The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc.* 3802 North Kenneth Avenue Chicago Illinois 60641

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS

No. 58
May 1988

(1) Hilites: Annual Meeting (2,20). BR on happiness, 1924 (5). Kohl on BR on happiness, 1984 (7). A great Humanist ad (41). BR in *Encyclopedia Americana* (10). Gore Vidal on monotheism (3). How to stay sober without God (21). A latin question (9). Candidates for Director wanted (29). Two volunteers needed (30). Humanist World Congress (40). *Nuclear Alert* (17). An asterisk in the left column indicates a request. The Index is at the end.

ANNUAL MEETING (1988)

(2) Late news: Please tell Marvin Kohl soon as possible (716-673-3495) the time of your arrival at Buffalo Airport. A special BRS van, Airport to Fredonia, is tentatively scheduled for 3:30pm, Friday, June 17. The new, revised Program, the Fredonia geo brief, the revised Registration/Reservation Form, and information about
* the "What is Happiness?" Panel: it's all there in Item (20) of this newsletter. Suggestion: see it now.

RELIGION

(3) Gore Vidal, from a talk to the American-Arab Antidiscrimination Committee, Suite 500, 4201 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington,DC 20001, telecast by C-Span on 3/15/88.

Monotheism means one god. Religions are reflections of organizations of men on earth. They do not come before man. Man comes before the religion. Monotheism is saying it's a totalitarian religion. All authority is concentrated in one god. What does this mean on earth? One King. One Pharoah. One Pope. One Bishop. Power. Authority. All questions are answered by the book and only certain people can get through it. And then they impose their will, the most totalitarian.

Western Europe, from whose tradition I come -- I come from an old Latin family, from the old Roman Empire -- had no such thing as the idea of a single god...some people thought there was, others thought there was not...but not until the 4th Century and Constantine, did it become a state religion, and if you didn't believe it, you were killed, or at least were in grave trouble. There were many different cults. It never occurred to anybody that there was just one...and only one group, one people, had The Truth. What arrogance!

The most successful part of the world for 2000 years was China. That's Confucianism. They did not have one god and the Hindus did not have one god. It was pluralism -- as simple as that. One of Confucius's disciples came up to him once -- his real name was Master Kung -- and said: "Master Kung, if you could sum up all of human wisdom in one phrase, what would it be?" This is the 5th Century before Christ. Confucius said it would be,"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

George Bernard Shaw's contrarian view about the Golden Rule comes to mind: "Don't do unto others as you'd have them do unto you. Their tastes may be different."

COMMENT

(4) From the Humanist Association of Canada newsletter (January 1988):

QUOTED

"DONALD REGAN left as White House chief of staff in 1987 and was replaced by Howard Baker. The transition went smoothly, with no loss of ineptitude. — *Alan Abelson, in Barron's.*"

---

*Russell Society News, a quarterly (Lee Eisler, Editor): RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036
Russell Society Library: Tom Stanley, Librarian, Box 434, Wilder, VT 05088

RUSSELL ON HAPPINESS

(5) *How to be Free and Happy* (NY: The Rand School of Sociel Science, 1924) presents a talk given by BR, "delivered under the auspices of 'FREE YOUTH', official organ of Young People's Socialist League at Cooper Union, New York City, on May 24th, 1924." With thanks to JOHN LENZ.

Ladies and Gentlemen: The subject upon which I am supposed to be talking to you tonight is a very modest and easy subject—"How to Be Free and Happy." I do not know whether I can give you a recipe, like a cook book recipe, which each one of you can apply. I do want, this last time that I am speaking in America, to say a few things which I believe firmly and consider, as far as my own experience goes, very important, and which I have not had much occasion, in previous talks, to say in this country.

Perhaps there may be some of you here, and certainly there are many elsewhere, who will say that the whole answer to my question "How to Be Free and Happy" is summed up in one simple sentence—"Get a good income!" (Laughter.) That is an answer which I think is generally accepted. If I put that forward I should have won the assent of every one that is not here. (Laughter.) However, I think that it is a mistake to imagine that money, that income, is a very much more important thing in producing happiness than it actually is. I have known in the course of my life a great many rich people, and I can hardly think of one of them who appears to be either happy or free. I have known a great many people who were extremely poor—they also could hardly be happy and free. But in the intermediate realms you find most happiness and freedom. It is not great wealth or great poverty that brings most happiness.

My impression about it is this: that when you are talking of the external conditions of happiness—I am going to talk mostly of the conditions in your own mind, about the internal conditions—a person must have, of course, enough to eat and the necessaries of life and what is needed for the care of children. When you have those things you have as much as really contributes to happiness. Beyond that you only multiply cares and anxiety. So that I don't think enormous wealth is the solution. I should say, for the external conditions of happiness, that in this country, as far as the material problem of the production of goods is concerned, you have quite solved it. If the goods that are produced were distributed with any justice, that certainly would be a real contribution towards happiness. Your problem here is two-fold. It is first a political problem: to secure the advantages of your unrivalled production for a wider circle. On the other hand, it is the psychological problem of learning how to get the good out of these material conditions that have been created by our industrial age. That, I think, is where we modern people have failed most—on the psychological side, on the side of being able to enjoy the opportunities which we have created. I think that this is due to a number of causes.

I should attribute it partly to the effect of Puritanism in decay. Puritanism in its heyday was a conception of life which filled people's minds and made them in their way happy. Anything which fills people's minds makes them happy. But people nowadays don't believe in the Puritan way; they retain certain principles which are connected with Puritanism, though not perhaps quite obviously. They have, in the first place, a certain kind of moral outlook, that is, a tendency to be looking out for opportunities to find fault with others, a tendency to think that it is very important to keep up certain rules of conduct. There are a number of old, inherited taboos and rules which people don't think about but simply go on with because they always have been there. These do not touch the core of the matter. The thing that has survived most out of Puritanism is a contempt for happiness—not a contempt for pleasure, a contempt for happiness! You find among rebels a very great desire for pleasure but a very small realization of happiness as against pleasure, and that has gone through our whole conception of pleasure and of happiness.

For ages the Puritan outlook was devoted to making people think that pleasure was a base thing, and because of that belief the people who were not base did not devote themselves to producing the better forms of pleasure, such forms as art, etc., and pleasure, therefore, became just as base as the Puritans said it was. And that evil has tended to survive. It tends to be still the case that the nations, such as yours and mine, which have gone through this Puritan phase are unable to get happiness and even to get pleasure—pleasure that is not trivial. It is only the less worthy forms of pleasure which survive in spite of that Puritan domination. I think that perhaps that is the main reason why Puritanism, wherever it has existed, has proved itself so very destructive of art, because art, after all, is the pursuit of a certain kind, probably the most supreme and perfect kind, of pleasure; and if you think of pleasure as bad, art is bad. That is one thing that we owe to Puritanism.

Another thing that we owe to it is the belief in work. In America I have spent most of my time in preaching idleness. I made up my mind when I was young that I would not be restrained from preaching a doctrine merely because I have not practised it. I have not been able to practice the doctrine of idleness, because the preaching of it takes up so much time. (Laughter.) I don't mean idleness in the literal sense, for most people, the great majority of us white people, don't enjoy sitting in the sun and doing nothing; we like to be busy. What I mean by idleness is simply work or activity which is not part of your regular professional job. Under the influence of this dogma, Puritanism has forced us to retain in our operative beliefs the notion that the important part of our life is work. That, at any rate, applies to the major portion of mankind: that the important part of what we do is getting on in our business, and getting a fortune which we can leave to our descendants, and they, in turn, get a larger fortune to leave to theirs. This whole business has taken the place of living for Heaven, for in the old Puritan days we tried to forego pleasures in this life in order to get to Heaven.

Heaven has disappeared, but the idea of living in order to leave a large fortune has not disappeared, and the kind of a life which is required for the one purpose is much the same that is required for the other—the foregoing of enjoyment for the sake of future benefits. That we have retained from the old Puritan outlook, and that, I think, is not in its modern form a very fine or noble thing. In the old days there was something splendid about it, but in this modern form it is not anything that we should particularly admire, and for the sake of it we do forego everything that would make life civilized, free and happy.

By the way, let me tell you what I have often noticed when I have been travelling on the continent of Europe, where there are beautiful objects of art. I have seen the middle-aged American business man being dragged about by his wife and daughter in a condition of almost intolerable boredom, because he was away from his office. It would be a better thing if, instead of getting concentrated upon work, people had larger interests. If we had a good social system we ought none of us have to work more than four hours a day. (Applause.) Well, I am very glad to get that response from you, but when I made this remark to some other audiences in America a thrill of horror went through them and they said to me: "What on earth should we do with the other twenty hours?" I felt, after that, that this gospel very much needed preaching.

It is really a terrible thing to get the human being with all his capacities—to get him into blinkers with such a narrow outlook that he can only run along one little path. It is a disfigurement of the human being—it is something that every person who wants to see growth finds intolerable. A population of stunted human beings is growing up, shut out from the pleasures of human companionship, the pleasures of art, the pleasure from all the things that really make life worth living. Because, after all, to struggle all your days to amass a fortune is not really an end worthy of anyone.

I don't want to suggest to anyone that pleasure, mere pleasure, is an end in itself. I don't think it is, and, indeed, I think that the effect of the Puritan morality has been to emphasize pleasures at the expense of happiness, because, as base pleasures can be got more easily, they are less controlled by the censorship of official morals. We all know, of course, the sort of way in which the ordinary person who does not live up to the official morality of his time fails to do so: he seeks those ways which are most frivolous and have the least value in their own selves. That always will be the effect of a morality which is preached but not practised.

I think the Chinese have shown their wisdom by having an official morality which can be practised. We in the West who have adopted the opposite plan, we have prided ourselves upon the extraordinary magnificence of the morality we profess, and thought that excused us from practising it. I think that if we are going to have a true morality, if we are going to have an outlook upon life which is going to make life richer and freer and happier, it must not be a repressive outlook, it must not be an outlook based upon any kind of restrictions or prohibitions; it must be an outlook based upon the things that we love rather than those that we hate. There are a number of emotions which guide our lives, and roughly you can divide them into those that are repressive and those that are expansive. Repressive emotions are cruelty, fear, jealousy; expansive emotions are

such as hope, love of art, impulse of constructiveness, love, affection, intellectual curiosity, and kindliness; and they make more of life instead of less. I think that the essence of true morality consists in living by the expansive impulses and not by the repressive ones.

What I am saying has, I am afraid, very revolutionary consequences to which I cannot hope to win the assent of everyone. There will be many who think that my deductions are not deductions to be accepted. For example, love and jealousy are—the one expansive and the other repressive. Now, in our traditional morality, when you subject it to psychological analysis and see whence it has sprung, you will all have to admit that jealousy has been the main-spring; it has been jealousy that has given rise to it. I don't myself feel that it is very probable that a code rising in that way and from that source can be the best possible. It seems to me far more likely that one arising out of the positive emotions would be better than one arising out of the negative, and that such restrictions as would have to be placed on freedom should arise out of affection or kindliness for other persons, and not out of the sheer repressive emotion of jealousy. If you apply that principle it leads to a better development of character and more wholesome type of person, a person freed from many of the cruelties which limit the conventional moralist.

There is a very strong element of cruelty in traditional morals—part of the satisfaction which every moralist derives from his morality is that it gives him the justification for inflicting pain. We all know that the infliction of punishment is to a great many people delightful. There was once a prime minister who travelled from Constantinople to Antioch, and spent there eight hours watching his enemy being tortured. I think that the impulse towards pleasure in the suffering of others is one which arises through people thwarting their natural emotions, through the fact that they have not been able to find a free outlet for their creative impulses.

I do not positively know whether that is really the basis of a great deal of cruelty, but I cannot help thinking that an enormous mass of the cruelty that we see in the world is from unconscious envy. That is a very deep-seated feeling in human nature, and when you have a nice, convenient code to embody it, of course it is very popular.

I don't know whether I can quite convey to you the kind of way in which it seems to me that one can live most happily. I find things in the Gospels which illustrate the sort of thing I mean—not texts which are very often quoted, but, for example, "Take no thought what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, or wherewithal ye shall be clothed." If you really lived upon that principle—which, by the way, forbids all discussion of the Volstead Act—you would find life very delightful. There is a certain kind of liberation, a certain kind of care-free attitude, which, if you can once acquire it, makes you able to go through the world untroubled, not distressed by all the minor annoyances that arise. The gist of the matter is to be rid of fear. Fear lies very deep in the heart of man; fear has been the source of most religions; fear has been the source of most moral codes; fear is our instincts; fear is encouraged in our youth, and fear is at the bottom of all that is bad in the world. When once you are rid of fear you have the freedom of the universe. Of course, you all know about the sort of dark superstitions of more barbarous ages, when men, women and children were sacrificed to the gods out of fear. This superstition we see to be dark and absurd, but our own superstitions do not strike us in the same light. Now, I am not prepared to say that no great disaster can ever overtake us, but I say this, that the fear of those things that might overtake us is a greater evil than the things themselves, and it would be far better to go through life not fearing, and come to some disaster, than go through life creeping, wise, and cautious, and burdened—never having enjoyed life at any moment and yet dying peacefully in your bed.

I think we want our lives to be expansive and creative, we want to live to a very great extent upon impulse; and when I say impulse I don't mean every transitory impulse of every passing moment—I mean those major impulses that really govern our lives. There are in some people great artistic impulses, in others scientific, and in others this or that form of affection or creativeness. And if you deny those impulses, provided that they do not infringe upon the liberty of another, you stunt your growth. I know, for instance, any number of men who are Socialists, and who spend their lives as journalists writing for the most conservative papers. These men may get pleasure out of life, but I don't believe that it is possible for them to get happiness. Happiness is at an end for any man who denies himself one of those fundamental impulses about which life ought to grow.

I should say precisely the same thing about the private affections. Where a really strong or powerful affection exists, the man or woman who goes against it suffers the same kind of damage—it is the same kind of inner destruction of something precious and valuable; all the poets have said so. We have accepted it when it was said in verse, because nobody takes verse seriously, but if it is said in prose and in public we think it is very dreadful.

I don't know why everybody is allowed to say a host of things in private that he is not allowed to say in public. I think it is about time we said the same things in public that we say in private. (Applause.) Walt Whitman, in praise of the animals, says: "They don't grunt and sweat over their condition—not one of them is respectable or unhappy throughout the whole world." I must say I have a very great affection for Walt Whitman. He illustrates what I mean—how the man who lives expansively lives in a kindly way; how he is free from cruelty, from the desire to stop other people from doing what they want.

idea into one's head—that every artificial morality means the growth of cruelty. Of course, we cannot live like Walt Whitman's animals, because man has foresight and memory, and, having foresight, he has to organize his life into a unit. That is where we develop our superstitions. And you know quite well that it would not do if you followed each whim without a certain amount of discipline, and I don't want you to think that there is not a need of discipline. There is, but it should be that discipline that comes from within, from the realization of one's own needs, from the feeling of something which one wishes to achieve. Nothing of importance is ever achieved without discipline. I feel myself sometimes not wholly in sympathy with some modern educational theorists, because I think that they underestimate the part that discipline plays. But the discipline you have in your life should be one determined by your own desires and your own needs, not put upon you by society or authority.

Authority comes from the past and the old, and, speaking to a League of Free Youth, I suppose I need not speak, at my time of life, with that respect which I might be expected to show to it, because the old, although they are supposed to be wise, are not necessarily wise. We learn a great deal in youth and forget a great deal in age. We are at our maximum at 30; at 30 we are at the moment when we learn at the same rate at which we forget. (Laughter.) After that we begin to forget faster than we learn; so if we do have to have authority I should have a council composed of persons of 30, but on the whole I think we can do much better without authority in those matters which do not directly affect the rest of the world.

Of course, it is your affair if you murder someone, but it is his affair also; so you cannot object to someone coming to interfere with your murdering him. But in those acts which affect ourselves it is absurd that the State or public opinion should have any voice at all. In the private relations of life society should take no part whatsoever—that is a matter for the individual. The welfare of children is, of course, a matter in which the community is concerned. It is not at present enough concerned. About children: you want that there should be enough, but not too many; you want them to be healthy and educated. Those are the things that the State should see to. At present it sees to some and not to others. All those things are affairs for the State. But where children are not involved, it seems to me that all interference is an impertinence—the State has no business in the matter whatsoever. Now, I don't want to talk only about that issue, because there are many other directions in which the same kind of thing applies. It applies, above all, in the aesthetic side of life. We in our industrial civilization have taken over from Puritanism, from Christianity, a certain utilitarian outlook, a certain belief that our acts should not be for their own sakes, for what they are now, but for a certain distant end. Things get to be judged by their uses and not by their real values. That is death to the aesthetic side of life, for the beauty of anything consists in what the thing is in itself and not in its uses.

I admit the sphere of the utilitarian, but not in judging of artistic matters. I find that we seem to have lost not only in the world of art—that is generally admitted—but we have lost something also in human companionship, in friendship, through not having so great a sense of intrinsic quality as we used to have. A man tends to be judged by what he does, and that is quite a different thing from the intrinsic quality of him; and so you will find that when a man has become a celebrity, everybody knows that what he says is very wonderful, whereas in his youth, when he was not recognized as a celebrity, he may have said far more wonderful things without being noticed. The excellence of a man's remarks, even if he is not famous, should be recognized; as well as vice versa.

In our private relations we all get so busy that we have not time to develop affections for others as they deserve to be developed; we have not time for sympathy, the understanding for all those things that make the beauty of human relations, because we all are so busy, and when we are not busy we are tired. (Laughter.) You have in this country, on the average, if the goods produced in this country were divided equally, much more than anybody needs for happiness, and it would be possible to live on a very much smaller amount of work and yet have enough; you could then develop and cultivate those things that make for happiness. You would have freedom. A man does not have freedom if he has to indulge all day in an activity which is not one he likes; that is as bad as a treadmill. We cannot always be doing delightful things, but we

can for the greater part of the day; and I think that in the advanced industrial nations a better ideal of private happiness is probably the thing that is most wanted. More important even than political and economic reconstructions is the realization of the things that really make for human happiness.

