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

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS
No. 23
August 1979

(1) Last call for dues (43). 1979 Annual Meeting (3,4,58,59,60). BBC-TV program on BR (2). Historian wins BRS Scholarship (8). New Treasurer wanted (11). Gödel upsets the applecart (17). Don Quixote paradox (44). Time to vote (51a, 62). Index (61). An asterisk in the left column indicates a request.

---

## COMING EVENTS

(2) BBC-TV program on BR. BOB DAVIS received this letter, dated June 29, 1979,from BBC-TV Producer Christopher La Fontaine:

> Thank you very much for your letter of May 24th referring to our projected programme on the life of Bertrand Russell and offering to help.
>
> This is most kind of you and I certainly would like to take up your kind offer when we have got the project finalised. As you know,we have made a preliminary film interview with Dora Russell which went extremely well and now it's a question of finding some television station in the US or some other country who will be prepared to share the production costs. As we are considering a dramatised documentary, it's likely to be fairly expensive, but we hope to raise the necessary money as this is a project well worth doing, and I am certain it would be well received.
>
> As soon as we make any progress I shall certainly let you know. Thank you once again for your interest in our programme.

---

## ANNUAL MEETING (1979)

(3) The 6th Annual Meeting of the BRS was held in New York City, at the Hotel Tudor, June 1-3,1979 (Friday evening to Sunday noon).

For the gist of what happened, see the Agenda (4), the Minutes of the Members' Meeting (58), and the Minutes of the Directors' Meeting (59), and the abstract of Harry Ruja's paper (60).

We taped all of the talks, and most of the discussions that followed. The tapes are (or soon will be) in the BRS Library;their sound is not of professional quality, but quite audible. The papers presented at the meeting will also be going to the BRS Library, with one exception: Albert Ellis didn't have a paper; he spoke (very fluently) from notes.

These officers were re-elected for one-year terms starting 1/1/80: Chairman, Peter Cranford; President, Bob Davis;Vice-President, Warren Smith;Secretary, Don Jackanicz. The present Treasurer, Steve Reinhardt, was not re-elected at his own request. The post is open starting 1/1/80 (or sooner), and a volunteer is wanted. See (11).

19 BRS members attended one or more sessions:LEONARD CARLSON,JACK COWLES, BOB DAVIS, LESTER DENONN, LEE EISLER, SEYMOUR GENSER,DAVID GOLDMAN*,STEPHEN HAMBY, DAVID HART,ROBERT HOMA, DON JACKANICZ, KEN KORBIN, JOHN LENZ, STEVE MARAGIDES, JACK PITT, STEVE REINHARDT, HARRY RUJA, WARREN SMITH, IRA STRAUS. (*became a member at the Meeting.)

11 non-member guests also attended one or more sessions: Jim Adams, Bernard Auffram, Mrs. Lester Denonn, Diane Hart, Ralph Kean, Norman Roscoe, Rose Ruja, Arline Rubin, Nancy Spataro, P. Tido, Judy Wald.

(4) Agenda:

**FRIDAY, 1 JUNE 1979**

**6 p.m.** Cocktails and Informal Dinner
Tudor Hotel's Three Lions Pub and Dining Room

**8 p.m.** Welcome and Introduction
Cameo Room (downstairs)

**8:15 p.m.** "Bertrand Russell," NBC Film (30 min.)

**8:45 p.m.** "Bertrand Russell on Israel"
DR. HARRY RUJA
Dept. of Philosophy, San Diego State University

**10:00 p.m.** Board of Directors Meeting

---

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

SATURDAY, 2 JUNE 1979

9:30 a.m. Opening Remarks
ROBERT DAVIS, President of Bertrand Russell Society
9:45 a.m. "Life and Times of Bertrand Russell," BBC Film (40 min.)
10:30 a.m. "Bertrand Russell's Response to Marx"
DR. JACK PITT
Dept. of Philosophy, California State University at Fresno
11:30 a.m. General Discussion
12:00 noon Lunch
2:00 p.m. "Bertrand Russell Discusses the Role of the Individual," film (15 min.)
2:20 p.m. "Bertie and Litigation From Birth Until Death: A Lawyer's Commentary"
LESTER E. DENONN
3:00 p.m. Discussion Followed By Business Meeting
5:00 p.m. Cocktails
7:00 p.m. Dinner

---

SUNDAY, 3 JUNE 1979

9:00 a.m. "Psychotherapy and Bertrand Russell"
DR. ALBERT ELLIS, Executive Director
Institute For Rational Living
10:30 a.m. "Bertrand Russell Discusses Philosophy," film (15 min.)
"Bertrand Russell Discusses Happiness," film (15 min.)

---

(5) Item deleted.

---

ANNUAL MEETING (1978)

(6) 1978. Two of the papers presented at the 1978 meeting, at McMaster University, are included in "Russell 29-32:1978": Carl Spadoni's "Philosophy in Russell's Letters to Alys", and Gladys Leithauser's "A Non-Supernatural Faust."

---

ANNUAL MEETING (1980)

(7) Chicago next?Since we have had several annual meetings on the East Coast and one on the West Coast, it's time we had a meeting between the 2 Coasts, in a city where there are a fair number of menbers. That points to Chicago. There are reason besides geography favoring Chicago: BR taught at Chicago; some of his students, now distinguished in their own right, might give talks. But not everything favors Chicago. Some members feel strongly that we should avoid Chicago because Illinois has not passed the Equal Rights Amendment.

If you think you might attend, please vote for the city you prefer, using the ballot, Part 2 (66).

As to time of the meeting, it will be a Friday evening to Sunday noon weekend. Please indicate the month you prefer. May or June seem to be the preferred months. If any specific weekend is impossible for you, mention it on the ballot.

---

RECENT EVENTS

(8) Historian wins BRS Scholarship.The first BRS Traveling Scholarship has been awarded to Kirk Willis, doctoral candidate in history at the University of Wisconsin - Madison. The award pays up to $500 for travel for purposes of research for a dissertation. Mr. Willis plans to travel to the Russell Archives, at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, to do research for his dissertation, "Bertrand Russell: An Intellectual Biography, 1972-1918."

The BRS intends to award the Traveling Scholarship annually. As this first award indicates, applicants need not be in the field of philosophy, but may be in any of the many other fields that also interested BR.

During the coming academic year, while Jack Pitt in in Europe on a sabbatical, George Sessions will serve as Chairperson of the Traveling Scholarship Committee. His address: Philosophy Dept., Sierra College, Rocklin, CA95677.

A press release announcing the award was sent to publications in the Wisconsin area and to journals in the fields of history, philosophy, psychology, sociology. A "please post" sheet, with the same text, was sent to each of 5* departments in selected universities (Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Michigan, Pittsburgh, Princeton, Texas, UCBerkeley, UCLA, USC, Washington, Wisconsin, Yale) and to some philosophy departments elsewhere. We expect this to produce many applications next year. *English, History, Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology

---

## REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

(9) Chairman Peter G. Cranford reports:

A chief over-all problem with The Bertrand Russell Society is what appear to be flaws in the organizational set-up dating back to its founding. Chief of these is the cost of getting together, which has made attendance at annual meetings sparse. Another is that communication going out to the larger body of members (as distinct from directors) is limited to the newsletter. Hence the super-democratic organization which we envisaged at the founding has not materialized. A third problem has been our heavy reliance on a very limited number of volunteer workers — fine though their work has been — in the Information Committee (newsletter), Library Committee, Science Committee, the BR Memorial Committee (London), and in promoting Russell as a psychologist as well as a philosopher. A fourth problem has been financing, a problem that is perhaps in the process of being solved with our acquisition of a new finance chairman. Perhaps a reorganization is needed. One director has recommended that we reorganize, with wide input from our membership. To effect this, I am of the opinion that it should be directed by someone with considerable successful organizational experience.

All of this should not be cause for great concern. Our founding fathers were able to rise above the deficient Articles of Confederation.

(10) Treasurer Stephen J. Reinhardt reports:

For the 2nd quarter of 1979:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Balance on hand (3/31/79) | | | 844.54 |
| Income: 21 new members | 242.67 | | |
| 39 renewals | 497.20 | | |
| Total dues | 739.87 | | |
| Contributions | 337.50 | | |
| Sale of RSN, books, etc | 176.81 | | |
| Total income | 1254.18 | | 1254.18 |
| | | | 2098.72 |
| Expenditures: Information & Membership Committees | 441.58 | | |
| Subscriptions to "Russell" | 199.50 | | |
| Other | - | | |
| Total spent | 641.08 | | 641.08 |
| Balance on hand (6/30/79) | | | 1457.64* |
| *Unrestricted funds | | 957.64 | |
| Special purpose funds (Traveling Scholarship) | | 500.00 | |
| | | 1457.64 | |

(11) New Treasurer wanted. Steve Reinhardt, now in his 4th year as BRS treasurer, feels that he must step down. We are delighted by his news that he has been given new responsibilities in his other job (the one that produces income), even though it will deprive us of a superb Treasurer. His records are models of clarity and completeness.

Steve is able to stay on as Treasurer till the end of the year, if the transition to a new Treasurer cannot be made sooner. How much time does the job need? About 8 hours a month, Steve estimates.

He will brief the new Treasurer on the details of the job.

If you are good at record-keeping and at keeping a checkbook balanced, etc., and would like to be * Treasurer, please write and tell us your qualifications.

This is urgent!

---

## REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

(12a) Library Committee (Don Jackanicz, Chairperson):

At the June 1979 annual meeting the BRS Library provided five films of Russell each of which being well received by those in attendance. By the time of the 1980 meeting it would be most welcome were we to have available one or more additional films to supplement these five which have been presented a number of times previously.

NBC and Mr. Lawrence E. Spivak were recently contacted for permission for the Library of Congress to produce an authorized duplication for the BRS of the filmed broadcast of Russell's October 28, 1951 "Meet the Press" appearance. Regrettably, both the organization and the individual refused to allow duplication even though officials at the L. of C. were interested in helping. About ABC there is nothing to mention presently, but CBS has offered to sell us authorized copies of two films of the program "Small World" on which Russell appeared on October 19, 1958 and February 28, 1960. Each is available for $150.00 plus shipping costs. So, for slightly more than $300.00 we could have two rare films to offer. I know each member would enjoy viewing these and the other two Russell films (BR Discusses Mankind's Future and BR Discusses Power each priced at $135.00) about which the membership has been informed but copies of which we have not yet acquired. I do request that the BRS authorize expenditure for at least one of these films now and for the rest within a short time. But now I am appealing to all BRS members to consider making a special donation toward the purchase of all the films needed to complete our collection. Thus far, $40.00 has been contributed toward this end, but we are very far from having enough for even one new film. All those willing to help acquire these worthwhile films can send a check or money order payable to the Bertrand Russell Society in care of the BRS Library. If action is taken quickly, we will certainly be able to have a premiere screening in 1980 and perhaps even a memorable Russell film festival.

Now I would like to extend an invitation to any BRS member having a certain amount of free time and an interest in participating more fully in our organization's activities. For some time I have been the only person involved with the work of the Library. I hope there are others who would find such work rewarding. So it is that I invite all members to contact me should they be interested in sharing the Library's work. A variety of responsibilities are involved all of which being conducive to meeting others in person and by mail and telephone. Quite a broad perspective on the BRS and the membership can be attained through Library work. So, please feel free to make an inquiry or to offer your time and help.

In Don's final paragraph, he asks for a volunteer to assist him. If you offered, on your BRS Questionnaire, to do a bit of work for the BRS, here is an opportunity.

(12b) What's available from the Library? Members who attended the 1979 Meeting were provided with the following lists:

- Books, articles, papers that can be borrowed.
- Films that can be rented.
- Books for sale.
- Cassettes that can be borrowed.

On request, the Library will send you any of these lists. Specify which list(s) you want. The Library's address is on Page 1, bottom.

(13) Philosophy-in-High-School Committee (Leonard Cleavelin, Acting Chairperson):

This committee is in the formative stage, and the following remarks are tentative. I would appreciate BRS members' sending me any comments/suggestions, and letting me know if they might be interested in serving on the Committee. My address is 6540 Hancock, St. Louis, MO 63139.

I don't think we need spend much time justifying the teaching of philosophy in high schools. As a very important segment of Western cultural and intellectual history, philosophy needs no more justification for its inclusion in the secondary curriculum than do such subjects as art, art history, foreign languages, and English and foreign literature. It certainly needs no more justification than some of the subjects that were taught for credit at my old high school: Popular Culture (as if that isn't self-contradictory), Rock Music, Ballroom Dancing, Science Fiction, and Practical Economics (i.e., "how to make and save money").

Rather, I see our main problems as being two: first, what kind of philosophy curriculum shall we propose, and second, how shall we get it accepted? I'm sure no one will think me derelict in my dutues if I don't worry about the second problem at this moment: until such time as we have a workable curriculum ready, the problem is more or less moot.

