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

RUSSELL SOCIETY NEWS
No. 46
May 1985

(1) Highlights. Annual meeting arrangements (31). BR on Schoenman (5). Dyson on East-West tensions (2). Stromberg's Fromkin Lecture (9). Freeman interviews BR, 1959 (10). Olum's good advice (6). The Index is at the end. An asterisk in the left column indicates a reqeust.

ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS

(2) Dyson on how to get along with the Russians. We think Freeman Dyson is always worth listening to. (For several reviews of his remarkable book, "Weapons and Hope", see RSN42). He was interviewed on TV recently, by Conchita Pierce, on March 24, 1985, over Channel 4 (NYC). This is how it went:

[Today we talk with world-renowned physicist Freeman Dyson, who wrote "Freedom and Hope" because he wanted to discuss the greatest problem now facing mankind, the nuclear arms race, and he wanted to discuss it from a a human rather than a technical point of view.

[He's trying to build a communications bridge between those who build and deploy weapons — he calls them the warriors — and the rest of us, whom he calls victims. He comes to us today as a combination of warrior and victim. Let's first take the concept of warrior.]

That means of course not just the people in the Pentagon,it also includes a lot of my professional friends at the universities, people who are professionals in arms control, for example, who look on the thing as an intellectual exercise. They're just as much warriors as the soldiers.

[And in looking at it as an intellectual exercise, is it more figures, is it more assured computer readouts?]

No I wouldn't say that. But it is a discipline,and it is part of their culture to talk very coolly and not to get emotional about it.

[In doing that, what do you think they lack?]

Very often of course,these are wonderful people. They've contributed a great deal, but still the world they live in somehow isn't the real world because it's too abstract. So I have great disagreements with them about strategic doctrines, for example,because their doctrines never seem to take into account the reality of the world — what a messy world it is — and what different kinds of people there are in it.

[And yet they are part of this world, so why don't they take in the reality?]

Well, it's hard,if you're sitting at the university, and reading books all the time,it's not the same thing as being out there, living it. I am of course interested in these negotiations which are just starting and I'd like first of all just to say,let's not expect anything to happen. It's probably not going to happen. That's not bad. It's important to talk with the Russians whether or not a treaty comes out of it.

[Why do you say, let's not expect anything?]

Because we have to be very patient. Negotiating is always very slow.The best treaty we ever got, since World War II, was the Austrian State Treaty, which most people have never even heard of. To my mind that was much more important than most of these other things that are more famous. The Austrian State Treaty was about people, not about weapons. And it got the Russians out of Austria, and established Austria as a neutral and independent country. The results have been wonderful.Austria has prospered ever since, and Russia has accepted the situation with grace. I find that a triumph. The reason it happened was because we were very patient. The negotiations went on more or less for about ten years, and it was done quietly, without any great fuss, and in the end a very good treaty came out. That's the kind of thing we should hope for. We're not going to have a treaty in a hurry.

[As we are looking at the news in Geneva, what should we watch for? Is it just an exercise in futility? You're not suggesting that.]

No, but if something serious is being done, it has to be done a quietly.So we shouldn't expect either side to talk. If they start negotiating in public it means the thing isn't serious.That's been the trouble all along with many of our negotiations. If you start telling the public what you're saying at the table, it means you're not really talking to the people across the table, you're talking to the people back home.

[Do you have a choice when the public clamors so much to know what's happening?]

Yes, you have to learn to hold your tongue and keep quiet. That's something we find difficult. The Russians of course are better at that.

[You've explained the concept of warrior. Now explain the concept of victim, and how that differs, because you want a bridge between the two.]

A victim is somebody who feels the evil of nuclear weapons in her bones.The victims seem to end up being female, though that's not always true.The more effective spokesmen of the anti-nuclear movement are women for some reason or other. I think it's just that somehow they do have a better way of looking at things. It's anyway different. You start from a gut feeling, real total disgust and horror at the idea of nuclear weapons. That's what I mean by being a victim. It's somebody who approaches the thing from a moral point of view rather than from an intellectual point of view.

[You're saying that the warriors who are planning all of this cannot hear the victims.]

*Russell Society News, a quarterly (Lee Eisler,Editor): RD 1, Box 409, Coopersburg, PA 18036
BRS Library: Tom Stanley, Librarian, Box 366, 142 Main St., Hartford, VT 05047

They sometimes do but on the whole not. It tends to be a dialog of the deaf. The warriors tune out any kind of emotional language because that's the way they're trained and the way they operate. And the victims tend to tune out the more technical discussions, the real horse-trading that has to go on in international negotiations, because to them that's kind of trivial and sordid, and hasn't anything to do with the real issue. That's a caricature of the two sides, but to some extent it's true.

[You're optimistic that the dialog will open?]

Well, that's one thing that I hope for. I think it has opened to some extent. We've seen in the last few years a definite rise of popular political activists against nuclear weapons, which I find very healthful. It's not only in this country, but it's happened in many other countries too. I think we're seeing a very slow convergence of these two points of view, and what one has to have in the end is a policy that satisfies both.

[You've said that when a real discussion is going on , it's not going to be going on in public.]

Right.

[When you heard the concept of Star Wars, what was your reaction?]

Well, it's a misrepresentation of what President Reagan actually said.What is called the Star Wars program is a research program. It's not anything you can point to and say, this is it. We don't yet know what it is. It's a program for investigation which will be on a long time scale, to find out whether defense against nuclear missiles actually is feasible or not, or what kind of defense is feasible. So the program as it exists is about one-third technical nonsense, about one-third military nonsense, and maybe one-third things that might ultimately make sense. The trouble is, those are things are wrapped up in a fog of secrecy; neither we nor the Russians have a chance to see how little substance there is in much of it.

[Is it arrogance or concern for survival that prompts us to propose it?]

It is a concern for survival, and ...if you actually read what Mr.Reagan said on March 23, 1983, 2 years ago, when he first proposed this program, you can see that moral conviction had a big part in it. He just was horrified, and I think quite rightly, that he might one day be forced into that situation where he has to press the button to exterminate tens of millions of people. He said, isn't there a better way? Isn't there some way we can defend ourselves rather than avenging ourselves? And I think he's right. The moral conviction that he started from I support. The only trouble of course is that the thing has been distorted out of all recognition by the technical people so that it's been presented to the public as a grand, grandiose system of laser battleships and death rays and all kinds of idiotic stuff which makes no sense technically or militarily.

[And yet the technical people are always there. That's one of the problems, isn't it.]

Yes. There are of course, good technical people in the program, and some of the program I think is very good. There's a hard core of stuff which makes sense, mostly ground-based. That's old fashioned rockets, old-fashioned radar, computers and stuff, which in fact might actually work, but of course the real problems are not with the death rays in the sky, the real problems are data processing, target discrimination, rather mundane things. That's where the real guts of the program is.

[Do we try to deal with the Russians in our own image rather than as they really are?]

I don't know if that's true. The only one of the negotiators whom I know is General Rowny. He has a pretty good working contact with Russians. He's been negotiating for quite a long time.I think he understands what Russians are like,he understands them as humans. I wouldn't say that the negotiators are unaware of the human aspects of the thing, after you've negotiated for a few years, of course you understand.

Americans are profoundly ignorant about the rest of the world, particularly about the Soviet Union. They have been through some terrible wars, and other catastrophes, much more than we have. They've learned that you can't calculate what will happen...that war, and peace also, is chaotic and incalculable. But you do survive somehow or other, if you're tough and if you hang on and hang on and hang on, you survive, and that, somehow, is very deep in their culture and I think we have to respect that. So they will not ever be happy with our notion of assured destruction, which is very much part of our strategic doctrine, not the whole of our doctrine but part of it.And the idea that we can somehow live in a state of stable equilibrium forever by knowing that we can assuredly destroy the other side if they do something bad is something I don't think the Russians really understand or accept. For them the important thing is survival and I think it always will be. So what they are doing is building whatever weapons they find appropriate to survive, and that of course doesn't look right from our point of view. It's hard to come to any sort of agreement about numbers of weapons as long as we don't have a feeling for the concepts on their side, and they don't have a feeling for the concepts on ours.

[Would communication be better if diplomats played a bigger role?]

I don't know. Hard to tell. Maybe they could do the job. I sometimes have the feeling we would get along better if the soldiers on both sides talked to each other. The soldiers have more in common than the political people. The soldiers understand things sometimes very well. They after all live in the real world. They know what war is like,better than we do. So I don't necessarily think it would be such a bad thing to have them negotiate. General Rowny is an example, as a soldier who negotiates. And most of the Soviet negotiators are in fact military people.

I think I am by many standards a hawk. I do believe that military strength is important. I think nuclear weapons are a very small part of military strength. And in a way the worst thing about these Geneva negotiations is that they are sort of addressed to not very relevant problems. They're addressed to these esoteric questions about numbers of weapons and whether or not you have particular warheads or particular weapons and where they're put, and things of this sort. To my mind those are sort of third rank problems.

First rank problems are,What's the political future of Germany? Couldn't we have a deal about Germany like the deal we had about Austria? That to my mind should be problem No. 1.

[Unified Germany?]

No, I wouldn't unify Germany, I would neutralize Germany. Have 2 neutral states, more or less as they are now, except they don't belong to the alliances, and they don't have nuclear weapons. That would be a magnificent treaty, but we are not going to negotiate that. It's not on the agenda, and wont be for a long time.

What else? I would like to get rid of a great number of nuclear weapons in a more drastic fashion than

anybody's talking about. "Live and let live" is sort of my slogan. It implies — it has something of the Star Wars philosophy in it — that we should try to defend ourselves, but with non-nuclear weapons.

[How optimistic can one be? When the Russians get the SS 20, then we then go into Cruise and Pershing missiles, deploying them in Europe. Because they have the SS18 that can carry 8 to 10 warheads,we feel we must have the MX. It's match for match]

That will always be so. There is always this tit for tat in the arms race. I don't find that so bad. The arms race is in fact grinding to a halt, although people aren't aware of it. We haven't increased the number of weapons substantially in the last 20 years. The Soviet Union has, but that's mostly catching up with us. The way things are now, it's very minor changes that are going on. What is the MX? It's a hundred missiles altogether. It's a small addition to the force. It really doesn't change things in any appreciable fashion, both from a military point of view and from a political point of view — it's a sort of a minor thing. The same is true of the Pershing 2. As far as I'm concerned the Pershing 1 and the Pershing 2 are more or less the same.

The major things directly concern people rather than just weapons.And it concerns who is doing what to whom. I think conversations about weapons are important, but more important are the conversations that go on in the background. For instance, there's a thing called the Joint Consultative Commission which is a joint committee of Americans and Russians that gets together every 6 months to discuss strategic negotiations, particularly to implement the treaties we already have. These discussions are very quiet and on the whole have gone very well. The Russians will only talk on a business-like level if they are sure the thing is going to be kept secret. That kind of thing is more important probably than what goes on in public.

Another thing we ought to be talking about much more is crisis management; setting up things that are more robust than the hotline so that we can deal with each other when we get into a stupid crisis. The most likely ways wars begin is through some local crisis in some part of the world that we haven't been thinking much about....mostly Third World. It could be also in Europe or in Korea or some other place. Anyway we should have some organization in being for getting together with the Soviet Union for sorting things out on a rapid time scale when bad things happen. They've done it very well in the Mediterranean, with the 2 fleets, because in the Mediterranean you have Soviet ships and American ships all the time almost bumping into each other, and they have now worked out a system of traffic control more or less so that when bad things happen, when ships almost collide,when they almost start shooting at each other, the naval officers on the 2 sides actually get together and sort it out.

[Are you comfortable with the President as President?]

Well, that's a complicated question. I don't want to make a political speech, I mean I'm...I happen to agree with him about that [Star Wars]. I disagree with him about lots of other things. The nice thing about the President is that he seems to get what he wants, which is always a great advantage, so that if he did want an arms control treaty, it would almost certainly get through the Senate. I think that's extremely valuable. To have a President who has the political savvy to get a treaty through the Senate and get it ratified is extremely important.

[And for all those who think the President might be wrong?]

Of course he can be wrong. I mean he's wrong about all kinds of things. I think his views about foreign affairs are usually highly unrealistic. Nevertheless if he could get us a treaty, I'd be very grateful.

[If his views about foreign affairs are unrealistic, foreign affairs is not unrelated to concepts of defense and peace.]

Eisenhower was in some ways a very similar character, and he got us a very fine treaty. It was Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles who got us this Austrian State treaty. They were 2 hawks, if ever there were, so just because a person is a hawk, it doesn't mean that they're necessarily wrong.

[If someone were to describe you, if they did not know you, what would they say?]

I'd leave that to other people, I don't want to indulge in any false modesty. I'm a scientist who tries to dabble in politics. That's really all I am.

BR ASSESSED

(3) Annan on Russell. In his book,"Leslie Stephen. The Godless Victorian", reviewed in the New York Times (12/26/84, p. C22),Noel Annan says this about BR:

> Bertrand Ruussell was the most original British philosopher since Hume and the greatest British logician since Occam, but when he considered moral and social problems he still wrote as if they could be solved by the simple application of reason without a thought for the structure of society and its institutions ... his prose resounded with imprecations against men for behaving irrationally. He wrote as if Max Weber had never lived.

Thank you,PAUL GARWIG.

BR MENTIONED

(4) Espionage novel. "Bertrand Russell makes a cameo appearance in the espionage novel,The Shadow of the Moth (NY: St. Martin's/Marek) by Ellen Hawkes and Peter Manso. The setting is Bloomsbury, Garsington, London and Paris. I enjoyed reading it,"says KEN KORBIN,"but hesitate to strongly recommend it. It was pleasant light reading."

BR ON SCHOENMAN

(5) The Memorandum. Toward the end of the 1984 BBC documentary, "Bertie and the Bomb,"comes an interview with Ralph Schoenman, BR's one-time secretary and general assistant. Schoenman comes through as an intelligent, competent, forceful person — which he no doubt is. Russell, in his Autobiography, tells of Schoenman's many useful and even remarkable achievements in the anti-nuclear and anti-war movements.

There began to be rumors that Russell was old and senile, that Schoenman was manipulating him, that Schoenman was the real author of statements being palmed off as Russell's,etc. Typical of the treatment that Russell received in the American press is the following from the New York Times of May 12, 1967. C. L. Sulzberger is a distinguished foreign affairs reporter, a member of the family that owns the newspaper, and not considered extreme in his views. This appeared on the editorial page:

Foreign Affairs: Corpse on Horseback

By C. L. SULZBERGER

PARIS—If a medieval Moorish king died on the eve of battle, retainers would dress his stiffened corpse, bind it astride a warhorse, and lead it against the enemy to encourage the troops. The system worked well and was adopted by the Spaniards when El Cid fought the Moors.

Now we find the relic of Bertrand Russell, this century's most distinguished philosopher, led into battle as a totem for the extreme left. The charger carrying the 94-year-old logician's intellectual remains is his young friend, an American expatriate named Ralph Schoenman.

Behind the Symbol

The forces marshaling behind this decrepit symbol are headed by Jean-Paul Sartre, famous existentialist. They include Sartre's companion, Simone de Beauvoir, and several mediocrities playing the role of yes men.

This strange cast has just produced a sorry morality play in Stockholm whose purpose was to convict—not try—the United States for war crimes in Vietnam. Of course, the Swedish performance wasn't a "trial" and there was no properly constituted "court." The meaning was propagandistic, not judicial.

The production, adroitly stage-managed by Schoenman in Russell's name, pretended it would examine "evidence" impartially. A Yugoslav member of the "tribunal," Vladimir Dedijer, told the Ljubljana newspaper Vjesnik last September: "The court will also hear witnesses from America: American soldiers who have seen with their own eyes what is going on in Vietnam. . . . This is no mutiny of European intellectuals against America."

This was pretense. Long before proceedings began Sartre, as chief "judge," pronounced the accused guilty by stating there was "only one victim in this war, and that is Ho Chi Minh." The "tribunal" refused to hear several North Vietnamese deserters including a colonel.

It rejected a Swedish lawyer's offer to defend the Americans. It spurned the suggestion that a professor of international law appear as an impartial expert. Two U.S. journalists who had been in Vietnam offered to testify; their credentials were destroyed.

