James served as “Acting Professor of Philosophy” at Stanford University in Palo Alto, California, for the first four months of 1906. He traveled there alone, since Mrs. James did not join him until 14 February. The main reason for this appointment was to help organize a philosophy department. The University had opened its doors to students for the first time in 1891. In recommending to President Jordan various candidates for a teaching position, James revealed a surprisingly extensive and personal knowledge of the philosophic scene in the United States. He especially recommended R. B. Perry. Also, James was quick to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of Stanford and to identify the direction he thought it must take to become an ideal university.

During their stay in California, the Jameses enjoyed many new experiences: a new climate, new people, new activities, and new scenes, which included a trip to the southern part of the state during a short vacation. James wrote a syllabus to accompany his new course, a general introduction to philosophy, for a large audience of students and guests. He represented Harvard at the meetings of the Association of American Presidents, substituting for President Eliot. All this idyllic living was shattered by the great earthquake that struck the whole
San Francisco peninsula on 18 April. Since all classes had to be cancelled due to the extensive damage to the university buildings, the Jameses left for home on 26 April.

After reaching home, James looked into the possibility of responding to an invitation to give a series of lectures at Columbia University, which had been offered some years before. The negotiations turned out to be an off-again, on-again affair, until the matter was settled finally in the affirmative.

James was shocked to learn in September that his cousin, Henrietta Rodgers, had died. He first heard of this through a graduate student, Horace Kallen, whom James had been urging to be sure to take the kind of vacation from studies and work as James had insisted upon for himself. When school did resume, James offered the same course, called “Philosophy 1 D,” which he had developed at Stanford. However, he felt that he should resign from teaching. This time the resignation stuck, and James did retire the following year.

No doubt, the main reason that turned James in the direction of accepting the Columbia lectures was that in the meantime he had accepted an offer to give another Lowell series of eight lectures in Boston in November and December. These were then written out and repeated at Columbia in late January and early February 1907.

Sandwiched between these two series of lectures was James’s presidential address, “The Energies of Men,” which he delivered to the members of the American Philosophical Association at their late December annual meeting, also held at Columbia University.
To James McKeen Cattell

Los Angeles
Jan 5. 1906

(Address, till next June, Stanford University, Cal)

Dear Cattell,

About a month ago I got a notification from the Secretary of the National Academy of Sciences, to the effect that you, I and a third person had been appointed a committee to report on some question which I now totally forget. You see what a good member I am! I pigeonholed the communication, expecting you to appear in Cambridge for the “Association” meetings, and waiting to confer with you then. But you were at New Orleans, and the thing escaped my mind till just now when, meeting with Mr. Hale the astronomer who is putting up the Carnegie Observatory here, we spoke of the Nat.l Academy, & that reminded me of that committee.

I am sorry to be so imbecile as to have forgotten the very problem proposed and still sorrier if my distance makes trouble for you. In general in these administrative matters, I have great confidence in your judgment, and if you send me a brief statement of what that is in this case, I make no doubt that I can easily subscribe.

Very truly yours

Wm James

· 393 ·
To F. C. S. Schiller

Stanford University, California
January 16, 1906

Dear Schiller of my soul,

You see where I am—*seit 8 Tagen*—and I owe you for two letters, one of which reached me only a few days ago—that of December 24th. I exult in your continued *gaudium certaminis* and beg you to send me the Quarterly and its article straight hither. I have ordered none of my periodicals forwarded, so pray send me *item*, a reprint of the Mind article, when you get one, hither. I am writing to my wife to forward the Hibbert Journal expressly. I saw Taylor just before leaving home, at the American Philosophical Association, which met at Harvard University. He is companionable enough, apparently, but hasn’t eaten of the fruit of the tree of life, a logic chopper and ratiocinator, as I imagine, to the end, with no *perceptions* of his own. “Where there is no vision, the people perish” as I hope will be the motto of our new philosophic building, “Emerson Hall”—an architectural horror, by the way. I hope you won’t spare him. In spite of his marvelous power of straight clear writing, he seems to me really very *crude*. *He won’t do* to be my successor at Harvard in a year or two. Do you yet know any Briton predestinate to that glory? I take my Journal of Philosophy here, so I shall see your article “Is Absolute Idealism Solipsistic?” duly. I’ve bro’t Poincaré’s *Valeur* book with me to read, but haven’t yet looked into it. Have just read Mach’s *Erkenntniss und Irrtum*—excellent wise stuff and very pragmatic.

Poor Hodgson’s death was the event, before I left. Absolutely sudden, dropt dead while playing violent
handball. Had said to a friend, a week before, that he thought he could count reasonably on 25 more years of life. All his work unfinished. No one can ever learn those records as he knew them—he would have written certainly 2 or 3 solid books. Too bad, too bad! And the manliest, unworldliest, kindest of human beings. May he still be energizing somewhere—it's not a case of "requiescat."