How should such a curriculum be organized? What topics should be included in it? What will be our goals and purposes in introducing philosophy to high school students?

There are, I suggest, two purposes. The first would be to help teach students to think and reason logically and rationally. (I believe there is a difference between thinking and reasoning, and between being logical

and being rational.) I was pleased to see the Harold Morowitz article in"Russell Society News"(RNS21-16); he advocates a course very similar to what I hope we would advocate. As Ronal Munson points out, in the preface to his book The Way of Words: An Informal Logic,"It seems to me that our society can only profit from raising the standard of rational discourse." That, I think, is one of our goals.

The second purpose, which goes hand in hand with the first, is to teach something that BR urged time and time again, namely, "that there are things which we thought we knew and don't know," (BR Speaks His Mind,p.12) and therefore to teach students "to act with vigour when they are not absolutely certain" (though always, of course, in a rational manner.)

At least one semester (preferably one year) would be spent studying logic, specifically what we might call informal logic — such subjects as the traditional fallacies of irrelevance (ad misericordiam, ad hominem, tu quoque,etc.) argument by analogy or example, inductive vs. deductive argument, and related subjects. I suggest that it is good to begin with logic, for several reasons. If a curriculum provides both logic and several selected problems in philosophy, it is possible that an initial exposure to logic might make the task of learning philosophical reasoning a little easier. There is also a pragmatic reason: out in the big bad world there are a lot of fundamentalists of various ilks, and "reactionaries " in general, who might take seriously the advice of St. Paul:"See to it that no one makes a prey of you by philosophy and empty deceit (Colossians,2:8) — and remember too that Socrates was executed for "corrupting the youth"! These well-meaning though misguided persons might well object to the inclusion of philosophy in the secondary curriculum on the grounds that it might be too subversive of the mos maiorum (loosely, "ancient customs" or "practices", in the sense I'm using it, the established religion/morals),which they feel must be passed down unthinkingly from generation to generation. A high school course in logic would not be as open to that objection, and therfore we might get a few schools to introduce their students to logic, if opposition to philsophy proves too great.

Ideally I think the philosophy curriculum should be divided into two tracks: one for college-bound students, one for the non-college-bound. This is not an elitist notion. The non-college-bound would spend one semester doing informal logic. This would teach him/her the basics of rational argument. The second semester would provide a topical introduction to philosophical problems,either theoretical (e.g.,metaphysics, epistemology,theoretical ethics) or more practical (e.g.,aesthetics,practical ethics). I assume that the non-college-bound need less of a knowledge of the "big names" and doctrines in philosophy and more of an introduction to the more important philosophical problems, and an invitation and opportunity to think for himself about them. Perhaps we can induce in him/her the habit of thinking philosophically, and which might remain for life.

The track for the college-bound would be different.Ideally their course in logic would last a full year, and need not be focused strictly on informal logic. Since it can be assumed that the college-bound students will be taking courses in certain disciplines (mathematics, science, political science,history,etc.) as undergraduates, the college-bound track could introduce topics in philosophy relating to some of these studies. For example, the course in logic might include some formal symbolic logic, some philosophy of science, and some basic epistemology and philosophy of mind;subjects that would fit in well with three areas of collegiate study: mathematics, physical sciences, and psychology.

As for the second course in philosophy, again ideally a full yeer, I have not quite decided. Since my undergraduate degree is in philosophy, my personal opinion is that the college-bound student should have a grounding in the Western philosophical tradition, which I feel is important to any person who could call him/herself "liberally educated." However I can see where the second course might well be devoted to a topical introduction, like the non-college course, but dealing, rather, with topics relating to collegiate studies (social-political philosophy, philosopy of science, philosophy of history, philosophy of mind, biomedical ethics,etc.)

(14) Science Committee (J.B.Neilands, Chairperson) received this letter and book review from Zhores A. Medvedev:

I hope that you remember my visit to the Univ.of Calif. which you sponsored through The B.Russell Society. The subject of my talk was on the Nuclear disater in the Urals, and because since 1977 (or1976) there were a lot of contradictory speculations about it, either it was or not, I finally decided to collect and publish all matherials in form of comprehensive book. It will appear in few weeks in New York (W.W.Norton Inc. N.Y. 10036) I sent them a list of my friends and colleagues to whom complimentary copy should be sent as soon as the book be available and you must receive it soon. I be glad to hear your comments and if you let your environmental colleagues know about this book -they probably be interested to write a review.

Hope that everything is OK in Univ.of California, but collect the facts about position of science I have read about financial difficulties of the University and possible closure of one or two campuses. We are not better under a new Conservative Government and the Institute is already told to cut the experimantal as well as personal budget. Because this institute is completely dependent of the government funds this is a serious blow.

All the best

Yours sincerely, Zhores A.Medvedev

28 June 1979

**NUCLEAR DISASTER IN THE URALS**
*Zhores A. Medvedev, translated by George Saunders.* Norton, $12.95
ISBN 0-393-01219-0
The recent near-disaster at Three Mile Island should stir interest in Medvedev's important but scientifically demanding book. Medvedev, a Russian biologist exiled in England, set off a controversy when, in an article in *New Scientist* in late 1976, he wrote of a 1956 nuclear disaster in the Chelyabinsk region of the southern Urals, site of the Soviets' first nuclear reactor. A leading British scientist, Sir John Hill, termed his story "rubbish." This book, remarkable as a work of "scientific detection," is Medvedev's convincing response. This famed Russian dissident traces the evidence he has found—mostly disguised and never specifying a particular region—in relatively recent Soviet scientific papers analyzing intense strontium-90 and cesium-137 contamination over a vast area which, he makes clear, can only be the southern Urals. Brief accounts by Russian emigrés now in Israel support Medvedev's findings. The so-called Kyshtym disaster in which untold numbers died after an explosion of buried nuclear wastes, remains unacknowledged by the U.S.S.R. Medvedev authenticates his work with translated documents. Glossary, notes, etc.

Publishers Weekly

(15) New Science Committee Chairperson proposed. Joe Neilands explained, in RSN22-4, why the Science Committee had remained a 2-member committee, "with a total absence of democratic process in our deliberations", and expressed a "willingness to at any time vacate the post in favor of another member, preferably one living in another corner of the country."

Since then, as a result of a suggestion by John Sutcliffe, ALEX DELY has become interested in the possibility of becoming Joe's successor. Alex calls himself a "philosopher turned physicist". He seems extraordinarily well qualified in science, and endowed with considerable energy. (Some members may recall the 3-page "Dely Report" of 7/1/77, distributed with NL15.)

Born in Belgium, he has worked at CERN (European Center for Nuclear Research), and during the past 5 years has had several fellowships,the latest being a National Science Foundation Fellowship, at the Laboratory for Astrophysics and Space Research,Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago. Next academic year, he'll be in the Physics Department of Illinois State University. Also, see (35).

Here are some things Alex would do, if approved as Chairperson:

. Survey BRS members as to their scientific interests.
. Discuss timely subjects, such as nuclear energy,genetic engineering,etc.,"with their many ramifications."
. Write quarterly articles on areas in physics such as elementary particles,relativity,cosmology, with their philosophical implications.
. Provide scientific book and journal reviews.
. And much more

Heads of committees must be approved by the Board of Directors, according to the Bylaws, Article XI,Section 2.
* Directors, please use the ballot (Part 5) at the end of this newsletter, to indicate your decision.

(16) Universal Human Rights Committee. DAVID MAKINSTER offers the following observations:

1. We need to decide just what the Committee is supposed to be and do.

2. We ought to decide exactly what we construe the phrase "human rights" to mean,i.e.,what rights do we hold to be universal for all people by virtue of their being human? Clarification of this would be facilitated if
* members would write in,pointing out just where BR explained his views on the matter. A basic statement of principles, with reference to BR's own declared principles, seems to me to be essential.

He makes one suggestion as to what the Committee might do:

I have often wished that some sort of "hot line" existed, which could serve as a clearing house for activities of many different groups involved in Human Rights issues, while offering a humane and rational perspective on those issues. Such a set-up would enable many groups to work toward common goals, to keep informed of one another's concerns, so as to use time and energy to best advantage, and to serve as an open forum for debate. If the UHRC could serve such a role, it could consolidate rather than duplicate the work of like-minded groups and individuals.

If you are one of the many members who said, on your BRS Questionnaire, that you were interested in the UHRC, here is an opportunity to take action. Write to David, giving your responses to these 3 questions:
1) What should the UHRC do, what activity (or activities) should it engage in?
2) What do you think of David's suggestion that the UHRC act as clearing house and consolidator of human rights activities of other groups?
3) What do you think BR meant by "human rights", and can you provide quotations in support?

* Write to David Paul Makinster,654 Hawkeye Drive, Iowa City, IA 52240.

---

ABOUT BR'S WRITINGS

(16A) BR for freshman. GLADYS LEITHAUSER, teaching English to college freshman (U.Michigan-Dearborn), tried using BR's Power as a model of exposition. Here's how it turned out:

On the whole I was quite satisfied with the book as a model for a class in English Rhetoric and Composition. But I must admit that the students did a bit of complaining — many of them seemed to find the book hard going. The fact is, however, that most of them have never had to read a sustained work of exposition or argument, even though they are college freshmen. Consequently, I don't think they are proper judges of what they can handle. What I found gratifying was a situation they, as individuals, could never see — that most of them wrote adequate summaries or criticisms and that their level of discussion became more sophisticated. Their final essays showed a wider grasp of issues and a better sense of organization than ther opening papers. The book has a visible structure as a whole. I especially like the analogy of power in human life to energy in the physical world, with its ability to take different forms. Russell is a fine stylist in terms of his sentence variation, his use of transition, his exact vocabulary, etc.,as you know.

In the second term, I used Education and the Social Order. It went less well. Perhaps it seems too dated. People did not do well in class discussion; they left everything for me to do. The funny part is that, once again, I was able to see a truly beneficial effect on their final, impromptu essays. I asked them to write on some institution or organization that had a positive effect on their lives. A good many turned in an analytical study of their educational experiences, and the analyses employed many of the topics Russell covers in the book. In conjunction with the second book, I also showed one of the films, A Conversation

with Lord Russell. I think it made their author more real to them.

* I'm going to choose a different writer for my model this semester. But if anyone wishes to suggest still a third possibility for my Winter Semester, I will gratefully receive the idea of another Russell book. My choice has to be available in paperback, and I'd like something in the 200-400 page range (which is why I'm not using Authority and the Individual, for example). It should also be one sustained work, or I would use a collection of essays.

(17) Gödel upsets the applecart. According to the following book review, Kurt Gödel proved that Russell and Whitehead were mistaken in what they thought they had done about whole numbers. The reviewer is Brian Hayes, who is "on the staff of 'Scientific American'." The review — the first half of which is reproduced below — is from The New York Times Book Review of 4/28/79, p. 13:

**GODEL, ESCHER, BACH**

*An Eternal Golden Braid.*
*By Douglas R. Hofstadter.*
*Illustrated. 777 pp. New York: Basic Books. $18.50.*

**By BRIAN HAYES**

CERTAIN ideas in the sciences have been stuffed almost to bursting with metaphoric meaning. Everybody's favorite is the concept of entropy, a measure of disorder in thermodynamics. Entropy tends to increase, and so the word is called on to express a variety of sentiments about the common fate of dissipation and decay. The uncertainty principle of quantum mechanics has been extended, or distended, in a similar way: From the principle that any observer disturbs the thing he measures comes the notion that no bystander is entirely innocent.

The incompleteness theorem proved in 1931 by Kurt Gödel seems to be another candidate for metaphoric inflation. It is a great truth, and so it ought to have a large meaning; perhaps it should have the power to change lives. Unlike entropy and uncertainty, however, the incompleteness theorem is not the kind of idea that grabs you by the lapels and insists on being recognized.

The theorem is a variation on the only well-remembered line of the Cretan poet Epimenides, who said, "All Cretans are liars." Another version of the same antinomy is more succinct and more troublesome; it reads, "This sentence is false." The unsettling effect of these statements was for a long time attributed to the looseness and ambiguity of natural languages, where a phrase can refer simultaneously to more than one thing. It was assumed that in a formal language, one constructed on strict rules of logic, no such inconsistent statements could be formulated; they would be unutterable. Gödel showed otherwise.

Gödel's proof employs a formal language invented by Bertrand Russell and Alfred North Whitehead, who had set out to build a secure foundation for the arithmetic of whole numbers. The language has a vocabulary of symbols and a grammar of rules for combining the symbols to form "strings" which can be interpreted as statements about the properties of numbers. A few simple strings are accepted as axioms, or self-evident truths. Any string of symbols that can be derived from the axioms by applying the grammatical rules must also be true; it is therefore designated a theorem. The language is at once simple and powerful, and until 1931 it appeared to have the satisfying quality of completeness. Russell and Whitehead believed that any true property of the whole numbers could be demonstrated in their language, and that no false propositions could be proved.

