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Russell’s collected prison correspondence is an editorial challenge. I provide the basis for such a project using the analogy of a shattered vase. All known correspondents are identified as well as their letters. The letters are in various forms—originals, transcriptions, condensed transcriptions, and mimeographs—as well as types—official, smuggled, and messages within letters. I pay special attention to Russell’s love letters to Constance Malleson, describe his prison experience, and show why the prison letters were important to his spiritual well-being.

1. INTRODUCTION

Russell opposed World War I from its beginning in 1914. He was involved first with the Union of the Democratic Control and then the No-Conscription Fellowship. He went to prison in 1918 because of what he wrote in “The German Peace Offer”.1 He was prosecuted under the Defence of the Realm Act for making a statement “likely to prejudice His Majesty’s relations with a foreign power”. Russell had theorized that American troops would be used to intimidate strikers in England, “an occupation which the American Army is accustomed when at home”. On 9 February 1918 he was found guilty and sentenced to six months in prison. He remained free until his appeal could be heard on 1 May. It was not successful, apart from assigning him more privileges.

1 The Tribunal, no. 90 (3 Jan. 1918): 1; reprinted in Papers 14, Paper 92.
II. “A SHATTERED VASE”

The letters that Russell wrote from prison in 1918 can be compared to a shattered vase. At one point in time this vase was nearly whole. But the vase was dropped and it split into many pieces. The pieces lay on the floor. Some got kicked aside. One or more people decided that the vase was so valuable that the pieces should be copied. Most of the time the copies were not perfect and did not match the originals. Not all the pieces got copied. More pieces got kicked aside, but at least some of the imperfect copies remained. Then it was decided that the pieces should be stored. But they were not all placed in the same drawer or even in the same house. In our time the vase can never be put back the way it was. But the pieces that remain can be put together to make something that looks like a vase. This analogy helps to illustrate the problems of identifying and editing this correspondence.

Letters to and from Russell while he was in Brixton Prison the first time—originals, transcriptions, and photocopies—are found in various locations in the Bertrand Russell Archives at McMaster University. Lady Constance Malleson, also known as Colette O’Niel, an actress and author, had been Russell’s lover since 1916. She has left discouraging notes for anyone hoping to edit the letters between her and Russell. They say:

“I’ve done my best to place them in proper order, but that is not saying very much.”

“Letters, often written on different pages, and seeming as if written on different dates, were quite often written on one and the same day.”

“It should be remembered that prison letters did not always reach either of them safely; several went astray.”

The Bertrand Russell Archives have about 87 prison letters from him, and about 93 to him. Many letters have no date. Some have never been recovered, others are extant in only fragmentary form. Some fragments may still be separated and despite best efforts have not been reunited as complete letters. Where are these letters now? Lists of them, with archival locations, can be found in the appendices.

Colette sent a typescript of letters to Russell in 1949 when he was liv-
ing in Ffestiniog, North Wales, and working on his autobiography. She knew at the time that the typescript “was corrupt as regards volume and contents but … [she] was under the illusion that it was correct as regards dates and placing of letters.”6 She later realized she was wrong. Some of these letters are now housed with Russell’s autobiography files, as are some transcriptions of his letters to Ottoline Morrell, Bloomsbury hostess, former lover and later devoted friend of Russell. These files have new transcriptions annotated by Russell in the late 1940s. Others are in the personal correspondence section, or, in Lady Ottoline’s case, in recent acquisition 69. Still others are with Colette’s papers in recent acquisition 596. Her papers also contain “literary” versions of their letters for a projected but never realized edition. But these letters are only one part of their communications while he was in prison. Messages to and from her were contained in the “official” weekly letter he was permitted to send from his cell. There was limited circulation of these letters, with personal sections removed by Gladys Rinder, who had worked with Russell at the No-Conscription Fellowship.7 Later in May he writes that his “ordinary” letters (i.e. official letters) were not to be circulated.8 He is thinking of a monthly manifesto instead, which presumably would be culled from the weekly letters. In the end both condensed weekly letters and monthly versions were circulated. The majority of the official letters are located in class 730, which holds correspondence between Russell and his brother, Frank. This class has originals, multiple typed transcriptions9 with carbons, as well as some (but not all) of the mimeographed extracts which were prepared monthly and circulated to Russell’s friends. There were over twenty people on the list to receive the mimeographed extracts.10 In addition to these mimeographed extracts, some of the carbons appear to have been circulated. One carbon, a match to a typed transcription in the personal correspondence, recently arrived at the Russell Archives from the Whitehead family.11 Frank shared responsibility for the official letter with Rinder, and on one occasion with Eva Kyle of a typing agency Russell used. The letters of the latter two are in the personal cor-

7 RA1 730.079960a, Russell to Frank Russell, 16 May 1918.
8 RA1 730.079965, Russell to Frank Russell, 27 May 1918.
9 Some of the transcriptions were made in 1918; others were done later.
10 RA1 710.054817, Rinder to Russell, 25 May 1918.
11 R3 Rec. Acq. 1410c, Russell to Frank Russell, 6 May 1918.
respondence. Frank’s wife, Elizabeth, sometimes contributed to the official letter as did Colette herself on one occasion. Last, but certainly not least, none of Constance Malleson’s original letters are extant for this time period—only a highly edited transcription of them remains. All of these letters, in all their various formats, have now been identified, entered into BRACERS with notes on how the various texts of each letter differ, and provided with cross-references. They are now together electronically, although not physically.

III. LIFE IN PRISON

Russell spent his last night of freedom at Colette’s flat. His appeal was heard on Wednesday, 1 May. He entered Brixton Prison that day. In his first official letter from prison, he tells Frank to thank Gilbert Murray, Wildon Carr and others for their successful efforts in getting him into the First Division. In his Autobiography (2: 34) he credits Arthur Balfour. And in an interview in 1959 he gave the credit to Frank himself, who was at school with Sir George Cave, the Home Secretary (Monk 1: 524).

What were Russell’s accommodations like? First Division, to which Russell was sentenced on appeal, was one of several divisions to which prisoners could be assigned. Prisoners in each division—First, Second, Third, Star, and Debtors—were not to mingle with others outside their division. There were very few prisoners in the First Division. The terms that Frank worked out were generally favourable; the regulations that allowed this were in place—but specifics still had to be hammered out once Russell made a formal request. The Home Office files reveal that on 2 May he was observed as having a private room, his own clothes, money (held by the governor) to pay for the purchase and cooking of food and the cleaning of his cell, and his own furniture. Books and newspapers could be sent in. On 4 May he was permitted writing materials.

