The rumblings from the Baldwin-Schiller affair continued for awhile. Also, James’s articles on various aspects of his doctrine of “pure experience” continued to appear this year in the journals. Included was a reply to another British critic, H. W. B. Joseph, again in defense of “Humanism.” Some articles that appeared in a volume dedicated to Howison by his colleagues centered on the James-Schiller-Dewey movement.

On 11 March James sailed alone for a three months vacation in Europe. The trip took him first to Italy, where he visited Genoa, Naples, Pompeii, Capri, and Sorrento. Then a steamer carried him to Athens. After seeing the Acropolis, he noted in his diary, “... shows that a human thing can be exactly right.” Altogether he spent about three weeks in Greece. He arrived in Rome on 22 April. He was asked to give a speech at the Fifth International Congress of Psychology. He wrote it in French and delivered it on the 30th. He met a group of Italian thinkers who were much interested in “pragmatism” and were starting a journal that featured such a movement. He left Rome on 1 May; it took him six days to arrive at Cannes via Orvieto, Siena, Pisa, and Genoa. He spent a week there with C. A. Strong, whose conversation was always very profitable to James philosophical-
ly. Strong, along with Bergson, were two thinkers whose views greatly stimulated James to formulate his own views.

On 15 May James stopped at Marseilles to see Frank Abauzit who was translating his Varieties of Religious Experience. Then on to Geneva to see Flournoy, Claperède, and others; to Lausanne to see his cousins Rodgers; to Dijon to see his colleague Barrett Wendell; to Paris to see Dr. Rupert Norton and the “beautiful” Bergson; and to Oxford to see Schiller. He sailed for home on the “Cedric” on 2 June, cutting short his trip by a week.

Not long after reaching home on 11 June, James traveled to Chicago to deliver some lectures on “Characteristics of Individualistic Philosophy,” from 30 June to 7 July. He spent the weekend of 1–2 July on Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, in the home of his friend, Mrs. Wilmarth.

Again, soon after returning to Cambridge, he and Mrs. James took off for Hurricane, Keene Valley, New York, in the Adirondack Mountains. He gave two lectures there at Thomas Davidson’s old summer school “Glenmore.” The rest of the stay was on vacation.

The American Philosophical Association met at Harvard on 27 and 28 December in the newly opened Emerson Hall for its fifth annual convention. Since James left for California on 28 December, he could attend only the meetings of 27 December. In the afternoon of that day, there was a joint meeting with the American Psychological Association. James was quite irritated at what seemed to him Münsterberg’s excessive prominence at the dedication of Emerson Hall.
To James Mark Baldwin

Cambridge
Jan. 1, 1905

Dear Baldwin,

I return the enclosures, and regret more than ever that you should have given occasion to Schiller’s letter. My point is the *wholesale* application of such epithets—in print. Schiller’s ‘pages’ are mixed, very superior ones, and others in bad taste. *Swamping* judgments do no good, and are untrue. Other critics had taken the serious pages seriously, and made protest against the others. But I don’t think you have a right in print to indulge in such undiscriminating wholesale damn-words as one uses in familiar talk with a friend. Schiller has sinned in this way towards Bradley, and I have protested in private letters to him. Bradley sins against every one, but the best way to rebuke him is to treat him with better manners than his own. If you, an editor, set such examples, we shall soon be all at sea, vomiting our mere personal antipathies into the common pool. Delicate irony is far more effective as a weapon.

Yours as ever,

Wm James
To Thomas Mitchell Shackleford

Cambridge
Jan 1. 1905

Dear Shackleford,

Arriving home yesterday from 5 days spent in Philadelphia, at the Am. Psychol. Ass., of which I was president, I find your kind Christmas remembrance—the excellent and enormous cigars. Pray don’t think that I regard this as a precedent to which I expect the Florida Supreme Court to live up in the future. I am grateful as an individualist and tychist, accepting whatever additions come to my universe, but storing up no claims.

