

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS

No. 20

November 1978

- (1) BRS at APA, 12/78 (2,9,10). Proposed BR memorial in Britain (4). Next year's meeting: time & place (50). Report on Nobel Symposium (8). Results of RSN19 ballot (12). BR's 10 Commandments (2 versions)(13,14). BR as political thinker(15). A.J.Ayer on philosophers (19). David Pears and Karl Popper accept (30,31). New procedure for paying dues (44a). Fund-raising volunteers wanted (45). An asterisk in the left column indicates a request.
-

COMING EVENTS

- (2) BRS at APA. The BRS will present its 5th annual symposium at the annual meeting of the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division) on December 26, 1978. This year's meeting is in Washington, D.C. For more details, see the program (9), and abstracts of the papers (10a,b).
-

- (3) Chairman Peter G. Cranford reports:

The most important development since the last report was the strengthening of our ties with British friends of Russell's: Dora Russell, Michael Scott, Peter Cadogan, and Lord Brockway. I arrived in London during the international humanist meeting, and was well received for several reasons...chief of which was that Dora was with me. She was obviously greatly loved and respected.

Dora, now 83, made the long train trip from Carn Voel to London alone. She is in fine shape physically, mentally and emotionally, and is a delightful conversationalist. She is an excellent promoter, and the fruits of her ability should be apparent before long. She succeeded in interesting key people in a memorial to Russell, and made tentative decisions as to the sculptor and the location in London — probably Red Lion Square opposite Conway Hall, or (less likely) in ancestral Russell Square.

John Sutcliffe, 36, is an impressive intellectual. Like Dora, he has considerable courage. He is very knowledgeable about Russell's ideas, and could more than hold his own if he were to meet an anti-Russell thug in some dark intellectual alley. John and his mother met with Dora and me for several days, and there was good talk and plenty of it.

I spoke with Rev. Michael Scott. Peter Cadogan, who worked with Russell (and was a World War II air force pilot), described Scott as a "living saint". Scott is a rational theologian, and this has caused him some problems with the church. I agree with Cadogan's assessment of Scott.

I was not able to visit the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, for lack of time. Incidentally, there is a suit pending between the Russell family and the Foundation.

I was not able to see Conrad or Lord John Russell. Dora reports that the latter thinks well of the aims of the Society.

Dora reported that Kate and her family would soon be returning to live with her.

One highlight of the trip: Dora took me and my son through the large waiting crowd, to visit Parliament. Lord Brockway showed us around, and we heard "Yes, m'Lord" a number of times, and other marks of deference. Dora, as the former wife of one lord and the mother of another, got her own share of deference, which she augmented by capitalizing on chivalry: she walks with a cane. When I assisted her on one occasion, her eyes twinkled as she said, "Don't worry about me. I don't really need it that much. But you'd be surprised at how much more attention I can get with it than without it!"

I asked Lord Brockway, who at 90 is completely alert (and favorably disposed toward the BRS), in what way age had affected BR's competence. He answered that the only substantial change had been emotional: Russell became short-tempered toward the end. John Sutcliffe, in conversation with Lord Brockway, found him very much in favor of the proposed memorial.

- (4) President Robert K. Davis reports:

See (50).

- (5) Treasurer Stephen J. Reinhardt reports:

See (51).

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

(6) Audio-Visual Committee (Warren Allen Smith, Chairperson):

On the possibility of producing Whettam's "Sinfonia Contra Timore", from the tape supplied by East German Radio, here are excerpts from our letter to Mr. Whettam:

...they will permit the use of the tape only for the 200 members of the BRS, and they say that reproduction in a larger quantity would require rights and be tied to financial obligations which would have to be agreed upon.

Only a few of our 200 members, however, are interested in music, for we are an academic society interested in Bertrand Russell, to whom the symphony was dedicated. Our proposal was to have made 1000 or so LP albums, to give 100 to the composer as well as to the orchestra, to give 100 or more gratis to major radio stations and university libraries, and to sell the remainder in order to pay the estimated costs of \$2500...with any overage going to our non-profit organization. Unfortunately, our modest proposal has been rejected.

We are still interested in purchasing 50 to 100 copies. Is it possible that the Leipzig Symphony might produce the the LP?

BRS Library holdings include phonograph records, tape recordings at 7½ ips, and cassettes of the following:

1. Bertrand Russell (Pye Golden Guinea GGL-0110)--a one-disc abridgment of Speaking Personally: Bertrand Russell
2. Bertrand Russell Speaking (Caedmon TC-1149)--four interviews of BR in 1960 by Woodrow Wyatt
3. Bertrand Russell Speaks: Human Nature and Politics (Audio Archives/Heritage LPA-1202)--BR presenting his 1950 Nobel Prize Lecture, with notes by Irwin Edman
4. Notice to the World:...Renounce War or Perish!...World Peace or Universal Death (Audio Masterworks LPA-1225)--proceedings of BR's 9 July 1955 Claxton Hall press conference
5. Searching for a New Land (Cetra LPX 12-13)--eleven bands of music by New Trolls, a rock group, one band a setting of BR's poem "To Edith."
6. Speaking Personally: Bertrand Russell (Riverside 7014-7015)--two discs; interview of BR by John Chandos
7. Whettam, Graham, "Sinfonia Contra Timore," an LP dedicated to BR by the English composer and performed by the Rundfunk-Sinfonieorchester Berlin (copy of a tape from Leipzig Radio Symphony Orchestra)
8. Wisdom: Conversations with the Elder Wise Man of Our Day, volume 2 (Decca DL-9084)--interviews by Romney Wheeler of David Ben-Gurion, Frank Lloyd Wright, Sean O'Casey, and BR

(7) Library Committee report (Donald W. Jackanicz, Chairperon): See (38 through 41).(8) Science Committee report (J. B. Neilands, Chairperson):

1. Scientists Discuss Ethics in Stockholm

On August 20-25 the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, with funding from the Nobel Foundation, presented a symposium titled "Ethics for Science Policy". The meeting was held at Södergarn, which is on an island in the Stockholm archipelago. The participants, all natural or social scientists, were from both eastern and western countries and, with a single exception, represented a broad spectrum of ideological opinion. The group called "Science for the People", comprised of younger, less professionally-oriented persons, was conspicuous by its absence. BR was there of course, in spirit, since it was he, together with Einstein, who started the Pugwash movement.

The symposium began with a dinner at the ornate headquarters of the Academy and on the following morning got down to business. Before the week was out a series of papers had been read on the philosophy of science, organization of research, ethical dilemmas in "big science" (space, nuclear power, defense) and, finally, communication among scientists and between science and the public.

The chairman was about to bring down the gavel on the last session when four participants delivered to the rostrum a resolution calling for greater social

accountability among scientists, with special emphasis on the urgent necessity that science should serve the causes of peace and human welfare. Nobel Symposia are quite dignified affairs and are not given to direct political action. The chairman intoned that to pass such a resolution would endanger the funding of future symposia. Thus chastened, the Gang of Four fell silent and, perhaps not wishing to embarrass the hosts, did not press the issue. The proceedings will be published by Pergamon Press in early 1979.

It was the consensus of almost everyone that spending for military purposes has gotten entirely out of hand. According to Frank Barnaby, Director of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, it is not too much to conclude that societies in both the US and USSR have become almost totally militarized.

Can a symposium like this accomplish anything of value? Allowing for the considerable expense of gathering people from the corners of the globe, we are left with the net advantage of meeting kindred souls, the opportunity to organize our thoughts on our ethical responsibilities to society and a forum in which to advance controversial ideas.

2. In early November, Professor Nguyen van Hieu, Vice-Director of the Vietnam Scientific Research Center, will visit Berkeley. The Committee on Science is arranging a buffet supper where Prof. Hieu will meet with members of the faculty of the University of California.

PHILOSOPHERS' CORNER

(9) BRS at APA (December 1978) -- the program:

Program
of
THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY

at the December 1978 meeting
of the Eastern Division of
THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

Time: December 26, 1978 (Tuesday morning)
Place: The Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

I. ON RUSSELLIAN CLUSTERS
Eugene Schlossberger

Commentator: David Rosenthal, Graduate Center
City University of New York

II. REPRESSION IN BERTRAND RUSSELL'S ON EDUCATION
Howard Woodhouse, University of Western Ontario

Commentator: Mark Wartofsky, Boston University

Chairman: Justin Leiber, University of Texas, Houston

Copies of the papers presented here today may be borrowed (at no cost) or bought (for \$4), by writing to Mr. Don Jalkanicz, Chairperson, BRS Library, 3802 N. Kenneth Avenue, Chicago, IL 60641.

This program is presented by the BRS Philosophers' Committee, chaired by Edwin Hopkins.

BRS at APA (December 1978) — abstracts of the papers:

(10a)

I. ON RUSSELLIAN CLUSTERS, Eugene Schlossberger

In his Inquiry into Meaning and Truth Russell adopted a view of things and properties which he had earlier criticized in "On the Relations of Universals and Particulars," namely the view that things are just bundles of co-instantiated properties. This view, if correct, does facilitate Russell's epistemological program and treatment of names. I present, however, a number of arguments concerning spatial location, instantiation, modality and temporal change which clearly suggest that, as Russell himself held in 1912, the bundle theory is inadequate. A better ontological grounding for Russell's views in the Inquiry must be provided if those theses are to be maintained.

(10b)

II. REPRESSION IN BERTRAND RUSSELL'S ON EDUCATION, Howard Woodhouse

In this paper I examine the methods suggested by Russell for controlling fear in the education of the young child in On Education. Upon analysis, some of these appear explicitly repressive despite the fact that Russell at the same time condemns traditional education and morality for requiring repression. After also examining Russell's conception of fear as either instinctual or learned, I explain the inconsistency in his educational theory by relating it to two main theoretical reasons:

1) The behaviorist conception of the child which Russell presents in On Education. His analysis is in terms of instinct, reflex and habit. Briefly, the establishment of good habits in the areas of sleeping and physical courage necessitate repression of both instinctual and learned fears.

