

Newsletter #14
May 1977

- (1) Debate cancelled (2). A large contribution (4). A pat on the back (5). One way to get involved (6). A proposal to the BRS (8). A new Co-Chairperson (10). BR on Lenin (15). Denonn recollects (16). Dora reviews Clark (33). An asterisk in the left column indicates a request or an offer to lend.
-

COMING EVENTS

- (2) Debate cancelled. The Tait-O'Hair debate on BR and religion (NL13-2) is cancelled for the present. Neither lady wanted to participate unless APA sponsored the event.

We say "cancelled for the present" because efforts are being made to hold the event at some other time, under some other sponsorship, perhaps at a university.

As of now there is no plan to have a BRS Psychology Symposium in San Francisco in late August. If such a plan should develop, we will notify members in time to attend.

(item deleted)

(3)

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

- (4) Chairman Peter G. Cranford reports:

I should like to add my congratulations to President Bob Davis for the magnificent annual meeting, in L.A. It was unusually well run and Bob's promotional ability in obtaining Will and Ariel Durant as speakers provided a treasured experience for Russellites.

The Society is coming of age as a living extension of the life of Bertrand Russell. The Durants brought him to life with their reminiscences of their relationship to him — all off the record, unfortunately. Tom Horne continued the process with his choral work — "Three Passions" — the prologue to the first volume of Russell's autobiography set to music. Thanks to the promotional efforts of Mrs. Betty De Loach Milham, a concert musician and friend of the late President Eisenhower, there is some reason to hope that the Westminster Choir may produce the work at Princeton University. Mrs. Milham, who attended Russell's lectures at Princeton, has provided the funds for the annual BRS Travel Grant, which will enable a scholar to travel to the Russell Archives at McMaster University. I would like to suggest that it now be called the Betty De Loach Award. The setting up of such an award was promoted by Jack Pitt and is our first real move into charitable activity.

We have had a minor setback in our plans to make Russell better known as a psychologist. Again we have been turned down by the American Psychological Association.

A present problem is the finance committee which I head. We can take some consolation in that we continue to be in solid financial shape though our budget is small. We have been able to support Lee in providing us with our jewel, the Newsletter, that binds us all together. The BRS Library is giving greater emphasis to films. Don Jackanicz's films will slowly but surely rival the Newsletter in keeping Russell's ideas alive.

To go back to finances, after a year of being finance chairman, I have made very modest progress. Part of this has been due to my schedule, which is filled from 5 A.M. to 9 P.M. with both personal and professional responsibilities. Too, as pointed out previously, humanistic organizations such as ours are having to retract, both here and abroad. I think that the only ultimately successful method is for the BRS to make money and to use a portion of what is made to have a professional fund-raiser — or at a minimum, to pay one of our members to work at it part-time. However we have no present cause to worry. I think for the time being we should simply be satisfied to function a year at a time, augmenting our contributions when possible and living within our means.

I would like to suggest to all members who feel "left out" that the best first step is to spread Russell's ideas in any way they can, and to contribute perhaps a widow's mite. With two hundred of us engaged in such activity, we can do a great deal of ultimate good.

(5)

President Bob Davis reports:

I received a letter from Edith Russell, and it says some nice things about the way things are going, here at the BRS. These are some highlights:

"The things that the BRS are doing and planning to do seem to me impressive and extremely encouraging, especially the scholarship program. I congratulate you most heartily. It seems as if things are coming rapidly and astonishingly well under your guidance. It is all so heartening and I much look forward to hearing more..."

She mentions Graham Whetlow's Symphony, dedicated to BR.

She mentions an Italian disc of BR's poem to her. (Set to music?)

She is interested in Tom Horne's choral work, "Three Passions" (NL12-40).

If anyone knows about the Whetlow Symphony or the Italian disc, please notify the Newsletter.

(6) Vice-President Gary Slezak reports:

I am now chairing the Awards Committee. The Committee's function has been outlined in N110-13,41. If you are interested in becoming more involved in the BRS, this is a good opportunity. The Committee will compile, over the next six months, a list of nominees and their credentials. The list will be submitted to the Board of Directors, which will narrow the list to 5 nominees. Afterwards, the general membership will vote and select the recipient of the 1978 BRS Award.

The Committee will consist of as many BRS members as wish to join it. In order to select the persons who most reflect BRS's work and actions, we need the involvement of as many members as possible. Please write me for more information. (215 E. Chestnut St., #206, Chicago, IL 60611.)

(7) Treasurer Steve Reinhardt reports:

Balance on hand (12/31/76).....	1561.23	
Income: 8 new members.....	105.00	
29 renewals.....	320.00	
Total dues.....	425.00	
Contributions.....	423.23	
	848.23	848.23
		<u>2409.46</u>
Expenditures: Information & Membership Com.....	-24.58*	
"Russell"subscriptions	172.50	
Toward film purchases	313.00	
Annual meeting.....	97.72	
	558.64	558.64
Balance on hand (3/31/77).....	1850.82	<u>1850.82</u>

*A negative amount, due to a refund of 97.60 from Harper's for ads paid for previously but not run, and unusually low expenses this quarter.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

(8) Applied Philosophy Committee (Martin Garstens, Chairperson):

Martin's report is in the form of a proposal to the BRS, titled:

RUSSELL AND THE SECOND DISCOVERY OF FIRE

Somewhere Teilhard De Chardin said: "Some day after we have mastered the winds, the waves, the tides, and gravity, we will harness for God

the energies of love: and then for the second time in the history of the world man will have discovered fire."

Bertrand Russell could have made this second discovery. He had all the tools: the brains and reasoning power, the background, the education, the health, the longevity (97 years), the occasion, the position in society and in government, the following among intellectuals, the ideals, the love and the desire to attain this goal.

The second discovery of fire, may I suggest, is the extension of man's capacity to reason in his social relations and morality, as the first was the successful use of reason in man's relation to nature. But Russell did not bring this about, and it behooves the Russell Society, in carrying on Russell's work, to understand why.

Russell lacked the common touch. In spite of all his talents and auspicious background, he remained an aristocrat with a distinct distaste for the common man and for those he thought less intelligent than himself. (See Kate Tait's review of Clark's "Life of Bertrand Russell" in RUSSELL 21-22, Spring-Summer 1976.) In my estimation, this was the primary weakness in Russell's approach to the social problem. He never thought out the necessary educational techniques to reach the common man and thus attain a mass following.

his cannot be an ordinary following. It is one in which the use of reasoning and scientific method a la Russell is central. It also consequently can only be slow in growth, but at least it could be a beginning.

The Russell Society, if it is to be more than a book reading association, must attempt to explore and correct this basic weakness of Russell's. Whatever additional flaws one finds in Russell's character (and there are many) ultimately reside in this weakness.

One area in which Russell has important things to say and which is particularly important for our time is that of ethics. If we can bring reason and scientific method into ethics, as has thus far not been done, ethics and rational morality would have more extensive influence. This, I believe, could be T. D. Chardin's second discovery of fire.

At the University of Maryland I am trying to interest some of the faculty in the question as to whether a verifiable scientific ethics can be formed from current philosophies of ethics (which are very numerous), which might attain some degree of consensus, in the same way as the natural sciences developed out of natural philology historically. If this can be done, it would be very important in making reason and scientific understanding more widespread than the natural sciences have done.

(9) Information Committee (Lee Eisler, Chairperson):

Editorial "we". In discussing TOM TASKONIS' letter (NL13-35), we said "We agree" or "We disagree" with various statements in the letter. When we said that, we were using the editorial "we"; that is, we were expressing the Newsletter Editor's opinion. We were not speaking officially on behalf of the BRS. When that is the case, we will say, "The BRS agrees (or disagrees)".

We (and the BRS) would like to make that perfectly clear.

