

NEWSLETTER #6  
April 1975

- (1) Two major events have occurred since the last Newsletter: The BRS session at the APA meeting (Items 2-7), and the Annual Meeting (Items 8-24). A new section, PHILOSOPHERS' CORNER (Items 33-35) is intended for members who are professional philosophers. Members will vote on the time and place of the 1976 Annual Meeting (Item 25). BR's own postscript to "The Conquest of Happiness" is reproduced in full (Item 31). The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation (England) is in trouble (Item 46). As usual, an asterisk in the left column indicates a request; please respond, if possible.
- 

DECEMBER 27, 1974

- (2) BRS/APA Meeting. The BRS presented a program on 12/27/74 at the meeting (in Washington, D.C.) of the American Philosophical Association, Eastern Division.

KATHARINE TAIT (nee Katharine Russell) reminisced about her father; DOUGLAS LACKEY discussed BR's first encounters with Wittgenstein; Carl Frank, of Rutgers, commented on the Lackey presentation; and PETER CRANFORD spoke briefly about the BRS. ED HOPKINS, who conceived the project and brought it into being, introduced the speakers. The project had been initiated too late to get into the official program issue of JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY, but BRS's own program-mailings were apparently not without results: about 30 persons attended, including BRS Members CRANFORD, EAMES, EISLER, GARSTENS, GUY, LAMONT, READER, and SLEZAK.

BRS intends to do this again at next year's APA Meeting (December 1975), in New York City. Ed is issuing a call for papers on BR (Item 33).

- (3) Kate's talk was charming and informative. Here are some of the things she said:

BR began thinking about education during World War I, because "he wondered how people could grow up and be delighted at the prospect of killing each other. So he began to think about how you could educate people not to be like that."

After John and Kate were born, BR began to study psychology "to find out what you do in the home, as well as in school, to bring up citizens of the right kind. So he read Freud, and the latest psychology he could get hold of, which, bad luck for us, turned out to be John Watson, who wrote: 'Moral education begins at birth.' The child doesn't develop virtues, but good habits." But, says Kate, there's more to it than conditioning. John and Kate — who were "conditioned" to have good habits — didn't find it any easier to be good than BR had found it,

having been brought up on his grandmother's moral principles.

BR and his second wife, Dora (Kate's parents), decided to found a school (the Beacon Hill School), where they could educate their children the way they wanted to.

"My father thought that learning should be interesting and exciting, but that not all of it could be, and that children should be able to accept some dull routine as a necessary prelude to the more interesting things that would follow. The education method and theory really worked. We learned an enormous lot, and we learned it with great interest and enthusiasm, much of it on our own."

Thus Kate considers the school a success; but her father thought it a failure.

"He was rather an all-or-nothing person. He thought that if you set children free, they would be intelligent, liberal and cooperative, and what turned out was that when you set them free, they bullied one another brutally, and he found that you had to supervise them. You couldn't simply enlighten their minds, you also had to be a policeman. That was a big disappointment. He hadn't really expected that at all, because he thought that all their problems came from their benighted upbringing, and if you liberated them, all would be fine. It wasn't."

BR loved to tell jokes. "Some were not so great:

"Hungary used to be called Yum-Yum, but people didn't like that, so they changed the name to Hungary, thought it was more dignified.

"One of the worst stories of my childhood: the Duke of Wellington had a tail, small, you didn't see it under his coat, and he had a special hole in his saddle where it fit." When Kate went away to school, she told the teacher about the Duke of Wellington's tail, and the teacher said, "I never heard that, are you sure?" Kate answered, "Well, my father told me so, and his grandmother knew the Duke of Wellington." When Kate went home, she asked her father about the tail, and when the truth came out, she felt humiliated.

"He kept us hopping with puzzles. How do you know the table is here when you're not in the room? How do you know the sun will rise tomorrow? And he told us about the Cretan who said, 'All Cretans are liars,' and how were you supposed to know whether they were or they weren't? We used to rack our brains over these things, and I grew up saying I would never be a philosopher. I rather enjoyed them at the time but they seemed so unanswerable.

"He knew so much — history, geography — he would always answer your questions. And he knew yards of poetry by heart."

When BR had finished his daily writing stint, "he was the most entertaining, the most affectionate, the most charming person I've ever met. But when he had to work he just tuned you right out.

"Every day of his life he read what he called 'a silly book', usually a detective story. Whenever we moved, we had to find a lending library, so he could have his supply of silly books. If no detective stories were available, any kind of sloppy romance was better than nothing. This was his relaxation. It was quite a long time before I realized that 'silly' was one word and 'books' another."

If you'd like more of this delicious stuff, Kate's book of reminiscences about her father is scheduled for publication this Fall, by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

(4)

Douglas Lackey's paper was titled, "Russell's First Encounter With Wittgenstein, As Documented In Unpublished Materials." What follows is a sampling of the paper, to show its aims and its flavor; but it is only a minor portion of the whole.

I wish in this paper to fill in some gaps in the biography of Russell and Wittgenstein. I hope the incidents I relate will be of interest to the history of philosophy and, derivatively, to philosophy itself.

My presentation has 3 parts. First, I describe this first encounter between R and W in much greater detail than has ever been done before. Second, I describe the state of R's philosophy when W was R's student. My aim is to show that many of the key notions of logical atomism associated with W in fact first appeared in unpublished writings of R to which W had access. Third, by providing a new documentary account of W's thought and personality from 1911 to 1913, I give a basis for a negative evaluation of the thesis...that W's ideas cannot be understood apart from the cultural mix of Hapsburg Vienna.

R and W had encounters in 5 different periods...

The most important meeting was the first. R actually succeeded in giving W some ideas, and W succeeded in changing some of R's own. R wrote about this in 5 different places. R's descriptions of the encounters were all written decades after the event and cannot be considered historical documents...The Notes on Logic by W are equally suspect...

Of the 1400 letters R wrote to Ottoline (Morrell) during these years, 84 record information about W. (The letters are now in the Library of the University of Texas.) And the main book on which R was working when W was his student has been preserved in manuscript.

"My German is argumentative and very tiresome. He wouldn't admit that there was not a rhinoceros in the classroom." (R's first comment.)

"My German engineer is a fool. He thinks that nothing empirical is knowable." (Early comment.)

"W brought me something he had written. It's very good, much better than my English pupils write. I shall encourage him, Perhaps he will do great things."

"After my lecture, W came to my room with me to compose a definition of logical form as opposed to logical matter, to which I suggested various objections, which made him miserable."

"This morning I had my lecture, then W, bringing me some lovely roses. He is a dear man, in spite of being a bore. He also brought me a very original suggestion, which I think is right, on an important point in logic."

"I like W more and more. He has the theoretical passion, which is rare, and one is glad to find it. He doesn't want to prove this or that, just to find out what things really are. He is very excitable

and rather mad, and he has excellent manners, though in an argument, he forgets about manners and simply says what he thinks. In spite of it all, something about him makes him a hero."

"W is a rather severe critic of my lectures. He says I make things too simple and too easy, and encourage the dogmatic discipleship which I deplore. He's very excitable, and has more passion about philosophy than I have. His avalanches make mine seem like mere snowballs. He has the pure intellectual passion in the highest degree, and it makes me love him. His disposition is that of an artist, intuitive and moody. He says, every morning he begins his work with hope, and every evening he ends in despair. He has just the sort of rage when he can't understand things that I have."

