The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc.* 1500 Johns Road Augusta Georgia 30904

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS
No. 24
November 1979

(1) It's Chicago in June 1980 (2). Science Committee seeks our interests (5a). BRS at APA 12/28/79 (8). Results of the vote: "chairperson" out, dues up, Dely in.(10). BR's Kalinga Prize (20). More paradoxes (38-40).Help wanted -- badly! (42). An asterisk in the left column indicates a request.

---

(1.5) COMING EVENTS

BRS at APA, December 28, 1979. See (8).

---

(2) ANNUAL MEETING (1980)

Chicago in June. As reported elsewhere (10), members voted to have our next annual meeting in Chicago, and in June. (Hamilton and July were 2nd choices.)

* Don Jackanicz, who lives in Chicago, is making arrangements, He would appreciate ideas and suggestions about
* any aspect of the meeting. Anyone wishing to present a paper should let Don know about it. Don's address: BRS Library, address on Page 1, bottom.

There'll be a lot more information about the meeting in the next issue.

---

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

(3) Treasurer Stephen J. Reinhardt reports:

For the 3rd quarter of 1979:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Balance on hand (6/30/79) | | 1457.64 |
| Income: 30 new members | 335.57 | |
| 74 renewals | 941.74 | |
| Total dues | 1277.31 | |
| Contributions | 332.50 | |
| Sale of RSN, books, etc | 3.39 | |
| Total income | 1613.20 | 1613.20 |
| | | 3070.84 |
| Expenses: Information & Membership Committees | 1009.55 | |
| Subscriptions to "Russell" | 357.00 | |
| Other | - | |
| Total spent | 1366.55 | 1366.55 |
| Balance on hand (9/30/79) | | 1704.29* |

| | |
|---|---|
| *Unrestricted funds | 1204.29 |
| Special purpose funds (Traveling Scholarship) | 500.00 |
| | 1704.29 |

---

*Russell Society News (Lee Eisler, Editor): RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036
BRS Library: Don Jackanicz, BRS Librarian, 3802 N. Kenneth Ave.,Chicago, IL 60641

## REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

(4) Audio-Visual Committee (Warren Smith, Chairman):

We have disbanded our project to produce an LP album. In May of 1978 we had considered producing the Leipzig Radio Symphony Orchestra's recording of a work dedicated to Bertrand Russell, Graham Whettam's"Sinfonia Contra Timore." The Rundfunk der DDR dallied so long before assenting to our modest request to use their tape, that we lost interest. However, we did lend our copy of the tape to Robert Sherman, program director of The New York Times's Radio WQXR, asking if he would assess the music. In September 1979 he played the composition, told his listeners about our Society and its plan to produce the LP, and received highly favorable listener response. To invest $2500 and hope to sell 700 LP's at $4, however, is considered too risky at this time. Meanwhile, if the East German Radio or Composer Whettam produces the LP, we will be glad to help distribute and sell them.

(5a) Science Committee (Alex Dely, Chairman):

As the new Chairman of the Science Committee, I would like to mention what I have in mind doing, and I would appreciate members' reactions to my proposals.

First, let me say that, as a physicist, I am greatly interested in fundamental physical theory, in fundamental aspects of the universe. I hope eventually to develop a comprehensive unifying philosophy of science (and of knowledge.)

I am presently working with George Blam (New York) on an alternative theory about elementary particles. We have just started to develop it mathematically, and it might interest BRS members to see how a theory gets born instead of merely seeing the end product, which is often complex.

I propose to review certain scientific issues in the newsletter, using journals and other sources that most BRS members do not ordinarily come across. Here are some subjects; I need to know which of them are of possible interest to members:

1. nuclear energy. 2. DNA research and regulations. 3.cosmology. 4. relevance of science.
5. nuclear warfare. 6.science and world government. 7. unified psychology. 8. Russell on science.
9. Einstein on science. 10. other_____

I also propose to have our members meet and talk with some experts in science, probably at an annual BRS meeting. Here too the subject will depend on members' interests.

I invite all members interested in any aspect of science and its applications to become members of the Science Committee. The duties are only what each individual member wants to do, little or much. Our technological society desperately needs the input of all people in its increasingly complex decisions. And this is a place to start.

* Please send me a postcard mentioning which scientific subjects interest you. And if you wish to be on the Science Committee, please say so. My address: Physics Department, Illinois State University, Normal, IL 61761

* * * * * * * *

(5b) We asked Alex where he stands on nuclear power. Here is his response:

I am moderately opposed to it in its present form. Only a year ago, I was in favor of it, but — besides TMI — I have since studied many NRC documents and internal Atomic Industrial Forum publications, and I was shocked. But this is a subject for future correspondence and/or papers.

(6) Russian nuclear disaster disputed. Last issue we reproduced a letter Joe Neilands had received from Zhores Medvedev, and a review of Medvedev's book, Nuclear Disaster in the Urals (RSN23-14). In the book, Medvedev claimed that there had been a nuclear explosion in the Chelyabinsk region of the Southern Urals, site of the Soviet Union's first nuclear reactor, in 1956, which the USSR had never acknowledged.

In the following New York Times story (10/30/79, p. C3), 4 American physicists dispute Medvedev's claim.

**By WALTER SULLIVAN**

FOUR physicists, including the former director of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, where the first atomic bomb was developed, have questioned reports that a nuclear accident occurred near the southern Ural Mountains of the Soviet Union in late 1957 or early 1958.

They believe, instead, that the reports refer to contamination by fallout from unusually "dirty" Soviet weapons tests, several of which were conducted at that time over Novaya Zemlya, 1,300 miles to the north. The blasts were in the multimegaton range.

The thesis that some form of accident occurred, with many casualties and widespread radioactive contamination, has been advanced by Dr. Zhores Medvedev, a dissident Soviet biochemist. He has proposed that a spontaneous chain reaction may have occurred in plutonium-laden reactor wastes.

In 1976, after leaving the Soviet Union, he described in the British journal New Scientist what he took to be evidence for a nuclear accident in the Ural area.

He has spelled out his argument more fully in his book "Nuclear Disaster in the Urals," published this month in Britain by Angus & Robertson and in the United States by W. W. Norton & Company.

His account has been seized upon by opponents of nuclear energy as a dramatic indication of its hazards. The challenge to his interpretation is presented in the Oct. 26 issue of Science, journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, by three Los Alamos staff members, Drs. William Stratton, Danny Stillman and Sumner Barr, and the laboratory's former director, Dr. Harold M. Agnew. Dr. Agnew is now president of the General Atomic Company in San Diego.

**Rumors Reached Europe**

Rumors of an accident in the Soviet Union began reaching western Europe in 1958. Some accounts said thousands were injured, some of them seriously If there had been such a catastrophe, Dr. Medvedev reasoned, Soviet biolo-

Dr. Zhores Medvedev — Camera Press


The New York Times/Oct. 30, 1979

gists would have taken advantage of it to study the effects of heavy radioactive contamination.

He searched the open Soviet literature for such accounts and found that unusually high levels of strontium 90 and cesium 137 had been found in several Soviet lakes.

From the life forms identified in the report he concluded that the affected area lay to the east of Kyshtym on the eastern slope of the Urals. Near that city the Soviet Union built the first reactors to produce plutonium for its weapons program.

Dr. Mevedev argues that radioactive wastes stored in metal tanks or dumped into an excavation accumulated a sufficient concentration of plutonium to constitute a "critical mass," leading to a spontaneous chain reaction and explosion.

In reply the authors of the Science article term it "unlikely" that the Russians would allow that much plutonium to escape their refining process. If a such a chain reaction did occur, they say, it would have been "too slow to disturb the ground more than trivially."

Such an accident, the physicists say, would be unlikely to spread strontium and cesium — and nothing else — over so wide an area. They point out that the report cited by Dr. Medvedev made no mention of plutonium as a contaminant. Strontium and cesium are typical constituents of nuclear weapons fallout in which the shorter-lived radioactive elements have already decayed.

Unusually high concentrations of weapons fallout have occurred in the United States and elsewhere under special meteorological conditions, such as the washing out of fallout particles from the atmosphere by heavy rains.

While the data can be explained as fallout, the four physicists say an accidental release of radiation cannot be ruled out. Nevertheless, they add, the magnitude of the event "may have been grossly exagerrated," the source of the radiation may have been identified "uncritically" and an improbable mode of its dispersal suggested.

Furthermore, they say in conclusion, "we find it hard to believe that an area of this magnitude could become contaminated and the event not discussed in detail or by more than one individual for more than 20 years."

(7) Universal Human Rights Committee (David Makinster, Acting Chairman):

Several members responded to my observations in the last newsletter (RSN23-16). I will make a full report -- including recommendations -- in the next issue.

---

PHILOSOPHERS' CORNER

(8) BRS at APA: the Program:

Program
of
THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.

at the December 1979 meeting
of the Eastern Division of
THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

Time: December 28, 1979 (Friday morning)

Place: The Sheraton Centre, New York City

I. DEFINITION AND DESCRIPTION IN RUSSELL, 1900-1910
Thomas P. Barron, University of Texas/Austin

Commentator: Jon Fjeld, Duke University

II. RUSSELL AND ONTOLOGICAL EXCESS
D. A. Griffiths, University of Hong Kong

Commentator: Tom Wartenberg, Duke University

Chairman: David Johnson, Naval Academy

Copies of the papers presented here may be borrowed at no cost, or bought for $2, by writing to: Mr. Don Jackanicz, Librarian, BRS Library, 3802 N. Kenneth Avenue, Chicago, IL 60641.

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

(9) **BRS at APA: Abstracts of the Papers:**

Russell and Ontological Excess, D.A. Griffiths

The Theory of Descriptions is usually presented as the means by which Russell liberated himself from Meinongian ontological excess. This presentation is examined, and found to be misleading.

It is argued first that the account of denoting set out in 'The Principles of Mathematics' (POM) avoids (as does Frege's theory) what Russell recognized, in 'On Denoting', to be the Meinongian route into ontological excess. Secondly it is shown that a second route, which Frege's theory does not avoid was recognized in both POM and 'On Denoting', and in the former avoiding tactics were developed. These tactics, however, clearly fail in the case of negative existential statements.

It is concluded, therefore, that Russell of POM does not need the theory of descriptions to curb his ontological excesses; an analysis of existential statements will suffice. A need will arise only if the POM account of denoting is rejected.

Definition and Description in Russell, 1900-1910, Thomas P. Barron

The label "logicist" -- commonly applied both to the program of the Principles of Mathematics and to that of Principia Mathematica -- is generally understood as indicating an attempt both (i) to define the concepts of mathematics in terms of logical concepts, and (ii) given these definitions, to derive the truths of mathematics from axioms involving only logical terms. I contend that this label is ambiguous since Russell meant one thing when he spoke of definition in the Principles, and yet another thing when he spoke of definition in Principia. The main function of definitions in the former work is epistemological; in the latter, ontological. I map out the problems that led to these important changes -- changes that the introduction to Principia tends to mask -- and show how they constitute a major discontinuity in the development of Russell's general ontology as well as in his philosophy of mathematics.

