After returning from the Philosophical Association meeting, James wrote that New York City, where he was born in 1842, seemed to him to have changed very much over the years, becoming in fact a "permanent earthquake." Before returning to New York, James held his last class at Harvard on 22 January. A week later he was lecturing at Columbia University until 8 February. The lectures were published in book form in May as Pragmatism: A New Name for Old Ways of Thinking.

No sooner was James back home than Cattell suggested that James give another series of lectures at Columbia. After some leanings in that direction, James decided in August against such a venture because he found it difficult to try to put his metaphysical speculations into popular form.

James did find the time and interest to serve as an agent in America to find a suitable candidate to be part of a committee to establish an international language. Such prominent men as Alexander Graham Bell and Thomas Raynesford Lounsbury were asked. But the real enthusiasm was for Bergson's new book; L'Evolution Créatrice. This book was to have a deep influence on James's thought. He also welcomed Schiller's second collection of essays Studies in Humanism and Stout's review of it.

In the correspondence from now on, the name of the

Two honors came to James in July. He was elected to the British Academy as a Corresponding Fellow and the Carnegie Foundation voted to pay him a retiring allowance.

G. Papini, whom James had met in Italy during his 1905 visit, had written an article on *pragmatism*, which James had Mrs. Royce translate, and which he urged Cattell to accept for republication. As to the book *Pragmatism*, the sixth chapter was devoted to the pragmatist conception of truth—what James called the “wider sense” of the word *pragmatism*. James’s view, along with those of Dewey and Schiller, was criticized in journals. James was surprised and, at times, became annoyed at what he took to be a lack of understanding of the doctrine, despite his efforts to be clear in his replies to some of his critics.

Though he had turned down the Columbia offer, James did accept on 29 November the invitation to give the Hibbert lecture series at Manchester College, Oxford University, in 1908. Finally, the debate over ‘truth’ was carried on at the annual meeting of the Philosophical Association in late December at Cornell University. James was a member of a symposium on the topic of truth.
To James McKeen Cattell

Cambridge, Mass.
Jan. 1, 1907

Dear Cattell,

I'm fairly ashamed to be such a tergiversator whenever you are concerned, but I will take the lectures in spite of what I said to you and Thorndike last Saturday night. Miller got hold of me on Sunday morning and made me wish I had held on till I were away from N.Y. at least, and now, my wife also consenting, and my recollection of that delightful Columbia philosophical circle pulling, I say yes instead of no. I will go into cold storage after instead of before the Columbia lectures! My organism can stand that extra strain, surely, before taking its eternal repose from the lecturing function.

What really tempts me is the prospect of converting all you Columbians into enthusiastic advocates of pragmatism as I conceive it. And since I have eight lectures all accurately mapped out, it will be easier to give the full eight as they stand, than to do any work of condensation into six upon them. Eight lectures then, $400 dollar fee, O Basilisk Cattell (who always has his way) on "Pragmatism, a new name for an old way of thinking," to be given on 4 successive days in each of 2 successive weeks, as soon as possible after January 23rd.

Believe me, very much yours, & with a happy New Year,

Wm James¹
Dearest Katie,

A happy New Year to you, or as happy a one as circumstances permit! Your last letter gave an impression of the circumstances being rather disconsolate, and the need of inner self-support great, but also of the healthy mind and will being there to meet the emergency, and, on the whole, of the strong soul being on deck. I am 36 hours back from New York, where I went to attend a meeting of our "philosophical Association," and where I spent a pleasant hour with your sisters Kit & Lizzie. They looked rather startlingly older than when I last saw them (no one knows how many years ago), and poor Lizzie complained of arterio-sclerosis (wh. is my trouble too) but said that her recent iodide-medication was already producing its effect. They agreed fully in the wisdom of your staying abroad, and in sooth they seemed themselves rather dépaysées in N. Y., with so many of the old circle passed over to the majority, and the city grown by leaps and bounds beyond all recognition. It isn't a place, or a city, but an infinite railroad station or factory of monstrous buildings, tearing down and going up wherever you look. I never wish to set foot in the place again—it looks so awful to the mere visitor, who doesn't see all the god fearing old fashioned domestic happiness that lots of those house-fronts conceal. And you, if you came back, would never cease to be the mere visitor. You'd never get used to it; and you will really have far more intimate sociability with your friends and com-
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patriots in Lausanne or elsewhere in Europe than you could ever have here. Compare your relations with us, for example, with your sisters! And that is only one specimen of what happens. I am going back to N. Y. in 4 weeks to give eight lectures at Columbia University, and after that I shall try not to go there any more. This will be my last lecturing exploit in this vale of tears. I finish my Harvard duties forever on the 23rd of this month—then Columbia, and then emancipation! I almost tremble at the freedom. You will have heard that the Paris scheme is absolutely abandoned. Fortunately! I don't see how I could have entertained it for a moment. My thoracic organs have been going back on me lately, so an uneventful life, an egoistic life, not trying to influence others by spoken word, or acted deed, is my cue. After 35 years of teaching, one has earned a day to one's self! But I hope to write.

