

# THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY QUARTERLY

---

November, 1995

No. 88

---



## **The Bertrand Russell Society**

3802 North Kenneth Avenue, Chicago, IL 60641-2814, U.S.A.

The Bertrand Russell Society was founded in 1974 to foster a better understanding of Russell's work and to promote ideas and causes he thought important. The Society's motto is Russell's statement, "The good life is one inspired by love and guided by knowledge."

The Bertrand Russell Society Quarterly is published in February, May, August and November. Letters and manuscripts should be addressed to:

Michael J. Rockler  
529 14th Street, NW  
Suite 1125  
Washington, DC 20045

### **OFFICERS OF THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY**

Chair and Quarterly Editor	Michael J. Rockler
President	John Lenz
Vice President	John Shosky
Vice President/Information Emeritus	Lee Eisler
Secretary	Don Jackanicz
Treasurer	Dennis Darland

# THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY

QUARTERLY

*Newsletter of The Bertrand Russell Society*

---

November, 1995

No. 88

## CONTENTS

From the Editor .....	Michael J. Rockler .....	p. 1
From the President ....	John R. Lenz .....	p. 3
By-Laws of the Bertrand Russell Society .....		p. 5
By-Laws of the Bertrand Russell Society Board of Directors .....		p. 11
Bertrand Russell Society Business .....		p. 13
Report by John Shosky .....		p. 18
Corliss Lamont .....		p. 22
The Enduring Impact of Corliss Lamont ....	Shohig Sherry Terzian .....	p.24
Russell on The Design Argument for God's Existence .....	Matthew McKeon .....	p. 26
Bertrand Russell Rejected Religion .....	Larry Judkins .....	p. 29
Why I Am Not A Russellian .....	John Novak .....	p. 31
Bertrand Russell Library .....		p. 33

## From the Editor Michael J. Rockler

I recently read Alan Ryan's John Dewey and the High Tide of American Liberalism. In this volume Ryan provides readers with an in depth examination, analysis and summary of Dewey's work. In under four hundred pages, he offers many new perspectives on Dewey's life.

Alan Ryan is no stranger to members of the Bertrand Russell Society. His previous book, Bertrand Russell: A Political Life, received the Bertrand Russell Society book award a few years ago. Ryan participated in the annual meeting and added much to the proceedings by his presence.

The current issue of Free Inquiry contains a special section--"Russell Remembered"--commemorating the 25th anniversary of Russell's death. Ryan is one of the contributors to this publication.

Reading Ryan's book on Dewey points up again for me some of the interesting differences between John Dewey and Bertrand Russell. Both of these intellectual giants wrote about education, democracy, religion and nationalism. In each of these areas they differed in many ways.

Dewey can be viewed as the great exponent of process in education. For him, process was the most significant part of education--learning was primarily to be based on experience in ways that were meaningful to children. Progressive education emphasized learning by doing and for Dewey doing was the most important component of the equation.

Russell also recognized the importance of experiential education and he too can be viewed as a progressive educator (particularly in ways in which his school--Beacon Hill--was influenced by Dora Russell). But Russell was much more committed to the importance of content than was Dewey. Russell believed that process was important but the process had to focus on some clearly defined objective.

Dewey can be viewed as the great modern philosopher of democracy. He believed profoundly in collaborative life. Russell, I believe, had a more realistic view of the limits of democracy than did Dewey. He understood the possibility of the tyranny of the majority--even as he was imprisoned twice in his lifetime for holding unpopular views. While committed to democratic life, Russell urged us to be wary of the "herd instinct" which could lead to disastrous consequences. Russell's grandmother introduced him to the biblical passage that says "Do not follow a multitude to do evil." This phrase remained a guiding principle for all of Russell's life.

The differences between Dewey and Russell with regard to religion have been described many times. Dewey never totally abandoned his New England religious perspectives and must be ultimately labeled a religious humanist. Russell on the other hand was clearly a member of the great pantheon of secular humanist philosophers.

Ryan makes the convincing case that Dewey was a nationalist who wanted to achieve a melting pot in the United States by creating a fully national culture. Russell, on the other hand, was a citizen of the world believing in internationalism and attempting to promote it throughout his long life. Dewey's narrow nationalism was appalling to Russell.

In this issue we reprint an essay from Free Inquiry by John Novak entitled "Why I am not a Russellian." Novak is an officer of the John Dewey Society. His view of Russell from the perspective of a committed Deweyian makes for interesting reading.

The first issue of the new Bertrand Russell Society Quarterly has been well received. I appreciate the many positive comments I have heard. In order to continue to produce a quarterly every editor must depend on the readers for help. Please send me articles or other material for future issues. My predecessors, Lee Eisler and Don Jackanicz, knew that the input from members was critical. This continues to be true. Please submit material for the next issue.

## From the President

### John R. Lenz, President, The Bertrand Russell Society

With this issue of the Quarterly you are receiving initial notice of our 1996 annual meeting. We will meet here at Drew University in Madison, New Jersey, on the weekend of May 3-5, 1996. It's not too early (as I've learned) to begin planning.

After talking with several people, we've decided to try an earlier date than usual for the 1996 meeting. I see several advantages in meeting here while school is still in session. We have an opportunity to promote awareness of Russell among a university community. Students and faculty will be able to attend. We also hope to attract new speakers and visitors from the greater New York area.

Drew is a lovely, wooded campus, located only 30 minutes from Newark International Airport and easily accessible (in about one hour) from New York City by train or bus. Bertrand Russell Society sessions will be held in an historic neo-Classical mansion, Mead Hall, built in 1836. We will provide transportation to and from the Madison Hotel; this is a grand, fairly luxurious hotel located 1-1/2 miles from campus. (We are able to take advantage of the Drew rate for rooms there--nearly half of the usual). For those with physical limitations, or financial need, we also have reserved the guest apartment (with three bedrooms) on campus.

Nearby Morristown is home to a statue of Thomas Paine. In fact, Bertrand Russell, as a member and once Honorary President of the Thomas Paine Foundation, helped to erect it. (Perhaps someone would like to talk on the fascination British humanists have with Paine?)

We're arranging an interesting meeting. James Birx (a contributor to *Free Inquiry* magazine) will speak on "Russell and Evolution." Michael Rockler will lead a workshop on a work of Russell's fiction (to be distributed to all who register). Don Jackanicz plans to speak on Bertie's interests in art. John Shosky and Tim Madigan should return with their unique offerings. Tom Stanley has supplied a videotape of Russell's 1960 interviews with the BBC (published as *Bertrand Russell Speaks His Mind*). We're waiting to hear from some new people who would add interesting perspectives; I'll announce these in the next Quarterly. And, of course, please help to spread the word about our Prizes for Papers, one for undergraduates and one for graduate students' John Shosky (at American University) runs this program.

The Annual Meeting provides a unique opportunity for us to come together, express our shared values and interests, see old friends and meet new ones. I hope you will consider attending and encourage your friends in the New York area to visit, too. Please call or e-mail me with any questions or suggestions: 201-408-3275 or [jlenz@drew.edu](mailto:jlenz@drew.edu).

P.S. Congratulations to Jan Eisler on being elected (over stiff competition) to the Board of Directors of the American Humanist Association!

And thanks to Tom Stanley for setting up a preliminary Bertrand Russell Society home page on the World Wide Web (Bertie would have approved of the move into this frontier): <http://freenet.buffalo.edu/~bk553>.

E-mail addresses: We are compiling a list of e-mail addresses of our members. If you would like your e-mail address to be included please send it to [jlenz@drew.edu](mailto:jlenz@drew.edu).