"He says, in his judgment, 'A Free Man's Worship' needs something solid in back of it. He dislikes the last chapter of my shilling shocker" — The Problems of Philosophy. In the last chapter, R says philosophy is good because it expands your mind. "W disagrees with that. It vexes him that philosophy should have any use outside of itself."

"I think W has genius. In discussion with him, I put out all my force just to equal his. With all my other pupils, I should squash them flat if I did so. He suggested several new ideas which I think valuable. He is an ideal pupil; he gives passionate admiration, with vehement and intelligent dissent. He spoke with intense feeling about the beauty of the big book" — Principia Mathematica — "and said that he found it like music. That's how I feel about it, but few others seem to... He said that the happiest hours of his life had been passed in my room. He is not a flatterer, but a man of transparent and absolute sincerity. I have the most perfect intellectual sympathy with him, the same passion and vehemence, the same feeling that one must understand or die, the same sudden jokes breaking down the frightful tension of thought."

"I shan't feel the subject" — logic — "neglected by my abandoning it so long as he takes it up. I thought he would smash all the furniture in my room today, he got so excited."

R wrote his paper on the ultimate constituents of matter. "He doesn't like the rest of my paper on matter, but only because of disagreement and not because it was badly done."

"I told him he ought not to simply state what he thinks but to give arguments for it. He says arguments spoil the beauty. He'd feel hurt, as if he were dirtying a flower... He does appeal to me. He's an artist in intellect, and this is very rare. I told him I hadn't the heart to say anything against him, but that he better acquire a slave to state his arguments."

"I gave W some sage advice, not to put off writing until he had solved all the problems, because that time would never come. This produced a wild outburst. He has the artist's feelings; he will produce the perfect thing or nothing. I explained how he wouldn't get a degree or be able to teach unless he learned to write imperfect things. This made him all the more furious. At last he begged me not to give him up even though he disappointed me. With all his intransigence, he makes me feel like a puny compromiser. I have such a strong protective feeling for him that I find it hard to be as reckless for him as he is for himself, though I think he is quite right about this."

"W just arrived, frankly pained by my article on religion." (The Essence of Religion.) "He felt I had been a traitor to the gospel of exactness, wantonly used words vaguely, and said things that are far too intimate for print. I minded this very much. Of course, I agreed with him."

"I feel very much inclined to leave this" — a proposed paper, What is Logic? — "to W."

"W is on the verge of a nervous breakdown, not far removed from suicide, feeling himself a miserable creature, full of sin. Whatever he says, he apologizes for having said it." W's 3 brothers committed suicide; W did not.

"I am pleased to find that W thinks just as well about this idea about matter as I do."

"Ten years ago I could have written a book on the store of ideas I have already, but now I have a higher standard of exactness. W has persuaded me that the early proofs of Principia Mathematica are very inexact."

"I find I can no longer talk to him about my work, only about his. I have become completely reserved."

R began to write a book on the theory of knowledge without telling W.

This is the end of the sampling of a fascinating presentation. There are no present plans to publish the Lackey paper.

- (5) Carl Frank disagreed with the Lackey contention that some ideas usually attributed to W were actually originated by R, because they can be found in R's unpublished manuscript. Frank maintained that, even though these ideas do appear in the unpublished manuscript, that does not prove that R originated them, for R and W had been discussing logic and philosophy quite intensely for a considerable time, and anything R wrote at that time would necessarily have reflected his discussions with W.
  - (6) Peter Cranford told how his almost accidental discovery of COH — he was attracted to it, in a bookstore, by its title; he was looking for a book to give to troubled patients in his private practice — was an event that ultimately led to the founding of The Bertrand Russell Society.
  - (7) Tapes. We have a tape (cassette) of the Tait, Lackey and Frank talks. It is not of professional quality, but the speakers are quite audible. We will lend it on request. Write the Newsletter.
- 

#### ANNUAL MEETING, 1975

- (8) The 1975 Annual Meeting — held in New York City, at the Hotel Tudor, February 7-8-9 — marked the start of the BRS's second year of existence.

President Peter G. Cranford presided at the first 2 sessions, Vice-President Bob Davis at the second 2. These members were present for one

or more of the 4 sessions: ARKIN, BLACKWELL, CRANFORD, DAVIS, EISLER, GARSTENS, GREENMAN, JACKANICZ, LACKEY, MANESSE, MCDONALD, REINHARDT, SLEZAK, TAIT, THOMPSON, WILLIAMS. Also present, Dan Manesse's guests: Margaret Tauss, Dr. Herbert Lauring.

The Meeting started Friday evening with a movie of BR — an NBC interview on BR's 80th birthday (excellent) — brought to the Meeting from Chicago by Gary Slezak. Afterwards, Peter Cranford gave a review of the first year, Lee Eisler presented highlights of Information and Membership Committee activities (Item 30), and Kate Tait, as Treasurer, spoke about money matters (Item 28.)

On Saturday, the sessions continued, morning, afternoon, and evening. All business was completed by the end of Saturday; no formal meeting was scheduled for Sunday.

Here is what happened on Saturday:

- (9) Bob Davis, in his introductory remarks, said that, basically, the BRS does 2 things: BRS makes it possible for Russellites to be in touch with one another; and it works to spread BR's ideas and further his purposes by means of projects — projects which members take part in, those who have the time and inclination. He said we had succeeded in our first year goal of acquiring members, and that the next goal, as he sees it, is to make sure that all members who might wish to, are in fact participating in a BRS program that appeals to them — or starting one of their own, as Dan Manesse has done (Item 16).
- (10) 1975 Contributions. \$1600 has been contributed or pledged for the coming year by the original BRS members.
- (11) Joe Neilands was prevented by flu, at the last minute, from attending the Meeting. (We missed him. Ed.)  
 Martin Garstens read us excerpts from Joe's article for "Organic Gardening", SCIENCE AND THE BIOSPHERE. It is very, very good; we will send reprints to all members, when available.  
 Joe proposed that the Committee on Science (which he heads) work to achieve 6 goals, provided the BRS approved. These were: phasing out research grants sponsored by the Dept. of Defense; requiring recycling programs where appropriate; mandatory disclosure of all sources of income by recipients of federal grants; requiring interdisciplinary and science policy studies on campuses with substantial federal grants; requiring performance records showing social responsibility of all principal investigators getting public funds; and focusing attention on the biological hazards of continuing to generate radioactive materials.  
 There was some opposition to some of the proposals, at the Meeting, and unfortunately, Joe was not there to explain or defend them. We decided therefor to have the proposals written up more fully, and submitted by mail to the members, so that they could vote for or against each of the proposals. You can expect to receive something in the mail on this, when it has been completed.
- (12) "What I Believe." The following was proposed by Douglas Lackey, and approved:  
 In order to induce a publisher to re-publish BR's 1925 essay, What I

Believe, as a separate paperback, BRS agrees to purchase 1000 copies (if it is published.) The book would probably sell for \$1 or \$1.30 retail. BRS's maximum commitment would be \$1300. Douglas Lackey undertakes to sell 250 copies per year, to his students; BRS would recover its money in 4 years.

The reason for the special interest in What I Believe is that it states BR's social views concisely, and is a good, short introduction to BR for beginners.

\* This is the first time the BRS has undertaken to spend a not inconsiderable amount of money, and for a purpose other than growth or internal communication. Any member who has feelings about this, one way or another, is invited to express them in the Newsletter.