The theorem by which Gödel upset that belief is a string of symbols in the Russell-Whitehead language that can be interpreted on two levels. In one sense it is a straightforward statement about the natural numbers that seems to be true; at the same time, it represents a statement of "metamathematics" with the evident meaning: "This string of symbols is not a theorem." The paradox of Epimenides is with us again, and this time there is no escaping through the loopholes of language. If the string can be derived from the axioms, then a falsehood has been proved and the Russell-Whitehead language is inconsistent; by implication, so is arithmetic. If the string cannot be derived from the axioms, then there is a true statement about the natural numbers that cannot be proved in the formal language. There is good reason for choosing the latter alternative and concluding that the Russell-Whitehead language is incomplete. In fact, the result is more general than that: Any system of formal logic powerful enough to describe the natural numbers is intrinsically incomplete.

* Questions: What did Russell and Whitehead think of Gödel's proof? Did they concede its correctness? Did they do anything about it?

(18) Hampshire's choices. The New York Times Book Review asked a number of writers the following: Which post-World War II books have already established themselves or may eventually establish themselves in a group of a hundred or so of the most important books of Western literature; also, which prewar books that were not considered in this category might now be, in the light of the history of the last three decades. This is how Stuart Hampshire responded:

**Stuart Hampshire**

Prewar: "German Social Democracy" by Bertrand Russell, six lectures made by him at the newly founded London School of Economics in 1896. They are a brilliant criticism of Marx's theories, increasingly valid and proven today.

Postwar: "Philosophical Investigation" by Ludwig Wittgenstein, a new conception of philosophy that will continue to be very influential. "1984" by George Orwell, which marked a turning point and will always be read and quoted. "Dr. Zhivago" by Boris Pasternak, the best of the books on the Soviet intelligentsia.

(Thank you, Ken Korbin)

(19) "Autobiography II" reviewed by William Gass, Professor of Philosophy at Washington University. First published in "Book Week", it is reprinted in Fiction and the Figures of Life by William H. Gass, Boston:Godine (Nonpareil Books), 1979, pp. 242-246.

Ghostly, like a slow sea fog, religious doubts and vague metaphysical disquiets began to darken Bertrand Russell's mind, and when, at eighteen, he read a refutation of the First Cause Argument in Mill's *Autobiography*, he became an atheist. He was somewhat puritanical and priggish in his views, but a day of constant kissing altered that. His first wife, Alys, intellectually freer about sex than Russell was, emotionally had the same beastly Victorian attitudes. In their relationship, she'd decided intimacy would, by preference, be rare. "I did not argue the matter," Russell says, adding smugly, "and I did not find it necessary to do so." Happy in his marriage, Russell had been leading a calm and superficial life: an imperialist in politics, an empiricist in philosophy, he had scrubbed his mind through mathematics until its surface shone with analytical clarity. One day a witness to the agonies of an attack of angina in Mrs. Whitehead, he changes again, this time going further, faster (in five minutes), and concluding that "the loneliness of the human soul is unendurable," that only intense love can "penetrate" it, that "whatever does not spring from this motive is harmful," that consequently "war is wrong," public school education "abominable," the use of force as well, and "that

in human relations one should penetrate to the core of loneliness in each person and speak to that." Not commonplace sentiments then, as inferences they were even more remarkable; but logic's hold on Russell has always been precarious.

*Happy* and *superficial*: these are constantly conjoined in Russell's life; only pain and controversy give his mind its weight; only then does it sink out of sight in the loneliness he speaks of. Is it, for all of us, the same? Once, bestriding his bike, he realized he no longer loved his wife. A grave, tumultuous insight suddenly possesses the rider of the machine. Of course he finds his reasons, but the page is plainer than he is. Over the years he had floated to the surface of Alys; he could no longer penetrate her; and no longer touching bottom there, he could not confront more than the forehead of himself either. For renewal, Russell needed another love affair. The rider would like to be running, feeling his own feet lifting him forward as he had, in the depths of his love, once before.

The first volume of Russell's *Autobiography*, from which these incidents have been taken, shows him to be a man of fairly shallow calculation, cold, and capable of the cruelty of indifference, using his mind as a weapon and a cover; but it shows him also periodically and quite irrationally shaken by instinct and impulse, warm and generous sometimes, noble and fine, or charmingly foolish. Gradually, throughout this brilliant second volume,[1] we see these hidden forces, appearing in his life in bursts, move his heart to the right place, allowing him to speak for peace and gentleness and love—often eloquently, with force, and at great personal sacrifice; but we see, too, that he hasn't yet ceased to simplify, to reduce, as though the weight of experience were mostly fatty excess to be sweated away by a series of vigorous mental exercises. His feelings may run deep, but his view of life remains naïve, and he is constantly surprised, sometimes desperately disappointed, driven to the edge of suicide.

Whitehead once complained of some of Russell's preliminary work for *Principia Mathematica* that "Everything . . . has been sacrificed to making proofs both short and neat." In youth, for a period, a materialist, he nevertheless found consciousness an irreducible datum; still, as this second volume shows, he has continued to feel his self, his inward person, to be like a ghost in some alien, indifferent, Cartesian machine. To touch. To be touched! But you cannot touch a ghost, nor can a ghost touch. *Ghost*. Over and over, unconsciously, he uses this word to describe himself, both in his present account and in the letters he wrote at the time. And the God he seeks vainly for is also a ghost, as is the love he needs.

Russell is forty-two when this volume begins, and a well-known philosopher, yet he is astonished to find that most people are delighted at the prospect of war. He had, he says, to revise his views on human nature; but he merely swings from one facility to another, and blithely compares his simplistic views with Freud's. He dreads failure, and has an unwholesome tendency to recant. Even D. H. Lawrence's furious, sick, sadistic, Fascist rant derails him momentarily; for passion appeals to him, as does Lawrence's cult of the deep core. Russell throws off this illness, although from it, slowly, he learns a little more. He honestly wants to be an impulsive man. We find him planning to be impulsive, and congratulating himself afterward for acting in the moment, heedless of consequence, as he does so often in his love affairs. This leads him to mistake the suddenness of his thoughts sometimes for cachets of their truth, though his intellect insists upon a thorough investigation.

Still, he never is able to commit his mind to social issues with the rigor and severity he allows it in logic and epistemology. There is not a little, in Russell, of the scholar's wistful love of power ("Power over people's minds is the main personal desire of my life . . ."), as if, through social action, he could finally penetrate others, materialize his ghost.

Throughout the First World War he carries his pacifism bravely, and there is a fine account of his imprisonment for it. There are also excellent descriptions of his trips to Russia (which he hated) and China (which he loved). With Dora Black, his second wife, he founds an experimental school for children. It swallows much of his money, while thought and theory, like bubbles of air, carry him soon from its depths, as he is carried gradually from Dora's, too. The freedom he wishes to give his pupils, as well as the freedom he wishes to give his wife, both have to be modified, the one in the practice, the other in the hope. "Anybody else could have told me this in advance, but I was blinded by theory." The Nazis then give his pacifism too stiff a test. Nonviolent resistance, he decides, "depends upon the existence of certain virtues in those against whom it is employed." This volume concludes with an account of his trip to the United States with his third wife, Patricia Spence, his teaching and writing here, and especially the (for us) shameful contretemps concerning his appointment at City College.

Clear, incisive, frequently witty, as honest as his inner check and the law will allow, Russell has written the history of an emblematic life: exemplary in its devotion to both emotion and truth, triumphant in its dedication to our freedom to decently pursue them, and symptomatic of the consequences of their separation in its sometimes painful failures.

[1] *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, 1914–1944* (Boston: Atlantic/Little, Brown, 1968).

(Thank you, Len Cleavelin)

(20) Russell Bibliographies by HARRY RUJA:

One who wishes to find a "Russell" to read, can do so easily enough in nearly any fair-sized library or bookstore. The current Books In Print, the basic listing of books available for purchase in the United States, has 70 different listings under "Bertrand Russell." Some of these are different editions of the same book, but even eliminating duplications, 51 different titles remain. The British Books In Print lists about 53 different titles for Russell.

It's hard to find a decent library which doesn't have some Russell. If it's a public library, intended for the general public, Russell's popular books will certainly be available, such as The Conquest of Happiness, Marriage and Morals, and the Autobiography; Among his more philosophical works, The History of Western Philosophy and The Problems of Philosophy have attracted, and continue to attract, many readers.

Kenneth Blackwell, Archivist of the Bertrand Russell Archives in McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, compiled for the Bertrand Russell Society a most useful Russell book-list, arranging Russell's major publications into 17 categories, and ending with his own list of the Top Russell Ten. Copies of this four-page list are available from the librarian of the BRS, Don Jackanicz, 3802 N. Kenneth Avenue, Chicago, IL 60641.

Blackwell also compiled a more ambitious Russell bibliography for The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, I.R. Willison, ed., vol.4, 1900–1950 (Cambridge University Press, 1972). (The item is unsigned, but

Blackwell has informed me that the bibliography is mostly his work. The editor lists Blackwell as among those to whose "advice and knowledge" the volume is indebted.) This bibliography runs to three double-column pages, in small print. At that, it lists only books and contributions to books, but it does have a substantial list of books and essays about Russell.

The earliest bibliography of which I know is one complied by Gertrude Jacob and published in The Bulletin of Bibliography (Boston) in September 1929 and May 1930. Journal articles by Russell and reviews of Russell's works are listed as well as his books, in addition to places of publication of portraits of him.

The fullest bibliography of Russell's works, by far, is that by Lester E. Denonn, which appeared in preliminary form in Who's Who in Philosophy, edited by D. D. Runes, and by Denonn and R.B. Winn as associate editors (New York: Philosophical Library, 1942) and in a much expanded form as an important part of The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell, edited by Paul A. Schilpp (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern Univ., 1944; other editions by other publishers, 1946, 1952, 1963,1971).This remains the standard and most useful bibliography of Russell to this day. It lists not only Russell's books and journal articles, and contributions to books edited by others, all arranged in chronological order, but it also lists translations, reprints, and reviews of his works.

I published a less ambitious bibliography in David F. Pears, ed., Bertrand Russell: A Collection of Critical Essays (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1977). I listed for the most part only those of Russell's writings which are primarily philosophical. Items in foreign languages were cited sparingly, but I did list books and articles about Russell. I arranged the Russell items chronologically within six categories: history of philosophy, philosophy of history, biography; survey of philosophy, miscellaneous; logic, foundations of mathematics; theory of knowledge, philosophy of science; metaphysics, philosophy of religion; and ethics, social and political philosophy. The secondary materials were listed mostly in alphabetical order, by author.

Blackwell and I have been engaged some 15 years in compiling what we hope will be the definitive bibliography. He is fortunate enough and resourceful enough still to find a new Russell item from time to time. The Archives have been a fruitful source of leads. Just the knowledge of the existence of the Archives has encouraged some Russellphiles throughout the world to bring rare items to Blackwell's attention. It may very well be another five years, however, before that bibliography sees the light of day.

---

## ABOUT BERTRAND RUSSELL

(21) G. E. Moore. reflects on his undergraduate years in Cambridge (1892-1896), in his autobiography. Parts of it, including the following, are contained in The Philosophy of G. E. Moore, Paul Arthur Schilpp, ed., Chicago, IL: Northwestern University, 1942, pp. 12-16.

### II. First Twelve Years at Cambridge. 1892-1904

*(a) Four undergraduate years: 1892-1896*

I went up to Trinity College, Cambridge, in October 1892; and for the first two years of my residence there was working for Part I of the Classical Tripos. In this line, in spite of the brilliance of some of my teachers—especially A. W. Verrall—, I do not think that I learned anything startlingly new. I had been so well taught by Lendrum, at Dulwich, that my work during these two years at Cambridge consisted almost exclusively in merely learning more of the same kind of things which he had already taught me.

It was in quite other directions that these first two years at Cambridge made a great difference to me. Towards the end of my first year I began to make the acquaintance of a set of young students—most of them a year or two my seniors, both in ages and academic standing—whose conversation semed to me to be of a brilliance such as I had never hitherto met with or even imagined. They discussed politics, literature, philosophy and other things with what seemed to me astounding cleverness, but also with very great seriousness. I was full of excitement and admiration. My own part in these discussions was generally merely to listen in silence to what the others said. I felt (and was) extremely crude compared to them; and did not feel able to make any contributions to the discussion which would bear comparison with those which they were making. I felt greatly flattered, and rather surprised, that they seemed to think me worthy of associating with them. I have said that at Dulwich I never became really intimate with any of the clever boys I met there. At Cambridge, for the first time, I did form intimate friendships with extremely clever people; and, of course, this made an enormous difference to me. Until I went to Cambridge, I had had no idea how exciting life could be.

