

RYSZARD JADCAK

*Nicolaus Copernicus University
in Toruń*

FROM THE HISTORY OF THE LVIV-WARSAW SCHOOL'S ENCOUNTER WITH MARXISM

An example of the implementation of the policy in the sphere of science, adopted by the new Polish authorities after the World War II, are the fate of the meeting of two philosophical orientations, the so-called Lvov-Warsaw school and Marxism.

The purpose of this article is to present the various stages of this confrontation, the forms it took and the main protagonists involved. The basis is mainly statements and critical dissertations published in the pages of the philosophical journals of the time, without going into the substantive value of these statements or assessing anything about the actual results of the campaign, which of course differed from the statements made.

On February 11, 1938, Kazimierz Twardowski (b. 1866), the founder and undisputed master of the orientation known as the Lviv-Warsaw school, dies in Lviv. Among Twardowski's students were professors of philosophy, psychologists and logicians, as well as art theorists, literary historians, musicologists and educational and political activists. Many scholars of this orientation had already become independent before World War II and, having taken up university chairs, formed other research teams around them. Despite the sometimes fierce disputes in interwar Poland between different philosophical orientations, as well as within the Lviv-Warsaw school itself, it is easy to see the strong position of K. Twardowski, who in many issues remained an authority for his former students, and his achievements found in them defenders and propagators¹.

On February 11-12, 1939, in Lviv, on the first anniversary of the "master's" death, the First Reunion of Twardowski's former students was held. Among other things, it was decided to organize reunions of Twardowski's former disciples every year, successively in various university centers in Poland. The reunion committee was headed by T. Czeżowski. The next reunion was to be held in 1940 in Warsaw². The outbreak of war prevented the realization of the resolutions of the Lviv convention.

¹ See, among others: I. B o b e r: *Around the disputes about philosophy in interwar Poland*. "Education Philosophical" vol. 6. 1988, pp. 23-42.

² "The Philosophical Movement" vol. XV, 1939, no. 1-2, pp. 5-8.

World War II brought an end to both the school, treated as a compact group of scholars, and to certain forms of doing science, especially philosophy³. Some of those admitting to the Lviv-Warsaw school suffered death at the hands of the occupying forces, some were thrown across the borders of the country by the fate of war, but most survived and took up work in liberated Lviv, in the old, reborn, as well as in the newly created centers, thus documenting the continuity of Polish science. Thus, for example, Czeżowski and Jaskowski began work at the newly created Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, Kotarbinski, Witwicki, Mostowski, the Ossowskis and Tatarkiewicz in Warsaw, Kokoszyńska, Sloniewska, Kreutz, Mehlberg in Wrocław, Ajdukiewicz in Poznań.

In general, it can be said that immediately after World War II, professors, originating from the Lviv-Warsaw school, took a prominent place again, especially in the humanities. However, in the new socio-political situation, there was a meeting and then a confrontation between representatives of various philosophical orientations of the interwar period and Marxism, acting in the role of ideological host and censor. Marxist ideologues not only felt obliged to respond to the neo-positivist tradition, represented by a group of intellectually active representatives of the Lviv-Warsaw School, but also to provoke their methodological and world-view declarations, corresponding to the changes initiated in Poland after World War II⁴.

In this situation, under the pressure of Marxism, new emphases appeared in evaluations of the role of K. Twardowski and his school. On the one hand, former students of Twardowski undertook to defend the good name of the master and his achievements for Polish philosophy, while on the other hand, efforts were made to demonstrate the ideological differences that existed within Twardowski's school. This was done by analyzing the very notion of "school" and the open, non-doctrinaire character of the orientation known as the Lviv-Warsaw school, enabling the existence and development of different directions and research methods. This can be clearly seen, among others, in the statements of K. Ajdukiewicz, J. Dąmbska, T. Czeżowski⁵.

³ J. Wołeński: *Lviv-Warsaw Philosophical School*. Warsaw 1985, pp. 3-32. Other opinions on this issue were expressed by, among others: I. Dąmbska: *F. Brentano a polska myśl filozoficzna. Kazimierz Twardowski and his school*. "Ruch Filozoficzny" vol. XXXVII, 1979, z. 1-2, p. 1, and J. J. Jadacki: *The Legend of the Lviv-Warsaw School*. "Philosophical Studies," no. 12/1986, pp. 214-215.

⁴ See, among others: K. Ochocik: *Wokół sporów o filozofię*. Warsaw 1978; A. Kolakowski: *Interpretation and Mythical Situations (critique of the so-called Lviv-Warsaw School in Polish Marxist thought of the first half of the 1950s)*. "Zdanie" vol. 1/9/1980; E. Sadzikowski: *Philosophical controversies in the pages of "Contemporary Thought" in the years 1946-1948*. "Studia Filozoficzne" no. 7/1983; T. Mendelski: *Z filozoficznych kontrowersji czterdziestolecia*. "Ideology and Politics" No. 7-8/1984.

⁵ K. Ajdukiewicz: *Kazimierz Twardowski as a teacher of philosophy*. "Z zagadnień dydaktycznych wyższego szkolnictwa," Poznań 1948, z. 5.; I. Dąmbska: *Forty years of philosophy in Lviv 1898-1939*. "Przegląd Filozoficzny" R. 44. 1948; T. Czeżowski: *W dziesięciolecie śmierci Kazimierza Twardowskiego*. In: *Philosophical Readings*, Toruń 1968.

At the same time, efforts were made to maintain ties between the "hard-liners." Referring to the resolutions of the Lviv convention of former disciples of K. Twardowski, on the 10th anniversary of the "master's" death, the Organizing Committee of the Philosophical Society in Wrocław, together with the Institute of Philosophy at the University of Wrocław, organized a solemn scientific session on February 11-12, 1948, which was also attended by a number of Twardowski's disciples from outside Wrocław⁶.

