# CRYONICS

NOVEMBER 1982

ISSUE # 28

## Contents:



CRYONICS is the newsletter of the Alcor Life Extension Foundation, Inc. Michael Darwin (Federowicz) and Stephen Bridge, Editors. Published monthly. Individual subscriptions: $15.00 per year in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico; $30.00 per year all others. Group rates available upon request. Please address all editorial correspondence to Alcor, 4030 North Palm #304, Fullerton, CA 92635 or phone (714) 738-5569.

## EDITORIAL MATTERS

As a few of our readers may have noticed from our colophon on the cover, CRYONICS is now published by the Alcor Life Extension Foundation instead of the Institute for Advanced Biological Studies. A complete explanation for this change may be found below in the news note entitled IABS AND ALCOR MERGE. From a practical standpoint this change means that all checks should be made payable to Alcor rather than IABS. We will still be bringing you the same good quality of material under Alcor's banner that we brought you under IABS's. Nothing in our policy including our committment to free and open discussion and reportage of issues will change.

We made an error for which we would like to apologize. In the October issue of CRYONICS we ran a directory of organizations with addresses and phone numbers. We mistakenly printed an old and out of date address for the Bay Area Cryonics Society. The correct address and phone number are: Bay Area Cryonics Society, 1259 El Camino Real #250, Menlo Park, California 94025, phone: (415) 858-0869.

Response to the gift subscription offer has been outstanding. Alcor added thirty people to the mailing list thanks to your fine efforts and thoughtfulness.

Steve Bridge is in need of the services of a cryonicist who reads French well to translate some cryonics related material from Anatole Dolinoff. If you can be of help with this matter please write Steve at 1720 N. Layman, Indianapolis, Indiana 46218 or call (317) 359-7260.

## IABS AND ALCOR MERGE

At a joint IABS/Alcor board meeting held on September 12, 1982 both IABS and Alcor voted unanimously to functionally merge the organizations. After several weeks of discussion it was decided that Alcor's corporate framework would be utilized by the "joint" organization since Alcor is a California corporation and has the larger number of donors signed up. Directors from both IABS and Alcor agreed that the Alcor name was the better of the two for public relations and promotional activities and decided to retain Alcor as the name for the new organization.

IABS members will retain all of the rights and privileges that they previously enjoyed. IABS lifetime memberships currently in effect will continue to be honored, although no new lifetime memberships will be issued by the new Alcor. The dues structure of Alcor is given below:

Associate Member.....$15.00/year
Suspension Member .....$135.00/year
Each Additional Family Member .....$67.50/year

Only full suspension members are entitled to vote or hold office in Alcor. Associate membership entitled an individual to a subscription to CRYONICS magazine and to receive other Alcor membership mailings.

Alcor members will be contacted over the next few months about updating suspension paperwork and meeting new financial minimums for cryonics coverage. Many people currently signed up as suspension members with Alcor do not have the minimum amount of funding currently being required by Alcor for suspension coverage. The new minimums are as follows:

Whole Body Preservation.....$100,000
Neuropreservation.....$ 35,000

All members are required to have at least $35,000 available in life insurance or on deposit with Alcor in escrow so as to insure that at least the minimum funding for the initial stages of cryonic suspension is available. It is important to point out that the full amount of funding for suspension coverage MAY NOT be provided for by private trust. Alcor now requires at least $35,000 as an immediate payment in the event a member deanimates.

Another major change which affects Alcor suspension members is the "Automatic Conversion to Neuropreservation Clause" which is present in the new paperwork. This clause states:

> "Alcor will only attempt to provide whole-body suspension to those donors who are adequately funded for that purpose. Alcor requires an automatic conversion to neuropreservation for any donor whose funding does not meet the minimum requirements for maintenance in whole-body suspension.

Alcor members who find this arrangement unacceptable and who wish to transfer membership to another cryonics organization will be assisted in doing so.

A composition of officers and board members from IABS and Alcor was selected to serve as the new Alcor board. The new Alcor officers are: Michael Federowicz, President; Eugene Hartnell, Vice President; Paul Genteman, Secretary; and Bill Jameson, Treasurer. Board members at large are Hugh Hixon, Jerry Leaf and Anna Schoppenhorst.

Board members of the new organization feel very strongly that they have united the strengths of both organizations into an entity which will be a real leader in the future growth of cryonics.

## TRANS TIME FACES MAJOR RENT INCREASE

Trans Time's Northern California facility, located in Emeryville, was recently hit with a rent increase of $150 per month. This raises the monthly rent from $415 to $575. This rent increase comes in the wake of notification from the next of kin of one of Trans Time's four paying whole-body customers that they do not intend to continue to pay for the costs of suspension. Art Quaife, Trans Time's president, stated that these relatives have been notified that unless other arrangements are made Trans Time will not be responsible for continued care for this patient beyond January 1st, 1983.

All of this news raises the question of just what yearly storage costs for whole body-donors are likely to be in the near future. According to estimates from Quaife the current cost per patient with three patients occupying the Emeryville facility are approximately $6,500 per year. If such costs were to be assessed on a fair market basis with workers actually being paid realistic and competetive wages the cost would rise to approximately $11,000 per patient per year.

This is the time for a careful evaluation of California cryonics operations. Perhaps reduction of overhead costs such as accounting, office space and salaries is in order. One thing this situation makes painfully clear is that effective action must be taken within the next few months to stop the hemorhage of cash California cryonics operations are experiencing and to adjust overhead to more realistically reflect the small-scale nature of California cryonics operations.

On a brighter note, Quaite informed us that a Northern California cryonicist has offered to purchase a facility for Trans Time under any reasonable terms. This individual has offered to then lease the facility to Trans Time with an option to purchase as well as right of first refusal on the sale of the facility to another party. Placement of additional patients into suspension and the prospect of bulk delivery may also help to hold the line on future price increases for long-term whole-body storage.

SCIENCE UPDATE by Thomas Donaldson, Ph.D.

LIVER TRANSPLANTATION BECOMES MUCH MORE ROUTINE

Right now the overwhelmingly most frequent organ transplants are kidney transplants. A need to transplant creates a need to store the organs transplanted, and therefore a need to freeze them. Since some of the problems of kidney transplants may not exist for other organs, cryonicists have an interest in the development of transplantation. As more different organs come to be routinely transplanted, more money should go into freezing and we will have better information on whicch to base our own decisions about suspension techniques.

Two recent articles in the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL (11 July 1981) have reviewed ths state of liver transplantation and its future prospects. In brief, its prospects are quite favorable.

RY Calne et al (p. 115) discuss their experiences with liver transplantation in Englandd at Cambridge-King's Hospital. Over the last 13 years, they have carried out a total of 108 liver transplants, with a steady improvement in technique. This improvement has involved improvements in immunosuppression (use of cyclosporin rather than corticosteroids), a considerably improved surgical technique (readers may know that the major barrier to liver transplants for a long time has been the surgical difficulty of harvesting and intact organ and its transplant into the patient, quite unlike the situation with kidneys) and much improved knowledge of what sorts of patients are likely to benefit from a liver transplant. The result of all of these improvements has been that in the last 22 patients fully 50% have survived for one year, with a good chance of longterm survival.