The meeting was on the whole interesting and improving mentally. Too much; and little or no chance for serious talk with any one. I, however, by staying away from evening functions, managed to have two good evenings of talk with my friends H. R. Marshall & D. S. Miller respectively. Miller’s two papers, Woodbridge’s and Miss Washburn’s were the best I heard. You will doubtless soon have them to read. A. E. Taylor was expected with an onslaught on Humanism; but it appears his pocket was picked of $75, his little all, at the Montreal Station, so he had to stay. Served him right say I! Perhaps it will make him believe in a world of chance. You will find Fullerton’s System of Metaphysics very good reading. (The Macmillan Co). His range is limited, but he is amazingly clear. With a happy New Year to you all, in which my wife asks to join, I am with renewed thanks for the cigars, yours faithfully,

Wm James
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To Henry Rutgers Marshall

Cambr.
Jan. 22. [1905]

Dear Marshall,

I return to you S.'s letter which seems to me masterly for straight & concise statement. How foolish, when he can argue & write so well, for his detracters to go off the track about his “vulgarity.” I say nothing about reality & realness, or of [reality] which we make. I don’t fully understand Schiller’s position, or yours,—or my own, yet.

Affectionately

W. J.

To F. C. S. Schiller

Cambridge
January 23, 1905

Dear Schiller,

With my invincible epistolary (and other) laziness, I am damnably behind hand in writing to you. I always wonder at your alertness in all these regards. Your pressure per sq. inch is so much higher than mine, that steam escapes in constant puffs. I have your good letter from
Davos of Dec. 28. Also your article on Myers. Also a letter to Marshall sent by Marshall for my instruction and delectation. All read, pondered and admired, but not to be animadverted on in detail at this present writing, by reason of the laziness aforesaid. I can’t write philosophy in letters—I need to get up too much steam. The Mind for Jan. arrived 2 hours ago. I haven’t done more than glance at it. It is evident that our movement, like the liberal movement in Russia, will not down—it is spreading its influence and out of just such discussion in detail as this, a better understanding of the whole thing will come. I am sure that I don’t half understand our own position yet, need to apply it to many cases and details first, etc. I enclose to you a letter from A. W. Moore, received by the same mail as Mind. Perhaps you had better return it.

Immediately on reading that insulting note of Baldwin’s I wrote him a sharp protest, to which he replied impenitently. Such manners are an abominable intrusion into philosophic literature. Since then he has sent me the correspondence between you both. It is a deplorable incident. But I think good can accrue from it, if you take from it a certain practical hint. There can be no question that your jibes on the one hand and a certain old-fashioned or Germanic polemic Schwulst on the other (as in the beginning and end of your late reply to Bradley in Mind, the parts I wished expunged) have alienated many readers whose taste is hypersensitive; and that, if you will constrain yourself both to be perpetually solemn and never to come the big bow-wow in polemics again, you will exert a far wider influence for good. To me it is unspeakably sad that, when a man reasons and writes as you do, more clean and clear in style than any one, full of new insights and new handleings of the old on every page, people should consider themselves free to ignore your philosophy, because forsooth their taste doesn’t quite relish your jokes and some
of your other ways. One of them is mentioning my name too often—cut that out! Another is being obsessed too much by F. H. B. Cut him out also! His literary manners are bad enough, but I don’t interpret them as you do, as the mark of a domineering spirit. I have had two letters from him this fall, of a very irreproachable tone. Bradley’s intellect, to my mind, is perverse, but he is a sincere thinker and works hard for truth in all his writings. Quite à l’encontre de Münsterberg, who affirms everything that occurs to him, without let or hindrance, Bradley’s mind seems to work under a perpetual sense of inhibition from possible objectors. He supposes and invents their objections when he has no text; isn’t free to advance without refuting them; imagines all his readers hostile; and finally à bout de force, gets impatient and says “in such an atmosphere and in such company, etc.”

It’s all pretty harmless and on the whole pretty pathetic. If you would see each other face to face, you’d cease to be such mutual bogies, appear as men and not as demons and very likely love each other passionately for the rest of your lives.

Goodbye! enough for today. Hurrah for Japan! and how interesting are the convulsions in Russia. Republics are the only safe governments with their centre of gravity already at the lowest point.

