Nourishing Life: Russell and the Twentieth-Century British Peace Movement, 1900–18

THOMAS C. KENNEDY

By now it is fairly commonplace knowledge that Bertrand Russell, despite rumours to the contrary, was never a pacifist. No doubt he helped give currency to those rumours by sometimes calling himself a pacifist, though at other times he vehemently denied ever being one.[1] Perhaps this confusion was due in part to the sort of ambivalence he expressed to Lady Ottoline Morrell early in the Great War: "I hardly know what I think. I don't think war always wrong.... I find I can't take Tolstoy's extreme position, and short of that it is so hard to know where to draw the line."[2]

Russell would probably have appreciated, and approved of, the sort of rigorous analysis that Martin Ceadel has recently applied to the use of the terms pacifist and pacifism.[3] Certainly, his careful definitions will be helpful to those who still conceive of pacifism as something one can be partly or mainly or even a little bit. Ceadel illustrates that pacifism is "an exacting personal faith" which cannot be, and never has been, successfully transformed into a political instrument.[4] Thus, we can safely say that Bertrand Russell was never a pacifist because at every stage of his long career, Russell's involvement in the peace movement was always intensely political.

How then are we to describe Russell? Ceadel would call him a "pacificist", an unlovely though historically authentic title.[5] Since one can confidently predict that, however accurate, pacificism is too ugly to receive a decent hearing, perhaps Jo Vellacott provides the best starting point for describing Russell's place in the constellation of peacemakers. Vellacott calls him a "pragmatic pacifist" or one to whom "peace was of generally overriding importance ... and the route to obtaining or preserving it was negotiable."[6] Russell described himself in very much the same way just after he had announced his support for the Allied war effort against Hitler.[7] The plea of pragmatism might help to explain Russell's running the gamut

from absolute resistance during the First World War to advocacy of preventive nuclear strike against the Soviet Union in the late 1940s. And there are those who maintain that Russell's approach to war and peace after the Second World War "was basically consistent with his position over the previous fifty years". Others, including Russell's major biographer, feel that in "the politics of peace his record is more contradictory than he would wish", while simultaneously acknowledging that it was also "perhaps more successful than his enemies would admit".[8]

Contradictory or not, at least no one could accuse him of being a Johnny-come-lately to peace advocacy. Russell himself always fixed his "conversion" to peace to a day during the Lent term of 1901, when upon seeing Mrs. Alfred North Whitehead, a woman he deeply admired, wracked by a terrible spasm of pain, he experienced an emotional transformation that changed his life. In the light of a "sort of mystic illumination", as Russell called it, he became "a completely different person" who suddenly realized that

> the loneliness of a human soul is unendurable; nothing can penetrate it except the highest intensity of ... love.... whatever does not spring from this motive is harmful, or at best useless; it follows that war is wrong ... that the use of force is to be deprecated, and that in human relations one should penetrate to the core of loneliness in each person and speak to that .... Having been an Imperialist, I became ... a pro-Boer and a Pacifist.[9]

There is no reason to doubt either the sincerity or the intensity of Russell's "pacifist turn", but it certainly did not immediately transform him into a fervent crusader for peace. Indeed, in the years before 1914, beyond the occasional reference to being shocked by the bloodthirsty militarism of apparently intelligent men like L. S. Amery or to rejecting the tactics of militant suffragettes "on pacifist grounds", peace advocacy seems to have played little part in Russell's life.[10] He did briefly correspond with G. M. Trevelyan concerning the moral efficacy of followers of Tolstoy who resisted conscription during the Russo-Japanese War; and while Russell did assert that such martyrs as those Russians would eventually lead the people of Europe to see the folly of war, he seemed unconcerned about the vigorous pro-conscriptionist movement in Edwardian Britain and took no part in efforts to counteract it.[11]

The picture one sees of the pre-war Russell, especially as painted by Jo Vellacott in her brief but incisive portrait,[12] is that of a slightly priggish academic creature, keeping brilliant company, thinking brilliant thoughts and writing brilliant books on mathematics and philosophy. Occasionally, however, some sign emerges of the man so deeply moved by Mrs.