2) Russell's 'behaviorised' conception of repression, by means of which he dissolves the notion of unconscious motivation into that of conflicting habits. Since these are readily amenable to instruction, Russell sees no need to invoke the metaphysical concepts of 'the censor' and 'the unconscious'.

He thereby abandons the psychological dynamism of the Freudian account. Finally I show that many of the problems inherited in On Education find their source in the philosophical psychology of The Analysis of Mind in which Russell adopted neutral monism. Secondary sources referred to include David Pears 'Russell's Theory of Desire' in J.E. Thomas and K. Blackwell (eds.) Russell in Review, Joe Park's Bertrand Russell on Education and Kate Tait's My Father Bertrand Russell.

(11)

BRS at APA (December 1979) — a call for papers:

The following announcement was sent to publications read by professional philosophers:

The Bertrand Russell Society announces a call for papers to be presented at its meeting at the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in New York in December 1979. Papers may be on any aspect of Russell's philosophy. They should have a reading time of about one half-hour and should be submitted in triplicate, typed and double-spaced, with an abstract of not more than 150 words. The name of the author, with his address and the title of his paper, should be submitted on a separate page. The submission deadline is May 15, 1979, and the papers should be sent to Edwin Hopkins, Chairman, Philosophers' Committee, The Bertrand Russell Society, 6165 64th Avenue #5, E. Riverdale, MD 20840. Those desiring the return of their papers should enclose a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

THE MEMBERS VOTE

(12)

Results of the RSN19 ballot:

Part 1. Election of Directors. All 8 candidates were elected...PETER G. CRANFORD, ROBERT K. DAVIS, LEE EISLER, MARTIN GARSTENS, JAMES E. MCKEOWN, HARRY RUJA, GARY SLEZAK, and BEVERLY C. SMITH...for 3-year terms starting 1/1/79.

Part 2. Time and place of 1979 meeting: New York City in June.

Part 3. Answers to Bob Davis' questions are to be found in his report (50).

Part 4. Honorary memberships: both nominations (of A.J. Ayer and Paul Edwards) were approved, by the necessary

"two-thirds of the members voting", as required by the BRS Bylaws. The formalities have now been completed.

Only 15% of the members voted. That's better than last year's 11% but nothing to brag about. Can we make a better showing with the current ballot (at the end of this issue)? The current ballot needs no envelope, and is already addressed. Instructions for folding are on the ballot. Please vote.

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

(13) "My Ten Commandments" originally ran in "Everyman" on April 3, 1930. Here it is:

Everybody, I suppose, has his own list of virtues that he tries to practice, and, when he fails to practice them, he feels shame quite independently of the opinion of others, so far at any rate as conscious thought is concerned, though probably not fundamentally. I have tried to put the virtues that I should wish to possess into the form of a decalogue, which is as follows:

1. Do not lie to yourself.

This I regard as the most essential of all commandments. Some unduly rationalistic person may object that it is useless to lie to yourself, since you will not believe your own lie; this is a delusion. Coué has taught us to cure illnesses by auto-suggestion, and the same method is equally effective in obscuring consciousness of our own defects. If you have been engaged in a business transaction, and have succeeded in driving a sharp bargain with a person much poorer than yourself, you have only to assure yourself every night as you drop asleep that you showed extraordinary generosity and that most people would have been far harsher; after you have said this to yourself for a week or a month, you will believe it. Braggarts soon come to believe in the feats of courage they attribute to themselves. When you wish to believe some theological or political doctrine which will increase your income, you will, if you are not very careful, give much more weight to the arguments in favor than to those against. Generally speaking, unless you practice the habit of telling yourself the truth, you will be able to perpetrate any villainy with a clear conscience.

2. Do not lie to other people unless they are exercising tyranny.

This is the exact opposite to the generally received opinion, which is that one should tell the truth to the strong but not to the weak. It is considered right and proper for governments and great newspapers to lie for public objects, such as the suppression of Bolshevism or the execution of innocent persons with unpopular opinions; it is considered right for parents to lie to children about matters of sex and even about the moral excellence of the said parents. My principle is the opposite of all this. I consider that governments should tell the truth to their subjects, and that parents should tell the truth to their children, however inconvenient this may seem, but I do not consider that tyrants have a right to expect the truth from their victims. In extreme cases, this would be admitted: a conspirator who, under torture, refuses to betray his accomplices, is admired, provided his cause is not too abhorrent. But I think the principle has much wider applications. I should not blame children for lying to their parents if their parents are unreasonably repressive; I should not blame a freethinker for concealing his opinions if the avowal of them would cause him to starve. Those who are intelligent but weak cannot be expected to forego the use of their intelligence in their conflicts with those who are stupid but strong.

3. When you think it your duty to inflict pain, scrutinize your reasons closely.

I should say, "Do not take pleasure in the infliction of pain," were it not a matter that is outside the will. If you do take pleasure in the infliction of pain, you may be able to alter your character by various indirect methods, but you cannot cease to feel this pleasure merely by telling yourself that it is base; you can, however, by an act of will refrain from actions to which you are tempted by the desire for this pleasure. As a matter of fact, the wish to inflict pain is very much commoner than most people realize, and it is at the bottom of a great many beliefs supposed to be moral. It used to be believed among ourselves, and is still believed in Japan, that it is wicked for a woman to have anaesthetics in childbirth. This belief has never had any basis other than sadism, although all kinds of pseudo-scientific reasons have been given for it. I doubt whether operations, such as the extraction of tonsils, are always necessary when surgeons recommend them, and I suspect that some surgeons in some cases derive an unconscious pleasure from the infliction of pain. It is every surgeon's duty to inhibit his natural shrinking from the infliction of pain, and there is a certain psychological tendency for such inhibition to leave room for sadistic impulses.

We admire and praise self-sacrifice, and derive pleasure from the contemplation of virtuous lives devoid of happiness; this also often has its root in cruelty, and causes moralists to commend self-sacrifice even when it does no good to anybody. For all these reasons we are too prone to believe that pain is good for other people; and although this belief is sometimes justified, as, for example, in the case of a necessary surgical operation, we ought to be very sure in each case that our judgment is not influenced by any impulse towards cruelty.

4. When you desire power, examine yourself carefully as to why you desire it.

The desire for power is part of the essential mechanism of human nature, and it is not to be regarded as in itself an evil; it only becomes an evil when associated with certain other desires and impulses. Religious leaders, political reformers, and men of science are all actuated by various forms of love of power, but are not on this

account to be thought ill of. On the other hand, the power that consists in thwarting people is bad. Love of power therefore is an evil when it is associated with hatred or contempt, but not otherwise. Whether love of power is good or bad depends entirely upon those other desires for the sake of which power is wanted. If you desire power in order to be able to be cruel, you had better either subject yourself to a psycho-analyst who will change your character, or else commit suicide.

5. When you have power, use it to build up people, not to constrict them.

This maxim applies especially in education. Those who deal with the young inevitably have power, and it is easy to exercise this power in ways pleasing to the educator rather than useful to the child. The stock example is the father who wishes his son to follow in his footsteps to be, like himself, an eminent statesman, a prominent financier, a distinguished man of science or what not, and who is indignant when he finds that his son's tastes are utterly different from his own. All propaganda in education really comes under this head, since it consists not in teaching the young to think for themselves but in hypnotizing them into the unthinking acceptance of formulas. Power over subject nations comes under the same head. There are very few instances in history of such power being abandoned voluntarily, although there are many instances of its doing great harm.

6. Do not attempt to live without vanity, since this is impossible, but choose the right audience from which to seek admiration.

The man who seeks the admiration of fools has to become a fool, and the man who seeks the admiration of rogues has to become a rogue, but the man who seeks the admiration of the wise and good has to become wise and good. Vanity, like love of power, is an essential ingredient in human nature, and those who imagine that they can live without it deceive themselves: but vanity has forms that are noble as well as forms that are ignoble. Vanity is the motive of Hamlet's dying speech:

O God! — Horatio, what a wounded name,
Things standing thus unknown, shall live behind me!
If thou didst ever hold me in thy heart,
Absent thee from felicity awhile,
And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain,
to tell my story.

But this is a noble form of vanity, essential to the greatest characters.

7. Do not think of yourself as a separate, wholly self-contained unit.

A certain degree of egoism is natural to man but theory has made us more complete egoists than we are by nature. The natural man, at any rate for certain purposes, includes within the scope of his egoism his family, his tribe, his nation, and even all mankind. He will include his family when he is protecting his children from death or disaster; he will include his tribe or his nation in time of war; he may include all mankind in the face of some natural cataclysm. This last does not necessarily happen. For example, on the occasion of the earthquake in Tokyo, the Japanese considered that the Koreans were in some way to blame, and set to work to murder them. But in general a collection of men faced with grave danger from some natural cause, such as tempest or shipwreck, will tend to co-operate so long as co-operation offers a chance of escape.

Most co-operation is due to fear, so that as people become more powerful they become more individualistic. This, however, is not an inevitable law of human nature. It is possible to be actuated by hope rather than fear, and to co-operate in securing goods rather than in avoiding evils. So the Athenians, after defeating the Persians, co-operated to make Athens beautiful; so the Elizabethans, after defeating the Armada, co-operated to make England great and splendid. Such co-operation, where it has occurred, has been a genuine instinctive movement, not a mere pale obedience to duty. It is the possibility of such co-operation on a large scale that makes it permissible to have hopes for the future of mankind. But this depends upon the existence of a social sense as deep and instinctive as that of gregarious animals, and the modern world, for reasons which are somewhat obscure, is inimical to this kind of social sense, except in the one form of patriotism, which is too limited and too much bound up with war to be adequate as a source of social progress.