(10) Membership Committee (Lee Eisler, Chairperson):

New Co-Chairperson. We are very pleased to report that Beverly C. Smith has become the Co-Chairperson of the Membership Committee. She succeeds Carol Mull in handling the inquiries and enrollments that result from our efforts to recruit new members. Officers, Chairpersons, Directors and others who may need printed material for recruiting purposes (e.g. the BRS Information Packet) should request it directly from Beverly (74 Montaine Park, Rochester, NY, 14617.) Our great thanks go to Carol, who handled this BRS responsibility impeccably, even when there were many other demands on her time.

(11) Philosophers' Committee (Ed Hopkins, Chairperson):

See (12), under PHILOSOPHERS' CORNER

PHILOSOPHERS' CORNER

(12) Report of the Philosophers' Committee, by Ed Hopkins:

All flows smoothly towards the meeting of the BRS with the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division) in Washington, D.C. this December. A call for papers has appeared in Journal of Philosophy, Review of Metaphysics, Russell, and Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association. So far (April 5th) only one paper has been received, but that is more than we had last year at this time. I expect to get 15 to 20 papers if the future succeeds in resembling the past.

I am getting together four copies of papers and comments, and the tape, of the last meeting. They will be turned over to the BRS Library.

I have been teaching a course titled, "Self-help through Philosophy," for a local learning network called The Baltimore School. The main text for the course was The Conquest of Happiness, with one essay by Seneca on "Tranquillity of Mind" thrown in. The discussions were interesting, I learned as much as my "students", and I rate the experience a success. I will be doing another five week, one-night a week, course during May.

(13) New periodical. The publisher of "Information Philosophie" has sent us the 28-page December 1976 issue. This Swiss periodical aims to inform its readers (in German) about "the newest trends, activities, and happenings in the philosophical world." Its address: Redaktion, Schlimpergstrasse 31, CH-8307 Effretikon, Switzerland. We couldn't find any subscription price; maybe our German wasn't good enough. You can
* borrow this issue from the BRS Library (3802 N. Kenneth Avenue, Chicago, IL 60641.)

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

(14)

The Faith of a Humanist is the title of a little pamphlet by BR, published by the "American Humanist Association, Humanist House, Yellow Springs, OH 45387." BOB DAVIS, who sent it to us, thinks it is about 20 years old, and has not been published in any book he knows of. Here is the complete text:

When I try to discover what are the original sources of my opinions, both practical and theoretical, I find that most of them spring ultimately from admiration for two qualities -- kindly feeling and veracity. To begin with kindly feeling: most of the social and political evils of the world arise through absence of sympathy and presence of hatred, envy, or fear. Hostile feelings of this sort are common between nations; at many times they have existed between different classes or different creeds within one nation; in many professions envy is an obstacle to the recognition of superior merit; hatred of Jews, oppression of Negroes, contempt for all who are not white, have brought and are bringing great suffering to would-be oppressors as well as to those whom they have sought to oppress. Every kind of hostile action or feeling provokes a reaction by which it is increased and so generates a progeny of violence and injustice which has a terrible vitality. This can only be met by cultivating in ourselves and attempting to generate in the young feelings of friendliness rather than hostility, of well-wishing rather than malevolence, and of co-operation rather than competition.

Veracity and Kindly Feeling

If I am asked "Why do you believe this?" I should not appeal to any supernatural authority, but only to the general wish for happiness. A world full of hate is a world full of sorrow. Each party, where there is mutual hatred, hopes that the other party will suffer, but this is seldom the case. And even the most successful oppressors are filled with fear -- slave owners, for example, have been obsessed with dread of a servile insurrection. From the point of view of worldly wisdom, hostile feeling and limitation of sympathy are folly. Their fruits are war, death, oppression, and torture, not only for their original victims but, in the long run, also for their perpetrators or their descendents. Whereas if we could all learn to love our neighbors the world would quickly become a paradise for us all.

Veracity, which I regard as second only to kindly feeling, consists broadly in believing according to evidence and not because a belief is comfortable or a source of pleasure. In the absence of veracity, kindly feeling will often be defeated by self-deception. It used to be common for the rich to maintain either that it is pleasant to be poor or that poverty is the result of shiftlessness. Some healthy people maintain that all illness is self-indulgence. I have heard fox-hunters argue that the fox likes being hunted. It is very easy for those who have exceptional power to persuade themselves that the system by which they profit gives more happiness to the underdog than he would enjoy under a more just system. And, even where no obvious bias is involved, it is

only by means of veracity that we can acquire the scientific knowledge required to bring about our common purposes. Consider how many cherished prejudices had to be abandoned in the development of modern medicine and hygiene. To take a different kind of illustration: how many wars would have been prevented if the side which was ultimately defeated had formed a just estimate of its prospects instead of one based on conceit and wish fulfillment!

Believing Without Proof

Veracity, or love of truth, is defined by Locke as "not entertaining any proposition with greater assurance than the proofs it is built upon will warrant." This definition is admirable in regard to all those matters as to which proof may reasonably be demanded. But since proofs need premises, it is impossible to prove anything unless some things are accepted without proof. We must therefore ask ourselves: what sort of thing is it reasonable to believe without proof? I should reply: the facts of sense-experience and the principle of mathematics and logic — including the inductive logic employed in science. These are things which we can hardly bring ourselves to doubt, and as to which there is a large measure of agreement among mankind. But in matters as to which men disagree, or as to which our own convictions are wavering, we should look for proofs, or if proofs cannot be found, we should be content to confess ignorance.

There are some who hold that veracity should have limitations. Some beliefs, they say, are both comforting and morally beneficial, although it cannot be said that there are valid scientific grounds for supposing them to be true; these beliefs, they say, should not be critically examined. I cannot myself admit any such doctrine. I cannot believe that mankind can be the better for shrinking from the examination of this or that question. No sound morality can need to be based upon evasion, and a happiness derived from beliefs not justified on any ground except their pleasantness is not the kind of happiness that can be unreservedly admired.

Religious Beliefs and the Universe

These considerations apply especially to religious beliefs. Most of us have been brought up to believe that the universe owes its existence to an all-wise and all-powerful Creator, whose purposes are beneficent even in what to us may seem evil. I do not think it is right to refuse to apply to this belief the kind of tests that we should apply to one that touches our emotions less intimately and profoundly. Is there any evidence of the existence of such a Being? Undoubtedly belief in Him is comforting and sometimes has good moral effects on character and behavior. But there is no evidence that the belief is true. For my part, I think the belief lost whatever rationality it once possessed when it was discovered that the earth is not the center of the universe. So long as it was thought that the sun and the planets and the stars revolved about the earth, it was natural to suppose that the universe had a purpose connected with the earth, and, since man was what man most admired on the earth, this purpose was supposed to be embodied in man.

But astronomy and geology have changed all this. The earth is a minor planet of a minor star which is one of many millions of stars in a galaxy which is one of many millions of galaxies. Even within the life of our own planet man is only a brief interlude. Non-human life existed for countless ages before man was evolved. Man, even if he does not commit scientific suicide, will perish ultimately through failure of water or air or warmth. It is difficult to believe that omnipotence needed so vast a setting for so small and transitory a result.

Apart from the minuteness and brevity of the human species, I cannot feel that it is a worthy climax to such an enormous prelude. There is a rather repulsive smugness and self-complacency in the argument that man is so splendid as to be evidence of infinite wisdom and infinite power in his Creator. Those who use this kind of reasoning always try to concentrate our attention on the few saints and sages; they try to make us forget the Neros and Attilas and Hitlers and the millions of mean poltroons to whom such men owed their power. And even what is best in us is apt to lead to disaster. Religions that teach brotherly love have been used as an excuse for persecution, and our profoundest scientific insight is made into a means of mass destruction. I can imagine a sardonic demon producing us for his amusement, but I cannot attribute to a Being who is wise, beneficent, and omnipotent the terrible weight of cruelty, suffering, and ironic degradation of what is best that has marred the history of man in increasing measure as he has become master of his fate.