Whitehead's suffering. In a letter to G. Lowes Dickinson, one of the few people, as Russell believed, who cared "about what matters", he bared his soul:

> We stand on the shore of an ocean, crying into the night and the emptiness; sometimes a voice answers out of the darkness. But it is the voice of one drowning; and in a moment the silence returns. The world seems to me quite dreadful; the unhappiness of most people is very great, and I often wonder how they all endure it.[13]

These words bespeak a compassion unrelieved by hope, a reflection, to be sure, of Russell's recurring depression over an increasingly destructive relationship with his first wife Alys. After 1911, however, when Russell finally left Alys and became the occasional lover and constant soul-mate of Lady Ottoline Morrell, his vision of the wretchedness of the human condition was softened by the belief that he shared with Ottoline "the same passion of search, and the same sense of the tragedy of human life" and that she also had "some vision, some glimpse of peace which I have not found."[14] Because of Ottoline, Russell gradually rejected the austerity and puritanism of his old donnish life. Ottoline Morrell not only provided Russell, who had been mainly celibate for a decade, some sexual release, she also guided him to a fresher, fuller appreciation of the fine arts and, more significantly, to a new awareness of the "joy of life". The positive impact of all this on him was made manifest in a letter he sent to Ottoline on 24 July 1914. Russell, who had, in earlier despairing days, been concerned about possible suicidal tendencies, reflected his new found joy in the title of a poem among those he was copying into a blank book to give to her: "Hey nonny no! Men are fools that wish to die." He could not know that within ten days men from all over Europe would be joyously rushing to arms as if in prophetic fulfilment of that line—"Men are fools that wish to die".[15]

One week later, as the war suddenly burst upon what had been the most glorious summer in living memory, Russell cried out to Ottoline:

> The burden is very heavy—it is hard to face life in a world so full of hatred. Fear is at the bottom of it and hatred grows out of fear. I wish I were with you. I seem to feel all the weight of Europe's passion, as if I were the focus of a burning glass—all the shouting, angry crowds, Emperors on balconies appealing to God, solemn words of duty and sacrifice to cover the red murder and rage. It seems as if one must go mad or join the madmen.[16]

Bertrand Russell's activities during the First World War have now been chronicled. My purpose here is not to retread the ground so masterfully

covered by Dr. Jo Vellacott in her recent book.[17] Rather, I want to introduce or reiterate some aspects of Russell's career from 1914 to 1918 which seem relevant to his role in helping to launch and to preserve the first meaningful peace movement of modern times. Russell's initial reaction to the war was a "despairing tenderness towards the young men who were to be slaughtered", mixed with a blinding rage against the statesmen, especially Liberal politicians—"a set of official gentlemen living luxurious lives, mostly stupid, and all without imagination or heart"—who had allowed "this flaming death of our civilization and our hopes" to occur. If we may take Russell at his own word, for some weeks he felt that if he were to meet someone like Grey or Asquith in the street, "I should be unable to refrain from murder". Nearly a year later, he still noted that if it were in his power, he "would have them all guillotined".[18]

In this mood of bitterness about the war and helplessness about doing anything to stop it, Russell commenced his brief and stormy friendship with D. H. Lawrence. The story of their bizarre relationship is well known, but it seems to me that there are aspects of the episode which are of some importance to the development of Russell's role in the peace movement, or at least to the image which was projected, for a time, in his involvement.

Russell's letters to Lady Ottoline in the last months of 1914 are filled with references to his depression, listlessness and lack of ambition. Neither philosophy nor his work with the Union of Democratic Control (UDC) gave him real satisfaction: "I seem to have lost all passion, both selfish and unselfish. It is the result of feeling defeated."[19] Then, early in 1915, Lawrence burst in upon Russell with more than sufficient passion and dynamism for both of them—"a man with a real fire of imagination".[20] For a brief period Lawrence's freshness and energy provided considerable stimulus for the lectures on social and political reform that Russell was preparing. Together they even made plans to join forces on a venture that might be called team-teaching for the moral and material regeneration of the British nation. But it was not to be. Lawrence soon became savagely critical of Russell's so rational, so logical views. He believed that Russell's efforts to oppose the war and influence public opinion against it were a mere pose. Russell, Lawrence said, did not really love humanity and his attempts to save people from themselves were false as well as fruitless. In one particularly stinging letter, Lawrence advised Russell to give up his sterile and hypocritical quest to be "a teacher or preacher" of peace and, "in the name of courage", to become "an outlaw".[21]