---

12 RA1 730.08001, 1 Aug. 1918; she added a postscript.
13 The Bertrand Russell Archives Catalogue Entry and Retrieval System. BRACERS is searchable globally at http://russell.mcmaster.ca/bracers.
14 RA1 730.079957, 6 May 1918 (SLBR 2: #312; Auto. 2: 35–6).
16 Papers 14: Appendix xiii.1.
17 RA5 Rec. Acq. 901.11, in old age he recollected these details in a fanciful manner to John Davidson, “Russell the Rebel”, Everybody’s Weekly, 10 Apr. 1954, pp. 19, 43.
The rules allowed only one visit and one letter a fortnight; Frank requested one visit a week\textsuperscript{18} of not less than three people (granted) and two letters per week (one was granted) with the length limited to one sheet. In fact that turned out to be two letters—as one letter could come in and one letter could go out each week. Russell's first visit with Frank took place before Monday, 6 May. This was unusual. After that, visits took place on Tuesdays or Wednesdays for one half-hour (regulations specified one quarter-hour). Business visitors were extra and separate.\textsuperscript{19} A list of Russell's visitors can be found in Appendix 4. On 16 May Russell asked for his three allowed photographs, one of which must be of Lady Ottoline Morrell.\textsuperscript{20} The second photograph was of his sister-in-law Elizabeth Russell.\textsuperscript{21} The third was of Colette.\textsuperscript{22} On 31 May Frank noted that he is glad his brother can walk about, that he is not locked in until tea-time, that he can keep his light on until 10 p.m., and is allowed flowers.\textsuperscript{23} What was not allowed was tobacco, which must have been a great hardship to Russell, an avid pipe-smoker. Like all prisons there was a way to get around restrictions some of the time. A fellow prisoner "used to give [him] cigarettes when the warders were not looking."\textsuperscript{24} In early August Ottoline gave him some snuff which he found a "solace."\textsuperscript{25} The restrictions on visitors as well as correspondence were also difficult. Although much better than other divisions, some of the restrictions were more severe than what is allowed in modern prisons, where smoking is allowed, correspondence is not limited and visits are longer.

It appears clear that Russell entered prison with nothing and was then over the next few days allowed the items described in the previous paragraph. This is normal prison practice. However, Louise Cripps remem-

\textsuperscript{18} See Papers 14: Appendix xiii.2 for Russell's own request. 
\textsuperscript{19} Papers 14: App. xiii.3. 
\textsuperscript{20} RAI 730.0799604. 
\textsuperscript{21} RAI 730.079976, Frank and Elizabeth Russell to Russell, 22 June 1918. 
\textsuperscript{22} RAI 200304 (SLBR 2: #315), Russell to Constance Malleson, c.27 May 1918. 
\textsuperscript{23} RAI 730.079968. Russell set his day at four hours philosophical writing, four hours philosophical reading, and four hours general reading as well as two hours of exercise (3 June 1918; 730.079969). The philosophical writing resulted in Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy (1919) and many papers, published and unpublished, in Papers 8 and 14. The book contains the sentence—well known among philosophers—that Russell would give the doctrine of the term "the" if he were "dead from the waist down" and not merely in a prison" (IMP, p. 167). 
\textsuperscript{24} RAI 760.131228, Crompton Llewelyn Davies, 28 March 1910. 
\textsuperscript{25} Letter no. 1489g, 8 Aug. 1918.
bers that Russell told her that “when he went to jail … he had taken a Bible, and inside the cover he had hidden a razor blade in case he would not be able to take the experience of being shut up.”

Accepting this recollection raises several problems. Apart from the rules, there is Russell’s own recollection: “The warder at the gate … asked my religion and I replied ‘agnostic’” (Auto. 2: 34) — hardly the words of a man trying to pass himself off as Christian with Bible in hand. Secondly, it would mean that he already had the idea of smuggling things in books, which was clearly not the case. And thirdly, he knew that he was going into the First Division with all its extra privileges. Cripps’ recollection also raises the side issue of how prisoners shaved and what access they had to blades.

Since there were never many people in the First Division, Russell’s interaction with fellow prisoners should have been extremely limited. To Colette, he does not mention any other prisoners in his correspondence except Maxim Litvinov, a representative of the Soviet Government, with whom he had no verbal contact. To Ottoline, however, in his last letter, Russell wrote about a Salvation Army officer with whom he was able to speak and the many inmates who read his review of Kant. Much later, in 1932, he wrote about several prisoners with whom he had some contact. In addition to the Salvation Army officer, they included debtors, a bigamist lawyer, and a man escaping from his wife. Some of these may be prisoners who cooked his food and cleaned his cell. In his Autobiography he states that “the prison was full of Germans, some of them very intelligent…. Several of them came up to me and argued warmly about my interpretation of [Kant].” Russell is referring to his review of N. K. Smith, A Commentary to Kant’s “Critique of Pure Reason.” Of course, Russell had contact with the warders, some of whom were Independent Labour Party members who greeted him upon his arrival.

28 Letter no. 1489n, 11 Sept. 1918.
29 “Are Criminals Worse Than Other People?”, New York American, 29 Oct. 1931, p. 15; reprinted in Mortals and Others.
30 The Nation, London, 23 (20 July 1918): 426, 428; reprinted in Papers 8. Russell obtained permission to send out the review (Papers 14: App. xiii.3).
31 R.A. 200337, Russell to Constance Malleson, 21 Aug. 1918.
IV. LETTER-WRITING IN PRISON

Considering these limited contacts, correspondence was vital. Russell wrote his first official letter to Frank on 6 May while Frank wrote his on 7 May. The official letters were crammed with messages to and from a variety of people. Colette had multiple identities, so there was often more than one message from her per letter. There were nineteen official letters to Russell from 7 May to 5 September. Not all of Russell’s outgoing official letters are extant. Seventeen have survived in various forms, dated from 6 May to 26 August. (Appendix 1 lists all the official letters.) His letter of 12 August is a bit of a puzzle. It is not with the rest of the official letters but in the files of the Home Office, which at first glance indicates that Frank never received it. However, Frank wrote in a letter that was mainly written by Gladys Rinder on 17 August that he had “got your letter of the 12th which seems to have been delayed some three days to put in an official notice to say your health was excellent.” A copy of this medical note, dated 14 August, attesting that Russell’s “general health appears to be much as usual”, initialled by the medical officer and signed by the Governor, is in the Home Office files. Also there is a letter which shows that Frank himself decided to send Russell’s letter and the medical note to Sir George Cave at the Home Office. Frank writes: “I think I ought to send you the enclosed received today and delayed I imagine for the sake of the official enclosure”, i.e. the medical note. In the letter Russell makes his case for early release and indicates that he suffers from headaches when he works hard. His letters of 5 and 19 August to Rinder are not extant — only condensed typed versions are available. His letter of 26 August to her is available only as an extract in the circular letter for August. There are no official outgoing September letters in any format. People who sent or received messages in official letters are listed in Ap-

32 There are several messages to and from T. S. and Vivienne Eliot. None are in the revised edition of The Letters of T. S. Eliot, ed. Valerie Eliot and Hugh Haughton (London: Faber and Faber, 2009).
33 RAI 730.080002.
34 RA3 Rec. Acq. 903i.
35 A black and white image of the letter is displayed on the website of the National Archives: http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/pathways/firstworldwar/britain/p_bertrand.htm. The letter was annotated on a cover sheet: “Not a letter that would prepossess anyone in writer’s favour!”
pendix 2; there are about twenty names in each list.