Thank Heaven, I've said no to the Paris temptation for next year. I shall probably never go. I have been in very poor shape, neurally, ever since last Spring and have so little "margin," that I feel as if a feather could knock me out, sometimes; yet I'm booked to lecture here till mid-May to 300 enrolled students and (so far) more than 100 visitors. They are starting a serious philosophical department and I have to create an atmosphere. Hence the nice artistic problem of an interest-arousing introductory course. It is inspiring; but would be more so, if I didn't feel as if the breath were leaving my body. I trust I shall pull through. I will send you in a day or two a copy of a syllabus that accompanies the lectures, to show you the sort of way in which I begin. Of course it's a bare table of contents.

This University is absolutely Utopian. It realizes all those simplifications and freedoms from corruption, of which seers have dreamed. Classic landscape, climate perfect, no one rich, sexes equal, manual labor practiced to some degree by all, especially by students, noble harmonious architecture, fine laboratories and collections, admirable music, all these latter things belonging to the community as such, while individuals live in the simplest conceivable way. Yet so perverse is man, that, when I listen and hear the great silence of the historic vacuum that lies behind all, I almost wish I were in Oxford!

Have you read Chesterton's Heretics? There's truth for you, right in the pit of the stomach. Goodbye dear
Schiller. Remember me to all inquiring friends and believe me

Ever affectionately yours,

Wm James

To Gilbert Keith Chesterton

Stanford University
California
Jan 17, 1906

I have just read your Heretics and cannot withhold my word of applause. You certainly do know how to hit truth in the pit of the stomach, and bring it down. And what straight writing! Only beware of letting flat contradiction become a "mannerism" in your old age. You, of all men, can afford to speak classically and without exaggeration. Keep it up.

Wm James (permanently of Cambridge, Mass.)
To F. C. S. Schiller

Stanford University
January 30, 1906

Dear Schiller,

Mind has come with Taylor's article, to which I am very glad you have a reply ready and zwar one characterized by unusual mansuetude of tone (for sooth to say I think you do habitually sin in the other direction and Taylor has probably some legitimate ground for complaint—your former article is out of my reach for verification as I write), because the ordinary reader will gather from this article of Taylor's, owing to his almost diabolic cleverness in putting things, that he has effectively knocked you out. Of course his way of taking your meaning is simply silly. Handling a big subject that requires some largeness of interpretation, with a mind narrowed to a spectrum slit. E.g., the 100th. decimal of Pi: as if consistency had no working value and as if the kind of inaccuracy that makes no difference in one case would not be fatal elsewhere, so that the habit of accuracy is a habit of truth. Compare great bank accounts, balanced to a penny, not for the sake of that penny, but for the value of the habit. Also I am sick of all his recent cram of mathematics and logic, which he takes so crudely. As if cardinal numbers had refuted ordinals! On the other hand, I think your statement of your general view of truth was originally unfortunately vague and sweeping. It ought to have discussed more types of case analytically and would then have given rise to less misunderstanding. Taylor's forte is his insistence on the fact that what we collectively call Truth does lean on fixed perceptions, inconvenient in many cases, yet which we submit to, because to
deny or ignore them or be inaccurate with them would be more inconvenient still. They are perceptions and how can we live unless by perception; so here is a meeting ground for both Taylor and you. Perceptions work; and they work, because they are true, i.e., constant, coercive, etc. By perceptions, I of course mean 1) sense-perceptions, 2) perceptions of time- and space-order, and 3) perceptions of comparison, which latter give rise to logic, mathematics and classifications.

But in the wider sense of Truth, as including judgments building-out perception (theories, constructions, many metaphysical and other "principles," etc.) you seem to me to be wholly right and Taylor nowhere. He doesn’t even seem to notice what you’re talking about. In these things truth means what you say it does, satisfactoriness on the whole and in the long run, which satisfactoriness of course includes consistency with the various orders of perception, and so depends in part upon the narrower order of truth. Taylor seems to think it must be unequivocally derivative from the narrower order. The world of thought is wide enough for both opinions together. Taylor seems to make his opinion exclusive of yours and it isn’t altogether surprising, if he and some of his friends have interpreted some of your earlier utterances as intended to be exclusive of theirs. But why not open yourself to the fruitful part of an adversary’s meaning? I confess that I am staggered by the tight little contracted character of the rationalist mind. But Taylor’s cleverness along his sharp little lines seems to me prodigious. No more today—the weather outside is refulgent, tho’ perhaps no more so than at Davos.

Yours as ever,

Wm James
To Charles William Eliot

Stanford University
California
Feb. 1st. 1906

Dear President,

I got your flattering telegram a couple of hours ago, and my negative answer is on its way now. I am touched by the confidence shown; but the truth is that I have too little strength to put it on any but genuine work at present, and I can't believe that there can be much demand that is solid at Berlin for my particular wares. It would mean a great deal of wear and tear socially, and much nervous trepidation, in an atmosphere not wholly congenial, and it would keep me away for another 6 months at least from the writing of a text book which is my most pressing duty. (This engagement here keeps me from that, but they offered me 5000 dollars so I could hardly say nay). I withdrew my candidacy for the Sorbonne for next year from Hyde, on account of the text-book. If that were offered for 1907–8, I should very likely accept. I could do much more real work at Paris than at Berlin.