Goodbye again, dear Schiller. Pray take my sermonizing in good part. I never should try to reform you, but for the strategic necessities of the hour. You should make all your force tell, not waste any powder or let any enemies get away, as they now are doing on these preposterous pretexts of taste.

Yours fondly

Wm James²
Dear Schiller,

Being a graphophobe I have delayed comment on your interesting letter about Joseph’s attack, which resembles the behavior of an ant crawling over a man and saying I can’t find any “man,” only some skin and nails and hairs. He takes too nearsighted a view! Meanwhile I have made a reply (not, please God, to his petty logic chop-pings but to the sources of his misapprehensions) and sent it to Stout and written also two other short articles for Woodbridge, one of them entitled the “Essence of Humanism,” with which I devoutly hope that you will agree. I think that certain hasty expressions of yours and Dewey’s have encouraged the notion that Humanism is “subjectivist” in the bad sense of waywardist, as if there were no anchorage at all. As I understand it, it only says that reality is still growing and in part by our thoughts. That the parts of it that have already grown are not [sic] fixed, as such, who doubts—and they enter as such into the whole which the grafting of the new upon them will bring. We need a more central and authoritative for-mulation or the discussion grows quite wild.

I got this morning the University of California publica-tions with two articles mainly upon us by Rieber and Bakewell. I have only glanced them over but they seem also to be beating the air, from the lack of more definite-ly systematic statements on our part.

However, no more palaver now! I may see you in May, having taken passage for Naples on the 11th. of March, expecting to go to Greece for a month and return about
June 10th. from England. I must spend a month in France and possibly some time in Switzerland. Where shall you be in May? No more just now.

from yours til deth

W. J.

The Occult Review has arrived with your amusing skit. 3

· To Charles Montague Bakewell ·

Cambridge
Feb. 22. 1905

Dear Bakewell,

I don't exactly know whom I have to thank for the California Denkschrift to Howison, but I write to you, to work the gratitude off. It is a stately volume, and I hope that Howison is pleased. So far, I have read only Rieber's article and yours. I leave Rieber to your tender mercies. You are so much farther advanced upon the road which leads to that humanistic fold where some day you will both lay down your weary heads in lamb-like rest. "Home at last!" At present, you are all but there, a touch and you are inside. And as you are now to Rieber, so will you soon be to your present self. What is this 'fixed' standard of yours that dominates purposively the process of experience and confines and pins it in, but the merest vestigial ghost of older rationalisms, interpretable now only as a very bad abstract way of naming the fact that
experiences do concretely manage to work out combined results? Give it up squarely and come out into the air!

It will interest you to know that I have been named “Acting Professor of Philosophy” at Stanford U., for 1905–6, with leave of absence for the 1st 1/2 year. I look forward with great glee to being a working part of California after next January 1st. Of course I hope to see much of you and Howison. I hope to see you also next July, when I am expecting to revisit Keene Valley, for a fortnight at least. Meanwhile my cordialest regards to you both and to the Howisons, also to the Riebers, from yours,

faithfully,

Wm James

· To James McKeen Cattell ·

Cambridge
Feb. 26 [1905]

How about Ostwald’s proofs? I shall possibly take a trip to Europe in a fortnight—and had better get that job done ere I go.

Wm James
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To F. C. S. Schiller

Cambridge
March 2, 1905

Dear Schiller,

Yours of the 16th. ult. just in and is like a breeze from—whence? Some good place anyhow. I thought I had acknowledged and praised your article on Myers, which I read with both applause and profit. I don't know what incomprehensible lapse of memory at the moment of writing made me omit your article On Saving Appearances from the references in note 9, p. 35 of my article on the Thing and its Relations. Such disagreeable accidents will happen. I think that article most masterly. I also squeal with delight at your deduction in 5 heads of the indeterminateness of truth in this letter. I believe every word of it; and, in general, the more I go on thinking, writing and reading and hearing others on the subject, that we have struck the fattest of possible leads, leading practically to a new epoch. This philosophy is susceptible of indefinite increase, usually you have only the alternative of “take it or leave it” with a philosophy.

