

“CLARK’S FATUOUS BOOK”:  
COMMENTS ON RONALD W. CLARK’S  
*LIFE OF BERTRAND RUSSELL*  
(Part 2)

EDITH RUSSELL

*Edith Russell had already written the lives of Carey Thomas and Wilfrid Scawen Blunt when she married Bertrand Russell in 1952. She ordered and preserved his files as no one before had, and took a great interest in his earlier years as she did, of course, in his current campaigns and family. When Clark’s Life appeared in 1975, she reacted strongly to it. She wrote three drafts of comments, each draft more extensive than the last, and including information only she would have. She numbered the comments within the chapters and referred to them in her final (and often difficult) manuscript by page and comment number. On the verso of the dustjacket, having turned it inside out, she wrote: “Clark’s fatuous book”; then she replaced the jacket in its new state. Not all of her original comments are present in the final version, which she headed “Comments on Clark’s Biography of BR; Rather Rough Notes”. She also made a summary of her overall attitude and complaints. Altogether Countess Russell laboured hard in her effort to correct for researchers—especially future biographers—what she saw as imbalance, errors in fact, and appreciation of her esteemed husband. Along with similar but shorter critical notes on Dora Russell’s autobiography and a draft book by Michael Burn, the document was listed in the finding-aid to her papers (see S. Turcon, “The Edith Russell Papers”, Russell 12 [1992]: 61–78). This unabridged, second excerpt covers Chapters 8 through 20, up to the founding of Pugwash. My notes are in angle brackets.*

*Michael Burn provides an insight into Edith Russell and her comments. “With people who wanted to interview her about Bertie she often felt ‘a desperate sense of inadequacy to express what she knew to be true’. She was aware that whatever she said, that happened not to accord with what the interviewer happened to think, or wish to think, was lessened in his mind (she once wrote me) ‘by the fact that I love Bertie entirely’” (Burn, Turned towards the Sun: an Autobiography (Wilby, Norwich: Michael Russell, 2003, pp. 267–8)).—K.B.*

## Chapter 8 “Ottoline: Ebbing Tide”

200/1 Clark should have discussed this silly assessment of O’s (Ottoline Morrell’s). There is much to be said against it, yet Clark apparently accepts it.

Cf. my notes on Gathorne-Hardy’s two vols.

201/2 Clark doesn’t appear to recognize the difference between careful, considered statements and casual, superficial talk.

I think that Clark, in this discussion of ethics, should have pointed on to *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*. Why, in face of it, does he say that B. “stuck here” for only 30 years?

“But he is a scoundrel”—characteristic dismissal and not intended to be taken too seriously. In context people usually understood this but, occasionally, there was an “earnest” interlocutor or one who wanted to use the denigration.

201/3 Except for a difference in scale, the mixture sounds remarkably like that in most human beings.

202/4 Clark almost never identifies the characters whom he introduces. In this case he should have pointed out that the gathering was largely one of Stanleys. Mrs. Churchill and V.S. were B’s cousins. He derived the same sort of enjoyment in observing them as he did in observing the Stanleys in Albemarle Street.

204/5 Interesting about the lack of civilizing power of music. Astute and perceptive about the limitations of W (Wittgenstein).

205/6 Clark does not add, as I think he should, that B. later (in the 1950’s) thought that he had been only partially right. B. had gradually come to the point where he saw the way out of the difficulties. He wanted then (1950’s ff.) to take up the work again, but he was drawn off by what he felt a far more important duty: to try to prevent the destruction of human life etc. threatened by nuclear fission and The Bomb.

[This Bertie told to me]. We talked about it off and on.

I should have told this to K. Blackwell when he queried it (Wittgenstein and *Theory of Knowledge*). But I had—unhappily, as I sometimes do—forgot it and only came upon a note that reminded me a short time ago, too late for Blackwell.

206–7 It is a relief to have some annual dates given. The book is so arranged that it goes forward and back—necessarily in so long a chronology—but without sufficient signposts as to when and where. Too much is left for the reader to do.

206–7/8 Wittgenstein’s attack and O’s aloofness. Madness. Struggle on brink of madness.

208/9 Why name only Lucy Silcox whom B. liked but was of little importance to him. Clark seems to have a fixation upon the women in B’s life.

---

208/10 He practised his Italian but Sanger, who could speak it perfectly, refused to speak Italian.

211/11 Good for Clark. A pity that he does not seem to remember these words of his own more often. At any rate he shows some sense here. Heavy handed, however.

213/12 A very revealing paragraph of B’s own character. Clark chooses his quotations admirably—but he has a rich quarry to excavate.

216/13 “The green eyes of the satyr were *already beginning to show*.”

Wiener does not seem to be a very good judge. A prig of prigs, and a jealous one. Also, it is questionable if, even later, the comment is just.

220–1/14 Necessary for the imagination to be touched and some sense of mystery to be felt. Significant.

223/15 Excellent!

224/16 And yet, after all this, she was surprised, later, that she had not understood the strength of B’s longing for children and companionship. It is surprising. It makes clearer why B. says “you have heart, but not understanding”. He was right, at any rate in the second half of the statement.

#### Chapter 9 “An American Adventure”

225/1 Characteristic, B’s attitude towards Poincaré.

230/2 Clark’s one reference to Margaret L. Davies—à propos letter from Harvard!

231/3 B’s pupils usually were “the bright side of the coin” but I think that Clark overstresses B’s resentment vs. those who “inveigled” him across the Atlantic. Perhaps this is Clark’s “humour” and his fixation on B’s determination to see conspiracies.

232/4 This shows equally well B’s dread of misleading and hurting. As to “Mr. Apollinax”—poetry, after all is fiction. B. refused a good many ladies who besought him for his attention—Lucy Donnelly and Lion Phillimore for instance, and the eldest d’Aranyi sister.

232/5 Clark must have got hold of a mis-dated letter or has mistaken or misinterpreted it. “Blue bells” do not grow wild in Cambridge Mass. in the spring or any other time.

233/6 Somewhere, Clark should call attention to passages such as this—especially in view of O’s and others reiteration of B’s lack of perception or interest in beauty.

233/7 This is an unwarranted slur.

Also McT (McTaggart)’s attitude was largely one of personal jealousy and the dislike of humiliation.

234/8 Clark should not quote as reliable Freda Utley’s remarks, especially those made after she became enraged with him because he refused to see her again. He nowhere, I think, traces F. Utley’s relationship to B. Nor does he any-

---

where place Freda Utley, except to say, later, that she is an American. If he had troubled to look at her *Lost Illusion*, published by Allen and Unwin in 1949, he would know that she is English to the bone. He would know, also, the early years of her relationship with B.

Presumably Clark so greatly overstresses this “lustfulness” for the sake of titillating his readers and selling his book. It is I suppose meant to be “new material”.

235/9 O. showed more percipience and balance than Clark.

Also, and after all, B. need not have mentioned H.D. (Helen Dudley) to O. Few men would have. [It is also to be noted that he need not have mentioned H.D. in his autobiography. B. made no attempt to hide anything up that might be interpreted as showing a flaw in himself. He only hid things up that implicated others whom he did not wish to hurt.]

#### Chapter 10 “Against the Stream”

237/1 Couldn’t have been much of a surprise. On p. 235 Clark himself quotes a passage from B. mentioning the probability of O. being hurt by being told about H.D.

237/2 “The adoring Miss Dudley”. Clark is very crude—jarring.