This place is a wonder. The conditions seem to me ideal for a man who wants to teach and study undisturbed for 9 months, and who is financially able to take 3 months away in the year. But the great surrounding vacuum is curious. The historic silence fairly rings in your ears.

I have 450 listeners, 300 of whom are regularly enrolled. Assistants take charge of the chores. No red tape. No rank lists. Instructors keep absences or not, mark as they like, etc. In short we are refreshingly individualistic, and the tone of study seems decidedly more
earnest than at Cambridge. I ask myself whether it be not partly cause and effect, & whether our red tape doesn't partly defeat its own ends.

Believe me, again with thanks & regrets,

Faithfully yours,

Wm James

· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

Stanford University
February 17, 1906

Quarterly Review just rec'd. Also wife arrived, simultaneously, with your post card to her about Hibbert Journal. I believe that I acknowledged that, sent on by her previously, by my direction and expressed due satisfaction to you. The Plato article is grossartig, one of the boldest, straightest and of course most impressive as being 'scholarly' things that you have written. So simple! I find it most instructive. I'm down with bad gout—if it isn't one thing, it's another!

W. J.
Dear Schiller,

Your letter of the 4th. about Hodgson, etc. came yesterday and along with it Woodbridge’s Journal of Philosophy with your article on Solipsism, which adds to the enlightenment, doubtless, of the young. Of course Royce has always agreed that the Absolute himself is a solipsist, but insisted that finite minds can’t be so until they merge in the Absolute by absorbing the totality of content. As long as there is any content of which you are ignorant, you mustn’t try to imitate the Absolutist’s solipsism.

I am pressed with examination reading—250 students and me convalescing but slowly from a bad attack of gout. I send you, to égayer you, some specimen replies and also in another cover my syllabus so far. The students have to read Paulsen, read the syllabus, and hear my lectures—then “combine their information.”

Your article on Plato chimes still through my intellect. Keep on diversifying yourself in this way and you will lead everything!

Affectionately thine

W. J. 6
Dear Perry,

Dr. Jordan tells me that you have at last been invited formally hither by action of the trustees, and asks me to make you come. I can’t quite undertake that commission, but I will set things down in black and white as fairly as I can, for your & Mrs. Perry’s choice.

The pros that one sees immediately are the exquisite landscape hard by, the splendid climate, both for comfort and for work, the simplification of all things which is so favorable to work, the excellent wholesome, earnest, though relatively to Harvard somewhat immature, tone of the students, and the existence of what seems to me a very good looking superior faculty, relatively young.

Further more, in your case, headship of the department, freedom to make your work in your own way, and possibility of making an important mark for all future time if you should stay here long, with things in this plastic condition.

I assume that they are offering you 4000 dollars.

The cons are that rents & supplies seem little cheaper here than in Cambridge. There are fewer temptations to spend money, however, in small ways, altho that great trade-centre San Francisco is only 70 minutes away by rail. The great economy here is fuel, on which one spends much less than at Cambridge. Hired help being so hard to get, the wives suffer from too much housework. The human vacuum and fewness of elements (ex-
quisite tho many of them are) ends by making a change necessary occasionally, especially for wives, who haven't the stimulus that the instructors get from their teaching function. Travel requires money; and salaries, so far, have been so small that a bad grumbling habit has set in, which is demoralizing to the tone of the teaching body.

Apparently neither trustees nor president have so far had the right kind of imagination. The exquisite "plant" and conditions point to a University of quality, unique all through, though not necessarily large. Whether that will ever be the policy, I know not. It means big salaries. You can't count on it. All talk from above seems tainted with vagueness. Don't trust any generalities, only engagements in black and white. Things may turn out for the best, they may not. The thing hinges mainly on money; and the U. may be pinched—I can't get anything definite in the way of facts. They ought to have two big men in the philosophy department. Jordan talks vaguely of adding to the force; but don't you count on anything! He means well, but is vague, talks impulsively, and can't live up to his intentions.

This is the seamy side, and the faculty is demoralized in consequence. A somewhat better era is certain; the future may be a fine one—it depends on what counsels get uppermost.

My total advice to you is come by all means. It will enlarge your knowledge of your own country, educate you grandly in that respect, even if your stay should be transient. You are just as much in the running (or almost as much) for a higher eastern place (e.g. at Harvard) here as you would be there. And if you stay here and identify yourself with Pacific civilization, it means more of a career than you could hope for on the Atlantic coast. You can be a really vital influence.

There are really utopian beginnings here, it all depends on the turn things take. The students, both female
& male, make on me a better impression than do the Harvard undergraduates—for earnestness and simplicity.