# **Bylaws of The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc.**

## **Article 1. Name**

The name of this organization shall be The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc. It may also be referred to as "the Society" or "the BRS".

## **Article 2. Aims**

The aims of this Society are: (1) to promote interest in the life and work of Bertrand Russell; (2) to bring together persons interested in any aspect of the foregoing; (3) to promote causes that Russell championed.

## **Article 3. Motto**

The Society's motto shall be Russell's statement: "The good life is one inspired by love and guided by knowledge."

## **Article 4. Power and Authority**

Ultimate authority resides in the Members. The Members elect the Directors. The Directors elect the Officers. The Officers make decisions and take action.

## **Article 5. Membership**

Section 1. General. Membership in the Society shall be open to all persons and organizations interested in Bertrand Russell and the Society's activities. Types of membership shall be: Individual, Couple, Student, Limited Income, Life, Organization, and Honorary. Dues shall be set by the Board of Directors, and are to be paid annually. Life members shall pay dues only once in an amount set by the Board. Honorary members pay no dues. Life and Honorary memberships are for life unless terminated for cause, as specified hereafter.

Section 2. Individual Membership. Individual Membership shall be available to all persons.

Section 3. Couple Membership. Couple Membership shall be available to two persons sharing the same mail address. Each person shall have one vote; two mail ballots shall be sent, but only one copy of other Society mailings.

Section 4. Student Membership. Student membership shall be open to any student enrolled in an educational institution and who is less than 25 years old.

Section 5. Limited Income Membership. Limited Income Membership shall be available to a person who, as the name implies, is living on a limited income.



Section 6. Life Membership. Life Membership can be conferred on any person who meets the minimum dues set by the Board of Directors for Life Membership.

Section 7. Honorary Membership. Honorary Membership may be conferred on a person who has been nominated by a member and approved by two-thirds of the Directors voting, after having met one or more of the following conditions: (1) is a member of Bertrand Russell's family; (2) had worked closely with Russell in an important way; (3) has made a distinctive contribution to Russell scholarship; (4) has acted in support of a cause or idea that Russell championed; (5) has promoted awareness of Russell or of Russell's work; (6) has exhibited qualities of character (such as moral courage) reminiscent of Russell. Honorary Members have the same rights and responsibilities as Individual Members, but they pay no dues.

Section 8. Organization Membership. Membership of organizations--such as libraries, associations, corporations--is available upon payment of dues and approval of the President. Dues shall be higher than for a Couple. Organizations may not vote or be on the Board. Only one copy of Society mailings shall be sent.

Section 9. Conditions of Membership. Application for membership shall be made in writing, submitting name, address, and correct amount of dues. The Board may refuse an application, in which case the President must notify the applicant within 30 days, stating why the application was turned down.

Membership terminates when a member fails to pay dues, resigns, dies, or is expelled.

Any member--including Life or Honorary--may be expelled for seriously obstructing the Society's business, misappropriating the Society's name or funds or acting in a way that discredits the Society. The expulsion procedure consists of five steps:

Step 1. A formal expulsion proposal shall be presented in writing to the Board by any member.

Step 2. The Board shall examine the evidence. If a majority of the Board Members voting decides, either by mail ballot or at a meeting, that expulsion may be appropriate, the matter will be submitted to, and decided by, the members. This shall be done by mail, or at an Annual Meeting if one is scheduled within two months.

If it is to be done by mail:

Step 3. The case against the member shall be presented in the next newsletter or by a special mailing.

Step 4. In the following newsletter, or in a second special mailing, the accused member shall present a defense against the charge. A ballot shall be included in the second newsletter or second special mailing, so that members can vote on whether to expel.

If the expulsion process takes place at an Annual Meeting:

Step 4. The equivalent of Steps 3 and 4 shall be followed, that is, the case against the member shall be presented, after which the accused shall present his defense; and then the members present shall vote on whether to expel.

The President shall notify the accused member as soon as the result of the vote is known.

## **Article 6. The Board of Directors**

Section 1. Responsibilities. The Board of Directors (also referred to as "the Board") shall be responsible for Society affairs and policy, and shall elect the Officers. The Board shall be subject to these Bylaws and to the Bylaws of The Board of Directors of The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc.

Section 2. Constitution. The Board shall consist of not less than six nor more than 24 members. Society Officers are ex-officio members of the Board. Elected and ex-officio Board Members shall have the same rights and responsibilities.

Members may nominate candidates for the Board, or volunteer to be nominated as candidates. Directors are elected to three-year terms that start on January 1 of the following year; one-third are elected every year. Directors may be reelected. If a Director dies, resigns, or is expelled, the Board may fill the unexpired term with any member.

## **Article 7. Officers**

Section 1. General. The Society shall have the following Officers: President, Vice President, Treasurer, and Secretary. There may also be other Vice Presidents whose duties shall be specified by the Board. Officers shall be at least 18 years old and shall have been members for at least one year. They shall be elected by a majority of the Directors present and voting at the Board's Annual Meeting. An Officer's term of office lasts until the next election of Officers, the following year. No one shall hold more than one Office at a time, except that the same person shall be Secretary of the Society and Secretary of the Board. An Officer may be removed or suspended by a majority of the Board members voting. An Officer may resign by notifying the Chairman of Board in writing. If an Office becomes vacant, the Board shall elect a successor to fill the unexpired term. If an Officer is temporarily unable to serve, the Board may elect a temporary replacement.

Section 2. The President. The President shall be the Chief Executive Officer, coordinating the work of other Officers and Committees. Other Officers and Committee Chairmen shall consult the President about their activities, and submit a written report on their activities to him one month before the Annual Meeting, with a copy to the Chairman. The President

shall promptly inform the Chairman of any major decisions. After the Board has selected the site and time of the next Annual Meeting, or of a Special Meeting, the President shall be responsible for making all Meeting arrangements, including compiling the Meeting's agenda. The President shall chair the Meeting. The President shall report regularly, through the Bertrand Russell Society newsletter.

Section 3. The Vice President. The Vice President becomes President if the President's Office become vacant, and assumes the office temporarily if the vacancy is temporary. The Vice President shall assist the President as requested.

Section 4. The Secretary. The Secretary shall: (1) record the minutes of Society and Board meetings; (2) handle Society and Board correspondence; (3) maintain a permanent file of Society and Board meetings, Officers' and Committee Chairmen's reports, newsletters, correspondence; (4) maintain a permanent record of Society and Board decisions, rules, motions made and carried; (5) have custody of Society's corporate seal.

Section 5. The Treasurer. The Treasurer shall: (1) keep records of money received and spent; (2) safeguard Society funds; (3) invest funds, with Board approval; (4) submit an annual budget to the Board; (5) submit quarterly and annual reports, for publication in the Bertrand Russell Society newsletter.

Section 6. Other Vice Presidents. The Office of "Vice President/ . . ." may be created and filled by the Board. There is no connection between this Office and that of the Vice President.

## **Article 8. Committees**

Section 1. General. There shall be standing (permanent) and ad hoc (temporary) Committees. Each shall have a Chairman, and may have a Co-Chairman and other members. A member may serve on, or chair, more than one Committee. Committee Chairmen shall consult with the President about their activities, and describe them in a written report to the President one month before the Annual Meeting, with a copy to the Chairman.

Section 2. Committees. The Board shall establish standing and ad hoc Committees, and appoint their Chairmen who, in turn, appoint Committee Members. Each Committee shall provide the Secretary with a written statement of Committee aims and procedures.