---

THE MEMBERS VOTE

(10) **Results of the RSN23 ballot:**

Part 1. Election of Directors. 6 candidates were elected, for 3-year terms starting 1/1/80: KENNETH BLACKWELL, JACK COWLES, LESTER DENONN, J. B. NEILANDS, RAYMOND PLANT, & STEPHEN J. REINHARDT.

Part 2. Time and place of 1980 meeting: Chicago in June. When only "1st choice" were counted, May, June and July were tied; but when 1st and 2nd choices were combined and counted, June was out front, followed by July. Chicago led the rest when 1st choice (only) were counted, and also when 1st and 2nd choices were combined and counted. Hamilton came in 2nd.

Part 3. Proposal on the use of "chairperson". "Chairperson" will be discarded. The vote against it was nearly 2 to 1.

Part 4. Proposal to raise dues. The proposal was approved. Dues are raised $5, except for students. The new rates, effective at once: regular $20, couple $25, student $5. Outside USA and Canada, add $5, as before.

Part 5. New head of Science Committee proposed. Proposal approved. Alex Dely is the new Chairman.

In 1977, 11% of the members voted; in 1978, 15%; this year the figure is 20%. Not great but improving.

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

(11) Sham education. TOM STANLEY writes: "I was pleased to see an article on Haldeman-Julius in Russell 29-32. William Ryan overlooked an early contribution Russell made to a Haldeman-Julius pamphlet." Tom sent us the pamphlet, from which we reproduce the overlooked contribution:

LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 1125
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

# A Book of American Shams

Nelson Antrim Crawford, Bertrand Russell, Joseph McCabe, and Others



HALDEMAN-JULIUS COMPANY
GIRARD, KANSAS

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS





## THE SHAM OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

*By* BERTRAND RUSSELL

Having not seen America since the spring of 1914, I was expected, during my recent visit, to notice many changes. Americans find it necessary to their self-respect to believe that their country changes fast, and no doubt in the main the belief is true; but naturally the changes are not so readily perceived by strangers as by those who take the constant background of Americanism for granted. Nevertheless I did notice some rather interesting changes. Ten years ago, I saw mainly universities and university teachers. Certainly their attitude then was in many respects different from that of many teachers at the present time. Ten years ago the majority were doing their work with no strong consciousness of outside interference; now many of them seem to feel that they have to choose between hypocrisy and starvation.

There are two quite different kinds of tyranny to which university men are exposed in America: that of boards of trustees in the privately endowed universities, and that of the democracy in the State universities. The former is primarily economic, the latter primarily theological; both, of course, combine on moral persecution, and dismiss any man who becomes involved in a scandal, however innocently. Moreover, methods exist of fastening scandals upon those whose opinions are disliked.



The tyranny of boards of trustees is part of the power of capitalism, and is therefore attacked by socialists. Upton Sinclair's book "The Goose-Step" consists of a long series of instances with names and dates. This book naturally roused great interest in academic circles. As a rule, the Principal of a university denounces it as a gross libel, and quite unreliable in its facts; but the younger teachers, in a quiet corner, will whisper that it is quite correct, at any rate so far as *their* university is concerned. An outsider cannot, of course, form a well-informed judgment on this matter without a much longer study than I was able to make. But obviously it is a bad system to make learned men dependent for their livelihood upon a collection of ignorant and bigoted business men. Some of our provincial universities have tended to imitate America in this respect, but so far the prestige of Oxford and Cambridge has prevented the bad effects that might have been feared.

The tyranny of the democracy raises more interesting problems, and is much less discussed, because those who dislike tyranny are apt to like democracy. In the South and in some parts of the Middle West, Protestantism is as fierce as in Belfast, and the whole intellectual atmosphere is reminiscent of the seventeenth century. Since the taxpayer's money supports the State universities, he feels that these institutions ought to magnify his ego by teaching what he believes, not what is believed by those who have taken the trouble to form a rational opinion. Hence the all but



successful attempts to make it illegal to teach evolution in certain States. In the East, in some States, the Catholics are sufficiently powerful to enforce an Inquisition on State teachers. This atmosphere of theological persecution makes many State universities quite as destitute of freedom as those that depend upon private endowments. And it is, in fact, a more serious matter than capitalist tyranny, for two reasons. First, the tyranny of a majority is harder to endure and to resist than that of a ruling oligarchy, because the latter, but not the former, rouses the sympathy and admiration of the public for the victim. Secondly, theology interferes more intimately than politics with the matters concerned in university teaching. It is very difficult to think of a single subject where a teacher can avoid conflicting with those who believe in the literal truth of the whole of the Bible, as the Fundamentalists do.

(12) About the Chinese. The following ran in "The Atlantic Monthly" in December 1921, pp. 771-777:

## SOME TRAITS IN THE CHINESE CHARACTER

THERE is a theory among Occidentals that the Chinaman is inscrutable, full of secret thoughts, and impossible for us to understand. It may be that a greater experience of China would have brought me to share this opinion; but I could see nothing to support it during the time when I was working in that country. I talked to the Chinese as I should have talked to English people, and they answered me much as English people would have answered a Chinese whom they considered educated and not wholly unintelligent. I do not believe in the myth of the 'subtle Oriental': I am convinced that in a game of mutual deception an Englishman or American can beat a Chinese nine times out of ten. But as many comparatively poor Chinese have dealings with rich white men, the game is often played only on one side. Then, no doubt, the white man is deceived and swindled; but not more than a Chinese mandarin would be in London.

One of the most remarkable things about the Chinese is their power of securing the affection of foreigners. Al-

most all Europeans like China, both those who come only as tourists and those who live there for many years. In spite of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, I cannot recall a single Englishman in the Far East who liked the Japanese as much as the Chinese. Those who have lived long among them tend to acquire their outlook and their standards. New arrivals are struck by obvious evils: the beggars, the terrible poverty, the prevalence of disease, the anarchy and corruption in politics. Every energetic Westerner feels at first a strong desire to reform these evils, and of course they ought to be reformed.

But the Chinese, even those who are the victims of preventable misfortunes, show a vast passive indifference to the excitement of the foreigners: they wait for it to go off, like the effervescence of soda-water. And gradually strange doubts creep into the mind of the bewildered traveler: after a period of indignation, he begins to doubt all the maxims that he has hitherto accepted without question. Is it really wise to be always guarding against future misfortune? Is it prudent to lose all enjoyment of the present through thinking of the disasters that may come at some future date? Should our lives be passed in building a mansion that we shall never have leisure to inhabit?

The Chinaman answers these questions in the negative, and therefore has to put up with poverty, disease, and anarchy. But, to compensate for these evils, he has retained, as industrial nations have not, the capacity for civilized enjoyment, for leisure and laughter, for pleasure in sunshine and philosophical discourse. The Chinaman, of all classes, is more laughter-loving than any other race with which I am acquainted; he finds amusement in everything, and a dispute can always be softened by a joke.

I remember one hot day, when a party of us were crossing the hills in chairs. The way was rough and very steep, the work for the coolies very severe. At the highest point of our journey, we stopped for ten minutes to let the men rest. Instantly they all sat in a row, brought out their pipes, and began to laugh among themselves as if they had not a care in the world. In any country that had learned the virtue of forethought, they would have devoted the moments to complaining of the heat, in order to increase their tip. We, being Europeans, spent the time worrying whether the automobile would be waiting for us at the right place. Well-to-do Chinese would have started a discussion as to whether the universe moves in cycles or progresses by a rectilinear motion; or they might have set to work to consider whether the truly virtuous man shows *complete* self-abnegation, or may, on occasion, consider his own interest.

One comes across white men occasionally who suffer under the delusion that China is not a civilized country. Such men have quite forgotten what constitutes civilization. It is true that there are no trams in Peking, and that the electric light is poor. It is true that there are places full of beauty, which Europeans itch to make hideous by digging up coal. It is true that the educated Chinaman is better at writing poetry than at remembering the sort of facts which can be looked up in *Whitaker's Almanac*. A European, in recommending a place of residence, will tell you that it has a good train-service; the best quality he can conceive in any place is that it should be easy to get away from. But a Chinaman will tell you nothing about the trains; if you ask, he will tell you wrong. What he tells you is that there is a palace built by an ancient emperor, and a retreat in a lake for scholars weary of the world, founded by a famous poet of the Tang dynasty. It is this outlook that strikes the Westerner as barbaric.

The Chinese, from the highest to the lowest, have an imperturbable quiet dignity, which is usually not destroyed, even by a European education. They are not self-assertive, either individually or nationally; their pride is too profound for self-assertion. They admit China's military weakness in comparison with foreign powers, but they do not consider efficiency in homicide the most important quality in a man or a nation. I think that at bottom they almost all believe that China is the greatest nation in the world, and has the finest civilization. A Westerner cannot be expected to accept this view, because it is based on traditions utterly different from his own. But gradually one comes to feel that it is, at any rate, not an absurd view; that it is, in fact, the logical outcome of a self-consistent standard of values. The typical Westerner wishes to be the cause of as many changes as possible in his environment; the typical Chinaman wishes to enjoy as much and as delicately as possible. This difference is at the bottom of most of the contrast between China and the English-speaking world.

We in the West make a fetish of 'progress,' which is the ethical camouflage of the desire to be the cause of changes. If we are asked, for instance, whether machinery has really improved the world, the question strikes us as foolish: it has brought great changes, and therefore great 'progress.' What we believe to be a love of progress is really, in nine cases out of ten, a love of power, an enjoyment of the feeling that by our fiat we can make things different. For the sake of this pleasure, a young American will work so hard that, by the time he has acquired his millions, he has become a victim of dyspepsia, compelled to live on toast and water, and to be a mere spectator of the feasts that he offers to his guests. But he consoles himself with the thought that he can control politics, and provoke or prevent wars as may suit his investments. It is this temperament that makes Western nations 'progressive.'

## II

There are, of course, ambitious men in China, but they are less common than among ourselves. And their ambition takes a different form — not a better form, but one produced by the preference of enjoyment to power. It is a natural result of this preference that avarice is a widespread failing of the Chinese. Money brings the means of enjoyment, therefore money is passionately desired. With us, money is desired chiefly as a means to power; politicians, who can acquire power without much money, are often content to remain poor. In China, the *tuchuns* (military governors), who have the real power, almost always use it for the sole purpose of amassing a fortune. Their object is to escape to Japan at a suitable moment, with sufficient plunder to enable them to enjoy life quietly for the rest of their days. The fact that in escaping they lose power does not trouble them in the least. It is, of course, obvious that such politicians, who spread only devastation in the provinces committed to their care, are far less harmful to the world than our own, who ruin whole continents in order to win an election campaign.

The corruption and anarchy in Chinese politics do much less harm than one would be inclined to expect. But for the predatory desires of the Great Powers, — especially Japan, — the harm would be much less than is done by our own 'efficient' governments. Nine tenths of the activities of a modern government are harmful; therefore, the worse they are performed, the better. In China, where the government is lazy, corrupt, and stupid, there is a degree of individual liberty which has been wholly lost in the rest of the world.