In haste to catch the mail & with love,

Yours ever,

W. J.

I will send you some syllabus stuff I give my class.7

\* To Ralph Barton Perry \*

Stanford University
California
Feb. 27. 1906

Dear Perry,

I wrote in a great hurry last night, to catch the mail, omitting certain things.

I wrote also \textit{wholly from the point of view of your own interests}. \textit{Our} interest is to keep you; and I dare say that pressure will be bro't on you to stay, so that your decision will not be an easy one. Were I at your age and the temptation to come here came to me, I think I should yield to it, in spite of some uncertainties.

One drawback here is the small library. If you accept, you must make a \textit{positive condition} of your coming that you be allowed to spend 250 or 300 dollars a year on books for the library (exclusive of the periodicals now
taken) to be designated by yourself. I was surprised on arrival to find so good a lot of philosophical books in the library for students' use. Most of the needful things, and no dead wood. It is a live library, though a small one.

We, by great good luck, have just stept into a little furnished flat on the campus, just big enough for a married couple ($250 for 6 months). A Swedish woman comes in once a week and sweeps etc for 50 cents—sonst we take care of things ourselves; and step across the way to a somewhat unappetizing college boarding house, where, however, the company is agreeable, and where one pays 16 dollars a month for 2 meals or 21 for 3 meals daily.

Most of the faculty live in the village of Palo Alto, a mile away. The clay mud is fierce during the rains (as now) and in summer it is dust unto dust and under dust to lie. But the fine weather is exquisite, the hills divine and never to be invaded by much civilization. The climate is queer. It has made me intensely wakeful, yet I stand the wakefulness as I never should at home. All this, however, without any feeling of excitement such as our N W weather brings. I feel absolutely let alone by the climate, it is simply comfortable.

As usual, my d—d health spoils everything. A bad attack of gout, unable to walk today, after 3 weeks of it, and an itching urticaria all over my skin with fever, s'thing I never had before in my life! 400 listeners, very appreciative and earnest, 275 of 'em enrolled, and examination books perhaps as good as those at Harvard. They give one mealy paid 'assistants' for the drudgery of the course, exams (account keeping etc). Very little red tape, tho' of course it will grow. At present instructors keep absences or not, give what tests & exams they please etc. There is no rank list but they drop delinquents easily, and the tone of study, ambition etc is distinctly superior to that at Harvard. Co-education seems to work here
quite ideally, the relations being friendly and wholesome in a high degree. I guess this is about all.

Yours as ever,

W. J.

To George Herbert Howison

Stanford University
California
March 7th. 1906

Dear Howison,

I know of no "out" whatever to Hocking. My only reserves would be that he is as yet untried in big tasks and "one never can know;" likewise a certain "preciousness" of style in his first article in Woodbridge's Journal. Altogether, I regret (sic) [regard] him personally as perhaps the most distingué young fellow we've had in recent years. All his personal traits, so far as known to me, are of a superior order. Handsome, good manners, ready to joke—in short a "gentleman." The only fault I can find is that like so many Americans, he is afraid of letting out his voice. As for whether he would "consider" $1000, I haven't the least idea, one way or the other.

I have been so poorly that in common prudence I had to back out from my promise to address the Union on the 23rd. I expect to be at S. F. next week, and shall certainly go out to Berkeley & see you.

Affectionately yours,

Wm James
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Dear Perry,

Dr. Jordan has just informed me of your refusal of both his propositions—so I can now sink back into satisfaction that Harvard has you for good. I am a little surprised, though, that you couldn’t come for the single year—probably they wouldn’t let you off.

My letter to you was written solely from the point of view of your own interests, you having asked me to advise you from that point of view. I have to confess that if I had been consulted about candidates in the interests of the University here, immediate as well as future, I should have advised their going in for Dewey. What they need now is a leader established in the public eye. They have been too shy, hitherto, and relied on younger men, to grow up, but the time for that is over.

You must have had a trying time deciding, you & Mrs. P. especially, for the wives have the second best time here. I hope they gave you securities at Harvard. In haste,

always truly yours,

Wm James
Dear President,

I have to report that the Association of American Universities had a harmonious meeting, rather strenuous so far as hospitalities went, and closed yesterday. The paper you sent me arrived in the very nick of time, and on the whole the paper on the same subject by President Wheeler agreed with it. He made much of interchange as a way in which the guild of teachers were made mutually acquainted, leading to rapider exchanges of place and promotion, which he regarded as normal.

Jordan's paper made very good literature and was full of sense. The Cornell contribution was an "elaboration of the obvious." The only really important paper was Dean West's of Princeton, yesterday. Masterly in both form and matter, it ought to have a wide circulation. Practically it recommended our Harvard constitution (not naming us, however) as the sole path of salvation.

There were no resolutions, no differences of opinion developed, nothing to lock horns over, for every one seemed of essentially the same mind on all the subjects. It was not worth crossing the Continent for, except for the sociability. The attendance was small, the only eastern men being President Remsen, President van Hise, Carpenter of Columbia, Burton of Chicago, Woolsey of Yale, & West of Princeton.