Among the young students with whom I began to make acquaintance at the end of my first year was Bertrand Russell; and it was mainly owing to his advice and encouragement that I began to study philosophy. Russell was two years my senior in academic standing; and hence, when I was in my second year (and it was only in that year that I began to know him at all well), he was already in his fourth year and completing his academic course by working for Part II of the Moral Sciences Tripos: he left Cambridge at the end of that year. In the course of it he must have formed the opinion, from hearing me argue with himself or with friends of ours, that I had some aptitude for philosophy: at all events at the end of the year he urged me strongly to do what he had done and to take Part II of the Moral Sciences Tripos for my Second Part; and if he had not urged me, I doubt if I should have done so. Until that year I had in fact hardly known that there was such a subject as philosophy. I came up to Cambridge expecting to do nothing but Classics there, and expecting also that afterwards, all my life long, my work would consist in teaching Classics to the Sixth Form of some Public School—a prospect to which I looked forward with pleasure. I had indeed at Dulwich read Plato's *Protagoras* under Gilkes; but I certainly was not then very keenly excited by any of the philosophical questions which that dialogue raises, and I do not think I had read any other philosophy at all. What must have happened, during this second year in Cambridge, was that I found I was very keenly interested in certain philosophical statements which I heard made in conversation. One such occasion I can remember. Russell had invited me to tea in his rooms to meet McTaggart; and McTaggart, in the course of conversation had been led to express his well-known view that Time is unreal. This must have seemed to me then (as it still does) a perfectly monstrous prop-

osition, and I did my best to argue against it. I don't suppose I argued at all well; but I think I was persistent and found quite a lot of different things to say in answer to McTaggart. It must have been owing to what I said on such occasions as this that Russell came to think I had some aptitude for philosophy. And I think this example is also typical of what (if I am not mistaken) has always been, with me, the main stimulus to philosophise. I do not think that the world or the sciences would ever have suggested to me any philosophical problems. What has suggested philosophical problems to me is things which other philosophers have said about the world or the sciences. In many problems suggested in this way I have been (and still am) very keenly interested—the problems in question being mainly of two sorts, namely, first, the problem of trying to get really clear as to what on earth a given philosopher *meant* by something which he said, and, secondly, the problem of discovering what really satisfactory reasons there are for supposing that what he meant was true, or, alternatively, was false. I think I have been trying to solve problems of this sort all my life, and I certainly have not been nearly so successful in solving them as I should have liked to be.

I have here mentioned one debt which I owe to Russell, and, since I have mentioned his name, I think I had better now (although it will interrupt my narrative) try to give as complete an account as I can of all that I owe to him. His name has often been publicly coupled with mine and, since I came to the United States in 1940, I have found that some misapprehension exists as to the relations between us. For one thing, I discovered that some people supposed that I was the elder of the two. That, of course, is, in itself, a mistake of no importance whatever; but I think it was probably due to another mistake, which is perhaps of some importance, though not much. I have heard it publicly stated (and I think I have also seen the same in print) that Russell was a pupil of mine! Nothing could be further from the truth. It would be far nearer the truth to say that I was a pupil of his, since I really have attended no less than three complete courses of lectures given by him, whereas he has never done more than attend one single lecture given by me. I imagine that this mistake must have been due to a passage in Russell's Preface to his *Principles of Mathematics* in which he acknowledges some indebtedness to me; but, of course, what Russell there says, though it may have been the origin of the mistake, gives no sort of excuse for it. The main facts about the connection between his work and mine are, I think, as follows. I have said that Russell left Cambridge in June 1894, at the end of my second year. But, though he had left Cambridge, I used, for some six or eight years after that date, to see him frequently and discuss philosophical questions with him. These discussions took place either when I visited him at his house in the country or when he visited Cambridge. For several years in succession he and his wife took a house in Cambridge for the whole of the Lent term, and I had much discussion with him during these visits. In these discussions there was, of course, mutual influence. It is to ideas which he thought he owed to me as a result of them that Russell was referring in the Preface to his *Principles;* and we both of us subsequently discovered that these ideas were largely mistaken. I do not know that Russell has ever owed to me anything except mistakes; whereas I have owed to his published works ideas which were certainly not mistakes and which I think very important. After about 1901 we met but rarely for a period of about ten years, until, from 1911 to 1915, we were both of us lecturing in Cambridge, and both had rooms in Trinity; and I then attended his lectures on the Foundations of Mathematics. I certainly owe much to all this personal contact with Russell; but I think I owe even more to his published works. I have certainly spent more time in studying what he has written than in studying the works of any other single philosopher. I reviewed for *Mind* his first philosophical book, the *Essay on the Foundations of Geometry*, which was developed out of the dissertation by which he won a Fellowship at Trinity. I read the proofs of his *Philosophy of Leibniz*. Later I worked very hard indeed for a very long time in trying to understand his *Principles of Mathematics;* and I actually wrote a very long review of this work, which was however never published. As for his Introduction to *Principia Mathematica*, his *Problems of Philosophy*, his Lowell Lectures, a series of articles which he published in the *Monist*, beginning with four entitled "Logical Atomism," his *Introduction to the Philosophy of Mathematics*, and his *Analysis of Mind* (which last I reviewed in the *Times* Literary Supplement), I have, in the case of all these six works, lectured in detail on particular passages in them on various occasions during my lectures at Cambridge. Of course, I have not agreed and do not agree with nearly everything in his philosophy; and my lectures on what he has written have always been partly critical. But I should say that I certainly have been more influenced by him than by any other single philosopher. Perhaps I should have owed to him even more than I do if I had taken another piece of advice which he gave me. About 1900 or a little later he urged me strongly to take private lessons from Whitehead in Mathematics, particularly in the Differential Calculus. This advice I did not take, not, I am afraid, for any well-considered reasons, but mainly from mere inertia and doubt whether it would do me any good. I still have no settled opinion as to whether, if I had taken it, it would have made any great difference to me.

(Thank you, Don Jackanicz)

(22) BR in fiction. Last issue we said we wanted to find out about characters in fiction that were based on BR (RSN22-12). KEN BLACKWELL has obliged with the following:

> Most of the fictional Russell characters are covered in Rosenbaum's essay in Russell in Review, with the notable exception of another character discussed by him in Russell 21-22.

(Russell in Review contains papers presented at the Russell Centenary Celebration at McMaster University in 1972. It is edited by J.E.Thomas and Kenneth Blackwell, and published by Samuel Stevens, Hakkert & Co.,Toronto,1976.)

Professor Rosenbaum discusses these characters:
- Mr. Apollinax, in the poem of the same name by T. S. Eliot (1915)
- Sir Joshua Malleson, in Women in Love by D. H. Lawrence (1916)
- Bertie Reid in The Blind Man by D. H. Lawrence (1918)
- Mr. Scogan in Crome Yellow by Aldous Huxley (1921)
- Thornton Tyrrell in Memoirs of an Infantry Officer Siegfried Sassoon (late 1920s)
- Melian in Pugs and Peacocks by Gilbert Cannan (1921

In general, Russell was"treated as a satiric or at least ironic figure". D. H. Lawrence had a brief friendship with BR,then came to dislike him with great intensity:

> The enemy of all mankind you are, full of the lust of enmity. It is not the hatred of falsehood which inspires you. It is the hatred of people, of flesh and blood. (Russell in Review, p. 72.)

This dislike was mutual, as this 1962 letter shows:

> Lawrence was a man who was consumed with a desire to punish those who did not share his intense feelings, borne of personal conflict and a wish to do violence. He hated rationality and emphasized violent feeling -- "thinking with the blood". Dear Bertrand Russell, Feinberg and Kasrils, eds.,Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969,p.158.

T.S.Eliot and BR didn't much care for each other either. Writes Eliot (1926):

> I am sorry to include the name of Mr. Russell, whose intellect would have reached the first rank even in the thirteenth century, but when he trespasses outside of mathematical philosophy,his excursions are often descents. (Russell in Review, p. 66)

An inquirer wrote to BR (in 1965), saying:

> Eliot's friends all seem to think that he was the epitome of goodness and morality, but his writings seem to me to display an astonishing narrow-mindedness and intolerance...

To this, BR replied:

> I entirely agree with your estimate of Eliot's character... I met him by chance just after the beginning of the First War in London in October.I said,"Hello,what are you doing here? He said,"I have just returned from Berlin." I said,"What do you think of the war?" He said, "I don't know except that I'm not a pacifist." I said, "I see.You don't care what people are killed about, so long as they are killed." (Dear Bertrand Russell, p.156) (And thank you, David Makinster.)

Here is a footnote from Russell in Review,p.85:

> ...parodies of Russell appear to have begun with the revue,"Beyond the Fringe"(1961). One of the original members of the cast was Alan Bennett, who mocked Russell's and Lady Ottoline's memoirs in his play,"Forty Years On". At one point in the play Russell mentions to "Lady Sybilline Quarrell" that "I had no contact with my own body until the spring of 1887, when I suddenly found my feet. I deduced the rest logically."

This has been a superficial(and distorted)sampling of the contents of the Rosenbaum paper in Russell in Review (pp. 57-87).We recommend that you get hold of a copy and read the whole thing. You can buy Russell in Review from the Archives, or borrow it from the BRS Library, address on Page 1, bottom.

---

## BR MENTIONED

(23) Lester Denonn told us that this past winter he'd been reading books about Plato, Kant, Hegel, Heidegger, Lecomte du Nouy,and Borges, all of which had Russell references (RSN22-15). We asked him to tell us what those references were:

> First Plato. What occasion would there be to refer to Russell in a work on Plato? J. N. Findlay found seven in Plato and Platonism.He says:" Platonism was also strongly present in the early thought of the great Cambridge realists, G.E. Moore and Bertrand Russell and in Russell's Principles of Mathematics of 1903..."
>
> Where would Russell appear in Kant's Rational Theology, a work by Allan W. Wood? Says he:"Kant's view has been, and still is, widely accepted and is even (owing to its adoption by Gottlob Frege and Bertrand Russell) incorporated into the standard systems of formal logic, via the existence quantifier."
>
> There are ten references to Russell in J. N. Findlay's Hegel: A Re-examination.He refers to Problems of Philosophy and Principia Mathematica but without quotations therefrom. At one point he says,"(Hegel is here dealing with the puzzles which agitated both Plato and Russell, as to what things can properly be said to be many; it seems that neither things without relation, nor things related to a Whole, can fitly claim the title.)"
>
> We find a not uncommon blast in a quotation from Pierre Lecomte du Nouy, as cited in Mary Lecomte du Nouy's biography:"If errors had not been committed by the priests of certain religions, materialism, in the shape of a faith reared against religious faith, might never have been born. It would never have been born because man is essentially religious. He has been religious for millenaries, ever since the age of Cro-Magnon Man, and the literary and pathetic explosions of a Bertrand Russell cannot change him."
>
> For a change, however, we can go to South America to learn of Jorge Luis Borges in the biography by Emir Rodriquez Monegal. He says:"Borges, in his discussions of Zeno and Korzybski, Bergson and Bertrand Russell, Neitsche and Mauthner, was developing (very quietly) a new vision that would enable him to write his metaphysical poems and stories..."
>
> In Heidegger & Modern Philosophy, edited by Michael Murray, there are nineteen references to Russell, not all of which were spotted by the one who prepared the index, a not uncommon fact,I have found. Principia Mathematica and The Principles of Logical Atomism are referred to but no quotations are added. Of course, I added my postcript:

Heidegger/ Geschmeidegger/ Whatever that means!
I think he was full of lima beans.
There is a "being" in each lima bean
At least in each one that I have seen.
Then why all the fuss about "being" and "is"?
He ranted about after drinking gin fizz?
That he was a Nazi there can be no doubt
That's why all of us should count him out.

And what of our own Sir Alfred, two of whose excellent books I purchased recently?As one would expect, there are eighty-nine references to Russell in Metaphysics and Common Sense. He also refers to The Philosophy of Logical Atomism and to An Inquiry Into Meaning and Truth, Our Knowledge of the External World, My Philosophical Development, A Critical Examination of the Philosophy of Leibniz, Principles of Mathematics, Principia Mathematica, Problems of Philosophy ("...is still as good an introduction to philosophy as there is."), The Analysis of Mind, "Reply to Criticism" in The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell, Logic and Knowledge,Human Knowledge, Its Scope and Limits, A History of Western Philosophy, and Principles of Social Reconstruction. Indeed a most adequate appraisal of Bertrand Rueesll's philosophy can be found in these pages.