Although Colette’s husband knew and approved of their affair, few others may have known—Russell’s brother and Colette’s mother did not know. As to how Colette might communicate, she and Russell agreed that she would place personal ads in *The Times* using the initials “g.j.” They may or may not have agreed to use “Percy” if the opportunity arose—Percy was a childhood nickname of Colette’s, and Russell would surely have recognized it. Both were used on 7 May. A message from g.j. appeared in the *Times*, and Frank’s letter of the same day contained a message from Percy. Over the next few months, messages were also sent from “c.o’n.” (the initials of her stage name), “Colette” and “Lady Constance”—sometimes in the same communication. Both the g.j. and Percy personas were referred to as males.

In addition to official letters, business letters were allowed. There are incoming letters from Dorothy Wrinch, Stanley Unwin of George Allen and Unwin Ltd. and J. H. Muirhead of the Library of Philosophy. There are outgoing letters to Allen and Unwin. Frank also wrote to Allen and Unwin on Russell’s behalf. There are also three letters that Russell sent from prison addressed to no one in particular. Writing to Colette from China in 1920, Russell regarded two of them as his best.36 One letter was about early memories, the other about pacifism and the littleness of man. Russell wrote to Colette that they “ought not to be lost”.37 Unfortunately, the one about early memories has been lost.38 The other letter was written on 30 July 1918. The original is not extant, but there are several typed copies.39 The third letter, 31 August, addressed to “(For anyone whom it may interest)”, exists in the form of typed copies.40 It begins: “There was never such a place as prison for crowding images….”

Russell’s mind was soon busy dreaming up other methods of communication. His first plan was to write letters to Colette in French, pretend-
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Russell had been reading books in prison on the French Revolution. François Nicolas Léonard Buzot (1760–1794) was a far-left Girondin Deputy in the French National Assembly. His love affair with Madame Roland started in 1792, a few months before she was arrested and he had to flee for his life. They smuggled letters to each other while she was in jail and he in hiding. He committed suicide to avoid arrest six months after she was executed.

Next came the smuggling plan. The plan involved placing letters in the uncut pages of books. Both Russell and Ottoline Morrell recollect how this came about. Russell states: “I discovered a method of smuggling out letters by enclosing them in the uncut pages of books. I could not, of course, explain the method in the presence of the warder, so I practised it first by giving Ottoline the Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, and telling her that it was more interesting than it seemed” (Auto. 2: 34–5). Ottoline recalled: “I was very puzzled one day to receive a journal of metaphysics, with a message in it that I should ‘find interesting.’” After puzzling about it for hours, she finally “found at the end some pages that were uncut and in between these pages were little thin sheets of notepaper which made a long letter from Bertie.”

When did this happen? In an official letter to Gladys Rinder, Russell wrote on 17 June: “[Message] To Lady O. Sent you a book today by my brother which you will find interesting, though you may not think so at first

41 Russell had been reading books in prison on the French Revolution. François Nicolas Léonard Buzot (1766–1794) was a far-left Girondin Deputy in the French National Assembly. His love affair with Madame Roland started in 1792, a few months before she was arrested and he had to flee for his life. They smuggled letters to each other while she was in jail and he in hiding. He committed suicide to avoid arrest six months after she was executed.
42 rai. 200302, c.26 May 1918; 200304, c.27 May 1918 (SLBR 2: #315).
43 rai. 200305, [May 1918].
44 Chap. 14, “Bertie in Brixton”, Ottoline at Garsington: Memoirs of Lady Ottoline Morrell, 1915–1928, ed. R. Gathorne-Hardy (London: Faber and Faber, 1974), pp. 252–3. She notes that the books he had in prison “had to be left behind for the prison library”. Since Russell could send books out of prison while he was there, this seems doubtful. At one point he asks for books to be taken away as he is “getting crowded out” (rai 730.079981, 1 July 1918). Some books he used were from the London Library (079977), and he also requested books from the Cambridge University Library (079998). For Russell’s “List of Philosophical Books Read in Prison”, see Papers 8: App. 11. His non-philosophical reading has not been compiled.
glance.” The book must have contained his letter to her of 16 June.45 In it he mentioned that he has already had two letters from her, her first smuggled letter being dated circa 28 May.46 They may have arrived in flowers. Ottoline recalled in her Memoirs: “I always took him a large bunch of flowers from Garsington…. These of course were handed to the warden, but I also held a tiny bunch … in the middle of which I had rolled a little private letter, tying the flowers round it so that it could not be seen.”47 She handed the small bouquet directly to Russell. The flower letters must have acted as an impetus to Russell. She and others quickly adopted the book method. However, she still used the flower method as late as 1 July.48

Russell may have attempted to put a smuggling plan into operation earlier. In an official letter to Frank of 3 June, a message to Miss Rinder appears: “Hope you sent International Journal to Percy — tell him it contained something in French that I thought might interest him.” In Frank’s official letter of 6 June, Miss Rinder included a message: “I sent the International Journal at once, and made other suggestions at the same time. Very sorry it was unsuccessful.” The International Journal was presumably the International Journal of Ethics, a quarterly published in English in the United States. What this French something was is not clear. However, what is extant is a fictitious letter from Mirabeau to Sophie de Monier.49 This letter contains specific instructions on how to smuggle letters in the uncut pages of books. It indicates that Russell was already using the method. Was this small piece of paper placed in the International Journal? Why was it not considered successful? In any event, Russell’s first extant smuggled letter to Colette is dated Friday, 21 June.50