The Spring advances here, but it's rain, rain, rain! I'm glad you didn't come—I went off at 1/2 cock in writing to urge you. Things here won't admit of reform yet, and a
volcanic explosion of some sort will probably have to occur first. But the potentialities of the place are exquisite.

Always sincerely yours,

Wm James

· To Ralph Barton Perry ·

Stanford University
California
April 11, 1906

Dear Perry,

Your excellent letter explaining your refusal, etc. is at hand, and very welcome. I confess that we had both of us been a little curious to know what had been going on behind the scenes, especially what made you decline the invitation to come for one year. At present all is made perfectly clear, and the decision was certainly the safest, and possibly, even as regards the remoter future, which is the big gambling stake in California, the wisest you could have made. I am mighty glad that Harvard still possesses you, though I am unaccustomed to imagine you in Palmer's chair. You must have been pleased at his adoption of you as his successor.

I am down for a general Introduction next year, which will certainly be my last as lecturer. I wish that I could see my way to using your book, but I can work Paulsen easier. I have read yours again while here, and admire it
more than ever as a synopsis, and retrospective sum­ming up of philosophic wisdom, wonderfully pregnant paragraphs & sentences, but don’t see how (in my hands at any rate) it can be made a means of working the sub­ject in to the inanimate minds of beginnings. What they need is a few problems very concretely treated. You cover too much ground (in my opinion) and often too abstractly. This is not to “rub in” my ancient criticism, but only to excuse myself for not using a book which for your sake I should have liked to use above all others.

Only 4 more weeks of lecturing now for me. Less than for you ’uns! but I am orfle tired.

Yours in haste

W. J.

Shaler’s death is a great shock—the best loved man in our university.¹⁰

· To Josiah Royce ·

Stanford University
California
April 22. 1906

Dear Royce,

Not knowing whether McVare still presides over the destinies of the tabular view, and requiring at any rate (I suppose) the approbation of our department for my proposition I write to you to say that I am willing, and should like, to give my Introduction to Philosophy at 8
o'clock. It would cut down the men, but leave me with the more earnest ones, and it would be of edifying example. Seeing them begin here at 8 this winter has made me more ashamed than ever (and that is saying a good deal) of our slugabed practice.

Henceforward I am prepared to pose at afternoon teas and other social gatherings as an authority on earthquakes. The critter herself was very vivid, and the San Francisco story is historical. I spent 6 hours there on the morning. No harm done to us.

In haste, yours, as ever

W. J.¹¹

· To Frank Angell ·

Cambridge
May 13. 06

Dear Angell,

We have been home 10 days, and I think the time has come to notify our safe arrival to you. The "East" looks very solid, dark, and complex compared with the civilization of Palo Alto, & Harvard seems tremendously tremenjusly so after sweet little Stanford. Everything in this world—even you and I—has its p'ints; but has to go without the p'ints of something else: which arrangement increases the richness of alternatives in the Universe. I find the Ph D. examination season on here now, the thing I most detest in my academic life, partly because it comes at the fatigued end of the year, and partly because
of the amount of humbug on our part connected with it. There is not much humbug on the part of the poor candidates, for although their theses usually make one grovel with admiration of their industry and learning, the oral examinations send the daylight into all their crannies. I invariably ask them questions which I can't my self answer, and feel mean that they should have no opportunity to show me up.

We have talked little except earthquake since our return, and are thoroly accustomed to the "pose" of heroes. With you all in California the state of excitement must have worn itself out, and in poor San Francisco the stage of unutterable fatigue with the number of decisions and the comfortless conditions must have set in. The next six months will make many nervous victims surely. It will be a new sifting out of those who are natively adapted to triumph in such a strenuous situation, from those who are not adapted. I should suppose that many citizens who could have been happy and prosperous at S. F. in quiet times will now simply bow their heads, and fall back on humbler conditions of living, in the country or in smaller towns, and there find perhaps a more genuine contentment than they ever had in the city. Blessed conditions of California, that make such rearrangements easy!

My regret is that we never got to Ben Lomond, never drove to La Honda, never saw the Santa Cruz mountains or paid a visit to Car-mell. Perhaps hereafter! I think the climate did have something adverse to me—I began to sleep immediately on my return and am now sleeping quite normally.

I enclose you a check on the Palo Alto Bank (solvent ?) for $100.00. Please make any balance not needed for Palo Alto relief over to the San Francisco relief fund. When I receive my pay for April from Stanford, I shall be generous abundantly, but I must wait for that. I left $100 at Berkeley. We are hoping to go to Milton in a
couple of days to give Mrs. Angell news of you and see your children. Believe me dear Angell with my wife's warm regards,

Yours ever truly,

Wm James


To James McKeen Cattell

95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
June 3, 1906

Dear Cattell,

Thanks for the Sciences of which a dozen (enough!) have arrived. As for the lectures, after writing my last letter, I had relaxed into a state of holy peace as regards my future thinking of that chalice as averted from my lips, but now your letter comes; I will say immediately "yes" to your proposition of six lectures. I hate them, and they're thoroughly bad for me. But I love your Columbia "Department," and will contribute to its grandeur, so count me in. I wish I could tell you how many thousands of dollars worth of jobs I've declined in the past 6 years. But no matter! The time will have to be last 1/2 of Jan. or 1st 1/2 of Feb. I note that I may have 3 consecutive days on 2 consecutive weeks, but it might prove better to space them, every other day for two weeks. When can that be definitely decided?

