



Minutes of the 2002 BRS Annual Meeting Chad Trainer, BRS Secretary

The Bertrand Russell Society met for its 29th annual meeting at Lake Forest College in Lake Forest, Illinois. The meeting was from Friday, May 31 to Sunday June 2. Lake Forest College is located in a community that is very upscale, rather detached and quiet—one might say conducive to philosophic contemplation. In attendance were Kenneth Blackwell, David Blitz, Alan Bock, Pat Bock, Edgar Boedeker, Rosalind Carey, Peter Friedman, David Goldman, Nick Griffin, David L. Henehan, Kevin Klement, Gregory Landini, Dean Larson, Lou Lombardi, Timothy Madigan, Steve Maragides, Edward McClenathan, Nancy Mitchell, John Ongley, Karen Perkins, Ray Perkins, Stephen Reinhardt, Alan Schwerin, Peter Stone, Chad Trainer, David White, and Linda White.

On Friday, there was registration and a book table from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. From 6 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. there was a buffet and Ken Blackwell gave a talk about "Notable Passages from Recent Selections of Russell's Letters." This was followed by the BRS board meeting from 8:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. (See "Minutes of the 2002 Annual Meeting of the BRS Board of Directors.") and then the Greater Russell Rochester Set's hospitality suite/salon.

The Saturday morning program began with Greg Landini presenting his paper on "Russell's Distinction Between Logical and Semantic Paradoxes," followed by David Blitz's "Russell and Peace in the Middle East," and Chad Trainer's "Earth to Russell: The Limits of Russell's Views on Space Exploration" was the last paper of the morning.

After lunch, the BRS held its 2002 annual Business Meeting from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. Alan Schwerin began the meeting by informing the members of the previous evening's developments at the board meeting.

Then the subject of fostering greater awareness of the BRS was discussed. Edward McClenathan mentioned the services of Elderhostels as something to be considered. Steve Reinhardt mentioned a catalog of services that provide lectures for senior citizens and could be to the Society's avail. David Blitz suggested paper contests, but Alan Schwerin countered that the efforts already made along these lines had not borne results in spite of the lucrative prizes. Steve Maragides insisted on the futility of such efforts. Ray Perkins stressed that people who have students need to do more work soliciting Russell papers. And Peter Friedman, while concurring with Perkins, pointed out the need for discovering ways and means in this area



and effectively getting on various "bandwagons" for exposure.

As a possible way to get greater attention, Alan Schwerin mentioned advertising in the American Philosophical Association publications. David Blitz proposed having a specific topic designated in soliciting papers. Ed Boedeker expressed concern that such designated topics might unduly limit submissions. Peter Stone and Peter Friedman said they saw no problems with specified topics for papers. David Goldman suggested specifying limited time periods for completing papers.

Alan Schwerin brought up for consideration, as a means to better attendance and exposure, the idea of having the BRS annual meeting during the academic year. Tim Madigan pointed out the problem with available dormitory space that would result. Schwerin raised the option of using hotels, instead. Peter Stone mentioned that the Center for Free Inquiry site in Los Angeles (a much discussed possible place for a meeting) didn't offer dormitories anyway and could attract UCLA students. Alan Schwerin said that off-college sites could reduce student attendance. Tim Madigan, however, saw no practical impact resulting, and Ray Perkins agreed. Ray reiterated that paper submissions were the best way to draw students into the BRS. David White said an advertisement for a spot on the APA programs was a good idea. And the Greater Russell Rochester Set spoke of how they could invite students to speak. Peter Stone said publication of papers in the *Quarterly* was an option. There was agreement that the Russell Prize Committee would be the proper group to address the matter. Greg Landini suggested free transportation to the APA conventions as a good incentive.

Peter Stone then encouraged the weekend's presenters to submit their papers to the *BRS Quarterly*. He also explained that he had membership forms and free copies of the *BRSQ* to circulate and improve awareness and scholarship in the field of Russell. Alan spoke of how membership is a precondition for delivering a paper to the BRS, and he requested a greater number of submissions for the meetings, which, he said, would relieve the burden on the professionals.

The topic of getting greater publicity for the BRS was revisited, with Greg Landini focusing on the merits of documentary audio/visual materials, public access channels, and the like. Alan Schwerin mentioned the value of "philosophical corners" in student newspapers that would use quotations from Russell. Chad Trainer suggested that the BRS work more closely with the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation by reciprocally promoting each other in their respective publications. Peter Stone indicated his openness to

the idea, and Ray Perkins said he had connections with the Foundation's publication, *The Spokesman*, that could be of avail.

