

John V. Day

*Mankind Quarterly*, vol. 55, n° 3, 2015

## **Bertrand Russell on Eugenics**

This brief essay takes a look at Bertrand Russell (1872–1970), the English philosopher and social reformer, and his ideas about eugenics and dysgenics. It is evident from his works that like many other leading thinkers and social reformers of his time, Russell recognized the importance of genetics for human welfare and was deeply concerned about the dysgenic trends that he observed in his time. He included eugenics as an integral part of his moral philosophy and never abandoned the belief in its importance, although he grew increasingly skeptical of some forms of genetic explanation and concerned about the real-world contexts of eugenic policies in his later years.

### **Introduction**

Eugenics, at least in England, is nowadays a word not to be used in polite company. All shades of conventional opinion in the news media have put the subject under a taboo, as shown by two recent articles in the British press. One, in a conservative magazine, rubbishes eugenics as a “dismal pseudo-science.”<sup>1</sup> The other, in a progressive magazine, apologizes for the many rationalists between the world wars who promoted eugenics, a phase in its history that it describes as “Rationalism’s dirty secret.”<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps the last public figure in England to highlight the need for eugenic policies was the Conservative politician Sir Keith Joseph. Giving a speech to party members in 1974, Sir Keith warned that two dysgenic factors were threatening Britain’s “human stock”—the increasing numbers of children born to unmarried mothers of low intelligence and low education, and the increasing numbers of their highly talented compatriots leaving the country.<sup>3</sup> Although Sir Keith’s Jewish ancestry deflected any accusations of Nazism, this speech torpedoed his

chances of becoming leader of the Conservative Party, a post subsequently won by his erstwhile campaign manager, the more flexible Margaret Thatcher.

But there was a time in 20<sup>th</sup>-century England when public figures embraced the idea of eugenics. The first International Eugenics Congress, held in London in 1912, had its inaugural address given by the former Prime Minister Arthur Balfour, while one of the vice-presidents of the Congress was the rising politician Winston Churchill.<sup>4</sup> Other prominent advocates of British eugenics in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century spanned the conservative spectrum from Anthony M. Ludovici, a Nietzschean opponent of Christian ethics, to William Inge, the Dean of St Paul's Cathedral.

Among the more progressive thinkers in England, many of them members of the Fabian Society, who called for eugenic measures were the dramatist George Bernard Shaw, the novelist H.G. Wells, the social reformers Sidney and Beatrice Webb, the economist John Maynard Keynes, the sexologist Havelock Ellis, and the economist William Beveridge, whose 1942 Beveridge Report gave a blueprint for the Welfare State.<sup>5</sup>

One of these progressive figures was Bertrand Russell (1872–1970), philosopher, mathematician, Fellow of the Royal Society, social reformer, peace campaigner, prose stylist, Nobel laureate for literature, aristocrat (who in 1931 succeeded to the title of 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl Russell), lothario and serial husband. Russell took a keen interest in population quality and eugenics throughout his adult life, from the 1890s until the 1960s, and never lost interest in the subject, although he became disillusioned after the Second World War about how unscrupulous rulers might distort eugenic states in practice.

As a young man Russell had his interest in eugenics piqued by reading Darwin's *Descent of Man*, Galton's *Hereditary Genius* and Karl Pearson's *Socialism and Natural Selection*. Once he had become more knowledgeable he often discussed eugenic ideas in correspondence with the biologists Julian Huxley, J.B.S. Haldane and Lancelot Hogben.

## Marriage

Russell's thoughts about eugenics began with the institution of marriage. His 1929 book, *Marriage and Morals*, has a whole chapter on eugenics. A feminist who would stand for parliament in 1907 as women's suffrage candidate, Russell wrote to his fiancée Alys in 1894 and argued that, for the "race" to survive, "the vast majority of women must be mothers."<sup>6</sup> Indeed, women should spend the first ten years of their marriages bearing and raising children.<sup>7</sup> One of Russell's biographers notes that only when the octogenarian Russell married his fourth wife in 1952 did he find "complete marital contentment."<sup>8</sup> Although he spent a great

deal of his life pursuing women, Russell believed that marriages were empty shells when they were barren:

Love is what gives intrinsic value to a marriage, and, like art and thought, it is one of the supreme things which make human life worth preserving. But though there is no good marriage without love, the best marriages have a purpose which goes beyond love.... For the great majority of men and women seriousness in sex relations is most likely to be achieved through children. Children are to most people rather a need than a desire: instinct is as a rule only consciously directed towards what used to lead to children. The desire for children is apt to develop in middle life, when the adventure of one's own existence is past, when the friendships of youth seem less important than they once did, when the prospect of a lonely old age begins to terrify, and the feeling of having no share in the future becomes oppressive.<sup>9</sup>