We should not be so ready to go to war if our lives were happier. It is to my mind quite an amazing thing to see the extraordinary feebleness in the modern world of what you might call the will to live. There is a will to work, but not a will to live; you don't find that the prospect of wholesale destruction is considered intolerable. You don't find that people are willing to sacrifice money and power in order that they may be rid of the menace of war; they don't really want to be rid of it. A happy nation would not be willing to sacrifice life, health and happiness for the idle business of fighting, and possibly winning. (Applause.) This comes because our lives are too collective and too little individual. We, living as we do, forced by the mechanical mould of our civilization more and more to resemble each other, we, I say, more and more live by mass emotions and less and less by the individual, personal ones. In that way the individual gets sacrificed. A life where the individual is sacrificed is not one where the individual is going to have a strong love for life.

We imagine we want all sorts of things, such as power and wealth, which are not the sources of happiness. You will find the sources far more truly portrayed in the Gospel. I am speaking of just the sort of thing that I quoted a moment ago, about taking no thought for tomorrow. If you have a human being that you love, or a child, if you have any one thing that you really care for, life derives its meaning from that thing, and you can build up a whole world of people whose lives matter. But if you start with the nation—"Here am I; I am a member of a nation; I want my nation to be powerful"—then you are destroying the individual. You become oppressive, because whether your nation is powerful depends upon the regimentation of people and you set to work to regulate your neighbor.

It is the individual that is important. You will think that, perhaps, is an odd thing for a Socialist to say. I believe the material side of life has got to be given over to Socialistic organization, but I believe that because I think the material side of life is the least important. So long as you have not enough to keep your life tolerable, material things are all-important—in most European countries there is such dire poverty that material things are of the utmost importance. But we can now, with our capacity of technical production, totally abolish the problem of poverty, that lingers because we are perfect asses. (Laughter and applause) And when you think of the world you will have when poverty is eliminated, you see that in such a world material things will not be the important ones. You will have to settle, in a Socialistic community, whether the community is to work an extra hour a day and have an extra motor-car for each member. In such a community as that the spiritual goods will be more important, will be worth more than the things that are got through the collective community. The collective community will give you your daily bread and your daily tasks. Your leisure you can devote, if you like, to other work, or football or movies, or whatnot.

I am sometimes asked: How can you ensure that people will use their leisure well? I don't want to ensure it. You are still in the realm of undue morality, of undue pressure of the community upon the individual, when you raise such a problem. As long as leisure is not used in any way to damage other people, it is a matter for the individual. Well, then, I say in the spiritual world we want individualism. It is in the material world that we want Socialism. We have Socialism now in the spiritual world and we have individualism now in the material world. (Laughter and applause.)

What you are to think, how you are to manage your emotions, are supposed to be matters for the State to settle; but whether you are to have enough to eat, that is not a matter of the State—there the sacred principle of liberty comes in. It has been put in exactly the wrong place. The thing that I am saying to you is really, after all, exactly what all great religious leaders have said, that the soul of man is the important thing. And that is the great thing to learn. The great thing is to feel in yourself that the soul, your own thoughts, your own understandings and sympathies, that is the thing that matters and that the external outward of decor life is unimportant so long as you have enough to keep you going and to keep you alive. It is because we are so immersed in competitiveness that we do not understand this simple truth.

I have been talking rather lightly to you, but the thing that I mean is something immensely living and a real kind of liberation—being free in this world, free of the universe, so that the things that happen to you no longer worry you, the things that occur no longer seem to matter. There is a kind of fire that can live in the soul of every man and woman, and when you have that you don't care any longer about the little things of which our lives are so full. You can live in that way—you can live freely and expansively. You will find that when you let those fears drop off you are closer to others, you can enjoy friendship in a different degree. The whole world is more interesting, more living—there is something there that is infinitely more valuable. Whoever has once tasted it knows that it is infinitely better than those things gotten by other methods. It is an old secret—it has been taught by all teachers and been forgotten by their priests; it is that secret of being in close contact with the world, of not having the walls of self so rigid that you cannot see what is beyond. The moralist is concerned to think "How virtuous I am," and he also is an egoist like the rest. It is not in that world of hard immorals that you will find the life that is happy and free. It is in the kind of life where you have lost fear because a little hurt is worth enduring—it comes from the knowledge of the fact that there is something better than the avoidance of hurt—there is the securing of a kind of intense union with the world, a kind of intense love, something glowing, warm, like a personal affection and yet universal. If you can achieve that you will know the secret of a happy life.

BR AND COMPUTERS

(6) *Bertrand.* We've known for some time that Russell is one of the people that computer design is indebted to (NL3-30). And that MIT has a computer named *Russell*, so-named by NICK TREFETHEN of the MIT Math Department (RSN53-12). Now we learn that there's a computer language named *Bertrand*, described in *Constraint Programming Languages: Their Specification and Generation* by William Leler (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1988). Here is the first paragraph of a description of it, with thanks to ANGELO D'ALESSIO:

> This book presents a general-purpose language called **Bertrand** (after Bertrand Russell), which is a solution to the problem of building constraint-satisfaction systems. Bertrand is a rule-based specification language — a constraint satisfaction system is specified as a set of rules and is automatically generated from those rules. Bertrand allows new constraints to be defined, and also has a form of abstract data type.

DENNIS DARLAND adds that there's an article on *Bertrand* in *AI Expert* (February 1988).

MORE ON HAPPINESS

(7) Kohl on Russell on Happiness. MARVIN KOHL, who is organizing the 1988 Annual Meeting (coming in June, at Fredonia, NY), has chosen as its theme: *Happiness and the Important Things in Life*. It seems highly appropriate, therefore, to run his article, *Russell and the Attainment of Happiness* in this issue, which comes just before the Meeting. The article originally appeared in *International Studies in Philosophy* 16:3 (1984) 14-24. (We omit 3 pages of footnotes, and will lend them on request.)

In this paper I propose first to bring together the central aspects of Russell's theory and examine his notion that happiness depends upon having and appreciating reasonably continuous success at satisfying one's basic needs and correlate interests. Secondly, I wish to examine the pessimist charge that happiness is not attainable largely because of man's unavoidable fear of death. Here I shall suggest that Russell's meliorism successfully parries this and related objections. Thirdly, I shall look at the problems involved in determining exactly what happiness is, in particular, whether or not Russell's characterization, if it is an accurate one, increases the probability of the inattainability of happiness. The answer to be arrived at here is relevant to his claim that, "an occurrence is 'good' when it satisfies desire."[1] My thesis is that, while Russell's rich but loose characterization does raise difficulties, it is a vital part of what may be called an emerging process satisfaction utilitarian social ethic.[2]

I

Let us begin with his distinction between two sorts of happiness, plain and fancy. The first is open to any human being, the other is not. Plain happiness requires the having of a central purpose which guides one's life. It also requires that this purpose be end-specific, that it permit progressively increasing success, and that the individual find both joy and worth in this central task.[3] In other words, plain happiness (perhaps best called "having a meaningful life") is, according to Russell, the result of having a certain kind of purposeful life. Fancy happiness, on the other hand, is a mixed mode caused by a more complex set of conditions and, as a rule, is defeated by the existence of contrary conditions. Russell does not explain the relationship between plain and fancy happiness, taking it for granted that the former is easily obtainable and an almost necessary condition for the latter. More often than not, he simply refers to "fancy happiness" as "happiness."[4]

Aside from changes in the social system required to promote happiness[5] or personal catastrophe, ordinary day-to-day unhappiness is largely caused by mistaken views of the world, mistaken ethics, and mistaken habits of life. On the other hand, ordinary men and women

> can achieve happiness, with only a small amount of external prosperity, if they have good health, a cheerful disposition and a sound philosophy of life. . . .[6]
>
> Omitting saints, lunatics, and men of genius, ordinary people need, for their happiness, certain fairly simple conditions, which with a little wisdom in economics and politics, could be fulfilled for almost everyone. I put first purely physical conditions—food and shelter and health. Only when these have been secured is it worth while to consider psychological requisites.[7]

In *The Conquest of Happiness* Russell provides what is perhaps his most complete single description of the requisite general conditions.

> Happiness . . . depends partly upon external circumstances and partly upon oneself. . . . Certain thing are indispensable to the happiness of most men, but these are simple things: food and shelter, health, love, successful work and the respect of one's own herd. To some people parenthood also is essential. Where these things are lacking, only the exceptional man can achieve happiness. . . .[8]

In short, happiness depends on a combination of internal and external causes. It depends upon having *and* appreciating reasonably continuous success at satisfying one's basic needs and correlate interests.

Notice that Russell also maintains that what is at issue is not universal happiness but the happiness of most persons. Thus, he insists that he is not talking about the happiness of exceptional individuals but only about most ordinary men and women. "Our problem," he writes, "is to preserve instinctive happiness for the many, not only for a privileged few."[9]

II

Three of the more interesting charges against Russell are: first, he assumes that because happiness seems desirable, it must also be obtainable; second, that since man's consciousness and fear of death are unavoidable for all who minimally think about life, that they are, in particular, the most serious threat to human happiness; third, that since Russell is an "apostate pessimist," he passes too lightly over the problem of pessimism.[10] Let us consider Schiller's charges, starting with the last point.

It is difficult to say whether or not "apostate pessimist" is an accurate label. I am inclined to believe it is not. If Schiller's criticism is based upon Russell's position in *A Free Man's Worship*, as I suspect it is, then he is in error because that work is not so much the expression of pessimism as it is the rejection of optimism. And it does not follow that the rejection of optimism entails pessimism. Apparently Schiller believes, as perhaps many do, that optimism and pessimism are logical complements. But this is not the case.

Pessimism, according to Russell, is the philosophy of life which holds that the world is essentially evil and that, because of this, life is ultimately not worthwhile. Non-pessimism is roughly that class of beliefs which, for a variety of reasons, deny that the world is essentially evil. Thus, a non-pessimist may be an *optimist* or a *meliorist*. An optimist is someone who generally holds that the world is essentially good. A meliorist, on the other hand, is someone who maintains that neither the evil nor the goodness of the world appear to be ultimately determined and, most important, that man therefore has both the freedom and the power of aiding in the world's betterment. The meliorist generally holds that it is possible, if man chooses to make the effort, to make the world a better place to live. Given this frame of reference, Russell emerges as the great prophet of melioristic humanism and *A Free Man's Worhsip*, I suggest, is best *intellectually* interpreted as an attempt to determine the rational limits of that meliorism.

Another possible source of confusion is the distinction between being intellectually and being temperamentally a pessimist. One can, I think, make a reasonable case for Russell being a temperamental pessimist during much of his early adulthood. His relative isolation from other children, his social isolation due to his mathematics study, his alleged unrequited love for Mrs. Whitehead, and his "natural" shyness—all may have contributed to his tendency to emphasize the negative, and to prehend the world with an attitude of relative despair. In this sense, there is some truth to Schiller's charge. However, it is important to realize that there is little evidence to show that this mode of emotional response was intellectually grounded or was the result of the kind of dispassionate rational scrutiny typical of Russell—and much evidence that it was not. Even though Russell may have been a temperamental pessimist during the early adult season of his life, he did not (even at that time) confuse that disposition (which resulted from poor education and a largely unhappy social environment) with the truth about the external world. I have already suggested that *A Free Man's Worship*, when scrutinized from an intellectual point of view, is definitely melioristic, or at least ends upon that note.

In the *Conquest of Happiness*, he stresses the point that "reason lays no embargo upon happiness" and that the pessimists are "unhappy for some reason of which they are not aware, and this unhappiness leads them to dwell upon the less agreeable characteristics of the world in which they live."[11] And in *The History of Western Philosophy*, he maintains that "from a scientific point of view, optimism and pessimism are alike objectionable" and that "belief in either pessimism or optimism is a matter of temperament, not of reason."[12] Meliorism, on the other hand, is not predominantly a matter of temperament.

It rests, or at least Russell's particular version appears to rest, on the following claims:

(1) Judgments that there are certain states of affairs are judgments of fact.

(2) Whether or not certain states of affairs—the inevitability of death, the shortness of certain lives, our relative lack of power over external nature, etc.—are evils is a matter of value judgment.

(3) Even if we conclude on the basis of correct valuation that there is a long list of evils that are (almost as a rule) beyond our power, it does not follow that life is not worthwhile.

(4) The reason is that we create our own values. And it is because we create our own values that, whatever plight the world may be in, we can decide, rationally decide, to accept what cannot be changed, change what we can and should, and enjoy both our limited powers and the sheer experience of being alive.

In a sense we have replied to the "terror of death" argument. According to Russell, "the wise man will be as happy as circumstances permit, and if he finds the contemplation of the universe painful beyond a point, he will contemplate something else instead."[13] Similarly, the wise man is not motivated by irrational fears, and it is as irrational to fear death as it is to fear the realities of life. Fear is the great enemy. It "should not be overcome not only in action, but in feeling; and not only in conscious feeling, but in the unconscious as well."[14] It is possible "to educate ordinary men and women that they should be able to live without fear."[15] And once fear is eliminated and rational courage is substituted, personal death will appear a trivial matter.[16] "The secret of happiness is to face the fact that the world is horrible, horrible, *horrible* . . . . You must feel it deeply, and not brush it aside . . . . You must feel it right in here"—(Russell said) hitting his breast—and then you can start being happy again."[17]

The basic question is whether Russell is right in holding that it is possible to educate ordinary men and women that they should be able to live without fear at least of death. Pessimists, like Tolstoy and Schiller, seem to be claiming that it is impossible to do so, that death, so to speak, is a natural, if not ontological, terror. Common sense and the evidence indicates the contrary to be true. Attitudes toward dying and death are malleable.[18] And while it is probably an exaggeration to say that we can come to view personal death as a trivial matter, Russell seems to be correct in holding that the terror of death and irrational fear can be eliminated.

Russell believes that a combination of meliorism and a long view of things provide a sufficient antidote to thwart the paralysis of utter despair. Man can be educated and is capable of growth. Man not only can improve his lot in life but, even after very bad times, he resumes his movement towards progress. Two of Russell's most revealing statements occur in the context of an evaluation of Spinoza's philosophy. I shall quote them at length.

> The problem [of the wicked having power] for Spinoza is easier than it is for one who has no belief in the ultimate goodness of the universe. Spinoza thinks that if you see your misfortunes as they are in reality, as part of the concatenation of causes stretching from the beginning of time to the end, you will see that they are only misfortunes to you, not to the universe, to which they are merely passing discords heightening an ultimate harmony. I cannot accept this; I think that particular events are what they are and do not become different by absorption into a whole. Each act of cruelty is eternally a part of the universe; nothing that happens later can make that act good rather than bad, or can confer perfection on the whole of which it is a part.
>
> Nevertheless, when it is your lot to have to endure something that is (or seems to you) worse than the ordinary lot of mankind, Spinoza's principle of thinking about the whole, or at any rate about larger matters than your own grief, is a useful one. There are even times when it is comforting to reflect that human life, with all that it contains of evil and suffering, is an infinitesimal part of the life of the universe. Such reflections may not suffice to constitute a religion, but in a painful world they are a help toward sanity and an antidote to the paralysis of utter despair.[19]

In a similar vein, he writes:

> If bad times lie ahead of us we should remember while they last the slow march of man, checkered in the past by devastation and retrogessions, but always resuming the movement towards progress. Spinoza, who was one of the wisest of men and who lived consistently in accordance with his own wisdom, advised men to view passing events "under the aspect of eternity." . . . . The child lives in the minute, the boy in the day, the instinctive man in the year. The man inbued with history lives in the epoch. Spinoza would have us live not in the minute, the day, the year or the epoch, but in eternity. Those who learn to do this will find that it takes away the frantic quality and misfortune and prevents the trend towards madness that comes with overwhelming disaster. Spinoza spent the last day of his life telling cheerful anecdotes to his host. He had written: 'A free man thinks of death least of all things, and his wisdom is a meditation not of death but of life.' And he carried out his precept when it came to his own death.[20]

To sum up: Russell did not think death was an obstacle to happiness because, like the stoics, he saw little point in fearing what cannot be conquered. He was by nature and intellectual conviction opposed to fear. And he held a melioristic and long view of things, which allowed him to view passing events under the aspect of eternity and to view man, in general, as instinctively driven toward growth, always resuming the movement toward progress.

III

Even the most casual reading of Russell reveals the importance of happiness. Not only does the intelligent and vigorous individual desire happiness but the protection and nurturing of this end is a major purpose, if not the most important purpose, of the major institutions in a properly run society. The basic aspects of social life—education, politics, the good life itself—requires an intimate understanding of the nature of life satisfaction. The general aim of education is to provide a solid basis for happiness. "Happiness in childhood is absolutely necessary to the production of the best type of human being."[21] The same is true of politics. "The most important purpose that political institutions can achieve is to keep alive in individuals creativeness, vigour, vitality, and the joy of life."[22] Again Russell writes that "a wise humanity, in politics as elsewhere, comes only of remembering that even the largest groups are composed of individuals, that individuals can be happy or sad, and that every individual in the world who is suffering represents a failure of human wisdom and of common humanity."[23] More important perhaps, happiness contributes to goodness and not vice versa. The good life is a happy life. "I do not mean," he explains, "that if you are good you will be happy; I mean that if you are happy you will be good."[24] Thus, unlike thinkers who hold that morality is a (or the condition) for happiness, Russell maintains that happiness, though not identical with morality, is, as a rule, a necessary condition.

The difficulty is that if happiness is a general ideal and necessary condition for morality, and if it is not some clear and distinct idea, then the situation is problematic. For it is one thing to offer the reader recipes for happiness, and to purport that all that is claimed for them is that they have increased one's own happiness.[25] It is another to maintain that happiness is one of the major human ends as well as a necessary general condition for morality, and then proceed to offer seemingly different and unclear recipes. Thus, we have the charge that Russell's characterization is too rich, too loose. And the more complex argument that because of this looseness, because the nature of the goal is unclear, happiness is generally less attainable.

What I wish to suggest is that this characterization is deliberate in that Russell believed that the available evidence indicated that his conception of happiness allows for the maximum of growth and the achievement of happiness for the greatest number of persons. This point, I think, had best be elaborated.

One of the most striking features of Russell's account of happiness is his belief that the word "happiness" can be correctly used to denote almost any kind or level of satisfaction and that "the great practical importance of psychology will come in giving ordinary men and women *a more just conception* of what constitutes human happiness."[26] For Russell, the central meta-question is: What is a more just way of conceiving of the kind of life satisfactions we wish to subsume under the name of happiness if we wish to minimize suffering and maximize the major modes of life satisfaction?