A Plausible Conjecture

There is a different and vaguer conception of cosmic Purpose as not omnipotent but slowly working its way through recalcitrant material. This is a more plausible conception than that of a God who, though omnipotent and loving, has deliberately produced beings so subject to suffering and cruelty as the majority of mankind. I do not pretend to know that there is no such Purpose; my knowledge of the universe is too limited. But I do say, and I say with confidence, that the knowledge of other human beings is also limited, and that no one can adduce any good evidence that cosmic processes have any purpose whatever. Our very inadequate evidence, so far as it goes, tends in the opposite direction. It seems to show that energy is being more and more evenly distributed, while everything to which it is possible to attribute value depends upon uneven distribution. In the end, therefore, we should expect a dull uniformity, in which the universe would continue forever and ever without the occurrence of anything in the slightest degree interesting. I do not say this will happen; I say only that, on the basis of our present knowledge, it is the most plausible conjecture.

Immortality, if we could believe in it, would enable us to shake off this gloom about the physical world. We should say that although our souls, during their sojourn here on earth, are in bondage to matter and physical laws, they pass at death into an eternal world beyond the empire of decay which science seems to reveal in the sensible world. But it is impossible to believe this unless we think that a human being consists of two parts — soul and body — which are separable and can continue independently of each other. Unfortunately all the evidence is against this. The mind grows like the body; like the body it inherits characteristics

from both parents; it is affected by diseases of the body and by drugs; it is intimately connected with the brain. There is no scientific reason to suppose that after death the mind or soul acquires an independence of the brain which it never had in life. I do not pretend that this argument is conclusive, but it is all that we have to go on except the slender evidence supplied by psychical research.

Happiness Through Kindness

Many people fear that, without the theoretical beliefs that I find myself compelled to reject, the ethical beliefs which I accept could not survive. They point to the growth of cruel systems opposed to Christianity. But these systems, which grew up in a Christian atmosphere, could never have grown up if either kindly feeling or veracity had been practiced; they are evil myths, inspired by hate and without scientific support. Men tend to have the beliefs that suit their passions. Cruel men believe in a cruel God and use their belief to excuse their cruelty. Only kindly men believe in a kindly God, and they would be kindly in any case. The reasons for the ethic that, in common with many whose beliefs are more orthodox, I wish to see prevail are reasons derived from the course of events in this world. We have seen a great system of cruel falsehood, the Nazi system, lead a nation to disaster at immense cost to its opponents. It is not by such systems that happiness is to be achieved; even without the help of revelation it is not difficult to see that human welfare requires a less ferocious ethic. More and more people are becoming unable to accept traditional beliefs. If they think that, apart from these beliefs, there is no reason for kindly behavior the results may be needlessly unfortunate. That is why it is important to show that no supernatural reasons are needed to make men kind and to prove that only through kindness can the human race achieve happiness.

BR ON PEOPLE

(15)

BR on Lenin. We said -- in N113-35 -- that BR found Lenin to be ruthless. Here is some of what BR said to John Chandos in 1961, taken from the LP, "Speaking Personally," (Riverside 7014/7015). We based our conclusion, that BR found Lenin ruthless, on the last paragraph below.

I met Lenin in 1920 when I was in Russia. I had an hour's talk with him *tete a tete*. The conversation was in English, and his English was quite good.

I was less impressed with Lenin than I expected to be. He was of course a great man. He seemed to be a reincarnation of Cromwell, with exactly the same limitations that Cromwell had. Absolute orthodoxy. He thought a proposition could be proved by quoting a text in Marx. And he was quite incapable of supposing that there could be anything in Marx that wasn't right. That struck me as rather limited.

I disliked his great readiness to stir up hatred. I put certain questions to him. One of them was: you profess to be establishing

socialism, but as far as the countryside is concerned, you seem to me to be establishing peasant proprietorship, which is a very different thing from agricultural socialism. He said, "O dear me, no. We're not establishing peasant proprietorship. You see, there are poor peasants and rich peasants, and we stirred up the poor peasants against the rich peasants, and they soon hanged them to the nearest tree, ha!ha!ha!" I didn't much like that.

ABOUT BERTRAND RUSSELL

(16) Lester Denonn recalls 3 hours he spent with BR in 1943:

At the suggestion of Professor Schilpp of Northwestern University, for whose Library of Living Philosophers I am preparing a bibliography of the works of Bertrand Russell, I have been in communication with Russell from time to time about the project. His recent series of lectures on Monday evenings in New York City gave me the opportunity of suggesting a meeting. His response was characteristically crisp: "Your letter reached me after some delay. I am afraid I probably couldn't manage dinner, but I could come to your office next Monday (Feb. 16, 1942) between 3 and 3:30, and give as much time as might be necessary. If however your work makes that impossible, I will try to manage a later hour on a later Monday. Yours sincerely (signed) Bertrand Russell."

The eventful Monday arrived but no Russell and finally at about quarter to four Mr. Russell was announced and in a few seconds was before me — all to myself. I had seen him but twice before, on the lecture platform at Cornell in 1924 and in Brooklyn in 1938. It was the same Russell I had seen, but an older man, frailer looking than his height on the dais led one to believe, but vigorous and hearty nonetheless, with unforgettably roguish, piercing blue eyes, that punctuated every remark, and the distinguished shock of white hair that crowns the familiar angular photographs.

He apologized for being late, stating that he had miscalculated the time it would take to reach my office. He strode to the window to enjoy the view and pass a few pleasantries about the shipping — or lack of it — and then indicated that he was ready to get down to business. He wanted to see how far I had progressed with the bibliography.

Before handing him my notebook, I remarked how thoroughly ashamed I was to sit down with him, since my Mother's maid had told me it was no honor to meet him. "Why that fellow ran a nudist camp in England, and what's more, they called him Barney, that's what they did." He shrugged his shoulders, realizing that the Barney was a lot of "Blarney," and merely commented that the newspapers — or some of them — had seen fit to print wholly unmitigated lies about him.

He opened the looseleaf and turned to 1895, to a note on his article, "The Logic of Geometry," appearing in "Mind." "I remember that well," he said. "Except for an earlier review, that was the first time that my name appeared in print as an author, and you know how an aspiring author is impressed by his first appearance in print."

He then read carefully line after line, year after year, commenting not infrequently on entries he had forgotten and recalling other possible sources for items. He was throughout extremely helpful in making suggestions.

Many of the books and articles struck forgotten chords that played first upon his eyes with merry twinkles and then tripped with droll laconic phrases into anecdotes sounded in rich English accent.

"Haldane on Infinity.' I remember that well. It was the custom for members of the Aristotelian Society to tear each other's papers apart unmercifully. Not knowing that the members had decided that it would be unbecoming to follow this practice with their president, a distinguished cabinet minister, I sat intently writing notes for refutation. When Haldane had finished, old Shadworth arose to move the vote of thanks but was too weak to continue. Imagine my consternation when they turned to me to make the motion. I did so, but rushed home with my notes to get the criticism off my chest. Hence the article."

"Proposed Roads to Freedom.' You know, that was called 'Roads to Freedom' in England, but my publishers thought it was safer to call it 'Proposed Roads,' in America."

"Cambridge articles? Oh, yes, I remember the controversy about one in which I tried to show that it was necessary to lie to become ordained in the Church of England. I caught one of the Professors of Church History in a glaring inconsistency on a point of church history"

"Articles in the Britannica? Why, of course. The Britannica came out with an edition during the last war in which the article about me painted me as a horrible fellow. When after the war, they invited me to write on mathematical philosophy, I answered that I learned from their prior edition that I was scarcely a fit person to become a contributor. A long letter of apology followed promptly."

"Weekly syndicated articles in the Hearst newspapers? You know, a writer has to make his living by his bad writing so that he can continue at what he thinks is his good writing."

"On Denoting' -- I think that was my best work. I have expressed the ideas better subsequently, but that represents the field -- on description -- in which I believe most will say is my most significant contribution."