238/3 There is more in this quotation than a “literary red herring”. Crude again.

238/4 This analysis is very acute and I think that Clark should have so emphasized it.

239/5 “Somewhat tardy statements”. How quickly does Clark think that one can become aware of and understand oneself so clearly? In bits and pieces this had already been said at various times to O. though she never seems to have brought herself quite to grasp and admit its accuracy.

243/6 They were never “competitors”. Certainly never in B’s mind. Nor, I think, in O’s. Equally certainly I. Cooper Willis was assuredly never a “competitor”.

244/7 Clark is good at setting out clearly B’s position in regard to the 1914 war. Probably because it has already been studied and set out so thoroughly by B. and by many others.

244/8 The “conspiracy view of history” again. What clap-trap it leads Clark into about Macmillan and Kennedy—who would have been equally as culpable if acting from thoughtlessness or ignorance. But how right B. has proved about conspiracy.

246/9 The power of thinking vs. instinct. Good!

247/10 Odd that Clark does not see this as conspiracy!

249/11 Clark uses this quotation about the voice of God as if it related to his relations with the Whiteheads instead of to the War.

251/12 This is a very inadequate description of Morel.

---

No mention in all this of B’s work with Germans in England that O., wisely, urged upon him.

252/13 The aims of the Union of Democratic Control.

252/14 B. was a good strategist or tactician. This passage shows it more clearly than it throws light upon B’s “pro-germanism”.

253/15 Especially in view of the following years and through the Second War this seems to me not fantasy but clear vision—not to say prophetic.

254/16 B’s belief in “an international organization able and willing to secure obedience by force” continued to be held by him to the end. And the belief in “passive resistance” certainly remained in the background throughout. The difficulty lay in procuring such an organization or such resistance. Clark should, I think, have noted this and tied his book together. But it is never tied together—partly because the material, the details, are insufficiently digested and, I suppose, because of the lack of space.

255/17 The infamy of the F.O. (Foreign Office) was not forgotten later.

But Clark does not say, as he should, that these statements, read superficially as “over-statements” are merely exact statements of fact baldly stated. As such they were entirely unpalatable—but could not be refuted.

255/18 B’s judgment of the four kinds of war surprises Clark. But it is difficult—I should think impossible as B. explains them—to find a flaw.

256/19 Is the *Principles of Social Reconstruction* the first of B’s popular political books? What about *Justice in War Time*?

260/20 Small wonder if B’s dislike of L. was stronger than Lawrence’s of B. considering Lawrence’s letters to B.

B. was not 5’7”. At the age of 80 he was 5’9” and probably taller earlier. In photos of those days he looks anything but “scrawny”—too solid perhaps. I should doubt if the jealousy that Clark feels was there on B’s part and I do not think it was jealousy concerning women anyway.

265/21 I do not think that B’s words about Lawrence in this BBC talk were so “harsh” and certainly not unjustifiably harsh as this suggests.

Nor was B’s a “lifetime of abuse”.

265/22 Pretty “harsh”! And not very exact portraits.

268/23 Clark evidently does not know much about Gilbert’s (Gilbert Murray’s) character.

268/24 Clark is making copy here (as well as not understanding G.M’s sentimentality and timidity). Does he—Clark—always *speak* well of his friends even “in the heat of the moment” or in casual talk?

269/25 Is this the letter in which L, from harsh criticism, turns to sugar and finally demands that B. leave him his money? Clark does not mention this revealing sequence.

270/26 Here Clark calls *Social Reconstruction* B’s second political book. Cf. p. 256/19. What was the first? Does the distinction between C’s two labels rest on “popular”?

---

270/27 Very interesting passage about the music of prose.

271/28 Interesting at this moment in view of Dora, John and Kate vs B's estate.

## Chapter II "Into Battle"

272/1 "Power over people's minds" = B's chief desire. This is very important and deserves discussion: Why did he want it? What sort of power? Etc. etc. But it (*sic*) doesn't get it. However, Clark permits B. to, himself, explain what he believes is the way towards achieving a great ambition and to give a clear-sighted view of the situation and his place in it.

274/2 Clark does not refer to this passage when he combats clap-trap about B's "Germanism". Yet it is explicit.

276/3 B. did not gloat. Nor did he exaggerate, as Lytton did, for the purpose of amusing or merely to be clever. In fact most of what are termed B's exaggeration are merely concise and unadorned and exact statements. Cf. *Autobiography* and J. Nicod's remark.

276/4 Clark, as usual, takes Elizabeth at face value.

276/5 Was it "a gross overestimate" of what the NCF was likely to accomplish or was it merely the ebulliance necessary to carry him on and through?

277/6 Perhaps it had little effect upon Lloyd George—or even an adverse effect—but it bucked up B's colleagues no end, and that was sorely needed at the time.

278/7 I think that this is another case of finding and manufacturing fun in order to pull through inevitable grim horrors.

279/8 It is surprising that Clark is impressed here by B's impact on "ordinary mortals" when in the late years of B's life Clark appears totally unimpressed by the same thing. I suppose this is because 1916 is far enough away and points of view have changed, making B. respectable and far-sighted and even admirable then. In more recent times, however, B. still remains wrong-headed etc. etc. Also, in 1916, his chief impact was upon the British whereas later it was equally, or more, upon foreigners—and Clark is too insular to rely upon foreigners' judgments.

280/9 An excellent description of B. at a friendly gathering.

285–6/10 Good for Clark!

B's remark that he needs stimulus and the stimulus of a feeling of success, whereas failure makes him collapse, is percipient. But he was not a vampire.

289/11 The 29th of what year. (1916, May.) Clark does not give the year nearly often enough in a book which, perhaps necessarily, see-saws back and forth in time. It is very difficult to follow. He puts far too much upon the reader.

289/12 In his analysis of two weaknesses that later (he says) led to disaster, Clark does not take into account, for instance, a situation in which the lesser of

---

two evils must be put up with. Moreover, I suspect that Clark’s later discovery of these two weaknesses is in very large part the result of their nearness to today and their infringement of C’s prejudices which time has not yet softened. So much for the “objective biographer”.

290/13 A remarkably wise observation of B’s. It should have been discussed in view of Clark’s later criticisms. It is:

“I don’t know how one *can* advocate an unpopular cause unless one is either irritating or ineffective.”

293/14 “Perhaps learned at Granny’s knee”. Clark’s crudity.

294/15 “The confidence of a Russell” seems a bit shaky in view of the shyness of a Russell.

294/16 B’s objective view of his mind.

295/17 Question this. What about special cases as evidence: various men and various women: C. Allen, I. Pretious, Clark’s “R’s dark lady” etc. etc.

Also, in view of the amount of emotion spent upon O. [which she could not cope with] it doesn’t seem to hold water.

295/18 Peace at last for a little time after the S. Wales adventure and success.

296/19 Clark should take advantage of this paeon of praise of Workers’ Education (in 1916) to point forward to B’s later sponsorship of the Institute for Workers’ Control in the ’60’s.

From here on (p. 296–7–8 to end of chap.) reads like Defoe’s “They’re at a loss to find his guilt / And can’t commit his crime.”

298/20 Samuel finds no question that “he is an enemy agent”. How cd. B. ever have forgiven him and been so kind to him in the ’50’s?