Russell's answer, in bold outline, is as follows: First, it must be a goal that enables men to fully taste what ordinary men might generally be expected to achieve in life—health, love, interesting work, perhaps parenthood. Second, the goal must be such as to provide for zest and the sense of accomplishment, two features that generally accompany earned success. This means that the task must be neither too difficult nor too easy. The price of aiming too high, of having unrealistic expectations, is necessary defeat and pointless frustrations. The price of aiming too low is boredom and the emasculation of vigor and zest.[27] Hence, a just conception of happiness requires that man aim high enough to allow for continual growth and the tasting of the fullness of life, yet

low enough to avoid a general sense of futility.

To be more specific: When happiness is properly understood and is the end that actually motivates men, men will desire the things heretofore mentioned. This does not imply a general standard for happiness.[28] Nor does it imply a fixed standard.

> All Utopias that have hitherto been constructed are intolerably dull. Any man with any force in him would rather live in this world with all its ghastly horrors, than in Plato's Republic or among Swift's Houyhnhnms. The men who make Utopias proceed upon a radically false assumption as to what constitutes a good life. They conceive that it is possible to imagine a certain state of society and a certain way of life which would be once and for all recognized as good, and should then continue for ever and ever. They do not realize that much of the greater part of a man's happiness depends upon activity, and only a very small remnant consist in passive enjoyment. Even the pleasures which do consist in enjoyment are only satisfactory, to most men, when they come in the intervals of activity. Social reformers, like inventors of Utopias, are apt to forget this very obvious fact of human nature. . . . Every vigorous man needs some kind of context, some sense of resistance overcome, in order to feel that he is exercising his faculties.[29]

Not only does happiness require activity, not only is it probably an indispensable part of happiness to be without something one wants, but "happiness, if it is to have any depth and solidarity, demands a life built round some central purpose of a kind demanding continuous activity *and permitting of progressively* increasing success."[30]

An important illustration of this point occurs in his discussion of having a so-called ideal income. Russell writes:

> it is not the amount of your income that makes you happy, but its rate of increase. The man who enjoys life is the man who, with habits adjusted to one standard of life, finds himself continually in a position to adopt a slightly higher standard. That is why, on the whole, England was happy under Queen Elizabeth, and America is happy at the present time.[31]

Again:

> The important question, in regard to happiness . . . is not the absolute amount of one's income, but its augmentation or diminution.
>
> Perhaps a very rapid increase, by altering one's habits and ones social milieu, may not be altogether a source of contentment, but a continual rise of (say) ten percent, every year is likely to bring the nearest possible approach to perfect bliss. . . . Above all, he has the feeling of being a successful man, since circumstances adapt themselves to his wishes, he acquires an illusion of omnipotence, than which nothing is more delightful.[32]

As the passages which I have just cited show, Russell's treatment of the question concerning the attainability of happiness is subtle and differs significantly from those who hold that happiness consists in having prospered. Russell concludes that felicity consists not in having prospered, but *in prospering*. That the best way to "attain" happiness is not to attempt to capture it, not to be completely successful, but to have a variety of ends, preferably ones rooted in instinct which permit progressively increasing success. Since continuous growth is an indispensable condition for happiness and since the happiness of each of us depends upon the well-being of the whole of mankind, a conception of happiness that protects against remediable suffering and allows for maximum continuous growth and the achievement of life satisfactions for the greatest number is the most just and nearly correct view.

BR, WRITER OF LETTERS

(8) On Pauling's visit: Russell's letter of 9/5/58, from the book, *The First Cuckoo: :Letters to The Times since 1900*, (London: Allen & Unwin, 1976), with thanks to TOM STANLEY:

> I am writing to report an incident which must bring shame to all who value the fair name of Britain. The incident concerns the dealings of the Home Office with Dr Linus Pauling, a very distinguished native-born American, Honorary Fellow of the Royal Society, recipient of honorary degrees from the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and London, Nobel Prizeman, and well known throughout the scientific world as a man of outstanding intellect and integrity. He came to the United Kingdom on August 31 for two main purposes, to deliver an address which he has been invited to give on September 15 at the Kekulé Symposium of the Chemical Society of London and to address a meeting organized for the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament which is to take place on September 22.
>
> On arrival at London Airport he was separated from the other passengers by the immigration authorities, and his son, who had come to meet him, was refused information as to whether he had arrived. He was closely questioned as to the purposes of his visit. When he mentioned the Chemical Society, he was asked whether he had any evidence that they had invited him. He replied that the evidence was in his baggage which was in the customs shed, and asked whether they accused him of lying. At the moment, they did not answer; but at a later stage they made this accusation. At first they said that he must leave the United Kingdom on September 15. He pointed out that this made his address to the Chemical Society impossible, and they reluctantly extended his permit to the next day, September 16. They stated as the ground of their action: 'We do not admit people to Great Britain who come principally to take part in public meetings, especially when against Government policy.'
>
> This action by the British authorities is shocking. First, for the gross discourtesy of subjecting a man of great intellectual eminence, who has been honoured by many learned bodies in this country, to insult at the hands of ignorant officials. In the United States McCarthyism has lost its vigour, but one is compelled to believe that it is being taken up in this country.
>
> Second, if Government policy is as stated to Dr Pauling, free speech has been abandoned and the only freedom left is that of supporting the Government.
>
> Third, on the particular issue of nuclear weapons the Government have laid themselves open to very damaging criticism. It will be said that they know their policy to be such as no well-informed person could support. Apparently their watchword is: 'Democracy, yes, but only ignorant democracy, for our policy is one which no well-informed democracy would tolerate.'

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

(9) For our learned members, a question from PAUL PFALZNER:

* What is the meaning and origin of this Latin tag:

CUPIDINE HUMANII INGENII, LIBENTIUS OBSCURA CREDUNTUR

BR BIOGRAPHY

(10) *The Encyclopedia Americana* tells it this way, in Volume 23 of the 1984 Edition. Thank you, TOM STANLEY.

RUSSELL, Bertrand Arthur William (1872–1970), British philosopher, mathematician, Nobel Prize-winner, and political activist. One of the most productive writers and thinkers of his time, Russell gained an unusually wide international readership not only in scholarly circles but among the general public.

Life. Russell was born in Trelleck, Wales, on May 18, 1872, the second son of Viscount and Lady Amberly, who both died when he was three years old. He was raised by his grandmother, Lady Russell, wife of Lord John Russell, who had twice been prime minister. The young Russell was educated by tutors at her home near Richmond. Precocious and lonely, he read prodigiously. He began to study geometry at 11, found it "indescribably delicious," and for the next three decades found his chief satisfaction in mathematics. At 18 he entered Trinity College, Cambridge, to study mathematics and then philosophy. His brilliance was recognized, and after graduation he became a fellow of Trinity College in 1895. Soon he began to publish his important books in philosophy.

Russell's inheritance provided him with an income for a time, but bit by bit he gave it away to political causes. Thereafter he lived on earnings from lecturing, from periods of teaching (for example, Cambridge, 1910–1916; University of Chicago, 1938), and from his writings.

The first three of Russell's four marriages ended in divorce. He had three children. In 1931, on the death of his elder brother, he succeeded to the family earldom. In 1949 he received the Order of Merit and in 1950 was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature.

Work on the Foundations of Mathematics. In 1900, Russell became convinced that the laws of logic should be expressed in symbols and that mathematics is really a branch of logic, contrary to what most philosophers had believed. In the next year he made his famous discoveries concerning the newly developing field of set theory. In *The Principles of Mathematics* (1903), he presented the rich but as yet ill-systematized results of this intensely creative period of thinking.

Russell had already begun collaborating with Alfred North Whitehead, and after long years of labor they produced their monumental treatise *Principia Mathematica* (1910–1913). In this book they organized symbolic logic into systematic form, with postulates from which theorems were strictly deduced. They then undertook to demonstrate how the concepts of arithmetic and algebra can all be defined purely in terms of concepts of logic, and how the laws of these branches of mathematics can be deduced merely from the postulates of logic. The *Principia* was of epoch-making importance to philosophy because of its new view of the status of mathematical knowledge and the impetus it gave to the development of mathematical logic.

Views in Philosophy. Russell neither founded nor wedded himself to any definite philosophical movement. During his early years at Cambridge he embraced the then dominant philosophy of Absolute Idealism, with its romantic doctrines that reality is all one logically unified whole and that the physical world really consists of nothing but mind. In 1898 with the aid of G. E. Moore, who had been a fellow student at Cambridge, he totally rejected it and adopted what he called Logical Atomism (according to which there are many separate, logically independent facts) and Realism (the doctrine that the physical world is independent of mind). Also, he long held that there is an additional world of "universals"—a realm of nonmental, nonspatial, eternal entities rather like Plato's "forms," which provide us with our knowledge of self-evident truths. Although Russell came to be sympathetic in many ways toward the tradition of British Empiricism, he never accepted its claim that all knowledge is based on experience.

With Moore, Russell originated the influential idea that "analysis" (studying definitions of concepts) is an important method for philosophy. But as a result of his work with Whitehead, he came to feel, as Moore did not, that the correct method in metaphysics and the theory of knowledge was to "replace inferred entities by logical constructions." This method required the use of logic to invent definitions by which inferred (hence, dubious) things could be explained away in terms of things with which we are directly acquainted. In a series of books starting with *Our Knowledge of the External World* (1914), Russell worked to develop theories by which physical objects and minds (which he regarded as inferred entities) could be treated as logical constructions out of elements that supposedly were more ultimate and better known. The philosophical theories he developed during this middle period were ingenious but, as he himself admitted, far from successful.

During his later years, Russell turned back toward the less abstruse Realism of his earlier period. His last original work in philosophy was *Human Knowledge* (1948). Russell had always disapproved of Pragmatism; nor did he care for Logical Positivism when it arose. After World War II he was unsympathetic toward the "ordinary language philosophy" current at Oxford and toward the influential later teachings of his former pupil Ludwig Wittgenstein.

Moral and Social Views. After World War I, Russell gave increased attention to moral and social issues. He became convinced that puritanical attitudes toward sex were a great cause of human unhappiness as well as a source of people's fierce pro-war sentiments. In *Marriage and Morals* (1929) he advocated trial marriage and easier divorce, and wrote tolerantly of adultery and homosexuality. These views excited the opposition of religious people that later led to a notorious court decision (1940) barring Russell from a professorship at the City College of New York.

In the 1920's the birth of his two older children turned Russell's thoughts toward education. With his second wife, Dora Black, he directed the Beacon Hill School (1927–1934), a progressive school in which children were encouraged to speak and act uninhibitedly. He gave his views of education in *Education and the Social Order* (1932).

Political Views and Activities. Russell was a socialist who cherished individual liberty. "I dislike communism because it is undemocratic and capitalism because it favors exploitation," he said. He never held public office, although he ran for election to Parliament three times (1907, 1922, 1923).

Russell's attitude toward war was that of a selective pacifist. Regarding Britain's entry into World War I as a disastrous political blunder, and sickened by the belligerent attitude of the public, he opposed the war in writing and in speeches. In 1918 his antiwar activities finally led to six months' imprisonment. He did not oppose World War II, however, for he reluctantly concluded that nazism was a menace to civilization that could be stopped only by force.

© KARSH, OTTAWA/WOODFIN CAMP

British Nobel Prize Winner Bertrand Russell's career combined philosophy, mathematics, and politics.

After 1945, Russell saw nuclear disarmament as imperative. Before the Soviet Union developed its own nuclear arsenal, Russell believed that the West should use the threat of preventive war to compel the USSR to agree to permanent nuclear disarmament. With the acceleration of the nuclear arms race, he later concluded that Britain should become neutral in the Cold War.

During the mid-1950's, Russell worked through "The Committee of 100" and later through the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. He participated in demonstrations, and in 1961—at the age of 89—was jailed for seven days after being arrested in London at a sitdown protest against nuclear weapons.

Russell bitterly opposed U. S. intervention in Vietnam and was convinced that the United States was committing atrocities there. This belief led him to sponsor an unofficial "War Crimes Tribunal," which met in Stockholm in May 1967 and pronounced U. S. leaders guilty of crimes against humanity. His *Autobiography* was published in that year. He died at his home in Penrhyndeudraeth, Merionnetshire, Wales, on Feb. 2, 1970, in his 98th year.

Russell's stature as a philosopher is unsurpassed among 20th century thinkers. An austere philosopher of mathematics, a passionate advocate of rationality, a wittily skeptical enemy of dogmatic and emotional thinking, a prophet of sexual freedom, an antiwar activist—Bertrand Russell combined all these elements and more.

STEPHEN F. BARKER
The Johns Hopkins University

Further Reading: Clark, Ronald, *The Life of Bertrand Russell* (Knopf 1976); Jager, Ronald, *The Development of Bertrand Russell's Philosophy* (Humanities Press 1972); Russell, Bertrand, *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 3 vols. (Little 1967–1969).

FOR SALE

(11) Members' stationery. 8 1/2 x 11, white. Across the top: "The good life is one inspired by love and guided by knowledge.* Bertrand Russell" On the bottom: "*Motto of The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc." $6 for 90 sheets, postpaid in U.S.A., Canada & Mexico. Order from the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.

PROMOTING BR/BRS

(12) Have you a complete set of RSN? Here is a suggestion that you may wish to act on: if you own all issues of the BRS newsletter -- Issue #1 through Issue #58 -- consider offering it to your local library. It's a bit of a plus for a library to have a complete set. The Library of Congress has one. Bill Young's Cedar Springs Library (in Auberry, CA) has one. And your own local library can have one too -- if you give the word.

The Library of Congress will show, in its literature, libraries that have complete sets. That's another plus for a local library. The following newsletter item shows how it would be shown.

So, if you've got one, and rarely refer to it, why not offer it to your local library? Even if you do * refer to it occasionally, you would still have access to it. You could be doing a scholar — and the BRS -- a good turn.

Think about it. Please let us know, if you do it. (With thanks to HARRY RUJA for the suggestion.)

(13) RSN in LC. Russell Society News was listed (as shown below) in a recent issue of *New Serials Titles*, which is published by the Library of Congress.

"This is a very valuable listing for us," says HARRY RUJA, "since most libraries order their catalog cards from LC [Library of Congress] (saving themselves the formidable task of doing their own cataloging), and if they use this card, they will file it under Russell, Bertrand, 1872-1970--Periodicals, in addition to filing it under the Bs as Bertrand Russell Society. Hence, anyone who looks up BR in the card catalog of the local library will be directed, if he searches through all the BR cards, to our publication.

"The letters DLC represent District of Columbia, Library of Congress [and indicates that DLC has a complete set of Russell Society News]. LC is committed to listing all the libraries which have various periodicals."

Thus, if a member donates his/her complete set of RSNs to the local library, as suggested in the previous newsletter item, that local library's code will be shown in this listing alongside DLC.

"Interest in RSN may increase significantly if it is widely and easily available -- and LC is the best agent to get this done."

Russell Society news / The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc. — — Chicago, Ill. : The Society,
v. : ill. ; 28 cm.
Quarterly.
Description based on: No. 43 (Aug. 1984); caption title.
Continues: Newsletter (Bertrand Russell Society)
1. Bertrand Russell Society—Periodicals. 2. Russell, Bertrand, 1872-1970—Periodicals. I. Bertrand Russell Society.
B1649.R94A175 192—dc19 87-642307
AACR 2
DLC

PROMOTING BR'S PURPOSES

(14) From the New York Times (3/19/88):

Doctor-Assisted Euthanasia Should Be Legal

To the Editor:

As one who feels strongly that the right to die is as sacred as the right to live, I object to Mark Siegler's use of loaded words to espouse his views in "The A.M.A. Euthanasia Fiasco" (Op-Ed, Feb. 26). Assisting a terminally ill patient to die peacefully without further pain is vastly different from saying a physician "deliberately killed another doctor's patient."

In my opinion, the Journal of the American Medical Association cannot be accused of acting irresponsibly by publishing the article "It's Over, Debbie" without attribution. Indeed, the journal's editors should be commended for preserving the anonymity of the young doctor who told the story. If his identity were revealed, there is no question he would be prosecuted and prevented forever from practicing medicine. He could wind up in jail — or worse. And for what? For acting humanely and jeopardizing his own career to help a suffering human being?

Dr. Siegler acknowledges fears about dying in hospitals, becoming dependent on others and whether or not doctors will provide adequate relief of pain and suffering even for the terminally ill. But his solution, relying on physicians to "convince the public that its fears ... will be addressed in a more humane and considerate way," is nothing less than fatuous.

As a member of the Hemlock Society, I applaud the organization's attempt to legalize doctor-assisted euthanasia — not suicide, Dr. Siegler, if you please — but merciful assistance in terminating hopelessly painful existence. If California residents approve a referendum legalizing euthanasia, I hope it will prove an inspiration to pursue the same objective in other states. This holds infinitely more promise than waiting for the medical profession to come to grips with reality.

LEN KIRSCH
Merrick, L.I., Feb. 26, 1988

BR'S INFLUENCE

(15) Ozmon. We found his story so engaging that we didn't mind the difficulty of reading the very poor photocopy. It appeared in *Phi Delta Kappan* 52, No. 3 (Nov. 1970), pp.146,152-3. 1970 was the year that BR died; perhaps the news of BR's death triggered Ozmon's recollections. With thanks to HARRY RUJA.

BERTRAND RUSSELL: SOCRATES OF OUR AGE (1872-1970)

I first met Bertrand Russell in 1951. He had come to the University of Virginia, where I was an undergraduate philosophy major, to speak on the subject of a "Happy Man in a Happy World." He was then 79, and though I had seen several pictures of him, including some film clips, he appeared shorter and frailer than I had imagined.

A friend who was pursuing a premed program at William and Mary College had driven 120 miles from Williamsburg to hear Russell that evening. We had both attended a rather bad Roman Catholic school, and our revolt against that kind of education, as well as concern with our own intellectual development (and certainly our intellectual motivation), were due in large measure to the man we were to see and hear that evening. We had read just about everything we could get our hands on by Russell since our freshman year in high school, and Russell seemed to reach us both intellectually and emotionally — though our parents and teachers never could. We particularly relished his dethroning of the greats like Aristotle, St. Thomas, and Hegel, as well as his opposition to status quo concepts like conventional marriage, the gray-flannel-suit syndrome, and racial inequalities.