The hard place is Mind and Body and there I want to conciliate Strong and Bergson.

It seems almost certain now that I shall sail on the 11th. Will write to you from somewhere on the Mediterranean. Haste!

W. J. 6
To John Grier Hibben

Cambridge, Mass.
March 8, 1905

Dear Hibben,

I had already heard of your scheme, but find it hard to imagine its details, and on the details would depend the kind of men you want. If they are simply to nurse the students for your and Ormond's examinations etc. then they should be more young and transitory men, & of less ebullient, ambitious, hustling, Napoleonic and Caesarian natures. If, on the contrary, their instruction and inspiration is to be collateral and even competitive, you want another type. You start with very generous salaries for youngsters, and yet I don't see the prospects for oldsters. We have several good names of both sorts to recommend, but can't do so till you specify the requirements more.

Of course Dickinson Miller is the best disengaged man in the field, and he has been so unlucky of late that the pay might possibly tempt him. But he is eigentlich a man of professional calibre, and ought to be a professor. The same is true of Perry, of whom you ask.

I sail for Europe on Saturday for 3 months, so I can't continue the correspondence. I advise you to consult Royce. It is very interesting scheme, and I hope it will succeed.

Truly yours,

Wm James
Cannes
May 12, 1905

Dear Schiller,

Thus far on the way (I am spending a week with poor Strong who is exiled here by his wife’s illness) to England and the USA. I must sail on June 9th. at the very latest. Of course a conference with you is one of my justifications for leaving home, but the days are few, I am very fatigued and the Oxford Social System is immense and once in it, I might be drawn too far. Would it be consistent with your convenience to come to London to meet me or even better, perhaps, to meet me at Southampton, where at my hotel we might for 24 or 48 hours settle the universe’s business forever? I go on Monday the 15th. to Lake Leman where I have business with poor Flournoy (who has just lost a grown up daughter) and with some ancient she-cousins, with whom I must spend three days. Thence, about the 23rd., to Dijon, where a colleague awaits me for 24 hours. Thence to Paris, where I can hardly arrive before the 25th. and where I ought to spend at least a week—which leaves but little time for England, with Liverpool staring me in the face on the 9th. Edward Carpenter has asked me to spend a night with him near Sheffield, an old friend another night at Liverpool and Douglas Fawcett invites me to visit him in Surrey. I shall have pretty surely to pass James Ward by at Cambridge, much as I long to see him. You see there is no time for “Oxford,” as such. Write me therefore to the care of Mesdemoiselles Rodgers, 9 Avenue Eglantine, Lau-
sanne, to say what place and time is most convenient to you.

Yours “for the truth”

W. J. 

• To Patrick Geddes •

Paris
May 25, [1905]

I just got your letter of the 2nd. on arrival here. Am not well and am hurrying home, sailing in a week probably, to avoid social entanglements—*a fortiori* such diabolic things as you have the hardihood to suggest. Sociological Society, forsooth! As if I could instruct sociologists. No! let me off! When I come back in a more fighting disposition than the present finds me, I might try. I hope that you and yours are well, and that your various projects prosper.

Wm James

Professor Patrick Geddes, Dundee, Scotland
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To Victoria Welby

28 Rue d’Offemont
Paris
May 26, 1905

Dear Lady Welby,

You are extremely friendly, and I should like above all things to make your acquaintance, although I am ashamed to say that long as I have known the outside, so to speak, of your writings, I have not even yet attained to reading them. I am a slow reader, and the pile of hopes deferred grows higher and higher.

I am hastening back to America, being far from well. I may have to sail on the 2nd, which will give me only two days in England, and make it impossible for me to get to Harrow. If I stay, as I hope to, till the 9th, I shall communicate with you in time to make an appointment for a call upon you at Harrow.