### **Dysgenics**

But Russell, never an egalitarian, was troubled by the quality of contemporary children. Anyone looking around England in the late 19th and early 20th centuries could see that many of the younger generation were mentally and physically substandard; to mention one example, more than a third of British working-class volunteers to fight in the Boer War (1899–1902) were rejected as physically unfit.<sup>10</sup> What was worse, the more intelligent people in England often used contraception to limit the size of their families, whereas what Russell bluntly called “stupid people” tended to produce larger families.<sup>11</sup> In his words:

The present state of the law, of public opinion, and of our economic system is tending to degrade the quality of the race, by making the worst half of the population the parents of more than half of the next generation.<sup>12</sup>

He spelt out his gloomy analysis in more detail:

In France the population is practically stationary, and in England it is rapidly becoming so; this means that some sections are dwindling while others are increasing. Unless some change occurs, the sections that are dwindling will practically become extinct, and the population will be almost wholly replenished from the sections that are now increasing. The sections that are dwindling include the whole middle-class and the skilled

artisans. The sections that are increasing are the very poor, the shiftless and drunken, the feeble-minded—feeble-minded women, especially, are apt to be very prolific. There is an increase in those sections of the population which still actively believe the Catholic religion, such as the Irish and the Bretons, because the Catholic religion forbids limitation of families. Within the classes that are dwindling, it is the best elements that are dwindling most rapidly. Working-class boys of exceptional ability rise, by means of scholarships, into the professional class; they naturally desire to marry into the class to which they belong by education, not into the class from which they spring; but as they have no money beyond what they earn, they cannot marry young, or afford a large family. The result is that in each generation the best elements are extracted from the working classes and artificially sterilized, at least in comparison with those who are left....

It seems unquestionable that if our economic system and our moral standards remain unchanged, there will be, in the next two or three generations, a rapid change for the worse in the character of the population in all civilized countries, and an actual diminution of numbers in the most civilized.

The diminution of numbers, in all likelihood, will rectify itself in time through the elimination of those characteristics which at present lead to a small birth-rate. Men and women who can still believe the Catholic faith will have a biological advantage; gradually a race will grow up which will be impervious to all the assaults of reason, and will believe imperturbably that limitation of families leads to hell-fire.<sup>13</sup>

Writing in Edwardian England, Russell argued that Britain's apparent success as an economic and military power had in reality led to "biological failure", because the well-off and the victors left fewer descendants than are left by the poor and the vanquished. Consequently courage, intelligence, perseverance, foresight and energy, biologically speaking, were disadvantageous to a race or an individual, and these qualities, if selection continues to operate as at present, will tend to die out of the human race.<sup>14</sup>

Incidentally, like the geneticist Sir Ronald Fisher and the philosopher F.C.S. Schiller, Russell discerned the effects of dysgenics not just in modern times, but also in antiquity:

In the ancient world, it is clear that Greece in the age of Pericles and Rome in the Augustan age were more intelligent than at later times; it is

also fairly clear that the decay of Rome was primarily a decay of intelligence.<sup>15</sup>

As noted above, Russell campaigned for British women to be given the vote. But he was less than starry-eyed about human nature, even declaring in his 1929 *Marriage and Morals* that “women are, on the average, stupider than men.”<sup>16</sup> Unlike Germaine Greer and a legion of academic women who are childless, Russell could foresee that the triumph of feminism would lead over time to the number of feminists dwindling:

Owing to the combination of economic prudence with the increasing freedom of women, there is at present a selective birth-rate of a very singular kind.... In the professional classes the young women who have initiative, energy, or intelligence are as a rule not inclined to marry young, or to have more than one or two children when they do marry. Marriage has been in the past the only obvious means of livelihood for women; pressure from parents and fear of becoming an old maid combined to force many women to marry in spite of a complete absence of inclination for the duties of a wife. But now a young woman of ordinary intelligence can easily earn her own living, and can acquire freedom and experience without the permanent ties of a husband and a family of children. The result is that if she marries she marries late....

