In the beginning of 1909, James declined to engage in further public debate about “Pragmatism,” though he continued to applaud Schiller’s vigorous efforts. He also suggested to Cattell that he publish in the Popular Science Monthly an article by Shackleford, which Cattell accepted in exchange for James’s article, finished on 12 February, entitled “On a Very Prevalent Abuse of Abstraction.” On 1 March James corrected the proofs of his “Report on Mrs. Piper’s Hodgson-Control,” which appeared later in July. He began to write his “Introduction to Philosophy” textbook, but did not get very far due to distractions and poor health.

“To lighten life’s baggage,” he resigned his membership in the National Academy of Sciences. He also dropped his subscription to the journal Science because he could not any longer read all the literature that came his way. Another sign of James’s slower pace was his decision in June not to accept an invitation to attend a Jubilee of the University of Geneva in Switzerland and to receive a rumored doctor of divinity degree. He did, however, receive instead the degree of Doctor of the Natural Sciences in absentia on 9 July.

James’s Oxford lectures were published in April as A Pluralistic Universe: Hibbert Lectures at Manchester College on the Present Situation in Philosophy. He
thanked Kallen for his review of the book in a Boston newspaper. Also, in April Bertrand Russell's second article on "Pragmatism" appeared, which, James noted in June, had a marked difference in tone from Russell's first article in 1908.

While on vacation at Chocorua, James continued to receive, read, and praise both articles and books sent to him by his friends, especially the books by Perry and Douglas Fawcett. In September his own book appeared, *The Meaning of Truth: A Sequel to Pragmatism*. This was a collection of essays evoked in response to many criticisms of his conception of 'truth'.

In the early part of September, James journeyed to Clark University in Worchester, Massachusetts, to attend a congress of scientists to celebrate the twenty years of the University's existence and achievements. There he met Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung. The president of the university, G. Stanley Hall, had conducted some psychic experiments and wrote to both James and Sir Oliver Lodge of the British Society for Psychical Research about them.

Another event more significant for either the scientific success or failure of the psychical research movement was the visit to this country of the Italian psychic medium, Eusapia Palladino, under the direction of Hereward Carrington. The first séance was held in New York City on 13 November. Münterberg was present at the 13 and 18 December séances in New York. James was most interested in the way the scientists would react.

His own views of mediumistic phenomena were published in the article "The Confidences of a 'Psychical Researcher'" for the October issue of the *American Magazine*. A writing of another kind resulted from the invitation of Nicholas Murray Butler to contribute to the *International Conciliation* series. James took this opportunity to formulate in print his thoughts on war and
peace which he had considered for years. The "Moral Equivalent of War" was the product of his efforts.

· To Paul Carus ·

95 Irving St.
Jan. 3, 1909

Dear Dr. Carus,

If to attract public attention is a mark of greatness, I must be becoming a 'great' man. This last number of the Monist suffuses me with blushes.

You may wonder at my having made no reply to your first article on my pragmatism. The fact is, and renews itself now apropos of this second article of yours, that I am deadly weary of polemic writing on the subject, either private or for publication. If I haven't already made my meaning clear by all that I have printed, I shall certainly never succeed in doing so. Outsiders generally end by judging between disputants rightly, and I leave the issue to them. Meanwhile, dear Dr. Carus, the world is wide enough for both you and me to live on our differing philosophies therein, so I hold my tongue still! You will pardon me, or rather applaud me, I know, for simply subscribing myself

Very sincerely yours

Wm James

· 499 ·
Cambridge, Mass.
Jan. 12, 1909

Dear Cattell,

Will you kindly cast your eye over this and see whether it is fit for the Pop. Sci.? The author (Hon. Justice Shackleford, Tallahassee, Florida) has been for 6 years past Chief Justice of the Florida Supreme Court—a splendid old fellow who, all alone in his state keeps up with philosophic reading in the most extraordinary way, and wants to publish a volume of essays. Judicial duties retarding him, he has sent me this one and another for my personal gratification; but it seems to me, in view of the incredibly stupid attacks that have been made on my ideas, that this defense, altho superficial, has a certain timeliness and merits publication. I say this in spite of the compliments lavisht on my unworthy self.

