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

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS
No. 70
May 1991

(1) Highlights: 1991 Annual Meeting Program (2). BR writes article for *Reader's Digest* (34). BR obit in *Time* (39). Ralph Schoenman on BR (37). BR quoted in a prayer (30). BR's birthday, a day to celebrate (16). *Why Radicals Are Unpopular* by BR (11). The Index is on the last page.

---

(2) ANNUAL MEETING, JUNE 1991

To register, use the REGISTRATION FORM on the green sheet atop this newsletter. But hurry; the meeting is nearly upon us.

The program:

Friday, June 22:

4:00 - 6:00	Registration
6:00 7:30	Dinner
7:30 - 7:45	Welcoming Remarks
7:45 - 8:45	1991 BRS Service Award to Don Jackanicz; BRS 1991 Book Award to Peter Hylton's *Russell, Idealism and the Emergence of Analytic Philosophy*
8:45 - 9:45	Harry Ruja, *Oddities in Russell's Published Work*
9:45	Board meeting; all members welcome.

Saturday, June 22

8:00 - 9:00	Registration
9:00 - 10:15	Workshop by Don Jackanicz on Russell's 1950 Nobel Prize Acceptance Speech. The speech appears in Russell's book, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics* as a chapter titled *Politically Important Desires.* A copy of the speech will be sent to all who register for the meeting. An audiotape of Russell delivering the Nobel Speech will be available for listening during the week
10:15 - 10:30	Coffee
10:30 - 11:30	Society Meeting
11:30 - 12:30	Marvin Kohl, *Russell, Love, and Moral Education*
12:30 - 2:00	Lunch
2:15 - 3:15	Michael J. Rockler, *Beacon Hill and Summerhill -- the Russell-Neill Correspondence*
3:15 - 3:30	Coffee
3:30 - 4:30	John Lenz, *Russell on History*
4:30 - 6:00	Free Time
6:00 - 7:00	Red Hackle Hour
7:00	Banquet. Speech by Lawrence C. Broadwell, Vice-President, Planned Parenthood Federation of America. Planned Parenthood is the recipient of the 1991 BRS Award.

Sunday, June 23

9:00 - 10:30	Gladys Leithauser and Margaret Moran, *Russell as Fiction Writer*
10:30 - 10:45	Coffee
10:45 - 11:45	Robert Davis, *Is Russell's Socialism Phoney?*
11:45 - 12:00	Closing Remarks

FOLLOW-UP

(3) The "Famous Russellian Proclamation" -- "That Man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving, etc." -- quoted in *The Bluffer's Guide to Philosophy* (RSN68-10), is from *A Free Man's Worship.* It can be found in *Why I Am Not A Christian,* in *Mysticism and Logic,* and in *The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russell.* Thank you, HARRY RUJA.

---

*Russell Society News, a quarterly. Thom Weidlich, Editor, 349 W. 123rd St., NY NY 10027
Lee Eisler, Co-Editor, 1664 Pleasant View Road, Coopersburg, PA 18036
Russell Society Library: Tom Stanley, Librarian, Box 434, Wilder, VT 05088

BOOK REVIEW

(4) Mr. Russell Predicts" in the Saturday Review of Literature, December 28, 1935.

Mr. Russell Predicts

IN PRAISE OF IDLENESS. By Bertrand Russell. New York: W. W. Norton & Co. 1935. $2.50.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE. By Bertrand Russell. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1935. $2.

Reviewed by ARTHUR COLTON

BERTRAND RUSSELL is an asset to civilization, whether one agrees with his social philosophy or not. His socialism is not Marxian. He dislikes the Russian procedure as much as the Italian and German. He thinks it probable that the era we are entering will be more socialistic than the last, but he looks to gradual changes born of situations and events, persuasive rather than violent. He finds unregulated economics too erratic to endure; they are headed for control. But socialism to him must be democratic, or it will be a despotism or an iron oligarchy. Here one may begin to question the probabilities. A socialistic state would have so much to do, such vast responsibilities, that it would have to be a huge and intricate organization in order to cover the ground. Could such an organization be run at all except by an oligarchy or dictatorship? A Russian Commissar would perhaps say that Russell was not tough-minded enough to face realities, but the Commissar might have his own illusions too. He might think that eventually all Russians will think alike, and then the state can safely change over to democracy and freedom. That speculation would be as dubious as Russell's, and in more diverging directions.

Bertrand Russell is an asset to the times, however, because he is a distinguished scientist and a model of lucidity. The essays in "In Praise of Idleness" are nearly all on social and political, rather than scientific issues, and do not bear the authority of a specialist; but his lucidity is with him always. The essay on Youthful Cynicism points out that this cynicism is a characteristic of intelligent youth in England, France and the United States, not in Russia, India, China, or Japan, or generally in Germany. The title essay "In Praise of Idleness" recalls Stevenson's on the same subject; but Stevenson is interested in the personal values of idleness, and Russell in the values to society of distributed leisure.

"Religion and Science," in the later part, deals with many ideas that are difficult in themselves, but his opinion is always clear. The first conflicts were in distant fields, the astronomical. The insurgents were Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo. The battle line shifted to geology and biology, and drew nearer and nearer to the intimately human—psychology, ethics, mysticism, free will and determinism. Is there a definite limit to science, any foreseeable halt in its triumphant career? He indicates one by saying that science has to do with facts, not values.

---

(5) IRAQIS GAS KURDS, 1966

BR would have been appalled at the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and at Saddam Hussein's treatment of the Kurds. BR was quick to condemn similar crimes in 1966. This is from "Information Bulletin No. 3" (June 1966) of Amnesty for Iraqi Political Prisoners. Thank you, KEN BLACKWELL. →

EARL BERTRAND RUSSELL CONDEMNS THE USE OF TOXIC GAS BY THE IRAQI ARMY AGAINST THE KURDISH PEOPLE

Earl Bertrand Russell made a special statement on 20th April, 1966, on the situation in Iraq after the Iraqi government used toxic gas in its racial war against the Kurdish people. Earl Russell said in his statement:

"I have now seen the evidence of the use of poison gas against villagers throughout Kurdistan by forces despatched by the oligarchy of Al-Bazzaz. This poison gas has been used by the United States in Vietnam. It is clear that these gases, which have been used experimentally against the Vietnamese people by the United States, are being tried out wherever there is popular revolution against cruel oppression. From Vietnam and Peru to Iraqi Kurdistan, the struggle of oppressed people for their liberation is met with barbarism, symbolised and implemented by new and deadly poison gas. In addition, the chemical known as napalm has been used by the Iraqi army against the Kurdish people".

Earl Russell went on in his statement, "Poison gas and napalm are only the first stages in the desperate attempt by the Bazzaz oligarchy to keep itself in power by all means. Behind Bazzaz stand the oil companies of America and Britain, and the militarism of the Pentagon".

Clara Claiborne Park reviews two books by two important women in BR's life. Sorry about the last six lines!

My Father the Philosopher, My Husband the Man

(6) *MY FATHER BERTRAND RUSSELL. By Katharine Tait. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. 211 pp. $8.95*
THE TAMARISK TREE: My Quest for Liberty and Love. By Dora Russell. Putnam's. 304 pp. $9.95

By CLARA CLAIBORNE PARK

IN 1921, BERTRAND RUSSELL set down what were in fact his expectations for his own children, the first of whom had just been born:

> If existing knowledge were used and tested methods applied, we could, in a generation, produce a population almost wholly free from disease, malevolence, and stupidity. One generation of fearless women could transform the world by bringing into it a generation of fearless children, not contorted into unnatural shapes, but straight and candid, generous, affectionate, and free. Their ardour would sweep away the cruelty and pain which we endure because we are lazy, cowardly, hard-hearted, and stupid.

Fifty-five years later, Katharine Russell Tait and her mother, Dora Black Russell, have given us very different books, each assessing in her own way the experiment which in his own autobiography Bertrand Russell, with laconic honesty, pronounced a failure.

The Russells were far from expecting the average parent to have a natural grasp of "existing knowledge" and "tested methods." Kate quotes her mother: "Those people who are not prepared to equip themselves in the necessary way must either abandon parenthood or have recourse to the expert." Although Dora Black's apprenticeship to parenthood consisted of several years of university study of 18th century France and Bertrand Russell was nearly 50 when his first child was born, neither doubted that they were experts in child development, as in how to live. Dora wrote *In Defense of Children* and *The Right to Be Happy;* Bertie wrote *The Conquest of Happiness* and *Education and the Good Life.* They founded their own school so their children could learn happily; "Happiness in children is absolutely necessary to the production of the best kind of human being." The idea of happiness shadowed the childhood of John and Kate Russell as ominously as ever Victorian ideas of sexual repression and sin had shadowed their father's. What right had they *not* to be happy? As Kate tells us, it was clear to them from the beginning that they had enlightened parents who "knew what was best for their children and did not repeat blindly the mistakes of their own upbringing," "that it was a privilege to belong to their family," that "we need never feel afraid, we could speak to our parents about anything," that "we were free and healthy and privileged." If they fell short, the fault must be their own, "since the method was foolproof and the parents were perfect." Guilt has many sources. It was an irony her father could not appreciate that Kate would ultimately find her liberation from guilt in that Christianity on which he had blamed many social and individual ills.

For Kate and John were not happy, as children or as adults. "They were born after 1914, and were therefore incapable of happiness," wrote their father. An explanation at once too grandiose and too easy, as Kate shows. Not the least of the ironies of the Russells' various accounts is the realization that the parents, products of an unenlightened Victorian upbringing, lived with so much more zest and confidence than their children. How much they saw and did! Until she comes to the debacle of her marriage, almost every page of Dora's chronicle is testimony to her capacity to enjoy. She decorated her home in brilliant, pure colors that denied the past. When Bertie, who was a feminist in name only, told her it was too dangerous for her to come with him to Bolshevik Russia, she went by herself; she ran for Parliament; she had babies because she wanted to, and enjoyed them. She was one of those "fearless women," and her quest for liberty and love might well have been successful if it had not run afoul of her husband's quest for more of the same.

The children's security was sacrificed not only to their parents' pursuit of happiness, but to their passionately held principles. Kate's memoir begins in a Cornish Eden, with a leisurely father all charm and affection devoting hours every afternoon to his children. But children need school, the Russells recognized that. Since no ordinary school could be trusted to produce the children of the future, ardent, rational, and free, when Kate was not yet four she and John experienced the transformation of their home into the bleakness of a boarding school and their parents into remote and impartial administrators. Overburdened with teaching, coping with contagious diseases and menu-planning, scrounging to raise money to keep the shaky enterprise going, the Russells seem hardly to have noticed as their children turned into guarded, mistrustful strangers. Dora had given up a promising career for a home and children, but the marriage could not survive the strains imposed by the school, by her two pregnancies by another man, and by the attractions of the pretty young governess hired to give Kate and John the companionship their parents were too busy to provide. The once-happy family had become, in Kate's words, "like jagged splinters, unable to touch one another without wounding."

Russell himself acknowledged the failure of the school in his *Autobiography.* He has little to say about the marriage; at the end of a long, full life (which included two more marriages) it clearly no longer interested him. It interests Dora passionately still. In China, she'd nursed him back to life; she loved him. She still can't understand what happened, when love and freedom and babies were "in accord with the moral principles by which we had been living," and "sexual enlightenment ... the foundation stone of a human, tolerant, happy, and peaceful society." Why should not Russell, in his sixties, welcome a baby that wasn't his, and then another, especially when he'd *told* her he didn't mind?

But he did mind, and the divorce that followed was as lacerating and ugly as any that take place among the unenlightened. "A word from us of what the other parent thought could bring on an endless explanation from the one to whom we spoke. I can remember still the sick, trapped feeling I used to get when some careless word of mine brought on a speech of self-justification, which could be ended only by assent, whether genuine or feigned." Merely to read of the children's holidays, mathematically apportioned to the half day between father and mother, causes pain.

For all her resilience, Dora too was permanently hurt. One might think so convinced a feminist would have taken her babies and returned gladly to the kind of generous, untrammeled life she believed she had a right to before Russell persuaded her to marry him. But unlike Russell, she was loyal to people as well as to principles. Pathetically, she ends her autobiography with her divorce in 1935, as if the 40 years since then had brought her nothing worth recording. As she had feared, the vibrant feminist was "absorbed, swallowed up entirely in his life and never able to become what I aspired to be in my own person."

Kate is now older than her mother was then, and her marriage too has disintegrated. Her memoir is half the length of her mother's, a quarter the length of her father's. Unlike theirs, it is concentrated, searching, bleakly honest — though less than candid when candor, we may surmise, would bring others embarrassment or pain. It is a touching and admirable book. One of its fascinations is to see recorded how Russell, while preaching freedom and ardor, in fact inculcated in his children the familiar values of his own childhood: duty, understatement, self-control. "Joy was to be shared; distress he considered private." "I believed that demanding a fair share of anything, pointing out any achievement of one's own, was selfish. One should always do one's outstanding best, and then say, 'Oh, it was nothing. I only did my duty.'" Kate feels these values as a prison, but we may be grateful for them. Her book is spare but deeply felt; its record of unhappiness contains no trace of self-pity or self-justification. She tells us she was gauche and fat, taking only easy courses in college; she does not mention that she entered at 15 and graduated with one of the two summa cum laudes in her Radcliffe class. Convinced early of her own inadequacy, she is scrupulously fair to everyone except herself. Out of its understatement, her book wells up unexpectedly to a final paragraph that rends the heart. It will repay reading, and rereading, by all who are concerned with Bertrand Russell, with love and children and families, with theory and practice, and with how passionate principles interact with recalcitrant

BR QUOTED

(7) BRS member Ramon ("Poch") Suzara quotes BR at length in his letter to the Manila Standard, October 23, 1990.