45 RA 3 Rec. Acq. 69, no. 1489a.
46 RA 710.08267/0. The assigned date of this letter means that it and the next one, 1 June (710.08267/1), should be flower letters, although both are written on good paper — the latter on Garsington Manor letterhead. It is hard to imagine the letterhead one being concealed in flowers. They also have crease marks from being folded.
47 Ottoline at Garsington, p. 252.
48 RA 710.08267/3, Morrell to Russell.
49 RA 3.20030, written in very early June 1918, Sophie was the name the Comte de Mirabeau (1749–1791), a French statesman, used for Marie Thérèse de Monier during their illicit affair. His letters to Sophie when he was imprisoned in the castle at Vincennes were first published in 1793.
50 RA 3.200306, written on the same sheet of paper as document .200306a dated “Tuesday 25th”.
Her first smuggled letter was written on 24 June. Once this plan was put into operation it lasted until he was let out. The method was considered to be safe only if the books were handed to Russell, not sent through the post. The official letters continued as well. They are not totally reliable in content once the smuggling scheme was in operation. Russell noted on 24 August: “In my public letters I make the worst of things, for the benefit of the authorities, but I am really very well indeed.”

In addition to Ottoline and Colette, Gladys Rinder sent and received smuggled letters. Others whose smuggled letters are extant include Dorothy Brett, Elizabeth Russell, Clifford Allen and Catherine Marshall, Helen Dudley, Arthur Dakyns, Mark Gertler and Lucy Silcox (see Appendix 3). Their letters had to be smuggled into the prison for Russell to read and then out again so they would not be found in his cell. Around 25 June Russell wrote that he was going to return Colette’s incoming letters to her because “it might be risky” for him to take them out of the prison himself. Smuggled letters could also go astray. Russell replied to Dorothy Brett on 30 August, but his reply was not found until 1923, when it fell out of a book along with his letter to Ottoline Morrell of the same day, according to an account by Elizabeth Trevelyan. Even then the two letters were not returned to Russell until 1956 because Elizabeth mislaid them and only found them again when she was packing up Robert Trevelyan’s books to go to Birkbeck College. Others who received letters from Russell were Dorothy Mackenzie and Elizabeth Russell. Of course, some of the outgoing smuggled letters have not survived. They were either not kept by their recipients or, if kept initially, disappeared over the years. Some of these letters may still be awaiting discovery.

What happened to these letters once they left the prison? Russell did not put Colette’s name in the letters written to her. Letters to Ottoline, however, were addressed to “O.” The letters were placed in “wrappers”.

52 R3 Rec. Acq. 69, no. 1489b, Russell to Morrell, 2 July 1918.
53 R3 .200339, Russell to Malleson.
54 R3 .20031, Russell to Malleson, c.25 June 1918.
55 Original letters 710.053272 (to Brett) and .053273 (to Ottoline Morrell), both dated 30 August 1918; note by Elizabeth Trevelyan on .053274; identified as the writer on the transcription, .047686.
The wrappers are never explained, just mentioned in passing.57 Probably Russell put a thin strip of paper around each letter indicating to whom it should go. Some of them were placed in the mail once they had left the prison with the visitor du jour, but none of the envelopes are extant. They did exist, however, and some were addressed by Russell himself. Ottoline wrote on 25 August: “It was such a surprise and delight to get the envelope directed by your own hand.”58 He stopped mailing letters to Colette during the time she may have been watched by Scotland Yard.59 On 29 July he decided it was safe to resume: “It is all right for me, but not for you, to post things—and it saves so much time to be able to have question and answer back within the week.” Of course, he couldn’t actually post things himself, and it is not clear why Colette could not mail something to Frank or Rinder to be smuggled into the prison if she was not visiting that week. It is rather far-fetched to suppose he was trying to keep their relationship secret this late in the game.

The last communication using the Times was on 27 June. By mid-July Colette was being visited by Scotland Yard inquiring about the identity of G.J. The matter, however, was not pursued by the authorities. Russell wrote to Colette60 to refer to the emissary who visited her as Mr. Cubitt. There is a character named Hilton Cubitt in an Arthur Conan Doyle story, “The Adventure of the Dancing Men”.61 At the centre of the story are secret writings used to communicate with Cubitt’s wife—he cannot understand them. This character may have been the inspiration for the name Russell bestowed upon the emissary.

V. CORRESPONDING WITH COLETTE

After all this information about the mechanics of the communications, some remarks about the extent and content of the various communications are in order. I will concentrate on his correspondence with Colette since I am editing it for possible publication. During this period of incarceration Russell suffered huge mood swings, and the letters helped
him to vent his frustrations. They also provided nourishment for his inner being. Colette was very involved with him during this time, despite Ottoline remembering that Gladys Rinder often had to invent messages from Colette to keep Russell happy.\(^{62}\) That could have been because a message was delayed, or because Russell was asking for details about something and Colette was writing about her feelings. Considering she was communicating using multiple identities, I find it hard to accept that Rinder had to invent messages often, if at all. Perhaps Gladys Rinder was exaggerating her role. These multiple identities sometimes even interacted, with Percy passing on a message from G.J. inside his own message.\(^{63}\) Russell complained to Frank that Elizabeth did not write as much as she could. Frank and Elizabeth were having terminal marital difficulties—Frank blamed Elizabeth’s slackness for her short letters.\(^{64}\)

Ray Monk picked up on Colette’s lack of involvement from Ottoline Morrell’s remarks and amplified it, forgetting she may have regarded Colette with some suspicion. Monk claims that Russell saw little of Colette while he was in prison as she was away touring (Monk 1: 537). In fact, she was only away for May and very early June. She wanted to take the night train from Manchester to visit him and return in time for her next performance, but Russell told her that was not necessary. However, one visit in May must have been managed, as he wrote to Frank on 27 May: “Please tell (or get Miss Rinder to tell) Lady Constance it was a great pleasure to see her, and I am sorry I was rude to her parasol.”\(^{65}\) On 3 June, again in a letter to Frank, Russell commented in a message to Gladys Rinder: “I was glad he [G.J.] had pleasure in seeing his friend. I do not know his friend very well....” In an annotation on a transcription of this letter, Russell explained that he was the friend!\(^{66}\) Once back she visited him at every opportunity allowed, usually with Elizabeth Russell, with her last visit coming on 4 September. She turned down an acting job in Wales because it would have taken her away.\(^{67}\) Before Russell even went to Brixton (and it was not known for sure that he would go until his appeal failed), Colette gave up an acting job in the play *Blanchette* by

\(^{62}\) *Ottoline at Garsington*, p. 253.
\(^{63}\) RAI 730.079984, 5 July 1918.
\(^{64}\) RAI 730.079997, 23 July 1918.
\(^{65}\) RAI 730.079961.
\(^{66}\) RAI 730.079969; annotated letter, RAI 210.007052–f6, fol. 569.
\(^{67}\) RAI 730.080001, Frank Russell to Russell, Malleson p.s., 1–2 Aug. 1918.
A smuggled prison letter from Russell to Colette, 27 June 1918.
The dark area at the top edge is where she mended the letter with cellotape.
The holes are burn holes, likely caused by a cigarette.
Thursday [27 June 1918] in ans to Colette’s of 24 June 1918.