Patient selection seems quite important to these results, and incidentally points up the role of doctors in choosing the time of death of patients. Patients suffering from liver cancer have turned out to be poor risks: even though they stand a better chance of surviving the surgery, they usually die later from widespread metastases of their cancer. Patients who were nonalcoholic and suffered from cirrhosis of the liver had a greater chance of dying of the operation itself, but if they survived a significantly higher chance of longterm survival, so that on balance they stood to gain more from a liver transplant. Children and patients over 55 are excluded from the operation.

Results and increased skill in liver transplants in the US have turned out very similarly to these (Starzl, TE GASTROENTEROLOGY 77 (1979) 375). We can look forward to a much increased logistic need to freeze livers and not just kidneys.

## RESULTS OF TRIAL OF SULFINPYRAZONE UPHELD

Readers of CRYONICS may recall the reports in 1978 and 1980 that the drug sulfinpyrazone had a marked effect in preventing deaths, particularly sudden deaths, after patients had undergone one heart attack. The trial of sulfinpyrazone, the Anturane Reinfarction Trial, studied 1558 patients ove a period of 16 months beginning 25 to 35 days after their first heart attack; the drug treatment appeared to markedly decrease the risk of sudden death in the first 6 months following the attack (N E JOURNAL OF MED 298 (1978) 289; NEJM 302 (1980) 250). Readers of CRYONICS will also recall that a number of scientists associated with the US FDA criticised this trial; the critics argued that the criteria of classification used were ambiguous, illogical, and inconsistent in their application, and the exclusion from analysis of particular patients as "nonanalysable" was a source of bias.

The authors of the original study have now replied to these critics by having the entire set of case reports from the Anturane study reviewed blind by external and independent reviewers. The review committee received no information about the treatment of the patients whose records they were to review; they were asked to reclassify all of these patients using the criteria originally used, including particularly the classification of a particular patient as one whose results were not to be used in the study for reasons of "noneligibility" or "nonanalysability".

The report of results from this reclassification appeared recently in NEJM 306 (1982) 1005. It supports the original authors of the studies of sulfinpyrazone, even though particular classifications and results do not always coincide. In particular, the review committee found a reduction of mortality during the 2 year period following a heart attack of 24 percent and a reduction in the SUDDEN DEATH RATE of 36 percent. These results, of course, are particularly good news for cryonicists, for whom the problem of sudden death has far more bite than it does for mortals.

The authors also have some arguments to mount against the critics. When patients were excluded from the study, they failed to meet criteria such as whether or not they had taken the medication prescribed, withdrew from treatment without having taken it to completion, or did not meet the criteria for prescribing the drug. If the purpose of the study is the assessment of clinical effect of the drug, such exclusions seem quite reasonable, and the authors of the original study so state.

It appears that sulfinpyrazone shows much promise for cryonicists despite complaints of the FDA.

••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••

"He who fights for the future lives in it today."

- Ayn Rand

"It is enough that our fathers have believed. They have exhausted the faith-faculty of the species. Their legacy to us is the scepticism of which they were afraid."

- Oscar Wilde

## CRYO-82, THE BIG FREEZE

By Jerry D. Leaf

While reading the last issue of Cryonics, I discovered that I am to write a "report" on my experiences at the meeting of the Society for Cryobiology, Cryo-82, held in Houston, Texas. In the same Cryonics, I am referred to as "one of the few public cryonicists who is a member of the Society for Cryobiology." That this should be noteworthy, or somehow remarkable, is one of the reasons I had to attend Cryo-82.

I did not go to Cryo-82 as an outsider, or merely as a cryonicist, but as a long standing member of the Society for Cryobiology, who is concerned about the stability and purposes of this valuable organization. I am concerned that the current Board of Governors are detracting from the legitimate purposes of the Society to satisfy their own personal goals. I will relate some of my experiences at Cryo-82, but I would also like to address some of the issues involved.

The problem is not that some cryobiologists do not like the idea of cryonics. This is to be expected since cryonics is not a widely accepted idea in the general populous. Cryobiologists probably have the usual range of ideas about death and dying, represent various religious faiths, and have a normal diversity of social and political views. A problem does arise when members of a scientific society, operating under the special advantages of a non-profit society, begin to operate outside that public trust, to satisfy the non-scientific prejudices of a portion of its' membership. The purpose of the Society for Cryobiology is to "promote research in low temperature biology and medicine." When a special interest group within the Society subverts the power of their elected offices to serve their personal views instead of the advancement of scientific research, it is time for an objection to be raised. One of the reasons I went to cryo-82 was to raise this objection.

In 1964 cryobiology became a formal scientific dicipline, with the creation of the Society for Cryobiology. In the same year, 1964, cryonics became a public issue, with the publication of The Prospect of Immortality. Some cryobiologists became cryonicists and some cryonicists became cryobiologists. It was a naturally incestuous relationship, and it has remained so to this day. In 1970 I became a member of the Society for Cryobiology while I was a graduate student working on a special study for a degree in cryobiology. My interest in low temperature biology, especially suspended animation, was stimulated by a college lecture given by the Cryonics Society of California in 1967. A few influencial members of the Society for Cryobiology, such as Dr. Harold T. Meryman, began creating an 'unofficial policy' that cryobiologists who wanted to participate in the Society for Cryobiology should not associate with cryonics organizations. When such inducements ultimately failed, they were later escalated to threats against jobs and careers. However, as you can well imagine, these kinds of activities were strictly

'unofficial'. Now the inducements have been escalated by Meryman, et al, attempting to make related "policy" on an "official" level in the Society for Cryobiology. From whence Meryman's views arise, we may never know, but he is clear about his feelings on the subject, as presented in a brief communication concerning the establishment of a National Institute of Low Temperature Biology:

> "I am quite unsympathetic with the goal of preserving human beings through freezing. I find the proposition mischevious in the extreme and fear that, like some other scientific "breakthroughs" that one might mention, the end result would be impossible to control and far more damaging than beneficial to society."

Meryman is so determined to do what he can for his cause, that he has even influenced the manufacturer of cryogenic containers to refuse further sales of custom designed dewars for cryonics use. I do not want to single out Meryman as the only person involved, but he has been the most aggressive and visible of his like minded associates.

