Stephen Toulmin accepts the 2001 BRS Award.
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Editorial:

Greetings from Rochester!

The search for a home for the Bertrand Russell Society Quarterly (BRSQ) has come to an end. The Greater Rochester Russell Set (GRRS), the most prominent—and only—chapter of the Bertrand Russell Society (BRS) in North America, has agreed to assume responsibilities for editing the Society’s fine journal. In May, the GRRS published its first issue (#110). At that point, however, the GRRS’s role was still technically unofficial. Since then, the Board has officially vested control of the project in a BRSQ Committee to be based in Rochester, with Peter Stone serving as both Committee Chair and Editor. We therefore feel that now is the right time to introduce ourselves and share with you our thoughts and excitement about the new project.

The astute reader will have noticed that the May issue (#110) followed the February issue (#106), but skipped three numbers in the process. Due to the somewhat irregular publication schedule of the BRSQ over the past few years, the numbering fell somewhat awry. Had the BRS produced 4 issues a year (in February, May, August, and November) every year since the start of 1974 (the year the Society was founded), then the May 2001 issue would indeed have been #110. Nevertheless, we don’t want the gap thus created to forever haunt the BRS without resolution. To set things aright, we are cutting the Gordian knot by announcing that the BRSQ has officially skipped issue #s 107, 108, and 109. The cover of this issue notes this prominently, so hopefully you won’t get too confused while perusing your back issues.

Whatever the numbering, this issue of the BRSQ should have plenty to interest the Russell enthusiast. Note, however, that while Peter Stone assumed the position of BRSQ Editor at the 2001 BRS Annual Meeting, he at the same time stepped down as Secretary of the Society and Board and as Chair of the BRS Awards Committee. As a result, you’ll be hearing from him a lot in this issue in all three capacities. We mention this because none of us (especially Peter) want this to become an “All Peter Stone! All the time!” publication. We strongly encourage members to send us Russell-related articles of all kinds for inclusion in the BRSQ. If you have something to say about Russell, write an article about it for us; as our previous editorial indicates (“The Farmer and the Cowman Can Be Friends”), we welcome submissions dealing with all aspects of Russell’s life and thought—mathematics, philosophy, politics, humanism, sex, etc. If you’ve read a Russell-related book, review it for us. If you just have a quick comment, send a Letter to the Editor. If it’s just a brief notice or clipping, we’ll mention it in our “Odds and Ends” column (An occasional feature that will premiere in our November issue). And announcements of events that may be of interest to BRS members (philosophical conferences, humanist gatherings, peace-related activist events, etc.) are always welcome. We’ll try to publish everything members send us (with the usual exceptions for length, libel, relevance, etc.). We’ll also occasionally publish items by non-members, but we will always give members priority.

But wait, you may find yourself thinking. I sent an article (book review, announcement, whatever) to the BRSQ some time ago, only to see it fail to appear again and again. Unfortunately, the lack of a stable home for the BRSQ created some problems of continuity. The editorship of the BRSQ changed hands four times over the past few years, and so a few items may well have been misplaced amidst all the changes. If you haven’t seen your piece appear, please don’t give up on us. Just accept our sincerest apologies, and send us another copy.

Articles, book reviews, etc., can be sent to David White, Philosophy Department, St. John Fisher College, 3690 East Avenue, Rochester, NY 14618, white@sjfc.edu.

Our preference is for written materials to be sent to us in Word, either on a disc or as an e-mail attachment. If you have any general concerns about the BRSQ, you’re welcome to write to the Editor, Peter Stone, at the Political Science Department, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627, prse@troi.cc.rochester.edu.

We here in Rochester are very excited about the BRSQ. We see it as a way to continue the excellent conversation about Russell carried on at the BRS Annual Meeting, a meeting at which our local chapter is always well-represented. Now let’s all do our part to keep this conversation going all year!

* * *

News about the 2002 Annual Meeting

Plans are well underway for the 2002 Annual Meeting of the Bertrand Russell Society. The tentative meeting location is the Center for Inquiry West, in Los Angeles. Stay tuned for more information!
Call for Board Nominations

This fall, the Bertrand Russell Society will be holding elections to fill 8 of the 24 positions on its Board of Directors. (There may be an additional seat or two to fill, as one or more additional directors may not complete their terms.) The time has come for nominations for those positions. Members are encouraged to send their nominations to Steve Bayne, BRS Secretary, 64 Vinal 6A, Somerville MA 02143, srbayne@channel1.com.

Please note that the deadline for nominations is October 1. The ballots will be sent out in the November issue of the BRSQ. Any member of the BRS may run for a seat on the Board. The 8 members of the Board with expiring terms may be renominated and reelected. Members may nominate themselves; if you do this, please include a short (1 paragraph) statement about yourself and why you should be on the Board. A complete list of current Board Members is included below; please don’t nominate any current Board member whose term does not expire this year.

Our esteemed Chairman of the Board, Ken Blackwell, would like to step down from that position after completing his current term (his fourth). The Board will select his successor next year from amongst its own members. Hopefully, members will be thinking about who would make a worthy successor to Ken in making their nominations this summer and casting their votes this fall.

Directors of the BRS (Note: Officers of the BRS, elected annually, serve ex officio on the Board of Directors.)


3 Year Term, Jan. 1, 2000 - Dec. 31, 2002: Steve Bayne, Jan Loeb Eisler, Keith Green, Nicholas Griffin, Justin Leiber, Chandrakala Padia, Harry Ruja, Peter Stone.


2002 BRS Award Search Begins
Proposals Welcome

The BRS Awards Committee will soon begin its search for a person or organization to receive the 2002 BRS Award. This award is given annually to one or more people or organizations for outstanding achievement in one or more areas of concern to Bertrand Russell. The award may reflect achievements in either the academic or social and political realm, and achievements made in the recent past or over a lifetime. The award may also be given for extraordinary acts that, by the character they display, are particularly reminiscent of Russell at his best.

Members of the BRS are invited to propose individuals or organizations to the BRS Awards Committee to be considered for the 2002 BRS Award. Anyone wishing to make a proposal should contact the Committee Chair as follows: Kevin Brodie, 54 Cedar Swamp Road, Storrs, CT 06268, kevin.brodie@lebanonct.org.

The Committee will begin deliberating in the early fall, so please get your proposals to the Committee as soon as possible.

For those interested, the following is a list of previous BRS Award recipients:

1980 Paul Arthur Schilpp
1981 Steve Allen
1982 Henry Kendall
1983 Joseph Rotblat
1984 Dora Black Russell
1985 Robert Jay Lifton and Lester Denonn
1986 People for the American Way
1987 John Somerville
1988 Paul Kurtz
1989 Paul Edwards
1990 (none)
1991 Planned Parenthood Federation of America
1992 Karl Popper
1993 Harry Ruja
1994 (none)
1995 Zero Population Growth
1996 Willard Van Orman Quine
1997 (none)
1998 Irving Copi
1999 Henry Morgentaler
2000 Stephen Jay Gould
2001 Stephen Toulin
The modern conference resembles the pilgrimage of medieval Christendom in that it allows the participants to indulge themselves in all the pleasures and diversions of travel while appearing to be austerely bent on self-improvement. To be sure, there are certain penitential exercises to be performed - the presentations of a paper, perhaps, and certainly listening to the papers of others. But with this excuse you journey to new and interesting places, meet new and interesting people, and form new and interesting relations with them; exchange gossip and confidences (for your well-worn stories are fresh to them, and vice versa); eat, drink and make merry in their company every evening; and yet, at the end of it all, return home with an enhanced reputation for seriousness of mind.

David Lodge, Small World (1984)

Quote of the Meeting

"To be surrounded by philosophers is unsettling."