Like a Shattered Vase

All the letters I have ever had were less wonderful than this one, my Heart’s Comrade, my Beloved—I could not have imagined any letter that would so light up my prison cell, and so fill my heart with [...]p of joy. I bless you every hour—I do love you to think of me as you[...]—I feel so much that way—such a longing to creep into your arms and be at peace. Your arms are so strong and loving and bring such warmth into the depths of my being—I have the most vivid imagining of them and of the touch of your lips—O my dear dear Love, the joy that is before us—I dare not think of it. If you are not in work when I come out we must go to Boismaison—I was afraid you were nervous of letters, from something you said a fortnight ago, so I wrote in a very subdued style—and your letter was all the greater joy. As soon as I am safe from being called up, we will give up all attempts at concealment, don’t you think so?—I am sorry for Marie—it must have been dreadful for her. Gladys’s letter came this morning, with lovely things from you—I always thought Chatsauvage had some likeness to Prince André. Did you like Natacha?—Miss R. gives news that Miss Wrinch is unhappy—I wonder if you could make friends with her, through Miss R? I think she is at No. 10, your square. I feel she might like it—I spend endless time here in day-dreams—not impossible ones—of wonderful things we will do together. We have never been by the sea together. After the war there will be abroad. Some day there will be a country cottage. Quite soon, I hope, there will be Bury Street.—“A heavy burning iron” you say—mostly my doing—it is quite wonderful that your love survived that time. It is that that makes me so very very happy now—it makes me feel peace with you. My soul’s joy, I think of you with love and tenderness every moment, and I see the future as a shining joy. I love you with my mind and sober judgment just as much as with my passion—in yourself, as much as in what you are for me. For me you are just the whole difference between life and despair—you give me happiness and gentleness—and through them, the strength one needs for the world at this time. Our future shall be full of greatness as well as joy—which you give me shall be given to the world—Goodbye Beloved—I kiss your eyes and stroke your hair—I want to lay my face against your cheek and feel your arms enfolding me—Goodbye Goodbye my lovely Dear, my Darling.
Annotations for the Illustration

200312 There are also two condensed, typed versions of this holograph letter, RA1 710.053414 and RA3 396.201116.

in ans to Colette’s of 24 June 1918 Letter no. 200 (RA3 396.1034779g) in the Urch–Malleson typescript. These words were added by Colette.

Heart’s Comrade Colette first called Russell her “heart’s comrade” in her letter of 17 November 1916. On 9 December she explains: “I want you as comrade as well as love.” Russell does not return the sentiment in writing until his letter of 9 April 1917 (200121). On 1 January 1918, Russell is so upset with their relationship that he writes he can no longer call her “heart’s comrade”. After their relationship is patched up, he says on 16 February: “I do really feel you now again my Heart’s Comrade.” The last time that Russell uses “heart’s comrade” in a letter to her is 26 August 1921 (200748).

imagined any letter This is one of the first, if not the first, of Colette’s smuggled letters, since she writes on 24 June: “it is absolutely wonderful that the abomination of those official letters is over and done with.”

with [...]p This letter has a hole in the paper from a cigarette burn where word(s) had been written; “songs” appears in both typed versions, but it fails to end in “p”. Perhaps Russell wrote “with a cup of joy”.

me as you[...] The words which follow are missing from the letter because of a hole made by a cigarette burn. Thus they were not transcribed in the condensed versions.

Boismaison The farmhouse, near Ashford Carbonel, Shropshire, owned by Mrs. Agnes Woodhouse, which they nicknamed “Boismaison”. They spent an idyllic holiday there in the summer of 1917 and returned before Russell entered prison.

sorry for Marie In her letter of 24 June, Colette wrote that: “Marie got ill and was quite without money … Marie is now well again.” This is obviously an edited version of Marie’s troubles. In Russell’s letter tentatively dated 25 June 1918 (200311), Russell asks if the child Marie was going to have was Miles’s. Marie Blanche was an actress and friend of Colette’s.

Gladys’s letter Letter from Gladys Rinder, 21 June 1918 (710.054821).

things from you The letter from Gladys Rinder contained messages from Colette in her personas of c.o.’n. and g.j. The former message notes that Lady Constance (i.e. Colette) will visit him on the following Wednesday (i.e. 26 June).

Chatsauvage … Prince André Russell is referring to himself, one of Colette’s nicknames for him being Chatsauvage (“wildcat”). Prince André (Andrei Bolkonsi) is a character in Tolstoy’s War and Peace. Colette had written as g.j. in Gladys Rinder’s letter of 21 June 1918 that she has “been thinking a good deal about our friend Monsieur Chatsauvage and his new book. He reminds me continually of Tolstoy’s Prince Andrei, and also of Count Bezukov.” Pierre Bezukhov is another character in the novel.

Natacha Natasha Rostova, the young heroine of Tolstoy’s War and Peace.

Miss R … Miss Wrinch Gladys Rinder and Dorothy Wrinch.

your square Mecklenburgh Square, London wc1.

Bury Street 34 Russell Chambers, Bury Street, London wc1. Russell first rented this flat in the summer of 1916. He lived in it himself and also sublet it to others. His last tenant, Frank Swinnerton, left in 1923, and so did Russell’s connection with this flat.

“A heavy burning iron” In her letter of 24 June Colette had written: “Some kind of heavy burning iron has passed over me this year.”
Eugène Brieux, directed by Jules Delacre, possibly to be staged in Belgium, so they could go away together to both Ashford and The Cat and Fiddle, near Buxton. She had been without work from when she met Russell in the summer of 1916 until she took a film role in November 1917, mostly because of her activities with the NCF.