"You will notice that I always spell Leibniz without the 't'. If there had been German birth certificates in his day, they would have shown the 't', but since he wrote mainly in French, he himself indicated the name most frequently without it."

"Jourdain's 'The Philosophy of Mr. B*rtr*and R*ss*l.' That was a curious work containing many direct statements of mine. Jourdain, poor fellow, suffered from paralysis. I would go to see him frequently and bring him all sorts of mental gymnastics, such as, 'first, the idea slipped my mind and then it went clean out of my head. Where was the idea between the two events?' It seems that Jourdain took them all down and got them out in book form, adding some others that he picked up elsewhere."

"Articles on China? A missionary once told me that one of my articles criticizing the English government's treatment of the Chinese had saved the lives of many Englishmen in the days when the anti-foreign difficulties were rife. The Chinese figured that if one Englishman could write that way, maybe all the English weren't so bad. But the English government didn't like the article very much anyway."

We had arranged a very interesting program early in our meeting. He wanted a little time out for an Englishman's regular afternoon tea while I signed my mail; then he would like about three quarters of an hour to review his lecture notes for the evening and then, in answer to a repeated invitation, "he probably could manage dinner," so long as he could get to his lecture a few minutes before the scheduled hour.

At five he left and returned shortly after half past. One of the boys chanced to be in the reception room when he returned. I introduced him to Russell and commented that he had heard him some years ago in a debate with John Cowper Powys. "Oh, I remember that debate. It was on marriage. I agreed with Powys on one point — that marriage has something to do with the difference between men and women."

I then took him on a short tour of the office, explaining what he had gathered from some of the telephone calls that had interrupted us, that the firm represented one of the large commercial banks of the city. "You know, no doubt, that I don't particularly like bankers," he said. He seemed a little perplexed at the fact that I should have shown such devotion to his works as evidenced by the large library of over sixty volumes that I have acquired and all the time I have spent on the bibliography, when my surroundings seemed so foreign to his social and political views. I acknowledged that I differed with him and added that, perhaps, my views were less remote from his than those of some of my colleagues. He seemed amused at this response and satisfied to let the point drop — for the time being.

Before returning to my room, I offered him a separate room for his lecture review but he said that that would be unnecessary. His notes were in longhand. He read them silently and carefully, with his ever faithful pipe aglow. "I can't think without it." Now and again he made a few changes. In order not to make him conscious of my presence, I sat preparing my contracts lecture for the next evening. He later explained that he always reviews his thoughts this way before a lecture and then is able to talk without reading from his notes, except now and then. Frequently he talks from a bare outline.

When he had finished, we repaired to Ye Olde Chop House on Cedar Street. He commented very favorably about the place. "It reminds me of an inn in London. I was the only Englishman who ever went there. They made it for Americans."

His running rapid-fire comment delighted me as it must have some of the guests at the intimately close tables, as his rich English voice was unmistakably arresting.

"Will Durant? Charming fellow. Writes beautifully, but never has a fact correct — not even my father's name."

"Whitehead? I am sure that we differ from each other on many points, but we have refrained from printing our disagreements. Yet I remember one occasion when I lectured on solipsism at a meeting at which he was chairman. I said I could not subscribe to the doctrine as I could not believe that I had created all that existed in the world, especially not the many pages of Mr. Whitehead that I could not understand."

He said that he had been in all of the United States on lecture tours except Florida, Georgia and South Carolina. This remark was prompted by my explanation of the reason why my family was presently in Florida. "I am very sorry to hear about the mastoid trouble your children have had. My two older children were also operated on for mastoids. I remember the night when one was taken to the hospital. I had to debate with a bishop. I don't like bishops, but I particularly didn't like this one. He argued that all human suffering was caused by sin. I

could scarcely understand how my little five-year-old boy could have sinned so much."

"Talking about bishops — you know my disinterested view of the so-called Bertrand Russell case is that it was an outrage. Even if I had not been concerned in it, I would still think it was an outrage. They used to say a lot about Tennessee." His eyes twinkled.

He asked me whether I differed from his philosophic position — again intimating that my surroundings bespoke wide divergence from his political ideas. I said that I had just finished a book still in typescript in which I developed an epistemological idealism along with a metaphysical realism, which I presumed was opposed to his realism. "On the contrary," he said, "if you are influenced by critics who mistake my views and place me with the realists, then you will think so, but if you will attend closely to my arguments, you will see that I haven't been an epistemological realist since 1905. My latest book should convince you of that."

He explained that he was lecturing once a week at the Barnes Foundation on the history of thought from Thales to today. He is carefully planning these lectures in preparation for a lengthy work on the history of human thought in its social and cultural background.

On the way to the lecture hall, he harked back to his perplexity at my choosing him for my philosophic labors in my philosophic hobby. I explained that insofar as hero worship was concerned, that I had a hero in the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes who, although not a systematic philosopher, stirred me deeply by the trend of his thinking. He stated that he could readily understand why an American lawyer interested in philosophy could feel that way about Holmes but that he was still curious about himself. I said I could not better express my views about him than I had done on previous occasions when I had said that I felt his to be the most catholic mind ("small 'c'," he interjected) that I knew through which I could view the currents of contemporary problems.

By this time we had reached his destination. He made sure not to mix up the books we had alongside of us. I had Laird's "Theism and Cosmology", and the philosopher had — a detective story. He got agilely out of the taxi, and as he swung around to enter the lecture hall, he turned back and said, "Be sure to tell your Mother's maid that I am neither so wicked, nor for that matter, so red as I am painted." ("Recollections of Three Hours with Bertrand Russell" originally appeared in "Correct English", Vol. 44, No. 1 — December 1943.)

Our thanks to DON JACKANICZ.

BR MENTIONED

(17) Studs Terkel. A review of Studs Terkel's newest book, "Talking to Myself," (Time Magazine, 4/18/77) mentions the wide variety of events and personalities that Terkel has written about.

"He was in Chicago when Dillinger was shot and in Selma in 1965. He has also elicited conversation from just about every notable from Bertrand Russell to Mahalia Jackson."

We will try to have the conversation he elicited from BR in our next issue. Our thanks to ALBERTO DONADIO.

BR QUOTED

(18)

Two kinds of work. George F. Will's article, "The Hell of Affluence" (Newsweek, 3/21/77) discusses Fred Hirsch's new book, "Social Limits To Growth". Its thesis is that when an affluent society has satisfied basic material needs, then people begin to want "positional" or prestige things such as a "choice" suburban home, an "exclusive" vacation spot, an "elite" education, a "superior" job — which are necessarily in limited supply — and this is bound to produce discontent. The number of persons educationally equipped for "superior" jobs increases faster than the number of such jobs. Wills' final paragraph goes as follows:

Today even more than in 1935, there is much truth in what Bertrand Russell then said facetiously: "Work is of two kinds: first, altering the position of matter at or near the earth's surface relatively to other such matters; second, telling other people to do so. The first is unpleasant and ill-paid; the second is pleasant and highly paid. The second kind is capable of indefinite extension: there are not only those who give orders, but those who give advice as to what order should be given."

ASSESSMENTS OF BR

(19)

Will Durant, on the contemporary scene in philosophy:

Professional philosophy still hides itself from the world, lost and secure in the labyrinths of logic, the mysteries of mathematics, or the meticulous, anesthetizing analysis of words.

Bertrand Russell is the lusty exception to this norm; he soon broke out of the cave to face bravely what seem to me the real problems of philosophy: nature and mind, morals and character, liberty and order, violence and law, youth and age, love and marriage, beauty and ugliness, Communism and democracy, war and peace, religion and secularism, progress and decay, the lessons of history, the meaning of life and death.

Thanks, again, to DON JACKANICZ.