Cryo-82 was to provide Meryman and his associates on the Board of Governors the final recourse afforded them as office holders in the Society. They drafted a Statement of Policy claiming that, "The act of freezing a dead body and storing it indefinitely on the chance that some future generation may restore it to life is an act of faith, not science." Just "freezing" something "dead" may or may not be science. However, if you are doing research into the techniques involved in perfusion, designing cryoprotective perfusates, developing methods of controlled rate cooling, working on safe storage systems involving high vacuum technology and collecting data relevant to evaluating your effort, then you're damned right, I call it <u>science.</u> As far as working with "dead" things is concerned, I am working with several organ systems at once, whereas most cryobiologists work with only one organ system in isolation. The organ systems I work with are as biologically 'alive' as the isolated organs experimentd with in simpler models. The use of the word "dead" in the Policy Statement clearly refers to "clinical" death, not "biological" death. Reanimation after "clinical death" is achieved in medical practice today. Merymans' laboratory is trying to develope the ability to freeze and store cadaver kidneys. Would Meryman accept my statement if I said, "The act of freezing a dead kidney and storing it indefinitely on the chance that some future generation may restore it to life is an act of faith not science?"

It is now a matter of public record that I do not support this Policy Statement. Another goal of the Meryman Board is to change the bylaws of the Society for Cryobiology so that the Board of Governors is impowered to expel any member of the

Society who does not support Society Policy. This means that any cryobiologist may be expelled from the Society if he is also involved with cryonics. Meryman will thusly have achieved his longed for goal of seperating cryobiology and cryonics.

So off I went to Cryo-82, for the scientific papers I would hear, and to have my say concerning "Policy Statements" and Bylaws." The Cryo-82 meeting was held at the Hilton Hotel, located on the campus of the University of Houston. The campus is a modern edifice, typical of todays wealthy Houston scene. The slate of scientific papers presented in four days totaled over 100, covering most areas in low temperature biology and medicine. The meeting was well organized and reasonably scheduled, for my interests, except the Business Meeting. The Business Meeting was scheduled on the eleventh hour of the last day, causing me to stay an extra night to ensure that I could make my flight connections at the Houston Airport 35 miles away.

The last day of the meetings I proceeded to the vicinity of the rooms where the Business Meeting was scheduled to take place. I say rooms, because the Cryo-82 Program had the Business Meeting scheduled to take place in two different locations at the same time. I vacillated between the two locations until I found where members of the Board of Governors were beginning to seat themselves. It was evident that most of the membership had already left for the Houston Airport. Dr. Meryman, President of the Society, entered and made a quick headcount. He asked someone to check the hallways for needed members. I rose from my seat and suggested they check the other room, since the program had the meeting scheduled in two places at the same time. My suggestion resulted in another 5 or 6 members. A quorum required 40 members, but they failed to materialize. Meryman remarked that it looked like we had a quorum. Having studied up on my Roberts Rules of Order, which govern Society meetings under our current bylaws, I rose from my seat on a "point of information", requesting a headcount to insure a quorum was present. We were still six short of a quorum. Meryman said that he would exercise his Presidential perogative and declair a quorum present. I rose to a "point of order" and reiterated the requirements of our current Bylaws regarding a quorum. No motion could be placed on the floor for consideration by vote, without a quorum. Meryman said he was only joking about declaring a quorum. I was not amused. He then turned to me and ask what I suggest they do, since I seemed well versed in parlimentarian procedures. I told them they could wait until next years meeting or put any motions to a ballot vote by mail. At this time we could only have an informal discussion of the issues. They choose the ballot by mail. It was agreed that minutes would be prepared containing our discussion. By the time the Proposed Bylaws came up for discussion, two of the Board members again sought to have a vote taken without a quorum. I again rose to a "point of order", informing them that they would not be able to vote on any proposed changes in the bylaws of the Society, even if a quorum were present, since the Board of Governors had failed to give

proper "notice" as required in our current bylaws. They asked if I had a copy of Roberts' Rules, which I held up. The appropriate pages were marked, but an actual examination was deferred. We continued with an informal discussion of the proposed new bylaws. I seemed to be the only member present who had a multiplicity of questions about the changes being proposed. At one point in the discussion David Pegg and John Baust made comments to the effect that I was obstructing the will of the Board. I replied that I was protecting the rights of the membership and that I resented any implication that I was in any way out of order. Pegg retracted this implication but Baust remained silent. John Baust was hosting the Cryo-82 meeting, so I imagine he felt I was ruining an otherwise very successful week in Houston.

At the begining of the meeting I identified myself as Jerry Leaf, from the UCLA Medical Center. When the minutes were published, I was also identified as the President of the Institute for Cryobiological Extension. The Minutes were inaccurate, having material added and deleted to suit whoever was responsible for their publication. Furthermore, I did not think the issues were clearly presented. None of the discussion concerning the Policy Statement on cryonics was presented. Therefore, I assembled material containing my own thoughts on the most relevant issues, with some documentation, and made a direct mailing to the members of the Society for Cryobiology. The following is one part of the material sent out to the membership, and deals with the "Policy Statement" on cryonics.

Dear Society for Cryobiology Members:

I am writing to you because important issues will be decided by you that will affect the character of our Society for many years. But first, I would like to introduce myself. I have been a member of the Society for Cryobiology since 1970. I am currently working at the UCLA School of Medicine, Dept. of Surgery, Div. of Thoracic Surgery as a Research Associate in Dr. Gerald Buckburg's laboratory, well known for its studies in myocardial protection and development of blood cardioplegia. I also own a private research laboratory, Cryovita Laboratories, dedicated to studies in low temperature biology and medicine.

As members of the Society we will be asked to vote on a completely new set of Bylaws. There are substantial issues involved in the proposed new Bylaws; however, I would like to address one particular area affected by these changes, the power of the Board of Governors to make "policy" and issue "policy statements", as provided in Section 4.14, part (a). This new power to make "policy", without approval of the membership, can only be appreciated by noting that support of "policy" is a new requirement of membership, Sec. 2.01, part (a) and (b). If a member should disagree with, i.e., not support, some future "policy" of the Board, then such a member would no longer satisfy the requirements of membership. The Board then has grounds for Discipline, Sec. 2.03, e.g., the Board may expel such a member.

Your first, and last, chance to openly disapprove a "policy"

is now before you. The "policy Statement" about cryonics, freezing clinically dead humans, is the first "policy" to come down to us from the Board. If you approve the new Bylaws you will never again have a chance to cast your vote for or against a Board "policy". The Board should be anxious for the membership to approve this "policy statement, as it will disqualify from membership several current members of the Society who will not support this "policy". If the Board seeks to expel these cryobiologists, the result may be lawsuits against the Board for loss of income. The possibility of such litigation perhaps accounts for Sec. 10.01, Indemnification, also a new addition to our Bylaws, if they are approved.

Why do we need a "policy" toward cryonics? It is apparent that Dr. Harold Meryman has deeply held negative feelings toward cryonics, based on his own social views.

The Board of Governors has complained about receiving inquiries concerning cryonics. Since the Board knows nothing about cryonics, they should disregard such inquiries as beyond their field of expertise, or respond within the limits of their knowledge as cryobiologists. I don't see what their problem is, unless they are simply looking for an excuse to make a policy statement about cryonics from more obscure motives. I receive much unsolicited mail, as we all do. It would be absured of me if I were to make a public policy statement about Ford Motor Company simply because I receive unwanted inquiries from them concerning my knowledge of their latest products or my opinion of their performance.