There are two interesting quotations from Our Knowledge of the External World: "Objects of sense, even when they occur in dreams, are the most indubitably real objects known to us. What, then, makes us call them unreal in dreams? Merely the unusual nature of their connection with the other objects of sense." And again:"It is only in the failure of our dreams to form a consistent whole, either with each other or with waking life, that makes us condemn them."

And in Sir Alfred's The Origins of Pragmatism we find occasion for eight references to Russell. I give only one penetrating quotation:"There are philosophers such as Hume and Russell, who have written with greater elegance, but no modern philosopher who matches William James in the vividness and range of his inquiry or the freshness of his humour."

And so I continue my enchanting, interesting, and rewarding search.

---

## BR'S PROPHECIES

This is a new section in the newsletter, suggested by Peter Cranford, who also sent the following item on
* power stations. If you come across similar prophecies or warnings in BR's writings, please send them in.

(24) "Power stations are acquiring such importance that, if they are left in private hands, a new kind of tyranny becomes possible, comparable to that of the medieval baron in his castle.It is obvious that a community which depends upon a power station cannot have tolerable security if the power station is free to exploit its monopolistic advantages to the full." In Praise of Idleness, New York: Barnes & Noble, 1962 (paperback),p.90. Originally published in London, in 1935.

---

## ASSESSMENTS OF BR

(25) The 17 inches."Concerning the Columbia Encyclopedia article on Russell, reproduced in RSN21-11," writes PAUL DOUDNA,"I was surprised at its length.The article in the 1950 edition is ohly about one-third as long.There are 20 people in the 1975 edition with longer articles than the one on Russell. They are (starting with the longest): Shakespeare, Napoleon,George Washington, Stalin, Woodrow Wilson, Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt, Julius Caesar, Thomas Jefferson,Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Theodore Roosevelt, Peter the Great, Voltaire, Charles V, Hitler, Henry VIII, Martin Luther, Harry Truman, Andrew Jackson, Thomas Aquinas. Russell tied Nixon and both beat out Jesus Christ by a small margin."

(26) "Bertrand Russell on Israel", an abstract of the paper that HARRY RUJA presented at the 1979 Meeting is included in this issue (60).

---

## PROMOTING THE BRS

(Next page)

(27) WIN Magazine is published weekly with the support of the War Resisters League."Win", May 24th issue,was devoted to resisting nuclear power, and did a good job of it.At WRL's July Conference in Tennessee, they will "explore such topics as Full Employment, the J. P. Stevens campaign, Lessons from the Civil Rights Movement, Nuclear Power, Feminism, and Nonviolence Theory. There will also be swimming, dancing, and singing, and the annual Anarchists vs. Socialists softball game."

"Win"has a page called "People's Bulletin Board." It consists of classified ads, for which there is no charge. They ran the following ad for us:

> Bertrand Russell Society. Information: W1, RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036. Russell was, among other things, the first eminent anti-nuclear activist.

We are indebted to HUGH MCVEIGH for letting us know about "Win" and the "People's Bulletin Board". BRS Member Ed Hedemann is on the staff of "Win".

---

## OPINION

(28) "Holocaust" by Gerald Green, shown on BBC Television, was reviewed by JOHN SUTCLIFFE in "The Freethinker":

Much has been written about the last war. As a member of a generation born during it, I knew none of the glory -- only the aftermath. We played on bomb sites, lived in a seedy drabness, and saw the guilt in our parents' faces for what war makes one human being do to another. We saw too their unspoken pain redeemed in the hopes and love they spent on us.

"Holocaust" is a complete travesty of the facts. Germans are no longer the stereotypes they once were, but the equally false romantic presentation of the past exploits human suffering for commercial success. They see "the Nazi" as something intrinsically distinct from humanity and not as, in fact, a potential in each of us to be evoked by fear and hate to persecute and exterminate the invented enemies of our madness. The dangerous superficiality of "Holocaust" imposes a certain acceptability of the facts and the madness it portrays.

Personally I cannot hate the Nazis. I cannot continue the festering sore that still creates their like, or compromise the hopes and love that came out of the real "Holocaust". We have survived and our survival demands the courage to recognize the facts and their implications, in Russell's words, to "remember your humanity and forget the rest". I cannot but think that in this our survival has some sort of significance.

* * * * * * * * *

("Holocaust" was also shown in Germany, and is credited with having been responsible,in part, for Germany's recent decision to eliminate the statute of limitations on Nazi war crimes. Ed.)

---

## ANOTHER VIEW

(29) Dora on Cadogan & Conway Hall, in a letter to Bob Davis, dated May 3, 1979:

I had just written to you when the latest newsletter from the BR Society arrived. It contains many interesting things.

But there is one paragraph on which I must comment; perhaps you could make what I say known at the forthcoming meeting in New York.

It concerns Conway Hall and Peter Cadogan. Conway Hall carries with it a long tradition of unorthodoxy and dissent. It was built to take the place of the nonconformist chapel at South Place and to carry on the ethical tradition of Christianity, from which belief in God gradually disappeared, succeeded by the Ethical Council(?) and Humanism. It has been associated with the 19the century protesters such as Bradlaugh, with the Rationalist Press Association and with the Secular Society, which publishes The Freethinker and was founded in 1881. The RPA publishes The Humanist. A regular lecture is given each Sunday morning at Conway Hall, by some well known figure in contemporary controversy. The hall and rooms are let to societies for their meetings, on the basis of complete freedom of speech, always provided that order is maintained. Even the National Front was allowed to hold a meeting there, but was later banned because of disorder. In the main, the Hall is very much the home of progressive and struggling minority movements.

Peter Cadogan is the Secretary and Organiser; he does not dictate the views of the Society; on the other hand, like everyone else,he is entitled to his own views and to express them. He works extremely hard and we have reason to be very grateful that he has undertaken to act as Secretary of our Russell Memorial Committee, the more so as the Ethical Society is at the moment in grave financial anxiety, because the Inland Revenue treat it as a political body and refuse the charity status that is accorded to religious organisations. This means a very heavy burden of income tax - penalty for believing in ethics minus God. In fact, in freedom of thought and speech Conway Hall is very much in line with Bertie Russell's views.

As to Rousseau, I have not read Peter Cadogan's opinion about him, with which, of course, John Sutcliffe is at

liberty to disagree. Nor does everyone associated with Conway Hall have to treat everything said by Bertie as gospel — Bertie would hate that. And I myself do not agree with Russell about Rousseau. It is worth while to study what Rousseau says in relation to the recent conflicts of the British Trade Unions with the Labour Government. I also think it nonsense to say that Rouseeau is a forerunner of the Nazis; this theory is based on not understanding the true source of the dogmas of the Herrenvolk — the Master Race — in Hitler Germany. If I can do the book I am planning for this summer, I hope to be able to say something about all this.

(Thank you, Bob Davis)

---

## COMMENT

(30) Don Roberts writes:

I enjoyed reading The Case of the Philosophers' Ring (May 79 item 34); thought the first half better than the last, the setting-up of the mystery better than its resolution (for several reasons). Readers of BR News might find it fun to locate sources for some of Collins' "events"; I have located the following, and would be interested in * others [I give the page number in Collins' book, and a few identifying words]:

15 'Why Bertie' Schilpp vol. 17 (= World of Math I:391) "O Bertie".

28 Whitehead writing mathematics Portraits from Memory 103 (=Autobiog I:190).

34,35 The formulas are in the Newman article, World of Math I:371, numbered 1.5 and 1.10.

56 Leibniz, Principles of Nature and Grace, sect. 7, asks: "Why is there something rather than nothing." Heidegger has made more money on the question than Leibniz did.

58 "Whereof one cannot speak" is the 1922 translation of the last sentence in the Tractatus. Reference given on Collins 67, also.

61 "Never glad confident morning" My Philosophical Development 75.

66 World of Math I:372, number 1.12.

67 World of Math I:371, number 1.6.

87 World of Math I:371, numbers 1.8, 1.9. Again the last sentence in Tractatus.

133 "the same God" Portraits from Memory 30 (=Authobiog II:30); Russell used the term "agnostic" in relating this story.

No doubt there are more (I admit there is not much value in the search). My major objection to Collins' book is that he make of Holmes a kind-of hippie (e.g., 123 Holmes scans the "psychic horizons").

I suspect Malcolm's Memoir of Wittgenstein is the source for the information regarding the furnishing of Wittgenstein's room (page 54), but I haven't taken the time to check it.

* If you locate other sources of Collins' "events", please inform the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom.

---

## NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

(31) Dong-In Bae. We had sent Dong-In an ad from the New York Times of June 15th or 16th in which certain Korean organizations protested about President Carter's planned visit to South Korea. Here are some of Dong-In's comments:

I agree with the ad. I also wrote a letter to President Carter on May 17th (copy enclosed), appealing to him not to visit Seoul under present political conditions in Korea. In South Korea and abroad, all groups opposing the Park regime are opposing Carter's South Korea trip, for reasons explained in my letter.

Some groups, including ours (The Korean Bertrand Russell Society) do not belong to the "Union of Overseas Koreans for Democracy and Unification", which signed the Times ad. That organization was founded in Tokyo in August 1978...

I was in New York June 7-10 to take part in the Overseas Koreans Conference. About 80 of us, including 3 friends of the KBRS, demonstrated at the White House in Washington, opposing Carter's visit to Seoul and demanding an end to military aid to the Park regime. Regrettably, I could not come to New York earlier to take part in the annual BRS meeting. I hope to meet BRS members again in the future.

Here are highlights of Dong-In's letter of May 17th to President Carter:

You visit to Seoul...(is) an explicit expression of your support of the Park regime, one of the cruelest and most anti-democratic dictatorships in the world. Your visit will legitimatize the status quo of this inhuman despotism.

We Koreans don't want another Korean war. If the purpose of your visit to Seoul is to demonstrate to North Korea the firmness of your support for South Korea, you could do so by announcing clearly, during your stay in Tokyo, your unshakeable commitment to the prevention of war on the Korean peninsula, just as you wisely did for the Middle East area.

I therefore appeal to you to reconsider your planned visit to Seoul and to cancel it.

(32) Leonard Cleavelin will attend Northwestern Law School (Chicago) starting this Fall.

(33) Harry Clifford sent this letter to the Star-Ledger (Newark, N.J.), where it appeared May 16, 1979:

Contrary to what reader E.D.Wilkerson says about Albert Einstein and "this hullabaloo about Einstein's relativity," Einstein was, in the words of the Encyclopedia Britannica ....one of the most creative intellects in human history." Each one of four research papers that he published contained a great discovery in physics: the special theory of relativity; the equivalence of mass and energy; the theory of the Brownian movement; and the photon theory of light.

His general theory of relativity was verified during an eclipse of the sun when astronomers ascertained that light rays from stars near the sun bend due to its gravitational force. This brought Einstein international fame.

Bertrand Russell,one of the great mathematicians and philsophers of this century, regarded Einstein's theory of relativity of such importance that he wrote a book about it, The ABC of Relativity. In this book Russell states:"It is true that there are innumerable popular accounts of the theory of relativity, but they generally cease to be intelligible just at the point where they begin to say something."

Einstein's profound theories revolutionized our conception of the physical world and changedthe course of science.

(34) Peter Cranford."The chief activities of the past year have been in bringing to a near close the writing of a series of feature articles and a book on methods of influencing people. The theoretical sub-structure is Russellian although the practical applications are empirically derived. John Sutcliffe has been concerned with the theory and I with the practice. Our joint thinking will be presented to interested groups in Manchester, England, the week of August 19-26, this year. Jack Pitt will also present a pertinent philosophical paper."

(35) Alex Dely writes from the Laboratory for Astrophysics and Space Research, The Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago: "This is where I'll be spending my summer, doing work at Space Lab II (Space Shuttle Program experiments), working with the Meyer groups in cosmic rays,the Kerr black hole studied by Chandrasekhar, and the Nambu elementary particle/high energy physics group. Hope to develop some comprehensive theoretical framework uniting the two. Have recently become involved in nuclear debate, trying to set up a mini-clearing house of nuclear information at Illinois State University." Also see (15).

(36a) Corliss Lamont has written another Basic Pamphlet,"Immortality: Myth or Reality?" An ad for it appeared in The New York Times Book Review of 4/21/79,p. 52. To obtain it, send 50¢ in coin or check to Basic Pamphlets, Dept. BRS, Box 42, New York,NY 10025.

(36b) The National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (175 Fifth Avenue, New York,NY 10010) issued this press release dated June 5, 1979:

The National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee hails Corliss Lamont's victory, on February 17, 1978 on winning $2000 damages from the United States government in his lawsuit against the Central Intelligence Agency for illegal and unconstitutional mail openings of his private correspondence. On June 4, 1979 Michael Krinsky, attorney on record for this case, presented Dr. Lamont with the $2000 U. S. Treasury check (dated 5/2/79).