Truly yours,

Wm James

P. S. He agrees that I should send it to you. If you can’t accept it, pray return it to him at Tallahassee.²
Cambridge
January 17, 1909

Dear Schiller,

I have a letter and p. c. from you, both unanswered; also, if I remember aright, a previous letter. The spectacle of your unverwüstlichkeit fills me with admiration of the creative energy. But the only thing I am writing for now is to applaud your contribution to this month's Mind. The tone of it is perfect and you never did a cleaner, clearer or more complete piece of work. That no one else should chime in heartily as yet on either side of the Atlantic, is to me one of the paradoxes of my experience. Possibly the words "as yet" cover the key to the riddle!

Yours heartily (and hastily)

W. J.³
Dear Schiller,

I have just read your "Rationalistic Conception of Truth" for which I thank you. It is ergötzlich and I don't think your pen was ever both so sharp and so light before, or your logic so inclusive of all the possibilities. It won't make converts, but it will make adherents shamefaced and in the Oxford atmosphere of fencing logically, wrangling and scoring points, it will increase your influence on the young and the prestige of your power. I, as you know, despise logic, where the material is inductive, and I think that if one wants to see what sorry tricks it will play with a man of genius one need only read over again, as I have recently done, the epistemological contributions of Bertrand Russell. Really pathological stuff, in my opinion. Your recent letter shows you working like a marine engine and snorting destruction to God's enemies like a cyclone. I am getting on fairly well, but doing almost no work, as the condition thereof.

I enclose an advertisement of my Oxford lectures, which I hope to send you in three weeks or so. We both thank you for your friendliness to our boy.

Yours ever,

W. J.⁴
95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
21. III .09

Dear Mr. Hague,

I wish to offer my resignation as member of the National Academy of Sciences.

I was acutely sensible of the honour, when elected; and hoped, when I accepted, to play some active part. But as time goes on, it looks more and more as if my only active relations to the Academy would probably be the voting (or neglecting to vote) for the addition of new members, or the writing of some one's necrological notice, or inflicting upon someone the burden of writing mine. I feel more and more, as I grow older, like lightening life's baggage, and this occurs to me as one of the places where I may harmlessly take in sail. I therefore respectfully beg the Academy to accept my resignation from its membership, and remain its and your

Obedient Servant,

Wm James

Mr. Arnold Hague
Home Secretary of the National Academy of Sciences
Washington, D. C. 5
Dear Cattell,

I substituted this year the Pop. Sci for Science, as member of the A.A.A.S. I ought to take both, but I find it physically impossible to read so much, and it muddles me to see so much that I can’t read.

I observe that the Pop. Sci. is bound with wires instead of being sewed like any self-respecting periodical with a circulation of less than 250,000. Don’t you think this is too low toned, blackguardly and infamous a thing for you as editor to be held responsible for? The saving of expense must be very small. The big 10 cent monthlies excuse themselves by saying that their enormous editions make sewing too zeitraubend to be possible—it would take half the month to sew them. You unfortunately have no such apology to offer; and the wires must be an annoyance to every reader, to say nothing of the eventual binder, who hates them like poison. I am a busy body, I know, but you ought to thank me for being one in this instance.

Yours as ever,

W. J.

Don’t answer this unless by acting on it!
Dear Mr. Huneker,

What blindlings we are! 'The idea' of your being bro't up under the influence of my father's writings seems to me most strange. I am ordering to be sent to you my last literary adventure, publisht last week, and too technical in matter for me to expect any but co-professors to read it.

