

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS

No. 62

May 1989

- (1) Highlights: Annual Meeting 1989 (2,3). BR on Pascal's argument (5). Conrad reminisces about his father (29). BR's *Population Pressure and War* (30). Nominations for Directors wanted (22). How the Army views peace activists (15). Adam Jacobs wins his case (7). 500 letters to Wittgenstein discovered in Vienna (19). The Index is at the end.

ANNUAL MEETING (1989)

- (2) Time and place: June 23-25, 1989, NYC. The theme: *Reality vs. Illusion: Death, War and the Problem of Skepticism.*

The arrangements and program are substantially the same as described in the last issue (RSN61-2.4).

PROGRAMARRANGEMENTSFriday, June 23...at Milford Plaza Hotel

4-6pm Registration
 7:30-8:45 Welcome, Presentation of 1989 Book and Service Awards, and talk by Alan Ryan, "Russell's Political Life"
 8:45-9:00 Tea and Coffee
 9:00 Board of Directors Meeting
 [all members welcome]

ETHICAL CULTURE SOCIETY MILFORD PLAZA HOTEL
 2 West 64th Street 70 West 45th Street
 New York, NY 10023 New York, NY 10036

Registration Fee = \$65.00 (Includes Banquet)

Single Day Registration: Saturday = \$15.00

Saturday, June 24...at Ethical Culture Society (Social Hall)

8-9am Registration
 9:00-10:30 Panel: "Skepticism vs. Benefits of Illusion". Panelists include David Goldman, Marvin Kohl, David Sidorsky
 10:30-10:45 Tea and Coffee
 10:45-11:45 General Meeting or Russell Videos
 12:00-1:30 Lunch
 1:30-3:00 Paper: Alan Ryan, Princeton University, "Russell's Pacifism"
 3:00-3:15 Tea and Coffee
 3:15-4:15 Paper: Marvin Kohl, SUNY, Fredonia "Understanding the Pragmatics of Pacifism"
 5:00-6:00 Red Hackle Cocktail Hour

Sunday = \$10.00

Students & Senior Citizens pay no Registration Fee
 Banquet = \$40.00

To register: use Registration Form, next page

Please mail completed Form and Registration Fee (payable to BRS '89) to:

Professor Michael Rockler
 Department of Education
 SUNJ Rutgers at Camden
 Camden, NJ 08102
 609-757-6051

To reserve a room at Milford Plaza Hotel:
 from any State except New York State: 800-221-2690
 from NY State: 800-522-6447
 from New York City: 869-3600

Rate = \$80.00 Single, \$90.00 Double. Identify yourself as a Bertrand Russell Society member to get the reduced rate. Reserve by May 15th

Sunday, June 25...at Ethical Culture Society

9:30-10-30 Paper: Tim Madigan, *Free Inquiry* "The Rationality of Waging War"
 10:30-10:45 Tea and Coffee
 10:45-11:45 Paper: Michael Rockler, Rutgers at Camden "Skepticism and Education"
 Noon End of Conference

Alternative accommodations: West Side YMCA, 5 West 63rd Street, New York, NY 10023. One block from Ethical Culture Society. 212-787-4400

*Russell Society News, a quarterly. Lee Eisler, Editor, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036
 Marvin Kohl, Co-Editor, 715 Maytum Hall, SUNY at Fredonia, Fredonia, NY 14063
 Ben Eshbach, Co-Editor, 1730 N. Lima St., Burbank, CA 91505
 Russell Society Library: Tom Stanley, Librarian, Box 434, Wilder, VT 05088

ANNUAL MEETING (CONTINUED)

The Saturday 9am panel -- *Skepticism vs. the Benefits of Illusion* -- will consider whether it is better to be a skeptic and hold, as Russell does, that --

Well-being demands that we only believe something to be true when the claim is supported by reliable evidence, and that we should doubt what is doubtful and disbelieve what is false --

or should we follow Taylor and Brown [Shelley Taylor and Jonathon Brown, *Illusion and Well-Being*, *Psychological Bulletin*, 1988, Vol. 103, No. 2, 193-210] and say that some illusions promote mental health, including the ability to be happy or contented, and the ability to engage in productive and creative work.

(3)

REGISTRATION FORM

1989 Annual Meeting, The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc.
June 23-25 New York City

Name(s) _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____ Phone (____) _____ - _____

Registration Fee \$65 (includes Banquet).

One day Registration Fee: Saturday \$15, Sunday \$10.

Students and Senior Citizens pay no Registraton Fee. Banquet \$40

Send completed Registration Form (or a copy of it) and the fee...to:

Professor Michael Rockler, Department of Education,
SUNJ Rutgers at Camden, Camden, NJ 08102 609-757-6051

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

(4) From the *San Francisco Review* (September 1960):

THE RISK OF DISARMAMENT

Bertrand Russell

At the disastrous Paris summit, man's future was at stake. In this exclusive article Britain's most eminent philosopher asks whether Khrushchev's disarmament plan is just a trap -- or our chance to end the race to global suicide.

Ever since the invention of the H-bomb, the human race has been exposed to a peril which is entirely new. It is the peril of universal death. A mistake by one man, at one moment, may bring about this disaster even when no one is expecting anything of the sort.

This is the consequence of the destructive power of nuclear weapons combined with the doctrine of instant retaliation, which holds that, in view of the advantages of delivering the first blow, H-bombs should be launched against the "enemy"

when there is reason to suspect a hostile attack, without waiting to verify whether such an attack is, in fact, taking place.

The official policy of the British Government is based explicitly upon the belief that there is no possibility of protecting ordinary civilians from an H-bomb attack, but that that small portion of the population which is in charge of launching sites and H-bombs can be kept alive just long enough to exterminate a good many millions of Russians. It is apparently thought that every Briton, in his last gasps, will die happy in the thought of the imminent equal agonies in Russia.

This sort of policy must strike every ordinary person as criminal madness. There is better hope now than at any time during the last 12 years for the prevalence of a saner attitude on the part of the leading powers of the world. Whether reason and humanity will prevail against ancient habits of thought and feeling is still doubtful. If there is to be a happy issue, the decisive actions will have to be taken by Governments. But by public opinion, and for this reason it is very necessary that public opinion should be aware of the dangers and alert in seeking ways of avoiding them.

Mr. Khrushchev's proposal of general disarmament has taken the West by surprise and has faced Western statesmen with some very awkward questions. On the one hand, they dare not definitely oppose his plan, since, if they did so, Russia would achieve a very great propaganda advantage in the eyes of un-

committed nations; on the other hand, the instinct of Western statesmen is to suspect a trap and to think that, as in the past, armaments may be a source of safety.

It is not yet clear which of these two sets of considerations will govern Western policy. For my part, I am entirely convinced that the West ought to assume Khrushchev's sincerity in spite of his Paris walkout and, on this assumption, suggest such safeguards in the way of inspection as may be genuinely needed.

But if his point of view is to prevail, it will be necessary that statesmen should assess the risks of this or that policy more realistically than they have hitherto done.

I think it should be possible to bring about such a reappraisal among Western statesmen, since the arguments to be adduced are completely unanswerable, both from the point of view of national self-interest and from that of the future of man. I will endeavour to set forth what seems to me to be the arguments in favor of this point of view. The questions involved are so difficult and so unfamiliar that it is easy for Governments to be themselves misguided and to generate a completely mistaken public opinion to which, in turn, they say they must bow.

The first thing to be considered is the question of Mr. Khrushchev's sincerity. Does he mean to carry out the ostensible purpose of his suggestions? Or is he trying to impose a trick by which the East will achieve a new superiority?

I think Mr. Khrushchev is an intelligent man who is aware that general disarmament would further Russian well-being and that nuclear war would be a disaster to Russia as well as to all other countries. I am confirmed in this opinion by his neutral attitude on the Sino-Indian dispute.

People doubt his sincerity because of Russia's brutal suppression of insurrection in Eastern Germany and Hungary and his Hitler-like temper shown in Paris.

The moral to be drawn is not that Communist Governments will not keep their word, but that agreements with them should be very precise. This applies to Khrushchev's disarmament proposals. If they are to be accepted, there must be very explicit agreement on the question of inspection.

Assuming Khrushchev's sincerity, what positive arguments are there for believing that acceptance of his suggestion is in accordance with Western interests? There are many, and I will begin with the least important.

The fiscal burden of armaments is, at present, already very severe and is certain, if no agreement is reached, to increase to astronomical proportions. Science is bound to invent more and more expensive ways of threatening the "enemy." We may expect both Russian and American stations on the moon, armed with missiles capable of exterminating Washington or Moscow at a signal from the Government of either country. When people have got used to this state of affairs, there will have to be stations on Mars and Venus.

I do not pretend to foresee exactly what science will be able to do in the way of threatened destruction, but experience since 1945 is sufficient to show that neither side will shrink from any expenditure that may be thought necessary until the populations of East and West are reduced to bare subsistence level. There will then, almost inevitably, on one side or the other, if not on both, be an outburst of impatient fury promoted by men who find the nervous strain unendurable.

If, on the other hand, a disarmament agreement is reached, the resources of science can be used to raise the standard of life in every part of the world, and to prevent an angry determination on the part of undeveloped countries to share in the "blessings" enjoyed now by those who possess a superiority in the arts of scientific homicide.

Much of the most serious argument in favor of a ban on nuclear weapons is that, so long as they exist, a nuclear war is at any moment possible, and, in the long run, probable. Politicians and the public have not yet rightly estimated the risks of various possible policies. A policy of general disarmament is apparently thought, by Western statesmen, to involve a risk of surreptitious gains by the Communist bloc, whether by propaganda or by "knaveish tricks."

But let us now consider the risks involved in the continued production and use of nuclear weapons. There is a cheerful assumption that of course these weapons will never be used. They exist only, we are told, as a deterrent.

This is an incredibly rash and unrealistic point of view. Mr. Dulles taught us to live with the doctrine of "brinkmanship," and, although at the moment a less madly dangerous policy is prevailing, we can have no assurance that good sense will continue to dominate. As things stand, there is little hope of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to many nations which do not at present possess them. History shows that politicians are not invariably wise, and, when many are in a position to use H-bombs, the likelihood that at least one may be insanely desirous of power becomes great. In addition, there is the possibility of a misinterpreted incident leading to instant retaliation.

It would seem, therefore, that in the absence of a disarmament agreement, the likelihood of a large-scale nuclear war, sooner or later, approaches very near to certainty; and such a war, if it occurs, would be an immeasurably greater disaster than the victory of whichever bloc we happen to dislike. A large-scale nuclear war might destroy the whole population of Europe and at least three-quarters of that of the United States.

This risk is vastly greater than any of those that statesmen are taking care to avoid. The only reason for not allowing it to govern policy is that it is new and that it demands a realization of the interests which East and West have in common, rather than those very much smaller interests in which they compete. I think Khrushchev has grasped this fact and, as it is quite obvious and quite indisputable, I do not despair of its being grasped by Western statesmen.

Why are the obvious arguments for disarmament not universally admitted both in the East and in the West? The reasons, I think, are partly rational and partly mere instinctive obstacles to rationality. It is not wholly irrational for one side to regard as a trick any disarmament proposals proceeding from the other side, and the possibility of a trick is heightened by Russia's extreme reluctance, at various times, to permit adequate inspection.

If Mr. Khrushchev's present disarmament proposal is to be accepted, adequate safeguards in the way of inspection must, clearly, form part of the agreement. But it would be a terrible mistake if suspicion were to cause the West to reject a disarmament treaty without first ascertaining whether adequate inspection would be permitted. And I think the East, also, has had grounds for suspecting Western tricks—for example, when the West has proposed, for propaganda purposes, measures only suggested because it knows the East will reject them.

A second more or less rational argument is that the economy of the West, and especially of the United States, is geared to the production of armaments and that a great depression would be unavoidable if this suddenly ceased.

This view is often proclaimed as if it were an indisputable truth, but those who are in the best position to judge take a different view. There is an American monthly called "Nation's Business," which is the organ of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In October, 1959, it published an article entitled "What Peace Could Do To You." This article says, among other things, "Any abrupt softening of cold-war pressures—if it come—can bring this country a boom, not the recession suggested by such phrases as 'peace scare'."

The article points out that the remission of taxation which would be rendered possible would lead to a large increase of consumer spending, and it supports this view by figures as to what has happened after previous reductions of military spending in 1919 and 1945.

It should be emphasized that "Nation's Business" is not a propaganda organ and is not primarily concerned with questions of international politics.

But I think the real strength of the opposition to disarmament comes not from quasi-rational grounds, but from the purely instinctive mechanism which has been built up in human beings

by six millennia of organized war. When a country feels itself threatened by another country or group of countries, the first instinct of everyone who thinks about the matter is to say: "We must make ourselves strong enough for defense if war should come, or, better still, strong enough to deter our enemies from attacking us."

It is this way of thinking which makes it so difficult to end the cold war by conciliation. The method of conciliation does not satisfy national pride and does not afford the sense of dominant power which unthinking patriots desire. There are even people who, in other respects, are not below the average of rationality, who yet think, where the present conflict of ideologies is concerned, that any degree of damage to the West, even to the extent of obliterating the whole population, would be worthwhile if it were accompanied by equal damage to the East.

It is, to my mind, amazing that anybody can think that the defeat of Communism is more important than the continued existence of our species. But perhaps the study of history should have prepared one for this kind of fanaticism. In the last days of the Byzantine Empire, the Government of Constantinople preferred defeat by the Mohammedans to becoming "Azymites" like Western Christians. One could multiply such examples, but they have not, in the past, had the tragic importance which modern fanaticism derives from nuclear power.

The danger from nuclear weapons is one which threatens the whole human race and not only this or that party or nation. It is a danger which makes no distinction between rich and poor, white and colored, Christian and pagan, Communist and capitalist. Nevertheless, those in the West who point out the dangers inherent in nuclear warfare are regarded as traitorous friends of Russia, but are, in fact, mainly of the non-Communist Left in politics.

The only explanation that I can see for this curious fact is that most of those who are on the Right in politics are incapable of admitting the facts of the modern world because these facts make their creed absurd. I think we must hope that the reasons in favor of nuclear disarmament, which are entirely non-party,

will come to be accepted by the Governments of all important countries. Some people will say that the obstacle to a rational treatment of the problem lies, not with Governments, but with public opinion. Public opinion, however, in such a difficult and technical problem is necessarily guided by what it is told.

At present the Governments of East and West try to create a public opinion in which populations will die quietly without realizing, in advance, that this fate was being prepared for them. The Governments, in this respect, are supported by those whose instinct it is to be always on the side of authority. They are supported, also, by the greater part of the press and by the pronouncements of scientists in government employ. And, among the elderly, there are many who think that the cataclysm will not come in their lifetime.

But more important than any of these forces is the natural disinclination to think about unpleasant subjects which, it is felt, may well be left to those whom they professionally concern.

