

wishes

of tendencies." But they cannot say one word against the idea that it is for a Psychologist to say what Psychology is, and that no theory of Philosophy of religion should influence this. The State of course often witnessed, that Psychologists ~~should~~ teach more about free will and not take the determinist attitude about mind. And Psychologists reply in their own way or pay no attention to this, any more than do Physiologist when they are told that they are not keeping any account of the "vital" ~~Biblic~~ principle of the body, or of the soul.

this

Then again it certainly seems to me that Dr T. ought in future be able to choose an assistant of his own. It is not for me, or anyone else to say what that assistant should be or not be. In the recent happening when Dr T. was contending for a certain man ~~that~~ was to bring another Professor into the Department. Dr Hickson strongly suspected this and its expediency. And I did not think that another Professor should be appointed of the same rank as Dr T. etc., etc.

I dictated this yesterday afternoon after the receipt of your letter in Cambridge here. On coming back last night from the house of Professor Sorley, my friend, the professor of Moral Philosophy I felt some resentment about the one-sidedness of the things (this is perhaps perfectly natural in a personal situation) that are being said about the present and the future of the department - They have had by the way the same long struggle here about psychology, a kind of imperfect knowledge of the new experimental psychology on the part of the professors of Philosophy, then a partial recognition of it through a young lecturer and a small laboratory, then two or three different lecturers (all more or less one-sided) and then at last a big laboratory with a University grant and complete recognition of the thing and a department and absolutely independent, a department in which philosophers and teachers, and medical students, and architecture students and sociology students and political economy students, and men from the Navy in the summer months etc., etc., all take partial or extended courses. - I doubt indeed if I could go on with those two men as they are and as they have been. Dr H. has been a disappointed man for nearly twenty years and it has been a trial everyday to meet him - for him and for me I suppose. I knew everyday what he was feeling and I knew that everything was soured for him, a mere stop-gap. I told you once that men who had been at school with him (from young doctors and lawyers and others and also business men in the clubs) have asked me again and again what I could make of Dr H, what did he think he was doing, what did his manner mean, why does not someone talk to him etc, etc. ? Dr Nicholson by the way is perfectly well acquainted with all this, will tell you how Dr H. has been regarded, and how he has been regarded by the authorities of the Theological Colleges. His reason for going is uncertain, and it is a kind of ~~neat~~ dig at me - as if I had to bear the weight of his whole career, his

This was a very hard situation

He unfair

on the surface