## **Article 9. Meetings**

Section 1. Annual Meetings. The Society shall hold an Annual Meeting, at a time and site determined by the Board and in time to give the members at least two month's notice of the Meeting. As to time: it should suit the convenience of as many members as possible. As to site: it should be either

(a) near locations of special interest to the Bertrand Russell Society, or  
(b) near population centers having many members. Any member may propose agenda items, in writing, to the President, in advance of the Meeting. At Meetings, items may be added to the agenda with approval of the majority of the members present. Six members constitute a quorum.

Section 2. Special Meetings. Any member may write to the Chairman requesting a Special Meeting, claiming that an emergency exists requiring immediate action. The Chairman shall decide whether the request merits consideration by the Board; if it does, the Chairman shall promptly inform the Board, which shall decide, within three weeks, by mail ballot, whether, when and where to hold a Special meeting. The Special Meeting shall be held no later than six weeks after the Chairman's initial receipt of the request. The Chairman shall announce the Special Meeting to all members by letter, as soon as possible. A quorum shall consist of the members present.

Section 3. Board of Directors Meetings. The Board shall hold its Annual Meeting during the Society's Annual Meeting and at the same site. The Board may also hold Special Meetings, in accordance with its now By-laws. Board Meetings shall be open to Society members.

## **Article 10. Publications**

Section 1. Newsletter. The Society shall publish a newsletter at regular intervals.

Section 2. Other Publications. The Society may authorize other publications.

## **Article 11. Voting**

Section 1. General. All members, other than Organization Members, shall be entitled to vote. All votes shall have equal value. Members may vote by proxy. In contests of more than two candidates or choices, a plurality shall be sufficient.

Section 2. Voting by Mail. Voting may be by mail. Ballots shall be sent to all eligible members, either in the Bertrand Russell Society newsletter or by special mailing. The deadline for the return of ballots shall be not less than three weeks from the date ballots are mailed by first class mail, not less than four weeks if mailed third class. Ballots must go first class to Canada and Mexico, and by airmail to other foreign countries. Mail ballots shall be tallied by the Elections Committee, and verified by the Secretary. Ballots for the Board's voting by mail shall be tallied by the Chairman, and verified by the Secretary; the Chairman may designate a substitute for the Secretary.

## **Article 12. Amendments to these Bylaws**

**Section 1. Voting to Amend at a Meeting.** These Bylaws may be amended at a Society Meeting by a majority vote of those members present and voting.

**Section 2. Voting to Amend by Mail.** These Bylaws may also be amended by mail ballot. The proposed changes, with supporting arguments, will appear in the Bertrand Russell Society newsletter or a special mailing. In the following Bertrand Russell Society newsletter or second special mailing, other views, including opposing views, will appear, along with a mail ballot. To pass, the Amendment must be approved by a majority of the ballots cast.

# **Bylaws of the Board of Directors of The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc.**

## **Article 1. Responsibilities and Obligations**

The board of Directors (also referred to as "the Board") has these responsibilities: (1) to set policy for the Society's affairs, and (2) to elect officers of the Society and of the Board. The Board has these obligations: to be governed by these Bylaws and by the Society's Bylaws.

## **Article 2. Membership**

Membership shall be in accord with Article 5 of the Society's Bylaws.

## **Article 3. Officers**

Section 1. The Chairman. The Chairman shall be elected by a majority of the Directors present and voting at the Board's Annual Meeting. The Chairman's term of office shall start as soon as elected, and shall run till the next election, at the Annual Board Meeting the following year. The Chairman may be reelected. The Chairman presides at Board Meetings, and rules on procedure.

If the Chairman is absent, the Directors may elect an Acting Chairman. If the office of Chairman is vacant, the Directors shall elect a new Chairman as soon as possible, at an Annual or Special Meeting or by mail ballot. The votes shall be tallied by the Acting Chairman and verified by the Secretary. The Chairman may be removed from office by a majority of Directors present and voting at a meeting, with the Secretary presiding.

Section 2. The Secretary. The Secretary shall be elected by a majority of the Directors present and voting at the Board's Annual Meeting. The Secretary's term of office shall start as soon as elected, and shall run till the next election, at the Annual Board Meeting the following year. The Secretary may be reelected. The Secretary of the Board and the Secretary of the Society shall be the same person. If the Secretary is absent from a Meeting, the Chairman shall appoint an Acting Secretary.

## **Article 4. Voting**

Voting shall be in accord with Article 11 of the Society's Bylaws, except as follows: the Chairman's vote counts as one except in a tie, when it counts as two.

## **Article 5. Committees**

Committees may be created by the Board, to perform Board functions, and shall follow Board instructions.

## **Article 6. Meetings**

Section 1. Annual Board Meeting. The Board shall meet annually, at some time during a Society Annual Meeting, and at the same site. Society Members may attend Board Meetings.

Section 2. Special Board Meetings. A Special Board Meeting shall be called by the Chairman when at least three Directors request it, stating the purpose. In choosing the time and site, the Chairman shall aim to achieve the largest possible attendance by Directors.

Section 3. Agenda. The Agenda for Board Meetings shall be prepared by the Chairman. Additions to the Agenda may be made by any Director, with the concurrence of the Chairman.

Section 4. Quorum. The quorum for any Board Meetings is three Directors.

## **Article 7. Amendments to Board Bylaws**

Any Director may propose an amendment.

At an Annual or Special Meeting, a majority vote of the Directors present and voting shall carry the proposed amendment.

When an amendment is proposed by the Chairman, in writing, between Meetings, the Chairman shall decide whether to hold the proposal for the next Meeting or put it to an earlier vote by mail. For voting by mail, the Chairman shall promptly notify the Directors by a special mailing of the proposed amendment, with supporting arguments, requesting opposing arguments by 21 days after the date of mailing. Thereafter, the Chairman shall mail the opposing arguments, and a ballot, to the Directors, with a voting deadline of 21 days after the date of mailing. The votes shall be tallied by the Chairman, and verified by the Secretary, who shall notify the Directors of the outcome.

## **Bertrand Russell Society Business**

The following pages contain Society business that need your attention. Each page may be xeroxed and sent to the appropriate address.

### **SOCIETY BUSINESS INCLUDES:**

- 1) Membership Renewal
- 2) Board of Directors Election Ballot
- 3) Registration for the Annual Meeting  
(please note the change in the dates of the Annual Meeting)
- 4) Call for Papers



## ATTENTION, PLEASE

### BRS Dues Are Due January 1, 1996

Everyone's Bertrand Russell Society renewal dues are due January 1, 1996. The January 1st due-date applies to all members, including first-year members (excepting those who joined in the final quarter, i.e. October/November/December 1995).

The 1996 dues schedule in U.S. dollars: Regular Individual, \$35. Regular Couple (two persons at the same address), \$40. Student or Limited Income Individual, \$20. Limited Income Couple, \$25. Plus \$10 for any membership outside the U.S.A., Canada, and Mexico. Plus \$4 for any membership in Canada or Mexico.

Please remember that the BRS's financial condition is a continuing concern. There is no immediate financial crisis. But neither is there, as yet, the solid financial foundation that long-term survival requires. We ask those members who can afford to, to make an extra contribution when renewing membership by choosing one of the special membership categories on the renewal coupon below.

Please mail dues, payable to "Bertrand Russell Society" in U.S. dollars, to Bertrand Russell Society; c/o Dennis Darland, 1965 Winding Hills Drive, #1304, Davenport, IA 52807.

Thank you for renewing and for your contributions. And thank you for renewing early.

---

### RENEWAL COUPON

I am glad to be an early renewer, to ease the renewal process for the BRS.