Our family news is good. Peggy is home for the holidays from Bryn Mawr, much consolidated and improved in soul for the 3 months experience. She has a just way of looking at things; and belies Godkin's epigram (when he said the trouble with women is that they haven't got the instincts of a gentleman). She has, after a fashion. Alice has had unusually little headache this fall, tho she has one this very day. She is too sociable, & hospitable, wants to fill the house with strangers while I want to empty it of every one but her and myself—whence fearful scenes of recrimination and accusation! But we love one another in spite of it all, and I must say that her moral excellence and "accommodating"-ness under the continuous regime of W. J. will entitle her to a high rank in the scale of saints hereafter. Aleck is a schoolboy, Harry more and more a busy lawyer—both healthy. Of Billy you know as much as we, probably. It is a lovely clearing from the South to day, after a real European December, in point of darkness. Hardly a ray of sun the
whole month. Well, Katie dear, keep up health and heart, and believe in the constant affection of both Alice & your loving

W. J.²

Cambridge, Mass.
Jan. 25, 1907

Dear Cattell,

I seem to be only too well taken care of socially by the Columbia friends. As I also have other friends in N. Y. I shall have all the conviviality I can stand under. Pray leave Columbia non-philosophers out, but let me see the younger men in the department. Better set that for the week beginning Feb. 3rd, as most of my evenings till then are already pre-empted.

This is evidently going to be my final flare-up, the bangout of the fireworks! I enjoy the prospect very much.

Yours faithfully

W. J.
• To Henry Guy Walters •

95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
Jan 25, 1907

Heartiest thanks for your tears and for your ultra cordial letter. My resignation doesn't mean moribundance but more abundance, rather, in more useful forms of energy than teaching, which after 35 years begins to pall. Send me a sample of your Nautilus work.

Truly yours,

Wm James

• To Jane Addams •

Cambridge, Mass.
Feb. 12, 1907

Dear Miss Addams,

I am just back from a fortnight in New York, where, in the intervals of “energizing” in the rhythm of that active city (or trying to), I soothed myself by the perusal of your book. I find it hard to express the good it has done me in opening new points of view and annihilating old ones. New perspectives of hope! I don't care about this detail or that—it is the new setting of questions. Yours is a deeply original mind, and all so quiet and harmless! Yet
revolutionary in the extreme, and I should suspect that this very work would act as a ferment thru long years to come. I read precious little sociological literature, and my opinions in that field are worth nothing—but I am willing to bet on you.

Of course you have sent it to Wells, and to Carpenter. Possibly to Chesterton, but I doubt whether it has occurred to you to order it sent to Bernard Shaw. I bet (again) that it will stimulate his genius in the most extraordinary way. The publishers have sent me a second copy (wasteful things!). May I send it, with a note (and your permission) to Bernard Shaw?

Gratefully and sincerely yours

Wm James

Bernard Shaw is a fanatic moralist of the new type, and will some day be cared for as such.

To James McKeen Cattell

Cambridge, Mass.
Feb. 13, 1907

Dear Pertinax,

I admire the way in which you seize the Psychological Moment, before I’ve cooled off! Yet I think it far too early to say yes even conditionally—I might and mightn’t—the great difficulty now being to see what next to lecture about. “Pragmatism” made a very well
subdivided little chunk. Leave it till your last moment for announcement purposes, and ask me again!

