

Say to-day that psychology is one of the natural sciences like biology or anthropology. It might be put in a department anthropology, as is partly done at Columbia University.

Ask Richie, Principal Smythe, Fraser and Professor A.R. Gordon (Hebrew) about how our teaching, the three of us is regarded.

If it were not for <sup>(3)</sup> <sup>(4)</sup> one my Introduction to Philosophy two (2) Moral Philosophy, ~~three~~ Principles of Social Philosophy the department of philosophy would be condemned as materialistic and physiological, as negative to personality and metaphysic and ideals

to <sup>the</sup>  
In No. 1 I give/the young minds of young students the ideals on which ~~are~~ civilisation rests, and, outline, of the great speculative attempts of the human mind.

<sup>or</sup> In No. 2 the "Moral Philosophy is made obligatory by the theological colleges and all their men."

<sup>It</sup> No. 3 I want to get back again, to for sociology cannot be materialistic. I am over wondering how the new sociology is doing. Must have <sup>to</sup> approved philosophy of society as ~~is debated~~. <sup>its basis</sup>

<sup>then</sup> I will add that the whole idea of water-tight "departments" is largely American, and especially the idea of managing, as you do a department ~~xxxxx~~ stores. No University man to-day believes in iron-bound departments. You cannot rope together a lot of subjects which may not go together. Subjects are always bursting their bonds, as you know as in the case of <sup>physiological</sup> psychology chemistry Or as in the case of psychology. And the new man who is appointed to these things will accept no dictation from the men who represent the older subjects. He alone knows his job.

I have been seeing the international congress of pschologists here have visited Cambridge from Oxford. It has all been pretty hard during my dear wife's illness.

<sup>when I come back</sup>  
Yours ever faithfully,

William Caldwell