And I hope to see the BRS continue to thrive for a long time to come. I have looked over the membership categories below, and chosen one that is right for my circumstances.

I have checked my membership category . . . . . and, if applicable, my foreign mailing category.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Student, \$20                    |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Income, Individual, \$20 |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Income, Couple, \$25     | <input type="checkbox"/> Plus \$10 if outside U.S.A.<br>Canada, and Mexico |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regular Individual, \$35         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regular Couple, \$40             |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contributor, \$40                | <input type="checkbox"/> Plus \$4 if in Canada or if<br>in Mexico          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sustainer, \$50                  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor, \$100 and up            |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Patron, \$250 and up             |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Benefactor, \$500 and up         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Life Member, \$1000 and up       |  |

I enclose my dues, in U.S. dollars, payable to "Bertrand Russell Society."

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS BALLOT**  
**Vote for Eight**  
**(3 Year Term January 1, 1996 - December 31, 1998)**

James Alouf \_\_\_\_\_

Linda Egendorf \_\_\_\_\_

Donald Jackanicz \_\_\_\_\_

Marvin Kohl \_\_\_\_\_

Tim Madigan \_\_\_\_\_

Michael Rockler \_\_\_\_\_

Warren Allen Smith \_\_\_\_\_

Ramon Suzara \_\_\_\_\_

Thom Weidlich \_\_\_\_\_

Return To: Donald Jackanicz  
Bertrand Russell Society - Secretary  
3802 North Kenneth Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60641

*Please return by December 15, 1995*

**Register Early for  
THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY'S  
ANNUAL MEETING, 1996:  
"The Humanism of Bertrand Russell"**

- Dates:** Friday, May 3 to Sunday, May 5, 1996
- Place:** Drew University, Madison, New Jersey. Easily accessible from Newark International Airport and New York City. A map and directions will be included with the February Quarterly.
- Lodging:** The Madison Hotel, Morristown, NJ. Reserve your rooms directly with them. We enjoy the special rate for Drew University; this is to be set shortly and is expected to be about \$79 per room (single or double). Call them at: 201-285-1800 (fax 201-540-8566), and tell them you are with the Drew party reserved by John Lenz (they don't know Russell, unfortunately; the meeting is being co-sponsored by Drew's Depts. of Classics and Philosophy). We will provide transportation from the hotel, on the same street as the school, 1-1/2 miles away.  
For those with physical limitations, or financial need, we also have a three-bedroom guest-apartment on campus; contact John Lenz.
- Information:** Contact John Lenz at 201-408-3275 or jlenz@drew.edu.
- To register:** The registration fee of \$75 per person includes the banquet on Saturday night, the Red Hackle hour, coffee and snacks, a copy of the text for the workshop, and all other activities and fees.

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Phone or e-mail:** \_\_\_\_\_

Please make out checks to John Lenz and send to:  
John R. Lenz, 38-B Loantaka Way, Madison, NJ 07940.

**Call for Papers**  
**(Deadline: March 1, 1996):**  
**Prizes for Papers Program of the Bertrand Russell Society**

The Bertrand Russell Society is offering PRIZES FOR PAPERS for the fourth consecutive year. We award two prizes annually for the best new papers, one by an undergraduate and one by a "young professional" (graduate student, junior professor, or non-academic).

The Prize-winners will present their papers at the Society's next Annual Meeting, to be held at Drew University in Madison, NJ, May 3-5, 1996. All expenses will be paid, including travel, lodging, and meals. (Winners from outside North America will receive a portion of their airfare.) Each Prize also includes a first-year membership in The Bertrand Russell Society. This includes subscriptions to The Bertrand Russell Society quarterly and to the semi-annual academic journal, *Russell*, published by the Russell Archives at McMaster University.

Papers can be on any aspect of Russell's life, work, or influence. They must be suitable for presentation to a general audience. They may be broad or narrow in scope and in any of the many fields that interested Russell: logic, mathematics, ethics, history, politics, religion, education, peace, nuclear war, history of ideas, etc., etc., or on Russell's relations with his contemporaries.

Papers should be designed for a presentation of 30 to 40 minutes, that is, about 15 double-spaced pages of text. Submit a complete or nearly complete paper, not an abstract. State that you would, if chosen, attend the 1996 Annual Meeting. Those who have previously appeared on an Annual Meeting program are not eligible.

Submit your paper by MARCH 1, 1996 to Prof. John Shosky, Dept. of Philosophy and Religion, The American University, 4400 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20016-8056. Phone: 703-660-9279; fax: 703-660-9871.

**Report by John Shosky**  
**Department of Philosophy and Religion**  
**The American University**  
**on the**  
**"Russell and the Origins of Analytical Philosophy"**  
**Conference**  
**University of Southampton -- United Kingdom**  
**July 14-16, 1995**

Several members of the society have urged me to write a report on this summer's Russell conference at the University of Southampton. OK, here goes.

Entitled, "Russell and the Origins of Analytical Philosophy", the conference was a superbly organized event drawing participants from the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Germany, France, Spain, Greece, Israel, Canada, the United States, Australia, and New Zealand. The organizer was Ray Monk, author of the well-received Wittgenstein: The Duty of Genius. Evidently motivated by his research on an up-coming two volume philosophical biography of Russell, Monk scheduled an all star line-up of speakers -- each distinguished in Russellian studies and each well-versed in Russell's early work.

In fact, this conference was another reminder that the renaissance in Russellian scholarship has been propelled by new discoveries in the Russell of 1899 through 1910, in large measure energized by the work of Peter Hylton, Francisco Rodriquez-Consuegra, and, especially, Nick Grif-fin. The attendance of all three at this event speaks well for Monk's organizational and persuasive abilities.

The conference began on Friday evening, July 14, with a fine presentation by Louis Greenspan of McMaster University, speaking about "Russell on the Philosophical Canon". I was very impressed with this lecture. Greenspan spoke of the excellent scholarship often found in the Russell's A History of Western Philosophy, a much-maligned book. Greenspan and I spoke afterwards about the need for a more balanced view of this book, and I applauded his courage in defending what many people would regard as nothing more than a propaganda piece for empiricism (I've even heard worse descriptions).

After dinner, there was a choice of two sessions. The decision on which to attend was agonizing. I passed up Ivor Grattan-Guinness of Middlesex University speaking on "Where is the Mathematics in Logicism", even though I admire him enormously. However, I felt this might be my only chance to hear Francisco Rodriquez-Consuegra of Valencia University. He spoke on "Russell's Perilous Journey from Atomism to Holism",

displaying a broad understanding of Russell's use of methodology and a strong sympathy of the difficulties encountered by Russell on his philosophical quest. I must add that Professor Rodriguez-Consuegra was very modest about his scholarship. However, he is a fine student of Russell. He is also the vanguard of a renewed interest of Russell on the European continent.

The next day, Saturday, July 15, began with a stunning presentation by Peter Hylton of the University of Illinois. Discussing "Concepts and Propositions", he took his audience on a whirl-wind survey of Russell's work on meaning and propositions. I wish I could tell you more. But I had a hard time following the paper due to my own deficiencies in scholarship. This was a paradigm example of a great conference paper and an equally impressive presentation. When he was finished I made a vow to re-double my own work back at American University because Professor Hylton is setting a fast pace.