Wise man's words

With the worldwide situation worsening everyday, perhaps we can reflect on the words of a wise man, Bertrand Russell. I quote:

"Our world is a mad world. Ever since 1914 it has ceased to be constructive, because men will not follow their intelligence in creating international cooperation, but persist in retaining the division of mankind into hostile groups.

This collective failure to use the intelligence men possess for purposes of self-preservation is due, in the main, to the insane and destructive impulses which lurk in the unconscious of those who have been unwisely handled in infancy, childhood and adolescence.

In spite of continually improving technique in production, we all grow poorer. In spite of being well aware of the horrors of the next war, we continue to cultivate in the young those sentiments which make it inevitable. In spite of science, we react against the habit of considering problems rationally. In spite of increasing command over nature, most men feel more hopeless and impotent than they have felt since the Middle Ages. The source of all this does not lie in the external world, nor does it lie in the purely cognitive part of our nature, since we know more than men knew before. It lies in our passions; it lies in ou emotional habits; it lies in the sentiments instilled in youth, and in the phobias created in infancy.

The cure of our problem is to make men sane, and to make men sane, they must be educated sanely.

At present the various factors we have been considering all tend towards social disaster. Religion encourages stupidity and an insufficient sense of reality; sex education frequently produces nervous disorders, and where it fails to do so overtly, too often plants discords in the unconscious which make happiness in adult life impossible; nationalism as taught in schools implies that the most important duty of young men is homicide; class feeling promotes acquiescence in economic injustice; and competition promotes ruthlessness in the social struggle.

Can it be wondered at that a world in which the forces of the State are devoted to producing in the young insanity, stupidity, readiness for homicide, economic injustice, and ruthlessness — can it be wondered at, I say, that such a world is not a happy one?

Is a man to be condemned as immoral and subversive because he wishes to substitute for these elements in the moral education of the present day intelligence, sanity, kindliness and a sense of justice?

The world has become so intolerably tense, so charged with hatred, so filled with misfortune and pain that men have lost the power of balanced judgment which is needed for emergence from the slough in which mankind is staggering.

Our age is so painful that many of the best men have been seized with despair. But there is no rational ground for despair: the means of happiness for the human race exist, and it is only necessary that the human race should choose to use them."

POCH SUZARA
8 Zipper St., SLV
Makati, MM

(8) Flora Lewis quotes BR in her New York Times column, December 1, 1990.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS
Flora Lewis

For a Sober Balance

PARIS

Word from America is about a mood of blues, depression, sense of guilt, fears of decline and dilapidation, a bleak future. A poll shows 4 out of 10 expect things to be worse in the next five years, compared with 2 out of 10 in 1984.

It is an extraordinary contrast to the smug euphoria of last year, when the long confrontation with Communism suddenly dissolved and the American way — the democratic system and free enterprise — were proclaimed triumphant.

It is also a sharp contrast to the East, and the feeling of Americans and West Europeans who go there to listen to pleas for aid and advice on how to "join" the open world. They explain, and commiserate, and discuss the tremendous problems of change. They can't help feeling lucky, privileged, maybe wiser . . . until they cross back over what is still the great divide in how people live and what they worry about.

One commentator says "America is like a barroom drunk," bragging about its prowess one moment and then blathering disconsolately about the hopelessness and futility of it all. Louis Lapham, the editor of Harpers, is quoted as writing, "I find myself wondering whether the American experiment with democracy may not have run its course." And that at a time when masses of people around the world are declaring that democracy can't be considered a luxury, as cynics suggested a generation ago, but is a necessity.

The hangover is understandable. There was a period of intoxication, of trumpeting "We're Number One," and deliberately but unavowedly neglecting the maintenance and care of society — education, the chronic poor, roads and bridges, the plunge into debt. But a hangover can be a lesson; it isn't a fatal disease.

There has been a peculiar line drawn between foreign and domestic affairs, as though Americans live in two separate worlds that have nothing to do with each other.

Perhaps there was something in the warning by Georgi Arbatov of the Soviet Union that when America lost its Communist enemy it wouldn't know what to do but mope.

The British philosopher Bertrand Russell wrote that he learned when very young not to compare himself with others because he always found some who were worse, "and that was bad for me," and some who were better, "and that was bad for me." But it's also true that it's the one way to put your problems in perspective when you get bleary-eyed and risk losing balance.

The Persian Gulf crisis brought the sense of things going wrong into intensified focus. In the first weeks after Iraq invaded Kuwait, there was a certain exhilaration to see that the world still looked to the U.S. in an emergency, that the U.S. was still the leader and nobody else would or could play the role. Now the burden is weighing.

People ask why we are practically alone in the military buildup. They ask if it's worth fighting for oil (which gives wealth and power to dominate, the things wars have always been about and aggressors always sought). Reaganesque bravado, which cheered the conquest of Grenada (for the wrong reason) has been left behind now that the challenge is vastly bigger and more serious.

The gulf isn't a sashay into Panama, a street brawl or a Saturday afternoon game that leaves everything more or less the same when it's over. Careful planning and public understanding are needed not only on how to deal with the crisis but also the consequences to be faced after.

Sensitivity to Saudi Arabia's strictures is irritating, and in a way demeaning. In respect for its way of life, which can mean death for American troops, the Red Cross is painted out on ambulances, the troops are forbidden pork as well as beer, the President goes out to sea for Thanksgiving prayers. French troops kept the cross, which is simply an inversion of the Swiss flag, but added a Muslim red crescent, dress their chaplains as medical aides and — it boggles the mind for the French — forbid wine. But it hasn't been publicized and people here don't know it.

There isn't an easy way out. War must be avoided if possible, but it may not be possible. Yet the choice cannot be to look after the world or the U.S. It isn't that kind of world anymore. The U.S. cannot run it alone, and cannot meet its own needs and aspirations by turning its back.

There are things to be done urgently at home, and abroad. To slump into resigned depression or a sense of being powerless would do no more good than noisy, empty boasts. The U.S. can't fix all the troubles in the world; neither did it cause them. □

(9)

OVERHEARD IN A BOOKSTORE
by Sheila Turcon

"You don't have the book." The excited voice was definitely marked with disappointment. "The university bookstore is all sold out and I was hoping I'd find it here..." The end of his sentence was inaudible but by then he had caught my interest by the intensity of his emotion. I was standing in the next row of a very small bookstore browsing for something that would interest a friend who is a voracious reader. It was a new bookstore but built in an old-fashioned style, with shelves and shelves of books disappearing up into the high ceiling, accessible only by oak-runged ladders that slid across both side walls.

"You see," he continued earnestly to the clerk, "I wanted to give the book to my father for Christmas.He likes to read, really he does, but he actually doesn't do it much. And this book is so clearly written and makes so much good sense that I think he'd enjoy it." There was a brief pause before he concluded with emphasis, "I know he would."

"Whatever is this gem of a book," I wondered, even more intrigued. I couldn't see the two of them that clearly over the rather high central bookstacks. Their voices were fading slightly as they walked away from me toward the Philosophy section. The clerk was listing off a number of possible alternatives to her customer. Her selections varied widely over a number of writers. She seemed to be stressing either their nationality or popularity in describing them. The young man was unenthusiastic as he agreed to look at several titles. Just as I concluded I'd never find out the name of the elusive book he sought so diligently, he said rather loudly, "You're absolutely sure you don't have a copy of *The Conquest of Happiness*?"

A rush of thoughts flooded through my mind. While I was glad that Russell's book, written sixty years ago, was still popular and wanted today, I regretted that neither bookstore had a copy for sale. Yet, there was nothing I could actually do; my browsing continued. It appeared, however, that the customer was not going to be shunted aside so easily. Back at the front of the store, he was asking the clerk what she thought of Russell. "Oh, I like him," she said, to my relief. (Would I have been prepared to go to his defense if the reply had been in the negative?) "I was living in Britain during the 1960s when he was very active for peace. Russell tried to help people, ordinary people, and I admired him for that." The young man seemed satisfied with her reply, nodding his head in agreement. Yes, they concurred, Russell was a good man, perhaps even a great one. He turned back to the Philosophy section and I tried to resume my task at hand.

I ended up leaving the shop at the same time as he and a young woman whom I had noticed drifting about the store like me, not realizing they were together. He had in the end bought some substitute book for his father, he was explaining. "But," he exclaimed proudly, "I got him a Russell book anyway," as he pulled it from the bag and waved it back and forth in a flourish. "My father is going to own a book by Bertrand Russell," he told her in an exuberant tone,"even if it's not my first choice." They were too far away from me to read the title, and I felt I had intruded on their privacy for too long to even consider asking. What, dear reader, do you suppose he chose?

ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

(10) Nominations for Directors, please. We wish to elect 9 Directors this year, for 3-year terms starting 1/1/92. This will give us a total of 24 elected Directors. The August newsletter will provide a ballot for voting.

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

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

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

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

Directors whose terms expire at the end of 1991 are LOU ACHESON, ADAM PAUL BANNER, KEN BLACKWELL, JOHN JACKANICZ, DAVID JOHNSON, JUSTIN LEIBER, GLADYS LEITHAUSER, STEVE REINHARDT, TOM STANLEY.

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

From Common Sense, March 1938.

(11)

Why Radicals Are Unpopular

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

In his last book "Freedom Versus Organization," Bertrand Russell commented on the tendency toward bitterness in the Marxian movement, tracing it back to the circumstances in the life of Marx himself. Here, at the request of the Editors, the great English philosopher and mathematician develops this idea in more general terms. A life-long socialist and intelligent fighter against every form of oppression, Mr. Russell's constructive hints here may well lead to a more effective radical strategy.

RADICALS (in the American sense) are by no means *always* unpopular; George Lansbury, for example, is universally beloved and I could think of many other examples of advanced politicians who are or were liked even by opponents. Nevertheless the fact remains that, on the average, men who desire important political or economic changes tend to be less agreeable companions, from the standpoint of the average man, than easy-going people who are content with things as they are.

The reasons for this are of various different kinds.

In the first place, Radicals are unpopular people because unpopular people become Radicals. Few things tend more to contentment than social success. A man who is liked at school and college, respected by business colleagues, and loved by the ladies whom he admires, will, as a rule, think that all's right with the world, unless he suffers from ill health or economic disaster. On the other hand, the man who is always out of it among his equals, who has no friends, and whose offers of marriage are rejected, is apt to become hostile to his own class, and to seek popularity in a new milieu by championing the cause of his social inferiors. The educated men who supply leadership to working-class movements are not infrequently of this type. I do not mean, of course, that the process is conscious. I believe that the rational arguments for Radicalism are overwhelming, and that, when a man's circumstances predispose him to discontent, he becomes capable of appreciating these arguments. To himself it appears that he is guided by pure reason, and, in a sense, this is true, since pure reason supplies grounds, of which he is aware, which wholly justify his opinions.

The man who becomes a Radical because he is unpopular is closely akin to the man who becomes a Radical from inordinate love of power. This latter is the familiar type that loses its Radicalism as soon as it achieves success; its best known examples are Julius Caesar, Napoleon, Mussolini, and Hitler. Most really able young Radicals belong to this class, which is responsible for the constantly repeated betrayal of the people by their chosen leaders. Ambition is a stronger stimulus to hard work than a pure desire for the public good.

The Radical leader, of whatever type, is likely to be a man who cares more for hard work than for what is called pleasure, and who, therefore, has difficulty in becoming popular among ordinary pleasure-loving people. A good many years ago I lived with Clifford Allen (now Lord Allen of Hurtwood), who was at that time a Socialist. Derby Day was approaching, and I made him a speech, saying: "You and I profess to be on the side of the People, but we have no sympathy with its enjoyments. It cares much more for horse races than for social reform. Is it not our duty, as friends of the People, to go to the Derby?" Neither of us had ever dreamed of doing such a thing, but we agreed that we ought to mend our ways. However, when the time came we forgot all about it. How, then, could we hope to win the sympathy of ordinary men? Most democrats by conviction are aristocrats in their pleasures, and are thereby cut off from the herd.

An Uncomfortable Realism

There are, however, deeper reasons for the unpopularity of Radicals. Their outlook on the world is uncomfortable, and brings to people's notice things which they would like to overlook. I remember once, when I was boating with a cheerful party during a holiday, we came upon a magnificent yacht belonging to a South African magnate, and I remarked: "That yacht is built out of the blood of negroes." You can imagine everyone was a bit disquieted. The gaiety of the occasion was spoiled for the moment. No one can be a Radical without being profoundly conscious of the things that are amiss in the world, which most people at most times wish to ignore. And consciousness of evils is naturally associated with hatred of those who seem to cause them. Very often, hatred and envy of the successful is the *cause* of Radicalism; but when it is not, it is usually one of its *effects*. If you think banks do harm, you will hate bankers; if you are a pacifist, you will abominate munition makers; if you are a Socialist, you will think ill of big industrialsts. The nature of your pre-occupations will make it inevitable that such men should be much in your mind, and therefore feelings of enmity are likely to play a large part in your emotional life. To easy-going people you will appear soured and bitter, and they will conclude that love of Man is bound up with hatred of particular men.