-Warren Allen Smith
Minutes of the 2001 BRS Annual Meeting
Peter Stone
Secretary, BRS

The Bertrand Russell Society held its annual meeting on May 25-7, 2001 at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, home of the Bertrand Russell Archives and the newly created Bertrand Russell Research Centre. Alan Schwerin presided. Peter Stone took notes. BRS members present were Stefan Andersson, Steve Bayne, Ken Blackwell, Howard Blair, David Blitz, Alan Bock, Pat Bock, Edgar C. Boekeker, Jr., Kevin Brodie, Rosalind Carey, Giovanni de Carvalho, Peter Friedman, Nick Griffin, David Heneman, Tim Madigan, Mary Martin, Ed McClennen, Ray Perkins, Ray Plant, Michael Potter, Steve Reinhardt, Cara Rice, Alan Scherbin, Warren Allen Smith, Peter Stone, Chad Trainer, Giovanni Vianelli, Thom Weidlich, David Wesley, David White, Avon Wilsmore, and Barrie Zwicker. Non-members present were Andrew Bailey, Matthew Barber, Renu Barrett, Elizabeth Blackwell, Andrew Bone, Adam Dobai, Arlene Duncan, Louis Greenspan, Afeah Henderson, Dan Kervick, Peter Loptson, Kent MacAskill, Nancy McClennen, Karen Perkins, Jane Robin, Carl Spadoni, Stephen Toulmin, Sheila Turcon, Samuel Wesley, Cory Wendorf, and Linda White. This turnout was the highest ever at a BRS meeting held at McMaster, of which there have been 5 since 1978.

The meeting began with tours of the Russell Archives and coffee at the Bertrand Russell Research Centre, at which various unpublished CD-ROMs of Russell were available for examination. A book swap was also held at which members could exchange Russell-related materials. The Russell Archives also offered various books for sale at the book swap.

On Friday night, President Alan Scherbin greeted everyone present at a welcoming buffet. At the buffet, Scherbin presented the 2001 BRS Paper Award to Giovanni Vianelli for his paper “The Centenary of the Paradox: Pythagoras and Some Recently Discovered Manuscript Pages by Russell.” Vianelli accepted the award in person. After this, BRS Awards Committee Chair Peter Stone presented the 2001 BRS Award to Stephen Toulmin, Henry R. Luce Professor at the Center for Multiethnic and Transnational Studies at the University of Southern California. Toulmin also accepted the award in person, and gave a brief history of his personal encounters with Russell. Ray Perkins then presented the 2001 BRS Book Award to Thom Weidlich (a freelance journalist) for his book Appointment Denied: the Inquisition of Bertrand Russell (Prometheus Books, 2000). Weidlich was also there to accept the award in person, and expressed his appreciation to the BRS. Toulmin concluded the evening for the Society with an address entitled “Rationality and Reasonableness in Twentieth-Century Philosophy.” The address was based on Toulmin’s recently published book, Return to Reason (Harvard University Press, 2001).

After the conclusion of the evening, the Board of Directors held its annual meeting (see Minutes of the 2001 Annual Meeting of the BRS Board of Directors).

Nick Griffin led off the program Saturday morning with “What Was Russell Trying to Do in Principia Mathematica?” an introductory talk aimed at non-philosophers. Alan Scherbin chaired this session. Andy Bone chaired the second session, in which Giovanni Vianelli presented the paper which received the 2001 BRS Paper Award, “The Centenary of the Paradox: Pythagoras and Some Recently Discovered Manuscript Pages by Russell.” Steve Bayne then concluded the Saturday morning session with a paper entitled “Toulmin and the Discovery of History.” Ken Blackwell chaired this session, and Stephen Toulmin took the opportunity to respond to Bayne’s remarks.

The members of the BRS then had the opportunity to avail themselves of numerous opportunities. These opportunities included a tour of the Bertrand Russell Archives, where other CD-ROMs were available; another session of the book swap and book sale by the Russell Archives; a continuous showing of two videos on Russell (this continued throughout the entire meeting); a trip to the McMaster Bookstore featuring numerous books by and about Russell; and lunch.

After lunch, the BRS held its 2001 Business Meeting. Alan Scherbin welcomed all BRS members to the business meeting, and congratulated the three newly elected officers of the Society and Board—Ray Perkins (Vice President), Steve Bayne (Secretary of the Society and Board), and Peter Friedman (Vice President for Outreach). He also congratulated the reelected officers—Dennis Darland (Treasurer) and Ken Blackwell (Chairman of the Board).

Ken Blackwell proposed a change in the Bylaws. He noted that there has been some confusion as to the number of officers of the Society and Board. He therefore proposed revising as follows the sentence at the start of Article 7, Section 1 of the Bylaws:
“The Society shall have the following five officers: President, Vice President, Treasurer, Secretary, and Chairman of the Board.”

This motion, Blackwell, observed, would explicitly recognize that special Vice Presidents (which the Board could create) were not officers. Thom Weidlich seconded the motion. Alan Schwerin found the idea of having officeholders (like special Vice Presidents) who were not “officers” rather odd. Dave Henehan asked for clarification as to the purpose of the motion. Blackwell explained that the goal would be to clarify who would be consulted during the day-to-day operations of the BRS. Peter Friedman suggested that a distinction between executive and non-executive officers might be a better way of drawing this distinction.

David Blitz saw good reason in having 5 officers to consult. An inquiry was made if the laws of Illinois had any ramifications for this proposed change, and further asked if the motion would have any bearing on the BRS’s ability to sign checks and contracts. Alan Schwerin answered that three people currently had the power to sign checks for the BRS—himself (President), Peter Stone (outgoing Secretary), and Dennis Darland (Treasurer).

Alan Schwerin proposed substituting for the proposed amendment the creation of an Executive Committee. The amended version of the amendment would substitute the following for the second sentence:

“The Society shall have an Executive Committee composed of the following five officers of the Society and Board: President, Vice President, Secretary of the Society and Board, Treasurer, and Chairman of the Board. There may also be other Vice Presidents whose duties shall be specified by the Board; these will not be members of the Executive Committee.”

Ken Blackwell accepted this amendment, noting that the Executive Committee would (quite properly) leave the President in charge of most executive decision-making. The motion carried 20-0, with two abstentions.

The Society then considered a motion by Peter Stone to expel John Boland from the BRS, an act deemed “appropriate” by the Board (as Alan Schwerin pointed out) by an overwhelming majority. Peter Stone laid out his case for expulsion, a case based on Boland’s continued abuse of the BRS’s e-mail listserv, BRS-List, as well as his repeated refusal to remove BRS members’ personal e-mail addresses from his own distribution list. Steve Bayne provided a defense of Boland, as requested by Schwerin.

Alan Schwerin inquired if any member had ever been expelled before. Ken Blackwell answered that only one expulsion has ever occurred (that of John Sutcliffe), and it took place in 1981. Thom Weidlich requested that the Bylaw governing expulsion (Article 5, Section 9 of the BRS Bylaws) be read; Ken Blackwell did so. Blackwell further explained that the Bylaws required expulsion decisions to be resolved at the BRS Business Meeting if the Board deemed an expulsion “appropriate” within two months of the scheduled Business Meeting. Otherwise, the matter would have been resolved by mail. He added Boland was informed of this procedure several weeks in advance of the Annual Meeting, but Boland decided not to attend.

The Society then debated the merits of the proposal, including alternatives to expulsion and the precedents set by this particular expulsion. After extensive discussion, the Society approved the motion by a vote of 23-7, with 4 abstentions. In addition to the members present, the following members voted by proxy: Derek Araujo, Javier Bonet, Gordon Diss, Don Jackanicz, Taslima Nasrin, Bob Riemenschneider, David Rodier, Ibn Warraq, Charles Weyand, and Gerry Wildenberg. Schwerin and Blackwell indicated they would write to Boland informing him of his expulsion, and would direct the Treasurer to refund Boland’s membership renewal and donation for the year 2001.