Ray Perkins also mentioned that, considering developments between Pakistan and India, as well as the new nuclear policy of Bush, a statement from the BRS to the U.S. is in order urging the elimination of nuclear weapons. He moved that the Society endorse the following statement: "We urge the US to negotiate, with the nations of the world, a treaty leading to the abolition of nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control. And, in order to reduce the danger of accidental nuclear war, we also urge the US forthwith to: (1) pledge 'no first use' of nuclear weapons, (2) de-alert its ICBMs, (3) ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and (4) preserve the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty."

Peter Friedman replied that other governments should be similarly urged. Greg Landini disagreed with the idea of the U.S. discarding nuclear weapons. Alan Schwerin asked if those present at the meeting were entitled to speak on behalf of the Bertrand Russell Society at large. Perkins said this was permissible since a quorum was present, and he emphasized the importance of acting promptly on the issue rather than delaying the matter indefinitely. Peter Stone then asked what exactly would be done with the resolution. Ray Perkins replied that the resolution would be given to the press. David White expressed opposition to the resolution on grounds that it was disrespectful to the American military, as well as insensitive to opinions Pakistan has publicized. David Blitz proposed perhaps a shorter version of the resolution. Peter Stone, while acknowledging the importance of the actual wording, said that, as a practical matter, world leaders are indifferent to what Russell thought, let alone what the BRS thinks. Much debate ensued, and Alan Schwerin raised the question of what to do on the matter considering that the meeting's allotted time was running out. David Goldman suggested voting on the issue and repudiating the verdict should the membership at large disapprove of the vote.

First, there was a vote on "whether or not to vote on the matter of the BRS issuing Ray Perkins' resolution." There were twelve votes for proceeding with a vote, and four votes against. Ray Perkins then reread his resolution. There were fifteen votes in support of the BRS issuing Ray's resolution and six votes against Ray's proposal. The meeting then concluded at 2 p.m. with Alan Schwerin explaining that the exact recipients of Ray's resolution would have to be addressed at a later time.

The Saturday afternoon presentations began with Ed Boedeker's paper: "Russell's Distinctions between Pure and Applied Logic." This was

followed by a panel discussion on Ray Perkins' *Yours Faithfully*, *Bertrand Russell* with David White, Rosalind Carey, and Peter Stone as presenters and Ray Perkins as a respondent.

After some free time, the Red Hackle hour followed with some Red Hackle courtesy of Don Jackanicz. The Red Hackle hour started off with a bang attended, as it was, by no less than the distinguished author and journalist Studs Terkel, recipient of the Society's Annual Award. Studs Terkel regaled everyone with anecdotes regarding his personal encounters with Russell. Studs Terkel's vim and verve, combined with the generous amount of time he talked, certainly set a positive tone for the evening's festivities. A full interview of Russell by Terkel was played, as well. There was the banquet, and then the evening was topped off again with the Greater Russell Rochester Set's hospitality suite/salon.

The Sunday morning papers began with Kevin Klement's "Russell's anticipation of the Lambda Calculus," followed by Alan Schwerin's "Russell and the Early Wittgenstein on Scepticism," and then Tim Madigan's "Russell's Influence on Music Theory."

**Minutes of the 2002 Annual Meeting of the
Bertrand Russell Society Board of Directors
Chad Trainer
Secretary, BRS Board of Directors**

At 8:30 p.m., on Friday, May 31, the BRS Board of Directors held its annual meeting. In attendance were Directors Ken Blackwell, Rosalind Carey, Nicholas Griffin, Peter Friedman, Tim Madigan, Ray Perkins, Steve Reinhardt, Alan Schwerin, Peter Stone, Chad Trainer, and David White. Steve Maragides, a longtime BRS member but not a director, was also present. Ken Blackwell opened the meeting with five items: next year's meeting site, the question of whether or not candidates for BRS awards should be restricted to those willing to appear at the annual meeting, a possible new award for editing, encouragement of potential new members by a waiving of their dues, and elections for the coming year.

Before delving into these subjects, the subject of "outreach" was brought up. Peter Friedman explained his visions of promoting the BRS through a news site service that, while charging other organizations for its services, would not charge the BRS. The BRS, it was explained, would also profit from building relationships with related links and working with an advertising agency. Peter Friedman explained, however, that lack of

progress on this front was attributable to insufficient resources. Ken Blackwell then suggested that the BRS' Web page be examined with a view to recommending improvements, and Steve Reinhardt suggested advertising in the *Bertrand Russell Society Quarterly*.

