

# THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY BULLETIN

---

---

## In this issue

- Chad Trainer remembers David S. Goldman
- Peter Stone on the Bertrand Russell Society's Facebook Group
- Sheila Turcon visits Brixton Prison (with guest star Tony Simpson)
- Russell Wahl translates from the original French two reviews of *Principia*
- Call for Papers: 52nd BRS Meeting in Bowling Green, KY, May 16-18, 2025
- Call for Student Papers: 2025 Goldman Student Essay Prize
- Time to renew! (And the renewal DRAW!)
- Russell Quote of the Issue on the last page



Bertrand Russell pictured on a record cover  
Source: Gregory Landini, October 23, 2024

# David S. Goldman: A Psychiatrist Respectful of Philosophy

BY CHAD TRAINER

The BRS mourns the passing of longtime member and contributor David Goldman. As academia becomes ever more specialized, it's unusual for people to attend philosophy conferences who are not specialists in philosophy. David Goldman was a psychiatrist by training who I knew from the annual meetings of the Bertrand Russell Society. Finding a psychiatrist at a Bertrand Russell Society conference interested me. In addition to the many quality presentations at these gatherings, I've always enjoyed the informal times when BRS members can socialize with one another. It was primarily during these informal occasions that I got to know David and was able to talk with him about psychiatry and philosophy.

I had initially joked with David that all too often psychiatrists seem uninterested in the logical soundness of philosophers' arguments. Instead, I told him, psychiatrists seem inherently cynical about philosophers' visions of a disinterested search for truth. Psychiatrists often act as though philosophy amounts to no more than the concoction of grandiose arguments to rationalize beliefs that the individual philosopher is committed to believing in any case. Psychiatrists frequently see philosophers' beliefs as a result of psychological factors of which the philosopher may be genuinely unaware.

In his book *The Making of a Philosopher*, Colin McGinn recalls his days at Oxford during the 1980s and what he saw as the feeble philosophic activity that was prevalent there. He recalls the frequency with which he settled for talking with psychologists instead. McGinn notes "Psychologists have a tin ear for philosophical issues, and their training imbues them with the conviction—I might say prejudice—that the only real questions are the kind that can be settled by means of controlled experiments; abstract conceptual questions simply don't compute with the majority of them."

Much to my pleasure I discovered David Goldman was not this type of psychiatrist.

Rather, he seemed to think philosophy involved substantive questions and was a wholesome enterprise capable of disinterested quests for truth. Bertrand Russell's 1930 book, *The Conquest of Happiness* was of the greatest interest to David. David enjoyed evaluating the book in terms of contemporary psychiatry. He even provided his patients with photocopies of select chapters from the book and claimed they actually benefited from these excerpts. He saw Russell as making contributions to three areas of psychiatry.

First, David credited Russell with having developed an explanation of why conventionally successful people are frequently unhappy. Standard psychiatric concepts of individual psychopathology and the impact of stress in the 21st century, David claimed, are compatible with Russell's thinking in this early 20th century book. But David argued few psychiatrists grasp something that Russell grasped, namely, that society generally is responsible for destructive forces. Because training in social advocacy is not part of psychiatrists' training, David thought the psychiatrists' training is narrower and does not look beyond individual or family disturbances. Clearly, David argued, we ought not to be discouraged by barriers in investigating social forces and institutions' responsibility for mental illnesses.

Second, David thought Russell had valuable guidelines for coping with irrational drives causing unhappiness. David went so far as to claim what currently goes by the name of "cognitive therapy" Russell anticipated with his focus on the "broad concept of reconstructing the unconscious and ridding it of irrational impulses." David did think, however, there were two defects in Russell's thinking here: his failure to appreciate the necessary role of a therapist and his unawareness of the recalcitrance of the brain's "fear circuits" to "verbal redirection." David thought Russell's error is "forgivable" in light of the fact that it was not until the

1990s that fundamental understanding of “fear circuits” was attained.

Third, David went so far as to consider as a “revolutionary vision” Russell’s belief in helping ourselves to society and nature’s “healing potentials.” In his essay “A Psychiatrist Looks at Conquest of Happiness,”<sup>1</sup> David says “Russell projected a wider, truly visionary concept of universal happiness available to those who could shed the narrow confines of a life in which selfish fulfillment was the primary objective. . . .” Russell, he maintained, provided us with the “remarkable discovery that happiness is our natural state if we overcome the narrow bounds of egotism and reconnect with the larger world.”

As a practicing psychiatrist, David Goldman thought Russell’s musings about social pathology, rational reconstruction, and “connecting to the wide world of possibilities” to be “important therapeutic principles.” He maintained such principles helped him with his patients, and he hoped the field of psychiatry will heed Russell’s 1930 book and encourage its practitioners and patients to observe its guidelines.

The Bertrand Russell Society thanks David Goldman for his gift and we’re glad to memorialize him by renaming the Student Paper Prize in his honor. I miss my conversations with David Goldman. He will be greatly missed in a variety of ways.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>Published in *The Bertrand Russell Society Quarterly* 136 (2007) and Alan Schwerin’s *Russell Revisited: Critical Reflections on the Thought of Bertrand Russell*.

---

## The Bertrand Russell Society Facebook Group

BY PETER STONE

On<sup>1</sup> February 8, 2009, I created a Facebook group for the Bertrand Russell Society (BRS).<sup>2</sup> I’ve been running the group ever since, admitting members, posting and moderating content, and keeping everything civil and polite (by internet standards, at least). What impact has this Facebook group had? This short article will offer an answer to this question by discussing the diverse crowd that has been attracted to this group over the past 14+ years.

As of June 14, 2023, the BRS Facebook Group had 18,976 members and one administrator (me). The group is private, meaning that content is visible only to members. The group was briefly made public at one point, but we were quickly reminded that many group members live in places (such as the Middle East) where public association with a notorious atheist was dangerous, and so reversed the decision within days. I personally approve all applica-

tions to join the group. This application process has for some time involved answering the following question posed by me: “Hello there. I see you’d like to join our Bertrand Russell Society Facebook Group. Great. How did you become interested in Russell? Have a great day!” The question provides a minimal level of screening against trolls, spammers, etc. I review the answers provided, along with whatever other information I can glean quickly about the applicants, before admitting them.

About a year ago, I decided to start keeping track of some information about the people joining our Facebook Group, including where they come from, what interests them, and most importantly, how they report becoming interested in Russell. The remainder of this paper presents the results of this inquiry to date.