Hatred of individuals who profit by the present system is, of course, not logically justified by the belief that the system ought to be changed. Successful men, as a rule, are only cleverer than unsuccessful men, not more wicked. We are all the product of our circumstances, and moral categories, as applied to persons, are unscientific. But even those who hold this doctrine most strongly are unable, in practice, to live up to it. Marx, in spite of his economic determinism, was filled with virulent hatred of the bourgeoisie, and in this respect his followers have

been faithful to his example. A profound religious faith, such as that of the Quakers, may enable a man to advocate remedial measures without hatred, but will seldom lead to championship of any fundamental economic or political reconstruction. The resistance to such changes has a force and violence which can hardly be met efficiently without the driving force of hostile feeling, except perhaps by one man in a century.

The Appeal to Personal Hatred

There are times when the very qualities that we have been considering make the Radical popular, and they are the times when radical changes are effected. Marat was popular during the French Revolution, because most people were suffering acutely, but did not regard their own suffering as inevitable. He told them that they would become prosperous if they cut off the heads of such and such individuals. This sounded easy, and they believed him. Similarly Hitler told the Germans that all would be well with them if they sufficiently persecuted the Jews. Misery produces, in the normal man, one or the other of two effects: apathy, if he thinks the situation is hopeless; hatred, if he thinks it attributable to the machinations of some individual or set of individuals. Hatred is more agreeable to the sufferer, and will therefore be adopted if possible. The politicians who appeal to discontent canalize hatred. In order to succeed, they must suggest as the enemy someone who is in any case unpopular, and they must have a very short and simple argument to prove that this person is the source of the evil. Socialists have failed, on the whole, because capitalists are not instinctively disliked, and because the argument that we should do better without them is too long. If, for "capitalists," you substitute "Jewish capitalists," the argument becomes much shorter and easier to understand. Foreigners, also, can always be plausibly represented as the enemy. In the French Revolution, the hatred of aristocrats was largely stimulated by the fact that they were in league with the hated Austrians; and in Russia, the Communists have always had national feeling on their side since the intervention of 1915 and 1920. But in general Radicals are internationalists, and are therefore unable to exploit anti-foreign feeling. This has been, perhaps, the greatest of their difficulties.

The Problem a Radical Faces

The conscientious Radical is faced with great difficulties. He knows that he can increase his popularity by being false to his creed, and appealing to hatreds that have nothing to do with the reforms in which he believes. For example: a community that suffers from Japanese competition can easily be made indignant about bad labor conditions in Japan, and the unfair price-cutting that they render possible. But if the speaker goes on to say that it is Japanese *employers* who should be opposed, not *Japanese* employees, he will lose a large part of the sympathy of his audience. The Radical's only ultimate protection against demagogic appeals to misguided hatreds lies in education: he must convince intellectually a sufficient number of people to form the nucleus of a propagandist army. This is undoubtedly a difficult task, while the whole force of the State and the plutocracy is devoted to the fostering of unreason. But it is perhaps not so hopeless a task as many are now inclined to believe; and in any case it cannot be shirked, since the appeal to unreasoning emotion can always be better done by charlatans.

FOR SALE

(12)

New 17-Year Index of BRS Newsletters, 1974-1990, Issues 1-68, 45 pages, 2523 entries. Buy it for $8 postpaid (within the USA). To borrow it from the RS Library, send $1 for postage (within the USA), plus you pay return postage, approx. $1.

BR postcard. After being out of print for several years, our favorite photo of BR -- taken in 1959 by Philippe Halsman -- is once again available. $1 for the first one, 75¢ each for more ordered at the same time. Postpaid.

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." 90 sheets, postpaid: USA $6, Canada and Mexico $7.

1990-Meeting Papers. The 10 papers presented at the 1990 Annual Meeting -- papers by Elizabeth Eames, Lee Eisler, Joan Houlding, Don Jackanicz, Marvin Kohl, Tim Madigan, Chandrakala Padia, Michael Rockler, Harry Ruja, and Thom Weidlich, 145 pages in all, bound -- can be yours for $18 postpaid. Or borrow them from the RS Library for $1 postage, plus you pay return $1 postage

Buy any of the above from the newsletter, or borrow from the RS Library. Addresses on Page 1, bottom.

---

(13) **AMERICAN ATHEISTS' 21ST CONVENTION**

Once again we are indebted to BRS Member LARRY JUDKINS for a report on an American Atheists' Convention. Larry's report on AA's 19th Annual National Convention (March 24-25, 1989) appeared in the August 1989 newsletter (RSN63-6). What follows is his report on AA's 21st Annual National Convention (March 29-31, 1991).

This year's convention was held in Scottsdale, Arizona, and over 400 people were present. I am happy to report that I was not the only BRS member in attendance. At least one other member was present, Christos Tzanetakos, Director of AA's Miami Chapter.

The major events on Friday included two portrayals of "the Great Agnostic," Robert Green Ingersoll, by actor William Boyd Francis. The first was titled "Some Mistakes of Moses", derived from a speech which Ingersoll himself considered one of his most important lectures. For his second performance, Mr. Francis delivered Ingersoll's address to the jury in the blasphemy trial of C. B. Reynolds, widely regarded as one of the hallmark pleas for freedom of speech in the United States.

Two speeches were given on Friday. First, Jon G. Murray, President of AA, spoke on the "Christianization of the United States," a talk which dealt with the efforts of religionists to make America a "Christian nation." Next, ex-theologian Frederick Ide gave an entertaining and informative lecture on "Denominations in America -- or How to Tell One Christian from Another."

Saturday was the principal day. After opening remarks by Jon Murray and others, AA's founder, Madalyn O'Hair gave an excellent extemporaneous talk on "the Rights of Atheists." Appropriately, this was followed by the lecture of Frank Shütte, Director of the International League of Non-Believers and Atheists, headquartered in Berlin, Germany. He spoke on "Mandatory Religion in Germany", a nation where blasphemy laws still exist and are enforced.

BRS members may find it specially interesting that Mr. Schütte also revealed that his organization has initiated an appeal to hold an "International Russell Tribunal" to investigate the causes and consequences of the recent Persian Gulf War. It is modeled on the "International Russell Tribunal on war Crimes in Viet Nam, " organized in 1966 by BR and Jean-Paul Sartre.

The day's final speech was that of Frank Zindler, Director of AA's Central Ohio Chapter. He is also a leader in the fight against the killing of children by Christian Scientists and other so-called "faith healers". I found his lecture, "Child sacrifice in America," to be the most fascinating -- albeit disturbing -- event of the entire convention.

Three "workshops" were held simultaneously in the early afternoon on Saturday. One dealt with overpopulation. Another sought to give the "Lazy Atheist" a "Guide to Political Power." In the third, a brief analysis of the Bible was provided by Arthur Frederick Ide.

Three more "workshops" were held concurrently in the late afternoon. One concerned "Atheism and Conscientious Objection." In another, panelists discussed the successful efforts of Atheists to remove a Christian cross from the campus of Arizona State University. In the third, Robert Sherman, National Spokesperson for AA, gave Atheist activists several very helpful suggestions on how to recognize and act on local church/state problems.

On Sunday, ex-CIA agent Victor Marchetti spoke on "the U.S. Special Relationship with Israel and Its Impact on Middle Eastern Affairs." Later, Jon Murray discussed an upcoming Supreme Court case which poses a serious threat to the principle of church/state separation. In this case the Supreme Court will have the opportunity to throw out the so-called "Lemon Test", which for nearly two decades the courts in the United States have used to determine whether or not a given law or practice violates the separation of religion and government.

During the entire Convention, a large book and product display room was open where literally hundreds of different books and other items were available for purchase. A philatelic station was also on hand where one could have envelopes stamped with a special postal cancellation to commemorate the occasion.

Of course, there were also plenty of opportunities for Atheists to socialize. A dance was held every evening, and conventioneers could also visit with each other during the wonderful meals, including the special Brunch Buffet and the Members' Dinner.

In conclusion I can only say that there was something for everyone, and that a great time was had by all. I strongly encourage all BRS members who are Atheists to try to attend the next National Convention of American Atheists.

SPEAK UP!

(14) Your letters, questions, and suggestions are always welcome. If there's something on your mind, tell us about it. Thanks to STEPHEN FREY for reminding us to remind you about this.

From Common Sense, February 1944. With thanks to Whitfield Cobb.

(15)

My Program for India

By Bertrand Russell

AS a life-long friend of Indian freedom, I am glad there is every prospect, within a short time after the end of the war, of achieving as much independence in India as any nation in the world ought to have. I have regretted that what seemed to me the mistaken policy of the Congress Party after the failure of the Cripps mission compelled me, for a time, to oppose certain claims made by Hindu nationalists. I opposed them because I was convinced that, if conceded, they would have led to a Japanese conquest of India, which would have destroyed all hope of Indian freedom and would have jeopardized freedom throughout the whole world. But as to what should be done when the Japanese menace is over, I firmly believe that India should have complete equality with other independent nations, subject only, in common with all others, to such controls as may be established by an international authority. I do not expect that India will choose to be a member of the British Commonwealth, and I do not desire that any pressure should be put on India to that end.

A recent book, H. N. Brailsford's *Subject India* expresses opinions which I share more nearly than those of any book on India known to me. Brailsford is, I fear, somewhat too optimistic as regards the prospects of Hindu-Moslem agreement. He ignores some awkward facts, such as Gandhi's statement that he would not eat food cooked by a Mohammedan or allow his daughter to marry into a caste different from his own. But these defects (if I am right in considering them such) are completely outweighed by Brailsford's merits.

His book deals not only with the politics but also with the economics of the Indian peninsula, and gives the kind of facts that a reader who is not Indian would want to know. The average income per person, he tells us, is about $19 a year; the average life expectation is twenty-three and a half years, as compared with fifty-four years in Great Britain. Of males 18.3 per cent are literate; of females 1.9 per cent. He estimates that in the jute mills, before the war, one hundred pounds went to British shareholders for every twelve pounds paid in wages. Such facts need to be borne in mind in any attempt to solve the Indian problem and in any appraisal of the effect of the British Raj.

He mentions, however, with complete fairness, the facts on the other side of the ledger: that famine was much worse in Mogul times than it is now; that the British have done important work in irrigation; that Indian capitalists are every bit as ruthless as British investors in India; that, since the outbreak of the war, the entire British investment in India has been wiped out; and that Gandhi sides with landowners and wealthy industrialists against the poorer sections of the population.

Brailsford holds, as I do, that the Congress policy after the failure of the Cripps mission was indefensible. He points out that "non-violent" resistance included tearing up railway lines and organizing strikes in munition works—actions which, if Congress had been more successful, would have facilitated a Japanese conquest of India. He mentions Gandhi's description of the Cripps offer as a "post-dated check on a tottering bank," and draws the correct inference that rejection was largely motivated by the expectation of a Japanese victory, since few Indians thought we could defend India against the Japanese. The Congress revolt in the summer of 1942 was, he says, a wrong done to the family of nations: "Congress miscalculated and forgot its international duty." He holds, of course—and in this I entirely agree—that the British badly mishandled the situation. But in criticizing their actions, Americans should ask themselves what would have happened in this country if, for example, the United Mine Workers had adopted a similarly obstructive policy to secure some political end; and, to get a just view of the danger, they should imagine the Germans in occupation of Canada.

THE mistakes of both sides in 1942 are, I hope, ancient history. A new beginning must be made, and I could wish the initiative to come from the British.

I do not myself think it likely that any serious administrative changes will be made while the Japanese are in Burma or the Malay peninsula, nor do I think they ought to be demanded. It is difficult to conduct a great war during rapid governmental changes, and it is at least doubtful whether an independent India would be able, at once, to contribute as much to the war effort as India contributes at present. But if the offer of post-war self-government were one that all India recognized as definite and irrevocable, the delay would be slight, since it must require time to prepare a new constitution and to reach agreement among Indian parties. All the preliminary work could be done while the war is in progress, and would certainly promote Indian loyalty to the cause of the United Nations. Brailsford says—and I have repeatedly urged—that any fresh offer to India should be guaranteed by the United States, Russia and China. Such a guarantee would remove any suspicion of bad faith. In its absence, Indians might expect the British, in the hour of victory, to forget what they had promised in the dark hour. Churchill's unfortunate remark about refusing to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire has naturally strengthened Indian suspicion.