Dr. Lamont stated: President Carter's Executive Order 12036 issued on January 26, 1978 permits the President and the Attorney General to authorize mail openings of correspondence in either United States postal channels or foreign postal channels without judicial warrant. For 20 years the excuse of "national security" has been consistently abused, yet the Carter Administration has not issued guidelines for a charter for the CIA that will protect American citizens against these government intrusions.

Dr. Lamont is donating the $2000 check to the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee's special fund to be used to promote effective guidelines for the FBI and CIA that will adhere to the Bill of Rights.

(37) Jack Pitt is in Europe, on a sabbatical for the academic year 1979-1980. Also see (34).

(38) John Sutcliffe. See (34) and (39).

## SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

(39) New Manchester School. Last issue we reported on John Sutcliffe's "Manifesto of the New Manchester School of Social Economics"(RSN22-11). To this he now adds "The New Manchester School Manifesto on Heuristic Psychology".

> "Heuristic psychology," says John,"consists of 3 major elements. Firstly, a theoretical model...Secondly, a system of analysis...(which)in human terms is either a personal biography of an individual or the social history of a community. Thirdly, on the basis of this we have developed a practical technique of rational influence to encourage, by self learning, the adoption of a line of behavior to actualize the positive potential in the psychology of an individual or group and to reinforce it as part of their behavior in order for them to meet the facts of their situation and if necessary to change them.
>
> ...
>
> "Peter Cranford and I are preparing a seminar on Heuristic Psychology to be held in August in Manchester. All are welcome to attend...or to submit papers." Also see (34).

The Manifesto which John sent us was accompanied by the following papers, reprints and letters:
."Happiness Reconquered" by John Sutcliffe (5 pp.)
."Industrial Democracy" by John Sutcliffe (3 pp.)
."Inherent Tendencies of Industrialism" by Dora Russell (4 pp.)
."Answers and Question" by Peter Cranford (3 pp.)(originally written in 1967)
."Bertrand Russell and The New Manchester School" by Lester Denonn (2 pp.)
."The Frugality Phenomenon" by Carter Henderson(4 pp.)(reprint from"The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists", 5/78)
. Letter of support from Lord Fenner Brockway
. Brief letters from Sir Alfred Ayer and Sir Alan Cottrell
All of these items, plus John's letter to Lee Eisler of 6/10/79 explaining Heuristic Psychology,will be available from the BRS Library, address on Page 1, bottom.

John's address is 9 Naseby Avenue/Higher Blackley/Manchester M9 2JJ/ England

---

## HONORARY MEMBERS

(40) About Paul Edwards. Professor Edwards has published a great deal, often as an editor. He was, for example, Editor-in-Chief of the monumental 8-volume Encyclopedia of Philosophy (see below).

A naturalized American citizen, born in Austria in 1923, he received a B.A. and an M.A. from the University of Melbourne, and a Ph.D. from Columbia University. He has had many scholarships, including a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1964-65.

He is presently Professor of Philosophy at the City University of New York, Brooklyn College, and has taught at the University of Melbourne; City College, New York;Columbia University; New School for Social Research, New York; University of California, Berkeley; and New York University.

In 1979 Columbia University awarded him the Nicholas Murray Butler Medal in Silver. It is awarded annually to an alumnus "who has evidenced outstanding competence in philosophy or in educational theory, practice or administration." Professor Edwards says:"I believe that Bertrand Russell was the first one to get the gold medal which is awarded once every ten years."

Books and monographs:
The Encyclopedia of Philosophy(8 vols.)(editor-in-chief), New York:Macmillan and The Free Press; London: Collier-Macmillan, 1967
The Logic of Moral Discourse, The Free Press, 1955
A Modern Introduction to Philosophy(ed. with Arthur Pap)Glencoe, Ill.:The Free Press; London: Allen & Unwin,1957
Buber and Buberism —A Critical Evaluation (The Lindley Lecture, 1969), The University of Kansas Press
Why I am Not a Christian and Other Essays on Religion and Related Subjects by Bertrand Russell (ed.), New York: Simon & Schuster; London: Allen & Unwin, 1957. Professor Edwards wrote the editorial introduction and the appendix,"How Bertrand Russell Was Prevented from Teaching at the City College of New York"

Articles:
"Are Percepts in the Brain?"Australian Journal of Psychology and Philosophy, 1942
"Bertrand Russel's Doubts about Induction",Mind, 1949
"Necessary Propositions and the Future," Journal of Philosophy, 1949
"Do Necessary Propsitions 'Mean Nothing'?", Ibid.
"Ordinary Language and Absolute Certainty" Philosophical Studies, 1950
"Hard and Soft Determinism," in S. Hook (ed.),Determinism and Freedom, New York University Press,1958
"The Cosmological Argument," The Rationalist Annual, 1959
"Some Notes on Anthropomorphic Theology," in S. Hook (ed.),Religious Experience and Truth, 1961
"Professor Tillich's Confusions," Mind, 1965
"Is Fideistic Theology Irrefutable?" The Rationalist Annual, 1966
"Atheism," "Atheismusstreit," "Common Consent Arguments,""Life, Meaning and Value of,""'My Death'," "Pansychism," "Popper-Lynkeus, Josef," "Reich, Wilhelm,""Russell, Bertrand, Sections I and IV," "Why" — all in The Encyclopedia of Philosophy

"Existentialism and Death — A Survey of Some Confusions and Absurdities," in Philosophy, Science and Method — Essays in Honor of Ernest Nagel, St. Martin's Press, 1969
"Difficulties in the Idea of God," in E. H. Madden, et al.(eds.), The Idea of God, Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1969
"The Greatness of Bertrand Russell," The Humanist, London, 1970
"Kierkegaard and the 'Truth' of Christianity," Philosophy, 1971
"A Critical Examination of 'Subjective Christianity'," Question, 1971
"The Greatness of Wilhelm Reich," The Humanist (U.S.) (text of a BBC broadcast, 1973)
"Heidegger and Death as 'Possibility'," Mind, 1975
"Heidegger and Death: A Deflationary Critique," The Monist, 1976

Translator (from the German):
"On the Foundations of Our Belief in a Divine Government of the Universe" (by J. G. Fichte). In Patrick Gardiner (ed.), Nineteenth Century Philosophy, The Free Press, 1967

General Editor of several series of books published by The Free Press, Macmillan and Collier Books. Volumes published so far:

The Idealist Tradition (A.C. Ewing), 1957
Theories of the Universe (M. J. Munitz), 1957
Logical Positivism (A. J. Ayer), 1959
Theories of History (P. Gardiner), 1959
Realism and Phenomenology (R. W. Chisholm), 1960
Twentieth Century Philosophy (W. Alston and G. Nakhnikian), 1963
A Critical History of Western Philosophy (D.J.O'Connor), 1954
The Existence of God (J. Hick), 1964
Problems of Space and Time (J.J.C.Smart), 1964
Body, Mind and Death (A. Flew), 1964
Perception and the External World (R. J. Hirst) 1965
The Nature of Man (E. Fromm), 1969
Introduction to Aesthetics (J. Hospers), 1969

General Editor (with Crane Brinton) of Collier Classics in the History of Thought. (14 volumes published so far).

General Editor (with Richard Popkin) of Readings in the History of Philosophy. (7 volumes published so far).

Forcoming Publications:
Heidegger and Death — A Critical Evaluation. First of a new series of "Monist Monographs" published by Open Court of LaSalle, Ill. Scheduled for publication September 20th.
"Reich, Wilhelm," Collier's Encyclopedia, scheduled for 1979.
The Philosophy and Psychology of Death (approx. 750 pages), New York: The Free Press, scheduled for 1980.

In recent years, Professor Edwards has devoted a good deal of his time to a highly critical examination of the works of various existentialists, including Kierkegaard, Heidegger, Buber, and Tillich.

---

## NEW MEMBERS

(41) We welcome these new members:

LOUIS ACHESON JR./17721 Marcello Place/Encino, CA 91316
HELEN ASBJORNSON/6442 Margaret's Lane/Edina, MN 55435
ROBERT BARBER/1425 Fillmore/Topeka, KS 66604
JAMES BERTINI/2104 S. Salina St./Syracuse, NY 13205
RAYMOND BLUM/1309 N. Spaulding Avenue/Los Angeles, CA 90046

ALEX BONFIGLIO/663 Wendy Drive/Newbury Park, CA 91320
TOM BRANDT/2003 Kalia Road/Hilton Lagoon Apts.(19K)/Honolulu, HI 96815
PROF. ANDREW BRINK/Dept. of English/McMaster University/Hamilton, Ontario/ Canada L8S 4L6
LEONARD CARLSON/2160 Holland Avenue/Bronx, NY 10462
BRUCE CHRISTIAN/6800 Rockledge Cove/Austin, TX 78731

GAIL EDWARDS/1848 Villa Drive/Greensboro, NC 27403
JAMES FEW/Rt. 6, Box 709/Hot Springs, AR 71901
SAMMY FRENCH/813½ W. 20th/North Little Rock, AR 72114
DAVID GOLDMAN, M.D./333 East 79th St./New York, NY 10021
DAVID HART/300 Kendrick Road/Rochester, NY 14620

LINDA HAYLEY/212 East B St./North Little Rock, AR 72116
STANLEY HEINRICHER/205 Cherry Drive/Melbourne Beach, FL 32951
ALVIN HOFER/9952 S.W. 8th St.(#118)/Miami, FL 33174
JOHN A. JACKANICZ/3802 N. Kenneth Avenue/Chicago, IL 60641
CONNIE JESSEN/2707 Pittsburgh St./Houston, TX 77005

PROF. RICHARD REMPEL/Dept. of History/McMaster University/Hamilton, Ontario/Canada L8S 4L6
ROBERT SASS/3067 Retallack St./Regina, Sask./Canada S4S 1T3
ARSHAD SHERIF/150 - 38 Union Turnpike(#10K)/ Flushing, NY 11367
MITCHELL SIMMONS/905 Everett St./Ahoskie, NC 27910
GLENNA STONE/2136 Cottingham Drive/Montgomery, AL 36106

DAVID SUSMAN/15075 Lincoln (432)/Oak Park,MI 48237
MICHAEL ZYGMONT/347 Hewett Road/Wyncote,PA 19095

---

ADDRESS & OTHER CHANGES

(42) MICHAEL BALYEAT/"undeliverable" says PO.
TOM BOHR/PO Box 9318/Stanford, CA 94305
LEONARD CLEAVELIN/Abbot Hall (807)/710 N. Lake Shore Drive/Chicago, IL 60611 (starting 8/23/79)
DENNIS J. DARLAND/1406 - 26th St./ Rock Island, IL 61201
ALEX DELY/Enrico Fermi Institute/LASR 225/U. of Chicago/933 E. 56th St./Chicago,IL 60637 (summer '79)

ALEX DELY/Physics Dept./Illinois State University/Normal,IL 61761 (academic year 1979-1980)
FRENCES L. DIMITT/9000 Fondren (#240)/Houston,TX 77074
ED HEDEMANN/123 Garfield Place/Brooklyn,NY 11215 (Not a change, but the address in RSN22-40 was wrong.)
BRIAN HOPEWELL/20 Charon Terrace/South Hadley,MA 01075
MICHAEL HOROWITZ/116 W. South Orange Avenue (#2)/South Orange, NJ 07079

GARY JACOBS/PSC Box 438/Hanscom AFB, MA 01731
DR. FRANK E. JOHNSON/801 N. Tyrol Trail/Minneapolis,MN 55416
MARK O. JOHNSON/5909 Headley Road/Gahanna,OH 43230 (till 9/8/79)
MARK O. JOHNSON/ Weld Hall 37/Harvard College/Cambridge, MA 02138 (after 9/8/79)
JAMES P. O'CONNOR/377 W. 23rd Avenue/Eugene,OR 97405

DUKE C. TREXLER/no change of address; remove quotation marks around Duke
WILLIAM L. WEBBER/615 Fourth St. S.W. (F)/Washington,DC 20024

---

MEMBERSHIP RENEWALS

(43) Last call for dues. As we reported last issue (RSN22-23),everybody's dues were due July 1st. Many members have paid their dues but many have not. There is a 2-month grace period, which extends the time to September 1st. If your dues have not been received by September 1st, you are a dead duck. We'd hate to lose you but we cannot afford to keep you without dues.
(If you have joined since the first of this year, i.e., 1/1/79 ,your dues are not due till July 1, 1980.)

We suggest you mail us your check right now, while you have it in mind. You wouldn't want to be a dead duck, would you? At least, we hope you wouldn't want to be.

Send dues to the BRS Membership Committee,RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036. Regular member $15, couple $20, student $5. Outside the USA and Canada, add $5.