Again, a choice followed: either Anthony Palmer of the University of Southampton speaking on "the Complex Problem" or Harold Noonan of the University of Birmingham discussing "The Gray's Elegy Argument -- and Others". I chose the latter because of the recent plethora of journal articles on the Gray's Elegy argument in On Denoting. Also, I had just finished teaching a graduate class at American on the "origins of Analytical Philosophy", where we covered On Denoting in some detail. But I learned in Noonan's presentation that my students and I had only scratched the surface, especially given the complexity of the "Gray's Elegy" example, and its distinctive nature compared to other examples in On Denoting offered by Russell.

Again, another choice -- Greg Landini of the University of Iowa on "Will the Real Principia Please Stand Up: Reflections on the Formal Logic of Principia Mathematica" or Anthony Grayling of Birkbeck College, Oxford, on "Complex Symbols, Meanings and Facts". And, again an utterly tragic choice. I very much wanted to hear both speakers on these topics. After much useless debate I simply decided to walk into the nearest room and hear whomever was speaking. This turned out to be Professor Grayling, the author of an up-coming book on Russell in the Past Masters Series. He was brilliant, outlining Russell's early positions on logic and language. His new book promises to be a valuable contribution. I only hope that I get to hear Landidni at another time.

My evolving decision rules on speakers was again tested by a choice between C.W. Kilmister of Kings College, London, addressing "A Certain Knowledge? Russell's Mathematics and Logical Analysis" or Charles Pigden from the University of Otago in New Zealand speaking about "Russell on Ethics". Pigden is evidently well-known for his prolific analysis of Russell on the information highway. I can believe the fantastic stories I heard,

because in discussion after the papers he displayed an encyclopedic knowledge about Russell and all things connected with Russell, i.e., reviews of his books, responses to his articles, etc. In this case, however, logic won out over morality, and I went to hear Professor Kilmister. He carefully demonstrated Russell's mathematical and logical development, linking it into the instruction Russell received in his student days. Kilmister may have received the ultimate one-ups--manship conference medal with his explanation of a mathematical paradox that forced Grattan-Guinness to exclaim, "I've never heard of that before." One sign of a good lecture is when Griffin and Grattan-Guinness are both taking notes. Kilmister kept their pens moving.

After a reception hosted by the Southampton Philosophy Department, a Gala Dinner followed, featuring Russell's daughter Katharine Tait as speaker. She was gracious, delightful, and genuinely pleased that all of us cared so much about her father's work.

Then, after dinner, Mark Sainsbury of Kings College, London, and Stewart Candish of the University of Western Australia presented a symposium on "Russell's Theories of Judgment". This symposium was great, with fresh insight on Russell's troublesome, persistent difficulties in his attempts to define, explain, and analyze our beliefs.

I must confess that I visited the many pubs that outline the Southampton campus that evening. As I enjoyed this hospitality and local brew of each establishment, I marvelled at the commitment and talent of each speaker. These presentations were motivating, but they were also humbling. There are a lot of great minds working on Russell, and these outstanding presentations demonstrate that careful research can still add vastly to Russell scholarship. And I must add that, for me, Russell is often best understood after a beer or two (legal and appropriate hours of consumption only).

The last day, Sunday, July 16, featured two presentations back-to-back: Nick Griffin of McMaster tackling "On Denoting Concepts" and Ray Monk of the University of Southampton concluding with "What is Analytical Philosophy?". Both speakers are well-known to the readers of the Russell Quarterly and need no introduction from me. Their lectures were an appropriate and resounding exclamation point at the end of the conference.

OK, I know -- you wished you were there. Well, again, thanks to Monk, you can be. Ray has arranged for publication of all of the conference papers. I do not know who the publisher is, although I suspect it will probably be Routledge or Thoemmes Press. However, you might look for this publication in a few months. It should be part of any serious library on Russell.

One important note: Almost every presentation I heard contained references to the Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell. The Russell

editorial project is re-invigorating and re-defining Russellian studies. A scholar cannot be on the cutting-edge of Russell's contributions to philosophy without a careful grounding in the published volumes of the Collected Papers. I returned home determined to cough-up the big bucks to buy those volumes which I do not possess, because, as expensive as they have become, the Collected Papers are indispensable. The new three volume A Bibliography of Bertrand Russell by Blackwell, Ruja, and Turcon is also a must.

Russell Society President John Lenz wrote a congratulatory letter to Monk, expressing the pleasure of the society with this important, historic conference.

Personally, I was honored to attend. I hope someday we can offer a similar conference on this side of the Atlantic, and that the society will be one of the sponsors. If so, I suggest that we do not schedule two presentations at the same time. Those kinds of decisions even Russell couldn't comfortably adjudicate.



## Corliss Lamont (1902-1995)

Corliss Lamont died on Wednesday, April 26 at the age of 93. Lamont was a true contemporary Russellian. He was an author, teacher and humanist philosopher. During the ignoble period of McCarthyism in the United States, Lamont stood steadfastly against the redbaiting hysteria that engulfed the country. Like Russell, Lamont never followed a multitude to do evil.

Lamont's career spanned much of the twentieth century. He wrote sixteen books and hundreds of pamphlets on subjects related to humanism and civil liberties. Lamont taught at Harvard as well as at Cornell and Columbia. He also served as a director of the American Civil Liberties Union for more than two decades. He opposed the Vietnam war and ran twice for the United States Senate.

In his 1981 autobiography, Yes to Life, he wrote:

My final word is that in the battles that confront us today for America's freedom and welfare, our chief aim as public-spirited citizens must be neither to avoid trouble, nor to stay out of jail, nor even to preserve our lives, but to keep on fighting for our fundamental principles and ideas.

The Philosophy of Humanism, published in 1949, remains a standard text for understanding the humanist perspective. Other books include: The Illusion of Immortality (1935) and The Peoples of the Soviet Union (1946).

The New York Times concluded its obituary of Corliss Lamont with the following paragraphs:

Corliss Lamont was born on May 28, 1902 in Englewood, N.J., where he grew up near the summit of the Palisades overlooking the Hudson River and Manhattan. He graduated from Phillips Exeter in 1920 and from Harvard in 1924 with a bachelor's degree and high honors. After a year at Oxford University in England, he became a philosophy lecturer at Columbia in 1932, earned a doctor of philosophy degree there.

Dr. Lamont's 1928 marriage to Margaret Hayes Irish, a writer who was co-author of his first book on the Soviet Union, "Russia Day by Day," (1933) ended in divorce. His second wife, Helen Lamb who he married in 1962, died in 1975. His third wife, Beth Keehner, who he married in 1986, survives him.

In the Fall, 1995 issue of Free Inquiry, Paul Kurtz writes:

Corliss Lamont was an heroic defender of the philosophy of humanism. He was a secular and not a

religious humanist. He believed that one could live the authentic life here and now without deity; and that this was possible through the use of reason and science.

Corliss Lamont honored the Bertrand Russell Society by participating in an annual meeting. His life represents some of the highest values espoused by Bertrand Russell. He will truly be missed by the skeptical and rational community.

## The Enduring Impact of Corliss Lamont

by

Shohig Sherry Terzian

Corliss Lamont was an American original yet a Renaissance man of scholarship and action. From childhood on, he said Yes to Life. His widespread empathies and international interests are explored with zest. In a study of American eminence, he is categorized as the firebrand stepson of JP Morgan & Co.! (WHO; the Story of Who's WHO in America, by Cedric A. Larson, 1958).

The similarities between Corliss Lamont and Bertrand Russell are striking. They were among the elite by birthright, coming from the upper classes and supported by inherited wealth which they both utilized to back their affirmation of life. And they both were inveterate and indefatigable letter writers.