All this would be different if all Governments could be induced to face the dangers, and to realize the new approach to international relations which these dangers necessitate. If the Governments did not devote themselves to keeping their populations ignorant and developing palpably dishonest schemes of civil defence, public opinion would soon become quite different from what it is. There is much reason to hope that the Governments of both East and West are learning wisdom, and that something like Mr. Khrushchev's proposal will be agreed to.

It would be a mistake, however, to think that the problems raised by nuclear weapons can be solved by disarmament alone. There must also be an agreed method of settling international disputes by means of an agreed international authority. Until this is done, wars will still be possible and, if prolonged, they will lead to the renewed manufacture of nuclear weapons.

So long as war remains possible, the nuclear danger will remain, and the future of our species will be at the mercy of powerful fanatics. If the grandchildren of the present generation are to live to maturity, the difficult problem of the permanent prevention of war will have to be solved. Its solution requires new ways of thinking.

RELIGION

- (5) Russell's response to Pascal's argument. Here is Pascal's argument, as summarized by A. J. Ayer:

Not to bet on the existence of God is to bet against it. But you should bet on it. For in so doing, you have everything to gain, and nothing to lose. Suppose that the chances are even, you are still betting on having two lives against one.

Ayer then says:

Bertrand Russell's reaction to Pascal's wager is worth recording. He argued that if there were a just God, he would expect men to make proper use of the reason with which he had endowed them. Since he had not supplied them with sufficient evidence for believing in his existence, he would be displeased with those who did so and pleased with those who did not. Russell made this not wholly serious point to me in conversation. I do not know if he ever put it into print.

From *Voltaire* (NY:Random House, 1986, p. 66-7). Thank you. TOM STANLEY.

(6)

OFFICERS OF THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.

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

RELIGION

(7)

Adam Jacobs wins his case. Last issue you saw Adam's letter to the NJ Supreme Court objecting to the use of the words "in the year of our Lord" on his certificate to practise law. Here is the outcome, as reported in the *New Jersey Law Journal* (4/13/89, pp 1,20):



Adam Jacobs, (left), Ann Sorrel, and Charles Novins were offended by the phrase 'in the year of our Lord' on their law licenses, and they let the state Supreme Court know so.

PHOTOGRAPHS BY BILL KOSTRINEY

Court Says Finis To Anno Domini

By Suzanne Riss

Any reference to the Lord offends Adam Jacobs, an agnostic.

So when he unpacked his attorney's license after three years at Rutgers Law School-Newark, he was morally affronted to notice the language in the lower right-hand corner. Next to his name, the date of conferral was indicated with the words "in the year of our Lord."

"I was shocked to see my name associated with a deity I do not believe in," says Jacobs, an associate with the Short Hills office of the New York firm of Fragomen, Del Rey & Bernsen.

Not one to let such disturbances go unchallenged, Jacobs and two law school classmates, Ann Sorrell and Charles Novins, wrote to the New Jersey Supreme Court last December ask-

ing that the religious reference be removed from the licenses. The trio has long been bothered by what it sees as a gradual encroachment of religious language into secular society — especially in the courts.

Last month, the state Supreme Court revised the license, removing the reference to "the year of our Lord." Stephen Townsend, clerk of the state Supreme Court, says the justices also took the opportunity to change the gender references on the licenses, replacing "his" and "her" with the attorney's name. The justices also replaced the license's white paper with cream parchment paper.

Lawyers admitted to the New Jersey bar as of December 1988 will receive the newly fashioned license. The changes have delayed the issuance of

CONTINUED ON PAGE 20

The three friends, who were admitted to the New Jersey bar in 1987, say they viewed the religious language on their licenses to practice law as a violation of the separation of church and state. And as activists since their days at law school, they wanted to do something to change it.

the licenses to the 1,800 lawyers who were admitted last December; they will receive their licenses during the next four months.

Townsend says the justices began to review the licenses a year ago after they received a letter of complaint about the religious reference from an attorney, whom he declined in name. The objections raised by Jacobs, Novins and Sorrel were considered during the justices' review, although Townsend would not say how much weight their comments were given. No other complaints about use of the phrase "in the year of our Lord" were received by the Court, according to Townsend.

Exchange Policy

While Jacobs, Novins and Sorrel say they are pleased with the Court's decision, they still have the old licenses which bear the language they find offensive. Townsend says that the Court is considering allowing attorneys who already have licenses containing "in the year of our Lord" to exchange them for the newly issued versions.

Until such an exchange is possible, the trio say they will not display their licenses in their offices. To do so, they say, would violate their right to free speech and religion because their names would be next to a deity in which they do not believe.

In their letter to the Court, Jacobs, Novins and Sorrel wrote: "We find it particularly objectionable that a direct reference to a deity is made on a document conferred by a judicial body, since the judiciary, among all other legal institutions, should be the most sensitive to maintaining religious neutrality on documents issued in its name."

The three friends, who were admitted to the New Jersey bar in 1987, say they viewed the theistic language on their licenses to practice law as a violation of the separation of church and state. And as activists since their days at law school, they wanted to do something to change it.

Sorrel, an associate with the Newark firm of Hellinger, Lindeman, Goldstein, Siegal, Stern & Greenberg, says that she had not looked at her license until she settled into her first job and unwrapped her certificate before getting it framed.

'Unreasonable Approach'

"When I opened it, I said, 'Wait a second. I don't like this language. I don't believe in the lord referenced in it.' ... I believe we can live moral and just lives without relying on religious tenets or on faith. I'm a rationalist. I reject the unreasonable approach to life," says Sorrel.

Novins, a part-time associate with Richard B. Livingston in Livingston, identifies himself as an atheist. He says that he, Jacobs, and Sorrel joined forces on this issue as they had many times at law school when they ran the school's newspaper. Among their causes at that time were keeping U.S. Army recruiters

off the campus and preventing the closing of a shelter for the homeless.

Says Jacobs: "We are always trying to encourage awareness of the deference, both subtle and open, that is given to religion by society at large and the legal community in particular."

The fight Jacobs, Sorrel and Novins waged, however, was not simply a philosophic one but also a legal one. The basis for their legal dispute was three-fold: the separation of church and state, the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment, and principally, the right not to speak, as enunciated by the Supreme Court in *Wooley v. Maynard*, 430 U.S. 705 (1976).

In *Wooley*, the U.S. Supreme Court held that New Hampshire could not force its citizens to display the state motto, "Live free or die," on the state's license plates. Jacobs, Sorrel, and Novins also cite the case of *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398 (1963), which requires the state to use the least restrictive means of accomplishing a compelling state objective that burdens religious beliefs.

Looking to the Federal Court

The trio's next project? Corresponding with the U.S. District Court in New Jersey and the Third U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Philadelphia to have "in the year of our Lord" removed from licenses issued by those courts.

Says Sorrel, "I would raise our, white out, or tape over the reference to 'our Lord' on my Third Circuit license before I would hang it on my wall."

The U.S. Supreme Court certificates show the date of conferral with the phrase "in the year of our Lord." The policy used by various states appears to be somewhat haphazard. The Pennsylvania state attorney license simply states the year of conferral, while the license in Massachusetts uses "in the year of our Lord."

In New York state, the larger version of the attorney license — the one that is suitable for framing — includes a reference to "the year of our Lord." However, the smaller version does not include that reference.

By way of explanation for the inconsistency, Daniel Brennan, staff attorney with the New York state Appellate Division, says, "I think it's a matter of no one bothering to change the language on the large license. Most people don't notice these things. They don't go to the trouble."

But Jacobs, Sorrel and Novins did go to the trouble. And they are not finished yet. In addition to being offended by the language on attorney licenses, they also object to the use of the Bible in the courtroom for witnesses to swear by even though non-believers are permitted to "affirm by" the Bible. They also object to Congress beginning every session with the Pledge of Allegiance, which contains the words "under God."

The list goes on. Yet even they acknowledge that one of their pet peeves probably will not see a change for some time. They object to the words "In God We Trust" on U.S. currency. ■

Adam is annoyed because this story in the *New Jersey Law Journal* fails to mention his many references to Bertrand Russell, whose writings he says inspired these activities.

NAME CHANGE

150 Years of Publishing Tradition...

Allen & Unwin, Inc. is now UNWIN HYMAN, INC.

In 1986 the venerable British publishing houses of George Allen & Unwin and Bell & Hyman merged to form Unwin Hyman, one of the largest independent British publishers. The U.S. division of Unwin Hyman, formerly Allen & Unwin, Inc., will now be called Unwin Hyman, Inc., and will continue its tradition of, and commitment to, publishing the finest in scholarly and general interest titles.

Landmarks

- 1838 George Bell, Publisher, established in London.
- 1871 John Ruskin sets up George Allen as a publisher.
- 1914 Stanley Unwin buys George Allen and forms George Allen & Unwin.
- 1976 Allen & Unwin, Inc., and Allen & Unwin Australia, Pty. Ltd., formed in Boston and Sydney.
- 1977 Robin Hyman buys George Bell and Bell & Hyman is formed.
- 1986 Allen & Unwin and Bell & Hyman merge interests to form Unwin Hyman.
- 1988 Allen & Unwin, Inc., Boston, becomes Unwin Hyman, Inc.

Our authors have included such distinguished scholars and writers as:

Max Weber, Bertrand Russell, Friedrich Nietzsche, James M. Meade, Sir W. Arthur Lewis, Charles Kindleberger, Alec Nove, Paul Kennedy, James Rosenau, K.J. Holsti, Agnes Heller, Ferenc Feher, Tom Bottomore, J.M. Synge, Niko Tinbergen, Genaro Arriagada

Our expanding U.S. editorial program now includes: gender studies, Soviet studies, international relations, Latin American studies, and media studies and popular culture.

UNWIN



HYMAN

UNWIN HYMAN, INC.

8 Winchester Place, Winchester, MA 01890

toll free 1 800 547 8889

- (8) Allen & Unwin began to publish BR's books in 1916 -- at a time when BR was in jail for his actions opposing the war (World War I), and when no large publishing house would touch his books (RSN55-36). Here -- with thanks to DON JACKANICZ -- is the announcement of the firm's new name. --->

BR RECOLLECTED

- (9) Shohig Sherry Terzian: "I heard that BR was to appear at some event at CCNY downtown Manhattan, and immediately made plans to meet him. BR was actually there, and not only did I meet him, but shook his hand, mentioning that I had had the honor of hearing Alfred North Whitehead at Harvard several times, while an undergraduate at Radcliffe. Compared to Whitehead, BR seemed subdued. Whitehead had mesmerized students with his veddy British appearance, his accent, his attire. BR was virtually solemn but affable, and listened intently while I raved on about my admiration for Santayana. To my great surprise, BR quietly said, "Yes, he's a great man, a great and wise philosopher. To which I mumbled, "Thank you, thank you..." becoming virtually speechless. Here was the great BR actually talking to me! This was wartime, Manhattan. BR had been in the headlines [the CCNY affair, 1939-40? RSN32-11], and I felt honored to have caught him before his lecture and appointments. I recall thinking: So this is greatness; Bertrand Russell was so simple, so kind, so for real..."

BRS CHAPTER (MCMASTER)

(10)

THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY

RUSSELL'S FRIENDSHIPS WITH
LUCY MARTIN DONNELLY
AND HELEN FLEXNER

By Maria Forte

At the turn of the century Bertrand Russell struck up friendships with two American women. One, Lucy Martin Donnelly, was on the faculty of Bryn Mawr teaching English Literature. The other, Helen Thomas, in whom Russell confessed later to be romantically interested, was a struggling writer. She married a prominent medical researcher, Simon Flexner. The women were close friends. Both kept Russell's letters, and he kept theirs.

For her doctoral dissertation at McMaster, Maria Forte edited and introduced this double correspondence. It ranges widely over personal, literary, political, religious and philosophical matters. Russell often confided thoughts and feelings in his letters to them that he did to no one else at the time. He even graded some student papers for Donnelly, telling her what he thought of the new academic study of English Literature.

Russell rarely saw Donnelly and Flexner during the years of the correspondence, which lasted nearly a half-century. When he did so it was during flying visits to America or the Americans' less frequent visits to Britain. Maria Forte has uncovered the personal story and laid bare the multiple levels of illusion (and possibly illusion) in the relationships, connecting Russell's side of it with his life as a whole during the period.



Thurs., Feb. 23 at 12:30. UH-317.

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY
THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETYTHE DIALECTIC OF
THE SCIENCESTHE NEW REALISM,
1898

Nicholas Griffin

Professor Griffin will be reading the Introduction, in two parts, to Volume 2 of *The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell*, of which he is co-editor. Volume 2 collects Russell's published and unpublished philosophical and mathematical papers for his formative period, 1895-99. During this time he was an idealist, or neo-Hegelian. In this guise he struggled to build a philosophy of science and then of mathematics that would satisfy the synthesizing goal of what Griffin has called "the Tiergarten programme". The unpublished manuscripts for the period are profuse, and yet, as Griffin and his co-editor, Dr. Albert C. Lewis, point out, may be well be vastly incomplete. The programme was brought to an abrupt end for was it so abrupt?) by Russell's conversion to realism by G.E. Moore in or about the year 1898.

The Society is fortunate in being able to hear an Introduction to a *Collected Papers* volume before it has been committed to print. The volume in question is expected to be published this year as *Philosophical Papers, 1895-99*.



Thurs., Mar. 16 at 12:30. UH-317.

Thurs., Mar. 23 at 12:30. UH-317.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

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

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 1990. 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, 1990. 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.

CONTRIBUTIONS

- (12) We thank SUSANA IDA MAGGI & ROBERT SASS for their recent contributions to the BRS Treasury. Much appreciated.
- (13) We remind all of you that a good way to, as they say, feel good about yourself is to bolster the BRS Treasury with a contribution. Any amount, large or small, is welcome. Send it c/o the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

(14) From *United Nations World* (September 1948) 2(8) 14-16:*Famous British Scientist and Philosopher***Bertrand Russell***Foresees Boredom or Doom in a Scientific World*

THESE ARE THE HAZARDS—

*Death in atomic or bacterial warfare**Robot slavery under a cruel dictatorship**Or a dull, safe, antiprogenerative existence . . .*

DR. RUSSELL HOPES BLEAKLY FOR THE BEST

EVER since men were sufficiently civilized to combine in communities, the chief aims of collective action have been to keep one's own society and to exterminate or subjugate those of neighboring nations. Most wars have been accompanied and exacerbated by a combat of "ideologies," in which victory decided what was to be considered "truth."

Should the Sabbath be observed Saturday or Sunday? Is it pork and beef that is unclean? Should we worship the sun or the Christ? These questions were decided by the armies of Titus, the prowess of the Great Mogul, and the warlike enterprise of the Conquistadores.