The laws are just as bad as elsewhere: occasionally, under foreign pressure, a man is imprisoned for Bolshevist propaganda, just as he might be in England or America. But this is quite exceptional; as a rule, in practice, there is very little interference with free speech and a free press. The individual does not feel obliged to follow the herd, as he has in Europe since 1914, and in America since 1917. Men still think for themselves, and are not afraid to announce the conclusions at which they arrive. Individualism has perished in the West, but in China it survives, for good as well as for evil. Self-respect and personal dignity are possible for every coolie in China, to a degree which is, among ourselves, possible only for a few leading financiers.

The business of 'saving face,' which often strikes foreigners in China as ludicrous, is only the carrying out of respect for personal dignity in the sphere of social manners. Everybody has 'face,' even the humblest beggar; there are humiliations that you must not inflict upon him, if you are not to outrage the Chinese ethical code. If you speak to a Chinaman in a way that transgresses the code, he will laugh, because your words must be taken as spoken in jest if they are not to constitute an offense.

Once I thought that the students to whom I was lecturing were not as industrious as they might be, and I told them so in just the same words that I should have used to English students in the same circumstances. But I soon found I was making a mistake. They all laughed uneasily, which surprised me until I saw the reason. Chinese life, even among the most modernized, is far more polite than anything to which we are accustomed. This, of course, interferes with efficiency, and also (what is more serious) with sincerity and truth in personal relations. If I were Chinese, I should wish to see it mitigated. But to those who suffer from the brutalities of the West, Chinese urbanity is very restful. Whether on the balance it is better or worse than our frankness, I shall not venture to decide.

The Chinese remind one of the English in their love of compromise and in their habit of bowing to public opinion. Seldom is a conflict pushed to its ultimate brutal issue. The treatment of the Manchu Emperor may be taken as a case in point. When a Western country becomes a republic, it is customary to cut off the head of the deposed monarch, or at least to cause him to flee the country. But the Chinese have left the Emperor his title, his beautiful palace, his troops of eunuchs, and an income of several million dollars a year. He is a boy of fourteen, living peaceably in the Forbidden City. Once, in the course of a civil war, he was nominally restored to power for a few weeks; but he was deposed again, without being in any way punished for the use to which he had been put.

Public opinion is a very real force in China, when it can be roused. It was, by all accounts, mainly responsible for the downfall of the An Fu party in the summer of 1920. This party was pro-Japanese, and was accepting loans from Japan. Hatred of Japan is the strongest and most widespread of political passions in China, and it was stirred up by the students in fiery orations. The An Fu party had, at first, a great preponderance of military strength; but their soldiers walked away when they came to understand the cause for which they were expected to fight. In the end, the opponents of the An Fu party were able to enter Peking and change the government almost without firing a shot.

The same influence of public opinion was decisive in the teachers' strike, which was on the point of being settled when I left Peking. The Government, which is always impecunious, owing to corruption, had left its teachers unpaid for many months. At last, they struck to enforce payment, and went on a peaceful deputation to the Government, accompanied by many students. There was a clash with the soldiers and police, and many teachers and students were more or less severely wounded. This led to a terrific outcry, because the love of education in China is profound and widespread. The newspapers clamored for revolution. The Government had just spent nine million dollars in corrupt payments to three teachers who had descended upon the capital to extort blackmail. It could not find any colorable pretext for refusing the few hundred thousands required by the teachers, and it capitulated in panic. I do not think there is any Anglo-Saxon country where the interests of teachers would have roused the same degree of public feeling.

Nothing astonishes a European more in the Chinese than their patience. The educated Chinese are well aware of the foreign menace. They realize acutely what the Japanese have done in Manchuria and Shantung. They are aware that the English in Hong Kong are doing their utmost to bring to naught the Canton attempt to introduce good government in the South. They know that all the great powers, without exception, look with greedy eyes upon the undeveloped resources of their country, especially its coal and iron. They have before them the example of Japan, which, by developing a brutal militarism, a cast-iron discipline, and a new reactionary religion, has succeeded in holding at bay the brutal lusts of 'civilized' industrialists. Yet they neither copy Japan nor submit tamely to foreign domination. They think, not in decades, but in centuries. They have been conquered before, first

by the Tartars and then by the Manchus. But in both cases they absorbed their conquerors. Chinese civilization persisted, unchanged; and after a few generations the invaders became more Chinese than their subjects.

Manchuria is a rather empty country, with abundant room for colonization. The Japanese assert that they need colonies for their surplus population, yet the Chinese immigrants into Manchuria exceed the Japanese a hundredfold. Whatever may be the temporary political status of Manchuria, it will remain a part of Chinese civilization, and can be recovered whenever Japan happens to be in difficulties. The Chinese derive such strength from their four hundred millions, the toughness of their national customs, their power of passive resistance, and their unrivaled national cohesiveness, — in spite of the civil wars, which merely ruffle the surface, — that they can afford to despise military methods, and to wait till the feverish energy of their oppressors shall have exhausted itself in internecine combats.

China is much less a political entity than a civilization — the only one that has survived from ancient times. Since the days of Confucius, the Egyptian, Babylonian, Persian, Macedonian, and Roman empires have perished; but China has persisted through a continuous evolution. There have been foreign influences — first Buddhism, and now Western science. But Buddhism did not turn the Chinese into Indians, and Western science will not turn them into Europeans. I have met men in China who knew as much of Western learning as any professor among ourselves; yet they had not been thrown off their balance, or lost touch with their own people. What is bad in the West — its brutality, its restlessness, its readiness to oppress the weak, its preoccupation with purely material aims — they see to be bad, and do not wish to adopt. What is good, especially its science, they do wish to adopt.

The old indigenous culture of China has become rather dead; its art and literature are not what they were, and Confucius does not satisfy the spiritual needs of a modern man, even if he is Chinese. The Chinese who have had a European or American education realize that a new element is needed to vitalize native traditions, and they look to our civilization to supply it. But they do not wish to construct a civilization just like ours; and it is precisely in this that the best hope lies. If they are not goaded into militarism, they may produce a genuinely new civilization, better than any that we in the West have been able to create.

III

So far, I have spoken chiefly of the good sides of the Chinese character; but, of course, China, like every other nation, has its bad sides also. It is disagreeable to me to speak of these, as I experienced so much courtesy and real kindness from the Chinese, that I should prefer to say only nice things about them. But for the sake of China, as well as for the sake of truth, it would be a mistake to conceal what is less admirable. I will only ask the reader to remember that, in the balance, I think the Chinese one of the best nations I have come across, and am prepared to draw up a graver indictment against every one of the great powers.

Shortly before I left China, an eminent Chinese writer pressed me to say what I considered the chief defects of the Chinese. With some reluctance, I mentioned three: avarice, cowardice, and callousness. Strange to say, my interlocutor, instead of getting angry, admitted the justice of my criticism, and proceeded to discuss possible remedies. This is a sample of the intellectual integrity which is one of China's greatest virtues.

The callousness of the Chinese is bound to strike every Anglo-Saxon. They have none of that humanitarian impulse which leads us to devote one per cent of our energy to mitigating the evils wrought by the other ninety-nine per cent. For instance, we have been forbidding the Austrians to join with Germany, to emigrate, or to obtain the raw materials of industry. Therefore the Viennese have starved, except those whom it has pleased us to keep alive, from philanthropy. The Chinese would not have had the energy to starve the Viennese, or the philanthropy to keep some of them alive. While I was in China, millions were dying of famine; men sold their children into slavery for a few dollars, and killed them if this sum was unobtainable. Much was done by white men to relieve the famine, but very little by the Chinese, and that little vitiated by corruption. It must be said, however, that the efforts of the white men were more effective in soothing their own consciences than in helping the Chinese. So long as the present birth-rate and the present methods of agriculture persist, famines are bound to occur periodically; and those whom philanthropy keeps alive through one famine are only too likely to perish in the next.

Famines in China can be permanently cured only by better methods of agriculture combined with emigration or birth-control on a large scale. Educated Chinese realize this, and it makes them indifferent to efforts to keep the present victims alive. A great deal of Chinese callousness has a similar explanation, and is due to perception of the vastness of the problems involved. But there remains a residue which cannot be so explained. If a dog is run over by an automobile and seriously hurt, nine out of ten passers-by will stop to laugh at the poor brute's howls. The spectacle of suffering does not of itself rouse any sympathetic pain in the average Chinaman; in fact, he seems to find it mildly agreeable. Their history, and their penal code before the revolution of 1911, show that they are by no means destitute of the impulse of active cruelty; but of this I did not myself come across any instances. And it must be said that active cruelty is practised by all the great nations, to an extent concealed from us only by our hypocrisy.

Cowardice is *prima facie* a fault of the Chinese; but I am not sure that they are really lacking in courage. It is true that, in battles between rival tuchuns, both sides run away, and victory rests with the side that first discovers the flight of the other. But this proves only that the Chinese soldier is a rational man. No cause of any importance is involved, and the armies consist of mere mercenaries. When there is a serious issue, as, for instance, in the Tai-Ping rebellion, the Chinese are said to fight well, particularly if they have good officers. Nevertheless, I do not think that, in comparison with the Anglo-Saxons, the French, or the Germans, the Chinese can be considered a courageous people, except in the matter of passive endurance. They will endure torture, and even death, for motives which men of more pugnacious races would find insufficient — for example, to conceal the hiding-place of stolen plunder. In spite of their comparative lack of *active* courage, they have less fear of death than we have, as is shown by their readiness to commit suicide.

Avarice is, I should say, the gravest defect of the Chinese. Life is hard, and money is not easily obtained. For the sake of money, all except a very few foreign-educated Chinese will be guilty of corruption. For the sake of a few pence, almost any coolie will run an imminent risk of death. The difficulty of combating Japan has arisen mainly from the fact that hardly any Chinese politician can resist Japanese bribes. I think this defect is probably due to the fact that, for many ages, an honest living has been hard to get; in which case it will be lessened as economic conditions improve. I doubt if it is any worse now in China than it was in Europe in the eighteenth century. I have not heard of any Chinese general more corrupt than Marlborough, or of any politician more corrupt than Cardinal Dubois. It is, therefore, quite likely that changed industrial conditions will make the Chinese as honest as we are — which is not saying much.

I have been speaking of the Chinese as they are in ordinary life, when they appear as men of active and skeptical intelligence, but of somewhat sluggish passions. There is, however, another side to them: they are capable of wild excitement, often of a collective kind. I saw little of this myself, but there can be no doubt of the fact. The Boxer rising was a case in point, and one which particularly affected Europeans. But their history is full of more or less analogous disturbances. It is this element in their character that makes them incalculable, and makes it impossible even to guess at their future. One can imagine a section of them becoming fanatically Bolshevist, or anti-Japanese, or Christian, or devoted to some leader who would ultimately declare himself Emperor. I suppose it is this element in their character that makes them, in spite of their habitual caution, the most reckless gamblers in the world. And many emperors have lost their thrones through the force of romantic love, although romantic love is far more despised than it is in the West.

To sum up the Chinese character is not easy. Much of what strikes the foreigner is due merely to the fact that they have preserved an ancient civilization which is not industrial. All this is likely to pass away, under the pressure of Japanese, European, and American financiers. Their art is already perishing, and being replaced by crude imitations of second-rate European pictures. Most of the Chinese who have had a European education are quite incapable of seeing any beauty in native painting, and merely observe contemptuously that it does not obey the laws of perspective.