HOWARD OZMON (4635, Columbia University Chapter) is professor of education at Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond. He is the editor of Contemporary Critics of Education *(Interstate Printers, Danville, Ill., 1970. $3.95), which includes a section on Bertrand Russell.*

We liked him too because he was a fighter. We were familiar with the attacks made on his views about free love, had heard him denounced from pulpits because of his views on religion, and knew how he had consistently argued against man's right to make war, despite social ostracism and imprisonment. Indeed, this frail gentleman from England had already turned us on, and no LSD trip could equal the excitement of hearing him in person. We knew, too, that there were several Baptist ministers in the audience, as well as ministers from other local denominations who had driven hundreds of miles just to face this devil in the flesh, and we looked forward to some fiery exchanges. After all, this was the man who had written such statements as:

> I say quite deliberately that the Christian religion, as organized in its churches, has been and still is the principal enemy of moral progress in the world.

And on another occasion:

> It is possible that mankind is on the threshold of a golden age; but, if so, it will be necessary first to slay the dragon that guards the door, and this dragon is religion.

Russell's appearance on stage was an electric one, with his mane of flowing white hair and a thin pipe clenched tightly between his teeth. He stood alone on the stage and spoke to the topic for only a short time. Then he invited questions. Many of the listeners had questions, half of them hostile and half of them friendly. Many of the questions were bluntly and emotionally delivered, such as, "Sir, are you an atheist or not?"

Whether Russell had previously decided or whether he sensed the antagonism of many in the audience, this was a night in which he decided to cool it. For an hour and a half he parried every question and answered on his own terms, pausing only from time to time to take a thoughtful puff on his pipe. It was obvious that he had come into the Bible Belt neither to excite nor to offend, but mostly to show that he did not have horns and a pitchfork (a point on which there had been considerable doubt). Needless to say, my friend and I were greatly disappointed. We had expected a fierce battle, knowing that our mentor could take them all on with one hand; yet he had decided against it. It was logical for us to guess, I suppose, that Russell felt that his audience already considered him too extreme, and that nothing would be gained by appearing to be more extreme until they had grasped the ideas that preceded it.

Despite our disappointment in the talk, we still had his writings — those wonderful writings filled with humor and love and intellect, writings that made you want to become a philosopher even if you were a plumber. We had known from previous experience with authors that they seldom equaled in appearance what their writings portended them to be. So we accepted the view that Russell was a great writer but a poor speaker.

It had been only a year before, however, that Russell had won the Nobel Prize for literature, and it was only much later that we heard on record the wonderful speech he delivered in Stockholm. It was everything that his talk at the University of Virginia was not. He was witty, glamorous, and intelligent, and proved for all time that he was indeed as much a speaker as he was a writer. Russell had them rolling in the aisles in Stockholm, and this helped to point out, I think, the complex personality of a man who can be at times both logical and emotional, and serene or buoyantly gay. A man to be reckoned with, and above all, a man.

For those who deplore the fact that this is no longer a world in which knights-errant exist, for one where there is room for both heroism and excitement, I would like to say that Bertrand Russell proved time and time again that life today is no less exciting or heroic than it ever was. In his own lifetime he championed causes that would have made a Lancelot retreat and pursued the morality of issues beyond the reach of even a Sir Galahad. Russell's entire life interested and enthralled us because he was not only a great thinker, but a thinker who deigned to put his ideas into practice in order to both educate and chide his fellow man. Like Socrates, he was the gadfly of his time, and though he was often swatted, he was never out of the fight for long.

In 1927 Russell and his wife, Dora, opened a school for young children called Beacon Hill. In addition to their own son and daughter, the Russells had as students some 18 other boys and girls between the ages of four and 11. At Beacon Hill the Russells tried to lay down a basis for a modern education by combining the best in teaching methods, diet, psychology, and curriculum. The Russell school was somewhat similar to A. S. Neill's Summerhill, and Russell seems to agree with Neill that suppression of the child's basic impulses during childhood may well result in ill effects in his adult life. The Russell school encouraged self-government and freedom with the child learning how to

free himself from dangerous impulses that might carry over into adult life. Russell stated the germs of his educational ideas in a fascinating little book entitled *On Education* or as it appears in its American title, *Education and the Good Life.*

In 1938, Russell came to the United States and taught, first at the University of Chicago and then at the University of California at Los Angeles. In 1940 he accepted an invitation from the Board of Higher Education in New York City to join the department of philosophy at City College. He was denied an opportunity to fill this post, however, by a judge who rendered void his appointment on the basis that it was his duty to protect the health, safety, and morals of the public. From 1941 to 1943 he lectured for the Barnes Foundation in Philadelphia, but Dr. Barnes, head of the foundation, dismissed him on January 1, 1943, with three days' notice. This time Russell brought action for a wrongful dismissal and won. In 1944 he returned to Britain and was reelected a fellow at Trinity College. In 1949 he was elected an honorary fellow of the British Academy and also won the highly coveted Order of Merit. In 1950 he was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature, and the committee awarding the prize cited Russell as one of the most brilliant spokesmen of rationality and humanity in our time – a fearless champion of free speech and free thought in the West.

Russell was an outstanding crusader for peace, and for a number of years served as the head of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. He spoke and wrote continuously against war as a way of solving human problems, and he campaigned vigorously for peace for over 60 years. In 1961, at the age of 89, he was sent to jail for his participation in a campaign for nuclear disarmament. In 1967, at the age of 95, he wrote an article entitled "War Crimes in Vietnam" in which he attacked the United States for its military actions in Vietnam, and he served on a war crimes tribunal which accused the United States of aggression in Vietnam.

In 1964, Paterson State College in Wayne, New Jersey, where I was teaching, suspended seven students because they campaigned to have more democratic procedures on campus, including the right to have political organizations. Another philosophy teacher and I stood up for the suspended students, and we worked until we got them readmitted. Although we did manage to get the students back in – with the aid of a lawyer and other pressures – we found that our own contracts had not been renewed for the coming year, as we had been told that they would be prior to the suspension of the students. When the students heard of this outrage they immediately held one of the early sit-ins in the 1960's, sitting in Hunziker Hall for over 36 hours, which was even more astounding when one considers that most of the students were females. One student wrote a letter to Bertrand Russell explaining the situation to him, and the Super Batman, always able to smell injustice and seeking to right wrongs no matter how far away and how small a locality, sent off a few terse letters attacking the college administration for their arbitrary and dictatorial attitudes, while defending the other philosophy teacher and myself. The college administration remained adamant despite the fact that this was the first time a Nobel Prize winner had ever taken cognizance that there was such a school in New Jersey, and we went on to accept better positions elsewhere. But Russell, we felt, had really shown his mettle by championing the right of so small a cause in so significant a place.

Russell believed that children are "born with only reflexes and a few instincts" which are neither good nor bad. It is up to the parent to see to it that the child has the kind of environment that will promote the development of good habits, which hopefully will become almost automatic. The best way to encourage this, Russell felt, is by setting a good example for children to follow. When the child sees the parent saying one thing and doing another, he becomes confused and hostile. Russell was one who practiced his beliefs and encouraged others to do likewise.

He believed that children have a normal desire to please their parents and elders, but that when they are faced with hypocrisy on the part of parents, or when parents try to force children to behave in a prescribed manner without their really accepting it, that they revolt against authority. Russell felt that rather than force children to behave in such and such a way, we should help to develop the child's habits so that he naturally chooses desirable behavior patterns. One of the desirable behavior patterns that Russell promoted was encouraging a child to stick with a task until it is completed. Although he recognized that a child's attention span is very limited, he felt that the child needs to be encouraged to remain with a task for longer and longer periods and encouraged to develop many worthwhile interests that occupy his time in a useful way. The development of many interests creates a built-in motivational factor that helps to assure continual effort toward learning.

Although Russell refrained from stating his educational proposals as universal for all children and believed that children should choose studies that they are interested in, he did feel that the parent can aid the process through sympathy, patience, understanding, and love, and thus prepare the child for the more formalized education to follow.

Once the parent has encouraged and developed the child's interests and curiosity, the teacher is now the one, to channel the curiosity of the child in constructive ways. Although the teacher, like the parent, should not force his interests and values upon the child, he should be ready to provide the child with information, advice, and the kinds of materials the child needs to pursue that interest. Although a teacher should not dictate interests, Russell did feel that a good teacher can stimulate the students or the class toward desirable goals without engendering rebellious feelings on the part of the child. Russell also pointed out that in the welter of ideas that face a child, he is very prone to accept the views of his parents, teachers, or society as the authoritative ones and to be critical of views which oppose such ideas. For that reason he felt that it is quite important that the child be encouraged away from dogmatism by learning that there are at least two sides to every question, and this can only be done, he felt, by having a teacher who is both fair and open-minded.

At Beacon Hill, Russell had the children abide by disciplinary rules because the children had either made the rules or because they could understand their reasonableness. He did not like the establishment of codes of behavior that children don't want to obey or have to obey without knowing why. Russell sought to establish the kind of school where respect for the child took precedence over the common practice of requiring respect from the child.

When one looks at Russell's educational ideas, he sees many of the Dewey proposals for education: child-centeredness, capturing the motivation of the child, an awareness of instincts, learning by doing, education for character and social reconstruction, and so on. Although many readers of Russell have overreacted to his criticisms of Dewey's general philosophy, and though there may be some serious differences here, I do not find great differences between their educational philosophies. Although Russell's views on education were never formalized to the extent that Dewey's were, they still represent the kind of attitude that

we tend to call progressive.

Russell died on February 2, 1970. He would have been the very first to tell you that he made mistakes, that he changed his mind about things; but after all, even at 97 one is still growing, and Russell was never afraid to change his opinion or to step into a new arena. Although he is often considered the founder of the recent linguistic movement in philosophy, his growing interests caused him to leave it behind and to step forward into broader spheres of interest.

His extensive education and interests, as well as his concern for truth, justice, and brotherhood, encouraged him to speak out time and time again on controversial issues, not only on issues pertaining to sex and religion, but political issues involving Cuba, Berlin, Czechoslovakia, and Vietnam.

When the definitive history of the twentieth century is written, it will pay little heed to most politicians, generals, and the show-business personalities we read about daily in the public press. But I feel certain that Russell will have an honored place as one who always tried to make us examine what we were doing, and who often suggested an alternative course of action. Though he was often treated with scorn and ridicule, I think that one day we shall say of him, as Plato said of Socrates, that of all the men of his time, he was the bravest, the justest, and the wisest. □

THOUGHTS

(16) *Soul* comes from the pen of ELEANOR VALENTINE:

They say a soul is indestructible
Even by hemlock or cyanide.
It cannot self-destruct or be destroyed.
It goes winging its way onward.
We imagine so, believing it is possible,
Wondering if it is provable.
I must think, does some fossil inspire this reverie?
And what has become of its primitive soul?
It lived in the ocean, they say,
Which by some upheaval became Highland Beach.
They think so from the evidence,
Without actually being Jehovah's Witnesses.
I don't myself know who they are —
Some sort of surveying scientists
From the Department of Mental Health,
Presumably accredited. I didnt check it out.

THE NUCLEAR PREDICAMENT

(17) *Nuclear Alert* is the International Accidental Nuclear War Prevention Newsletter, edited by former BRS member Dean Babst. The current issue (Winter 1987-88) can scare the hell out of you.

Here are excerpts:

ACCIDENTAL WAR PREVENTION PLANS

•An agreement establishing "nuclear risk-reduction centers" was signed between the Soviet Union and the United States in September 1987. The centers, which will be in Washington and Moscow, will exchange information on matters such as an accidental missile launch or a commercial nuclear accident like the Chernobyl reactor fire that might be misinterpreted. The centers will act as "high-tech supplements" to the Washington-Moscow hotline.

•The U.S. European Command has a contingency plan that sets out ways of preventing a nuclear war from being started by a rogue commander or the accidental deviation from a flight plan. It allows even a junior serviceman's calls to be routed directly to the national command center in Washington if a nuclear weapons accident or incident threatens to trigger a war. Using a communications code called PINNACLE, the caller would send a message known as NUCFLASH over any available communication means. A copy of the plan (Conplan 4367) was obtained under the Freedom of Information Act by Dr. Peter Wills of the New Zealand branch of Scientists Against Nuclear Arms and was reported in the newspapers of England, West Germany and New Zealand but not in the U.S. Why is the U.S. mass media so sound asleep to these dangers? A copy of the plan (document) is available upon request from the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

A nuclear explosion in space, whether accidental or by revolutionaries, would generate an electromagnetic pulse (EMP) that could blackout communications over a vast area. In such a situation, how would military callers send NUCFLASH messages?

•China would like to make positive contributions towards the prevention of accidental nuclear war according to Mrs. Chen Liming who spoke in detail on "Accidental Nuclear War: Causes and Precautions" (Pugwash Newsletter, January 1987.)

•India and Pakistan have reached an agreement in principle not to attack each other's nuclear installations. This confidence-building measure for reducing accidental war danger deserves codification in a formal agreement (*Arms Control Today*, Nov. 1987).

MASS DENIAL

General reluctance to think about nuclear war dangers, permits the following type perils to grow:

• The number of fuses that could trigger a nuclear war is growing as the number of nations with nuclear weapons increases. By their example, the U.S. and Soviet Union have been leading this growth.

• As time available for war decision decreases, each threatened nation's trigger finger becomes more itchy. Time now allowed is only 4 to 7 minutes, in some crises. "Star Wars" defense systems would reduce decision time still further.

• As each nation refines its weapons systems (e.g. first strike and stealth weapons), the trigger fingers of all threatened nations become more nervous. If deep arms reduction agreements are not achievable, an unintentional nuclear war is a certainty because the current arms race is a time bomb with many fuses.

Fortunately, many people are becoming uneasy about the direction of the arms race. In order to change direction in world thinking, we first need to become dissatisfied with the direction we are going. The more the danger is known, the more

nations can work together to prevent or limit a local war from going nuclear and global. In order to help increase awareness, this Newsletter is being sent to all nuclear powers as well as many other nations for their leaders to share with their military specialists and scientists.

The Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States is encouraging because it increases decision time in some situations. Also it is a helpful first step in moving toward further arms reduction agreements.

CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS

Reflections On The Cuban Missile Crisis by Raymond Garthoff (Brookings Institution,1987), describes misunderstandings which occurred during the crisis, any one of which could have produced a nuclear war.

- A U.S. spy, Col. Oleg Penkovsky, sent a prearranged signal before he was arrested —that the Soviet Union was about to launch a nuclear attack. The CIA chose to disregard it.
- The U.S. Air Force was ordered to an unprecedented level of alert, DefCon 2, on Oct 24, 1962. The alert was transmitted to Strategic Air Command forces in plain English rather than code because the commanding officer, Gen. Thomas Power, wanted to flaunt U.S. nuclear superiority.
- A U-2 reconnaissance plane over Cuba was shot down on Oct. 27 which nearly led to reprisals. Evidence suggests the Cubans rather than the Soviets shot down the plane. President Kennedy's specific order for no reprisal reached the operational level almost too late to call off the strike.

Fortunately in 1962, there was much more time for assessing warning signals and unexpected events and a nuclear war did not occur

TERRORISTS AND PROLIFERATION

The U.S. Department of Defense released a report in November 1987 that said there is a growing risk that terrorists could steal radioactive materials to build nuclear weapons. The report, prepared for Congress, estimated that in the 1990s up to 300 shipments of weapons-grade plutonium—10 times the current level—will leave Europe each year.

Libyan leader Gadhafi told university students last June that the Arab world must develop or obtain an atom bomb for its defense and "should drop it" on anyone that threatens its independence.

LAUNCH ON WARNING CAPABILITY

Dr. Clifford Johnson, a Stanford University computer professional, alleges in a court suit that the Secretary of Defense is operating a "Launch On Warning Capability" which takes the power to declare war away from Congress and the President. Dr. Johnson says that computers can launch on warning under the current plan. This is so because after sensors register the flight of missiles, we become wholly dependent upon a 'Computer-in-Chief' to recognize the statistical pattern and estimate the probability of attack, quickly enough to advise and execute a responsive launch of Minuteman and MX missiles prior to a predefined "use them or lose them" deadline. He is being assisted in the appeal of his suit by the Bay Area Lawyers Alliance for Nuclear Arms Control and the Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility.

ACCIDENTS AND MISTAKES

Each nation could do much to help arouse world public support for arms reduction agreements if they reported some of their serious accidents, false alarms and miscalculations.

- Young computer hackers in West Germany broke into the U.S National Aeronautics and Space Administration computer network last summer and gathered secret information on space shuttles and rocket failures. It was reported the youths had the ability to paralyze the entire network.
- The U.S. Air Force hurriedly parked an armored car atop a Minuteman III silo in Wyoming after the nuclear missile inside gave off false signals suggesting it was about to launch. "The theory, according to the spokesman, is that the cover is blown aside so rapidly that a vehicle parked atop it with brakes off will be left hanging in thin air and then drop straight down, in hopes of keeping the launching missile from going anywhere." This recently reported event occurred four years ago. (*San Jose Mercury News*, Oct. 29, 1987)
- Two separate Minuteman III tests at Vandenberg Air Force Base on 6-25-87 and 7-12-87 each went awry and were destroyed in flight, raining burning debris over the South Pacific.
- An unarmed Minuteman II missile was destroyed because of technical problems seconds after lift-off from Vandenberg Air Force Base on 11-9-87 spraying fiery debris across the sky.
- Poland apologized in June 1987 for the accidental shelling of a West German ship during maneuvers in the Baltic Sea.
- A $4 million fuel tank on the last U.S. Atlas-Centaur rocket was damaged in a July 1987 accident that will delay launching of the rocket for up to a year. Four men were injured.

STOCK MARKET CRASH

The U.S. stock market crash of Oct. 19, 1987 dramatically illustrates how computerized early warning systems feeding on their own alerts can trigger a disaster. One investment banker said, "Whether the 'launch on warning' programs were responsible for the market collapse is debatable, but there is no question they exacerbated it." (*Newsweek*, November 2, 1987) In a similar manner, could the computerized early warning systems of nations such as the U.S., Soviet Union, Britain, France, or China when triggered by a sudden crisis, interact with each other's warning systems stepping up alert levels until some nation mistakenly launches nuclear missiles?