After a period of relative calm, the first open polemics between Marxists and representatives of the Lviv-Warsaw school took place in the second half of the 1940s. At the same time, some of the speeches of the "hard-liners" could be, and probably were, perceived by Marxists as a kind of provocation⁷.

The venue for the polemics became the pages of "Kućnica" and "Myśl Współczesna." The latter magazine was established in accordance with a resolution of the Central Committee of the Polish Workers' Party (PPR) in January 1946. Its purpose was to: *promote the Marxist worldview among the intelligentsia and bring together academics close to or approaching Marxism*⁸. The editor-in-chief from 1946 to 1951 was Zygmunt Szymanowski.

In the last issue of Modern Thought in 1947, Stanislaw Ossowski's article *The Marxist Doctrine Against the Background of the Modern Era* appeared, extended in early 1948 with an article entitled *Theoretical Tasks of Marxism*⁹. In it, Ossowski accused Marxists of the apodictic tone in which they formulate their theories. It evokes associations with the unshakeable certainty of believers. Ossowski urged that the dialectical method should not be reduced to conventional formulas and that petrifying procedures should not be applied to it. Such were the phenomena Ossowski saw in the Marxist milieu in Poland.

This work was met with a replication by Adam Schaff *Marxism and the Development of Science* and Julian Hochfeld *On the Meaning of Marxism-Article of Discussion*¹⁰. S. Ossowski referred to both of these contributions in his treatise *On the Trails of Marxism*. The importance of Ossowski's article was raised by the fact that at the same time Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz in his article *Change and Contradiction* demystified the meaning given to dialectics, as - allegedly - removing logic into the shadows¹¹.

Both speeches could be seen as an expression of the academic community's disapproval of Marxism's progressive ideological offensive. They also provoked a counteraction. Here a demand was made, directed at all intellectual circles in

⁶ "Ruch Filozoficzny" vol. XVI, z. 1, 1948, p. 60.

⁷ T. Kotarbinski: *On the formation of a world view and Life*. "Flames" no. 8/1947; T. Czeżowski: *Perspektywy światopoglądowe*. "Ruch Filozoficzny" vol. XVI, 1948-1949; K. Ajdukiewicz: *What is the freedom of science*. "Life of Science," R. 1948, z. 6.

⁸ *Materials Auxiliary to the History of Journalism of the People's Republic of Poland*. Warsaw 1971, z. 1, pp. 174-175.

⁹ S. Ossowski: *Marxist doctrine against the background of the modern era*. "Contemporary Thought," December 1947, pp. 501-513; *The same, Theoretical Tasks of Marxism*. Ibid, January 1948, pp. 3-18.

¹⁰ A. Schaff: *Marxism and the development of science*. "Contemporary Thought," June-July 1948, pp. 245-263; J. Hochfeld: *On the meaning of Marxism - a discussion article*, Ibid, April 1948, s. 70-94.

¹¹ S. Ossowski: *On the trails of Marxism* "Contemporary Thought" August-September 1948, p. 19-34; K. Ajdukiewicz: *Change and contradiction*. Ibid, pp. 35-52.

Poland, and specific scholars to stand firmly on the side of Marxist materialism.

The battle waged at that time against, among others, the Lviv-Warsaw school must be seen against the background of the slogans proclaimed about classism and partisanship in philosophy and science. This program was clearly expressed by A. Schaff in the articles *Class struggle in philosophy* and *The class character of philosophy*¹².

Schaff's dogmatic view of science and philosophy found its expression in the following tasks Schaff posed to philosophy and philosophers: *Materialism or idealism? Here is a question that no philosophical system can bypass either posing it directly, or indirectly pondering it when solving various philosophical problems. And yet with this issue squeezes into philosophy all the rich political life. For the consequences of both one and the other positions have clear social and class overtones, for - or against the labor movement, for - or against capitalism. This consequence cannot be avoided even if one refuses to consider thorny theoretical issues. And silence, for in today's era of tapering class struggle, there is a consequence. Whoever is silent supports the objectively existing state of affairs; whoever does not explicitly advocate progress is objectively against it*¹³.

These statements are accompanied by administrative actions aimed, among other things, at unifying the philosophical community. In 1946, "Przegląd Filozoficzny", edited since 1923 by W. Tatarkiewicz, ceases to come out in Warsaw. In 1950 the "Ruch Filozoficzny", founded in 1911 by K. Twardowski as an organ of the Philosophical Society, and the "Kwartalnik Filozoficzny", coming out in Cracow, were closed down. In this way, the philosophical circles traditionally associated with these journals were deprived of the centers that had integrated them for so many years. As a kind of justification for the fact of the discontinuation of the "Philosophical Review" can be considered an article, published by Leszek Kolakowski after the closure of the magazine, in which we read that the views of the representatives of Polish academic philosophy, are: *hopeless banalities dug out of the century-old archives of world quackery; the washings of a few terminally derided "socialist humanists"; obscure, shallow, or even fantastic prognostications, etc.*¹⁴.

The second stage of the confrontation between Marxists and non-Marxist philosophical orientations, occurred in connection with the preparations for and the very deliberations of the First Congress of Polish Science. Once again, the different methodological and worldview options in the humanities were revealed with all clarity at that time. This is mentioned, among other things, in the report of the pre-Congress meeting of the Social Sciences section of the Congress, on July 3, 1950.

¹² A. Schaff: *The class character of philosophy* (I and II). "Kuznica" 1948, no. 46; The same: *Class Struggle in Philosophy. On the fortieth anniversary of Lenin's "Materialism and Empiriocriticism."* Ibid, 1949, no. 23; See also B. Burlikowski: *Philosophy and Science as Viewed by Marxists in the late 1940s and 1950s.* "Humanitas" vol. XIII.

¹³ A. Schaff: *The Birth and Development of Marxist Philosophy.* Warsaw 1950, pp. 63-64.

¹⁴ L. Kolakowski: *Some remarks on the "Philosophical Review"*. "New Ways" 1950, no. 2, pp. 290, 194, 289.