I have to beg your pardon about Huysmans, of whom you have direct personal knowledge. I only know 3 things of his, a novel about a man's troubles in finding a decent mistress after his wife left him, the book 'à Rebours', and a pamphlet of art-criticism. All 3 made my gorge rise, and I suppose that his later catholicism was only a sort of insincere pose & mystification. I defer to your judgment—the categories of human beings are beyond classing. My brother in law W. M. Salter carried off your volume almost immediately after I received it, and I have only had that one look at it as yet. I've just read an extraordinarily brilliant article of yours on Violinists in Everybody's Magazine.

Believe me,
Very sincerely yours,

Wm James
Cambridge
April 27, 1909

Dear Schiller,

What a ripping good letter writer you are—even from Rome. I congratulate you on your pluck in reading your lecture in Italian to orecchii romani! Also in your advances in formal logic and pragmatism as a denial of the same. What you tell me of Taylor doesn’t either surprise or elate me. He seems to be the nimble flea of contemporary philosophy, which doesn’t however detract either from his cleverness or his candor. I shall never expect him to be an ally, for his mind seems to be merely ratiocinative and Humanism needs the feeling for reality. The good [J. E.] Russell is a genuine convert. I never heard of What is Reality? Can’t you give me the author’s name? Meanwhile I can inquire at Houghton-Mifflin’s. I have just sent you a little squib on ‘Relativismus’ which I hope you’ll approve. I am poorly as to my precordial symptom and want to get to Nauheim, but doubt whether I can compass it.

Affectionate regards,

Wm James\textsuperscript{7}
Dear Mr. Huneker

What a reader you are, and what a rememberer!—to say nothing of what a letter writer! I haven’t seen Gaultier’s Pragmatisme, of which you write. To tell the truth I’m tired of reading even what I say myself, let alone what others say, in elucidation of that unhappy word. I don’t think I mention it once in my last book. Papini, I hear by rumor, recently died insane. Too bad! for he was indeed a genius. The freest I have known, even if he did delight a bit too much in épater-ing the bourgeois. Salter disappeared to N. H. yesterday, carrying your book with him, to my dismay, as his wife tells me, so I can’t read your Stirner or Nietzsche till I get it back from him. I read a life of Stirner a few years ago, by some conscientious German. Strange epigram! This man, so exalting of the self, seems to have been the most effaced and null of God’s creatures, in his actual personal incarnation. So null, that almost nothing can be collected to tell about him. I am impatient to get at your articles on him and on N—.

Very sincerely yours,

Wm James
To your card, just in, I say “Yes, Knox is magnificent.” [Bertrand] Russell has evidently taken great pains, but is absolutely ineffectual. I think he’ll give in, he’s on the brink of the precipice. I wrote to him yesterday. I’ve been seeing J. E. Russell—glorious old boy for innate liberalism of mind. My reference to Theaetetus in Relativismus paper was a quotation from current opinion. I am sorry you took it for my own view. Of Witmer don’t for Heaven’s sake write! He’s a dwarf and should be totgeschwiegen.

W. J.}

To Horace Meyer Kallen

Silver Lake, N. H.
June 19, 1909

Dear Kallen,

I hardly ever look at the Transcript, but yesterday I stumbled accidentally on last Wednesday’s issue with your long review of my Oxford lectures, for which please accept my thanks. I am not sure that you haven’t elaborated the Hebraic-Hellenic contrast at too great length, or at any rate used those words too absolutely. Your
remarks on “evolution” vs. Darwinism are worth making, and under whatever names the \textit{devenir réel} and the \textit{statically true} have to be contrasted. When you get down to my text, you are successful, & I imagine, interesting. It must have been difficult, but for me of course the two paragraphs before the last are the important ones. In the knife-simile you have supplied an essential link in the Bergsonian argument for which he ought to be grateful. And the penultimate paragraph is profound, to me, and must be kept account of in future.

Yours as ever,

Wm James$^{10}$

$^{10}$

\textit{To F. C. S. Schiller} \textit{.}

Silver Lake, N. H.

