

13.3.84

Dear Joske,

well, I am one ahead of you, I have a typewriter, even one of these modern electronic babies, and I ~~have~~ learned how to type when I was 15, but only with two fingers. But I am faster with 2 fingers than others are with 10.

Thank you for your good wishes. I hope they will come true. I especially hope your wishes for happiness will come true for Grazia.

I am sorry you did not like what you call A - I have forgotten my own lettering, I don't keep copies of letters (of any letters) but I think I know what you are referring to. Of course I accept your editorial judgement. I am a little disturbed that there is so much religious fervour behind it - it almost sounds as if this is not a matter of taste ('not our cup of tea') but of good versus evil but, maybe, I read too much into your comments. And I am curious as to what it is that disturbed you so. I don't remember our discussions about the Busoni stuff, but I read A again and it seems perfectly alright to me. Not as 'scholarly' and constipated as my Aristotle essay * or my essay on Mach, but not incorrect (as is most of Popper's 'Three views' which seems to me to be in the same category, though less witty) and clear and straightforward. You always come back to my 'good life' essay which to me now seems an incoherent piece of garbage (form, not content). Well, I won't find out in a letter. But I am curious.

There is another things which does not make be curious but disturbs me *Somewhat.*

~~.....~~. You call B and C orthodox Popperian. Now this can mean (I) that B and C contain ideas and ways of arguing which are also found in Popper or, (II) that these ideas have not only been used by Popper, but have also been introduced by him. (I) is certainly false: I don't think Popper would support the idea that in a democracy the ultimate judgement about truth and falsehood lies in the hands of democratic councils and NOT in the hands of scientists, philosophers and other specialists. But (II) is also false: all the ideas and procedures I use in B and C are found either in Mill, or, if you want to become more specific, in Mach and they are found there in a better form and combined with a better philosophy than in Popper. To see my opinion on these matters read the marked passage on the enclosed two pages which I wrote as part of a short essay for a journal called NEW IDEAS IN PSYCHOLOGY. In a few words: Popper steals AND MUTILATES what he has stolen. I would not mind the theft - lots of ideas have been around for quite some time, but I do mind the mutilation. ~~And this is why I would not like to give the slightest aid to the mutilators.~~

Now it seems that Popperians will read B and C as Popperian arguments and will feel that Popperianism is strengthened thereby. This is why I withdraw B and C and bow out of the whole affair. Sorry about that. I am not against Popper - but I certainly am not going to support the Popperian mania, neither directly, nor indirectly.

OK. I hope we shall one fine day be able to discuss this whole matter somewhere over a glass of wine. In the meantime - all the best to you and to Judith from

Invented

I do

** or what he writes
about Bohr*

tend other more interesting matters

Dear Joske,

I just returned from a conference on Crete, topic: myth. I did not go because I had anything to say or because I like conferences - as a matter of fact that last conference I attended, again in Greece (and in honor of Imre Lakatos) was exactly 10 years ago. I went because they offered to satisfy my "most extravagant wishes" and because they did satisfy them - they gave me two tickets, one for Grazia, one for me and put us up right at the ocean, in a beautiful little chalet. At the conference I heard one thing I liked - it was a Sufi saying "beyond Truth and falsehood there is a meadow - let us meet ~~us~~ there". That saying I really liked. On returning home I found your letter and I marvelled at how different we are. Still, we once had some good times together, in Alpbach, in London and so there must be some point of contact somewhere. Only it apparently can't be in the intellectual field. Here the difference arises even in minor things. You, for example, demand that I read some papers of yours which deal with the topic I made some snide remarks about. I would never do such a thing. On the whole I don't even remember what papers I wrote and about what things. If somebody asks me something for the tenth time and I have written about it I do not say 'read my paper' or 'why don't you remember what I said a week ago' - I repeat my explanation because I permit people to be lazy, or forgetful and because I don't mind and mainly because I don't put such weight on the first instance of my having produced an account of some matter. So, alas, I shall not go back to your published work because I don't read this kind of stuff any more and because I go about things in my own way. Don't regard this as a criticism, it is just a statement of difference to facilitate future (non-rational) encounters. You say I vilify Popper. I am sorry about that, but I have a big mouth and occasionally it runs away with me. Besides I don't think I am as crude as Popper is in his criticism of Hegel and I am also more accurate (footnotes galore could be given, if needed). Most importantly, however, I regard (this is now a personal opinion of mine) all this philosophy-cum-rationalism business as a case of AIDS - a weakening of the intellectual immune system of nice people so that they fall sick and cease to be human^x. About this I feel very strongly. The situation becomes even more vicious when one is permitted to be 'critical' for then the defences really are down. Never mind. I can't do anything against it, I am too lazy to do anything against it, I don't know if anyone could do anything against it, even if (s)he tried so I just talk with a few friends and when I give my lectures I give a picture-show as it were: these are the views that exist, this is how they started, how they became influential, what their effect was, here and there, always as concrete as possible and if people ask me 'which view should we choose' I say 'that is your business' and if they ask me which view I choose I say 'that is my private business' - and that is that. Today I have a cold and I am tired and lonely because Grazia is still in Crete and I am back in Zuerich to give my lecture. All the best and, remember "beyond truth and falsehood there is a meadow - let's meet there"

Pam

Whenever I hear the word
truth I feel ~~violence~~
that violence is done