Dear Dr. Scott,

I would not dream of thinking you were going wrong, for you are a psychologist and I am not. Indeed I felt rather venturous in the Eddington Lecture in venturing so far as I did in introspective psychology.

No, introspective is not the right word—subjective rather. Perhaps "Subjective Topology" is the right name for the subject, of which introspection refers only to the inward turning aspect.

I had thought of "attention" as a kind of surface ripple of activity moving about from place to place in an otherwise effectively undisturbed boundary surface. After reading your letter I see that this activity must extend, to some extent at least, inwards for there is much in our memories that we can recall, or pay attention to, at will. I am not so clear about reaching outwards. We certainly intervene actively in the outer world through muscular action, but not as we perceive things through the senses. Still, there is no doubt that the Greeks and Romans thought of sight as a sort of invisible tentacle stretching out from the eyes searching for touching objects. Indeed, Euclid uses the argument that, unless sight proceeded from the eye, instead of the alternative view of a passive eye which light enters, we should never fail to find a dropped needle at once.

P.T.O.
So perhaps it will appear that the body scheme may be morphologically different as conceived by different races.

Thank you for writing.

Yours sincerely,