June 22, [1909]

Dear Schiller,

Your card of the 5th. has duly come and makes me sorely wish that I had been at the Aristotelian Society to hear the debate. I hope you didn’t get off there your diabolical moremonistic pun! I have been up here with my brother-in-law, Salter, breathing the sylvan fragrance for 3 weeks past, the family still at Cambridge. The simplified life and the natural beauty do me good and I find that by walking slowly enough, I can get about much as I please. A note rec’d last night from Woodbridge reveals the thickness of the night which our rays have got to dispel. “I wish Truth could be let alone,” he writes; “I
am still convinced that there is something profoundly absurd in an inquiry as to the true conception of truth and something intellectually comic (and tragic) about a controversy between rival conceptions of it.” Such an utterance is well calculated to make us realize how genuinely original and really “epoch making” our doctrine is.

I had an extraordinarily courteous and reasonable letter from Bradley the other day. He makes concession after concession, so far as our works go and were he younger and in better health, I shouldn’t be surprised to see him make a volte-face as regards the citadel and embark on a new career. Knox’s article continues to look great and [B.] Russell’s to grow smaller and smaller as my mind looks back.

I am correcting the proofs of my collected writings on “Truth” to form a volume about as big as Pragmatism and to be published in September. Seen together, they have a decidedly solid look to me and I hope may close a certain period of Woodbridgetian darkness in the history of opinion on the subject, when they once get digested by the reader. Certainly the change of tone is already marked—vide a clipping from yesterday’s Boston Herald which I enclose. Think of the change of tone from B. Russell’s Transatlantic Truth to his article in the Edinburgh Review.

I hope that you will have a fine Swiss vacation. I finally declined only two days ago the invitation to the Geneva Jubilee in July. Country life here agrees with me better, tho’ I confess I should have liked to exchange chaff with Royce about the D. D. degree which Flournoy whispers has been in store for me.

Yours, dear Schiller, as ever,

W. J.¹¹
Beloved Katie,

Think what you have lost (or gained?)! I have refrained from writing to you for many weeks past because I have been weighing the arguments for and against my accepting an invitation to the Jubilee of the University of Geneva next month, at which, as Flournoy whispered to me in a confidential note I should probably have gained a doctor of divinity degree (!!). A week ago, at the last possible moment, I definitely decided not to go, so thou and I are not to meet this side of next summer, when I hope we shall. Apart from the expense of making such a trip which (with the children costing what they do in these days) is prohibitive, I am better, under home conditions, in the country, than trying to keep up with the procession at Jubilees in towns, even tho you and Lausanne are near to retreat to. But next summer I intend fully to make it up, for I fairly thirst for the Swiss scenery and civilization, and think that we shall all come over for a couple of years. At the age of 67 one begins to earn the right to enjoy the greater finish of European conditions. Fighting the fierce American summer fight should be reserved for youth. Exhausted with the Cambridge winter, and with the sociability that redoubles there in Spring (people trying to make up what they had deferred in that line), I have been up here with the Salters (Alice’s sister is Mrs. S.) who live very primatively on a superb hill top, for three weeks. I have enjoyed greatly the simplified life, and the beauty (not so much the insects!) and go down tomorrow to bring up
Alice & Peggy on July 2nd., to open our Chocorua house & abide there for the summer. Our healthes are all good (mine is so if I go slow) but our prospects are a little uncertain, owing to Aleck who came over here hot to go off with Billy for a year in a Paris studio, but who has been fired by the sight of so many of his schoolmates in College to re-enter the lists for Harvard. I don't know how it will turn out. As for myself, I have another book coming out in September, & have begun to write another one still. I am beginning to be acknowledged, in more than one country, and must live up to my reputation and not get down from my pedestal. I find it a pleasant enuf perch. I haven't been to N. Y. all this winter, so can tell you nothing of your family there. You will of course write, and communicate what you are going to do this summer. But for the tourists, what a paradise Switzerland would be! Believe me, dear Katie,

ever lovingly yours,

W. J.¹²

· To Thomas Mitchell Shackleford ·

Chocorua, N. H.
July 11. 09

Dear Shackleford,

I have your long letters of the 5th & 6th. & hasten to reply.