The obvious charm which the tourist finds in China cannot be preserved; it must perish at the touch of industrialism. But perhaps something may be preserved, something of the ethical qualities in which China is supreme, and which the modern world most desperately needs. Among these qualities I place first the pacific temper, which seeks to settle disputes on grounds of justice rather than by force. It remains to be seen whether the West will allow this temper to persist, or will force it to give place, in self-defense, to a frantic militarism like that to which Japan has been driven.

(Thank you, John Harper)

---

## BR BIBLIOGRAPHIES

(13) Another BR bibliography. "Harry Ruja, in his article on bibliography (RSN23-20)," writes Tom Stanley, "did not mention the one I've found most useful: 'Bertrand Russell: A Classified Bibliography, 1929-1967' by Harry Ruja, in 'The Bulletin of Bibliography' September-December 1968, pp. 182-190, 192 and January-March 1969, pp. 29-31. This is especially valuable for its lists of book reviews and articles in magazines."

---

## ABOUT BERTRAND RUSSELL

(14) Virginia Woolf's diary provides another point of view about BR:

*Saturday 3 December*

I dined with the Sangers last night, & enjoyed society. I wore my new black dress, & looked, I daresay, rather nice. That's a feeling I very seldom have; & I rather intend to enjoy it oftener. I like clothes, if I can design them. So Bertie Russell was attentive, & we struck out like swimmers who knew their waters.[3] One is old enough to cut the trimmings & get to the point. Bertie is a fervid egoist—which helps matters. And then, what a pleasure—this mind on springs. I got as much out of him as I could carry.

"For I should soon be out of my depth" I said. I mean, I said, "all this" & I waved my hand round the room, where by this time were assembled Mr & Miss Amos, Rosalind Toynbee, a German, & Mrs Lucas—[4] "All this is mush; & you can put a telescope to your eye & see through it."

"If you had my brain you would find the world a very thin, colourless place" he said

But my colours are so foolish I replied.

You want them for your writing, he said. Do you never see things impersonally?

Yes. I see literature like that; Milton, that is.

The Choruses in Samson are pure art, he said.

But I have a feeling that human affairs are impure.

God does mathematics. That's my feeling. It is the most exalted form of art.

Art? I said.

Well theres style in mathematics as there is in writing, he said. I get the keenest aesthetic pleasure from reading well written mathematics. Lord Kelvin's style was abominable.[5] My brain is not what it was. I'm past my best—& therefore, of course, I am now celebrated. In Japan they treated me like Charlie Chaplin—disgusting.[6] I shall write no more mathematics. Perhaps I shall write philosophy. The brain becomes rigid at 50—& I shall be 50 in a month or two. I have to make money.

Surely money is settled upon Russells by the country, I said.

I gave mine away years ago, to help promising young men who wanted to write poetry.[7] From 28 to 38 I lived in a cellar & worked. Then my passions got hold of me. Now I have come to terms with my self: I am no longer surprised at what happens. I don't expect any more emotional experiences. I don't think any longer that something is going to happen when I meet a new person.

I said that I disagreed with much of this. Yet perhaps I did not expect very much to happen from talking to Bertie. I felt that he had talked to so many people. Thus I did not ask him to come here— I enjoyed it though a good deal; & got home & drank cocoa in the kitchen; & at 7.30 this morning traced a smell of shag in the house & found L. smoking his pipe by the kitchen fire, having come back safe.

*Saturday 23 February*

That reminds me of the celebrated Mr [Bertrand] Russell the other night at Karin's. (She gives her weekly party in the great gay drawingroom which is nevertheless a little echoing & lofty & very very chill). He said "Just as I saw a chance of happiness, the doctors said I had got cancer. My first thought was that that was one up to God. He had brought it off—just as I thought I saw a chance of happiness. When I was just getting better—I had very nearly died—my temperature was 107 twice over—the thing I liked was the sun: I thought how nice to feel the sun & the rain still. People came a long way after that. I wanted people very much, but not so much as the sun. The old poets were right. They made people think of death as going where they could not see the sun. I have become an optimist. I realise now that I like life—I want to live. Before that illness, I thought life was bad. Its an odd thing—both my pessimism & my optimism are instinctive" (I forget which he said was the deeper of the two.) So to Charlie Sanger, who is good all through; & then on to Moore. "When he first came up to Cambridge, he was the most wonderful creature in the whole world. His smile was the most beautiful thing I have ever seen. We believed in Berkeley" (perhaps). "Suddenly, something went wrong with him; something happened to him and his work. Principia Ethica was nothing like so good as his Essay on Judgment (?). He was very fond of Ainsworth.[10] I don't know what happened— It ruined him. He took to putting out his tongue after that. You (I, that is) said he had no complexes. But he's full of them. Watch him putting his tongue round his mouth. I said to him once, Moore, have you ever told a lie? "YES" he said—which was the only lie he ever told. He always speaks the truth at the Aristotelian. An old gentleman met me on my way here, & asked if I were going. No; I said ⟨not such a fool⟩. Joad is speaking tonight. Haldane made a speech once, & old Shad Hodgson had to pass a vote of thanks. He had had an epileptic fit that afternoon. He got up & talked nonsense—utter nonsense. So they asked me. And *I* had to thank Haldane, though I'd got ready to criticise every argument he used. Never mind: I put them all into an article, & that stung much sharper."[11] I asked him, as I ask everyone, to write his life for the press. But my mind is absolutely relevant. I cant ramble. I stick to facts. "Facts are what we want. Now the colour of your mother's hair'?' "She died when I was two—there you are—relevant facts. I remember my grandfather's death, & crying, & then thinking it was over. I saw my brother drive up in the afternoon. Hooray! I cried. They told me I must not say hooray at all that day. I remember the servants all looking very attentively at me when I was brought to Pembroke Lodge after my father died. Whitehead's father, who was the local parson, was sent for to persuade me that the earth was round. I said it was flat. And I remember —some seaside place, now destroyed—remembered the sands, I think."[12]

3. The Hon. Bertrand Arthur William Russell (1872-1970), grandson of Lord John Russell, twice Prime Minister, and heir-presumptive to his earldom; philosopher, mathematician and pacifist; at Trinity College, Cambridge, he and C. P. Sanger were both Apostles. VW and Russell came to dine without their spouses: LW was seeing his constituents in the north; Russell's wife, Dora Black, with whom he had spent the previous academic year in China and had married in September following his divorce from his first wife Alys, had given birth to their son on 16 November. Russell was at this time earning his living in London by journalism and lecturing.
4. Maurice Sheldon Amos (1872-1940), jurist, was a friend and contemporary of both Sanger and Russell at Trinity; his sister was called Bonté and was a doctor. Rosalind Toynbee, *née* Murray (1890-1967), wife of the historian Arnold Toynbee, daughter of Professor Gilbert Murray and granddaughter of the formidable Lady Carlisle, was herself a novelist. Mrs Lucas was probably Emily Beatrice Coursolles Jones (1893-1966), not long married to the Cambridge don F. L. Lucas (see below, 3 January 1922, n 3); in 1919 she had reviewed *Night and Day* in the *Cambridge Magazine* (see *I VW Diary*, p 310, fn).
5. William Thomson, first Baron Kelvin of Largs (1824-1907), Professor of Natural Philosophy in Glasgow for over 50 years, mathematical physicist and fecund inventor; his papers were published in 5 volumes, 1882-1911.
6. On their way back from China in July Russell and Dora Black had visited Japan where they had been pursued by journalists. See *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, Vol. II (1968), pp 133-5.
10. G. E. Moore's 'The Nature of Judgment' was published in *Mind*, vol. viii, 1899; his *Principia Ethica* in 1903. Alfred Richard Ainsworth (1897-1959), Scholar of King's, an Apostle, was a close friend of Moore's; in 1894 the two went to Edinburgh together, where from 1903-07 Ainsworth was a lecturer in Greek. In 1908 he married Moore's youngest sister Sarah (an unhappy union which ended in divorce) and joined the Board of Education which he was to serve until 1940.
11. The Aristotelian Society, with lay as well as academic membership, was founded in 1880; the presidential address by Richard Burdon Haldane, 1st Viscount Haldane (1856-1928), statesman and sometime Lord Chancellor, criticised by Russell (see *Mind*, vol. xvii, 1908), was on 'The Methods of Modern Logic and the Conception of Infinity'. Shadsworthy Hollway Hodgson (1832-1912) was the first president, 1880-1894, and a leading spirit of the Aristotelian Society.
12. Both Bertrand Russell's parents—John Russell, Viscount Amberley (1842-1876) and Katherine Louisa, *née* Stanley (d. 1874), had died before he was four years old, and he and his brother were taken to Pembroke Lodge, Richmond Park, the home of his grandfather Lord John Russell, 1st Earl Russell; the elder boy Frank (John Francis, 2nd Earl Russell, 1865-1931) was sent to Winchester, but Bertie was brought up by his grandmother in rigorously disciplined, isolated, spartan conditions. The summer of 1877 he spent with his grandparents in the Isle of Thanet, in the parish of St Peter's, of which the Rev. Alfred Whitehead was vicar; his son Alfred North Whitehead (1861-1947), FRS, mathematician and philosopher, was co-author with Russell of the commanding *Principia Mathematica* (1910-13). See *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, 1872-1914*, 1967.

Saturday 23 February (continued)

He had no one to play with. One does not like him. Yet he is brilliant of course; perfectly outspoken; familiar; talks of his bowels; likes people; & yet & yet— He disapproves of me perhaps? He has not much body of character. This luminous vigorous mind seems attached to a flimsy little car, like that on a large glinting balloon. His adventures with his wives diminish his importance.[13] And he has no chin, & he is dapper. Nevertheless, I should like the run of his headpiece. We parted at the corner of the Square; no attempt to meet again.

13. Bertrand Russell's first, and for almost two decades loveless, marriage to Karin's aunt Alys Pearsall Smith finally ended in divorce in 1921, when he married Dora Black; but he had had in the interim several manifest affairs with married women. See Russell's autobiographical volumes and *The Life of Bertrand Russell* by Ronald W. Clark, 1975.

All of the above comes from The Diary of Virginia Woolf, Volume 2, 1920-24, Anne Olivier Bell and Andrew Mckeille, eds. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich 1978) pp.146-148, 293-295.

(Thank you, Don Jackanicz)

(15) Skinner. From a review, by Rosemary Dinnage, of B. F. Skinner's The Shaping of a Behaviorist (Part Two of an Autobiography), in The New York Times Book Review, 5/20/79, p. 11:

**In his first volume of autobiography Professor Skinner took the reader up to his early 20's and his decision to do postgraduate study in psychology at Harvard. He had spent a year after graduation trying, and failing, to become a writer. Bertrand Russell's account of J. B. Watson, founder of behaviorism, aroused his curiosity and he bought a copy of Watson's "Behaviorism." (Years later Professor Skinner met Russell, who was lecturing in Minnesota, and told him that he had converted him to behaviorism; "Good heavens," said Russell, "I thought I had demolished it.")**

(16) An empty house. Leo Abse, M. P., reports the following, in the November 1978 issue of "In Britain":

I WAS born in 1917, when millions of young men were being slaughtered in France, and jingoism reigned supreme. My mother, as wilful as she was beautiful, defying the times, decided to name me after the most provocative and renowned pacifist of the era, the philosopher Bertrand Russell. Only a vigorous intervening grandmother had at the very last second rescued me from the intimidating fate of having his name inscribed upon my birth certificate.