Given the blackness of Lawrence's mood during this period and the obsessive, self-proclaimed hatred of humanity arising from his mental state, it is not surprising that he should accuse Russell of opposing the war for entirely selfish or élitist reasons. But such a denunciation was also extremely unfair. Whatever Russell's shortcomings and weaknesses, he continued to

act upon the views he proclaimed, and, for this, he paid a considerable price: twice tried and convicted, dismissed from his livelihood, denied a passport, banned from travel in strategic areas, threatened by hostile mobs, and, finally, imprisoned. Lawrence, on the other hand, however much he conceived of himself as a persecuted rebel who would "not be compelled to do anything", remained a very discreet "outlaw", struggling chiefly against private demons rather than public authorities.[22]

Still, for a time at least, Lawrence's view of Russell's motives and activities seemed to have prevailed. Observers, some of whom certainly ought to have known better, pictured Russell as a silly and self-indulgent cynic whose opposition to the war was largely based on sheer perversity. Of course, as Russell's biographer points out, the authorities themselves, "sedulously" built up an image of "the dilettante professor, stepping into a strange arena and usually making a fool of himself".[23] In any case, it is difficult to believe that, sixty years after the events, one account of the peace movement during the Great War should characterize Russell as an "idiosyncratic" and fastidious pacifist who differed from others in the "Cambridge–Bloomsbury circle to which he belonged" only because "he possessed both vestigial backbone and a modicum of physical health".[24] Another recent account praises Russell's spectacular contributions to "international understanding and peace ... during the last thirty years or so of his long life", as if the Great War period was unknown or best forgotten.[25] One would have thought that the opening of the Russell Archives, as well as other collections that throw light on the depth and breadth of Russell's contributions to the peace movement, would have put an end to the stubbornly persistent image of a bumbling professor who thought it clever to make trouble for the authorities. Surely the publication of Jo Vellacott's authoritative account of Russell's career during that period will finally correct the image that Lawrence privately and the Government publicly sought to cultivate.

There was another, more positive, way in which Russell's encounter with Lawrence influenced his involvement in the peace movement. Russell was initially attracted by Lawrence's passionate fervour, his wildness. No doubt Lawrence was all the more attractive in contrast to the pacifists and other opponents of the war with whom Russell had come into contact. Early in the war, for example, he told Ottoline: "I long for people who are direct and simple and passionate about public events."[26] Sometime later, remarking on the "Sunday-schooly" people he had met at a conference of peace advocates organized by the Society of Friends, Russell called them "an awful crew. Pacifists are really no good.... One must find other outlets for people's wildness and not try to produce people who have no wildness."[27] Lawrence, of course, was wild, but as Russell had said of one "wild" person in UDC circles, he did not have "the virtues that should go with wild-

ness".[28] Russell could never have accepted the irrational and authoritarian aspects of Lawrence's social and political creed, but the stimulus of Lawrence's ideas did help move Russell to seek out people with the right sort of wildness. Indeed, in the very letter in which he first voiced his distaste for Lawrence's philosophy, Russell noted his desire to "make friends with the No-Conscription people". It was in the No-Conscription Fellowship (NCF) that Russell at last found the right combination of virtue and wildness.[29]

But before he became intimately involved with the NCF, Russell had to finish the series of lectures that was published in 1916 as *Principles of Social Reconstruction*. Because this is one of Russell's most important political books, and because it contains ideas vital to his conception of the role that the peace movement should play in the life of the nation and world, more than passing reference needs to be made to this study. From the earliest days of the war when Russell first resolved "to devote the rest of my life to doing what can be done for peace", he believed that a "powerful *Book*" was needed to give direction to the anti-war movement. For a time he had hoped that Norman Angell might write such a book; but though Angell proclaimed his inadequacy for the task,[30] Russell remained convinced that "a stable peace can only be attained by a process of popular education" which would transform a "barbarous standard of values" based on the superiority of physical force into an enlightened standard based on humane and civilized values.[31] By the spring 1915, Russell, seeing no likely candidate to author the book he envisioned, began to outline a series of lectures incorporating ideas for the sort of social and political regeneration he had in mind. What he produced was *Principles of Social Reconstruction* (*Why Men Fight* in the United States).