Women who have mental interests, who care about art or literature or politics, who desire a career or who value their liberty, will gradually grow rarer, and be more and more replaced by a placid maternal type which has no interests outside the home and no dislike of the burden of motherhood. This result, which ages of masculine domination have vainly striven to achieve, is likely to be the final outcome of women's emancipation and of their attempt to enter upon a wider sphere than that to which the jealousy of men confined them in the past.<sup>17</sup>

### **Eugenic measures**

How were all these dysgenic trends to be reversed? In private, when writing to his fiancée Alys in 1894, Russell speculated about granting marriage certificates to those prospective couples who would make good parents.<sup>18</sup> And in 1907, in his first published paper on eugenics, he advocated that the state should pay “desirable” parents by awarding scholarships for their children's education.<sup>19</sup> In an article of 1928 he even proposed that if scientists knew more about heredity “we could improve the breed indefinitely” in successive generations by having

25% of the women mate with the best 1% of men — conjectural figures which he amended in the 1950s to 30% of women and 5% of men.<sup>20</sup> Perhaps, too, Russell predicted, mankind may one day be transformed by genetic engineering:

If science continues to advance as fast as it has done recently, we may hope, before the end of the present century, to discover ways of beneficially influencing the human embryo, not only as regards those acquired characters which cannot be inherited because they do not affect the chromosomes, but also as regards the chromosomes themselves. It is likely that this result will only be achieved after a number of unsuccessful experiments leading to the birth of idiots or monstrosities. But would this be too high a price to pay for the discovery of a method by which, within one generation, the whole human race could be rendered intelligent?<sup>21</sup>

At the other end of the scale Russell also wanted undesirable people to be prevented from becoming parents, as he explained in an article for the progressive *Jewish Daily Forward* in 1927:

By sterilizing the feeble-minded of two generations, feeble-mindedness and idiocy could be almost stamped out; but here religious scruples intervene, and even humanitarian feelings which lead to the opinion that one man must not be made to suffer for the good of others except as a punishment for sin. Scientifically-minded people naturally grow impatient of these restrictions upon their activities.<sup>22</sup>

Later that year, when an Indian magazine interviewed Russell, he reiterated the need for sterilization:

Our only hope now lies in America, which has already started artificial sterilization of the feeble-minded in the States. That is already a great step forward in the right direction.<sup>23</sup>

Writing in 1928, however, Russell saw any prospects for wide-ranging eugenic reform in America and Europe hindered by political and religious prejudices:

In America and Great Britain, the fetish of democracy stands in the way; in Russia, the Marxian disbelief in biology. Wherever the Catholic

Church is strong, mere quantity tends to be thought alone important. In France, the economic system that has grown up around the Code Napoléon makes any eugenic reform impossible. Probably the best chance is in Germany, but even there it is small.<sup>24</sup>

Russell had to face the inevitable problem of what a eugenic state might achieve in practice. In the 1930s he regretted that the study of heredity was still in its infancy, and so any application of eugenic ideas would be unscientific:

Among men of science there is a natural tendency for heredity to be emphasized by geneticists, while environment is emphasized by psychologists. There is, however, another line of cleavage on this question, not scientific, but political. Conservatives and imperialists lay stress on heredity because they belong to the white race but are rather uneducated. Radicals lay stress on education because it is potentially democratic, and because it gives a reason for ignoring difference of colour.<sup>25</sup>

Nowadays, thanks to the University of Minnesota's twin studies and many other studies in behavior genetics, we know a lot about the inheritance of personality traits and intelligence, but in his day Russell was reduced to pleading for a "scientific millionaire" to fund a study of identical twins separated at birth and raised in very different environments.<sup>26</sup> But even if our rulers were well-informed about behavior genetics, we still cannot be sure they would choose the best people to reproduce:

If we knew enough about heredity to determine, within limits, what sort of population we would have, the matter would of course be in the hands of State officials, presumably elderly medical men. Whether they would really be preferable to Nature I do not feel sure. I suspect that they would breed a subservient population, convenient to rulers but incapable of initiative.<sup>27</sup>

After the Second World War, Russell was increasingly convinced that the solution to many eugenic problems lay in a world government. Only then could sperm banks be created, enabling a significant proportion of women to bear the offspring of geniuses,<sup>28</sup> and only then could politicians tackle the problem of global overpopulation:

The population of the world is increasing, and its capacity for food production is diminishing. Such a state of affairs obviously cannot continue very long without producing a cataclysm. To deal with this problem it will be necessary to find ways of preventing an increase in world population. If this is to be done otherwise than by wars, pestilence, and famines, it will demand a powerful international authority. This authority should deal out the world's food to the various nations in proportion to their population at the time of the establishment of the authority. If any nation subsequently increased its population it should not on that account receive any more food. The motive for not increasing population would therefore be very compelling.<sup>29</sup>

### Racial problems

At various periods in his life, and especially after Adolf Hitler's rise to national prominence in Germany, Russell derided such racial doctrines as "the Yellow Peril, Australia for the Australians, and the superiority of the Nordic race."<sup>30</sup> His 1932 book *Education and the Social Order* dismissed the idea that "negroes are congenitally inferior to white men" as an unwarranted assumption,<sup>31</sup> and in later life he claimed he had never suggested that blacks were inferior to whites.