I remember an occasion when they were both to speak on the BBC. Samuel was in a great taking about it and telephoned at all sorts of hours and pressed B. to lunch with him to discuss the occasion. He was altogether in a great fuss. B. took it with the greatest good nature and kindness and helped Samuel all that he could.

304/21 Probably “his listeners” did know it. It was current gossip in many circles.

Clark is very brave in pointing out the Govt.’s follies at this time. It is safely far in the past.

## Chapter 12 “Colette”

307/1 This is a distortion of the truth and shows Clark’s only superficial understanding of what went on. Bertie did continue to love Colette—he did not “abandon” her after five years. But he had by 1921 been obliged to recognize that Colette would not have children and would be but an uneasy companion. He gives the impression that he does in his autobiography to spare Colette. Her own book ends at that time and her ms. which carries on the story and which Clark has now read has not been published. (The typescript of Constance Mal-

---

leson's book of her letters to Russell is at McMaster.) She, so far as B. could discover, was quite happy with B's account in the *Autobiography*. He scrupulously took care to send it to her before publication. She made a suggestion or two, corrected a date and some other mistake that he had made (I can't now remember the exact details) and he duly changed his account to meet her criticism. He feared that to carry on the tale would be to humiliate her. He continued to be fond of her and even to love her, but he knew that to try to take up where they had left off during the 19-teens would bring only disaster. He had ceased some time before the time that he published the autobiography to be "in love" with her and felt only affection—and that only when something like the birthday roses recalled her. And he felt the deepest concern for and sympathy with her in her illnesses in the 50's and 60's. And he was grateful for her continued love. But he had long since recognized the too high a key for comfort that she demanded. B. usually makes, not the best, but the worst of his story—as to my way of thinking, he does here.

What Clark does not admit is that Colette herself was promiscuous and had any number of affairs. Also, she utterly refused to have another child. It was she, not he, who broke off the affaire to begin with.

He also never mentioned Miles Malleon's odd attitude.

309/2 " ... however seriously he may have regarded her as a reserve player ... " Ugh!

313/3 Frank's "savage treatment" of his wife? Clark always seems to accept what others say of B. and Frank rather than what they say. There seems to have been no attempt on Clark's part to understand Frank or to understand the people who have written about B. or F.

315/4 Clark does not say what the letter says, beyond giving the first sentence and the peroration. Is this because it is published in the *Autobiography*? If so, Clark should say so.

316/5 But it made considerable impact upon lay opinion in the U.S.A.

318/6 What strange and unimportant things Clark admits to lifting from the *Autobiography*.

320/7 It is an account re-shaped and sheared.

326/8 "There was also Mrs. Eliot, not so easily shuffled off as was Helen Dudley."

It is odd that Clark thinks that H.D. was easily "shuffled off". It was far from "easy" and H.D. could hardly be said with truth to have been "shuffled off".

327/9 She was charitable—why not?! It is maddening of Clark never to suggest O's own doings with various visitors to Garsington.

328/10 Clark shows unexpected percipience here.

329/11 His hair remained jet black at the nape of his neck.

This sounds more like B's laugh than most of the descriptions that Clark gives of it sound.

---



Chapter 13 "From Lean to Race"

(43)

P330 Pacific's negativity. Need wilderness

P332 I don't agree that these are "more substantial points". But this whole thing is the clearest trick that he was to find himself in years later in the CWB, Fitzgerald, Comm. 0/100 etc.

P332 Very clear exposition of B's position as to the need of force

P333 surely, Roads to Freedom is more than merely "competent", while for one agrees or with a remarkably clear, sustained exposition, criticism & argument

P334 Clark is free with criticism of B's treatment of Collette, but he does not take the chance to suggest Collette is over backsliding. He nowhere mentions them, even to explain what these storms were in large part about. It is like his avoidance of any admission as to Philip Russell's interference with B's diaries as well as his affairs or as to Tom's break of trust or Peter's unfair judgment. So much his respectivity! Besides the laws of libel interfered. If so, Clark should have allowed for that. He could have reminded his readers that some of these people were alive at the time of the publication of his book. But Philip Russell - though his daughter <sup>the illegitimate son</sup> Clark clearly knew - to be. Clark has not, of course, seen Collette's letters to B. But he nowhere mentions the embargo, so his readers are well permitted the chance of allowing for this gap in knowledge.

P336-7 I wish I knew how accurate Clark's description of logical atomism (I, later, logical positivism) is or B's description of it (part of the "essentials of linguistic analysis" B's. How closely do B's & C's correspond?

P338 It was not an "exaggeration". He had used the military B. Strikes in the U.S.A. It was a photo - a Savage photo, if you like. Starker language! No facing the group would have been in the photograph & understood. The author writes didn't.

A page from Edith Russell's manuscript comments on Clark's *Life of Bertrand Russell* (reduced by 40%). The original (RA REC. ACQ. 967, box 2.18) is in red ballpoint, with some black.

## Chapter 13 "From War to Peace"

330/1 Pacifists negative. Need wildness.

332/2 I don't agree that these are "more substantial points". But this whole paragraph gives the cleft stick that he was to find himself in years later in the CND, Pugwash, Committee of 100 etc.

332/3 Very clear exposition of B's position as to the use of force.

333/4 Surely, *Roads to Freedom* is more than merely "competent". Whether one agrees or not it is a remarkably clear, sustained exposition, criticism and argument.

334/5 Clark is free with criticism of B's treatment of Colette, but he does not take this chance to suggest Colette's own backslidings. He nowhere mentions them, even to explain what these storms were in large part about. It is like his avoidance of any admission as to Philip Morrell's interference with O's diaries as well as his affaires or as to Dora's break of trust or Peter's unfaithfulness. So much for objectivity! Possibly the laws of libel interfered. If so, Clark should have allowed for that. He could have reminded his readers that some of these people were alive at the time of the publication of his book. But Philip wasn't—though his daughter and his illegitimate son were. Clark clearly kow-tows to her. Clark has not, of course, seen Colette's letters to B. But he nowhere mentions the embargo, so his readers are never permitted the chance of allowing for this gap in knowledge.

336–7/6 I wish I knew how accurate Clark's description of Logical Atomism (and later, logical positivism) is. Is it B's description or is that of the "exponents of linguistic analysis" B's. How closely do B's and C's correspond?

338/7 It was not an "exaggeration". They had used the military vs. strikers in the U.S.A. The fact had been published in a U.S. Government paper which was where B. got it from (as C. says). It was a joke—a savage joke, if you like. Slovenly language! The Garsington group would have known the reference and understood. The authorities didn't.

340/1 All this about a book that Clark calls merely "competent" (*cf.* p. 333). Yet he omits all mention of many (most, in fact) of B's books.

344/9 B's hope of influencing coming generations—this paragraph is important, more so than most. But Clark does not underline or discuss it.

345/10 I do not understand Clark's placing of people. Maud Burdett was the oldest of all these friends. Why are Neville and Littlewood "*the* mathematician"? Mrs. Hamilton and the others are not placed at all.

350–1 There is another chance to suggest C's many loves and affaires. Not taken. He takes it on the next page but softens it by putting B's jealousy all down to a lively imagination. He evidently does not know about C's abortion etc.

351/12 Colette had not been told because it would have distressed her—as it distressed B.—and as an affaire it was over before B. knew Colette.

---

352/13 The situation with H.D. was appalling for B. as well as for H.D. But I don’t see why Clark should think that it was appalling not to have spoken of H.D. to Colette for another thirty years.