Is communism or capitalism a better economic system? This question remains to be decided, not (in all likelihood) by the economists, but by war. Human passions and human ambitions remain what they were when the ancient Egyptians invented "civilized" war. Always science has supplied new means for the satisfaction of old lusts.

In general, however, science does not increase the destructiveness of war, since, as a rule, it strengthens the defense as much as the attack.

What makes the gravity of the present situation is that recent inventions have done much more for the attack than for the defense. The happy periods in human history are those in which defense is stronger than attack; we, unfortunately, seem to be entering upon a period of the opposite kind. It must be admitted that bacteriological and atomic weapons offer, for the future, opportunities of destruction against which, at present, no adequate defense can be foreseen.

THE FATE THE SCIENTISTS BROUGHT ON THEMSELVES

In old days, men of science did whatever research was important in their own judgment: Newton, Cavendish, Faraday, and Darwin chose their own subjects, and were, intellectually, their own masters. Now, since the usefulness of science in warfare has been recognized by governments, this freedom is rapidly disappearing. In some countries the disappearance is already complete, in others it is only in process of taking place. Most men engaged in science, especially physicists, need enormously expensive apparatus, which can only be provided by governments of American billions. The part played by governments in directing scientific activity is rapidly increasing in importance; in a matter of international concern, when some government kidnaps an eminent physicist. There is no hope of stopping this movement towards the enslavement of scientists, as long as the world continues to be oppressed by the fear of scientific war.

Science itself has brought about this situation, though the men of science had not the faintest intention of leading to any such result.

As a consequence of their subjection to governments, men of science are increasingly compelled to pursue the ends of governments rather than those proper to science. The purposes of governments are partly in harmony with the good of mankind, but contrary to it: they wish their country (and to a lesser degree their allies) to be prosperous and powerful, but they wish the countries of their enemies or potential enemies to be poor and weak.

The scientist who discovers how to benefit others is therefore at least as honored as the one who shows how to benefit ourselves. The pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, which was once the purpose of science, is lost sight of; there are even philosophers who tell us that there is no such thing. A physicist who wishes to study uranium can have access to any amount of public money, but if he wished to devote equal skill and equal labor to the study of (say) carbon, he would have to persuade his government that he was on the track of a method of inventing robots.

This state of affairs is profoundly distasteful to most men of science, but it is not in their power to do anything except acquiesce or utter protests which are doomed to inevitable futility.

Of course, subjection to the State is not necessarily an evil, except insofar as the purposes of the State are evil. But so long as there are many states, and so long as the danger of war exists, the purposes of states must be partly evil when viewed from the standpoint of mankind as a whole.

Short of a relapse into a pre-scientific society—which could only take place by a process involving widespread starvation and appalling misery—the only cure for this diversion of science to methods of destruction is the creation of a single superstate strong enough to make serious wars impossible. But this is a problem for the politicians, not for the men of science.

Assuming this problem solved—as it must be if a scientific society is to survive—scientific technique could

become almost wholly beneficent. The increased productivity of labor, which we owe to it, has been hitherto a doubtful boon, since it has been used less to diminish the burden of work than to increase the proportion of the population that can be set apart for the business of war. But if the fear of war were removed, the human race by the help of science could both work less and produce more. There need, in fact, no longer be any abject poverty anywhere in the world.

Science has already achieved immense triumphs in the prolongation of life and the diminution of disease. Given the better economic conditions that might come with the abolition of war, a great deal more could be done in this direction even without any improvement in medicine: and there is of course every reason to expect that improvement in medicine will continue. If, however, a lower death rate is not to lead to overpopulation, it will be necessary that the birth rate should be low, not only in those Western countries where this is already the case, but everywhere.

At present, for nationalistic reasons, government desire for a high birth rate is a cause and incentive of war; but if the danger of war were removed we might hope that a less insane policy would prevail. It is obvious that if war is eliminated and the death rate from diseases much diminished, only a very general low birth rate can prevent a worldwide shortage of food. For a time, this might be prevented by the application of more science to agriculture, but in the long run, if the population of the globe continues to increase, it must become impossible to feed it. A scientific society, therefore, can only be stable if the birth rate is so low as not to lead to any appreciable increase of population.

A SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY CAN BE DULL—OR VICIOUS

Given a low birth rate and a system making large scale wars impossible, a scientific society may be stable, which it is not at present. But, though stable, it might contain little or nothing that, according to existing standards of value, would deserve to be admired.

Ever since the invention of gunpowder, every advance in scientific technique has increased the power of the State. Up to a point, this is an unquestionable gain: almost any government is better than anarchy. But until recently governments which were very bad could be removed by revolution, and this put a limit to what was practicable in the way of tyranny. Now, as a result of scientific technique there appears to be no such limit.

Given control of the police and the armed forces, an oligarchy, however small, can exterminate political op-

ponents, and by means of a monopoly of education and the press can, within a generation, persuade almost all its subjects that it is enlightened and benevolent, and has no aims except the national welfare.

It can, meanwhile, devote its energies to stabilizing its own power and to increasing its own wealth at the expense of the powerless. And with every increase of injustice and despotism it can enhance its popularity, since no means exist of telling truths or refuting falsehoods except when the government so desires.

This is not a fancy picture. It has been achieved in Russia where the Bolsheviks, at first, were hardly 1 per cent of the population. If it is not to happen everywhere, democracy must be preserved and strengthened:

■ There must be publicity for facts that the government wishes to conceal and for opinions that it wishes to silence.

■ There must be constitutional means of bringing about a change of government.

■ The authorities must not have power to deprive people of liberty or of food except by due process of law, and the judges must be independent of the executive.

■ Accusations brought by the authorities against political opponents—for example, that they are plotting the forcible overthrow of the government—must be investigated carefully, impartially and critically, and during the investigation the accused must not be exposed to torture by the police.

■ A man's wife and children must not be punished for his sins.

All these are old-fashioned Liberal demands, which to many people appear out of date. Belief in benevolent despotism, which died out in the 18th Century, has been revived in our time, partly by those who hope to be the despots, and partly from ignorant impatience with existing evils. The result is a real possibility that the scientific society may be of the despotic sort. It is therefore worth while to remind ourselves of the inevitable evils of such a society.

First there are economic evils. The oligarchs are sure to allot to themselves much larger incomes than they permit to the vulgar herd. In Russia at the present day, the percentage difference between the incomes of the rich and the poor is certainly greater than in Britain, and it is estimated by competent authorities to be greater than in the United States. An oligarchic system makes such inequality nearly certain, for in the long run wealth is the result of power. Only equality in the distribution of power can secure economic justice.

Next come cultural evils. In order that those who are deprived of power should not have a sense of injustice, they must be uneducated or miseducated. In a scientific society, the lat-

ter has been found the better method. The poor are made to attend school, and have access to reading matter, but what they are taught and what they are allowed to read is what the government thinks good for them, and bears no relation to fact. The average inhabitant of Moscow stares with pitying incredulity at travelers who tell him that there are underground railways in Western cities.

MEN CANNOT BE TRUSTED WITH TOO GREAT POWER

In order to keep up a large scale deception of this kind, there is need of very elaborate precautions against any infiltration of knowledge. This inevitably produces, sooner or later, a dull and stereotyped orthodoxy, which makes all serious intellectual innovation impossible. After some generations of such a regime, the capacity for original thought will have atrophied, and men will merely repeat authoritarian phrases from the books that established the orthodoxy.

Not least of the objections to an oligarchic regime is the probable prevalence of sheer cruelty toward underlings. As regards slavery, this is a commonplace, but it applies to many systems which do not nominally involve slavery. British industrialism was unbelievably inhuman where wage earners had no political power. King Leopold's treatment of the natives of the Congo provoked a scandal, but was only worse in degree than such that Negroes have suffered elsewhere.

In Russia inhumanities not unlike those of the Congo and of early British industrialism are inflicted by the forced labor camps which have become an integral part of the Soviet economy. Human nature is not to be trusted with irresponsible power, and where irresponsible power exists, appalling cruelties are to be expected.

On such grounds, a scientific society, if it is to be such as most people in Western nations can admire, must preserve a vigorous democracy and a considerable measure of cultural freedom. I think that perhaps, even at its best, it is likely to contain less than we could wish of some good things, particularly art.

Human beings are a mixture of social and anarchic impulses, but as society grows more organic the freedom that can be allowed to the anarchic part of human nature grows less. Artistic impulses tend to be connected with anarchic elements, and to die out when life is tame and well regulated.

AGGRESSION: AN EXPRESSION OF SPONTANEITY

If a scientific society is to survive, the self-assertiveness which leads to

wars will have to be curbed by authority, and spontaneity will have to be restrained in many directions. It may prove impossible to restrain it in harmful directions without diminishing it in directions that are desirable. If so, safety will have been purchased at the expense of dullness. But this is a doubtful speculation, and we may hope that it is a mistaken one.

Science may be a boon if war can be abolished and democracy and cultural liberty preserved. If this cannot be done, science will precipitate evils greater than any that mankind has ever experienced.

Thank you, TOM STANLEY.

DISSENTING OPINION

(15) From *Nuclear Times* (March/April 1989):

HOW 'THEY' SEE 'US'

THE MILITARY VIEWS PEACE ACTIVISTS AS A BUNCH OF CRUSADERS, CRIMINALS AND CRAZIES

On September 1, 1987, a U.S. Navy locomotive ran over Brian Willson, leader of a group of protesters who were blocking the railroad tracks outside the Concord Naval Weapons Station in California. The train, operated by civilian Navy employees, hit Willson when he failed to move off the tracks, fracturing his skull and severing his legs.

The House Armed Services Committee concluded after an investigation that the accident had resulted "from an overabundance of trust on the part of all concerned": the protesters standing on the tracks believed the oncoming train would stop; the train crew believed that the protesters would move. But this game of chicken seems more indicative of a mutual lack of understanding—the wide gulf between the military establishment and its civilian critics that has both sides thinking in terms of "us" versus "them, with little idea of what makes the other side tick.

For its part, however, the military has made some effort to understand its critics. This has been seen as necessary in recent years, whether to deal with growing local opposition to nuclear weapons in the early 1980s, or more recently, to mobilize public support for military spending at a time of budget crunches and improving U.S.-Soviet relations.

The results of these efforts, as revealed in writings and through recent interviews, show attitudes that are biased by the nature of the military itself: its purpose in "understanding" the peace movement has been to learn how better to fight it.

"Crusaders, Criminals and Crazies." Every activist in the country is familiar with the litany of derogatory adjectives used to describe them: naive, misguided, emotional, irresponsible, anti-American—just for

starters. Typical of military literature on the subject is the Army's 1983 training manual, *Countering Terrorism on U.S. Army Installations*, which specifies three types of radical activists: "crusaders, criminals and crazies."

Elsewhere, peace movement activists are frequently characterized as floundering fools—crazies in the weird, disjointed sense. A 1983 study by the conservative Hudson Institute for the Department of Defense (DOD) categorizes anti-nuclear activists as either "protected"—"those who actually believe that unilateral sweetheart actions will bring like responses"—or "naifs"—"those who believe simple-minded 'peace' slogans." The study's author, B. Bruce-Briggs, refers to these activists as "silly riffraff." Dale Smith, a retired Air Force major and author of *The Eagle's Talons: A Military View of Civil Control of the Military*, prefers the term "starry-eyed idealists." In a March 1983 editorial, the *Santa Maria Times*, which serves California's Vandenberg Air Force Base, calls anti-nuclear activists simply "anti-whatevers."

While these analysts are largely dismissive, others stress that it is a serious mistake to underestimate the "excessively or persistently optimistic" viewpoint. "Peacekeeping by wishful thinking" can be subversive, or at best, "dangerously counterproductive," explains James H. Toner, in the September 1987 issue of *Parameters*, the official military journal published by the U.S. Army War College. "Confronted by a popular mythology which often suggests that peace is available virtually for the asking, leaders, sycophantic and saccharine, trundle to Pollyannas in endorsing schemes which sometimes, in their simplicity, may undermine rather than support the struc-

tures of peace."

Soviet Tools. At the opposite extreme from irrelevant crazies is, according to the Hudson Institute, a more sinister group: the outright "leftists," "deviants" and "nihilists." These supposedly disaffected activists are seen as the genuine subversives in the peace cause—not least because they are believed to serve as intentional or unwitting agents of Soviet propaganda.

Alleged Soviet manipulation and disinformation of peace groups seems a given for military and right-wing civilian political analysts. In the September 1988 issue of *Army* magazine, Gen. John R. Galvin, commander of U.S. forces in Europe, attributes opposition from the European and U.S. peace movements to "the Soviet effort to prevent deployment of the Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missiles." In an October 1982 column for *The Washington Times*, Patrick Buchanan, former Reagan White House communications director, wrote, "Anyone who cannot see the hand of Moscow and the ugly faces of its odious little affiliates inside the 'peace movement' in Europe and the 'freeze movement' in the United States is simply not looking." There seems to be some disagreement, however, over whether the peace movement is subordinate to, or merely manipulated by, the Soviet Union: when asked in off-the-record interviews about the alleged Soviet link, several Pentagon officers took great care to assure that they don't believe the Soviets actually "run the show," but that they understandably take an interest in it.

Activism and Terrorism. Military analysts reserve a special category for peace activists who engage in civil disobedience and direct action. These "anti-nuclear extremists," in the words of a February 1982 RAND Cor-

poration report, *The Appeal of Nuclear Crimes to the Spectrum of Potential Adversaries*, represent a special threat. The report describes such activists as "individuals or groups so committed in their opposition to nuclear programs that they would be willing to undertake criminal actions to further their cause." A 1980 RAND memorandum lists "possible" crimes that could be committed by these "extremists" as including "low-level standoff attack," "theft or purchase of information," and taking and holding hostages.

The absence of such crimes in any instances of direct action has not stopped military observers from perfunctorily equating the criminality of civil disobedience with terrorism. Analyzing Nuclear Regulatory Commission data, the Army's counterterrorism manual lists "extremist protest groups" in the category of terrorists motivated by politics and ideology.

Similarly, Lt. Col. David Linn of the Office of Security Police, writing in the August 1985 *USAF Security Police Digest*, describes what he calls the "soft-core terrorism" practiced by Western European activists targeting NATO. "Militant protesters vandalizing road signs which direct forces on military maneuvers or cementing demolition shafts can easily springboard to acts of hard-core terrorism such as fire-bombing vehicles and bombing pipelines or communication sites."

Crusaders. While crazies can be dismissed, and "countermeasures" can be taken against criminals, the military is less sure of what to do with a third type of activist, the "rank and file" of the movement: students, professionals, housewives, retirees and environmentalists. As described in the Hudson Institute study, these are "the concerned," those who "recognize the great problem of nuclear war and have been sold programs that appear to deal with it" (emphasis added).