As regards the Wallace, I think there was an Edwin
Wallace who did something but I forget what it was—may be Butler meant him.

My 8 lectures on Exceptional Mental States were given at the Lowell Institute in the late '90s, covering hypnotism, degeneration, genius, double personality, witchcraft, etc, and no part of them has been printed. I have grown into a distaste for the morbid side of life, to wh. I once paid much attention.

Keep the article from the Republican!

My new book will be called "the Nature of Truth, a Sequel to Pragmatism."

Keep those English reviews as long as you wish to!

As regards the "finite God," I have just finisht reading the proof sheets of a book by Douglas Fawcett (author of the "Riddle of the Universe") which runs on lines most astonishingly congruent with Bergson's, Fechner's and mine. He goes at great length into the question of a finite Deity, and it seems to me that no one has defended that view so well. He is an amateur in philosophy, his serious occupation being automobiling up the Alps(!) in wh. he has broken all records, but his book, which is soon to appear, is an extraordinarily rich case of "vision." You must read it without fail.

You are an extraordinarily scholarly mind, which I am not—a fact that makes me tremendously glad to be no longer a "professor" where I was always made to feel my deficiencies by the demands of students for bibliographic references for their theses etc. It tickles me to have my own writings treated as a "source"—as you treat them! But I fear that your summer program is going to lead you to overwork yourself badly, and I wish that you would take the scholarship of the subject more lightly—so much of the literature is worthless that it is best killed by silence. Moore's article in the Aristotelian Society, e.g., is the painful crawling of an ant over the outside of a subject whose centre he gets no glimpse of. It shouldn't
be *mentioned*. Nevertheless I will send it to you on my return to Cambridge, if you insist on reading it.

It sometimes seems to me that the history of philosophy consists essentially of two parts, first the wanton creation of difficulties and artificialities by intellectualism, and the struggle back to the dramatic concreteness of common sense after remanding intellectualism to its proper subordinate place. But that place, which we are just beginning properly to apprehend, is not fully *comprehended* yet.

Yours ever truly

Wm James

··· *To F. C. S. Schiller* ···

Chocorua, N. H.
July 17, 1909

Dear Schiller,

All hail to yours of the 5th., summoning me to a public constatation of Bradley's weakening estate. Not I! I've done with polemicizing on the subject of truth and leave the job to other hands. Moreover, Bradley's symptoms of giving out are chiefly in private letters to me and the poor fellow, who is evidently in very bad case with his kidney, complains that he is intellectually defunct, etc., so that I see no need for further rubbing it in to him, by anyone. In general I think one can easily overdo *explicitness* in controversies like the present one. Truth makes its way silently, well enough, and if after 10 years a
certain kind of attack stops, that army may be considered beaten.

I shan't see the July Mind or the Hibbert for 3 weeks or so, when I revert for awhile to Cambridge. The Greats paper on Logic, which you enclose, is an example to me of the terror of examinations. I'm glad to be quit both of passing and of giving them. There is hardly a question on this paper that I could even begin to answer and I should surely flunk it. Where is Knox on Pratt to appear? Had I gone to Switzerland, I could have seen not only him, but you and Strong and last [but] not least Douglas Fawcett who has sent me the proof sheets of his forthcoming book *The Individual and Reality*—an amateurish thing but all the better for the impression of sincerity which that gives and most astonishingly congruent all over with your positions and mine. He spends most of his time ascending [the] Alps in a motor car! and his last headquarters were at the "splendid" Hotel, Les Praz, près Chamonix. You two ought to meet. I don't repent not going, for I can stand but little fatigue in these days and the life here suits me best.

Affectionately yours

Wm James
Dear Perry,

I got your letter, which touches me very much, invoicing your "Economy" book weeks ago, up here. The book remained in Cambridge, and I have only now got round to reading it, in part aloud with Alice & Bill. I need hardly say that I "agree" with about everything in it, but I should like to say what a splendid trumpet blast of liberalism in Ethics it seems to me to be, and how the style in which certain pages are written fills me with admiration, as if the elevation of the argument had given wings to the pen. It goes deep, and is indeed the Gospel instead of the law. It will immediately give you a Master's place—yet all the while you kept us ignorant (me, at any rate) of this most important stream of constructive effort that was going on inside of you!!

