Since the committee of the Carnegie Institution turned down Peirce's request for a grant, James renewed his efforts to have the decision revised, but to no avail. He did, however, secure Harvard's sponsorship of a series of lectures by Peirce in the spring. James argued that, since his students heard so much about Peirce in his new course, it would be helpful to them to hear Peirce himself.

In the early part of this year, James sent to some friends copies of the syllabus he used for his "Philosophy of Nature" course. He hoped to write a new book along the lines of this syllabus. The book would present his metaphysics, a "system of tychistic and pluralistic philosophy of pure experience" or "a pluralistic empiricism radically defended." One of the people to whom James sent his syllabus was G. F. Stout, who had asked James for a testimonial, since he was leaving Oxford with the hope of teaching at St. Andrews University in Scotland.

James did not teach the second half of the school year. He booked passage on a steamer for Genoa, Italy, on 28 February. However, he cancelled this trip and went to North Carolina in early April. While there he expressed his dislike for the architecture of the new Emerson Hall building that was to house the philosophy faculty and classes. Later in that month he was honored by being
elected a member of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences.

Now that James was mainly out of psychology, it is most interesting to see how he ranked the psychologists in the country at the request of Cattell, who along with Schiller, was an advocate of the “questionnaire” method of obtaining opinions.

In line with his own philosophic tendencies, James welcomed with enthusiasm the “school” of empiricism being developed at the University of Chicago under the leadership of John Dewey. James saw this movement fitting in closely with Schiller’s philosophy as expressed in Schiller’s collection of essays entitled Humanism (1903). At the end of August, James gave five lectures on his “radical empiricism” at Thomas Davidson’s old summer school “Glenmore” in Hurricane, New York. This school was continued by Davidson’s friend, C. M. Bakewell. James offered the lectures to “hear how the stuff would sound when packed into that bulk.” While there he acknowledged the honor of election to the Accademia Nazionale del Lincei of Rome, Italy, as well as putting his views on vivisection in a “nutshell” in reply to a request for his opinion. In the middle of October, while he was vacationing at Chocorua, James wrote an article containing his reminiscences of Davidson.

James felt very badly about the American government’s treatment of the insurrectionists in the Philippine Islands. He belonged to the New England Anti-Imperialist League to protest such matters. He thought that “the great disease of our country now is the unwillingness of people to do anything that has no chance of succeeding.”

In December James submitted his resignation from teaching, which was intended to become effective for the school year, 1904–05.
95 Irving St.
Jan. 1. '03

Dear Marshall,

Can you immediately write a word to the Carnegie Committee in favor of aid to Chas. Peirce whilst writing out the "Logic" which will be his magnum opus, & contain all his ideas?

He seems to me an ideal beneficiary, yet they have turned him down. A revision is yet possible, if his friends act quickly enough.

Send your line to Hon. H. D. Peirce, Department of State, Washington & mark it "personal." He is Chas.'s brother, & is collecting documents.

I hope you are well. I am vastly so, on the whole. A happy New Year!

Yours in haste

Wm James
Dear Russell,

Your letter is gratifying—I answer it before I have read the New World article, (which must have come out in my absence, for I never saw that number before) since I am balled up just at present and can’t read it for several days.

We had a plan of asking you and Mrs. Russell to visit us for the holidays, but we had to have a surgical operation and a “trained nurse” instead. No danger, only a congenital hernia on our boy which this seemed the best time to have cured, and all has gone well, though he must keep his bed a fortnight more.

I rejoice in your own reported betterment. I too believe I ought to go on to a lighter diet, and what you say inspires in that direction. I am vastly tougher nervously than I was a year ago. I got pretty low again in September, and as soon as I returned I went back to the Roberts-Hawley lymph & went up like a cork. I can’t possibly doubt the effect this time. It has carried me through the winter so far.

Does your Dr. really know anything about it?