These "crusaders" are generally viewed as well-intentioned, reasonable and law-abiding. Several Washington-based Pentagon officers we spoke with went so far as to acknowledge a positive role of what they call the "public-interest" community—a group most peace activists would consider themselves to be part of.

Yet for others in the military, it is precisely this group's success that is most alarming. Citing anti-nuclear activists' ability to draw media attention and embarrass the armed services, and the way they "negatively shape U.S. defense policies," the

Hudson Institute concluded that "the concerned are those at whom a counter-disarmament campaign can be directed."

Dealing with Activists. Not everyone in the military holds extremist views of anti-nuclear activists, and the military's negativism about peace activists has to some extent ebbed and flowed with the movement's own growth and decline. In the heyday of the Freeze, for example, some—particularly high-level officers—voiced positive and respectful views of the movement and its participants. In a January 1983 interview with *National Guard* magazine, Gen. John W. Vessey, Jr., chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, "Those people arguing for a freeze now have their hearts in the right place. But their logic is flawed." General David C. Jones, Vessey's predecessor, asserted in the official DOD publication, *Defense 82*, that "this movement cannot be dismissed as the emanations of a fringe element—it is drawing increasing numbers of very serious-minded concerned citizens."

But in spite of such respectful attitudes on the part of high-level officers, the rank and file of the military—particularly those responsible for physical security and public relations—generally have held more negative attitudes. And because it is precisely these functionaries who have been assigned the task of "interfacing" with anti-nuclear activists, the military has in a way codified their more extremist views.

In turn, such attitudes are reinforced by the mandate the military has assigned its public affairs and security programs. Rather than emphasize direct debate with critics, the military defines these programs' mission as "confrontation management"—containing the visibility and effectiveness of protesters. The approach means that the military deliberately limits its interaction with questioning citizens. Officers who have contact with an unfriendly public are directed to forego discussions about policy. During the deployment of MX missiles, for instance, Maj. Michael C. McMullin, the official Air Force public liaison for Nebraska and Wyoming, flatly ruled that "blue-suiters [Air Force officers] would not enter into a debate, nor share the same platform with someone representing the opposition, i.e., an 'anti-MX' group." Further, the major noted in his 1987 thesis for the Air Command and Staff College that "we did not recognize these types of groups [the MX opposition] as civic groups; therefore, we would not accept speaking requests from them."

In an article entitled "Participatory Democracy: Challenge to Readiness" in the June 1986 issue of *Army*, Milton H. Mater, a retired Army colonel, and Dr. Jean Mater discuss "organized civilian efforts to halt, delay or change military projects." The authors write that, today, peace activists' "battle arenas are the public hearing or public meeting and the courtroom. Their weapons are grassroots groups, coalitions, media-bait slogans, letters to the editor While adversaries play the game of power politics, the Army plays a different game, based on rationality, attempting to resolve the conflict by carefully explaining technology and military requirements."

The Mater's article, although extremist in tone, reveals a subtler, but more fundamental bias that widens the gap between the military and the peace movement. Hiding behind claims of impartiality and rationality—and the declared political neutrality of the armed forces—the military not only excuses itself from real contact with citizens, it intimates that politics is an illegitimate way to make decisions about defense. Here the military itself seems naive. Decisions on competing programs are made on the basis of politics, whether those political struggles be inter-service or intra-bureaucratic within the Pentagon, or in the public domain.

Gen. Galvin, writing in *Army*, appears to acknowledge this at least in part: "Development of the ability to present the military viewpoint will be more critical in the years ahead To maintain support for adequate national and alliance security, leaders at all levels are going to have to become more articulate and more accessible to the press and the public than we frequently have been in the past."

But as battles are fought in the coming years over defense spending and program priorities—and over the very definition of "national security"—the military will have to do more than articulately express its views. It will have to recognize that its opposition is more than a bunch of crazies—it is a manifestation of a nation weary of nuclear weapons. It will have to join the political debate as an equal partner—and work with the peace movement and the public—rather than merely sharpen its sword for a tougher battle ahead. □

Julie A. Morrissey is a research associate with the Institute for Policy Studies' Arms Race and Nuclear Weapons Research Project. William M. Arkin is director of the institute's National Security Program.

BOOKS IN WORK

- (16) **Ottoline.** This item appeared in the *London Review of Books* (2 March 1989). Ottoline was BR's longtime friend and mistress. Thank you, DAN MCDONALD.

READERS' REQUESTS

FOR A BIOGRAPHY WHICH I HAVE BEEN COMMISSIONED TO WRITE of Lady Ottoline Morrell, I would be most grateful to hear from anybody who can contribute recollections of Lady Ottoline, and/or of her husband Philip Morrell. Please write: Miranda Seymour, 53 Antrim Mansions, Antrim Grove, London NW3.

RUSSELL ARCHIVES

(17) From the *Hamilton Spectator* (4/27/68):

Russell Papers

McMaster purchase will make city a Mecca of scholarship

By WILLIAM READY

THE Russell Papers are a gift of great bounty, the greatest bounty of its kind ever to come to Canada, and it cost McMaster not a penny. The money came from purses public and private, from foundations and from individuals, alumni and friends.

The sums ranged from \$255,000, the gift of the Atkinson Charitable Foundation, through the generous and imaginative pump-priming grant of the Canada Council of \$150,000, down to the dollars and cents that have begun to come in to the University.

Along with the cash have come letters of congratulation, inquiry and pride in the project that has allowed Canadians to bring this great research collection to Canada, where it will do more good than any library collection in the social sciences and the humanities ever before assembled in this land.

Generosity

McMaster is still bewildered by the enormous content of this gift. Throughout the world learned journals and newspapers alike have realized ever since the Russell Papers came on the market that it was the most significant archive of its kind that has ever existed.

It needed a man like Bertrand Russell to assemble it, and indeed Earl Russell's generosity in this gift must not be neglected, nor the perspicacity and vision that persuaded him to decide upon McMaster as the proper place for his Papers.

Had this collection been broken up and sold in parts, the Russell estate would probably have realized far more money from the sale, because there are tens of thousands of letters alone that are so fascinating in nature and from people so eminent in the world of learning, literature and political events that they would have brought often scores of pounds singly from their purely holographic nature.

Such a letter, for example, as one of Aldous Huxley's recommending yoga to the Earl — a missive three pages

long; or Bernard Shaw's postcard advising Russell that if he took legal action on a pacifist cause he would wind up doing six months in jail (as Lord Russell did, fulfilling Shaw's prophecy).

The manuscript preparations for the great Principia Mathematica, Russell's greatest scientific achievement, with comments and annotations, theorems and equations by A. N. Whitehead, the foremost mathematician of his time, Russell's teacher, and later, colleague.

All these are here and so many more unique items essential for any real appreciation of the life and times of Russell.

Scholarly institutions all over the world would have welcomed the chance to possess them, and money was not the prime obstacle that they had to overcome.

But Bertrand Russell decided that a university like McMaster, with a Fellow of the Royal Society as its president, a scientist eminent and respected throughout the world guiding a university that is eminent also in the classics, in Shakespearean scholarship, in physics, art, and with a burgeoning new division of biomedicine, was the most deserving place to house his archives.

McMaster has an archival centre as well that promises to become one of the very best. If it does, it will be because of the generosity of Canadians who have given so freely towards its establishment and its strengthening, because of men like Lord Russell who have seen the virtue of it, and because of leaders like President H. G. Thode and those other faculty members who have encouraged in every way possible this research development within the University.

Moreover, and this is important, McMaster holds all this unique and scholarly material only in trust, as it were, for the rest of the

world of learning, here, and in Ontario, in Canada and throughout the world.

There are scholarly examples, here of Russell's great mind at work in enterprises so multifarious and so current that the young and those not dedicated to scholarly pursuits will find them exciting as an exhibition, more than they can well imagine.

Visitors

Beginning in the fall of '68, by which time the Russell Papers will be in order and in their proper place, there will be exhibitions of them available for loan (in copy form) and for show (in the original) both at the university and through the public libraries and all kinds of schools and institutions in Hamilton and beyond.

The Times Literary Supplement, that most eminent journal of the world of letters, forecasts in an article on the Russell Papers at McMaster — there have been scores of these articles, ranging from Time and Newsweek magazines through to the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune — that Hamilton will see many visitors who will come here seeking a view or study of the Russell Papers. This is as it should be, for the future of Hamilton town and McMaster gown are wedded.

Who knows? The Holiday Inn and the Sheraton Connaught may have copy exhibitions from the Russell Papers, and along with signs pointing to Dundurn Castle there may be arrows directing tourists and scholars to the Russell Papers which, again, is as it should be.

Come September there will be a symposium on the Russell Papers at the university to which all the town will be invited, as well as a scholarly round table on them to acquaint the other universities with this great wealth of research that has come to Canada as a gift.

It is not too much to say that these papers may change and exhilarate the very nature of the growth of graduate studies in Ontario; certainly they will accelerate the already existing impetus that has been afforded them by the department of university affairs.

The growing co-operation between the universities and their libraries throughout the province will take a long step forward sooner than they expected in sharing in the use of the wealth of this collection.

Defender

What is it that makes the Russell Papers so important?

The popular image of Lord Russell is of one who is against the government, who would hang Lyndon Johnson from a sour apple tree, who was expelled from King's College, Cambridge, to that College's everlasting shame, and was expelled from an American university professorship because of his views that were out of step with the prevailing squint.

Wherever there has been injustice in the world, or rather wherever Russell has seen injustice, he has been there in defence of the weak and the oppressed, often in a way that has covered him temporarily with obloquy and worse.

Being human, people tend to see the dark side of his face and imagine the worst. Even if their worst often their imaginings have been accompanied with a purulent snigger or a hypocritical gasp of dismay that a man can be so free of convention, this belted earl who in reality has been, compared to most men, a clear and shining kind of secular saint, a man who has done such good by stealth to help penurious colleagues, artists, as these letters show.

But such is the case of prophets everywhere. Only now, as he accepts his old age with grace and dignity, are his many private benevo-

lences coming to light.

Freedom

The years have demonstrated the rectitude of many of his public protests that were so unpopular when he had the courage to make them. Even now he shows some of the impudence of the infant terrible that has been a sort of dented halo around him all his life.

There may be many of us who may oppose many of his actions and statements, but unless we defend to the end his right to say and do these things, we shall be but a sham, a fake university.

The cause of women's rights, for instance, as he espoused them in the day when brickbats were the only bouquet for such a championship, the confessions and execrations flowing at him in print and manuscript through the years along with the many compliments and the blessings; all are here.

There is not a single facet of human activity during his near-century of living that he did not participate wholly in.

Russell is such a full man in the flight and swooping freedom of his mind and action that he makes Da Vinci appear rooted to the earth, and Thomas More a time-server.

The Dreyfus case received his warm and active attention, and he was on the right side in it, although it seemed to be leftist and masonic to those who wanted Dreyfus condemned if only to encourage others like him.

There are more than a hundred articles that he wrote for the Hearst press, his correspondence concerning nuclear disarmament, the war in Vietnam, the manuscripts of his novels and short stories.

Go-between

This list can go on and on, but a great catalogue has already been compiled of all the material and a copy of it can be consulted at the National Library of Canada and at the Hamilton Public Library, as well as at McMaster.

A number of commentators have remarked upon McMaster's "shrewd investment" in obtaining these papers in the teeth of such determined and more affluent ri-

vals; that is also a feather in the cap of all who made it possible.

As for myself, I was merely the go-between in this affair, and all the reward that I can even bear to think of I have received already from the warmth and the generosity of those people who made it possible, and from the requests that are already piling up by dedicated scholars from over the world who want to get a crack at the papers.

We shall publish a guide to them before the summer is through and until that time they will be under guard and in process of being organized for use.

As soon as possible, however, and certainly before the fall term begins, all the people will be invited to share in McMaster's pride at having received this great donation that will make McMaster more of a Mecca of scholarship than ever before.

Thank you, HARRY RUJA.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

6 Wednesday, January 25, 1980
EVENING OBSERVER, Dunkirk-Fredonia, N.Y.

Marvin Kohl New Associate Dean

Marvin Kohl of Fredonia has been appointed associate dean of arts and humanities at Fredonia State University College.

Dr. Kohl's scholarly background is in the area of ethics, focusing on matters of life and death and the nature of happiness and well-being. He has been chairman of the philosophy department since 1963 and a professor in the department since 1965.

A graduate of New York University and the City College of New York, where he received his doctorate and bachelor's degree, Dr. Kohl began his teaching career at Long Island University.

He is the author of the book "The Morality of Killing" and the editor of "Beneficent Euthanasia" and "Infanticide and the Value of Life." He has received National Institute of Mental Health and National Endowment for the Humanities fellowships and was recently a Visiting Scholar at Harvard University. He also presently serves as a contributing editor of "Free Inquiry," a consultant to the "Russell" journal and he is president of the International Bertrand Russell



DR. MARVIN KOHL

Society.

Dr. Kohl and his wife, Phyllis, live at 168 Temple St., Fredonia. They have four children: Richard, Rhiana, Matt and Maura. His hobbies include Chinese cooking, friendly running and rock gardening.

(18) Marvin Kohl, BRS President, in a new post ----->

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

- (19) Ting-Fu Hung, who lives in Munich, has kindly sent us a newspaper article on Wittgenstein, from *Die Zeit*-Nr. 18-28, April 1989, pp.14-17. It is headlined (in German), YOU WILL EVENTUALLY UNDERSTAND. Subhead: 500 letters to Wittgenstein, previously unknown, have been discovered in Vienna...including some from Bertrand Russell, Gottlob Frege, John Maynard Keynes, as well as others.

One letter in German in Russell's handwriting is displayed. It is dated 25 Nov 1915, and says:

Dear Wittgenstein:

It gave me great pleasure to receive your letter a few days ago. I am extraordinarily pleased to learn that you are writing a treatise for publication. I hardly think it necessary to wait for the end of the war. [W. was in the German army.] Can't you have a duplicate MS. sent to America? [America had not yet entered the war.] Professor Ralph Barton Perry, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass, USA, would send me the MS. and I would have it published.

I think of you constantly, and want to have news of you. Be happy, and may Fate take good care of you!
[Möge das Schicksal Dich shonen!]

Yours,

Bertrand Russell

We have sent the article to the Russell Archives, to be available to scholars.

- (20) Ramon Suzara writes from his native Philippines (3/16/89):

I live and work in one of the most backward countries in the world. It is backward culturally, socially, economically, politically, and backward in science and technology. It's quite doubtful whether the Philippines will ever catch up with civilization. What's indubitable, however, is that this country is ahead religiously. It's the only Christian nation in all of Asia. Here, the task of nation building is just passed on everyday to God's mercy; and, when nothing happens, everybody begs for God's forgiveness. In the meantime, Filipinos in general have the fatal habit of wasting time fighting over the problems by completely ignoring the possible solutions.