- (13) \$300. Officers were authorized to spend up to \$300 on a single project, if money is available, without getting permission from the members. The reason for this is, we elect officers to carry on our business, and we have to give them the means to do it (within limits), without making it burdensome.
- (14) Arthur Arkin spoke informally about the value of BR's ideas to psychiatry.
- (15) A New York City chapter will soon start. Potential members include GREENMAN, JACKANICZ, MANESSE, McDONALD, THOMPSON.
- (16) Daniel Manesse read 2 brief chapters from his novel, GOTHAM COLLEGE, (meaning CCNY), on how Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia (an otherwise admirable Mayor, Ed.) caved in before the pressure of NYC's Catholic politicians, who didn't want BR to teach at CCNY, and who succeeded in seeing that he didn't. Dan had been a student at CCNY at the time of the original episode (1940).  
Dan will undertake to publish, at his own expense, a Russell magazine. "It might be a good place for students to get first things published," says Bob Davis; or for anyone else who wishes to write. The whole idea — like any new idea — is necessarily experimental. If things go well, BRS might eventually sponsor the magazine.
- (17) "Philosophy" . Martin Garstens, a philosopher by avocation (he earns his living as a physicist), and George Williams, a philosopher by vocation or profession (he teaches philosophy for pay), discussed the 2 kinds of BR writings: (1) the "philosophical" writings (on epistemology, language, logic, metaphysics, etc.); and (2) the "popular" writings (on religion, morality, marriage, sexual conduct, happiness, education, politics, power, rationality, nuclear weaponry, etc.)  
George, as devil's advocate, said that some philosophers consider the popular writings as "mere journalism", not philosophy at all, and ignore everything BR wrote except the "philosophic" writings. (At the Meeting, many of the "non-philosophers" seemed to feel just the opposite: they largely ignore BR's books on "philosophic" subjects and value BR for his "popular" writings.)  
Martin, who heads the Committee on Applied Philosophy, thinks that the academics whom George was referring to, have too narrow a view of philosophy, and ought to include under "philosophy" the things that touch people's everyday lives.

\* Comments are invited.

- (18) Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation in trouble. Lee Eisler read a letter from Ken Coates, a Director of the Foundation. The letter also appeared in THE NEW YORK REVIEW OF BOOKS 2/20/75, sent in by Noam Chomsky. (See Item 46.)
- (19) BR writings for beginners. Which of BR's writings would you recommend to a young beginner, say, a highschool or college student?  
 Not everything is suitable. One of Gary Slezak's groups, you may recall, was turned off by The Conquest of Happiness, calling it sexist, elitist, etc. We are looking for writings that do not contain outdated passages or require explanations in order to be acceptable to young people.  
 Some possible topics: ecology, women's rights, marriage, sex, child rearing.  
 The selected writings could be used in 2 ways: they might end up in a book, possibly titled THE MODERN BERTRAND RUSSELL READER; or they might end up on a reading list, perhaps titled INTRODUCING BERTRAND RUSSELL, A List of Selected Readings.  
 \* Please send suggested titles (of books or essays) to Bob Davis, 1737 Silverwood Terrace, Los Angeles, Ca. 90026. He will work with George Williams and Ken Blackwell on this project.
- (20) Pamphlets. Ken Blackwell suggested a series of brief pamphlets, with titles like RUSSELL ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS, RUSSELL ON EDUCATION, RUSSELL ON RELIGION, RUSSELL ON HAPPINESS...you get the idea. Will members please send suggestions for possible pamphlets to the Newsletter, with sources for quotes.
- (21) Documentary film. The idea of having a film on BR, made from existing film and stills, has occurred to several members. The requirements for bringing off such a project successfully are not inconsiderable. You have to know how to make a film, or else, how to get hold of quite a bit of money so you can hire someone else to make it. The film footage and stills have to be acquired, along with permission to use them. Not a small project. Members with ideas on this — or on an "entertainment" type of film, based on dramatic events in BR's life — should write Bob Davis (1737 Silverwood Terrace, Los Angeles, Ca. 90026), who will work with George Williams on this.
- (22) 2-year terms for officers. There was no election of officers or committee chairpersons at the Meeting, as they had been elected in 1974 for 2-year terms.
- (23) Next year's meeting. Several members have suggested that Annual Meetings be held at some place other than NYC, and perhaps in some month other than February. It was decided, at the Meeting, to let the members decide when and where to hold the 1976 Meeting. See Item 25.
- (24) Some minuses. Because of a foul-up in making arrangements, we had to make a last minute switch from the Hotel Roosevelt. (It turned out, they wanted a guaranteed number of guests, a cocktail party, and a banquet. We couldn't afford it. The Hotel Tudor made no such demands, and provided a large meeting hall at no charge.) We apologize to members who were left waiting in the lobby for a while, early Friday evening. Lee Eisler was asked to make arrangements next year.
-



## NEXT YEAR'S MEETING

(25)

Vote. We are going to vote — by mail — to decide when and where to hold the 1976 Annual Meeting.

Use the ballot on the last page of this Newsletter to state your preference as to time and place.

Here are some considerations:

Time of Meeting

Perhaps February is not as convenient for you as some other month. Some have suggested June because the school term is over by then. Another suggested time is December, just before or just after the American Philosophical Association meeting; this would make it easier for our philosopher-members (and others) who attend the APA meeting to also attend the BRS Annual Meeting; it comes at Christmas vacation time, when there are no classes. The December suggestion assumes that the Meeting will be in NYC, because that's where the APA meeting will be.

Please suggest the 1976 weekend (Friday, Saturday, Sunday) that you prefer. Give exact dates, e.g., June 11-12-13, 1976.

Place of Meeting

The U.S. and Canadian members are spread out as follows:

ARKANSAS	McWilliams
BRITISH COLUMBIA	Segnitz
CALIFORNIA	Ashkenazy, Block, Davis, Kong, Kraus, Kravig, Lipin, Neilands, Pitt, Ramsay, Ruja, Sessions, Tobin, Weinbren
CONNECTICUT	Ambery
DELAWARE	Reinhardt
GEORGIA	Annis, Cranford, Stone
ILLINOIS	Eames, Gannt, Schultz, Slezak, Turquette
INDIANA	Berkshire, Waite
IOWA	Spang
KANSAS	Ringer
KENTUCKY	Forno
MARYLAND	Garstens, Guy, Hopkins, Kahan, Reader
MINNESOTA	Magel
MISSOURI	Claiborn, Marie John
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Garrison, Otto, Tuck
NEW JERSEY	Freedman, Kaplowitz, Lefkowitz, Rybnikar, Thompson, Weiner, Williams
NEW YORK	Arkin, Axel, Denonn, Greenman, Becky Hyman, Dick Hyman, Jackanicz, Kohl, Lackey, Lamont, Manesse, McDonald, Tait
NORTH CAROLINA	Perley
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES	Vera Roberts
OHIO	Saal, Thomas

ONTARIO	Blackwell, Milne, Plant, Don Roberts, Lorraine Roberts, Scheu
PENNSYLVANIA	Eisler, Quevedo
SOUTH CAROLINA	Malatesha, Oliver
SOUTH DAKOTA	Anderson
TEXAS	Flanagan, Hackemack, Kwok, Levine
VIRGINIA	Buxton, Elam
WASHINGTON	Allendorf, Richard German, Nancy German, Love
WISCONSIN	Campbell, McKeown

Here is a numerical comparison of members East and West:

East: (New York State + contiguous States and Provinces + New England States + other Eastern Seaboard States): Connecticut 1, Delaware 1, Georgia 3, Maryland 5, New Hampshire 3, New Jersey 7, New York 13, North Carolina 1, Ontario 6, Pennsylvania 2, South Carolina 2, Virginia 1. Total, 45.