The first principal of good science is observation, and whereas Dr. Meryman has never observed the perfusion and freezing of a human, I cannot see how he can make any scientific judgment about its value scientifically. Since I have observed such procedures, have in fact directed the most technically advanced of these procedures, I can state unequivocally that scientific knowledge has been gained by doing "cryonic suspensions" or "clinical cryostasis", as such procedures are called. I am compiling data that should have the opportunity to be presented to those most knowledgable in low temperature biology and medicine, cryobiologists. If we allow Dr. Meryman and/or our Board of Governors to decide for us what is or is not knowledge, why should we travel to meetings? They can simply mail the "truth" to us in a series of Policy Statements.

I am also pursuing research at Cryovita Laboratories using animal models for experiments in both organ and who animal preservation at low temperatures. I expect to be allowed, as a member of the Society for Cryobiology, to present my findings, for your judgment, at future meetings of the Society for Cryobiology. This is the normal and proper function of a scientific society and its membership.

Cryonics involves the experimental application of cryogenics, cryobiology and medicine. I have made arrangements for funding and the donation of my body, after clinical death, to be used for such an experiment. I have done this because I think

experiments with humans can provide advanced knowledge, along with animal research, that will result in the eventual development of suspended animation. Suspended animation, as a clinical modality, could extend the period of time available to pursue therapy for some patients disignated "terminally ill", thus saving human life. I fully understand the experimental nature of today's cryonic suspension.

The science of cryobiology seeks to gain scientific knowledge of the effects of cold on living systems. The literature of cryobiology is represented by material on both plant and animal life, on living systems as small as a single cell and as large as whole mammals. While much low temperature research has been aimed at discovering the basic principles involved in the freezing and thawing of biological systems, a considerable effort has been made to achieve more specific technological goals, i.e., organ preservation. The work on organ preservation has as its goal the preservation of human cadaver organs for transplantation. The desired result will be the saving of human life. I recognize the value of this kind of research, as does Dr. Meryman, since his laboratory has been and is involved in organ preservation studies. I am also interested in preserving human life, if possible, and I do not think a case can be made for the parts being more valuable than the whole, in this instance.

While Dr. Meryman's organ research is greatly supported by public funds, all cryonic suspensions are supported by private money, freely donated by choice after an "informed consent". As for my own animal research, I do not accept public tax money, but only private donations. Dr. Meryman believes a "massive infusion of money" could lead to "an orgy of empirical experimentation" resulting in a "waste of resources". Apparently organ preservation research in Dr. Meryman's laboratory results in scientific experimentation, but if others, not on his approved list, do organ preservation research it results in an "orgy of empirical experimentation". If Dr. Meryman gets an "infusion of money" from the public cash box it's money well spent, but if others, not on his approved list, receive money, it is a "waste of resources."

The value of any scientific society or scientific publication is the sharing of information. I expect this is the reason most of us are members of the Society for Cryobiology and subscribe to the Journal of Cryobiology. It is a function of scientists to hear and see all sides of an issue. This is what distinguises science from less rational endeavors. The presentation of data for examination and criticism is the most reliable road to truth, not policy statements by demigods. There are other members of the Society for Cryobiology that are involved in cryonics, but have been told they would be excluded from their chosen profession, cryobiology, if this became public knowledge. So they have remained silent, some under direct threat to their jobs. I do not accept irrational limitations imposed on my thoughts, my research or my associations with

(Continued on page 24.)

# CRYONICS POLL RESULTS -- PART II

by Steve Bridge

Although we had originally planned to publish these results in two parts, we have so much material that a third part will be necessary. It will be published in next month's issue.

66 polls were returned to us, but the total number of answers is larger for many questions because of multiple responses. For some questions, the answers of the respondents have been divided into three groups:

S = Suspension members (41)
M = Members of a group, but not signed up for suspension (16)
(I refer to these just as "members" in the text.)
N = Non-members (9)

To begin Part II, we will continue with the Personal section of the poll.

42. *Hobbies and spare-time activities*

Reading --22
reading SF --5
Physical activities and sports --32
(bicycling, running, skiing, swimming, fishing, karate, diving, mountaineering, square dance, etc.)
Various intellectual studies --18
(economics, nutrition, astronomy, psychology, artificial intelligence, electronics, etc.)
Music --11 (piano, guitar, organ, concerts, recordings)
Movies --11
Tourism and travel --9
Cryonics and immortalism --7
Collecting --6 (books, stamps, coins)
Writing --6
Personal computer --4
Computer & video games --3
Construction, woodwork, machinery--6
Sex --5
Gardening --3 (and farming --1)
Sailing & boating --3
Flying --3
Theatre --2

Others: Models, model railroading, radio, partying, bars, talking with friends, dream, painting, volunteer, home business, police scanner, photography, bridge, who has spare time?

43. *What magazines do you read regularly? (Other than Cryonics)*

The Immortalist --43
Anti-Aging News --23
Omni --15
Time --13
Scientific American --13
L-5 Newsletter --11
Newsweek --9
Science Digest --9
*Science --9
Cryobiology --8
U.S. News and World Report --7
*Science News --7
Analog --6
*Reason --5
Nature --4
*American Scientist --3
*New England Journal of Medicine--3
*Science '82 --3
*Byte --3
*Consumer Reports --3

Plus 72 other titles read by 1 or 2.

* "write-ins"

43 (cont.) Note: Please be aware that we do not have time to read all of your favorite magazines. You readers need to watch for useful information and send us copies. Better yet, do as Thomas Donaldson does and send us summaries of important developments.

44. *Which of these books have you read?*

| | S | M | N | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. The Prospect of Immortality (Ettinger) | 36 | 11 | 7 | 54 |
| B. Man into Superman (Ettinger) | 24 | 4 | 5 | 33 |
| C. The Immortalist (Harrington) | 17 | 2 | 3 | 22 |
| D. Prolongevity (Rosenfeld) | 15 | 1 | 3 | 19 |
| E. Cryonics (Sheskin) | 6 | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| F. Suspended Animation (Prehoda) | 15 | 1 | 1 | 17 |
| G. We Froze the First Man (Nelson) | 20 | 1 | 2 | 23 |
| H. The Life-Extension Revolution (Kent) | 25 | 4 | 3 | 32 |
| I. The Age of the Pussyfoot (Pohl) | 13 | 2 | 2 | 17 |
| J. The Door into Summer (Heinlein) | 21 | 3 | 3 | 27 |

-----Each of these books is recommended in one way or another for you to expand your knowledge of the history, philosophy, and technology of cryonics, life extension, and immortalism. Some are more important than others, of course, but The Prospect of Immortality should be considered essential. The last two books on the list are fiction using cryonics as a base. For many readers they were a first introduction to cryonics.

Number of books on the list read

| | S | M | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | 2 | | |
| 9. | 1 | | |
| 8. | 4 | | |
| 7. | 2 | | |
| 6. | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| 5. | 5 | 1 | |
| 4. | 4 | | 2 |
| 3. | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| 2. | 5 | 2 | |
| 1. | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 0. | | 3 | 2 |

The two suspension members who have read all ten books are, not surprisingly, Thomas Donaldson and Michael Darwin.