The BRS then moved on to other business. Alan Schwerin called for treasury and membership reports. Ken Blackwell directed the BRS to Dennis Darland’s last treasury report (published in the May 2001 issue of the Bertrand Russell Society Quarterly) and indicated that the Society had received 116 renewals thus far this year. Schwerin urged everyone to either join the BRS or renew their membership as appropriate. Warren Allen Smith moved to approve these reports, Kevin Brodie seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

The Business Meeting concluded with a pair of announcements. Peter Stone announced that he had taken over as editor of the Bertrand Russell Society Quarterly, and urged members to send materials for publication to the Greater Rochester Russell Set (GRRS), which will now collectively produce the publication. And Ray Perkins invited all members to brainstorm for possible sites for the 2002 Annual Meeting. Ken Blackwell added that members should propose their own cities as possible sites, not the cities of other people. Phoenix, Arizona and Lake
Forest, Illinois were suggested in the manner Blackwell advised, and Schwerin will consider these proposals.

Saturday afternoon began with David Blitz’s paper “Did Russell Really Advocate Preventive War against the USSR?” in a session chaired by Rosalind Carey. Before the start of the next session, it was announced that Routledge had made available exam copies of some of its Russell-related books. These books were available to meeting participants at a 20% discount. Peter Stone chaired the session that followed, which featured Andy Bone’s “Russell and the Communist-Aligned Peace Movement in the 1950s.” Kevin Brodie then presented “Russell, Gardner and Home Room: Philosophy Class in High School.” David Blitz chaired this session. The afternoon concluded with a panel discussion of Ray Monk’s Bertrand Russell: The Ghost of Madness chaired by Alan Schwerin. Panel participants included Tim Madigan, Peter Stone, Warren Allen Smith, and Peter Friedman. After a brief recess, the BRS held its Red Hackle Hour and banquet. Nick Griffin capped off the evening with his talk “How the Russell Papers Came to McMaster.”

Sunday morning began with Chad Trainer’s “Bertrand Russell: A Carneades Incarnate,” presented in a session chaired by David White. Ray Perkins chaired the following session, which featured a paper by Rosalind Carey entitled “Why Did Russell Accept Neutral Monism?” Alan Schwerin then spoke on “Metaphysics, Mysticism and Russell.” Stefan Andersson chaired this session. Thom Weidlich chaired the final session, in which David White capped off the paper sessions with his “Russell, Smith, and the Religion of the Future.”

Ken Blackwell then reiterated the call for meeting attendees to join the BRS if they had not done so already. He also urged them to nominate candidates for the forthcoming Board elections. Blackwell then announced that the BRS had enough Red Hackle left from its Saturday Red Hackle Hour to provide for a future meeting at McMaster, and that he had already e-mailed John Boland about his expulsion (and received no less than six e-mails in response) and removed him from BRS-List. Alan Schwerin and the Society then thanked Blackwell appreciatively for his work in organizing the meeting. Blackwell then asked that the BRS request, so the Archives proceeded to the auction with a pledge from the BRS in hand. The bid failed; the winning bid was for $17,000, and as auction-watchers within the BRS predicted, the manuscript was immediately thereafter available for bids at a higher asking price ($45,000). The BRS’s pledge did not affect the outcome; there were two bids considerably higher than any amount the Archives could have raised.

Ken Blackwell asked the Board for guidance on the question of future large potential purchases such as these. Was the Board, he asked, content to allow the officers to agree to make decisions on purchases of this size? Peter Stone pointed out that technically, the buck had to stop somewhere, and that there was no provision for the officers of the Society and Board to make decisions of any kind collectively (by majority vote, for example). Alan Schwerin was wary of setting a bad precedent via bids of this kind, and supported Blackwell’s call for guidance on this matter.
Nick Griffin observed that the Board could respond to this request in numerous ways. Perhaps the solution, as Ken Blackwell proposed, lay in entrusting the decision to a majority vote among the officers after all. Thom Weidlich proposed that the limit on such large purchases be $1000. Ken Blackwell, however, did not want a limit. Steve Reinhardt observed that such limits usually apply to officers at subordinate levels in corporations, although not at the top. Peter Stone observed that the issue of a limit was only half the matter; the other half was the question of the person or group empowered to make such spending decisions, with or without a limit.

Nick Griffin moved that the Board restrict the power of the Society’s officers to make spending decisions of this sort to $1000 or 10% of the Society’s cash in hand, whichever was greater. Ken Blackwell ruled that this constituted a proposed amendment to the Bylaws of the BRS, and so was out of order for a Board vote. Peter Stone, however, questioned why this would qualify as a Bylaw amendment; surely, he observed, the Board could direct the BRS’s officers on questions of policy without constantly changing the Bylaws. Blackwell then reversed himself, and permitted the motion. Steve Bayne seconded the motion.

Steve Reinhardt revisited the question of whose actions would be restricted by the amendment. Was it to be a majority of officers thus restricted, and if so, for which spending decisions? All of them? Peter Stone asked for clarification on the question of who could at present sign checks on behalf of the BRS. Alan Schwerin indicated that at present, three people had that power—Alan Schwerin (President), Peter Stone (Secretary), and Dennis Darland (Treasurer). Of the three, however, only Darland is currently in possession of any blank checks.

Alan Schwerin observed that ultimately, there was no foolproof solution to this matter, that at some point the Board had to trust someone to make judgment calls on questions like this. Nick Griffin decided in response to withdraw his motion. Thom Weidlich moved that the Board express its approval of the current informal arrangements (informal consultation among the officers) for handling purchasing decisions of this sort. Tim Madigan seconded the motion, and the motion carried 11-1.

Ken Blackwell then announced that the Board’s vote indicating that expulsion of John Boland from the BRS might be appropriate had carried. The final vote total, according to Alan Schwerin (who counted the ballots to so as to make the process as fair as possible), was 18-2. As President, Schwerin will preside over the expulsion motion at the Society Business meeting on Saturday, May 26. Peter Stone, as the Society member making the expulsion motion, will present his case for expulsion. Steve Bayne will then (at the request of Schwerin), offer a defense of Boland (who will not be present at the meeting), and then, following a discussion the Society will vote on the matter. Schwerin promised to prevent the whole process from dragging on forever.

The Board then took up the question of the 2002 Annual Meeting. In pursuance of the Board’s expressed desire for a west coast meeting in the near future, Peter Stone has been in contact with Charles Weyand, a longtime member of the BRS who lives in Los Angeles. Weyand is willing to work with other west coast Society members in setting up a meeting in Los Angeles next year; he has already contacted many of them and received varying degrees of support. He has not, however, proposed a definite meeting time or place. In addition, as Alan Schwerin pointed out, a meeting in Los Angeles could be expensive.

In light of the indeterminate nature of the Los Angeles proposal, Ken Blackwell expressed the desire for a backup location. Thom Weidlich suggested Rochester. David White expressed some interest but thought that the timing could be cut very close if Rochester had to wait and see if Los Angeles would work out. He also outlined some of the shortcomings of meeting in Rochester—most notably, the absence of high-quality meeting space. Steve Bayne suggested that MIT might be a suitable venue in Boston, but did not push the matter further. Peter Friedman mentioned the University of Pittsburgh in the same light; furthermore, as home to the papers of F.P. Ramsey and Rudolph Carnap, it might be especially appropriate. However, Peter Stone asked if the BRS had any active members in Pittsburgh, and received a negative response.

Ken Blackwell stressed the need for fresh ideas as to meeting sites, and proposed asking the Society for further ideas at its business meeting the following day. Thom Weidlich, however, felt uncomfortable with leaving the matter without a motion, and Peter Stone and Steve Bayne concurred.

Ray Perkins suggested the Society revisit the Center for Inquiry in Amherst, NY (near Buffalo). Tim Madigan agreed to breach the idea with his contacts there but was not optimistic. In addition, he seconded David White’s assessment of the drawbacks of Rochester.