In contrast, the "tribunal" invited six North Vietnamese prosecution witnesses, including the President of Hanoi's Supreme Court and a boy said to have been burned by American napalm. President Johnson and Secretary Rusk were personally insulted. Surprisingly, the Stockholm Government remained silent although it is a Swedish legal offense to affront leaders of governments with which relations are maintained.

The tragedy implicit in this shoddy farce is not accurately represented by Sartre, who has been working his way back to the political east ever since he broke with Moscow over the Hungarian uprising. Nor is the tragedy accurately represented by the nonentities who nodded approval of their existentialist patron. The tragedy comes with Russell himself.

Human Echo Chamber

The great philosopher simply outlived his own conscious ideas and became clay in Schoenman's unscrupulous hands. The man who, two generations ago, wrote "The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism" is now an automatic sounding board for Communist drumbeats. Twenty years ago he wanted Washington to threaten war on Russia if the latter wouldn't agree to internationalize nuclear weapons. After hiring Schoenman he assailed Kennedy and praised Khrushchev during the Cuban missile crisis.

It is pitiable when a hero becomes his own tomb, and in the case of Lord Russell it is not hard to see when the interment occurred. Schoenman joined him as secretary in 1960. Since then the philosopher has talked like a zombie. He announced that the Warren Commission report "covers its authors with shame."

Invaluable to the N.L.F.

Douglas Pike, in his studious book "Viet Cong," writes: "No individual within the Communist bloc or without was of more value to the N.L.F. [political expression of the Vietcong] in its externalization efforts than Bertrand Russell, the British philosopher. . . . That he should have become such an unthinking transmission belt for the most transparent Communist lies . . . that he should have thrown over all objectivity and accepted on an unsubstantiated basis virtually all statistics and statements supplied him by the N.L.F. is one of the great intellectual tragedies of our times."

This tragedy cannot fairly be laid at the door of the wasted peer whose bodily endurance outpaced his brain. Schoenman has simply proved himself an adept operator. Russell is no more accountable for the Stockholm farce enacted in his name than were the dead Moors accountable for battles they no longer understood but into which their swaying corpses were borne.

BR says: "What I came only gradually to appreciate,what could only emerge with the passage of time, was his difficulty in putting up with opposition, and his astonishingly complete, untouchable self-confidence." (Autobiography III,p. 149)

Russell eventually fired Schoenman.

Because of the gossip and the rumors,Russell wrote a memorandum on Schoenman. Russell did not write it for publication, but to make it available for setting the record straight. It appeared in New Statesman, 11 September 1970 (a few months after BR's death). Here it is, with thanks to HARRY RUJA:

THE RUSSELL MEMORANDUM

(This is the full text of the document which Bertrand Russell dictated and approved two months before his death. It clarifies the history of his relationship with Ralph Schoenman)

I am writing this memorandum concerning Ralph Schoenman, not necessarily for publication, but for reference in case any of my actions in relation to him should be called in question by him or, possibly, by his friends, or by anyone else. In part I am writing it for my own satisfaction since I have been told that he 'has it in writing that I am senile' — the implication being that whatever I now do or say in regard to him is said or done, in reality, by someone else using my name. This is not true. My relations to him have been mine from our first meeting when he came to see me at Plas Penryhn towards the end of July 1960, to the time of my letter breaking off relations dated 19 July 1969.

My general analysis of his character is given on page 109 ff. of the Allen and Unwin edition of the third

volume of my autobiography. In it I tried to give my first impressions of him, both pro and con, and to indicate what I later discovered. In the first draft of this analysis I was somewhat more adversely outspoken than in the published version, which I toned down partly to avoid both the possibility of libel and the difficulties of recriminations and long-winded 'evidence' and 'defense', and partly because I did not wish to injure him in any way or his position in working for causes that seem to me to be just.

I had said in the first draft that I found him 'surprisingly unlicked'. I found him not only impetuous but 'aggressive and entirely undisciplined and I realized that these characteristics might well make him seem a "dangerous young man".'as I had been warned that he was, 'to anyone of whom he did not approve.' I early recognized his lively instinct for self-dramatisation, his swashbuckling assumption of the importance of his own role at the centre of the stage. His conviction of the unshakeable belief in the penetration and breadth of his understanding were obvious. I did not for some time, however, grasp the closely related characteristic of his utter incapability of imparting reliable information. His reports of people's reactions and his observations were — and unfortunately, I fear, still are — very often excessively and misleadingly incorrect and his quotations must always be verified. I was impressed by his courage, both moral and physical although it too often flouted necessary caution and resulted in unnecessary provocation. And I was impressed by his generosity in helping anyone of whom he thought well or thought to be suffering injustice, although it often led to useless waste of effort and money, both of which might have been far more advantageously spent.

Were I to list his kindnesses to me, the list would be very long and would include many generous deeds that must have cost him dear in worry and work. I found the quickness of his mind, although it made for considerable superficiality and glibness, immensely refreshing,as I did his sense of fun and absurdity and irony, although this often created difficulty, unrestrained as it was by any sense of decorum. In fact, in a world made up largely of people who act, if at all, only on second or more thoughts and guard themselves well with subsidiary clauses, his companionship was as welcome as a delicious fresh breeze on a muggy day. The drawbacks and faults that I found were, I both hoped and thought, such as would be tempered, even erased, by time and experience. They seemed to me to be the outcome of his prodigious driving energy. I underestimated because, certainly in the early years of our acquaintance, it was rarely shown in my presence, the extreme irritability that sometimes accompanies such quick energy. Only after considerable time did I come to appreciate, as I said in the first draft of my autobiography,'the essential intolerance of opposition and the ruthlessness of his rush towards whatever happened to be his immediate objective'. I did not understand in him at first 'the ascendancy of the ego over intelligence' which has prevented him from profiting by his experience or his recognized mistakes. He has not grown up — only grown older and more rigidly confirmed in all his characteristics. He has amassed a great deal of e experience, but it remains a mass of experience. The pattern of his thought and attitude and action remains the same. I have had occasion to call his attention to this fact increasingly often. He himself sometimes alluded to it in deference to my criticisms.

To the admirable obverse of Ralph's characteristics there is always the reverse to be feared. His optimism, for instance, is invaluable. It permits him to see the practicability of ideas that anyone less hopeful would not even attempt to carry out and to inspire others to work for these ideas. His persistent determination to justify his optimism supports him through setbacks that would discourage most people. But these qualities, so admirable in some respects, are disastrous in other ways. They are in large part responsible for his marked tendency to act as if gestures of support and half-hearted promises of financial help are firm promises which will be confirmed and to count upon them as if they were already confirmed. They are also in large part responsible for his firm belief that if he but tries long and hard enough he can extract support from even the most reluctant target. This, in turn, led to his prolonging the many travels and visits that he made on my behalf or on that of the Foundation to twice, or much more, the length that they had been planned to take. And, in its turn, this extension of his term of absence from my or the Foundation's daily work has left his colleagues to carry on activities that he began but of which he had not fully informed them because he expected to return in time to deal with them himself. Moreover, as he moved about with speed and often with no prior notification to his colleagues, it was impossible to obtain information from him quickly, if at all. As his journeys became more and more frequent during the years that he was working for the Foundation he became more and more difficult to work with. And the fact that the 'promises' and 'important things' that he was accomplishing so seldom bore observable fruit, tended to bewilder and dismay and ultimately discourage his colleagues.

Linked to, and perhaps causing, this failure to bring promises and schemes to fruition is his failure to retain the respect or liking of most of those with whom he has had any sort of protracted relationship. He has drawn many people into the work of the Foundation. He has inspired many others, some of them of public distinction, to see the work of the Foundation, as I do, as potentially important to the world. But those who have been drawn in gradually drop out or, because they are led to emulate his extravagances, have had to be sacked. Often after several meetings with those who at first were ready to help us he has lost their sympathy by his importunities and exaggerations, arrogance and bad manners.

His self assurance, which enabled him to carry through transactions that would have been impossible without it, also permitted disastrous displays of tactlessness and offensive importunities. These displays were increased by the limelight shed upon our part in the Cuban affair. It inflated his ego more than I at the time realised. When, for instance, he went to China, on my behalf at the end of 1962, or the beginning of 1963, he took it upon himself to teach the Chinese wnom he met the folly, as he considered it, of the moralities and customs inculcated by their Government. At the first interview given to him and his companion by Premier Chou En-lai they were received most courteously and the Premier was friendly and helpful. At their second interview they were received coldly and severly chided for their behavior and tactless indiscretions while in China. As their sponsor, naturally, I was rendered suspect. To my distress and to the grave embarassment of our work I have never been able to recover the warmth and friendliness formerly accorded me by the Chinese Government.

On the other hand, it was necessary to balance against Ralph's infamous folly in China the fact that he had gone there bearing a message from Nehru which might have provided a way out of the entanglements of the Sino-Indian Border Dispute. Against great odds, he and his companion had managed to reach Nehru and obtain this message from him. And they had also obtained the backing of Mrs. Bandaranaike, then Prime Minister of Ceylon. No one else, I believe, would have done this. No one else would have believed in the possibility of doing it or had the persistence and hardihood to achieve it. It provides an obvious example of the dichotomy of Ralph's work, admirable up to a point, but finally ruined by impetuous egotistical folly.

Discourteous Stupidity

Again, I remember that on one of his visits to Israel for me he was given an interview by the Prime Minister, Ben Gurion. He took it upon himself to lecture the Prime Minister on his and the Israeli Government's shortcomings, a lecture naturally resented by its recipient. He told me of this, as he told me of the Chinese episode, upon his return and I pointed out that I thought he had been greatly at fault. He agreed with me. I optimistically believed that he would not repeat these quite uncalled-for rude provocations.

The lack of good manners was obvious both in very important matters such as I have just recounted and in small daily give and take. Discipline was abhorrent to Ralph and he revolted from it instinctively, whether it was administered from without or was recognisably called for from within. No rudeness to someone of whom he disapproved was flinched from by him. No engagement for a fixed time, whether made with an elderly or distinguished pundit or one of his friends could be kept on time. He was unable to restrain himself from taking over the conversation if it seemed to be going as he did not wish. Sometimes this was extremely unfortunate. I remember two occasions in particular when this happened. Once when an old friend, with whom I had worked closely and had had many vehement discussions, came to see me concerning our joint work and disagreed with me, Ralph drew the unhappy impression that I was being brow-beaten and not being treated with due deference.Finally, my friend remarked angrily that he had come to see me and not to see Ralph. In he end, I had to ask Ralph to leave us. On another occasion, Ralph believed that I did not hear correctly what was being said by an American acquaintance. He undertook to reply, himself, to all questions put to me until my acquaintance, like my friend, pointed out that the questions were addressed to me. Both these unwarranted intrusions caused considerable trouble. In spite of my remonstrances, I do not think Ralph ever understood the discourteous stupidities of which he had been guilty. The basis of them was perhaps the amiable one, from my point of view, of a wish to protect me, a wish that sometimes led him into fulsome follies or worse, as it did at the end of my speech at the London School of Economics in February 1965. The wish sprang, I still think, at least in part from a genuine affection for me, and, possibly, admiration, as did his other fulsome flatteries. I am by no means immune to flattery. It is so rare as to be sweet in my ears. But if it is very obvious, it can only be irritating and embarassing. And his was too often so obvious as to make me feel a fool. At first I thought that this was the result of sincere feeling and of his desire to please me, but later I realised that it was also an indirect way of inflating his own ego. On all occasions he used my reputation and any weight that my name might carry to support his own views. And he had a vastly inflated opinion of my importance.

Ralph could not, of course, resist the limelight, even in small and silly ways, and even against my expressed wishes. Towards the end of June 1965, a lobby against our government's support of U.S. policy in Vietnam was held in the House of Commons. Ralph wished me to attend it. I did not want to do so, as it seemed that my views on the Vietnamese War were very well known and that there were plenty of others who would attend the lobby. Finally, however, I gave way to his pleas on condition that, since it was a very serious occasion, I should go quietly and as one of many. Ralph acceded to this condition. When, however, we reached the House of Commons, he produced a large sign that he insisted my being photographed holding. He then proceeded, like a monkey on a stick, to climb all over the motor car in which we had driven up in order to flout the police — I forget now how and why. It was all quite foolish and undignified, and I was ashamed. Again, after his ostracism by the British Government, he appeared here — his last visit — done up in a preposterous 'disguise' late one evening. It did not occur to him that in doing so he was exposing me to the charge and penalties of harbouring someone forbidden entry to Britain. He simply could not resist flamboyant showing off.

Telegram to Khrushchev

It was after the Cuban crisis that I began to see more clearly than I had done the effect of the reverse side of Ralph's good qualities. He found himself at that time at the centre of the events in which I took part and have related in my book Unarmed Victory and came to regard himself as having been indispensable to me at the time. Perhaps he was. Perhaps I should never have sent the telegram that gave Krushchev an opportunity to send his open letter of withdrawal had it not been for Ralph's encouragement and work or for the telegram that he sent to Krushchev for me in the early hours of 26 October 1962. By well after midnight I had become very tired by the stress of the day. I went to bed after a long discussion with Ralph and after arranging what might be done in various eventualities. I exacted a promise from him that he would wake me if anything further transpired before breakfast. He did not wake me, but woke my wife to obtain her backing in sending a further telegram to Krushchev, the possibility of which we had discussed. It was sent, and when I woke, I approved of its having been sent. It did not occur to me that Ralph had done more than a good secretary should have been expected to do in the circumstances. I did not know until considerably later that he was most indiscreetly and inaccurately putting it about, or perhaps allowing it to be put about, that the correspondence at that time was all initiated and accomplished by him. At first I did not believe this of him, but reports coming through the years giving chapter and verse concerning this and similar indiscretions have convinced me that he is not to be trusted where his ego is concerned. I am now forced to believe that he has made it incorrectly evident that he, or to a lesser extent, others have been entirely responsible for various writings and statements published by me since our acquaintance began. Whether he has ever claimed to have written Unarmed Victory or not, I do not know. He was out of the country at the time of its writing and, when he returned to London, I

asked him to verify and supply certain facts that I needed. In reply he sent me a long account of the whole affair from his point of view, a book, which he had written. My wife and I spent a day in concentrated search for the few facts that I needed. It was the culmination of his tendency to write full length reports of his impressions instead of the factual notes required of him. Since that egregious performance, he has improved in this respect, in regard to my work at any rate. For my answer to the charge that anyone else, other than I, has written my letters or publications or opened and replied to letters from my correspondents see Page 164 of the Allen and Unwin edition of Volume III of my autobiography.

Ruining my Reputation

Complaints, all couched as jokes, came to me in the early days as often as might be expected from the people upholding our civil disobedience work. Ralph would, they said, try to bully them into doing what he thought right by saying that he was speaking as my secretary and voicing my wishes. This, I gather, moved them less than he thought it should. Not till the year following the establishing of the Foundation did I receive serious complaints of him save from people who did not in any case like what we were trying to do. Always, when any complaints of him came to my notice, I discussed them with him and more often than not he admitted them, promising reform and thereafter referring to my criticisms and his determination to defer to them.

After the establishment of the Foundation in September 1963, however, the unfortunate traits of which I have spoken became steadily more marked. I began to receive serious complaints from his colleagues and others who were sympathetic to our work. At the end of January, 1964, two of his colleagues called upon me at Plas Penrhyn to beg me to expel him from his position in the Foundation as my secretary. They spoke for themselves and three other colleagues. Their charges had three main bases: (1) that Ralph was ruining my reputation by telling people that he was responsible for what purported to be my work; (2) that he was playing fast and loose with funds obtained on the ground that they were to be used for my work for peace; (3) that his attitude was dictatorial and his intolerance of opposition intolerable. For these charges they presented chapter and verse. I asked the two who had come to see me and the other three colleagues to put their charges in writing. They did so, and with their letters gave me some precise knowledge that I had not before possessed. I was grateful to them for troubling to do this. Neither they nor any of Ralph's other associates in the work had, up to this time, made to me any serious or precise complaints. When asked why not, they all said, in various ways, they had not wished to distress me. They did not seem to realise that by delaying they had put me into a very false position and one that would inevitably harm our work if and when I tried to extricate myself from it. They had hinted at dissatisfactions but had never given me any information with which to face Ralph. I could now, and did tackle Ralph about the matters that they had brought up. He either denied the charges and the evidence for them in toto or explained what the 'evidence really sprang from'. In view of his rebuttal of the charges,his promise to reform in one case (the charge of wasting money and energy on ill-planned journeys) and, especially, the fact admitted by all his colleagues, that there was no one else who could take his place and carry on his work, I did not repudiate him. Moreover, I had strong reasons to doubt the reliability and even the capability of most of the complainers. I now suspect that these 'reasons' may have been carefully provided by Ralph himself! The most reliable and capable of Ralph's colleagues were unwilling at that time to bear the unpleasant consequences of plain speaking,although later they were driven to do so. Their reluctance has done great harm both to me and, what is worse, to our work.