Of British opinion at the present time I cannot speak at first hand, since I have not been in England since 1938. But from all that I can learn,

there has been a strong movement towards the left. Everybody recognizes Mr. Churchill's supreme merit as a leader in time of war, and no one wishes to forget what we owe to his courage in 1940. But his politics, apart from the simple aim of victory, are not those of the majority. As soon as the war against Germany comes to an end, there will have to be a general election, and the new Parliament is likely to be very different from the present one. Great Britain will emerge from the war as a debtor country, subordinate to the United States at sea, and unable to oppose Russia effectively in Asia. Thus the whole basis of British imperialism in Asia will have disappeared. These facts, combined with the growth of liberal sentiment, make it practically certain that, when the war with Germany is finished, the British will be willing to re-open negotiations with Indian nationalists, and to acquiesce in a United Nations guarantee of whatever agreement may be reached. So far as the British are concerned, therefore, the outlook is hopeful.

The British are likely to offer dominion status at first, but as this admittedly entails the right of secession it differs only sentimentally from the offer of outright independence. It is in fact a folly to endeavor to fit India as a dominion into the British Commonwealth of Nations. The other dominions have sentimental ties with England, while India has none. India will belong naturally to an Asiatic Federation, with China and (eventually) Japan. The white country which will have the closest relations with this federation will be neither England nor the United States, but Russia. Even against Russia, south-eastern Asia is likely to assert its independence vigorously.

Japan has created in Asia the feeling that it is possible to be independent of the white man. Neither the United States nor the British Dominions are likely, in any measurable future, to permit much Asiatic immigration, and Asia, in consequence, will maintain an attitude of aloofness towards white men. The genuine independence of Asia is likely to be one of the most important results of the present war. Whatever British imperialists may desire, the day when the British could rule India will cease with the defeat of Japan.

WHAT, then, ought the policy of the United Nations to be? They should recognize—and the British should recognize—that India must have such a measure and degree of independence as is compatible with the existence of whatever international authority may be established. Complete independence is an anarchic ideal: no nation ought to possess it where questions of peace and war are concerned. But the superior authority should be international, not national; national imperialism should be abolished wherever it is politically possible to do so.

Great Britain should, at the earliest possible moment, join with the United States, Russia and China, in an offer of self-government to India, terminating all special British rights. This would come into effect six months or a year after the end of the war with Japan. The four nations would immediately appoint commissioners to negotiate with leading Indians of all parties, with a view to framing a constitution. This constitution would be embodied in a treaty between India and the United Nations as soon as India acquired a national government capable of concluding treaties, and the constitution would be effective at the given date at the end of the war.

Certain conditions should, however, be attached, not only for India, but also for all the nations restored to self-government after liberation from the Nazis or the Japanese. The first of these should concern the rights of minorities. In Europe, however boundaries may be drawn, there will be racial minorities, and there will be the Jewish problem. No persecution of minorities should be tolerated by the international authority. There was such a provision in the covenant of the League of Nations, but it was a dead issue: in the future, care must be taken to make the provision effective. In India the important minorities are religious, and there must be a stipulation that they are to suffer no disabilities.

The second proviso which should be imposed everywhere is more difficult. There should be no overthrow of an agreed constitution by force, though legal means of changing the constitution should be provided, and should not be made too difficult. In many countries, at the outbreak of the war, fascist military groups had acquired power by unconstitutional means; of this process Spain was the outstanding example. In this way democracy was destroyed throughout a large part of Europe, and governments were set up which had no sanction except military force.

IT is generally recognized that the primary purpose of the international authority should be to prevent war. I am contending that it should consider it part of its duty to prevent civil war, as well as war between nations. The reasons are twofold: first, civil war may easily spread into international war, as the Spanish civil war nearly did; second, that by the establishment of fascist tyrannies the aims of the international government can be defeated and war made probable. I do not say that the form of government everywhere should be democratic; I say only that the form of government should be sanctioned by a democratic vote, and alterable only by a democratic procedure. Any attempt to alter it by force should be defeated by the intervention of the international authority.

In the case of India, this means that every important Indian group should acquiesce, in advance, to the proposed constitution, and should bind itself not to resort to civil war to change it. If no such constitution could be devised by the negotiations between Indians and the United Nations' commissioners, Pakistan would be necessary. If an agreement on the basis of Pakistan were also unobtainable, Indian freedom would have to be postponed. It is hardly to be supposed that, in such circumstances, it would long remain impossible to frame an agreed constitution. If it did, the United Nations would have to conclude that India is not yet ripe for self-government.

The dangers of civil discord in India between Hindus and Moslems are said by Hindus to be exaggerated by the British. As to this, I am content to leave the matter in the hands of the proposed commissioners, who should have power to act by a majority, so that the British commissioner could not alone make his view prevail. The commissioners should be expected to negotiate and inquire for some considerable time before making definite proposals. And they should listen to proposals as well as make them. If the problem is soluble, this method should solve it.

Mr. Brailsford suggests ten measures that should be adopted in India. First, there should be

a Pacific Charter, supplementing the Atlantic Charter; it should, in the name of all the United Nations, offer independence to all the Asiatic regions hitherto governed by white men—India, the Dutch East Indies, the Philippines, etc. Second, the India Office should be abolished, and its work taken over by the Dominions Office. Third, there should be a political amnesty. Fourth, Congress should call off the revolt. Fifth, the Viceroy should advise the Princes to concede civil and political rights, with the understanding that if they refused the British would no longer protect them. Sixth, the coalition ministries should resume office in the six Congress provinces. Seventh, Congress and the Moslem League (perhaps with the help of a mediator) should negotiate over Pakistan. Eighth, the Viceroy should call upon the best man to form a national government. Ninth, as soon as active hostilities are over, there should be new elections in the provinces. Tenth, the relations with the British Commonwealth should be fixed by treaty, and India, having been granted dominion status, should decide whether or not to secede.

THESE proposals are designed to be easily practicable and to safeguard British pride as much as is consistent with securing the important points. I should myself prefer to see the United Nations taking a more active part in the negotiations, but so long as the substance is secured, the form is unimportant. My chief criticism of Brailsford's ten points is that I am not very optimistic as regards the seventh, negotiations between Congress and the Moslem League. I think it likely that considerable pressure will be necessary to produce agreement between these two parties, and I think the United Nations could bring the necessary pressure more easily and more impartially than the British could.

I think also that Mr. Brailsford is optimistic if he supposes that white men will surrender the riches of the Dutch East Indies and the Malay Peninsula, with the strategic port of Singapore. I think it more possible that these will come under a condominium, giving America equal rights with England and Holland. The possibilities of American financial imperialism are suggested by Mr. Brailsford, but could, I think, have been emphasized.

In conclusion, I, like Mr. Brailsford, would say to my compâtriots: Do not deceive yourselves into thinking that you can retain your Indian Empire after the war; you cannot, and it would be the part of wisdom to surrender gracefully. To Indians I would say: Since your triumph at no distant date is assured, be a little patient while the war lasts, remembering that a Japanese victory would be fatal to all your hopes. And to both sides I should say: Cultivate an international outlook and endeavor to see the affairs of your own country in relation to the supreme need of world peace.

BR'S BIRTHDAY, MAY 18TH

(16)

We repeat what we said in the last issue:

May 18th is the birthday of our Lord. Lord Russell was born 119 years ago. He left us a legacy of insights and great ideas which enlighten and inspire. And a sterling example of moral courage. All of which deserve to be celebrated.

One way to celebrate is to get together with other nearby BRS member and arrange for a birthday dinner -- at a restaurant or at somebody's house -- with, if possible, a birthday cake and candles, and, of course, a toast to Russell's memory.

We suggest that you make your arrangements and reservations well in advance.

After the celebration, please tell us about it, for mention in a future newsletter.

P.S. Since you will be reading this <u>after</u> May 18th, let us make BR's Birthday a Movable Feast, just like the British sovereign's. Celebrate BR's birthday as soon as you can; we think it will count just as much in Atheist Heaven as if you had done it on May 18th.

RELIGION

(17) Our thanks to **WILLIAM K. FIELDING** for sending us this ad from *The New York Times* of 9/23/90 (?) (date uncertain):

WHERE WE STAND

By Albert Shanker, President
American Federation of Teachers

An Essential Part of American History

Teaching *About* Religion

Progress doesn't always follow a straight line. Take the case of religion and the public schools. When I was young, public education still reflected this country's largely Christian and Protestant origins. Most kids, no matter what their faith—or lack of it—started the day listening to a passage from the King James Bible and saying the Lord's Prayer. And this was hard for many of us.

But when the U.S. Supreme Court abolished state-mandated prayer and devotional use of the Bible in public schools, things went to the other extreme—teaching about religion became a bigger taboo than teaching about sex. And this happened even though the Supreme Court was careful to distinguish between teaching religion in public schools and teaching *about* religion. In fact, by the 1980s, religion had disappeared so completely from the public schools that one popular text series for children in elementary school identified the Pilgrims as "people who made long trips"—17th-century tourists, perhaps—and Christmas as a "warm time for special foods."

It's not hard to see how this happened. People in schools worried about the line between acknowledging the role of religion in American society and history and appearing to favor a particular faith. Would yearly concerts of Christian religious music cross the boundary into favoring Christianity? Could a teacher speak about the importance of Christian values in Martin Luther King's life and work without being accused of promoting the Christian religion? Did mentioning one religion—or religious holiday—mean you needed to give equal time to others? (And if so, which others?)

But as the description of the Pilgrims suggests, "When in doubt, leave it out" isn't a responsible, or a practical, answer. If students don't know anything about the religions that helped shape our cultural heritage, they'll have a very limited appreciation of that heritage. And if they're ignorant about the religions practiced in our multicultural society, it will be difficult for them to understand —or live harmoniously with—the people who practice them. Most important, if students don't get a chance to discuss religion in their American history classes, they won't learn about our unique tradition of religious freedom or how and why the separation of church and state was established and maintained—and they won't find out about the role they must play in carrying on these essential features of our democracy.

Fortunately, people of all political and religious persuasions now agree that it's important to introduce teaching about religion into the curriculum. That doesn't mean it will be easy to avoid some of the pitfalls, but materials that should help are appearing. For example, *Religious Freedom in America: A Teacher's Guide* by Charles C. Haynes (Silver Spring, Md.: Americans United Research Foundation, 1986) includes articles about the tradition of religious freedom in this country and about Supreme Court decisions on the subject, as well as a list of resources. And this fall, a curriculum series called *Living With Our Deepest Differences: Religious Liberty in a Pluralistic Society*, which was developed and pilot-tested for upper elementary school, junior high and high school by the Williamsburg Foundation, is scheduled to come out.

Religion in American History: What To Teach and How by Charles C. Haynes (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1990) is particularly useful because it suggests ways of integrating religious issues and questions into a standard American history course. Besides listing and providing bibliography for 29 religious influences in American history, Haynes offers 9 original documents that illustrate important religious issues, and he provides excellent supporting material for each.

The documents show our country at its unique best—and at its worst. And they raise issues that we are still dealing with and will as long as our country exists. George Washington's moving letter to the Jewish congregation of Newport, Rhode Island, which lays out the distinction between religious toleration and religious freedom, ought to make students feel proud and humble; it's a remarkable tradition they have to live up to and continue. On the other hand, an 1837 petition to Congress arguing for a curtailment of the rights of Catholics reveals a darker side of our heritage. But it doesn't encourage an attitude of comfortable superiority: Some of the arguments it advances were still current when John F. Kennedy ran for president in 1960—and they'd play well in a number of circles today. So students will have to grapple with the problems the petition presents instead of just dismissing them.

The best protection religious freedom can have now and in the future is for all of us to understand the challenges it has faced in the past. Teaching about religion in the public schools, and particularly in American history classes, is belated but welcome; it will help protect this uniquely American—and uniquely precious—freedom.

To order *Religious Freedom in America*, send $6 to Americans United, 8120 Fenton St., Silver Spring, Md. 20910; to order *Religion in American History*, send $16.95 to ASCD, 1250 N. Pitt St., Alexandria, Va. 22314; for information about *Living With Our Deepest Differences*, contact Learning Connections, P.O. Box 6007, Boulder, Colo. 80306; tel. 303-441-9260.

FINANCES

(18) Treasurer Dennis Darland reports on the quarter ending 3/31/91:

Bank balance on hand (12/31/90)			843.47
Income: New members	174.50		
Renewals	3,970.13		
total dues	4,144.63		
Contributions	770.00		
Library sales & rentals	147.55		
Misc. income	69.29		
Total income	5151.97		+5151.97
			5995.44
Expenditures: Information & Membership Committees	67.46		
Library expense	11.85		
Subscriptions to *Russell*	300.00		
Misc. Expenses	24.75		
Total expenses	504.06		-504.06
Bank Balance (3/31/91)			5,491.38

BOOK REVIEW

(19) BR, of course, was no friend of Christianity. We think he might have liked this book.

Books of The Times *THE NEW YORK TIMES* **THE ARTS** *SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1990*

The Racist Sins of Those Who Spread 'the Word'

By GEORGE JOHNSON

During the survivalist craze of the early 1980's, extremist political movements were thriving. There was the Christian Patriots Defense League of Flora, Ill., which insisted that white Americans, not Jews, were God's chosen people. In preparation for a race war that they believed was biblically ordained, members were stockpiling food and weapons and preparing to establish a smaller, all-white America in the middle of the continent, a parallelogram whose corners would be Pittsburgh, Atlanta, Lubbock, Tex., and Scottsbluff, Ark.