NEWSLETTER SPONSORSHIP

Once a year, in this Winter issue, we suggest you join or renew your membership in **The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation**. Your tax deductible contribution will help pay the cost of the Newsletter and permit you to receive other Foundation publications. Please return to:

The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108.

Contributing Member $35_____ Supporting Member $100 _____ Other $ _____

NAME _____ ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE/PROV. _____ ZIP _____

COUNTRY _____

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

(18) John Lenz, BRS Vice-President, has been awarded a Fulbright grant in order to spend the academic year 1988-89 in Greece. He will be at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, writing his dissertation. He has also been invited to be a supervisor on an American excavation in eastern Crete. We offer congratulations.

(19) Herb Vogt and Bette went to a recent meeting of the Springfield College Alumni Association, and noticed this quotation attributed to BR in the local paper, *San Antonio Light*, of April 11th:

> Even in civilized mankind, faint traces of monogamous instinct can be perceived.

Do you think BR could have said that? We do.

Herb also enrolled his son, Lee Arno Vogt, in the BRS, which gives us our first second-generation member.

(20)

ANNUAL MEETING (1988)
(continued)

Theme of the Meeting: HAPPINESS AND THE IMPORTANT THINGS IN LIFE

Program: Friday, June 17	4-6pm	Registration
	6-7:30	Dinner
	7:30-8:30	Welcome, Presentation of 1988 BRS Book Award, and Movie
	8:30-9	Tea and Coffee
	9:00 on	Board of Directors Meeting. (All members welcome.)
Saturday, June 18	7:30-8:45	Breakfast
	9:00-10:15	Paper: Kenneth Blackwell, McMaster University, "Russell's Theory of Happiness"
	10:15-10:30	Tea and Coffee
	10:30-11:45	General Meeting (BRS Members' Business Meeting)
	12:00-1:00	Lunch
	1:00-3:00	Panel: What is Happiness?"
	3:00-6:00	Movie, Tours or Free time
	6:00-7:00	Red Hackle Hour
	7:00	Banquet
	8:00	Presentation of 1988 BRS Award to Paul Kurtz, of SUNY at Buffalo: "The Meaning of Life"
Sunday, June 19	8:00-9:15	Breakfast
	9:30	Paper: Robert James, President, AHA of NJ: "Out of the Night -- Russell's Struggle Against the Weight of of Rudimentary Grief"
	10:30	Paper: Lee Nisbet, Medaille College: "Russell's Theory of Happiness: A Pragmatic Critique"
	11.45	Snack and Farewell

***

The "What is Happiness?" Panel. The literature concerning happiness is long and complex. Several authors have asked what happiness is, some tried to teach us how to achieve it. Aristotle and Bentham are in the first category, Epictetus and Russell seem to be primarily in the second. This panel will focus on what is (or ought to be) referred to by the word "happiness" and the extent to which one can profitably talk about the necessary conditions of a happy life. After the presentation, there will be time for feedback and questions from the audience. Panelists include Raymond Belliotti, Kenneth Blackwell, Robert Davis, Randall Dipert, and Marvin Kohl (Chair).

***

Fredonia: A Geo Brief. The State University of New York (SUNY) College at Fredonia is located within the village of Fredonia, in the heart of northern Chatauqua County, at Exit 59 of the New York Throughway, halfway between Buffalo, NY and Erie, PA. This largely residential village, with its beautiful tree-lined avenues, has a deeply-rooted history. The neighboring city of Dunkirk is located on the shores of Lake Erie.

The SUNY Campus is about 50 miles from the Buffalo Airport. There is no regular Airport-to-Fredonia bus. Rental cars are available. Try to arrive for a BRS-arranged 3:30pm van, Airport to Fredonia, fare $10. If not possible, phone Marvin (716-673-3495) for alternative arrangements.

***

Registration/Reservation Form, for Campus Housing and Meals.

. double room, 2 nights, cost per person, $25
. single room, 2 nights, $40
. meals (five, including Banquet) $55
. Banquet (Chinese) $18

Circle the amount enclosed

Single room and meals, $40 + $55 = $95..... $95
Double room and meals (2 persons), $50 + $110 = 160..... $160
Banquet only, $18..... $18

Name of person sharing room_____
Your name_____
Your address_____
Your phone: home (- -) work (- -)

Please make checks out to Faculty Student Association (FSA). Send checks to, or request more information from, Marvin Kohl, Philosophy, SUNY, Fredonia, NY 14063. 716-673-3495

NO RELIGION

(21) How to stay sober without God, from *Free Inquiry* (Spring 1987, Vol. 7, No. 2):

Since its inception in 1935, Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) has helped legions of individuals recover from alcoholism. But there are between ten and fifteen million alcoholics in the United States, according to its own statistics, who don't attend AA meetings. No doubt many of these are skeptics, agnostics, secular humanists, deists, pantheists, atheists, and freethinkers who cannot in honest conscience accept AA's concept of an intervening God or "Higher Power" in their lives.

To be sure, AA does claim to welcome for membership anyone with a desire to stop drinking, but its *Big Book* puts an insurmountable philosophical obstacle in the way of many. "The alcoholic," it reads, "at certain times has no effective mental defense against the first drink. Except in a few rare cases, neither he nor any other human being can provide such a defense. His defense must come from a Higher Power." In addition, AA's understanding of alcoholism itself is damagingly out of date. Clinical studies have established that there is no such thing as an "alcoholic personality." Alcohol is "selectively addictive"—nonalcoholics don't have a patent on willpower, they simply do not become physiologically addicted to the drug. Yet AA's *Big Book* reflects none of these new scientific findings and continues to depict alcoholics as childish personalities and emotional cripples. By pinning the blame on the alcoholic's flimsy spiritual spine, AA tends to increase his or her feelings of guilt and shame.

Newly sober alcoholics, who are hanging onto their fragile lives as tightly as they can, may be ready to consider *any* philosophy or religion, no matter how debasing, incorrect, or personally unsavory it is. I call this the "grateful syndrome." For instance, I came to my position of unbelief gradually, as a sober alcoholic. But I was too timid—indeed, too terrified—to challenge the group, lest I lose my precious sobriety.

Today AA officially recognizes agnostics and atheists—after many years of passionate campaigning by its nonreligious membership—in controversial meetings called "We Agnostics." Although the Lord's Prayer has been deleted, these liberal gatherings are, in reality, good old AA meetings, loaded with religion, superstition, and mysticism.

So where can secular alcoholics go for group support without sacrificing their integrity and conviction?

In Los Angeles, in November 1986, I convened a Secular Sobriety Group. We rely on rational intelligence and human emotions and have shown by the success we've had so far that one need not be mystical to be merry, or go from grog to God in order to refuse a drink.

We've been meeting in a local Parks and Recreation facility every Monday evening at eight o'clock. Our gatherings there are informal; to provide a relaxed atmosphere, they're lit by candles. We have neither dues nor fees and ask only for small donations to help defray the costs of room rental, coffee and light snacks, printing, and mailing.

The Secular Sobriety Group (SSG) has been publicized in a number of area newspapers and on local radio stations—at no charge because of our nonprofit, grass-roots status. The response has been most gratifying: We have been receiving an average of two telephone calls a day. The callers range from recovering alcoholics (and their family members) to humanist therapists inquiring on behalf of alcoholic clients, all in search of an alternative approach to AA and other religious alcohol-and-drug-addiction support groups.

Alcoholics attending our group meetings cover a broad spectrum, from the newly sober to those of us who have been sober for many years. Members include carpenters, social workers, actors, office clerks, athletes, nurses, and schoolteachers. We are keeping the structure of our meetings loose and dogma-free. We simply stress the life-and-death necessity of alcoholics' staying sober, and we encourage one another to cultivate an internal freedom from alcohol and other mind-altering drugs—no matter what happens in our lives that might contribute to a relapse.

Some of our members prefer anonymity; others offer their full names, telephone numbers, and even business cards.

Although we welcome *all* alcoholics to our meetings, our approach is especially attractive to the nonreligious.

Lives are being saved, extended, made fruitful. There are no gods or goblins at our meetings. No belief in a "Higher Power" or adherence to any party line is required for sobriety. Our bond is a human one, natural but not supernatural, and so is our health and success. We value free thought over mind-control and over mindlessness. Yet most of all we celebrate and support all alcoholics in achieving and maintaining sobriety, regardless of their belief or nonbelief.

As a sober alcoholic since April 24, 1978, this is all quite exciting to me.

SSG
P.O. Box 15781
North Hollywood, CA 91615-5781

Or you may call SSG at 818-980-8851.

NON-RELIGIOUS SUPPORT GROUPS
FOR RECOVERING ALCOHOLICS, ADDICTS, FAMILIES

Secular Sobriety Groups

SSG

ANONYMOUS MEETINGS
NO DUES OR FEES

(818) 980-8851
(213) 662-8976

SOS P.S. They have just changed their name to Secular Organizations for Sobriety, SOS for short. **SOS** "better expressed the urgency of our movement, and is easier to remember."SOS's new National Newsletter comes from CODESH, Box 5, Buffalo, NY 14215-0005. The above was written by James Christopher, SSG/SOS Founder.

---

(22) DIRECTORS OF THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.
elected for 3-year terms, as shown

1986-88: LOU ACHESON, KEN BLACKWELL, JOHN JACKANICZZ, DAVID JOHNSON, JUSTIN LEIBER, GLADYS LEITHAUSER, STEVE REINHARDT, CARL SPADONI TOM STANLEY

1987-89: JACK COWLES, WILLIAM FIELDING, DAVID GOLDMAN, STEVE MARAGIDES, FRANK PAGE, MICHAEL ROCKLER, CHERIE RUPPE, PAUL SCHILPP, WARREN SMITH, RAMON SUZARA

1988-90: IRVING ANELLIS, BOB DAVIS, JIM MCWILLIAMS, HUGH MOORHEAD, KATE TAIT.

The 6 BRS officers are also directors, ex officio

NEW MEMBERS

(23) We welcome these new members:

MS. AURORA ALMEIDA /88/ 80 DEERPARK CRESCENT BRAMPTON, ONT. CANADA L6X 2T7
MRS.DEIRDRE M. BRETON /88/ 75 TOYNBEE TRAIL WEST HILL, ONT. CANADA M1E 1G1
MS. SUSAN ENDRESHAK /88/ 2268 W. COLUMBIA (APT. 4) DAVENPORT, IA 52806
MR. ABE GOLDBLATT /88/ 33221 STANFORD ST. HYATTSVILLE, MD 20783
MS. CLARE HALLORAN /88/ 71-21 69TH ST. GLENDALE, NY 11385
MR. TIMOTHY JOHN HARRIS /88/ 12707 N E 116TH. APT. 304 KIRKLAND, WA 98034
MR. REUBEN HELLER /88/ 1261 LOMA VISTA DRIVE BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90210
MR. J. N POYSER /88/ 58 CHARLES AV. POINTE-CLAIRE,QUE. CANADA H9R 4K8
MR. ALAN J. TULLIO /88/ 40-11 216TH STREET BAYSIDE, NY 11361-2321
MR. LEE ARNO VOGT /88/ 2491 ELLSWORTH BERKELEY, CA 94704
MR. BILL WILSON /88/ 520 W. 3RD ST. CHENEY, WA 99004

NEW ADDRESSES

(24)
MR. WALT H. COKER /84/ 17825 N. 7TH ST. #134 PHOENIX, AZ 85022-1115
DR. STEPHEN HAMBY PH.D./76/ 2618 ARBUCKLE ST. HOUSTON, TX 77005 3930
MR. ANDRES KAARIK /81/ VIDARGATAN 6 STOCKHOLM SWEDEN S-113 27
MR. BENITO REY /87/ 80 DEERPARK CRESCENT BRAMPTON, ONT. CANADA L6X 2T7
MR. MARK SALVATORE /87/ 1299 CALIFORNIA ST. #18 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109-5058
MR. ED TANGUAY /87/ 9 ROCKDALE COURT CONWAY, AR 72032
MR. WALTER WINFIELD, JR. /87/ PO BOX 8726 SILVER SPRING, MD 20907

MATHEMATICS

(25) "The Dangers of Abstraction" by Joel E. Cohen, in the *Wall Street Journal*, 4/19/87, p. 29, with thanks to DON JACKANICZ:

Mathematics is a Dr. Jekyll and a Mr. Hyde. Computers, the visible instruments of mathematics, are all around us. Yet stories of the remoteness of mathematics and of mathematicians are legion. For example, C.N. Yang, a Nobel laureate in physics, once explained the difference between a physics book and a mathematics book. A physics book is one you can't read after the first page. A mathematics book is one you can't read after the first sentence.

Not all mathematicians think their subject is so remote. In 1983, in their first book, "The Mathematical Experience," Philip J. Davis and Reuben Hersh humanized mathematics as an activity of passionate, fallible men and women. The book told what it feels like to do and love mathematics. It won the 1983 American Book Award in Science. Properly understood, mathematics, the fearsome Mr. Hyde, became a lovable uncle.

In a new book, "Descartes' Dream: The World According to Mathematics" (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 321 pages, $19.95), Messrs. Davis, professor of applied mathematics at Brown University, and Hersh, professor of mathematics at the University of New Mexico, report on the practical Dr. Jekyll: the mathematics of business and industry, medicine and law, government and war.

In business, for example, mathematics helps design the bodies of autos and aircraft to reduce air turbulence, helps schedule manufacturing, analyzes the failures of parts, suggests how to inventory spares, optimizes distribution to points of sale, helps set finance charges for credit sales and so on. Mathematics continues to contribute to the growth of national productivity in almost every sphere of life in technologically advanced countries.

Descartes and Leibniz dreamed in the 17th century that all human actions could be guided by mathematical reasoning. They would be amazed to see how much of their dream is true today.

Unlike Descartes and Leibniz, but like many humanists of the past and present, Messrs. Davis and Hersh fear that mathematics has penetrated our lives too far. Their fear derives from the secret of mathematics' success, abstraction.

Mathematics replaces complex processes or situations with symbols and simplified rules for manipulating those symbols. The symbols and the rules ignore everything about the real world except what is essential to the mathematician's or scientist's purpose. Scientists use mathematical abstractions to figure out the consequences of their assumptions. They can also test their assumptions by comparing mathematically derived consequences with observable reality. The symbolic abstractions that replaced falling bodies, planets, chemicals and chromosomes have given people astounding power.

When the purpose of the abstraction is to deal with people, however, there are potential dangers. "The final intent of the application of mathematics to people," the authors write, "is to be able to compare two individuals or groups of individuals; to be able to arrive at a precise and definitive opinion as to which is taller, smarter, richer, healthier, happier, more prolific, which is entitled to more goods and more prestige, and ultimately, when this weapon of thought is pushed to its logical limits and cruelly turned around, which is the most useless and hence the most disposable . . . Whenever we use computerization to proceed from formulas and algorithms to policy and to actions affecting humans, we stand open to good and to evil on a massive scale."

Messrs. Davis and Hersh suggest that "advanced mathematization, through abstraction and subsequent loss of meaning, played a role" in the Holocaust. "It is no accident that the great evils of the period 1933-1945 were perpetrated in a country that was the world leader in theoretical science and mathematics . . . Numbers tattooed on the arms of the victims, reduced them to the level of branded cattle." Beneath the bedside manner of the mathematical Dr. Jekyll lurks a Faust.

This mathematical self-flagellation is absurd. Replacing individuals and groups by abstractions is an older and deeper part of human experience than mathematics: The Chosen People fight the Amalekites. Armies distinguish enemies and allies, privates and generals. The law recognizes classes of creditors, stockholders and debtors. Hospitals, universities, corporations and unions all deal with people abstractly.

The problem lies not in using mathematics to approximate features of people, as the authors suggest, but in using the inadequate mathematics of falling bodies, planets, chemicals and chromosomes to approximate people poorly. Here I betray my optimism and sympathy for Descartes's dream.

The computer, drudge extraordinaire, is as happy storing 10 million numbers to characterize Johnny Jones, second grader, as it is storing only his IQ. The challenge is to choose the numbers wisely and to comprehend them. Once the human population outgrew the face-to-face group of a few dozen individuals, there was no escaping the masks we put over others' faces. With better mathematics and better instruments of mathematics, we can try to give those masks human features.

This is Mathematics Awareness Week. The new book by Messrs. Davis and Hersh could be just your number — or if it's half wrong, it's at least half right, and that's better than most books on the subject.

Mr. Cohen is professor of populations at Rockefeller University.

(26) GOVERMENT/POLITICS

NECLC puts a spotlight on the Reagan Administration's lax enforcment, or non-enforcment, of laws in situations that might reveal illegal actions by government agents or work against Administration goals, such as the defeat of the Sandinistas. This ad appeared in the Sunday New York Times (3/20/88, p. E7), shown here reduced in size. ------>

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

Dear Mr. President:

The Reports of the Tower Commission and of the Special Committees to investigate the Iran-Contra debacle have left open important questions for the American people. As President, you have the constitutional power to secure the answers to these questions:

1. Did the Department of Justice obstruct the Miami Assistant U.S. Attorney's investigation of military operations by the Contras against the government of Nicaragua with whom we had a treaty of peace?

2. Did your Administration support and fail to prosecute violations of the Voorhis Act, 18 U.S.C. 2386, which requires registration of organizations subject to foreign control and engaging in political and military activity in the case against Nicaragua?

3. Should the Contras have registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act?

4. Did the Contras engage in drug sales and if so, were United States government agencies including the National Security Council and the C.I.A. aware of such activities and did they assist in or conceal such drug traffic?

5. Did the indisputable removal and theft of documents in the files of the National Security Council and the destruction of others as described in the Iran-Contra report, violate our laws intended to preserve such documents in the U.S. government files, 18 U.S.C. 641, 654, 2071 and 3042?

6. Did such removal, theft and destruction constitute an obstruction of justice under 18 U.S.C. 1505 since they occurred during an on-going investigation conducted personally by the Attorney General?

NATIONAL EMERGENCY CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMITTEE

Corliss Lamont, *Chairman*
Edith Tiger, *Director*
Leonard B. Boudin, *General Counsel*

175 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 11710
(212) 673-2040

THE F.B.I. INVADES U.S. LIBRARIES

LIBRARIANS UPSET BY ATTEMPTED SURVEILLANCE

Americans concerned with Civil Liberties and especially with academic freedom should be alarmed at a campaign recently undertaken by the Federal Bureau of Investigation known as The Library Awareness Program. This Program is part of a national counter-intelligence effort and aims to persuade librarians at public and university libraries throughout the United States to help the F.B.I. in tracking down foreign spies or other intelligence agents who may be using the libraries. It is clearly an effort to turn librarians into Government informers.