45. *Have you ever been a regular reader of science fiction ? If "yes," at what times in your life?*

| | S | M | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 28 | 7 | 6 |
| No | 12 | 9 | 3 |
| A little | 1 | | |

Most of the SF readers started reading it during their early teens. 22 of 41 are still regular readers of SF.

46. *List the one or two most important books in your life.*

Only nine titles received more than one mention, but all of the titles are being listed in case you want to read some for yourselves to find out why even one person considered them so important.

The Prospect of Immortality --18
Atlas Shrugged (Rand) --13

Dictionary --6
The Door into Summer (Heinlein)--2
The Immortalist (Harrington) --2
Origin of the Species, etc. (Darwin) --2
The Bible --2
How I Found Freedom in an Unfree World (Browne) --2
In Search of the Miraculous (Ouspensky) --2

The Moon is a Harsh Mistress (Heinlein)
Capitalism: The Unknown Idea (Rand)
Man into Superman (Ettinger)
The Tragedy of Life (de Unamuno)
Why I am not a Christian (Russell)
The Power of Positive Thinking (Peale)
Biological Effects of Freezing and Supercooling (Smith)
Life-Extension Revolution (Kent)
All and Everything (Gurdjieff)
The Catcher in the Rye (Salinger)
Foundation Trilogy (Asimov)
Titan, and Wizard (Varley)
Catch-22 (Heller)
Anthem (Rand)
The Fountainhead (Rand)
The Source (Michener)
Sands of Mars (Clarke)
Profiles of the Future (Clarke)
The Jungle (Sinclair)
We (Lindbergh)
Stuka Pilot (Rupel)
Earth Abides (Stewart)
On Liberty (Mill)
The Lord of the Rings (Tolkien)
Flying Saucers are Real (Keyhoe)
The Coming Deflation
Plagues and Peoples (McNeill)
Incentive Management
Sex and the Single Man
Think and Grow Rich
The Magic of Thinking Big
The Egyptian (Waltari)
The High Frontier (O'Neill)
The Microbe Hunters (de Kruif)
C.R.C. Mathematics Handbook of Tables

47. *Are you currently taking any anti-aging drugs? If so, which ones?*

Many readers included vitamins in this question. For the sake of consistency, all vitamins taken are listed in #49. It is interesting to see what drugs or nutrients are thought of as "anti-aging." The question was made purposely vague to see what response there would be.

Yes --18 (but many listed just vitamins. There aren't any --2. No --49

Which ones? BHT --6 RNA-DNA --4 Pantothenic acid (or calcium pantothenate) --4 Hydergine --2 Procaine H-3
Vegetal extracts Embryos extracts Cysteine
Filatov's and Gaylord Hauser's products Cognitex-1
SOD (superoxide dismutase) Phenylalanine Deanol
Coffee and Cigarettes (ed.--I guess it depends on how you define "anti-aging")

48. *Have you taken any anti-aging drugs in the past?*

I have only listed the responses on the readers who no longer take these drugs to avoid repetition.

Deanol --4 Pantothenic acid --3 GH3 --1 BHT --1
Phenylalanine --1

49. *Do you take vitamin supplements? Which vitamins and what amounts?*

All sorts of things besides vitamins were given as answers to this question. I have listed all answers but not the amounts.

None --16
All and lots --8
Yes (unspecified) --3
Multiples --21
Vitamin C --22
Vitamin E --22
Vitamin A --9
B-complex --8
Selenium --8
Zinc --6
Lecithin --5
Manganese --3
Niacin --3
Iron --3
Vitamin B-6 --3
Folic Acid --3
Brewer's Yeast --3
Lysine --2
Beta Carotene --2
Vitamin B-5 --2
PABA (p-aminobenzoic acid) --2
Vitamin B-12 --2
Vitamin B-15 --2
Vitamin D --2

All below --1

Methionine, Magnesium, mineral suppl., Folate, Copper, Vitamin B-1, B-2, Royal Jelly, Bee Pollen, Kelp, Choline, Inositol, K-1, Potassium, Garlic, Calcium.

50. *Are you a vegetarian?* Yes --5 No --56
Try to be --3 Somewhat --1 Chicken and fish only --2

51. *Do you modify your diet in any other way?*
(read each line across, not columns.)

Low fat --17 Less meat --10 No red meat --1 No pork --1
No salt --5 Low salt --7 No sugar --3 Low sugar --6
Low amount --4 Low calorie --2 Keep slim --2
No large meals --1 Large breakfast, smaller lunch and dinner --1
High fibre --4 Whole grains --3 Low dairy --1
No snacks --1 Low carbohydrates --1 High carbohydrates --1
No soft drinks --1 No additives --1 No chemicals --1
No preservatives --1 Avoid "no preservatives" foods --1
Low nitrite --1 Organic food --1 Grow own food --1
Low processed foods --1 Fruits --1 Low cholesterol --1
Try to eat everything raw or steamed --1 Modified Pritikin --1
High protein in combinations --1 Careful --2

Just about everyone has some idea about what is safe or prudent, but a glance at this list shows many contradictory approaches. This is an obvious reflection on the confusion in the public and in the scientific areas today concerning the effects of nutrition on health and life span.

52. *Do you get regular exercise?*

| | S | M | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 27 | 12 | 8 |
| No | 14 | 4 | 1 |

52. (cont.) *What kind of exercise?*

Running --18
Walking --20
Health spa --5
Swimming --5
Exercise (calisthenics, etc.) --5
Aerobics --4
Bicycling --4
Gymnastics --2
Tennis --2
Yoga --2
Racquetball --2
Weight training --2
Karate --1
Working --1
Square dancing --1
Ballet --1
Large garden --1

53. *Is there anything else you do as an anti-aging or pro-health measure?*

The suggestions offered here are offered without recommendation by this writer. The reader is on his own as to what he wants to believe.

Don't smoke --7 (we should have asked this of everyone).
Little alcohol --5 No alcohol --2 No hard drugs --2
Work on life extension and cryonics --4 Careful with health --2
Relaxation-meditation --3 Low stress --3 Giggle a lot --1
Limit unpleasant emotions or ideas --2 Attempt autosuggestion --1
Visit M.D. at need --1 "Optimum-health" oriented M.D. --1
Limit sun exposure --2 Tax avoidance --1 Own handguns --1
Love children --1 Work with children --1 Plenty of sleep --2
Make love a lot --1 Happy with wife --1 Read a lot --1
Fast twice a week --1 Growth group --1 Psychoanalysis --1
Diet soda --1 Drink spring water --1
Avoid use and contact with suspicious chemicals ( petrocemicals, food additives, etc.)--1

54. *Do you know CPR (cardiopulmonary resuscitation)?*

Yes --36 (although several said they needed retraining)
No --28
? --2

55. *Do you use seat belts?*

| | S | M | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 31 | 12 | 6 |
| No | 7 | 4 | 3 |
| Sometimes | 1 | | |
| No answer | 2 | | |

74% of the respondents wear seatbelts. This is well above the national average estimate of 10%. We're glad to see so many of you taking care of your safety.