Yet in the 1929 first edition of his *Marriage and Morals* Russell was explicit about racial differences: "It seems on the whole fair to regard negroes as on the average inferior to white men." Later editions of the book reversed this opinion by 180° to read: "There is no sound reason to regard negroes as on the average inferior to white men, although for work in the tropics they are indispensable, so that their extermination (apart from the question of humanity) would be highly undesirable."<sup>32</sup>

But even as late as 1949, in the second edition of *The Scientific Outlook*, Russell was still implying that any forthcoming scientific society would regard "negroes" as being low in intelligence:

If we were right in supposing that the scientific society will have different social grades according to the kind of work to be performed, we may assume also that it will have uses for human beings who are not of the highest grade of intelligence. It is probable that there will be certain kinds of labour mainly performed by negroes, and that manual workers in general will be bred for patience and muscle rather than for brains. The governors and experts, on the contrary, will be bred chiefly for their intellectual powers and their strength of character. Assuming that both kinds of breeding are scientifically carried out, there will come to be an



increasing divergence between the two types, making them in the end almost different species.<sup>33</sup>

As for the White Australia policy, which until recently successive Australian governments enforced to stop its vast but largely empty territory being settled by Asians, when Russell lectured on “Birth Control and International Relations” in 1922 he drew attention to Japan’s imperialism and the “persistent efforts” made by Japanese to emigrate to Australia, forecasting that any barriers erected by whites to keep “coloured races” out of large parts of the world would sooner or later break down:

This policy may last some time, but in the end under it we shall have to give way—we are only putting off the evil day; the only real remedy is birth control, that is getting the people of the world to limit themselves to those numbers which they can keep upon their own soil.... I do not see how we can hope permanently to be strong enough to keep the coloured races out; sooner or later they are bound to overflow, so the best we can do is to hope that those nations will see the wisdom of Birth Control.... We need a strong international authority.<sup>34</sup>

### **Ethics of war**

These days, few general readers know about Russell’s views on eugenics or have studied his *Principia Mathematica*. Most people associate him with agnosticism and campaigns for peace. His support for conscientious objectors during the First World War landed him in prison, and he later opposed Nazi expansionism, the post-war British nuclear programme, American involvement in Vietnam, and—at the age of 97, just months before he died—what he regarded as Israeli aggression in the Middle East. But in 1915, during, paradoxically, the First World War, this pacifist of pacifists wrote an article for a philosophical journal on “the ethics of war” which championed the colonial wars that had advanced European civilization:

By a “war of colonization” I mean a war whose purpose is to drive out the whole population of some territory and replace it by an invading population of a different race. Ancient wars were very largely of this kind, of which we have a good example in the Book of Joshua. In modern times the conflicts of Europeans with American Indians, Maories, [*sic*] and other aborigines in temperate regions, have been of this kind. Such wars are totally devoid of *technical* justification, and are apt to be more ruthless than any other war. Nevertheless, if we are to judge by results, we cannot

regret that such wars have taken place. They have the merit, often quite fallaciously claimed for all wars, of leading in the main to the survival of the fittest, and it is chiefly through such wars that the civilized portion of the world has been extended from the neighborhood of the Mediterranean to the greater part of the earth's surface. The eighteenth century, which liked to praise the virtues of the savage and contrast them with the gilded corruption of courts, nevertheless had no scruple in thrusting the noble savage out from his North American hunting grounds. And we cannot at this date bring ourselves to condemn the process by which the American continent has been acquired for European civilization. In order that such wars may be justified, it is necessary that there should be a very great and undeniable difference between the civilization of the colonizers and that of the dispossessed natives. It is necessary also that the climate should be one in which the invading race can flourish. When these conditions are satisfied the conquest becomes justified, though the actual fighting against the dispossessed inhabitants ought, of course, to be avoided as far as is compatible with colonizing. Many humane people will object in theory to the justification of this form of robbery, but I do not think that any practical or effective objection is likely to be made.<sup>35</sup>