The New Christian Crusade Church of Metairie, La., taught that Hitler was a better Christian than Billy Graham. A booklet from something called the Church of the Holy Brotherhood, whose address was a post office box in San Francisco, called upon its members (if there really were any) to stalk and kill black people because they "serve the anti-Christ."

Historians generally dismiss groups like these, which have existed throughout American history, as aberrations. But in "The Arrogance of Faith," Forrest G. Wood, a professor of history at California State University at Bakersfield, argues that "Christianity, in the five centuries since its message was first carried to the peoples of the New World — and, in particular, to the natives and the transplanted Africans of English North America and the United States — has been fundamentally racist in its ideology, organization, and practice."

He sees no paradox or doctrinal inconsistency in the fact that so many

The Arrogance of Faith

Christianity and Race in America From the Colonial Era to the Twentieth Century

By Forrest G. Wood

517 pages. Alfred A. Knopf. $29.95.

Alfred A. Knopf

Christian settlers persecuted Indians or kept slaves. "English North Americans embraced slavery *because* they were Christians, not in spite of it," he writes.

Considering all the suffering that has been inflicted in the name of the world's great faiths, it might seem perverse to pick on Christianity. But Mr. Wood argues that Christians have been especially dogged about trying to implant their ideas into unwilling minds.

Drawing on a story from Benjamin Franklin, he writes about a group of Susquehanna Indians who sat patiently listening to a missionary tell them about the Garden of Eden. After learning that a snake tempted Eve with an apple from the tree of knowledge, the Indians politely agreed that "it is indeed bad to eat apples." But when they told their own myth about a woman coming down from the sky to help them find maize, beans and tobacco, the missionary dismissed it as "mere fable, fiction, and falsehood." The Indians, who believed in many gods, seemed perfectly happy to accept another one into their pantheon. But they quickly learned that the Christians had no intention of reciprocating.

So it is with monotheism: if there is one true religion, then others are, by definition, superstitions. Islam is known for its enthusiasm in spreading the faith, but Mr. Wood believes that Christianity has been especially aggressive because of its biblical mandate to spread "the word" to every being on the planet. Only then would the prophecies be fulfilled so that Christ could make His Second Coming. "Herein lay the fundamental component of the Christian's racism," he writes, "his inherent inability to leave other people alone."

Some Puritan preachers taught that the "red men" were agents of Satan put in the New World to test the settlers' resolve. In the early 17th century, when tens of thousands of Indians died of smallpox brought by the Puritans, John Winthrop was able to convince himself that the epidemic was God's way of "thinning out" the human fauna to make room for Christians.

Stories like these make perversely fascinating reading. A large part of the book is devoted to describing the theological contortions used to justify slavery. Especially popular was a cryptic story in Genesis about how Ham was cursed for showing disrespect for his father, Noah. (He watched him sleeping naked.) God punished Ham by making his son Canaan a slave. Throughout the South, preachers taught that black people were descendants of Ham and Canaan and carried the biblical curse.

This kind of theological rationalization continues to this day. The belief that the prophecies will not be fulfilled until the Gospel is spread to every corner of the earth has been used to justify the development of a lucrative Christian satellite broadcasting network. Variations of the story of Ham are still circulated by racist groups. It is disappointing that despite the promise of the subtitle, the book barely makes its way into the 20th century, leaving off just after 1900.

And though the book is engagingly written, there is finally something wearing about the zeal with which Mr. Wood prosecutes his case. Christianity, like all religions, has often been used to encourage rather than transcend mankind's worst instincts. The Bible provided slave owners with a convenient sourcebook of theological excuses. But it also helped lay the foundation for the moral code that led people to question slavery in the first place.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

(20)

Coletts (Jan) See Eisler

Eisler (Lee) writes: "If someone had told me a year ago that I'd be getting married again within a year, I'd have said he was either kidding or crazy. That shows how wrong I can be. Jan Coletts and I met about a year ago at a conference of the American Humanist Association. We were married this month -- the merry month of May. And merry it is indeed."

Ruppe (Cherie) -- the adventurous one -- is "off to Australia to visit my friends for a month. All is well here. I'm thriving." Now that's what we like to hear.

BOOK REVIEW

(21) BR's Religion and Science (1935) is reviewed by "the gloomy dean," Rev. William Inge in The Spectator (18 Oct 1935).

Religion and Science

By the VERY REV. W. R. INGE

LORD RUSSELL is a formidable controversialist, and in this book he deals, as we might expect, shrewd blows at those who still think that the cause of religion may be defended against triumphant naturalism. He believes in science, and "cannot admit any other method of arriving at truth." "Whatever knowledge is attainable must be attained by scientific methods."

He believes in science as the only avenue to truth. And yet for him all truth is relative. The question between Galileo and the Inquisition was "only one of convenience in description, not of objective truth." It is not an intellectual error to say that the sun goes round the earth. Now this may be good science—it is not for me to say—but I think it is bad philosophy. If all truth is relative, there is no standard by which to measure anywhere, and the word truth, which has an absolute meaning, had better be dropped. Some of our physicists and astronomers dabble in subjective idealism, I think illegitimately. We cannot begin with atoms (no matter how much minced up) regarded as concrete entities, and end with mental concepts. Science is based on realistic assumptions, and cannot drop them at will.

The assumption of universal relativity leads Lord Russell, quite logically, of course, to declare dogmatically that there are no absolute values. Now as religion rests entirely on the belief that the ultimate values are absolute, all possibility of agreement is cut off at the outset. If he is right, religion is not worth discussing.

For him, "mysticism expresses an emotion, not a fact; it does not assert anything, and therefore can be neither confirmed nor contradicted by science." Religion poaches when it "makes assertions about what is and not only about what ought to be." "Questions as to values lie wholly outside the domain of knowledge." "What science cannot discover, mankind cannot know."

No papal bull could be more dogmatic than these statements. But a Christian philosopher would deny every one of them. He is not interested in what ought to be, but in what is. Mysticism seeks for facts, not emotions. Spiritual truth is not apprehended by science; but it is, in Plato's language, true "knowledge," whereas our views about the external world are only "opinion." Those who attack religion without perceiving the foundation on which it rests may do some pretty sniping at the outposts, but they will never carry the main position.

Let us suppose, with some not inconsiderable thinkers, that reality is spiritual, and that it is partially but truly revealed to us under the three forms of truth, love (or goodness), and beauty, which the religious mind believes to be the attributes of a living and unchanging Creator. Then we approach nearest to truth and reality (the two words are almost interchangeable) when our minds are most fully possessed by the quest of truth, the experience of love, and the appreciation of beauty. The proof is experimental; in following these three ideals we are at once lifted above ourselves and exalted into a higher state of being. We feel and know that we are in contact with reality. In all philosophy we come to a place where we must trust ourselves; and no other experiences can be compared with these.

Within this scheme, science holds a very honourable place. It is entirely false to say that science gives us facts without values. This is a most fallacious abstraction; there is no perception without valuation. Science is the service of one of the ultimate values, truth. Nor is it possible, since human nature is after all one, to pursue one of these ultimate values alone. Lord Russell is by no means an example of scientific detachment when he encounters cruelty, oppression, and injustice. But, speaking broadly, we may say that Darwin, St. Francis, and Wordsworth climbed the hill of the Lord by different paths. Does Lord Russell really think that only the first attained to real knowledge?

If I am right, Lord Russell has begun his study of religion with presuppositions which predetermine his verdict against it, and prevent him from understanding the religious view of reality. Science is a noble pursuit, but the saint and the poet or artist have equal rights; and it is a happy truth that those who follow any one of these eternal spiritual values are not much cramped by their specialising, for the three, though distinct, are united as "a threefold cord not quickly broken."

Having thus made our necessary protest, we are free to enjoy the brilliant sword-play of the author. He has a heavy indictment against ecclesiastics for taking away the key of knowledge, and persecuting those who wished to explore new truths. I have no wish to defend them. Rome especially has always been a bully, under Diocletian, under the Popes, and now under Mussolini. It has believed in coercion. We cannot make a man unsee, but we can sometimes make him unsay, or at least we may make him hold his tongue. But I think there have been times—say in the fourth century and in the thirteenth, when theology was abreast of the best thought of the time; and Lord Russell himself thinks it possible that religion and science will soon cease to quarrel. Our angry passions have been diverted to politics, and those who value what Bismarck called the imponderables may find themselves on the same side.

Some of the sly hits are delicious. When chloroform was first used in childbirth, the clergy quoted Genesis: "In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children." "Yes, but God gave Adam an anaesthetic when He extracted his rib." "True, but He never gave the woman one."

"The Hegelians identified the moral law with the law of the State, so that true freedom consisted in obeying the police. This doctrine was much liked by governments."

His criticism of alleged cosmic purpose is, I am afraid, unanswerable. "Why did the sun give birth to planets? Why did the earth cool, and at last give rise to life? Because in the end something admirable was going to result—I am not quite sure what, but I think it was scientific theologians and religiously-minded scientists."

It is well known that there is a keen controversy between the mechanicists and those whom their opponents call vitalists, as to whether the laws which regulate inorganic matter are sufficient to explain the phenomena of life, mind, and spirit. Lord Russell very dogmatically, as usual, supports the mechanicists, and says that only "a very few" men of science hold the opposite opinion. Oddly enough, this is almost a quarrel between the two old Universities. I once asked the *doyen* of Cambridge science what he thought of Professor John Haldane's views on this subject. He shook his head, and said, "We think him a heretic." But at Oxford he is strongly supported. Lord Russell, of course, is a Cambridge man.

The book ends with the sadly true warning that "the threat to intellectual freedom is greater in our day than at any time since 1660; but it does not now come from the Christian churches." We may trust a determinist to be a champion of freedom, like the Calvinists; the Jesuits, the apostles of free-will, have been the worst enslavers of the mind and conscience. Should a philosopher laugh or weep over the vagaries of human nature?

Religion and Science. By Bertrand Russell. (Home University Library: Thornton Butterworth. 2s. 6d.)

BOOK REVIEW

Malcolm Rutherford reviews Ryans's Bertrand Russell: A Political Life in the Financial Times, July 9, 1988.

(22)

Malcolm Rutherford on the philosopher who quarrelled with almost everyone

Reason on the rampage

BERTRAND RUSSELL: A POLITICAL LIFE
by Alan Ryan. Allen Lane The Penguin Press. £16.95, 226 pages.

BERTRAND RUSSELL was a man of supreme intelligence who had all the self-confidence arising from having been born into the top of the aristocracy to boot. He also lived to the age of 97. Those three facts help to explain a great deal about him.

Of his intelligence there was no doubt. It was said of his childhood that the only thing that kept him from suicide was that he wanted to learn more about mathematics. His *Principia Mathematica* was published in 1910. He died in 1970.

His grandfather was Lord John Russell, who had been Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary. His godfather was John Stuart Mill, who agreed that accepting such a title did not imply a belief in the deity. His midwife was Elizabeth Garret Anderson, whose medical studies had been paid for by Russell's mother but who, under the rules of the time, could not practise as a doctor because she was a woman. So Russell belonged firmly to the liberal, aristocratic intelligentsia.

It was a bigger class then than it was later. And that in a way was Russell's undoing. He never really learned to belong to anything else, and probably did not want to. The world changed around him and to some extent caught up with him. There was no point in being a Liberal in the 1930s since the Liberal Party was on its way out. There was not much point either in his belonging to the Labour Party after 1945, since to be an effective member meant becoming embroiled in the Party organisation, and for that Russell was totally unsuited. Eventually the Party threw him out altogether.

In fact, for most of his life Russell quarrelled with almost everyone, though not all at the same time. Again that seems to go back to his origins. Because he was so intelligent and had such a fertile mind that ranged over so many subjects, he could be intolerant of those less able and less well-read. As Alan Ryan remarks, it was never enough for Russell to refute someone's argument; he had to say that they were sadists as well. The aristocratic background did not lend humility.

He was also sheltered. When he was jailed at the end of the First World War, for writing an article calling for an early peace, he was made a first division prisoner. That meant having another prisoner to clean his cell, eating food sent in to the jail and unlimited reading matter. During his six months inside he read 200 books and wrote two.

His personal life did not help his public persona. He was married four times and had numerous affairs. Sometimes he seemed to write books on morality partly to justify his own behaviour. When he was offered a chair at the City University of New York in 1940, the mother of a girl student objected through the courts. Her lawyer described Russell as: "Lecherous, libidinous; venerous, erotomaniac, aphrodisiac, irreverent and narrow-minded." The court ruled in the mother's favour and the university withdrew the appointment. "Narrow-minded," however, seems a bit much.

Russell spent most of the Second World War in the US, making it clear that he was as opposed to Hitler as anyone and indeed publicly denouncing a book that he had written in favour of appeasement in the mid-1930s. When he returned to England shortly before the end of the war, he was surprised to find that he was regarded as a rather respectable figure. He was given the Order of Merit, the Nobel Prize for Literature (he wished it could have been for philosophy) and gave the first – some say the best – Reith Lectures for the BBC.

It did not last. Russell was too intolerant of other people, of political movements and of any large organisation to stay in line for long. He achieved a reputation for inconsistency. One explanation was that he had thought about so many subjects so often that he sometimes forgot what he had concluded in the first place. Another was that he was getting old. He was 73 when the war ended and 95 when he was denouncing the American presence in Vietnam. A third is that the state of the world changed rather more than he did. He resisted the Vietnam war almost as he had resisted the First World War.