In the French communications to her Russell could pour out his heart, full of love. He also affirmed: “Thanks to you my youth has been restored, and I feel strong enough to accomplish enormous works.” Once he moved on to the smuggled letters he had space to write about his plans for their future as well as the state of the world. At the same time he was considering a hunger strike if the regulations were not changed to make him ineligible for military service. When her replies started to arrive, he was in bliss with his heart filled with joy (see my annotated illustration). They discussed Lytton Strachey’s book, *Eminent Victorians*. Russell seemed relatively content. Then he started to press Colette for information about her former lover, Maurice Elwey. She did write about him on 18 July. In the same letter she wrote about meeting an American colonel, the kind of person you get to know instantly, she said. Even though Colonel Mitchell was married and had a lover in England, Russell was instantly wary once he learned of his existence. And he was also worried that Colette had been visited by Scotland Yard. And he wanted Colette to leave her husband. Issues were piling up.

On 22 July he wrote: “It is difficult to settle to work: desire for you makes me so restless that I spend hours walking backwards and forwards in my cell, like the lions and tigers in the Zoo.” A week later he confessed: “The longing to be with you is such a hunger that it is very difficult to deal with. Since I have been here, there have certainly never been 5 consecutive waking minutes that I have not thought of you—and as a rule I think of you the whole time, whatever else I may also be thinking of.” He gave her permission to read Ottoline’s letter that he was sending back out but told her not to tell Ottoline this. He sent reflections

---

68 RA3 200104, c.27 May 1918 (SLBR 2: #315); translation from SLBR.
69 RA3 200306a, 200307, 200313a (25 June–8 July 1918). The upper age for compulsory military service had been raised to 51 in April 1918.
70 RA3 200312, 27 June 1918.
71 RA3 200321.
72 RA3 200324, 29 July 1918.
on sex and vanity and that odd book, the Bible. By 15 August he realized that he was reaching the breaking point:

I have grown so nervy from confinement and dwelling on the future that I feel a sort of vertigo, an impulse to destroy the happiness in prospect. Will you please quite calmly ignore anything I do these next weeks in obedience to this impulse…. If you possibly can, write me longer letters, with more definite news or answer my letters enough for me to know if they have reached you.

Phyllis Urch, a friend of Colette’s, finds an explanation for this in the termination of his ties to his former lover, Helen Dudley. “Confronted by her heartbreak, a mood of near madness assailed him and vented itself on Colette.” After a visit from Dudley the storm cleared, and Russell assured Colette on 21 August that his black mood was gone. The next day he commented that he was able to write better letters to Ottoline because he was no longer in love with her—his letters to Ottoline when he was in love with her and to Colette now are inferior. He was able to read philosophy fruitfully. His small cell was now full of books—he joked with Ottoline on 30 August that he could hardly turn around because it was filled with books and earwigs. He was also reading history, which provided a means of escape. Colette was reading as well. She finished off War and Peace, then Anna Karenina, and began work on a screen treatment of Wuthering Heights. Despite the snuff supplied by Ottoline and the occasional illicit cigarette, Russell missed his tobacco. In early September he asked Colette to bring his “despatch-case containing watch-chain etc. and leave it at prison gates next time you come—it will be quite safe. If you could insert 2 of my pipes (not new ones), 2 ounces tobacco, and 1 box matches, I could leave the prison in style!”

Colette was in charge of making the practical plans for their life together. Russell had written on 29 July: “When I come out, I shall need,
for myself, an address, a room to work in, and a bed when you don’t want me (I hope not often). 84 She prepared Russell’s Bury Street flat for his return after Helen Dudley left and moved there herself shortly before his release. In fact, Colette’s sister had lived in the Bury Street flat during the spring and summer of 1918, and Colette had to find her a place to stay as well. The Attic where Colette used to live with her husband Miles was sublet to Elizabeth, who then arranged for Dorothy Wrinch to live there. Russell was to work at The Studio, a place that he and Colette had rented for themselves, as a retreat. It was never considered as a place to live full-time, but Miles Malleson lived there briefly in the summer of 1918 after he left the Attic. Russell would have his meals at Gordon Square. And he would spend his nights at Bury Street. It would be the closest that he and Colette ever came to living together. He unexpectedly got out of prison two weeks early on 14 September. 85 He went to Bury Street, accused Colette of having an affair with Colonel Mitchell, and left. Their relationship never recovered. It did continue, however, with breaks, reconciliations and infrequent sexual intimacies until his marriage to Edith. Their friendship endured until his death.

VI. CONCLUSION

The prison experience did not mark Russell in any significant way. His health did not suffer as he feared it might if he were placed in Second Division. Although he was nominally a member of the Prison System Enquiry Committee, his incarceration did not engender in him any particular new interest in prison welfare. 86 By mid-October he felt he was returning to his normal robust state. 87 The war was ending and a new chapter opening in his life.

84 RA3.200324, 29 July 1918.
85 His full term of six months would have released him at the end of October. In late July Frank learned from Cave that Russell would get a six-week remission (RA3.730.079997). This was a fortnight earlier than “what was to have been” (RA3.200324). But the date changed again to 2 October (RA3.200328–200329, p. 2, 8 Aug. [SLBR2: #319]). The arrangement with Cave had fallen through. In the end, the earlier date turned out to be the correct one.
86 See the meeting notification from Stephen Hobhouse, 1 Aug. 1919 (RA1.710.051108). The date is not marked in Russell’s pocket diary. Hobhouse and Fenner Brockway headed the Prison System Enquiry Committee. There is no sign Russell attended any of the infrequent meetings of their general committee.
87 RA3 Rec. Acq. 16, Russell to C. Allen, 14 Oct. 1918.
APPENDIX I. OFFICIAL LETTERS

All letters have the initials of the Governor (C.H.) or occasionally another prison official (H.B.); exceptions are noted. Some letters are also stamped. These letters were dubbed by Philip Morrell as "the 1st, 2nd or 3rd Epistles General of St. Bertrand to the faithful" (RA 710.082671, O. Morrell to Russell, 1 June 1918). Condensed versions of these letters had limited circulation. Extracts had wider circulation. The document numbers of the circulated letters can be found in brackets.