When during the Cuban crisis of 1962 I shared platforms with the twice-imprisoned third Earl, Nobel prize winner and holder of the Order of Merit, he laughed, even at that grim moment, as I recounted the family tale. And, although the philosopher died eight years ago, again, in North Wales last month, in his half empty eyrie – Plas Penrhyn, perched high above the Glaslyn Estuary – I heard his fluted laugh.

The house he had occupied for twenty years was now half empty and disconsolate: with the recent death of his courageous fourth wife, Edith, the estate is now being wound up. Most of the ungainly furniture had gone, some across the Atlantic for the re-creation, over the ocean, of his study, as an ugly shrine for his admirers, and his massive library stacked high, ready for shipment to the new purchasers, the Canadian MacMasters University. The shabby buff-coloured walls still had hanging upon them the vulgar embroidered tributes, gifts from Mao and from Ho Chi Minh: the cold linoleum-floored bathroom still had as its centrepiece a stained, chipped, enamelled tub. Only a reproduction of Piero della Francesca's peaceful Holy Ghost, remaining in its position above the bed of the avowedly godless guru, strove to overcome the cheerlessness.

(Thank you, Bev Smith)

---

BR QUOTED

(17) Joan Baez has been crusading recently against "the cruelty, violence, and oppression" that continues under the present Vietnamese regime.

She was not chagrined by the reports that the end of the Vietnam war did not bring an end to violence in that ravaged country. "I was not disillusioned," she said. "I met Bertrand Russell once when he was in his 80s and we sat in his little room and he served us tea. I said, 'All right, Bert, let's get on with it. What do you think our chances are?' 'Our chances of what?' he asked. 'Of survival,' I said. And he said that if people started turning things around in the next 20 years we could make it, and I asked what the chances of that were, and he said, 'Probably none.' So we laughed and ate our little tea cakes. And then you just get on with it. For me, it's all part of having had a Quaker upbringing. You tell the truth as you know it."

From a story in the International Herald Tribune 7/5/79.

(Thank you, Alberto Donadio)

(18) Impulse. DAVID HART had the pleasant experience of looking up a word in a dictionary and finding BR quoted. The word was "impulse", the dictionary was The American Heritage Dictionary, and the quote was:"Respect for the liberty of others is not a natural impulse in most men."(Bertrand Russell)

(19) Reader's Digest, May 1979, provided the following:

> The secret of happiness: let your interests be as wide as possible, and let your reactions to the things and persons that interest you be as far as possible friendly rather than hostile.
> Bertrand Russell, The Conquest of Happiness (Liveright)

(Thank you, Peter Cranford)

---

## BR HONORED

(20) The Kalinga Prize for the popularization of science was established by UNESCO in 1951 and awarded to BR in 1957. The Prize, awarded annually, consists of one thousand pounds sterling, and is based on a grant to UNESCO for this purpose by Mr. B. Patnaik, of India. The winner of the Prize also receives the UNESCO Gold Medal, and is invited to visit India as a guest of the Kalinga Foundation Trust.

Kalinga was the name of an ancient empire that covered a great part of India and Indonesia. The empire was conquered by the sovereign, Asoka, more than 2000 years ago, but the campaign of conquest gave him such a distaste for war that he spent the rest of his life working for peace.

In 1957 there were 7 candidates from 6 countries. BR was nominated by the Venezuelan Association for the Advancement of Science. The jury of 3 consisted of a Belgian, an Englishman and a Pole — designated by the Director-General of UNESCO.

Winners in other years include such well-known names as Julian Huxley, Waldemar Kaempffert, George Gamov, Ritchie Calder, Arthur C. Clarke, Gerard Piel, Warren Weaver, Eugene Rabinowitch, Konrad Lorenz, Margaret Mead.

Professor Pierre Auger spoke, at the Kalinga Prize Ceremony in Paris, January 28, 1957:

> The Director-General, in his speech,emphasized the great importance of the interpretation and dissemination of science for the present-day world. In this field, the man whom we honour today has, during a long and fruitful career, made an outstanding contribution. He has written books like "The Analysis of Mind" and "The Analysis of Matter", where interpretation of the results of science takes the form of personal creativity; and he is also the author of general works like "A History of Western Philosophy" and "Human Knowledge, its Scope and Limits". Through him, countless men of good will have been guided towards a deeper understanding of the value of science, of what science brings us, and what it means.
>
> Ladies and gentlemen, it is both a very easy and a very difficult thing to describe Bertrand Russell's achievement. It is easy if one confines oneself to its world impact, to the simple fact that the list of books I have before me comprises 48 separate works,translated into many languages and read throughout the entire world, and that to these must be added a host of booklets, essays, articles and lectures. The vast scope of this output should also be mentioned, since the subjects range from politics — his first book dealt with German social-democracy — to the theory of relativity, to which should be added mathematics and philosophy, as well as numerous problems of sociology and ethics.
>
> Its very scope, however, makes it exceedingly difficult to define his work and to summarize it in a single formula. Bertrand Russell wrote for logicians, and taught them many things — how, for example, to construct and demolish paradoxes. He wrote for mathematicians, for whom he defined their principles; but in addition, he wrote for an educated though non-specialist public, to whom he explained the practical significance of the relativity or quantum theories. Finally, he wrote for what may be described as the public at large, dealing, either seriously or humorously, with the problems that beset us all when we reflect upon ourselves and try to find our bearings amid the tumult of our century.
>
> Yet it seems to me that, when all this is said, there emerges, not indeed a formula, but a sort of general light shed upon our problems, as a result of which we find these problems more clearly stated, nearer solution and sometimes, indeed, actually solved. Bertrand Russell has re-analyzed the discoveries of the theoretical and experimental sciences, combined and connected them, and identified those features in them which are new and of importance for our future and that of our communities — in short, he has "humanized" them. And for this reason I venture to recognize in his work a particularly brilliant example of scientific humanism, that new humanism which is so great a need of the world today. Every subject of concern to thinking men is examined by Russell from an essentially rational standpoint. He applies to political, moral and economic questions a sort of generalized scientific method. One outstanding feature of this method is undoubtedly his constant and, I would say, almost instinctive care to avoid all "conventional" theories, all statements based on a particular tradition, habit of thought, or prejudice. This is a thread leading from Montaigne, through Descartes, to Russell which I, as a Frenchman, am particularly glad to see. But systematic doubt, though essential in the application of the scientific method, is not in itself constructive; it has to be fought and overcome by hope. And that hope is there, in all Bertrand Russell's works — the hope of learning, the hope of understanding, the hope of acting more effectively, more usefully and more happily; a hope based on a complete conviction that the world of the future will be built for man, by man himself.

BR responded to the above in this way:

This present occasion is one in which I am very happy to be a participant. I wish to express my thanks to the Jury who awarded the Prize and to the donor, Mr. Patnaik. My only regret is that, owing to old age, I am not able to go to India as I should have wished to do had it been possible. I am very conscious of the importance of India both in the distant past as the inventor of the numeral zero and of the numbers which in the West are mis-called Arabic, and also as a rapidly increasing contributor to the corpus of scientific knowledge. I think that Mr. Patnaik deserves the gratitude of mankind for his recognition of the importance of popular science. There was a time when scientists looked askance at attempts to make their work widely intelligible. But, in the world of the present day, such an attitude is no longer possible. The discoveries of modern science have put into the hands of Governments unprecedented powers both for good and for evil. Unless the statesmen who wield these powers have at least an elementary understanding of their nature, it is scarcely likely that they will use them widely. And, in democratic countries, it is not only statesmen, but the general public, to whom some degree of scientific understanding is necessary. To insure wide diffusion of such understanding is by no means easy. Those who can act effectively as liaison officers between technical scientists and the public perform a work which is necessary, not only for human welfare, but even for bare survival of the human race. I think that a great deal more ought to be done in this direction in the education of those who do not intend to become scientific specialists. The Kalinga Prize is doing a great public service in encouraging those who attempt this difficult task.

In my own country, and to a lesser degree in other countries of the West, "culture" is viewed mainly, by an unfortunate impoverishment of the Renaissance tradition, as something concerned primarily with literature, history and art. A man is not considered uneducated if he knows nothing of the contributions of Galileo, Descartes and their successors. I am convinced that all higher education should involve a course in the history of scientific knowledge in so far as this can be conveyed without technicalities. While such knowledge remains confined to specialists, it is scarcely possible now-a-days for nations to conduct their affairs with wisdom.

There are two very different ways of estimating any human achievement: you may estimate it by what you consider its intrinsic excellence; or you may estimate it by its causal efficiency in transforming human life and human institutions. I am not suggesting that one of these ways of estimating is preferable to the other. I am only concerned to point out that they give very different scales of importance. If Homer and Aeschylus had not existed, if Dante and Shakespeare had not written a line, if Bach and Beethoven had been silent, the daily life of most people in the present day would have been much what it is. But if Pythagoras and Galileo and James Watt had not existed, the daily life, not only of the Western Europeans and Americans but of Indian, Russian and Chinese peasants, would be profoundly different from what it is. And these profound changes are only beginning. They must affect the future even more than they have already affected the present. At present, scientific technique advances like an army of tanks that have lost their drivers,blindly, ruthlessly, without goal or purpose. This is largely because the men who are concerned with human values and with making life worthy to be lived, are still living in imagination in the old pre-industrial world, the world that has been made familiar and comfortable by the literature of Greece and the pre-industrial achievements of the poets and artists and composers whose work we rightly admire.

The separation of science from "culture" is a modern phenomenon. Plato and Aristotle had a profound respect for what was known as science in their day. The Renaissance was as much concerned with the revival of science as with art and literature. Leonardo da Vinci devoted more of his energies to science than to painting. The Renaissance architects developed the geometrical theory of perspective. Throughout the eighteenth century a very great deal was done to diffuse understanding of the work of Newton and his contemporaries. But, from the early nineteenth century onwards, scientific concepts and scientific methods became increasingly abstruse and the attempt to make them generally intelligible came more and more to be regarded as hopeless. The modern theory and practice of nuclear physicists has made evident with dramatic suddenness that complete ignorance of the world of science is no longer compatible with survival. On this ground, above all others, I am happy to be associated in the work which the Kalinga Prize exists to promote.

---

## BR MEMORIAL

(21) Peter Cadogan, in a letter dated 7/10/79 to Bob Davis:

Bertrand Russell's bust has been finished in its original clay by Marcelle Quinton. Freddie Ayer has seen it and he told me last Thursday that he was very impressed. We are still awaiting the O.K. from Camden Council concerning the site in Red Lion Square. My hope is that we will make the Appeal to coincide with the beginning of the University term in October.

---

BR'S INFLUENCE

(22) Underground admirer. The following cartoon, by Robert Crum, ran in the undergroun publication, Hydrogen Bomb and Chemical Warfare Funnies, copyright 1970 by the Rip Off Press, San Francisco.