Ken Blackwell stressed that the BRS had not met on the west coast since 1993. If not a west coast meeting now, he asked, then when? He proposed working with Charles Weyand to secure a place and time by
The Board continued brainstorming for possible meeting places. Steve Bayne indicated having attended a good conference at SUNY Buffalo; perhaps a good meeting could be organized there. Ray Perkins thought that his own university (Plymouth State College, in central New Hampshire) might be able to serve as host. Nick Griffin suggested McMaster follow Alan Schwerin and Monmouth University in hosting the meeting twice in a row, and idea of which Ken Blackwell did not approve.

Steve Bayne suggested Iowa and Chicago as other possibilities. Ken Blackwell, however, reiterated the need for a BRS member onsite, and proposed working with Los Angeles, with Plymouth State College as a backup. Peter Stone asked if a motion was required to this effect, as was done in previous years. Blackwell said no. Alan Schwerin then moved that the Board make no motion on the question of a 2002 meeting site. Nick Griffin seconded the motion, only to have Blackwell rule the motion out of order. The Board then proceeded to waste much time with Russell Paradox-related jokes about a motion not to make a motion. The Board decided (without a motion, paradoxical or otherwise) to leave the annual meeting location site in the hands of the officers of the Society and Board, with the understanding that Los Angeles and Plymouth State College would be the first and second meeting location choices, respectively.

The next item on the Board’s agenda concerned the Society’s publication. The Greater Rochester Russell Set (GRRS, the BRS’s unofficial chapter in Rochester, New York) had produced the May issue of the Bertrand Russell Society Quarterly in May (the first time in several years when an issue of the Quarterly had appeared in the month advertised). Peter Stone, as a member of the GRRS, proposed that the Board

June 30, and going with a backup location (as yet to be determined) after that. Kevin Brodie proposed reserving space in Buffalo and then canceling if Los Angeles worked out. Nick Griffin, however, indicated that such a move would double the work and expense of the early stages of the meeting process. David White supported Blackwell’s proposal, but stressed the importance of having people with experience organizing conferences involved with the process; if Weyand had no such experience, that meant that the President and others would have to work very closely with him. There was no substitute, however, for a person “on the ground” at the meeting site. Peter Stone expressed agreement.

1) officially reestablish the Bertrand Russell Society Quarterly (officially disbanded at the 2000 Annual Board Meeting, but unofficially revived by the GRRS);
2) establish a Quarterly Committee, with the responsibility of producing the Quarterly, and with the understanding that the Chair of this Committee would also serve as editor of the Quarterly; and
3) appoint Peter Stone as Chairman of this Committee.

Ken Blackwell expressed approval of this proposal. He argued that it was about time the Society placed its Quarterly operations on an official level. Kevin Brodie moved that the Board approve Peter Stone’s proposal, and Alan Schwerin seconded the motion.

Alan Schwerin asked if any Rochester-area universities would be involved with the project. David White explained that St. John Fisher College had provided the tax-exempt status for the nonprofit mailing rate but did not furnish further support. He suggested the BRS establish what would be necessary to send the Quarterly out under its own imprimatur should this prove necessary. He further urged Dennis Darland to send him a check for the May issue as soon as possible.

Peter Friedman suggested the BRS consider a web version of the Quarterly. Peter Stone promised to investigate the possibility after the GRRS had placed the publication on a secure footing. After further discussion and clarification, the Board passed the motion endorsing Stone’s proposal unanimously.

The Board then held elections for Board and Society officers. The Board first considered whether to maintain the Vice Presidency for Humanist Outreach. Steve Bayne moved that the office be changed to a more general Vice Presidency for Outreach, and that Peter Friedman be elected to this position. Warren Allen Smith seconded, and the Board approved the motion unanimously.

The Board then elected the following officers by acclamation:

Treasurer—Dennis Darland (nominated by Weidlich, seconded by Schwerin)
President—Alan Schwerin (nominated by Perkins, seconded by Griffin)
Secretary of the Society and Board—Steve Bayne (nominated by Perkins, seconded by Weidlich)
Vice President—Ray Perkins (nominated by Schwerin, seconded by Madigan)
Ken Blackwell was reluctant to stand for reelection, and only agreed to do so because of the evident lack of other candidates.

The final issue taken up by the Board at this meeting was the question of BRS-List, the BRS's listserv. The repeated spamming of this list by John Boland has prompted Ken Blackwell to seek more explicit Board authorization from this list, rather than the tacit, unofficial support currently given to it. With such authorization, he would feel better equipped to deal with possible abuses of the list. Peter Stone moved that

1) BRS-List become an official listserv for the BRS;
2) The purpose of BRS-List is to allow members to make BRS-related announcements and to discuss BRS-related business (in accordance with the more detailed description of the list proffered by Ken Blackwell);
3) The list-owner of BRS-List be empowered to ensure that BRS-List serve this purpose, using all appropriate means up to and including removal of a BRS member from the listserv; and
4) Ken Blackwell be approved as list-owner of BRS-List.

Thom Weidlich seconded Peter Stone’s motion, which the Board then unanimously approved.

Minutes of the Special Meeting of the BRS Board of Directors
Peter Stone
Secretary, BRS Board of Directors

The BRS Board of Directors held a special meeting on Sunday, May 27, 2001, in conjunction with the BRS Annual Meeting at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario. Ken Blackwell chaired. Peter Stone took notes. Directors present were Stefan Andersson, Steve Bayne, Ken Blackwell, Tim Madigan, Steve Reinhardt, Alan Schwerin, Warren Allen Smith, Peter Stone, Thom Weidlich, and David White. Peter Friedman also attended; as Vice President for Outreach, he participated as an *ex officio* Director. A number of other BRS members, including Dave Henehan, also attended the meeting.

At the conclusion of the 2001 Annual Meeting, Ken Blackwell realized that the BRS Board of Directors had left several issues unresolved. He therefore, in conjunction with Directors Steve Reinhardt and Peter Stone, called for a special meeting in accordance with the Bylaws of the BRS Board of Directors. Blackwell arranged the special meeting to coincide with the tail end of the 2001 Annual Meeting of the BRS so as to ensure maximum possible participation of the Board, in accordance with the Board’s Bylaws (Article 6, Section 2).

Ken Blackwell opened the meeting by expressing his wish to amend the Bylaws of the BRS Board of Directors. Currently, those Bylaws set a quorum for a Board meeting of only 3 directors (out of 24 plus *ex officio* directors). Moreover, a special meeting of the BRS Board of Directors can be called upon the request of only 3 directors (as was done in the case of this special meeting). Blackwell found the number for the quorum far too low, and urged the Board to consider amending this provision. Peter Stone moved that the Board raise the quorum for a board meeting to 6 (thus changing Article 6, Section 4 of the Board Bylaws). Steve Bayne seconded.

Stefan Andersson questioned the need for such a change in the Bylaws. Ken Blackwell responded by explaining the circumstances under which he recognized the need for change. In the days leading up to the opening of the Bertrand Russell Research Centre (held in November 2000), Blackwell had asked the Board if the directors attending wished to hold a special Board meeting so as to address the question of declining membership. Some directors indicated that they would not be attending the opening but favored a special meeting. This drew Blackwell’s attention to how easy it was to schedule a special Board meeting, and how low the quorum was.

Peter Friedman worried that this change might cause the BRS to react too slowly to new circumstances. Ken Blackwell assured him that most Society business was conducted by the various officers, and now by the newly formed Executive Committee. Alan Schwerin added that as things stood now a small number of directors could take some action that would embarrass the BRS against the wishes of the majority, and Blackwell concurred that the change would provide a safety net against this possibility. Peter Friedman then admitted that this method could be tried and changed if it did not work.