As for giving your Williams men a “talk,” I am getting shyer & shier of that sort of thing. Writing seems my only channel of communication that is satisfactory, and I am absorbed now in the metaphysical technicalities out of which I hope someday to write a new book. They are quite unfit to “talk” about to the young.
Later in the year we shall hope to have you with us. Best regards to Mrs. Russell & the young ladies.

Yours ever truly

Wm James

The looseness of reasoning in Royce's books staggers me, for the whole thing professes to be reasoned.¹

· To Henry Rutgers Marshall ·

95 Irving St.
Jan. 7. 1903

Dear Marshall,

I am hoping to leave for N. Y. on Jan 21, and perhaps dine at the so-called National Institute of Arts & Letters. Are you not a member? It will give me great pleasure to go to your Philosophical Club the following night, and discuss if you like, monistic & pluralistic theories, though I think I won't write anything.

I shall be delighted, if it be still convenient to you, to be your guest on those two days.

You are very kind!

Yours, as always,

Wm James²
To Edgar B. Van Winkle

95 Irving Street
Cambridge
Feb 8 1903

Dear E. B. V. W.,

I return to you the Harbinger, rather reluctantly, since it would seem as if an "effort" of that kind all in my own handwriting ought to become the heirloom of my family rather than yours. Perhaps you'll leave it to my children in your will. They are filled with astonishment that their father's poetic genius should never have manifested itself after the age of 13.

I thank you for your kind letter. I haven't yet seen your boy—if you lived in Cambridge you would understand why—but I hope to do so before long.

It was a fine experience to see you again—but not exactly the physical type I should have expected of you. That would have been something more tall and lank and scholarly.

Affectionate regards!

Wm James

...
Dear President,

You may remember that some 5 years ago I asked the Corporation whether, in case I raised the money, they would appoint Chas. S. Peirce to give a short course of lectures on Logic.

The Corporation declined, and the lectures were given at Mrs. Bull’s in Brattle Street, and were a great success, so far as arousing strong interest in advanced men went.

Peirce wants to devote the rest of his life to the writing of a logic which will undeniably (although in some points excentric) be a great book. Meanwhile he has apparently no means. I am willing to help financially again, & venture (since the Corporation has partly changed its composition) to renew my old question. My class in Phil. 3 has this year been dosed with some of Peirce’s ideas at second hand, and is (I know) full of curiosity to hear his voice. I can’t imagine the possibility of any personal clash with the authorities here, in case he lectured. He is one of our 3 or 4 first American philosophers, and it seems to me that his genius is deserving of some official recognition. Half a dozen lectures, at 100 dollars a piece, would seem to me about right.

Can’t the Corporation change its earlier mind?

Respectfully its,

Wm James 4
Harvard University
March 2, 1903

Dear Stout,

Your request of the 17th. puts me in a somewhat embar­rassing position. I thoroughly disapprove of the Scotch methods of candidacy, and the other day I finally struck work on the pamphlets. I have been asked lately to con­tribute testimonials to all the chief candidates to all the chief vacancies, and a couple of months ago, in answer to David Irons I flatly refused, not because I disbelieved in him, but because I think that we Americans at least may make a beginning of protest against this absurd pamphlet system. I forget whether his candidacy is for the same St. Andrews place or not, and have written to him to know, but get no reply. Perhaps he’s “mad”! Under the circum­stances, cher et illustre maître, I think I had better de­cline to testimonialize you also. You surely won’t need my word, and your case will be so splendid a precedent to quote when I refuse all future comers.

Schiller says that they’re in despair at the danger of losing you, as well they may be. And apropos of that, is it conceivable that, le cas échéant, you might accept an invitation to Harvard? There are possibilities of a place being vacant, and last year when we in the department canvassed things, you ran strong.

I send you for your own private solace, what I wrote the moment your letter arrived, and before I had written to Irons, and decided to rally on my principles. I send you also a copy of my syllabus, since you so kindly men­tion it. Much of it is unintelligible except to the class.