The leading idea, of the field of ethics being that of the human interests allied against the material environment, and the consequent appeal to reasonableness all round seems to me unconquerable truth and common sense, and the way in which you handle egoism is the endgültig way, and quite in the line of your epistemological realism. For the man who simply obeys his egoistic interests there is no theoretic refutation. But when he reflects on them, comparing them with others, the conceptual commutability of all egos instantly appears, and argument can have only one result, and that the reasonable one. Just so "solipsism" vanishes, the moment one thinks of other thinkers at all, for then they are as real as the objects which one supposes themselves to know, and
which for oneself are real. Morally as well as epistemologically solipsism as a system is a preposterous abstract from the concrete psychology of men—the only real solipsisms are practical, selfishness namely, & dogmatism. Your table of virtues is tremendously fresh, unconventional, and stimulating. I care least for the fine-art chapter. What I care most for is the reasoned faith in radical democracy, and the smiting and sweeping sentences in which every now and then it comes to the fore, scouting the pedantic, conventional, and scholastic alternatives, whatever they may be.

It is really a splendid book!

I suppose that Mrs. Perry is stationary at Norwell, but can't you and Holt, (or you alone, if Holt can't do it) manage to come up here for a week end, or for any 2 or 3 days before August—better the last week?

Ever truly yours,

Wm James

.

To James McKeen Cattell.

Chocorua, N. H.
July 31. 09

Dear Cattell,

Apart from the general difficulty of rating men serially (after the two or three sommités have been told off) I have neglected my psychological reading so utterly in the past ten years that I feel myself to be a back number and quite out of touch with the progress of that branch of
learning. I actually could make no reply. Get a younger
and more wideawake man in my stead! I re-enclose the
printed slip, and hope that you’re enjoying your
vacation.

Yours always truly,

Wm James

· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

Chocorua
Aug. 4, 09

Dear Schiller,

This country is being eaten up by innumerable host of
caterpillars (unknown here before) they swarm and de­
foliate all our trees. I am reminded of them by an ex­
quisite specimen of professional philosophy by H.
Rickert in Kantstudien, XIV, Heft 2, Zwei Wege der
Erkenntnisstheorie. Ignoring all phenomenal intermedi­
aries between mind knowing and thing known he
swarms over the subject with innumerable scholastic dis­
tinctions, etc., etc. in the most diseased way. I wish you
would review him. He has a couple of most insulting pp.
about pragmatism wh., if it have no other advantage, has
at least that of decaterpillarizing epistemology from such
work as Rickert’s.

Yours ever,

W. J.

· 518 ·
I wish you might meet Douglas Fawcett. I have just had a very interesting letter from him.¹⁴

• To F. C. S. Schiller •

Chocorua, N. H.
August 22, 1909

Dear Schiller,

I re-enclose poor Schinz’s letter which is pathetic in its benighted sincerity. I am sorry I spoke hard-heartedly of your review. I have reread it, but still think that more urbanity and ingenuity were never wasted on an unworthy object. He was not worth mentioning at all and is not a fair protagonist of our adversaries.

I have read Bradley’s article in Mind for July and agree with it fully, finding it excellent pragmatic doctrine, expressed in parts just as you or I might have exprest it, but compatible also with his own previous system, it seems to me. I don’t remember Stout’s or [B.] Russell’s sensationalist absolutism which he seems to be criticizing. I don’t think they can possibly have meant anything as absurd. Of course to work with the system is the mark of truth, but the system itself has central pins, points of anchorage, to which the rest is coordinated and on the whole the sensational order is the least moveable of these, but for pragmatism sensations must work with concepts and with other sensations to be accounted real and many of them fail thus to accredit themselves. I don’t myself see much use in crowing over Bradley about this article. When we prevail, it will be by our own views doing more work than others and so leaving them high
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and dry without explicit notice. I confess that I should like most to be able to show the pragmatic method at work and then let follow consequences as they will on public opinion. Any number of concepts remain to be interpreted by that method, the Self, consciousness, etc., even more than the religious concepts.