Warren Allen Smith asked if there was any advantage to an odd quorum. Stefan Andersson asked if there was any advantage to an even one. Ken Blackwell said no to both. Steve Bayne asked if proxy votes could affect
the procedure at all. Ken Blackwell said that proxy votes were acceptable only for votes of the Society as a whole, not the Board.

Alan Schwerin said that the number requested in the motion was an improvement without setting a figure too high as to pose problems with regular Board meetings. Peter Stone concurred, but added that the Chair should make a strong effort to encourage enough directors to attend meetings so as to obviate the problem of the quorum. The Board then passed the motion 10-0, with 1 abstention.

Peter Stone then noted that he was stepping down as BRS Awards Committee Chair. He nominated Kevin Brodie to take over the position. Warren Allen Smith seconded the motion, and it carried 10-0, with 1 abstention. This concluded the meeting.

A Post-Meeting Note from the Chair

The accounts for the annual meeting are complete. The meeting was designed to break even, and it did. There was even a slight surplus of $40 for the BRS treasury. In addition, the meeting attracted 7 new members for the Society, and t-shirt sales netted $148.20.

Thanks are due the Bertrand Russell Research Centre (and its director, Nick Griffin), which hosted the meeting, Alison Miculan, Arlene Duncan, David Godden, and Liz Blackwell.

- Ken Blackwell

The 5th Biennial Radical Philosophy Association Conference will be held at Brown University on November 7-10, 2002. The theme of the conference is “Activism, Ideology, and Radical Philosophy.” Please send paper, workshop, poster, and other proposals to RPA PROGRAM COMMITTEE, c/o Lisa Heldke, Philosophy Department, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, MN 56802. Or send them as an attachment to heldke@gac.edu. The deadline for submissions is January 31, 2002. For more information on the RPA, go to www.radicalphilosophy.org.

Articles:

The Manuscript of “Mysticism and Logic” at Auction
Carl Spadoni

“At last I have a bone with meat on it,” L.P. Jacks, the editor of The Hibbert Journal, told Russell on 20 April 1912, after reading his essay, “Mysticism and Logic.” “If you had my work for a week you would know what a joy it is,” Jacks added. Russell’s essay, which focuses on the tension between the mystical and the logical, is unquestionably one of his most important pieces of writing. First published in July 1914 in The Hibbert Journal, it has been reprinted frequently. The section of the essay called “Reason and Intuition” appeared in Russell’s Lowell Lectures, Our Knowledge of the External World (1914). The essay was the lead article in Mysticism and Logic, and Other Essays (1918).

Writing the essay did not come easy to Russell, however. He was dissatisfied with its first draft on 11 January 1914 because it consisted mainly of scraps from other lectures. Even when he altered it a few days later, he was disappointed with the result. He told Lady Ottoline Morrell that the essay was “sober, careful, and balanced” but not eloquent. Jacks sent proofs to Russell on 28 April 1914. He returned the manuscript by separate post to Russell at Trinity College, Cambridge. When Russell was lecturing in the United States in May of the same year, he gave the manuscript as a gift to his good friend, Lucy Donnelly. When Professor John Slater edited the essay for volume 8 of the Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell, he was unable to locate the manuscript in Donnelly’s archives or elsewhere. Its whereabouts were unknown for more than 85 years. The fact that the manuscript surfaced at auction in San Francisco on 10 May of this year was cause for excitement among Russell scholars.

According to the description in Butterfields’ auction catalogue (lot 3067), the manuscript is 44 pages long. The estimate was modest, between $4,000 and $6,000. Russell’s manuscript was one of many treasures in the catalogue—an early photo of Hitler as a corporal, a page of a manuscript by Isaac Newton, letters from Margaret Mitchell, and most conspicuously, a battered briefcase embossed “J.F.K.” (apparently a wedding present from Jacqueline Bouvier to her future husband, John F. Kennedy). At McMaster University, however, only the Russell manuscript interested us. Butterfields reproduced the first page in facsimile. Even a brief glimpse of it showed that there were textual variants and deletions. Bob Riemenschneider of the BRS viewed the manuscript in San Francisco and confirmed that there were many more.
The Honorary Russell Archivist, Kenneth Blackwell, and I discussed our bid and the market value of the manuscript several times. Initially, we thought that we might be lucky to purchase it for under $10,000. Auctions are unpredictable, and the amounts paid for Russell manuscripts and letters vary considerably, depending on their content and the dealer who owns the document in question. We also attempted, rather impossibly, to judge the importance of the manuscript’s research value relative to other Russell documents that might come on the market. We didn’t want to purchase the manuscript simply for its iconographic cachet. We revised our bid several times. The Library, the Russell Research Centre and members of the Russell Society jointly raised $15,000 for our bid.

A dealer from San Francisco, Michael Thompson, phoned me about the manuscript a couple of weeks before the auction. Thompson has sold a number of Russell manuscripts and other items to the Russell archives since 1970. He intimated that the manuscript would fetch many times the catalogue estimate, and he also mentioned that several dealers and collectors would be interested in its purchase. At this point we knew that our bid was in jeopardy. Another contact in California informed us that unless we were prepared to put between $30,000 and $50,000 on the table, our bid would be unsuccessful. The contact’s prediction proved to be correct. The winning bid was $17,000. With auction fees the manuscript’s price came close to $20,000.

The manuscript is now owned jointly by three antiquarian book dealers—Michael Thompson, Heritage Book Shop, and Bernard Quaritch. Their asking price is $45,000. In comparison to the $2.4 million recently paid by the owner of the Indiana Colts for the typescript scroll of Jack Kerouac’s *On the Road*, $45,000 may appear to be rather paltry. Yet it is a considerable sum for one Russell manuscript. Given the Library’s budget and other funding sources available through the Russell Research Centre, it is unlikely that we will be able to raise this amount unless a donor can be found. Admittedly, we are disappointed that McMaster University was unable to purchase the manuscript. Since the Russell Archives came to McMaster in 1968, we have been able throughout the years to purchase many significant Russell documents. The auction has brought to the attention of the educated public and the scholarly world one of Russell’s greatest essays.

*Carl Spadoni is Research Collections Librarian at Mills Memorial Library, McMaster University, home of the Bertrand Russell Archive.*

Russell discovered the paradox which bears his name in either May or June 1901, depending upon whether you believe his *Autobiography* or the autobiographical essay, “My Mental Development,” which he wrote for the volume edited by Paul Arthur Schilpp, *The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell* (most recently published in paperback by Open Court, 1990). One hardly likes to talk about “celebrating” an event which caused so much trouble, but the wonderful four-day conference organized by Godfrey Link and his colleagues at the University of Munich shows that logicians will use any excuse to have a good time.

The conference brought together philosophers, logicians, set theorists and historians of mathematics from all over the world to discuss Russell’s paradox and its aftermath. Fifty-one papers were presented over the four days, plus two symposia and two evening panel discussions, so participants had to pick and choose which sessions they went to—often with considerable difficulty from a range of equally tempting items. The fact that one had to choose between hearing Hans Kamp on definite descriptions and Alasdair Urquhart on Russell’s “zig-zag” theory gives some idea of the difficulty.

Participants were worked hard, with sessions beginning at 9:00 a.m. and continuing through the evening. Alas, this left little time for sightseeing—though I can report that Leopoldstrasse, which ran from the hotel to the conference hall, was pleasant and spacious. We got a brief glimpse of Munich’s cultural life on Saturday afternoon when Leopoldstrasse was cordoned off for a large technopop festival. Unfortunately, it poured with rain for the whole event, and few of us were tempted to linger with the handful of drenched fans dutifully bopping in the street. Discussions, of course, were carried on over meals in restaurants around the hotel. In one, a group of us got so carried away discussing the Gray’s *Elegy* argument in “On Denoting” that the restaurateur had to ask us to be quiet—this was probably the first time that particular argument could be cited as the cause of disorderly conduct in a restaurant.

