the socio-cultural disciplines. He is even more neglectful of the sociological and characterological factors inherent in all knowledge. True, he mentions the fact that a literary artist may convey "intimate personal knowledge by artistic means", while ethical theories are merely used to show the part played by probability in ethical conduct. Except for some perfunctory references to the word "history", there is no mention whatsoever of any of the social studies. In connection with the concept of "psychological" or "subjective certainty", the author admits that some people feel that Churchill is good and that Stalin is bad or vice versa. And yet no word about the efforts of sociologists, economists, historians and other social scientists to interpret scientifically precisely these and similar issues!

That the question of the respective merits and demerits of Messrs. Churchill and Stalin is not just a question of purely private taste, a matter where one might expect to find that "disagreement is the rule", is certainly known to a writer who has himself greatly contributed to the clarification of such issues. The strange blindness of so clear-sighted a man as Mr. Russell may in part be traced to his point of departure which consists of an over-simplified dichotomy between "individual" and "social" knowledge. Neither type of knowledge is seen historically and sociologically, both appear as fixed and separate data (inspite of the reference to "animal behavior"). According to Russell social knowledge is the possession of the "community" called mankind which has at its disposal a "collective intellect" and the one language of common sense and science. Thus Russell completely overlooks the fact that the scientific world community with its scholars and common sense citizens (by the way, a fairly late product of Alfred Weber's "civilizational process") represents the most inclusive type of society, but that at the same time the individual has always been a member of many and changing communities, each with its own "language" and system of beliefs and facts, principles and inferences (e.g. tribe and nation, church and party, class and caste, culture area and historic epoch). Human knowledge is the sum-total of these ever-changing, frequently interacting, and sometimes conflicting systems of knowledge. Even the purely scientific knowledge of world civilization can be fully grasped only if allowance is made for its interdependence with the mode of existence and knowledge of these manifold groupings which are the vehicles of Alfred Weber's "cultural" and "societal processes".

Up to the present time illumination of the interdependence of these various systems of knowledge has been attempted mainly by social philosophers such as Marx and Freud, Pareto and Mannheim. It is therefore the more regrettable that a philosopher of science of the stature of Bertrand Russell has failed to apply his genius to this task. Thus he might have thrown more light even upon the epistemology of logical and scientific knowledge.