LOCAL CHAPTERS

- (20) Chicago area. Gary Slezak writes: "At our last meeting, we discussed BR's 'The Problems of Philosophy' and continued our discussion from the previous meeting of Sidney Hook's article attacking Russell (NL12-62). The next meeting is scheduled for late May. We plan to show new films recently purchased for the Library."
-

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

- (21) Peter Cranford has been writing papers: "Russell and his Detractors" (5 pages); "Bertrand Russell's Conception of the Meaning of Life" (8 pages), which will be a chapter in Dr. Erika Wick's book (title unknown). Both papers are available from the BRS Library (3802 N. Kenneth Avenue, Chicago, IL 60641)
- (22) Albert Ellis' article, "Religious Beliefs in the United States Today," in "The Humanist" (March-April 1977) suggests reasons why "so many intelligent and well-educated people today fall back on devout dependency on supernatural forces, which their own parents and teachers had largely abandoned in the 1920s and 1930s."
According to an item in the Indianapolis Star (4/20/77), Albert Ellis, "psychotherapist and author, will speak at the 28th Annual Meeting of the Mental Health Association in Marion County at 8 P.M., May 12th." (Thank you, CAROL MULL.)
- (22.5) Ed Hopkins has been teaching a course, "Self-help through Philosophy." See (12).
- (23) Corliss Lamont was named Humanist of the Year by the American Humanist Association. He gave the keynote address at the AHA's recent meeting in L.A., telling what he believed characterized a Humanist, and citing BR an example of someone who remained vital to the end because he never retired but kept himself involved. BRS members present were BOB DAVIS, CHARLES GREEN and BILL YOUNG.
- (24) Justin Leiber has been appointed a visiting scientist at M.I.T. His book, "Noam Chomsky: A Philosophical Overview" (St. Martins Press, New York) will soon be followed by "Structuralism: Scepticism and Mind in the Psychological Sciences." He chaired last year's BRS session at the annual meeting of the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division) and expects to chair it again this year (in Washington, late December.) He is looking for a job teaching philosophy.
- (25) Betty De Loach Milham has 3 organ concerts scheduled for July: at Hartwick College, Oneonta, N.Y. July 3rd; at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, NYC, July 23rd; and one in Passaic, N.J., date and place not known. (If interested in attending the Passaic concert, write Betty, 1474 Lyon Avenue S.E., Aiken, SC 29801.) In addition to giving concerts, she teaches piano,

organ and harpsichord, and has organized and been director of the Aiken Choral Society.

- (26) Jack Pitt, ERS Secretary, is one of twelve participants attending a 2-month seminar this summer at The Johns Hopkins University. The seminar, "Philosophy and the Social Sciences," will focus upon theories concerning the psychological basis of culture, and upon alternative explanations of institutions and institutional change. It is funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities with the intent of enabling scholars from different parts of the country to come together to engage in advanced study and research. The amount of the award is \$2400.

- (27) Warren Allen Smith writes "Manhattan Scene", a 2-page sheet "for excerpting by West Indian newspapers." It consists of items from various publications and organizations, plus a generous helping of jokes. Here are samples from the issue of March 31, 1977:

The truth behind the food crisis, claims the Environmental Fund, is that the 1974 UN meetings in Bucharest and Rome mistakenly assumed, first, that the hungry nations have the right to produce as many children as they please; and, second, others have the responsibility to feed them. Thus, the Fund (1302 18th St., NW, Washington, D.C. 20036) states that although countries have every right to increase their populations, they also have the accompanying responsibility to care for those people. It's not up to the U.S. or Australia or some other nation to care for the rest of the world, particularly when they do not realize that the real problem behind world hunger is "too many people." At some point, concludes the group, "we in the U.S. are going to find that we cannot provide for the world any more than we can police it."

Groucho Marx, when asked what he thought of computer dating, said, "I'm in favor of it. But only if the two computers love each other."

NEW HONORARY MEMBERS

- (28) We are delighted to report that we have two new honorary members:

Katharine Russell Tait, daughter of Bertrand Russell and Dora Black Russell, is a founding member of the ERS and was its first Treasurer.

John Russell, son of Bertrand Russell and Dora Black Russell, is now the Earl Russell, having inherited the title from his father. John writes, "here are still many causes which could activate the mind of Bertrand Russell. The battle is not over. And so it is with particular delight that I welcome your invitation to me to join the Bertrand Russell Society as an Honorary Member."

NEW MEMBERS

(29) We are very pleased to welcome these new members:

George Carter/EPP/Carnegie-Mellon University/Pittsburgh, PA 15213
 David Bruce Harley/98 Bertram Dr./ Dondas, Ont., L9H 4T7/Canada
 Vance G. Ingalls, Jr./2237 Mason/ San Francisco, CA 94133
 James Kuzmak/24 Collingswood Road/ New City, NY 10956
 (Mr.) B.J. Lucas/4316 Dallas/ Houston, TX 77023

Carl C. Neel/541 McBee Street/Malvern, AR 72104
 Jay Seckels/5234 S.E. Ogden/Portland, OR 97206
 Larry E. Small/4361 Lake Drive/Robbinsdale, MN 55422
 William L. Webber/46-C Dana Street/Cambridge, MA 02138
 Verna J. Wefald/Apt. 708/1673 Columbia Road, N.W./Washington, DC 20009

Charles L. Weyand/17066 Los Modelos/Fountain Valley, CA 92708

ADDRESS CHANGES & CORRECTIONS

(30) Corrections are underlined. A new address has no underlining.

Truman E. Anderson, Jr./1200 Denver Club Bldg./Denver, CO 80202
 Dr. John Cook/Stevens Clinic Hospital/U.S. 52 South/Welch, WV 24801
 Alex Dely/2419 N. Prospect Rd., #B/Peoria, IL 61603
 Alberto Donadio/AP55323/Medellin, Colombia
 Justin D. Leiber/20 C 128, M.I.T./77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139

Elizabeth De Loach Milham/1474 Lyon Avenue S.E./Aiken, SC 29801
 Thomas Charles Taskonis/329 East 12th Street, Apt. 9/New York, NY 10003

BULLETIN BOARD

(31) Good book, good buy. We have bought a limited number of copies, at a bargain price, of Dora Black Russell's The Tamarisk Tree, list price 9.95. We offer it at \$4 plus 50¢ for postage. Dora — BR's 2nd wife, and mother of our two new honorary members — tells what it was like being married to BR and running the Beacon Hill School with (and without) him. Order The Tamarisk Tree from DON JACKANICZ, 3802 N. Kenneth Avenue, Chicago, IL 60641.

RECOMMENDED READING

- (32) "From Under The Rubble", Alexander Solzhenitsyn, editor (Little Brown 1974) is a collection of essays, 2 of which are recommended by BOB DAVIS: "Socialism in our Past and Future" by Igor Shafarevich, and "Contemporary Socioeconomic Systems and their Future Prospects" by Mikhail Agursky. "Both dissidents, both hostile to socialism, both thought-provoking. Several other essays are, unfortunately, religious hogwash," says Bob.
-

BOOK REVIEWS

- (33) Dora reviews Clark. The following review, by Dora Black Russell, of Ronald W. Clark's "The Life of Bertrand Russell" originally appeared in "Freethinker" (December 1975, Vol. 95, #12):

In two respects at least Ronald W. Clark has undertaken an immense task -- to deal with the extent and complexity of Russell's life, as well as the vast amount of material, published and unpublished. He has the possibly unenviable advantage of being the first person allowed by the Russell Estate and McMaster University to make use for publication of the Russell Archives; he has also the correspondence between Russell and Lady Ottoline Morrell and Lady Constance Malleon, both now no longer living. One must give him considerable credit for exhaustive work, which no one who has ever undertaken research should undervalue.