Conscious self-sacrifice should never be called for. Whenever it is, there is an implication of a feeling of dislike towards the object of the sacrifice.

8. Be reliable.

I mean by this to suggest a whole set of humdrum but necessary virtues, such as punctuality, keeping promises, adhering to plans involving other people, refraining from treachery even in its mildest forms. This whole set of virtues used to be commoner than it now is among the young. Modern education, in lessening the emphasis on discipline, has, I think, failed to produce reliable human beings where social obligations are concerned.

9. Be just.

I mean by this that everybody's acts should be judged quite regardless of whether you like or dislike the people concerned. But this is a very rare and difficult virtue, unknown, for example, in law courts. There is no country on earth where a foreigner can rely on getting justice against a native; there is no institution on earth of which the head does not have favorites who are allowed a latitude forbidden to those who are in disfavor. Justice is essentially an intellectual virtue, demanding the power to think dispassionately. Intellectuals, however, by no means always practice it. If it had existed among intellectuals they would not have behaved as they did in the Great War, either in Germany or elsewhere.

10. Be good-natured.

No collection of virtues, however brilliant, will make a person tolerable in daily life who is perpetually in the habit of scolding or complaining. A certain truthfulness and bonhomie are essential to the simpleness and happiness of everyday existence. This may seem a humble virtue, but I believe the lack of it has more to do with causing unhappy marriages than any one other factor.

If all these commandments were obeyed, mankind would be intelligent and happy. At present they are neither.

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS.)

* * * * *

(14) While we're on decalogues, let's have another. This one comes from the Autobiography, Volume 3, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1969, p. 71:

"A LIBERAL DECALOGUE" *

by
Bertrand Russell

Perhaps the essence of the Liberal outlook could be summed up in a new decalogue, not intended to replace the old one but only to supplement it. The Ten Commandments that, as a teacher, I should wish to promulgate, might be set forth as follows:

1. Do not feel absolutely certain of anything.
2. Do not think it worth while to proceed by concealing evidence, for the evidence is sure to come to light.
3. Never try to discourage thinking for you are sure to succeed.
4. When you meet with opposition, even if it should be from your husband or your children, endeavor to overcome it by argument and not by authority, for a victory dependent upon authority is unreal and illusory.
5. Have no respect for the authority of others, for there are always contrary authorities to be found.
6. Do not use power to suppress opinions you think pernicious, for if you do the opinions will suppress you.
7. Do not fear to be eccentric in opinion, for every opinion now accepted was once eccentric.
8. Find more pleasure in intelligent dissent than in passive agreement, for, if you value intelligence as you should, the former implies a deeper agreement than the latter.
9. Be scrupulously truthful, even if the truth is inconvenient, for it is more inconvenient when you try to conceal it.
10. Do not feel envious of the happiness of those who live in a fool's paradise, for only a fool will think that it is happiness.

* This first appeared at the end of my article "The Best Answer to Fanaticism - Liberalism," in *The New York Times Magazine*, December 16, 1951.

(Thank you, AMY BLOCK.)

ABOUT BERTRAND RUSSELL

(15) Liberal, Socialist, or Anarchist? That's the caption under a picture of BR on the front cover of the BEC's "The Listener", of 8/31/78. The following article starts on p. 263 of that issue:

Alan Ryan

Bertrand Russell's liberalism

Bertrand Russell is an underrated political thinker. But, if this is regrettable—and I, at any rate, think it is regrettable—it is not exactly surprising. One thing that must stand in the way of a proper estimate of what Russell contributed to our political ideas is the enormous reputation he acquired for his contributions to logic and the foundations of mathematics. Russell was a leading figure in what amounts to the only revolution these subjects had undergone in two-and-a-half millennia. It was an intellectual achievement which inevitably overshadowed his contributions to thinking about politics.

A second thing that, rather less happily, gets in the way is Russell's tremendously energetic career as a political activist. I am sure that there is much more to be said on behalf of his activities as the persecutor of the American persecutors of the Vietnamese than his opponents were willing to let on. Yet the simple-minded Marxism and the global paranoia with which his secretary and disciple-turned-mentor, Ralph Schoenman, encumbered that hostility to American folly, suggested that Russell was senile if he meant half of what he was supposed to be saying, and just silly if he was letting other people say it in his name. Ronald Clark's biography of Russell, which Penguin have just brought out in paperback, deals admirably with these rather melancholy events. He points out, with some subtlety, what it is very likely that Russell's lifelong allegiances would have led him to think, and what not. We now tend to associate accusations of pursuing an 'imperialist' policy with Marxist critics of American behaviour. But it ought to be remembered that the basis of the theory of imperialism was provided at the turn of the century by an English liberal, J. A. Hobson, a colleague of Russell's at the London School of Economics. Like many other radicals before the First World War, Russell simply took it for granted that capitalist countries would try to gain control of overseas markets and overseas sources of raw materials.

His hostility to America was of almost equally long standing. In the middle of the First World War, one of his fears was that a long-drawn-out conflict would drag the Americans into the European struggle between employers and workers; the pre-war American record led him to think that American soldiers on British soil would be used to put down strikes and intimidate political radicals. None of this, however, demanded the least attachment to Marxism as an intellectual doctrine, and certainly none of it went along with any affection for communism in practice. This can be seen readily enough by the proximity in date of two of his best-known books on politics: *The Principles of Social Reconstruction*, the lectures which give the clearest, most complete and most persuasive account of his political views, came out in 1916, and the cool and unenthusiastic appraisal of the new Soviet régime which makes up *The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism* came out a mere four years later, in 1920.

One of Russell's achievements as a political thinker was to keep alive and enrich the liberalism into which he had been born through the vicissitudes of the 20th century. Russell was of course, the child of liberal aristocrats. But the liberalism into which he was born was not the cautious, commercially oriented, only very mildly reformist outlook of the solid Liberal

Party. True, Russell's grandfather, Lord John Russell, had earned the nickname of 'finality Jack' by declaring that he hoped the Reform Act of 1832 would constitute a final settlement of Britain's constitutional problems; but Russell's parents were decidedly of the radical wing of liberalism. Lord and Lady Amberley were devoted to the causes to which John Stuart Mill and his allies were devoted, so much so that they persuaded Mill to become the infant Bertrand Russell's godfather—stressing, of course, that this was to be in 'no religious sense'.

The Amberleys' enthusiasms in the 1860s look strikingly like the causes for which their son was to fight in his turn. They scandalised their contemporaries by advocating a complete equality of the sexes at a time when almost nobody was prepared to contemplate more than a few timid concessions to a wife's right to physical and economic protection from her husband. It was not just a matter of giving wives some say over the property they brought into marriage; it was equally a matter of women's right to have a marriage dissolved without suffering financial and social penalties.

Kate Amberley worked with John Stuart Mill and his stepdaughter on the Women's Suffrage Society—and she drew from Queen Victoria the wish 'that she could have that young woman whipped'. Her husband scandalised polite society by publicly declaring that there was an urgent need to discuss the whole topic of birth control, since it seemed that the misery and poverty of the working classes could hardly be alleviated so long as they were unable to control the size of their families. Mill, of course, had been jailed for a night many years before, for distributing birth-control advice in working-class districts. One can only hope that the recollection comforted Russell in 1940 when the uproar aroused by his little book on *Marriage and Morals* cost him a professorship in New York.

If radicalism about the relations between men and women was the most obviously scandalous departure from the political proprieties, a more politically explosive issue was the rights of private property. Here, too, Russell's parents displayed the same casualness about the virtues of private property that their son was to display. The old Whig aristocracy had taken it for granted that landed property was an essential prop to the stability of English social and political life; their renegade offspring were inclined to argue that landlords were simply another variety of monopolist, that the rights of landlords were a tax imposed by the idle upon the industrious, and that the conjunction of all this with inheritance was merely to compound injustice by allowing its beneficiaries to pass on their ill-gotten gains to their children.

Earlier liberals had somewhat reluctantly conceded that the state could interfere with the rights of the owners of capital, to the extent of stopping employers exploiting their employees to an intolerable degree. They had agreed, less reluctantly, that the state ought to prevent the exploitation of children and other defenceless beings. Their successors began to explore the possibility of quite different ways of organising industry, such as workers' co-operatives, municipal ownership, outright nationalisation, and so on. It was this movement which made it entirely natural for

Russell to argue, after the First World War, that the liberal cause could be best served by a Labour government, and it was as a Labour candidate that he fought the Chelsea constituency in which he lived during the 1920s.

The picture of his attitudes in foreign affairs and in matters of war and peace is more difficult to summarise. Many orthodox liberals disliked war because it was bad for business. But the radicals' hostility to war was awkwardly allied to their principled hostility to injustice. Mill, for instance, thought that the Northern American states were entirely justified in fighting the civil war to abolish slavery. In the 1860s, Russell's father, Lord Amberley, had written an essay proposing the creation of a 'league of nations' with sufficient power to make an aggressive war a bad risk for any individual nation tempted to embark on it and this, too, demanded a willingness to stop war by threatening war.

It is worth bearing in mind how utterly different this liberal pacifism was from, say, the pacifism of a Gandhi. Gandhi's was all but absolute: characteristically introspective, and concerned with the damage that the violent man does to himself, to his own soul. Liberal pacifism meant scepticism about the efficacy of war, and it was generally piecemeal and instrumental. The point can be illustrated if we look at one of the most notorious episodes in Russell's career; soon after the war, he actually advocated a pre-emptive attack by the United States on the Soviet Union in order to stop the Soviet Union acquiring nuclear weapons. Although he later denied having made the suggestion at all, and although he always said that it was made, so to speak, in passing, and was of no great importance, it was not a moral aberration, nor, I think, a momentary lapse from his usual pacifism. Rather, it was the logical upshot of much the same process of thought that had led him to regard the First World War as a piece of criminal folly.