Lee, nine (9) months, I inadvertently shocked a whole lot of my Christian friends and relatives including ex-girlfriends. I adopted from the streets of Manila a three (3) month old baby boy starving to death. He was so emaciated, sickly looking - just a poor miserable piece of humanity. He weighed then only 8 lbs. Well, the boy is a year old now, so fat and healthy, weighing 30 lbs - always smiling, a very good child who has captured the minds and hearts of my people. In fact, my ex-girlfriends want him and love him and so the boy has not only a home here with me, but also in different places. I named the child Bertrand and everybody now calls him "Bertie."

I love Bertie very much as if he were my own flesh and blood. I still feel dissatisfied, however, as there are still thousands of such kids abandoned in the streets of Manila. It is frustrating not to be able to find them decent homes.

Best wishes,

Ramon



NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

- (21) Herb Lansdell offers a persuasive defense of the use of animals in research. We reproduce part of Page 1 of his 10-page article in the *International Journal of Neuroscience*.

Intern. J. Neuroscience, 1988, Vol. 42, pp. 169-178
Reprints available directly from the publisher
Photocopying permitted by license only

© 1988 Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, Inc.
Printed in Great Britain

LABORATORY ANIMALS NEED ONLY HUMANE TREATMENT: ANIMAL "RIGHTS" MAY DEBASE HUMAN RIGHTS

HERBERT LANSDSELL

Yerkes Regional Primate Research Center, Emory University

(Received February 29, 1988)

Arguments for animal "rights" confuse the issue of what rights are about and, in the context of the care of laboratory animals, are misleading. Only human beings have rights and they should be cherished and extended. Consideration of the welfare of animals is important, but the context is that it is for the benefit of human beings and the animals serving humanity. Scientists need to explain the worth of animal research, particularly in regard to psychological studies. They also need to expose the fallacies in the animal rightists' arguments as one of the means to help diminish the threat to science.

Keywords: humane treatment, animal welfare, rights, laboratory animals, animal rights, antivivisection

The activities of antivivisectionists have become a threat to biological research in the U.S.A. and with their statements about animal "rights" they are confusing people with a false claim of similarity to the issues of human freedom and welfare. Although no reasonable case can be made for being inconsiderate to dogs, cows, cats, horses and other animals that have played significant roles in human societies for thousands of years, the reasons for not being cruel to them have little or nothing to do with the notion that animals can have rights. Without doubt most people tend to develop an attachment to an animal that serves them, and it may often be similar to the affection that a person can have for another human being. But the view that these and other animals have rights is leading to circumstances that can preclude them from being of service to humanity, including their use in scientific studies. The argument needs to be dealt with so that this hindrance to research may be contained (Frank, 1987), and in doing so the main issue of rights for human beings may benefit a little from the clarification.

Laboratory scientists who use animals need to debate the antivivisectionist leaders, consider their arguments, and explain to the public the nature of animal research and the basis for being kind to laboratory animals (Johnson & Morris, 1987). Organizers of crimes against laboratories may be unreasonable and unlikely to participate in a fair discussion of the issues. But this type of difficulty is not sufficient reason to ignore the arguments their sympathizers offer about animal "rights". Scientists have an obligation to deal with the arguments made by the sympathizers and other antivivisectionists (Caplan, 1986); countering the arguments could in fact contribute to the advancement of science and human welfare. The nature of rights and their origin first needs some examination in answering the arguments.

THE ORIGIN OF RIGHTS AND THEIR NATURE

Human rights start as arguments for privileges that people proclaim on the basis of historical and moral considerations. For a concept of a right there has to be a

Correspondence to: Herbert Lansdell, Yerkes Center, Emory University, Atlanta, GA 30322, USA.

ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

- (22) Nominations for Directors, please. We wish to elect 10 Directors this year, for 3-year terms starting 1/1/90. 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 10 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 1989 are JACK COWLES, WILLIAM FIELDING, DAVID GOLDMAN, STEVE MARAGIDES, FRANK PAGE, MICHAEL ROCKLER, CHERIE RUPPE, PAUL SCHILPP, WARREN SMITH, RAMON SUZARA. They are eligible for re-election.

BRS Officers are Directors ex officio.

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.

FINANCES

- (23) Treasurer Dennis Darland reports on the quarter ending 3/31/89:

Bank balance on hand (12/31/88).....	1780.26
Income: New members.....	421.50
Renewals.....	4504.39
total dues.....	4925.89
Contributions.....	1027.50
Library sales & rentals.....	25.00
Misc. income.....	96.50
total income.....	6074.89
	<u>+6074.89</u>
	7855.15
Expenditures: Information & Membership Committees...	1055.95
Library expense.....	0.00
Subscriptions to <i>Russell</i>	0.00
Meetings.....	450.00
Doctoral Grant.....	0.00
Misc. expense.....	0.00
	<u>1505.95</u>
	-1505.95
Bank balance on hand (3/31/89).....	6349.20

FOR SALE

- (24) 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." New reduced USA price, \$5 for 90 sheets, postpaid. Canada & Mexico still \$6. Order from the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.

OBITUARY

(25)

Dora Russell. This is the obituary from The (London) Times (6/2/86) that we were unable to print last issue. Sent us by HARRY RUJA, who comments: "Dora's book, *Hypatia*, was the first book she had written alone, but two years earlier, she and BR had jointly written *The Prospects of Industrial Civilization*. The statement, that she had 4 children during her marriage to BR, is strictly true, but two of those were not BR's."

Mrs. Dora Russell, who died at her home in Cornwall on May 31, was a central figure for much of this century in feminist and peace movements. In the 1920s she put forward views which were considered ahead of their time, but have since been echoed by many feminists.

She campaigned for family planning, women's rights and progressive education. She worked consistently for the peace movement, helping in the organization of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and of the Women's Peace Caravan that toured the Soviet Union in the 1950s.

During her 12-year marriage to Bertrand Russell - she was his second wife - she was involved with him in numerous causes.

Born in 1894, the daughter of Sir Frederick Black, KCB, a senior civil servant, she met Russell when she was a fellow at Girton, having already been inspired, as were many progressive young students, by his opposition to the First World War.

With Russell she went on an extensive tour of China and, on their return in 1921, was married to him. Together they set up a progressive school, Beacon Hill School, which she continued to run after their divorce in 1935.

Her first book, *Hypatia, or Women and Knowledge*, published in 1925, drew thundering attacks from newspapers for its argument in favour of sexual freedom for women. Her second book, *The Right to be Happy* (1927), expressed her strongly held view that human problems could not be solved by the invention of bigger and better machines and that the source of human happiness lay in human beings themselves.

A work published in 1932, *In Defense of Children*, called for children's rights to be respected, and suggested that the history of the treatment of children was more often than not the history of brutality and cruelty.

In 1983 she finally published a book that she had begun, but abandoned due to lack of encouragement, in 1923, *The Religion of the Machine Age*. Inspired by her visits as a young woman to the United States and the Soviet Union, its thesis was that communism and capitalism were reverse sides of the same coin, both involving worship of technological progress.

In all her books, Dora Russell emphasized the importance of the resources of nurturing, affection and creativity, too often neglected, she felt, in a male dominated world.

A warm and enthusiastic fighter for causes she believed in, her own life was blighted by misfortune. In her autobiography, *The Tamarisk Tree*, published in 1975, she described how, during her prolonged and bitter divorce from Russell, she fell deeply in love with a man younger than herself, Paul Gillard, an active communist.

He was killed by persons unknown as he walked home in Plymouth one night. His death meant the end, she said, of her "quest for liberty and love. From now on I lived for impersonal ends."

She later married a friend of Gillard's, Pat Grace, who helped her in the running of her school.

During her marriage with Russell, she had four children, two sons and two daughters. Her eldest, John, suffered a severe nervous breakdown in the 1950s and her younger, Roddy, was crippled in a mining accident and was an invalid until his death in 1983.

Despite personal misfortune, Dora Russell's zest for life remained undimmed. During and after the war, she worked for the Ministry of Information, writing many reports, particularly those related to science, for publication in Russia at a time when the two powers were allies.

Her visit to Bolshevik Russia in 1920, when she smuggled herself across the border, had left her with a strong sympathy towards the Soviet Union and she always decried the destructiveness of the "cold war" relationship.

She lived for much of her life, particularly the latter half, in Porthcurno, Cornwall. The publication of her two-part autobiography, *The Tamarisk Tree*, by Virago in 1975 and 1980, led to a new generation of feminists and peace campaigners discovering her.

Even in her late eighties, visitors to her remote Cornish home were astonished by her intellectual vigour. Her enthusiasm for her causes remained, and departing guests would leave with the words, "On with the women's revolution!" ringing in their ears.

She continued to speak at meetings of the peace movement. In 1983, at the age of 89, she led the London CND rally in a wheelchair, and earlier this year she took part in a demonstration outside the RAF base at St Mawgon in Cornwall.

OBITUARY

- (26) Harry Clifford -- a valued BRS member since 1975 -- died on October 12, 1988, at age 87. His son, Walter, writes:

My father's death was very sudden; up until the last moment he had been both mentally and physically very active, writing letters to newspapers about his various concerns in the world... [For instances of Harry's letters to newspapers, see RSN41-18 and RSN61-39.]

All in all, he was quite a remarkable man, who held Bertrand Russell in the highest esteem. If my dad had a hero, B.R. was the man. He left a considerable collection of Russell books, as well as a letter from Russell written to him a number of years ago and relating to the subject of nuclear proliferation.

Our thanks to Walter Clifford for his letter conveying the unhappy news.

NEW MEMBERS

- (27) We welcome these new members:

MS. BEVERLY BOLING /8300 SKILLMAN #509/DALLAS/TX/75231/ /
 MR. MILTON I. BRAND/7145 PEBBLE PARK DRIVE/WEST BLOOMFIELD, MI 48322
 MR. DAVID BRANDT-ERICHSEN /5100 N. MOONSTONE DR./TUCSON/AZ/85715/ /
 MR. SHAUN BUHLER /1503 W. HAYS #101/BOISE/ID/83702/ /
 MR. JOE CIARROCCA /120 MARKET ST./HATFIELD/PA/19440/ /
 MR. JEFFREY A. HILL /1661 W. REPUBLIC #20/SALINA/KS/67401/ /
 MR. DOUGLAS KING /7100 ALMEDA #1022/HOUSTON/TX/77054/ /
 MR. KARL C. LAWRENCE /BOX 223/HENDERSON/NY/13650/ /
 MR. DANNIE MINKOWSKI /PO BOX E --185 660/JACKSON/MI/49204/ /
 M4. RICHARD MONNIER /42 BROWNE ST./BROOKLINE/MA/02146/ /
 MR WILLIAM S. NEWHALL, JR. /4830 HILTON COURT/RENO/NV/89509-2925/ /
 MR. MATTHEW M. PATTON /662 1/2 N. VOLUTSIA/WICHITA/KS/67214/ /
 MR. ARTHUR STEIN /1000 PARK AV./NY/NY/10028/ /

NEW ADDRESSES

- (28) PROF. DONG-IN BAE /SOCIOLOGY/KANGWEON NAT'L U./CHUNCHON 200-701/ /S. KOREA/
 MR. ADAM PAUL BANNER /2180 MEDFORD APT.2/ANN ARBOR/MI/48104/ /
 PROF. ANDREW BRINK /382 MOXLEY ROAD,/DUNDAS, ONT./ /CANADA/L9H 5L5
 MR. SAM DIBBLE, JR. /BOX 792/MARLIN/TX/76661/ /
 MS. PEGGY DOYLE-WALTERS /BOX 398/KAYCEE/WY/82639/ /
 MR. PRADEEP KUMAR DUBEY /147-6 ARNOLD DR./WEST LAFAYETTE/IN/47906/ /
 MR. GRAHAM ENTWISTLE /98 VAUGHN HILL ROAD/BOLTON/MA/01740/ /
 DR. BERND FROHMANN /LIBRARY,ELBORN COLLEGE,U/W/O/LONDON, ONT./ /CANADA/N6G 1H1
 MR. TIM J. HARRIS /12707 N E 116TH. #A304/KIRKLAND/WA/98033/ /
 MR. ROBERT M. HICKS /PO BOX 582, STATION Q/TORONTO/ /CANADA/M47 2N4
 MR. THEODORE M. JACKANICZ /235 E. 87TH ST. APT. 7J/NY/NY/10128/ /
 DEAN MARVIN KOHL /715 MAYTUM HALL/SUNY/FREDONIA/NY/14063/ /
 MR. TIMOTHY J. MADIGAN /30 CHATSWORTH AV. #1/KENMORE/NY/14217/ /
 MR. RALPH A. MILL /13309 SE FAIRWOOD BLVD./RENTON/WA/98058/ /
 MR. BRIAN R. MOLSTAD /8848 S PLEASANT/CHICAGO/IL/60620/ /
 MR. NICK PACINO /8701 DELMAR BLVD. #1-B/ST. LOUIS/MO/63124/ /
 PROFESSOR DAVID F. PEARS /7 SANDFORD RD., LITTLEMORE/OXFORD/ /ENGLAND/OX4 4PU
 MR. G. NAGABHUSHANA REDDY /NUCLEAR & BIOPHYS,UCLA MED/LOS ANGELES/CA/90024/ /
 PROF. NATHAN U. SALMON /PHILOSOPHY, U/CALIFORNIA/SANTA BARBARA/CA/93106/ /
 DR. RICHARD SHORE /1906-277 WELLINGTON CRES/WINNIPEG,MANITOBA/ /CANADA/R3M 3V7
 PROF. DAVID S. STOLLER /326 PATRICIAN LANE/PLACENTIA/CA/92670/ /
 MR. THOM WEIDLICH /349 W. 123RD ST.T./NY/NY/10027/ /
 MR. KIMBERLY WHITAKER /1510 HALSTON CIR APT C/HUNTSVILLE/AL/35811E/ /

BR RECOLLECTED

- (29) Conrad Russell reminisces about his father, in *The Times* (London), May 14, 1972 (pp32 ff). Conrad is BR's 2nd son, by his 3rd wife, Patricia ("Peter"). We regret the poor quality of the text and the occasional missing words. Thank you, HARRY RUJA.

Perhaps any son feels some sense of oddity at being asked to pay tribute to his father as one of the greatest men of his century. It is characteristic of Bertrand Russell that he should have brought up a son for whom this sense of oddity shades off into a warm amusement at the solemnity of the human race. The tributes which have been paid, both to the quality of his mind and to his achievements in changing the ideas of his many generations, are deserved. Yet it is also important, and vastly to his credit, that the impression left in the mind of a child growing up in his house is not one of awe and reverence, but of affection and laughter.

The pictures which linger in the memory are not of a great mind scything down opposition, but of a gentle, ignorant, fun-loving and amusing man. The pictures of him which linger are mostly of simple enjoyment of simple things. One remembers his pleasure in the first good puff of a newly-lit pipe, or in the appearance of his mid-morning cup of tea. I remember him insisting me into the mysterious ceremony of winding his gold watch, and his delight in having tea on the terrace and looking at the mountains in the afternoon sun.