Personal
Outgoing:
6 May 1918, RA 730.079957 (SLBR 2: #312; Auto. 2: 35–6), to Frank Russell
16 May 1918, 730.079960a, to Frank Russell
21 May 1918, RA 3 Rec. Acq. 596 .200299 (SLBR 2: #313), to Gladys Rinder; contains letter from "Buzor" to "Madame Roland"
27 May 1918, 730.079965 (SLBR 2: #314; Auto. 2: 36), to Frank Russell
3 June 1918, 730.079969 (Auto. 2: 86), to Frank Russell
10 June 1918, 730.079973 (Auto. 2: 36), to Frank and Elizabeth Russell
17 June 1918, .200299a, to Rinder; missing prison official initials, thus possibly smuggled
24 June 1918, 730.079978, to Frank Russell
1 July 1918, 730.079981, to Frank Russell
8 July 1918, 730.079987 (Auto. 2: 36), to Frank Russell
15 July 1918, 730.079991, to Frank Russell
22 July 1918, 730.079994 (Auto. 2: 36–7), to Frank Russell
29 July 1918, 730.079998, to Frank Russell
5 August 1918, .200299d, to Rinder; original not extant (this is typed and condensed); assumed to be official
12 August 1918, Rec. Acqs. 418/903i, to Frank Russell; in the files of the Home Office
19 August 1918, .200299e, to Rinder; original not extant (this is typed and condensed); assumed to be official
26 August 1918, Rec. Acq. 17c, to Rinder; an extract in the circular letter for that month; assumed to be official
Incoming (Russell numbered Frank's letters with roman numerals):
7 May 1918, 730.079960, from Frank Russell
13 May 1918, 710.041885, from Eva Kyle
19–20 May 1918, 730.079963, from Frank and Elizabeth Russell
25 May 1918, 710.054817, from Rinder; missing prison official initials, thus possibly smuggled
31 May 1918, 730.079968, from Frank Russell
6 June 1918, 730.079972, from Frank and Elizabeth Russell
15 June 1918, 710.054819, from Rinder
21 June 1918, 710.054821, from Rinder
22–27 June 1918, 730.079976, from Frank Russell
5 July 1918, 730.079984, from Frank and Elizabeth Russell
12 July 1918, 730.079990, from Frank Russell; p.s. from E. S. King, Frank's secretary
19 July 1918, 730.079993, from Frank Russell
23–26 July 1918, 730.079997, from Frank and Elizabeth Russell
1–2 August 1918, 730.080001, from Frank Russell and Constance Malleson
9 August 1918, 710.054830, from Rinder


Like a Shattered Vase

17 August 1918, 730.080002, from Rinder and Frank Russell
23 August 1918, 710.054834, from Rinder
30 August 1918, 710.054835, from Rinder
5 September 1918, 710.054837, from Rinder

Business/philosophy/politics

Incoming:
Dorothy Wrinch. 6 letters, 710.057982, .057985–89. Only .057982 and 89 have prison initials; others were possibly smuggled.

Outgoing:
Allen and Unwin. 10 June, 19 Aug., 4 Sept. 1918, r13 Rec. Acq. 70
Frank Russell wrote to Allen & Unwin on Russell’s behalf, 11 June–5 Sept. 1918, box 6.43. He sent Allen & Unwin a copy of a letter, 23 May 1918, from J. B. Lippincott, which was addressed to Russell.


Prison and government officials (incoming and outgoing)
C. Haynes, Governor, r13 Rec. Acq. 903i
T. Vansittart Bowater, Chair of the Visiting Committee, Rec. Acq. 903i
Home Office, Rec. Acq. 418, 903i

APPENDIX 2. MESSAGES

Messages for the following are in Russell’s official letters, followed by their message initials:
Clifford Allen
H. Wildon Carr
Hilderic Cousens (H.C.)
Arthur Dakyns
T. S. Eliot
Ernest E. Hunter (E.E.H.)
P. E. B. Jourdain
Eva Kyle
George Kaufmann (G.K.)
G. Lowes Dickinson (G.L-D.)
Dorothy Mackenzie
Constance Malleson
Miles Malleson
Ottoline Morrell
Gladys Rinder (in Frank Russell letters)

Messages from the following are in the official incoming letters:
Allen and Unwin
Clifford Allen (C.A.)
Clare Annesley
E. W. Barnes (Master of the Temple)
J. B. (probably Joan Beauchamp)
E. N. Bennett
H. Wildon Carr
G. Lowes Dickinson
Helen Dudley
T. S. Eliot
Edith M. Ellis (Miss E.)
Ernest E. Hunter (E.E.H.)
P. E. B. Jourdain
George Kaufmann (G.K., G.K – n)
J. B. Lippincott & Co.
J. Ramsay MacDonald (J.R.M.)
Dorothy Mackenzie (D.M.)
Constance Malleson
Catherine Marshall (C.E.M.)
Ottoline Morrell
Gladys Rinder (in Frank’s letters)
Frank & Elizabeth Russell (in Rinder’s letters)
Lydia Smith
Philip and Ethel Snowden
Lytton Strachey (L.S.)
Violet Tillard (V.T.)
Charles Trevelyan
Robert C. Trevelyan
A. N. Whitehead
Evelyn Whitehead
Dorothy Wrinch
Unidentified: P. (some instances remain unidentified; one “P.” is Colette)

APPENDIX 3. SMUGGLED LETTERS

To Constance Malleson:
The document numbers of transcriptions and literary versions can be found in bracers.
ra3 Rec. Acq. 196 .200302, [26 May 1918], “Buzot” to “Madame Roland”
.200304, [27 May 1918], “Buzot” to “Madame Roland” (SLBR 2: #315)
.200305, [May 1918]; in French but using neither the Buzot nor the Mirabeau identity
.200301, [very early June 1918], “Mirabeau” to “Sophie de Monier”
.200306, 21 June 1918
.200307, 22 June 1918
.200310, Monday 24 June 1918
.200306a, Tuesday 25 June 1918; written on verso of .200306
.200311, Tuesday evg. [25 June 1918?]
.200312, Thursday [27 June 1918]
.200309, Tuesday evg. [11 June 1918]
.200313, July 5 [1918] (Auto 2: 87)
To Ottoline Morrell:

All letters except one (noted below) are photocopies; originals are at the University of Texas.

ra\textsuperscript{3} Rec. Acq. 385.001489a, [16 June 1918] 001489b, [1 July 1918] 001489c, 14 July 1918 001489d, [14 July 1918] 001489e, [25 July 1918] (SLBR 2: #317) 001489f, 1 August 1918 (SLBR 2: #318, text is problematic; does not contain all of the letter; includes part of 001489g) 001489h, 8 August 1918 (Auto 2: 89–90) 001489i, 11 August 1918 (Auto 2: 90) 001489j, 8 August 1918 001489k, 21 August 1918 001489l, 26 August 1918 001489m, 27 August 1918 ra\textsuperscript{1} 710.053273, 30 August 1918 (letter that went astray; see n.55 above) (Auto 2: 92) (original) ra\textsuperscript{3} Rec. Acq. 385.001489n, 4 September 1918 001489o, 11 September 1918

From Constance Malleson:

The original letters are not extant. Typed, edited transcriptions are in the Urch–Malleson typescript, beginning on p. 231, letter no. 198, 31 May 1918, and ending on p. 289, letter no. 224, [13 Sept. 1918]. The transcriptions indicate that she sent him official letters in May. This was not the case. Their text generally comes from the messages she sent, which were included in the official letters written by Frank and others. There are also a few literary versions of her letters; document numbers are available in brackets.