Dr. Lamont considered Russell to be the world's leading representative of the Humanist philosophy which he espoused. He called Russell a modern Socrates, continually challenging the shibboleths of Establishments. At one time, Russell received both moral and financial support from Lamont for his expose of crimes in Vietnam. Incidentally, long before McNamara's revelations, Corliss Lamont was vindicated when his Harvard classmate, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, attested that the U.S. erred in participating in that conflict.

Philosopher George Santayana was another favorite of Dr. Lamont's (and mine, too!) His exchange of letters with Santayana began in 1935 and continued well into the last year of Santayana's life in September, 1952. In a basic pamphlet entitled "The Enduring Impact of George Santayana," Dr. Lamont describes his visits with GS in Rome at the Convent of the Blue Sisters near the Colosseum. I often relive these meetings between the two for I had occasion to retrace his steps walking up the narrow cobblestoned Via Santo Stefano Romao to the outside gate of the Convent. I happened to be in Rome in October, 1986 participating in the international conference of the World Psychiatric Association. I had a hard time trying to locate the exact location of the Convent but I was determined to pay my respects to GS. We shared a table in a modest restaurant near our hotel, the Cicerone, with two kindly priests. Both knew exactly where it was and gave us specific directions in getting to our destination.

We were greeted by a kindly Sister who had taken care of GS during his final year. She was elated when I told her that GS had mentioned the gracious Sisters who were looking after his welfare. Is it any wonder that I often reread Dr. Lamont's "Enduring Impact of George Santayana"?

Each time I feel as though Dr. Lamont followed in GS's footsteps with his own enduring impact which will continue to serve as an inspiration to us all.

Dr. Lamont also edited and contributed to Dialogues on GS and helped initiate the GS collection at Columbia University. He ranked Russell and Santayana as two of the 20th century's most readable philosophers. I surely regret that circumstances prevented me from accepting his kind invitation for lunch at the onset of our correspondence. I know that I would have fallen under his spell!

## Russell on the Design Argument for God's Existence by Matthew McKeon

In, *God And The New Cosmology*,<sup>1</sup> M.A. Corey argues that recent cosmological research suggests that the universe was designed for human existence. He believes that the Design Argument for God's existence, buttressed by the physical evidence, provides a solid basis for natural theology. In a nutshell, physicists have discovered further complex cosmological requirements for the existence of human beings. These discoveries, coupled with the high improbability of the life-supporting characteristics of the universe occurring by chance, demand an explanation. Corey argues that the best explanation is that the universe was created by a designer for the purpose of evolving human beings.

Corey refers to one of Russell's criticisms of the Design Argument in *Science and Religion*. In this paper, I seek to show that Corey misrepresents Russell's remarks, and in so doing fails to countenance Russell's criticism of the Design Argument which is relevant to Corey's position.

Corey acknowledges that one problem with any version of the Design Argument is, "... the tremendous amount of time it took after the Big Bang for humans to appear and to rise to any degree of significance on this planet."<sup>2</sup> The following comments by Russell are offered as a representative formulation of the problem.

Why should the best things in the history of the world [such as life and mind] come late rather than early? Would not the reverse order have done just as well? . . . Before the Copernican revolution, it was natural to suppose that God's purposes were specially concerned with the earth, but now this has become an unpalatable hypothesis. If the purpose of the Cosmos is to evolve mind, we must regard it as rather incompetent in having produced so little in such a long time.<sup>3</sup>

These remarks are a part of Russell's critique, in *Science and Religion*, of a pantheistic view of the creator. Briefly, Russell characterizes the pantheistic creator as one that is, "not external to the universe, but is merely the universe considered as a whole. There cannot therefore be an act of creation, but there is a kind of creative force *in* the universe, which causes it to develop according to a plan which this creative force may be said to have in mind throughout the process."<sup>4</sup> If the plan is to create human life, then the fact that the evolutionary process took approximately 15 billion years suggests that this "creative force" is fairly inept. Corey's rebuttal to this objection is based on a new cosmological understanding of the universe.

There is a minimum cosmological time that it takes to produce a world where intelligent life forms can develop

through normal evolutionary pathways. These evolutionary pathways are themselves divided into three separate cosmic epochs: 1) an initial stellar synthesis epoch, wherein the heavier organic elements upon which life depends, such as carbon, oxygen, and iron, are synthesized deep within stellar interiors over approximately 10 billion years of time, 2) an intermediate epoch, wherein these heavier elements are spewed into space by huge supernova explosions, and are then allowed to crystallize into concrete solar systems, and 3) a final biosynthesis epoch, wherein life gradually evolves into progressively more complex forms over billions of years of organic evolution.

When the minimum times for these major cosmic epochs are calculated, we find that the minimum age for the development of intelligent life is approximately 15 billion years, which is also the estimated age of our present universe. If anything, the age of the universe can be used as evidence for . . . the existence of a Grand Designer for the following reason: if the evolution of the universe were merely a random event, one would never expect it to happen just as soon as it possibly could.<sup>5</sup>

Assuming for the sake of argument that this is correct, the rebuttal seems to meet the difficulty Russell points to in the cited passage from *Religion and Science*. However, Corey's rebuttal is besides the point since Russell's remarks are aimed at a pantheistic view of the creator and Corey does not subscribe to this view. Corey believes that God is a personal being who is omnipotent, omniscient, and "the most sublime of all realities."<sup>6</sup> Russell's criticism of the Design Argument as a defense for the existence of this type of creator can be found a few pages earlier in *Religion and Science*.

A man who desires a house cannot, except in the Arabian Nights, have it rise before him as a result of his mere wish; time and labor must be expended before his wish can be gratified. But Omnipotence is a subject to no such limitations. If God really thinks well of the human race. . . , why not proceed, as in Genesis, to create man at once?<sup>7</sup>

The difficulty of explaining the necessity of evolution of *any temporal length* in the plans of a designer who is at least omnipotent and omniscient is a common theme of Russell's criticism of the Design Argument in his writings on God and religion. For example, in *The Value of Free Thought*, Russell writes,

Design implies the necessity of using means, which does not exist for omnipotence. When we desire a house, we

have to go through the labor of building it, but Aladdin's genie could cause a palace to exist by magic. The long process of evolution might be necessary to a divine Artificer who found matter already in existence, and had to struggle to bring order out of chaos. But to the God of Genesis and of orthodox theology no such laborious process was needed; no gradual process, no adaptation of means to ends, was required by a being who could say: Let there be light, and there was light. The vast astronomical ages before life existed may have been inevitable for a finite Deity working in a reluctant material, but for Omnipotence they would have been a gratuitous waste of time.<sup>8</sup>

Furthermore, as Russell notes, there is nothing known about the universe that rules out that God is not omnipotent and must struggle against the forces of nature to carry out His plans. I believe that Russell exposes a central problem with using the Design Argument to ground belief in the existence of a creator. At best, the argument establishes the existence of a creator who is greatly more powerful and intelligent than ourselves. But such power and intelligence may fall short of omnipotence and omniscience. The argument says even less about the degree of benevolence of the designer.<sup>9</sup> What features of the universe provide compelling evidence for the existence of the creator as depicted by Corey?

In sum, granting for the sake of argument that cosmological evidence confirms that (1) it would take a universe as old as our own just to evolve human beings, it follows that (2) the age of our universe is perfectly compatible with the existence of a creator only if, as acknowledged by Corey<sup>10</sup>, (3) life must evolve through natural evolutionary pathways. The gist of the criticism in *Religion and Science*, missed by Corey, is that (3) seems false if the creator is omnipotent, and so (1) is not a good reason for thinking that (2) is true on Corey's understanding of the creator. I think that Russell would accept (2) on the view of a non-omnipotent creator, but perhaps he would stress that the age and the structure of the universe is compatible with the existence of a creator unworthy of devotion and worship.