353/14 She was *not* waiting for him as planned because he got out of prison sooner than had been expected. She was out of town with the American Colonel or some man.

356/15 Here B. puts his finger on one of the reasons why he and Colette had to part. The emotional atmosphere was geared too high. She would not do as a daily companion. Too rich.

356/16 Clark does not ask *why* B. says that Colette has “behaved angelically” nor why “the shock [to B.] was so severe”. What was “the shock”—the abortion incident?

#### Chapter 14 “Turning Point”

359/1 O. “*beginning*” to have her reservations about B.?

I should think that he had to keep to intellectual matters in self-protection.

360/2 Good! One of the few places—this bit about Direct Action—where C. points forward and pulls things together.

362–3/3 Clark’s presentation of *Analysis of Mind* is clear. Is it good? I am not qualified to judge.

364/4 This seems to me when relations with C. changed. From this time on, though he continued to love her, he no longer found any sort of peace with her. By her nature she refused him companionship and children, both of which were necessary to him. A steady diet of whipped cream would not do.

370/5 Not so easy, this “shuttling”!

370/6 B’s judgment of W’s *Tractatus* was tribute to B’s honesty.

371–2/7 This is very important. Dora has, judging from her book, forgot it. But it was the rock upon which the marriage foundered.

372ff./8 It seems clear from these pages that B. was correct when he said many years later that he was not “in love” with Dora, certainly not deeply, if at all, in love. But he needed her *faute de mieux* as a companion and mother of children.

374/9 Clark never points out the exactness of B’s dictum that minds must be changed when they receive fresh evidence that refutes their present beliefs—change, too, with change of circumstance. The change in B’s mind may be the visit to Russia (and his publication of it) exemplify this beautifully.

376/10 B’s fairness. Both pros and cons of Russian academic life given.

377/11 Pity Clark doesn’t say more about Gorki.

380/12 The *Autobiography* should have been referred to, if not quoted, here.

380/13 This is a place where Clark has a chance to use one of his favourite words “exaggeration”—with truth. He is right to explain B’s feeling here. Woolf’s sentence is, from hurt feelings, exaggerated.

---

381/14 Clark here suggests what was, according to B's later statements to me, true: his attachment to Dora was less than ardent.

381/15 B. told me that C. Allen, when he was very ill on board the boat on the Volga, told B. that he, C.A., had become a conscientious objector, not because he conscientiously objected to the War, but because he was afraid. This may account for the note of dislike and the occasional acerbity of C.A.'s remarks to and about B. One is apt not to like much a person to whom one has given away what seems slightly shameful about oneself.

381-2/16 A clear concise description of the difference between Dora and Colette.

[~~"Our ecstasy"—his and mine—which, according to his telling repeated often, even a few days before his death, superseded all others for him (and for me). But it was never, as far as I know, written of, so Clark would not credit it even if he heard of it.~~]

383-4/17 On p. 383 Colette apparently provided the evidence for divorce proceedings—then on p. 384 one finds that Dora provided the evidence (as was true), but this anomaly is not noted by Clark. Again, he depends too heavily upon the reader sorting things out.

384/18 B. changed it in the second edition of the *Practice and Theory of Bolshevism*, omitting Dora's chapter and substituting the word socialism for communism.

385/19 Clark himself has lost his heart to Colette but "ecstatic happiness tinged with poetry" (*cf.* p. 381) will not do for a steady diet. If protracted, it is too high-flown to be anything but boring and exhausting.

385/20 This is the time that Dora says in *The Tamarisk Tree* was so blissfully happy for them both.

386/21 This bit of Government idiocy I do not remember having heard of before. It is the first fact, so far, that I've come upon in this book that I hadn't already known (*or* that I know is *not* a true fact). (Re BR's ranking no. 6 in a UK list of "Suspected Persons".)

388/22 Why does Clark always choose rather second rate people to quote, like Magee, Utlej and now Hook?

388/23 Clark does not note what is also true—B. needed the money, especially if he had as he hoped he would have, children.

389/24 Clark should have quoted or, at the least, cited what Mao has to say about B's ideas (*cf.* Pelican edition of Schram's book on China).

390/25 Clark says nothing of Dora's affairs which worried B.

390/26 This (on Time) is an extremely important quotation. It should have been given greater emphasis by Clark, I think. (Re BR's coming to think in long stretches of time.)

390/27 I question whether B. thought of Browning as a sickly sentimentalist. He much liked some of Browning's work.

391/28 These two quotations do not show any "weathercock judgment".

---

They are quite compatible—one the public vast scene, the other purely personal temporary scene. This is slovenly, superficial thinking on Clark’s part.

391/29 Clark seems not to know that B. begged Dora to put the expedition off because he felt so ill before they started. She refused, pleading that it was all arranged and would be so delightful and that B. would be the better for it.

392/30 This is one of the few admitted quotations from the autobiography. Many other passages that occur in it are quoted but they are attributed to their primary source:—letters or diaries. I suppose this is to show how scrupulous and thorough Clark has been.

394/31 Possibly. At any rate it is good to have Clark drawing a conclusion in so many words and not leaving all the work to the reader.

395/32 Why isn’t the Girton don named? She was Eileen Powers.

395/33 Very interesting prophecy that turned out to be true. I wonder if Mao knew it.

396/34 There was no “misunderstanding” and Colette actually did refuse to have another child (she already had had one). And Colette, in saying that she had now [when it was too late] changed her mind appears to admit her former refusal.

397/35 “meanwhile he turned to other business”—having finished with Colette? Crude.

397/36 “the ever-accommodating Alys”. Why does Clark always speak of her contemptuously? And, as usual, he bludgeons Frank.

### Part III “A Long March Downhill”

Was it downhill? Not a happy title. I should have thought it was still a struggle upwards.

#### Chapter 15 “Start of an Experiment”

Up to this point the book, p. 19–397, is 378 pages long and covers the first 50 years of B’s life.

From here to the end, the book, p. 401–639, is 238 pages long and covers the last 48 years. (140 difference)

401/1 It is odd that nowhere in the book does Clark say anything of B’s Indian, Persian, etc. etc. students and reputation. He was well known and greatly respected as a philosopher before this in Western Europe and Asia as well as in the U.S.A. long before this. The surprise was amongst other philosophers, that he turned out to be so young a man. But it is part of Clark’s insularity not to realize this.

401/2 This foolish reference to the safety-belt of the Pearsall Smith money *again!*

402/3 This account of B. and Mrs. Webb is extremely revealing—of her.

B’s very just—it seems to me—if picturesque criticism of the W’s. If it is a matter of “likes” and “dislikes” in the usual sense, so do everyone’s even in pol-

---

itics and economics. But, in point of fact, B. advocated much that he did not like.

No. Only if he finds evidence that condemns them does he change his conclusions.

405/4 Why “ever-enjoyable”. Clark has devoted himself to showing B’s and others’ sufferings. How he likes clap-trap!

405/6 B’s literary style—its development. Good quotation.

408/6 Surely there is more than this about the Boxer Indemnity Committee in the *Autobiography* (as well as, unpublished, among B’s papers). (See *Papers* 16.)

410/7 Clark might well connect these with B’s later efforts vs. the nuclear bomb etc.

411/8 Clark should note here that the *ABC of Relativity* was brought up to date by Pirani and re-published in 1969.

412/9 Americans and Hindoos continued to the end to be ubiquitous.