One would not guess, from reading the public tributes, that one of the things which gave him greatest pleasure was watching the sun set behind the mountains, or that one of the things which made him most indignant was watching someone else incompetently making up his fire.

The greatest tribute I can pay to him in his capacity as a parent is to say that the times when I am most vividly reminded of him are not when I consider some great cause to which he has made a vital contribution, but when as a parent myself I am explaining something interesting or exciting to my three-year-old son. When I point out something to him from the window of a train, and watch the expression of wide-eyed delight grow on his face, I often sud-

Memories of my father

By Conrad Russell

Bertrand Russell was born 100 years ago, on May 18, 1872. A Nobel Prize-winning philosopher, scientist and author, he was known to the world as a brilliant intellectual and prophet of nuclear doom. But what was he like as a man and a father? Here Conrad Russell, who is a lecturer in history at London University, reveals this unknown side of his father's character

denly realise that I have been mimicking the explanations and demonstrations which used to create the same reaction in myself many years ago. My first memory of my father is of him pointing out the humps of salt floating on the surface of the Great Salt Lake. My second memory is of him supervising, with total calm and apparently infinite leisure, the process of disembarkation at the end of a three-day train journey.

Two dominant themes run through all these memories of his enjoyment of simple things. One is of the intense vitality of his interest and of his desire to know: the identification of a distant mountain seen from Snowdon could exercise his mind with the same intensity as a problem in mathematical logic. The other is of his constant wit and capacity to create amusement. When I was four he used to console me during the uncomfortable process of dressing boils by devoting endless inventiveness to describing the exploits of a character called Captain Niminy-Piminy - a cross between Nansen and Baron Munchausen.

Above all, I remember him not as an 'intellectual' but as a man who was at his happiest out of doors. His favourite proverb used to be to the effect that "men of wisdom love the sea: men of virtue love the mountains", since he hoped that this proved that he was endowed with both qualities. Certainly, growing up as his son provided an unrivalled education in the skills needed to handle both the sea and the moun-

tains. Such maxims as "If there's a current, always begin by trying to swim against it, to make sure you can" stick firmly in my mind and, I hope, will stick equally firmly in my sons' minds.

On the mountains, I never remember him getting lost, since he had an unrivalled sense of direction, but he was always ready with such pieces of advice as that one should note the direction of the wind if one saw that the clouds were coming down unexpectedly. He knew the North Welsh mountains so well, and taught me to know them so well, that such advice was superfluous, but I have often been glad of it in more difficult conditions in other places. In outdoor situations he was endowed with an authoritative calm which was most delightful to a son. I remember, for example, shouting to him for help when I got out of my depth in the sea: he stood calmly at the edge of the water, and simply said "Swim", which I did.

Again, the two dominant themes in my memories are of fascination in detailed information, and of sheer simple joy. I remember him reaching the top of Knicht, when he was 77 and I was eight and our climbing powers were approximately equal. I remember him, at 95, swinging over the steps to the balcony at Plas Penrhyn for the sheer delight of the view of Snowdon in the afternoon sun. Above all, I remember him spending hours watching the movement of water in waterfalls. One of my earliest memories of him is of watching him standing under a waterfall in California, and one of my latest is of him gazing rapt at the fall of the water through the rapids of Aberglaslyn in North Wales.

In the midst of his enjoyment he was able to indulge his love for information and understanding. It was characteristic of him that he should know the exact height of almost every mountain in North Wales. It was equally typical that he

could expound the working of the laws in such a way as to make them not merely intelligible to a child, but intellectually fascinating. He had the same understanding of the sky, and could give the most brilliantly lucid demonstration of the working of an eclipse.

It should already be clear that, for him, the conventional distinction between work and leisure had much less meaning than it had for most people. Except when he was driven on by the urgent pressure of public events, or by the need for money, he would normally work because he found it fun. Similarly he would absorb the experience of his leisure into his work. For example, in his book on *Human Knowledge* he discussed the question whether it is possible, when sitting on a beach, to know that there are more grains of sand on the beach than one can see at that moment.

This question had occurred to him during a holiday in Wales, while he was sitting on Black Rock Sands looking along the beach, and he had immediately consulted me about it. At the moment this was an exercise in conversational amusement, but subsequently, like so much else, it was absorbed into his work and became part of a serious philosophical discussion. He did not acquire the ideas used in his work simply by working: he acquired them by living. I still remember the moment when this suddenly became clear to me. I was listening to a broadcast talk of his, and we had recently been reading *Oliver Twist* aloud and, lo and behold (as he would have said), there was Mr Bumble among the examples used in his talk.

Growing up with him, and indeed with both my parents, was an education in itself, and I could perhaps claim, with greater justice than Osbert Sitwell, to have been "educated during holidays from Eton" and from other schools. The lack of distinction between work and leisure was one of the most important elements in this education.

Another thing he taught me very early was that words, just as much as any other toys, could be used with a precision which was great fun. As so often, the point was best made with one of his enormous collection of stories—in this case one of his numerous stories about the dimen-

ture of Herbert Spencer by his juniors.

A schoolboy remarked to Herbert Spencer: "What an awful lot of rooks." Herbert Spencer (and here my father's voice would grow portentously solemn) replied: "I see nothing awful about those rooks."

"I didn't say they were a lot of awful rooks," said the schoolboy. "I said they were an awful lot of rooks." After a number of these stories, precision in the use of words became second nature.

The fact that he worked at home meant that it was possible to learn an understanding of 'work' far earlier than most children can. The privilege of having their fathers work at home is one many children used to have during their most imitative years. Now, in the days of commuting, it is one very few children enjoy, and it has been an inestimable advantage to me to be one of the few who did enjoy it. One of the first things impressed upon me was that, during working hours, my father's study was out of bounds. This rule was so sacred that I did not venture to break it until I was eight. When I went in, with my heart in my mouth, my father was covering pages with an endless series of mathematical symbols. When the door opened, he simply continued working and, after what seemed an age, I withdrew crestfallen, wondering whether he had ever known I had been in the room.

Perhaps the most valuable of all the lessons he taught was that ideas had to be considered on their merits: any idea, however extraordinary it sounded, might be true, and one could only reject it once one had seriously considered the evidence for and against it. He was well aware that most ideas which are now considered conventional had, at some other time, and often at some other time during his own life, been considered too eccentric to be worth a hearing. He knew, in the words of his godfather J. S. Mill, that the conventional man ought to reflect that "the causes which make him a churchman in London would make him a Buddhist or a Confucian in Peking"—a remark whose truth is only highlighted by

For this reason, it was impossible for him to be a conventional member

of 'the Left'. He could not, without doing violence to his own mind, have become one of those people who know their position as soon as they know what is the 'Left-wing' stance on the question. The classic example of this fact is his visit to Russia in 1920. Being the man he was, he could not help considering the evidence, and, considering it, could not help coming down against the main trends of the Russian Revolution and, even more strongly, against many of the Marxist theories behind it. The result, *The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism*, is one of his best and most important works. It is so good precisely because it is not the work he wanted to write when he went, but the work he was forced to write by the evidence he observed, even though in the process he had to part company with many of his closest friends. This book shows his mind working in some of the ways I remember with most affection.

It is commonly known that he was no respecter of persons, but it is not so commonly known as it should be that he was not a disrespector of

he could have a withering contempt for the argument of a Prime Minister or of a great philosopher if he did not find it intellectually convincing, but it is not equally well known that he could have a profound respect for the opinion of his masseur or of his gardener if he thought it was cogently presented.

The readiness to consider a case on its merits extended to the person presenting the case, as well as to the type of case presented. My father thought he had a right to demand that governments should listen to what he had to say, but it is not as well understood as it should be that he did not think this was some peculiar right of his own: he thought it was a right inherent in being a human being, and belonged to anyone willing and able to present a cogent case. For his son, of course, such an attitude was a joy. It meant that, as soon as I could form coherent sentences, I could argue with him, and always take it for granted that I would be treated as an equal: my arguments would be treated with any respect they might deserve and, if I won an argument, my victory would be conceded without fuss.

the man brought up in the tradition of J. S. Mill, that every man is entitled to his individuality and that part of his individuality is that his opinions matter. When teaching people who think that they have no right to an opinion on a controverted question because they have not researched on it, I wish passionately that everyone had had such an upbringing. Again, this respect for good arguments, from whatever quarter they might come, sprang from the same root as so much else in him that gave pleasure: the passionate interest in anything from which there was something new to be learnt.

At the same time as he adjusted to a century which saw more change than those he grew up with could ever have imagined, he preserved a strong sense of the past, and of his own family past. Many of the causes for which he fought were the same for which his parents had fought against the ridicule of their contemporaries. But his sense of family extended much further back than this: he had been brought up by his grandfather, Lord John Russell, and his wife. They were the source of many of his best stories, and

his sense of present extended as far back as Lord John's active political memories: as he used to say, it was history up to Waterloo, and after that it was gossip.

Indeed it was sometimes gossip rather earlier than that. I remember one occasion when when he switched from a tirade against Mr. Wilson to a tirade against the Younger Pitt, and suddenly the uncanny sense was borne in upon me that he was speaking as if the two Prime Ministers were contemporaries. So, in a way, he was recalling the youthful memories on which Lord John Russell and his wife had brought him up, and Mr. Pitt had been the political villain of Lord John's youth, to whom the 14-year-old Lord John had dedicated some satirical verses, ironically expressing "the hope that you may live long enough to bestow a pension upon your humble servant." Among Lord John's anecdotes, one which made a particular impression on

my father, was the story of Lord John's visit to Napoleon on Elba, when Napoleon had urinated on the floor in public. As Talleyrand said, it was a pity so great a man should be so *mal élevé*.

But my father's sense of family stretched further than this. To him,

a family did not only mean the people who lived under the same roof: that was what he meant by the Victorian phrase "my people". "My family" meant something it can mean only to those who have grown up with family portraits: a line stretching back to the 16th century, and which he hoped would stretch for many generations after he was dead. A family was a line in which the generations he knew, long as they were, were only a very small part in which his achievement was one among a long succession.

His concern for the posterity of the human race should be seen in the context of this sense of family posterity: of generations stretching out far beyond his knowledge. This sense of continuity combined with an intense enjoyment of the present. One cannot say anything about his sense of family without saying what intense pleasure he derived from his last wife, Edith: the sight of her coming into a room could bring a light to his face which is not often seen in men beyond the stage of engagement. He took pleasure in many things, but perhaps more in her company than in anything else.

It would be distorting to conclude without touching on his public career. Of his work in mathematics and philosophy I am incompetent to judge, though I saw it give much pleasure to the ablest among my undergraduate contemporaries. The immense effect of his comment on social questions may be partly illustrated by the fact that almost every view for which he has been in trouble has subsequently become conventional. One of his greatest achievements was in combating the whole

complex of values expressed in the statement that "we are a Christian country". This statement was last made by Sir Alec Douglas Home to the Scottish Christian Conference, I think in 1965. It has not, I believe, been made by any prominent figure since.

That I have lived through my career without experiencing (except at Eton) any embarrassment for not being a Christian is not the least of the things I owe to my father. One story in which he took much pleasure was the story of the clergy who gathered round the sick-bed of Thomas Hobbes, hoping to receive his deathbed repentance. Hobbes got up, and said to them: "Be off, or else I will detect all your cheats from Aaron to yourselves." The clergymen all turned and ran. There is no doubt that my father could have achieved a similar feat.

In his greatest attempt, the abolition of nuclear weapons, he has so far failed. The best commemoration he could be given would be to grant him this last, and greatest, success. However, though he did not achieve this, he achieved something less. Up to about 1959, Ministers regularly used to defend the dropping, as well as the possession, of nuclear bombs, and used to get away with doing so. In a very short time and largely because of my father's efforts, this view changed.

The last Minister to make a serious attempt to defend the use of nuclear bombs in war was the then Mr Henry Brooke, during the 1964 General Election, and he was howled down by his audience. For this rapid swing of opinion, my father deserves a very large share of the credit. Whether this achievement is enough to preserve the human race remains to be discovered. My father believed it was not.

It is, of all others, the point on which he would have been happiest to be proved wrong.

POPULATION

- (30) The following is a chapter from BR's *Fact and Fiction* (NY: Simon & Schuster, 1962, pp. 267-276). It originally appeared in *The Human Sum*, ed. C. H. Rolph (London: Heinemann, 1957), and was included in *The Population Crisis and the Use of World Resources*, ed. Stuart Mudd (The Hague: Dr. W. Junk, 1964). (Thank you. TOM STANLEY)

Population Pressure and War

THE WORLD is faced at the present day with two antithetical dangers. There is the risk, which has begun to sink into popular consciousness, that the human race may put an end to itself by a too lavish use of H-bombs. There is an opposite risk, not nearly so widely appreciated, that the human population of our planet may increase to the point where only a starved and miserable existence is possible except for a small minority of powerful people. These risks, though diametrically opposed to each other, are nevertheless connected. Nothing is more likely to lead to an H-bomb war than the threat of universal destitution through over-population. It is with the nature of this threat and with the means for averting it that I shall be concerned in what follows.

Wars caused by pressure of population are no novelty. Four times—so the historians of antiquity assure us—the population of Arabia was led to overrun neighbouring countries by drought at home. The results were many and of many kinds. They included Babylon and Nineveh, the Code of Hammurabi, the art of predicting eclipses, the Old Testament, and finally Islam. The barbarians who destroyed the Roman Empire did not keep accurate vital statistics, but there can be little doubt that population outgrew the resources of their northern forests and that this pressure precipitated them against the rich Mediterranean lands. During the last few centuries population pressure in Europe has been relieved by emigration to the Western hemisphere and, as Red Indians do not write history, we have thought of this process as peaceable. The East, however, has enjoyed no such outlet. It was mainly population pressure that precipitated Japan's disastrous excursion into imperialism. In China, the Taiping Rebellion, civil war, and Japanese aggression, for a time kept the population in check. In India, the population grew and grows unchecked, producing a downward plunge towards misery and starvation.

But, although population pressure has been a vital element in human affairs from time immemorial, there are several new factors which make the present situation different from anything that has preceded it. The first of these is the utter disastrousness of scientific warfare which means that war makes the survival of anything doubtful and the survival of any good thing almost certainly impossible. The second is the absence of empty or nearly empty land such as those into which the white man overflowed from the time of Columbus to the present day. The third, which has an immense importance but has hardly begun to be recognized, is the success of medicine in diminishing the death rate. These three factors taken together have produced a situation which is new in human history. It must be coped with if utter disaster is to be avoided. The East has been awakening to this necessity; the West, largely for ideological reasons, has been more backward.