Thanks for your compliments—but the single word "I believe" would be worth them all! Hard hearts, hard hearts, in the Columbia philosophical department!

Fondly yours,

Wm James

\[ \text{\textit{To F. C. S. Schiller}} \]

Cambridge
February 20, 1907

Hurrah for the book, just come! It looks \textit{stattlich} with its 500 pp. I'm sorry you say what you do of the "correspondence-with-reality" view of Truth, on p. IX. It perpetuates misunderstanding. Better to \textit{explain} "correspondence," as \textit{taking account} in any profitable way, and "reality" as (1) sensations, (2) relations among ideas and (3) previous truths. I got your letter and the typescript of my article, which I didn't need back. Also the Journal of Philosophy with the Mad Absolute. Terribly busy and fatigued, which accounts for brevity. Better be reviewed by an enemy than by me.

W. J.\textsuperscript{5}
To Alexander Graham Bell

95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
Feb. 21. 1907

Dear Mr. Bell;

It never rains but it pours, so here I am, writing to you again.

Are you interested in the project of an International language,—not necessarily Esperanto, but any other candidate, if more successful?

I have a letter from the eminent French logician and mathematician Couturat, asking me to say who in my estimation would be the best American to ask to serve on an international committee of nine, to organize definitely the propaganda.

Naturally your name suggests itself. We need a person—not necessarily a philologist—rather the contrary!—whose example would win respect for the cause, and whose reputation is national. Exempt too from the suggestion of crankiness! President Eliot, and several others whom I have consulted, suggested your name independently.

I myself believe that this is one of the great "causes" of the future. The ease with which Esperanto is learned appears quite marvellous.

There is to be one member of this Committee of nine from each country. The point is to organize the movement towards the adoption of the international language as a public school study in the different countries. The Committee is to have its first meeting in Europe, in May or June probably, at the best convenience of its members.
Can I ask M. Couturat to propose your name to the delegation which elects this Committee?

Sincerely yours

Wm James

Ostwald is on for Germany. Villareal of Lima for the South American Spanish countries. If you can’t serve, who do you next think of?

· To James McKeen Cattell ·

95 Irving St.
March 10, 1907

Dear Cattell,

I was surprised yesterday at receiving about a hundred reprints of my lecture in the March Pop. Sci. I don’t think I asked for them, so I owe them entirely to your liberality, but I don’t mean to circulate these lectures in advance of the book, so I shall need only 6 or 8 copies of the Pop. Sci. itself when my 2nd lecture comes out. I did ask for 50 copies of Science with my energy article in it—but they have not yet come.

Yours as ever,

Wm James

· 437 ·
To Alexander Graham Bell

95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
20. 3. 07

Dear Mr. Bell;

I thank you for your two kind replies to my two letters. I am glad you are well enough again to write. I am very sorry you can’t see your way to being on the International language committee. I will write to Prof. Lounsbury of Yale to sound him.

Exceedingly obliged for the promise of $50 yearly (D.v., of course!) for C. S. P. I am now sure of my 500 dollars; and with as much on the relatives’ side, his future safety is made sure. As we are proposing to start payments early in April, a check from you would be welcome now.

Sincerely yours,

Wm James
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To Thomas Raynesford Lounsbury

95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
March 20, 07

Dear Professor Lounsbury,

An international committee (to consist of one member from each of twelve countries) is being formed at Paris, to organize definitely the movement in favor of an International language—not necessarily Esperanto! I have been asked to advise concerning its American member. The committee is to meet some where in Europe in May or June next, it is hoped. M. Couturat, the distinguished mathematician, is the Secretary at present.

Were I a frenchman, I would now enumerate the gifts of nature and the resources of art, the academic authority, public fame and political influence that infallibly point you out as the worthiest possible American member of such a committee. But I refrain! I hope that you care for the cause, which I believe to be tremendously important. If you do, should you be willing to serve on such a committee? I should like to be able to urge you upon my correspondent Couturat, if he hasn’t already written to you independently. In all seriousness, I believe that your name would add much prestige throughout our country to the project.

Very sincerely yours,

Wm James
My pragmatism book (MS now with printer) should appear in both countries by June 1st. I have read only 25 pp. of your book as yet (being balled up with labor and having lent it to one Kallen, an enthusiastic Pragmatist who is writing a Ph.D. thesis on that subject). I shall get at it soon now. No chance of Europe for me for the next twelve months.