(Thank you, John Mahoney)

---

INTELLIGENCE

(23) Una Corbett's letter appeared in The Baltimore Sun, 3/9/79:

## Special Schools

*Sir:* After the debacle more than 10 years ago of the effort to make City College a haven for bright academic students and later to create a special elementary school for Hopkins Hospital medical personnel, both of bitter memory, it is shocking to learn that school authorities still foster a strange notion of education and the role of the public school system in a democracy.

The current effort to garner bright children for Roland Park Elementary School confirms my teaching experience that the bright students got the major attention of school authorities. Easy to teach, well motivated, with parental interest and support, they are supposed to bring prestige to the school.

I once struggled with a class of 40 tenth-grade English students while across the hall a Latin teacher read Catullus with seven college-bound seniors. The practice of changing deteriorating junior high schools to middle schools with careful districting to assure admission to only chosen students is in the same pattern.

Under the pressures of our current turbulent society have educators lost their vision? The public schools are our greatest socializing and humanizing institution. Their chief job is training for citizenship with independence of thought and concern for action toward the betterment of individual and community, the ultimate goal.

Administrators, teachers and parents concerned with education would do well to ponder the following comment in a recent *Newsletter* of the Bertrand Russell Society:

"Intelligence measured by smartness has very little value.

"Real intelligence is judgment embodied in useful knowledge, a good set of emotions, habits of diligence, a reasonable dedication to altruism and a minimum of self-destructiveness."

Una Corbett.

Una tells us what prompted her to write the letter:

In my letter, I quoted from a letter Peter Cranford had written to The Atlanta Constitution, as reported in RSN16-21. I liked his statement so much that I copied it and used it whereever possible, and was delighted to include it here, as The Sun is widely read.

The effort to set up special schools for bright children is a device to avoid integration. The City College mentioned is a comprehensive public high school for boys, founded in 1840 and having great prestige, as many leading Baltimoreans are alumni. After the 1954 Supreme Court decision, deprived blacks flocked to it. In the Johns Hopkins Hospital case, the School Board planned a special school so that the children of the medical personnel would not have to attend neighboring inner city schools, largely black. The Roland Park School is in an affluent neighborhood where white children have fled to private schools as black children are bused in. This school has recently set up a special program for bright children, inviting children from other schools to transfer to it. Of course, the other schools resent this raiding and are protesting.

This seemed a good opportunity to remind citizens of what the public schools are all about, to use the Peter Cranford quotation, and to mention the Bertrand Russell Society.

---

## CURRENT PUBLIC ISSUES

(24) "Carter's energy policy is a disaster!" writes JOE NEILANDS. "It appears to be a scheme to capitalize the synthetic fuel development process on behalf of the oil industry.

"A group here has been trying to raise consciousness about nuclear energy and the weapons lab with some success. Although we have not yet induced the Regents to sever connection with Los Alamos and Livermore, we have the votes of the Governor and about half of the other members of the Board."

---

## OPINION

(25) More on Cadogan. This letter appeared in "The New Humanist" (date of issue not known) pp.38-39:

HUMANIST sectarianism is no better than any other kind, but I think it is necessary to say something about a recent publication by Peter Cadogan, who has been general secretary of the South Place Ethical Society throughout the 1970s. In a series of articles printed in the *Ethical Record* (February, March, April 1979) and reprinted as a leaflet called *Humanism* (May 1979), he gives his "opinion as to what the organised humanism of the future, in England, needs to amount to if it is to be credible and to command new and significant support".

Most of the text is unexceptionable in the context of the romantic and rhetorical tradition of ethical Humanism. The opening paragraphs on Faith, Inspiration, Belief, Philosophy, and Vision resemble a sermon more than an argument, but I am worried about something more serious than mere style. For most freethinkers in this country, the essence of Humanism—the one thing without which it is not Humanism—is the rejection of religion. Yet Cadogan seems to be saying that this may have been a mistake. He insists that "we detach religion from supernaturalism" and "we are in a period of transition from supernaturalist to humanist religion", that a "society without a religion is a contradiction in terms, a society without meaning", that the arts are "linked inextricably with religion" and science is linked with religion as well as with the arts, and that the Humanist movement is "akin to the best tradition of the churches" and "we should be actively associated with them".

No one wants to deny that there is a strong religious component in the history of Humanism and a weak religious component in the Humanist movement today, and no one wants to damage the legal claims of the South Place Ethical Society to be considered as a religious organisation with charitable status. But I am sure it is true to say that in this country most Humanists see religion as being linked inextricably with the supernatural and therefore reject it, and few Humanists are still impressed by or even interested in the various attempts to establish a non-theistic form of religion—whether the "Rational Religion" of the Owenite movement, or the "Religion of Humanity" of the Positivist Churches, or the "Religious Humanism" of the Ethical Societies. This tendency is still relatively strong in Continental Europe and North America, but I suggest that it scarcely exists today in Britain and that Cadogan's attempt to impose it on the Humanist movement as a whole will lead not to its revival but to its destruction. Most Humanist individuals and organisations are opposed to humanistic as well as theistic religion, and naturalist as well as supernaturalist nonsense.

As well as this general objection, I find some objectionable details in this new statement of his case. "What are the sacred books of humism? They include the works of Sir Thomas More, Francis Bacon and William Shakespeare, William Blake and D. H. Lawrence." Cadogan no longer says that "the sacred" is "beyond criticism"; but, even so, should we really give reverence to More's writings advocating the death penalty for Protestants, Bacon's essay against atheism, Shakespeare's frequent praise of monarchy, Blake's frequent sneers at atheism and science, or Lawrence's frequent praise of irrationalism? Humanists who seek support from the great figures of English literature would surely do better with William Morris, Bertrand Russell and Shelley, Thomas Hardy and E. M. Forster.

"Since the seventeenth century the philosophy of science has been greatly inhibited by Cartesian dualism of mind and body and its mechanical/material explanation of the universe." That kind of dualism hasn't played much part in science for two centuries or in philosophy for a century, and the reductionist explanations of the universe have surely been much more successful than the transcendental ones of the past.

"Surveys show that some 93 per cent of the population no longer go to church." The most recent of such surveys—two carried out a year ago, by National Opinion Surveys and for the Mormon Church (see the *New Humanist*, Autumn 1978 and February 1979)—give much lower figures, between 30 and 60 per cent never going, the more significant fact being that only about 15 per cent go both regularly and voluntarily. "The same surveys show that most of that majority think 'there is something' nevertheless. No organised body of opinion has yet been able to define and structure the opportunity that this presents." The implication that the Humanist movement should represent the large section of the population who don't go to church but believe in "something" is surely based on a complete misunderstanding of the nature of Humanism and of the history of our movement.

I am finally worried by Cadogan's postcript. He asks: "Is there such a thing in this country as a Humanist *movement?* Or is Humanism a mere shaky verbal umbrella held over ethicism, secularism and rationalism to give the appearance of unity without its substance?" He then says that on most issues "we have a large number of friends who may be humanists with the small *h* and to whom we are much closer than Humanists as such", and that this "*real* humanist movement", this "humanism of the future" is to be found among people who are "agnostics," Christians, Jews", and who are in "ecological and environmental movements", "decentralists", "Women's Libbers", "life-stylists", the "consciousness movement", "net-workers", "humanistic psychology".

In a further paragraph which was not reprinted in the leaflet, he adds that "if we really started to think in these terms and broke with the pathetic and frustrating belief that the movement consists of four organisations only (SPES, NSS, RPA, BHA) we would be in a position to get out of our present cul-de-sac". Apart from the obvious fact that no one believes the movement consists only of the four organisations in question, there is the harsh fact that when South Place appealed for help in its current crisis the response came from the organised Humanist movement and no one else. It is surely unwise to turn against old friends when new friends turn away from you! What emerges from this attempt to answer these questions is another question—not whether there is a Humanist movement, but what Peter Cadogan is doing in the Humanist movement.

The seriousness of this question is shown by his reply to criticism from Barbara Smoker in the *Ethical Record* of June 1979. He says that attempts at liaison between the Humanist organisations during the past ten years have failed "*because there is no agreement about positive objects we want to pursue together*" (his emphasis). He adds that "this is a serious matter and one reason for the overall decline of organised

Humanism over recent years". He doesn't add that during the past four or five years there has been substantial agreement between three of the organisations in question, and that sectarian disagreement has come almost entirely from representatives of the South Place Ethical Society. As a result there is now close and constant liaison between the British Humanist Association, the National Secular Society, and the Rationalist Press Association on a day-to-day face-to-face basis. So it is certain that there is a formal Humanist movement, though it is small and weak; but it is not certain that the South Place Ethical Society is part of it. Is this what Peter Cadogan wants, or what the rest of the South Place Ethical Society want? Nearly all Humanists sympathise with their legal and financial problems, but we should be sorry if South Place ended by ceasing to be either religious in law or Humanist in identity.

* * *

WHILE I am about it, I might as well make another criticism of Peter Cadogan. In a South Place lecture on Bertrand Russell, given at Conway Hall in July 1978 and summarised in the *Ethical Record* of March 1979, he included the following passage:

> Russell was a Cartesian Newtonian dualist and he remained so even though he began to work at the discoveries of Einstein and Rutherford. Those discoveries threatened his original logical atomist position and they were not pursued. . . . He chose to ignore the Darwinian revolution in biology and led English philosophy into an impossible cul-de-sac from which it is only now beginning to emerge. Physics and mathematics are not the scientific bases of the life sciences. They turn upon the study of cells and their function. This is a different order of thinking and is a higher and more complex scientific dispensation from which to take off into human enquiry. Russell ignored it and, sustaining the 17th century dualism of mind and body, added substance to the archaic and inhibited the processes of enlightenment.

It is no part of our work to defend prominent rationalists against attack, and I myself made several public attacks on Russell's social and political ideas while he was still alive; but it is part of our work to put the record right and correct inaccurate attacks. Leaving on one side things which seem to me to make no sense at all, I think nearly everything in that passage is wrong.

Russell took different views at different times of the old problem of what kind and how many basic forms of reality there are, but one view he never held and always opposed was dualism—the view that everything is either appearance or reality, mind or matter, soul or body, and that these two substances are quite separate. As A. J. Ayer says in his Modern Masters book *Russell* (1972): "An opinion which has been widely held, both before and after it was given the authority of Descartes, is that objects or events are divisible into the two classes of mental and physical, which do not overlap; but this is a view which Russell consistently contests." According to Russell's own accounts, from 1894 to 1898 he accepted the idealist monism of Hegel and Bradley (that there is a single form of reality, mind or spirit), then he preferred pluralism (that there is an infinite number of forms of reality), then soon after the completion of *Principia Mathematica* in 1910 he accepted the view known as neutral monism ("The stuff of which the world of our experience is composed is, in my belief, neither mind nor matter, but something more primitive than either"). So Cadogan's basic thesis is the reverse of the truth.

Then Russell did not just begin to work at the discoveries of Einstein and Rutherford, but completely absorbed them into his philosophy of science and indeed became one of the popularisers of their view of the world, writing a whole book on relativity. Moreover, he went beyond their discoveries when they were in turn superseded about half a century ago. But all this had nothing to do with his logical atomism, because this had nothing to do with science. As he said, "The atom I wish to arrive at is the atom of logical analysis, not the atom of physical analysis."