A few facts are necessary to make the situation clear, but I shall deal with them briefly as Professor Huxley's previous article* has dealt with most of them. The population of the world, which at most periods has been very stationary, began to grow with unprecedented rapidity about the year 1650. Since then the rate of growth has been not merely maintained

but continually increased and is now much more rapid than it was even twenty years ago. The present rate of increase in the population of the world is, roughly, one a second or eighty thousand a day or thirty million a year, and there is every reason to think that during the next decade the rate of population growth will become even greater. As a consequence of the growth in numbers during the last twenty years, human beings, on the average, are less well nourished than they were before the Second World War. It is considered that 2,200 calories is the least upon which health and vigour can be maintained and that those who have less than this are under-nourished. Adopting this standard, half the world was under-nourished during the 'thirties and two-thirds of it is under-nourished now. To this process of deterioration no limit can be set except by a slowing-up of the increase in numbers. A careful survey of the world's resources in the matter of food leads to the conclusion that technical advances in agriculture cannot keep pace with the great army of new mouths to be fed. Moreover, technical advances can barely hold their own against the deterioration of the soil which results from a desire for quick returns. There is yet another matter of policy which has played a great part in the USSR and is destined to play a great part in China as well as in various other countries. This is the determination, for reasons of national power and prestige, to industrialize very quickly and even at the expense of agriculture. In the existing state of the world, one can hardly blame countries for this policy. Before the First World War, Russia had little industry but was an exporter of grain. Before the Second World War, Russia had much industry and had ceased to export grain. Russia was defeated in the First World War and was victorious in the Second. In view of such facts, we cannot wonder at the race towards rapid industrializing on which many under-developed countries have embarked.

All these reasons make it nearly certain that poverty and under-nourishment will increase in many of the most important parts of the world during at least the next twenty years, even if everything possible is done to prevent this result. The downward trend will continue until the growth of population has been slowed up. The deterioration in living conditions must be expected to produce increasing discontent and increasing envy of the more prosperous parts of the world. Such feelings tend to produce war even if, on a sane survey, no good can come of war to anybody.

In regard to the population problem there is an enormous difference between the white and non-white parts of the world. In most white countries there has been a continual decline in the birth rate during the last eighty years and, at the same time, such a rapid advance in technique that the growth in population has not been incompatible with a rise in the standard of life. But in the East, in Africa, and in tropical America the situation is very different. While the death rate has declined enormously, the birth rate has remained nearly stationary and the nations concerned have not enjoyed those outlets which enabled Western Europe to prosper during the nineteenth century. Let us consider the three most important

countries of the East: India, China, and Japan. These three countries, between them, contain two-fifths of the population of the world. China, where the vital statistics are somewhat uncertain, is estimated to have a population of 583 million and an annual increase of 11.6 million. India has a population of 372 million and an annual increase of 4.8 million. Japan has a population of 86.7 million and an annual increase of 1.2 million. All these three countries, as well as the USSR, have recently undergone a change of policy in regard to population. In India and Japan, this change has been very notable. Nehru inaugurated the change by a pronouncement which had no precedent among the leading statesmen of the world: "We should," he said, "be a far more advanced nation if our population were about half what it is." In pursuance of this policy, his government inaugurated a birth control campaign. Unfortunately, so far, economic and ideological reasons combined have led to the adoption of ineffective methods, but there is every reason to hope that better methods will be adopted before long. The Japanese government in an official bulletin published in December, 1940, just one year before Pearl Harbor, said: "If we think of the distant future of mutual prosperity in Asia, and if we give heed to the glorious mission of the Japanese race, the one thing of which we can never have enough is the number of superior people belonging to the Imperial nation." Defeat in war has changed the attitude of the Japanese government, which is now doing everything in its power to lower the rate of population growth. In the absence of birth control information, abortions in Japan have become extremely prevalent. According to Dr. Yasuaki Koguchi there were between one million eight hundred thousand and two million three hundred thousand induced abortions in the one year 1953. So desperate is the economic situation that large numbers of women have resorted to sterilization. The Japanese government, although it does not forbid abortion, is aware that contraception would be preferable and does what it can to encourage it.

Both China and Russia have been compelled by hard facts to take up an attitude not consistent with what Communists have hitherto regarded as Marxist orthodoxy. They have been in the habit hitherto of proclaiming that only under capitalism does a population problem exist and that under Communism over-population cannot occur in any foreseeable future. In Russia abortion, which Stalin had made illegal, was made again legal by a decree of November 23, 1955. China, during the past two years, has permitted and even encouraged propaganda for scientific methods of contraception avowedly "at the general request of the masses" and in the hope of bringing about a steady fall in the Chinese birth rate.

In all these four countries—Russia, India, China, and Japan—the main difficulty is not now the opposition of government or of public opinion to birth control, but the lack of the necessary appliances and the extreme poverty which would prevent their purchase even if they were obtainable. It is for this reason that abortion is common in spite of the danger to health that it involves. But, however great the difficulties may be, there is good reason to hope that in all four countries the birth rate will be much reduced within a generation.

In under-developed countries that are still under Western domination, a less enlightened policy prevails. In Africa, the West Indies and the tropical part of Central and South America nothing is done to check the increase of population, and the standard of life is, in consequence, continually falling. Western nations, and especially the United States, spend great sums of money in the hope of benefiting under-developed nations, but the hoped-for benefit does not result because it is not accompanied by control of population. On the balance, what the West spends philanthropically on under-developed regions

merely increases the number of sufferers and augments the terrible sum of human misery. It is a humiliating reflection for those who are inclined to feel complacent about what are called "Western values" that on this supremely important question, upon which the whole future of mankind depends, the West is less enlightened than the East and less capable of rational adjustment to circumstances. This is due, no doubt, in large part to the fact that the most powerful Western countries, owing to their low birth rates, do not have a serious domestic population problem. Western practice at home is at variance with Western theory. What people do is right, but what they think they ought to do is wrong. What they think they ought to do has disastrous consequences, not at home, but wherever Western nations dominate less developed regions either directly or through financial and medical assistance. By their superstitious and benighted policy, they are breeding great areas of discontent and hostility.

There are in the world at present sharply marked divisions between areas of prosperity and areas of poverty. In Western Europe and North America and Australia, the immense majority of the population are adequately nourished. In Africa, India, and China, a large majority have less food than is necessary for health and vigour. This situation is not getting better. On the contrary, it is getting worse. The poorer countries are growing poorer, while the richer ones grow richer. It is mainly the increase of population that causes the poverty of the poorer countries. The resulting situation is explosive. It is hardly to be expected that the less prosperous parts of the world will tamely acquiesce in the continually widening inequality. The situation is of just that kind that in the past has always led to war and conquest. However irrational a resort to war in modern circumstances may be, hunger and sullen anger may, in desperation, produce an outbreak that can end only in utter disaster. There cannot be secure peace in the world while the present economic inequalities persist. If peace is to become secure, it can only be through an improvement in the standard of life in undeveloped regions, and this improvement will have to be so great and so long-continued as to give a prospect of ultimate economic equality. As things are at present, if the world's supply of food were divided equally among all the populations of the world, there would have to be a catastrophic decline in the Western standard of life, and it is obvious that Western nations would not submit to such a decline except as a result of defeat in war. Hopes of peace, therefore, must rest on measures designed to benefit the East without injuring the West, and such measures are impossible unless they involve a very great fall in the birth rate of the more prolific countries.

It is difficult not to be filled with despair when one contemplates the blindness of statesmanship and of everyday popular thought on the issues with which modern man is faced. The leading powers of the world spend enormous sums and devote their best brains to the production of methods of killing each other. Eminent moral leaders give their blessing to such efforts, and at the same time tell us that it is wicked to prevent the births which, by their excessive number, drive the nations on to the invention of H-bombs. I could wish to see it generally recognized in the West, as it is coming to be recognized in the East, that the problem of over-population could probably be painlessly solved by the devotion to birth control of one-hundredth or even one-thousandth of the sum at present devoted to armament. The most urgent practical need is research into some method of birth control which could be easily and cheaply adopted by even very poor populations. There is, at present, only an infinitesimal research on this all-important matter, although it is in the highest degree probable that rather more research and rather more public encouragement could produce incalculably beneficial results.

Given a successful outcome to such research, there should be in every town and village of the more prolific countries centres of birth control information and public assistance as regards the supply of birth control apparatus. The Western nations have a special responsibility in this matter, for it is the discoveries of Western medicine that have so lowered the death rate as to produce a lack of balance that, on a global scale, is a wholly new phenomenon. I will give two illustrations out of many. In Ceylon, when DDT was introduced to combat malaria, the death rate fell within two or three years to the level of Western death rates, while the birth rate remained constant, with the result that there is at present an increase of population at the rate of 2.7 per cent per year. The figures of the death rate in Japan are even more remarkable. In the five years before the Second World War, the average death rate in Japan was 17.4. In 1946, it had risen to 17.6. In the following years it fell with extraordinary suddenness: in 1951 it was 10.0 and, in 1954, 7.9. A large part of this fall is attributable to American methods of public health. In spite of the very highest motives, those Western medical missions and medical scientists who have with extraordinary suddenness brought about the great decline in the death rate have incidentally done very much more harm than good. The desirable remedy does not lie in restoring the death rate to its former level. It does not lie in the promotion of new pestilences. Least of all does it lie in the vast destruction that a new war may bring. It lies in adapting births to deaths. The stern limits of the earth's fertility will

see to it before long that the balance between births and deaths is restored. It will see to it with an arithmetical inevitability which is independent of human wisdom or folly. But if the balance is restored by human folly, immense suffering throughout the world will be involved; while, if it is restored in accordance with the dictates of good sense and humanity, there can be an end to poverty and an end to the vast hopelessness of female lives devoted to the production of children who ought not to exist and whose existence must almost inevitably be filled with misery.

During what remains of the present century, the world has to choose between two possible destinies. It can continue the reckless increase of population until war, more savage and more dreadful than any yet known, sweeps away not only the excess but probably all except a miserable remnant. Or, if the other course is chosen, there can be progress, rapid progress, towards the extinction of poverty, the end of war, and the establishment of a harmonious family of nations. It seems that the East is becoming alive to the problem, but the West, in its theories and in its external dealings, lags behind. Of all the long-run problems that face the world, this problem of population is the most important and fundamental for, until it is solved, other measures of amelioration are futile. It is too late to escape from great hardship in the near future, but there is good reason to believe that, if war can be averted meanwhile, the pressing needs of the world will bring amelioration before it is too late.

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

(31) Books for sale:

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL:

Appeal to the American Conscience.....	93.15
Authority and the Individual.....	3.75
The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, Volume I.....	6.00 H
Volume II.....	13.00 H
Volume III.....	11.00 H
Education and the Social Order.....	4.25
Essays in Analysis, edited by Douglas Lackey.....	6.50 H
Has Man a Future?.....	8.00 H
History of the World in Epitome.....	1.00
In Praise of Idleness.....	3.75
The Impact of Science on Society.....	3.00
An Inquiry into Meaning and Truth.....	6.00
Mortals and Others, edited by Harry Ruja.....	8.50 H
My Philosophical Development.....	3.75
Political Ideals.....	3.75
Power: A New Social Analysis.....	5.50
The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism.....	3.75
Principles of Social Reconstruction.....	3.75
Roads to Freedom.....	4.00
Sceptical Essays.....	4.25

The Scientific Outlook..... 5.50

BY OTHER AUTHORS:

Bertrand Russell 1872-1970.....	4.50
Bertrand Russell and the Pacifists in the First World War by Jo Vellacott.....	10.50 H
Bertrand Russell as a Philosopher by A.J. Ayer.....	2.25
Essays on Socialist Humanism in Honor of the Centenary of Bertrand Russell.....	4.00
Into the Tenth Decade: A Tribute to Bertrand Russell.....	9.00 H
The Life of Bertrand Russell in Pictures and his Own Words.....	5.75
Mr. Wilson Speaks 'Frankly and Fearlessly' on Vietnam to B.R.....	1.75
The Tamarisk Tree, Volume I by Dora Russell.....	5.50 H

H Cloth, otherwise paperback.

Prices are postpaid. Please send check or money-order, payable to the Russell Society, to The Russell Society Library, Box 434, Wilder, VT 05088

(32) Books to lend:

When no author is indicated, the work is by Bertrand Russell. The donor'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. I. Ramon Suzara.
6. Let Me Die Before I Wake. by Derek Humphery.
7. Essay on Bertrand Russell. edited by E. D. Klenke. 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.

Books to lend (continued):

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. Unnamed 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 1985 BRS Annual Meeting at McMaster University, June 24-26, 1985, Jim Ho 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-Guinness, Bob Davis.
57. Why Men Fight, Bob Davis.
58. Grants, by Virginia White, Bob Davis.
59. Fund Raising for the Small Organization, by Philip Sheridan, Bob Davis.
60. The Grantsmanship Center Training Program, Bob Davis.
61. Nonprofit Organization Handbook, by F.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 Hofstadter, Lee Eisler.
67. The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell, Vol. I, 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 Regression 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 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. Fractatus 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, Malinga 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 Vellecote, St. Martin's Press.
108. Russell by Kilmeister, 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 Samuel 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 Hedpath, Creative Education, Inc.
116. Bertrand Russell by Paul Kuntz, G.K. Hall (publisher).
117. Noam Chomsky: A Philosophical 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, Auth.
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 Forstace 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 Dockler and Bertrand Russell on Impulse by Chandrakala Padia, Papers read at the 1957 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.
139. Russell's Earliest Interpretation of Cantorian Set Theory, 1896-1900 by Irving Anellis, Offprint 3pp The Author.
140. Wisdom, The Magazine of Knowledge February, 1957. Three articles about Russell with rare portraits, John Bookfellow.
141. A 14-Year Index of Newsletters of the Bertrand Russell Society 1974-1988 compiled by Lee Eisler.
142. Russell and Engels: Two Approaches to a Hegelian Philosophy of Mathematics, by Irving Anellis, Offprint, The Author.
143. The Interpretation of Frege's Philosophy, by Michael Dummett, Irving Anellis.
144. The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russell, Tom Stanley.
145. The Selected Papers of Bertrand Russell, Tom Stanley.
146. New Hopes for a Changing World, Tom Stanley.
147. Understanding History, Tom Stanley.
148. The ABC of Atoms, Tom Stanley.
149. The Analysis of Mind, Tom Stanley.
150. Is Life Meaningful in a Universe Without God? by Paul Kurtz, Paper read at the 1988 annual meeting, The Author.
151. The Amberley Papers, Dan McDonald.
152. Russell Remembered by Rupert Crawshaw-Williams, Dan McDonald.
153. Which Way to Peace? Whitfield Cobb.
154. Bertrand Russell on Education by Joe Park, Tom Stanley.
155. Nightmares of Eminent Persons Jerold Harter, Herb Lansdale, John Tobin, and Jean Anderson.
156. A Bibliography on Philosophy and the Nuclear Debate by William Gay, 12pp offprint, The Author.
157. Philosophy and the Contemporary Faces of Genocide by William Gay, 18 pp offprint, The Author.
158. Principia Mathematica to *56, Jean Anderson.
159. Bertrand Russell's Philosophy of Morals by Lillian Aiken.
160. Inside Beacon Hill: Bertrand Russell as Schoolmaster by Shirley Jespersen, 9pp offprint The Author.