But, Russell suggested, the time for any European wars of colonization had long since gone:

Such wars ... belong now to the past. The regions where the white men can live are all allotted, either to white races or to yellow races to whom the white man is not clearly superior, and whom, in any case, he is not strong enough to expel. Apart from small punitive expeditions, wars of colonization, in the true sense, are no longer possible. What are nowadays called colonial wars do not aim at the complete occupation of a country by a conquering race; they aim only at securing certain governmental and trading advantages. They belong, in fact, rather with what I call wars of prestige, than with wars of colonization in the old sense. There are, it is true, a few rare exceptions. The Greeks in the second Balkan war conducted a war of colonization against the Bulgarians; throughout a certain territory which they intended to occupy, they killed all the men, and carried off all the women. But in such cases, the only possible justification fails, since there is no evidence of superior civilization on the side of the conquerors.<sup>36</sup>

## Legacy

For a variety of reasons, many of those who pontificate about eugenics one way or the other never reproduce themselves. The Catholic writer G.K. Chesterton, the great British opponent of eugenics in its heyday, left no children. And, between them, the eugenicists Sir Francis Galton, Anthony M. Ludovici, Dean Inge, George Bernard Shaw, the Webbs, Havelock Ellis and John Maynard Keynes managed to produce a combined total of one offspring, a daughter to Dean Inge who died in childhood, although the childless Ellis and Keynes at least had the excuse of being homosexual.

Bertrand Russell, a decided heterosexual, fathered three children, and yet in spite of his penetrating intellect one may wonder whether he passed on the best genome. As the historian Stephen Heathorn observes, Russell and his first wife “made a fundamentally eugenic decision not to have children with one another precisely because they had been warned by Russell’s family of the prevalence of mental illness among their ancestors”.<sup>37</sup> In the event, Russell’s son John by his second marriage inherited the family’s predisposition to schizophrenia and then passed it on to two of his own daughters.<sup>38</sup>

Russell had once written, in hindsight somewhat recklessly: “If the State is to undertake the expense of children, it has the right, on eugenic grounds, to know who the father is, and to demand a certain stability in a union.”<sup>39</sup> But he later fell short of meeting his own basic requirements. Russell and his second wife Dora Black had an open marriage, and she assumed, to her husband’s dismay, that their “openness” allowed her to have one child by him and two more by one of her lovers, the young American journalist Griffin Barry.<sup>40</sup>

So far as Russell’s own inheritance goes, he did father the historian Conrad Russell but he never left us Sir Francis Galton’s projected “galaxy of genius.” Nor did he ever work as a biologist to advance our understanding of heredity or show us how to create a eugenic state. What he did leave instead was many articles and book chapters, written from the viewpoint of a highly perceptive layman, arguing in favor of mankind’s biological improvement. These ideas reflect his own times. For example, Russell’s *Marriage and Morals* appeared in 1929 and in the next few years received over a hundred reviews, none of them rejecting its belief in eugenics.<sup>41</sup> The negative reactions began arriving only after the Second World War, and this was when Russell, too, became more cautious. When he spoke out against Christian teachings, Russell showed his fearlessness, bearing in mind the establishment forces arrayed against him; but when, during his heyday, he argued in favor of eugenics, he was merely swimming with the mainstream.