-------Now let us turn to the section of the poll concerning your reactions to CRYONICS magazine.

24. *Have you read the IABS booklet, Cryonics: Threshold to the Future?*

| | S | M | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 18 | 6 | 1 |
| No | 22 | 8 | 7 |
| No answer | 2 | | 2 |
| Don't know | | 2 | |

We hope that more of you will have the opportunity to read this after we finish preparing our new edition. We got several suggestions for improvement which we have noted, but which won't be very interesting for readers of this magazine.

25. *Which aspects or articles in CRYONICS have most pleased you?*

It is interesting to compare these answers with those in #26. Apparently we are managing to have something for everyone, since only one reader could find nothing good to say about CRYONICS, yet practically every item mentioned under "most liked" was also some one else's "least liked." We plan to keep printing as wide a variety of articles as possible. Of course, much of this variety depends on our readers's interest in providing us with new articles.

Reports of research advances and science updates --17
Technical articles --13
Financial --6
Anti-aging and nutrition --5
Freedom of discussion (no censorship; open forum) --5
Donaldson's articles --5
Current events --4
"The cost of Cryonics" --4
All --4
Philosophical --3
Reports on solutions to technical, financial, and legal problems --3
Simple stuff --2
Discussions of problems facing cryonics organizations --2
Interviews --2
Organizational news --2
None --1

All other answers below --1

Practical; reliable; large volume; eclectic nature.
Deals with important and controversial issues; deals with emotional issues; "tell it like it is" reporting.
Editorials; historical; general articles; thoughtful feature articles.
Discussions of: freezing damage; neuropreservation; publicity; hi-tech vs. low-tech; TT-BACS problems; the state of the art; the future of cryonics; advancements in reviving the "dead;" facts about facilities.
Speculative; futuristic; experimental theories explained and postulated.
Michael Darwin; Paul Segal; Col. Chamberlain article; book and movie reviews.

26. *Which have least pleased you?*

No answer --22 None --11

In-fighting, backbiting, arguments, quarrels, cryonics politics --10
(ed.: There is no way to totally avoid this area and still have the freedom of discussion which we feel is necessary to cryonics. However, we recognize the sensitivity of this sort of article and have already begun taking greater care in the manner in which we present controversial issues.)
Highly technical papers are not readable --6
Philosophical --2

All other answers below --1

Donaldson's guest editorship issue; Donaldson is difficult reading.
Correspondence; Negative remarks; Mystical articles.
Small talk about latest health fads; Articles on aging.
Aging experiments on animals; Articles on neuropreservation.
Carping at cryobiologists; Mike is paranoid (sees shadows of shadows).
Articles for the"intellectual"; Reviews of plays and movies; Science fiction scenarios.
Some bad writing and editing; Much is badly written and dull.

27. *Suggestions for future articles and questions you would like answered.*

There are some terrific suggestions for articles here. They can serve as a source of ideas for the editors for many issues. However, we have neither the time nor expertise to write all of them. Some of our readers are just as able to do the writing as we are, if not more so. Many of these ideas do not take brilliance or a deep understanding of technical problems. Most just take time, persistence, and asking questions of a lot of other people around you. Interview other cryonicists; do reading and interpret it for us; compile lists. We surely do not do our articles out of our heads; we have to do the research, too.

Beginning discussion on revival--costs, procedures, moral philosophy, and timetable.--3
More on technical reports and cryobiological advancement --3
Details and reports on experiments being conducted by Cryovita and Trans Time --3
More interviews --2 Who's Who in Cryonics --2

All other suggestions below --1

More "movement" news and tidbits. Economic and political.
Continue analyzing controversial areas. Guest editorial section.
Articles that will have mass appeal.
Have articles in each issue targeted at each subgroup --"New subscriber," "old-timer," "research fanatic," etc.
How to increase membership in the movement.
How to change public opinion about cryonics.
Unite cryonics movements.
History and biography of past and present cryonics managers.

27. (cont.)

Articles dealing with the survival of cryonics groups.
Real problems cryonics organizations face, including procedural.
Changing laws to favor cryonics--what is needed?
Tell us what is presently being done with frozen ones and their funds.
Early history of cryonics from "insiders."
How can cryonics be marketed with low front-end costs?
Discussion of investment, insurance, and legal arrangements.
What are other organizations doing? (Prometheus, NY, Florida, overseas).
What are the technical capabilities of each cryonics organization for perfusion, storage, research, financial status, etc?
More discussion and constructive suggestions on the bum deal we're getting from cryobiologists.
More legal and moral regard for the rights of stored people as opposed to merely absolving the societies of most or all responsibility.
What's the likelihood of being frozen before clinical death (in a state of rapidly deteriorating health)?
What the future will be and how to cope.
Most current up-to-date preparation plans (do's and don'ts).
Balanced discussion on neuropreservation.
How do cryoprotectants protect?
Can we synthesize a more suitable perfusate?
Reviews of the cryobiological evidence for and against cryonics.
A good discussion of identity from a structural standpoint.
Practical problems of perfusing whole ischemic animals --not merely a technical report.
More on drugs and pharmacology.
Metal fatigue in capsules over undetermined years of storage?
Reports on studies of roles of the pituitary and hypothalmus. (ed.--We are mostly saving these for Anti-Aging News.)
Use of artificial body replacement parts.
Human cloning research --what is the latest?
Use of bio-chip implants to "draw off" memory/personality for later re-implantation.

28. *Other suggestions for improvement.*

*Note:* Several additional suggestions were listed last month.

Photos, graphic, illustrations --5. (ed.--We need help for this. It's not our strong point.)
Drop the use of pseudonyms for by-lines. (ed. --"Corey Noble" is the only pseudonym being used, and for that we have no choice.)
Ask readers to support subscriptions of CRYONICS to their local libraries.
Readers should be asked to write their politicians to support aging research and other types of research of interest to us.
Mention names of political opponents. Give addresses so letters can be sent to lobby.
Vigorous and controversial letters section.
Write clearly, concisely, with humor and zest. Limit statistics.
Try selling on magazine stands.
Avoid negative articles. Avoid personal attacks.
More and longer articles. Format like Playboy. (ed.--???)
Plus there were a number of congratulatory comments. Thank you.

END OF PART II.

STEPS ON THE ROAD TO IMMORTALITY:
MIGUEL DE UNAMUNO

Almost all immortalists have read Alan Harrington's book THE IMMORTALIST and may very well remember from it the quotations from Miguel de Unamuno. You may remember them as very acute: it was Unamuno who first described the "hunger for immortality" about which Harrington writes so well, who said "The world is made for consciousness. Each consciousness...a human soul is worth all the universe", and who described the reaction of the Athenians to the idea of immortality brought by Paul (a reaction which will wake many memories in cryonicists of their own encounters with "intellectuals"):

"Paul stands...before men of culture and tolerance, who are ready to welcome and examine every doctrine...But when he speaks to them of the resurrection of the dead their stock of patience and tolerance comes to and end, and some mock him, and others say: 'We will hear thee again of this matter!' intending not to hear him."