Ralph's Uproar

Among the first serious complaints that I received from anyone not working with us followed the Peace Conference at Helsinki in July 1965. On July 15 I received a telegram signed by the 'Delegation of Federal Republic of Germany' saying: 'Speech of your personal representative caused uproar. Strongly rejected by audience. Tremendous provocation of Peace Congress. Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation discredited. Essential you dissociate yourself from Schoenman and his speech. Friendly greetings.' (The stops,absent in the telegram, are added by me.) Needless to say, I was exceedingly disturbed by this. As I knew nothing of what had gone on at the Congress, however, I felt that I must await further news and, especially, Ralph's version of the matter, before taking any action. Following the Conference, I received many conflicting reports. Towards the end of July I replied to one correspondent:

> Thank you for your letter of 26 July and its enclosure. It was kind of you to write expostulating with me directly about the difficulties at Helsinki. As I was not there, I find it hard to straighten out the conflicting reports that have come to me. The statement that you enclose [which she said in her letter was the speech which caused a great deal of disturbance] was a message from me. From all that I can gather I make out: that it was not this message but a later speech by Mr. Schoenman that caused the difficulty. At any rate, the final resolution adopted by the Congress seems to me admirable — but not the first that they adopted after the first meeting. It seems to me just possible that strong obstructionist methods were needed to make the change between the first and the final resolution possible. If so, I am glad that they were taken, though I am sorry that the Foundation has to bear the burden of the disapproval of some of the delegates. As to whether the same end could have been achieved by another and more acceptable manner, I should think probably it could have been, but I was not there, I repeat, in the heat of conflicting points of view. I am glad that you found the Conference a success from many points of view.

From this reply, it may be understood how tangled, apparently prejudiced, and often mistaken the criticisms were. Those who upheld Ralph's action were hardly clearer. What I made of it all at the time,the above letter indicates. Moreover, as I have said above, the resolution of which I approved was adopted by the Conference after, and not before Ralph's's uproar and was probably owing to it.

A month later,a woman scientist, who had done very commendable work in Britain for international peace, wrote to my wife criticising Ralph's actions at the Conference very severely. She had not herself been present and

based her remarks upon those of a delegate who did not himself complain to me.All these criticism I took up with Ralph when he returned. He replied that he had gone to Helsinki not only as my representative but also as an appointed delegate in his own right. He said that, apart from reading my message, he had made it clear that he was acting and speaking not as my representative but as himself. He was 'convinced' — a favorite word of his — that had he not acted and spoken as he did, the Chinese delegates would have had short shrift. He was convinced that the Conference had been rigged by the Americans against the Chinese. It seemed to me, as I told him, that even if this were so, he might have achieved his end by restraining his temper and being very much more tactful and quiet. He agreed reluctantly that possibly this was so and that he would try not to commit such impetuous and provocative errors again.

A few weeks later I received a long letter from a friend, who had also been a delegate at Helsinki, describing Ralph's actions and describing how fantastic and fanatical they had appeared to be and, consequently, how harmful to our work. They destroyed, she said, much goodwill towards it and achieved only an immediate and Pyrrhic victory for Ralph's point of view. Again I discussed these matters with Ralph, pointing out clearly that,while the end that he had wished to achieve might have been praiseworthy, his methods of achieving it had been altogether deplorable. He countered by saying that no other methods would have been effective. I disagreed. He promised again to be less violent and ill-mannered in future.

Is Russell Senile?

I received a long letter from this same friend a year later. She had been in London for six weeks, during which time, she said, no fewer than 26 people, all of whom were sympathetic to my own work, had remarked on the way in which my 'image was being tarnished' and my friends alienated by 'Ralph's unfortunately arrogant personality plus attitudes and methods which are all too often open to question, I am told, from the standpoint of ethics'. These people had asked:'What is the hold this man has over Russell? Is Russell now senile and unable to make his own decisions and so is accepting whatever is put before him? How is it Ralph seems to overrule Russell to continue doing the things Russell himself has personally repudiated?' To my request for specific facts backing up these charges, I received no reply and they continued to seem quite unreal to me.

A month or two later in this same year, I received a letter of resignation from one of the Directors of the Foundation. In it he said:

> My sympathies and engagement in your work and the aims of the Foundation are what they always were. I feel as strongly about the war in Vietnam as ever. I think that the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation with the extraordinary example of your life and work could become the most important independent intellectual force in the world today.
>
> The reason for my resignation is personal. I feel that Ralph Schoenman has captured the Foundation and turned it into a monolithic expression of his own limited interests and abilities.
>
> Before my resignation becomes official, I would strongly urge that an independent group examine Mr. Schoenman's competence to continue further his sole leadership of the Foundation. I also feel that an independent group of accountants should make a report to the board of directors concerning both income and disbursement over the last three years.
>
> Believe me, Lord and Lady Russell, that resigning at this moment is painful. I also find it painful to be unable to conclude the film about you which I have begun. I have notified Schoenman of this on four separate occasions in writing. I believe that the raw materials of the film, as now unedited, is of great value. As of today, Schoenman has not answered any of my letters concerning its disposition. I feel that it is improper for me to continue physical ownership of the negative and film. Will you be kind enough to let me know what should be done with it.

Auditing the Accounts

I should at that time willingly have consulted accountants and an independent group of individuals as to Ralph's administration of funds and general competence. But where could I find such a group? As to the matter of the film, Ralph and his colleagues told quite a different story from that told above. We were finding it difficult to extract the film from its maker in spite of many letters to him asking to have it sent to the Foundation.

Until that time,though I had received other complaints, few had given me precise information that could not [be], and was not, explained away by Ralph. A good example, and a very nice letter of this sort, came from a young man unknown to me in May, 1967:

> I have an unusual letter to write, so may I in advance beg your patience and forgiveness.
>
> I have been engaged in the activities of the Hampstead CND and the Camden Committee for Peace in Vietnam during the past two years, and more recently, Hampstead labour party.
>
> Inside and outside committees I have met a great many people holding a great many views, although naturally almost all fall within that part of the spectrum called the left. I have found however two things that almost everybody has in common, one is a profound respect for you, the other is dislike of Ralph Schoenman.

I certainly have no doubts concerning his dedication to your work. It is his public presentation that is in question. I wish I could give you specific examples of what I mean but this is very difficult. There is a certain conceit, a certain unwarranted hostility towards people that goes ill with his position. My impression of Mr. Schoenman is general, as are the impressions of most people, but such as it is,it is a bad one. I would not presume to write to you thus were I alone in this feeling.

I am vague on the cause, perhaps I can better illustrate the effect. I have a friend who holds a very responsible position, has a most pleasant disposition, and excellent opinions. I remarked to him on the photograph of you on your verandah in the "Observer" earlier this year.He agreed with me, an excellent picture, but added that Ralph Schoenman was probably just out of sight propping you up. He was half in jest, but others make similar remarks, and are serious. The spite or cynicism of such remarks is not directed at you but at Mr. Schoenman.

My purpose is to bring to your attention something that I find very disheartening. Had I not met many other persons who share my opinion, I would not presume to write to you.

I must say I intend no harm or calumny to Mr. Schoenman, but knowing how widespread my feeling is, I think it has to be of some importance.

I hope you will not think me impertinent for I am, sir, with the greatest respect, yours most faithfully.

Such generous and obviously sincere criticisms as the foregoing were extremely disturbing and carried entire conviction. But it was quite impossible to make Ralph understand them. His reply was to the effect that anyone who worked with energy for the ends that I desired would be more than likely to incur such criticism. And it seemed to me that there was a good deal of truth in this reply. I could only beg Ralph to be gentler and more tolerant in his presentation of our views and beliefs.

Display of Egoism

As I watched the development of the War Crimes Tribunal in 1967 doubt became even stronger in my mind. Ralph was appointed Secretary General of this Tribunal. I watched his doings with greater objectivity than I had been able to do formerly since he was acting, not as my secretary or representative, but as an executive of an organisation which I entirely supported though in the running of which I took no active part. I had been increasingly aware for some time that, though Ralph was invaluable in developing an idea to the point of practicability, he was disastrous to that idea when he attempted, himself, to carry it out. This belief was confirmed by his actions as Secretary General and by the unnecessary quarrels and muddles largely created, I understood, by him. Again, the dichotomy was visible: it is quite possible that the Tribunal would never have got off the ground had it not been for his intense efforts; but had his efforts been accompanied by even a little restraint and considered planning and with less provocation to those who did not approve of his methods or of the Tribunal itself, the latter might have accomplished as great — and it was great — a work as it did with far less cost in human frustration and futile work as well as in money.

I felt that his display of egoism and flouting of advice, especially of advice given by his colleagues, at this time and in the following months when he flew about the world, as it seemed to me, heedlessly, rendered him only a liability to the Foundation. But the Foundation had become, in November 1966, a limited company. The change had my entire approval. The company was administered by directors of whom I was not one. I had no executive position in it. It was, consequently, no part of my business to retain or to dismiss Ralph except as my secretary. And he ceased to be my secretary in 1966.

I felt that Ralph should be dismissed from the Foundation. I had for some time insisted that he should not speak either as my secretary or my representative except on such occasions as we had specifically agreed that he should do so. I reiterated this in a letter in 1966. He assured me that he honoured this decision of mine. I constantly heard and read of his having made pronouncements as my secretary or representative. He pointed out that this was not his fault, that in spite of his denials, others took it for granted that he was still my secretary. Perhaps this was true. In any case I could do no more than urge him to make it very clear that he was not speaking or acting for me. I felt that I might or might not agree with what he said or did. I wrote to him in 1967 on this subject in categorical terms such as I had used only in speech theretofore.

The Directors of the Foundation company were not even yet fully convinced that he could no longer be useful to the work and was harming it. I had frequent discussions with some of them about the matter. They appeared to feel that it would make their position as colleagues of Ralph more difficult were I myself to break with him. They feared also, I learned, that if I did so, he would retaliate in ways that would not only hurt my feelings but would harm my work. I did not know at this time that this was one, and perhaps the chief, of their reasons for their cooler than lukewarm reception to my wish to break with him. Nevertheless, I now think I should have broken with him several years ago. Instead, I temporised. I made a grave tactical mistake: in my desire to put my attitude towards him and my criticisms quite clearly before him and yet in no way harm the efficiency of his work as the directors had made me feel I might do, I agreed with my wife that she should make the criticisms to him in my presence and that I would merely agree with them. It was a foolish plan. Unfortunately, his assurance was such that he took refuge in the belief that my wife was persuading me to oppose and mistrust him . I soon realised that all I was doing by this roundabout method was confirming in him the very characteristics that I most deplored. When, in 1969, I learned of what I had not suspected hitherto, that, consciously or, again, through over-optimism he was indulging on behalf of the Foundation in what can only be termed dishonest means of accumulating funds for his work. I could no longer continue to support him an any way.

Financial Unscrupulousness

He was without authority, selling the rights of books, refusing to send on funds owing to the Foundation in London, attempting to divert funds payable to it from the sale of my archives, insisting that English tax laws be flouted, and employing other such discreditable means. Perhaps I should have recognised this tendency towards financial unscrupulousness in Ralph earlier, for I had had occasion to remonstrate with him a number of times when it seemed to me that he was sailing very close to the wind. For instance, he arranged with the editor of one journal to pay a certain sum for the right to publish statements and articles by me hitherto unpublished. He then sent these articles and we received the money for them. But he sent them to other journals which occasionally, owing to their dates of appearance, published them before the editor with whom we had made the original contract could get them out. Naturally, this editor was angry. And so was I. I quarrelled with Ralph about it, but failed to convince him. At the time I felt I had to support Ralph. I now feel I was mistaken in this.

During the past two years, since he has been forbidden entrance to Britain, he seems to have been attempting to carry out his ideas without reference to the advice and needs of his colleagues in the Foundation. Certainly he has flouted my criticisms, paying no attention to them save to pronounce them all biased. His actions have reinforced the confirmation that the War Crimes Tribunal has given to my belief as to where his value lay when he was still valuable. But his actions since 1967 have become so egregious that he appears to me no longer to have any value in carrying on the work that I believe the Foundation to be engaged in and which I think should be done. It is for his colleagues to give the facts of their difficulties in working with him.My own reasons for breaking with him I have tried to make clear in this memorandum and to indicate to a slight degree in my autobiography. I have given them directly to Ralph himself in the past, especially on the few occasions when he has visited me here in the last three or four years. I have referred to them in my last letters to him, copies of which I think are in my files along with other correspondence addressed to me by him and others. I am particularly sorry to have had to make this open breach with Ralph because I fear that it will distress his parents whom I both like and respect — unless of course they can take refuge in the belief that I have been persuaded, or even forced, to make it by my wife and the other wicked people who surround me.

Definitive Break

The question of cardinal importance that has been put to me is why I did not break with him earlier. I did not do so because, until the last few years, he was the only person who could and would carry out the work that I thought should be done. The balance of his accomplishments over his drawbacks has only gradually been reversed. His faults and mistakes were of less importance than his ability to turn vision into practicable effect and his courage and optimism in carrying out our ideas. When, sometime after the Cuban debacle, he finally took the bit in his teeth and later careered away unrestrained as Secretary General of the War Crimes Tribunal, I became increasingly doubtful of his usefulness to the work and remonstrated with him both frequently and severely. Since his methods, however, have become importunately open to question and, consequently,intolerable, during the last two years, and during the last year can only be termed dishonest, I have felt it necessary to make a definitive break with him.

I did this in my letter to him of July 1969, to which I received no reply. Towards the end of November 1969. I was obliged to write again in an endeavor to extract an undertaking that he would cease using my name or my wife's as he has been doing to support his own work. And in the past few days, I have found it necessary to prepare a public statement of repudiation,, since I must, if possible, dissociate myself and my wife from all Ralph's actions in the minds of all men who will listen.

Russell

Postscript:
Had I seen the letter which Ralph wrote to two of his co-directors on 29 June 1968,earlier, I would have unhesitatingly broken definitely with him at once. But I was not shown this until late in November 1969 . It is a preposterous document. But in it he presents his point of view on our association at length. It therefore deserves examination. In it he objects to what I said of him in my autobiography on the ground that it is 'a betrayal of all the years I have devoted to the Foundation and to Bertie, years in which I have worked flat out and at the risk of life for twenty hours a day'. Possibly he is referring to the first draft of my autobiography. I was, and still am, unaware of any occasion upon which he risked his life either for my sake or that of the foundation. If he is referring to his travels in Africa, the dangerous part of those were made without authorisation from either me or the Foundation. The same is true if he is referring to his second journey to Bolivia where he got himself imprisoned and shot at. In both cases, he was begged to return to London or to stay in London as he had been away many weeks longer than had been intended and all the work of the Foundation was held up by efforts to straighten out what he had begun and abandoned. Much of the rest of his letter, three closely typed pages, is a diatribe against my wife who, he states, has been waging a campaign against him. In the course of this he utters nonsense, saying that 'she has tried to deny me help of the Foundation when I have been in prison or in need of assistance to recover my passport. She has manoeuvered to prevent my return to Britain and when I did return she put out a vicious Press statement dissociating Bertie from me which only a miracle prevented the bourgeois press from blowing up into a major scandal'. All this is, of course, untrue. She has often helped Ralph and would have helped him in prison had there been anything that she could have done for him. She has never put out a Press statement of any sort, vicious or otherwise. Moreover, he says that 'she has harassed and bullied and tormented Bertie to secure his acquiescence in her efforts'. I have never been bullied or harassed or tormented by her. The idea is ludicrous. And in point of fact, she felt optimistic about Ralph for a longer time than I did. Ralph thinks that it was she who made me demand that he should not be my secretary.'The muted and barely existent public

support of Bertie for me when I have been in grave danger and now banned from Britain' is owing to her. And her nefarious actions culminate in 'harmful' remarks that I make about him in my autobiography. I had been under the impression that I had helped Ralph as much as I could and I do not think that I have been ungenerous to him in my autobiography.