Yours with apologies & Glückwünsche

Wm James
I regard Mr. Stout as one of the foremost philosophers of our time. In psychology his work is admirable for clearness, subtlety & accuracy of analysis. His mind is preeminently independent and original, and I expect him to do constructive work in philosophy as important as that which he has already done in psychology.  

· To George Herbert Palmer ·

Victoria Inn
Asheville, N. C.
April 3, 1903

Dear Palmer,

An item in the Tribune announces a conditional 50,000 for Emerson Hall, which I suppose practically ensures the project, on which I congratulate you. I never cared for it as much as you seem to have cared.

What I confess I dread is becoming an accomplice in another architectural crime. Must the building go on Quincy St.? Isn’t the Holmes field region, with “power” for the laboratory etc., accessible from outside, better? I think this question ought to be thoroughly threshed out, before any irrevocable step is taken. The only way of saving the Quincy St. site architecturally is by erecting an almost identical mate to Robinson Hall opposite it, where the two would form a frame for the absolutely heterogeneous Sever Hall. To introduce a third heterogeneity and discord there, would, I think, be an absolutely unpardonable outrage on the public eye.

Surely it isn’t too late for both architect and site to be reconsidered. Longfellow is capable of any atrocity. I
don't want to hurry back now to fight this, being completely "tuckered out," but I do hope that you won't through the mere inertia of the movement already begun lend yourself to architectural villainy,—just look at some of the recent work!—and beg you to show this note to Münsterberg and to the President.

I expect to be home by the end of next week.

Yours as ever

Wm James

You have a nice nephew here!6

· To Hieronymus Georg Zeuthen ·

95 Irving Street
Cambridge (Massachusetts)
U. S. of A.
April 26, 1903

My dear Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the reception of your letter of April 4th. acquainting me with my election to membership in the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences.

I need not assure you that I accept with pleasure, and regard it as a very great honour to be connected with so illustrious a learned Society.

I am, with thanks, and high respect,

Yours very sincerely

Wm James
To F. C. S. Schiller

Cambridge
May 1, 1903

Dear Schiller,

Of all the letter-writers I know, commend me for repleteness with pith and moment, both subjective and objective, to you! Promptitude also! I am myself more stingy and costive, so I reply to your free and generous effusion of the 22nd. ult. by just enough to meet the practical needs. I am very glad in the first place that your essays are so well advanced towards reprinting. What under heaven has got into Miss Johnson—to cut out a man like you! What next? She has just sent me proof of my notice of Myers—so dead and dreary that I regretted writing it. That book can't be criticized now—it will have to breed its own criticisms as any good hypothesis does, by being hung up and attracting around it the facts, favorable or adverse, for the observing of which it has sharpened our attention and faculties. These will criticize it. Obviously it is now only a theory, which the facts extant are insufficient either to establish or to condemn. It is a fine example of mental power as it stands and thus I like to leave it.

What a pathetic, tragic and comic story you tell of poor Mrs. Dyer. Dear old Louis Dyer doesn't seem to be built on the right sort of lines for navigating these turbid waters. I pity them both, but am very glad that she is
now well. An interesting result, from the psycho-physical point of view!

Now for your wonderful activity as “promoter” of my personal interests. Neither by “acclamation,” proclamation, exclamation or declamation shall I ever be a don at Oxford. A younger and better man would have to be Stout’s successor, even if you had the “living” in your personal gift. But the Gifford lectureship is another matter altogether and were I re-invited by any of the Scottish Universities, I should (I think) gladly accept. I am going to concentrate myself on that book anyhow. I believe popular statement to be the highest form of art and after next year, I expect to be free to choose my own times and places as I have not been before. So, if the spirit moves you to pull wires for me, I will not say nay. Everything would pull together to make such an appointment help the mountain to bring forth the mouse.

I am glad that Moore is your pupil. The Chicago School is doing well. Dewey is certainly growing to be a very “wise” man—the only trouble is that his style is over-abstract.