Sincerely yours, and with cordial regards,

Wm James¹⁰
I spent 2 amusing days at Dijon, where my colleague Wendell not only lectured, but we assisted at the public performance of a play "Raleigh in Guiana" written by him, and acted by the English department of the Lycée with an accent à faire pouffer de rire. The Hotel de la Cloche there is excellent, and Dijon is a charming town. Train not crowded at all thither; but the train thence at 5.35 P. M. all first class, was rather crowded, and there was no room at the H. des Sts. Pères, although I had written 2 days previous, so I put up for the night at a place quelconque. I am now at Rupert Norton's, very comfortable, but very seedy, though I sleep better. To England Wednesday night.

Affectionately,

W. J.¹¹

I am going by the Cedric, June 2nd.—and am very glad to head for home a week earlier, sleep being still bad, and me dreading a sort of vortex of sociability with which
I am threatened at Oxford, & wh. I shall now escape. I have had a delightful quiet time at Rupert Norton’s pleasant apartment, and had a very satisfactory interview with my philosopher Bergson, as well as seen 4 more friends. Summer has come with a vengeance. I wonder if Henrietta has left.

Lovingly

W. J.12

- To F. C. S. Schiller -

June 2, 1905

Euston Station, on train. Hey for America! I slept last night (very comfortably) in a bath room in a small hotel in London Street, all London being “full up.” Have just read (rather languidly) Knox on Bradley—absolutely fatal, but really too thoro’—less elaboration wd. have sufficed. A Frenchman wouldn’t have written so. The last 2 pp. are great. I’m glad to leave “Europe” on such a delightful impression as that of Oxford—and to find how extraordinarily complete your and my agreement is. God bless you.

W. J.13
Dear Mr. Marvin,

I got your letter of March 7th just before starting for a few weeks of holiday in Europe, and the holiday spirit has held me so tight in its grasp ever since, that I have been too lazy to answer it till now. I dare say that you have long ago forgotten its contents. You said that my definition of Humanism applied to all "transcendentalist" systems after Kant. I must confess that I didn’t emphasize enough the point (which however I intended to make, and believe I made) that Humanistic experience is pluralistic, and its parts lean on each other from next to next, whereas in all these post Kantian systems, however conceived, it is through the whole that they get connected with each other, that being the logical prius. In "Humanism" as I understand it, no whole need be realized at all, and the largest ensemble that is realized may be a sum or result. I was culpable in not bringing this out more plainly: it is such an essential part of my humanism, that I take it for granted too much.

Your own definition of Humanism is that it “maintains knowledge to be at any moment faultlessly true.” It seems to me that to judge of this, one needs to define the word “true” —a thing which the critics of humanism sedulously avoid doing. If it means simply “satisfactory” then your definition will pass; but if it means “stably satisfactory,” I don’t think it will. The word faultless would seem to mean stable or inalterable, and your metaphor of the maps would lead one to say that anything in
an opinion that proves inalterable is part of permanent or faultless truth. Our knowledge surely becomes truer as it thickens up, provided the new relations modify our conception of what was first laid down.

I am extremely glad that you find yourself able to become a member of our philosophical department, though I don’t yet know for which half of the year you are to come. I hope for my half, the first—for I go to Stanford University after the Christmas holidays. With you & Ostwald, we shall have a rich crew, even though Miller be gone, and Santayana be away.

Hoping to talk these things over with you erelong, I am very truly yours,

Wm James

---

To Robert Underwood Johnson

Cambridge
June 26. ’05

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I have duly pondered your most persuasively written letter of the 22nd. and admired the admirably serious way in which you interpret the Secretary’s duties, but as Saint Paul (I believe) said, “None of these things move me.” On the contrary, your picture of the Academy’s duties and functions rather makes me feel glad that I wrote promptly enough not to be too late with my declension of the honour. I am an unassimilable barbarian, & there is an end of the matter.

Regretting to disappoint you personally, and thanking
you for your charmingly courteous letter, I am going to stand fast by both my resignations, and remain nevertheless yours most sincerely

Wm James

R. U. Johnson Esq.¹⁴

To Mary J. Wilmarth

Cambridge
June 26, [1905]

Dear Mrs. Wilmarth,

Is it undignified to confess to you that only yesterday, asking my sister in law, Mary Salter, whether she had lately seen you, I proceeded to remark: “How I wish that she would invite me once more to Lake Geneva!”? I should most gladly come out on Saturday the 1st to stay over Sunday, but there is a movement on foot to “dine” me with a group of University colleagues, and I don’t know what date they will have set. I will wire you as soon as I know, and define the date.