Here is K. Ajdukiewicz in his speech mentioned that due to the small, so far, achievements of Polish Marxists in the field of philosophy, a current methodologically close to the Vienna Circle is gaining importance. He also stressed the great merits of Polish mathematical logic. He put forward three complexes of issues facing those working in the field of philosophy: 1) *the promotion of a scientific view of the world, which would be based primarily on the results of empirical research. This would be both a rationalist worldview*; 2) *working on the history of ideas, the history of philosophy, which would be practiced using the dialectical method*; 3) *deepening and spreading philosophical culture*.

Against such a view of the tasks, J. Hochfeld argued that the central issue, to which only the tasks mentioned by K. Ajdukiewicz can be referred, is a clear stand against the dispute of materialism - idealism on the ground of the science¹⁵.

The First Congress of Polish Science met in Warsaw at the Polytechnic building from June 29 to July 2, 1951. The substantive deliberations of the Congress took place in sections. The Philosophy and Social Sciences Subsection and the Pedagogy and Psychology Subsection emerged from the Social Sciences and Humanities Section.

The evaluations and organizational decisions made on the basis of the discussion in the Philosophy and Social Sciences Subsection had a special role for the beginning of a new stage in the ideological offensive in the humanities. The discussion mainly concerned the situation in philosophy and sociology. It also revealed the existing divisions and different options in the scientific community. It was acknowledged that the representatives of the Lviv-Warsaw School have done many things in the field of science (especially in the field of logic), but that the philosophy of this school bears the stigma of idealism, and thus cannot for Marxist philosophy constitute a tradition to which one would have to refer. While appreciating, for example, the evolution of the views of K. Ajdukiewicz and T. Kotarbinski, it was nevertheless considered inadequate, since in many points the views of these authors remained idealistic.

The thesis attributing to the Lviv-Warsaw school an idealistic position, which was the main point intended to discredit it scientifically, was addressed by Maria Kokoszyńska and K. Ajdukiewicz. Arguing with such an interpretation of the Lviv-Warsaw School, they pointed to the need for an understanding between its representatives and Marxism. Their speech, however, did not find understanding. To Ajdukiewicz, who read the criticism against him as an attempt to put him on the defence, Jozef Chalasinski replied: *that the challenge to thoroughly revise his scholarly output was posed to him not by individual people but by history, that therefore such a revision is not a "punishment" but an obligation imposed by the social situation*¹⁶.

It is interesting that, unlike Ajdukiewicz, J. Chalasinski carried out such a critique of his own pre-war scientific and writing achievements at the Congress. *I take this criticism without regret, as I treat it as a fulfillment of the duty, stemming from a sense of social and moral responsibility that is incumbent on every scholar and writer in this pivotal era*¹⁷.

¹⁵ "Life of Science" R. V, no. 7-8/1950, pp. 571-572.

¹⁶ *Proceedings of the Subsection of Philosophy and Social Sciences of the First Congress of Polish Science*. "Philosophical Thought" No. 1-2/1951, p. 356.

The discussion on the tradition and situation of Polish philosophy did not, as could be predicted, lead to an agreement of positions. Divergences remained. Although it was declared that Marxists do not intend to force non-Marxist philosophers to subordinate their philosophy to social goals, at the same time the motion adopted at the end of the session, with three abstentions, posits that only Marxist-Leninist philosophy can fulfill the role of a guiding world view of Polish society that builds socialism. Thus, all Polish philosophy must gradually move towards Marxism-Leninism¹⁸.

It sounded like an ultimatum. Soon, too, implementation of the adopted program began. This was to be served, among other things, by the Institute for the Training of Scientific Personnel, which was established back in 1950¹⁹, the Institute of Philosophy of the Polish Academy of Sciences and the new central philosophical journal "Philosophical Thought." In all these institutions, the leading position was held by A. Schaff (b. 1913).

At the same time as the ideological campaign turned against the representatives of non-Marxist philosophy, they began to be deprived of the right to lecture (e.g. Maria and Stanislaw Ossowski, Wladyslaw Tatarkiewicz, Izydora Dambaska) and others were allowed only to lecture on logic (Janina and Tadeusz Kotarbinski, Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz, Tadeusz Czeżowski, Maria Kokoszyńska).

In the implementation of the ideological program in the field of philosophy, a special role was to be played by the quarterly "Myśl Filozoficzna" (Philosophical Thought), formally the organ of the Philosophical Committee of the Polish Academy of Sciences. A. Schaff became the editor-in-chief of the journal, and the Editorial Committee also included: J. Chalasinski and J. Hochfeld.

The first meeting of the Editorial Board of "Philosophical Thought" took place on October 20, 1951, and was devoted to discussing the content of the first two issues of the journal in preparation. The content of the introductory article, which was refereed by A. Schaff, did not raise significant doubts. Only Ajdukiewicz suggested that the text of the program statement should not prejudge the results of the evaluation of the Lviv school.

-Warsaw School and limited himself to stating that the position of this school requires analysis and evaluation from Marxist positions. In conclusion, A. Schaff accepted the suggestion of K. Ajdukiewicz as to the formulation in the program article of an assignment on the evaluation of the Lviv-Warsaw school²⁰.

Indeed, in the word from the Editorial Board opening the first two combined issues of "Marxist Thought" it was stated that the condition for the victory of Marxist philosophy is the breakdown of those directions which, dominating at present, impede the development of scientific thought in Poland. A critical assessment of the Lviv-Warsaw school and Florian Znaniecki's school in sociology comes to the fore²¹.

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 361.

¹⁸ Ibid, p. 367.

¹⁹ The institute operated under the Central Committee of the Communist Party and its director was Adam Schaff. It had three departments: philosophy, economics and history, which were divided into chairs. In 1954, the IKKN was transformed into the Institute of Social Sciences at the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party.

²⁰ "Philosophical Thought" No. 1 (3), 1952, pp. 337-338.