Affectionately yours,

Wm James
Chocorua, N. H.
June 9, 1903

Dear Baldwin,

I am glad to see your handwriting again. Glad also that you can recommend two men from Harvard, even though they be Princeton nurslings. Perry has a berth with us for next year, & will probably not be tempted at all by Texas. He is now in Europe. Rogers made a good impression on me at his Ph.D. exam. I don't know him otherwise. Palmer, who manages that business, has I understand recommended to Mezes Dodson & Burnett, both Ph.D. of this year with us, & both older than Rogers, which probably was his reason for preferring them.

How you skip about! and how stagnant I remain. Mentally too! whilst your mind is an effervescing vat out of which truths are incessantly getting born. Your article in the May Psych. Rev. is germinative with directions of solution—but oh! that the Abschluss were reached! I feel so often, in reading you, as if I were in presence of a universe 1/2 born, and which I can't grasp with my categories, though quivering on the edge of doing so. Certainly you stir up more conceptions than any one else I know, and as deep ones.

With best regards to you both, I am very truly yours,

Wm James
To James McKeen Cattell

Chocorua, N. H.
June 10, 1903

Dear Cattell,

I have to eliminate 1st. a lot of philosophers whose contributions to "psychology" I am ignorant of, if they exist, taking psychology sensu stricto. 2nd. a lot of dii minores whom I know too little to compare or scale, although they are psychologists in the narrow sense. 3rd your name & my name, for obvious reasons.


I am puzzled where to put the names of Dewey, Royce & Ladd. Ladd has been doubtless very effective in education. From that point of view he might come in between Hall & Titchener for ought I know. Royce and Dewey, so far as I know, haven't yet influenced psychological education at all (in the narrow sense), yet they have contributed ideas which psychology will be influenced by. All three are men of volume, and ought to go in the 1st batch, though I can't interpolate them and it seems absurd to put them after the first batch. I put them collaterally, in spite of Ladd being so deficient in originality. –On reflection, I think Ladd deserves, for his observations on visual imagery, a place in the more original series, so I make him number 3 1/2.
The next "batch" (batch 2) beginning with Allin and ending with Washburn, make on me the impression of being stronger men than any in Batch 3, but I doubtless have an erroneous impression as to certain individuals in both batches. I cannot scale them in either.

Starbuck I can't place—I think his book on Conversion to be an excellent contribution to the Science of human nature, but it is not homogeneous enough with other men's work to be comparable.

Permit me to say that in my private breast you stand lower now than you did before I got this problem from you! The variety of dimensions in which we estimate a man's eminence, the subjective bias, the accidents of acquaintance & ignorance, the subjective uncertainty are so tremendous, that when one gets away from ½ a dozen eminent names, I don't think that one can do more than make a few groups. I doubt whether the averages of individual rating will be of any value—the votes will be too few. Even with the 1st half dozen I doubt whether a lump rating of the men means much, they should be compared in single respects. My own uncertainty as to my own rating exists in every instance, almost.

I wish you joy of the task however. It will give you occupation enough.

Sincerely yours,

Wm James¹⁰
My dear Sir,

I thank you for your "Introduction" which I have read with the liveliest interest and pleasure. It comes as a bolt "from a clear sky" for I had no previous knowledge of your existence, and here I find a thoroughly equipped new American philosopher, independent in thought and free in style. I admire particularly your informality & freedom from technicality. At first I thought you were going to be popular in the prolix sense, but the moment you get down to reasoning you are as concise as any one could wish, and as direct, and on the whole the impression the book leaves is predominantly that of rapidity and pithiness. It is a real comfort to see things moving again in our language.

All the pleasure which I have taken in the book is strangely enough coupled with a complete disbelief in most of its theses. I mean all your contacts with absolutism. I think your reasoning in the Chapters on Pluralism, Singularism and Causation are victims of the dangers (which you yourself warn against) of too abstract a treatment. I am sure that they are incoercive. But I am so accustomed to absolutism in others that I am resigned, and can enjoy the "points" in which one man excels another. You show so admirably empiricist a temper, and hold to so many of the essential features of my empiricism, that I still think you may end as a pluralistic empiricist.