When evenly matched armies fought one another in what Russell saw as a war between opposing colonial powers, there was no goal at stake which was morally defensible in itself, or likely to be promoted by the means being used. When the existence of the atomic bomb made it likely that any future war would result in the extermination of mankind, it was overwhelmingly worthwhile stopping such a war breaking out; and, at this time, the American monopoly of nuclear weapons made it at least conceivable that that monopoly could be used to stop anyone else acquiring them. In effect, Russell was thinking to the end of the argument that began with the suggestion that the United States should tell the Soviet Union not to develop nuclear weapons, and went on to contemplate what would have to happen if the Soviet Union refused to comply.

There was not much room in Russell's way of thinking for doubts about the way in which the means employed might contaminate the ends for which they were used. He did not exactly relish the idea of world peace endorsed by fear of American bombs, but it was a better prospect than the near-certainty of general destruction. Thomas Hobbes, 300 years earlier, had said much the same thing: Leviathan is better than war of all against all, with continual danger of violent death. Of course, once the Soviet Union had got nuclear weapons, the whole argument fell to the ground, and for Russell to turn to the politics of nuclear disarmament was not a contradiction of his previous position—it was a recognition of this fact.

All of what I have said so far may suggest that Russell simply took over the ideas of his parents and their political friends

and just applied them to new conditions. Nothing could be further from the truth; his godfather, John Stuart Mill, died when he was less than a year old, and his parents both died within the next two years. In so far as Russell took over the ideas to which he had been born, he had to do so by thinking them out for himself, against the efforts of his grandmother and the tutors whom she hired to bring him up.

Still, even if he had to rediscover his inheritance, there is still the question of what he added to it. Did he add anything to it, other than a good deal of personal courage, and an extraordinary literary talent? Oddly, I think part of the answer is that he subtracted a good deal, and that that was a creative achievement. This negative achievement amounted to taking the defence of individual freedom and diversity out of the rationalist, utilitarian setting in which predecessors like Bentham or Mill had placed it; this he did by appealing to an account of human psychology which owed more to the insights of writers like Nietzsche and Freud than it did to the empiricism of Mill, Hume or Locke.

Russell's *Principles of Social Reconstruction* provides a non-calculating case for liberty. Its foundation, said Russell, was the observation that men are creatures of impulse rather than reason; they do not, and, indeed, cannot, pursue happiness by carefully calculated methods. Impulse is blind and non-instrumental; impulses are organic, are sources of energy which aim at the satisfaction necessary to that impulse, pretty well regardless of further consequences.

The important distinction on which Russell placed most of the weight of his argument is between possessive impulses and creative ones. Creative impulses lead us to do things and make things which others can share without loss to ourselves; possessive impulses lead us to exclude others, to seize what we can and defend it against others. To talk about these impulses being 'a search for happiness' as the utilitarians had done, is either vacuous or misleading; it is vacuous—if all we mean by happiness is that our impulses are satisfied, and it is misleading if we take it literally, if we allow ourselves to forget that men will satisfy an impulse even at the expense of their own lives; to want to die for a cause, say, or to murder in revenge, cannot really be called the pursuit of happiness. The capitalist barons of Russell's days—the Carnegies, Rockefellers and Pierpont Morgans—were impelled by the need to stamp their will on the world, not by the desire to have as much money as would make them happy.

The *Principles of Social Reconstruction* is a hymn to the creative impulses. Although impulse is blind, it can be shaped and redirected, as well as simply repressed or satisfied, and the peculiar cast that Russell gives to familiar liberal themes comes from his concentration on the ways in which creativity can be liberated and possessiveness reduced. Russell's views about the attractions and dangers of socialism illustrate this. He agreed that among the horrors of capitalism in his day, we ought to include the poverty of many workers—their poor diets, inadequate housing, insufficient clothing; but it did not seem to him that it would be very

difficult to abolish poverty in this sense. This is another topic, but Russell was always oddly unperceptive about institutions: he saw that bureaucracy might be oppressive, but he was prepared to take it on trust that it would be efficient, and he did not foresee the sheer technical complexity of trying to abolish poverty.

But even if poverty were abolished, he thought that that would be a small step towards freedom; as early as his first book, his lectures on *German Social Democracy*, written in 1895, he complained that socialists overestimated the importance of material prosperity. Poverty was a very great evil, but it did not follow that affluence was a very great good. Given reasonable prosperity, the greater goods are enjoyable work and self-government at work and in the political realm. State ownership is a very limited step in this direction; you could nationalise the railways overnight and still do nothing to give the workers on the railways any sense that it was their industry.

So, one finds Russell keeping both the admirers of Bolshevism abroad and the enthusiasts for nationalisation at home, very much at arms length. Both were too keen to get men under their control, and therefore insensitive to the claims of diversity and variety; both were obsessed by the goals of efficiency and productivity, and therefore insensitive to the impact that this search had on our characters as well as on our welfare, narrowly considered. Trotsky called him a moth-eaten liberal aristocrat for his pains; but the insult was a compliment to Russell's good sense in seeing that Bolshevism might be permissible in a barbarous society which was being dragged into the modern world by main force, but that it was no model for a civilised society to follow. Equally, the Webbs did not like Russell's private life or his politics—Mrs Webb thought he was a dangerous anarchist in both domains—but he never fell for the powerful as they did.

Like his liberal predecessors, Russell was obsessed with education. Liberals always have been, because, if there is to be change without violence, it will presumably have to come about by persuading people of the need for it. The old empiricist belief that the mind was naturally a clean slate on which the educator might draw what he liked, encouraged a belief in the effectiveness of education; but it also opens up the prospects of a brave new world, in which peace and quiet are secured by indoctrination. Russell's enthusiasm for the psychology of impulse allowed him to defend an education in which social conditioning came a poor second to finding ways of shaping the artistic and intellectual capacities of children.

There is a standard myth about all this, of course, which represents Russell as the advocate of a childhood free-for-all, in which infantile self-expression reigns supreme. This is evidently nonsense: Russell constantly emphasised the need for discipline, self-control and orderliness. A mathematician, whose passion for the subject sprang from his sense of the unique satisfaction to be had from following complex arguments to their remotest conclusions, was not likely to advocate laissez-faire as an educational principle. Teaching yourself to keep alert and attentive is a different

matter from maintaining a sullen silence in the face of teacher's threats.

The importance of this is not just a matter of the educational deficiencies. Russell thought that there were far too many bored, resentful and unfulfilled people in all the most civilised countries; and this meant that there were far too many people who would welcome any sort of excitement, even if this was the excitement of a war or a pogrom. Commentators have always found it hard to understand the brief friendship between Russell and D. H. Lawrence; but it is not a surprising friendship in itself. Russell thought of the modern world in much the same terms as Lawrence—at any rate, in the sense that he thought Lawrence was right about the lifelessness of too much of it. Russell traced both that lifelessness and the violence to the excessive repression of the instinctual life.

Russell, obviously, and in personal terms, very quickly parted company with Lawrence on everything else; for Russell, like Freud and other embattled rationalists, thought that it was precisely the blindness of the impulsive life which makes the rational organisation of that life more essential. The indirectness of that organisation is obvious—the cultivation of creativity and the redirection of possessiveness is more like the gardener's provision of the right environment for his plants than the mechanical assembly of, say, an engine. But this is far from supposing that there is no such thing as skilful gardening. Freud, to be sure, was a more determined, more perceptive, and, in many ways, a better equipped student of the psyche than was Russell. Russell, however, had strengths of his own. He did not fall back on stoicism and scepticism about politics as Freud usually did, but stood by the liberal belief in the importance of institutional and organisational change.

The crispness of his intellectual style has led a lot of critics to take Russell for an 18th-century rationalist, who had not yet suffered the doubts and uncertainties of the later 19th century. But this is almost exactly wrong. The tone of voice may be that of the 18th century, but the achievement is a 20th-century one. By the middle of the first war, liberalism seemed to many of Russell's contemporaries to have been rendered obsolete by the violence and irrationality that the 20th century had already displayed; they appeared to render the 19th-century liberal's belief in the inevitability of peaceful, rational improvement entirely incredible. Russell's achievement was to keep his nerve in the face of the evidence, to absorb its implications, and to argue that the new disillusionment with human nature made liberalism more necessary than ever. It was not because men found it easy to understand themselves and tolerate each other's peculiarities that they needed Russell to remind them of the importance of freedom and reason, but precisely because they have always found it so hard.

Radio 3

Alan Ryan is reader in politics at the University of Oxford.

PROMOTING BR/BRS

- (16) * Promotion by public events? PETER CRANFORD, who has just visited England, says, "Those with expertise advise us that the better route for the BRS might be events, speakers, public meetings." Any comments?

BR QUOTED

- (17) Reflection of Bertrand Russell is the caption on this Letter-to-the-Editor of "Chemical And Engineering News" of 7/10/78:

SIR: I was moved and somehow deeply encouraged by the recent discovery of your editorial "Nothing to kill or die for" in the Jan. 2 issue of your journal. A reflection of Bertrand Russell's came to mind, part of a lecture delivered in the late 1940's, and printed under the title "Science and War" in the book "The Impact of Science on Society":

"Either we must allow the human race to exterminate itself, or we must forgo certain liberties which are very dear to us, more especially the liberty to kill foreigners whenever we feel so disposed. I think it probable that mankind will choose its own extermination as the preferable alternative. The choice will be made, of course, by persuading ourselves that it is not being made, since (so militarists on both sides will say) the victory of the right is certain without risk of universal disaster. We are perhaps living in the last age of man, and, if so, it is to science that he will owe his extinction."