In this study Russell attempted to illustrate what moved human beings to act, why their actions were so often negative and destructive and how they might be persuaded to act positively and creatively. Russell began his lectures by referring to the "almost unbearable" gulf separating him and the great majority who supported the war; his desire "to save men from ... ruin" caused many of those same men to revile him. Still, he noted, all that he would say was "informed by the hope of seeing such political institutions established in Europe as ... [would] make men averse from war".[32] Russell believed that the destructive propensities so common to human society arose from the thwarting of the principle of growth, that "instinctive urgency" which was the source of all human desires and impulses. Impulses, he said, were of special significance for they, not rational considerations, were at the root of most human actions. Russell went on to identify two groups of impulses: possessive, or those that "aim at acquiring or retaining something that cannot be shared"; and creative, those that bring to life "some valuable thing, such as knowledge or art or good-will".[33] The chief political embodiments of possessive impulse were the State, war and

property, while creative impulses were best expressed through education, marriage and religion. As Russell saw it, the fundamental quest of future generations was to build a society in which people were educated to express the creative impulses that celebrated life and love and to control the possessive impulses that led to death and destruction.[34]

Having identified the institutions through which both creative and possessive impulses were made manifest, the burden of the remaining lectures was to illustrate how creative impulses might best be developed and possessive impulses best controlled.[35] For the purposes of this study, I wish to concentrate on Russell's ideas about how the impulse to war could be harnessed for the positive good of society.

War, Russell said, was "the worst enemy of freedom" because so long as war and the fear or war remained an "imminent danger", the State would remain "a Moloch, sacrificing sometimes the life of the individual, and always his unfettered development."[36] Therefore, the basic problem for pacifists and peace advocates was to prevent the impulse toward war by introducing far-reaching changes in education, economic structure and "the moral code by which public opinion controls men and women". The difficulty in accomplishing such a goal, Russell said, was that

> Pacifism, in practice, too often expresses merely lack of force, not the refusal to use force in thwarting others. Pacifism, if it is to be both victorious and beneficent, must find an outlet, compatible with human feeling for the vigour which now leads nations to war and destruction.[37]

The role of the peacemaker, consequently, was not simply to oppose war, but to work for the establishment of ideas and institutions which would "give men more and more political control over their own lives, and in particular to introduce democracy into the management of industry ... as well as politics." Since, as Russell believed, everything that intensified free political life tended to "bring about a peaceful interest of the same kind as the interest which leads to desire for war", the more human beings were released from the stifling control of the State or the capitalist, the more their creative impulses would be freed for the general benefit of humanity.[38] Russell's vision, to be sure, was full of hope, but he was not entirely borne away by his enthusiasm. "Only a supreme fire of thought and spirit", he said, "can save future generations from the death that has befallen the generation we knew and loved."[39]

From 18 January to 7 March 1916, while Britain and all of Europe were being inexorably dragged deeper and deeper into a seemingly endless orgy of hate and blood and destruction, Russell presented his lectures to growing crowds. He was, at first, buoyed up by the belief that his message was becoming "a rallying ground for intellectuals", if not for the masses.[40]

Eventually, however, he was cast down again by the realization that his audiences were not being "*practically* affected" by his words. As he told Lady Ottoline, "if they have agreed with any single word I have said, they must give up supporting the war".[41] But, alas, most of those who heard him speak came to be comforted or edified or entertained, not to be converted. There were, to be sure, some converts; one of these, Arthur Graeme West, wrote to tell Russell that "some few of us ... are to be relied upon to do twice as much afterwards as we have done during the war.... it is for you that we would wish to live on." Lieutenant West mailed his letter from the Somme; three months later he was dead.[42]

For Russell, the most important message that penetrated through disappointment and tragedy was that the audience to which he really wished to speak was already out practising the message he was preaching. It was in the passionate wildness of the conscientious objectors and war-resisters of the No-Conscription Fellowship that Russell saw the incarnation of the political philosophy he had expressed. Before the lecture series ended, he had appeared at NCF headquarters to offer his services—if they thought he might be useful.[43]

The depth of Bertrand Russell's hatred for the war made it inevitable that sooner or later he would join the NCF. Athough he did a good deal of work for the Union of Democratic Control, more than he has been given credit for,[44] he was never satisfied with the UDC's wartime stance. The Union, he told Ottoline in 1915, might make a considerable contribution after the war "but for the moment they are tumbling over each other in their eagerness to disclaim any lack of patriotism".[45] By contrast, the NCF was both bold and pertinent.