Indeed, Unamuno is one of the major sources of quotations for Harrington, and perhaps much more important, Harrington is openly adopting many of Unamuno's ideas about human feelings regarding death. Who, then, was Miguel de Unamuno, and what were his ideas?

Migual de Unamuno spent most of his adult life as a professor of Greek at the University of Salamanca. He lived for 72 years, from 1864 to 1936. He was born in Bilbao, in Basque Spain, and he was one of many Basques who have contributed to hispanic literature and thought.

All of Harrington's quotations come from perhaps the best known of Unamuno's books, THE TRAGIC SENSE OF LIFE. Unamuno wrote many other books: novels (ABEL SANCHEZ), short stories (VER CON LOS OJOS) and memoirs (MEMORIES OF CHILDHOOD AND YOUTH, an autobiography which compares to Ben Franklin's), and other books. If we read the standard references about THE TRAGIC SENSE OF LIFE we will notice very little open discussion of Unamuno's opinions on his central subject, Death. Most commentators prefer to describe him as "a leading existentialist" and an exponent of "the conflict between rationality and irrationality". When we actually read THE TRAGIC SENSE we soon discover that it is about (to put matters in his language) not at all an abstract "conflict between rationality and irrationality", but about a matter which concerns everyone very deeply, that concerns you also, dear reader. The "rationality" of which Unamuno writes is not just the ability to engage in abstract ratiocination: it is the clear realisation on logical and scientific grounds that he, I, you, are all going to die, and not only that we are all going to die but that human civilization and the Earth itself are finite and therefore mortal. The "irrationality", on the other hand, is the irrational belief in the immortality of the Soul. When I read about Unamuno for this essay I was amused at the way so few philosophers danced about the exact nature of this "rationality"

and "irrationality" without ever confronting it.

This avoidance is of course a sign of just how acutely Unamuno was correct in this perceptions of the importance of his subject. From someone writing in his time and place, to have honestly confronted one's feelings and to have gone on to say them openly is a tremendous achievement. However I also will have to say that actually reading Unamuno's book is likely to give cryonicist immortalists very mixed feelings, because along with being right on some vital questions Unamuno is quite openly wrong and foolish in his solution to the problem, which is Christianity. (Yes, folks, Unamuno was a Christian, he believed in what Friend Stuart calls PITSBAB). I do not know how Unamuno would have reacted to any hint of physical immortality; I'm not even sure that he would not have tried to suppress it as a threat to Christian belief (for perhaps the same reason as some people think that immortalism is in conflict with Christianity now). On the other hand, someone dying only 3 years after McCay's work, and who could not possibly be expected to consider its implications, can hardly be judged on the same basis as someone in 1982 who believes exactly the same things; and Unamuno managed to say, much more clearly, everything that Harrington said about our feelings in regard to Death, 50 years before Harrington said it.

The argument for Christianity, to explain the point, sums up in a story which Unamuno tells. It seems that in his youth Unamuno was speaking to a peasant, and told the old peasant that some thinkers believed that we perished utterly after death, but that there was indeed a God who had created and cherished the World. To which thoughts the peasant replied, "But if we perish, then wherefore God?" Or to put matters in a more abstract setting, people have invented God and want desperately to believe in him because if there were a God they could hope to live forever in Him. To cryonicists who want to avoid any hint of confrontation with Christianity Unamuno may indeed prove embarrassing, since Unamuno says openly what many of us have quietly suspected: that any significant progress to immortality is likely to severely impact upon religion, so severely that it probably won't survive with its present theologies or indeed in any form with recognizable continuity.

Most immortalists will have wondered about the refusal of the generality of mankind to come anywhere near seriously considering the indications that we CAN make inroads upon our central Problem. If Unamuno does not offend your atheist world-view too much, you can read him with profit on this point, since one of the main things Unamuno had to do was not merely explain his own feelings about death (such confessions would merely be thought too special and individual, on a level with the confessions of a shoe-fetichist) but to analyze how others have felt on this issue, not by way of what they said openly but by way of what they must have really felt when they wrote down all the fine sentiments to which the public adheres. Here is Unamuno on Spinoza, in his first chapter of THE TRAGIC SENSE, "The Man of Flesh and Blood":

"To be a man is to be something concrete, unitary, and substantive...Now we know what another man, the man Benedict Spinoza, that Portuguese Jew who was born and lived in Holland in the middle of the 17th century...had to say. The sixth proposition of Part III of his ETHIC states: 'unaquaeque res, quatenus in se est, is suo esse perseverare conatur', which is to say: Everything in so far as it is in itself endeavors to persist in its own being. And in the following proposition, the seventh, of the same part, he adds: 'conatus, quo unaquaeque res in suo esse perseverare conatur, nihil est praeter ipsius rei actualem essentiam', that is: the endeavor wherewith everything endeavors to persist in its own being is nothing but the actual essence of the thing itself. THIS MEANS THAT YOUR ESSENCE, READER, MINE, THAT OF THE MAN SPINOZA,...OF THE MAN KANT, AND OF EVERY MAN WHO IS A MAN is nothing but the endeavor, the effort, which he makes in order to continue to be a man, not to die. And the other proposition which follows these two, the eighth, says: 'conatus, quo unaquaeque res in suo esse perseverare conatur, nullum tempus finitum, sed indefinitum involvit', that is, The endeavor whereby each individual thing endeavors to persist involves no finite time but indefinite time. That is to say that you, I, Spinoza, wish never to die and that this longing of ours never to die is our actual essence." This is what Unamuno has to say about a "philosopher" and the real meaning of his abstract philosophy.

And then in the following chapter he goes on to say of Spinoza: "read his ETHIC as a despairing elegiac poem, which in fact it is...It is not the philosophy of resignation but of despair. And when he wrote that the free man thinks of nothing less than of death, and that his wisdom consists of meditating not on death but on life ('homo liber de nulla re minus quam morte cogitat...'), when he wrote that he felt, as we all feel, that we are slaves, and he did in fact think about death, and he wrote it in a vain endeavor to free himself from the thought..." And Spinoza, of course, did not believe in the immortality of the Soul or the possibility of eternal life, and argued cogently that the belief was vulgar and the hope of future heavenly reward unnecessary: that such a belief was absurd, no less absurd (so said Spinoza) than if "believing that his soul was not eternal and immortal, he should therefore prefer to be without a soul and to live without reason; all of which is so absurd as to be scarcely worth refuting...", to which Unamuno replies: "When a thing is said to be not worth refuting you can be sure that either it is flagrantly stupid...in which case all comment is superfluous...or it is something formidable, the very crux of the problem." And he points out from Spinoza's statements that he, Spinoza, the Portuguese Jew, would very likely have exactly prefered to be without a soul, or irrational, or an idiot..