What sort of people apply to join this Facebook group? Most are there out of a genuine

interest in Russell, but there are exceptions. We regularly have people try to join the group because they love Russell Crowe.<sup>3</sup> They apparently love him so much they'll join any Facebook group with "Russell" in the name. (For some reason, fans of Jack Russell Terriers do not seem to share this enthusiasm.) Occasionally, someone will approach the group with a genuine interest in Russell, but not a healthy one. In this category falls the respondent devoted to Lyndon LaRouche (political cult leader and author of the infamous "How Bertrand Russell Became an Evil Man" (1994)).

The group's impact can without exaggeration be described as worldwide. Over the past year alone, we have had people join the group from Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China (although Facebook is currently banned there), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France (including Saint Martin), Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Hong Kong (where Facebook is not currently banned), Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, the Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, the Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway (including someone from the village of Hell), Pakistan, Palestine, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russia, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Somalia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain (including the Canary Islands), Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Tajikistan, Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine,

the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom (including England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales), Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vietnam, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. We have also had members join from every state in the United States except Delaware, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, South Dakota, and Wyoming, plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico (as well as at least one person from my hometown of Bethlehem, PA—a stranger to me, I must admit!). Also represented are all ten provinces of Canada and five out of the six states of Australia.

More interesting have been the responses to my screening question.<sup>4</sup> Some applicants decline to answer the question at all. Others give a perfunctory answer, such as, "Yes." (Perhaps language barriers are responsible for answers like this.) Some give answers that are only slightly more informative, such as "I have read his books." Occasionally, someone feels compelled to give a smark-alecky answer, such as "What a stupid question!" (These people do not get into the group. It's a bad idea to annoy the moderator!)<sup>5</sup>

But many other answers are more illuminating. Some have only a passing knowledge of Russell. Many, for example, mentioned encountering wise and intriguing quotes from him on Facebook or the like and being moved to find out more. But more could be counted as proper Russellians. Many list a book by Russell that introduced them to his work. *A History of Western Philosophy* (1945) was particularly popular. One respondent said the book was "well worth a read...and a re-read" while another was "awed by the breadth of his profundity" in the book and yet another described it as his "favourite book." *The Problems of Philosophy* (1912), and *Why I Am Not a Christian* (1957) are also mentioned quite often. One reported reading the first line of the former and being "hooked ever since;" another reported that reading the latter work "changed my life." Others mentioned *Why Men Fight* (1916), *Mysticism and Logic* (1918), *The ABC of Relativity* (1925), *Marriage and Morals* (1929), *The Con-*

*quest of Happiness* (1930), *In Praise of Idleness* (1935), *Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits* (1948), *Authority and the Individual* (1949), *Unpopular Essays* (1950)—which one respondent described as “awesome”—*Satan in the Suburbs* (1953), *Nightmares of Eminent Persons* (1954)—particularly “The Theologian’s Nightmare”—*Has Man a Future?* (1961), the *Autobiography* (1967-1969), and even *Principia Mathematica* (1910-1913).<sup>6</sup> One even claimed to have stumbled upon *Principia* at age thirteen, while another writes, “I have studied Bertrand Russell for 50 years. First tried *Principia* at 19. Still working on it.” But some souls not quite brave enough to tackle *Principia* appreciated the graphic novel version; three mentioned *Logicomix* (2008). One respondent reported reading half of Russell’s books, with another foolhardy soul claiming to have read all of them! And one expressed appreciation for the fact he could read Russell in his native tongue of Assamese, while another claimed to have translated some of Russell’s books into Arabic.

Others were attracted to Russell because of something about his life, rather than anything specific he wrote. One mentioned the plane crash he survived near Trondheim, Norway in 1948. One mentioned the Russell’s audience with Lenin. Many followed his work in the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND). One noted Russell’s influence on Kwame Nkrumah. There’s even one respondent who found echoes of Russell’s life in his own: “I read the Penguin Classics editions of Russell whilst in Prison in the 1970s.”

Some respondents came to Russell through another writer. Many mentioned Noam Chomsky—not surprisingly, given that Chomsky is both an honorary member of the BRS and recipient of its 2020 Award. One respondent came to Russell as a “Chomsky fan” with a “wise friend” who told him “Chomsky is the Bertrand Russell of this century.”<sup>7</sup> And many of our new Facebook group members also belong to Chomsky-related Facebook groups.<sup>8</sup> Others mentioned the New Atheist movement, along with specific New Atheists like Richard Dawkins, Sam Harris,

Christopher Hitchens, or even Bill Maher. One claimed that the arguments of the New Atheists “were mostly re-affirmations of the ideas of Bertrand Russell”—a claim few of them would deny, I suspect. Wittgenstein of course gets mentioned,<sup>9</sup> sometimes in conjunction with the 1993 Derek Jarman film about him (in which Russell was played by Michael Gough).<sup>10</sup> Carl Sagan also got a mention as a gateway into Russell, as did Einstein. One respondent reported sharing with Russell a love of Shelley. And one respondent heard Russell “quoted often by people like [the late evangelical minister and sexual predator] Ravi Zacharias.” Would be fascinated to learn the context in which Russell was quoted by him!

Some respondents came to Russell via someone close to them, like the one who mentioned his “mother’s ban-the-bomb sympathies in the 1960s.” Sometimes, it’s a father who makes the connection; sometimes, it’s a son or a cousin or a teacher or a friend. One reported having regular conversations about Russell with his father-in-law. One looked into Russell because a girl he fancied “was very keen on his CND activities,” a story very reminiscent of Michael Ruse’s experience with the CND.<sup>11</sup> Another was invited to join the Facebook group by a friend, noting that he and his friend “are the most intelligent people in our town.” One respondent even grew up thinking that the drawing of Bertie on the wall was a drawing of his late grandfather! (He still has the drawing.) Then there’s the respondent who at university called Russell “Uncle Bertie” so often that “to my amusement, some people thought we were actually related.” And one respondent shared a particularly nice familial wish: “I’ve always loved Bertrand Russell. I would love to join your group so I can introduce his wisdom to my children.”

Some learned about Russell through a special mutual friend—McMaster University. In the words of one respondent:

40 years ago, I attended McMaster University in Hamilton and the library was the Bertrand Russell library. Who was this person? When

I learned more about him and his philosophy I was hooked! Admired and read many of his books/essays till this day. I'd like to learn much more!