---

PARADOXES

(44) Len Cleavelin sends this splendid excerpt from Don Quixote. This situation is this:

Sancho Panza has been tricked into believing he is the governor of an island Don Quixote has been promising him for years. He sits as a judge and a case is presented to him:

> Nevertheless, in spite of his hunger and fortified only by the preserves he had eaten, he undertook to sit in judgment that day; and the first matter that came before him was a problem propounded by a foreigner in the presence of the major-domo and the other attendants.
>
> "My lord," he began, "there was a large river that separated two districts of one and the same seignorial domain—and let your Grace pay attention, for the matter is an important one and somewhat difficult of solution. To continue then: Over this river there was a bridge, and at one end of it stood a gallows with what resembled a court of justice, where four judges commonly sat to see to the enforcement of a law decreed by the lord of the river, of the bridge, and of the seignory. That law was the following: 'Anyone who crosses this river shall first take oath as to whither he is bound and why. If he swears to the truth, he shall be permitted to pass; but if he tells a falsehood, he shall die without hope of pardon on the gallows that has been set up there.' Once this law and the rigorous conditions it laid down had been promulgated, there were many who told the truth and whom the judges permitted to pass freely enough. And then it happened that one day, when they came to administer the oath to a certain man, he swore and affirmed that his destination was to die upon the gallows which they had erected and that he had no other purpose in view.
>
> "The judges held a consultation. 'If,' they said, 'we let this man pass without hindrance, then he has perjured himself and according to the law should be put to death; but he swore that he came to die upon that scaffold, and if we hang him that will have been the truth, and in accordance with the same law he should go free.'[2] And now, my Lord Governor, we should like to have your Grace's opinion as to what the judges should do with the man; for up to now they have been very doubtful and perplexed, and, having heard of your Grace's keen understanding and great intellect, they have sent me to beseech your Grace on their behalf to tell them what you think regarding this intricate and puzzling question.".

"Certainly," said Sancho, "those judges who sent you to me might have spared themselves the trouble, for I am a fellow who has in him more of the dull than of the sharp; but, nevertheless, let me hear the case once more and it may be that I'll hit upon something."

The one who had propounded the question then repeated it over and over again.

"It seems to me," said Sancho at last, "that I can settle the matter very shortly. This man swore that he was going to die upon the gallows, and if he does, he swore to the truth and the law says he should be freed and permitted to cross the bridge; but if they do not hang him, he swore falsely and according to the same law ought to be hanged."

"My Lord Governor has stated it correctly," said the messenger; "so far as a complete understanding of the case is concerned, there is no room for any further doubt or questioning."

"Well, then," said Sancho, "my opinion is this: that part of the man that swore to the truth should be permitted to pass and that part of him that lied should be hanged, and thus the letter of the law will be carried out."

"But, my Lord Governor," replied the one who had put the question, "it would be necessary to divide the man into two halves, the lying half and the truthful half, and if he were so divided it would kill him and the law would in no wise be fulfilled, whereas it is essential that its express provisions be carried out."

"See here, my good sir," said Sancho, "either I am a blockhead or this man you speak of deserves to die as much as he deserves to live and cross the bridge; for if the truth saves him, the lie equally condemns him. And this being the case, as indeed it is, it is my opinion that you should go back and tell those gentlemen who sent you to me that, since there is as much reason for acquitting as for condemning him, they ought to let him go free, as it is always more praiseworthy to do good than to do harm. I would give you this decision over my signature if I knew how to sign my name; and in saying what I do I am not speaking on my own account but am remembering one of the many pieces of advice which my master Don Quixote gave me the night before I came here to be governor of this island. When justice was in doubt, he said, I was to lean to the side of mercy; and I thank God that I happened to recollect it just now, for it fits this case as if made for it."

Don Quixote by Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, translated by Samuel Putnam, New York: Viking, 1954, pp. 842-843

(45) Paul Doudna says there is a sign in an office where he works which says: "I never make mistakes. I once thought I did,but I was wrong."

And this: "According to an article in ETC. Magazine, the scholastic philosophers had a famous dictum: 'Never deny; rarely affirm; always distinguish.' They did not intend it to be a paradox, but obviously anyone believing this must deny that one should deny."

(46) Charles Green says G. K. Chesterton"had a particular fondness for paradoxes. For example, in a Father Brown story,'The Invisible Man', no one saw the culprit enter the house where he committed the crime because, being the Postman, everyone saw him — but didn't see him. Also, in his autobiography, recalling past events in his life, GKC noted, 'Really, the things we remember are the things we forget.'"

(47) Nicholas Griffin doesn't agree with what we said about paradoxes in RSN22-29a:

> On paradoxes I think you got it right first time, and that the distinction between paradoxes of meaning and paradoxes of behaviour (RSN22) doesn't hold up.
>
> If a paradox of meaning is defined as 'a statement which implies its own negation, and is in turn implied by its negation' then it is clear that the Epimenides ('"All Cretans are liars," said the Cretan') is not a paradox of meaning. In this paradox we have two statements:
>
> (1) '"All Cretans are liars," said the Cretan'
>
> and the shorter, contained statement:
>
> (2) 'All Cretans are liars'.
>
> Clearly (1) does not imply its own negation, for its negation is 'The Cretan didn't say:"All Cretans are liars."' But neither does (2) imply its own negation, for (2) is simply a non-paradoxical, if racist, statement about the vices of Cretans. If an Egyptian had said (2) there would have been no logical problem.
>
> What generates the Epimenides paradox is the assertion of (2) by a Cretan. In other words it is the speaker's behaviour in uttering the statement which contradicts the speaker's statement - but this is a paradox of behaviour. It so happens that, in the case of the Epimenides, the speakerss behaviour is linguistic behaviour, and this, presumably, gives rise to the mistaken belief that meaning is involved.
>
> Russell, in particular, could not have adopted the offered distinction between paradoxes of meaning and paradoxes of behaviour, because for him all paradoxical ~~statements~~ sentences were meaningless (i.e. did not express propositions) and thus neither implied,nor were implied by, anything.

To add to your collection, the following paradox was passed on to me by a colleague from his son:

'There is three erors in this sentence.'

* Any comments?

(48) Also see (17)

---

CONTRIBUTIONS

(49) We thank JACQUELINE BERTHON-PAYON, LEN CLEAVELIN, JACK CLWLES, BOB DAVIS, LEE EISLER, WILLIAM HULET, DON JACKANICZ, DON LOEB, HUGH MCVEIGH, HARRY RUJA, JON SPRING, for their contributions, and last but not least PETER CRANFORD and KATHY FJERMEDAL for their multiple contributions. Much appreciated.

---

FUND-RAISING

(50) 3 have volunteered to try to help solve the problem of fund-raising, we are very pleased to report. KATHY FJERMEDAL of 1130 20th St(#7), Santa Monica, CA 90403, DAVID MAKINSTER of 645 Hawkeye Drive, Iowa City, IA 52240, and HUGH MCVEIGH of 311 State St.,Albany, NY 12210.

We don't underestimate the difficulties of the problem, the solution to which has eluded us for 5 years. Perhaps these 3 will achieve a breakthrough.

We think we know reasonably well what the merits of our case are -- that is, why BRS projects are worth funding -- but we're less sure of whom to tell it to.

---

BRS BUSINESS

(51a) We want your vote! There is a ballot on the last page of this issue, for voting on the following:
. Part 1. Election of Directors .Data in (51b).
. Part 2. Time and city of 1980 meeting. Discussed in (7)
. Part 3. Proposal to discontinue the use of "Chairperson". Discussed in (53).
Plus two parts for Directors only:
. Part 4. Proposal to raise dues.Discussed in (52).
. Part 5. Proposal to elect a new Science Committee Chairperson.Discussed in (15).

(51b) Director-Candidates. Here are a few facts about each candidate:
. KENNETH BLACKWELL (Hamilton, Ontario) is Archivist of the Russell Archives, Editor of "Russell", a Founding Member and a Director of the BRS.
. JACK COWLES (New York City), a retired naval officer (Commander/Aviator/Intelligence), has been interested in BR ever since he took BR's course in philosophy at UCLA in 1940.
. LESTER DENONN(Brooklyn, N.Y.) is a distinguished lawyer, a BRS Honorary Member and Director, and editor or co-editor of The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russell, The Wit and Wisdom of Bertrand Russell, and Bertrand Russell's Dictionary of Mind, Matter and Morals.
. J.B. NEILANDS (Berkeley, Cal.) is Professor of Biochemistry at UC Berkeley; a Founding Member and Director of the BRS and Chairperson of its Science Committee; member, 3rd Commission of Inquiry, Bertrand Russell War Crimes Tribunal, North Vietnam (1967).
. RAYMOND PLANT (Hamilton, Ontario) was the first person to join the BRS after it had been founded. He is thus, except for the 12 Founding Members, the oldest BRS member in terms of seniority. He is Regional Solicitor for the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth.
. STEPHEN J. REINHARDT (Wilmington, Del.)joined the BRS in 1974, has attended every meeting since, and has been BRS Treasurer, and a Director, since 1976.

* Please vote!

(52) Higher dues proposed.There are several reasons for raising dues: 1) Inflation raises all our costs (recruiting, newsletter, subscriptions). 2) The Traveling Scholarship needs $700 per year. The 1979 award was covered by a large donation, which will not be repeated. We have to find the money for 1980 and thereafter. 3) There are other projects that need funding, such as The BRS Award, The BRS Book Award, making out-of-print LPs of BR available to members. The proposed new dues schedule, below, would not provide enough extra money to fund all of these, but it might provide enough to get us started on one of them.

The present dues schedule is: regular member $15, couple $20, student $5. The proposed new schedule, to take effect October 1, 1979, would be: regular member $20, couple $25, student $5.

If 200 members pay an additional $5 per year, it will raise an additional $1000.

* Directors, please vote on this, using Part 4 of the ballot, last page of this newsletter.

(53) "Chairperson". In RSN22-37, we reprinted an item from the Washington Post headed "'Chairperson' out of order, Oxford dictionary rules." We are not bound, of course by what the Oxford dictionary decides, but it does indicate the dissatisfaction that many feel with "Chairperson". One can be for women's lib without being for "Chairperson". A man or a woman can be a "Chairman". A woman can also be a "Chairwoman".

We would like to see the BRS drop the use of "Chairperson". What does the majority wish? Please us the ballot
* (Part 5), last page of this newsletter.

---

## "RUSSEL SOCIETY NEWS" MATTERS

(54) Blank Page 4? Several members have advised us that Page 4 in their last newsletter (RSN22) was blank. If yours was blank, please let us know and we'll send you a replacement for the blank page.

---

## COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED

(55) Science for the People has issued an 8-page pamphlet headlined "3 MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR DISASTER — what the public is not being told — what antinuke organizers need to know."

It is carefully written, with 41 footnotes citing sources of statements. It describes the TMI affair, and then deals with these topics: Low Level Radiation/Core Meltdown —the Ultimate Disaster/Plutonium — the Ultimate Poison/Radioactive Waste — No Place to Put It/Cheap Power? — Forget it!/Who Benefits from Nukes?/Are We Hooked?/What Are the Alternatives?/What Needs to be Done/How To Do It.

It closes with a "Resource List" of periodicals, films, books and pamphlets, and 31 antinuclear organizations, plus this: "For an updated list of organizations, write to the Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Groundswell Monthly Newsletter, 1536 16th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036."

For a copy of the pamphlet, send 25¢ to Science for the People, 897 Main Street, Cambridge, MA 02139.

(56) For Non-Believers. The First International Exhibition of Literature for Non-Believers will be held at Stockholm University, Sweden, September 1-31, 1979. Write to: Literature Exhibition, Box 170, S-147 00 Tumba, Sweden.

(57) CAPP. The Committee Against Physical Prejudice is "Fighting Bigotry Based On Personal Appearance." They say, for instance, that "Television has increasingly made overweight and various types of unattractive people either the butt of jokes or the victims of insult" and they want to do something about it. Their address: PO Box 18118, Cleveland Heights, OH 44118.

---

## ANNUAL MEETING(1979)(cont.)

(58) Minutes of the Members' Meeting:

The sixth annual meeting of the Bertrand Russell Society, Inc. was held Friday, June 1 through Sunday, June 3, 1979 at the Hotel Tudor, 104 E. 42nd St., New York, NY 10017. Except where noted, the events described below took place in the Hotel's Cameo Room.

Friday, June 1

An informal dinner at the Hotel's Three Lions Pub preceded the calling to order of the first session at 8:30 p.m. by President Bob Davis. Following his welcome, the film Bertrand Russell was presented. Next, Harry Ruja delivered a paper entitled "Bertrand Russell on Israel" which primarily concerned Russell's 1970 condemnation of that nation as an aggressor. While Russell was defended against charges of anti-Semitism, it

was claimed that he had seriously misinterpreted recent Middle Eastern history and had thereby reached an incorrect conclusion regarding Israel's place within the international community. Discussion followed after which the session was adjourned at 10:35 p.m. The Board of Directors then met in separate session.