I am having a rather poor time with my health this summer, but it may mend. Last summer “abroad” made me turn a corner in my life. I no longer want pioneer conditions, but all the establisht comforts of civilization to take care of me. This summer our trees defoliated by a new invasive caterpillar named heterocampa, our lawn completely desiccated by the long drought, 3 chimneys having to be rebuilt and today our spring of water (which has supplied the house for 20 years) gone dry, so that we must either return to Cambridge or haul water from the lake (which we are now doing) and get drinking water from another spring. Precarious “help” and in general always living under “emergency” conditions! How different was the little Inn at Bibury, Gloucestershire where Alice and I spent a fortnight last year! How different the hotel at York! But I’m in a bad mood owing to loss of sleep, so I will rail no more, but sign myself,

Yours as ever,

W. J.
To G. Stanley Hall

95 Irving St.
Cambridge
Sept. 11. 09

Dear Hall,

I had to take my train yesterday before I got a chance to say good bye to you. I suppose that what you wished to speak to me about was the Lodge affair. Write to me at Chocorua, and I won't write to him till I shall have heard what you say.

I congratulate you on the evidently great success of your 2nd international Congress—vastly better than the bigger affairs. The program for next weeks seems to me in particular important, and I hope that the newspaper reports will be full.

Yours, as ever,

Wm James
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Dear Mr. Whitehead,

I have read your article in the N. C. R. with much interest. The quotations on p. 344 & 345 interested me particularly as connecting S’s experiences with others more common. My bad health prevents my taking up any active work in psychics; but I hope that you will yourself all alone make the exhaustive study of Swedenborg, which you suggest.

Of course I agree as to Swedenborg being a bearer of light. I am staggered however by his hugging so close the scriptural text.

Sincerely yours,

Wm James

95 Irving St.
Cambridge
Oct 17. 09
To Herbert Rutgers Marshall

95 Irving St.
Oct 29. '09

Dear Marshall,

Your "Consciousness" looks as enticing as it is formidable. I thank you "von herzen" for the inscription. I am ordering you my latest in return—you may not get it promptly; the first edition is out of print.

Lucklessly I can't look at your book or at any other serious thing, for I don't know how long, being at present in the trough of the sea, with nervous prostration & anginoid sensibilities—alg- but not hed-onic!

Good luck to your book!

Yours affectionately

Wm James

· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

Cambridge
October 30, 1909

Dear Schiller,

Yrs. of the 20th. along with a ripping good letter from Knox, came yesterday. I have been silent of late because, under the most splendid hygienic conditions in
New Hampshire, I have been getting worse and worse as to my pectoral pain and dyspnoea and have at last gone into regular nervous prostration such as I had 10 years ago after Nauheim. I have written only 26 pp. of MS in the past month and nothing before that for six months, but my brain has now “struck” entirely and I am to lie by and “isolate” myself for many weeks. I haven’t yet read Bradley’s October article. I wrote to Stout (in reply to your question) proposing him for my reviewer, if he would accept. Nothing could please me more than a review from you, but I think it would profit the situation more to draw out the objectors and make them define themselves or give up. Pringle-Pattison would be my second choice. Your assent can be discounted and you ought to be kept for better things than praising me.


Your phrase that our critics think it “impossible that for us experiencing a real thing should be experiencing a real thing” is splendid. Goodbye! write when you can, irrespective of my replying and shed no tear, for I expect to come out of this hole.

Yours ever affectionately

Wm James

19
Cambridge
November 6, 1909

Dear Schiller,

Your card of the 26th. ult. telling that you review me, etc., just arrives. Of course I entirely assent to the treatment you propose. Your form of attacking the problem is doubtless logically more shipshape than mine, but I think that mine works perhaps more easily on the philosophic rabble.