The line-up of speakers was quite spectacular, with John Bell, Charles Chihara, Sol Feferman, Harvey Friedman, Geoffrey Hellman, Hans Kamp, Per Martin-Löf, Vann McGee, Yiannis Moschovakis, Charles
Parsons, Graham Priest, Alasdair Urquhart, and Hugh Woodin among the logicians and set theorists, and Allen Hazen, Peter Hylton, Andrew Irvine, Greg Landini, Bernard Linksy, Francisco Rodriguez-Consuegra, and Russell Wahl among the Russellians. Jan Mycielski and Ray Monk were scheduled to attend, but did not show up. David Kaplan was there but did not give a paper, though he contributed frequently to the discussions and also to the panel discussion on Russell.

The Russell panel, held on Sunday night, was a lively event chaired by Andrew Irvine. Peter Hylton, David Kaplan, Alasdair Urquhart, and myself were panelists, and the talk, much of it in response to questions from the floor, ranged widely over Russell’s work and even, to some extent, his life. Your reporter was lured into speaking injudiciously and ill of Wittgenstein, though in this company he was more mildly reprimanded than he might have expected. More seriously, I was especially pleased to have the opportunity to talk about the work of McMaster’s newly created Bertrand Russell Research Centre.

The set theorists in the second panel on the following night were much more serious. David McCarty, Sol Feferman, Harvey Friedman and Hugh Woodin took part, with Yiannis Moschovakis in the chair—one could hardly do better for expertise than that. It was a surprise to some of us outsiders to see just how passionately they are divided over the constructivism vs. realism issue. Very little in this century-old dispute seems to have been settled and even things that one thought were settled seem now to be open again. Most remarkable here were Woodin’s comments—a preview of his paper (the very last at the conference), “Set Theory after Russell: The Journey back to Eden.” (The title refers to Hilbert’s remark that mathematicians would never be expelled from the paradise that Cantor had created for them.) Woodin ended his talk with the conjectures that Cantor’s continuum hypothesis would turn out to be decidable—contrary to Paul Cohen’s 1963 proof—that it would be shown to be false and that the cardinality of the continuum would prove to be $\aleph_2$. This was the most surprising news that your reporter took away from the entire conference—indeed, that he had heard in a very long time!

Several of the papers on Russell were only obliquely on the paradox and its resolution. Peter Hylton, for example, compared Frege’s concept of a function with Russell’s, and Rodriguez-Consuegra spoke on Russell’s theory of judgment from 1910-18. Some of the papers were not on the paradoxes at all. Two, by Van McGee and Sebastiano Moruzzi, were on Russell’s 1923 paper on vagueness, casually dismissed by Ray Monk as “arguably the weakest piece of philosophical writing that Russell...had produced” to that date. I missed Moruzzi’s paper (in order to hear James Levine on Russell and Moore at the turn of the century), but McGee’s was an important piece dealing with quite serious problems in semantics broached in Russell’s paper for the first time.

Recent books by Bernard Linsky and Gregory Landini have taken radically different views of Principia Mathematica. They aired their differences at the conference in a special symposium on propositional functions—and on several other occasions. Continuing work by Allen Hazen, who spoke on “Interpreting the 1925 Logic,” has served to convince me that there is more mileage in PM2 (for all its mistakes) than I had previously supposed.

Russell’s paradox remains a potent source of difficult for logicians and set theorists. Many current ways of dealing with it were discussed at the conference—with constructive and type theoretic approaches taking pride of place. These, of course, are not mutually exclusive and elements of both can be found in PM. An approach I favour—of which there is definitely no trace in PM—is that of abandoning classical logic. This view was represented at the conference by Alan Weir and Graham Priest, who nonetheless took different views as to how to implement the project. Weir recommended placing restrictions on condition Cut (transitivity of implication) and Priest the adoption of a paraconsistent metatheory. Both projects are yet in their early stages and—sad to say—on account of Curry’s paradox, not even a paraconsistent metatheory will save a logic with unrestricted comprehension principles from triviality.

Russell’s work—even his weakest, if we are to believe Monk—remains a lively source of controversy. There is still no commonly accepted way of dealing with the paradoxes and each attempt to eliminate them seems to produce similar problems somewhere else. It is hard the avoid the conclusion that Russell seemed drawn to that we are doing something deeply, deeply wrong. “Never glad, confident morning again,” as Whitehead said when Russell first told him of the problem.

Nick Griffin is Director of the Bertrand Russell Research Centre at McMaster University.
Updates on Awards and Honorary Members

The philosopher Stephen Toulmin attended the 2001 BRS Meeting at McMaster University to accept his award in person. BRS Awards Committee Chair Peter Stone made the following remarks before presenting the award to Toulmin:

In recent years, the BRS has presented its Award to a number of distinguished and impressive figures—Irving Copi, Stephen Jay Gould, Henry Morgentaler, Karl Popper, and others. However, this year's Award recipient, Stephen Toulmin, has one outstanding quality that all of these other fine figures lack—he had the intelligence and good taste to show up and accept his award in person. We at the BRS are honored and privileged by Professor Toulmin's presence at our Annual Meeting.

Professor Toulmin was born in England, and studied mathematics and physics at King's College. After the war, he studied philosophy at Cambridge with (among others) Ludwig Wittgenstein. He received his doctorate in 1948, having written a dissertation on the place of reason in ethics, subsequently published as a book under that title. Professor Toulmin has taught at numerous institutions, including Oxford, Melbourne, University of Leeds, Columbia, Dartmouth, Michigan State, Northwestern, Stanford, and the University of California at Santa Cruz. His many books include "Wittgenstein's Vienna" (co-authored with Alan Janik; Simon and Schuster, 1973), "The Abuse of Casuistry" (co-authored with Albert Jonsen; University of California Press, 1988), "Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity" (Free Press, 1990), and most famously "The Uses of Argument" (Cambridge University Press, 1958). This modern classic argued that not all types of argument can or should be held to the standards of formal logic. His most recent book, "A Return to Reason" (Harvard University Press, 2001), continues this critique, arguing that too formal a conception of rationality can impoverish our notion of reason.

Professor Toulmin presently serves as Henry R. Luce Professor at the Center for Multinational and Transnational Studies at the University of Southern California. This title, coupled with the background described all-too-sketchily above, demonstrates well why he is receiving the BRS Award this year. Toulmin has worked on many issues of great concern to Russell, such as philosophy of science and the nature of ethics. He has pursued these issues with the same disdain for disciplinary boundaries that Russell himself practiced. In an era which produces specialists without the vast classical training assumed of philosophers in the previous century, it is rare to see someone demonstrate the breadth of knowledge that Stephen Toulmin has.

In his book "Wittgenstein's Vienna," Professor Toulmin argued that much of the spirit of innovation gets lost when a particular set of tools become ends in themselves, and the purposes for which they were to be used fall into neglect. Philosophy has itself been dogged by this problem. In the wake of the analytic revolution pioneered by Frege, Wittgenstein, and (of course) Russell, many so-called disciples of the greats are content to work ever more esoterically on refining their formal systems without regard to the profound problems the giants created these systems to solve. Professor Toulmin himself has done much to keep philosophers' "eyes on the prize," as it were, and for this he deserves the respect of anyone who professes to honor the legacy of a man like Russell. And so it is my great pleasure to present the 2001 Award of the Bertrand Russell Society to Stephen Toulmin. The Award Reads,

The 2001 Bertrand Russell Society Award to
STEPHEN TOULMIN
For pursuing the life of the mind across disciplinary boundaries
in the spirit of Bertrand Russell

Here are some selected quotes relating to Toulmin from the meeting.

"I have a terrible Tristam Shandy-like tendency to elaborate."

Stephen Toulmin

"Is that the kind of argument that would have convinced Hitler?"

Bertrand Russell, in response to Stephen Toulmin's argument in "An Examination of the Place of Reason in Ethics"

"I was afraid I might find myself in a nest of symbolic logicians."