You are very good to have remembered me so long. I hope that your daughter may also be there.

Always sincerely yours

Wm James¹⁵
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To Charles Montague Bakewell

Cambridge
July 12. [1905]

Dear Bakewell,

Your good long letter of the 3rd. from Oliver’s Mills, reaches me only this A. M. via Chicago. On reading it and the Glenmore circular, I go back on my recent announcement of arrival by the 24th. It will be more convenient to me to take the last 2 days of that week to lecture; so we probably shan’t arrive before the 26th. I shall in this way miss your lectures which (I assume) can be given the 24th, -5th & -6th. But we can talk the universe over. Heaven knows what I can lecture about—I am thinking of working up some of Fechner’s panpsychic speculations, but it means a good deal of work. Is Davidson’s pupil Cohen to be thar?

I pine for the air and for the view, but especially to have a good gossip with you again.

Yours ever truly

Wm James
To Charles William Eliot

95 Irving St.
July 12. [1905]

Dear President,

Someone told my wife this afternoon that you had written to some newspaper to screen the Colleges from my indictment at Chicago that they were training schools of crime. I’m very sorry you should have been at any such trouble. What I said was a very brief and passing version of something I said much more emphatically at Commencement a couple of years ago—that intellectual training doesn’t curb men’s passions, it only gives them more instruments of service—the conclusion being that “education” is useful mainly as a critical spirit, enabling men to know the better from the worse in a sober hour, and thence fitting them to hold up the hands of the right leaders, when their private interests are not too much involved.

The practical purpose was to bid them support my philosophy rather than that of the rest of our department! I only saw one newspaper report, a single paragraph—but that was diabolical. It was sent me by an unknown correspondent who said he thanked God for raising “one man courageous enough to tell the truth about the Colleges,” adding “I never had a College education, the blood of Jesus is enough for me.”

Great hulking adult ploughmen & their feminine counter parts in the Chicago summer term. Splendidly earnest. I expected to lecture to 50 at the outside. There were 800 at my first lecture, and 500 at the last—on
which occasion I felt them pulling on my line like one fish.

Best regards “from house to house,”

Yours ever truly

Wm James

Cambridge
July 23. [1905]

• To Thomas Mitchell Shackleford •

Dear Judge Shackleford,

It is an age since I have written to you, tho’ I have had it “on my mind” to do so since last March, when I carried an envelope addressed to you on to the Steamer that took me to Naples, meaning to fill it up when I got at sea. But neither that, nor any other good resolution, was fulfilled:—I fell rather into a trance of laziness towards all my customary activities. I spent a week at Naples, 3 weeks in Greece, and the other six between Italy, Switzerland, France, & England, and came home refreshed mentally but profoundly tired physically, as is always the case with me in the Spring of the year. But I escaped my writing table & the Ph. D. examinations, and now I am feeling comparatively well again. There was a psychological Congress at Rome, at which I was forced, rather unwillingly, to speak. What pleased me was to see what roots “pragmatism” is striking in Italy—in fact I was hailed there (to my surprise) as a kind of master,
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which was an agreeable experience. I had much talk with
that monument of sincerity & veracity, Strong, at
Cannes, a couple of very renumerative hours with
Bergson, at Paris, and a day with Schiller at Oxford. The
ferment is working—see the last Mind, the last Philo-
sophical Review, and the last J. of Philosophy etc. I have
written nothing for 4 months, but read some German
books. We have let our Chocorua place, our children are
scattered & the good wife & I are making our summer
headquarters here, though with some absences in the
shape of visits. In three days we go for a fortnight to
Keene Valley in the Adirondacks. Schiller’s article on
Taylor in the July Mind (also Hoernlé’s on Bradley) seem
to me very masterly. I lectured, at the beginning of the
month, at Chicago University, on “the Characteristics of
an Individualistic Philosophy” and was delighted to find
that it could be put into a shape that kept 500 auditors
attentive—big truly sons & daughters of the prairie—
mostly teachers.