W. J.

Dear Professor Lounsbury,

I am exceedingly sorry to hear of your poor “shape,” cerebrally, and regret that I should have troubled you about the International Language scheme at all.

A. Graham Bell also declines, so, you and he being my only candidates, I will write to Couturat that my cards are played.

I hope you’ll get well speedily. Beware however of resting your brain absolutely, for too long. After 3 or 4
months, I believe that a certain amount of one’s “life-work” is indispensable for recovery.

Very sincerely yours,

Wm James

· To Mary Whiton Calkins ·

Cambridge
May 20. 07

I don’t think there has been any literature of the kind you write of, unless possibly Bergson’s new book (wh. is probably “epochmaking”) l’Evolution Créatrice, Alcan, contains it. I have done nothing. I see you take pluralism [sic] as necessarily monadistic, wh. I don’t see as a necessity. The last 2 essays in Schiller’s Studies in Humanism are a beginning of pluralistic evolutionism. If you start with tychism, you can have relations between terms vary, as well as terms, so you needn’t remain monadistic. Yours, in haste, W. J. who hasn’t yet had time even to look at your Persistent Problems.⁹
To F. C. S. Schiller

Chocorua
June 13, 1907

Yours of the 27th. ult. rec'd and highly appreciated. I'm glad you relish my book so well. You go on playing the Boreas and I shedding the sunbeams, and between us we'll get the cloak off the philosophic traveler! But have you read Bergson's new book? It seems to me that nothing is important in comparison with that divine apparition. All our positions, real time, a growing world, asserted magisterially and the beast intellectualism killed absolutely dead! The whole flowed round by a style incomparable, as it seems to me. Read it and digest it, if you can. Much of it I can't yet assimilate.

[unsigned]

To Horace Meyer Kallen

Bay View, Maine
July 12, 1907

I advise you to write fully to Schiller for advice. I will simultaneously write to him to introduce & commend you. So Royce is using my Pragmatism-book already—bully for him. I shall be here till the 22nd at least, and then for a couple of days in Cambridge. I wish you joy of the Aesthetics, & hope you'll get a fair audience.

W. J.
Dear Schiller,

A student of ours named Kallen, candidate for Ph.D., is about writing to you for advice about whether to go to Oxford next year—he has one of our fellowships. He is a Russian Jew by birth, very intense in character, very able and with high potentialities of all round cultivation, an enthusiastic and aggressive 'pragmatist', an active political worker, a decidedly original mind, neurotic disposition, but sails indefinitely long close to the wind without losing headway, a man with a positive future and possibly a great one and in good directions: Revers de la médaille: sticky, conceited, censorious of all institutions. Nevertheless faithful, candid, goodlooking and in favor of all good things. I shouldn't wonder if these eastern jews formed the chief ferment of ideality in our future America—they seem quite different from the more materialistic German hebrews.

If you want that kind of a man for a famulus—encourage him; if not, discourage. He gains lots from experience and will gain lots from Oxford. I value Kallen very much, but have been disappointed in the portions of his thesis he has got ready this year. Too much general program and denunciation—too little hard work at discriminations.

The July Mind is just in and I have read most of it, including you on Bradley cursorily again, in spite of my aversion for minute polemics. Taylor is a regular little monkey, monkeying first with Bradley's absolute and now with the new mathematical logic, wh. he under-
stands as an ontology. Heaven help him! He has no more weight than a thistle down, in spite of his admirable power of expressing himself. See how they are beginning to sing small and take their hats off, in consequence of our recent writings, to wh. Dewey’s article in this number will add its strong effect, tho’ I could wish him to be a bit less obscure or less one sided rather, in his writing, wh. is solely from the point of view of his own problem of how problems are solved, whereas there is truth and knowledge apart from solving problems. However, the day is dawning and in a year or two even, I seem to foresee that states of mind like Joachim’s and Taylor’s will seem absolutely senile. But Bergson will be the great intellectualism-smasher!