²¹ Ibid, 1951, No. 1/2, p. 15.

A. Schaffw article *The Tasks of the Philosophical Front in the Light of the Resolutions of the First Congress of Polish Science* admitted that a deep dividing line between Marxists and the Lviv-Warsaw School was revealed at the Congress. *The congress discussion confirmed once again that the issue of the Lviv-Warsaw school is coming forward as one of the main problems of the ideological struggle on the philosophical front in Poland.* The author felt that special analysis should be given to the views of: T. Kotarbinski, K. Ajdukiewicz, Stanislaw Lesniewski, Jan Lukasiewicz and Alfred Tarski, and the journal "Myśl Filozoficzna"²² should become the place of discussion.

In the first two issues of "Myśli Filozoficzna" two more articles deserve attention. Here, in the text *Logika, jej zadania i potrzeby w Polsce współczesnej (Logic, its tasks and needs in contemporary Poland)*, K. Ajdukiewicz, referring to the proceedings of the First Congress of Polish Science, undertook to formulate the tasks facing Polish logic "in the present day." Recalling that Polish logic reached its peak development in the interwar period, he then stated: *And this native tradition should be upheld and we should make every effort to put the government of souls in Poland at the service of sober reason by spreading logical culture of thought and speech, and to immunize minds against all doctrines and beliefs that are not supported by logical arguments. For by fostering a logical culture, we prepare the ground for a scientific view of the world, and thus pave the way for progress*²³.

It resonated widely, in fact introducing a new tone to the discussion of the Polish philosophical tradition, especially the Lviv-Warsaw School, Bronislaw Baczko's article entitled *On the philosophical and socio-political views of Tadeusz Kotarbiński*²⁴. It opened a series of "critical" texts, prepared at the IKKN, the purpose of which was to provide a Marxist analysis, or rather to discredit the achievements of the representatives of the Lviv-Warsaw school, and thus to shatter its "myth." This was served, among other things, by the phraseology peculiar to the dogmatic Marxist circles of the time, and often by simplifications and insinuations²⁵. We can already find signs of this "method" in the aforementioned article by B. Baczko.

Responding to Baczko's article were two texts by T. Kotarbinski: *Humanities without hypostases*, where he gave a positive lecture on his views on the merits of rheism in the humanities²⁶, and a polemical article entitled *Answer*²⁷.

Kotarbinski's first text was argued against by Chałasiński, who ultimately reduced the whole thing to the need to unequivocally take a particular side, including on the reconstruction of the humanities. There is no compromise path. *History has greatly simplified the matter of choice. There is either the path of partitionist capitalism or the path of socialist revolution*²³.

²² Ibid, p. 37.

²³ Ibid, p. 141.

²⁴ Ibid, pp. 247-289 Subsequently published in a separate booklet by "Książka i Wiedza" Warsaw 1952.

²⁵ See S. Symotiuik: *Conception of Criticism and Models of Criticism in Polish Disputes philosophical of the 20th century.* Lublin 1987 (especially chapter IV).

²⁶ "Philosophical Thought" 1952, no. 1 (3), pp. 257-270.

²⁷ Ibid, 1952, no. 2 (4), pp. 315-330.

²⁸ J. Chalasinski: *The thing about "Humanities without hypostases".* "Philosophical Thought" 1952, no. 2 (4), p. 414.

In the *answer* given to Baczko, Kotarbiński considers, among other things, the question: *is he a dialectical materialist?* He answers it positively, giving as an argument his consistent anti-mechanistic stance. Here Kotarbinski treats dialectics as a framework discipline, in which the outline of a general theory of change considered from the point of view of progress is continued. In this context, the scientist states that Rheism, Somatism and Radical Rheism, in a word, the theoretical assumptions of his worldview are no competition for dialectical materialism²⁹. Thus, without abandoning the methodological principles of the Lviv school, and on the contrary, even emphasizing in polemics - as he himself wrote - with *extreme, dogmatic Marxists*, its merits, Kotarbinski drew attention to those elements of Marxism in the improvement of which the methodologists of neo-positivism can participate. Kotarbinski was convinced that such co-working was possible. It can help Marxists, among other things, to clarify the terms and concepts used on the grounds of this theory.

The discussion on Kotarbinski's philosophical views in the pages of Philosophical Thought was closed by the Editor's statement in the 2(4) issue of the journal in 1952. The claim about the eclectic nature of Kotarbinski's philosophical system and the bourgeois-liberal character of his social views was upheld. Kotarbinski's declared openness to the problems raised by Marxism was not accepted. *It should also be regretted,*" it was written, "that in the Reply and in Humanities without hypostases *the author limited himself only to declarations of solidarity with dialectical materialism and scientific socialism, while substantively upholding the old views, the fallacy of which was shown above, that he did not undertake a critical and self-critical analysis of the views he proclaimed, aiming at the realization in practice of the declared aspirations towards the assimilation of dialectical materialism and scientific socialism*³⁰.

Such a stance must have particularly painfully affected Kotarbinski, given that his postwar activity was precisely an example of an attempt to reconcile the philosophical stance brought up from Twardowski's circle of influence with the demands that were placed on the intelligentsia in the new political conditions of Poland.

A critical discussion of K. Ajdukiewicz's views was undertaken by A. Schaff himself. Before his article, entitled *Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz's Philosophical Views (Critical Sketch)*, appeared in "Myśli Filozoficzna", it was discussed at the meeting of the IKKN Chair of the History of Philosophy on November 9, 1951. Both L. Kolakowski and B. Baczko found the article too harsh. A number of general and specific issues were raised. L. Kolakowski, for example, noted that the quotations from Ajdukiewicz's works cited by Schaff do not always document the charges leveled against him of giving an excessive role to language in the study of reality. He also advised to present the social consequences arising not only from radical conventionalism but from all subjectivism. Halina Eilstein pointed out the need for a more precise formulation of the difference between idealism and Marxism's positive stance toward semantics. Also Henry Holland and B. Baczko addressed the problem of the consequences conventionalism for social practice. A Schaff recognized most of the

²⁹ T. K o t a r b i ń s k i: *Reply*, "Myśl Filozoficzna" 1954, no. 2 (4), p. 297.