Great to see the impact Russell's presence at McMaster has had!<sup>12</sup>

Russell's ideas have also influenced people. This includes his ideas in philosophy, mathematics, religion, and politics. The Russell Paradox is of course mentioned, with one respondent learning about it through Douglas Hofstadter's *Gödel, Escher, Bach* (1979). Several teachers reported using Russell in class, with one remarking that "when you study mathematics you are going to come across his philosophical writings as they relate to proofs." One respondent reported a more ambitious takeaway from Russell: "At the age of 18, I was introduced to his theory of descriptions, which made it possible to deconstruct any religion or philosophy that used words that did not have descriptors. I have embarrassed so many philosophers with this..." Russell's criticisms of religion get frequently mentioned in responses like the following: "His views on atheism is in perfect accord with my unexpressed thoughts." One person stumbled upon a clip of Russell critiquing religion, then tried to find him again later by googling "smart old guy on atheism!" Quite a few mentioned Russell's teapot. One respondent expressed support for his views on "global governance," while another credited Russell with being the first "pacifist conscientious objector" ever to cross his path. One respondent, however, used this reply to inform us gravely, "He is wrong about Freud."

Occasionally, a respondent displays more enthusiasm for Russell than knowledge about him. One claimed to have "read a book about his service as a president of the United States." Slightly less confused is the respondent who allegedly "read all 11 volumes of his immortal History." I can only assume this person is here confusing Russell with Will Durant, author of the 11-volume *Story of Civilization* (1935-1975).<sup>13</sup> One claimed to have read long ago

a work by Russell entitled "Technology and Species;" that person has been unable to find that work again, and admits that this may be a case of the Mandela effect in action. Another joined the group because of "The place called after him in London"—presumably Russell Square. (Wrong Russell!) One reported the story about the guru whose explanation of the nature of the universe ends with "turtles all the way down," even though Russell's own version of the story does not end with that particular punchline.<sup>14</sup> One aspiring philosopher reported a fascination for "Russell's turkey." Russell's use of chickens in illustrative examples is well-known, but could he have taken these examples in unexpected new directions via other forms of poultry?<sup>15</sup> More serious is the person who was "shocked" to learn of Russell's "support for Nazis," which I can only assume refers to Russell's defence of appeasement in *Which Way to Peace?* (1936). More encouraging is the respondent who mentioned Russell's "anti-fascist stance," as well as the three respondents who mentioned Russell's letter to Oswald Mosley declining to debate him.

A few respondents have a direct connection to Russell of some sort. One claimed to have worked at the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation in 1965. One claimed to have met him at the Birmingham town hall in 1966, while another met Russell on a CND March to Aldermaston at the tender age of 13. The mother of one group member studied with Russell at UCLA; the mother of another worked at the Russell Archives at McMaster University some time ago. Another both likes philosophy and lives near Penrhyndeudraeth, Wales (Russell's final place of residence). And two reported becoming interested in Russell because of a shared love of pipe smoking!

Four respondents claimed the closest of possible connections to Russell—a direct blood relation of some sort. One even claimed Russell as an "ancestor." Follow-up messages to all four yielded no additional information. More productive was my follow-up query to Emma Hope, who wrote in her response that "Bertrand Rus-

sell taught my father how to ride a bicycle. He was a friend of my grandfather.” My query produced the following response:

Bertrand Russell was a friend of my grandfather Richard Hope, who wrote *Love Letters of an Anarchist* (1925). My father and his brother Bill went to school at Dora Russell’s school, at Telegraph House. My grandmother took them every day in two panniers on a pony up to the school from their house in Harting.

When he [Emma’s father] told Professor [C.E.M.] Joad, who came to play tennis at the Thatched Cottage, where they lived in Harting, and that Bertrand Russell had taught him to ride a bicycle, Joad said, ‘Is that ALL you can remember about the great man?’

While I cannot confirm that any blood relatives of Russell belong to the group, I can confirm that the group contains Samuel M. Copi, grandson of the great logician and 1998 BRS Award winner Irving M. Copi.

Many respondents provided brief but enthusiastic responses about Russell, such as:

He resonates with me.

His thought blew my mind.

My best philosopher ever.

He is the man.

I am amazed by his logic.

I like Russell’s towering erudition and intellect, his keen logic and profound liberalism, all of which he couched within overriding humanism.

He speaks to me at every turn.

Anyone interested in philosophy must be interested in Bertrand Russell as well.

By his wisecracks.

From reading his pithy insightful observations about mankind.

He is my role model.

Decades ago, I found that he speaks my thinking beautifully.

I consider Russell to be the most impressive communicator of truth and virtue of anybody I have ever read.

Let’s say his philosophy is a kind that prefers harsh truth to sweet fallacy.

I appreciate his acceptance and validation of uncertainty.

By reading his articles and numerous papers on rationality, pacificism, and humanism, I was inevitably hooked on his ideas and efforts to make the world a better place without superstition or divine intervention.

When I read what he has said and written, I wonder how so many seemingly intelligent people can still cling to religion.

Facing up to the consequences, even prison, with humour intact.

The clarity of his writing and clear thinking is unique in this world of blowhards.

I admire his genius. I consider him one of the most important persons in human history.

He was controversial and I like people like that.

I like his philosophy. He makes me see the world differently.

Russell was the true Renaissance Man. Broadly educated, but humble. Most of all, a critical thinker. One of my enduring mentors.

I found his expression economical, succinct with words.

I think this person is more important now than ever in propagating common sense to our modern life.

Russell was both witty and rational. Always thought he was one of the very greats. Great clarity, no obscurantism or fuzziness.

I like his reasoned view of life without bringing in unreal explanation. I find it bracing.

Russell has been an inspiration since my childhood.

Because I like his style.

His teachings have kept me sane in this mad world.

Wish those in control had paid more attention to his suggestions so we would not be in the horrific situation we find ourselves in today.

AIN'T HE JUST VERY GOOD WITH WORDS? (caps in original answer)

Some of the answers say little about Russell but are entertaining nonetheless:

I actually stumbled across his writings when analyzing Gonzo journalism.

I love sexual liberty.

Studied history and philosophy at university. Need I say more?

Many years ago I studied philosophy and it's a shame that it was Heidegger.

Finally, here is the most perplexing answer I have received, which I reproduce verbatim:

have a big fence I sit on - it has a building plaque NEUTRAL MONISM

I would welcome any light anyone can shed on that one.

Let me end this short report with a question. If you are on Facebook, and aren't a member of the BRS Facebook Group, why not? Join us at [facebook.com/groups/BertrandRussellSociety](https://www.facebook.com/groups/BertrandRussellSociety). Wouldn't you love to be in company like this?