But several considerations arise in dealing with archives. The volume of the material is overwhelming and indigestible in a short space of time; how much should be verbatim, how much paraphrased; most important of all, what should be selected for publication and what left out. As I indicated in my autobiography, Russell left his papers to two Trustees, Countess Edith Russell and Anton Felton, of the Russell Estate. They had the power to destroy or otherwise dispose of these papers. None of Russell's children have been told what has or has not been preserved of family correspondence. I do not know if any letters of mine to Russell exist; if so, I have been informed that, on Russell's orders, they are not to be published till five years after my death. All this is relevant only in the sense that a biographer is inevitably highly selective in the use of material and will be guided by his own opinions, values and tastes, as well as by the availability and sheer superabundance of documents with which he has to deal.

Perhaps I should say at once that I am one of those who dislike the modern passion for prying into every detail of people's private, more especially their sex, lives and the hoarding up of letters and papers for the purpose of sale and future "revelations". Many letters survive, of course, for sentimental reasons and may later be discovered. But others are both written and preserved by those concerned out of a sense of their own importance; these, to the disadvantage of humbler persons, survive to make and possibly distort history. I do not know to what extent learning more about a writer or statesman may damage the image one may have formed

of him. I do know that, when I read how the wife of John Donne gave birth to twelve children and died in childbirth, it tarnished somewhat for me the glory of his love poetry.

But I want first to comment on Clark's handling of Russell the mathematician, philosopher, rationalist, political reformer and agitator. Clark gives chronologically the relevant information and extracts from letters, and as regards the achievement with Whitehead of "Principia Mathematica", there is little that anyone not expert can say, except to note the agony and exhaustion the work entailed. But when it comes to other activities, Clark fails to get inside the spirit of Russell and the times through which he was living. Clark is either lacking in the necessary imagination and empathy, or else he is too right-wing in politics to do justice to Russell's campaigns. He is certainly, like one aspect of Russell himself, a class and cultural snob. We are frequently reminded that Bertie was "a Russell", so inspired by great traditions that his aristocratic bearing at the Nobel Prize ceremony in Stockholm was such as to "put the Royal Family at ease"!

Exploration of religion with Ottoline has space, but the great battle for reason against authority, intolerance and superstition is scarcely mentioned. But this mattered greatly at the period when a mere handful of "Heretics" in Cambridge, with C. K. Ogden were upholding the young in their unbelief amid an environment of compulsory chapel-going in the Colleges. Nor is credit given to Ogden, the rightful inventor of the impudent "Today and Tomorrow" series to which both Bertie and I contributed. I have been credited with "influencing" Bertie towards anti-religion. The truth is that both of us had to struggle free from a religious upbringing. And, in fact, one of Bertie's first suggestions to me on our return from China was that I should join the Rationalist Press Association and the Independent Labour Party. We both attended dinners of the RPA, Bertie worked and wrote for them for half a century, and was their President from 1955 till the day of his death. He was on the Panel of Distinguished Members of the National Secular Society, to whom he gave a lecture in 1927 on "Why I Am Not a Christian", which was later published by the NSS and the RPA.

To the National Secular Society on the occasion of their Centenary as late as 1966 he wrote: "It is good news that the National Secular Society is publishing a centenary brochure, and I am glad to take this opportunity of congratulating the Society on a hundred years of successful work for liberal causes. Ninety-eight years ago my father was defeated in a Parliamentary election because he advocated birth control. Throughout the disgracefully scurrilous campaign his opponents alluded to him as Vice-Count Amberley. A Bishop accused him of infanticide and his usual political friends fought shy of supporting him. Not only in this matter of birth control, but in all questions where sex plays a part, there has been, during the last hundred years, and especially during the last fifty, a profound change in which the National Secular Society has taken a valiant part. The Blasphemy Laws, though still on the Statue Book, have become a dead letter. There still remains much to be done to secure a rational ethic, and we may look forward confidently to the continuation of the valuable work of the National Secular Society in this field. I wish all success to the Society."

In 1964 this was his contribution to the NSS campaign for Secular Education: "The attempt to impose religious belief on children should be resisted. Religious doctrine is arbitrary and entirely the province of those who wish to maintain such views as they find adequate to their needs. It is entirely unacceptable, however, that doctrine should be

foisted upon the young as a matter of duty in the course of their education. I welcome the campaign against compulsory chapel and religious coercion in our schools."

As we all know, from present controversy, none of these causes can be called a dead letter. And Bertie Russell stands out in his time, as great as Voltaire in his, as a tireless fighter of great integrity who was a support and inspiration to multitudes among the confused and troubled, to whom he brought relief and clarity of thought.

On philosophy Clark rightly gives space to the harrying of Russell by Wittgenstein. As I have never been a Wittgenstein fan I can only feel sympathy with Russell, when, in the midst of writing the results of very hard-won thought, he was assailed by attacks on his personal character and by theories that seemed to destroy the very foundation of his work. As to this now I cannot judge, but at that date, since I was studying philosophy and eighteenth-century thought myself, I enjoyed Bertie's application of the atomic and analytic method to matter and mind, and I recall sharing his puckish delight that Einstein had "upset MY Newtonian cosmology."

The story of Russell's pacifism from 1915 onwards is usefully told in detail from Russell's angle. This was the time in Russell's life when he was most emotionally alive, and was able, in great meetings, to reach out and feel himself at one with the mass of ordinary people. But it does not convey just what Russell meant to us young men and women, a man who stood up alone for the sake of life, conscience, the hope of a better world. We would have followed him anywhere.

By the same token, Clark's estimate of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) and the Committee of 100 is totally inadequate. Those of us who had been young beside Russell in 1916 now found again the champion we needed. At its outset, CND was an uprising of intellectuals, who were among the few who really understood the meaning of nuclear weapons. It did not come from the mass of the people. But, as information spread, it became a great movement of morality, humanity and compassion. It was pre-eminently a movement for which the combination of qualities that Russell possessed were required. That work, the manifesto with Einstein, and forming the Pugwash group of scientists, had an effect on world opinion which will never be forgotten if our history survives.

Searching my own beliefs I find that there is no cause which Russell led or supported — apart from several aspects of his hostility to Russia — with which I have not been in whole-hearted agreement. Strange as it may seem to this more cynical age, there were some things which Russell and my generation really believed and knew we had to fight for. Nor should it be forgotten that many benefit today from some, at least, of our victories. There have been great changes in the marriage laws, in the relations of men and women, and in the theory and practice of education. Some of us innovators and pioneers indeed have lived to see our ideals distorted and misused; "free love", for instance, is not the same thing as "having sex", nor is much of the education today styled "progressive" in accord with what Russell and I intended.

About our school Clark has pieced together information from various sources. His use of hearsay, innuendo and anonymous malicious gossip is, in a serious book on such a subject, inexcusable and near libel. Seducing members of the staff was not, as implied, Bertie's habit. Remarks to the staff about women alleged to have been made by Bertie, are quoted from sources not given and an anonymous teacher claims to have been sexually approached. Such statements, which may even be deliberate falsehoods by those who made them, should not have been reported by a

scrupulous biographer. The one case, to which the quotation from my divorce refers, is fully told in my book and arose in our own home before the school started, as did any subsequent incidents of the kind. We kept our private lives apart from the school. It is also untrue that Griffin Barry ever came to stay at the school until after Bertie had left it and me for good. As regards the staff, they did have reasonable liberty for their own lives; a bungalow classroom some distance from the main school house could be used now and then to give a party to their friends. Two marriages took place among the staff, who were, in the main, loyal and excellent teachers. My daughter Kate has written that she learned more at our school than at any other time of her life.

Clark gives the impression that we taught the children about intercourse and sex fully in biological terms. In fact we did not; our sex teaching by present standards was old-fashioned. We were not dealing with adolescents; we answered questions, did not discourage or discuss masturbation; our aim was to let the children feel that there was nothing unclean or improper about their bodies. (I am, in fact, dubious about the way sex teaching is done nowadays.)

Even where he quotes from published statements by Bertie or me, Clark gives a false impression. We were not in entire agreement; I did not teach socialism in the school; its basis was democracy instead of authoritarianism, and co-operation instead of competition. At that time it seemed as if our social system were moving in such a direction, which, regrettably, cannot be said now.