³⁰ "Philosophical Thought" 1952, no. 2 (4), p. 337.

comments. He responded positively to the proposal to re-examine the arguments put forward against radical conventionalism and idealistic semantics, and pledged to make the relevant changes and clarifications in the text³¹.

A. Schaff began his analysis of K. Ajdukiewicz's views by negating two "myths" associated with the Lviv-Warsaw School: *So, first - it is not true that the Lviv-Warsaw School has supposedly created some kind of strictly scientific philosophy, which is a negation of metaphysics and irrationalism. However, it is true that the philosophy of the Lviv-Warsaw School is, in its essential features - despite the individual deviations of its representatives - a philosophy of idealistic semantics and conventionalism, and therefore a refined and sophisticated variety of individualism; thus it is deeply opposed to the demands of scientific exactitude (...) Secondly, it is not true that the philosophy of the Lviv-Warsaw School was an original creation of Polish philosophical thought. It is true, however, that from its inception (Twardowski) through the entire period of its existence, it was a conglomeration of the most varied influences of bourgeois Western philosophy*³².

A. Schaff held K. Ajdukiewicz mainly responsible for "idealistic semantics". According to the critic, Ajdukiewicz separates language from thinking, considers the analytic criterion as the only criterion of truth, wants to replace epistemology by the analysis of language, and wants to make from the analysis of language a panacea for all worldview issues.

Ajdukiewicz responded to these accusations in the pages of "Myśli Filozoficzna" in an article titled *In the matter of Prof. A. Schaff's article on my philosophical views*. In it, he stated that he found none among Schaff's charges that he could consider valid. He admitted that much of what he once wrote and preached today no longer holds up. This is the case, for example, with some of the theses of so-called radical conventionalism. What he preached was often different from the materialist doctrine, but it did not contradict it, as he took on other issues. Refuting Schaff's attack on the content of the 1948 work *Epistemology and Semiotics*, K. Ajdukiewicz noted: *it seems me that this work, because of its content, should have been welcomed by the Marxist as an ally-it should not have met with such reluctance*³³.

To discussion with Ajdukiewicz joined also L. Kolakowski by publishing an article entitled *Philosophy of Non-Intervention*. In it, he considered conventionalism to be a reactionary doctrine, idealistic and: *harmful, because it dogmatizes and at the same time protects all idealism from scientific criticism*³⁴.

³¹ Party School Archives (in liquidation). 5/107.

³² A. S c h a f f: *Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz's philosophical views (critical sketch)*. "Myśl Filozoficzna" 1952, no. 1 (3), p. 212. The article was also published in a separate publication (Warsaw 1952) as a transcript of a lecture delivered at the IKKN at the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party for second-year students.

³³ "Philosophical Thought" 1953, no. 2 (8), pp. 292-334.

³⁴ *Ibid*, p. 372.

Schaff itself did not accept Ajdukiewicz's declaration that he had retreated from the theses of extreme conventionalism, *and even if he had retreated from them, scientifically I remain indebted to them until he has dealt with them*³⁵.

Schaff's accusations that Ajdukiewicz was unable or unwilling to understand the philosophical content of Marxism, the reason for which was his self-confidence and disregard for Marxism, must have sounded dangerous. *How can one explain the fact,*" Schaff asked, "that *after nine patches of people's power in Poland, a man with such philosophical erudition as Prof. Ajdukiewicz could not make serious progress in understanding and assimilating Marxism*³⁶.

In this situation, Schaff considered further polemics with Ajdukiewicz pointless. However, he expressed the hope that the criticism so far helped not only to dispel doubts about the nature of Ajdukiewicz's polemics, but also to overcome the "myth" of the Lviv-Warsaw school, with the *aim of undercutting its influences*³⁷.

The state of implementation of the program of ideological crackdown on, among others, the Lviv-Warsaw school was devoted to the meeting of the Chair of the History of Philosophy of the IKKN at the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party on February 15, 1952. A discussion of this issue was undertaken by B. Baczkowski. Having generally evaluated positively the subject matter of the lectures devoted to interwar Polish philosophy, and mainly to the Lviv-Warsaw school, he considered insufficient critical interest in interwar logic as a shortcoming (*we have no one at the moment to sit on this issue and work it out. This is obviously not good.*)³⁸ When preparing lectures for the students of the IKKN in the future, B. Baczkowski considered it necessary to include a synthesis of the entire Lviv-Warsaw School, and not only monographic presentations of individual people, such as works on Kotarbinski and Ajdukiewicz, , in the final stage of development, H. Holland's dissertation on Kazimierz Twardowski³⁹.

After Kotarbinski and Ajdukiewicz, it was the turn to deal with the "legend" of the founder and master of the Lviv-Warsaw school - Kazimierz Twardowski. This task was undertaken by H. Holland.

The discussion of the work he was preparing was dealt with on March 4, 1952, at a scientific meeting of the Department of the History of Philosophy of IKKN. The work was appraised in no small measure. L. Kolakowski: *The work is a pamphlet in a good sense.* B. Baczkowski: *Holland took the easy way out in the work: he carried out a devastating critique where he had the material to do so, and omits the less gripping issues.* Marek Fritzhand: *Work*

³⁵ A. Schaff : *On the evaluation of the philosophical views of K. Ajdukiewicz.* "Myśl Filozoficzna" 1953, no. 3 (9), p. 208. A. Schaff also devoted to the criticism of conventionalism and neopositivism some parts of his book: *Z zagadnień marksistowskiej teorii prawdy.* Warsaw 1951.

³⁶ A. Schaff : *On the evaluation of...*, op. cit, p. 202.