There follows in this letter a long, very revealing paragraph. He sums it up in the introductory sentence: 'the truth is that every major political initiative that has borne the name of Bertrand Russell since 1960 has been my work in thought and deed.' He continues, naming what he considers these major political initiatives. To all this he says I have agreed enthusiastically. I have referred to my wife's evil campaign against him 'with anguish', assuring, even crying. This is entirely the figment of his imagination. He himself, he says, has been 'trapped in the dilemma of not tearing him (that is me) apart by fighting Edith'.

I should ask Ralph to reflect on his own past speeches concerning the duties of a good secretary. And also upon the number of times that I have urged him to work and to publish in his own name. Further, I should ask him to compare the paragraph about my wife on page 5 (Allen and Unwin edition) in the preface written by him in the book which he edited entitled Philosopher of the Century. It was first published in 1967. I entirely subscribe to what he says in that paragraph, as does my wife. But I should think that the change that he finds to have taken place in one year, 1967-8, would seem even to Ralph to be unlikely. I suppose that he has invented my wife's campaign as a face-saving device against my criticisms.There is no slightest danger, and never has been, of my being torn apart by conflicts between my wife and Ralph.

This letter leaves me with the impression that Ralph must be well established in megalomania. The truth is, I suppose, that I have never taken Ralph as seriously as he liked to think I did. I was fond of him in the early years. But I never looked upon him as a man of parts and weight and much individual importance.

NUCLEAR AFFAIRS

(6) Don't let the experts intimidate you! Don't get snowed by technical talk...numbers of missiles, numbers of warheads,delivery systems, first strikes, hardened silos, SS20s, Minutemen, Midgetmen, etc.,etc.,etc.

That's the message from Dr. Paul Olum, who worked on the Manhattan Project in Los Alamos, and is now President of of the University of Oregon:

> You don't need to know all the technical details to be informed. I think you know enough when you know that two of our nuclear submarines will carry 480 warheads and there are only 200 Russian cities over 100,000. If we wanted to aim them at cities we could destroy all their cities with two of our nuclear submarines which are mobile and essentially invulnerable. We do have overkill...It seems to me, the information you need you have. You don't need all the technical details.

This remark was made during an excellent Phil Donahue show, in December 1984. The participants — Dr. Olum, Herbert York, and Peter Weyden — discussed Weyden's new book, "Day One", about the building of the first atom bomb.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

(7) * Walt Coker is attempting to put together a book on Bertrand Russell and A. S. Neill as models of progressive educators. He would like to correspond about research for this project. PO Box 3164, Scottsdale, AZ 85257

(8) George Kave has been reading "The Lost Half-Century", an essay (in "A Hoard for Winter", Columbia Uiversity Press, 1962) by Dean Emeritus Virginia Gildersleeve of Barnard "which sadly notes that nearly all books and newspapers printed in America...are on paper whose chemical composition dooms [them] to disintegration within 20 to 100 years.[She] regretfully contrasts their passing with some of her treasured volumes printed in the 16th Century, and even the recently found Dead Sea scrolls from 2000 years ago. To whom can we entrust the selection of what shall survive, she asks.

"The question assumes the existence of something worth preserving...Consider all the wasted words that wend their way to the printer. Do they deserve a second chance...?

"...our best current hope is the chemical decomposition of paper. What we need is a law requiring that all other laws be written on paper guaranteed to last no more than 2 years, or at most 5. [And the same for] newspapers, magazines, best-selling fiction, etc. ,etc." [Except, of course, certain newsletters. Ed.]

BR CELEBRATED

(9) The Morris Fromkin Memorial Lecture, was given by ROLAND N. STROMBERG at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee on November 4, 1981. We present it here ... but without the 8 1/2 pages of footnotes, which we will lend on request. We show where the footnotes belong: (*1) indicates Footnote 1,(*2) indicates Footnote 2, etc.

A man who lived 98 years, who wrote some 75 books and several thousand articles, as well as 50,000 or so letters (*1), who has frequently been called the philosopher of the century, or the twentieth century Voltaire, whose range extended from The Principles of Mathematics and Outline of Philosophy through Power and Authority and the Individual to Marriage and Morals and The Conquest of Happiness was truly a philosopher in every sense of the word. But he was also historian, journalist, educationalist, religious controversialist and, of course, especially relevant for our purposes, reformer, social critic, political gadfly. He was a man, too,who lived a most interesting life, whether we consider the four marriages, the several other major love affairs, and how this private life intertwined in fascinating ways with his creative life and his varied intellectual concerns; or whether we think about the man who especially in his later years became a sort of independent world power, firing off letters to world leaders (Krushchev, Kennedy, U Thant) at every international crisis — and getting replies.

My topic as accepted by the Fromkin Lecture Committee proposed to use this extraordinary person as a means to the definition or clarification of the meaning of "social justice and human rights," the Fromkin theme, especially with reference to his extensive American experiences. The Fromkin Lectures on the theme of Social justice and Human Rights in the United States (*2),though they have discussed many interesting subjects have never, during the dozen years of their existence, addressed the question of the meaning of the term social Justice, I hoped to fill this gap. Not by an abstract formal analysis, but rather, as befits a historian, by looking specifically at a philosopher and activist who — a pure philosopher of the highest quality and significance — also addressed himself copiously to social and political issues; and who moreover involved himself actively in many political causes throughout his life. It seemed a plausible goal. I do not know whether I have been able to reach it. But I have had fun — a tribute to the compelling vitality of Bertrand Russell, which makes studying him an exciting adventure.

The extent of Russell's political/social interests is revealed by the number of his non-philosophical writings, which became more dominant as his life wore on. Of his first ten published volumes, nine were philosophical or mathematical. But of the next 64, only 12 were of this sort.Analysis of his books by content reveals that roughly a third were on philosophical or scientific subjects, another third political,social, or economic; the remaining third belong to a miscellany that includes of course religion and autobiography (he loved to write about himself, to an extent that may justify Virginia Woolf's description of him as a "fervid egoist"(*3)); also two volumes of short stories, and historical writings. (Russell valued history highly and wrote it well if with a certain Voltairean carelessness about mere fact: a characteristic citation ran "I remember reading this once in a book which I hope was accurate"! "On the Value of Scepticism," 1947.)

Russell's interest in politics and social or economic issues actually goes back to his earliest years. He said that but for the accident of obtaining a fellowship in mathematics/philosophy, he might have been an economist (*4). He wrote some early tracts as a free-trade economist. His first book (1894) was about the German Social Democratic Party. His interest in politics was manifested in the United States in 1896 when during his first American visit he got excited about the Bryan-Mckinley election. A period of desperate unhappiness in his first marriage, to the American Quakeress Alys Pearsall Smith, accompanied an immersion in mathematical studies. He said that adolescent impulses to suicide had been cured by mathematical work (*5) and it would seem that when he was happy, especially in love, he turned more to his social ideas and projects. An almost mystical experience in 1901, connected with the illness and suffering of Evelyn Whitehead (wife of his colleague and collaborator Alfred North Whitehead) he regarded as a major turning point in his life, leading him to abhor suffering and cruelty, to experience that "unbearable pain for the suffering of mankind" which at the beginning of his Autobiography he named as one of the three passions dominating his life.

In 1903-1904 he entered into the debate about protectionism in Great Britain, raised by Joseph Chamberlain, and took part in a parliamentary campaign. "The beginning of a more endurable life for me was my time in politics last Winter," he wrote in 1905 in the diary he was then keeping, mostly to record the unhappiness of his marriage. (*6) "I suppose he will always be popping out of his cloister into the world," his father-in-law observed at this time; and so he did. The Evelyn Whitehead experience led to a conversion to anti-imperialism. (*7) In 1907, he ran for Parliament as a votes-for-women candidate. In 1910 he campaigned for Philip Morrell, husband of Lady Ottoline Morrell with whom he was about to embark upon a passionate love affair; this was the time of the great political battle over the budget and the power of the House of Lords. It is true that during these years (c. 1900 to 1910) Principia Mathematica, his chief claim to philosophical immortality, which he co-authored with Whitehead, absorbed more of his energies than any other purely philosophical topic ever did. But World War I was to arouse his political instincts to the fullest, as he dropped everything for his long battle against the prevailing war spirit, which cost him his fellowship at Trinity College, Cambridge, and ultimately a not altogether unpleasant term in jail.

At this time he produced books on Justice in Wartime and Principles of Political Reconstruction. From that point on, it is fair to say, social reconstruction, politics, reform, never ceased to dominate his life.We must notice a split between Russell's philosophical thinking and his ethical or political views. Russell

generally held that pure philosophy has little or nothing to do with moral values and with one's actions as a reformer or political activist. It was in fact a hallmark of the revolution in philosophy at Cambridge that Russell participated in early in the century, that philosophy should be strictly scientific, and that science has nothing to say about values as ends. "Philosophy throughout its history," he wrote in his History of Western Philosophy, has consisted of two parts inharmoniously blended"; the failure to separate the scientific, factual, from the ethical or political "has been a source of much confused thinking." Indeed,the belief that metaphysics has any bearing on practical affairs is proof of logical incapacity." (*9) The genuinely scientific philosophy, Russell wrote in 1914,"must not hope to find an answer to the practical problems of life." (*9) Reason can only advise as to means; as ORussell puts it, "There is no such think as an irrational aim except in the sense that it is impossible of realization." (*10) Sharply separating the scientific from the moral in order to gain precision and clarity the Analytical philosophers were forced to abandon the latter realm to personal taste which cannot be argued about. A judgment of disapproval is just a cry of distaste,"I disapprove of adultery," or of economic greed, is exactly like "I hate spinach or "I can't stand rock music." In Russell's own typically puckish way of putting it, to say,"I don't like the Emperor Nero" is to say "Nero - o fie!" All judgments of value are based, in the last analysis, upon emotion." (*11) It is true that Russell was never very happy with his writings on ethics (*12); and around World War II, along with many others, he struggled to define a more objective standard. "I could not bring myself to think that Auschwitz was wicked only b because Hitler was defeated." But, he added, "the ghosts of Hobbes and Thrasymachus...seemed to jeer at me and say I was 'soft'."(*13) In 1922 he wrote that "to apply moral terms to human beings...to call themn knaves and scoundrels or what not -- is unscientific," which to Russell meant totally unacceptable.(*14)

The paradox is that he himself freely and profusely did just that, calling everybody in power from Lord Grey to Harold Wilson a scoundrel. (*15) He acknowledged the contradiction: "I have suffered a violent conflict between what I felt and what I found myself compelled to believe" about ethics. (*16) But in general he was content to follow his impulses on questions of value. Paring away the moral element to make philosophy more scientific meant leaving morals, in effect, to unreason, and Russell pretty consistently accepted this. He agreed with David Hume that "Reason is and ought to be the slave of the passions." In answer to a question concerning the source of his political commitments, the old Russell wrote that "If you saw a child drowning, you would try to save it and and would not wait for some -ism to persuade you that it was worth saving." (Unlike the student of the ancient Greek philosopher who left his master in the ditch because he could think of no valid reason to help him!) "I see the human race drowning and have an equally direct impulse to save it." (*17) Years earlier his friend and lover Constance Malleson, watching him at a meeting, said that "he seemed detached in mind and body -- but all the furies of hell raged in his eyes." Russell could no more resist those furies than he could silence his superb logical-analytical gifts. The two enormous energies resided in the same slight body of this passionate sceptic, and at times pulled him in opposite directions. It is ironic that the rationalist philosopher was, for that very reason, a creature of impulse and instinct in his political responses -- a source, most students would agree, of serious flaws as well as much strength.

This tendency to choose causes emotionally and uncritically, adopt and defend them passionately while putting at their service his immense dialectical gifts, may be a questionable method. It seems typical of many modern intellectuals, who are searching for a faith as well as looking for chances to exercise their intellectual gifts.The point here is that it seems appropriate to look for Russell's conception of justice and rights less in his formal philosophy than in his life, actions, and non-philosophical writings. We cannot divorce the conception from the man; we can only point to Russell and say "look at the man, look at the life; there is your definition."

*****

I would like for a few moments to pay respects to the second part of our title, reminding you of Russell's long and close connection with the United States. Two of his four wives were American. His visits of 1896 and 1914, when he taught at Harvard (with T. S. Eliot as one of his students), and lectured also at Madison, Ann Arbor, Chicago, were followed by some years in the 1920s when Russell became a familiar figure on the American lecture circuit. He made the rounds iN 1924, 1927, 1929, and 1931. He lectured in Milwaukee, interestingly enough, of the very date of this lecture, November 4, in 1927.The Milwaukee Journal of that date ran a front page story about the man who had recently debated with Will Durant on "Is Democracy a Failure?" (Russell thought it was not) and who that morning addressed the Wisconsin Teachers Assocation on "Education and the Good Life."(He also spoke in the evening at St. Johns's Church on "England's Political Situation.") At a time when headlines proclaimed "Teapot Dome Case Declared Mistrial" and "Most radio sets still battery operated," as well as "Daddy Browning Dances His Nights Away, never thinking of girl Peaches who is gone," Russell chose to allude to Chicago Mayor Bill Thompson's assaults on "unpatriotic history", urging the teachers to stand fast for "truth first" against prejudice. It was certainly a characteristic message.

Russell's purpose on these tours was simple enough, it was to make money. He was at this time dependent for his income on lectures, book sales, and journalism.Perhaps we no longer remember that the U.S. lecture circuit was once second only to the marriage market as a means of transferring wealth from the New World to the Old. It was the same motive that led Russell to write a column for the Hearst newspapers, 1932-1935, after the Depression dried up the springs of lecture fees and book sales. Having made himself into an accomplished public speaker, and adopted that persona of sardonic iconoclasm that became his trademark, Russell was a great success as a public speaker. He wrote, "America persecutes Americans for the opinions it hires foreigners at great expense to express." (*18) These lectures contained much not only of Russell's social philosophy, and his views on world affairs, but also, especially during the 1929 tour, his daring excursions into free love, open marriage, "preliminary partnerships."In the 1920s Russell had children by his second wife, Dora, turned his thoughts to education, and established an experimental school. He found himself in need of money to finance the school as well as support his family. He made some $10,000 on the 1927 tour, no mean sum (one

would have to multiply by eight or ten for the present equivalent), in addition to spinning off books like The Conquest of Happiness which threatened to make Bertrand Russell the Dear Abby of his day.

In September, 1938 Russell returned to the United States, partly to avoid the coming war, partly because he had yet another wife, another child, and new money needs. He was appointed visiting professor for a term at Chicago, then professor at UCLA for three years. In 1940 he received what he thought was a permanent appointment at City College of New York, whereupon he resigned from the California post, prematurely as it turned out. What followed became one of the most celebrated of American academic cases. A colleague at this university who was a student at CCNY in the early 1960s told me recently that echoes of the Russell case could still be heard then. Attacks on the appointment as a "chair of indecency," a threat to public morals, offering atheism and the morals of the barnyard in the guise of philosophy emanated chiefly from Roman Catholics. Like Socrates, Russell was held to be a corrupter of youth. The attacks were answered by those who saw in this movement "an attack upon the liberal democratic tradition,"one which "imperils the whole structure of intellectual freedom upon which the American university rests." (*19) There was great excitement, mass rallies, manifestoes, editorials, petitions. It was a true cause célebre. Russell's friends deplored clerical fanaticism and held academic freedom to be at stake. (An appointment approved by the Board of Regents was revoked by the State Supreme Court acting on the suit of a citizen who had a child at the University.) His works were described in the brief filed by the opponent of his appointment as "lecherous, libidinous, lustful, venerous, erotomaniac, irreverent" and also, she added, "bereft of moral fiber"

Russell noted that with this affair "I seem to have recovered with the radicals the ground had lost by disliking Stalin." For it should be noted that for all his socialist dislike of capitalism, Russell ever since his visit to the Soviet Union in 1920 was a fairly consistent foe of what he saw almost from the beginning as a betrayal of the freedom he so passionately believed in. (*20) So in the fellow-traveling days of the 1930s his standing among modish intellectuals was somewhat ambivalent. Seldom did he join the crowd, even when it was an unorthodox crowd.