The rationalization of mass killing of his fellow men has been a primary occupation of mankind during historical time, and certainly before it. The position your journal has taken, I like to hope, may be symptomatic of diffusion of insight into the fundamentally self-destructive nature of such lightly promulgated delusions.

Robert Krause, M.D.

Binningen, Switzerland

(Thank you, JOE NEILANDS.)

BR & HUMAN RIGHTS

- (18) Jews in the USSR. The following comes from "Jews in Eastern Europe", June 1966, pp. 82-84:

Bertrand Russell Supports Students

Thirty thousand students signed a petition on Soviet Jews drawn up by the World Union of Jewish Students, the London *Jewish Chronicle* reported on March 27, 1966. It stated that the petition requested the following:

1. Soviet Jewry's right and opportunity of following its national and cultural heritage by studying and teaching its history, language, cultural and artistic traditions; rights which are guaranteed under the constitution of the U.S.S.R. and observed in connection with all other recognised national minorities of the U.S.S.R.; further to permit religious Jewish believers the identical rights and facilities for the practice of their religion, as are guaranteed to other religious minorities in the Soviet Union.

2. The destruction of manifestations of antisemitism, whether they be in defamatory articles in the press, or in discrimination in certain fields of employment and education.

3. The right of families, torn asunder by war and the bestialities of Nazi persecution, to be reunited with their relations, from whom they are still separated twenty long years after the holocaust.

4. The right of emigration for those Jews who wish to leave, such right to be granted freely and in conformity with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The petition ends by stating:

"We hope that the Soviet Socialist peoples who have fought for and

preserved their liberty in the face of great suffering and sacrifice, will accord that same liberty and those same rights to the Jewish citizens of their republics.

"It is with this sole aim of equality that we raise our voice in protest today."

The petition was delivered to Soviet embassies in Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, France and Switzerland on March 27 and subsequently in England and Israel.

The World Union of Jewish Students received a message from Bertrand Russell in support of its efforts to publicise the facts about Soviet Jews. The message was as follows:

"The situation of Jews in the Soviet Union is one of those tragic anomalies that exercise the concern of those who are steadfastly opposed to the cold war and seek greater understanding between the nations. The irony of this situation is that Soviet Jews, survivors of a people whose destruction was a priority of Nazi Germany's war aims, are still facing a problem of national survival.

"In 1948 Stalin and his secret police executed the Jewish creative intelligentsia and totally destroyed Jewish institutions, publishing houses, schools, theatres and every vestige of national existence outside the synagogue. De-Stalinisation has brought little improvement. Jews still have no schools, no national theatres and no secular communal institutions.

"Although restitution was frequently promised in 1956 and 1957, only token symbols of culture have been permitted—a handful of books in the

Yiddish language, published in small editions and exploited as reassuring propaganda abroad, one monthly Yiddish magazine, one or two dramatic groups and a few touring Jewish singers. This represents the total cultural resources of three million people traditionally regarded as one of the most talented and creative Jewish communities in the world.

"A comparison with other Soviet nationalities exposes the basic injustice of their situation. For even the smallest national groups in the Soviet Union are given the opportunity to pursue a cultural, social and political life of their own, denied to Jews.

"Although the anti-religious campaign in the U.S.S.R. is directed against all religions, it is prosecuted with exceptional severity against Judaism, and propaganda against Jewish religion often assumes a character of racial anti-semitism, as in the writings of Kichko, Mayatsky and Osipov. The closure of synagogues has been conducted ruthlessly. At the time of the October Revolution there were some 3,000 synagogues in the Soviet Union. By 1956, according to a Soviet report to the United Nations, only 450 remained. Since then a further 350 have been closed and many cities with large Jewish populations have no places of worship available at all. Religious life is additionally hindered by the denial to Judaism of essential facilities available to other recognised Soviet religions, to the extent that makes it impossible to practise Judaism with the freedom guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution.

"It is particularly tragic that the Soviet authorities have still taken no steps to end the separation of members of Jewish families disunited in appalling circumstances during the Nazi war. As a result of repatriation agreements between the U.S.S.R. and other communist countries in Eastern Europe, most of these problems have been solved in regard to Poles, Rumanians and Germans who were allowed to resettle in their own countries, many Germans being permitted to join relatives in Western Germany.

"The one community which suffered most at the hands of the Nazis—the Jews—have many thousands of individuals in the U.S.S.R. who have been waiting for more than 20 years to join their close relatives in Israel and other countries. Elsewhere in Eastern Europe, Jews in similar positions have been allowed family reunification. The Soviet Union, however, has granted exit permits only to a small number of mainly elderly persons. Soviet Jews have no opportunity to voice their feelings publicly and are dependent on the support of public opinion abroad.

"I am happy that students of British universities are engaged in this special effort to make the facts more widely known. Discrimination against Jews in the U.S.S.R., like the persecution of dissident intellectuals, seriously impairs the development of the Soviet Union as a true socialist society and hinders the efforts of all those working for international co-existence."

(Thank you, BOB DAVIS.)

PHILOSOPHERS

(19) A.J. Ayer on philosophers, as reported by Ved Mehta in *Fly and Fly Bottle*, Boston: Little Brown, 1962, pp.83-84:

I racked my sleepy brain for some more questions, and finally asked him whether there was one particular quality that all philosophers shared.

He was thoughtful for a moment and then said, "Vanity. Yes, vanity is the *sine qua non* of philosophers. In the sciences, you see, there are established criteria of truth and falsehood. In philosophy, except where questions of formal logic are involved, there are none, and so the practitioners are extremely reluctant to admit error.

To come back to Austin, no one would deny the incisive quality of his mind, and yet when Strawson defeated him in an argument about Truth, it never seemed to have once crossed Austin's mind that he was the vanquished. To take another example, Russell attacks Strawson as though he were just another Oxford philosopher, without reading him carefully. But perhaps at his age Russell has a right to make up his mind about a book without reading it."

DISSENTING OPINION

(20) BR and anti-Semitism (continued). IRA STRAUS writes:

In a paper abstracted in RSN19-48, Harry Ruja "defends" Russell against evidence that the latter held anti-Semitic attitudes. More precisely, he lets the distressing evidence (brought forth by Clark and Hook) pass, denying only that Russell's private sentiments affected his public judgements.

Even this, however, is unconvincing. In Russell's Bolshevism: Practice and Theory (NY: 1920) we find the disgusting remark that the Bolsheviks' orientation toward Asian empire "is probably accompanied in the minds of some with dreams of sapphires and rubies and golden thrones and all the glories of their forefather Solomon." (p. 116) A significantly irrationalizing effect must be conceded to Russell's distaste for Jews if we are to explain the presence of this ludicrous remark in a book which is generally so clear sighted and often so movingly prescient.

In his argument against Bolshevism, Russell dwelt perceptively and at length on cultural and national differences. His anti-Semitism indicates the seamy side of this concern -- linked to insular patriotic attitudes and possibly also to the anarchistic aspect of Russell's politics at the time. The other side of Russell's concern with the present fact of historical particularism -- his advocacy of liberal Anglo-American imperialistic internationalism -- of course won out in the 1940s, when he belatedly supported the war against Hitler and anxiously advocated a preventive war against Stalin.

When the Soviet Union developed its atomic capability, Russell moved on to the indubitable slogan, "Better Red than Dead," but he seems to have deduced from this only an inadequate policy of negotiation, arbitration and disarmament. The logical conclusion, it seems to me, would be to offer and negotiate complete but highly conditional surrender. Russell, by concluding only that one should yield rather than fight on any single question, enabled Hook to make the effective point that this would only encourage recklessly aggressive demands. But we may demolish here Hook's shibboleth that Russell's new position was inconsistent with his old one. To emphasize the urgency of an imperialistic solution, Russell had written in 1945 that "as soon as both sides possess atomic bombs, either side would be more rational if it made complete surrender to the other than if it resisted even the most extreme demands. But rationality is not to be expected in human affairs." (Common Sense XIV, Oct. 1945 p. 4.)

In the late 1960s Russell's universalistic concerns faded from public view as he exhibited an irresponsible enthusiasm for anti-imperialistic, anti-Western nationalism. His remarks against Israel -- which Ruja attributes to so extensive an ignorance of elementary facts as to indicate either extreme personal prejudice or an extraordinarily poor and prejudiced selection of political advisers -- may be better understood in this context, the context of a nexus of anti-imperialism, anti-Semitism, anti-Westernism and, sad to say, anti-rationalism.

And so it is not true of Russell that "his sentiments were always noble" (Ruja). We who are humanistically inclined must again remind ourselves that we can worship only with reservations, for all of our gods are imperfect.

COMMENT

- (21) John Sutcliffe on Jacqueline's sadness: "Jacqueline Berthon-Payon's feelings (RSN19-21) are my own on this point. Russell is still hated by many influential politicians at both ends of the political spectrum. For instance, a former Prime Minister, according to my information, played no small part in preventing the issuance of a commemorative stamp (which Prof. A. J. Ayer had proposed) for the centenary of Russell's birth. If this is true, then it is not surprising that no government money was forthcoming to keep BR's books and papers in England."
- (22) Agnostic, yes! Atheist, no! Writes SIGRID SAAL: "Referring to RSN19-19 (the New York Times story on Madalyn O'Hair and atheism, etc.), I would like to say that I for one certainly am not one of the ones who 'like what goes on in her head'. I am certainly sure that Bertrand Russell, God rest his soul, was not one either -- an agnostic, yes, but never an atheist."

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

- (23) Fred Allendorf -- whose Ph.D. is in Genetics, and who has been Assistant Professor of Zoology at U. of Montana -- is now at the University of Nottingham, having received a NATO-NSF Postdoctoral Fellowship to concentrate on research in the area of evolutionary genetics.

