

July 30, 1960

Dear Professor Ferrater Mora,

Without having the pleasure to know you otherwise than through some of your ~~writings~~ ^{lectures}, I would like to tell you how much I like your "Philosophy To-Day". It is, according to my opinion, by far the best book written on that subject; moreover, it contains a wealth of systematic insights which I believe to be very valuable. One idea - to divide the currents "geographically" into European, Russian and Anglo-Saxon - appeals to me particularly; as a fact, before knowing your division I decided to apply it in my future lectures in the Un. of Kansas (Lawrence). Perhaps more important still is to see, that you are one of the very few contemporary thinkers who try to overcome the desperate parochialism of most of our venerable colleagues. An other thing, which struck me very much is you chapter on philosophy of religion as it should be. And I could quote, I think, many other details which seem to me excellent.

But the book being as good as it is, I am sure it will have a very great success and probably many editions. So I think I may venture some purely historical criticisms, or perhaps requests.

(1) You seem not to realize, that the "Anglo-Saxon" philosophy is not only represented by a few thinkers in the "great" countries like Germany etc. of the European Continent, but is the dominant philosophy in both the Scandinavian countries and in Poland, the last in spite of being Communist-occupied. A member of my Institute, Dr. Z. Jordan, just wrote a book on Poland 1945-1960; he shows, that, in spite of all, the Polish philosophy is essentially what it has been since 1920, namely "scientific" and this in more "American" than "English" way. I would, therefore, suggest that you might mention both Scandinavia and Poland as constituting an exception in Continental Europe. This because the contributions of those two groups seem to me to be more than marginal.

(2) Frankly, your knowledge of Russian philosophy is inadequate. You start e.g. with an enormous statement: "dialectical materialism" "historical materialism" and "Marxism" are, you say, synonymous; ~~the~~ they are not. I am sorry to say but this ~~whole~~ section will have to be re-written. It is far below the level of the whole.

(3) There are some new developments in the Soviet Union, which seem to substantiate your prognosis that sometime scientific philosophy (as you understand it) will win. I am personally of the opinion, that it would be easier to gain the Russian and their satellites, than the European. The reason is very simple: the official "philosophy" is mostly nonsense, while the Continental official philosophy is not so obviously nonsensical. Therefore, the reaction of more scientific minds in Russia and elsewhere in the Communist world is stronger than in Europe. You can get informations about it from your colleague, Professor Kline, one of the very few serious societologists specialized in philosophy. ^{of} my Institute the following three books may, perhaps, be recommended: (1) N. Lobkowitz: Das Widerspruchsprinzip in der neueren sowjetischen Philosophie, (2) S. Müller Markus: Einstein und die Sowjetphilosophie, (3) Bocheński (ed.) Studies in Soviet thought. We work on the assumption that Soviet philosophy will very soon become a major factor in human thought; and, incidentally, we are, as far as I know, the only organized group (14 men) which works on contemporary Soviet philosophy.

I hope you will understand that these remarks are prompted by my admiration for your work and by the feeling that you are one of the very few philosophers who might be interested in the sort of

000216

168

research we are doing here.

Sincerely yours

July 30, 1960

J. Bochenski

Dear Professor [unclear],
without having the pleasure to know you otherwise than through some of your [unclear] I like to tell you how much I like your "Philosophy Today". It is, according to my opinion, by far the best book written on that subject; moreover, it contains a wealth of systematic insights which I believe to be very valuable. One idea - to divide the currents "geographically" into European, Russian and Anglo-Saxon - appeals to me particularly; as a [unclear] before knowing your division I decided to apply it in my future lectures in the U.S. of Kansas (Lawrence). I think it is perhaps more important still to see, that you are one of the very few contemporary thinkers who try to overcome the desperate parochialism of most of our venerable colleagues. An other thing which struck me very much is your chapter on philosophy of religion as it should be. And I could quote, I think, many other details which seem to me excellent.

But the book being as good as it is, I am sure it will have a very great success and probably many editions. So I think I may venture some purely historical criticisms or perhaps requests.

(1) You seem not to realize, that the "Anglo-Saxon" philosophy is not only represented by a few thinkers in the "great" countries like Germany etc. of the European continent, but is the dominant philosophy in both the Scandinavian countries and in Poland, the last in spite of being Communist-occupied. A member of my institute, Dr. A. Jordan, just wrote a book on Poland 1945-1960; he shows that, in spite of all, the Polish philosophy is essentially what it has been since 1920, namely "scientific" and this in more "American" than "English" way. I would, therefore, suggest that you might mention both Scandinavia and Poland as constituting an exception in Continental Europe. This because the contributions of those two groups seem to me to be more than marginal.

(2) Frankly, your knowledge of Russian philosophy is inadequate. You start e.g. with an enormous statement: "dialectical materialism" "historical materialism" and "Marxism" are, you say, synonymous; they are not. I am sorry to say but this whole section will have to be re-written. It is far below the level of the whole.

(3) There are some new developments in the Soviet Union, which seem to substantiate your prognosis that sometime scientific philosophy (as you understand it) will win. I am personally of the opinion, that it would be easier to gain the Russian and their satellites, than the European. The reason is very simple: the official "philosophy" is mostly nonsense, while the Continental official philosophy is not so obviously nonsensical. Therefore, the reaction of more scientific minds in Russia and elsewhere in the Communist world is stronger than in Europe. You can get informations about it from your colleague, Professor Aline, one of the very few serious Sovietologists specialized in philosophy. Of my institute the following three books may, perhaps, be recommended: (1) N. Lopkovic: Das Widerspruchsprinzip in der neueren sowjetischen Philosophie, (2) S. Miller Markus: Einstein und die Sowjetphilosophie, (3) Bochenski (ed.) Studies in Soviet thought. We work on the assumption that Soviet philosophy will very soon become a major factor in human thought; and, incidentally, we are, as far as I know, the only organized group (14 men) which works on contemporary Soviet philosophy.

I hope you will understand that these remarks are prompted by my admiration for your work and by the feeling that you are one of

00021

~~012000~~