My dear Mr. Whithead,

It was kind of you to bother to write about my review. I got an immense amount of stimulation and help from reading the book, as well as from your other writings— as far as my marked limitations in mathematics permit— and am only sorry I couldn't convey the matter more adequately.

I have learned, in spite of my limitations, a great deal from your previous writings, and I should have acknowledged them definitely in my experience. and "nature were it not that— aside from not finding it appropriate to go into that matter at all in that book— I find it so hard to tell just where the convergencies exist and when and far the divergencies begin, that any such statement might mislead readers as to our views as not as to mine. If I may venture a word as to where I fancy the divergence chiefly starts from, it is that I do not find in your writings any account of thought existentially considered; that is, of thinking. If I take it you would certainly deny bifurcation here as well as well as with regard to sense. I cannot get rid of the feeling that if you developed the implications of a denial of bifurcation with respect to thinking— as you have done with respect to sense, your "eternal objects" would get a different meaning to what appears to be their meaning as now presented. With a certain change in that respect, carried out into the ramifying implications of the doctrine, I should gladly follow you, as far as I am able to follow in understanding.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature: John Dewey]
To Alfred North Whitehead
504 Radnor Hall
Chalk, Reiss Road
Cambridge, Mass.