Columbia University, the New York Public Library and the New York Library Association became incensed at the F.B.I.'s new policy and termed it "an intrusion on the privacy and academic freedom of library users." One method of surveillance advocated by the F.B.I. is for a librarian to hand over the names of foreign students or other foreigners, together with the titles of books borrowed by them. Apparently anyone reading Karl Marx or other radical writers would then be in for a lot of trouble.

In an authoritative article on Sept. 18, 1987, The New York Times reported: "F.B.I. agents have asked librarians in New York City to watch for and report on library users who might be diplomats of hostile powers recruiting intelligence agents or gathering information politically harmful to United States security. The initiative has upset library officials."

The Columbia Library, when approached by two F.B.I agents in June, 1987, refused to cooperate in any way with the Library Awareness Program. Later, on October 1, the Intellectual Freedom Committee of the American Library Association issued an advisory statement attacking the F.B.I. and alerting librarians to the "unwarranted government intrusions upon personal privacy" that threaten "the First Amendment right to receive information." The Committee called the F.B.I. snooping an "unconscionable and unconstitutional invasion of the right of privacy of library patrons." It stated that "libraries are not extensions of the 'long arm of the law' or of the game of Big Brother."

We defenders of civil liberties denounce the F.B.I. Library Awareness Program as an outrageous and cynical violation of the Bill of Rights.

Write your Senators and Representative, and Director William S. Sessions of the F.B.I. These unconstitutional activities should be stopped.

Corliss Lamont, *Chairman*
Edith Tiger, *Director*

National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010

NECLC fights the good fight against Reagan's FBI, in this ad in the <-------- New York Times (1/17/88) shown here reduced in size, with thanks to BOB DAVIS.

DORA

(27) *Dora Who? A Tribute To Humanism's Other Russell*, by BEVERLEY M. EARLES, from The Humanist (Nov/Dec 1987):

Most of us know that history books are a department of politics and prejudice. Some of us agree with Bertrand Russell that objectivity is indeed a delusion, a delusion shared by lunatics. Certainly, humanists understand only too well what it is to have the humanist tradition omitted from historical records and public consciousness. It all has to do with the attempt to bend the facts of history to the beliefs and values of the guardians of civilization. If humanists are lucky, they make it as far as the footnotes or else something we don't recognize as humanism is publicized by a raving religious right. Many a respected encyclopedia continues to suggest that *true* humanism was stone cold dead by the year 1800. Well, if the funeral for humanism was held in the year 1800, then each self-proclaimed humanist since that date is a resurrected fossil.

But, as the saying goes, people who live in glass houses really ought to draw the curtains. We humanists, if nobody else, *have* written up our own history, including that since 1800, and any objective lunatic can see that our history of ourselves presents humanism mostly as a history of ideas. The life has been sucked out of it and there is barely a woman discussed in any depth.

Dora Russell lived a tireless, passionately defiant humanistic life from her first college days through her death in 1986 at the age of ninety-two. Recently, no less than four television documentaries were made about her as one of the great women of our century. Obituaries appeared in the *New York Times* and London *Times*. However, Englishwoman though she was, you won't find her discussed in even the British books on humanism and freethought. I discovered, and Nicholas Walter, the managing director of the Rationalist Press Association, agrees, that Dora Russell's "free thought activity was almost universally ignored." The Rationalist Press Association, incidentally, was the notable exception in all this.

The question is *why*? Why was she passed over? I suggest the following as principal reasons. First, Dora Russell did not have personal recognition high on her list of priorities. Second, humanists have not always had a strong conception of women as authorities. Third, humanism has had a tendency to concentrate on the contribution of scholarly ideas rather than deeds. And fourth, we have not looked past the giant personage of Bertrand Russell, to whom Dora was married for twelve years.

Of all four points, it is the last that I wish to stress and that is relevant to an anecdote told about freethinkers Sidney and Beatrice Webb, founders of the socialist Fabian Society in Britain and the London School of Economics. The story has it that as a couple they *always* agreed on fundamental public matters and that, not surprisingly, such total harmony intrigued people. One day, Beatrice Webb was asked to account for it. She explained that she and Sidney had agreed early in their married life always to vote alike on great issues. One partner decided which way they voted and the other partner decided which were the great issues.

No doubt this is one means of arriving at the two-in-one ideal of marital bliss, and I suspect that a similar arrangement exists in the White House. But it is a means which I do not think most humanists would find acceptable because it offends our very precious sense of individuality. This being so, then, why do we not take more care when we look at the lives of others? Being married to Bertrand Russell posed a problem for Dora's affirmation of self, but she dealt with it by refusing to live in Bertie's shadow. With the notable exception of recent feminist writing and the media attention referred to earlier, however, that shadow has tended to cling. People say to me, "Well, being in the family of any celebrity always poses problems of self-identity." I agree with them but point out that sometimes we just don't bother to look *further* than the famous person in question. Even when it is all laid out for us to see, we don't always see it. John Stuart Mill openly credited much of the theory in *The Subjection of Women* to his partner, Harriet Taylor, and yet history and posterity continue to credit it *entirely* to Mill. I recently purchased a 1986 edition of *The Subjection of Women* from humanist publisher Prometheus Books. It does not mention Harriet Taylor as a collaborator, although other influences on Mill, such as Coleridge, Comte, and Wordsworth, *are* given due recognition. The copy on the cover of the book *does* say that here *John* Stuart Mill "strikes a powerful blow for women's rights."

Being Dora Russell meant having a publisher insist against her own wishes that her books be published under the name *Mrs. Bertrand Russell* and to find, even to this day, that her own books are occasionally catalogued under the name Bertrand Russell. It meant having the pioneering humanist school which she worked at tirelessly for sixteen years swiftly dismissed as a failure by critics who, almost without exception, focus upon the first five years of the school's existence. These were the years when Bertie was there and who, upon leaving, declared the whole business a failure.

Despite being a loyal member of the Bertrand Russell fan club, I do not think that Bertrand Russell has the last word on Beacon Hill School. And it is worth remembering in this connection that he used to criticize philosophers who thought they could know facts simply by sitting still and thinking. Aristotle, he said, could have avoided the error of thinking women have fewer teeth than men by simply asking Mrs. Aristotle to keep her mouth open while he counted. Aristotle didn't do this, though, because he assumed he already knew. It is noteworthy that commentators on Beacon Hill School think they know all that is worth knowing or at least worth mentioning about it by behaving just like Aristotle. By today's standards, that is just plain ignorant.

Dora Russell stood in that fine humanist tradition of courage—courage to stand up for her convictions in spite of the herd and often in defiance of other opponents of the status quo. She was highly provocative. She infuriated men with her discussions of patriarchy; she infuriated feminists by arguing that there are a number of decisive differences between men and women that are to be embraced, not denied in misguided neuter thinking. She infuriated the guardians of the status quo on just about everything—advocacy of free love, birth control, and abortion, running an atheistic humanist school that did not teach the greatness of the British empire. She was part of that enthusiastic band of intellectuals that incensed conservatives by praising the 1917 Soviet revolution, but she equally antagonized the left by unfashionably criticizing sexist practices of the revolutionaries.

She was a member of the committee out of which the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament sprang and, in 1958, she organized a women's caravan of peace. This caravan toured Europe by truck and coach on a mission of goodwill to break down the barriers of the Cold War. Peace groups were antagonized because the caravan went through the Eastern bloc and ended with a splendid rally in the wicked Soviet Union. Prominent Western peace groups weren't going to have anything to do with that nonsense! So, deprived of the goodwill and financial assistance they had hoped for, the band of women set off on what turned out to be a very successful mission. They were enthusiastically received by dignitaries and women's groups throughout Europe, although they were arrested in Switzerland for taking part in an antinuclear demonstration. They were released on the condition that they not make speeches. "Switzerland was a peaceful country, [the authorities] said, not in need of people talking about peace," remembers Russell.

The difference between Dora's peace mission and so many others was that she and the other women thought that it should involve dialogue with peace groups on the "other side," with the so-called enemy. Such a dialogue was so successful in generating goodwill that, in fact, no one believed Dora's story when she returned to England. Fortunately for us, Dora's is the approach that now prevails, but, in 1958, critics thought that Dora and her band of women were either subversive or just plain crazy.

Philosophically, the central thrust of Dora Russell's ideas was based upon a critique of Cartesian thought. It is not widely known that Descartes, the revered father of modern philosophy, spent much of his time sleeping and avoiding women. For Descartes, the higher things of life—that is, mathematics and philosophy—could not coexist with a feminine presence. Mind and body were incompatibles. In Russell's opinion, this patriarchal mind-body dualism of Descartes continues to have an enormous influence over our values and is both dehumanizing and life-denying in its effects on women and men alike. Insofar as the intellect and its work have been valued beyond that of the body and emotions, which has been the allotted domain of women, so each of the sexes has been alienated from an essential aspect of being human—the men from the nonrational aspect and the women from the rational. In the cause of liberation, then, Russell sought an integration of *values* that would free both sexes. She advocated more involvement for men in the nurturing process as one means of reducing this disproportionate degree of rationalism in the male mode of living. She sought to liberate women in such a way that they would have to forego *neither* motherhood nor career. The work of childcare is as important as the work of a physicist; proper nursery schools are a *community* responsibility, she said.

It is essential to realize that she said all this and acted upon it as early as the 1920s; if she had waited until such ideas could have become fashionable in feminism, she would not have expounded them until the late 1970s. She was fifty years ahead of her time, and one now hears Betty Friedan, Erica Jong, and others echoing her views. Dora felt very intensely that mothers and children have been the most continuously oppressed human beings in the history of civilization. She helped formulate a slogan for the birth control campaign of the twenties which read, "It is four times as dangerous to bear a child as to work in a mine, and mining is man's most dangerous trade." She wanted above all to ensure a future for the generations of humanity born since the advent of the bomb, so she founded a Permanent International Committee of Mothers to work for this end.

From the very beginning, Dora wrote on highly controversial subjects, such as modern marriage, immortality, rationalism, and feminism—"things about which the English don't wish to hear," she said. She was a founding member of the League of Progressive Societies and Individuals, which included Julian Huxley, H. G. Wells, and Rebecca West among its members. The league very often met at Dora's school. No one else would have them because of their "outrageous" views and behavior—some of them were nudists. Dora continued her heavy involvement during this period with the Independent Labor party and the World League for Sex Reform. She was a founding member of the National Council for Civil Liberties in 1934 and of the Abortion Law Association. In 1954, Dora was asked to represent the Women's International Democratic Federation at the United Nations. At the time, the federation had 140 million members and had recently lost its nongovernmental organization status with the United Nations. When Russell came to New York to fight for reinstatement, she was issued one of the most restricted visas imaginable. She was considered a dangerous and subversive representative of communist front organizations and was not allowed outside of a two-square-mile area of Manhattan. This kind of treatment was not unfamiliar to her, however. Way back in the latter part of World War I, she and Bertie had been prevented from relaxing on the beach, as was their custom, because it was feared that while playing in the sand they would send signals to enemy ships.

If one wanted to know how much one can cram into fulltime humanist living, one should read the three volumes of Dora Russell's autobiography, *The Tamarisk Tree*. The second volume includes a discussion of the kinds of things that went on at the Russells' humanist school. It also contains a sample of the plays which the children wrote, produced, and performed. The third volume contains so much detail about the war years and after that one critic wrote, "The future historians of Britain, if he (or she) is to reveal the real life of our people, must go to Dora Russell's autobiography to learn the facts." Dora's papers will be going either to the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam or the Cambridge University Library.

Dora Russell has a deserved claim to fame which she never sought herself—a claim *not* as Bertrand Russell's bohemian partner in his second marriage but as an individual in her own right. Along with famous and not-so-famous humanists, she embodies many of our ideals and must be safeguarded for present and future generations. And if some of her ideas give you humanistic indigestion, an effect which she seems to have on most people at some point, it is worth remembering two statements made by one of the great freethinkers of all time, Robert Ingersoll. They are a reminder that we humanists, too, believe it or not, create our own sacred cows and spout our very own sanctimonious claptrap. Ingersoll said, "Heresy is a cradle. Orthodoxy is a coffin. . . . Heresy extends the hospitality of the brain to a new thought."

Dora's heresy is that she challenges some of those dearly held principles which groups of humanists assume. She does not always make extensive arguments for them so much as she makes a series of pronouncements. This greatly irritates philosophical critics who conveniently forget that Bertie employed similar methods to great advantage.

It is essential for us to recognize the continuing relevance of what Dora has to say, and it certainly cannot be overemphasized that, if Bertrand Russell is the only Russell you have read, then your treasury of humanist knowledge is not as rich as you might think. ▣

Dora Black Russell received the BRS Award in 1984, "for sharing Russell's concerns, collaborating in his work, and helping to perpetuate his legacy." She was the prime mover behind -- and financial guarantor of -- the memorial bust of Russell unveiled in London's Red Lion Park in 1980.

Thank you, TOM STANLEY.

CONTRIBUTORS

(28) We thank JUSTIN LEIBER and STEVE DAHLBY for their recent contributions to the BRS Treasury. Much appreciated.

ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

(29) Nominations for Directors, please. We wish to elect 9 Directors this year, for 3-year terms starting 1/1/89. This will give us a total of 24 elected Directors. The August newsletter will provide a ballot for voting.

* We are asking you to nominate candidates (whose names will appear on the August ballot.) Any member may nominate any other member to be a Director-Candidate.

If you wish to be a Candidate yourself, notify the Elections Committee and someone will probably nominate you. The duties of a Director are not burdensome. Directors are occasionally asked their opinion about something or other by mail, and they are expected to make a reasonable effort to attend annual meetings, though not at great expense. The cost of attending meetings is (federal) tax-deductible for Directors.

We would like to have more than 9 names on the ballot,so as to give members a choice.

A brief statement about the candidate should accompany a nomination. If you are volunteering, include a brief statement about yourself.

Directors whose terms expire in 1988 are LOU ACHESON, KEN BLACKWELL, JOHN JACKANICZ, DAVID JOHNSON, JUSTIN LEIBER, GLADYS LEITHEISER, STEVE REINHARDT, CARL SPADONI, TOM STANLEY. They are eligible for re-election.

* We urge last year's candidates who were not elected to try again this year.

TO NOMINATE SOMEONE -- or to volunteer yourself -- write the Election Committee,c/o the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.

VOLUNTEERS WANTED

(30) BRS Treasurer sought. If you would like to consider becoming BRS Treasurer, Dennis Darland, who has been Treasurer for the past 9 years, will brief you on how he keeps the Society's books, and will lend you his
* Apple II+ on which to do it.

If you'd like to explore the possibility, write Dennis, c/o the newsletter, address on Page 1. botom. Or phone 319-359-3930.

* Newsletter Editor sought. We are looking for the next Editor of Russell Society News. If you like to write, and might wish to consider becoming Editor, let Lee Eisler hear from you (c/o the newsletter), to find out what the requirements are. Perhaps you will want to give it a try.

Live dangerously! Find out more! Let's hear from you.

INVITATIONS TO WRITE/MEET

(31) Tad Jones, a new member, is majoring in Bible and Religion at Harding Univerfsity, Searcy, AR. He writes:

* After a long period of intellectual and emotional struggle, Russell's *Why I Am Not A Christian* helped me to arrive at the decision to sever the yoke of Christianity. As a recent apostate at a Christian university, I am beset by well-intentioned defenders of the faith, and have no one to challenge and encourage me in my pursuit of truth. Truth alone is incentive enough to persist in my present direction, but correspondence with other lovers of wisdom would be greatly appreciated.

His address: 109 S. Oak, Apt. B, Searcy, AR 72143.

(32) Benito Rey is a Cuban who was on his way to the USSR, on behalf of the Cuban Government, when he jumped the plane in Gander and got political asylum in Canada. He asked to join the BRS, promising to pay dues when he
* got his work-permit and earned some money. We took a gamble that he would, and he did. He paid his dues with his first salary check, and also enrolled his wife, Aurora Almeida.

He is an electrical engineer. His work has been in digital and microprocessor equipment design for television (character generator, sub-titler system, etc.) His wife is an orthodontist.

Both wish to begin a new life in Canada, and would like to meet members. Their current address: 80 Deerpark Crescent, Brampton, Ont., Canada L6X 2T7. Phone: (work) 416-890-5200, (home) 416-450-8901.

---

(33)

RUSSELL SOCIETY LIBRARY
Tom Stanley, Librarian
Box 434, Wilder, VT 05088

Books to lend:

When no author is indicated, the work is by Bertrand Russell. The doner's name appears at the end.