In the event, Russell lost his fight and was denied his chair; in part because greater things were in the air; the second world war in Europe broke out in earnest, and Russell, who had earlier been an "isolationist" and an "appeaser,"out of simple shrinking from war,changed his mind and supported this war against Hitlerism. With great clarity, as always, Russell in 1936 had seen the alternatives as submission to Hitler or war — and opted for submission (*21) But he could not sustain this position. He nevertheless stayed in the United States during the war, teaching at Harvard, then at the Albert Barnes Foundation run by the eccentric Philadelphia millionaire and art collector, with whom Russell soon violently quarreled and ended in court;and at the Rand School. It was while with Barnes that he wrote the popular History of Western Philosophy, said to be the leading seller of all his books. He was then 73, but his career had hardly begun, one might say; certainly his greatest fame lay ahead, also his most notable involvements with the USA.

It is probably a common view that Russell never had anything good to say about the United States, but that is not quite true. One might build a theory of a love-hate relationship, reflected in the marriage and then rejection of the first wife, and the final marriage to a rather anti-American American. If in the World War I years and in the 1960s Russell frequently inveighed against American "imperialism" (he was jailed in 1918 primarily for an outrageously anti-American remark), he also wrote in 1922 that "If any one Power is to be supreme in the world, it is fortunate for the world that America should be that one (*22). He said similar things in World War II, and after, e.g.. "I look to the Empire of America for the best hopes that a distracted world permits"(he certainly much preferred us to the USSR), and "Every country has its defects, but in relation to the world, I believe those to be less than those of any other country."(*23) Even on the cultural plane amid many scathing comments on the "absolutely unbelievable conventionality" in the United States, the appalling combination of Puritanism and technology, the lack of anything except "the bare unmitigated fight for financial success," Russell could also say that the intellectual level of students was higher at Chicago than at Oxford, that Americans were doing the best work in philosophy, that the U.S. might overcome cultural sterility to "create the new forms appropriate to modern life."(*24) Russell, who liked American movies and was an omnivorous reader of detective novels, was rather less a cultural snob than one might think — much less so, for example, than George Santayana whom he reproached for a lack of respect for the common man. (*25) In a characteristic ambivalence, Russell in 1938 remarked that "Life in America is both more violent and more vital than life in England; what is bad is worse,and what is good is better. (*26) These are rather random samples from a large amount of material on this subject. (*27) What Russell most disliked about American civilization was a facet of his leading passion, his love of free and bold speech, individuality and dissent.The tyranny of the majority in the USA disturbed him as much as earlier it had bothered that other liberal European aristocrat, Alexis de Toqueville.

For several reasons, including the deterioration of his third marriage as well as the New York and Philadelphia contretemps, Russell was not happy in the United States during his 1938-44 stay. He returned home to receive his Trinity College post back, to inhabit the rooms Newton once lived in, and to become a world figure.

****

The world fame which came to him after 1950, when he became an octagenarian and then nonagenarian wonder, stemmed in part from success on British television, where Russell exhibited his amazing quickness of intellect (Brains Trust); from being awarded the Nobel Prize in 1950; and of course from the series of political causes with which he was associated, most notably (from 1954 on) the campaign for nuclear disarmament. His professional philosophical reputation somewhat declined as he grew a bit out of date and out of touch; he

scorned the new linguistic school, based on the later turn of his one-time pupil and friend Ludwig Wittgenstein. But of course he became an internationally known sage and and oracle to whom people wrote from all over the world and to whom statesmen were to render tribute.

Our task is to isolate his conception of social justice and human rights. If we seek what Russell specifically said about "justice," we find that this was not one of the topics he most often or fully addressed. Philosopher T. V. Smith, in a review of one of Russell's books, observed that

> Truth is Russell's god. He has little to say of Beauty, and less to say of Goodness and Justice. (*28)

This is relatively true, I think.What aroused Russell most was intellectual error. Truth and justice, indeed, =overlap. In 1914, Russell felt a sense of outrage primarily at the unfairness with which Germany was treated. "Every tale against Germany is believed — there is no hint or trace of justice or mercy.""I suffer most from the absence of any attempt at justice, at imagining how matters look from the German side." (*29) Justice in Wartime was the title he gave to his war essays. So, if truth was his god, it entailed justice in the sense of intellectual fair play, seeing and stating all sides of a controversy and judgingg it fairly. Elsewhere, one of his few specific discussions of justice begins by construing justice as meaning "desert," and contrasting it with equality. "Justice" is, paradoxically, unjust in the sense of allowing some to have more than others, perhaps not altogether deservedly. (How can we measure services to the community, weigh the musician's claim against the merchant's, the professor's against the lawyer's?) Pure equality is not workable, but inequality must be justified by its effects: "I think, therefore, that one should say that the principle of justice demands equality except in so far as inequality can be proved to be socially useful." (*30) (By equality Russell here means equality of condition, not opportunity.)

Russell does not pursue this very far, but he would seem to have come close to the most celebrated recent formulation of a theory of justice, that of John Rawls (*30A), who argues that inequality (of access to primary goods) may be justified if it helps the least advantaged: inequality meaning giving a special advantage to some. There is a difference in that Rawls rejected utilitarianism, to which Russell pretty consistently held:actions are justified by their results, in maximizing human welfare, (Utility is a rival principle to "justice"in a sense: we do not ask about an act primarily where it is "just" but whether it secures the most happiness.) I must leave this matter to the philosophers; but there does seem to be a resemblance in that both Rawls and Russell urge equality unless inequality can be shown to be beneficial to society. Russell held that claims to the bare minimum of freedom — he specified food, drink, health, housing, clothing, sex, and parenthood — should override any other claims. (*31) As examples of the fact that minimal standards of justice were not yet realized in the world, he cited radical inequalities, injustices to women (he instanced denial of equal pay for equal work); and inheritance of wealth.

But "I would tell the truth whatever the consequences for human beings"!(*32) The first of Russell's two greatest social passions was the passion for truth,for liberty of opinion, diversity of opinion, open discussion, "untrammeled debate," "equal facility for all opinions."This essential liberalism was a relic of his aristocratic Whiggism, reaching far back in the proud Russell line to the ancestor who had lost his head opposing the tyranny of the Stuarts in the seventeenth century, and extending to the John Stuart Mill influence transmitted via Russell's mother, Kate Amberley. It was nourished in the Cambridge of his early years, when Russell participated in the revolt against Victorian orthodoxy that embraced the Bloomsbury Circle. It included dislike of popular hysteria as well as state control.

His closest book to a systematic treatise on politics was Power, in which was reflected a fear of, as well as a preoccupation with, repression as the most important factor in human affairs. The fear of unchecked power also colored his socialism; it perhaps also produced it, but it qualified it. Russell's leading reproach against capitalism was that, as he thought, it concentrated too much power over politics and opinion in the hands of an economic oligarchy;power in private hands subverts political democracy and threatens liberty of thought. (*33). This was also his foremost criticism of Russian Communism. "The most dangerous features of communism are reminiscent of the medieval church. They consist of fanatical acceptance of doctrines uncritically, and savage persecution of those who reject them.(*34) He said he agreed with John Dewey that having with difficulty emancipated himself from one orthodoxy, he was not about to shackle himself with another. And (1951) "In the Soviet Union human dignity counts for nothing." (*35) What turned this Soviet Union's regime from a hopeful liberator of mankind into a greater tyranny than any that ever existed, he said, was its ignoring the principle that the State must be limited by law which protects the individual from arbitrary and irresponsible power. "It is the abandonment of democracy that I find particularly disastrous." He occasionally expressed fears that under any kind of socialism "powerful officials" would inherit all the oppressive habits of the capitalists; his socialism was anti-statist, leaning toward the guild variety at one time, and always toward social democracy. (*36)."I do not believe that the economic changes advocated by socialists will, of themselves, do anything towards curing the evils we have been considering," he declared (the evils being popular credulity, misinformation, propaganda — enemies of the free mind.)(*37)

Russell's libertarianism was at the root, too, of the rather unsuccessful experiments in education — maximum liberty and freedom from authoritarian constraints for children, which seems at times to have turned the school at Beacon Hill into pandemonium. If proper educational methods were adopted, Russell then believed, "one generation would suffice to solve all our social problems." He did not seem to find the secret. But the aim was to "cure people of the habit of believing propositions for which there is no evidence." (*38)

The other persistent political theme in Russell was internationalism, extending from the free-trade enthusiasm of his youth to the insistence in old age that there must be a single world government, the sole alternative

to terrible global death from nuclear weapons (even if, as he alternatively posed, the world government was imposed by the US or by the USSR.) His commitment to freedom of discussion even faltered in the presence of this goal, for he occasionally said that the teaching of nationalism should be prohibited or banned from education.(*39) In Education and the Social Order (1932) he wrote that "establishment of an international authority sufficiently strong to impose its settlement of disputes upon recalcitrant states" is the most important of all reforms, I find no sign that he ever wavered from this opinion. His Hobbesian realism convinced him that this would never come about by mere power of opinion or human virtue -- Russell generally thought of human nature in no flattering terms — so he was prepared to see it established by force of arms. "I do not say this is a pleasant prospect" but it is a necessity.(*40) This conviction led him into some characteristic extremisms, such as the famous advocating of preventive war against the Soviet Union in 1947, if they did not accept internationalization of atomic energy, and later forgetting or denying that he had ever said this ("I had, in fact, completely forgotten that I had ever thought a policy of threat involving possible war desirable...I read these [statements] with amazement. I have no excuse to offer.") (*41); or, by 1958, holding that a world government brought about by the Soviets would be preferable to no world government. In 1933 he had written that "terrible as a new war would be, I still...snould prefer it to a universal communist empire."(*42) The hydrogen bomb changed his mind.

Russell's twin passions of free thought and international government,, to save the world from a final destructive war, reenforced by his mystically based hatred of cruelty and suffering, came together in his last great crusade, the one that earned him both world fame and obloquy. He forced himself on the BBC in 1954 to point out that the world was on the brink of nuclear disaster from the new and more terrible weapons and delivery systems, the H-bombs and missiles. He did not really have any answer to the cruel dilemma of the balance of terror (*43); but he was convinced that it must be talked about. He set in motion the Pugwash conferences to bring Soviet and Western scientists together for discussion. He created the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament to bring the issue to the streets (still very much alive as recent headlines remind us). Later he was prepared to advocate civil disobedience as a means of arousing the public. The armaments issue took precedence over all others; for, unless we survive, there can be no just society or any other kind. The only cure for it that he knew was discussion and controversy, forcing the issue before the attention of an apathetic public and attacking it with information.

He became an embattled and controversial public figure. Sometimes he was more thin-skinned than one would suppose. At least three times he brought or threatened to bring law suits against those who ventured to answer his epithets in kind. One of these involved the eminent scholar Robert Conquest, who had reproached him for declaring that there were no Soviet missiles at all in Cuba n 1962, it was all a fable made up in Washington (*44). A newspaper columnist enraged Russell by remarking that the Earl ought to issue just one statement, namely that he is "in favor of any act calculated to render the West helpless in the face of international Communism," and then shut up. (*45)

So it no doubt seemed at times to many people. Russell asserted that Kennedy and Macmillan were "much more wicked than Hitler."(April 1961) He later claimed that the Vietcong was non-communist ("a non-communist popular front").(*46). But emphatically it is not true that Russell in his last years criticized only the West. The record clearly shows that his protests went in all directions. (*47) To Nikita Krushchev, with whom he exchanged long letters, Russell denounced the sentencing of Pasternak's friends in 1961, and later he protested to other Soviet leaders over the treatment of Soviet Jews and other political prisoners. He protested to Tito the imprisonment of Djilas. He filed complaints with Cuba and Rumania, as well as Greece, Portugal, Turkey, Algeria, whenever there was abridgement of free speech. This commitment to intellectual freedom comes through as an authentic belief, beyond all political expediency. And this is rare indeed. It is rare, it seems to me, to find anyone who will denounce all cases of injustice and oppression; people's indignation is amazingly selective. Those who burn with indignation at the situation in El Salvador or South Africa usually have nothing to say about Afghanistan or Poland. If it was a matter of intellectual freedom, Russell always was moved to righteous wrath regardless of the offender, whether Communist, of whatever variety, or non-Communist. A rare and noble trait, I submit.

****

Bertrand Russell's idea of social justice and human rights, then, included the vision of the fearless, free intelligence doing battle with the idiocy of the world. Lord Acton once wrote of "the vast tradition of conventional mendacity; Russell agreed with this though he would, perhaps, have preferred "stupidity." It is the solemn humbug of the world that inflicts suffering; Hannah Arendt's banality of evil would have pleased Russell. "Nice people are the ones who have nasty minds," he wrote in an essay on "Nice People". Nice people are cruel as well as stupid. Russell once said he was prepared to believe anything bad about the police, regardless of the evidence! He accepted the Mark Lane line on the Kennedy assassination, he was certain of the innocence of the Rosenbergs, etc. This conspiratorial mentality, this uncritical belief in the wrongness of whatever authority and Establishment affirmed, may well be a Russell defect; but his belief that important truths are suppressed by conspiracies of silence was what motivated him to speak out.

"The evils of the world are due to moral defects quite as much as to lack of intelligence," he once wrote, "But the human race has not hitherto discovered any method of eradicating moral defects; preaching and exhortaton only add hypocrisy to the previous list of vices. Intelligence, on the contrary, is eaily improved by methods known to every competent educator. Therefore until some method of teaching virtue has been discovered progress will have to be sought by improvement of intelligence rather than of morale."(*48) The scientific method, the scientific temper, which "is capable of regenerating mankind and providing an issue for all our troubles," as he once wrote, (*49) is applicable to fact not values. The most troublesome contradiction I find in the life and thought of the twentieth century's greatest all-around philosopher is that this view of salvation by the critical intelligence, which he so often preached and which is so

compatible with his fundamental philosophical position, is something that he did not in the end live up to. It was not "the improvement of intelligence" that he represented in his last years, for he was gullible, often factually wrong in his appraisal of world affairs, and almost hysterically emotional. He was, rather, a moralist and a prophet, an accuser condemning the wickedness of a world whose leaders he claimed were deliberately bent on the extermination of the human race. (*50)

The cleavage between fact and value, science and morals, is a dilemma not alone of Russell's , but of our age, which he mirrored so well. It has been so ever since Neitzsche (a philosopher whom Russell, so far as he knew him, intensely disliked, but whom in fact he resembles in many ways) pointed out the death of God. "The sense of the world must lie outside the world," Ludwig Wittgenstein observed."In the world everything is as it is and happens as it does happen. In it there is no value." The scientific world-view neither praises nor condemns. Yet never has there been so much condemnation as in our age of science.

But I am not here to criticize Russell so much as to call him to your attention. First, the man — the long, interesting and illustrious life, the incredible energy, the passionate idealism and the lightning-quick razor-sharp brain — Dionysus and Apollo superbly if not always harmoniously combined. (*51) Second, the significant connection with the United States over the years, including much more than I had time to tell of, down to the attempt to hold a trial of the war crimes of the United States in the Vietnam War. Lastly, the long search for social justice and human rights, which led him in and out of prison, into the streets as well as the chambers of the great — and which intensified as his long life went on. It is a life and quest that we will not soon forget.

This large postcard announced the Stromberg Lecture ——————————>

BR INTERVIEWED

(10) Freeman Interview. John Freeman of the BBC interviewed BR in March 1959. Here is the transcript, as it appears in the appendix to The Future of Science (NY: Philosopohical Library, 1959). It will also offer relief to those who are suffering from too much small print.

