

engaged in and which I think should be done. It is for his colleagues to give the facts of their difficulties in working with him. My own reasons for breaking with him I have tried to make clear in this memorandum and to indicate to a slight degree in my autobiography. I have given them directly to Ralph himself in the past, especially on the few occasions when he has visited me here in the last three or four years. I have referred to them in my last letters to him, copies of which I think are in my files along with other correspondence addressed to me by him and others. I am particularly sorry to have had to make this open breach with Ralph because I fear that it will distress his parents whom I both like and respect - unless, of course, they can take refuge in the belief that I have been persuaded, or even forced, to make it by my wife and the other wicked people who surround me.

The question of cardinal importance that has been put to me is why did I not break with him earlier. I did not do so because, until the last few years he was the only person who could and would carry out the work that I thought should be done. The balance of his accomplishments over his drawbacks has only gradually been reversed. His faults and mistakes were of less importance than his ability to turn vision to practicable effect and his courage and optimism in carrying out our ideas. When, sometime after the Cuban debacle, he finally took the bit in his teeth and later careered away unrestrained as Secretary General of the War Games Tribunal, I became increasingly doubtful of his usefulness to the work and remonstrated with him both frequently and severely. Since his methods, however, have become importunately open to question and, consequently, intolerable, during the last two years, and during the last year can only be termed dishonour, I have felt it necessary to make a definitive break with him.

I did this in my letter to him of July, 1969, to which I received no reply. Towards the end of November, 1969, I was obliged to write again in an endeavour to extract an undertaking that he would cease using either my name or my wife's as he has been doing to support his own work. And in the past few days, I have found it necessary to prepare a public statement of repudiation, since I must, if possible, disassociate myself and my wife from all Ralph's actions in the minds of all men who will listen.

Russell

Postscript: Had I seen the letter which Ralph wrote to two of his co-directors on 29 June, 1968, earlier I would have unhesitatingly broken definitively with him at once. But I was not shown this until late in November, 1969. It is a preposterous document. But in it he presents his point of view on our association at length. It therefore deserves examination. In it he objects to what I said of him in my autobiography on the ground that it is "a betrayal of all the years I have devoted to the Foundation and to Bertie, years in which I have worked flat out and at the risk of life for twenty hours a day." Possibly he is referring to the first draft of my autobiography. I was, and still am unaware of any occasion upon which he raked his life either for my sake or that of the Foundation. If he is referring to his travels in Africa, the dangerous part of those was made without authorization from either me or the Foundation. The same is true if he is referring to his second journey to Bolivia when he got himself imprisoned and shot at. In both cases he was begged to return to London or to stay in London as he had been away many weeks longer than had been intended and all the work of the Foundation

was held up by efforts to straighten out what he had begun and abandoned. Much of the rest of his letter, three closely typed pages, is a diatribe against my wife who, he states, has been waging a campaign against him. In the course of this he utters nonsense, saying that "she has tried to deny me help of the Foundation when I have been in prison or in need of assistance to recover my passport. She has manoeuvred to prevent my return to Britain and when I did return she put out a vicious Press statement dissociating Bertie from me which only a miracle prevented the bourgeois press from blowing up into a major scandal." All this is, of course, untrue. She has often helped Ralph, and would have helped him in prison had there been anything that she could have done for him. She has never put out a Press statement of any sort, vicious or otherwise. Moreover, he says that "she has harassed and bullied and tormented Bertie to secure his acquiescence in her efforts." I have never been harassed or bullied or tormented by her. The idea is ludicrous. And in point of fact, she felt optimistic about Ralph for a longer time than I did. Ralph thinks that it was she who made me demand that he should not be my secretary. "The muted and scarcely existent public support of Bertie for me when I have been in grave danger and now banned from Britain" is owing to her. And her nefarious actions culminate in "harmful" remarks that I had helped Ralph as much as I could, and I do not think that I have been ungenerous to him in my autobiography.

There follows in this letter a long, very revealing paragraph. He sums it up in the introductory sentence: "the truth is that every major political initiative that has borne the name of Bertrand Russell since 1960 has been my work in thought and deed." He continues, naming what he considers these major political initiatives. To all this he says that I have agreed enthusiastically. I have referred to my wife's evil campaign against him "with anguish," apologising, assuring, even crying. This is entirely the figment of his imagination. He himself, he says, has been "trapped in the dilemma of not tearing him (that is me) apart by fighting Edith."

I should ask Ralph to reflect on his own past speeches concerning the duties of a good secretary. And also upon the number of times that I have urged him to work and publish in his own name. Further, I should ask him to compare the paragraph about my wife on page 5 (Allen and Urwin edition) in the Preface written by himself to the book which he edited entitled *Philosopher of the Century*. It was first published in 1967. I entirely subscribe to what he says in that paragraph, as does my wife. But I should think that the change that he finds to have taken place in one year, 1967-68, would seem even to Ralph to be unlikely. I suppose that he has invented my wife's campaign as a face saving device against my criticisms. There is no slightest danger, and never has been, of my being torn apart by conflicts between my wife and Ralph.

This letter leaves me with the impression that Ralph must be well established in megalomania. The truth is, I suppose, that I have never taken Ralph as seriously as he liked to think I did. I was fond of him in the early years. But I never looked upon him as a man of parts and weight and much individual importance.

Russell