Clark quotes from an article which I wrote about the school fairly recently in the journal, "Anarchy," as if the views it contained were from Bertie and me. In fact I stated clearly at the beginning of the article that this account related only to the time after Bertie had left. The fully democratic Council, with domestic staff and gardeners, was my innovation, as was the teaching of history from the beginning of the world, associated with biological and archaeological objects found by the children. But Clark rightly assesses that Bertie found the financial drain of the school unbearable and that, while he took pleasure in elaborating theories of education, he lacked the patience and community spirit to put them into practice.

Where his sources are other writings by me, Clark, either by carelessness or selective omission, again gives false impressions. I was attacked in America in 1928 for my book, "Hypatia," which contained views about sex, not for the "Right to be Happy," which did not. My autobiography, recently published, and which he has obviously read, contains incidents in which I participated. He states that the idea for the book, "Prospects of Industrial Civilisation," came to Bertie on the ship for China, but not that it arose entirely from theories about the nature and effect of industrialism which, as I explained, I put to Bertie in the midst of the Red Sea, theories which he called highly original and are elaborated in my own book.

I also tell the full story of the onset of Bertie's illness in China and how two Chinese chauffeurs and I played our part in helping to save his life, by getting him back from the Western hills, and demanding the opening of the gates of Peking. Clark dismisses this as a car with a puncture on the way back from Bauding, the place where previously he had caught the chill which later developed. The photo of Bertie facing pp. 320-321 is one I took of him on the wall of Peking not the Great Wall; the other showing him on a veranda, taken by Mr. Chao, is of our own Chinese house, not the University, and there is a shot of me, back

view, also photographing him. When it comes to my marriage to Bertie, Clark gets the registry office wrong; it was Battersea, not Chelsea. Nor was there any celebration or speech by Frank Russell, other than his characteristic remark that the Registrar had tried to marry him to Eileen Power, the other witness, before we arrived. My son John was born at 31 Sydney Street, Chelsea, and not in hospital. These things are all related accurately in my autobiography.

Clark seems deliberately to play down the wives in this story, possibly because three of them are still alive. But I think there are other reasons. The temptation to make use of the rich harvest of the Ottoline and Colette letters was very great; one or two that are included contain important information, but it might have been preferable to keep most of them for the two books of correspondence which will undoubtedly be published. Ferreting out every detail of the sex life of eminent persons is the passport to a large sale and evokes the greatest attention from reviewers. Why does not Women's Lib protest against the spate of male chauvinist sex which has, for weeks, been flooding our Sunday press? First, we had Augustus John, now we have to have Russell and Shaw. Unavoidably I have to deal with Bertie's attitude to women.

In the tradition of Englishmen he was brought up to know nothing about them, except to place them in two categories; wives for child-bearing and domestic chores, the rest for romantic liaisons, or the purely physical satisfaction of the sexual appetite. To Alys, the very young Bertie was an insufferable little prig and snob, correcting her grammar and manners, informing her that she was "fat" and unintelligent. For years, depriving her of "conjugal rights," he did not seek a divorce. It must be remembered that, at that date, divorce broke professional careers and husbands assumed that wives could do without sex. (James Barrie never consummated his marriage and was hurt and astonished after many years of pretence, when his wife wanted to leave him.) I note that at one point, Alys, possibly in desperation, asked Bertie if he could "acknowledge" a child if she had one. In her Quaker way she believed in free love and also in women's rights.

Fortunately Ottoline took him in hand, arousing in him aesthetic values which he lacked, bringing also the warmth of a real companionship with a woman. His letters to her reveal a part estimate of himself: "I have a perfectly cold intellect which insists upon its rights and rejects nothing. It will sometimes hurt you, sometimes seem cynical, sometimes heartless ... you won't much like it. But it belongs with my work -- I have deliberately cultivated it and it is really the main thing that I have put discipline into... the sudden absolute cessation of feeling when I think I must be trying at first. And nothing is sacred to it -- it looks at everything quite impartially..." (p.139)

Ottoline responded: "It was exhausting but delightful for me to have my mind kept in strict order... I often... wanted to hide under shady sentimental willow trees but this was never allowed." Indeed Bertie's gift to her, and to me, as to any intelligent woman or man whom he valued, was to inspire that poise and self-confidence which spring from discovering one's inherent talent. Thus he evoked in Ottoline the capacity to queen it later among her Garsington intellectual coterie.

Ottoline notes in her diary that concern for the nation, due to their aristocratic lineage, was a further bond between them. One entry goes to the heart of Bertie's tragedy: "He is so lonely and tortured by his brain incessantly working, and he cannot be sympathetic to the things that so much affect me. His body and mind seem to have a huge gap between them ... his intellect is so immense but en l'air, not en rapport with the

things of this sensual life. No visionary power or imagination in that direction or what there is is very arctic and bare."

The pursuit of intellectual excellence at no matter what cost, and the dominance of the scientific mind, sharpened for the uncompromising pursuit of truth, had, at times, brought both Russell and Whitehead to the verge of madness. Men were intoxicated by their exciting discoveries in physics, and, so exacting was the work in this field and in mathematics, that even at an early age men's brains became too old to cope with it. I have also written of this remoteness of Bertie's intellect, seeing in it not only the danger of individual isolation, but the peril of an entire society dominated by the schizophrenia of a scientific elite.

When he comes to Bertie's dilemma about Colette and myself, Clark sets the scene like a Barbara Cartland novel that I recently read. A nobleman of ancient lineage, deciding that the time has come to beget an heir, begins to extricate himself from his aristocratic mistresses and seek a likely candidate among young debutantes. The eligibility of the selected young woman, said to be gentle — and even intelligent — is discussed by the titled ladies. She may be taken on trial, but should she, after journeying to China, presently fail to deliver the goods, she may be discarded in favor of previous loves, irrespective of her sacrifice of her own promising career. Reading this, I can only say (like Bergson when Bernard Shaw insisted on expounding his philosophy for him) "O no, it was not quite zat." Clark is well aware that the pursuit of truth did not apply in Bertie's pursuit of ladies, hence he might have guessed that the impression given by the letters he cites, is not the whole story.

I was, of course, ignorant of the depth of his relations with Colette. Their love began when, through the war, Bertie was most alive emotionally and nearest to the way ordinary human beings feel. Clearly there is reason to see in this the love of his life, and that they should have married then. But the question to ask is why did Colette, professing eternal love, not wish to go with Bertie to Russia and China? Why did he hide the fact that I was to be with him? Colette faced the same choice as I — to live day by day beside a man of austere intellect and have children; or the glamour and color of the theatre, and the dramatic expression of her own personality. Bertie once wrote that he liked to live like the great characters in Shakespeare or Grand Opera; so perhaps, did she. Both were a bit theatrical; and passionate meetings and partings did not involve any lasting commitment.

The reticence of Bertie's letters about my lone disappearance into Russia covers, not so much indifference, as our bitter quarrel before he went. Faced with my anger because he broke his promise to "start our life" by going there together, he had — always admiring an adventurous spirit — more or less dared me to go alone. Alarmed at the result, he was not as Clark says, inactive. But there was little he could do. He wrote desperate letters to the British Consul in Reval and urged Arthur Watts to find me and get me out. In the event, I presently returned from China, having helped to save the life of the father and delivered the goods in the shape of his son — possibly to the misfortune of all four of us.

I did not aspire, as Colette suggested, to become the Empress of all the Russells. Experiencing three generations of them, I found, as she did, that the relation is quite otherwise. Bertie often mentions his own lustfulness. I doubt if he ever experienced the full sexual thrust of the male. It was inhibited in him by his cold loveless aristocratic upbringing, and by his own intense devotion to his intellect. He was a frightened small boy, a will-o'-the-wisp, a lonely man out in the cold

without the constant physical and emotional warmth of a woman beside him.