Alan Ryan's book is what it says it is: A Political Life. It is about the politics of the man based on a careful reading of all that he thought and said. There is, I think, one omission. Russell's anti-Americanism, both as a young and an old man, stems from his own peculiar background. America simply did not fit into his aristocratic intellectual world. For the rest, the book is wonderfully entertaining and informed: almost a social history.

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

(23)

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

1990-92: JACK COWLES, WILLIAM FIELDING, DAVID GOLDMAN, STEVE MARAGIDES, FRANK PAGE, PAUL SCHILPP, WARREN SMITH, RAMON SUZARA, THOM WEIDLICH

1991-93: IRVING ANELLIS, BOB DAVIS, BOB JAMES, HUGH MOORHEAD, CHANDRAKALA PADIA, HARRY RUJA

The 6 BRS Officers are also Directors, ex officio

HUMANIST NEWS

(24) Free Inquiry & Prometheus Books get a free plug from Doug Ireland, media critic in The Village Voice (April 16, 1991). Ireland also nicely excoriates Catholicism's silliest ritual:

> Just when you thought that network television's self-degradation in its endless search for profits had reached its nadir, along came ABC with 20/20's unbelievably repulsive "exorcism video." Complete with a Hollywood-hype soundtrack (the pounding exhortations of Orff's Carmina Burana), the segment stimulated a flood of gush from the show's cohosts: Barbara, more Wawa than ever, lisped her "thanks to the Catholic Church for being so courageous as to allow our cameras" to record the theatrics. No courage was involved: the Church's membership is declining faster than you can pronounce the words "condom" or "abortion," and the decision to put these sensational doings on the air (facilitated by the priest described as Cardinal O'Connor's "exorcism consultant") amounted to a primetime promo. It's as if Saatchi & Saatchi had hired George Romero to produce a spot designed to bring into the fold the ignorant, the superstitious, and the downright psychotic. There were a few caveats sprinkled over Tom Jarriel's report--the unfortunate girl whose privacy was violated stopped seeing demons after being heavily medicated by her psychiatrist, and by constantly repeating "I'm happy now," she gave the impression of a zombie on mood elevators. But, as Roger Ailes will tell you, it's the pictures that count on TV, not the words. The only real instance of demonic possession on the show involved those who presented it: Jerrold, producer Rob Wallace, Wawa, and Hugh Downs, an overrated airhead who seemed completely duped by this medieval claptrap. All of these avaricious subintelligences should be force-fed On the Barricades: Religion and Free Inquiry in Conflict, a collection from the pages of the useful secular humanist review Free Inquiry just published in Buffalo by Prometheus Books.

AWARD NOMINATIONS WANTED

(25)

If you would like to submit names of people you believe should be considered for the 1992 BRS Award or the 1992 BRS Book Award, please do so. When you submit a name, state why you think your candidate deserves the Award. Here are the 2 Awards:

The BRS Award. Your candidate should meet one or more of the following requirements: (1) worked closely with BR in an important way (like Joseph Rotblat); or (2) made an important contribution to Russell scholarship (like Paul Arthur Schilpp); or (3) acted in support of an idea or cause that Russell championed (like Henry Kendall); or (4) promoted awareness of BR or BR's work (like Steve Allen); or (5) exhibited qualities of character, such as moral courage, reminiscent of BR.

The BRS Book Award should go to a recent book that deals in an important way with some aspect of BR's life, work, times, or causes.

Please send your candidates c/o the newsletter, for forwarding. Address on Page 1, bottom.

OFFICERS OF THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.

(26)

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

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

From Feinberg and Kasrils, Bertrand Russell's America, vol. I, 1896-1945 (New York: Viking Press, 1973). Originally published in Forward, March 24, 1929, as "When Bertrand Russell Goes to the Movies."

(27)

THE CINEMA AS A MORAL INFLUENCE

Everybody knows that America is more virtuous than Europe, and that the Middle-West of America is the most virtuous portion of that country. There is a perfectly simple test of virtue which proves the justice of this common opinion: if A wants to persecute B, while B does not want to persecute A, then clearly A is more virtuous than B; he has a higher moral standard and is more inclined to moral indignation. Consequently, where a large public has to be appealed to, its most virtuous portions determine the nature of the appeal, for while the vicious can tolerate virtue, the virtuous cannot tolerate vice. Hence every increase in the size of the audience means an increase in the virtuousness of the appeal.

These observations apply with especial force to the cinema. The productions of Hollywood are exhibited in all parts of the world, with the possible exception of Greenland and the Antarctic continent. In the Middle-West, they seem natural; in the rest of America, intelligible; in other continents, interesting because they are so curious. Moreover, much can be done by altering the captions: I saw at Locarno an American film about bootleggers and rum-runners being caught by virtuous policemen, but in order to make it sympathetic to a southern wine-drinking population, all the captions had been altered so as to make it appear that cocaine was the substance in dispute. To an Italian-speaking population, the American objection to alcohol seems just as strange as the Hindu objection to beef: it is a fact concerning which sociologists could speculate, but for which one would not seek a rational explanation.

The movies have had one effect which may hereafter prove of some considerable importance: they have persuaded the populations of all other civilised countries (quite unjustly, of course) that Americans are silly. The morality of the nursery tale and the simplicity of the fairy story are, if one were to judge by the cinema, demanded in America by grown men and women. In this respect, America is peculiar. The British appear to be incapable of producing films, but the Germans and Russians can utilise the cinema to produce things that are really admirable, and are only prevented by political considerations from being popular throughout the continent.

For my part, I am a person of simple tastes: I like to see a race between a motor-car and an express train; I enjoy the spectacle of the villain gnashing his teeth because he has just failed to pick off the engine driver; I delight in men tumbling off skyscrapers and saving themselves by telegraph wires; I am thrilled by a sheriff's posse galloping through a sandstorm in the alkali desert. And the enjoyment of these unsophisticated delights is enhanced by the feeling that in that matter at least one is in harmony with the great world democracy. I am too old to have enjoyed the experience, which younger Europeans have on first landing in America, that the movies have suddenly come to life. In old days, cultured persons arriving in Italy had an analogous sensation; they saw Italian opera and Italian painting exemplified by living men and women. Nowadays, for the great mass of mankind, it is America that gives this sensation, since it is only Americans who are represented in the cinema. America has thus become the classic land of art for all simple souls.

The cinema will lose its international character by the introduction of the 'talkies'; one cannot imagine the characters in the movies talking French, Italian, German, or Russian; American is the only language compatible with their acts, gestures, and sentiments. The cinema is perhaps the most heart-rending of all the many examples of artistic barbarism. Its possibilities in a thousand directions are immeasurable; it is capable of an epic sweep which is quite impossible to the 'legitimate' drama; it can deal with such a theme as Shaw's 'Methuselah' far better than Shaw has dealt with it; it can present great movements in history; it ought to be used in all schools for the teaching of history, geography, and zoology. But all these things are impossible so long as the whole of the technique is in the hands of men whose taste has been degraded by the necessity of making an appeal to the most ignorant and stupid parts of the population, and who are themselves so ignorant and stupid that they can do this without cynicism. Many countries have State opera and State theatre, but not State cinema, because the cinema is modern and has not yet been dignified by tradition and great artists long since dead. Nor do I altogether desire the creating of State cinemas in the different countries, since they would inevitably be used to further nationalism. The power of the cinema as propaganda is almost boundless, and the propaganda of nationalism by the State would certainly be more harmful than the propaganda of mere silliness by commercial promoters. If the nations were in earnest to avert wars, those which belonged to the League of Nations would spend money in the promotion of first-rate films to illustrate the ideals which inspired the creation of the League and to promote loyalty to the League as a means of averting war. This of course is out of the question, because the will to peace exists only in those small northern nations which cannot hope to gain anything through war. The Americans, the British, the French, the Italians, the Germans, and the Russians all in their various ways desire war, provided it is the right war. Not one of them has any real will to peace, and not one of them would spend a cent to promote the ideals of pacifism. Perhaps American producers could be induced to engage in pacifist propaganda throughout Europe on condition that no film having this object should be allowed to be shown in America. This might be suggested to the Senate as a means of carrying out its intentions in ratifying the Kellogg pact.[1] The power which the cinema has placed in the hands of Americans for purposes of foreign propaganda has hardly as yet been realised by Americans. When they do realise it, the effect may be curious.

The passion of this age for doing things by mechanism which are not worth doing at all is one which I do not wholly share. When the 'talkies' were new, I went to London by invitation to see and hear a professor in America giving a lecture on 'The Marvels of Science'. It was not nearly so good a lecture as hundreds of other professors could have given, and there was not a word in it which to me personally there was any advantage in hearing. I would not have walked across the street to hear the actual professor in person giving the actual lecture. The sole point of the lecture was the mechanism by which it was produced.

I suppose in time we shall have mechanical knives and forks which will shovel the food into our mouths at precisely the best rate from the point of view of digestion and mastication. Conversation at meals will of course become impossible, since the fork will not wait for the end of a sentence; but it will be a marvelous invention. I suppose also that old gentlemen will produce their favorite anecdote out of a gramophone instead of taking the trouble to speak it. In time we shall all become too lazy to think of a new remark of which we have not already a record. Instead of writing love letters, a man will obtain an eloquent set of records from the shop, and anyone who trusts to his own unaided invention will be thought mean. Individual initiative will be confined to crime; those who are plotting a burglary or bank robbery will no doubt still have to rely upon their own invention, but all legitimate activities will have become stereotyped. I do not look forward to this state of affairs with any pleasure, but I do not see how it is to be avoided.

[1] Ratified in July 1929; U.S.A. and France undertook to settle all disputes by peaceful means.

(28) BR's entry in The Cynic's Lexicon by Jonathon Green (St. Martin's Press, 1989). Thanks, Bob Davis.

BERTRAND ARTHUR, EARL RUSSELL

1872–1970 British philosopher

In America everybody is of the opinion that he has no social superiors, since all men are equal, but he does not admit that he has no social inferiors.

***Unpopular Essays*, 1950**

The average man's opinions are much less foolish than they would be if he thought for himself.

We have, in fact, two kinds of morality side by side; one which we preach but do not practise, and another which we practise but seldom preach.

***Sceptical Essays*, 1928**

The infliction of cruelty with a good conscience is a delight to moralists – that is why they invented hell.

Our great democracies still tend to think that a stupid man is more likely to become honest than a clever man and our politicians take advantage of this by pretending to be even more stupid than nature made them.

***New Hopes for a Changing World*, 1951**

It seems to be the fate of idealists to obtain what they have struggled for in a form which destroys their ideals.

***Marriage and Morals*, 1929**

Man is a credulous animal and must believe something. In the absence of good grounds for belief, he will be satisfied with bad ones.

Unpopular Essays, 1950

There are two motives for reading a book: one, that you enjoy it, the other than you can boast about it.

The Conquest of Happiness, 1930

There is no nonsense so arrant that it cannot be made the creed of the vast majority by adequate governmental action.

Unpopular Essays, 1950

Obscenity is what happens to shock some elderly and ignorant magistrate.

Look magazine, 1954

The fact that an opinion has been widely held is no evidence whatsoever that it is not utterly absurd. Indeed, in view of the silliness of the majority of mankind, a widespread belief is more likely to be foolish than sensible.

Marriage and Morals, 1929

People who are vigorous and brutal often find war enjoyable, provided that it is a victorious war and that there is not too much interference with rape and plunder. This is a great help in persuading people that wars are righteous.

Unpopular Essays, 1950

One should respect public opinion insofar as is necessary to avoid starvation and keep out of prison, but anything that goes beyond this is voluntary submission to an unnecessary tyranny.

The Conquest of Happiness, 1930

BR ON EINSTEIN

(29)

BR sent a letter to the September 1964 Annual Meeting of the Society for Social Responsibility, which included a memorial session on Einstein. Here is BR's message to the meeting (with thanks to Whitfield Cobb):

Albert Einstein was concerned throughout his life with the question of individual responsibility and the role of conscience. His concern was directed to his scientific work as much as to the world of political events and personal relations. He had a peculiar dedication which never excluded a simple awareness of other people or of the comparative unimportance of our own desires. The combination of selflessness and deep involvement in creative work characterizes many men of great intellect, but it was the prophetic side of Einstein which led him to speak and agitate against war for the greater part of his adult life.

Science is a creative endeavor and if it is to be pursued as such, the scientist must retain a deep concern for the relationship of his work to the world around him. The scientist is equipped to understand both the psychological and the physical forces which now threaten us with obliteration. It was Einstein's example which pointed to the desperate necessity for all who could understand and see the problem to give their minds and hearts to the cause of opposing destructiveness and pursuing peace. A world in which the obliteration of hundreds of millions of people instantly can be proudly discussed in terms of national morality is both a dangerous and a diseased world. It is not easy to remain sane and active in such a diseased world. If we are concerned to commemorate the life and work of Einstein then we must dedicate ourselves to the effort of opposing all that moves mankind towards callousness, indifference, destruction, cruelty and murder.