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>Presented at the 2023 Annual Meeting of the Bertrand Russell Society. I greatly enjoyed the discussion with the participants there, especially Ken Blackwell, Rosalind Carey, Landon Elkind, and Tony Simpson.

<sup>2</sup>The BRS also has a Facebook page (not a group) at <https://www.facebook.com/BertrandRussellSociety>. This page was set up by Landon Elkind on April 21, 2014 and currently has 3,298 followers. I am also one of the managers for this page, but I concentrate my efforts on the Facebook group.

<sup>3</sup>There was also one respondent who wrote, "I became interested in him by reading about his cinematography and watching some of his famous movies." I assume this was a reference to Russell Crowe, but perhaps the respondent is a fan of *Aman*, the 1967 Bollywood film in which Bertrand Russell had a cameo.

<sup>4</sup>Note that I have silently corrected grammatical and spelling mistakes in these responses. No respondent is identified by name here without permission.

<sup>5</sup>I responded more favourably to the person who answered my question with the question, "Is this a metaphysical or literal question?"

<sup>6</sup>One respondent alluded to this great work by writing, "1 + 1 = 2 is easy to believe but very difficult to prove." Another described it as the work "where the 'fuzzy thinking' and the 'simple minded' collaborators shared insults and compliments."

<sup>7</sup>Many have made the comparison before. See, e.g., my "Chomsky and Russell Revisited," in Tim Madigan and Peter Stone (eds.), *Bertrand Russell: Public Intellectual*, second ed. (Rochester, NY: Tiger Bark Press, 2021).

<sup>8</sup>Quite a few also belong to Leonard Cohen Facebook groups, but I cannot work out any connection there.

<sup>9</sup>One answered my question with a laconic, "Actually, I like Wittgenstein more."

<sup>10</sup>And speaking of popular culture references, one respondent learned of Russell through Steptoe and Son. I am personally grateful that Derek and Clive have not yet been mentioned.



<sup>11</sup>See Michael Ruse, “Bertrand Russell as Public Intellectual: A Personal Reflection,” in Tim Madigan and Peter Stone (eds.), *Bertrand Russell: Public Intellectual*, second ed. (Rochester, NY: Tiger Bark Press, 2021).

<sup>12</sup>Ken Blackwell, longtime Russell Archivist at McMaster, also deserves credit. One respondent (Maie Liiv) is a close friend of Ken’s, and developed an interest in Russell by “osmosis.”

<sup>13</sup>A different respondent was drawn to *A History of Western Philosophy* by Durant’s *The Story of Philosophy* (1926). And another suggested that Russell’s “clarity of thought may only be matched by that of Will Durant.”

<sup>14</sup>Here is Russell’s version:

If everything must have a cause, then God must have a cause. If there can be anything without a cause, it may just as well be the world as God, so that there cannot be any validity in that argument. It is exactly of the same nature as the Hindu’s view, that the world rested upon an elephant and the elephant rested upon a tortoise; and when they said, “How about the tortoise?” the Indian said, “Suppose we change the subject.”

See “Why I Am Not a Christian,” in *Why I Am Not a Christian* (New York: Simon Schuster, 1957), pp. 6-7.

<sup>15</sup>A worthy catalogue of Russell’s chicken examples can be found in Tim Madigan, “Mr. Russell’s Chicken: A New Symbol for Philosophy,” *Bertrand Russell Society Bulletin* 145 (Summer 2011), pp. 7-10.

---

## Justice: Russell on Trial

BY SHEILA TURCON

When<sup>1</sup> I heard a few years ago that Brixton Prison was open for lunch I knew I wanted to go. Last summer I made that wish a reality. And since I was going to be in London I decided to visit all the justice buildings that Russell appeared in before he went to Brixton.

Russell’s first trial was in the Magistrate’s Court located in the Justice Room at the Mansion House on 5 June 1916. Why was it held there? Russell was charged under the Defence of the Realm Act for making statements likely to prejudice recruitment. His article, commonly known as the Everett leaflet (B&R A19; 49 in *Papers* 13), was issued by the No-Conscription Fellowship from offices on Fleet Street. Thus the venue for the trial. Presiding was Charles Wakefield, the Lord Mayor, who also lived in this grand building. The prosecutor was Archibald Henry Bodkin who also prosecuted several spies during World War I. Russell spoke in his own defence although he did have a solicitor, a Mr. C. Baker, by his side. Under the British system a solicitor cannot speak in court. Russell’s speech is printed in *Rex v. Russell* (B&R B6; 56 in *Papers* 13) but not all of the court proceedings appear in this pamphlet. Frank was there in support. Also there was Sir Charles Mathews, Director of Public Prosecutions, indicating

the significance the government placed in this trial. Russell relates an anecdote about Mathews in his *Autobiography*. Edward Grubb, the treasurer of the No-Conscription Fellowship was on trial for a pacifist publication. His brother Frank, though not a pacifist, was impressed by Grubb’s character and integrity. When Mathews finished his cross-examination of Grubb, Frank whispered to Mathews who was a friend: “Really, Matthews [*sic*], the role of Torquemada doesn’t suit you!” (*Auto.* 2: 40). Mathews was so angered by this comment that he never spoke to Frank again. Since Grubb was convicted on 17 May,<sup>2</sup> Frank and Mathews were not on speaking terms during Russell’s trial. Also in the courtroom were Frank’s wife Elizabeth and Constance Malleon, although Russell’s affair with her had not yet begun. Elizabeth was struck by Colette’s “amazing beauty” and was anxious to meet her.<sup>3</sup> Strachey and Ottoline Morrell were also in the gallery. There is a photograph of Russell with them outside the Mansion House—this photograph was published in his *Autobiography*. Strachey’s opinion of the Lord Mayor was that he “looked like a stuck pig” (Clark, *The Life*, p. 285). Russell was found guilty and fined. He appealed.

When I visited the building it was closed for

repairs. I did chat with one of the construction workers who told me the Lord Mayor<sup>4</sup> was a good person and people should follow whatever he said. The Mansion House is a towering building rising directly from the sidewalk and makes humans feel insignificant. The grand stairs are no longer used (were they ever used?) and entrance is by a side door. King Charles and Queen Camilla used the door this past autumn.