Another attraction for Russell in the NCF was its youth. From the beginning of the war, Russell had felt an overwhelming sense of loss in seeing the lives of so many gifted young men wasted. The personal dimension in this universal tragedy was that Cambridge, within months, was denuded of students. For Russell, who felt he needed the vigour and irreverence of young people to challenge and refresh him, the situation was doubly intolerable.[46] In the leadership of the NCF, most of them under thirty, Russell found both surrogates for his lost students and fulfillment of his faith that there was hope for the future because the "young are all right".[47]

For all this, Russell took rather a long time to take the plunge with the Fellowship. Partly, the delay was because of his work, but more important, I think, it was due to an innate shyness and fear of being rejected or thought ridiculous. This fear was reflected in a letter to Ottoline Morrell noting his reluctance to approach labour leaders because he did not know any of them and, in any case, they would "distrust me for not being one of them".[48] Significantly, when Russell did throw in his lot with the NCF, his point of

contact was Fellowship Chairman Clifford Allen, whom Russell had known slightly at Cambridge.[49]

In the end, of course, what drove Russell to establish the NCF connection he had so long contemplated was the introduction of conscription. From the first days of the war, Russell had warned that "of all the measures open to adopt, none is so likely to bring ... disaster as universal military service". Throughout 1915 he became increasingly distressed with the growing momentum toward compulsion; and by the early days of 1916, he found the "whole conscription outlook ... utterly black.... One can only hope that gradually conscription will make the war unpopular."[50] Russell banked his hopes for the unpopularity of compulsory military service on working-class awareness that the chief motive of conscription was "to obtain a new weapon against organized labour". The means for creating such an awareness seemed to Russell to rest with the NCF because it alone was bringing together both "intellectuals and the better sort of labour.... I believe the future of England depends on this cooperation.... together they might achieve great things after the war."[51]

The first few months of Russell's association with the NCF was perhaps the most exhilarating period of his life. His letters to Ottoline shimmer and sparkle with joy:

> I go on being crazy all day long, loving the people I work with, as happy as a King.... Ever since I got in with the NCF life has been full of happiness.... it is *real* happiness all day long.... I can't describe how happy I am having these men to work with and for.... They have something that is great and vital and important.... Wherever one goes one finds it.... It is inspiring to find the men in the peace movement so splendid everywhere.[52]

Perhaps the most exciting time of all was Russell's triumphant speaking tour in South Wales during June 1916. Organized by the NCF and financed by wealthy Quakers, this tour was the fulfillment of Russell's desire "to stump the country on a stop-the-war campaign". Until this time Russell had never been at ease as a public speaker, but the Welsh tour, in the words of his biographer, "set the seal on his relations with those outside his own academic and social world.... Here, possibly for the first time ... Russell found that emotionally he was giving as well as taking."[53] In a letter to Ottoline, Russell summarized his state of mind: "I enjoy it all.... Quietly lately I have somehow found myself—I have poise and sanity—I no longer have the feeling of powers unrealized within me, which used to be perpetual torture. I don't care what the authorities do to me, they can't stop me long."[54]

There was obviously a sort of euphoria in all this that could not last. But it

was a great turning-point in Russell's life and a great moment for the future of the peace movement. Even though Russell would, within a few months, feel disillusionment with his work for peace (as he would at intervals throughout his life), from the glorious spring of 1916, he never after ceased to be a great moral force in the life of Great Britain—and of the world. He would make serious errors of judgment and he would terribly mismanage personal relationships, but through high and low points, he remained a seminal figure in the effort to bring peace, with all its joys and blessings, to the world.

Russell provides an example to latter-day peace advocates not only for his enduring attachment to principles he first articulated during the Great War, but also for the day-to-day contribution he made to the operation and even the survival of the British peace movement. As more and more of the young conscientious objectors Russell admired so much were arrested and imprisoned, he began to discover the inherent limitations in the NCF position and his enthusiasm waned.[55] Just at this time, however, he was faced with increasing responsibility for keeping the NCF, now at the cutting edge of the peace movement, alive and well. The point cannot be too strongly made here that, despite the continuing myth that the Bloomsbury–Garsington circle, with its brilliant and sparkling company, was "a main focus of the peace movement in Britain",[56] the truth is that Garsington was only a behind-the-lines rest area for privileged peacemakers. The front, at least for those still not in prison, was at a desk or typewriter or speaker's rostrum. Russell went to Garsington about as often as a soldier got relief from the front line; the rest of the time he was in the trenches.