412/10 Clark says that B’s “unpredictability” meant that “no organizer of meetings could be quite certain of what he was in for”. But he does not, I think, give good evidence for calling him “unpredictable”. B. usually gave warning, before the event, of what he intended to say—at least in outline. Evidence of this is to be found in all the fuss about speaking of Direct Action at one of the CND Trafalgar Sq. meetings and also the meeting of the Youth CND at which he tore up his Labour Party card.

415/12 To the view that World Government, if it comes, will come through imperialism was a view that B. continued to hold. As to the details of this quotation—they have taken place: witness the great industrial multinational companies and the doings of the CIA and the U.S. Government in Chile.

416/13 It was the banning of Scott Nearing (from Harvard, 1924), not who did the banning, that was important. As to who did it—B. admitted his error. This whole story is characteristic.

416/14 And how right was the point of view of the Chicago journal *Unity*!

417/15 As I heard the story from the Flexners at the time, it was they—the Flexners—who received Feakins’ reply in response to their invitation to B. that he would dine with them for \$100. B. never heard either story till I told him about the Flexners by chance in the early 1950s. He was horrified and upset by it.

419/16 He never scrubbed the memory from his mind of any departed affection. Ghastly and harmful nonsense!

420/17 I think that Conrad in an article about his father tells this story as having happened to him—not to Kate or John. (“Memories of My Father”, *Sunday Times Magazine*, 14 May 1972.)

421–2/18 It was always his contention that the whole point of education was to teach people to think and to give them as much solid fact and reason as they could take. And the rest of this exposition of B’s views on education given

---

by this paragraph continued to be held.

422/19 Clark cannot resist a covert sneer at Frank.

425/20 Good for Clark! He tells of the school with something like balanced fairness.

426/21 And Clark might have mentioned that Dora, equally, practised these beliefs. Only she went further and was willing to have extra-marital children in spite of her promise not to do so.

426/22 Freda Utley is responsible for this picture about B’s “abnormally strong sexual urges”. I suppose it comes from the book published in 1969 *The Odyssey of a Liberal*. Why does Clark quote F.U.?

427/23 This is nonsense. B. often, if there was no one around to do it for him, made the tea in Richmond and London and Plas Penrhyn. The point is that he would never do anything that didn’t interest him if there were others around to do it for him. That seemed to him—and to me—cold common sense. Why expend the energy?

Clark, like Dora, puts too much weight upon B’s aristocratic background. And they appear to have very odd views of what an aristocratic background produces.

428/24 B’s statement in the *Daily Telegraph* reads to me like a breath of fresh air and I doubt if it put off any parents who contemplated sending their children to Beacon Hill School.

428/25 The Tower study was not “hideously ugly” from within. The views from the windows were enough to prevent that.

429/26 Clark does not mention Dora’s own lecture tour in the U.S.A. and the jewel case incident. B. had given her what he had of his mother’s jewels. B. thought that they were left in the bank. But she took them with her. She carried them in their box when she went out to lunch with her then lover, forgot them and left them in the restaurant. They were never retrieved.

I think that he should have added a reference to his remarks on p. 422 (Dora concerned with education for socialism; B. concerned with the individual).

429/27 How right he was! (About Beacon Hill School.) Kate’s book (*My Father, Bertrand Russell*) gives the evidence.

430/28 Max Eastman was evidently one of the idiots and B. pulled his leg.

430/29 And so he did, give the best he could. He was known for his reliability and generally contrasted with the usual run of British lecturers who seldom gave what they promised but made a great fuss. Sassoon—H. Nicholson and V. Sackville West and Yeats etc. etc. at Bryn Mawr.

431/30 B. *did* object to the dogmatism of the anti-theologian strongly. Also to the hypocrisy that he found amongst many “free thinkers”.—Ethical Culture Te Deum etc. [See Feinberg’s edition of the *Collected Stories* for account of this and, also, Rupert’s book (*Russell Remembered* by R. Crawslay-Williams).]

431/31 The continuing friendship with B. of the Dudley family should give those, including Clark, who oh and ah about his “treatment of Helen Dudley”,

---

some pause.

432/32 Good for Clark!

432/33 Manning was also desiccated, very limited, and bigoted. I know. I went to school with his two daughters, poor, serious, dry, pale and frightened and thin—very etiolated.

433/34 Clark might have noted that though the Mormons tried to convert B., he made no effort to convert them. He never did attack individuals' beliefs unless they asked to discuss them with him—then of course he said what he thought. Even then, he often parried the questions, if the questioner was too innocent or too stupid for discussion to do anything but harm.

#### Chapter 16 "End of an Experiment"

436/1 "Together [Dora and B.] issued the statement that neither would use the title except where strictly necessary for formal occasions." B. said that Dora issued the statement as from them both but that he had no strong feelings vs. using the title. As I understood it, B. felt the title to be a nuisance but also felt that he owed it to his people, his grandfather in especial, to use it and to carry the responsibilities, burdens which it imposed. Later, after the Second World War and his American experience he felt this obligation much more strongly and he also felt grateful to the decorativeness of titles in all the deadly seriousness of post war life and politics.

436/2 Alys was not travelling in the Mediterranean with Lucy Donnelly. I was. When Lucy and I were in Egypt, Alys came out to pay visits to various friends there. She came under her own steam. And Lucy, who took her obligations to Alys hard, invited her to spend a month with us, at my expense at Mena House. She left us there to pay other visits. When we boarded our ship at Alexandria for Sicily, to our surprise we found that Alys was on board the same boat. She was travelling "tourist" and we were in first, a point that Alys stressed on every possible occasion to show how good a socialist she was. But I noticed that she always invited herself to meals with us and to any entertainment given in the first class! At one entertainment she disrupted the concert by entering into conversation with a Turkish woman. The latter complained of the hardships she had endured from her husband and exhibited to Alys the bruises and wounds that he had inflicted upon her arms and neck. They became so interested in these horrors that their voices rose. People turned to scowl and hush them and the music of the concert was all but drowned. Lucy and I blushed with shame. When, later, I told B. about this scene he laughed like anything—partly at the prudery of Lucy and me.

439/3 An excellent example (reporting to Trinity on Wittgenstein's research) of B's honesty and generosity. Clark might well have outlined it as he usually does when recounting what he considers to be B's shortcomings. The passage also shows B's prophetic ability.

---



440/4 This statement of being unable to feel physically fond of a woman for more than seven or eight years ~~or even Clark’s emendation to nine years~~ later proved to be quite untrue.

440/5 Clark very much overdoes this “insatiable appetite for personable and intelligent young women”.

441/6 A very clear presentation by B. of the difficulties of his position.

441/7 I think that Joan Folwell was quite right in saying that B. “wanted to avoid hurting people”. I also think that she seems to have been a harmful goose.

443/8 The discrepancy here is accounted for by B’s ardent wish not to have an open breach with Dora because of the harm and distress that might cause the children. Also, he had no desire to behave vindictively toward Dora. He wanted her to be happy, for the sake of peace principally. Also, Dora promised to have no further children by anyone but B. if he would accept this one (Harriet) as his. Again, she failed to keep her promise and B. recognized the fact that she would not keep such a promise in the future—hence his refusal to accept the next one (Roddy).