West: California, 14, Washington 4. Total, 18.

If all members were to attend the 1976 Meeting, the total mileage traveled would be considerably less for a NYC location than for any other.

There is no doubt that NYC works a hardship on West Coast members. A Westerner has to spend \$500, more or less, to attend, which is a lot, even though it is tax-deductible (we think.) Only 1 out of 18 Westerners attended in 1975.

\* The final choice rests with the members. Please send in your ballot (Item 52, last page of Newsletter.)

#### REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

##### President Peter G. Cranford reports:

The first year. Although the year's activities have been well documented in our Newsletter, it may be of value to the new members if I recapitulate briefly what we have accomplished and then indicate towards what direction the Society seems to be moving.

In February 1974 eleven interested persons met at the Hotel Tudor in New York City. This had been preceded by a great deal of correspondence in which the purpose of a possible Bertrand Russell Society was debated over a period of many months. The chief aim finally arrived at was, to spread Russell's ideas.

This was done throughout 1974. Pilot chapters in Fresno, Los Angeles, Hamilton, Baltimore, and Chicago were started, under the guidance of Dr. Jack Pitt, Dr. Joe Neillands, Ken Blackwell, Dr. Martin Garstens, and Gary Slezak. Lee Eisler stimulated interest in the Society on a national and local level by news items and advertisements in various national publications, and kept the membership thoroughly informed through his excellent Newsletters. Perhaps five or six members distributed copies

of The Conquest of Happiness in appropriate places. Spreading of ideas also occurred through personal contact. Several members of the original group published articles on or in the spirit of Russell, and others are forthcoming. Dr. Ed Hopkins had a very successful program on Russell's ideas at the December meeting of the American Philosophical Association, and similar exposure is slated in other national associations, in sociology, psychology, political science, and psychiatry. In addition, our activities have been reported in Russell, the official organ of The Bertrand Russell Archives.

All during this time, the Society was steadily growing. By the end of the year it was approaching the hundred mark. This was due in large part to Lee Eisler's advertising done at very little cost, by members bringing in other members, and by our exposure in Russell.

The ages of our members range from early teens to early eighties. The intellectual, educational, and motivational level is very high. Many of the members have read Russell extensively and some knew him personally or had contact with him. Most are drawn to him by his great mind, his great character, and his liberal activism. The calibre of the members has changed the direction of the Society. Some of us thought there should be some alternative to the mysticism and drug culture that was being widely promoted, and that a young group could be interested in Russell's rationalism. But it turned out that the Society was drawing almost entirely from a pool of people who were already familiar with Russell's ideas and who wanted to know others who also were. We then decided that we would first concentrate on building up an organization of "Russellites" and have this group serve as a core for planning further. This has worked out very well, and it is entirely probable that we shall have several hundred of such members by the end of 1975.

The psychological strength of the organization at this point stems from the intellectual and moral stimulation that Russell provides. Additional strength comes from the desire of the members to know other members who have been taught by Russell (directly or indirectly) and who have his attitude toward life. How many such people exist in the world we do not know. It is possible that when these are all brought into the Society, growth will slow down. It is more probable that the so-called Russellites, who are clearly highly intelligent, capable, socially oriented, and motivated, will so stimulate the Society that it will continue to grow and act more or less indefinitely — as have the religions.

This brings me to the point that I have tried to make in various ways. Without some degree of Russellian mysticism, I do not think the Society will ever be a strong force in the world society. I know that my argument for the need for mysticism may not be palatable to some. Some are intimidated by Russell's Why I Am Not A Christian, some have been concerned in the past about the development of a "cult of personality", and some tend to turn their back on any form of mysticism. The truth of the matter is that in two important ways, we are no different from the major religions. We believe in love as the chief ingredient of the good life and we have faith that life can have meaning. We differ in that we are committed to implementing this with knowledge acquired in a scientific manner.

(Peter is going to have to tell us, in the next Newsletter, what he means by "Russellian mysticism." Ed.)

A decided weakness in the organization is the poor representation at the Annual Meeting. We had eleven members at our first Meeting, and sixteen at our second, in 1975. We must try to make a better showing next year.

The attendance of key officers and chairmen and members of our committees should be encouraged even if we must subsidize a portion of the expense. Some could not come because of the allied problems of distance and time. Part of this general problem may be solved by a small separate but representative business meeting preceding the Annual Meeting. Part can be solved by getting up a western Society. (Bob, could you do this?)

The time has come, too, to have a rather formal agenda, through a program committee that would have things completely structured months in advance of the Annual Meeting. (Bob, could you do this, or select a committee that would? I will serve on it, though I am poor at this sort of thing.)

As to finances, I will serve as coordinator of a committee this year. I need ideas as to how to proceed. My first one was to appoint every member as a member of the Finance Committee, and to have a small Steering Committee in which responsibility could be concentrated. Another feeling I have is that I would never want us to be a money-grubbing group, and to think instead that we do not solicit money but rather provide an opportunity for a member to invest charitable funds wisely.

I think finally that in all our activities in 1975, we should constantly orient ourselves with the thought, "What would Russell advise in such a situation?"

(27) Vice-President Robert K. Davis' report is merged into Items 8-24, on the 1975 Annual Meeting.

(28) Treasurer Katharine Tait reports:

For the quarter ending 2/7/75:

Balance on hand (December 1, 1974).....1409.59

Income: Pledges and contributions.....366.66

Membership dues.....176.00

542.66  
1952.25

Expenditures: Information Committee....419.73

McMaster(16 subs).....48.00

William Mobley.....150.00

Katharine Tait(expenses) 60.00

707.73

Balance on hand (February 7, 1975).....1244.52

For the year ending 2/7/75:

Balance on hand (February 7, 1974).....0000.00

Income: Pledges and contributions.....2315.00

Membership dues.....685.00

3000.00

Expenditures: Information Committee...	1227.04	
McMaster (subs).....	159.00	
Fresno meeting.....	54.40	
Stationery.....	66.24	
W. Mobley.....	180.00	
K. Tait, expenses to D.C....	60.00	
	<u>1746.68</u>	
Misc.....	<u>8.80</u>	<u>1755.48</u>
Balance on hand (February 7, 1975).....		1244.52

---

### REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

#### (29) International Civil Liberties Committee (Bob Davis, Chairman):

"I am looking for an interested member to take over the chair of this Committee. The V.P. duties preclude my giving adequate attention to it; this pains me, but that's how it is. Approval was given, at the Meeting, for the Chairperson to affiliate with Amnesty International. As mentioned earlier (NL3-20), Amnesty selects 3 political prisoners each month — one each, from the East, the West, and the Third World — held in violation of their civil rights, and writes letters to officials of the offending countries. The prisoners, to be selected by Amnesty, must not have used or advocated violence. Amnesty is well respected, and their selections should preclude questionable or dishonest figures.

"Also, if there is no objection, I will change the name of this Committee to the Committee on International Human Rights."