**Notes**

- <sup>1</sup> Sewell (2009), 19.  
<sup>2</sup> Appleby (2011), 38.  
<sup>3</sup> Joseph (1974).  
<sup>4</sup> Gilbert (2009); Lynn (2001), 293-294; Pearson (1996), 23.  
<sup>5</sup> Lynn (2001), 23-24; Pearson (1996), 22.  
<sup>6</sup> Heathorn (2005), 128.  
<sup>7</sup> Heathorn (2005), 116.  
<sup>8</sup> Quinton (1997), 471.  
<sup>9</sup> Russell (1916), 191-193.  
<sup>10</sup> Heathorn (2008), 4.  
<sup>11</sup> Heathorn (2005), 116-117, 124.  
<sup>12</sup> Russell (1916), 195-196.  
<sup>13</sup> Russell (1916), 177-178, 180-181.  
<sup>14</sup> Heathorn (2008), 5.  
<sup>15</sup> Russell (1928), 81. Cf. Russell (1916), 181.  
<sup>16</sup> Monk (2000), 88.  
<sup>17</sup> Russell (1916), 178-179, 181.  
<sup>18</sup> Heathorn (2008), 3.  
<sup>19</sup> Heathorn (2005), 116; (2008), 3.  
<sup>20</sup> Heathorn (2008), n.88; Russell (1952), 62.  
<sup>21</sup> Russell (1949), 176.  
<sup>22</sup> Heathorn (2005), 135.  
<sup>23</sup> Heathorn (2008), 23.  
<sup>24</sup> Russell (1928), 80-81.  
<sup>25</sup> Russell (1932), 45.  
<sup>26</sup> Russell (1932), 47.  
<sup>27</sup> Russell (1924), cited from <<http://cscs.umich.edu/~crshalizi/lcarus.html>>.  
<sup>28</sup> Heathorn (2008), 16.  
<sup>29</sup> Russell (1952), 124-125.  
<sup>30</sup> Russell (1949), 191-192.  
<sup>31</sup> Russell (1932), 51-52.  
<sup>32</sup> Monk (2000), 104-105.  
<sup>33</sup> Russell (1949), 259-260.  
<sup>34</sup> Quoted by Chesterton (1922), 162-163. Cf. Russell (1954), 54.  
<sup>35</sup> Russell (1915), 134 (his italics).  
<sup>36</sup> Russell (1915), 134-135.  
<sup>37</sup> Heathorn (2005), 113.  
<sup>38</sup> Andreasen (2000), 109; Monk (1994-5) 124; Overskeid (2004), 4-5.  
<sup>39</sup> Russell (1916), 185.  
<sup>40</sup> Quinton (1997), 468.  
<sup>41</sup> Heathorn (2005), 136-137.

**References**

- Andreasen, Nancy C. (2000). Schizophrenia: The fundamental questions. *Brain Research Reviews* 31: 106-112.
- Appleby, John (2011). Rationalism's dirty secret. *New Humanist* 126(1): 38-41.
- Chesterton, G. K. [1922]. *Eugenics and Other Evils*. Michael W. Perry (ed.). Seattle: Inkling Books, 2000.

MANKIND QUARTERLY 2015 55:3

Gilbert, Sir Martin (2009). Churchill and eugenics.

<[www.winstonchurchill.org/support/the-churchill-centre/publications/finest-hour-online/594-churchill-and-eugenics](http://www.winstonchurchill.org/support/the-churchill-centre/publications/finest-hour-online/594-churchill-and-eugenics)>

Heathorn, Stephen (2005). Explaining Russell's eugenic discourse in the 1920s. *Russell: The Journal of Bertrand Russell Studies* 25(2): 107-139.

Heathorn, Stephen (2008). Bertrand Russell and eugenics. In: Alan Schwerin (ed), *Russell Revisited*, pp. 1-23. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Joseph, Sir Keith (1974). Speech at Edgbaston ("our human stock is threatened"). <[www.margarethatcher.org/document/101830](http://www.margarethatcher.org/document/101830)>

Lynn, Richard (2001). *Eugenics: A Reassessment*. Westport: Praeger.

Monk, Ray (1994-5). The madness of truth: Russell's admiration for Joseph Conrad. *Russell: Journal of the Bertrand Russell Archives* 14: 119-134.

Monk, Ray (2000). *Bertrand Russell, 1921-1970*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Overskeid, Geir (2004). Solitary pain: Bertrand Russell as cognitive therapist. *The Psychological Record* 54: 3-14.

Pearson, Roger (1996). *Heredity and Humanity*. Washington DC: Scott-Townsend Publishers.

Quinton, Anthony (1997). Russell, Bertrand Arthur William (1872-1970): Third Earl Russell. In: Colin Matthew (ed), *Brief Lives*, pp. 461-472. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Russell, Bertrand (1915). The ethics of war. *International Journal of Ethics* 25(2): 127-142.

Russell, Bertrand (1916). *Principles of Social Reconstruction*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Russell, Bertrand (1924). *Icarus, or The Future of Science*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner.

Russell, Bertrand (1928). Science. In: Charles A. Beard (ed), *Whither Mankind*, pp. 63-82. New York: Longmans, Green and Co.

Russell, Bertrand (1929). *Marriage and Morals*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Russell, Bertrand (1932). *Education and the Social Order*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Russell, Bertrand (1949). *The Scientific Outlook*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Russell, Bertrand (1952). *The Impact of Science on Society*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Russell, Bertrand (1954). *Nightmares of Eminent Persons and Other Stories*. London: The Bodley Head.

Sewell, Dennis (2009). How eugenics poisoned the welfare state. *The Spectator* (28 November): 18-19.