I hope that you are cooling off in your Tennessee
Mountains, and that you all are well. With warm re-
gards, I remain truly yours,

Wm James

To Henry Rutgers Marshall

Cambridge
Aug 16. 1905

Dear Marshall,

I am glad your new book—which I fancy will be your
greatest—is about to appear, clad in its native austerity
of style. I must say that I think these recent articles of
yours are very profound and luminous, though your whole system of thought is more schematic than I like. If you had injected a little of the lovely Fechner’s concreteness into your last article, e.g., I should have rejoiced.

I have small experience of publishers, but the best has been with Longmans, Green, & Co. Their partner in this country, Mr. Mills, is an impeccable man to deal with, and I have found them liberal and obliging throughout. Rumour also ascribes to them a preeminent place for fair dealing. They have a regular printer arrangement for books published on commission, which is my way, though possibly you would prefer a royalty basis.

I hope you’re well. I must settle down to work on that problem of psychic synthesis again.

Ever truly yours,

Wm James

---

To Charles Montague Bakewell

Cambridge
Aug 30. 1905

Dear B. –

Pray send me one word of news as to how Woodbridge’s lectures went off, and what ground he took. Of course I don’t expect an elaborate compte rendu, but just a page & a half.

I have been absolutely knocked out by the venomous
cold I bro’t back from Ridgefield 2 1/2 weeks ago, though
Alice is better. To day my catarrhal symptoms are on the
wane; but the prostration of strength continues. We
leave this noon for our friends the Merriman’s at Inter­
vale, where I doubt not the change of air will start me
towards health again. It would have been absolutely im­
possible for me to go to either end of Keene Valley again,
and I must give it up for this year.

I have just read Carveth Read’s Metaphysic of Nature.
Too *dumpf* in tone; but *honest*, —a real english book; full
of felicitous epigrammatic sentences, but not destined to
have an influence, in my opinion.

Yours—

Wm James¹⁹

*To Charles Montague Bakewell*

Cambridge
Sept 22. 05

Dear Bakewell,

I got your long and interesting letter about Woodbridge,
and it made me wish more than ever that I had been
there. Thank you. I suppose that by this time you are at
New Haven, getting settled before the struggle begins.

I write to day on account of a visit I have had from Dr.
Angier of Berlin, who aspires towards the psychology
place at Berkeley. He is one of our best Laboratory Ph
D’s—not, I fancy a ‘philosopher’, but a sterling good
man. I am much influenced in my view of his value by
Holt’s opinion. Holt is tremendously critical, doesn’t usually let personal sympathy or friendship blind his intellectual judgments, and swears that Angier is the ablest man we’ve graduated in Psychology since we’ve been here. Angier says they are urging him to stay in the Berlin Laboratory. He goes back thither now with pay.

I believe that M–g has some dislike of A., tho’ I know not on what grounds, nor do I suppose that it would make him withhold a fair judgment on his abilities.

Good luck to you, & regards to “the Missus”—if she will pardon the familiarity,

Yours,

Wm James

---

To F. C. S. Schiller

Cambridge
October 14, [1905]

I have just read in the Mind which came today, Hoernlé’s second article, and I have rarely been more satisfied with anything than with his statement up to the last 4 or 5 pp. I think that something better may be done over that conclusion. But he is a master of statement as well as of thought and I wish you’d tell him, with my compliments, how much I have been “transported.”

W. J.
To George Frederick Stout

Cambridge
Oct. 17. '05

Thanks for “Things & Sensations,” which is clear and (as I understand it) I believe, true. Doesn’t it tend to make continuity rather than substantial or “through & through” union, union by co, rather than by in or of an absolute “whole,” the secret of the one and the many? I read your paper as if it meant s’tHING like what I once tried to say in the Psychological Review, pp. 111–113, vol. 2. But very likely you will repudiate that. I am delighted with Hoernlé’s paper in Oct. Mind.