How can you now, by the way, hold to atomism as an absolutely imposed belief, when so disparate an account
of the same phenomena—equally mathematical too—as “energetics” competes? It seems to me that that is the worst kind of a priorism. But I don’t mean to discuss, only to praise & thank.

Yours most sincerely

Wm James

· To Mary Whiton Calkins ·

Chocorua, N. H.
July 30, 1903

Dear Miss Calkins,

I know not what imp mislaid your letter of inquiry, and has kept me from answering till now.

Dewey began to lecture on July 15th. Baldwin will lecture this week beginning—but lo, here is a Program which I enclose, the only one I have.

I should admire to have you in my audience, so pray come. The place is beautiful, and the company rum. I want one sane thinker while I am there. Mr. Weston writes me that the Glenmore accommodations are all besetzt. I advise you to write to the Willey House (if you go) for room. You can cross to Westport from Burlington, as well as get there by the West Shore. Stage goes from W. to Elizabethtown, & from Elizabethtown to Keene Centre, where for 1 dollar you can get hauled to Glenmore. Come, and demolish my system!

Ever truly yours,

Wm James

· 315 ·
To James Rowland Angell

Chocorua, N. H.
Aug. 9th [1903]

I have just read with great satisfaction your "Structural & Functional" essay, and find it clear and illuminating. I wish I could say the same of Mead's, whose paper I guess to aim at something s'what similar, but cannot read out what. You have developed a full-coat of mature philosophic feathers around your psychological core, and live, as I perceive now, in the shape of a complete and well balanced philosopher. How few do! how few are not crude! Is Dewey much to be thanked for this? or only your maker? I fully agree to the truth of the position you maintain, and wish now that you or someone would write a psychology frankly on "functional lines." Well done, it would be a great relief.

Wm James

To Pasquale Villari

Cambridge (Massachusetts)
August 17. 1903

My dear Sir,

I have to acknowledge the honour of your letter of the 14th. of July, announcing my election as foreign associate for the philosophical Sciences, by the Class of moral,
historical and philological Sciences of the Accademia dei Lincei.

I accept, I need not say with the greatest pleasure, the distinction so generously accorded to my small deserts by so ancient and eminent a body, and beg to remain, with high respect, your and the Academy's obedient servant,

William James

To Professor Pasquale Villari
President of the Accademia dei Lincei

· To Owen Wister ·

Lee House
Port Henry, N. Y.
Aug 22 1903

Dear Wister,

I sent back your plays the other day, intending to accompany them with a line of thanks and comment, which, as usual, I neglected to compose. I now remember my default.

I think l'Evasion to be the most solidly constructed play I ever read, a perfect masterpiece of technical art, as well as a jolly good sarcasm on official medicine and professional officialdom at large. Reading a thing so well done makes it seem easy to do, but the number of ways in which one can fail is suggested by l'Avarie, which I imagine was no great stage success in spite of the tremendous wit & humor of certain scenes. It was a rather
unpleasant picture to me of le maître's spiritual atmosphere, so to call it.

L'Engrenage was much the most banal play of the three, though equally solid technically. How late do you stay at Saunderstown? If through October, I shall feel tempted to run down for a night. Am now on my way to spend a fortnight (I hope) in Keene Valley N. Y. With warm regards,

Yours very truly

Wm James

· To Sarah N. Cleghorn ·

Nodoneyo
Hurricane
Essex County, N. Y.
Aug. 29. 1903

My dear Sir,

Your inquiry of the 23rd. is just received. To call vivisection “altogether wrong” seems to me an impossibly sweeping and undiscriminating position. You probably would allow in the abstract that pain is a price that may be paid for certain goods, and you probably would not insist absolutely that one being must never be forced to serve other beings’ ends.