- (24) Alberto Donadio is moving to Switzerland (from Colombia), and would be pleased to meet any BRS member who happens to be in Geneva during his stay there (from mid-November 1978 through October 1979.) His address: International Commission of Jurists/109, route de Chêne/1224 Geneva, Switzerland.
- (25) Ed Hopkins has stopped teaching math to high school girls in favor of programming computers for Univac, doing scientific work for Goddard Space Flight Center.
- (26) Justin Leiber has been appointed Associate Professor in the Philosophy Department of the University of Texas (Houston). "The Philosophy-Psychology Symposium that has been operating out of SUNY Binghamton is coming here, so there is room for a lot of activity. I wear my Bertrand Russell T-shirt bravely. I have been rather startled to find both the campus and the city attractive; partly it is that both are optimistic and growing. My landlady, who had been a philosophy major at U. of Texas in Austin, asked the person I gave as reference, 'He isn't given to throwing waffles on the roof, is he?'"
- (27) Malt. We are delighted to report that R.N. ("Malt") Malatesha, who was looking for a job for Fall '78 (RSN18-27), has found one. Or, quite possibly, the job found him, as the following indicates:
While he was Assistant Professor of Education and Special Education at Idaho State University, he won an award given by Oregon State University at Corvallis. His new job is with -- can you guess? -- Oregon State University at Corvallis. The award was for his research paper, "Neuropsychological aspects of reading disability." He writes: "I will be doing research in neuropsychology, as Research Professor."
He had been selected by the International Neuropsychological Association to present one of his papers at Oxford, in summer 1977. His doctoral degree in reading is from the University of South Carolina. He has one master's degree in psychology, another in educational psychology.
- (28) Jim McWilliams writes: "Since I'm about to quit my job here with the government, I'd better send you some money before I get too broke to send it. Just in case I marry one of these (censored) I've been working with, I'm sending you dues for (censored) and wife. And if I don't marry one, you can keep the difference and call it a contribution. These days five dollars won't buy anything anyway, not even in a Mexican (censored)."
- (29) Kouji Tomimori writes from Japan: "My favorite hobby is climbing mountains. I am going to climb Mt. Yari, which is the most famous mountain after Mt. Fuji. It was named after Yar, which was a representative arm of 'Samurai', and its height is 3190 m."

HONORARY MEMBERSHIP

- (30) David Pears has accepted an offer of honorary membership, we are delighted to report. He qualifies under Article II, Section 2(III) of the BRS Bylaws ("The nominee has made a distinctive contribution to some area of Russell scholarship".) He edited the volume, Bertrand Russell: A Collection of Critical Essays, Garden City: Doubleday 1972 (Anchor Books), which includes his essay, "Russell's Logical Atomism", and identifies him as Tutor in Philosophy at Christ Church, Oxford. He is author of Bertrand Russell and the British Tradition in Philosophy, New York: Random House 1967. His essay, "Russell's Theory of Desire", appears in Russell in Review, edited by Thomas & Blackwell, Toronto: Samuel Stevens, Hakkert & Company, 1976.
- (31) Karl Popper. It is good news indeed that Sir Karl has accepted an invitation to become an honorary member. He qualifies under Article II, Section 2(III) of the BRS Bylaws.
He is Emeritus Professor in the University of London, a Fellow of the Royal Society, and a Fellow of the British Academy. He has written many books and essays, including The Logic of Scientific Discovery, The Open Society and Its Enemies, New Foundations for Logic, etc. For much more about him and his work, see The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, New York: Macmillan 1967.
Our letter of invitation to him had mentioned "the general compatibility of your views with Russell's," to which he responded in this way:

I am a great admirer of Bertrand Russell, whom I knew and loved, even though I did not always agree with his political views and activities. He was a great man and, I believe, the greatest philosopher since Kant (whom I value much more highly than he did.) I gladly accept your invitation to become an honorary member of your Society, and so to honour Russell's memory.

* * * * *

* The BRS Bylaws require "approval by two-thirds of the members voting." Please vote, using the ballot on the last page.

- (32) A.J. Ayer and Paul Edwards. The BRS members have voted their approval of these 2 nominees, by mail ballot, as already mentioned (12). Welcome to the Society, Gentlemen!

Their addresses: Professor Sir Alfred Ayer/New College/Oxford, England
Professor Paul Edwards/390 West End Avenue/New York, NY 10024

NEW MEMBERS

(33) We are pleased to welcome these new members:

J.M. ALTIERI/P.O. Box 1781/Old San Juan, PR 00903
 LAURENCE DALTON/17147 Owen St./Fontana, CA 92335
 MICHAEL T. DOORLEY/721 Highland Avenue/Newark, NJ 07104
 GRAHAM ENTWISTLE/100 Cornell Avenue/Ithaca, NY 14850
 RODNEY C. EWING/821 Solano, NE/Albuquerque, NM 87110

JACK FULTON/Hillcrest Hall, Room N105/U. of Iowa/ Iowa City, IA 52242
 RONALD HOLMBECK/Route 3/Cumberland, WI 54829
 ROBERT HOMA/213 Barnum Terrace/Stratford, CT 06497
 BRIAN HOPEWELL/6230 Ravenna Avenue, NE/Seattle, WA 98115
 MICHAEL HOROWITZ/Chemical Bank, Room 628/55 Water St./New York, NY 10041

NORA HUNT/1149 Heron Court/Fairfield, CA 94533
 MARK HYBERGER/548 W. Johnson, Apt. 301C/Madison, WI 53703
 MARK O. JOHNSON/Weld Hall 37/Harvard College/Cambridge, MA 02138
 BRUCE KEITH/825 Jones, #4/San Francisco, CA 94109
 BRUCE KUZMANICH/10114 Homan Avenue/Evergreen Park, IL 60642

KEVIN NORTON/200 Palmer Drive/North Syracuse, NY 13212
 JOHN & IRENE PRIMAK/American Bell International, Inc/P.O. Box 66-1437/Tehran, Iran
 WILLIAM R. RYAN/3812 Old Dominion Blvd./Alexandria, VA 22305
 REV. MICHAEL SCOTT/43 King Henry Road/London, England
 FERNANDO VARGAS/Suite 551/130 West 42nd Street/New York, NY 10036

THEODORE A. WOJTASIK, JR./2129 Newport Place, N.W./Washington, DC 20037

NEW ADDRESSES & OTHER CHANGES

(34) Changes in existing addresses are underlined. A new address has no underlining.

DR. FRED W. ALLENDORF/Genetics Research Unit/University Hospital/Clifton Blvd./Nottingham, England NG7 2UH
 MICHAEL BALYEA/1469 Worthington Avenue/Columbus, OH 43201
 GREG BEAULIEU/205 - 3520 31st St., N.W./Calgary, Alta., Canada T2L 2A4
 LINDA BLITZ/1220 Shenandoah Road/Alexandria, VA 22308
 E.B. COCHRAN/Box 1071/Tiburon, CA 94920

STEVEN R. CONN/0208-2 East Quad Prescott/U. of Michigan/Ann Arbor, MI 48109
 DENNIS J. DARLAND/1406 - 26th St./Rock Island, IL 61201
 ALBERTO DONADIO/International Commission of Jurists/109, route de Chêne/1224 Geneva, Switzerland
 GENE L. EVANS/4908 Delbrook Road/Mechanicsburg, PA 17055
 BARRY GOLDMAN/8531 Roseland Ct./Oak Park, MI 48237

W. MCKENZIE GOODRICH/77 Pine St., Suite 110/Portland, ME 04101
 STEPHEN HAMBY/Dept. of Psychology/Mount Saint Mary College/Newburgh, NY 12550
 DR. EDWIN E. HOPKINS/6165 64th Avenue #5/E. Riverdale, MD 20840
 BRUCE KEITH/1865 Laurinda Drive/San Jose, CA 95124
 GENE KING/18080 Oakdale Road/Dallas, OR 97338

ARLYN KRAVIG/17008 Hartland St./Van Nuys, CA 91406
 JAMES KUZMAK/St. John's College/Annapolis, MD 21404
 DOUGLAS LAWSON/1426 21st St., N.W./Washington, DC 20036
 JUSTIN LEIBER/Dept. of Philosophy/U. of Texas/ Cullen Blvd./ Houston, TX 77004
 PROFESSOR R.N. MALATESHA/School of Education/Oregon State U./Corvallis, OR 97331

KATHIE POWELL/10989 Bushwood Way/Columbia, MD 21044
 ANDREW C. RAMSAY/750 Guerrero #3/San Francisco, CA 94110
 CYNDE STOLL/73 Cayenne Common/Lake Jackson, TX 77566
 JOSEPH TRUDDEN/33 40 81 St., Apt. 21/Jackson Heights, NY 33172
 MAJOR HERBERT G. VOGT/Marko Villas Apt. 307/2101 S. Atlantic Avenue/Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

(35) When you change your address, please notify us as soon as possible. 9 copies of RSN19 were lost because members had not notified us of changed addresses. The Post Office notified us of the new addresses (for a fee), but threw away the newsletters, because the Post Office does not forward 3rd class mail. We sent another RSN19 to the 9 new addresses, but this cost money, and delivery was delayed as much as 2 months. So please notify us.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

- (36) Movie quotes BR. KEN KORBIN has supplied what DON JACKANICZ was looking for (RSN19-35) -- references to BR in the 1964 movie, "The Best Man", which was based on a play by Gore Vidal:
- Reporter: Do you think people mistrust intellectuals in politics?
- Candidate: I'm glad you asked that question. Bertrand Russell seems to think so. He once wrote that the people in a democracy tend to think they have less to fear from a stupid man than from an intelligent one.
- (37) A BR-Flew debate? RON EDWARDS had inquired about a BR-Flew debate (RSN19-36). To find the answer, JOHN SUTCLIFFE went right to the source: he asked Anthony Flew about it. Here is Flew's response:
- I never met Bertrand Russell, and a fortiori, never participated in a debate with him. However, I was once asked to join in a radio or TV programme with him only to have the invitation withdrawn after he had objected to my participation. I do not know whether this objection was grounded on my being an Oxford-trained linguistic philosopher, or whether Russell could not bear in his later years to meet a spokesman of the classical Whig position of his own distinguished forebears.
- In a forthcoming book of papers on Russell published by Allen & Unwin and edited by George Roberts there will be my own most substantial contribution to Russell studies -- a paper called "Russell on Bolshevism".