Toulmin, explaining why he was nervous about attending the BRS Annual Meeting.

"I'm very metaphysical about this."
Steve Bayne, in his presentation on Toulmin.

"God, sir, I was a genius when I wrote that."

Samuel Johnson, in response to prompting by Boswell (Toulmin quoted this in his response to Bayne's presentation).

BRS Books Award Committee Chair Ray Perkins presented the 2001 BRS Book Award to Thom Weidlich. In doing so he made the following remarks:

The BRS 2001 Book Award is for the best book on Russell's life or work published in the previous year. This year's competition was unusually difficult owing to the excellence among the contenders, which included Gideon Makin's, *The Metaphysicians of Meaning: Russell and Frege on Sense and Denotation* (London: Routledge); Ray Monk's *Bertrand Russell: the Ghost of Madness* (London: J. Cape); Richard Rempel and Beryl Haslam's Vol. 15 of *The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell, Uncertain Paths to Freedom: Russia and China, 1919-22* (London, New York: Routledge); Jack Odell's *On Russell* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth); and Thom Weidlich's *Appointment Denied: the Inquisition of Bertrand Russell* (Buffalo: Prometheus).

This year's award goes to Thom Weidlich for *Appointment Denied*. This important account of one of the most disturbing episodes in Russell's life and one of the most shameful in the history of U.S. civil liberty is skillfully told in a way that helps us to better understand both Russell's personal ordeal in the disgraceful City College case and the illiberal character of American politics in 1940.

Noam Chomsky

The October 29, 2000 issue of the *Augusta Chronicle* noted the passing of Dr. Peter Cranford, Sr. Cranford was a retired clinical psychologist who helped create both the game show *The $64,000 Question* and the Bertrand Russell Society. Cranford was with the BRS from the very beginning, serving as its first Chairman of the Board and providing generous financial and moral support at a time when the Society desperately needed both. In 1999 he was made an Honorary Member of the BRS in recognition of his tremendous contribution to the Society.

Taslima Nasrin, an honorary member of the BRS, is finishing up an autobiographical work, *My Girlhood*, that will be published by Steerforth Press (South Royalton, Vermont).

In June, the French Parliament invited Nasrin to speak on the worldwide refugee situation. The occasion was the 50th anniversary of the 1951 Geneva Convention, which guaranteed the right to asylum. "If there were no such law about asylum," she told them at the event, "I would have been killed by fanatics long ago, as so many others have been."

When forced to leave Bangladesh in 1993 because of a fatwa placed on her by Muslim fundamentalists, Dr. Nasrin, a physician, fled to Sweden, where she remains today. For a period of time she hid in Germany, Paris, and (with Society member Warren Allen Smith) New York City. More information is available at [http://humanists.net/nasrin/index.html](http://humanists.net/nasrin/index.html).
Nelson Mandela has accepted the BRS's offer of honorary membership. A transcription of his letter of acceptance appears below.

01 March 2001

RE: LETTER SENT TO MR. MANDELA

I acknowledge with thanks receipt of your letter 08 December 2000 addressed to Mr. Mandela. We apologise for the belated response to your communication.

Mr. Mandela has asked that I convey his thanks to you for your letter that you sent to him. The time and trouble you took to send your letter is greatly appreciated.

You can send copies of your Russell Society News to the Nelson Mandela Foundation offices, on the address listed below.

Yours Sincerely,

BUYI SISHUBA
SECRETARY

* * *

News from the Humanist World

The Bertrand Russell Society is an associate member of the International Humanist Ethical Union (IHEU). It encourages its members to become individual supporters of the IHEU as well. Supporters receive free copies of the IHEU's thrice-annually publication, International Humanist News, as well as discounts on attendance of IHEU Congresses. Annual membership costs £30 (Visa or MC accepted). To join write to IHEU, 47 Theobalds RD, London WC1X 8SP, or fax +44 207 404 8641. For more information, drop them a line, or visit their website at www.iheu.org.

* * *

Several members of the BRSQ Committee have received complimentary copies of the new publication Commonsense: The Intercollegiate Journal of Humanism and Freethought. The complimentary copy (Volume 2, Issue 3, spring 2001) is quite good, featuring several excellent student articles on religion and ethical issues as well as an interview with Peter Singer. The journal promises to be an excellent forum for philosophical and ethical discussion, one that reaches out beyond the traditional academic audience. Subscriptions cost $25, and can be obtained by writing to Commonsense, P.O. Box 370, Princeton, NJ 08542-0370. For more information, contact the journal at 507-252-9403 or at publisher@cs-journal.org. Or visit the journal's website at www.cs-journal.org.

* * *

The BRSQ would also like to direct your attention to Splash!, the newsletter for the St. Petersburg Area Secular Humanists (SPLASH). The editor is Jan Loeb Eisler, a longtime member of the BRS. The June newsletter contains a fascinating report on the Indian Rationalist Association's efforts to combat an outbreak of mass hysteria in New Delhi, a hysteria based on a mythical "monkey-man" supposedly plaguing the city. Membership in SPLASH costs $40 for individuals and couples, $20 for students and low income persons. For more information, write to SPLASH, P.O. Box 8099, Madeira Beach, FL 33738-8099. Or drop Jan Loeb Eisler a line at splash.info@gte.net.

* * *

Rationalist International, a high-quality humanist newsletter based in India, will be hosting the Third International Rationalist Conference on February 8-12, 2002 in New Delhi. Conference registration is already open. For more information, visit Rationalist International's website at www.rationalistinternational.net or write to Conference Secretariat International, Rationalist Conference 779, Pocket-5, Mayur Vihar-1, New Delhi 110 091, India.

* * *

The American Humanist Association is currently seeking contestants for its Annual Humanist Essay Contest. Possible topics include "Responding to the Population Crisis," "Alternatives to War in the Twenty-First Century," and "Death with Dignity: Is It the Ultimate Human Right?" First price is US $1000. Contestants must be below 25 years of age and residents of North America. For full details on the application process, write to The Humanist Essay Contest, 1777 T Street NW, Washington, DC 20009-7125, or visit the website http://www.humanist.net/essaycon/. The deadline for entries is December 1, 2001.
Russell feared that the establishment of a World Government would be impossible if Stalin succeeded in producing his own nuclear weapons. Russell suggested that Stalin should be given an ultimatum: either accept the demands of freedom and democracy or face the possibility of a nuclear war. As the Soviet Union soon had nuclear weapons itself, the ultimatum was only briefly threatening. Russell at times expressed himself carelessly, something which Monk comes back to over and again. A few years later his disdain of Stalin and communism was replaced by an equal disgust for American imperialism.

Russell's marriage to his third wife Peter came to an end soon thereafter. She subsequently forced Conrad to choose between her and his father. As a result, Conrad did not see his father until two years before Russell's death. At the same time it became evident that Russell's other son, John, suffered from severe psychological problems. In 1946 John married Susan Lindsay, daughter of the American poet Vachel Lindsay. Susan also struggled with deep psychological disturbances. When they met, she had been married for two months and had a daughter, Anne, from an earlier relationship (John adopted Anne when he married Susan). In January 1947, the couple had another daughter, Sarah; the following August, the family moved to England. The young couple had difficulties taking care of themselves and their children. For a short while they stayed with Dora, but conflicts arose between her and Susan. They moved in with Griffin Barry. The situation soon became intolerable and when their third daughter, Lucy, was born, they moved to a smaller apartment. John and Susan lacked the ability to create a stable home and the money John had received through a trust from Russell was soon gone. Russell bought a big house and offered John and his family use of the two top floors.