I observe that the date I attributed to my death is 1962, which is coming ominously near, and begins to cause me some alarm.

Freeman:* Well, before you feel too much alarmed, let us examine this obituary which was written in jest and see how true it really is. To start with, let's go back to the distant past. What is your very earliest memory, Lord Russell?

Russell: I suppose my very earliest memory is tumbling out of a pony carriage when I was two years old, and my earliest at all vivid memories are of arriving at the house of my grandparents, Pembroke Lodge, in Richmond Park, after the death of my father, who died when I was three.

* John Freeman is the B.B.C. correspondent who conducted this interview.

Freeman: How did you come to be in the care of your grandparents? Your mother had also died?

Russell: Yes, she also. She died when I was two.

Freeman: Do you have any memory of your parents?

Russell: Very little. I remember nothing of my mother. I remember my father once giving me a leaflet printed in red letters, and the red letters pleased me.

* * *

Freeman: Were you always a skeptic from small childhood or did you believe in the conventions?

Russell: Oh, I wasn't a skeptic when I was very young, no. I was very deeply religious and lost my conventional beliefs very slowly and painfully. I remember that when I was four years old they had just been telling me the story of little Red Ridinghood, and I dreamed that I had been eaten by a wolf, and to my great surprise I was in the wolf's stomach and not in heaven.

Freeman: This was the beginning perhaps of skepticism?

Russell: Yes.

Freeman: Tell me, did you say your prayers when you were a child?

Russell: Oh, yes.

Freeman: When did you cease doing that?

Russell: I suppose when I was about twelve or thirteen.

Freeman: Do you think now that you had a happy childhood?

Russell: More or less. It was very solitary. I had one brother who was seven years older than me and I had little to do with him. Otherwise I didn't have much to do with other children, so that it was a solitary childhood, but it was not unhappy.

Freeman: Looking back now, with all the learning that you have acquired since, would you say that some feeling of insecurity was one of the spurs to intellectual action?

Russell: I don't quite know. I think it's a possible spur. I think there are others of a different sort; pure ambition will sometimes do it.

Freeman: Were you obsessed at a tender age with a sense of guilt or sin?

Russell: Oh, yes. They asked me one day what was my favorite hymn and I chose 'Weary of earth and laden with my sin.'

Freeman: At what age was that?

Russell: Six years old. The things I felt guilty about were – oh, eating blackberries when I had been told not to, and I remember once when at family prayers my grandmother read about the prodigal son, I said to her afterwards: "I know why you read that today: it was because I broke my jug."

Freeman: Do you think now, looking back, that there is any really unfortunate legacy you carried out of your childhood?

Russell: Yes, I do. The family attitude, certainly on matters of sex, was morbidly puritanical.

Freeman: Now, let us turn to your schooling.

Russell: My grandmother didn't approve of public schools. She was very unconventional in her outlook, and she thought they were a sort of conventional institution.

Freeman: Would you have liked a more conventional education?

Russell: No, not at the time. I was quite satisfied, and I think looking back I'm still satisfied, because I learned a great deal more than I should have done at any school.

Freeman: What sort of learning, at that age? Did you, for instance, study the classics?

Russell: To a certain degree. I was never fond of the classics. Mathematics was what I liked. My first lesson in mathematics I had from my brother, who started me on Euclid, and I thought it the

most lovely stuff I'd ever seen in my life. I didn't know there was anything so nice in the world. But I remember that the first lesson was a disappointment because he said: "Now, we start with axioms." I said: "What are they?" and he said: "Oh, they're things you've got to admit although we can't prove them." So I said: "Why should I admit them if you can't prove them?" and he said: "Well, if you won't we can't go on." And I wanted to see how it went on, so I admitted them *pro tem.*

Freeman: How did you educate your own children?

Russell: I educated them in various ways: I tried to find modern schools, but I think that there are some things in what's called progressive education that I like and some that I don't like; and I never found exactly what I should like.

Freeman: Did you send any of your own children to an ordinary public school?

Russell: Yes, my youngest son went to Eton.

Freeman: And was that successful?

Russell: Yes, quite successful.

Freeman: What was it that first provided you with the incentive to become a mathematician?

Russell: I liked it for a number of reasons: in the first place, the sheer pleasure which is the sort that people get from music or poetry – it just delighted me. And then, apart from that, I thought that mathematics was the key to understanding the universe, and I found all sorts of everyday things explained by means of mathematics. I remember I had a new tutor once who didn't know how much I knew, and I spun a penny, and he said: 'Do you know why that penny spins?' I said: 'Yes, because I make a couple with my fingers,' and he said: 'What do you know about couples?' I said: 'Oh, I know all about couples!'

Freeman: How old were you then?

Russell: I must have been twelve or thirteen.

Freeman: Have you found on the whole in your own life that the pursuit of either mathematics or philosophy has given you some sort of substitute for religious emotion?

Russell: Yes, it certainly has. Until I was about forty, I should think. I got the sort of satisfaction that Plato says you can get out of mathematics. It was an eternal world, it was a timeless world, it was a world where there was a possibility of a certain kind of perfection, and I certainly got something analogous to religious satisfaction out of it.

Freeman: What period of your life, or rather what episode in your life, led you to turn again from philosophy, to some extent, into social work and politics?

Russell: The first war. The first war made me think 'It just won't do to live in an ivory tower. This world is too bad. We must notice it.' I thought, as a politician, and I still think, that it would have been very much better for the world if Britain had remained neutral and the Germans had won a quick victory. We should not have had either the Nazis or the Communists if that had happened, because they were both products of the first World War. The war would have been brief; there would have been nothing like so much destruction.

Freeman: Have you ever had a moral objection in principle to killing?

Russell: Oh, no. I don't like any kind of general rule like that.

Freeman: How much in fact did you actively campaign against the first World War?

Russell: As much as I could. I went all over the place, making speeches, and I did everything I could to help the conscientious objectors. I wrote about it wherever I could.

Freeman: Did you have a sort of public notoriety as an unpopular figure or were you regarded as just a crank?

Russell: I wasn't actually pelted with rotten eggs, but I had an almost worse experience. I was at a meeting of pacifists at a church and it was stormed by a mixture of colonial troops and drunken viragos. The drunken viragos came in bearing boards full of rusty nails, with which they clamped everybody on the head, and the colonial soldiers looked on and applauded them, and the police looked on and did nothing. Women had all their clothes torn off their back and were badly mauled, and the viragos with rusty nails were just about to attack me – I didn't quite know what one did about this – when somebody went up to the police and said: 'Look, you really ought to stop these women, you know, he's a distinguished writer.' 'Oh,' said the police. 'Yes, he's a well-known philosopher.' 'Oh,' said the police. '*And he's the brother of an earl!*' And then the police rushed and saved me.

Freeman: Was this the time that you went to prison?

Russell: No, this was earlier.

Freeman: What exactly did you go to prison for?

Russell: For writing an article. I was convicted on the ground that this article was 'intended and likely to cause bad relations between England and the United States,' because I pointed out how United States troops were used as strike-breakers and it was thought I oughtn't to have done that.

Freeman: Were you tried by a jury or by a magistrate?

Russell: By a magistrate in London. And he said this was 'the most despicable crime.' He sentenced me to six months. Originally it was six months as an ordinary criminal, and then on appeal it was altered to six months in the First Division.

Freeman: Which meant more lenient treatment?

Russell: Oh, very much. It's a profound difference.

Freeman: Do you think, looking back, that Trinity College behaved either wisely or justly in depriving you of your Fellowship at the time of your own trial and imprisonment?

Russell: No, certainly not, especially as they did it while the case was *sub judice*. You see, all the younger Fellows had gone to war and the government of the college was left to the old boys, and the old boys said, 'We must do our bit – we can't fight, we're too old,' and their bit was to get rid of me!

Freeman: Something very similar to that, of course, happened in the second World War, when your appointment at the College of the City of New York was terminated. What actually did happen?

Russell: Oh, in the second World War I was completely patriotic, I supported the war, and I was entirely orthodox in my views about that.

Feeman: Nevertheless you were thrown out of another college?

Russell: Ah, but that was for quite different reasons. That was on the ground of my views about marriage and morals.

Freeman: But your views must have been known when you were appointed to the College of the City of New York?

Russell: Oh, yes. Civilized people didn't mind them, but there was a whole rabble in New York of uneducated Irish people, and they had completely ignorant views.

Freeman: What happened to you when you lost your job in New York? Did you have another job to go to in America?

Russell: I didn't know I should have. I was completely ostracized. No newspaper would print a word I wrote, no magazine would print a word, no hall would allow me to lecture in it, so that I was cut off from all my means of livelihood, and I couldn't get any money out of England at that time because of currency regulations, and so I was expecting to starve. I had three children whom I was educating, two of them at the university and one younger, and I expected we should all suffer very badly; and we should have done but for a certain man called Dr. Barnes who came to my rescue and gave me a job.

Freeman: Is that the only time in your life that you've ever been really short of money?

Russell: Most of my life I've only had just enough, and the rest of my life I've generally had just enough with a certain security; but at that time I really did not know how I was going to carry on my children's education.

Freeman: Could I ask you, because it's of interest to the background of the academic life generally, were you left a fortune by your family, or have you earned all you've had all your life?

Russell: I was left a certain amount of money. When I came of age I had capital that brought me in about £600 a year, and then I became a socialist and I came to the conclusion that I ought not to live on inherited money, and I got rid of my capital gradually to various causes which I thought important. Since then I've lived entirely on my earnings.

Freeman: Looking back now on all the causes that you have especially championed throughout your working life, do you think your advocacy has been on the whole successful?

Russell: It depends entirely upon what things you're thinking of. My views on what you may call sexual questions have, I think, been immensely successful – I mean, the world has moved that way; and to a very great extent on education, too. And one of the things that I used to be enormously interested in was equality of women, and that of course has been completely successful. Also I was from an early time a socialist and there is a great deal of socialism in England now and I'm glad of it. So that I have had a fair measure of success; but in other things of course not at all.

Freeman: Do you think that on the whole the fanatics in the world are more useful or more dangerous than the skeptics?

Russell: Oh, much more dangerous. Fanaticism is *the* danger of the world, and always has been, and has done untold harm. I might almost say that I was fanatical against fanaticism.

Freeman: But then are you not fanatical also against some other things? Your current campaign, for instance, in favor of nuclear disarmament – would you encourage your supporters to undertake some of the extreme demonstrations that they do undertake and isn't that fanaticism?

Russell: I don't think that's fanaticism, no. I mean, some of them may be fanatical, but I support them because everything sane and sensible and quiet that we do is absolutely ignored by the press, and the only way we can get into the press is to do something that looks fanatical. The worst possibility is that human life may be extinguished, and it is a very real possibility; but assuming that doesn't happen, I can't bear the thought of many hundreds of millions of people dying in agony, solely because the rulers of the world are stupid and wicked.

Freeman: Is it true or untrue that in recent years you advocated that a preventive war might be made against communism, against Soviet Russia?

Russell: It's entirely true, and I don't repent of it. It was not inconsistent with what I think now. What I thought all along was that a nuclear war in which both sides had nuclear weapons would be an utter and absolute disaster. There was a time, just after the last war, when the Americans had a monopoly of nuclear

weapons and offered to internationalize nuclear weapons by the Baruch proposal, and I thought this an extremely generous proposal on their part, one which it would be very desirable that the world should accept; not that I advocated a nuclear war, but I did think that great pressure should be put upon Russia to accept the Baruch proposal, and I did think that if they continued to refuse it might be necessary actually to go to war. At that time nuclear weapons existed only on one side, and therefore the odds were the Russians would have given way. I thought they would, and I think still that could have prevented the existence of two equal powers with these means of destruction, which is what is causing the terrible risk now.

Freeman: Suppose they hadn't given way, would you have been prepared to face the consequences? You would have used these weapons on the Russians in spite of the words you have used to me about their horror?

Russell: I should. They were not, of course, nearly as bad as these modern weapons are. They hadn't yet got the hydrogen bomb, they had only the atom bomb (and that's bad enough, but it isn't anything like the hydrogen bomb). I thought then, and hoped, that the Russians would give way, but of course you can't threaten unless you're prepared to have your bluff called.

Freeman: Do you look back to the nineteenth century on the whole with nostalgia and regret?

Russell: It all depends on what you're thinking about. The world was much more beautiful to look at than it is now. Every time I go back to a place that I knew long ago I think how sad it is. One piece of beauty after another is destroyed, and that I do profoundly regret. But when it comes to ideas, there's immensely less humbug than there was, and that I rejoice in.

Freeman: Have you written an autobiography?

Russell: I have, yes.

Freeman: Are you going to allow it to be published in your lifetime?

Russell: No, not till I'm dead. In the first place because it won't be complete until then, and in the second place because there are all sorts of things that ought not to be said too soon. It may even have to wait some time after I'm dead – I don't know.

Freeman: One last question: suppose, Lord Russell, that this film were to be looked at by your descendants in 1,000 years' time, what would you think it worth telling that generation about the life you've lived and the lessons you've learned from it?

Russell: I should like to say two things, one intellectual and one moral. The intellectual thing I should want to say to them is this: when you are studying any matter or considering any philosophy, ask yourself only what are the facts and what is the truth that the facts bear out. Never let yourself be diverted either by what you would wish to believe or by what you think would have beneficent social effects if it were believed. But look only at what are the facts. The moral thing I should wish to say to them is very simple. I should say love is wise, hatred is foolish. In this world, which is getting more and more closely interconnected, we have to learn to put up with the fact that some people say things that we don't like. We can only live together in that way and if we are to live together and not die together we must learn a kind of charity and a kind of tolerance which is absolutely vital to the continuance of human life on this planet.

Thank you, TOM STANLEY.

NEW MEMBERS

(11) We welcome these new members:

SHAWN A. BURKLIN/8733 57TH ST. N./PINELLAS PARK/FL/33565
BARBARA L. COLLINS/637 SOUTH 13TH ST.(28)/HUDSON/WI/54016
BERNARD DAVIS/29 REVERE ST. (4)/BOSTON/MA/02114
ALLEN GENTHE/755 LANCASTER ST./PLATTEVILLE/WI/53818
STEPHEN H. LEPP/113 WALDEN ST. (3)/CAMBRIDGE/MA/02140

RICHARD LYNCH/9615 LIVENSHIRE DRIVE/DALLAS/TX/75238
JEFF M. MESHINSKY/4117 JONES BRIDGE ROAD/CHEVY CHASE/MD/20815
ROBERT S. MONTEMURRO/588 AVE. DALLAIRE/QUEBEC/CANADA/J9X 4V9
MICHAEL J. ROCKLER/5105 NORTH PARK DRIVE/PENNSAUKEN/NJ/08109
KERMIT ROSE/ 1914 ROSEDALE/TALLAHASSEE/FL/32303

PHIL SHAPIRO/5201 CHEVY CHASE PKWY.,NW/WASHINGTON/DC/20015
ZACHARIAH SHUSTER/27 W. 72ND ST. (HOTEL OLCOTT)/NY/NY/10023
RICHARD C. SLAGLE/USS MCINERNEY,FFG-8/FPO MIAMI/FL/34092-1466
STEVE SPRAGUE/2836 E. 1ST ST./LONG BEACH/CA/ 90803

NEW (OR CORRECTED) ADDRESSES

(12) When something is underlined, only the underlined part is new.