Again, Russell did not ignore the Darwinian revolution in biology, but took it completely for granted, so that summaries of its importance and implications may be found in several of his books. I am no more a biologist than Cadogan, but it seems odd to say that physics and mathematics are not the scientific bases of the life sciences in view of the remarkable contributions made by physics and mathematics to recent advances in biology—the mathematical theory of evolution developed by J. B. S. Haldane, the molecular biology of Jacques Monod or James Watson and Francis Crick, and the experiments from Stanley Miller to Sidney Fox which have shown how life might have originated. Biology obviously involves different emphases from physics and mathematics, but surely no biologist would claim that it is a higher order of thinking or a higher or more complex scientific dispensation. In the end human inquiry must rest on all the branches of science, and Russell, as the philosopher closer to science than any before him, was perfectly well aware of this. Whether he led English philosophy into an impossible cul-de-sac or inhibited the processes of enlightenment, I know no more than Cadogan, but it seems unlikely, and at least he didn't falsify the arguments of the thinkers he disagreed with.

NICOLAS WALTER

(Thank you, John Sutcliffe)

(26) Holocaust. "I was among those who were offended by the cheap, commercial untruths of the TV docudrama, 'Holocaust', writes Eliot Freemont-Smith in "The Village Voice" (8/20/79, p.52). "But sometimes one must weigh the pains against the gains. 'Holocaust' was shown in Germany earlier this year -- over howls of nationalistic insult and outrage -- and is generally credited with forcing the Bundesrat to rescind the statute of limitations on Nazi crimes. So you never know."

This view should perhaps be kept in mind when considering John Sutcliffe's unqualified condemnation of 'Holocaust' (RSN23-28).

---

## NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

(27) Professor Sir Alfred Ayer was one of the speakers at the "Fifty Year Retrospective in Philosophy" at the University of Delaware, on October 24th. (Thank you, Steve Reinhardt)

(28) R. N. ("Malt") Malatesha has just received a grant from NATO to conduct an international meeting on Neuropsychology and Cognition.

(29) Joe Neilands attended the week-long American Chemical Society meeting in Washington, in September, and is now taking a two-quarter leave from his duties as Professor of Biochemistry at UCBerkeley to do some writing.

(30) Kathryn Powell is working for her M.A. in International Affairs, at American University in Washington, D.C.

---

## QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

(31) Poor fish. Alberto Donadio asked (in RSN21-28) whether BR had ever said something like, "All medicines should be thrown out at sea. Only the fish would suffer from it."

We happened to come across the following in The Mind/Body Effect by Herbert Benson (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1979) p.103:

We can no longer state, as did did Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, the physician and man of letters, in 1860: "Throw out opium...throw out a few specifics which our art did not discover...throw out wine...I firmly believe that if the whole materia medica, as now used, could be sunk to the bottom of the sea, it would be all the better for mankind -- and all the worse for the fishes."

Benson gives the source of his quotation as The Works of Oliver Wendell Holmes. Vol. 9. Medical Essays. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1892.

---

## NEW MEMBERS

(32) We welcome these new members:

ADAM PAUL BANNER/DESIYAB/Ataturk Bulvari No.44/Ankara, Turkey
REBECCA A. BURKART/411 North 29 Street/Battle Creek, MI 49015
ISHAM BYROM,JR./1108 Berwick Trail/Madison, TN 37115
RICHARD CLARK PH.D./2061 Albatross St./San Diego, CA 92101
H.R. Cooke, Jr./Geological Survey of Greenland/Oster Volgade 10/DK-1350 Copenhagen K,Denmark

DUSTY COOKSEY/c/o Sue Murphy/Rt. 1, Box 233/ Harrah, OK 73045
EUGENE CORBETT, JR. M.D./PO Box 267/Fork Union, VA 23055
ALBERT ENGLEMAN/PO Box 23/ Solana Beach, CA 92075
DAVID ETHRIDGE/7841 Willow St./New Orleans,LA 70118
JOE GORMAN/1333 Mountain Av/Claremont, CA 91711

CHARLES D. HARRIS/NAVSECSTA - S3Ø/3801 Nebraska Avenue N.W./Washington,DC 20390
BRUCE HEDGES/12 Z Manzanita Park/ Stanford, CA 94305
C.L. ("BUD") HERRINGTON/1907 West Oakland Av/Sumter, SC 29150
SYD LEAH/21745 125 Av/ Mapleridge, BC/Canada V2X 4E7
ANDREW LYNN/73 Margaret St./Box Hill Nth, 3129/Victoria Australia

ED MARTINEZ/10-2 Westbrook Hills Drive/Syracuse, NY 13215
WILLIAM T. ("TED") MOORE/711 S. Main St. (D-3)/Blacksburg, VA 24060
LELAND PRATSCH/1195 Collette Place/St. Paul, MN 55116
SARAH ("SALLY") PRIMM/2420 W. Kiowa St./Colorado Springs, CA 80904
JACK RAGSDALE/PO Box 28200/Dallas, TX 75228

D. ANTHONY RANN/PO Box 1000/Butner, NC 27509
BRAD ROBISON/3001 College Av.(Apt. C)/Berkeley, CA 94705
IRENE SAYLOR/242 E. King St. (Apt. 5)/Lancaster, PA 17602
KENNETH SCHEI/12652 Gibraltar Drive/San Diego, CA 92128
BETSEY SHAFFER/172 Essex St./Bangor, ME 04401

SURESH SUNDARRAJAN/Box 7844/Ole Miss,MS 38677
CRAIG TISON/30626 Hathaway St./Livonia, MI 48150
JUDY WALD/110 E. 59 St./New York,NY 10022
KELLY WHALEN/GA. TECH. Box 36332/Atlanta,GA 30332

---

## ADDRESS & OTHER CHANGES

(33) New addresses or corrections. (Corrections are underlined.)

JAMES BERTINI/Rubin Hall,35 Fifth Av./New York,NY 10003
LINDA BLITZ/3212 S. 12th St./Arlington, VA 22204
DR. JOHN COOK JR.
GRAHAM ENTWISTLE/207 Kelvin Place (#3)/Ithaca, NY 14850
DR. NICHOLAS GRIFFIN

THOMAS HAW/PC:"Addressee unknown at address given"
GARY JACOBS/104 Offut Road/Bedford, MA 01730
DR. VALERIE JANESICK/School of Education,SUNY/1400 Washington/Albany,NY 12222
DR. R. N. MALATESHA/777 S.W. 15th St./Corvallis, OR 97330
THEO MEIJER

KEVIN NORTON/5562 Bear Road (H-1)/ N. Syracuse, NY 13212
KATHRYN POWELL/4430 Macomb St.,NW/Washington, DC 20016

---

## RECOMMENDED READING

(34) "D. H. Lawrence's Nightmare" by Paul Delany (New York:Basic Books, 1978): "It has a good deal about Russell in it," says MARTIN GARSTENS, which is possibly an understatement. Here is the Russell entry in the index:

> Russell, Bertrand, x, xi, 27, 29, 33, 45, 52, 75, 84, 243, 318, 320, 327, 382; affair of, with C. O'Neill, 252–53, 276; blood-consciousness and, 180; break with, 206–8, 245; breaks with O. Morrell, 276; collaboration with, 115–18, 122; end of war and, 384; esoteric ideal of male comradeship and, 89; excess of reason of, criticized, 178–79; feud between O. Morrell and Frieda and, 200; Frieda criticizes, 100; and Frieda's divorce from Weekley, 95; and Frieda's visitation rights, 95; D. Garnett compared with, 87; "Goats and Compasses" and, 198; and imperiousness of O. Morrell, 92; Lawrence to, on Forster, 53; Lawrence to, on giving power to working class, 181; Lawrence's attack on, 82; and Lawrence's discovery of principle of evil, 84, 85; Lawrence's nervous breakdown and, 189–90; Lawrence's quarrel with liberalism and, 132–35, 137, 140; and Lawrence's struggle with powers of darkness, 112; and Lawrence's visit to Trinity College, 78–80; O. Morrell, revolution and, 64–74; Mansfield's flirtation with, 252–53; Mountsier's arrest and, 283; need for supreme leader and, 119–21, 123; new Ranamin and, 172, 173; pacifism of, 67–68, 109–11, 124, 145, 319; position of, at Trinity College, 77; and reissue of *The Rainbow*, 194; renewing friendship with, 349–50; *The Signature* and, 141, 143–46, 148; Smillie and, 374; visit by, 83; *Women in Love* and, 273; in *Women in Love*, 68, 179; world government and, 250

---

## BOOKS BY BR

(35) Autobiography III. David Hart writes:

> As you may know, Allen & Unwin has never had the U.S. distribution rights for volume 3 of BR's Autobiography. Althought the rights for volumes 1 and 2 have been reverted to A & U, Simon & Schuster retains exclusive U.S. rights to volume 3. Those who, like myself, appreciate the fine quality of the A & U edition have had either to forego purchase of volume 3 or settle for the inferior S & S edition. No more! The A & U clothbound edition is available from Blackwell's, Broad Street, Oxford OX1 3BQ, England. The price, as of August 1979 is £ 6.22, including postage.

---

## BRS LIBRARY

(36) New BR film needed. Don Jackanicz reports that "we've received 3 contributions of $25 each toward the purchase of a new film. This is very encouraging, even though films are expensive — $175-300 each. We would like to have at least one new film for the 1980 meeting. (There are still 5 commercially available BR films that we don't own.) This is therefor a timely moment for anyone who can do so to make a contribution; please give it careful consideration. Any amount is welcome, modest or otherwise."

---

## FUN

(37) Fun with Smullyan. JOHN HARPER and TOM STANLEY each sent us the following pages from What Is the Name of This Book? by Raymond Smullyan (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:Prentice-Hall). Martin Gardner calls it "the most original, most profound, and most humorous collection of recreational logic and mathematical problems ever written." (Wow!)

## 243. A Proof that You Are Either Inconsistent or Conceited.

I thought of this proof about thirty years ago and told it to several students and mathematicians. A few years ago someone told me that he had read it in some philosophical journal, but he could not recall the author. Anyway, here is the proof.

A human brain is but a finite machine, therefore there are only finitely many propositions which you believe. Let us label these propositions $p1, p2, \ldots, pn$, where $n$ is the number of propositions you believe. So you believe each of the propositions $p1, p2, \ldots, pn$. Yet, unless you are conceited, you know that you sometimes make mistakes, hence not everything you believe is true. Therefore, if you are not conceited, you know that at least one of the propositions, $p1, p2, \ldots, pn$ is false. Yet you believe each of the propositions $p1, p2, \ldots, pn$. This is a straight inconsistency.

*Discussion.* What is the fallacy of this argument? In my opinion, none. I really believe that a reasonably modest person has to be inconsistent.

## B. MORE MONKEY TRICKS

## 244. Russell and the Pope.

One philosopher was shocked when Bertrand Russell told him that a false proposition implies any proposition. He said, "You mean that from the statement that two plus two equals five it follows that you are the Pope?" Russell replied "Yes." The philosopher asked, "Can you prove this?" Russell replied, "Certainly," and contrived the following proof on the spot:

(1) Suppose $2 + 2 = 5$.
(2) Subtracting two from both sides of the equation we get $2 = 3$.
(3) Transposing, we get $3 = 2$.
(4) Subtracting one from both sides, we get $2 = 1$.