Please note the approximate one-way postage shown below, and remit that amount when returning the books.

45¢ #11,14,32,44,64,82,83,93,94,95,113,114,121,126,127,136,139,142,150,157,16
 90¢ #2,3,4,6,8,9,12,13,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,33,34,35,
 40,41,46,47,49,50,54,55,57,65,66,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,8
 85,86,87,88,89,90,92,96,97,98,100,101,102,104,105,111,112,115,117,118,120,
 121,124,128,129,130,131,132,133,134,137,139,145,147,153
 1.25 #1,5,7,10,22,31,36,37,38,42,43,45,51,53,56,58,59,99,106,107,108,110,116
 1.40 #143,144,148,149,152,154,155,158,159
 1.60 #48,52,62,81,91,103,122,138
 1.95 #60,61,63,67,109,119

(33) Books for sale from McMaster:

Antinomies and Paradoxes: Studies in Russell's Early Philosophy, edited by Winchester and Blackwell. Proceedings of a conference held at the University of Toronto in 1984. As published in Russell, n.s.8 (1988). 248 pp. \$12.50

My Own Philosophy by Bertrand Russell. Printed for McMaster by the Cambridge University Press. Edition limited to 600 numbered copies. 30pp. \$4.00

Catalogue of the Centenary Exhibition 17 full-page ill. 40pp \$1.00

Intellect and Social Conscience: Essays on Bertrand Russell's Early Work, edited by Spadoni and Moran. Proceedings of the Conference on Russell's early non-technical work held at McMaster in 1983. 238pp. \$7.00

Russell in Review, edited by Thomas And Blackwell. Proceedings of the Centenary celebrations. 268 pp. Cloth \$12.00

Orders should be sent to the Mills Memorial Library, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8S 4L6. Prices are in Canadian dollars, payable to McMaster University Library Press.

(34) Book news:

Among the sixteen essays to be published in the forthcoming Rereading Russell are "Portrait of a Philosopher of Science" by Ken Blackwell and "Russell's 1913 Theory of Knowledge Manuscript" by David Pears. The collection is scheduled to be published sometime in May. The publication date for Andrew Brink's Bertrand Russell: The Psychobiography of a Moralist is June 1, 1989. Production difficulties have delayed the release of the new paperback edition of Paul Schilpp's The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell. Open Court Publishing has, however, sent the Society an advance issue.

The Society needs a reviewer for the Schilpp volume, and for these recently published volumes from Allen & Unwin:

Essays on Language, Mind, and Matter 1919-1926, edited by John Slater. Volume IX in "The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell".

Logic and Knowledge, Essays 1901-1950, edited by Charles Marsh. This paperback edition of Russell's essays in the fields of logic and the theory of knowledge is available for \$19.95.

Prophecy and Dissent 1914-16, edited by Richard Rempel with Margaret Moran. Volume XIII in "The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell".

Any member who is willing to write a review of one of these titles for the News is urged to contact me as soon as possible. There are no deadlines on the reviews.

The W.W. Norton paperback printings of Power and The Scientific Outlook are out of print. The Library has only two copies of each in stock.

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

(35)

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

1989-91: LOU ACHESON, ADAM PAUL BANNER, KEN BLACKWELL, JOHN JACKANICZ, DAVID JOHNSON, JUSTIN LEIBER, GLADYS LEITHAUSER, STEVE REINHARDT, TOM STANLEY

The 6 BRS officers are also directors, ex officio

ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

- (36) **AA.** We sent postcards to California BRS Members, alerting them to the American Atheist Meeting, March 24-25, in Mission Valley, CA. If you attended, please send us a brief report on it, for the Newsletter. Thanks.
- (37) **CCP.** Concerned Philosophers for Peace, now in its 8th year, was formed in 1981 at the Pacific Division meeting of the APA. In 1987 it held a joint meeting with IPPNO, International Philosophers for the Prevention of Nuclear Omnicide. (IPPNO IS BRS Laureate John Somerville's organization.) It issues a newsletter twice a year. For information: Concerned Philosophers for Peace, Department of Philosophy, The University of Dayton, 300 College Park, Dayton, OH 45469-0001.
- (38) **FREETHOUGHT TODAY** — published 10 times a year by the Freedom From Religion Foundation (FFRF) — fights the good fight for atheists and agnostics. To sample it, send \$1 to *Freethought Today*, PO Box 750, Madison, WI 53701
- (39) **SOS** (Secular Organizations for Sobriety) is the freethought alternative to the religiously oriented AA (Alcoholics Anonymous). Its good-looking 8-page newsletter (Dec/Jan 88-89) tells how to conduct an SOS meeting, and, among other things, lists its National Board Members, which include Steve Allen, Paul Kurtz, Vern Bullough, Gerald Larue, and others. For the quarterly newsletter, send \$12 to SOS Subscriptions, FREE INQUIRY, Box 5, Buffalo, NY 14215-0005.

BOOK REVIEW

- (40) *Intellectuals*, by Paul Johnson, is reviewed by John D. Judis in *The Washington Post's Book World* (2/26/89). Thank you, DON JACKANICZ.

How the book is advertised
(NY Review of Books, 5/18/89, p.27)

"Johnson's intellectuals are egotistical, male chauvinist, avaricious, deceitful and perverse. They are responsible for everything he detests."

The Men Who Knew Too Much

INTELLECTUALS

By Paul Johnson
Harper & Row, 385 pp. \$22.50

By John B. Judis

THE NOUN "intellectual" appeared in the early 19th century and was used in the same pejorative sense as the more recent term "egg-head," but, in the intervening years, it has come to refer more neutrally to someone who dwells upon the larger questions of life and society. In this book profiling major liberal intellectuals from Rousseau through Mailer, however, British conservative Paul Johnson wants to restore the original, negative sense of the term. Johnson's intellectuals are egotistical, male chauvinist, avaricious, deceitful and sexually perverse. They are responsible for everything Johnson detests, from Stalin's Russia to the "childish" decade of the '60s.

Johnson argues that the ideas of these "secular intellectuals" are "rooted in" their depraved personalities. "Sartre's inability to maintain a friendship with any man of his own intellectual stature helps to explain the inconsistency, incoherence and at times sheer frivolity of his political views," Johnson writes. There is even a causal chain from the man to his works to the acts performed in his name. Johnson writes of Marx's capacity for political quarreling, "There is nothing in the Stalinist era which is not distantly prefigured in Marx's behavior."

Johnson writes a good sentence and parts of this book are fun to read, but his central argument is thoroughly tendentious and even contemptible. The book masquerades as a study of a defined historical type, the intellectual, and of the relationship between the intellectual's personality and his work, but the argument boils down to an attempt to discredit certain intellectuals' ideas by linking them to their unsavory personal lives. Johnson's method is not that of the historian but that of the ad hominem debater and the supermarket tabloid.

The problem lies with how Johnson defines, or fails to define, the term intellectual. He claims that the "secular intellectual" has historically displaced the priest and witch doctor as the guardian of culture. He then confines these "secular" intellectuals to anti-religious and left-liberal thinkers like Marx or Bertrand Russell. But the point is misleading. What occurred historically was the detachment of church from state and of

Benevolent geniuses or monsters of deception?

This penetrating examination of the moral and judgmental credentials of leading intellectuals contains incisive portraits of Rousseau, Shelley, Marx, Ibsen, Tolstoy, Hemingway, Russell, Brecht, Sartre, Wilson, Victor Gollancz, Lillian Hellman, Cyril Connolly, Norman Mailer, James Baldwin, Kenneth Tynan, Noam Chomsky and others who are revealed as both brilliant and contradictory, magnetic and dangerous.

Paul Johnson

Author of A HISTORY OF THE JEWS and
MODERN TIMES: The World from the Twenties to the Eighties.

"Fascinating... Instructive... Johnson is a superb writer... His book is a celebration of plain truth and common sense by a very sensible Englishman!" —USA Today

2nd Printing
Before Publication

Harper & Row

A Main Selection of the
Conservative Book Club

a state-sanctioned priesthood from the ruling elite. What has displaced the single priesthood is a heterogeneous group of Catholics, Protestants, Jews, atheists, liberals and conservatives, including Johnson himself.

Historical generalizations aside, what, then, of specifically liberal intellectuals? Is there, as Johnson suggests, some link between their personal misconduct and their ideas? Like the good debater, Johnson happens to choose only intellectuals whose personal lives were not models of middle-class sobriety—and he then proceeds to cast even their noblest

—Continued on page 5

acts in the most invidious light. For instance, James Baldwin (whom Johnson incorrectly describes as a "black nationalist") began writing essays about civil rights because he discovered black rage was "becoming topical, fashionable and just."

BUT EVEN IF one accepts Johnson's

son's bilious characterizations of these liberal intellectuals, one must still reject his characterization of the type. There are many liberals and leftists whose personal lives were fairly humdrum—John Dewey, John Kenneth Galbraith, Eugene Debs, most of the Frankfurt School and most of the Bolshevik leadership, for instance. Were Galbraith's or Dewey's ideas necessarily sounder than—or dramatically different from—those of the philanderer Thorstein Veblen?

Of course, conservative intellectuals like Johnson have not always lived like Mother Teresa. But did Roy Cohn or Willmoore Kendall's enthusiasm for Joe McCarthy reflect their own peculiar lifestyles? Or did Albert Jay Nock's theory of education—later heralded by the young and socially correct William F. Buckley Jr.—reflect Nock's libertinism? Or must these individuals and their ideas be subjected to the same canons of objective judgment as their political opponents?

There is undoubtedly a connection between people's characters and their works and ideas, but it cannot be used as the basis for evaluating what they think or for evaluating a general category of thinkers and their ideas.

Johnson gives predictably short shrift to the actual ideas of his subjects. He is at his best discussing literary figures like Hemingway or arm-chair political philosophers like Russell or Mailer, but his discussion of Rousseau's, Marx's or Sartre's work—as opposed to their sexual or personal lives—is cursory and even ludicrous. "Capital is a series of essays glued together without any real form," Johnson declares—a judgment that will certainly seem curious to anyone who has read that elegantly structured book. Johnson entirely ignores Sartre's difficult but brilliant *Being and Nothingness*. Readers expecting to learn something about Marx's concept of surplus value or Sartre's idea of bad faith will be sorely disappointed:

these ideas are not even introduced.

The way Johnson dwells on his subjects' personal lives is particularly reprehensible. *Intellectuals* reads like one of those back-alley books on sexual perversion whose ostensible purpose is to condemn but whose real motive is to titillate. Johnson excerpts at length and with no particular purpose Edmund Wilson's diary, which he describes (a private diary!) as "quasi-pornographic." While condemning Kenneth Tynan's "self-immolation at the altar of sex," he reveals in details about Tynan's masturbation and sadism.

In short, Johnson's book is not about intellectuals, but only about certain liberal ones he dislikes. And it is not about their ideas, but about their personal lives, particularly their sex lives. It is a book of questionable intellectual value. ■

John B. Judis is senior editor of *In These Times* and author of "William F. Buckley Jr.: Patron Saint of the Conservatives."

(41)

INDEX

Allen & Unwin is now Unwin Hyman, Inc.....	8	"In the year of our Lord" is out.....	7
American Atheists met in March.....	36	Index to this newsletter.....	41
Annual Meeting (1989), Program, etc.....	2	Jacobs (Adam) wins his case.....	7
Annual Meeting (1989, Registration form.....	3	Kohl (Marvin) becomes Associate Dean.....	18
Army: how it views peace activists.....	15	McMaster's BRS Chapter holds 3 more meetings.....	10
Ayer quotes BR on Pascal's argument.....	5	Members' Stationery for sale.....	24
Book News from RS Librarian Tom Stanley.....	34	New addresses.....	28
Book Review: <i>Intellectuals</i> by Paul Johnson....	40	New members.....	27
Books for sale from Russell Society Library...31		News about members:	
" " " " " McMaster University.....	33	Ting-Fu Hung sends Wittgenstein article...19	
Books to lend from Russell Society Library...32		Marvin Kohl now Associate Dean.....	18
BR <i>Foresees Boredom or Doom in a Scientific</i>		Herb Lanedell defends animal research....21	
World.....	14	Ramon Suzara adopts a walf.....	20
BR on Pascal's argument for God's existence...5		Nominations wanted for election of Directors.22	
BR recollects by Shohig Terzian.....	9	Officers of the BRS.....	6
BR's <i>Population Pressure and War</i> (1957).....	30	Other Organizations:	
BR's <i>The Risk of Disarmament</i> (1960).....	4	American Atheists.....	36
BRS at APA 1990: Call for Papers.....	11	CPP, Concerned Philosophers for Peace.....	37
BRS Chapter at McMaster meets 3 more time...10		FFRF's <i>Freethought Today</i>	38
BRS Directors.....	35	SOS, Secular Organizations for Sobriety...39	
BRS Officers.....	6	Ottoline: a biography has been commissioned...16	
Call for Papers for BRS at APA, 1990.....	11	Peace activists, how the Army views them....15	
CPP, Concerned Philosophers for Peace.....	37	Ready (Wm.) enthuses over Russell Papers....17	
Clifford (Harry), 1975 member, dies at 87...26		Registration Form for Annual Meeting (1989)...3	
Conrad Russell reminisces about his father...29		Russell (Conrad) reminisces about his father.29	
Contributions sought.....	13	Russell Papers will make McMaster a Mecca...17	
Contributors thanked.....	12	Russell Society Library report.....	31
Darland (Dennis)'s Treasurer's Report, 1st/4...23		SOS, Secular Organizations for Sobriety.....	39
Directors' election: nominations sought.....	22	Stanley (Tom) reports on the Library.....	31
Directors of the BRS.....	35	Suzara (Ramon) sounds off on the Philippines.20	
<i>Disarmament, The Risk of</i> , by BR.....	4	Stationery for Members for sale.....	24
Dora's obituary in The Times (London).....	25	Terzian (Shohig) meets BR.....	9
Election of Directors, nominations wanted....22		Treasurer's Report, First Quarter 1989.....	23
For sale: Stationery for Members.....	24	Unwin Hyman Inc is Allen & Unwin's new name....8	
FFRF's <i>Freethought Today</i>	38	US Army: how it views peace activists.....	15
<i>Freethought Today</i> , from FFRF.....	38	Wittgenstein: 500 letters discovered in Vienna.19	
Highlights.....	1		