The work that Russell did for the NCF was not only unfamiliar, unattractive and difficult, it also laid him open to the sort of personal (as opposed to intellectual) criticism he had never previously had to endure. By the early months of 1917, when he was acting Chairman for the Fellowship and was drudging away every day in the London headquarters, he had become so dispirited that he told of hoping for some "painful and dangerous illness from now until the end of the war".[57]

One might suppose that, given this state of mind, Russell would have become somewhat crusty and impatient with those who daily confronted him with hosts of problems, mainly trivial—at least from the standpoint of helping to end the war. Quite the opposite seems to have been the case. Russell proved to be the chief conciliator among NCF leaders. No one worked harder to settle difficulties and disputes within the organization; no one took more time and trouble to ease the anxieties of imprisoned C.O.'s and their overwrought families;[58] no one showed more concern and compassion for all the victims of the war, both those who suffered in the fighting and those who suffered because they would not fight. Russell later deprecated his efforts during the Great War as futile,[59] but if he did not succeed in

his objective of making peace, he did provide a shining example of how a peacemaker should act. One of the young women who worked closely with Russell at NCF headquarters later remarked on the sort of role Russell played there: "I always felt that your influence in the offices was in some sense creative: it brought harmony and good feeling where before and *afterwards* there was friction."[60] No wonder that nearly fifty years later, on the occasion of Russell's ninetieth birthday, Constance Malleson recalled: "Russell to some of us who were young in 1916 was the sun that lit our world. His spirit appeared indestructible; and today after the long years, we know that it is."[61]

During those intervening years, there was no more consistent force for peace than Bertrand Russell. And for him, in matters of peace as with every kind of political question, "the indispensable elements ... were a conception of the end and a conception of the means necessary to attain it".[62] There are many who, perhaps justifiably, severely criticized the means Russell advocated at various times during those long years. But if his judgment was sometimes open to question, his end was always the same end he described in a letter written from his prison cell in 1918:

> The world after the war will be a hard utilitarian world.... In such a world, I wish to have the vigour and capacity to keep better ideals alive.... some work of a similar kind will exist for all of us. Let us keep before our minds constantly the thought of serving the world: not some derivative "principle", nor pride, nor desire to confute our opponents, but the positive desire to nourish life in the world rather than to minister to death.[63]

Notes

1 *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 3 vols. (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967–9), 3: 18. *See also Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1959), p. 90.
2 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 21 Nov. 1914 #1151.
3 *See* Martin Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914–1945: The Defining of a Faith* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), pp. 1–17.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 315 and *passim*.
5 *Ibid.*, pp. 3–8.
6 Jo Vellacott, draft copy of biographical sketch of Russell, to be included in *The Biographical Dictionary of Modern Peace Leaders*, ed. Harold Josephson, to be published by Greenwood Press, 1983. I am grateful to Dr. Vellacott for generously allowing me to see the draft of her essay.
7 Russell to Elizabeth Trevelyan, 29 July 1940, Trinity College Library, Cambridge. Cited by Ronald W. Clark, *The Life of Bertrand Russell* (New York: Knopf, 1976), p. 467.
8 Edward Sherman, "Bertrand Russell and the Peace Movement: Liberal Consistency or Radical Change" in *Bertrand Russell's Philosophy*, ed. George Nakhnikian (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1974), p. 258; and Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

9 *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 1: 145–6. Bennett and Nancy Simon, "The Pacifist Turn: An Episode of Mystic Illumination in Russell's Life", *Russell*, no. 13 (Spring 1974): 11–12, 17–24, provide a fascinating, if contentious, Freudian explanation of Russell's reaction at this time. *See also* Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, n.d. #154 and 2 May 1911 #49.

10 *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 1: 153.

11 *See* George M. Trevelyan to Russell, 17 July 1904, in *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 1: 192–3. *See also* Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 23 April 1911 #37 for Russell's apparent lack of concern about conscriptionists.

12 Vellacott, *Bertrand Russell and the Pacifists in the First World War* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1980), pp. 1–6.