Ettinger has made a very similar kind of point; we know that we have touched something very deep in people, and that their longing for immortality really does exist, precisely because so many people try so hard not to think about cryonics or immortality. And when reporters come around to interview us, and

we ask them about their own feelings, they will always say that they have come to us because "other people" will be interested, and they themselves will never dream of actually considering cryonics, it is just another assignment in a long day... (But how do THEY know what interests other people unless by their own feelings??).

Most readers will probably know Unamuno from Harrington's writings and quotations of him. It is Unamuno who first pointed out that all of our striving for public notice and fame was precisely an attempt to immortalize ourselves, and analyzed suicide as due to the perception of the suicide that he was going to die: "The majority of suicides would not take their lives if they had the assurance that they would never die on this earth. The self-slayer kills himself because he will not wait for death." (p.233 of Dover edition of THE TRAGIC SENSE, in the chapter "The Mythology of the Beyond"). In his chapter "Faith, Hope, and Charity" Unamuno also says much of what Harrington says in his own chapter "Love and Evil". Where Harrington differs from Unamuno, of course, is in his frank call to do something about the problem on a scientific level, even though Harrington's willingness to look calmly at death seems to have given out just at the point where he meets CRYONICS. That idea is just too much: that we might someday discover a means to prevent aging and death, that is reasonable, but to ask that we someday learn how to reverse it, that is TOO MUCH and an imposition upon mankind!

It is hard at this early date, when no one knows the time and the manner by which immortality will come, to draw any conclusions about what it will really mean to us psychologically. What would be important, of course, is not just that we could expect to live for a longer time: that would be a simple change of scale, worthwhile, certainly, but unlikely to change our feelings, since we would merely transpose our present anxieties about death at 70 into new ones on a grander scale, death at 7000, 7 million, 70 billion years. The really important change would be that we had, once, actually done something to INCREASE our expectation of life. The hopelessness people now feel about immortality is the most pervasive element of their psychology of death, and if we remove it we can expect a change of state, to philosophies which will be neither of resignation nor of despair.

In cryonicist circles such a change has already started. This may account for the way in which (particularly to noncryonicists) cryonicists seem ascetic: they are denying their present pleasures for the purpose of a future state. And who would try for an immortality of fame or public notice if they had the choice of striving for a physical immortality instead? So that we would expect a tremendous growth of privatism: I believe we can see this happening already among cryonicists.

# RAISING RESEARCH FUNDS

# AT THE

# LAKE TAHOE LIFE EXTENSION FESTIVAL

by Fred Chamberlain

Over the last several months, a survey has been taken to evaluate several approaches for raising research funds, at the Lake Tahoe Life Extension Festival. Also, there has been the thorny question of how to allocate these funds; how to divide them equitably amongst the various groups currently engaged in life extension oriented research.

Three principal methods of fund raising have been examined, to date. Suggestions as to other possibilities are most welcome. Currently, plans are:

1. Part of each registration fee will go towards research. We'll budget in a certain amount, for example $5 to $10, and then attempt to get the best possible bargains on conference space and banquet facilities and services. Everything in excess of actual expenses will be available for use in research.

2. An auction will be conducted, with articles donated by attendees. The articles can be things related to life extension, for example, rare books or out of print periodicals, or they might be something you just don't use any more, like an old Rolls Royce or twin engine airplane.

3. Subject to checking out the rules and legalities, a raffle of some kind is possible. A vacation condo weekend (on which we can reduce the rent by eliminating the commission), a boat cruise (on which we could request a discount), anything that can be donated, all of these are potential "prizes". The items don't have to necessarily all be large, and they don't necessarily have to even be "delivered" at Lake Tahoe. If you have any billiant ideas on juicy items for a raffle with a low cost base, now is the time to trot them out!

On the question of how to allocate research funds, we agonized long and hard. A committee composed of representatives from various groups would have a bias, regardless of how you tried to prevent it. Contributors and recipients alike would tend to wonder about the criteria used and question how the "pie" was divided. So far, the best approach we've come up with is a "free market" system. Here's how it would work:

1. Each organization doing research would be requested to send in a brief summary (100 words or less) of its research goals and progress. This would be nothing like a complete report, just something simple that almost any attendee could digest.

2. When registration blanks are mailed out, a copy of these summaries would be included. Each registration form would have a place to check a box beside the organization of the registrant's choice, with the note "Please direct any research donations from this registration fee and/or contribution to the organization shown". Each person registering to attend the Festival, or contributing funds (some people may *not* be able to attend, but want to contribute to research anyway) would thus choose how *their* research donation was to be *distributed*. This is a workable method for registration fees and direct contributions, but it becomes more difficult with auctions or raffles.

3. In the case of an auction, how would you distinguish the contribution of the person who *donated* the article from the person who *purchased* it? In a raffle, it becomes even more complex as to the bookkeeping. It seems simpler, if not more equitable, to distribute proceeds from auctions/raffles in the same proportions as the registration fees and direct contributions. At least, then, somewhat of a balance is preserved.

At first, the amounts of research funds flowing from these sources may seem trivial, but in the long term they may become substantial. Life extension is "embryonic" at this moment, but it will someday (not too distant) be a giant. Lesser causes than Life Extension have erected hospitals and profoundly changed human opinion through fund raising that started with bingo games. If, instead of erecting monuments or reforming primative tribes, we throw our efforts behind research, then we bring closer the day when our lives are safe from disease, aging and accidents.

*Organizations who are candidates for these research funds are encouraged to promptly prepare the "100 words or less" summaries and get them to us, so they can be distributed along with the registration forms.* (Mail to Fred and Linda Chamberlain, P. O. Box 16220, South Lake Tahoe, CA 95706). Only organizations who provide summaries will be named among the choices on the registration form; if an organization cannot come up with a 100 word summary, it is a pretty fair guess it cannot effectively supervise research either. Any comments or suggestions, from organizations and/or individuals, will be greatly appreciated.

(Continued from page 10)

others. I hope you will not accept unfounded and grossly unjust limitations on yours. I will vote against any limitations of my activities that are legal and, therefore, my right to pursue. I will also vote against any policy statement that attempts to detract from the pursuit of scientific knowledge and its communication to other scientists. I hope you will join me in this action. Thank you.

Sincerely Yours,

Jerry D. Leaf
President
Cryovita Laboratories

The results of the mail ballot are not yet known. Whatever the outcome, the important thing has been done. They were denied the silence and sanction of the victims.

I wish to thank Betty Leaf for her computer work that made the Society mailing possible, as well as this paper; Mike Federowicz for his usual tireless efforts in orchestrating the actual mailing to the membership and Hugh Hixon and Al Lopp for helping Mike prepare the mailing.

Jerry D. Leaf
Research Associate, UCLA
President, I.C.E.
Director, Trans Time Suspension Team
Member, Society for Cryobiology

**ALCOR LIFE EXTENSION FOUNDATION**
4030 NORTH PALM #304
FULLERTON, CALIFORNIA 92635
(714) 738-5569