DR. THANOS CATSAMBAS/no adequate address available
ALEX DELY/8522 E. Helen Place/Tucson, AZ/85715
DR. STEPHEN HAMBY/124 Bibb Road SW/Huntsville, AL/35801-3225

DR. CHARLES W. HILL/Rte 7, Box 1414/Covington, LA/70433
JOHN R. LENZ/511 W. 112th St.(7)/NY NY/10025
DANIEL J. O'LEARY/5562 Bear Road (M2)/N. Syracuse, NY/13212

DR. CARL SPADONI/56 Dalewood Crescent/Hamilton, Ont./Canada L8S 4B6

BR AND THE ATOM BOMB

(13) Another opinion. Last issue we reprinted I.F Stone's disapproving view of BR's apparent willingness in 1946 to atom-bomb Russia, if necessary, to bring about world government. HARRY RUJA disagreed with Stone. This is how he expressed his disapproval of Stone's disapproval , in the May 1973 issue of "Humanist in Canada":

Did Stone Come To Praise Russell? Whether that was a nettle I.F. Stone got hold of at the Russell centenary conference at McMaster or just some limp spaghetti can only be decided, I suppose, when his speech is printed and his evidence evaluated. But what mystified me when I listened to him in Hamilton last October and watched the reactions of the audience — and still mystifies me — is how Stone could consider himself, and be considered, an admirer of Russell while accusing him of having advocated dropping atom bombs on Russia without provocation and in time of peace.

When I disputed Stone's interpretations and declared that he was at best praising Russell with faint damns, I was shouted down by the 1,000 other Russell "admirers" in the auditorium.

As a child, Stone told us, he went bodly into dark corners and found nothing to fear; now Stone goes into the "dark corners" of Russell's career and finds a bloodthirsty monster, recklessly egging America on to mass destruction of the inhabitants of one of the most populous countries on earth.

I myself am skeptical that the corner is as "dark" as Stone supposes. Rather, Stone seems simply to be projecting the ideology of confrontation politics on to Russell's words instead of appreciating them as a determined, perhaps even a desperate, attempt to take advantage of a unique opportunity to establish an authentic world government and thus assure peace for future generations, perhaps even saving mankind from extinction. If, as Stone insists, Russell was proposing diabolical measures in the indulgence of rancor against the Soviet Union, then why does he not call him a devil and withdraw from the company of Russell-admirers?

Stone entitled his address "Bertrand Russell as a Moral Force in World Politics". How ironic in the light of its content! The noble title does greater justice to the man than the speech did. When one brings to mind some of the events in Russell's long public life which this characterization fits — from his denunciations in 1914 of the liars, fools, and brutes who embroiled his country in what ironically came to be called 'The Great War' to the challenge within our own memory to Lyndon Johnson to stand trial as a war criminal for his devastation of the land and people of Vietnam — one cannot help feeling pangs of disappointment that Stone chose instead to misconstrue, as a bit of fanatic cold-war jargon, what, in context, is a realistic, cold-sober analysis of the prospects for peace and the likely ways of achieving it.[1] His performance, in the light of what it could have been, must strike the candid observer as petty, perhaps even malicious, a travesty on the nobility of the man we had come together to honor.

[1] Let the reader judge for himself by examination of some of Russell's writings of the period. See, e.g., "The Outlook for Mankind", Listener, 13 March 1947, 37, 370-2; "The International Bearings of Atomic Warfare," United Empire, January 1948, 39, 18 - 21; "There Is Just One Way To Peace," Maclean's, 1 January 1948, 61 (1), 7-8, 33-5; "The Future of Mankind," Unpopular Essays, London & New York, 1950.

ABOUT BR'S WRITINGS

(14) The Lure. We don't know anything about Jacob Needham except that he teaches youngsters and has written a book. The book is titled, "The Heart of Philosophy", and here is a bit of it, with thanks to MIKE TAINT:

I have tried asking people about their own adolescence: What was the most important book for them when they were young? What turned them on to serious ideas? I ask them that because I have been scrutinizing every book in my library trying to find at least the right readings to start with. But every book or author mentioned is one I have already considered and rejected. Spinoza? Too difficult. Hermann Hesse? Too sentimental. Plato? Of course, but not to begin with; they will have heard too much about him from other sources. Grimm's fairy tales? Rich with real ideas, but teenagers are still too close to childhood to approach them freely. Nietzsche? Camus? Too subjective. Kierkegaard? Too subtle—and also, although anyone with a search can see he is as far as possible from being conventionally "religious," young people would be too distracted by the Christian language of Kierkegaard; one can't begin with Kierkegaard. The Stoics—Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius? No, although I myself had been deeply moved by them when quite young. Examining Epictetus again two months ago, I was disappointed by the moralizing tone that the Victorian translations had put into his writings. Moralizing in any form is the kiss of death in pondering great ideas.

So I have thought again of how I first became interested in ideas when I was young. What author first helped me? The answer surprises me: Bertrand Russell.

Had anyone advised me to start my class with Russell, I would have dismissed the suggestion out of hand. I had not even considered his work over the summer—Bertrand Russell, lucid, witty, skeptical, a principal founder of modern logical analysis who approached the great questions of philosophy with little more than a very sharp pencil in his hand; Russell, who brought into the twentieth century the faith of the Enlightenment in scientific method as the model of understanding; who could dispose of Plato in a paragraph, or the whole of the religious traditions of mankind in a brief and amusing chapter. No, not Russell.

Then how to explain the immense impact that his writings had

on me when I was sixteen? Although he cleverly tears at every ancient and medieval metaphysical doctrine, I did not feel clever or even wish to be clever after reading him. Although he demonstrates the logical flaws in the Western idea of God, he did not shake my belief in the existence of a Creator—on the contrary. Master of the modern scientific canons of knowledge, he pictures man as a wisp of consciousness in an immense, indifferent universe that will inevitably snuff out his life and the very memory of his life on earth. Then why did I keep turning to his books for the very thing I would wish to bring to my own students—a sense of man's enduring place in a greater scale of reality?

I remember to the day and hour the first time I read Russell. It was shortly after the start of my third year in high school. I had just earned my driver's license and on Sunday mornings I used to take the family car and drive out of the city in order to be by myself in some wooded area. On the seat next to me was a pile of books representing the week's foraging in the public library. I remember that at that time I was very taken with the novels of Thomas Hardy; their austere representation of the human condition confirmed, in some sweet way, my own loneliness. This time, among the books beside me was one I had picked off the library shelf without thinking too much about it: *Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits* by Bertrand Russell.

I mentioned loneliness, but I don't mean to imply anything beyond what many, if not most, adolescents experience in our culture as a result, I believe, of their not being sufficiently occupied. This problem takes on a colossally destructive dimension, however, when it exists within the confusion that has now spread everywhere about the nature and function of the family. To my mind, the question exists in the following form. The family is the matrix of the growth of feeling in man. Modern psychological theories of the family have concentrated mainly on the emotions of loving acceptance and personal warmth. Traditionalists stress its function of inculcating moral values and a sense of responsibility. Others speak of preparing the child "for life," and there are countless other theories as well as numerous experiments being tried throughout the modern world with different forms of the family. But something seems to me to be left out in all these views of the role of the family, and this something has to do with the true range of feeling that is possible for man and necessary for his complete development. Father and mother: Sooner or later in every individual life something must take their place, something that is not external. In a grown-up man, what is the source of aspiration and love of self? What guides one's own individual struggle for Being in a grown-up man? From what place in oneself comes authentic shame and authentic pride? And to what, and with what quality, are the impulses of reverence and honor directed in a grown-up man? These are not rhetorical questions and I hope I will not be misunderstood if I tentatively propose an answer: As a child loves father and mother, so the man may come to love truth.

That particular Sunday was especially dreary for me. The Sunday boredom had set in even before noon. By the time I parked the car near an especially beautiful stretch of the Wissahickon Creek north of Philadelphia, I was encased in self-pity. On the way, I had tuned the radio to whatever music would support this emotional state, and now I regarded all the beauty around me through its lens. Anything to intensify it, anything to bring emotion of any kind. It was the only way I could feel alive. Surely, that is the fundamental meaning of the boredom that begins to be such a dominant fact of life when we are young: the yearning for emotion. Out of this yearning come many things—including some forms of crime.

I picked up a book and began to read—it was Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*, perfect for the mood I was in. But right beneath it was the Russell book, and the title, *Human Knowledge*, drew me. While enjoying the crushing sorrows of poor Jude, my mind kept wandering to the title of Russell's book. I soon put down Hardy and took up Russell.

I stayed glued to that book for the next three hours without even thinking of lunch. Why? What happened?

I wasn't able to follow much of Russell's sophisticated thought about science and human experience. So there was no question of this teenager agreeing or disagreeing with his point of view. Something much more important and elemental was taking place in me. Russell spoke about human language and I realized that language exists—I spoke language, I read language; poetry and novels and books, and perhaps music and art were also language. He discussed space and time, and I realized that space is all around me, that everything exists in space; and time flows everywhere, I am in it, everything is in it—but what is it? And there is ethics; my worries and problems—were they not *ethics*? And there is mind—I have mind and I have a body, and everything I see is a body, but where is the mind? My loneliness dissolved: it simply dried up as the various aspects of myself were presented to me as objects of inquiry in the large world. I knew then that there exists something that one might call *clarity*. I knew it as a feeling, a wish. It was an entirely new feeling and yet, at the same time, strangely intimate and warm. Critics of the contemporary era often speak of the sense of alienation and cosmic loneliness produced by the modern emphasis on the scientific attitude. They have their point, but it has no weight when placed against the first taste of objectivity toward oneself. There is nothing cold about it. On the contrary, then and only then did I first begin to feel that there is a home for man behind the appearances of this happy/unhappy world. I could not read many more novels after that in my adolescence. I never even finished *Jude the Obscure*.

So now I look upon this summer's efforts to prepare my course as somewhat beside the point. I have been worrying too much about the content of the course and not enough about the search that needs to be brought to all philosophy, no matter what its content. I don't agree with Russell; I believe his vision of reality is shallow, his concepts of human nature and knowledge lead nowhere. Yet his is a greater mind than my own, and I once needed to listen to it.

Today is September 10 and in two hours I meet with my young class for the first time. I feel that I am back at square one. Yet, for some reason, I am not nervous about it anymore.

CONTRIBUTIONS

(15) We acknowledge with thanks the contributions made by the following members to the BRS Treasury during the past six months: MICHAEL BRADY, STEVE DAHLBY, ALICE DARLINGTON, BOB DAVIS, LEE EISLER, DAVID GOLDMAN, BILL GREGORY, CHARLES HILL, OPHELIA & JAMES HOOPES, DON JACKANICZ, HERB LANSDELL, HERMAN LEFKOWITCH, GLADYS LEITHAUSER, SUSANA MAGGI, JIM MCWILLIAMS, STEVE REINHARDT, HARRY RUJA, CAROL SMITH, CARL SPADONI, TIMOTHY ST. VINCENT, TOM STANLEY, RAMON SUZERA, HERB & BETTY VOGT, JOHN WILHELM, VINCENT WILLIAMS, JUDITH & TERRY ZACCONE.

THE SUBJECT

(16) Does the subject of money bore you, excite you, or neither? It doesn't bore or excite us either. We just want the BRS to have enough of it to be able to move forward.

For instance, we'd like to acquire a lot more members, not because bigger is necessarily better but because — in this case — the greater the number, the greater the financial stability. And that is a prerequisite for our long-run survival as an organization.

BUT...

To acquire more members:
. We'd have to advertise more. That takes money.
. We'd have to make surveys. That takes money.
. We might wish to hold contests, and offer prizes. That takes money.
. We might think of other things to do, to stimulate interest in the BRS. They will all take money.

Furthermore, results are not guaranteed. We might spend the money and not get results. We can hardly afford that now.

BUT...

If we had some extra money, we could afford to take some chances. We could afford to go after a substantial number of new members.

That's why we would like to have some extra money ...for the serious business of trying to increase our membership...and our life-expectancy.

If you think this makes sense, and you'd like to lend your support,here's how to do it: when you've got some * money to spare, send it along to the BRS Treasury, c/o the newsletter, address on Page 1, bottom. We'll put it to good use. Thanks!

BRS LIBRARY NEWS

(17) Librarian Tom Stanley reports:

Book sales have picked up considerably since the list was printed in RSN 45. A few are now unavailable from the publishers. We have these additions:

Into the Tenth Decade demy 4to, wraps, Spokesman Press
" A handsome brochure, profusely illustrated, prepared in honor of Russell's 90th birthday. An essential addition to all Russell libraries. ".....3.00

Appeal to the American Conscience 8pps, fold-out format, demy 4to, Spokesman
A 1966 statement on the war in Vietnam 2.00

The Incompatible Prophecies: An Essay on Science and Liberty in the Political Writings of Bertrand Russell by Louis Greenspan. Stiff wraps, Mosaic Press
" written in a distinctive, lucid style and based on exhaustive research, this book should provoke much debate in the growing literature of Bertrand Russell." A review of this item by Barry Ruja is in Russell: 33-34 .....4.00

I'd like to suggest that each of us donate a Russell book to our local library. Many of them will acknowledge the gift with a bookplate:" Given by the Bertrand Russell Society"

Merv Griffin has agreed to donate a video-cassette of his 1965 interview with Russell. Dealing almost exclusively with the war in Vietnam, the bulk of this talk was printed in RSN 36. I have not as yet received the tape, but it will certainly be available for the annual meeting.

We are indebted to UNESCO for their donation of four photos of B.R. at the Kalinga Prize Award ceremony.

(18) Books to lend:

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

1. History of Western Philosophy. Jack Ragsdale.
2. Mysticism and Logic.
3. Bertrand Russell's Best. Ramon Suzara.
4. An Outline of Philosophy. Ramon Suzara.
5. Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, Vol.1. Ramon Suzara.
6. Let Me Die Before I wake. by Derek Humphery.

7. Essay on Bertrand Russell. edited by E. D. Klemke. Bob Davis.
8. Morals Without Mystery. by Lee Eisler. Author.
9. Authority and The Individual. Don Jackanicz.
10. Autobiography of Bertrand Russell (in 1 Vol.). Don Jackanicz.
11. Bertrand Russell 1872-1970. Don Jackanicz.
12. Bertrand Russell - A Life. by Herbert Gottschalk. Don Jackanicz.
13. Education and the Social Order. Don Jackanicz.
14. Effects and Dangers of Nuclear War. Don Jackanicz.
15. Essays on Socialist Humanism. Don Jackanicz.
16. German Social Democracy. Don Jackanicz.
17. Icarus or The Future of Science. Don Jackanicz.
18. The Impact of Science on Society. Don Jackanicz.
19. An Inquiry into the Meaning of Truth. Don Jackanicz.
20. In Praise of Idleness. Don Jackanicz.
21. Has Man a Future. Don Jackanicz.
22. Justice in Wartime. Don Jackanicz.
23. National Frontiers and International Cooperation. by Zhores Medvedev. Don Jackanicz.
24. My Philosophical Development. Don Jackanicz.
25. Political Ideals. Don Jackanicz.
26. Principles of Social Reconstruction. Don Jackanicz.
27. The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism. Don Jackanicz.
28. Roads of Freedom. Don Jackanicz.
29. Sceptical Essays. Don Jackanicz.
30. Secrecy of Correspondence Is Guaranteed By Law. by Zhores Medvedev. Don Jackanicz.
31. The Tamarisk Tree. by D. Russell. Don Jackanicz.
32. Mr. Wilson Speaks "frankly..." Don Jackanicz.
33. Marriage and Morals. Don Jackanicz.
34. Dear Bertrand Russell. Jack Ragsdale.
35. Education and The Good Life. Jack Ragsdale and Lee Eisler.
36. Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits. Jack Ragsdale.
37. Why I Am Not A Christian. Jack Ragsdale.
38. The Evolution of Conscience. Ralph Newman. Jack Ragsdale.
39. The Conquest of Happiness. Lee Eisler.
40. The ABC of Relativity. Lee Eisler.
41. Bertrand Russell, The Passionate Sceptic. by Alan Wood. Don Jackanicz.
42. Mortals and Others. Don Jackanicz.
43. Unarmed Victory. Don Jackanicz.
44. The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation its aims and its work.
45. Yes to Life. by Corliss Lamont. The Author.
46. Russell.by A.J. Ayer. Ramon Suzara.
47. The Will to Doubt. Ramon Suzara.
48. The Life of Bertrand Russell. by Ronald Clark. Ramon Suzara.
49. The Problems of Philosophy. Ramon Suzara.
50. Unpopular Essays. Ramon Suzara.
51. Human Society in Ethics and Politics. Don Jackanicz.
52. Principles and Perplexities: Studies of Dualism in Selected Essays and Fiction of Bertrand Russell. by Gladys Leithauser. Don Jackanicz.
53. Photos, 1983 BRS Annual Meeting at McMaster University, June 24-26, 1983. Jim Mc Williams.
54. The Art of Fund Raising. by Irving Warner. Bob Davis
55. The Grass Roots Fundraising Book. by Joan Flanagan. Bob Davis
56. Dear Russell-Dear Jourdain. by I. Grattan-Guiness. Bob Davis
57. Why Men Fight. Bob Davis
58. Grants. by Virginia White. Bob Davis
59. Fund Raising for the Small Organization. by Philip Sheriden. Bob Davis
60. The Grantsmanship Center Training Program. Bob Davis
61. Nonprofit Organization Handbook. by P.V. and D.M. Gaby. Bob Davis
62. Successful Fundraising Techniques. by Daniel Conrad. Bob Davis
63. The Foundation Directory. Bob Davis.
64. Great Americans Examine Religion. by Ralph de Sola. Jack Ragsdale.
65. But For The Grace of God. by Peter Cranford. Jack Ragsdale.
66. Godel, Escher, Bach. by Douglas Hofstader. Lee Eisler.
67. The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell, Vol.I. Cambridge Essays, 1888-99. Edited by Blackwell, et al. Allen & Unwin.
68. The Right to Be Happy. by Mrs. Bertrand Russell. Al Seckel.
69. Power, A New Social Analysis. Al Seckel.
70. Bertrand Russell, A Bibliography of his Writings, 1895-1976 Compiled by Werner Martin. Al Seckel.
71. Satan in the Suburbs. Al Seckel.
72. My Father, Bertrand Russell. by Katharine Tait. Al Seckel.
73. A Matter of Life. Edited by Clara Urquhart. Al Seckel.
74. Essays in Skepticism. Al Seckel.