BR QUOTED

(30) "Atheist Enlivens Prayer," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, January 26, 1991. Thank you, Paul Doudna.

The St. Louis Board of Aldermen's tradition of beginning its meetings with a prayer provided unusual fare on Friday: a quotation from Bertrand Russell, one of the century's most famous atheists.

For decades, board meetingsopened with a reading of a brief, standard prayer. But Aldermanic President Thomas A. Villa has written his own each week since he was elected in 1987.

His prayers have ranged from solemn topics to hopes for the St. Louis Cardinals during the 1987 World Series, and they frequently include quotations from famous people. On Friday, he quoted Russell in a prayer for peace in the Middle East.

Villa's prayer: "Almighty God and Father, Bertrand Russell stated: 'Extreme hopes are born of extreme misery.' We hope and pray for world peace."

Russell, (1872-1970), was an English philosopher and logician who also was a pacifist and an atheist. Villa said he knew of Russell's philosophy but considered the quote appropriate, "and we need all the help we can get.

"Next week it'll be Nietzsche," joked Villa, a practicing Catholic.

Friedrich Nietzsche, (1844-1900), was a German philosopher who wrote, "God is dead."

---

(31) CONTRIBUTIONS

We thank these members for their recent contributions to the BRS Treasury:

MS. CHERYL BASCOM /3740 MULTIVIEW DRIVE/LOS ANGELES/CA/90068 1226/ /
MR. STEVE DAHLBY /9115 N. CARESSA WAY/CITRUS SPRINGS/FL/32630/ /
MR. DENNIS J. DARLAND /1965 WINDING HILLS RD.(1304)/DAVENPORT/IA/52807/ /
DR. DAVID S. GOLDMAN /35 E. 85TH ST./NY/NY/10028/ /
MR. ADAM JOHN GRAHAM /P.O. BOX 760/CAMPBELLFORD, ONT./ /CANADA/K0L 1L0
MS. CLARE HALLORAN /71-21 69TH ST./GLENDALE/NY/11385/ /
DR. GLADYS LEITHAUSER /122 ELM PARK/PLEASANT RIDGE/MI/48069/ /
MR. RALPH A. MILL /13309 SE FAIRWOOD BLVD./RENTON/WA/98058/ /
MR. NILS NYGARDS /7435 HIGHWAY 65 NE/MINNEAPOLIS/MN/55432/ /
MR. ROY H. ODOM, JR. /P.O. BOX 1528/SHREVEPORT/LA/71165/ /
PROF. DON D. ROBERTS /PHILOSOPHY/U. OF WATERLOO/WATERLOO, ONT./ /CANADA/N2L 3G1
MR. TIMOTHY S. ST. VINCENT /240 W. EMERSON ST./MELROSE/MA/02176/ /
MR. MARK WEBER /229 PUEBLO DRIVE/SALINAS/CA/93906/ /
MR. THOMAS WEISBACH /7 IMRIE ROAD/ALLSTON/MA/02134/ /
MR. RONALD H. YUCCAS /812 MORVEN CT./NAPERVILLE/IL/60563/ /

We remind members that contributions are welcome at all times, in any amount. Please send contributions care of the newsletter or the RS Library, addresses on Page 1, bottom.

---

(32) NEW MEMBERS

We welcome these new members:

MR. JAMES O. CATRON, JR. /N. FLORIDA JR.COLLEGE/MADISON/FL/32340/ /
MR. DEEP CHAND /BENARES CHAPTER, BRS/ VARANESI, INDIA
MR. ROBERT T. CHAPEL /49 HILLSIDE DRIVE/WARWICK/NY/10990/ /
MR. WILLIAM A. DRAUT /P. O. BOX 486/MIDDLETOWN/OH/45042/ /
G. S. V. KRISHNA /BENARES CHAPTER, BRS/ VARANESI, INDIA
DR. WILLIAM P. MYERS /132 LAKE MARIAM ROAD/WINTER HAVEN/FL/33884/ /
MR. WILLIAM N. NEAL /2813-53RD ST., DES MOINES, IA 50310/ /
MR. HARV NYRE /1950 BAY SHORE ROAD/LAKE HAVASU/AZ/86403/ /
MR. ASHOK PANDEY/ BENARES CHAPTER, BRS/ VARANESI, INDIA
MR. NARENDRA PATHAK /BENARES CHAPTER, BRS/ VARANESI, INDIA
MR. HARI RAI /BENARES CHAPTER, BRS/ VARANESI, INDIA
MR. JIM REID /68 EMERSON ROAD/WELLESLEY/MA/02181/ /
MR. JOHN STEWART /193 7TH AV. #4R (c/o DALE S)/BROOKLYN/NY/11215/ /
MR. JACK SUTTON /1647 OCEAN PARKWAY/BROOKLYN/NY/11223/ /
MR. JEFFREY TURCO /13 LONG LANE/MIDDLETOWN/CT/06457/ /
MR. BENJAMIN WADE /51 BROOKS ST./MAYNARD/MA/01754/ /

---

(33) NEW ADDRESSES

MR. ROBERT P. CANTERBURY /601 N. CEDAR ST. #705/LANSING/MI/48912-1239/ /
MS. MARIE CARDELLA /21 OSBORNE ST./BLOOMFIELD/NJ/07003/ /
MR. J. GREGORY GANEFF /QUAD 2122 U/IOWA/IOWA CITY/IA/52242/ /
MR. EVAN FROST GELLAR /ZERO WINNISIMMET ST./CHELSEA/MA/02150/ /
MR. ARTTIE PIAR GOMEZ /102 NEWELL ST./PITTSFIELD/MA/01201-5418/ /
MR. MARTIN LIPIN /7724 MELITA AVE./NORTH HOLLYWOOD/CA/91605/ /
MR. HUGH MCVEIGH /645 FIRST AVE./TROY/NY/12182/ /
MR. BRIAN R. MOLSTAD /P.O. BOX 19382/MINNEAPOLIS/MN/55419/ /
MR. ROY H. ODOM, JR. /P.O. BOX 1528/SHREVEPORT/LA/71165/ /
MR. BERT PARNALL /1117 STANFORD NE/ALBUQUERQUE/NM/87131-0001/ /
DR. RICHARD SHORE /1906-277 WELLINGTON CRES/WINNIPEG,MANITOBA/ /CANADA/R2H 2B3
MR. BRUCE THOMPSON /82 TOPPING DRIVE/RIVERHEAD/NY/11901/ /
MR. THOMAS WEISBACH /7 IMRIE ROAD/ALLSTON/MA/02134/ /

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

(34) "A Philosophy for You in These Times." BR in Reader's Digest! October 1940.

The editors of The Reader's Digest proposed to Lord Russell: "Suppose some evening you were able to make a super-broadcast to 130 million Americans. What would you say?"
This is his inspired message.

TODAY'S WORLD is full of painful things. The hopes for mankind which once were universal have come to seem illusory; instead of progress, there has been a revival of ancient savagery.

How can we avoid becoming discouraged and hopeless? What is the use of caring for children if the world is to be such that existence is intolerable for them? Is all hope for human happiness and improvement, indeed, merely self-deception?

I am sure the answer to these questions is not to be found in despair.

IT MAY SEEM to you conceited to suppose that you can do anything important toward improving the lot of mankind. But this is a fallacy. You must believe that *you* can help bring about a better world. A good society is produced only by good individuals, just as truly as a majority in a presidential election is produced by the votes of single electors. Everybody can do something toward creating in his own environment kindly feelings rather than anger, reasonableness rather than hysteria, happiness rather than misery. The sum of such actions makes the difference between a good and a bad world. If you are an eminent statesman, your environment is large; if you are obscure, it is small. In the one case you can do much; in the other, little. But you can always do *something*.

Every parent who brings up a child in such a way that he becomes rational and kindly is achieving part of what must be done to make a happy world. Everyone who resists the temptations to intolerance which beset us all is helping to create a community in which differing groups can live side by side in mutual amity. One man can do little against a vast evil, but vast evils arise from adding together many little evils, and vast goods arise in the same way.

You may say: "What can one man do against a world?" But if you were wicked you could do equally little for evil. Good and evil alike, however vast, spring from the efforts of individuals — not only of eminent individuals, but of the ordinary men and women of whom communities are composed.

Never before in the history of the world has the independent thought and conscience of every human being been so necessary and important. We need — each of us — to make a serious and determined effort toward something better than the present. There must be the hope of a world with less cruelty and suffering, and there must be a firm will to do whatever is possible toward bringing it into existence. We cannot combat the immense dynamic forces of communist and fascist fanaticism without something equally dynamic and at least as resolute.

We *can* set our faces against injustice, prejudice, falsehood, and cruelty. But it is not enough merely to go about overflowing with vague benevolence. Our emotion must lead to work that is somehow connected, however indirectly, with the creation of a better world.

THEN, TOO, if one is to keep sane and balanced in times of disaster, it is necessary to remember constantly what is good in the world as well as what is bad. The only adequate way for us to endure large evils is to find large consolations. If there is to be any way out of despair, it must be by remembering more things, not fewer, by enlarging our horizon, not by narrowing it, by being more aware of what is good, not by seeing only what is bad.

The human race is a strange mixture of the divine and the diabolic, making both good and evil inevitable. Complete despair is no more rational than blind optimism. There is not only cruelty and suffering. There is poetry and music and love and aspiration, rising triumphant over pain — showing us how splendid man can be at his best, inspiring us to live up to what is noble and turn away from what is petty and mean. There are the sublimities of man's achievements with pure intellect; thus have we learned what we know of the ways of nature, thus are we able to contemplate the great and timeless universe in which the eddies of the present seem of small account. There are courage and endurance in many millions of human beings, heroism in countless humble homes scattered throughout the land. There is heroism in serving mankind. I am thinking of the doctors and nurses who expose themselves to infection in dangerous epidemics, of scientists who risk their lives in experiments to save others suffering, of firemen and lifeboat crews, of gallant rescues, of facing unpopularity for a cause, and innumerable other forms of bravery.

There have been, in history, good periods and bad periods, but neither have been lasting. It is our misfortune to live in a bad period, but it will end. And it will end the sooner if we as individuals keep hope alive.

And so, to the man tempted by despair, I say: Remind yourself that the world is what we make it, and that to the making of it each one of us can contribute something. This thought makes hope possible; and in this hope, though life will still be painful, it will be no longer purposeless.

BERTRAND RUSSELL, British mathematician and philosopher, is the grandson of Lord John Russell, twice Prime Minister. A United States resident since 1938, he has taught at various American universities, delivering lectures full of dry humor and giving sympathetic advice on students' personal problems. Eminent as a writer and lecturer on social and moral questions, he is well known for his *Education and the Good Life*, *Conquest of Happiness* and *Marriage and Morals*.

BR REMEMBERED

Leonard Lyons recalls BR in a February 1970 column (in the New York Daily News???):

(35)

2/ 170

The Lyons Den

LEONARD LYONS

Bertrand Russell spent his first eight years with his grandfather, who was born in 1792. And his grandfather told him about reading the news report of George Washington's death. Russell wrote his own obit, he told me, to be published by the London Times June 1, 1962.

He finally published that obit in his "Unpopular Essays." He wrote of himself: "In 1920 I compared the Soviet State to Plato's Republic — to the consternation of Platonists and Communists alike." He suggested when Russia was championing China and Africa: "We should drop pamphlets there, saying 'Remember, the Russians are also white.'"

Our first meeting was at his Waldorf suite, 1414. He said: "An easy number to remember. It's the square root of 2." He said it in clipped British accent, and added "Most Americans think it's affectation—that if you wake up an Englishman he'd speak American."

Another visitor asked about the H-bomb and the possibility of its destroying the human race. Lord Russell replied: "We shouldn't worry too much about exterminating the human race. Human beings are quite unnecessary. Robots can think, make jokes and do other things as well as we can."

BERTRAND RUSSELL

If Russia got the H-bomb first, he said, we should be nice and preach the brotherhood of man. "But if we get it first, we should order Russia to sign a peace treaty, then evacuate Hungary, proceeding with legality, always with legality.

"And if we have to use the H-bomb, then use it. Whoever gets it will dominate."

He changed, of course, and led the ban-the-bomb sit-downs: "One *should* change when a fact comes along. Maturity, I suspect, consists of being so fixed, so set in mind that you cannot learn anything more." He felt that if his white hair overnight were to revert to its original brown, nobody would pay any attention to him again.

I next saw him at his home in Richmond, Surrey, when Sylvia and I brought our two eldest sons to meet him. Lord Russell mentioned his three children and said he should have had 2.4, the precise average per family to maintain the population.

"But having 2.4 children is hard to manage," he said.

He opposed Winston Churchill, whose wife was Lord Russell's cousin. He admired Albert Einstein, perhaps because they agreed on many vital things: Both disapproved of World War I, and supported the Allies in World War II. He told us the first time he ever heard of Churchill was as a boy when his barber said: "Lord Randolph's son is getting a haircut here too."

Russell refused to advise children: "For one, they have no power." He counseled me: "Send your children to school away from home. Family feeling is undesirable. There's just too much of it in the world."

He told author Joe Heller: "Because half the world is wrong doesn't mean the other half's right."