Peter Stone pointed out the propriety of addressing last year's Treasurer Report and Minutes. Alan Schwerin moved to accept last year's Treasurer Report and Ray Perkins seconded the motion. Steve Maragides was asked to send thanks to Dennis Darland for the quality of Dennis' work as Treasurer, and there was discussion of Dennis' high value in this role, especially in adding stability to the Society. Ray Perkins made a motion to accept last year's minutes and Peter Stone seconded it.

The location of next year's meeting was then addressed. Ken Blackwell expressed regret that planning for a meeting at the Center for Inquiry's Los Angeles site had not come to fruition. Peter Stone brought up the Greater Russell Rochester Set's relationship with the Center for Inquiry, and David White said that Paul Kurtz has indicated complete support for the BRS using the Center. Nevertheless, the lack of an active member in California was considered a stumbling block. Peter Stone mentioned that Charles Weyand could be useful for outreach in this matter. Alan Schwerin asked how strong our support was in California. Peter Stone mentioned the increasingly aged status of the people in California, and Ken Blackwell pointed out that nobody from California attended last year's meeting.

Ray Perkins volunteered Plymouth State College of the New Hampshire University as a fall-back site for the annual meeting but said that he would like to see the meeting in California come through. David White suggested California as the location for the meeting in two years so that there would be more preparation time. Alan Schwerin reminded the board of the difficulties last time in getting California to work as the place. Peter Stone pointed out that, in any case, there are advantages to having information on the annual meeting's location as early as the November *Quarterly*.

Alan Schwerin moved to accept Ray Perkins' offer of Plymouth State for next year's meeting and to consider California as a further goal. Rosalind Carey suggested that Lake Forest could be used again, and Peter Stone expressed his support for this idea, saying that Plymouth State or the Los Angeles Center for Inquiry could be considered for 2004. Alan Schwerin then withdrew his motion, and a motion was made by Rosalind Carey for Lake Forest College as the location for next year's meeting, which Alan Schwerin seconded. Concerning future meeting locations, Peter Friedman suggested Princeton but Ken Blackwell said that we need someone on site.

Brief discussion followed of having a meeting at City College of New York so as to provide the institution with a means to, at least, partially atone for its 1940 treatment of Russell. At this point, Ken Blackwell indicated his unease with the *present* officers taking charge of this matter.

The subject of BRS awards was discussed, first, whether the BRS awards should require awardees to attend the meeting at which the award is announced. Alan Schwerin mentioned the disappointment involved in selecting awardees who are no-shows. But then the prospect of the BRS locking itself out from many possible awardees as a result of a change here was considered, and no motions for a change were made. Ken Blackwell clarified that it was only the main award of the BRS that was under consideration here.

The possibility of a new award for editing collections of Russell's papers and letters was brought up. Alan Schwerin stressed the importance of giving recognition to such editors. Tim Madigan suggested calling such an award the "Harry Ruja Award." Ken Blackwell, however, did not think this appropriate, as Ruja was best known as a bibliographer, not an editor. Peter Friedman then suggested calling it the "Russell Scholar Award." Peter Stone noted the already small pool of candidates and was joined in this observation by Nick Griffin. Alan Schwerin proposed an award for Russell editorial scholarship with a committee empowered to exercise discretion as to whether or not to issue an award. Then Ken Blackwell wondered whether a foreign language award would be in order. Alan Schwerin moved that the current book awards committee have the discretion to make an occasional special award for editing. Ray Perkins seconded the motion.

Officer elections were considered next. Ken Blackwell said he was looking forward to retiring as Chair of the Board but would certainly stay on as a director. The directors then elected the following officers by acclamation:

President—Alan Schwerin (nominated by White, seconded by Perkins)
Chair—David White (nominated by Schwerin, seconded by Perkins)
Vice President—Ray Perkins (nominated by Schwerin, seconded by Stone)
Secretary—Chad Trainer (nominated by Schwerin, seconded by Griffin)
Treasurer—Dennis Darland (nominated by Stone, seconded by Perkins)

The directors expressed their gratitude to Ken Blackwell for his years chairing the Board and the meeting then concluded with Alan Schwerin thanking, on behalf of the Society, David White, Tim Madigan, Peter Stone, and Rachel Murray for the quality of their work with the *BRSQ*.

Studs Terkel at the 2002 BRS Annual Meeting Peter Stone

On Saturday, June 1, 2002, Studs Terkel came to Lake Forest College to accept the 2002 BRS Award. He arrived during the Society's Red Hackle Hour, and drank heartily of Russell's favorite brand of scotch. Alan Schwerin presented him with a box of his favorite brand of cigars as well as Bombay gin, another of Terkel's favorites. Terkel reminisced about Russell with those assembled for about 45 minutes before departing for another engagement.