75. The Problem of China. Al Seckel.
76. Russell On General Facts by Ausonio Marras and Russell, Frege, and the " Meaning " of The Theory of Descriptions. Papers read at the 1976 Meeting of the A.P.A.
77. Acquaintance and Naming: A Russellian Theme in Epistemology by Augustin Riska and Russell on the Essence of Desire by Raymond Frey. Papers read at the 1977 Meeting of the A.P.A.
78. On Russellian Clusters by Eugene Schlossberger and Repression in Bertrand Russell's " On Education " by Howard Woodhouse. Papers read at the 1978 Meeting of the A.P.A.
79. Definition and Description in Russell, 1900-1910 by Thomas Barron and Russell and Ontological Excess by D.A. Griffiths. Papers read at the 1979 Meeting of the A.P.A.
80. Russell On Logical Truth. by Nicholas Griffin. The Author
81. Bertrand Russell and the Origin of the Set-Theoretic Paradoxes by Alejandro Ricardo Garciadiego Dantan. The Author.
82. Bertrand Russell, America, and the Idea of Social Justice by Roland Stromberg. The Author.
83. The Relevance of Bertrand Russell To Psychology and Bertrand Russell's Conception of the Meaning of Life by Peter Cranford. The Author.
84. Dictionary of the Mind, Matter, and Morals. Edited by Lester Dennon. Tom Stanley.
85. Bertrand Russell Speaks His Mind. Tom Stanley
86. The Bertrand Russell Library of Lester Dennon. Tom Stanley
87. The Analysis of Mind. Tom Stanley
88. Religion and Science. Tom Stanley
89. Portraits From Memory. Tom Stanley.
90. The Scientific Outlook. Tom Stanley.
91. Wisdom of the West. Tom Stanley.
92. The Principles of Mathematics. Tom Stanley.
93. Bertrand Russell: Philosopher and Humanist. by John Lewis. Tom Stanley
94. The Good Citizen's Alphabet. Whitfield Cobb
95. War Crimes in Vietnam. Whitfield Cobb.
96. Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy. Whitfield Cobb.
97. The Prospects of Industrial Civilization. Whitfield Cobb.
98. Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus. by Wittgenstein. Introduction by Bertrand Russell. Whitfield Cobb.
99. Freedom Versus Organization. Whitfield Cobb.
100. Bertrand Russell and His World. by Ronald Clark. W.W. Norton.
101. The Final Epidemic: Physicians and Scientists on Nuclear War. Edited by Ruth Adams and Susan Cullen. Physicians for Social Responsibility.
102. Photos, Kalinga Prize Award Ceremony. Paris, January 28, 1957. UNESCO.

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

One-way postage:

39¢: ##1, 14,32 44,64,82, 83, 93, 94, 95
69¢: ## 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 39, 40, 41, 46, 47, 49, 50, 54, 55, 57, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102
94¢: ##5, 7, 10, 22, 31, 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 45, 51, 53, 56, 58, 59, 67, 99
$1.19:##1, 48, 52, 62, 81, 91
$1.62:##60, 61, 63

NEARBY MEMBERS

(19) A new service. Occasionally a member has asked us whether other members lived nearby. In the past, we haven't been of much help. But now things are different, thanks to a computer. We can provide the names and addresses of other members who live in your state, or in a nearby states. If this is of interest, write the newsletter (address on Page 1, bottom), naming the states.

RECOMMENDED READING

(20) Ten Best Books. We invited members, at JAMES MAKI'S suggestion, to list their 10 favorite books by authors other than Russell (RSN45-10). Here are some responses:

George Kaye:

1. James L. Adams, "Conceptual Blockbusting", 2nd ed. (NY:Norton, 1979)
2. Kenneth L. Higbee, "Your Memory: How It Works & How to Improve It"(Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice-Hall, 1977)
3. Gilbert Highet, "Man's Unconquerable Mind" (NY: Columbia Univ. Press, 1954. (esp. pp 3-45)
4. Wayne C. Booth, ed.,"The Knowledge Most Worth Having"(Univ. of Chicago Press, 1967. (esp pp. 1-28, 109-202, papers by Booth, Platt, Scott, Redfield, McKeon)
5. Will & Ariel Durant, "The Lessons of History" (NY:Simon & Schuster, 1968)
6. Mortimer Adler & Charles Van Doren,"How To Read A Book"(NY: Simon & Schuster, 1972)
7. Isaac Asimov, "Asimov's Biographical Encyclopedia of Science and Technology" ((NY: Doubleday,1982)
8. The World Almanac, annual (NY:Newspaper Enterprise Ass'n)
9. Ronald Gross, "The Independent Scholar's Handbook" (Reading, MA:Addison-Wesley, 1982)
10. John Bear, "How To Get The Degree You Want" (Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed Press, 1982)

Adam Paul Banner:
"Books that I would recommend to our membership as worthy of reading in terms of personal understanding... The ivory tower economic and educational researchers have accurately diagnosed the world's economic woes as their patient died."

1. Paolo Lionni and Lance. J. Klass,"The Leipzig Connection"(Portland, OR: Heron Books, 1980)
2. Ivan Illich,"Deschooling Society" (NY: Harper & Row, 1983)
3. Ivan Illich, "Medical Nemesis" (NY:Pantheon Books, 1976)
4. Lansing Lamont, "Campus Shock"

John Wilhelm. "My favorite book":

Alfred Korzybski, "Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics", available from Institute of General Semantics, PO Box 517, Ridgefield, CT 06877

Ken Korbin

1. "The Fall". by Albert Camus
2. "The Plague" by Albert Camus
3. "Steppenwolf" by Herman Hesse
4. "Time Must Have A Stop" by Aldous Huxley
5. "Messiah" by Gore Vidal
6. "A Movable Feast" by Ernest Hemingway
7. "Eyeless in Gaza" by Aldous Huxley
8. "The Benefactor" by Susan Sontag
9. The Erasers" by Robbe-Grillet
10. "The Lake" by Kawabata
11. "Blind Date" by Jerzy Kosinski

James Maki

1. "The Life Triumphant" (1908) by James Allen
2. "As A Man Thinketh" (1890) by James Allen
3. "A Philosophy of Solitude" (1933) by John Cowper Powys
4. "The Meaning of Culture" (1929) by John Cowper Powys
5. "Reflections of a Lonely Man" (1903) by A. C. McClung
6. "Wayside Wisdom" (1909) by E. M. Martin
7. "The Pleasures of Life" (1890) by Sir John Lubbock
8. "The Art of Thinking" (1961) by Dagobert D. Runes
9. "The Life of the Bee" (1901) by Maurice Maeterlinck
10. "Signs and Seasons" (1886) by John Burroughs

Keith Thompson

"Soldiers" by Rolf Hochhoff. "This 3-act play illuminates the moral issues of total war with an exactitude that only great theatre aspires to...That no production of this play has been staged in conjunction with the disarmament debate seems a gross oversight."

TREASURER DENNIS DARLAND'S REPORT

(21) For the quarter ending 3/31/85

Balance on hand (12/31/84)			586.64
Income:	23 New Members	433.00	
	144 Renewals	3281.90	
	total dues	3714.90	
	Contributions	423.50	
	BRS Library	120.00	
	Misc	3.00	
	total income	4261.40	4261.40
			4848.04
Expenditures:	Membership Committees	125.17	
	Information Committee	471.19	
	BRS Library	43.77	
	Bank charges	24.33	
	total spent	664.46	664.46
Balance on hand (3/31/85)			4183.58

ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

(22) Nominations for Directors, please. We wish to elect 9 Directors this year, for 3-year terms starting 1/1/86, which will give us a total of 24 Directors. The August newsletter will provide a ballot for voting. In this (May) newsletter we seek the candidates who will be on the ballot.

We are asking you to nominate candidates. Any member may nominate any other member to be a Director-Candidate.

If you wish to be a candidate yourself, notify the Elections Committee and someone will probably nominate you.

The duties of a Director are not burdensome. Directors are occasionally asked their opinion about something, by mail, and they are expected to make a reasonable effort to attend annual meetings, though not at great expense. The cost of attending meetings is tax-deductible for Directors.

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

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

Directors whose terms expire in 1985 are LOU ACHESON, KEN BLACKWELL, LESTER DENONN, DAVID HART, MARVIN KOHL, JIM MCWILLIAMS, STEVE REINHARDT, AND CAROL SMITH. They are eligible for re-election.

* To nominate someone — or to volunteer yourself — write the Election Committee,c/o the newsletter, address on Page 1,bottom.

NUCLEAR AFFAIRS

(23) Do nuclear affairs get too much space in the newsletter? That's what we asked you in the last issue (RSN45-18).

MICHAEL TAINT says:"I think that the PSN treatment of the nuclear issue is right on the nail. From personal experience (ie., I'm a former Titan II missile crew commander) I can tell you there's no greater issue facing humanity today . I think the BRS should continue to discuss the topic."

PRESIDENT DON JACKANICZ'S REPORT

(24) Work continues on planning the 1985 BRS Annual Meeting. If you have never attended an Annual meeting, why not make this your first? If you have attended one, you know how rewarding the experience can be, of meeting many persons approaching Russell from different perspectives, of participating in presentations, discussions, and

other program events,and of joining together to study/celebrate/criticize/evaluate/defend/attack/interpret the life, work and times of Russell. I ask each member to review the meeting announcement-reservation form and to consider taking part. We will be meeting in Washington, DC at Georgetown University and The American Film Institute. The program is diverse, the setting attractive, the cost reasonable; the decision is yours.

In early April I visited Britain with the intention of learning more about the possibility of holding a future Annual Meeting there. I had originally considered several meeting sites, but the appropriateness of Cambridge is obvious. During my visit, I became convinced that Trinity College would be the ideal setting. I was well received at the Trinity Bursar's Office. Officials there readily agreed that a Russell Society meeting at Trinity would be a welcome event. The one difficulty is that the popularity of conferences at Trinity requires reserving time and space two to three years in advance. Sot the earliest BRS Annual Meeting in Cambridge would be in 1987 or 1988!

I have previously heard from some members in support of a Britain Annual Meeting. Others have expressed disagreement with the proposal chiefly because of the time and expense for our members, who are mostly American and Canadian. Between now and the June 1985 Meeting,I would very much appreciate receiving additional opinions from members. When the BRS Board of Directors, which is responsible for choosing future meeting sites, meets this June, I will submit all such opinions.

While at Trinity College's Wren Library, I had the privilege of seeing on display an original Russell manuscript, fine examples of medieval manuscripts, Newton's books, and the Capell collection of Shakespeariana. In London, I again visited the bust of Russell in Red Lion Square, and can report that it is weathering well.

ABOUT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

(25)* I.A.T.A. -- The International Appropriate Technology Association — has issued a call for papers for its symposium, titled "Problems and Promises in Appropriate Technology", to be held in the Fall of 1986. Its Executive Director, BRS Member ADAM PAUL BANNER, can be contacted at I.A.T.A.,603 East Madison Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109.

(26) Palestine Human Rights Campaign was "established in 1977 to secure internationally recognized human rights for the Palestine people..." It issues a monthly newsletter — physically attractive and very well written -- and the enemy is Israel. Here is the start of the March editorial:

> Israeli occupation policy has consistently relied on collaborators who could be armed and set against the local population. The collaborators are generally petty criminals or political hacks with no popular support; in either case, they are artificial creations of Israel. In the West Bank, the collaborators are known as the Village Leagues; in south Lebanon they call themselves the South Lebanon Army (SLA).
>
> In south Lebanon, we are now watching the Israeli response to the categorical failure of its surrogates, the SLA, to control and intimidate the local population.
>
> Israel's vicious 33-month occupation of south Lebanon has united the people there in a classic guerrilla war against the occupier. Unprepared for guerrilla warfare,Israel placed its faith in the SLA, only to see it completely disintegrate when Israel announced its plans to withdraw from Lebanon.

Their national office is 220 S. State St.,Suite 1308,Chicago, IL 60604. There are also offices in Seattle and Washington,DC.

FOR SALE

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

OFFICERS OF THE BERTRAND RUSSELL SOCIETY, INC.

(28) Chairman, Harry Ruja; President, Donald W. Jackanicz; Vice-President, David. S. Hart; Treasurer, Dennis J. Darland; Secretary, John R. Lenz;Vice-President/Special Projects, Marvin Kohl; Vice-President/Information, Lee Eisler.

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

(29) 1982-84: LOU ACHESON, KEN BLACKWELL, LESTER DENONN, DAVID HART, MARVIN KOHL, JIM MCWILLIAMS, STEVE REINHARDT, CAROL SMITH

1983-85: DAVID GOLDMAN, DON JACKANICZ, STEVE MARAGIDES, FRANK PAGE, CHERIE RUPPE, PAUL SCHILPP, WARREN SMITH, KATE TAIT

1984-86: JACQUELINE BERTHON-PAYON, BOB DAVIS, ALEX DELY, ALI GHAEMI, HUGH MOORHEAD, DAN WRAY

BR HONORED

(30) The Kalinga Prize for the popularization of science was established by UNESCO in 1951, with funds provided by Mr. H. Patnaik of India. BR won it in 1957. In other years it has gone to Julian Huxley, Gerard Piel, Eugene Rabinowitch, and Margaret Mead, among others. We reported on the 1957 event in some detail, in the November 1979 issue (RSN24-20), but had no photo. Here at last is a photo of BR receiving the Kalinga Prize (one thousand pounds sterling, and a UNESCO gold medal), from Professor P. Auger,Director of the Department of Exact and Natural Sciences of UNESCO, with Dr. L. Evans, Director General of UNESCO, looking on. Our thanks to UNESCO for supplying the photo, and to TOM STANLEY for obtaining it from UNESCO.

ANNUAL MEETING (1985)

(31) June 21-23, Washington,DC. A separate enclosure, sent with this RSN, gives rather complete details, including the program, costs,reservation form, how to get there (by car or from bus terminal, RR station, or airport), etc.

To summarize: everything takes place on Georgetown University's campus, except for Sunday morning in the JFK Center for the Performing Arts, American Film Institute, Main Theatre. Regular sessions in the University's Intercultural Center Auditorium; Saturday evening's Red Hackle Hour, Banquet, and presentation of the BRS Award, in Darnell Hall; lodging in Copley Hall.

President Don Jackanicz planned this meeting and made the arrangements. If you have a question, write him [901 6th St.SW (712A), Washington, DC 20024] or phone [202-484-1398].

Be there!

INDEX

(32)