Russell never took his seat in the House of Lords, he told my sons, because he believed in single-chamber government. He felt visits to the House of Lords were a waste of time, like speaking into a well. "If I want something heard I say it over the BBC. There's no comparison between the House of Lords and the BBC."

At our next meeting at his Richmond home he said he reads one detective story a day, each borrowed from a lending library, to keep his desk uncluttered. He said he paid no tax on his Nobel Prize money, as if it were football-pool winnings.

"A football pool is worth more, and deservedly so. It's harder to win."

The customs of America, he said, are based on the dreams of spinsters. When his publisher, M. Lincoln Schuster, sent him a copy of Russell's "Unpopular Essays," it was held at British Customs. Russell protested: "They think if I read it, my moral character would be damaged." A few days later the book finally was delivered to the author.

He spoke of his five-year contract with the Argyrole King, Dr. Albert Barnes, and of having to sue for the final two years' salary: "Barnes died an appropriate death, running through a red light, and his car was hit. Dr. Barnes had no respect for the law."

Bertrand Russell died Tuesday, at 97, at his home in Wales. He once phoned a N. Y. friend who asked from where he was phoning. Russell said: "From Plas, Penrhy, Penrhynusudrath, Merioneth, Wales. I'd spell it for you but I'm the one paying for this overseas call." *

*"I'd spell it for you but I'm the one paying for this overseas call."

HUMANIST HUMOR

(36) From the April 1989 Humanist Association of Canada Newsletter, with thanks to Paul M. Pfalzner.

'Look, I'll defend to the death your right to say what you want to say. I just haven't the time to listen to it.'

ABOUT SCHOENMAN

The AP reports on BR's controversial secretary during the 1960s. In The Roanoke Times, March 25, 1965. With thanks to Whitfield Cobb.

(37)

Angry American Serves As Bertrand Russell's Secretary

By MILTON MARMOR

LONDON (AP) — Bertrand Russell's secretary is an angry American, one-third the age of the philosopher who finds so much to criticize in the way the United States deals with world issues.

One thing in particular piques the 29-year-old secretary and confidant Ralph Schoenman:

"There is an attempt all over the world to portray Bertrand Russell as senile and to say that I write his speeches.

"It is very tempting for some people to say this since Russell is 92. These people are raising a red herring in saying these things because they don't want to have to discuss what Russell has said.

"It's invidious. It's outrageously untrue.

"I draft many things for him, of course. That's my job. But Russell is in command. His speeches and his statements are his."

Russell crusades against nuclear weapons, the cold war, for release of political prisoners, against American policy in Viet Nam.

Schoenman, now permanently residing in England, has become, like Lord Russell, a controversial figure. One London newspaper referred to Schoenman as Russell's "lend-hand man" — an allusion to Schoenman's political views.

Intense young Schoenman has more than respect for Russell:

"I'm in awe of him," he says. "I think Bertrand Russell is a renaissance man. He is a man who can not be comprehended by his contemporaries because of his riches, his range and his subtlety.

"The mind of that man is so extensive in its scope. And he's never without humor. He's never without that double awareness of the tragedy and irony of things."

There are those in the Russell Peace Foundation, formed to propagate the philosopher's views, who see Schoenman as the man to carry on the Russell crusade when he is gone. Schoenman is a director of the foundation, which operates in offices near Piccadilly Circus.

Russell has never been there. He writes and dictates a stream of letters and pronouncements to world statesmen from his rented house in Wales and his tiny, also rented, house in London's Chelsea District.

Meanwhile Schoenman flies all over the world. He has been to Peking to see Chou En-Lai, to Russia, to India, the Middle East and he now is off to Africa.

The United States picked up his passport 14 months after he went to Communist China.

"I got it back without restrictions," Schoenman remarked. "I didn't use it in China. Chou En-lai invited me there."

Schoenman is the only son of Hungarians who went to New York after World War I. He was born in New York.

At 17, he won a scholarship to Princeton University, where he attacked Sen. Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin. He hitchhiked to Alaska and worked on a fishing boat but went back to Princeton for his bachelor of arts degree in philosophy and political science.

In 1958 he came to London and soon had a master of arts degree from the London School of Economics.

He plunged into the anti-bomb movement, addressed meetings, took part in the Aldermaston marches. He soon favored mass civil disobedience.

In April 1960, he wrote to Lord Russell, then president and the father-figure of the campaign for nuclear disarmament.

Russell invited him to Wales. Their daily contacts have continued ever since.

Schoenman calls himself a Socialist and an Anarchist.

"They are not necessarily self-contradictory," he says. "But I wouldn't call myself a Marxist. That has the connotation of dogma. My views are too varied. Anyway, I cannot accept the Hegelian nonsense in Marx. Yet, I don't like the attempt to dismiss Marx out of hand."

Schoenman believes the real fight for the future will take place in America and that one day he will go back to the land whose way of life evokes his hostility — and he hopes to change it.

NEWSLETTER ITEMS WANTED

(38) We depend on you to help us with the newsletter. Whenever you come across something in your reading that strikes you as specially interesting, please send it to us -- or send a good photocopy -- for possible inclusion in a future newsletter. If you're not sure about whether or not to send something, send it! We'll use it if we can. We need your input.

OBIT

(39) BR's obit in Time magazine, February 16, 1970.

The Last of the Victorian Rebels

AT Plas Penrhyn, his comfortable country house in northern Wales, he worked until the very end—a sparrow of a man, 97 years old and still trying to straighten out the world. A statement went off to Cairo on the Middle East crisis; letters and papers were prepared on Viet Nam and the plight of political prisoners. Then, after a whisky, he retired with a touch of flu to his bedroom overlooking Tremadoc Bay. Not long afterward, the long, passionate life of Bertrand Russell came to an end.

Only five mourners, including members of the immediate family, were present at the private cremation, and there were no ceremonies. But the world took note. Prime Minister Wilson laid clum-

RUSSELL AT 44
The golden mountain . . .

sy claim to him as "the British Voltaire." *Izvestia* extolled him as "most representative of the progressive spirit outside the Communist world." The World Jewish Congress called him "one of the greatest humanitarians of all time." The Queen pointed to his "distinguished contribution to 20th century thought."

It was Russell's thought that had primacy and gave weight to the workings of his large and sometimes foolish heart. Skeptic, agnostic and above all rationalist, he won his first fame as a mathematician, later as a philosopher by creatively applying mathematical methods to the linguistic mysteries of meaning. His most notable work, *Principia Mathematica*, written with the collaboration of his fellow mathematician, Alfred North Whitehead, is a bench mark of 20th century philosophy. Paradoxically, though, Russell was less a man of the 20th century than the last of the eminent, eccentric Victorian rebels.

Aristocratic Disdain. The Rt. Hon. Bertrand Arthur William Russell, third Earl Russell, was born into a tradition of aristocratic disdain for what the neighbors might say, if not with an active desire to *épater le bourgeois*. His grandfather, the first earl, was Prime Minister of England. His parents were ardent freethinkers and campaigners for women's rights. Bertie, considered frail, was educated at home, and there was much coming and going of tutors.

Perhaps mercifully, both his parents died before he was four years old, and Russell was raised by his grandmother, a Presbyterian of strict self-discipline. At eleven, Bertie discovered Euclid under the tutelage of his older brother —"one of the great events of my life," he wrote, "as dazzling as first love." For the next 27 years, mathematics was his "chief source of happiness."

Liberating Numbers. Sex soon began to run a close second. Russell rhapsodizes in his three-volume autobiography about the joys of honeymooning with his first wife Alys, a Quaker from Philadelphia. Stimulated by such delights, Russell wrote his first major work, *The Principles of Mathematics*, at the breakneck rate of 200,000 words in three months. The book was designed to liberate numbers from the mystique that had clung to them since the days of Pythagoras and to demonstrate that all mathematics derives from logic. The three-volume *Principia Mathematica* took Russell and Whitehead ten years. Most of it is completely inaccessible to non-mathematicians, but not all. For example, it contains a careful explication of what is generally considered Russell's greatest philosophical "discovery": the Theory of Descriptions.

This was designed to purge language of the built-in ambiguities that tend to muddy strictly logical thought. Russell takes as an example the sentence: "The golden mountain does not exist." The ambiguity is that the words "golden mountain" may be taken to indicate a something where there is really a nothing. One might ask: "What is it that does not exist?" The answer would be "the golden mountain," implying that it has some kind of reality. Russell's solution was to turn the substantive phrase into what he called a descriptive phrase, *i.e.*: "There is no entity c, such that 'x is golden and mountainous' is true when x is c, but not otherwise."

According to this theory, a man, a concept or an object can only be considered to exist in terms of its exact description. Obviously this requirement can have a devastating effect on such imprecise words as evil or God. Russell's aim—and the aim of the linguistic school that has burgeoned in his wake with the work of his pupil Wittgenstein and many others—was to make over and diminish philosophy. Its traditional function was as a dispenser of wisdom, a guide to right and wrong; the linguistic school saw it merely as a tool to test the truth of limited propositions.

Russell's tremendous intellectual effort to forge that tool was complicated by his discovery—apparently as a sudden revelation while bicycling along a country road—that he no longer loved Alys. But he slogged along for nine years with both wife and book until *Principia Mathematica* was finished. So, almost, was he. "My intellect never quite recovered from the strain," he wrote. "I have been ever since definitely less capable of dealing with difficult abstractions than I was before."

Indeed, he never again put his intellect to a comparable test, but began a new phase as a public—and private —personality that lasted the rest of his life. First he plunged into an affair with a rangy, red-haired bluestocking named Lady Ottoline Morrell, the wife of an acquaintance. He promptly told Alys. "After she had stormed for some

AT 89
. . . does not exist.

hours," he writes in his autobiography, "I gave a lesson in Locke's philosophy to her niece, Karin Costelloe, who was about to take her Tripos. I then rode away on my bicycle, and with that my first marriage came to an end." He did not see Alys again for 39 years.

This cool-cat manner, displayed many times during his four marriages and numerous affairs, is a token of the ascendancy of head over heart. Recounting one of his most successful affairs, he wrote: "We did not go to bed the first time we were lovers, as there was too much to say." At least as important, however, was Russell's pre-Freudian ignorance and indifference about his own and others' subsurface motivations.

On the Public Stage. World War I, for Russell, was a "rejuvenating" experience. Like his grandfather before him, the arid mathematician-philosopher became an actor on the public stage. As a passionate pacifist, he was sentenced to six months in jail. After the war, he visited and wrote about Russia, where he found too much government, and China, where he found too little. He started a widely publicized progressive school with his second wife ("We allow them to be rude and use any language they like"). He lectured at the University of Chicago, U.C.L.A. and Harvard.

Declension of Logic. Adolf Hitler was too much for Russell's pacifism; he supported the Allies in World War II. After the war, the honors began rolling in: Britain's Order of Merit in 1949 (an encomium limited to 24 living Britons) and the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1950.

The postwar period also brought the declension of a great logician into a rhetorical polemicist. In 1948, astonishingly, he urged preventive war against the Soviet Union. "Either we must have a war against Russia, before she has the atom bomb, or we will have to lie down and let them govern us." His first recommendation was ignored, and so by the 1960s he was seriously suggesting that the second be adopted. The Ban-the-Bomb movement and then the Viet Nam War set the old humanitarian excitement running high, and this bright-eyed disturber of the peace must have rejoiced when, at the age of 89, he got himself sent to jail again for seven days for leading a demonstration against nuclear weapons. Less elegantly, Russell's anti-Americanism (which he denied on the astonishing grounds that he had had two American wives) became obsessive. The Americans in Viet Nam, he said, were "at least as bad as the Nazis."

Far truer to his life was the courageous confession—in an essay called "Reflections on My 80th Birthday"—that the mathematical structure he had worked so hard to erect was nothing but an illusion: "I set out with a more or less religious belief in a Platonic eternal world, in which mathematics shone with a beauty like that of the last Cantos of the *Paradiso*. I came to the conclusion that the eternal world is trivial and that mathematics is only the art of saying the same thing in different words."

Long before his death, he shed the Victorian optimism that had envisioned a gradual spread of freedom and prosperity and decline of tyranny and injustice. He feared, instead, a nuclear war that would exterminate mankind with terminal horrors of loot, rapine and anarchy. But he was not entirely pessimistic: "I may have conceived the theoretical truth wrongly, but I was not wrong in thinking that there is such a thing, and that it deserves our allegiance. I may have thought the road to a world of free and happy human beings shorter than it is proving to be, but I was not wrong in thinking that it is worthwhile to live with a view to bringing it nearer . . . These things I believe, and the world, for all its horrors, has left me unshaken."

INDEX

THE 1991 ANNUAL MEETING IS WITHIN EASY REACH OF EAST COAST BRS MEMBERS

IT'S IN BETHLEHEM PA...ON LEHIGH UNIVERSITY'S ATTRACTIVE MOUNTAINSIDE CAMPUS

2 HOURS BY BUS FROM NEW YORK CITY

1 HOUR BY BUS FROM PHILADELPHIA

JUNE 21-23, FROM FRIDAY DINNER TO SUNDAY LUNCH

WE'D LIKE TO SEE YOU THERE!

TO REGISTER, USE THE GREEN REGISTRATION FORM

MAIL IT TODAY, EVEN IF IT'S SUNDAY