Russell's signature. A recent catalogue issued by Charles Hamilton
Auctions of New York purports to distinguish between two reproduced
signatures as secretarial and genuine. Alas, the one designated "secre­
tarial" is as genuine as can be. The other looks as if it was written
by Russell while descending from a cab during an earthquake. Hamilton's
hastily Inducted conclusion that Russell rarely, in old age, signed his
letters Is also mistaken. The evidence of the Archives is the complete
occasion~

The Bertrand Russell Society. Talking with the other 10 "Founders"
of the Society in New York earlier this month led me to reflect that it
would hardly matter if the Society accomplished nothing else but occasion­
ally to bring together, over an ounce or two of Red Hackle, people with
common interests in Russell. But no doubt the various action committees
will accomplish more than that. Tid-bits gleaned from the New York Times
while there: Jane Fonda's anti-war protests were in part inspired by the
"Russell tribunal" investigating U.S. war crimes in Vietnam; and the
reviewer of Macmillan's memoirs covering the Cuban Crisis remarked that
Russell was the only effective Englishman at the time.

Contributors. John G. Slater, associate professor of philosophy
and chairman of the department of philosophy at the university of Toronto,
was chosen several years ago to be general editor of The Collected Essays
of Bertrand Russell. Lester E. Denonn, who possesses one of the two lar­
gest private collections of Russelliana, compiled the original Russell
bibliography for A. Schilpp's The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell, now
in its fifth edition. He and Robert E. Egner are soon bringing out an
enlarged edition of The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russell.

New Russell Debate. I had heard rumours that Russell had debated
with Mortimer J. Adler, but could find no listing of the debate in any
catalogue. Even Dr. Adler, who, when I wrote him, confirmed that the
debate took place (in Chicago), denied ever seeing it in printed form.
But thanks to the kindness of The Guild Bookshop in Chicago, we now have
a photocopy of it. It is a 24-page mimeographed typescript, with the
title-page as follows: SINAI TEMPLE FORUM / presents / DEBATE: ARE THERE
ABSOLUTE PRINCIPLES ON WHICH EDUCATION SHOULD BE FOUNDED? / by / BERTRAND
RUSSELL ... and / DR. MORTIMER J. ADLER ... / SINAI TEMPLE / 4600 South
Parkway / [21 January] 1941. Only one original is known to exist, and
we do not know who has it; but there must be more copies around in Chicago.
There may even be another printed debate with Adler. He told me at a
reception for the new Sanakopokia Britamica that he agreed to a second
debate with Russell, providing Russell would take the affirmative position
for once. It took Russell half a year to find a proposition he would
defend! It was: Resolved that science is enough for the good life and
the good society. According to Adler, in less than five minutes Russell
was negating this proposition.

Quotations. Can anyone help us with these alleged quotations from
Russell? (1) "Concerning Locke's primary qualities, did Russell use the
expression 'the self-assertion of matter'? (2) Russell invented the
word game of "I am firm, you are obstinate, he is a pig-headed fool".
But when? Was it not earlier than the New Statesman competition of 5
June 1948? And did he call this irregular verb a "bastard conjugation"?
(3) "Logic and mathematics ... are the alphabet of the book of nature,
not the book itself" quoted by Wood in My Philosophical Development, p.
277. (4) "Philosophers are fond of endless puzzles about ethical values
and the basis of morals. My own belief is that as far as politics and
practical living are concerned, we can sweep aside all these puzzles,
and use common sense principles" (Wood, Passionate Skeptics, p. 231).

Russell and Trotsky. A new compilation, Trotsky on Britain (New
York: Pathfinder Press, 1973), includes both Russell's 1926 review of
Trotsky's Where is Britain Going? and Trotsky's hitherto untranslated
rejoinder. He considered Russell "a mathematician in philosophy, a
philosopher in mathematics, an aristocrat in democracy, and a dilettante
in socialism." Too bad!

Omission. The citation for the original publication of Russell's
unsigned review of Boutroux's William James (reprinted in Russell II)
is the Cambridge Review, 34(5 Dec. 1912), 176.