It is a short walk from the Mansion House to the Guildhall where the appeal was held. It is much older—fifteenth century compared with the eighteenth century Mansion House. Hearing the appeal was Sir William Trelor. Prosecuting was Richard David Muir. Russell had a barrister this time, Llewelyn Williams, who argued that Russell was not trying to discourage recruitment but instead enlighten the public. The appeal was denied. Russell refused to pay the fine but funds were raised and it was paid off.<sup>5</sup> Again this building was closed for repairs. I was however able to visit the adjoining Art Gallery but not the one that was there in 1916—that building was destroyed in World War II. Inside I photographed the City's Coat of Arms with its motto, Lord Guide Us. The Guildhall is set back at the end of a courtyard with the Art Gallery on its side.

The last trial held at the Mansion House was in 1991. It was then amalgamated with the Guildhall Justice Room to form the City of London Magistrates' Court at 1 Queen Victoria Street. Thus, it has been more than thirty years since these buildings have held trials. They are used for public and private receptions and banquets. The Lord Mayor continues to live in the Mansion House. This position is ceremonial and there is a new mayor every year. It has not been possible to find out how the former Justice Rooms are currently used.

Two years later on 9 February 1918 Russell appeared at the Bow Street Magistrates' Court again charged under the Defence of the Realm Act. His article, "The German Peace Offer" (B&R C18.01; 92 in *Papers* 14) appeared in *The Tribunal* printed in Adelphi, thus the change in venue for the trial. In it Russell wrote about the

American garrison intimidating strikers which they did at home. Russell's brother Frank was back in support and Sir Charles Mathews also returned. Brigadier-General Childs from the War Office was also present. The government meant business. The case was heard by Sir John Dickinson. Russell's barrister was Cecil Whitely. Whitely and Bodkin had prosecuted an accused spy in 1915. Under the British system lawyers can work for both the prosecution and the defence. The prosecutor was Travers Humphreys.

Humphreys stated that "it is hard to understand how the passage about the American garrison could have been written by anyone who was not directly hostile to Britain". Whitely countered by noting the article was written to prevent the relationship of this country being prejudiced with a foreign Power. Russell wanted to warn the public against a serious menace. He had stepped back from opposing the war and would not be writing any further articles. The magistrate pronounced that Russell had lost all sense of decency and fairness and had committed a despicable offence. He sentenced him to six months in the second division. Whitely said he would appeal and Russell was allowed to leave the court. Outside he was cheered by his supporters. Ronald Clark in *Bertrand Russell and His World* (1981) included a photo of Russell outside the court with an unidentified man. My assumption is that this is probably his barrister, Whitely. Under the British system Russell also required a solicitor who was Harry Wilson. On 13 February Wilson wrote to Russell that they needed to meet to discuss his appeal. There is no surviving legal correspondence from 1916 and this letter is the only surviving piece of 1918 legal correspondence in the Archives.

Russell would appear for a second time at Bow Street in 1961. He and his wife Edith led an anti-nuclear protest in Hyde Park followed by a march to Trafalgar Square. They, with others, were summonsed under the medieval Justices of the Peace Act (1361), for inciting breaches of the peace. On 12 September "Bow Street seemed like a stage set as we walked down it with our colleagues amid a

mass of onlookers . . . By contrast the scene in the courtroom looked like a Daumier etching . . . The magistrate” observed “that, from his point of view, I was old enough to know better . . . By the end of the morning all our cases had been heard.” Bertram Reece presided and was not amused by the sustained applause which greeted Russell’s speech in court. “This is not a music hall. It is a court of law” he opined. Russell and Edith left for Chelsea to have lunch and returned to hear their sentences that afternoon. “As each person in alphabetical order was sentenced, he or she was taken out to the cells where we behaved like boys on holiday, singing and telling stories . . . till we were carted away in our Black Marias.” In all 32 people got prison time. Russell spent a week in Brixton in the hospital wing (Auto 3: 114–117). The story made the front pages of the *Daily Mirror* and the *Evening Standard*.<sup>6</sup>

I visited the Bow Street building with Ruth Derham, the biographer of Frank Russell. Bow Street Magistrates’ Court closed in 2006 and the building is now the NoMad hotel. In its previous function as a court it had a vehicle entrance, now gone. When you enter the hotel through the entrance with the canopy overhead, the former courtyard behind where the vehicle entrance used to be is now an atrium. An original entrance at the end of the building remains the same and opens into former courtroom 1, now the events space for the hotel. The other two courtrooms no longer exist. I did not visit the Police Museum which is also in the building.

Russell’s 1918 appeal was held at the Middlesex Assizes, also called the Quarter Sessions and the London Sessions in the Guildhall in Parliament Square before Allan J. Lawrie on 1 May. Humphreys reappeared for the prosecution. Russell had a new defender, Tindal Atkinson, with whom he had met on 28 March. Russell liked him and thought him intelligent.<sup>7</sup> According to *Common Sense*, Whitely was also there. Russell had less faith in his solicitors, of whom only one is known, Harry Wilson. There was limited newspaper coverage of this appeal and no paper mentioned who was in

the courtroom. Colette was—Russell recollected her “tense face in Court” in a letter of he wrote her a year later on 15 May. Humphreys said that the article was likely to cause trouble and disagreement and mutual antagonism between the Allies. Atkinson in defence stated that the article presented only a picture of what might possibly happen if at the conclusion of the war England and France had been exhausted and the only soldiers left to maintain order in this county and in France were the Americans. In pronouncing his sentence Lawrie concluded that it would be a great loss to the country if Mr. Russell, a man of great distinction, were confined in such a form that his abilities would not have full scope. He did not reduce the length of Russell’s sentence but changed where it would be served to the First Division with all its privileges, which were considerable. There was no hard labour; instead prisoners were housed in their own cells with a desk, books, and writing materials if they wished. Meals, made to order, were delivered to them.

Russell faced three esteemed prosecutors in his trials—Bodkin, Muir, and Humphreys—all of whom had books published about their careers. None of them mentioned Russell among their famous cases. For a while Humphreys and Muir worked out of the same Chambers.

The Guildhall looks very old but it was only constructed in 1913. It now houses the Supreme Court and is open for tours so I took one. It is built of Portland stone and has a relief frieze depicting historical scenes including King John with the Magna Carta at Runnymede. I did visit Runnymede on this trip. Inside the Guildhall are three courtrooms. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council also meets in this building using courtroom 3. Much of the history of Middlesex is preserved in the building including stained glass windows and paintings. The symbol of the Supreme Court is woven into the carpets throughout and appears at the front entrance. Courtrooms 1 and 2 are greatly altered. There is no longer any need for the judge’s bench, jury box, prisoner’s dock, or a witness stand—they have all been removed. Courtroom

1, the largest, remains traditional while courtroom 2 has been totally modernized. There are grand stairs leading up to courtroom 1. The former cells in the lower level have been turned into a café and display area. There is a portrait of Herbrand Arthur Russell, 11th Duke of Bedford in the Library. This relative of Russell was Lord Lieutenant of Middlesex from 1898 to 1926. The library is usually on the tour but it was struck off without reason while I was there.