Since Clark stresses sex issues, women cannot easily evade them. Should romantic love prevail over a trail of mental breakdowns, broken marriages and careers? What do we mean by love, anyway? We seem obsessed by sex; our sex codes are in confusion. Do we now — so it seems — evaluate men as sex objects in the way that men have traditionally evaluated women?

Do women propose to emulate and themselves live by the masculine sex code? Have they not something better to contribute from the inspiration of their own psyche both to human life and human society? Are not the lack of love, the growth of self-seeking in our society traceable to the very same causes that bedevilled Bertie's own ideals in his personal life and beyond? These were the sort of problems with which those of us struggling for sexual liberty and understanding were dealing and which are smirched by Clark's prurience.

Ronald W. Clark no doubt thinks that he has told the complete story without fear or favour. In fact the whole tone of this book denigrates Bertie vis-a-vis the Establishment. Amid all the detail about ancient lineage and the rest, one element is missing — the spark of genius. Bertie had insight and vision which I am glad that my life allowed me to come in contact with and to share. Was he ever really wrong about human choices and human destiny? What choice is the world making even now?

THE BRS LIBRARY

(34)

Report of the Library Committee (Don Jackanicz, Chairperson):

Not having attended the 1977 annual meeting, I am indebted to Lee Eisler for having presented the Library Committee report in Los Angeles. According to the minutes of that meeting, "in discussion it was remarked that most of Russell's books are available without too much effort either from Libraries or bookstores. It was voiced that the Library might best concentrate on films, tapes, and records." I fully agree with the former observation but only partially with the latter suggestion.

The Books in Print catalogue provides a lengthy list of Russell's works while most community and academic libraries do offer some variety of printed material by and about Russell. For this we can be grateful, but it should be remembered that some members may not be in a position to purchase personal copies or can not readily consult well-stocked collections of Russelliana. It is in the interest of these members that many of the Library's items should be considered. In addition, a number of the Library's books and articles, because of their uncommonness or rarity, are such as to attract potentially every

members. We have seen that few members have made use of the Library. Yet it is encouraging to know that a growing assortment of printed material is available upon request by any member. I am confident that those members in need will contact the Library.

That the Library should obtain films and recordings of Russell is a proposal I have supported from the beginning. I do not believe making such non-printed materials available should be the Library's sole or even principal activity. But it has been established that Russell films and recordings are useful and popular at B. R. S. functions. The Library now possesses two films and a third is being ordered. At the Los Angeles meeting a Treasury appropriation of \$250.00 was made for the purchase of a BBC/Time-Life film titled Bertrand Russell. I am pleased to report the possibility of obtaining this film at a discount. If this can be done, the remainder of the Treasury appropriation might be applied toward acquiring another film. While none are presently in the Library, tapes and records would likely become as popular as films, and their contribution, like all gifts from members, is to be welcomed.

By the distribution time of Newsletter 15 we should have received our third film. As of April 1, 1977, however, the Library has accumulated fifty items through the contributions of B. R. S. members and others. All of these contributors are to be applauded, and the membership is reminded that their requests will be gladly received and promptly filled.

ODDITIES

(35)

Bedford anecdote. The following comes from Interesting Anecdotes, Memoirs, Allegories, Essays, and Poetical Fragments: tending to amuse the Fancy, and inculcate Morality. By Mr. Addison, 1797:

The late Duke's great-grandmother, wife to the fifth Earl of Bedford, and mother of the excellent Lord Russel, died before her husband was advanced to the Dukedom. The manner of her death was remarkable: - She was very accomplished in mind as well as person, though she was the daughter of Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset, by the dissolute Countess of Essex. But the guilt of her parents, and the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, had been industriously concealed from her; so that all she knew was their conjugal infelicity, and their living latterly in the same house without ever meeting. Coming one day into her Lord's study, her mind oppressed and weakened by the death of Lord Russel, the Earl being suddenly called away, her eye, it is supposed, was suddenly caught by a thin folio, which was lettered, Trial of the Earl and Countess of Somerset. She took it down, and, turning over the leaves, was struck to the heart by the guilt and conviction of her parents. She fell back, and was found by her husband dead in that posture, with the book lying open before her.

(Thanks, Bob Davis and Peter Houchin.)

CONTRIBUTIONS

- (36) Money contributed by members (in addition to dues) during the first 3 years of BRS existence (1974-1976) has provided 64% of BRS income, and is essential if the BRS is to prosper and develop its possibilities. We thank the following members for their recent contributions to the BRS Treasury: TRUMAN ANDERSON, JR., JUSTIN COLEMAN, PETER CRANFORD, FRANCES DIMITT, DON JACKANICZ, TERRY & JUDITH ZACCONE.
-

BRS BUSINESS

- (37) Time to nominate Directors. As you recall, the BRS has 15 Directors; 5 are elected each year, for a 3-year term (NLI0-7,39). Any member may nominate a candidate for Director. The names of the candidates will appear on a ballot in the next issue (NLI5).
- * If you wish to nominate someone, send your candidate's name and a brief statement of qualifications, to the Elections Committee, c/o Bob Davis (7025 W. Franklin #86, Hollywood, CA 90068.)
- The 5 Directors whose terms expire on 1/1/78 are ED HOPKINS, DON JACKANICZ, JIM MC KEOWN, JACK PITT and KATE TAIT. Directors are not limited to a single term; they may be re-elected.
- (38) Classified information. The membership list, that we distributed to members with NLI3, is for members' personal use only. Its purpose is to facilitate communication among members. It is not to be sold or given to other publications or organizations without the written permission of the BRS President.
-

ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

- (39) Denver Freethinkers' Society has issued another 4-page "Directory of U.S. Freethought Groups and Publications — 1977". Their address: PO Box 1621, Englewood, CO 80150. The BRS's name and address is listed, with the letter "U" alongside, meaning "unknown". This means they don't know anything about us. The Directory states, "The information here presented was obtained from the groups themselves." This is misleading, since it implies that the BRS supplied the information in response to a request, and knew it was going to be listed in the Directory, none of which is so. On the other hand, one could say that the information presented did come from the BRS, since it probably came from our classified ads. The Directory also states: "No implication is intended that the groups and publications herein assembled are in mutual accord with any philosophies, viewpoints or policies, except as specifically stated."
-

P.S.

- (40) Carol Mull is teaching, at Clark Junior College of Business, a class in Business Law, and a class and lab in Electronic Accounting Machines and Mini-Computers. Next quarter she will also have a class in Art Appreciation. Many students are veterans, handicapped or underprivileged, and Carol's aim is to help make them more employable. Next Fall, she will do her usual 6 lectures on Symbolism, at Indiana Central College. Busy gal!
- (41) Maiden speech. Next issue we expect to run John Russell's maiden speech, of July 21, 1976, in the House of Lords. It deals with the industrial nations' obligation, as he sees it, to help feed the 3rd World.
-

INDEX

- (42) Introductory (1). Debate on religion cancelled (2). Item cancelled (3). Chairman Peter Cranford reports (4). President Bob Davis reports (5). Vice-President Gary Slezak reports (6). Treasurer Steve Reinhardt reports, first quarter '77 (7). Committee Reports: Martin Garstens, Applied Philosophy (8); Lee Eisler, Information Committee (9) and Membership Committee (10); Ed Hopkins, Philosophers' Committee (11,12). New philosophy periodical (13). "The Faith of a Humanist" (14). Lester Denonn recollects (16). Studs Terkel (17). Two kinds of work (18). Will Durant on BR (19). Chicago area chapter (20). News about members: Cranford (21), Ellis (22), Lamont (23), Leiber (24), Milham (25), Mull (40), Pitt (26), Warren Smith (27). Two new honorary members (28). New members (29). Address changes (30). Good book buy (31). Recommended reading (32). Dora reviews Clark (33) BRS Library report (34). Bedford anecdote (35). Contributions (36). Nominating Directors (37). Membership list is confidential (38). Freethought Directory (39). Maiden speech (41). Index (42).