

Ans

TELEPHONE No 768.

BARRMORE,
LADY MARGARET ROAD,
CAMBRIDGE.

LY

Sunday Sept 3

Dear Bertie

I hope to post the
proofs of these at the same
time as this letter, viz before
5 or 6 o'clock when the
mail departs. But last
night when I should have
finished them, the idea
suddenly flashed on me
that these could be

treated in exactly the same way as I have now got space [which is a picture of beauty, by the bye].

So till the small hours of the morning, I was employed in making notes of the various ramifications.

The result is a relational theory of time, exactly on par with that of space. As far as I can see, it gets over all

the old difficulties, and above all
got^{to} abolish the instant in time, e.g.
the present instant, ~~see~~ even in the shape
of the instantaneous group of events. This
of has always bothered me as much as
the 'point' - but I have had to conceal
my dislike from lack of hope. But
I have got my knife into it at last.

According to the theory,
the time-relation as we
generally think of it [
sophisticated of philosophers]
is a great cock up. Simultaneity
does not ~~belong~~ belong to it.
That comes in from the
existence of the space-relation.
Accordingly ~~all~~ the class
of all points in space serves
the purpose of the instant in
time. Also each object
runs its own track (properly
so called).

BERTRAND RUSSELL

TELEPHONE No 768.

BARRMORE,
LADY MARGARET ROAD,
CAMBRIDGE.

I don't pretend that this
is an explanation of the
theory. But I jot ~~down~~
these notes down to let you
see that the theory is
rather far-reaching.

The fact is that with large
objects - i.e. extended through
long times and large spaces -
their mutual relations

When become too complicated
for simple logical statement.

We break them up into
small enough objects and
their ^{relations} of a sufficient
logical simplicity begin
to appear. We push this
to its process of paring
away at the objects to its
ideal limit [marked of
course of classes of things
tucked away in each other]

and [with some cooking] we reach the
ideal logical simplicity of time and
space as usually conceived.

My root idea is that an object has
essential extension in time as well
as in space, and that ^{there are} time-parts of an
object just as there are space-parts.

In fact the time and space extensions

are the object. The
merely formal properties of
time and space, as usually
considered, arise from their
being logical abstractions.
The scientific universe arises
from the research for objects
which are always time-parts
of yet greater objects.

The general result seems to
me to help a naive realism.

Yours affectly

A. N. Whitehead