Peter Stone presented the award to Terkel on behalf of BRS Awards Committee Chair Kevin Brodie, who could not attend the meeting. The short duration of Terkel's stay precluded the delivery of Stone's formal remarks. These remarks are reproduced here, however, because they lay out the justification for giving Terkel the award.

Before proceeding with tonight's award, I'd like to take a moment to acknowledge the loss of a past award recipient. As you all know, Stephen Jay Gould, famed paleontologist and recipient of the 2000 BRS Annual Award, died only a few short weeks ago, after losing his second battle with cancer. (He survived the first, and told the story of it in his book *Full House: The Spread of Excellence from Plato to Darwin* to the enlightenment of us all.) There have very few people in the history of science and philosophy who could write both brilliant technical books for the specialist and elegant popularizations for the layperson. Russell was one, Gould was another, there haven't been too many, and so this is a real loss for both the life sciences and the reading public.

And now for tonight's main event. I've served on the BRS Awards Committee for several years now, including a stint as Committee Chair, and I can tell you that selecting a recipient for the BRS Award every year is quite a challenge. Despite our high standards, which require locating someone who exemplifies some aspect of Russell at his best, every year several candidates offer themselves to the committee's attention—an embarrassment of riches, one might say—necessitating a difficult choice.

This year, however, the committee had a wonderful tool for focusing its attention—Location! Location! Location! Once the decision to meet near Chicago was announced, one BRS member told the committee, if you're in Chicago you simply must honor Studs Terkel. And he was right.

Studs Terkel has many qualifications for the BRS Annual Award. For one thing, he had the excellent judgment and good taste to show up and accept the award in person. (Many of our distinguished award recipients in the past have not been so refined.) More seriously, there is a narrow and a broad reason for presenting Terkel with the award. The narrow reason is his important personal connection with Bertie—he conducted a famous interview with the Good Lord in 1962. In describing that interview, Terkel famously remarked that Russell was “The Man Who Shook the Hand of the Man Who Shook the Hand of Napoleon.” I suppose that means that tonight I become the man who shook the hand of the man who shook the hand of the man who shook the hand of the man who shook the hand of the man who shook the hand of Napoleon. I leave it to the logicians of the Society to sort that one out.

The broad reason, like the narrow one, concerns interviews. Interviewing, after all, is what Studs Terkel does. Interviewing everyone from peace activists to cleaning ladies. He interviews people to show us what people think about subjects that matter to us, and then puts it all down in well-written books just to make it all easy for us to try to get a handle on. Well, maybe not easy—the topics he discusses are rarely easy—but certainly a whole lot easier than it would have been without Terkel on the job.

These books have focused on topics like working (*Working: People Talk about What They Do All Day and How They Feel about What They Do*. Pantheon, 1974); race (*Race: How Blacks and Whites Think and Feel about the American Obsession*. New Press, 1992); important moments in our history, such as World War II (*The Good War: An Oral History of World War Two*. Pantheon, 1984); and most recently life and death (*Will the Circle Be Unbroken? Reflections of Death, Birth, and Hunger for a Faith*. New Press, 2001). Given Russell’s own ongoing concern with religion and the continuing temptation of people towards irrational faiths, I’m sure this last book will be of great interest to the members of the BRS.

Russell made expert use of the pen to advance the cause of a liberal and enlightened humanity, a cause motivated by his “unbearable pity for the sufferings of mankind.” Terkel has done much the same, but he has incorporated the microphone and the tape recorder, and the many voices they can capture, into the process. For this reason, we are proud to present the 2002 Annual Award to Studs Terkel. The award reads,

**The 2002 Bertrand Russell Society Award to
Studs Terkel
for dedicating his life to the abolition of the suffering of
mankind in the spirit of Bertrand Russell.**

My Memory of Russell Studs Terkel

Note: Studs Terkel told me the story that follows over the phone, and I transcribed it. Since it is a transcribed portrait from memory, there may be some inconsistencies with other accounts of the Terkel-Russell meeting.—Kevin Brodie, BRS Awards Committee Chair

One of the most memorable moments in my life was visiting Russell, in 1962, in his cottage in North Wales, during the Cuban Missile crisis. I went to interview him, but the only thing he wanted to talk about was the crisis. I had a whole list of other things I wanted to discuss with him, but he wouldn’t have it. I sat down before him, and a secretary taps me on the shoulder and says “Only a half an hour.” Meanwhile, I am struggling to get my tape recorder to work. The tape keeps popping out. When I actually get it to stay and I press the record button, the tape won’t move. I am incredibly embarrassed. Russell says to me, “I believe you have problems with technology.” I said, “Lord Russell, technology and I are not empathetic.” He seemed to like that remark, and commented, “Technology is problematic in a number of ways,” and I knew exactly what he meant: the atom bomb.