³⁷ Ibid, p. 223. K. Ajdukiewicz's views were referred to by A. Schaff again in the article: *Ten years of struggle for the victory of Marxist philosophy in Poland*, published in "Myśli Filozoficzna" 1954, no. 3 (13), pp. 3-32.

³⁸ At a meeting of the Department of Dialectical and Historical Materialism of the IKKN on 25 X 1954 Yaroslav Ladosz presented a plan for a candidate dissertation entitled *Is the idea of Lukaszewicz's multivalued sentence calculus a breakthrough in the development of logic? Aim - to shatter the myth about the role of Jan Lukaszewicz's logic.* Party School Archives. 5/140.

³⁹ Party School Archives. 5/109.

showed the falsity of Twardowski's "scientificness", dispelled the myth of his scientificness. The tone of the work - a combative polemic, not a pamphlet. In general, however, the work was assessed as good, despite comments on the overuse of comparisons and quotations and the paucity, and sometimes even complete lack of substantive criticism of certain Twardowski's views⁴⁰.

Holland's dissertation entitled *The Legend of Kazimierz Twardowski* appeared in the 3(5) issue of *Philosophical Thought* in 1952. We will limit ourselves here to the author's final statement, as it reflects well the thoughts to which the entire text and the argumentation used in it were subordinate. In it, Holland refers at the same time to B. Baczka's *Reply*, in which Kotarbinski defended K. Twardowski's philosophical scientism. *It should be said clearly and explicitly: this legend has nothing to do with reality. Twardowski's philosophy was not a scientific philosophy, it was instead - carefully kept silent by most of his disciples - an extremely obscurantist, Yiddish, Klekhovian philosophy*⁴¹.

The hardliners welcomed Holland's text with outrage, which was expressed both in attempts to defend the school's achievements and to consolidate the community.

S. Kotarbinski, in a letter sent to the editors of *Philosophical Thought*, admitted that Holland's article brought to light unknown passages from K. Twardowski's old texts proving that in the early period of his work he preached fideistic views. This, however, does not verify Kotarbinski's global assessment of the degree of scientism and attitude of Twardowski as the scholar underwent an evolution, as a result of which he took an anti-clerical position. Kotarbinski recognized, that the dispute about Twardowski requires reliability. Meanwhile, Holland's text, infused with contemptuous and derisive remarks, is unceremoniously insulting to Twardowski. The Editorial Committee⁴² also bears responsibility for this.

In its response to Kotarbinski's letter, the Editorial Committee of "Philosophical Thought" admitted that in the course of its editorial work it had neglected to remove certain unfortunate phrases and expressions from Holland's article. This, however, does not change the Editorial Committee's view of the need for a militant character and tone of criticism. From substantial matters, it was stated, among other things, that Kotarbinski's opinion about the change that supposedly took place in Twardowski's views after 1907 does not correspond to the truth, if one takes into account, for example, his introductions to the Polish editions of two works by G. Fechner. Thus, in essence Kotarbinski attempts to uphold the myth about Kazimierz Twardowski with which his students live⁴³. In this situation, the Editorial Committee renewed its invitation to discuss in the pages of "Philosophical Thought" the views of the Lviv-Warsaw School.

The atmosphere that, especially in connection with Holland's article, prevailed among K. Twardowski's former students is evidenced, among other things, by letters from Izydora Dąmbska.

⁴⁰ Ibid, 5/107.

⁴¹ H. Holland: *The legend of Kazimierz Twardowski*. "Philosophical Thought" 1952, no. 3 (5), pp. 312. The text also came out in a separate publication (Warsaw 1953).

⁴² T. Kotarbiński: *On the article "The Legend of Kazimierz Twardowski."* "Myśl Filozoficzna" 1952, no. 4 (6), pp. 356-357.

⁴³ Ibid, p. 358.

We learn from them about the attempt to take action against the content and form of this article. In a letter from I. Dąbska to Fryderyka Jarzębińska from 10 December 1952 we read, among other things: *I am like a wounded animal that "dyes" over and over again and seeks a burrow and solitude suitable for dying. Froze in me all Faith and hope - "blue sister" It is very difficult for me to live. I jerk again and again to learn something or write something. (...) I am supposed to attend the Logicians' Conference. I don't want to go to it, but I am cheered by the desire to discuss orally the case of Mr. Holland's article against the Professor. You must have read the pamphlet. Don't you think that we students should react to it somehow. I discussed with the Gromskis a project (put forward by Edmund) to collect the responses of various students and distribute in a copy to various people and institutions. Because they won't want to print anywhere, by the way, in "Philosophical Thought" I'm the one who doesn't want to print anything. I do not understand that after what happened the composition of the Editorial Committee of this journal has not changed⁴⁴.*

On the same issue wrote I. Dąbska in a letter of January 6, 1953 to Professor Edwin Jędrkiewicz. *Did you have in your hands the lampoon of a certain Mr. Holland, directed against Professor Twardowski? (...) I am oppressed by our powerlessness in this regard. I have been communicating with some of my colleagues about whether it would be possible to respond somehow to this assault. Opinions are divided. T. Kotarbinski sent a letter to the Editor, which, with changes, will be published in the next issue of "Philosophical Thought". K. Ajdukiewicz wrote a private letter to the Chief Editor strong and full of dignity. This will not be announced. I wrote something like a reply and I don't know what to do with it, because in "Philosophical Thought" neither I want to print nor they would not post it, and there are no more philosophical journals that would be willing and able to announce it. I feel that we are out of order towards Professor - by keeping silent, and I don't know what to do; especially since some of the students are very much against any further defense now because of the known intention of the ^{article}⁴⁵.*

In the reply mentioned in the letter, I. Dąbska, in addition to condemning the language used by Holland, also pointed out several obvious errors and misrepresentations made by Twardowski's critic. At the end she wrote: *Mr. Holland, angry with Twardowski's disciples, that they venerated him and were grateful to him, and that they saw him as a promoter of philosophical culture in Poland, accuses them of collusion and browbeating and reminds them of an old saying: amicus Plato sed magis amica veritas. A fine saying, but in Twardowski's case there was no conflict in his choice of friend. Twardowski was a scholar and practiced scientific philosophy more carefully and strictly than those who dogmatically preach one or another (materialistic or) view of the world based on secular or spiritual authorities. After Twardowski's death, one of his disciples another old maxim in the spirit of his pointer: de mortuis et de vivis nil nisi veritas. Perhaps Mr. Holland would do well to consider his article in light of this indication⁴⁶.*

The article by Holland and Kotarbinski's response were referred to at a meeting of the Scientific Council of the Institute of Philosophy at Warsaw University,

⁴⁴ Archive of I. Dąbska (in the possession of the family).