From Ottoline Morrell:

Ottoline’s hand is very difficult to read. The content of her letters concerns her county estate, Garsington Manor, and the activities of the people there that summer: her husband, Philip, and daughter, Julian, as well as Dorothy Winch, Brett, and Mark Gertler. Books and other matters are also discussed. She passed on one brief message from Francis Meynell. Russell numbered some of her letters. ra\textsuperscript{1} 710.082670, [28 May 1918] 710.082671, 1 June 1918 710.082672, 20 June [1918] 710.082673, 1 July [1918] 710.082673a, 8 July [1918] 710.082674, [July 1918] 710.082675, [July 1918] 710.082676, 30 July [1918] 710.082677, 4 Aug [1918] 710.082678, Sunday 11 Aug [1918] 710.082679, 17 Aug 1918 710.082680, 25 Aug. [1918] 710.082681, 2 Sept [1918] 710.082682, [Sept. 1918]

From Gladys Rinder:

Several of her letters were not dated. Approximate dates and date ranges have been assigned. Messages from others are in these letters; message senders include Mrs. Hamilton, Dorothy Winch, Dorothy Mackenzie, Ottoline Morrell, Helen Dudley, Clifford Allen. ra\textsuperscript{1} 710.054818f1, [May 1918] 710.054825; sometime from May to August 1918 710.054822, [July 1918] 710.054831, [August 1918] 710.054828, [July 1918] 710.054833, 6 August 1918 710.054827, [8 August 1918] 710.054829, 8 August 1918 710.054836, 3 September 1918 710.054838, [6 September 1918]

Dorothy Brett, ra\textsuperscript{1} 710.047684, 26 August, written from Garsington; she compares prison to her deafness; Russell’s reply of 30 August (in Auto. 2: 92–3) to her fell out of a
book in 1923, according to Elizabeth Trevelyan. See n.55 above.

Dorothy Mackenzie (later Cousens; former fiancée of Graeme West), RA3 Rec. Acq. 393. She received a letter from Russell, 8 August 1918, in response to a letter from her (not extant).

Elizabeth Russell (who also wrote official letters), 710.055306, incomplete letter, June–August 1918. “I love my little expeditions with C. to you. She lunches with me first … she is the cleverest little thing … like a gamin—anyhow some sort of boy … interested in her work—such a mercy, else she would gut out her heart.” On 21 August Russell sent her two poems for Frank (710.055308).

Friends who sent letters but did not receive a separate reply (or may have received a message or reply that is no longer extant):

Clifford Allen and Catherine Marshall, joint letter, RA1 710.046804, 27 June 1918: Allen has received a personal letter from Russell.

Maud Burdett, 710.047912, 15 May 1918; sent before the smuggling plan was in effect; she enclosed a book.

Arthur Dakyns, 710.048817, 27 June 1918: “you are not finding it so bad after all”, “I shall come from the ends of the earth”, he says, if there is a chance of seeing Russell.

Helen Dudley, 710.049573, 19 August 1918; previously dated 1915. The dating is somewhat tentative; she doesn’t mention in her letter that Russell is in prison; she has received a letter from him (not extant).

Mark Gertler, 710.050264, June 1918: “Ottoline tells me there is an opportunity to write to you.”

Lucy Silcox, 710.055949, 51, 53, 3 letters, June (incomplete), 10 and 22 August 1918.

People who sent letters but to whom there are no extant responses as separate documents:

The first two are American readers of Why Men Fight. Possibly Russell’s regular correspondence was held until his release. Few such letters are extant. Alice Ives Gilman, RA1 710.050294, 30 May 1918

Samuel Milliken, 710.052952, 29 August 1918, addressed to Russell care of the Century Company, New York

Scott Nearing (American economist, radical), 710.053791, 16 August 1918, addressed to Russell at Trinity College from New York—the first extant letter from Nearing to Russell and a letter of praise

To no specific recipient:

.200299g, 30 July 1918, “To all and sundry”; 3 other typed copies; appears in Auto. 2: 88–9 as addressed to Gladys Rinder because someone typed on 210.07052f, fol. 579 “copy of letter from B. Russell to Miss Rinder”.

Rec. Acq. 14, “(For anyone whom it may interest)”, 31 August 1918; 2 other typed copies; in Auto. 2: 93–4 with 2 salutations, the second being Ottoline Morrell because Edith Russell erroneously added this information (210.07052f, fol. 588).

APPENDIX 4. VISITORS

Note: Regular visitors came on Tuesday or Wednesday.

Regular visitors were:

Frank Russell

Elizabeth Russell
Constance Malleson
Ottoline Morrell

Russell's letter of 16 May: extra people for visits, in order of preference
Gilbert Murray
C. P. Sanger
J. E. Littlewood
Desmond MacCarthy
Margaret Ll. Davies
E. H. Neville
Mrs. Hamilton
T. S. Eliot
Maud Burdett
Francis Meynell
Arthur Dakyns
“You won’t forget Clifford Allen if and when available (Miss Rinder will know)”
Gladys Rinder, “Am looking forward to seeing you on Wednesday” (Russell’s letter of 28 May)

Possible visitors mentioned in Russell’s correspondence:
Russell’s letter of 10 June:
Captain Holland
Russell’s letter of 11 July:
Dickinson visited with Elizabeth Russ-
SELL and Constance Malleson on the previous day.
Russia’s letter of 14 July:
Wants to see William H. Buckler (a Trinity acquaintance at the US embassy)
Russia’s letter of 15 July:
Henry W. Nevinson, J. Ramsay MacDonald, Mrs. Huth Jackson are mentioned as visitors.
August:
Helen Dudley came to see him before leaving for America.

Philosophy visitors (could visit on other days of the week):
A. N. Whitehead
Dorothy Wrinch

Business visitors:
Russia’s letter of 16 May:
“Withers and Wildon Carr, both business, must be seen singly.” Withers (Russell’s lawyer) visited in June (730.079969); Carr also visited in June (730.079978) and again in July.
John J. Withers
H. Wildon Carr

The Editor encouraged me to submit this paper to the journal. It is based on the speech that I gave at the annual meeting of the Bertrand Russell Society in May 2010. He spurred me on to further research and fact-checking as well as contributing his own suggestions, including solving the mystery of Russell’s 12 August 1918 letter to Frank.