Yours as ever,

W. J.¹⁰

· To Charles William Eliot ·

Bay View, Maine
July 20, 1907

Dear President,

I have your note enclosing one from President Pritchett, and the one relative to Mr. Hoernlé which I re-enclose. The vote of the Carnegie Committee is exceedingly gratifying to me—not only because the sum implied (which you name as $3000) is 400 more per annum than what you had announced to me as my due from Harvard, but because of the exceedingly gracious terms in which
the appropriation was couched. Graciousness tells! And as for the compliments, etc., they make me think of the French saying "La renommée vient à ceux qui ont la patience d'attendre, et s'accroît à raison de leur imbecilité." When you're just about defunct, people awaken to your powers!

As for Hoernlé, I don't know that his powers concern us particularly, just now, for if we are to take up a younger man for purposes of eventual promotion, I don't know what we can do better than stick to Fuller, with whom we are making a beginning. But Hoernlé is a splendidly promising fellow, with whom I have had a little correspondence about some extraordinarily clearly written articles of his in Mind. He is now a candidate for a Cape-town professorship, but he oughtn't to be buried in Africa.

We have got some very competent younger philosophers in America now, and a few of them write clearly. But their competence is critical wholly, and no one shows any strong originality. I fancy that from that point of view Perry and Holt will pan out as well as any one.

With best regards to both you yourself and Mrs. Eliot, I am

always faithfully yours,

Wm James

11
To Mary Whiton Calkins

95 Irving St.
Cambridge
July 31. '07

Dear Miss Calkins,

I have just “got round” to the reading of your Persistent Problems, and must testify to my admiration. It is excellently planned & splendidly executed, something to feel that you have “left behind” when you are called to higher spheres. And what a relief it must be to you to have got it all “off”—I hope you’re having a splendid holiday. What strikes me as most admirable in the composition of the thing is the “persistent” way in which you have limited your subject to the evolution, step by step, of modern idealism, and then the completeness with which you have handled it within the limits. You have marked every step on that line of progress so distinctly, and secured it so candidly, that the reader is kept perpetually aware of his position in the journey, and the result is a great clearness aided by the cleanness and perspicuity of the style everywhere. Really a splendid piece of composition—and what careful reading of your authors also! Upon my word you’re a wonder! Of course you dislike praise—all philosophers do! but I can’t help praising. By reason of the cleanness and dryness and straightforwardness of its statement, it seems to me that your exhibition of the transcendentalist argument must supersede all others. Bradley and Royce have created it, but you have made it plain and accessible, both to assent and criticism. You must have felt proud of your paraphrase of Hegel. The Descartes chapter seems to me splendid, and the one on Kant very good; but haven’t
you rather forced your interpretation of his transcendental ego?—I never read quite as much into it. I regret to have to say, after all this, that you haven’t converted me to belief in the absolute self, sincere and candid as your argumentation is. It still remains to me only an interesting and sublime hypothesis, and the reason why it isn’t more is the non-conducting character (to my mind) of the argument from “relation” (middle paragraph of p. 419). I don’t see how you can hold that seriously—but I will do naught but praise, so I say no more, prudently.

With hearty congratulations and kind regards,

Yours always truly,

Wm James

P.S. What a triumph also for your downtrodden sex!

· To James McKeen Cattell ·

Cambridge, Mass.
Aug. 21, 1907

Dear Cattell,

I send herewith a translation of a clever & instructive article on Pragmatism by G. Papini of Florence. The original is in “Leonardo” for last February, and Josiah Royce being in California, I seized the opportunity to alienate the loyalty of his wife from his famous Absolute, and to prevail on her to perpetrate the translation, which has been revised by me. It seems to me to be rather in the right line for the Pop. Sci., so I offer it to you, and
hope you may think it fit for publication therein. It accentuates more than I have done the pragmatic notion that Reality is there not so much to sit for its unaltered portrait at our hands, as to be changed by us into something richer & better. With faithful portraiture intellectualism says that our relations to reality are consummated.

Since I am writing to you, let me speak of another matter, my Columbia lectures next winter, namely. It is more and more evident that I cannot give them. No subject heaves in sight as even remotely possible for popular treatment and I am sure that after this no subject will. My mind is occupied now solely with Spitzfindigkeiten that can interest the fewest. I accepted the appointment on the chance that something might turn up, and felt that you were safe in any event, because Royce is to deliver 8 Lowell Lectures anyhow and, I failing, you could turn him on with them. They are sure to be entertaining and popular. Unless you have somebody better in mind, you had better engage him to repeat his Lowell course as I did mine last year. In any case release me without further delay, and make other provision.

