

The blue pencil numbering suggests that there may have been other letters which are either lost, of which I have not yet located. The letters from HRJ are presumably either drafts (of letters that may not have been sent), or copies retained by him.

John Barnard, 18 Nov 2024

5.6.19

Oriel College  
Oxford

2

Dear Mr. James,

Your letter of June 2<sup>nd</sup> merits a perfectly frank reply. The last time we met you made a violent attack on me personally as the result of some action taken by me in my official capacity; action which I had taken in the bona fide belief that it was the right course to adopt, a belief which I still hold.

You then accused me, among other things, of having pretended to be a friend to you and the Presidency College while secretly intriguing against both; you compared me, with obviously offensive intent, with Sir Harcourt Butler; and the last words you uttered as you left my room were 'You cur!'. So far as any man can judge of his own actions, I believe every charge you made to have been wholly unfounded, and seeing that I have never received from you any personal explanation (if explanation be possible) or expression of regret, you cannot, I think, be surprised

that I still recall the scene with  
grave resentment.

At the same time, this resentment  
could not affect a cloud the appreciation  
which enabled me to refer to you, with  
perfect sincerity, on the occasion of the  
Hindu School Centenary ~~celebrations~~, in  
the terms to which you allude.

In all these circumstances I feel  
that something more is due from you  
to me before I can - as I would very  
willingly do otherwise - let bygones be  
bygones.

Yours sincerely

P. C. Lyon

H. R. James Esq

3

Fonthill  
Tunbridge Wells  
8.6.19.

Dear Mr Lyon

I ~~welcome~~ your  
~~frankness~~ thank you for  
your letter ~~of frankness~~.  
I am willing <sup>enough</sup> to  
accept your assurance that in the  
hurt you did me - the deadly  
hurt - you were acting in good  
faith; indeed my writing to you  
is a ~~regretting~~ <sup>regretting</sup> ~~but~~ <sup>but</sup> ~~your~~ <sup>your</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~column~~ <sup>column</sup>. But is  
it not plain & palpable, that,  
this good faith notwithstanding,  
the consequences of your official  
action were, to put it mildly,  
very injurious to me; & not once  
but twice? The second time,  
when I was relying on your



support in difficult circum-  
stances, when it appeared to  
me that you had by a sudden  
change of purpose of which I had  
no warning made my position  
~~untenable~~ <sup>absolutely</sup> untenable, when I saw my  
work going to pieces through no  
fault of mine, & through official  
action which might easily  
have been ~~very~~ <sup>so</sup> different (for I  
deserved well), can you not admit  
that the grave expression of a  
sense of betrayal, even if mistaken,  
was forced from me in good  
faith also? I appeal to your  
own sense of justice. Few men  
are the loss of the usual  
rewards of good service so clearly  
& directly to the action of one  
man, as I do to yours. And yet,  
while you have had, & have,

nearly all the advantages,  
I think I have, perhaps, one  
little advantage, in that I  
can remember & realize  
all this without resentment.

I ~~can only~~<sup>am</sup> feel sorry that  
you do not feel you can grant  
the request I made.

Sincerely yours

H R James

Fontwell  
Turbridge Wells  
10. 6. 19.

Dear Mr Lyon

I did not ~~thought~~<sup>expect</sup>  
to see you on Thursday or Friday,  
but I am grateful for your  
note & the consideration it  
shows for my point of view. I  
think if you could somehow have  
conveyed to me in 1912 — what  
you now write in 1919, the course  
of events might have been ~~very~~  
different. Before the flow fell  
~~in~~ in 1912, remember that, humbly  
speaking & as things generally  
go especially, I had every reason  
to believe that I was 'safe' to

needed Kuehler; I was treated  
apparently on all hands as his  
niece - up to January 1913.  
So pardon me, if I say that  
when it would have meant much  
to me, you showed no smallest  
sign of 'appreciation'; you said  
no word that might have <sup>softened</sup>  
the blow. But I must not <sup>thus</sup> go on:  
only I would like you to <sup>see</sup> understand,  
now that you speak of appreciation,  
that it would have been possible  
in 1912 to have let me down more  
easily - if I was a deserving public  
servant. And in 1916? - you  
can yourself judge best whether  
the ~~substantive~~ <sup>positive</sup> measures taken  
against me were in any sense  
necessary in the public interest.  
I think they only did harm. ~~By~~



~~Violence~~ <sup>properly speaking</sup> in my role, there  
was none. ~~You could have~~  
~~been any?~~ I was too exhausted.  
My words <sup>when I came to see you</sup> you were ~~those~~  
sincere: they were meant in  
seriousness as <sup>deliberate</sup> moral condem-  
nation. I believed them strictly  
justified. I ~~gladly~~ <sup>am glad</sup> ~~never~~ <sup>however</sup>,  
~~admit that in this I was~~ <sup>in this</sup> mis-  
taken. I accept your assurance  
that ~~you believed the actions you~~  
~~took to be right.~~ <sup>Make back</sup> the  
imputation of bad faith & I  
regret the pain it may have  
caused you.

I hope we may some  
day meet, & meet without  
bitterness

Sincerely yours  
H. P. James