1. History of Western Philosophy. Jack Ragsdale.
2. Mysticism and Logic.
3. Bertrand Russell's Best. Ramon Suzara.
4. An Outline of Philosophy. Ramon Suzara.
5. Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, Vol.1. Ramon Suzara.
6. Let Me Die Before I wake. by Derek Humphery.
7. Essay on Bertrand Russell. edited by E. D. Klemke. Bob Davis.
8. Morals Without Mystery. by Lee Eisler. Author.
9. Authority and The Individual. Don Jackanicz.
10. Autobiography of Bertrand Russell (in 1 Vol.). Don Jackanicz.
11. Bertrand Russell 1872-1970. Don Jackanicz.
12. Bertrand Russell - A Life. by Herbert Gottschalk. Don Jackanicz.
13. Education and the Social Order. Don Jackanicz.
14. Effects and Dangers of Nuclear War. Don Jackanicz.
15. Essays on Socialist Humanism. Don Jackanicz.
16. German Social Democracy. Don Jackanicz.
17. Icarus or The Future of Science. Don Jackanicz.
18. The Impact of Science on Society. Don Jackanicz.
19. An Inquiry into the Meaning of Truth. Don Jackanicz.
20. In Praise of Idleness. Don Jackanicz.
21. Has Man a Future. Don Jackanicz.
22. Justice in Wartime. Don Jackanicz.
23. National Frontiers and International Cooperation. by Zhores Medvedev. Don Jackanicz.
24. My Philosophical Development. Don Jackanicz.
25. Political Ideals. Don Jackanicz.
26. Principles of Social Reconstruction. Don Jackanicz.
27. The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism. Don Jackanicz.
28. Roads of Freedom. Don Jackanicz.
29. Sceptical Essays. Don Jackanicz.
30. Secrecy of Correspondence Is Guaranteed By Law. by Zhores Medvedev. Don Jackanicz.
31. The Tamarish Tree. by D. Russell. Don Jackanicz.
32. Mr. Wilson Speaks "frankly..." Don Jackanicz.
33. Marriage and Morals. Don Jackanicz.
34. Dear Bertrand Russell. Jack Ragsdale.
35. Education and The Good Life. Jack Ragsdale and Lee Eisler.
36. Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits. Jack Ragsdale.
37. Why I Am Not A Christian. Jack Ragsdale.
38. The Evolution of Conscience. Ralph Newman. Jack Ragsdale.
39. The Conquest of Happiness. Lee Eisler.
40. The ABC of Relativity. Lee Eisler.
41. Bertrand Russell, The Passionate Sceptic. by Alan Wood. Don Jackanicz.
42. Mortals and Others. Don Jackanicz.
43. Unarmed Victory. Don Jackanicz.
44. The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation its aims and its work.
45. Yes to Life. by Corliss Lamont. The Author.
46. Russell.by A.J. Ayer. Ramon Suzara.
47. The Will to Doubt. Ramon Suzara.
48. The Life of Bertrand Russell. by Ronald Clark. Ramon Suzara.
49. The Problems of Philosophy. Ramon Suzara.
50. Unpopular Essays. Ramon Suzara.
51. Human Society in Ethics and Politics. Don Jackanicz.
52. Principles and Perplexities: Studies of Dualism in Selected Essays and Fiction of Bertrand Russell. by Gladys Leithauser. Don Jackanicz.
53. Photos, 1983 BRS Annual Meeting at McMaster University, June 24-26, 1983. Jim Mc Williams.
54. The Art of Fund Raising. by Irving Warner. Bob Davis
55. The Grass Roots Fundraising Book. by Joan Flanagan. Bob Davis
56. Dear Russell-Dear Jourdain. by I. Grattan-Guiness. Bob Davis
57. Why Men Fight. Bob Davis
58. Grants. by Virginia White. Bob Davis
59. Fund Raising for the Small Organization. by Philip Sheriden. Bob Davis.
60. The Grantsmanship Center Training Program. Bob Davis
61. Nonprofit Organization Handbook. by P.V. and D.M. Gaby. Bob Davis
62. Successful Fundraising Techniques. by Daniel Conrad. Bob Davis
63. The Foundation Directory. Bob Davis.
64. Great Americans Examine Religion. by Ralph de Sola. Jack Ragsdale.
65. But For The Grace of God. by Peter Cranford. Jack Ragsdale.
66. Godel, Escher, Bach. by Douglas Hofstader. Lee Eisler.
67. The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell, Vol.1. Cambridge Essays, 1888-99. Edited by Blackwell, et al. Allen & Unwin.
68. The Right to Be Happy. by Mrs. Bertrand Russell. Al Seckel.
69. Power, A New Social Analysis. Al Seckel.
70. Bertrand Russell, A Bibliography of his Writings, 1895-1976 Compiled by Werner Martin. Al Seckel.
71. Satan in the Suburbs. Al Seckel.
72. My Father, Bertrand Russell. by Katharine Tait. Al Seckel.
73. A Matter of Life. Edited by Clara Urquhart. Al Seckel.
74. Essays In Skepticism. Al Seckel.
75. The Problem of China. Al Seckel.
76. Russell On General Facts by Ausonio Marras and Russell,Frege,and The " Meaning " of The Theory of Descriptions. Papers read at the 1976 Meeting of the A.P.A.
77. Acquaintance and Naming: A Russellian Theme in Epistemology by Augustin Riska and Russell on the Essence of Desire by Raymond Frey. Papers read at the 1977 Meeting of the A.P.A.
78. On Russellian Clusters by Eugene Schlossberger and Repression in Bertrand Russell's " On Education " by Howard Woodhouse. Papers read at the 1978 Meeting of the A.P.A.
79. Definition and Description in Russell, 1900-1910 by Thomas Barron and Russell and Ontological Excess by D.A. Griffiths. Papers read at the 1979 Meeting of the A.P.A.
80. Russell On Logical Truth.by Nicholas Griffin. The Author
81. Bertrand Russell and the Origin of the Set-Theoretic Paradoxes by Alejandro Ricardo Garciadiego Dantan. The Author.
82. Bertrand Russell, America, and the Idea of Social Justice by Roland by Roland Stromberg. The Author.
83. The Relevance of Bertrand Russell To Psychology and Bertrand Russell's Conception of the Meaning of Life by Peter Cranford. The Author.
84. Dictionary of the Mind, Matter, and Morals. Edited by Lester Dennon. Tom Stanley.
85. Bertrand Russell Speaks His Mind. Tom Stanley
86. The Bertrand Russell Library of Lester Dennon. Tom Stanley
87. The Analysis of Mind. Tom Stanley
88. Religion and Science. Tom Stanley
89. Portraits From Memory. Tom Stanley.
90. The Scientific Outlook. Tom Stanley.
91. Wisdom of the West. Tom Stanley.
92. The Principles of Mathematics. Tom Stanley.
93. Bertrand Russell: Philosopher and Humanist by John Lewis. Tom Stanley
94. The Good Citizen's Alphabet. Whitfield Cobb.
95. War Crimes in Vietnam. Whitfield Cobb.
96. Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy. Whitfield Cobb.
97. The Prospects of Industrial Civilization. Whitfield Cobb.
98. Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus by Wittgenstein. Introduction by Russell. Whitfield Cobb.
99. Freedom Versus Organization. Whitfield Cobb.
100. Bertrand Russell and His World by Clark. W.W.Norton.
101. The Final Epidemic: Physicians and Scientists on Nuclear War edited by Adams and Cullen. P.S.R., N.H. chapter.
102. Photographs, Kalinga Prize Award Ceremony, Paris, January, 1957. UNESCO
103. Theory of Knowledge: The 1913 Manuscript,Volume VII of the Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell. Allen & Unwin.
104. Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare. Philip LeCompte.
105. Late Night Thoughts on Listening to Mahler's Ninth Symphony by Lewis Thomas. Dan McDonald.
106. Six Men by Alistair Cooke. Craig McGee.
107. Bertrand Russell and the Pacifists in the First World War by Jo Vellacott. St. Martin's Press.
108. Russell by Kilmister. St. Martin's Press.
109. Contemplation and Action, Volume XII of the Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell. Allen & Unwin.
110. Bertrand Russell's America 1945-1970 by Feinburg and Kasrils The South End Press.
111. Dewey and Russell: An Exchange edited by Samual Meyer. The Philosophical Library.
112. Philosophical Essays. Ramon Suzara.
113. Bertrand Russell: A Classified Bibliography by Harry Ruja. Offprint. The Author.
114. Principles of Polemic in Russell by Harry Ruja. Offprint. The Author.
115. Bertrand Russell edited by Ann Redpath. Creative Education, Inc.
116. Bertrand Russell by Paul Kuntz. G.K. Hall (publisher).
117. Noam Chomsky: A Philosophic Overview by Justin Leiber. Bob Davis.
118. ABC Broadcasts. Transcripts of Russell's 1950 broadcasts in Australia. Document Archivist, Australian Broadcasting Company.
119. The Philosophy of Logical Atomism and Other Essays, Volume VIII of the Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell. Allen & Unwin.
120. Bertrand Russell on Compossibility by Peter Cranford. The Author.
121. The Dora Russell Reader. Methuen, Inc.
122. The Religion of the Machine Age by Dora Russell. Methuen, Inc.
123. Who Wrote Bertrand Russell's 'Wisdom of the West?' by Carl Spadoni. Offprint, The Author.
124. The Philosophy of Logical Atomism edited and with an introduction by David Pears. Open Court
125. The Development of Bertrand Russell's Philosophy by Ronald Jager. Author
126. Burali-Forti's Paradox: A Reappraisal of its Origins by Moore and Garciadiego. Alejandro Garciadiego.
127. Russell's Earliest Reactions to Cantorian Set Theory and Russell's Problems with the Calculus by Irving Anellis. Offprints. Together with abstracts of papers on logic and mathematics by Anellis. Author.
128. Bertrand Russell's Library by Spadoni and Harley. In The Journal of Library History. Tom Stanley.
129. Bertrand Russell's Early Approaches To Literature, Bertrand Russell's First Short Story: The Perplexities of John Forstice As "Spiritual Autobiography" and "The World As It Can Be Made": Bertrand Russell's Protest Against The First World War by Margaret Moran. Offprints Author.
130. The Importance To Philosophers Of The Bertrand Russell Archive,Bertrand Russell-The Radical, and "Perhaps you will think me fussy...": Three Myths In Editing Russell's "Collected Papers" by Ken Blackwell. Author.
131. The Concept Of Growth In Bertrand Russell's Educational Thought by Howard Woodhouse. In The Journal Of Educational Thought. Author
132. Bertrand Russell and the Scientific Spirit by Sam Labson, Bertrand Russell on Education by Michael Rockler and Bertrand Russell on Impulse by Chandrakala Padia. Papers read at the 1987 annual meeting.
133. Bertrand Russell on Ethics, Sex, and Marriage, edited by Al Seckel Prometheus Books.
134. Ottoline: The Life of Lady Ottoline Morrell by Darroch. Hugh Mc Veigh
135. The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell, edited by Schilpp. Tom Stanley
136. Abstracts of papers read at the 18th International Congress of Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy, Moscow, 1987 5pp. Irving Anellis.
137. Death, Depression, and Creativity: A Psychobiological Approach to Bertrand Russell and Bertrand Russell's "The Pilgrimage of Life" and Mourning by Andrew Brink. Offprints 36 pp The Author.
138. The Rhetorical Approach of Bertrand Russell: A Study in Method by Donna Weimer. M.A. thesis 1983 The Author.

There is no charge for borrowing books. The borrower pays postage both ways. Please note the approximate one-way postage shown below, and remit that amount when returning the books.

45¢ #11,14,32,44,64,82,83,93,94,95,113,114,123,126,127,136
90¢ #2,3,4,6,9,13,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,33,34,35,39, 40,41,46,47,49,50,54,55,57,65,66,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80, 84,85,96,97,88,89,90,92,96,97,98,100,101,102,104,105,111,112,115,117,118, 120,121,124,128,129,130,131,132,133,134,137,139
1.25 #1,5,10,22,31,36,37,38,42,43,45,51,53,56,58,59,67,99,103,106,107,108,110, 116
1.60 #48,52,62,81,91,122,138
1.95 #60,61,63,109,119

Books wanted:

Principia Mathematica, Volume II, first edition. Dr. Walter Lessing, 50 F, Cornwall Gardens, London S.W. 7.

The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell edited by Schilpp. Any edition. Frank Page, 19755 Henry Road, Fairview Park, OH 44126

Bertrand Russell, A Collection of Critical Essays edited by Pears. Any edition. Tom Stanley, Box 434, Wilder, VT 05088

New books to lend:

139. "Le paradoxe de Russell dans des versions positives de la theorie naive des ensembles" by Roland Hinnion. 2pp Offprint
"Russell's Earliest Interpretation of Cantorian Set Theory, 1896-1900" by Irving Anellis. 31pp Offprint Irving Anellis.

140. Wisdom, The magazine of knowledge February, 1957. Three articles about Russell and Karsh portraits. John Rockfellow.

Misc:

Peace Archives: A guide to library collections is available free of charge to qualified scholars, research libraries, and institutions. World Without War Council, 1730 Martin Luther King, Jr. Way, Berkeley, CA 94709.

A catalog of audio cassettes on Religion and Philosophy is available from Audio-Forum, Suite A95, 96 Broad Street, Guilford, CT 06437. Among the items offered:

ECN222 Karl Popper: Theories and Ideas Popper's ideas are clearly explained both by himself and some of the most eminent 20th century thinkers. BBC production. $10.95

SCN084 The Originators Assesses the contributions of Russell, Marx, Darwin, Popper, Darwin, Wittgenstein,Freud, Weber and Jung. Produced by the BBC. (2 cassettes) $19.95.

Radio for Peace International is a one of a kind international short-wave station created by the World Peace University in Oregon and the University for Peace in Costa Rica. Programming consists of a mix of interviews, talk shows and dialogues, information exchange, news, plays and music, as well as courses from the two universities.

Current Operational Schedule:

0100-0400 UTC 7.375 MHz Weekdays
2100-0000 UTC 15.495 MHz Weekdays

For further information regarding programming contact RFPI, University for Peace, Apartado 88, Santa Ana, Costa Rica.

An expression of appreciation from JEAN ANDERSON: "I am sure that many BRS members have been aware of the efforts of Tom Stanley as Russell Society Librarian. Recent Library offerings have increased and diversified, and it remains remarkable that many items are available on loan. The new availability of videotapes makes that often debased medium regain worth -- and genuine excitement. Clearly Tom Stanley has given our Library much of his thoughtful time and effort."

FINANCES

(34) Treasurer Dennis Darland reports on the quarter ending 3/31/88:

Balance on hand (12/31/87)			2,287.31
Income: New members	312.00		
Renewals	4650.68		
total dues	4962.68		
Contributions	32.50		
Library sales and rentals	112.50		
Misc	2.75		
total income	5110.43		5110.43
			7397.74
Expenditures: Membership and Information Committees	1548.77		
Library expenses	108.85		
Misc	7.53		
total spent	1665.15		1665.15
Bank balance on hand 3/31/88			5732.59

***

Contributions are actually larger than shown, and renewal dues smaller than shown, because many members, when renewing, combine their contributions with their renewal dues. For example, a regular member who renews as a "Sustainer", paying $50, is actually making a contribution of $20; it shows up here as dues, not as contribution. We will try to change this in future.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

(35) Philosophers Committee (David E. Johnson, Chairman):

BRS at APA. The following report on the December 1987 session was prepared by Professor Jan Dejnozka:

The BRS sponsored a meeting on the philosophy of Bertrand Russell in conjunction with the meetings of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in New York City on December 28, 1987.

The session was chaired by Prof. Panayot Butchvarov of the University of Iowa.

The first half of the meeting was a paper by Prof. Jan Dejnozka of the U. S. Naval Academy entitled "Russell's Robust Sense of Reality: A Reply to Butchvarov". Both Butchvarov and Prof. Stewart Umphrey of St. John's College, Annapolis, MD, responded to the paper.

The abstract of Dejnozka's paper reads as follows.

"Professor Panayot Butchvarov argued in "Our Robust Sense of Reality," Grazer Philosophische Studien (26) 1986, that (1) Russell has no criterion of existence, (2) Russell cannot have, since he holds that all objects exist, and (3) identifiability indefinitely many times is a genuine, i.e., classificatory, criterion of existence. This criterion in Meinongian in that on it many objects do not exist. I reply that (1) and (2) are false and that (3) states Russell's own structural position. Most notably in "The Philosophy of Logical Atomism," Russell uses "exists" in three interrelated senses. In sense (i) all objects exist. In sense (ii) lone particulars (sense-data) are unreal and groups of correlated particulars are real things. In sense (iii) existence is a second-level property. It is sense (ii) which confounds Butchvarov. It effectively makes identifiability Russell's classificatory criterion of existence. Thus like Frege, but in a different way, Russell is a neglected major proponent of Quine's "no entity without identity" in the history of analytic philosophy."

Butchvarov's main point in his reply was that though Dejnozka was correct in his discovery or identification of sense (ii), the criterion provided by it is of limited interest. It is of interest only in the phenomenology of perception, and only to sense-datum theorists in that area. In his final comments Dejnozka agreed with this, but suggested ways to widen the interest of Russell's account.

Umphrey's main points in his reply were that Russell's sense (i) of "exists" is not clearly articulated by Russell, and that this sense if not clearly a genuine notion of existence. In his final comments Dejnozka suggested ways of addressing both issues involving Parmenides, Plato, and Aristotle's Square of Opposition.

It is pleasing to be able to announce that this paper, along with the replies made to it will be forthcoming in Grazer Philosophische Studien (32) 1988. The replies were Panayot Butchvarov, "Russell's Views on Reality," and Stewart Umphrey, "The Meinongian-Antimeinongian Dispute Reviewed: A Reply to Dejnozka and Butchvarov".

The second part of the meeting consisted of a paper "On What is Denoted" by Prof. Russell Wahl of Idaho State University with a reply by Prof. Justin Leiber of the University of Houston.

The abstract of Wahl's paper reads as follows.

"Recently, Professor Hintikka has argued that Russell's views on denoting and quantification require that the quantifiers in epistemic contexts range only over objects of acquaintance, and that Russell was therefore committed to the view that denoting phrases denote only objectrs of acquaintance. Hintikka gives two arguments for this conclusion, one involving Russell's claim that his theory of denoting entails his principle of acquaintance and the other involving a puzzle similar to those Russell offered in 'On Denoting.' Hintikka suggests a modification of Russell's view which employs two types of quantifiers with different value ranges. I argue that Russell's theory of denoting requires that the quantifiers range over all objects whatsoever, and that both of Hintikka's arguments fail. It is neither necessary nor desirable to add the different types of quantifiers to Russell's theory. It is not clear that this addition is needed even when Russell's theory of proper names is rejected."

Prof. Leiber did not have any outstanding disagreements with Wahl, but made several amplifying comments. Perhaps, as another person suggested, Hintikka's views were a little odd to begin with and not very plausible. It was suggested in the audience discussion that Wahl's points were even more conclusive when considered with respect to what Russell named with his logically proper names, namely sense-data, as opposed to Wahl's example of Socrates.

(36) * Call for Papers. The Bertrand Russell Society announces a call for papers to be presented at its meeting with the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in December, 1989. Papers may be on any aspect of Russell's philosophy. They should have a reading time of about one-half hour and should be submitted in triplicate, typed, and double-spaced, with an abstract of not more than 150 words. The name and address of the author should be submitted on a separate page. The submission deadline is April 1, 1989. The papers should be sent to David E. Johnson, Chairman, Philosopher's Committee, The Bertrand Russell Society, Sampson Hall, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD 21402-5044. Those desiring the return of their papers should enclose a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

(37) * The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation has sent an appeal (dated 12/87) called: *After the Summit: A Disarmament and Development Initiative (DDI).* It aims -- as its name implies -- to promote disarmament and economic development throughout the world. It mentions specific problems, and asks for comments, for endorsement, and for donations. The full text of the 3-page appeal may be borrowed from the Russell Society Library, PO Box 434, Wilder, VT 05088.