The door being thus opened to the possibility that inflicted suffering may be right, it seems to me that the only question is the practical one, of whose, how much, when, where, etc. Absolutely irresponsible power to in-
flict pain on animals for human ends cannot well be entrusted to Tom, Dick, & Harry. I think that in principle vivisectors should be made responsible to some tribunal for what they do. They ought to welcome such responsibility. In practice it seems not easy to find a good tribunal to supervise the matter. The exasperated public opinion which you represent is in this state of affairs, I think, a healthy check upon the callousness of physiologists. There have undoubtedly been, and probably still are, especially on “the Continent,” gross abuses of power, especially for lecture demonstrations. This is my opinion in a nutshell.

Sincerely yours,

Wm James

S. N. Cleghorn Esq.\(^{15}\)

---

\* To F. C. S. Schiller \*

Burlington, Vt.
September 4, 1903

I write thus at the P. O. on my way homeward after a 3 weeks trip. It suddenly comes over me that I haven’t yet answered your last letter. Of course I accept the dedication, if you haven’t meanwhile found a worthier recipient of so great and undeserved an honour. I have, inter alia, been spending a week at “Glenmore,” Thomas Davidson’s old summer school of Philosophy at Hurricane, N. Y. (above Keene Valley) and given 5 lectures on “Radical Empiricism,” just to hear how the stuff
would sound when packed in to that bulk. It sounded *queer* and I must make it sound less so to the common mind. Heartiest regards.

W. J.

... To James Mark Baldwin ...

Chocorua, N. H.
Sept. 6, 1903

Dear Baldwin,

On my return last night from "Glenmore," where you had been faithless as a lecturer, and I faithful, I find yours of August 30th awaiting me. I had been greatly disappointed on arriving at that glorious hillside to find that both you and Dewey were absent. I had hoped for some instructive interchange of views.

What you write me is quite startling. As a residence, I should think that Baltimore would be a poor exchange for Princeton, but in other respects the change probably amounts to a promotion. Students of the right sort will no doubt go to you, and if you don't have laboratory drudgery, you will found a "school." I am glad for the sake of our national philosophic activities, that you have accepted the charge of creating this new post. May it prosper and may you like it. Who can replace you, though, at Princeton? No one!

I had a fine time at Glenmore, though my lectures were, I fear, too technical for all but the few. It is a beautiful region—on the whole (the rest of Keene Valley included) the most beautiful one I know.
Good luck to you, and may Mrs. Baldwin’s path (as a pioneer’s wife) be made easy.

Yours always faithfully

Wm James

To F. C. S. Schiller

Chocorua, N. H.
September 9, 1903

Dear Schiller,

Reaching home, I get yours of the 26th. ult. and my son William at the same time. I thank you herzlich for treating him so kindly.

You enclose but one half a page of preface proof. I suppose the rest will follow. I am glad [the] thing is so far forward. I am sure that the times are now ripe for it to make a strong impression. I rejoice in the prospect of your visiting this country. I must try again for the third time to get the Ingersoll appointment. I don’t know what bee has got into Eliot’s bonnet that makes him so mistrustful.

As for the Psychological lectureship, I am glad if it means relief from your tutorial drudgery, but if not that, then curse it. You seem to me distinctively a metaphysician and “cosmologist” not to say “cosmogonist” à la Hesiod, but a non-experimental psychologist’s chair can be wrested to any purpose and it won’t hurt you to lecture on metaphysics under that umbrella. Have you read Strong’s book Why the Mind Has a Body? — a very well
knit thing, which somehow nevertheless fails to convince me, although it has bro’t the panpsychic hypothesis fairly into the ranks of orthodox discussion. Morton Prince in his Human Automatism (Boston, 1884 or 5) set forth the same conclusions with almost identical arguments, so far as they go. Bergson is the cud which I keep chewing, though I can’t yet get satisfying nourishment therefrom. Alas! that I can do so little straight forward work myself. The moment I get interested I get wakeful and used up and have to stop. So it is very slow a progress. Goodbye. Bless you!

