

1

On an Article by Dr. Schweitzer.

In an article in this periodical, dated March 26, 1914, entitled Some Critical Remarks on Analytical Realism, Dr. A. R. Schweitzer attacks the views of Mr. Russell and Professor Spaulding on the philosophy of mathematics from the standpoint of one whose sphere of activities embraces both mathematics and philosophy. Before considering his attack in detail, I should like to criticize two points concerning his method of procedure. The first is that he couples Spaulding and Russell together in his indictment. It is, perhaps, justifiable to saddle Spaulding's philosophy with whatever defects may be found in Russell's theory of mathematics, for, as Schweitzer points out, "he has tried to carry out the Russell programme"; and he explicitly recognizes the Principles of Mathematics of Mr. Russell as the font et origo of all his speculations. Mr. Russell has never, however, accorded any such recognition to the work of ~~Mr.~~ ^{Professor} Spaulding, and Schweitzer himself points out that Spaulding has been guilty of many crass mathematical errors, which could not conceivably be have been committed by Russell. Dr. Schweitzer's paper is in this respect, therefore, eminently unfair to Mr. Russell.

But he is still less fair to Mr. Russell in another respect. In his whole paper, there is not

a single reference to any other book of Mr. Russell than the unfinished Principles of Mathematics, written by Mr. Russell in 1903, and left incomplete and ~~with~~ put out of print by Mr. Russell himself, on account of his dissatisfaction with certain points in it, nor is there any other sign that his acquaintance with the work of Mr. Russell is not limited to a ~~sea~~ study of this obsolete book. I here is no sign, I repeat, ~~of~~ that Dr. Schweitzer is ~~is~~ aware of the existence of that admirable piece of subtlety, of mathematical ingenuity, and of painstaking care in reasoning — the Principia Mathematica, written by Mr. Russell in collaboration with Professor Whitehead, author of Universal Algebra, Mathematical Concepts of the Physical World, etc. — which I would most heartily recommend him, as a mathematician, to peruse. In this monumental work, he will fail to find not a few of the defects of whose existence he complains in the Principles, and he will find some of the questions answered, which he asks in his article.

Whether, however, the Principles is a fair sample of ~~Russell's~~ Russell's work or not, it represents, at all events, a more or less coherent set of views, which a philosopher of mathematics might hold, and is hence a suitable object for a critical paper, such as that of Dr. Schweitzer. The question which we shall consider in this paper is, then, whether Dr. Schweitzer's criticisms, considered on their own

merits, hit their mark. However, since the differences between the Principia and the Principles are only those between a more or less complete theory and a first draft, between the finished blue-prints of an architect and the rough sketch he first makes of the house to be built, we are entitled to rebut Schweitzer's accusations ~~that~~ and innuendoes that Russell's analysis is barren and fruitless as an engine of ~~mathematical~~ mathematical discovery" by pointing to the theories of

"...we are asked to take the word of the realists that their analysis is a means of discovery, but for tangible evidence they, in effect, refer us to analyses of known contents." ~~...~~
~~...~~ p. 171. "But so far as I have been able to ascertain, neither Spaulding nor Russell has had experience in mathematical research"

selections, of relation-arithmetic, of series — which, as far as I know, were never strictly defined until Russell took them up — and, above all, of measurement, developed in the Principia.