One year earlier Russell received The Order of Merit and the following year he was awarded The Nobel Prize for literature. He received the news while on a successful lecture tour in the US and in New York, of all places, he was treated as a hero. It was at this time he renewed an old friendship with Edith Finch, which developed into a romance. They married two years later and were happy in this union. Edith moved to London. This, however, created further turmoil in Russell's household. On Christmas Day 1953, John and Susan moved out, leaving their children in the hands of Russell and Edith, who started procedures to get full custody of the children. Russell thought that John was in such poor mental condition that he needed professional help. When Susan left John the following summer for another man, he broke down. In December he was admitted to a mental hospital. He was diagnosed as having a psychosis. Russell's worst fears had come true.

During the Fifties Russell's political involvement grew. He wrote a number of books and articles in which he explained how the world could be spared of nuclear war. On the day before Christmas Eve 1954, Russell gave his most famous radio broadcast—"Man's Peril"—in which he said, "I appeal, as a human being to human beings: remember your humanity, and forget the rest. If you can do so, the way lies open to a new Paradise; if you cannot, nothing lies before you, but universal death." These words echoed those of a few years earlier in New York, when he said that what the world needs is love—Christian love, or compassion. These words made many think that Russell had become a Christian, something he ardently denied. There was, however, something of a revivalist in Russell. An English bishop once said that Russell was a natural Christian, except for his views on marriage. Russell's ethical views had much in common with what Jesus said in The Sermon on the Mount and Saint Paul's eulogy of love, but he could not believe in God or any Christian dogma.

In his eagerness to save the world Russell wrote to a number of distinguished scientists urging them to sign a document explaining the horrible consequences of a nuclear war. He wrote a letter to Albert
Einstein asking him to sign the document, which he did just a few days before he died. The document became known as The Russell-Einstein Manifesto. It was the beginning of the Pugwash movement in which the future Nobel Prize winner, Joseph Rotblatt, with the help of Russell, played an important role.

In 1956 Russell and Edith moved with the grandchildren to a remote house in Wales called Plas Penrhy, from which he continued his struggle for peace. He became engaged in the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND). At the beginning of the Sixties he started The Russell Peace Foundation in order to implement his ambitions more effectively. It was during this time that he met a young radical American, Ralph Schoeman, who would develop a great influence on Russell—an influence decraved by many of Russell’s friends. Russell and Edith were soon relating to Ralph as a son. He possessed all the qualities that John lacked. After some time, though, his eccentricities caused Russell a number of difficulties. His presence in the home also created problems for the grandchildren, who thought that Ralph received far too much attention at their expense.

In the fall of 1962 the Cuban missile crisis unfolded, which gave Russell and Schoeman an opportunity to act. Russell wrote letters to Kennedy, Khrushchev and other top-politicians urging them to come to their senses. Russell acted as a “World Ambassador” and enjoyed the attention that was being directed towards Plas Penrhy. Whether Russell had any real influence on the outcome is difficult to say, but he seemed to think so at times, a belief to which Monk refers with some sarcasm. A short time later a border conflict erupted between India and China. Russell again had an opportunity to act and wrote letters to Nehru and Chou En-lai. He sent Schoeman to negotiate a settlement. The negotiations were unsuccessful, in part because of Schoeman’s odd behavior.

In the spring of 1963 alarming reports began filtering through about American activities in Vietnam. Russell was among the first to react. The motives of the Americans were more than obvious to Russell and he found their methods loathsome. Russell sent out his own observers to collect information that would later be used as evidence in an unofficial trial against the United States. This prepared the way for the Russell Tribunals. The first session took place in Stockholm in the spring of 1967. In the light of these sessions there is no doubt that the United States had committed terrible crimes in the name of democracy. Monk withholds any credit that well could be given Russell in this regard.

Additional problems arose with Schoeman, however, which finally led to his dismissal from the Peace Foundation.

During the Sixties Russell was so deeply involved in world politics that he did not have time to pay much attention to his grandchildren. They suffered badly from being neglected and from the conflicts within the family. The youngest, Lucy, suffered the most. At the age of twenty-seven she burned herself to death on a gravestone in a remote churchyard.

Russell died quietly in February 1970 with Edith at his side. He was cremated without any religious ceremonies and his ashes were scattered over the Welsh hills. He had reconciled with his youngest son Conrad two years earlier, but the only one who never stopped loving Russell was his daughter Kate, who had become a Christian and married a minister.

Monk has no positive remark to make on Russell’s work on ethics and religion. Anyone interested in forming an opinion in these areas should consult Russell on Ethics, edited by Charles Pigden, and Russell on Religion edited by Louis Greenspan and myself. These are the first collections of texts by Russell on various topics under publication by Routledge. Through these collections, a new generation of readers has the opportunity to discover an important writer and philosopher, who has been overshadowed by a number of less interesting but more fashionable thinkers, during the latter part of the 20th century. Thought I would disregard Monk’s often pointedly negative view of Russell, I cannot deny that he has written an interesting book about one of the most fascinating personalities of the last century in all categories.

Stefan Andersson defended his doctoral thesis Bertrand Russell’s Search for Certainty in Religion and Mathematics up to The Principles of Mathematics 1903 in 1994 at Lund University. He has continued to do research on Russell and Wittgenstein’s views on logic, ethics and mysticism and on the Russell Tribunals. He lives in Lund and is currently working on Forty-Four Semesters or Why I Did Not Become a Lutheran Minister. Part one of his review appeared in the May 2001 issue.

Greater Rochester Russell Set
Celebrating Five Years of Monthly Russell
Meetings Open to the Public

GRRS Catches APA’s Attention

The American Philosophical Association has placed a copy of our flyer
upon its website, citing it as “an example of the kind of thing that we
would like to encourage.” The flyer can be viewed at the APA site at
http://www.apa.udel.edu/apa/centennial/100anniv.html.

Advance Program 2001-2002

Fall 2001

Sept. 20 Newcomer’s Night
Oct. 18 “On Denoting”
Nov. 15 Who’s Who in Hell
Dec. 20 Russell on Religion

Spring 2002

Feb. 21 “Dora, Dora, Dora”
Mar. 21 Wittgenstein’s Vienna
Apr. 18 “Tom and Viv and Bertie”
May 16 The Conquest of Happiness

Christian’s Coffeehouse
Village Gate Square, 274 North Goodman St., Rochester, NY.
For information
call Tim Madigan 716-424-3184 or write TimothyMad@aol.com
or visit http://home.sjfc.edu/~white/grrs.
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Eastern Division, American Philosophical Association, meeting in
Atlanta, December 27-30, 2001. There will be a BRS session at the
meetings and a BRS table at the smoker. If you are interested in giving a
paper or tabling at the smoker, please get in touch with David White
white@sjfc.edu). Confirmed speakers include: Kevin C. Klement
(University of Massachusetts), Timothy Madigan (University of
Rochester Press), Matthew McKeon (Michigan State University).

BRS Business and Chapter News:

Bertrand Russell Society, Inc., 2nd Quarter Treasurer’s
Report, Cash Flow Report, 4/1/01 Through 6/30/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE 3/31/01</td>
<td>7,452.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFLOWS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions:</td>
<td>-45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrib-BRS</td>
<td>-45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Contributions</td>
<td>-45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Members</td>
<td>260.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>412.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Dues</td>
<td>673.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Inc</td>
<td>10.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Inc</td>
<td>2,575.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Inc</td>
<td>148.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INFLOWS</td>
<td>3,363.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTFLOWS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS Paper Award</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Exp</td>
<td>2,427.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>1,072.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Exp</td>
<td>295.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL Sub</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OUTFLOWS</td>
<td>4,046.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL TOTAL</td>
<td>-683.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE 6/30/01</td>
<td>6,768.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The reason for the negative contribution figure is the refund of a
contribution by a member who was expelled. Also all annual meeting
expenses & income are included except $107.49 in partial refunds to
those who paid but could not attend. Also the newsletter expense
includes an advance for the August issue. Dennis J. Darland, BRS
Treasurer, didarland@qconline.com.