THE BRS LIBRARY

- (38) Librarian's report, by Don Jackanicz, Chairperson, BRS Library Committee:

The BRS Library continues to receive various requests for materials to be borrowed, books to be bought, and informational mailings. Please refer to earlier issues of RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS for the Library's printed holdings. Elsewhere in this issue appears a brief article about films available for rental. Also in this issue appears a revised list of books for sale through the Library.

I am pleased to report that as of October 24, 1978 244 requests have come in for Peter Cranford's paper entitled "Bertrand Russell's Relevance to Psychology". The 243rd request, it might be noted, was sent from Australia! Through this paper's circulation within universities, hospitals, government offices, etc., many readers have been either introduced to Russell for the first time or shown that his writings have varied applications outside the fields of philosophy and mathematics.

In RSN-19 I mentioned that a fee would be charged for the borrowing of materials from the Library. However, except for films (described elsewhere in this issue), I am putting off charging fees, pending further consideration of the need and advisability of so doing. Therefore, all borrowing is free (except for films); the borrower pays postage (and insurance, where necessary) for all items.

As always, I welcome all inquiries, requests, and orders. The address is: Donald W. Jackanicz, BRS Library, 3802 N. Kenneth Avenue, Chicago, IL 60641, USA.

- (39) Recent acquisitions. Previous acquisitions have been listed in N113-48, N115-33, N116-40 and RSN17-55. Here are the latest. The donor's name appears at the end of each item.

70. Notice to the World: Renounce War or Perish!...World Peace or Universal Death. Tape recording (cassette) from the LP, Audio Masterworks LPA-1225. BR's 1955 press conference, with scientists from both sides of the Iron Curtain, on the dangers of atomic warfare; the ancestor of the Pugwash Conferences and the Salt Talks. Gary A. Jacobs.

71. Phil Donahue Show with guest Gore Vidal. Video cassette, 60 minutes. "Intelligent talk by intelligent people," says Lee Eisler, who asked Donahue for a transcript and got this cassette instead. "They almost sound like disciples of BR, and air views that don't ordinarily get a hearing on commercial TV." Multimedia Program Productions.

(40)

Books for sale. Due to recent price increases by publishers, we have had to raise our own prices slightly. However, the prices below, which include postage, are 15% below list prices. Occasionally there may be minor delays due to the need to special-order from publishers. Books are paperback unless called "hardbound". Please send your check or money order, payable to the BRS, with your order.

BY RUSSELL

- THE ABC OF RELATIVITY-----\$6.50
- THE AMBERLEY PAPERS, with Patricia Russell (2 v.)-----\$16.50, hardbound
- AUTHORITY AND THE INDIVIDUAL-----\$3.25
- THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BR, in one volume-----\$5.00
- THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BR, Vol. 1-----\$7.10, hardbound
- THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BR, Vol. 2-----\$7.10, hardbound
- BERTRAND RUSSELL: AN INTRODUCTION, edited by Brian Carr-----\$8.35 hardbound; \$4.70 paperback
- EDUCATION AND THE SOCIAL ORDER-----\$3.85
- FREEDOM AND ORGANIZATION, 1814-1914-----\$9.45, hardbound
- GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY-----\$4.70, hardbound
- HAS MAN A FUTURE?-----\$2.25, hardbound
- HISTORY OF THE WORLD IN EPITOME-----\$0.80
- HUMAN SOCIETY IN ETHICS AND POLITICS-----\$11.15, hardbound
- ICARUS, OR THE FUTURE OF SCIENCE-----\$2.00, hardbound
- THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON SOCIETY-----\$2.80
- JUSTICE IN WARTIME-----\$6.25, hardbound
- AN OUTLINE OF PHILOSOPHY-----\$11.15, hardbound
- POLITICAL IDEALS-----\$3.25
- POWER: A NEW SOCIAL ANALYSIS-----\$6.90, hardbound
- THE PRACTICE AND THEORY OF BOLSHEVISM-----\$4.70, hardbound; \$3.25 papbd
- PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION-----\$5.80, hardbound; \$2.00, paperbd
- THE PROBLEM OF CHINA-----\$7.10, hardbound
- PROSPECTS OF INDUSTRIAL CIVILIZATION, with Dora Russell-----\$5.00, hardbd
- ROADS TO FREEDOM: SOCIALISM, ANARCHISM, AND SYNDICALISM-----\$6.00, hardbd; \$3.85, paperback
- SCEPTICAL ESSAYS-----\$6.00, hardbound; \$3.85, paperback
- UNARMED VICTORY-----\$4.45, hardbound

ABOUT RUSSELL

- BERTRAND RUSSELL, A LIFE, Herbert Gottschalk-----\$1.10
- BERTRAND RUSSELL, 1872-1970-----\$0.90
- BERTRAND RUSSELL, THE PASSIONATE SCEPTIC, Alan Wood-----\$1.60
- ESSAYS ON SOCIALIST HUMANISM IN HONOUR OF THE CENTENARY OF BERTRAND RUSSELL, Ken Coates, editor-----\$3.50
- THE LIFE OF BERTRAND RUSSELL IN PICTURES AND HIS OWN WORDS, Christopher Farley and David Hodgson, editors-----\$3.50
- MR. WILSON SPEAKS 'FRANKLY AND FEARLESSLY' ON VIETNAM TO BERTRAND RUSSELL-----\$1.00
- THE TAMARISK TREE: MY QUEST FOR LIBERTY AND LOVE, Dora Russell-----\$4.75, hardbound

Papers presented at the 1976 BRS session of the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division) annual convention-----\$4.00
 Papers presented at the 1977 BRS APA annual convention-----\$4.00

(41)

5 films for rent, all b&w, 16mm. The borrower pays a rental fee, postage and insurance both ways, and a deposit. Fees are in a state of flux at the moment; if interested in borrowing any of the following films, please write and inquire about the fees (which will probably be in the \$10-\$25 range.) The films:

- THE LIFE AND TIMES OF BERTRAND RUSSELL. 40 minutes. Biographical.
- BERTRAND RUSSELL. 30 minutes. A general interview with BR.
- BERTRAND RUSSELL DISCUSSES HAPPINESS. 14 minutes.
- BERTRAND RUSSELL DISCUSSES PHILOSOPHY. 14 minutes.
- BERTRAND RUSSELL DISCUSSES THE ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL. 14 minutes.

Other BR films exist, and the Library is making efforts to acquire them.

FINANCES/CONTRIBUTIONS

(42)

Recent contributors. We thank the following members for their contributions: CAMPBELL, GRANFORD, DAVIS, DONADIO, HOOPES, FRANK JOHNSON, KRAVIG, LEITHAUSER, MCVEIGH, MCWILLIAMS, O'CONNOR, READER, RUJA, STOLL, TOMIMORI. (Kouji Tomimori also made a contribution in 1977, inadvertently omitted from previous acknowledgements. Apologies.)

(43)

Contributions solicited. See (44b).

BRS BUSINESS

(44a) New procedure for paying dues. In 1979 everybody's dues will be due on July 1st. This will eliminate (a) the need to send out several hundred renewal-request letters during the year, and (b) a number of record-keeping chores.

The May issue of RSN will carry a notice that everyone's dues are due on July 1st. Please mail your dues as soon as you see the notice. We will not deposit your check until July 1st.

It is a good idea to pay dues promptly. It not only enables the BRS to pay its bills, it also avoids possible interruptions of our mailings to you of "Russell Society News" and "Russell".

* If you see any flaws in the new procedure, please let us know. It will go into effect January 1, 1979, unless we learn of some reason why it shouldn't. Suggestions or comments are also welcome.

(44b) New reason for making a contribution now. One disadvantage of the new renewal procedure is this: The BRS Treasury won't take in any renewal money during the first half of the year.

Therefore, a particularly good time to make a contribution to the BRS -- for those who are able to -- is now, to help us over the first 6 months.

As you perhaps know, dues cover only a portion of our operating expenses; without contributions there would be a large deficit. Most of our money is spent to publish the newsletter, to pay for members' subscriptions to "Russell", and to recruit new members. If we are to survive as an organization, we need contributions in addition to dues.

In order for us not to be overly dependent on a few large contributors (which is the case at present), we need many contributors, each contributing what he or she can spare. We will not be on an economically sound basis until this happens.

* If we could average a \$15 contribution from half of our members, we think that would solve our money problem for 1979. Can you spare \$15? If you can, please send it; and if you can't, please send what you can spare. Send it to the newsletter (address on Page 1). If you like what we are doing, help pay for it with a contribution. Every bit helps.

FUND-RAISING

(45) Volunteers wanted for fund-raising. Experience desirable but not essential. The BRS will solicit funds from Foundations, government agencies, individuals -- by mail. We need a supervisor, preferably with some relevant experience, plus several aides. This is important work in a critical area.

We will supply basic information, on whom to approach and how to write the solicitation.

Many of you, on your Questionnaires, have offered to do some work for the BRS. Here is an opportunity.

We do not know at present how much time it might require of you, but this is probably flexible; that is, you would do what you could in the time you could spare.

* Volunteer, stating your credentials; write (or phone) Peter G. Cranford, 2108½ Walton Way, Augusta, GA 30904 (404-736-3514).

"RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS" MATTERS

(46) New, for beginners in philosophy: GARY JACOBS suggests that the newsletter have a section where beginners in philosophy can ask questions (and have them answered.) "We must remember that our ranks are quite diverse," says Gary. Let's try it. Novices, let's have your questions.

ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

(47) The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation issued this press release, which we picked up from "Die Fackel"(49):

Hon. President: the Earl Russell, OM, FRS (1872-1970); Hon. Vice-President: Edith, Countess Russell
Directors: Ken Coates, Chris Farley

The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation Ltd.

Press Release

BERTRAND RUSSELL HOUSE,
GAMBLE STREET,
NOTTINGHAM NG7 4ET,
ENGLAND (Reg. Office)

On the weekend of July 1st and 2nd the third International Russell Tribunal met in order to prepare for its second session, beginning January 3rd, 1979.

In the launching statement of October 16th., 1977 the Tribunal had declared that it would investigate in particular but not exclusively the following questions:

- +++ Are citizens of the Federal German Republic being denied the right to exercise their professions on account of their political views?
- +++ Is censorship being exercised through provisions of the criminal and civil law and through extra-legal measures?
- +++ Are constitutional and human rights being eroded or eliminated in the context of criminal court proceedings?

In the first session the week after Easter 1978 the Tribunal considered the first question and some related issues. The Tribunal concluded that citizens of the Federal Republic are frequently denied their right to exercise their professions on account of their political views, and that this constitutes a serious threat to human rights.

During the weekend conference, the members of the Tribunal reviewed various proposals for the agenda for its second session

which had been suggested by its advisory council, its secretariat as well as by other interested organizations and individuals. The principal topics which the Tribunal considered were:

1. Censorship
2. Changes in criminal court proceedings
3. The growth and methods of the "Verfassungsschutz"
4. The relationship between the practice of "Berufsverbote" and discriminatory practices in trade unions, professional organizations and private sector employment
5. Prison conditions and the treatment of prisoners

With respect to the fourth proposal, the Tribunal concluded that since it had devoted the entirety of its first public session to the subject of "Berufsverbote" and because there were other substantial questions demanding thorough public examination no additional time for the taking of evidence on "Berufsverbote" or similar or related practices in the Federal Republik would be allocated in second public session. The jury is now satisfied both by testimony received during the first session and from documentation it has reviewed, that the threat

to human rights because of political non-conformity is not limited to the realm of public employment. The final report on the first session will explore every major facet of this problem.

Furthermore the Tribunal decided that an examination of the criminal process necessarily included an inquiry into the treatment of those who are held in pre-trial detention. The Tribunal recognized that a full inquiry into prison conditions and the treatment of prisoners would require more time than the Tribunal has for the exploration of the subjects it has decided to consider.

Hence, the issues which will be explored publicly in January 1979 will be:

- +++ Censorship in the Federal Republic
- +++ The growth and methods of the "Verfassungsschutz"
- +++ Alleged violations of human rights of persons involved in the criminal process.

Berlin, July 2nd 1978

(48)

The Russell Press, Nottingham -- publishing arm of The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation -- prints Amnesty International's briefing papers, we noticed.

Incidentally, we just heard that the U.S. Department of Justice has asked the State of North Carolina to throw out the conviction of the "Wilmington 10". The "Wilmington 10" is one of the cases that Amnesty International has been working on, apparently with success (although Amnesty International never claims success for any outcome.)

PERIODICALS RECEIVED

(49)

"Die Fackel/The Torch/Le Flambeau", Issue No. 5, September 1978, has been received, and forwarded to the BRS Library. As many know, it is published by the Korean Bertrand Russell Gesellschaft, of which BRS Member DONG-IN BAE is founder and President. This 60-page issue is in Korean except for the following items in English: 2 BR quotes, 2 anti-war songs (Buffy Saint-Marie's "Universal Soldier" and Bob Dylan's "With God on our side), and a BR Peace Foundation press release (47).

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS (CONTINUED)

(50)

President Robert K. Davis reports:

I am reporting on the results of the questionnaire in RSN19.

Re the 1979 meeting, the members showed a preference for New York City in June. The meeting will be held there the first weekend in June, June 1-3. The Board has confirmed that time and place. In the past we have stayed at the Hotel Tudor and had our meetings there. Whether we do that again, and other details, will be forthcoming.

I hope to have a good series of talks for us. Please plan to attend!

Some of the topics for those talks, that members suggested, were: BR on scepticism, ethics, power, Wittgenstein, mathematics as logic; BR on Vietnam, Beacon Hill School, a talk by Paul Edwards, teaching philosophy in grade and high schools, fictional accounts of BR, a talk by Dora Russell. We hope to provide some of these.

Anyone interested in giving a talk on one of these topics (or on any other), please write me. And soon! (7025 W. Franklin #86, Hollywood, CA 90068.)

There is sufficient interest in a BRS tour to Britain to warrant further efforts. I have spoken to a travel agent and will try to have something definite set up by mid-winter. The places that members were most interested in were: London, Cambridge, Oxford, North Wales, and Woburn Abbey. If we offer this trip, it will not be limited to members; you can bring a friend.

We got little input on the book award idea. People liked the idea, but offered few titles. Most felt it should be a current award. I am going to ask our Librarian, Don Jackanicz, to head this effort.

People were split on the Folly Award idea. Some favored it emphatically; some didn't like it. Nominations were: Sidney Hook, Vanessa Redgrave, Anita Bryant, Idi Amin, and Senator Proxmire.

These books were suggested for a high school philosophy course: Wisdom of the West, A History of Western Philosophy, Authority and the Individual, Why I Am Not a Christian, Sceptical Essays, Philosophical Essays, Problems of Philosophy, Basic Writings of Bertrand Russell, How to Philosophize, Will Durant's Story of Philosophy, Philosophy: an Introduction by Randall, Philosophy for Pleasure by Honton, Plato's Dialogues, The Talit Dimension by Polany.

So! We hope to pursue these ideas in the coming months and tell you more.

On the personal side, I will be talking to the L.A. Humanist group on November 20th about BR. In December I will visit Britain for a month, see some BR-related people, and visit Cambridge, Woburn Abbey, and Oxford for a week.

(51) Treasurer Stephen J. Reinhardt reports:

For the quarter ending 6/30/78:

Balance on hand (3/31/78).....	\$940.04	
Income:		
30 new members.....	\$294.34	
15 renewals.....	190.45	
Total dues.....	484.79	
Contributions.....	443.50	
Sale of NL back issues & stationery.....	61.43	
Total income.....	989.72	\$989.72
		\$1929.76
Expenditures:		
Information & Membership Committees.....	\$704.53	
Subscriptions to "Russell".....	133.00	
Other.....	162.10	
Total spent.....	999.63	999.63
Balance on hand (6/30/78).....	930.13	

For the quarter ending 9/30/78:

Balance on hand (6/30/78).....	\$930.13	
Income:		
28 new members.....	\$318.20	
25 renewals.....	325.00	
Total dues.....	643.20	
Contributions.....	190.50	
Sale of NL back issues & stationery.....	34.00	
Total income.....	867.70	867.70
		1797.83
Expenditures:		
Information & Membership Committees.....	\$208.71	
Total spent.....	208.71	\$208.71
Balance on hand (6/30/78).....	\$1589.12	
* * * * *		
Unrestricted funds.....	\$1089.12	
Special purpose funds (BRS Travel Grant).....	500.00	1589.12

INQUIRY

- (52) Book by Edith sought. CAROLYN WILKINSON writes: "I have been trying to find some of Edith Finch Russell's writings -- and in particular, the book she wrote in the early 1900's -- the biography of Carey Thomas, President of Bryn Mawr College." Any suggestions? Please respond care of the newsletter (address on Page 1, bottom.)

INDEX

(53)

Introductory (1). BRS at APA, 12/78 (2,9,10a,10b). Chairman Cranford reports (3). President Davis reports (4,50). Treasurer Reinhardt reports (5,51). Committee reports: Audio-Visual (6); Library (7,38-41); Science (8). BRS at APA '78: program (9); papers (10a,10b). BRS at APA '79: call for papers (11). Results of RSN19 ballot (12). "My Ten Commandments" (13). "A Liberal Decalogue" (14). "BR's Liberalism" in BBC's "Listener" (15). BRS needs public events? (16). Letter to Editor of C&EN (17). Jews in the USSR (18). Ayer on philosophers (19). Straus on BR & anti-Semitism (20). Sutcliffe on Jacqueline's sadness (21). Agnostics, yes! Atheists, no! (22). News about members: Allendorf (23), Donadio (24), Hopkins (25), Leiber (26), Malatesha (27), McWilliams (28), Tomimori (29). Honorary memberships: Pears (30), Popper (31), Ayer & Edwards (32). New members (33). Address changes (34). Moving? Notify BRS (35). Q&A: "Best Man" quote supplied (36); Flew on BR-Flew debate (37). BRS Library: Librarian's report (38); recent acquisitions (39); books for sale (40); films for rent (41). Contributors thanked (42). New reason for making a contribution (43,44b). New procedure for paying dues (44a). Volunteers wanted for fund-raising (45). New RSN section for philosophy beginners (46). BR Peace Foundation: in West Germany (47); prints Amnesty International's briefing papers. (48). "Die Fackel" (49). President Davis reports (50). Treasurer Reinhardt reports (51). Book by Edith sought (52). Index (53) Ballot (Pears, Popper) (54).

Nominees for honorary membership must be approved by two-thirds of the members voting. Please make checkmarks below, to indicate your approval or disapproval. Brief remarks about each nominee are given in (30) and (31).

David Pears. Check one: () Approve
() Disapprove

Karl Popper. Check one: () Approve
() Disapprove

Your name _____ date _____

Remove this page and fold it according to the instructions on the other side; follow the 3 steps. This ballot needs no envelope. Must be postmarked before January 1, 1979.