444/9 No action was taken till 1963 because, till then, Dora refused to admit publicly that Harriet was not B’s child, although B. was willing to admit that he had perjured himself by signing the birth certificate, at the time of her birth. He foresaw many of the difficulties (Harriet’s education, for instance) that would result if the masquerade continued [and now, what a mess we should be in if Harriet as well as Dora, John and Kate were claiming money from the estate]. Although he thought that he had been right at the time in order to give Dora another chance to keep her word.

The campaign for the removal of Harriet’s name was renewed in the ’50s and ’60s because B. was told that Harriet wished to have it removed.

444/10 Not only John and Kate but the baby Harriet as well went to Cornwall.

Marjorie Spence started life as “Doreen” not Marjorie. Then changed to Marjorie and then to Patricia and nicknamed “Peter”.

444/11 Quite right. She was not inexperienced.

444/12 I think that Heaven will have to forgive Colette this injustice, for injustice I think it indubitably was.

444/13 Not “irrationally”. Clark, a few lines further on, tells of his beloved Freda Utley’s reaction to the man. He was *generally* known as a spy. Dora was one of the very few people who denied that he was.

444/14 Freda Utley was *not* an American friend of B. She was British to the core. Clark does not, apparently, know who Freda Utley is. He has not looked into her *Lost Illusion* in which she tells of their (Alys and B’s) early friendship and the debt she owes him.

445/15 Clark is ignorant of what went on. He should know, because I told him, both about B’s feeling of guilt towards Peter and about the two children’s

---

devotion to her. But he has not, of course, seen the “banned” correspondence. He does not like to accept “a private source”.

445/16 A rather disgusting double entendre.

446/17 It is true that Barry never did anything financially for his two children but very far from true that B. did not do quite as much—far more in the end—than Dora for his. I strongly suspect that Francis Meynell was anything but impartial in his criticism of B.

447/18 I should have thought not only between the Wars, but always, B. had and shows this feeling for the individual as the important unit.

448/19 A pity that Clark does not indicate what the “recipe” is.

448/20 Good for Clark. He is quite right—they are “not potboilers”. But the part that Peter chiefly played in making them not potboilers was that she drove B. to take refuge in work for them from her demands and worrying affairs. She did, also, some good work for them, though perhaps not as much as Clark estimates.

448–9/21 Interesting letter: Marxists’ minimising the part played by beliefs in causing political events. B. vs. overstress on purely economic causes.

449/22 What a pity that B. never wrote “The Cult of Feeling”! In part of course he did, in the *History of Western Philosophy and Power* as well as the essay in the *Political Quarterly*, 1935, of which Clark writes.

I know from the fact that he said he wanted to speak of my help with books written during our marriage how much he overestimated the help given him by others. I refused to let him speak of it since I realized that anything that I had added or suggested about what he wrote was drawn from him himself and our talks, etc., together.

451/23 B. played very fair.

451/24 In view of this, it seems that B. was right not to cut O. out of his autobiography. He did, however, include only letters written *to* her, not *from* her in deference to her wish.

452/25 Clark might have added that part of B’s illness was owing to the problem of whether or not to marry someone with whom he was “in love” physically but with whom he was well aware that he would not remain “in love” and with whom he did not wish to set up a household and by whom he did not want children. ~~The story of the restaurant dinner during which he was forced to accept marriage by Peter’s tears belongs here.~~

452/26 B. continued to love Telegraph House, in spite of the ugliness of the house, to the end and in spite of all the difficulties and grief he had encountered there.

453/27 B. detested the very unpleasant personal habits of Joad also as well his attitude towards and treatment of women. [All this added to the fact that he thought little of Joad’s philosophical ability.]

454–5/28 I don’t understand this paragraph. Were *Power and Freedom and Organization* mere journalism? (Or does Clark think they were entirely written

---

by Peter?) He himself on p. 448 says they were not mere journalism.

456/29 Interesting, in view of the present, the difficulties in keeping Dora from claiming all the money. Also interesting for B’s generosity and honesty in letting Santayana know at once when the money was no longer needed.

457/30 Interesting three reasons given to Norton for wishing to go to the U.S.A.

458/31 O. died, April 1938.

459/32 I wonder why Clark thinks that few are spared—does this mean that he takes the account as accurate? *The Coming Back* by Colette.

460/33 Note that the agreement that John and Kate should join B. and Peter in the U.S. if things grew worse in Europe was made before B. and Peter sailed.

461/34 Gerald Brenan presents Clark’s own views on *Which Way to Peace?* better than Clark does.

463–4/35 No mention of B’s serious illness before term began in Santa Barbara. He had to spend some weeks lying flat on his back in hospital. Both he and Peter suffered from the heat.

#### Chapter 17 “The American Ordeal”

466/1 This point, that it is the *place*, not the political entity of England, that B. loved deserves to be better known.

467/2 “If I were young enough to fight myself, I should do so, but it is more difficult to urge others”. This is an important difference between B. and many—most indeed—other people as was shown in the first Great War.

467/3 This remained true. He was always a pacifist in the sense that he thought peace “the most important thing in the world” (that is the political world). In the first Great War the war was unnecessary—harmful to peace; in the second Great War peace could be achieved and maintained only through the defeat of Hitler. This whole paragraph p. 466–7 is extremely important and Clark has put it together well.

468/4 It is true that Dora agreed to John and Kate’s staying in America for “the duration”. But Clark should have mentioned the fact that she urged B. to accept the responsibility and the expense of having Harriet and Roddy also with him in America. He refused because he had not the means to support them.

468/5 B’s respect for children (and for all individuals).

475/6 No. The implication here is wrong. He sat naked, because of the extreme heat, at work in the cabin that he used as a study. At work on *An Inquiry into Meaning and Truth*.

476/7 Excellent adumbration of the *History of Western Philosophy* in letter to Colette from Harvard in 1940—to be written “for the future—say 1000 years hence, when the new shackles will have worn thin and the human spirit will again face the world unafraid”.

---

477-8/8 House hunting on “the Main Line”—but no mention of the stop-gap at Bryn Mawr and then at the lodging house, “the Bell and Clapper”. The latter at least should be noted, even though it is told of in the *Autobiography*. Since it gave B. hideous nightmares for the rest of his life.

480/9 The “anti-Russell faction” consisted of Barnes’ two female secretaries who hated Peter.

481/10 B. understood his own problems with uncommon clarity. The difficulty lay in finding solutions to his problems. Clark’s slovenliness. This analysis of the essay or article “If you Fall in Love with a Married Man” might be applied with little change to all B’s casual journalism.

482/11 Freda Utley “the friend of pre-war days” (now living in the U.S.A. and for all I—E.R.—know become an American citizen) who found that Peter surely was “never unfaithful to Bertie”. *Why* does Clark put this in? He must know that it is untrue; and he should somewhere note that one of B’s chief difficulties and worries during this time in the U.S. was Peter’s affairs.

483/12 The rôle of “secretary-protector” is also imaginary. Clark, in saying that B’s enthusiasm for Peter had become rather muted, but that she continued to support him loyally. So she did, publicly—again, Clark does not mention her affairs and extravagance—but so did he support her loyally and in every way.

483-4/13 Are these adequate reasons for not using B. in the “war effort”? Clark should, but does not, mention the fact that at once, upon return to England, he *was* used.

484/14 No. He did not—alas, for me—see “much” of me.

