L.A. meetings on 9/19 and 11/16 (25). News about members: Bae (26); Cobb (27); Cranford (28); Dora (29); Schilpp (30). A response to "2 + 2 + ?" (31). New honorary member Schilpp (32). New members (33). Address changes (34). Collectors' Corner (35): Davis (36); Lenz (37); Lessing (38); Davidson (47). Contributions: BR Memorial (London) (39); BRS Treasury (40). Expulsion of member proposed (41). Corrections: Moorhead was there (42); how to order LOLP (43); Bob Davis's idea (44). "The Torch" (periodical) received (45). More on "Islamic Revolution" (periodical) (46). Collector Davidson (47). BR Memorial unveiled (48). Index (49). Ballot (50).

(50)

BALLOT

This ballot is in 2 parts. Part 1 is for all members. Part 2 is for Directors only.

Part 1. Expulsion of a member

The case against this member -- that is, the case in favor of expelling him -- is provided in (41).

Please check one: () I vote for expulsion.

() I vote against expulsion.

Part 2. Proposed changes in BRS Travel Grant

If you are a Director, you have been sent a memo giving reasons for the proposal to change the "1982 Travel Scholarship" (so-called) to the "1982 Doctoral Grant" (That memo was not included in this newsletter to save newsletter space.)

Please check one of the 3 options below:

() I approve of the proposed changes.

() I disapprove of the proposed changes.

() I wish to postpone a decision now, and discuss the proposed changes at the 1981 annual meeting.

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 January 1, 1981

.....
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 