W. J. ¹⁷

· To Pauline Goldmark ·

Chocorua
Oct. 14. 1903

My dear Pauline,

About to leave these sylvan glories, what is more natural than to write a word to you, and express my sorrow that you had to return to town before they had developed? I have been fortunate enough to wait till yellow is beginning to be the prevailing colour, but the whole preceding month has been a spectacle of jewelry, as if the world were rubies and gold, and emerald & topaz. The thing has been at once violently sensational & exquisitely spiritual. I never saw so much of it, or such warm Americanism in the atmosphere, and I wish that you could have enjoyed it with me. It makes one patriotic!

I have been thinking of Keene Valley and East Hill the
past few days, for I have been writing, at Professor Knight's solicitation (a Saint Andrews professor—editor of Wordsworth) 37 pp. of reminiscences of T. Davidson, to go into a "life" of him which K. is about to publish. When once I got started, I enjoyed the writing greatly—with D. as a subject, it became so easy to be racy.

I see that a book by your friend Mrs. Kelley is about to be published—I shall read it, for your sake as well as the subject's, with great interest. Thank your sister Josephine for her nice letter. I devoutly hope that Susan's health is improving and will continue to improve indefinitely. I am in fine condition, almost like my own self again in spirit, as indeed I ought to be, for my outward duties etc. are now "fixed" so harmoniously. Good bye! Have a good winter, don't over work yourself, and keep a place in your affections for your ancient but faithful friend.

W. J.\textsuperscript{18}

\textbf{To James McKeen Cattell}.

Cambridge
Nov. 29. 1903

Dear Cattell,

Yours of the 25th re Perkins's Automatism article, received.

I never thought of hinting at any special payment for him. Pay whatever usual price the magazine would pay for that much of a contribution. Send it to me, made out to his order. I mentioned his need of "realizing" to ac-
count for my having offered to get an author's fee for him if he would put his experience on paper. He seems a very respectable fellow indeed, but I doubt whether any other magazine than the Pop. Sci. would pay him anything at all for his "case."

Yours always,

Wm James

\[ \text{To Mrs. Charles Russell Lowell} \]

95 Irving Street
Cambridge
Dec. 6. 1903

Dear Mrs. Lowell,

Many thanks for your delightful letter. I am glad you still have the gift of tears about our national soul. I cried, hard, when the hostilities broke out & General Otis refused Aguinaldo's demand for a conference,—the only time I've cried in many a long year, and I know one other person who did likewise, a man of 60.

As for these little leagues, of course they are ridiculous, and I only went to the meeting because I had heard the people ridiculed so much. It seems to me that the great disease of our country now is the unwillingness of people to do anything that has no chance of succeeding. The organization of great machines for "slick" success is the discovery of our age; and, with us, the individual, as soon as he realizes that the machine will be irresistible, acquiesces silently, instead of making an im-
potent row. One acquiescence leads to another, until acquiescence itself becomes organized. The impotent row-maker becomes, in the eye of public opinion, an ass and a nuisance. We get to live under the organization of corruption, and since all needful functions go on, we next treat reform as a purely literary ideal. We defend our rotten system. Acquiescence becomes active partnership. Against this the only remedy is that every little donkey like your correspondent should keep making a row. We want people who are willing to espouse failure as their vocation. I wish that that could be organized—it would soon "pass into its opposite." Believe me, with affectionate regards,

Yours faithfully,

Wm James

· To Charles William Eliot ·

95 Irving Street
Dec. 12, 1903

To the President & Fellows
Harvard University

Dear Sirs;

I beg to place my resignation in your hands. Poor health of late has much impaired my working powers, and I believe that a "foot-free" condition will be better for me personally. I also believe that it will be better for our
philosophical department to have a man who can bestow on it his undivided energies in my place.

I trust that you will accept this resignation as simply as I offer it. I have spent 30 (to me) pleasant and profitable years of teaching at Harvard. There is always sadness in severing such a connexion; but objectively I feel that in my case the hour has struck, and the time come for my successor to be appointed.

I am, dear Sirs, your obedient Servant,

Wm James