<sup>1</sup>M.A. Corey, *God And The New Cosmology*, (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1993).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid, 233.

<sup>3</sup>Bertrand Russell, *Science and Religion*, (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1935) 221 and 227.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid, 200.

<sup>5</sup>Op. cit. note 1, 55-56. Corey cites John Barrow and Frank Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986) 385.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid, 256, and 237.

<sup>7</sup>Op. cit. note 3, 203.

<sup>8</sup>Bertrand Russell, "The Value of Free Thought" in *Bertrand Russell on God and Religion*, ed. by Al Seckel (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1986) 239-269, 258.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid 261.

<sup>10</sup>Op. cit. note 1, 234.

## Bertrand Russell Rejected Religion by Larry Judkins

I am often asked how I came to be an atheist.

Actually, my atheism was the result of a very gradual evolution rather than a sudden conversion. Throughout my childhood and especially my teen years, I slowly but steadily became more and more skeptical of orthodox religion in general, and Christianity in particular.

I was 19 years old when I finally crossed the imaginary line separating an extremely liberal (and vague) form of religious belief from unbelief, and became a true atheist. This was the result of reading a collection of essays in a book titled *Why I Am Not a Christian* by the philosopher Bertrand Russell.

At the time, the essays of Lord Russell (he was an English lord) were the most radical--and rational--words I had ever read on the subject of religion. Of course, in the 19 years since that time, I have read countless books and essays that make *Why I Am Not a Christian* seem mild by comparison.

Nevertheless, I am still in complete agreement with Lord Russell's basic outlook concerning religion as expressed in *Why I Am Not a Christian*--specifically, that "all the great religions of the world . . . [are] both untrue and harmful." Like Lord Russell, I regard religion "as a disease born of fear and as a source of untold misery to the human race."

Unfortunately, there is one area of Lord Russell's philosophy of religion in which he was very inconsistent: Lord Russell sometimes referred to himself as an agnostic and sometimes as an atheist.

He freely admitted that he was confused as to which term more accurately represented his views. One such confession of uncertainty can be found in the essay, "Am I an Atheist or an Agnostic?" in the book *Bertrand Russell on God and Religion*.

Another such confession can be found in *Dear Bertrand Russell: A Selection of His Correspondence with the General Public*. On page 5 is a letter to Lord Russell asking him whether he considers himself an atheist or an agnostic.

In response, Lord Russell wrote, "I do not wonder that you. . . are in doubt as to whether to call me an atheist or an agnostic as I am myself in doubt upon this point and call myself sometimes the one and sometimes the other. I think that in philosophical strictness at the level where one doubts the existence of material objects and holds that the world may have existed for only five minutes, I ought to call myself an agnostic; but, for all practical purposes, I am an atheist. I do not think the existence of the Christian God any more probable than the existence of the Gods Olympus or Vahalla . . ."



Lord Russell's confusion upon this matter stemmed from the fact that he misunderstood the true nature of atheism and incorrectly perceived agnosticism to be a "middle ground" between atheism and theism. According to Lord Russell in his essay "What Is an Agnostic?" (*Bertrand Russell on God and Religion*), "A atheist, like a Christian, holds that we *can* know whether or not there is a God. The Christian holds that we can know there is a God; the atheist, that we can know there is not."

Lord Russell continued. "The agnostic suspends judgment, saying that there are not sufficient grounds either for affirmation or for denial." Therefore, an agnostic is neither an atheist nor a theist.

The problem with this is that very few atheists maintain that an atheist is one who knows that God does not exist. Instead, they define an atheist as one who lacks belief in the existence of God.

Belief, of course, is altogether different from knowledge. Since everyone must either have a belief in God or lack such belief, all agnostics must also be either atheists or theists.

Bertrand Russell, who readily admitted that he did not know whether or not a God exists, was clearly an agnostic. However, he was also clearly an atheist, since it is obvious that he lacked belief in the existence of God.

Bertrand Russell was born on May 18, 1872. During his long life (he died February 2, 1970), he wrote dozens of books and composed literally hundreds of shorter works. In 1950, he won the Nobel Prize for Literature.

Those interested in studying the intellectual objections to religion would do well to begin with the works of Lord Russell mentioned above.

*Larry Judkins is a resident of Orlando and longtime member of the Bertrand Russell Society.*

## Why I Am Not a Russellian

by John M. Novak

*Reprinted from Free Inquiry, Fall, 1995, with permission.*

Bertrand Russell is certainly an important humanist. As a philosopher, social activist, and educator he has been an inspiring figure, willing to take strong stands and pay the consequences for being a freethinker in a world in which expressive freedom and penetrating thought were usually only linked rhetorically. I still turn to his essays for insights, humor, incisive comments, food for thought--and am seldom disappointed. However, in spite of my admiration for Russellian intellect, prose, and life stance, I find that his humanism does not run deep enough and his approach to education and society is more idiosyncratic than substantive. Allow me to briefly elaborate.

As I see it, a humanist is someone who realizes we cannot escape the human perspective and so tries to savor, understand, and better this human outlook. This humanist perspective can be stated this way: Since we cannot isolate ourselves from human experiences, how can we get more out of them? Russell certainly was able to savor human experiences and was committed to clearly denouncing that which he felt got in the way of human betterment. However, in my estimation, he succumbs to a subtle transcendental temptation in his understanding of the human perspective. Quite simply, at some basic level, Russell thinks that humans have immaculate receptions of knowledge--immediate knowledge of atomistic aspects of reality.<sup>1</sup> These atomistic perceptions are thus the foundation for certain knowledge. This enables Russell and others who hold this view to have a type of incisive certainty and cut to the bone on some basic knowledge issues.

As appealing as this claim for foundational certainty is, there is another point of view. That is, that life is messier and that human perception does not have this privileged access to knowledge; knowledge claims regarding the empirical world are always inferential. In actuality, all knowledge is mediated, that is, constructed from some perspective within problematic situations. Thus, experience is always occurring in some context and must be filtered through some perspective to become knowledge.

This constructed view of knowledge doesn't mean that there isn't a reality "out there," only that we do not have direct knowledge of the "out there." The defensible contracts we make with the "out there" and call knowledge are always mediated, partial, and from a certain perspective. This not "New Age--you make your own reality," but rather a fundamental realization that the knowledge we have is not immediate, immaculate, or immune from bias. My objection to Russell is that his view of the immediate knowledge claim of certain types of experiences misses the actual human process

of knowledge-making, and thus diminishes a deeper understanding of the human perspective and, ultimately, human possibilities.

In the realms of the social and the educational, Russell engaged in a variety of progressive projects. In spite of his vigor and courage, however, I do not see how this activity in these areas connected with his work in philosophy.<sup>2</sup> As I see it, Russell saw philosophy as purer than the activities of everyday life. When engaging in the impurities of life, he tended to follow some personal intuitions and passions. As powerful as these were, they are of limited use to others in trying to construct a principled social and educational philosophy. Intuitions and passions need to be heavily supplemented to deal with social and educational complexities. Russell's rather narrow work in philoso-supplement.

Bertrand Russell supplies a courageous and energetic supplement to a self-correcting humanist perspective. He provides some spicy food for thought that is good in doses, but cannot serve as a steady diet. I'd invite him to my house to occasionally prepare a meal and help clean out the refrigerator, but not to plan my life-long philosophical menu.