On p. 265 "regulative" would have been infinitely better than "constitutive," tho' you can hardly treat it as a "misprint." Evidently my mind groped for regulative, but blindly took up the other term of the Kantian pair.

No matter for the proof of you on Bradley. I'll await the Jan. number. I write in bed with an inflamed knee—so must stop.

Yours ever

W. J.
To Horace Meyer Kallen

95 Irving St.
Cambridge
Nov. 10. [1909]

Dear Kallen,

Your article is a splendid one, puts a number of points in a clear and new light, and I am very glad indeed that you’ve written it.

I enclose Bergson’s letter with the passages I spoke of marked. You can return it without comment.

Yours,

W. J.

To Nicholas Murray Butler

Cambridge
Dec. 2. 09

I will send you in a week the peace article you ask for, tho I fear it may possibly not be 2000 words short, and otherwise not be exactly what is needed. No matter! it will serve then for elsewhere.

Wm James
Dear Mrs. Jones,

What a pleasure to hear from a lady who knows how to write a letter!! I have already mailed the ‘Talks’, with my name on the title page, and have just read the account of the accident, in the Isis, which I return to you. Being myself of the kind who, when they are on the roof of a piazza, lie down on their stomachs and call for their mother to take them away, you may imagine how my imagination is fired with admiration of the Arnold Lunn type. I am glad you met him, and he you, and I hope he will be spared for more cliffs & more philosophy still.

With best regards to you both, and gratification that I should still exist for you, believe me, dear Mrs. Jones,

Very sincerely yours

Wm James
To Jane Addams

95 Irving St.
Cambridge
Dec. 13. 09

Dear Miss Addams,

I have just read your Spirit of Youth, and think it "simply great." Hard not to cry at certain pages! The fact is, Madam, that you are not like the rest of us, who seek the truth and try to express it. You inhabit reality; and when you open your mouth truth can't help being uttered. I think that this book will have a great and vital influence. I am proud that you should have thought of sending it to me.

Believe me, dear Miss Addams, your faithful colleague and pupil in sociology,

Wm James

To Ralph Barton Perry

95 Irving St.
Dec. 27. 09

Dear Perry,

Miss Emmet needs but 2 (or 3) more sittings to finish my picture. If left to her unaided lights, she will come on January 10th to do so. But if the picture is needed earlier
she will come earlier. She ought in the latter case to be informed promptly—perhaps you will phone me.

You spoke of a presentation banquet, and I may have chilled you by expressing horror. What I should like would be a dinner (here, I the host) of the department, visiting committee, and whoever else you wish to ask (you the inviters). We can seat 12 comfortably in our dining room, and four or 5 more, if required, in the library. The great thing is to define the date, so let us know.

Yours ever,

W. J.\textsuperscript{24}

\*To Oliver Lodge\*

\*95 Irving St.\*  
\*Cambridge\*  
\*Dec 29. 09\*

My dear Lodge,

I thank you for the copy of Stanley Hall’s letter, in the terms of which I find nothing objectionable. I hope they will write their book, and I’m glad that you invited him vainly to contribute to the Proceedings. They become responsible now, whereas hitherto Hall & Münsterberg have enjoyed the otium cum dignitate of irresponsible little sneers & digs from a safe distance. Münsterberg has also made himself responsible at last, by having two sittings with Eusapia in N. Y. I am told (not by himself) that he thinks he has caught her—which I doubt! I have
just been talking with Robert Wood (the physicist at the J. H. U.) & found him in a most satisfactory state of mind, convinced subliminably, I think, but waiting for proofs. He has seen her but twice, and proposes now (this “not for publication”!) to x-ray her and have an observer read all her movements on a fluorescent screen behind the wall. If the arrangements will work this will be crucial; and if Wood gets anything crucial, scientific respectability won’t be the thing to close his mouth.

A happy New Year to the whole Lodge family from yours faithfully,

Wm James²⁵