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid. Unpublished article.

which took place on January 19, 1953 and was devoted precisely to discussing the editorial work of "Philosophical Thought." Kokoszyńska and Kotarbinski, who attended the meeting, accused magazine, that on the occasion of discussing about the Lviv-Warsaw school, many misrepresentations were made, and the offensive tone and disparagement of the person of the opponent was not avoided. In their opinion, Twardowski was supposed renounce the views he initially proclaimed. They also emphasized his merits as an educator and social activist. In summing up the discussion, A. Schaff, however, concluded that any attempt to oppose the pedagogical and social activities of the founder of the Twardowski school, to his idealist philosophical views, is completely without basis. On the contrary, Twardowski's activities *in other sections were in full accord with backward philosophical views*⁴⁷.

The letter by Kotarbinski replying to article by Holland about Twardowski was also revisited at a joint meeting of the staff of the Department of Dialectical and Historical Materialism and the Department of History of Philosophy of the IKKN on January 29, 1953. A. Schaff, referring to the discussion that was provoked by some formulations of Holland's in text dedicated to Twardowski, noted: that *it is not permissible for aspirations of one kind or another to allow the center of interest in a just, winning cause to be shifted from substantial to personal quarrels*⁴⁸.

Despite this peculiar reprimand, the tone and applied to the Lviv-Warsaw's school's arguments have not changed.

Generally speaking, the authors of publications taking part in the ideological battle against non-Marxist currents in philosophy, while recognizing certain differences in the way science was practiced, and in the issues taken up by individual scholars, nevertheless emphasized the clear ideological unity of the Lviv-Warsaw School. The direction that was supposed to unite the systems of its individual representatives was idealistic semantics, and conventionalism, most evident in the philosophy of Ajdukiewicz. Thus, against the representatives of the school, the accusation of succumbing to subjective idealism was generally made.

Note that in addition to philosophers and sociologists, some psychologists - Twardowski's disciples - also became the object of attack during this period. In the name of cleansing Polish psychology of the remnants of the "bourgeois way of thinking," the theories of Władysław Witwicki, Stefan Bałey, Mieczysław Kreutz, among others, were criticized. They were mainly accused of biologism, indeterminism, and the entire psychology was described as bourgeois, idealistic⁴⁹.

⁴⁷ "Philosophical Thought" 1953, no. 1 (7), p. 354.

⁴⁸ Party School Archives. 5/107, s. 5.

⁴⁹ M. in: R. Radwiłowicz: *W. Witwicki's psychology in the service of bourgeois ideology*. "Nowa Szkoła" vol. 5, 1954, no. 5.; J. Ekel, I. Kurczówna, R. Radwiłowicz, J. Reykowski: *Critical analysis of views on personality in Polish psychology of the interwar period*. "Studia Pedagogiczne" vol. 1, 1954; S. Kowalski: *Outline of personality in the light of Marxist psychology*. Wrocław 1956. The firmly established opinion of the nature of the Lviv-Warsaw school can also be seen from a paper published in Kyiv in 1978

M. N. Vernikova: *Metodologičeskij analiz krizisa filozofskovo idealizma. Na materialach polskoj filosofii konca XIX-pervoj tret i XX veka*.

In the face of this peculiar "reprimand", the circle of hard-liners made attempts to preserve the achievements of K. Twardowski and cultivate the memory of the "master". A special role was played here by Izydora Dąmbska and Halina Śloniewska. It was mainly on their initiative that a private gathering of several of Twardowski's former students was convened in Wrocław on February 10-11, 1952, at which his merits were recalled⁵⁰.

A similar meeting, albeit in a slightly more modest group, was also held in Breslau in February 1953. *"I can't tell you,"* wrote I. Dąmbska to E. Jarzębińska in a letter dated February 28, 1953, *"how I am tormented by our silence and powerlessness. It seems to me that the extent to which any of us is working today: at school, in the library, at the University, or elsewhere has no bearing on the matter of our attitude to Him: the students to the Teacher.(...) There was only Professor Czeżowski, as there was last year, myself and the two house ladies. Apart from a rather sterile dispute: whether to remain silent (this is Czeżowski's opinion) or somehow try to react to Mr. Holland's lampoon - nothing was discussed. There is supposedly to be some more discussion about the Professor at the Warsaw "Philosophical" Institute under the direction of Mr. Schaff. From the students there will be only Ajdukiewicz, Kotarbinski well and Kokoszyńska. I am afraid, therefore, that Professor will not have such spokesmen there as needed"*⁵¹.

The year 1953 marks the end of an essentially open campaign waged against the Lviv school in philosophical journals. The gaining of dominant positions by Marxists, but also certain changes in state policy towards science that took place after the death of J. Stalin and especially after the second congress of the Polish United Workers' Party (March 1954) resulted in a greater openness towards representatives of the Lviv-Warsaw school. This was especially evident at conferences of logicians, to which hardliners were also invited.