From the Guildhall a taxi, not a black Maria to his great disappointment, took Russell to Brixton Prison. It is quite possible his taxi travelled across Westminster Bridge, and along Westminster Bridge Road to Kennington Road. I boarded a bus on Kennington Road across from my hotel with Tony Simpson who agreed to have lunch at Brixton with me. It was the 17th of August, a sunny perfect day. The neighbourhoods we passed through going south looked normal—there was no obvious sign of poverty. We got off near Jebb Avenue the small side street that leads to the prison and followed the signs to the restaurant, the Clink. I thought about all of Russell's 1918 visitors who had taken this exact route. We had to check in at the security portacabin across from the entrance. Ronald Clark in his 1981 book printed a photo of the entrance taken in the early twentieth century with lace curtains on the window. The window is still there today without curtains. We had already submitted information for a background check. There was a dress code—shoes had to be close toed, logos were not allowed, clothing had to be modest. The list of forbidden items was extensive—phones, cameras, smart watches, gum, handbags, umbrellas, hats, and tissues. If we had these items we were allowed to lock them up. We surrendered our IDs and were issued lanyards with an identity number to hang around our necks. There might be dogs inside we were warned—don't get nervous they are only there to sniff you. We passed by the main vehicle door and entered through the Visitors door. Once inside we went through airport style security with pat downs. There were no dogs. We quickly crossed the courtyard and en-

tered the circular building that used to be the home of the governor.

The Clink charity has been very successful. Operating in four prisons it trains inmates nearing the end of their sentences in the hospitality industry. Jobs are waiting upon release and only 8 per cent who graduate from the programme reoffend. Food critics praise the restaurant—a recent article called it the best in London.<sup>8</sup> The image of the inside of the restaurant was taken for a published article. There are also two of Princess Alexandra who visited in 2016. In one she is standing beside a display case containing a mug. You can buy souvenirs. I bought a cookbook and mug, Tony a tea towel. There were about five servers in the room, ours was named Lennox, and the noise levels were wonderfully low, a rare occurrence in restaurants these days. While we were there the artwork on the walls, supplied by the charity Koestler Arts, included images of Spike Lee and Malcolm X as well as abstract pieces. From his seat Tony had a view of the outside through windows with bars which formed a hexagon pattern. We enjoyed a superb three course meal eaten with plastic utensils. The Baked Alaska was particularly memorable.

When it came time to pay the bill Tony couldn't as his credit card had been left behind in the security shed. Confusion reigned for a bit—with playful chatter about us having to do the washing up or even locking us up. We were then let out to the courtyard accompanied by the head trainer where we waited for what would come next. We were thus given the time to take in the surrounding buildings although unlike in Russell's day razor coils curl on the edges of the roofs. We then left the prison via the vehicle entrance and were accompanied to the security hut. A machine had been brought there for Tony to pay the bill.

I have visited many buildings where Russell lived. Going to Brixton stands out as a highlight. I would highly recommend a visit.

*All photographs taken by the author in August 2023.*



Mansion House



Guildhall



Bow Street Magistrates Court (now the NoMad Hotel)



Guildhall, Parliament Square (now the Supreme Court)



Brixton Prison gate



Brixton Prison Clink sign

## Sources (other than newspapers)

- Douglas G. Browne, *Sir Travers Humphreys: A Biography*. London: George C. Harrop, 1960.
- Ronald W. Clark, *The Life of Bertrand Russell*. London: J. Cape, 1975.
- Ronald W. Clark, *Bertrand Russell and His World*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1981.
- The Clink Quick & Easy Cookbook. Sutton: The Clink Trading, 2016.<sup>9</sup>
- Sidney Felstead, *Sir Richard Muir: A Memoir of a Public Prosecutor*, ed. Lady Muir. London: John Lane, 1927.
- Robert Jackson, *Case for the Prosecution: A Biography of Sir Archibald Bodkin*. London: Arthur Barker, 1962.
- Thomas C. Kennedy, *The Hound of Conscience: A History of the No Conscription Fellowship, 1914–1919*. Fayetteville, U. of Arkansas Press, 1981.
- Bertrand Russell, *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell 1914-1944*, vol. 1. London: Allen Unwin, 1967.
- Bertrand Russell, *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell 1944-1967*, vol. 3. London: Allen Unwin, 1969.
- “Visitor’s Guide to The Supreme Court of the United Kingdom”, leaflet, n.d.<sup>10</sup>

## Newspaper sources

- “Earl’s Brother Fined”, *Evening Standard and St. James Gazette*, 5 June 1916, p. 7.
- “Professor Fined”, *Daily Mirror*, 6 June 1916, p. 2; with photograph of Russell.
- “No-Conscription Case. Hon B. Russell Fined”, *Daily Telegraph*, 6 June 1916, p. 6.
- “A No-Conscription Pamphlet. Mr. Bertrand Russell Heavily Fined”, *The Guardian*, 6 June 1916, p. 7. “No-Conscription Leaflet. Mr. Bertrand Russell Fined £100”, *The Times*, 6 June 1916, p. 5.
- “Appeal of Earl’s Son”, *London Evening News*, 29 June 1916, p. 3. Note: Russell was the grandson of an Earl.
- “No-Conscription. Hon. B. Russell’s Appeal”, *Daily Telegraph*, 30 June 1916, p. 3.
- “Hon. Bertrand Russell”, *Evening Standard and St. James Gazette*, 29 June 1916, p. 12.
- “Prison Sentence on Hon. B. Russell. Six Months for Sneering at U.S. Troops. Lecturer to Appeal,” *Sunday Pictorial*, 10 February 1918, p. 2; with photograph of Russell.
- “A Very Despicable Offence”, *The Observer*, 10 Feb. 1918, p. 8.
- “Hon. B. Russell Sent to Prison”, *The Weekly Dispatch*, 10 Feb. 1918, p. 3.
- “The Hon. B. Russell. Charge Under the D.O.R.A. Regulations”, *The Guardian*, 11 Feb. 1918, p. 6.
- “Hon. Bertrand Russell; 6 Months’ Imprisonment for ‘Very Despicable Offence.’ Insult to U.S. Army”, *Cambridge Daily News*, 11 February 1918.
- “Mr. Bertrand Russell’s Appeal”, *The Daily Telegraph*, 2 May 1918, p. 8.
- “‘Loss to the Country.’ Hon. B. Russell to Serve His Sentence in First Division”, *Daily News*, 2 May 1918.
- “Mr. Bertrand Russell’s Appeal”, *Common Sense*, 4 May 1918, p. 225.
- “Bertrand Russell and Wife Jailed”, *Evening Standard*, 12 September 1961, p. 1.
- “Jailed—The Star-Sit Downers”, *Daily Mirror*, 13 September 1961, p. 1.
- “Prison for Lord Russell and 31 Others”, *The Guardian*, 13 September 1961, p. 3.