#### Chapter 18 “A Member of the Establishment”

488/1 Clark finds a change in B. at 72—“from this time on” though he had moments of percipience he had also moments of unawareness and contradictions and over-statements that harmed the causes that he had at heart, Clark thinks. But Clark’s own account shows that (according to Clark) he had always had these. I do not agree with Clark’s account, of course.

488/2 How does Clark know that B. sensed that from 72 on his life would be packed with excitement? He gives no evidence of this “sensed” on B’s part.

489/3 The family was not re-united for some time. After B’s landing in Scotland he could not find out where Peter and Conrad were. Then he learned that they were in the South of England (Devon or Cornwall?) and that Conrad was desperately ill. He could find no place to house them at Cambridge.

489/4 Clark, a few pages back, pointed out that one of the reasons why B. was not used during the war was his anti-Communism. Now he says that this was not the case. The War was still on but Clark says the anti-Communism was muted. It was not as the end of the paragraph shows.

490/5 This was always true: he managed to hide his griefs and fears and to appear to be full of laughter and lightheartedness. His self-discipline and his

---

manners were perfect.

491/16 *An Outline of Philosophy, The Scientific Outlook, Power* Clark says “might not be exactly pot-boilers”. They are in no sense pot-boilers. I suppose that this is merely Clark’s very heavy humour?

494/7 The point is that B. was outraged by Wittgenstein’s uncalled for rudeness to an older man and an invited guest.

496/8 Far from there being “no doubt”, there is surely doubt that B. chose to speak on “Western Values” in order to infuriate the users of the phrase.

496/9 And how right B. was that the rise in juvenile crime was owing to the War.

497/10 This seems sheer idiocy. When Clark has no doubt—beware! As usual, this foolish statement the notes say is taken from Freda Utley.

497/11 What is this dictation to me? (The “Private Memoirs” (1955), still unpublished, except in brief extracts.) He never tried to explain the failure of his relationships with women or criticized Peter, Ottoline and Dora and Colette “for certain alleged actions” in any dictation to me.

498/12 This business of Gamel being a difficulty in his marriage with Peter is nonsense. The difficulty was Colette.

498/13 The reason for Gamel’s not replying to B’s letters, she explained to B. on her first visit here, was that the correspondence upset Gerald and she did not want to upset Gerald.

499/14 Peter’s “accident” was attempted suicide. The “young woman” was Irena (Irina) Stickland.

499/15 The affair did not “mellow into an almost father-and-daughter relationship”. B. remained grateful to I. Stickland for her support and kindness at Cambridge but he found her pretensions and sentimentalities distasteful, and the relationship during the ’50s simply faded away.

500/15 Should be “in Dorset House” not “in Dorset Square”.

501/17 Colette wearing the dress trimmed with B’s mother’s lace. This was the lace that Colette later sent to me.

503/18 The attaché case and his hat were retrieved.

504/19 They were.

504/20 Though he longed sometimes to get back to it. He thought that he had found a way out of the difficulties with which Wittgenstein had faced him long ago and wanted to write the book that these difficulties had prevented him from writing. (Cf. p. 205/6.)

504/21 The dots, I suppose, stand for Elizabeth Crawshay-Williams.

506/22 I think that Clark has muddled this sadly.

507/23 Clark should have mentioned F. Themerson’s drawing of this in *The Good Citizen’s Alphabet*.

509/24 They sometimes had their doubts of Alys’s love. She could appear to be very bitter—though much of the bitterness was probably induced by Logan.

---

509/25 “This was comedy”! Ugh!—She gave him beer, but she had been serving beer ever since the war.

509/26 It was not “dislike” but embarrassment at his inability to take things up again at the place they’d been broken off.

509/27 I do not remember her breaking bones—only the bad heart and bronchitis-pneumonia.

509/28 “Her Bertie”. How *can* Clark be so crude!

510/29 Much more should have been said of this Australian journey—Greenish, newspaper reports, journeys.

511/30 B did not advocate war after the Russians developed nuclear armaments. That would have meant destruction. He advocated the threat of war, with the possibility of carrying out that threat when only the U.S. had the bomb in order to prevent Russia developing nuclear arms. He foresaw the arms race and its probably inevitable ending—nuclear destruction. [*Cf.* p. 513.]

511/31 Clark should have mentioned that the book under the title *The Impact of Science on Society* contains additions to the Matchette lectures which were first published by Columbia.

512/32 By no means “the first signs” (of BR’s “anti-Americanism”) that it is possible to see.

513/33 This is all chronologically hard to follow. 1950 → 1951 → 1950.

513/34 Peter received the £10 000 before the divorce in 1952. Story of the telegram of poverty to Festiniog.

The Telegram story; B. was living at Festiniog. Peter had left him. He received a telegram from her saying that she was down to her last penny and needed money (or something like that). B. was outraged as he had given her the Nobel money just a short time before. He felt especially tried as he knew that the inhabitants of Festiniog would hear about the telegram and gossip and think him very mean and unjust to Peter.

513/35 In these last two paragraphs Clark seems to show that he misses the point of B’s advocacy of preventive war and then total opposition to nuclear war after the Russians also possessed nuclear weapons. *Cf.* p. 511.

#### Part IV “The Last Attachment”

##### Chapter 19 “Towards a Short War with Russia”

517/1 “Few, moreover, saw as clearly as he the possibility of peace through world government which nuclear weapons afforded.” Clark seems to forget this point later on.

517/2 “The last great attachment” of B’s life was the salvation of humanity from a “nuclear holocaust”. Two questions are raised: 1) What policies did he support in ’45–’50; 2) “What is to be made of the contradictory denials and avowals” of the ’50’s? These are resolved by a chronological account of events, Clark thinks.

---

518/3 Possibility of American domination and peace enforced by America. Any wars there might be would be short since U.S. is unilaterally superior to all other nations.

518/4 League of Nations could be formed during this time.

“No point in agreements not to use the atomic bomb as they would not be kept.”

518/5 Only one thing could achieve peace. That is for America to make war on Russia during “the next two years” but B. would not dream of advocating this. The date of this letter to Gamel should be noted, but it is not beyond the fact that it was written in September. Presumably in 1945.

519/6 See possible draft of letter to Kingsley Martin in “Notes” for this page [p. 720].

520/7 Only the possession by U.S. of atomic weapons prevents war on the West by Russia.

520/8 Plans for a confederation monopolizing nuclear weapons. If Russia would not join them—War!

This suggestion made five months before the Baruch proposal.

521/9 B’s strongest argument for this preventive war was that he foresaw the coming of the H-bomb and then any war, preventive or otherwise, would be useless.

521/10 B. did not believe that Russia should be given any information about the process of manufacturing the atomic bomb unless Russia joined the confederation with the U.S. If Russia joined then she could be given the information—partly because Russia would soon work it out for herself. There were only about two years free for manoeuvre.

522/11 B. states his views in *Polemic*, 1945.

523/12 Letter to Walter Marseille.

524/13 Westminster School speech.

527/14 B. denies advocacy of preventive war.

527/15 B. tells Freeman that he did advocate preventive war and doesn’t repent of doing so. 1959.

529/16 B. again denies advocacy of preventive war 1963 and in 1969 agrees that he did.

## Chapter 20 “Into the New World”

531/1 Clark might well have added “as B. had foreseen”.