#### (30) Information and Membership Committees (Lee Eisler, Chairman):

To give an idea of activities -- and costs, in round numbers -- of these committees:

- . A printed page, such as the one you are now reading, costs 4¢ to 5¢.
  - . A 15-page issue of the Newsletter costs, with 30¢ postage, slightly over a dollar.
  - . 4 Newsletters per year will cost about \$4 to \$6.
  - . A new member receives 11 pages (Letter of Welcome, Questionnaire, Constitution, Founding Meeting Minutes) plus all back issues of the Newsletter. A member joining today gets a total of 87 pages (through Newsletter #5), costing about \$4.50, plus \$1 postage, if first class,
  - . An inquirer is sent 7 pages costing 35¢ plus 20¢ postage.
  - . Our clasified ads cost from \$4 (THE HUMANIST) to \$25 (BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS) each. SATURDAY REVIEW costs \$20.
  - . During the first year, information about the BRS was sent to some 200 persons, about one-third of whom joined.
-

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL

(31)

A P.S. to "The Conquest of Happiness." The following article by BR first appeared in the July 1935 issue of NASH'S PALL MALL MAGAZINE (England), and is printed here with the permission of The Bertrand Russell Estate.

Are We Any Happier?

Happiness and unhappiness, as everyone recognizes, are due partly to causes lying within the individual, partly to his external circumstances. When we say that a person is melancholic, we imply that his unhappiness comes from within; if we adhered to etymology, we should mean that he suffered from black bile. On the other hand, in the days before so many monarchs had lost their thrones, it was customary to say of a man that he was as happy as a king, and in our times most people envy the very rich. In some ways, a man can increase his happiness by his individual good sense, even without augmenting his outward prosperity; in other ways he is dependent upon matters outside his own control, such as the success or failure of his country in war. It is important to discover the proportion between these two kinds of causes of happiness, since, broadly speaking, the latter are far more dependent than the former upon political and economic conditions.

There are those who maintain that any sane man can make himself happy by a sound philosophy, however poor he may be; there are others who regard external circumstances as decisive except in a few rare instances. I do not hold with either extreme, but I think the second much more nearly true than the first.

In the ancient world, when the Greeks had lost political freedom, many of their wisest men adopted the Stoic philosophy, which taught that true happiness comes wholly from within, and will be enjoyed by the virtuous man, however hardly fate may deal with him. The doctrine was taken over by the Romans, among whom its most eminent advocate was the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. He was perhaps hardly in position to judge how much happiness would have remained to him if he had been transformed into a starving proletarian, but the early Christians, whose morality largely resembled that of the Stoics, showed that, to some men, happiness is possible in spite of poverty and persecution.

No one can deny that by self-discipline, self-knowledge, and a wise philosophy, much can be done to increase contentment. But when it is argued that, for the community in general, such things can take the place of social and political improvement, many important factors are overlooked.

In my book, The Conquest of Happiness, which was published five years ago, I dealt with the private and individual means of acquiring happiness, and as I confined myself to these, I may have seemed to be assigning undue importance to them. What I said in that book still seems to me just, but it was stated to be only one side of the whole truth, In what follows, I shall consider mainly the other side.

There are a few saints and sages, and also a certain number of lunatics, to whom very little in the way of good fortune is necessary. Men who have a firm faith, whether true or false, which enables them to feel sure that the causes they care for will ultimately triumph, may merge their ego so completely in the success of their creed, that what happens to themselves as individuals ceases to seem important to them. If everybody were of this sort, the world would be divided into inquisitors and martyrs, each deriving felicity from the flames of the auto da fe.

But most men have not this inflexibility; their beliefs are held with a certain measure of doubt, and are apt to be abandoned if they lead to misfortune. History shows that it is commoner to recant under persecution

than to persist, and even among those who persist, a very small modicum of doubt will rob martyrdom of its ecstasy and deprive the inquisitor of insensibility to the tortures of his victims. It is not therefore through increase of bigotry that universal happiness will be achieved.

Leaving such extreme cases on one side, it may be said that ordinary men can achieve happiness, with only a small amount of external prosperity, if they have good health, a cheerful disposition and a sound philosophy of life, and these, it may be said, are purely personal matters. But as soon as we consider their causes we find ourselves plunged into the world of politics and economics.

Take first good health. The diminution of illness and the lowering of the death-rate are among the most cheerful features of the modern world. In England, the improvement began at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and has continued steadily, apart from occasional epidemics such as that of influenza at the end of the War. The causes are by no means obscure. The chief causes, between 1801 and 1811, were, according to Clapham's Economic History of Modern Britain, "the conquest of small-pox, the curtailment of aguish disorders through drainage, the disappearance of scurvy as a disease of the land, improvements in obstetrics, the spreading of hospitals and medical schools." All these are what may be called public causes.

Later improvements have been brought about in similar ways: by sanitation, by advances in medical science, by public health services, by the better diet and housing, which, throughout the period from 1850 to the Great War, accompanied the diminution of poverty. The increase of happiness thus brought about obviously greatly exceeded anything that could have been achieved by merely operating directly on individuals.

Take next, as a source of happiness, the possession of a cheerful disposition. Mark Tapley always kept up his spirits, even when he was suffering from malaria in a dismal swamp. It used to be thought that anybody could acquire this sort of talent by moral effort. No doubt, a man can, by moral effort, abstain from overt complaining, and utter encouraging platitudes even amid the direst misfortunes. But when this is merely an expression of will-power, not genuine gaiety, it is apt to be more irritating than the most lugubrious lamentations.

A spontaneously cheerful disposition, which alone is a source of happiness to its possessor and his companions, depends upon a variety of causes, partly physical, partly mental. The two chief essentials are right functioning glands and wise psychological treatment in early childhood, which depends upon diet, sunshine, and good sense in parents and teachers. In cold countries, and especially in towns, diet and sunshine will be deficient wherever there is great poverty, while parents and teachers will not, as a rule, deal wisely with children unless they have been instructed in the bad effects of unregulated severity. In southern countries, among families living on their own produce, where there are no schools and parents are too busy to notice their children, the conditions for a cheerful disposition may exist naturally; but in northern, industrialized countries they can only be brought about, on a wide scale, by deliberate public effort.

It remains to consider a sound philosophy of life, as one of the apparently private sources of happiness. We must, however, confine ourselves to such philosophies as genuinely influence action, for those which remain purely theoretical may only increase unhappiness. Mr Micawber had the most correct principles as to income and expenditure,

and yet was always in debt, because his belief in his own principles did not go deep enough to restrain his extravagant impulses.

A philosophy which determines conduct is not so easily produced as one which is only a matter of words. Take, for instance, a man's estimate of his own importance. A frequent cause of unhappiness is the difference between the value a man sets upon himself and that which the world sets upon him. Poets, painters, composers and inventors, are often convinced that their work is of immense importance, although others refuse to notice it. Sometimes they are right, but usually they are wrong.

In a less noteworthy form, the same sort of delusion is common among unsuccessful men, and is a considerable source of unhappiness. If, from the first, their expectations had been lower, they would not have been disappointed and might have lived contentedly. On the other hand, this same kind of humility would be fatal to the work of really great men, who need self-confidence in order to persevere against opposition.

We can only say, therefore, that a man should esteem himself at his true worth, but whether he does so may not be apparent until he has been dead for a hundred years. This only amounts to saying that it is a good thing if people are intelligent as to their own capacities, and neither unduly humble nor unduly conceited. In the great majority of cases, this is a matter which is determined by the environment.