Saturday, June 2

The second session was called to order by Bob Davis at 10:00 a.m. A film, The Life and Times of Bertrand Russell, was presented after which Jack Pitt addressed those assembled on "Bertrand Russell's Response to Marx." Using German Social Democracy as his principal source, he contrasted Marx and Russell's views on religion and human labor concluding that areas of striking agreement and disagreement exist between the two writers. Discussion followed, and the session was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Reconvening at 2:10 p.m., the session continued with the film Bertrand Russell Discusses the Role of the Individual. Lester E. Denonn then presented "Bertie and Litigation from Birth until Death: A Lawyer's Commentary." Included were topics such as the custody case over the child Bertrand, his four marriages and three divorces, his World War I activities, the 1940 City College Case, and posthumous legal disputes. A discussion period followed.

Bob Davis then began the business meeting by examining the question of the future disposition of Lester E. Denonn's extensive collection of Russelliana valued in excess of $100,000. In the ensuing discussion it was agreed that this rich library would best be kept whole for research purposes and that foundations should be approached toward that end. Next, Jack Pitt, Chairman of the Scholarship Committee, reported on the award of the first BRS Traveling Scholarship to Kirk Willis, a history graduate student at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. Mr. Willis is preparing a doctoral dissertation entitled "Bertrand Russell: An Intellectual Biography, 1872-1918" and was chosen from a field of four qualified applicants. In his report Jack explained the selection process and distributed copies of the poster used to announce the Scholarship. As Secretary, Don Jackanicz stated that copies of the minutes of the 1978 annual meeting and Board of Directors meeting were available for inspection; as Chairman of the Library Committee, he also discussed Library matters with reference to a ten page handout describing materials available for sale and on a lending and rental basis.

Treasurer Steve Reinhardt then reported the BRS remains solvent. Somewhat over $1000 is in the Treasury. Members were reminded to consult issues of Russell Society News (RSN) for more complete financial statements. It was also stated that dues alone do not provide for the BRS's needs--contributions have always been and will likely remain necessary. Lee Eisler, Chairman of the Information and Membership Committee, began his report by recommending an increase in membership dues because of inflationary pressures. An informal show of hands indicated general agreement. As of May 1, 1979, he stated, current BRS membership totaled 252; in addition, 177 persons are ex-members. The problems of member recruiting, retention, and drop-outs were reviewed. This year, it was explained, an average of $12 in advertising expense was required to obtain a new member. Lee concluded his report by commenting on the RSN of which he is the editor: by reducing its type size and using non-profit organization postal rates for domestic mailing, considerable savings have been realized; all members are invited to contribute materials to the RSN be they essays, reviews, notices, or letters. In the absence of Ed Hopkins, Chairman of the Philosophy Committee, Lee briefly reported that the December 1979 BRS Symposium at the American Philosophical Association meeting will be held as scheduled and that papers are now being selected.

Following these Committee reports, Lee Eisler proposed that the term "Chairperson" be avoided in all BRS activities. He opined that "Chairman" is appropriate for persons of either sex and that the other term was clumsy and unnecessary. An alternative term, "Co-ordinator", was put forth. Although no definite vote on this matter was taken, it was informally agreed that the RSN will no longer use "Chairperson".

Bob Davis then opened discussion on a variety of topics. He noted that outside fundraising has thus far been unsuccessful although he is investigating the possibilities. Three Committees--Awards, Applied Philosophy, and Human Rights--have been inactive as have the local chapters such as that in Chicago. It was generally agreed that local chapters are at least presently unworkable due to the spirit of the times which does not allow for easily co-ordinated, regular meetings. The Science Committee and the Philosophy in the Schools Committee are functioning, Bob noted, but no one was present to offer reports on them. A site for the 1980 annual meeting has not been chosen. However, Bob suggested that Chicago be considered as previous meetings have been held on the East and West Coasts as well as at the Russell Archives. No one has signed up for the 1979 BRS-sponsered Britain tour. Outlining the manner by which such tours are organized, Bob emphasized the complexity involved when a special tour is made to order as opposed to when a group such as the BRS reaches an agreement, as was done in this case, to join a regularly scheduled tour with general appeal. It was suggested that a future annual meeting might be held in Britain in which event a more Russell-related tour might be arranged. Bob next read an open letter signed by Joan Baez and other members of the Humanist International Human Rights Committee which appeared in the May 30, 1979 edition of the Washington Post and other newspapers; the letter lamented the present domestic situation in Viet Nam and urged that nation's leaders to pursue just and humane policies toward dissenters and minorities. After a group discussion of what Russell's attitude toward recent Viet Nam events might have been, the session was adjourned at 4:40 p.m. Some of those in attendence retired to the Hotel's Three Lions Pub for cocktails as plans for the traditional Red Hackle Hour could not be met owing to a scarcity of that Scotch. At the suggestion of David S. Goldman, the formal annual meeting dinner was held at the Saito Restaurant, 305 E. 45th St., a few blocks north of the Hotel.

Sunday, June 3

After Bob Davis called the final session to order at 9:10 a.m., Albert Ellis spoke on "Psychotherapy and Bertrand Russell." Defining psychotherapy as "the science and art of how humans disturb themselves and what they can do about it," he referred to a variety of Russell's works to illustrate that the rational and the irrational (or the non-rational) must be balanced to foster a long-range hedonism. Following a lively discussion period, two films, Bertrand Russell Discusses Philosophy and Bertrand Russell Discusses Happiness, were presented. At 11:15 a.m. the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald W. Jackanicz

Donald W. Jackanicz
Secretary

July 1, 1979

(59) Minutes of the Directors' Meeting:

The Board of Directors of the Bertrand Russell Society, Inc. met in one session on Friday, June 1, 1979 in the Cameo Room of the Hotel Tudor, 104 E. 42nd St., New York, NY 10017. The following eight Board members were present: Bob Davis, Lester E. Denonn, Lee Eisler, Don Jackanicz, Jack Pitt, Steve Reinhardt, Harry Ruja, and Warren Smith. The following seven Board members were not present: Kenneth Blackwell, Peter G. Cranford, Ed Hopkins, Dan McDonald, Joe Neilands, Gary Slezak, and Katharine Tait.

In the absence of Board Chairman Peter G. Cranford, the meeting was called to order by Bob Davis at 10:40 p.m. The first order of business was the election of officers for the term of one year to begin January 1, 1980. Each of the following persons was unanimously elected:

--Chairman of the Board of Directors---------Peter G. Cranford
(Nominated by Lee Eisler, seconded by Lester E. Denonn)
--Secretary of the Board of Directors--------Don Jackanicz
(Jack Pitt, Lee Eisler)
--President----------Bob Davis
(Lee Eisler, Warren Smith)
--Vice President----------Warren Smith
(Bob Davis, Steve Reinhardt)
--Secretary----------Don Jackanicz
(Jack Pitt, Warren Smith)

The incumbant Treasurer, Steve Reinhardt, announced his desire to step down from that post at the conclusion of his present term. No persons were nominated for Treasurer, and it was agreed that nominees would be solicited via Russell Society News (RSN). While he had the floor, Steve stated he will send copies of the records to Peter G. Cranford who will arrange for an independent audit of BRS finances.

The meeting then turned its attention to the BRS Bylaws and whether any reform of them might be necessary. Lee Eisler proposed (1.) that the Bylaws be amended to mention specifically that the Chairman of the Board of Directors is an officer of the BRS; (2.) that the Bylaws be amended to make the Chairman of the Board of Directors responsible for preparing the agenda for Board meetings and the President responsible for preparing the agenda for the annual general meetings; and (3.) that Article VI, Section 4 of the Bylaws be amended so as to omit "other members" in favor of "member" or to have "including oneself" follow "other members" in the sentence presently beginning "Any member is free to submit the nomination of any other members. . . ." To these proposals Jack Pitt expressed his disagreement by stating that changes in the Bylaws should be considered for only the most compelling reasons. Discussion of this constitutional issue briefly went on, however, it was pointed out that Article X specifies Bylaw amendments require a majority vote of the Society, not of the Board. Therefore, the proposed amendments were put aside with the understanding that future discussion of them and possible others may be forthcoming in the RSN.

Next, the topic of Committees was discussed especially in relation to the problems of those which are inactive. Lee Eisler expressed his regret that certain Committees exist with no head or clearly defined work. Noting that in most cases the work of individuals rather than of Committees has resulted in accomplishments, he suggested that inactive Committees contribute to member dissatisfaction. Bob Davis then recommended that members, especially new members, be located who are willing to give of their time to Committee functions. Don Jackanicz proposed to define a form of subsistence for inactive Committees but did not elaborate on this. In the end it was informally agreed to allow the status quo to continue.

A brief discussion followed concerning the Scholarship Committee with Jack Pitt distributing the résumé of George Sessions who is assisting in that Committee's work.

With no further business at hand, Lester E. Denonn moved that the meeting be adjourned; Jack Pitt seconded the motion which was unanimously carried. The meeting thus closed at 11:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald W. Jackanicz

July 1, 1979 Donald W. Jackanicz, Secretary

(60) "Bertrand Russell on Israel". Abstract of the paper by Harry Ruja, read on June 1st, at the 1979 Annual Meeting:

Though in June 1943 Russell had written sympathetically of the Zionist ideal ("In a dangerous and largely hostile world, it is essential for the Jews to have some country which is theirs..."), the reality of the Jewish state failed to arouse his enthusiasm. He was silent when Israel declared its independence in 1948 and remained silent during the turbulent years which followed while Israel fought off its enemies. In June 1967, however, he labelled Israel the aggressor in the Mideast conflict, and in January 1970, just a short time before his death, he renewed the accusation.

Russell's adverse judgment of Israel was the result of a misperception of the facts relating to the Mideast conflict. He disregarded the hostility of the Arab nations to the very existence of the Jewish state; he failed to take into account the offers of peace Israeli leaders made repeatedly; he ignored the fact that Israel's "expansion" was not the product of imperialistic ambitions but of the defeat of her enemies who sought not additional territory but Israel's liquidation; and erroneously he assigned responsibility for the Arab refugees to Israel rather than to the Arab leaders who had urged the Arabs living in "Palestine" in 1947-48 to leave while hostilities were in process.

Jews honored Russell at his death for his vigorous messages in behalf of freedom for Soviet Jews and his moving words of pity and sympathy at the 1953 memorial in London for the martyrs of the Warsaw Ghetto. It is a matter of regret that Russell failed to assess the Mideast conflict accurately and condemned Israel instead of defending her in her search for peaceful self-determination.

---

INDEX

(61) Introductory (1), BBC-TV program on BR (2). 1979 Annual Meeting, general (3), Agenda (4), Minutes: of Members' Meeting (58); of Directors' Meeting (59). Two 1978 papers in "Russell"(6). 1980 in Chicago? (7). First BRS Traveling Scholarship awarded (8). Chairman Cranford reports (9). Treasurer Reinhardt reports (10). New Treasurer wanted (11). Library Committee report (12a). What's available from the Library (12b). Philosophy-in-High-School Committee (13). Science Committee report (14). New Science Committee Chairperson proposed (15). Universal Human Rights Committee (16). BR for freshman (16A). Gödel upsets the applecart (17). Hampshire's choices (18). Autobiography II reviewed (19). Ruja on "Russell Bibliographies" (20). G. E. Moore thinks back (21). BR in fiction (22). Denonn finds new references to BR (23). BR's prophecies (24). 17 inches (25). "Bertrand Russell on Israel" (26,60). WIN Magazine ad (27). Sutcliffe reviews "Holocaust" (28). Dora on Cadogan & Conway Hall (29). Don Roberts locates sources for "Philosophers' Ring" (30). News about members: Bae (31), Cleavelin (32), Clifford (33), Cranford (34), Dely (35), Lamont (36a,b), Pitt (37), Sutcliffe (34,38,39). New Manchester School (39). About Paul Edwards (40). New Members (41). Address changes (42). Last call for dues (43). Paradoxes: Cleavelin's Don Quixote (44), Doudna (45), Green (46), Griffin (47); also see Gödel (17). Contributors thanked (49). 3 fund-raising volunteers (50). Time to vote (51a); Director-Candidates (51b). Higher dues proposed (52). Proposal to drop "Chairperson" (53). Blank Page 4 in RSN22? (54). Communications received: Science for the People (55), for Non-Believers (56), CAPP (57). 1979 Minutes: of Members' Meeting (58); of Directors' Meeting (59). "Bertrand Russell on Israel" (60). Index (61). Ballot (62).