Truly yours,

Wm James
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Cambridge
August 3, 1906

Dear old Schiller,

How you keep it up! I have read your reviews of Sturt and Joachim in the Nation and your article on Taylor in the July Mind. I could almost wish the latter had been less elaborate. When one has construction in hand, polemic writing may well take a second place. Taylor will be effectively superseded if we once get out a perfectly clear expression of what we believe, without all this labor of refuting him. I'm not sure that he will himself succumb to what you say of the Pi case. To my mind his talk about it was absolutely childish. Does he not see that a habit of neglecting fractions may be so pernicious that the "truth" of even useless decimals is worth contending for? That granted, all your remarks about the 100th. decimal follow.

Sturt has sent me his book, but I have hardly had time to look at it. I wish it were less polemic and more constructive. But out of all this polemic writing advance in clearness must result. I find Dewey's article in the same Mind most illuminating and masterly. Mackenzie excellent too, but he fails to take the last step, after leading right up to it, being unwilling to admit that what experiences "mean" and "know" may just be other experiences in the plural. He leaves us with a monistic Absolute, only not idealistic. But things are drifting tremendously in our direction. It reminds me of the Protestant reformation!14

[rest missing]
You blessed old Schiller, here comes in your letter of August 9 from Sils Maria, redolent of vigor and good spirits and fight. What a godlike life you lead, between Oxford and the Engadin peaks. And what a contrast with my penurious tide of health and energy. No matter, while there's life, there's hope. I'm off for a fortnight in the Adirondacks tomorrow, where I can't climb, but where I can at least lie on the ground instead of sitting on a "piazza," and where I shall read Sturt, among other things. I've just read Joachim, a beautiful piece of composition and clear writing. But hasn't the Lord delivered him into pragmatism's hands, just? I think it ought to clear up the situation amazingly. I'm overjoyed at the table of contents that you are sending me. I didn't realize that things were as far forward as that. And I'm particularly rejoiced that Plato is to occupy so central position. I hope that the whole Quarterly Review criticism gets in bodily. The most effective way of turning the tables on our particular adversarys is to fling Plato's Theaetetus right into their teeth. They treat us now as little street boys and ignoramuses, of which I indeed am one, but they can treat you as such no longer if you emphasize and develope that particular criticism, which their lop-sided training will lead them especially to respect.

Young Barlow shall be welcome! Hurrah for Goldstein! I didn't know a German could be anything but a dogmatist.

The ghost of dear old Hodgson is reappearing through Mrs. Piper and I am to co-ordinate his utterances and make report. Not convincing, to me: but baffling exceed-
ingly. I send you a pretty memorial of him, read at the Tavern Club by de Wolfe Howe.

Ever thine

W. J.

Possibly I may get to Europe for a few weeks next Spring. In haste and with hearty admiration for the Aristotelian Society fragment also.¹⁵

· To Horace Meyer Kallen ·

St. Hubert's
Sept 4. [1906]

Dear Kallen,

I meant to write to you yesterday but forgot about it. And here I am, about to leave tomorrow at 7 A.M. I hope that you may be getting better adapted to the climate of Glenmore. If not, there is a Broe boarding house about a mile before you reach here in Keene Valley where the beauties of this nature would be open to you. I can't find anything about its prices etc. You have, as intermediate stations, Elizabethtown (Maplewood house) or Lake George, where there must be s'thing cheap alongside of the fashionable parts, but I am ignorant of conditions there. Possibly you are getting information at Glenmore. The main thing to me seems to be that you should get the whole month of Sept. in the country somewhere and that means making your cash go as far as possible. And not doing any study after 4 P.M.!!!

· 416 ·
I enclose a card to Adler, in case you should come along to this part of the Valley. I spoke to him of you, and I think he would be glad to see you. He is very jealous of his time, and the best time to call is about 4.30 or 5 P.M. Good luck! and to a happy meeting in October!

Yours truly

Wm James

---

To Horace Meyer Kallen

95 Irving St.
Sept. 9. '06

Dear Kallen,

Reaching home last night I find your letter of Thursday. I re-enclose Mr. Boardman's to you.

I cannot believe that Henrietta Rodgers is dead. I should certainly have heard of it direct. I advise Mr. Boardman not to write to Katherine about it till it is confirmed. It might shock Henrietta to learn of such a rumor.

I am very sorry that your vacation is being cut short by such a call. I do think that your recuperation is more important than these civic troubles which are always with us, and your particular share in which can certainly be postponed till you have got a "position" of some sort which will make your influence greater.