There have been ages of self-confidence and ages of humility; there have similarly been nations and classes where every man thought himself capable of remarkable achievements, and others where such a belief would have been thought presumptuous. The self-confident ages contain great achievements, but end in political chaos or enslavement; the modest ages may be politically stable, and in a slow way constructive, but are hostile to individual genius. Athens from Pericles to Plato, Renaissance Italy, Elizabethan England, France in the late eighteenth century, were convinced of their own greatness, individually and collectively. Plato, Columbus and Shakespeare were more convinced of their capacity to do great things than they could have been if they had been born in the late Roman Empire or during the Dark Ages; and what applied in a supreme degree to them applied in a proportionately lesser measure to their contemporary compatriots. As these instances illustrate, self-confidence, on the average, depends upon social conditions rather than upon the individual.

Those who interpret all history in economic terms might argue, with a very considerable degree of truth, that happy ages are those in which the average income is increasing, and unhappy ages are those in which it is diminishing. Some people, mostly well-to-do, preach contempt of filthy lucre, and maintain that it is easy to be happy though poor. The important question, in regard to happiness, however, is not the absolute amount of one's income, but its augmentation or diminution.

Perhaps a very rapid increase, by altering one's habits and one's social milieu, may not be altogether a source of contentment, but a continual rise of (say) ten per cent. every year is likely to bring the nearest possible approach to perfect bliss. The boy or girl whose parents are rising in the world gets, every year, rather better holidays and education than he or she had been expecting. When the boy becomes a young man, if he does well, he can marry the girl of his choice, whereas if he does badly he may have to wait a long time. When he in turn has children, if he prospers he can always give them rather more than his previous standard of life had led him to expect. Above all, he has the feeling of being a successful man; since circumstances adapt themselves to his wishes, he acquires an illusion of omnipotence, than which nothing is more delightful.



The optimism of the nineteenth century, which now seems a pathetic delusion, was caused by the rapid and general increase of material prosperity, and conversely the impoverishment of the present day is producing a number of forms of pessimism, most of which are disguised as optimistic beliefs in nonsense. The world is full of highly-educated young men who cannot find any exercise for their laboriously acquired capacities. When we suffer, we find relief in the belief that our misfortunes are due to human enemies; therefore times of increasing poverty are times of hatred.

In our day, it is common to attribute the world's misfortunes to the Jews or the capitalists, the socialists or the wickedness of foreign nations. Hence arise a number of violently persecuting creeds, nationalism, anti-semitism or fascism and communism. As our economic misfortunes are due to failure to organize and co-operate as much as modern industrial technique demands, all these dividing fanaticisms only increase the general chaos and breakdown, but this in turn, by a natural psychological mechanism, increases hatred, which further intensifies poverty, and so on endlessly in a vicious circle.

The man who sees hope in individual reformation might, nevertheless, make an effective retort to our argument that average happiness depends upon changes of average income. The prosperity of the nineteenth century was brought about by the intelligence of a rather small number of men, who made scientific discoveries and invented machines. What is needed in our day is the general acceptance of similar discoveries in economics and social psychology, but this is difficult, because men find it hard to think about their fellow-men without passion.

When Galileo studied falling bodies and Newton discovered the laws of planetary motion, when James Watt contemplated the kettle and Faraday investigated the phenomena of electromagnetism, they did not love or hate the objects that they were considering. Galileo did not waste his breath in telling bodies that they ought not to fall, nor did James Watt exhort the steam to be content with the space allotted to it. But when we study human beings and their behaviour, we are continually labelling it "misbehaviour;" and ceasing, in so doing, to consider it with that scientific detachment which is necessary for intellectual understanding.

In the Middle Ages, epidemics were attributed to the wrath of Heaven, and combatted by collective prayer in churches, which of course spread the infection. Nowadays, however ardently the sanitary authorities may wish to check the disease, they do not attribute it to an enemy or regard the microbes as wicked. When any considerable section of the population is able to view our present misfortunes in the same dispassionate manner, the cure will not be difficult to find.

At present, education and the press combine to make this difficult, by inculcating nationalism and emotionalism. But when we consider that the scientific attitude towards the physical world is scarcely more than three hundred years old, and that astronomers promise the human race another billion years or so of existence, it is perhaps not an excessive optimism to hope that sooner or later, the scientific attitude will spread to human affairs. When that happens, poverty will be abolished in a generation, and its abolition will bring a decay of hatred that may make the gain lasting.

If social science is to dominate politics and economics, as physical science has come to dominate our dealings with the inanimate world, the change, in the one case as in the other, must proceed from a beginning among a few exceptional individuals to a gradual conquest of the thoughts and imaginations of ordinary men and women. In spite, therefore, of the immediate importance of social causes in producing happiness, a sound individual philosophy remains important, since it is the source from which

must spring the transformation of social forces from causes of misery to causes of happiness.

The individual is moulded by society, but it is equally true that society is moulded by individuals. Social reform and individual enlightenment are two sides of one process, and neither can be considered apart from the other.

---

#### ABOUT BERTRAND RUSSELL

(32)

"Guided Tour of Intellectual Rubbish", the one-man show — "based on the life and writings of Lord Bertrand Russell" — that didn't get produced last Fall because of Robert Rounseville's death (NL3-33), was written by Marvin Kaye, of NYC, Mr. Kaye writes that he owns the script, that copy-right is jointly held by the BR Estate and himself, and that he has gotten the Estate's permission to look for a new actor.

He is "just beginning to work on a new production. Your Society might very well be instrumental in our pursuits, though at this point, it is a bit early to offer any concrete suggestions. However I certainly appreciate your good wishes and would be most interested in staying in touch.

"At present, the script is aimed at the college lecture circuit, though I am negotiating now with London for permission to take it off-Broadway later, if the demand warrants. Also, I hope it may eventually be made into a filmed TV broadcast, perhaps for the educational network. But this is early to be talking about it!

"The script itself is on file at McMaster University, which I hope to visit prior to production. It is a two-act one-man show, but it is not a podium show. There are several settings and the actor communicates with the audience as if he were speaking spontaneously to them. (There are "plants" in the audience.) In the second act, there is the equivalent of a one-act play for one actor in a dramatization of Russell's amusing "Mr. Bowdler's Nightmare."

---

#### PHILOSOPHERS' CORNER

(33)

A call for papers on BR. The BRS program for the December 1975 meeting (in NYC) of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association will consist of the reading and discussion of two papers on BR. ED HOPKINS — who is in charge of the program — requests that papers be submitted by July 1, 1975. (This deadline will enable us to get the program into the Program Issue of the JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY.) A committee of 3 — ELIZABETH EAMES, DOUGLAS LACKEY and Carl Frank — will select the two papers. Papers may be on any aspect of BR's philosophy, should have a reading time of about half an hour, should be typed double-space, submitted in duplicate, with an abstract of 150 word maximum. Mail it to Dr. Edwin E. Hopkins, 352 S. Drew Street, Baltimore, Md. 21224.

(34) A call for stand-by judges. We are late in calling for papers on BR (preceding item.) (We'll start considerably earlier for the 1976 program.) But since time is short (with a July 1, 1975 deadline), the committee of judges may be swamped, if many papers are submitted. Perhaps some of our philosophers would be willing to volunteer as stand-by judges, in case of need. If so, please send your name to Dr. Edwin E. Hopkins, address above.