For example, on September 15-16, 1954, the Logic Section of the Philosophy Committee of the Polish Academy of Sciences held a conference of logicians in Warsaw devoted to establishing a plan for logical research for the years 1955-1957. Participants in the deliberations included Kotarbinski, Ajdukiewicz, Kokoszyńska, Seweryna Romahnov. The research was programmed under the chief motto of "purifying logic from the elements of idealism and linking it more closely with the detailed sciences." It is interesting to note that the spread of logical culture (including in schools) was considered a condition for the upbringing of the new man, who, standing on the ground of a scientific view of the world, is able to work effectively in any situation for the good of the working masses⁵².

In the first issue of 1955, "Philosophical Thought" inaugurates discussions on the program of didactics of logic in colleges. Kotarbinski and Ajdukiewicz, among others, speak on the subject. Much space is devoted to logic at the meetings of the Philosophical Committee of the Polish Academy of Sciences, in which hard-liners also participated. Through the efforts of the community of logicians, at the end of 1953 the first volume of "Studia Logica", published by the Philosophical Committee of the Polish Academy of Sciences, came out. They print in "Studies" of K. Ajdukiewicz, T. Kotarbinski, Jerzy Slupecki, M. Kokoszyńska, A. Mostowski, S. Luszczewska-Romahnowa.

⁵⁰ Papers of H. Śloniewska. Library of IFiS PAN Warsaw.

⁵¹ Archive I. Dabbskaya.

^{52nd} National Conference of Logicians in Warsaw. "Philosophical Thought" 1954, no. 4 (14), pp. 339.

In the late 1950s, professors who were once removed from the classroom return to their chairs. Philosophical journals resume their activities: "Ruch Filozoficzny" (from 1958), "Studia Filozoficzne" (from 1957). In 1957, the first volume of "Archive of the History of Philosophy and Social Thought" comes out, published by the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, which was established by a resolution of the Presidium of the Government on October 17, 1956.

Still in the 1956 collective work entitled *Ten Patches of Development of Science in People's Poland*, A. Schaff, discussing the situation in the philosophical sciences, concluded that Marxism had now become the dominant trend. The Ivano-Warsaw School receded into the background. However, other dangers have emerged forcefully. According to Schaff, the excessive concentration of attention on the Lviv-Warsaw School caused us, as Marxists: *to make two mistakes: first, we neglected to fight against a much more dangerous opponent, Catholic philosophy, social democracy, nationalism, which has a wide range of influence; second, we neglected to criticize the influential directions of bourgeois philosophy, which today effectively serve the capitalist base* (p. 97). Finally, the participants in the campaign against the Lviv-Warsaw school themselves are beginning to be critical of the theses they proclaim and the ideological phraseology used in the struggle.

This was the case, for example, with B. Baczek, who, although from Marxist positions, referred critically, in a scathing text, to some negative phenomena in Marxist philosophy. He considered the style of practicing Marxism to be apologetic, schematic and dogmatic. It was also a mistake, according to Baczek, *to absolutize the thesis of Marxism as a breakthrough in philosophy*⁵³.

A. Schaff, summing up his former objections to conventionalism and neo-positivism, stated in his work *Introduction to Semantics* (Warsaw 1960) that *on principle points I fully maintain my once-proclaimed critical views on the directions of interest here and treat them as a supplement to present considerations* (p. 89). At the same time, he renounced the nihilistic character of this criticism and recognized that Marxism cannot pass indifferently over the problems of semantics.

H. Eilstein, in a dissertation entitled *Contribution to the Concept of Matter as a Physical Being*, emphasized the convergence of Kotarbinski's materialist realism with the thesis of Marxism proclaiming that the only objective entity is matter. She also suggested the possibility of incorporating certain theses of materialist realism into the Marxist conception of matter⁵⁴.

Also L. Kołakowski admitted after many years that: *For some time, Marxist philosophers were mainly concerned with combating the non-Marxist tradition in Polish philosophical culture. The main object of attack was the Polish school of analytic philosophy, the so-called Lviv-Warsaw school (Kotarbinski, Ajdukiewicz, Ossowski, Ossowska and others. (...)) Many Marxists of the older and younger generations took part in these battles (Adam Schaff, Bronisław Baczek, Tadeusz Kroński, Helena Eilstein, Władysław Krajewski; they were also attended by the writer of this one, who does not consider this activity of his to be something to be proud of*⁵⁵.

⁵³ B. Baczek: *On the style of philosophizing*. "Philosophical Thought" 1956, no. 4 (24), pp. 3-28.

⁵⁴ In *The material unity of the saint*. Warsaw 1961. p. 89.

⁵⁵ L. Kołakowski: *The main currents of Marxism. Rise - development - decay*. Paris 1978, vol. 3, p. 179.

The material presented above proves conclusively at whom the blade of the ideological campaign in philosophy of the late 1940s and early 1950s was mainly aimed. It can be thought that Marxists felt particularly threatened precisely by representatives of the Lviv-Warsaw school, because of the place and role they occupied in science.

This is where the Marxists' statements took on accents that were unacceptable in scientific criticism. This criticism was characterized by harassing terminology, often barefaced accusations and ethicizing. In the absence of substantive argumentation, victory over the adversary proved apparent.

Those criticized, while defending themselves, accepted some of the criticism without wanting to intensify the conflict. There are even some nods to the Marxists, however, either overlooked or considered insufficient. It must also be admitted that the representatives of the Lviv-Warsaw School tried to assimilate the terminology used by Marxists. However, this did not mean abandoning the principles of scientific thinking that the "hardliners" prided themselves on.

However, the consequence of the campaign against Marxist orientations in philosophy was not only the expulsion of representatives of the Lviv-Warsaw School from some of the chairs of philosophy, logic or psychology, and their replacement by Marxists. It also forced Marxists themselves to address issues hitherto overlooked or neglected, such as semantics and logic in general, and the relationship of philosophy to the mathematical-natural sciences. Indirectly, therefore, the result of these discussions was to raise the level of philosophical education of some Marxist circles. This was eventually admitted by those who confronted the Lviv-Warsaw school.