I then got my tape recorder to work, and we proceeded with the interview, with the secretary tapping my shoulder every ten minutes to remind me of my time remaining. I wanted to ask Russell more general questions about war and the human race, so I broached the subject again. He said to me, “Only if you can trick me,” so I reached into my pocket to find a poem I knew he loved, one by Shelley about youth and age. Of course, I couldn’t find it. I can find everything else—my lunch receipt, a Cubs ticket stub, but not the poem. While I am searching, the secretary taps me again and says “five minutes.” Finally, I managed to locate it, and read it to him. Russell smiled, and said, “Very good, young man, that is one my favorites. You may ask me the question.” I then asked him about the prospects of the human race at this point in history, and he quoted Einstein to me: “Since the split of the atom, we need to find new ways of thinking. We cannot assume that bombs will solve our problems. We must find new ways of solving our problems.”

That is what I remember most: him quoting Einstein, and his remarkable patience with me. Here he is, an intellectual giant, in his nineties, and he never once showed the slightest irritation with me. His intellectual life spanned longer than anyone in history. I mean, he’s talking about nuclear

war, and his grandfather shook hands with Napoleon. That's quite amazing when you think about it. But that's what I remember. Me bumbling around, and his remarkable patience!

The 2002 BRS Book Award

BRS Book Awards Committee Chair Ray Perkins presented the 2002 BRS Book Award to Nick Griffin and Alison Roberts Miculan. In doing so, he made the following remarks:

The competition this year was stiff. I read all the 2001 entries in the New/Forthcoming Books section of the Russell Archives' website (except mine, which should have a 2002 date). However, the choice of the committee was unanimous. Nick Griffin's brilliant epistolary biography of Russell is a delight to read and is an important source of new biographical detail about one of the world's most interesting and important thinkers.

The award plaque reads,

**The 2002 Bertrand Russell Society Book Award to
Nicholas Griffin, assisted by Alison Roberts Miculan, for
*The Selected Letters of Bertrand Russell:
The Public Years, 1914-1970,*
which has enhanced our understanding of Russell's life.**

Many members may not be aware of the many prestigious books that have also won the award. To rectify this, we reprint below a complete list of past BRS Book Award winners.

2001—*Appointment Denied: The Inquisition of Bertrand Russell* (Prometheus, 2000), by Thom Weidlich.

2000—*Russell on Ethics: Selections from the Writings of Bertrand Russell* (Routledge, 1999), ed. by Charles Pigden.

1999—*Russell's Hidden Substitutional Theory* (Oxford U.P., 1998), by Gregory Landini.

1998—*Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell. Volume 10: A Fresh Look at Empiricism, 1927-42. Volume 11: Last Philosophical Testament, 1943-68* (Routledge, 1996, 1997), ed. by John G. Slater and Peter Kollner.

1997—*Bertrand Russell: The Spirit of Solitude* (Free Press, 1996), by Ray Monk.

1996—*Continuity and Change in the Development of Bertrand Russell's Philosophy* (Kluwer, 1994), by Paul Hager.

1995—*A Bibliography of Bertrand Russell* (Routledge, 1994), by Kenneth Blackwell and Harry Ruja.

1994—*Bertrand Russell: A Life* (Viking, 1993), by Caroline Moorehead.

1993—*The Selected Letters of Bertrand Russell, Volume 1, 1894-1914* (Houghton Mifflin, 1992), by Nicholas Griffin.

1992—*Russell's Idealist Apprenticeship* (Oxford U.P., 1991), by Nicholas Griffin.

1991—*Russell, Idealism and the Emergence of Analytic Philosophy* (Oxford, 1990), by Peter Hylton.

1990—*Bertrand Russell's Dialogue with His Contemporaries* (Southern Illinois, 1989), by Elizabeth Eames.

1989—*Bertrand Russell: A Political Life* (Hill and Wang, 1988), by Alan Ryan.

1988—*Bertrand Russell* (Twayne, 1986), by Paul Kuntz.

1987—*The Spinozistic Ethics of Bertrand Russell* (Allen & Unwin, 1985), by Kenneth Blackwell.

1985—*Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell. Volume I: Cambridge Essays 1888-99* (Allen & Unwin, 1983), ed. by Kenneth Blackwell, Andrew Brink, Nicholas Griffin, Richard A. Rempel, and John G. Slater.