CALL FOR PAPERS

(38) IPPNO. BRS Laureate JOHN SOMERVILLE's International Philosophers for the Prevention of Nuclear Omnicide has issued this Call for Papers. ------>

* **At the XVIIIth World Congress of Philosophy, August 20-27, 1988, in Brighton, England, International Philosophers for the Prevention of Nuclear Omnicide will present symposium sessions on August 21 and August 24 on the topic, "Philosophy of Peace in the Nuclear Age: What Must We Do to Prevent Nuclear Omnicide?" Papers are limited to twenty minutes reading time, and will be followed by discussions. Abstracts may be sent in advance of papers. Address papers or abstracts to Secretariat, IPPNO, 1426 Merritt Drive, El Cajon, California 92020 as early as possible.**

(39) IPPNO reports (March 1988):

Our next big international step is of course our program at the XVIIIth World Congress of Philosophy, in Brighton, England this coming August. We have been granted twelve hours of program time for our multi-session symposium on the topic, "Philosophy of Peace in the Nuclear Age; What Must We Do to Prevent Nuclear Omnicide?" Exceptionally good international dialogue with us on this question is assured by the responses that have come from leading philosophers of peace in the other superpower and the third world.

These included P. N. Fedoseyev, Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and his fellow philosopher in the Academy, I. T. Frolov, who, in reply to my inquiry, have promised to answer all questions concerning their new "perestroika," especially in its relation to world peace. In fact, so relevant did I find Gorbachev's recent full-length book, *Perestroika*, published by Harper & Row (whole sections of which could have been written by any one of us in the peace movement) that I made so bold as to invite Gorbachev himself to address and dialogue with us in Brighton, if his schedule should permit, and if not, to urge his wife, who holds her own higher degree in philosophy, to come in his stead. While this may be unlikely, it is not impossible. I sent a copy of the letter to Fedoseyev, whom I met on my first trip to the USSR in 1935. I had been sent by Columbia University as a post-doctoral research Fellow to investigate the theory and practice of Soviet philosophy, having first learned Russian. The investigation took two years, and I have remained in friendly touch (though clearly not always in agreement) with Fedoseyev ever since. He might possibly urge one of the Gorbachevs to come.

We have received definite acceptances from Kate Soper, the new British Chairperson of European Nuclear Disarmament (END), also from philosopher Stephen Tunnicliffe, a leader of END's religious wing, Thomas Clough Daffern, British scholar who is proposing an all-European Section of IPPNO, James Saunders, head of Britain's International Institute of Peaceful Change, Adam Schaff, Poland's best known international philosopher and J. Kuczynski, Editor of Poland's best known philosophical journal, *Dialectics and Humanism*, D. Chattopadhyaya, India's best known Marxist philosopher, J. P. Atraya, Editor of the Indian *Darshana International*, Mourad Wahba of Egypt, President of the Afro-Asian Philosophy Association (AAPA), Mona Abousena, Rapporteur of the AAPA, J. Antuna, President of Spain's PAZ Y COOPERACION and C. Lopez de Letona, its secretary General, a representative of the African Peace Research Institute (APRI), based in Nigeria, which seeks to organize an African section of IPPNO among African universities, A. Abdel-Malek, head of Unesco peace and culture researches in Paris.

For USA philosophers our Call for Papers has appeared in a number of journals, including the Newsletter of Concerned Philosophers for Peace, the Journal of Philosophy and the national Bulletin of the APA, the January 1988 issue of which has a special announcement of IPPNO's U.N. Award and our Brighton Call for Papers. In addition, Ron Hirschbein organized a national mailing to all members of the APA (between six and seven thousand) of our Brighton Call along with the general memberhip information about IPPNO. This mailing was made possible not only by Ron's campus and colleagues, but by other campuses and colleagues, including, to date, those of Joe Kunkel, Stan Dundon, George Hampsch, Paul Allen and Joan Miller.

Papers and abstracts received from USA philosophers are (in blind reviewing process) being read and evaluated by Ron Glossop and Joe Kunkel. Ron Glossop conceived of and carried through a very strong application on behalf of IPPNO to the recently formed U. S. Institute for Peace, for travel funds for American philosophers to take part in the IPPNO program of the XVIIIth World Congress (Brighton), and to publish its proceedings, but the Institute could not help us. However, we can try again in relation to our Second (full-scale)

International Conference, scheduled and confirmed for Moscow in the latter part of June, 1989. At the suggestion of Joe Kunkel and George Hampsch, our Call for Papers for that Conference has already been formulated and begun to circulate.

Functionally relating to IPPNO and our Brighton program, and especially to the problem of our relations with the Soviet Union in the interest of world peace, Paul Allen has worked for some two years on his project SAVI (Soviet-American Visits and Interaction) which has now come to full fruition in the definite Oconfirmation recently received by Paul from the Soviet hosts. As a first step, an American group of 12 will spend ten days in the Soviet Union in discussion, dialogue and observation just prior to the Brighton World Congress.

The Peace Messenger Award which IPPNO received from the Secretary General of the United Nations last year has now been followed by another mark of special recognition, in connection with the forthcoming (May-June, 1988) "Third Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament." We have been notified that IPPNO has been selected by the U. N. General Assembly as one of the organizations that "will be given the opportunity to attend the public meetings of the special session and submit written and oral statements on matters related to the agenda." This welcome communication came from the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs. We are in process of ascertaining all the relevant details.

The one area that has lagged behind in IPPNO's general onward and upward movement has been publication. A year or so ago, we were on the point of completing an attractive and financially feasible arrangement with an outstanding international publisher for launching our Journal of International Dialogue. Unfortunately. the publisher's business is based abroad, and the disastrous fall of the US dollar interrupted the implementation of the arrangement, and has left it in a sort of limbo wherein we have some sixty papers from our First International Conference, the proceedings of which are eminently deserving of publication in whole or part. In addition to formal journal and proceedings publication, we have need of an international newsletter which would do for the international dimension of IPPNO what the CPP newsletter does so well for the national CPP. In view of our lack of budget, the ideal solution might come from some internationally minded campus willing to support the publication of such a newsletter. Any suggestions on this matter or any other will always be deeply appreciated.

Please also bear in mind that what IPPNO has been able to accomplish so far has entailed financial expenditures far beyond its income from dues, and that the balance has been made up only by personal donations of individual members. We really cannot thank them enough. Any donation you can make beyond the current 1988 dues will therefore also be deeply appreciated in all cases.

John Somerville
Co-Chair, IPPNO
Chair, USA Section

(40) Tenth Humanist World Congress will meet July 31-August 4, 1988 at State University of New York at Buffalo (Amherst Campus). According to the annouuncement:

The Theme of the Congress: The Need for a New Global Ethic

As the twenty-first century approaches, humankind is faced with radical disruptions of its social institutions and of the planet's ecology. Yet the opportunity to usher in an era of unprecedented human achievement has never been greater. The very discoveries and changes that are now transforming our society provide us with the unparalleled means to improve human life.

Can we develop appropriate ethical values that will enable us to live together in harmony and enhance the conditions of life on this earth?

Our moral and ethical values were developed by nomadic and agrarian cultures thousands of years ago, values that were, by contemporary standards, based on outmoded ideas of the universe and human nature. Yet ancient tribal loyalties and nationalistic and ethnic chauvinism dominate large sectors of the world; the globe is still divided into nation-states, contending religious faiths, and ideological blocs.

Although we need to retain viable moral wisdom from the old faiths, we also need to develop contemporary principles that will serve post-modern civilization. If we are to achieve to the fullest of which we are capable as a species, we must work toward a constructive, positive visualization of the next century; we must use the best methods of scientific inquiry to solve human problems.

We must foster the attitude that we are all part of a world community and that we have an ethical obligation to humankind as a whole, including a responsibility to generations yet unborn. As our world is transformed by discoveries in medical technology, biogenetic engineering, information transmission, and space travel, our need to live and work together in peace becomes ever more urgent.

The goal of this Congress is to offer answers to these questions: How can we build a twenty-first-century world community in which war and economic conflict; ecological despoilation; and racial, religious, and sexual rivalries are superseded? How can we improve the standard of living and health care *and* reduce excessive population growth worldwide? Is it possible to maximize human freedom and civil liberties while maintaining a genuine social concern for human welfare?

How do we develop a new global ethic, a humanism that is truly planetary in focus?

AL SECKEL is one of the Conference Participants. He will show a film on Bertrand Russell.

The Congress is sponsored by The International Humanist and Ethical Union (IHEU), described as follows:

> The International Humanist and Ethical Union (IHEU) has more than three million members and is a coalition of more than sixty secular humanist, rationalist, freethought, skeptical, and atheist organizations in twenty-two countries. The early sponsors of the IHEU, which was founded in 1952, were also instrumental in the founding of the United Nations. They included Lord Boyd Orr (first head of the World Food Organization), Sir Julian Huxley (the first head of UNESCO), and Brock Chisholm of Canada (the first head of the World Health Organization).
>
> The IHEU publishes the journal *International Humanist* and provides a platform for the exchange of ideas of particular interest to humanists. In addition, the IHEU has representatives at the United Nations and the Council of Europe. It is headquartered in Utrecht, the Netherlands. The IHEU convenes congresses every 2 years. For information, write to:
> **IHEU, Oudkerkhof 11, 3512 GH, Utrecht, The NETHERLANDS** or **FREE INQUIRY Magazine, Box 5, Buffalo, NY 14215 USA.**

For further information, write *Free Inquiry*, Box 5, Buffalo, NY 14215.

(41) American)Humanist Assocation. This splendid ad was given the prominence it deserves; it appeared on the back page of The Review of the Week, of the (Sunday) NY Times (4/24/88, C16). Original size 8 1/2 x 10 1/4.

A JOYOUS LIFE-AFFIRMING PHILOSOPHY THAT RELIES ON REASON, SCIENCE AND DEMOCRACY!

TEN BASIC PRINCIPLES OF HUMANISM

FIRST, Naturalistic Humanism believes in an ethics or morality that grounds all human values in this-earthly experiences and relationships and that holds as its highest goal the happiness, freedom and progress of all humanity in this one and only life. The Humanist watchword is compassionate concern for all men, women and children.

SECOND, Humanism, with its non-theistic view of the universe, rejects all supernatural belief as myth and considers infinite and inspiring Nature as the totality of existence. Human beings are evolutionary products in whom body and mind are inseparably conjoined, so that personalities can have no immortality or conscious survival after death.

THIRD, Humanism, with its ultimate faith in the human race, believes that we possess the power or potentiality of solving our own problems, primarily through reason, scientific method and democracy. In making decisions we can exercise free choice, however conditioned by heredity, education and economic circumstance.

FOURTH, Humanism was initiated by the ancient Greeks, such as Aristotle, more than 2000 years ago and incorporates in its synthesis the sound elements in other philosophies, including the Naturalistic viewpoints of John Dewey, George Santayana and Bertrand Russell.

FIFTH, while Humanism opposes all religious theologies, it embodies ethical ideals from various religions, especially Christianity. America and the world need nothing so much as precepts of the Ten Commandments, such as "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not bear false witness," and "That shalt not kill." And Jesus Christ in the New Testament gave voice to such Humanist hopes as social equality, human brotherhood and peace on Earth.

SIXTH, Humanism holds that the individual attains the good life by harmoniously combining personal satisfactions and continuous self-development with significant work and other activities that contribute to the welfare of the community, the state, the country and the world at large. Useful work usually increases happiness.

SEVENTH, Humanism believes in the widest possible development of art and awareness of beauty, including appreciation of Nature's loveliness and splendor. There is no heavenly father in or behind Nature, but Nature is truly our fatherland. Humanists vigorously support legislation and other ecological efforts for the conservation of the environment. Our responsiveness to every sort of natural beauty evokes in us a feeling of profound kinship with Nature and its myriad forms of life.

EIGHTH, in world affairs, Humanism advocates a far-reaching program, in cooperation with the United Nations, that stands for international peace and understanding, the abolition of nuclear weapons and the elimination of all racial, ethnic and nationalist prejudices. Humanist organizations the world over cooperate through the International Humanist and Ethical Union.

NINTH, Humanism upholds full freedom of expression and civil liberties throughout all areas of economics, politics and culture. Reason and science are crippled unless they remain unfettered in the pursuit of truth. In the United States Humanists militantly support the fundamental guarantees of the Bill of Rights, stressing the basic People's Right to Know. And we remember that Jesus in religion and Socrates in philosophy were both courageous civil liberties martyrs.

TENTH, Humanism, in accordance with scientific method, encourages the unending questioning of basic assumptions and convictions in every field of thought. This includes, of course, philosophy, Naturalistic Humanism and the ten major points here outlined. Humanism is not a new dogma, but is a developing philosophy ever open to experimental testing, newly discovered facts and more rigorous reasoning.

This message is printed as a public service by

•Corliss Lamont
President Emeritus
American Humanist Association

•Beth Lamont
Humanist Advocate

THERE MAY BE HUMANISTS ALL AROUND YOU!

For information about Humanism and its exciting activities phone (716) 839-5080 or write: American Humanist Association, P.O. Box 146, Dept. A, Amherst, New York 14226-0146. Regular membership $35.

RATIONALITY

(42) Hawking, in the New York Times (4/19/88, C5):

He sees "a gradual descent into wooliness."

By MALCOLM W. BROWNE

ARMY chaplains used to tell their troops that "there are no atheists in foxholes," meaning that the hope for supernatural intercession can powerfully appeal to someone looking into the muzzle of an enemy's gun.

Actually, foxholes have always been populated by nonbelievers as well as the faithful, but no one doubts that fear and anguish can induce the suspension of disbelief. Scientists committed to objective measurement and rational inference have also sometimes sought solace in religion or mysticism.

The British physicist Oliver Lodge, for instance, whose study of relative motion prefigured Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity, became a mystic and spiritualist after the death of his soldier son in World War I. Lodge believed that an all-pervading "ether" extending throughout the universe linked everything together, effectively eliminating even the gap between life and death. It should therefore be possible, he reasoned, for a living father to communicate with his dead son.

Mystical world views supposedly based on scientific ideas have been promoted in many recent books offering spiritual succor. In some, the reader is offered a kind of pantheistic cosmos in which personal identity merges with the infinite, and is thus immortal. A favorite theme of such proposals is that "fields" interconnect everything in the universe, providing, among other things, for extrasensory communication between minds. Quantum theory thus becomes the handmaiden of the supernatural.

But Stephen W. Hawking will have none of it.

Science and the Unfathomable

Dr. Hawking, regarded by colleagues as one of the greatest physicists of our age, specializes in time, gravity, black holes, the physical bases of existence and the origin of the universe. Few scientists have a better claim to having bridged the gulf between science and the unfathomable.

Dr. Hawking, moreover, has lived in a clinical foxhole for half of his 46 years. He is a victim of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, confined to a wheelchair and incapable of moving, speaking, writing, or even holding up his head unassisted. He expresses his thoughts by tapping a kind of telegraph key that operates a speech synthesizer, but even the act of tapping is becoming increasingly difficult for him. The disease is incurable, progressive and inevitably fatal.

Life for him is a continuous ordeal. During a recent visit to the United States from his home in Cambridge, England, he listened to plans an assistant had made for lectures and interviews the physicist was to attend the following day. "One more tomorrow," he wearily tapped.

But if Dr. Hawking has ever been tempted to seek comfort in mysticism, he has never let the impulse show.

In his latest studies of the nature of time, discussed in his new book, "A Brief History of Time," published by Bantam Books, Dr. Hawking uses a quantity called "i," the square root of minus one. This "imaginary" number has troubled mathematicians for centuries, because it cannot exist in reality; the square of any number, either positive or negative, is always positive, and therefore there can be no square root of a negative number. The German mathematician Leibniz defined "i" in a strikingly mystical way: he called it an "amphibean between being and nonbeing."

Paradoxes in Quantum Theory

The fundamental tool of cosmology, quantum theory, is filled with paradoxes that some philosophers have adapted to mystical notions. Dr. Hawking was asked in a recent interview whether he believed there was any real difference between mathematicians and mystics. He replied: "There is no sharp boundary, just a gradual descent into wooliness."

"Wooliness" of thinking, in Dr. Hawking's view, is a sin that science cannot tolerate. While some philosophers have argued that quantum theory offers a proof of the existence of God, Dr. Hawking takes mischievous pleasure in suggesting that the universe may have required no act of creation, in which case there is no need for a creator.

In any case, Dr. Hawking and other similarly minded scientists believe it is time to blow the whistle on those who would invoke the name of science to support the claims of parapsychology and mysticism. Even confronted by his own mortality, these thinkers contend, the scientist has no need for the supernatural.

John A. Wheeler, the theoretical physicist who coined the name "black hole," offered this assessment of the supernatural: "Above all, let us continue to insist on the centuries-long tradition of science, in which we exclude all mysticism and insist on the rule of reason." Anything else, he says, is "moonshine."

CONTRIBUTIONS

(43) Gentle Reminder. Are we too timid to ask you for money? Or too proud? Or too stupid?

None of the above (we trust).

* We are asking you to send a contribution to the BRS Treasury (c/o the newsletter), if you have money you can spare.

We'll put it to good use. We'll use it in an effort to increase the number of members...so that eventually -- when we have a larger membership -- we won't need to keep asking you for contributions. Won't that be great! No more coming to you -- like this -- hat in hand, asking for money. We think that's a goal worth working for.

Don't you agree?

Please do what you can to bring that time closer.

Thanks!

---

(44) OFFICERS OF THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.

Chairman, Harry Ruja; President, Marvin Kohl; Vice-President, John Lenz; Treasurer, Dennis J. Darland; Secretary, Don Jackanicz; Vice-President/Information, Lee Eisler.

---

(45)

INDEX

IF YOU HAVEN'T YET MADE YOUR RESERVATION

FOR THE 1988 ANNUAL MEETINGO

USE THE RESERVATION FORM ON P. 14

BUT DON'T DELAY MUCH LONGER!