531/2 Clark divides the last two decades of B’s life into three periods: 1) The Christmas Broadcast 1954, the manifesto 1955, and the Pugwash movement; 2) the CND; 3) under the controversial and encroaching influence of Schoenman, his secretary, the Committee of 100 and then “a plethora of allied but peripheral activities” (by this does Clark mean the work of the Foundation under B’s leadership—prisoners, neutrals, Vietnam, China, Tribunal etc. These latter

---

hardly seem “peripheral”).

532/3 B’s fiction should be mentioned here. Most of it (save *Forstice*) written in 1950’s.

532/4 Not in the least surprised, naively or otherwise, though he sometimes said that he was in order to underline the simplicity and reasonableness of the measures that he suggested should be taken.

532/5 Attempts to buy back Ffestiniog house failed because Peter refused to sell to him.

532/6 Colette certainly wrong in this. B. was quite able to care for someone “with the whole of him” for more than a short time.

532/7 The first time, before his marriage to Dora, she threw herself aside.

533/8 “The gardens” etc. at 41 Queens Road sound much grander than they were. The desk in the sitting room was not piled with papers (there was B’s study) and the “day-bed” had mostly already read books and journals piled on it. Clark’s list does not “complete” the list of furniture in the “living-room” (which was called the “sitting room”).

534/9 I was *not* “a teacher from Bryn Mawr”.

I wonder that Clark does not mention wsb’s (Wilfrid Scawen Blunt’s) affaires!

534/10 Not to those who had any particular right to know.

534/11 I like to think that I am a runner up for the Virgin Mary.

534/12 I am reduced to being a companion only.

535/13 Clark is quite right in implying that I had nothing to do with B’s change, from total opposition to co-operation with Russia. That was owing 1) to the coming of the hydrogen bomb which made all war impossible, 2) and to common sense—the recognition of changed circumstances, possibilities and necessities.

535/14 Why does Clark quote F. Utley and how did F. Utley know what or what I did not understand about Russia? I only met her briefly once or possibly twice when she came to tea at Richmond and then I don’t think that I uttered more than the necessary civilities (nor do I remember B. saying much. It was F. Utley who talked). Otherwise, my only connection with her was when, some-time later, she wished to come to see B. at Plas Penrhyn. He did not wish to see her and said that he *would not* see her. He asked his secretary to put her off. B. himself refused to speak to her as he was sure that he could not hold out. He did not wish to see her because she kept on and on about the total wickedness of Russia etc. etc. and he had tried so often to wean her from *complete* subjection to any dogmatism and had failed—that he was bored and felt it a waste of time to talk to her. Also, he was, at the time, *very* busy. But the secretary could make no headway in staving her off. She rang again and I spoke to her. I dissuaded her from coming. But she hated me for it and comforted herself, I gathered from reports, by thinking that I wouldn’t let B. see her! (In actual fact, it was I who had persuaded him, against his will, to see her at Richmond. He was thoroughly

---



“fed up” with her.)

536/15 B. was “unimpressed” because he was fairly certain that the BBC would try to play down the seriousness of what he wanted to say (in “Man’s Peril”). He was right—it tried, by turning the talk into one by “three generations”.

537/16 “Man’s Peril” was and is considerably more than a “strikingly successful broadcast”. It is a beautiful piece of writing. Moreover it states the peril unequivocally and the way to avoid it. Nothing has needed to be added to it or subtracted from it since it was delivered.

537/17 This is an excellent example of the way in which Clark sacrifices the integrity of his biography to the god of “new material”. Adrian was President of the British Association in 1954 and President of the Royal Society from 1950–55 and was the Master of Trinity. It was as Master of Trinity and, in connection with international science, as President of the R.S. that Adrian was important to B. B. identifies Adrian in the *Autobiography* as holding these two offices. But Clark does not mention them. He identifies Adrian only as President of the British Association (for one year). Moreover Clark does not, later, give Adrian’s reason for not supporting the scientist’s manifesto—built on “Man’s Peril”—which B. gives in his *Autobiography*. Adrian found it “too eloquent”—a point of view which B. felt many scientists would agree with. This is an important comment which Clark should have either noted or referred to. Somewhere in his book Clark should say that his book is supplementary to the *Autobiography*, but he never does. And he always, if he can, finds material other than that given by B’s *Autobiography* (and which seemed to B. the important material) to support both B’s and his points.

538/18 Clark might well have noted here the beginning of B’s attempt to use the Neutrals. But he makes nothing of the campaign to use them, in spite of its importance.

538/19 Bahba, B. recognized, was very ambitious, both personally and for India.

539/20 More important to B. at the time was Einstein’s letter applauding “Man’s Peril”.

539/21 B. had already, I believe, consulted Einstein as to the advisability of a manifesto signed by eminent scientists.

539/22 He suggested this conference and later upheld many although he had little faith in conferences accomplishing much. But in the climate of the Cold War, B. felt that conferences were of more use than usual as they might at least show the upholders of either side that the upholders of the other side were, also, human beings.

540/23 Good for Clark!

541/24 Clark might have told of Biquard’s midnight descent upon Queen’s Road on the eve of the manifesto broadcast. Clark should have indicated here the story that the *Autobiography* tells of the week before this.

---

542/25 One important and noteworthy difference was that the Lindau pronouncement was one-sided—only Western—no pro-Communists invited or included, I believe. Clark should have mentioned this difference.

542/26 Bohr not only tried to explain but expressed again and again both to B. and to me his regret for not having signed.

543/27 It usually *was* conspiracy—like the BBC’s trying to turn “Man’s Peril” into a banal entertainment.

543/28 This is nonsense. It had not been frequently discussed publicly.

543/29 There was only one who expressed himself as unconvinced. He was an American whose feelings had been hurt by something—I forget now what—said about America or George Washington.

544/30 Yet Clark castigates B. for suspecting “conspiracy”.

544/31 Good for Clark!

545/32 I don’t think that I ever heard B. call Pugwash “houndsditch”. What is Clark’s source for this statement? Certainly B. did not habitually refer to it so.

545/33 What nonsense these people talk about “the aristocrat”.

547/34 True, B. did not lose interest in Pugwash. But, as he suspected that such institutions inevitably do, it began to become respectable. He saw it becoming more and more like a polite debating club and more and more willing to accept half-measures on the plea that they were at least a “breakthrough”. The final proof was “the partial test ban” agreement. He thought that consciences were salved by this and, therefore, the *whole* measure would be delayed. This was far more than a “constitutional distrust of governments”.

547/35 But I thought that Clark himself said that B. long ago had found no “certainty” in mathematics.

548/36 B’s acceptance of the computer’s ability is equal in generosity to Frege’s acceptance of B’s criticism. Clark should, I think, have emphasized it.

549/37 B’s reply to Strawson is “not entirely satisfactory”—to whom?

549/38 He might have added Spencer Brown’s testimony here; but that is told of (at least in part) in the autobiography.

550/39 I do not think that this is quite true. During these years of which Clark is writing we spent about half the year in London at Hasker Street. I think that if we had been there longer B. would have been worn out. Also he would have lost the perspective that comparative quiet away from London gave him.

550/40 It did not keep away all of them—more’s the pity!

550/41 I am no longer even a companion, but a devoted “secretary-wife”! Clark might well have noted, when he speaks here of Conrad’s break with B. that he (Conrad) later decided that he had been quite wrong and, regretting the lost years, returned to B.

550/42 By Kate’s own telling, it was the other way around. She drew him (her husband, into religious enthusiasm).

551/43 This is a wonderful and completely misleading epitome of John’s illness—no mention at all of Susan!

---