13 Russell to G. Lowes Dickinson, 19 July 1903, in *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 1: 187. *See also* Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, 8 May 1914 #1028.

14 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 22 July 1914 #1054. Other letters which expressed a similar view include: postmarked 9 April 1911 #23; postmarked 12 April 1911 #26 and #28; postmarked 24 Feb. 1914 #993; and postmarked 24 June 1914 #1044. The best discussion of the Russell–Ottoline friendship and correspondence is Andrew Brink, "Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell: The Letters of Transformation", *Russell*, nos. 21–22 (Spring–Summer 1976): 3–15.

15 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 24 July 1914 #1057. For Russell's rejection of asceticism and austerity, *see* Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 31 March 1911 #11 and postmarked 22 April 1911 #36.

16 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 1 Aug. 1914 #1063.

17 Vellacott, *op. cit.*, *passim*. *See also* Thomas C. Kennedy, *The Hound of Conscience: A History of the No-Conscription Fellowship, 1914–1919* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1981), which contains information about Russell's activities with the NCF.

18 *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 2: 17, 42–3; and Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 25 June 1915 #1295. *See also* Russell's unpublished letter to *The Nation*, 4 Aug. 1914.

19 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 19 Dec. 1914 #1168. *See also* the following letters: postmarked 27 Sept. 1914 #1117 and postmarked 20 Nov. 1914 #1150.

20 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 22 Jan. 1915 #1208; and *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 2: 20–2, 53–4.

21 *See* Lawrence to Russell, [19? March 1915] and [19 Feb. 1916], in *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, Vol. 2: *June 1913–October 1916*, eds. George J. Zytaruk and James T. Boulton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 309–10, 546–7; and *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 2: 19–24. *See also* Paul Delany, *D. H. Lawrence's Nightmare* (New York: Basic Books, 1978), pp. 77–86.

22 *See* Lawrence, *Kangaroo* (London: Martin Secker, 1930), pp. 238–91; Stephen Spender, "D. H. Lawrence, England and the War" in *D. H. Lawrence: Novelist, Poet, Prophet*, ed. Spender (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), pp. 71–6; and Delany, *op. cit.*, pp. 82–5. A revealing discussion of the Russell–Lawrence relationship can be found in S. P. Rosenbaum, "Bertrand Russell: The Logic of a Literary Symbol" in *Russell in Review*, eds. J. E. Thomas and Kenneth Blackwell (Toronto: Samuel Stevens, Hakkert & Co., 1976), pp. 68–76.

23 Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

24 Keith Robbins, *The Abolition of War: The Peace Movement in Britain, 1914–1919* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1976), pp. 86–8 and *passim*. This account is rather hostile to pacifists in general and to Russell in particular.

25 Herbert Feigl, "Russell and Schlick: A Remarkable Agreement on a Monistic Solution of the Mind-Body Problem" in *Bertrand Russell, Memorial Volume*, ed. George W. Roberts (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1979), p. 332.

26 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 11 Aug. 1914 #1069.

27 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 8 July 1915 #1302 and postmarked 11 June #1286. *See also The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 2: 17.

28 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 13 Feb. 1915 #1222; the reference was to Arthur Ponsonby.

29 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, 11 June 1915 #1286. Russell first heard of the NCF through Irene Cooper-Willis, early in 1915; *see* Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, n.d. [March–April 1915] #1240.

30 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 12 Sept. 1914 #1107 and postmarked 14 Sept. 1914 #1108.

31 Russell, "Why Nations Love War", *War and Peace* [later *International Review*], 2 (Nov. 1914): 20–1.

32 *Principles of Social Reconstruction* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1916), pp. 9–10. There is an interesting discussion of *Principles of Social Reconstruction* in John G. Slater, *Bertrand Russell, Polymath* (Toronto: Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto, 1982), pp. 10–11.

33 *Principles of Social Reconstruction*, pp. 5, 18–20.

34 *Ibid.*, pp. 5, 161–2.

35 *Ibid.*, Chaps. 2–8.

36 *Ibid.*, p. 54. *See also The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 3: 15.