Now, the Pope and I are two. Since two equals one, then the Pope and I are one. Hence I am the Pope.

## 245. Which Is Better?

Which is better, eternal happiness or a ham sandwich? It would appear that eternal happiness is better, but this is really not so! After all, nothing is better than eternal happiness, and a ham sandwich is certainly better than nothing. Therefore a ham sandwich is better than eternal happiness.

## 246. Which Clock Is Better?

This one is due to Lewis Carroll. Which is better, a clock that loses a minute a day or a clock that doesn't go at all? According to Lewis Carroll the clock that doesn't go at all is better, because it is right twice a day, whereas the other clock is right only once in two years. "But," you might ask, "what's the good of it being right twice a day if you can't tell when the time comes?" Well, suppose the clock points to eight o'clock. Then when eight comes around, the clock is right. "But," you continue, "how does one know when eight o'clock does come?" The answer is very simple. Just keep your eye very carefully on the clock *and the very moment it is right* it will be eight o'clock.

---

PARADOXES

(38) Little old lady. "I remember an old story about the little old lady," writes H. F. Cooke, Jr., from Denmark, "who always sat in her pew after church services until everyone else had left, and said that if everyone would just wait as she does until everyone else has left, there would be no crush at the door."

(39) Insanity. Another from HFC Jr.: In a letter to Time Magazine (October 1) about the violence in Ireland, a Mr. Smith asks: "What is the purpose of their insanity?"

(40) Jeremy Bernstein in his delightful book, Experiencing Science (New York: Basic Books, 1978), starts his chapter on Gödel's Theorem this way (pp. 246-248):

APRIL 28, 1906 *was* a good day. Soft spring breezes wafted over the River Cam. Stem-bent daffodils assisted the chorus of earliest birds. Bertrand Arthur William Russell, the third earl, had just descended from his railway carriage in the Cambridge Station. His step was brisk as he walked along St. Andrews Street. The Great Gate of Trinity College was not far away. He was looking forward to a discussion of ethics with his colleague G. E. Moore. His work with Whitehead had been going well—they were writing the *Principia Mathematica*. The title stirs the blood. Newton's *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica* created theoretical physics. Their book, so they thought, would create the foundations of mathematics. All of mathematics, they felt, would be shown to be derivable from a few self-consistent axioms, a few symbols, and a few rules of inference. It would be a logician's dream come true. Russell's sense of well-being was nearly total. Almost accidentally, his left hand swept over his chin. He was temporarily disconcerted by a disagreeable sensation of stubble. In his eagerness to come up from London, he had forgotten to shave.

"No matter," he thought, "I shall visit my barber—Barrett," whose shop was located on the corner of St. Andrews and Market streets. " 'Barrett the barber' belongs to the class of all men whose professions have the same first initial as their last names," thought Russell. " 'Locke the logician,' 'Plato the philosopher,' 'Maxwell the mathematical physicist'—they're all members of the class," Russell noted. He stopped in front of Barrett's shop. Before entering it he looked in the corner of the shop window for the familiar hand-lettered sign. It was there—faded but still legible. It read: "Barrett is willing to shave all, and only, men unwilling to shave themselves."

Russell chuckled softly to himself. The sign had first appeared in the summer of 1902. That June, Russell had written a note to his German colleague, the logician Gotlob Frege. After reading Frege's *Grundgesetze der Arithmetik* (*The Foundations of Arithmetic*) Russell had found an absolutely fatal flaw in it. Frege's definition of "class" was faulty. The class of all classes that are not members of themselves is *not* defined.

Think about it. Turn it over in your mind. If this class *is* a

member of itself then, by definition, it is not a member of itself, and if it *is not* a member of itself then it is a member of itself. One is awash in a paradox. Frege understood this almost at once. He wrote to Russell, "Your discovery of the contradiction caused me the greatest surprise, and I would almost say consternation, since it has shaken the basis on which I intended to build arithmetic. . . ." Russell and Whitehead had worked for years afterward to eradicate the contradiction. A "theory of types" had been formulated and a notion of "meta-mathematics" had been introduced. All was now secure—or so they thought.

As Russell entered Barrett's shop, his nostrils were assailed by the smell of perfumed shaving tonics and bubbling soaps. Barrett greeted him with pleasure.

"Ah, Your Grace," he said. "I see that you have come up from London."

"Yes, Barrett," Russell replied. "And *I* see that the old sign is still there."

Barrett braced himself for the inevitable question. "Tell me, Barrett," Russell went on, "in view of your sign, are you willing to shave yourself?"

Barrett flinched.

On this same day, a thousand miles away in the town of Brünn, in the Austro-Hungarian Empire—the same town, by the way, in which Gregor Mendel was born—Kurt Gödel was born.

This was to be the start of something big.

(Thank you, Steve Reinhardt)

---

## CONTRIBUTIONS

(41) We are grateful to the following members who have made contributions to the BRS Treasury during the past 3 months: ED COCHRAN, ALBERTO DONADIO, ALEX DELY, UNA CORBETT, CHARLES HILL, JIM MCWILLIAMS, IBRAHIM NAJJAR, JOE NEILANDS, JIM O'CONNOR, RAY PLANT, STEVE REINHARDT, WARREN SMITH, KOUJI TOMIMORI, and not least to PETER CRANFORD and KATHY FJERMEDAL for their continuing multiple contributions.

---

## HELP WANTED

(42) Help wanted very much! Please give the following your most careful consideration.

3 BRS jobs need to be filled, and soon.

If you are one of the many who said, on your BRS Questionnaire,that you were willing to do some work for the BRS, now is the time that we need you.

Please speak up!

These are the 3 jobs:
. Treasurer. This is for someone good at keeping records and balancing a checkbook,etc. Steve Reinhardt says it takes about 8 hours a month.
. Membership Committee Co-Chairman: sends BRS printed matter to persons who inquire about the BRS, and to those who join. Inquiries come in from all over the USA, and occasionally from foreign countries (with colorful foreign stamps.) Sometimes a letter tells why the inquirer is interested in (and indebted to) BR, which can be quite interesting. Takes 3 to 6 hours a week.
. Library Committee Co-Chairman will share the work with Chairman Don Jackanicz. The Library lends books, films, and tapes, and and also sells books.

If you wish to volunteer for one of these jobs, please notify the newsletter (address on Page 1, bottom.) Or if you'd like to know more about any of them (before making up your mind), tell us so and we'll send information.

It is important that these openings be filled without excessive delay, so that we can continue to function the way we ought to. So...

Please speak up! Write now.

---

## BRS BUSINESS

(43) Renewal procedure. In 1979 we made some changes in membership-renewal procedure. We suspect that the new system is not well understood by at least some members. So please allow us to be repititious and explain it once more.

Under the new system, everybody's renewal dues are due on the same date, July 1st. Notification that dues are due consists of an item in the May newsletter. (Under the old system, your dues were due 12 months after the date you joined, and you were sent a letter notifying you that dues were due.)

We realize that a renewal-notice in the newsletter is not as visible as a letter; it is more easily overlooked. Therefor next year, in the May newsletter envelope, there'll be an extra, separate sheet of paper, of a different color, that says dues are due.

The new system has a certain built-in unfairness to some members. Renewal dues for a member who joined in December come due in about 6 months (July 1st); so his first year's dues cover only about 6 months of membership. On the other hand, renewal dues for a member who joined in January come due in about 18 months (July 1st of the following year). These are the extreme cases. To the extent that the month in which you enrolled comes closer to July, your first year's dues will come closer to covering 12 months of membership. Thus, no matter when members joined in 1978, their renewal dues were due July 1, 1979.

We try to compensate for the unequal lengths of first-year memberships. A member who joined anytime in, say, 1978 receives all 4 1978 BRS newsletters and all 1978 issues of "Russell".

The new system saves the Membership Committee a lot of time and work, and also eliminates one source of possible error (the due date).

After the first "year" of membership, renewal dues always cover 12 months of membership.

(44) Agenda for 1980 meeting. It might be well if some thought were given to the 1980 agenda well in advance of the meeting. This is what the bylaws say about the agenda:

> Article IX, Section 1. Agenda. The agenda for Society meetings shall be prepared by the Board of Directors. Items for the agenda may be proposed by any member, and must be submitted to the Chairman of the Board of Directors in writing.
>
> Article XI, Section 2. Additions to the Agenda. At a meeting of the Society, additions to the agenda may be made by a majority of those members present and voting.

* Send your agenda suggestions to Chairman Peter G. Cranford, 1500 Johns Road, Augusta, GA 30904.

---

## FOR SALE

(45) Lester Denonn's Russell Library — which now consists of over 2100 books by, about, or referring to BR — is looking for a good home, which will probably be a university. Three conditions must be met: (1) the university must be considered suitable; (2) the university must be willing and able to provide appropriate facilities; and (3) money must be raised. A donor (or donors) must be found who will buy the Library — the price is said to be in the neighborhood of $100,000 — and present it to the university.
For further information, write to Lester Denonn, 135 Willow Street, Brooklyn, NY 11202.

---

## ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

(46) Humanists Mid-South is organizing an AHA chapter for humanists living in the South and Midwest, Len Cleavelin advises. BRS members who might wish to look into it should write to Humanists Mid-South, c/o Stewart V. Pahl, 210 Combs Street/ Hot Springs, AR 71901.

(47) The Fellowship of Religious Humanists sponsored The Institute for Humanist Leadership, in Chicago, on October 11-13, as part of its annual meeting. The Institute was "planned primarily for humanist leaders and those preparing themselves to become humanist leaders. Other interested parties are invited to attend." Speakers included a Unitarian minister, 2 rabbis, and 5 professors (including Paul Kurtz, editor of "The Humanist" and of Prometheus Press). The group celebrated a John Dewey Day and a Charles Darwin Day. The Fellowship publishes a quarterly, "Religious Humanism." Its address: PO Box 278, Yellow Springs, OH 45387.

---

## COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED

(48) Religious tax-exemption is anathema to Aura Dawn Veirs. Here is an excerpt from her letter:

> I believe religious tax-exemption must be repealed, because religions are accumulating wealth and investing it, and are placing their candidates into public office, where they subvert civil law, such as calling abortion and homosexuality "religious crimes," and demanding they be punished by civil law. All laws oppressing women (and thus their families) are based on purely religious argument.

She enclosed photocopies of certain pages of Religious Wealth and Business Income by Martin Larson (New York: Philosophical Press, 1965) — a book that apparently supplied her with some of the facts (or alleged facts) that she mentions in her letter:

> Page 75 mentions the 1958 "Der Spiegel" articles which said the Jesuits owned 50% of the stock of the Bank of America, and controlled Phillips Oil and Creole Petroleum, and were invested in munitions factories, aircraft plants, steel, and DiGeorgio Fruit Company, a notorious exploiter of farm labor here and abroad.

Her address is 4346 Via Padova, Claremont, CA 91711.

---

INDEX

(49)