## Notes

<sup>1</sup>I would like to thank Kenneth Blackwell for his improvements to this article.

<sup>2</sup>Kennedy, p. 127.

<sup>3</sup>Letter, Russell to Constance Malleson, 2 Nov. 1917.

<sup>4</sup>In 2023 Nicholas Lyons was Lord Mayor.

<sup>5</sup>See *Russell*, Vol 6, no. 1, Summer 1986.

<sup>6</sup>Presumably the story was covered by other newspapers.

<sup>7</sup>Letter to Constance Malleson, 28 March 1918.

<sup>8</sup>Eibhlis Gale-Coleman, “I Ate at Brixton Prison’s Restaurant, the Best Restaurant in London”, *Business Insider*, posted 24 February 2024.

<sup>9</sup>This cookbook contains a history of the Clink Charity. Purchased at Brixton Prison.

<sup>10</sup>Given to me during my 2023 tour.

---

## Translations of two brief reviews of *Principia Mathematica* from *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*

BY RUSSELL WAHL AND PAMELA PARK (TRANSLATORS)

Below appear two reviews of *Principia Mathematica* published in French and translated into English for the first time here. Material in square brackets is inserted by the translators. Footnotes are from the current *Bulletin* editors.

The author of the second review of 1927 remains unidentified (there are plenty of suspects). The author of the first review of 1911 was identified by Stephan Soulié as Maximilien Winter (1871-1935). Winter co-founded the *Revue* with Xavier Léon and later ran the supplement to the *Revue* (making him a suspect for authorship of the second review). That journal had published plenty of logicist pieces, including Russell’s justly-famous 1906 “Les paradoxes de la logique”.

### From *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*, T. 19 No. 2 Mars 1911, p. 19

BY MAXIMILIEN WINTER

**Principia Mathematica**, by A. N. Whitehead and B. Russell, i vol. in 8 of 666 p., Cambridge, *University Press*, 1911.<sup>11</sup> – The book Messrs. Whitehead and Russell have just published is the first of three volumes which comprises their work. This recasting of the theory of mathematical principles from the logicistic [logicist] point of view, is an extensive work and merits a deeper analysis and examination than could be given in a bibliographic note. But it is important to inform as quickly as possible those who study the logicistic doctrine of the appearance of this important work and to give them some indication of its contents. The first volume consists of an introduction and two parts. The first part is entitled: *Mathematical Logic*. The authors

examine here in order: the theory of deduction; the theory of apparent variables; classes and relations; the logic of relations; products and sums of classes. The second part has as its title: *Prolegomena to Cardinal Arithmetic*, it consists of the following sections: unit classes and couples; sub-classes, sub-relations, and relative types; one-many, many-one, and one-one relations; selections; inductive relations. We should mention in closing that the authors have separated their work from philosophical controversies; their exposition is made in a dogmatic form: “We have... avoided both controversy and general philosophy, and made our statements dogmatic in form.”<sup>12</sup>

**Principia Mathematica**, by A. N. Whitehead and B. Russell, volume I, Second edition i vol. in 8 of 674 p., Cambridge, *University Press*, 1925. – The supplement of the *Revue* analyzed (March 1911) the first edition of this famous work. The second edition reproduces the first; but the authors have added a forty-page introduction in which they summarize the main improvements in the domain of mathematical logic which have occurred in the last fifteen years. The subjects studied in this introduction are the following: molecular propositions, elementary functions of individuals, general propositions of limited scope, functions of variables, functions other than matrices, classes, mathematical induction. The most important contributions in mathematical logic these last fifteen years are, according to our authors, the works of Messrs. Hilbert, Bernays, Chwistek, H. Weyl, Brouwer, König, Lewis, H. M. Scheffer, J. Nicod, Schönwinckel.

In order to examine fruitfully the many difficult issues studied, it would require an extensive work on these issues; let us hope that the *Revue* will one day give this. Let us content ourselves in this bibliographic note, now that time elapsed (twenty years have passed since the discussions of Poincaré and Couturat) allows us to formulate an impartial judgment to indicate in a few words the importance of this current work.

No doubt Poincaré was correct, as opposed to Couturat, when he denied that symbolic logic would ever have a role analogous to that of the infinitesimal calculus, but he was wrong to conclude from this that it was of no importance at all for this reason. In the development of axiomatics due to Hilbert and his students, in the works of the Polish school of which the principle journal is *Fundamenta mathematica*, in the problems which recur in the *General Analysis* in Moore's sense, symbolic logic has been a powerful aid. It isn't enough, as some philosophers have done, to try, in order to lower the import of symbolic logic, to attach it to some old thesis of the Schools, in the manner of Aristotelianism, for example. The questions have changed considerably over these twenty-five centuries and must be examined by methods intrinsic to them. The fundamental role of symbolic logic in axiomatic research has been, moreover, made evident forcefully by Hilbert himself. The results that he, his students, the Polish school, Moore, and others have obtained establish the importance of the work of Messrs. Whitehead and Russell. We can only regret that, since the premature death of Couturat and Nicod, no one in France has followed the study of symbolic logic. Let us hope that these scholarly logicians will one day find followers here.

## Notes

<sup>11</sup>The actual publication date for Volume I was 1910.

<sup>12</sup>The French text reproduced this quotation in its original English.

