

La Salle, Ill., May 31, 1892.

Charles S. Peirce, Esq.,
12 West 39th Street,
New York.

My dear Sir:

Your letter is just received. Many thanks for the spirit in which you write. I am greatly pleased that the harmony of our minds is not endangered, and I hope that it never will be. I am glad that you express your surprise at not being in harmony with the MONIST. It is not impossible that I did not make myself sufficiently clear. I do mean to say that you are in harmony with ~~the~~ monist; but that your first paper contains an important deviation from our conception of necessity. And it is a matter of course that such a fundamental idea as is necessity will affect its superstructures also, *and I shall state why in this point I differ from you.*

My impression is that we are working, perhaps not so much in the same line, as on lines converging to a common goal. Before I had special reasons for believing that, I felt it instinctively. And this instinctive belief originated from having found among your writings, certain hints, undeveloped ideas and suggestions, which might have meant little to others, but to me were indicative of the underlying tendencies of your philosophy. They were straws in the wind, which I observed before making my tests with the vane.

My discussion of your article on "Necessity" will soon be in your hands, and I am curious what you will think of it. I do not believe that my objections are similar to those made by Prof. Royce;

for I glanced at his book, "The Spirit of Modern Philosophy", and apprise that there is as great a gulf between his theoretical views and mine, as there is between Prof. Adler's ethics and mine.

Mr. Hegeler's monism, no less than mine, is broad enough to encompass not only sympathizers and men as you are, who steer for the same goal, but also opponents. We would not hesitate to admit to our columns the bitterest opponents of monistic thought, among them the Roman Catholics, who, by the bye, are in many respects much more monistic and also consistent than their Protestant brothers.

Mr. Hegeler is not narrower than I am, but I should say that he is more positive. I would restrain editorial interference to matters of principle only, and leave the working out of our aim to the contributors, admitting, however, the editor as one of the contributors. *As such I would offer advice my time longer than I do.* So, for instance, my proposition was to name the new quarterly "THOUGHT" and not "THE MONIST"; but in Mr. Hegeler's opinion, the name "THOUGHT" was unmeaning, *He regarded it* as an attempt at being non-committal. He wants to have the solution which he arrived at expressed unequivocally. The name of the journal is to him the flag; while to me it would be an invitation to the class of people who are welcome to contribute. Mr. Hegeler had the same objection to the name, "THE OPEN COURT". I shall be pleased to have your article for the Fall number of the MONIST.

With kind regards,

Yours very truly,

P. Cairns