(35) Courses on BR. We have the following available, which we will lend on request (sent to the Newsletter):

from CHARLES R. MAGEL, Chairman, Phil. Dept., Moorhead State College  
 . Syllabus, Fall 1974 Course on BR. 2 pages.  
 . 5-page form, STUDENT EVALUATION OF COURSE

from GEORGE SESSIONS, Phil. Dept., Sierra College  
 . Final exam, requiring an analysis of arguments in a 1948 6-page article in Atlantic Monthly by W. T. Stace (included.)

---

#### SPECIAL REQUESTS

(36) BRS-APA Session, 12/27/74. We may not have an accurate record of members attending this session. If you attended and were not named in Item 2,  
 \* please notify the Newsletter. In any case, if you attended and wish to make any comments about the session, we'd be pleased to have them; write  
 \* the Newsletter.

(37) Project "1976". This, you may recall (NL2-45, NL3-50), is to be a collection of BR quotes on America, both favorable and unfavorable, that we might be able to publish, to tie in with the American Bicentennial and gain some publicity for the BRS. Members were asked to send in suitable quotes; the response has been underwhelming. It's time to change this miserable record of non-performance. We suggest the following: when you come upon something BR has written that you consider suitable, please put it on a 4 x 6 card, with your name on the back, and mail it to Gary Slezak, 6229 S. Talman Avenue, Chicago, IL. 60629. It may earn you a bit of immortality, who knows?

---

#### NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

(38) PETER CRANFORD is quoted, in an article by Elinor Ashkenazy, REFLECTIONS: ON ACCEPTING DEATH (The Progressive, February 1975, p. 20):

Dr. Peter Cranford, a clinical psychologist in Augusta, Georgia, says the fear of dying is a necessary fear: "Without this fear, the species would have almost nil survival value." In his opinion, attitudes toward death are not likely to change. "except for less belief in a hereafter. My own feeling is that an adjustment to foreknowledge of death is the price we have to pay for having the power — unlike other life — to

look into the future."

- (39) MARVIN KOHL was Special Editor of the Benificent Euthanasia issue of THE HUMANIST, July/August 1974.
- (40) HERMAN LEFKOWITZ reports that on December 18th he heard a short radio interview with JOE NEILANDS on the U.S. Government's attitude (regrettable) toward chemical weapons. He heard it on New York City's Pacifica (non-commercial) station, WBAI.
- (41) GARY SLEZAK visited the Russell Archives in December, doing research for an article on BR's stay at the University of Chicago. He is also working on a comparison of the predictions of Nostradamus, Jean Dixon, and BR.

#### LOCAL CHAPTERS

- (42) Chicago area. GARY SLEZAK writes (11/20/74): "The Chicago area group is not a campus group. I hope membership will eventually include several area universities. As of now, members represent U. of Chicago, the Chicago Circle Campus of the U. of Illinois, and the U. of Wisconsin. We might evolve into a 'Midwest Chapter'."
- Here is Gary's report of 11/27/74: "The Chicago area chapter of BRS is now in existence. The first meeting, held in early November, was primarily an organizing meeting.
- "The second meeting took place in my apartment on November 25th. It went extremely well. A film was shown: an NBC interview with BR in 1951. (Much of what BR said during the interview is outlined in New Hopes for a Changing World, published the same year, 1951.)
- "After the film discussion, a sociologist from the University of Wisconsin, Dr. James E. McKeown, spoke to the group on BR's contributions to sociology, which — in his opinion — were many. He stressed BR's ability to foresee major societal change, and noted that ultimately BR was an optimist. Dr. McKeown, a very distinguished sociologist (see Who's Who in the World, 1974-75), plans to be an active member of our chapter." (He has since joined BRS. Ed.)
- "Later we put together a tentative reading list for future discussion purposes. Our first book discussion is planned for early January on COH. We will explore the book in detail and discuss the criticisms leveled against it by those (non-Russellites) who comprised my first COH group. (NL3-16) Books to be discussed at subsequent meetings are: Human Society in Ethics and Politics, Marriage and Morals, Why I Am Not A Christian, Education and the Social Order, Mysticism and Logic, Power, Freedom and Organization, and selections from A History of Western Philosophy.
- "We're advertising at other area universities and hope to increase our membership. We number 6. Some, but not all, plan to join the national Society soon. Others are mainly interested in discussing certain works. A few of the graduate students seem interested in doing some writing, but nothing definite is being planned at this stage."

## NEW MEMBERS

(43)

We are very pleased to welcome these new members:

Dan Anderson/2015 E. 34 R./Sioux City, S.D. 57104  
 Truman E. Anderson, Jr./825 Petroleum Club Bldg./Denver, Co. 80202  
 Mike Annis/1309 Glenn Avenue/Augusta, Ga. 30904  
 Dong-In Bae/5 Koeln 41/ Luxemburger Str./ West Germany  
 Dawn D. Bishop/ 1016 Beech Lane/ Anchorage, Alaska 99501

James Haley Buxton/ 720 Pennsylvania Avenue/ Norfolk, Va. 23508  
 Dan Claiborn/ 2314 Braemore/ Columbia, Mo. 65201  
 Paul Courtright-Whyte, O.D./ 317 Waugoo Avenue/Oshkosh, Wi. 54901  
 Dr. and Mrs. Richard H.L. (Nancy A.) German/4107 North 36th/Tacoma, Wa. 98407  
 Dr. Alfred H. Guy, Jr./Chairman, Philosophy Dept./U. of Baltimore/  
 1420 North Charles St./ Baltimore, Md. 21201

Marie P. John/ Apt. 16D/230 Brentwood/St. Louis, Mo. 63105  
 Dr. Herbert C. Landsell/8412 Harker Drive/Potomac, Md. 20854  
 Daniel Manesse/P.O.Box 41/Woodlawn Station/ Bronx, N.Y. 10470  
 Dr. James E. McKeown/ 1469 N. Sheridan Road/ Kenosha, Wi. 53140  
 Dr. Herbert R. Otto/Philosophy Dept./Plymouth State College/Plymouth, N.H. 03264

Charles E. Peters/3650 Old U.S. Route 68, North/Yellow Springs, O. 45387  
 Dario Quevedo/ Dept. of Mathematics/ U. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15260  
 Vera Roberts/PO Box 34/Frobisher Bay/N.W.T. XOA OHO/ Canada  
 Sigrid Saal/939 Timber Trail Lane/Cincinnati, O. 45224  
 George S. Sessions/ Philosophy Dept./Sierra College/ 5000 Rocklin Road/Rocklin, Ca./ 95677

Dr. Herbert Adrian Stahl/7307 Monticello Blvd./Springfield, Va. 22150  
 Dan Sumner/912 E. 61st St.#3/Chicago, Il. 60637  
 John R. Tobin/867 East Howard St./Pasadena, Ca. 91104  
 Dr. Grahame Weinbren/2413 Rinconia Drive/ Hollywood, Ca. 90028  
 Abraham Weiner/61 Laidlaw Avenue/Jersey City, N.J. 07306

Bernard L. Wheeler/2606½ Eagle St./ Anchorage, Alaska 99503

## MEMBERSHIP STATISTICS

(44)

Member #100 joined on 3/25/75.

## BULLETIN BOARD

(45)

Membership list. We have extra copies, listing 83 members (and their addresses) as of 2/1/75. It was prepared for the Annual Meeting. If you'd like one, ask.