I hope that you and yours are all well. I dare say that you may be haunting (as I am not) the Zoological Congress. I am actually at Lincoln, Mass., but return to Cambridge on Friday, en route for Bar Harbor.

Truly yours,

Wm James¹²
To James McKeen Cattell

Cambridge
Aug 31. 07

Thanks for yours of Aug 24.—Please have the proof of Papini sent direct to Mrs. Royce. I am leaving for Keene Valley, for (I hope) 3 weeks—I will think of your idea of highly “dialectical” course—repulsive to the swinish multitude; maybe I can work it.

W. J.¹³

To F. C. S. Schiller

Cambridge
August 31, 1907

I have just read your controversy with [J. E.] Russell in the Journal of Philosophy. I think your part is admirable for breadth and clearness. Poor Russell is honest and sincere but absolutely stone-blind to everything, after he had seen that the thought must be “as” the object. No use! but some readers will take it in. Keep it up!

W. J.¹⁴
To Horace Meyer Kallen

Chocorua, N. H.
Sept. 29, 1907

Dear Kallen,

I thank you for your decidedly elaborate review of my "Pragmatism" in the Transcript—full of misprints as it is. It will probably do good to the "cause." I fully accept the correction administered in the last 1/2 column. The distinction you make is sound and important, and when the "truth" definition is spread out at due length will have to have all justice done it. The whole "will to believe" business has also to be revised in the light of it. The total goodness of a belief for the believer depends on its relation to his other beliefs and their goodness, and you can only call a single good belief true with the reservation "ceteris paribus." Those who defend the Kantian "as if," teleology, etc. mean that a view of the world's purposiveness that combines with everything else we know can pass for "true." It is surely neither "false" nor "irrelevant."

Let me know when you leave for "abroad." I will keep my financial promise by remittance after you're there. I hope you are rested a bit. I shall stay here at the hotel till about the 14th. Thank you again and truly yours

W. J.\textsuperscript{15}
Cambridge
October 16, 1907

Dear Schiller,

Yours of Sept. 25th. is very welcome. Likewise Mind with your flamboyant account of my book, for which thanks. Strong also enjoyed very much meeting you. He is a clear thinker, devoted to truth, and may do great things—how great I can’t now tell.

[J. E.] Russell must be about 70, a dear good honest man, dry in teaching and utterly stupid as to what you and I mean. Hopeless!

As to Bergson, I admit all you can say as to his unsatisfactoriness and non-finality, but he has opened new horizons, surely, and he has as surely given intellectualism its coup de grâce. Who else has done either in our time?

Your friend Goldstein has written me an enthusiastically cordial letter about Pragmatism and Prof. Jerusalem of Wien is translating it into German, hopes it to appear next month. If that nation ever does take hold, it will do so with its usual ponderosity and disgust us with our own work.