Your first duty is to keep yourself in decent condition so as to gain the position. I don't mean that you should get nervous about your health, but that you should get
what is a prime element of mental as well as bodily hygiene in the long run, one rural month at least in the year.

You mistake my praise of Joachim. What he has done is to save us from a big lot of critical labor, and to open our door wide.

Great haste,
Yours truly

W. J.

· To Ralph Barton Perry ·

95 Irving St.
Sept. 10. 06

Dear Perry,

Just touching Cambridge between Keene Valley and Chocorua. I have informed the office that you will answer questions concerning my new introductory course D. in Paulsen, on Tu. Th. & Sat., at 9. Will you do so? Probably none will be asked. I don’t wish, for good reasons, to get home here till Thursday night. I will meet my students on Saturday at the 9 o’clock hour.

You, I believe, are Dean now, and I hope that you will relish the fierce light that beats on that throne. I got your points about “K.,” and will reserve them till I get energizing again on the subject. Kind regards to Mrs. P. Pray let me know if aught transpires, addressing “Chocorua.”

Yours as ever

W. J.
To Charles William Eliot

Chocorua, N. H.
Sept. 23. 06

Dear President,

I find myself in a very awkward situation. For a year past my infirm “heart” has been giving me trouble again, and within the past fortnight something like the bad symptoms of seven or eight years ago have broken loose. The obvious indication is to spare it. Much of the trouble is doubtless “nervous,” and sure to ameliorate when I get home and treat myself as I know how. I can, no doubt, carry through my half year’s course as advertized.

I can; but the question is how far I ought to subject an organ which is going back and losing its tone, to a deleterious strain? Next to carrying trunks up stairs the most angerfend thing I know is lecturing, especially to large classes. The cumulative effect of it is very great on me.

Under these circumstances it is natural that I should find myself wishing that I had forced my resignation through, last year. Is it too late for it to take immediate effect now? The course, Phil. 1 D, I advertize is a supernumerary novelty. If dropped, it would leave our traditional program in no essential particular altered. I might resign then, and let the course drop altogether.

That is one alternative. The other would be to start the course as advertized, on the express understanding that I shall be free at my conscientious discretion to stop lecturing whenever I think it is having damaging effect. Fortunately we have this year Apthorp Fuller Ph.D., already licensed as lecturer, a man very sympathetic with my general attitude in philosophy, who would undoubtedly be glad enough to step into the breach in case
I called on him. I should have absolutely to determine the amount of help required; and to notify the students on meeting them next Saturday that they cannot count on my uninterrupted ministrations.

I should also expect Fuller to be paid out of my salary.

I rashly accepted an appointment last winter to give a short course of lectures at Columbia. This of course I shall resign from. But a Lowell course to which I have also been appointed, I shall only resign from under stress of necessity, for the fee ought to more than cover the expense of Fuller, and I need my income.

I ask you either to accept my resignation outright, or to authorize the arrangement with Fuller, experiment being left to decide the amount of help I shall require of him. I haven’t yet written to sound him! Use your own preference, and I shall be satisfied; though my own abstract preference is decidedly for the first & most decisive solution.

It might be that the department would like to have Fuller give the course wholly, in his own name. This would be a 3rd solution.

I shall return home Wednesday night, and report to you promptly.

Sincerely yours,

Wm James

If there is anything I hate it is this perpetual crying “baby,” and I probably seem so vivacious when in action, that others can’t well believe in the lack of solidity with which I am beset. If the earthquake hadn’t closed Stanford a month too early last year I don’t know how I should have got through the lecturing, it fatigued me so.17
To Katherine Rodgers

Chocorua, N. H.
Sept. 25, 1906

Dearest Katie,

From Henry comes a letter last night enclosing one from you to him and giving the terrible news. He, it appears, had known it from the first, but had not notified it to us, thinking we would get it in a direceter way—we write pretty infrequently to each other.

Three weeks ago a student of mine told me that a friend of his had asked him to ask me if Miss Dorrington Rodgers was dead. I replied of course not—I should have heard. It gave us a twinge of anxiety, and I felt like writing, but refrained because I tho’t that such a rumor, if false, and it was pretty certainly false, would give pain to Henrietta. So now, dear little Katie, the day whose possibility must have often haunted your imagination, has really come, and life for you must be a great readaptation. It isn’t the death, it is the suffering the poor child must have gone through and borne, as you say, so heroically & patiently, that is the shocking feature of the news your letter brings us. It doesn’t seem exactly compatible with our notions of divine wisdom that a person as frail and innocent as poor Nettie should be reserved for so heavy a punishment at the end. But she is safe now, and as a mortal, gathered into the world of our tender memories, of your very tenderest. For myself, Katie, I am glad that you are the one preserved, and who knows, whether the new life now forced upon you may not awaken some resources of energy and health not drawn on hitherto? You say nothing of your plans; and I suppose they are not yet fully settled. Whatever you
incline to do, I hope you will let us know. Do it through Henry, since that will save double writing and you must be rather overwhelmed at present with epistolary calls. To think of beautiful Lake Leman and Lausanne having now this intimately pathetic association! How I recall every minute of the days spent with you 18 months or less ago! If you come home, dearest Katie, you must make a good long stay with us and get wonted to our family ways. Our own plans after next spring are somewhat doubtful. I am “down” for a Paris lectureship, but it is not at all certain that I shall toe the mark. In that case, whether next summer gets passed here, or abroad, or if abroad, where?, is all a mass of uncertainty. But you must keep close to us, dearest Katie, in spirit if not in body, and believe us both, with warmest sympathy and love,