(46)

BR Peace Foundation in trouble. We received the following communication, postmarked January 20th, from THE BERTRAND RUSSELL PEACE FOUNDATION, LTD., Bertrand Russell House, Gamble Street, Nottingham NG7 4ET, England:

Dear Friend:

We are writing to ask your advice and help concerning a grave crisis which confronts this Foundation. Our work has increased considerably in the years since the death of Bertrand Russell, partly because we have established a first-class modern printing press (which services a large number of trade union, community civil liberties, socialist, radical, anti-war and womens' organisations, besides the needs of the Foundation itself); together with an extensive publishing house which has produced approximately 100 pamphlets and some 3 dozen books in the recent past. But the traditional work of the Foundation in defence of peace, in opposition to imperialism, and in support of political prisoners in every continent of the world, has not in the least declined since Russell's death.

We are profoundly moved by the large number of letters which come from every part of the world, requesting assistance, and expecting our intervention to be effective. Of course, the fact that Russell is now silent means that the role of the Foundation has changed, and that very often it has become a switchboard, either connecting victims of repression with appropriate lobbies which can help them, or sometimes directly organising petitions and press coverage on their behalf. This has increased the difficulties of the work. Where, in the past, a simple letter from Russell could often have a dramatic effect on a dictatorial government which was ill-treating its political prisoners, now it is necessary to organise quite extensive collections of signatures in order to achieve a somewhat smaller impact. None the less, we have abundant evidence that the work we have been doing is useful, and that very many people have need of it.

However, we now face a double crisis, which poses a risk that we may be put out of action for an uncomfortably long time. Firstly, the Inland Revenue are insisting on pressing a very high tax claim against us relating, as we feel, unjustly, to money given by Bertrand Russell and expended in connection with the Tribunal on War Crimes in Vietnam. We had made careful allowance to meet all due tax payments, and this case is being pressed even though the special commissioner whose function is to adjudicate such claims has already decisively found in our favour. The Revenue admit that they have chosen to move against us as a test case, in order to reverse the precedents of judge-made law which govern the matter in question. They have told us that they intend to appeal, if necessary, through all the relevant courts, to the bitter end.

They have also refused to underwrite any of the legal costs which this decision imposes on us, even though there is no suggestion that we were culpable, and even though it is admitted that the case is brought entirely in order to establish new norms to assist the Revenue in future cases which have no connection with ours. The legal costs involved in this enormous litigation could be prodigious. As if this were not enough, the local council has simultaneously decided to issue a compulsory purchase order to enable it to demolish our printing factory and all our extensive associated offices. The sum of these two initiatives means that the Foundation urgently needs to raise a very large amount of money in order to maintain its capacity to continue Russell's work. The absolute minimum amount involved is 20,000 pounds. Large as this sum is, our survival cannot be assured on less.

We feel that you may well be able to help us in elaborating a strategy for the organisation of an appeal for so large an amount. We wonder, could you send us your ideas on this matter, and any suggestions you may have concerning persons who may be able to donate substantial amounts, or organisations which may be willing to publicise our difficulties and help us to overcome them?

We cannot say how sorry we are to be compelled to write to you in this vein, but we know that there are very many good friends who will help us to frustrate these attempts to put us out of action and we feel confident that you will help us in reaching them.

Yours sincerely,

Ken Coates (signed)

(Ken Coates and Chris Farley are listed on the stationery as Directors- Ed.)

(47)

Medal. We are indebted to LESTER DENONN and to his friend, Mr. Joseph Sternberg, for leading us to the following:

A medal, or coin, about 3 inches in diameter (72 mm.) — with a head of BR on the front; on the back, a dove escaping through a broken bar of a cage, with the motto, "Je suis libre et le monde sera lui aussi!" (I am free and the world will be too!) — is offered for sale by the French government agency, MONNAIES ET MEDAILLES.

The page describing the medal identifies BR (correctly) as a philosopher and mathematician, and (incorrectly) as winner of the Nobel Peace Prize. (BR's Nobel Award is for literature.) But that is merely an incorrect detail, not important, and not on the medal itself. The medal was put on sale in 1966, at a time when BR was working vigorously for peace, protesting against the Vietnam war, and apparently the French were honoring him for it.

The price in bronze is 41 francs + 7% export tax, in silver 440 francs + 18% export tax, packing and shipping included. Shipment by air costs extra. Pay by bank check or postal money order, payable to l'Agent Comptable des Monnaies et Medailles. Order from: Monnaies et Medailles/ 11, Quai de Conti/ 75270 Paris/ France.

For a glimpse of the logical French mind at work, consider the categories under which this medal is cross-referenced in the French filing system: philosophers, mathematicians, Great Britain, allegories and symbols of Right and Liberty, Nobel Prize, philosophic thoughts, doves and pigeons.

\* Does anyone know the source of the quotation?

## CORRECTION

- (48) Brenan, not Brennan. We misspelled the name of BR's friend, in NL5-13,14. Sorry.
- 

## FINANCES

- (49) Necessary lubricant. "I would like to say a little about money," (Peter Cranford talking.) "It is a necessary lubricant for any organizational machine. Hurst John started a tradition of voluntary pledges over and above dues (which barely cover the cost of the Newsletter.) This worked very well for us our first year, and we wound up with a surplus. I wrote the original founders to see if they could make a pledge this year and about \$1600 was pledged by the eleven members.

"I should like to make the same appeal to the nearly 90 other members who have come to us this year. In the event that a member is financing his own project, and cannot afford any more, whatever he spends on his project is considered a contribution and should be reported to the Treasurer... and is deductible.

"Those who do finance their own projects and still have spare funds can help by subsidizing those, such as students, who cannot afford to make a pledge. I would suggest to those in this category that they consider a monthly pledge and thus escape the financial intimidation of a large pledge in the face of uncertain economic conditions.

"There may be a few individuals who may be in very good financial shape, and I would like to say to these that we need the money to build up our resources and would greatly appreciate any assistance they can give to help insure this."

- (50) Tax-deductible contributions. Contributions of money to BRS are tax-deductible. Dues and the cost of attending the Annual Meeting are deductible for professional philosophers; these items may also be tax deductible for the rest of us, we think. (We believe we are classed by the IRS as a philosophical society, but we are trying to rectify that, so that we are classed as a cultural/educational/charitable society.) Probably the best course is to take deductions, on your tax returns due 4/15/75, for out-of-pocket expenses connected with BRS, while we await final clarification from the IRS.

- (51) Contribution received. We acknowledge with thanks a generous contribution from Marie P. John.
-



(52)

BALLOT

When and where  
would you like to have  
the next Annual Meeting?

Note: In selecting dates, choose a weekend (Friday, Saturday, Sunday), with this exception: if you choose December just before or just after the APA meeting (December 28-29-30), then the only options are December 26-27-28 — the overlap will permit BRS members to attend the BRS session at APA — or December 31, January 1-2.

1(a). My first choice for date of meeting is \_\_\_\_\_

1(b). My second choice is \_\_\_\_\_

2(a) My first choice for its location is \_\_\_\_\_

2(b) My second choice is \_\_\_\_\_

3. I probably will attend the next Annual Meeting...

(a) if it is held at the location I have indicated in 2(a) or 2(b).  
Check here if true.( )

(b) if it is held in New York City.  
Check here if true.( )

(c) no matter where it is held.  
Check here if true.

Your name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Your address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Please remove this page from the Newsletter and mail it to The Bertrand Russell Society, Inc., R.D. 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, Pa. 18036.