37 *Principles of Social Reconstruction*, pp. 17, 65, 67. In making these points Russell acknowledged his debt to William James's essay "The Moral Equivalent of War" (*see* James, *Memories and Studies* [New York: Longmans, Green, 1911], pp. 267–96). Russell, however, wrongly attributed James's ideas to a speech "delivered to a congress of pacifists during the Spanish-American War of 1898"; in fact, James first presented the lecture at Stanford University on 25 Feb. 1906. *See* Gay Wilson Allen, *William James* (New York: Viking Press, 1967), pp. 451–2.

38 *Principles of Social Reconstruction*, pp. 68–9.

39 *Ibid.*, p. 170.

40 Russell to Lucy Donnelly, 10 Feb. 1916, in *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 2: 59.

41 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 3 March 1916 #1356. *See also* Robert Ginsburg, "The Rhetorical Dilemma of Pacifism", *Peace and Change*, 6 (Winter 1980): 1–6, who makes the point, with particular reference to Russell, that "the contribution ... some citizens make to resolving the problems of war and peace consists in nothing more than having listened with great interest to the speeches ... made by notable persons." Thus, ironically, the more effective the rhetoric of the peace advocate, the less likely it is to inspire action (p. 5).

42 Arthur Graeme West to Russell, Dec. 1916, in *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 2: 76–7.

43 Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 274 and Vellacott, *op. cit.*, pp. 32–43.

44 Vellacott, *op. cit.*, pp. 13–14.

45 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, n.d. #1270. *See also* letter postmarked 11 June 1915 #1286; published in *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 2: 52–3.

46 For Russell's comments about the tragedy of "young men ... who hate war and get killed", *see* Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 19 April 1915 #1249; postmarked 10 May 1915 #1264; and postmarked 14 June 1915 #1288.

47 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, n.d. #1270.

48 *Ibid.*

49 At first, Russell, while he was impressed with Allen's ability as an organizer and chairman, found him "not attractive personally"; *see* Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, 5 Feb. 1916 #1352; postmarked 8 Feb. 1916 #1353; and n.d. #1367. During the course of their association, however, they became very close and even shared rooms together after the war.

50 Russell, "Armaments and National Security", *Labour Leader*, 11 (15 Oct. 1914): 5; and Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 2 Jan. 1916 #1344. (*See also* letter n.d. #1268.)

51 Russell, "On Pending Laws of Conscription", *Labour Leader*, 13 (6 Jan. 1916): 7; and Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, 5 Feb. 1916 #1352.

52 These are extracts from Russell's letters to Lady Ottoline between April and June 1916, #1364, #1368, #1370, #1371, #1393, and #1396.

53 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, n.d. #1382, and Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 294. *See also* Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, n.d. #1375 and #1389.

54 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, n.d. #1387.

55 Russell to Lady Ottoline Morrell, postmarked 16 July 1916 #1407, and 1 Sept. 1916 #1418.

56 Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 280. Russell was himself upset by the attitude of many of the Garsington set. Even before the war he noted how the J. M. Keynes–Lytton Strachey group "aimed rather at a life of retirement among fine shades and nice feelings". On Strachey in particular he told Ottoline: "Lytton is maddening with his superiority. Why doesn't he *do* something? Then he would know how hard it is. I mean something not just as one's own mood dictates, but brought on by outward circumstances" (n.d. #1395).

57 Russell to Catherine Marshall, 3 May 1917 (not sent). This letter was inspired by serious differences between Russell and Marshall involving the operation of NCF headquarters. *See* Vellacott, *op. cit.*, pp. 141–6, 180–1 and Kennedy, *op. cit.*, pp. 216–21.

58 *See*, for example, letter from "Wife of a C.O." to Russell, 4 April 1917. *See also* Vellacott, *op. cit.*, pp. 61–3, 72–7, 103–4, 175–82, 192–6, 204–16, and *passim*.

59 *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 2: 40. On this point, *see* Vellacott, *op. cit.*, pp. 242–9.

60 Gladys Rinder to Russell, n.d. (Russell Archives 710.054822).

61 Quoted by Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 595.

62 Richard Wollheim, "Bertrand Russell and the Liberal Tradition" in *Bertrand Russell's Philosophy*, pp. 218–19.

63 From an untitled two-page typescript [1918, beginning "Despair in regard to the world"] in the Lady Ottoline Morrell papers; a three-page carbon typescript of this short essay is also in the Lady Constance Malleson papers in the Russell Archives. I am grateful to Jo Vellacott for bringing this document to light.