I rejoice very much in Stout’s review of you in Mind. At last we have something really clarifying and helpful from an outside source. It will tend to sober the others, I doubt not. Is “Philosophy or Bluff?” in the Saturday Review by G. E. Moore? There is a certain suggestion of his way of thinking, ass that he is. Do you know whether the contemptuous review of Pragmatism in the N. Y. Nation came from Oxford? I ween it did, but have been too polite to ask. Who cares? I think, Schiller, that such
reviews, of which you can’t complain on the score of manners, show the advantage of more conciliatory tactics. They are absolutely uninstructional and add to the confusion lamentably, but would justify themselves, if asked to, by alleging the need of castigating your swagger and “side.” The whole recriminative polemic simply wastes time. I wonder who is going to review me, to neutralize your review, next January. I wish it might be Stout; and I am very curious to see how his next article will handle the subject. I hope he may find some stronger objection than the one at the end of the present article, which he certainly ought to have known better than to urge. After saying that we are “interested” in the ejective life of our fellows, he proceeds to treat the satisfactory “working value” of our belief concerning our fellow beings as if it might pragmatically be allowed to violate this interest! Perhaps the most important need of our mind is to have it satisfied. In my California address, partly reprinted in Pragmatism, lecture II, I said that “matter” and “God” were synonymous, so far as they both were conceived as making the same world. I have always had a bad conscience about that, but added nothing, partly because the illustration cleared up what I meant, partly to avoid complication of statement. But from the first the “automatic sweetheart” difficulty was strong. Would she, if devoid of consciousness, “work” as “satisfactorily” as one with consciousness, even tho her outward acts were exactly the same. No! and why? Because our social interest in her soul is a positive factor. We wish to be sure of her interest in us, and that her responsive caresses are meant and felt. That conception of her prompts other conduct from us—less “cold, dull & heartless” as Stout would say, thus conforming to Peirce’s criterion. That is part of the game; and part of Stout’s case. How absurd to imagine you as leaving such an interest out. The purely theoretic interest of thinking consistently, even tho inconsistency might not impede
us "practically" in the narrow sense, is like unto this interest in each other's souls. Stout is as bad as the common herd here. Truth, we say, is the property of conceptions that are satisfactory. He keeps the "satisfactory" and drops the "conceptions," as if the satisfaction per se constitutes the truth, according to us. But the satisfaction cleaves tight to the special conception. It simply doesn't work satisfactorily to conceive our fellows as soulless, it does work so to conceive them with souls. Wherefore we believe it true that they have souls, and carry that belief into life as our theoretic act. Surely that is Stout's only way of believing this; and why he should cut you off from the privilege is to me absolutely unintelligible in the man who could write the rest of that article. Or am I myself the dunderhead? I should like you to send this to Stout, the rest of whose article I greatly admire.

Poor Kallen. I hope you will find some position of equilibrium for him, and get along well together. I wrote him a letter in return for his review of "Pragmatism" which I fear arrived too late, and was not forwarded to the Steamer. I will wait now till I hear from him. Please give him my regards.

Affectionately,

W. J.

I can't guess what you mean by saying that you find my paper "A Word More about Truth" obscure. I tho'it it cleared things a good deal.16
To F. C. S. Schiller

Cambridge
Oct. 17. [07]

Your 2 cards just in. I have sent Murray's query about 1st use of pragmatism to C. S. P. I sent my copy of P's original article to Papini (I think) who has never returned it. Where is your handling of McKenzie? Article on Freedom and R. in Oxf. and Camb. Rev. also just in. Looks tempting.

W. J. 17

To Horace Meyer Kallen

Cambridge, Mass.
Oct. 26, 1907

Dear Kallen,

Yours of the 12th is just in, and I am glad to hear of your safe arrival and prosperous settlement. Glad also that Schiller pleases so. I had hoped to send you a hundred dollars today, but since you say you are in no immediate need of more cash, I refrain, and will rely on you to notify me in time as soon as you are likely to need it. Don't fail in this. With best wishes,

Yours as ever,

W. J.
Cambridge
Nov. 6, ’07

I have read your review of me with great pleasure and interest. Sweetly written! and I thank you for the praise. As for the censure, if you have found nothing harsher to say, it seems to me a good omen for “pragmatism.” On the whole I count you as in the fold and am glad of it.

W. J.18

95 Irving St.
Nov. 7. 1907

Dear Cattell,

I thank you for your invitation to the Century Club, but I’m not going to the meeting after all. A virulent catarrh and an attack of gout are on me, and I feel so seedy that New York will be too strenuous a bath. Colchicum seems to be getting a “holt” on to the gout, which may prove a light attack. A bad one is no joke. One at Stanford kept me on crutches for 6 weeks.

I hope you will enjoy the Academicians.

As ever, yours,

Wm James

• 455 •
Dear L.–

Just back from Ithaca, where I heard nothing of any paper by you. Either it didn’t arrive or it was crowded out. Gardiner told me that he had hoped for your presence—that was all! The meeting was good, all epistemological. The discussion of pragmatism didn’t come off for the symposium consisted of 5 independent essays with no talk. A warning for the future.

What glorious surroundings you are in! Go in & conquer! A big mail awaits me on my return, so I must be brief, so with a happy New Year to you, I subscribe myself.

Yours as ever,

W. J.¹⁹