---

*Have an idea for contributing to the Bulletin, whether by you or someone else? Write to the editor! See the footer for a link to contact us (or email the editors directly).*

---



Robyn Blumner, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Center for Inquiry, accepts the 2024 Bertrand Russell Society Award from BRS Board Member Tim Madigan. The award inscription reads: *“The Bertrand Russell Society Award for 2024 is presented to the Center for Inquiry for its unwavering support for freedom of thought, skeptical inquiry, and humanist principles.”*  
Source: Timothy Madigan, June 8, 2024

---

## Call for Papers: 52nd Meeting on May 16-18, 2025

The 52nd annual meeting of the Bertrand Russell Society will take place on May 16-18, 2025 in Bowling Green, Kentucky. The meeting will be locally organized by Landon D. C. Elkind (Western Kentucky University) and is co-sponsored by the Western Kentucky University Department of Political Science and Philosophy Club. Information about travel arrangements and logistics is posted here.

If you are interested in presenting a paper at the BRS Annual Meeting, please submit the paper through our website, at the following link: <https://bertrandrussellsociety.org/submissions/>.

Given that 2025 is the 100th anniversary of *Principia Mathematica's* second edition, submissions relating to *Principia Mathematica's* second edition are strongly encouraged. We of course welcome papers on any aspect of Russell's personal life and his thought, work, and legacy.

We also welcome proposals for other activities that might be appropriate for the meeting (e.g., a master class on a work by Russell). The abstract should be no longer than two paragraphs. The deadline for submission is **March 5th, 2025**.

---

## Call for Student Papers: David S. Goldman Student Essay Prize

The Bertrand Russell Society invites essay submissions for its David S. Goldman Student Paper Prize, which is awarded annually to the best essay in Russell studies submitted by a student (graduate or undergraduate). The Prize includes a free year of membership in the Society, plus registration, lodging, and a \$200 cash prize awarded at the Society's next annual meeting.

The Society has previously awarded a best paper by an undergraduate student and by a graduate student in the same year, and has recognized particularly exemplary runner-up submissions. The Society does not award a Student Paper Prize every year, but only in years where there is a sufficiently meritorious paper.

Essay submissions should deal with some as-

pect of Russell's life, work, or influence, and be of suitable length for a 25-to-35-minute presentation (including Q&A) at the annual meeting.

Student Paper Prize submissions should be emailed with a cover page including the paper's title and abstract, plus the author's name, email address, and institutional where they currently (or as recently as the fall semester) attended.

Submissions should be emailed as a PDF file with the subject line "BRS Student Essay Prize Submission" to Landon Elkind (chair of the program committee for the upcoming annual meeting) at [landon\[dot\]elkind\[at\]wku\[dot\]edu](mailto:landon[dot]elkind[at]wku[dot]edu).

Essay submissions are due by the call for papers deadline of **March 5th, 2025**.

## Time to Renew!

We encourage you to renew your membership in the Bertrand Russell Society! We are a group of academics, activists, and private individuals. What unites us is our abiding and shared interest in Russell's life, works, and values. We strive to preserve and promote Russell's legacy.

Membership in the Society gives you the right to decide our course in the stewardship of Russell's legacy. You get to vote in elections and at membership meetings, present papers at the annual meeting, engage in committees, stand for elected office, and discuss Society matters and Russelliana in our discussion list.

## Renewal draw!

If you renew your BRS membership by January 8th, 2024 (meaning the treasurer has received payment, whether by mail or online, by that date), then you will be entered into a drawing to win a free hardback copy (or e-book if you prefer) of *Bertrand Russell, Feminism, and Women Philosophers in His Circle* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2024), co-edited by Landon D. C. Elkind and Alexander Mugar Klein. Here is the book's description from the publisher:

This book examines Bertrand Russell's complicated relationships to the women around him, and to feminism more generally. The essays in this volume offer scholarly reassessments of these relationships and their import for the history of feminism and of analytic philosophy.

Russell is a founder of analytic philosophy. He has also been called a feminist due to his public, decades-long advocacy for women's rights and equality of the sexes. But his private behavior towards wives and sexual partners, and his apparently dismissive (occasionally public) responses to some women philosophers, raises the question of what sort of feminist (or chauvinist) Russell actually was.

Focusing on women in Russell's circle of acquaintance, including feminist activists and his philosophical interlocutors, this book casts new light on a timeless thinker's feminism and the women who played critical roles in the making of analytic philosophy.

*Remember:* if you purchase a gift membership for someone else, too, then you get entered an additional time (i.e. you are entered into the drawing once per membership purchase). Couple members are each entered for the drawing (or else the primary BRS member is entered twice).

Life members are also eligible for the drawing!

## Membership Rates

Membership rates (which were recently and substantially reduced) are as follows:

- Individual/Couple \$40/\$50
- Student/Student Couple \$10/\$20
- Retiree (or Limited Income)/Retiree (or Limited Income) Couple \$10/\$20
- Developing Economies/Developing Economies Couple \$10/\$20 (see here for countries **not** on this list)

- Trial Individual Membership \$30 (renewable once)
- Life Membership/Life Couple Membership \$1,000/\$1,250

## Benefits of Membership

The reduced membership rates still offer all the benefits of membership, including:

- a print and electronic subscription to Russell: the Journal of Bertrand Russell Studies
- belonging to a community united by our abiding and shared interest in Russell's life, works, and values
- rights to vote in elections and at membership meetings eligibility to present papers at the annual meeting
- the privilege to stand for officer and committee roles in the Society
- subscription to our discussion list and and Russelliana event series

You can join the BRS (or renew your membership) at this reduced rate [here](#).

---

## Russell Quote of the Issue

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

The first step in a fascist movement is the combination under an energetic leader of a number of men who possess more than the average share of leisure, brutality, and stupidity. The next step is to fascinate fools and muzzle the intelligent, by emotional excitement on the one hand and terrorism on the other. This technique is as old as the hills; it was practised in almost every Greek city, and the moderns have only enlarged its scale. But what I am concerned with is the reaction of modern liberal sentiment to this new attack on liberty. Does the principle of free speech require us to put no obstacle in the way of those who advocate its suppression? Does the principle of toleration require us to tolerate those who advocate intolerance? Public opinion, among those who dislike fascism, is divided on these questions, and has not arrived at any clear theory from which consistent answers could be derived. [...] But when, as in the case of the fascists, the aims of the rebels are fundamentally opposed to a governmental theory accepted by the majority, and when, further, it is obvious that violence is intended to be used at a suitable moment, there is every justification for preventing the growth of organized power in the hands of a rebellious minority. For if this is not done, internal peace is jeopardized, and the kind of community that most men desire can no longer be preserved. **Liberal principles will not survive of themselves; like all other principles, they require vigorous assertion when they are challenged.**

*“Freedom and Government”, 1940, CPBR 10 pp. 441-442*