

did

I have long wondered that he ~~take~~ not take a wider field ere this. As I may also try to indicate on a separate sheet ~~of~~ informal ~~fundamental~~ remarks *about Dr Hickson in the past*

*some*

*issue*

The whole thing may solve itself directly and simply. Dr T. has long wanted independence. (1) ~~for~~ for the logical (1) reasons of complete freedom and the teaching of his science, that has now no doubt definitely come before the world as a field on its own account. Psychology is a perfectly definite thing and a man can and should be a Professor of Psychology just as he might be a professor of anatomy or Physiology.

(2) He has desired it also for his own ambition to be an independent Professor in McGill, or any other place. He fights for this by attacking me and saying that I am conducting his affairs badly, that I am not sympathetic to the subject. I really think that after Dr T. is Associate Professor of Psychology, and that now psychology has become so complexed and so detailed he better be allowed to treat it in his own way, independently of me and philosophy (a thing of course that he has been doing for some years, with no possible or actual interference from me) Dr T., moreover, is overwhelmingly insistent on being independent of me and of philosophy because (I suppose) he would claim that for this independence he must be made a Professor. And so his long (natural) goal will be reached. I am certain that he feels that as things are I will not go to you and say that in my opinion Dr T. should be made Professor. To him naturally and associated Professor was but a "step" to the other, and Hickson and I both knew that would be immediately be the case (of course Dr H. would admit he feels that Dr T. had been promoted over his head and he certainly feels, anyhow, that T. has all along rather crowded him). He wants distinctly to be a Professor. I cannot criticise this. But I say that the time has come when I should be relieved, whether I believe in this or not, and for giving any reason for or against. He has a subject that has gone beyond my pious knowledge of it, that has now a hundred applications where other experts and psychologists alone are concerned. I think it better that Dr T. should face the University directly on his own account. He is older too, and impatient of his long career, and naturally wants his Department. He has not published books and so on and he is on the whole not known outside McGill, etc., etc. But in most places his subject is now a Department on its own account. The Professors of Philosophy can no longer carry it and are not competent to do so. They do not want it. The Psychologists ~~presents~~ presents for interference as they would resent and as they do resent priestly or clerical interference. Neither set of men wholly approves of the other. The separation has come about at many places through a quarrel, and a life-long quarrel. To the Psychologist the Philosophers are dealing with another world, with values and ideals and so on. To the Philosophers and Psychologists have gone too far, and their science is a bundle

*Psychology*

*October*

*x*

*from saying previous*

*result then*

*plan*

*how I to go to you and say that T. should be a university professor he would have the best of it*