#### Notes

1. This point is made in great detail in *Dewey*, by J.E. Tiles (London: Routledge, 1988) and more recently by Tom Burke in *Dewey's New Logic: A Reply to Russell* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).
2. I am not alone in my perception of Russell's philosophy being ir relevant or at odds with his politics. Alan Ryan, author of *Bertrand Russell: A Political Life*, makes this same point in *John Dewey and the High Tide of American Liberalism* (New York: Norton, 1995).

**John Novak is professor of education at Brock University in St. Catharines Ontario and editor of *Insights*, the newsletter of the John Dewey Society.**

## BRS LIBRARY

The Society library sells and lends books, audiotapes, videotapes, and other materials by and about Russell. Please direct library inquiries and requests to Tom Stanley, Box 434, Wilder, VT 05088 (tom.stanley@infoport.com).

**Books for sale** H-Cloth, otherwise paperback. Prices are postpaid. Please send check or money order (U.S. funds only) payable to the "Bertrand Russell Society" to Tom Stanley.

### *By Bertrand Russell:*

Appeal to the American Conscience .....	Spokesman .....	\$3.50
Authority and the Individual .....	Unwin-Hyman .....	7.95
Has Man a Future? .....	Allen & Unwin .....	H 8.00
History of the World in Epitome .....	Spokesman .....	1.00
In Praise of Idleness .....	Routledge .....	8.95
My Philosophical Development .....	Uwin-Hyman .....	7.95
Political Ideal .....	Unwin-Hyman .....	7.95
Power: A New Social Analysis .....	Routledge .....	8.95
Principles of Social Reconstruction .....	Unwin-Hyman .....	7.95
Skeptical Essays .....	Routledge .....	8.95

### *By Other Authors:*

Bertrand Russell by John Slater .....	Thoemmes Press .....	\$19.00
Bertrand Russell, 1872-1970 .....	Spokesman .....	1.50
Bertrand Russell's America, Vol. 2, 1945-1970 edited by Barry Feinberg and Ronald Kasrils .....	South End Press .....	9.95
Liberty and Social Transformation: A Study in Bertrand Russell's Political Thought by Chandrakala Padia	Heritage Publishers H.	11.50
The Life of Bertrand Russell in Pictures and His Own Words, edited by Christopher Farley and David Hodgson .	Spokesman .....	10.95
The Selected Letters of Bertrand Russell, Vol. I, The Private Years (1884-1914) by Nicholas Griffin .....	Houghton-Mifflin ..	H. 17.50

The library has a small supply of Caroline Moorehead's BERTRAND RUSSELL: A LIFE--for sale for \$14.00 (postage paid)

### **Audio cassettes in the lending library**

#### Speeches:

- 200 Nobel Prize Acceptance Speech. 1950 45'
- 201 "Mind and Matter." 1950 52'
- 202 "Bertrand Russell in Australia." 1950 55'  
Four ABC broadcasts: "Guest of Honor", "The World as I See It",  
"What Hope for Man?" and "My Philosophy of Life".
- 203 "Living in an Atomic Age." 1951 90'  
Six BBC broadcasts: "Present Perplexities", "Obsolete Ideas", "The  
Modern Mastery of Nature", "The Limits of Human Power", "Con  
flict and Unification" and "The Achievement of Harmony".

- 204 "Life Without Fear." 1951 34'  
 205 "Portrait from Memory: Whitehead." BBC 1952 15'  
 206 "Man's Peril." BBC 1954 15'  
 207 Russell-Einstein Manifesto. 1955 30'  
 208 "The World and the Observer," BBC 1958 30'  
 209 Kalinga Prize Press Conference and Acceptance Speech. 1958 48'  
 Includes five minute interview of January 24, 1958.  
 210 "Address to the CND." 1959 30'  
 211 "The Influence and Thought of G.E. Moore." BBC 1959 42'  
 Interviews with Russell, Leonard Woolf, Morton White and John  
 Wisdom.  
 212 Address to the Verkeley Vietnam Teach-In. 1965 14'  
 213 "Appeal to the American Conscience." 1966 29'

Interviews, debates:

- 225 "Is Security Increasing?" NBC 1939 30'  
 226 Russell-Copleston Debate on the Existence of god. BBC 1948 20'  
 227 "The Attack on Academic Freedom in Britain and America." NBC  
 1952 30'  
 228 "Bertrand Russell' Romney Wheeler Interview. NBC 1952 30'  
 229 "Face to Face." John Freeman Interview. BBC 1959 30'  
 230 "Bertrand Russell Speaking." 1959 52'  
 Interviews by Woodrow Wyatt on philosophy, taboo morality, reli  
 gion, and fanaticism.  
 231 Woodrow Wyatt Interviews (I). 1959 52'  
 On the role of the individual, happiness, power, and the future of  
 mankind. 1959 52'  
 232 Woodrow Wyatt Interviews (II). 1959 52'  
 On nationalism, Great Britain, communism and capitalism, war and  
 pacifism and the H-bomb  
 233 "Close-Up." Elaine Grand Interview. CBC 1959 30'  
 234 "Speaking Personally: Bertrand Russell." John Chamndos Interview  
 1961 90'  
 235 David Susskind Interview. 1962 90'  
 236 Studs Terkel Interview. SFMT 1962 39'  
 237 "On Nuclear Morality." Michael tiger Interview. 1962 32'  
 238 Interview on Vietnam. CBC 1965 10'  
 239 Merv Griffin Interview. 1965 24'

Lectures, broadcasts:

- 250 "Bertrand Russell." Rev. Paul Beattie. 1975 15'  
 251 "Bertrand Russell as a Philosopher." A.J. Ayer. BBC 1980 15'  
 252 "Bertrand Russell." 1986 Professor Giovanni Costigan. 100'

- 253 "Portrait of the Philosopher as Father." Katherine Tait. (In German) 30'
- 254 "Bertrand Russell's Philosophy of Education." William Hare. 15'
- 255 "Bertrand Russell's Pacifist Stance in World War I." CFMU-FM 1992 30'
- 256 "Russell vs. Dewey on Education." 1992 115'  
With Michael Rockler, Tim Madigan and John Novak.
- 257 "A.J. Ayer's Language, Truth and Logic" by Darren Staloff. 1994 40'

#### Documentaries:

- 275 "The Life and Times of Bertrand Russell." 1962 40'
- 276 Beatrice Webb on the Russells / Russell on the Webbs. 1966 35'
- 277 "Sound Portrait of Bertrand Russell." NPR dramatization. 1980 60'
- 278 "Bertrand Russell: A Reassessment." BBC 1980 43'
- 279 "Bertie and the Bomb." Soundtrack of BBC television program. 1984 40'

#### Miscellaneous:

- 300 "The Conscience of Wisdom." CBC 1962 62'
- 301 "Sinfonia Contra Timore" by Graham Whettam. Dedicated to Russell. 1972 27'

#### Library News

What I Believe: 3 Complete Essays on Religion--by Bertrand Russell was released by Audio Editions (1-800-231-4261) in September. The selections are "What I Believe", "Why I Am Not A Christian" and "A Free Man's Worship". 2 Hrs. 25'. The reader is Terrence Hardiman. ISBN 15727001, \$16.95. A copy is in the lending library.

Religion and Science--by Russell was released in 1994 by Audio Scholar (1-800-282-1225). The two hour and ten minute abridgement is read by David Chase. ISBN 187955715, \$17.95. A copy is in the library.

The publication of the Thoemmes Press edition--My Father, Bertrand Russell--has been put on hold until next March to coincide with the release of the first volume of Ray Monk's Russell biography.