Yours ever

Wm James

· To James McKeen Cattell ·

Cambridge, Mass.
Oct. 29, [1906]

Dear Cattell,

If I succeed in giving the lectures at all (as I hope I shall) it will have to be during our mid year recess, which usually runs from about Jan 20th to Feb. 8th.

I put in the if because I’ve had a very disagreeable recrudescence of heart symptoms this fall, and next to
carrying trunks up stairs, lecturing is as bad a duty as I am called on to perform. Along with this is a ragged state of nerves, and in view of both conditions I am carrying on my Harvard instruction only from week to week, another man being engaged to take my place in case it seems best for me to stop.

Meanwhile I'm trying to get ready some Lowell lectures for next month—lectures which for financial reasons I don't like to back out from. So you see how I am squeezed, & why I say "if."

But I hope to come up to the scratch. So you had better advertize the course, and let me disappoint expectation, if need be, when the time comes.

I positively can't do duty as President of the Amer. Society of Naturalists, but this is a small matter.

As President of the Amer. Philosophical Association, I can in any case send a written "address" but I hope to be there in the flesh as well.

Sincerely yours,

Wm James

P.S. I think you said I might lecture on 3 successive days of two weeks (successive). On the whole this might suit me best. The title of the course had better be: "The Pragmatic Movement in Contemporary Philosophy."
Dear Cattell,

I have deferred answering your letter of the 3rd till I could interview Santayana, and the time has sped. He says that he is to give six lectures on "the appreciation of Art" at the Brooklyn Institute in January & February, and will be ready at very short notice to give them, if required. Of course I don't propose to start my lectures without a reasonable certainty of putting them thru. Therefore, if you approve of Santayana's subject, and don't require more than the six that I bargained for, I will let you know in time for the announcement of change to be made 10 days in advance.

As for the time, my time would naturally be the last week in Jan. & the first in Feb. The days are indifferent. In view of an eventually possible change on Santayana's part, need the days & hours be advertized now? Morning is best for me, but I suppose it has to be afternoon.

The address I shall write for the philosophers will be of general human interest enough to do for the general Society of Naturalists. But it will last 50 minutes, I fear. I had hoped to do something on "composition" in "consciousness," which would have been highly technical. It won't pan out in time, so I fall back on a popular talk with concrete illustrations of the reserves of energy in people that they habitually don't draw upon. I have notified you all i.e. Castle & thru him the other members of the executive committee that they need expect nothing from me as president. Angell also. As I told you, I think it likely that I may have to send my address to the philoso-
phers to be read. Very sorry to put you out and I won't, unless compelled by force majeure.

Truly yours,

Wm James

· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

Cambridge
November 25, 1906

Yours of the 11th. rec’d. How glad I am that your 500 pp. are to appear so shortly. I’m sure that that vol. will give a great shove to the cause and to your reputation. I have decided to write out my Lowell lectures and have done 1 1/2 already. Splendid audience—but they’ll be much better as written. Very sorry for your examinership, tho’ you seem exultant. Poor Strong’s wife is dead and he’s back in America. Affectionatest greetings.

W. J.

P.S. What do you say to the following dedication of my vol. of lectures?—“To Schiller, Dewey, and Papini.” Don’t you think Papini deserves it? With his Uomo-Dio he certainly has given a new kind of shove to the doctrine. I hope you have enjoyed Chesterton’s Dickens and Wells’ Days of the Comet.
Cambridge, Mass.
Dec. 4, 1906

Dear Mr. Wells,

I’ve delayed acknowledging the double present you have made me till I should have read both books thru. Which I’ve now done with unalayed delight. The “America” will start up a lot of thinking in brains capable of it, which will eventually take effect, and on the whole, with its tact & brilliancy to boot, is as good a service as a foreigner has ever performed. It breaks conventional crusts.

The “Comet” is very great—written out of perceptions; & such words to hit them off by! But you’re an artist & philosopher & not a statesman, thank Heaven, and the present of fact and future of vision in both books are rather unmediated. The real future won’t be discontinuous, or quite as much of a breach with the past as the Comet made. Meanwhile you deal in possibles; bring them home alive & hot, and wake us from our dogmatic slumber.

With you & Chesterton & Bernard Shaw no one can now accuse this age of lack of genius.

Keep it up!
Yours fondly

Wm James

You’re a pragmatist! I’m writing a small book with that message.21