Wm James

To Charles William Eliot

[Oct. 26, 1905]

Dear President,

Since you send me this letter, I make another remark or two on Sidis’s case. He is (I fancy) 35 years old, is fully engaged in his own line of practice, and the certainty of his not becoming later a “general” practitioner is altogether different from that of (say) an ordinary candidate who should plead exemption from obstetrics on the ground of his intending to be an ophthalmologist.

It is in truth a very peculiar case. In the N. Y. Patho-
logical Institute, he developed an interest in, and a great
ability in treating, by what may be called suggestive
methods (invented partly by himself) various nervous
diseases and invalidic states. Working as he did, both
there, and in the Woman's infirmary along with M. D.
colleagues who could take the legal responsibility, he
was all right. But naturally he must now take the M. D.
dergree. I regard it as absolute pedantry to make him
spend three months (he being poor & the examination
requirements anyhow interfering terribly with his se­
rious work) of drudgery at labor cases, bandaging, and
bronchitis cases. He is author of 3 solid & important
books, two of them mainly clinical, and recognized (by
all who know anything) as an authority in his own line of
practice.

Sincerely yours,

Wm James

95 Irving St.
Cambridge
Dec 8. 05

· To Henry Rutgers Marshall ·

Dear Marshall,

I trust you are coming to the meeting of the Societies. I
offer you and Gardiner for your joint use, suite 56, Dun­
ster Hall, belonging to two younger colleagues of mine,
and one of the best sets of rooms in College. They said I
might offer it to two of my friends, but won’t give it to the swinish multitude of philosophers. I leave for California on the 28th, so I can barely see you. I wish I could ask you to this house, but the gods have decided otherwise.

Truly yours,

Wm James

· To Charles William Eliot ·

95 Irving Street
Dec. 28, 1905

Dear President,

Prof. Münsterberg has sent me a copy of a letter of resignation which he sent to you to day, in consequence of a letter which I wrote to him.

Since the matter has been bro’t to your attention I enclose the copy I kept, of my own letter. I think that I had better have it back.

In my irritation at what seemed to me M–g’s excessive prominence on that day (after the Emerson meeting he went on and introduced Dewey, the President of the Association meeting (!) in a speech, and Dewey, following the program, immediately called on him as the first speaker in the discussion—5 speeches in one hour, and all this with no opportunity afforded to the visitors of the Emerson meeting to escape!), I was ignorant of certain
excuses which he had. In our committee we had discussed the ceremony of opening, and Palmer declined to take an active part. I, wishing to head off the chairman, proposed that no one of the department should speak; which was agreed upon; and we then decided to ask you & Edward E. I never dreamed of your requiring any words of introduction, and supposed that things were safe. To my astonishment, Münsterberg “bossed the show.” I heard groans over it from influential people; and supposed at first that he had usurped the opportunity, in spite of the department’s resolution. But Palmer told me he had given his consent or advice (which I think was wrong in him) and Münsterberg himself told me to day that the thing had been arranged with you. These are the excuses to which I refer. But I doubt whether either you or Palmer meant that his presiding should be so loquacious.

I much regret to have wounded Münsterberg’s feelings, but it did seem to me well that he should get a reflection of what is being said of our department. His zeal and good intent are admirable, but in public utterances he does not strike the right quiet note. He has a splendid business head, and makes a first rate chairman (save for his unprovoked onslaught last year on Miller!). His willingness to do work and to assume cheerfully the heaviest burdens is extraordinary. His services with Emerson Hall have doubtless been great, and deserve our gratitude. If our sensibilities are grated on sometimes, the fault is in our own laziness in letting him do all the work. The remedy is in our hands, but we are a lazy crew, where business drudgery is concerned—all but him!

He must have felt my letter to be profoundly unjust and ungrateful; and of course his resignation must not be accepted now. I was surprised, after the Miller episode, to find Münsterberg still chairman this fall. If a new
chairman should be appointed next year, I imagine that Perry had better be tried.

Very truly yours,

Wm James$^{25}$