The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science

Editor
Imre Lakatos

Department of Philosophy, Logic and Scientific Method
The London School of Economics
(University of London)
Aldwych, London WC2A 2AE
England

1 February 1972

Dear Joske,

Thank you very much for your 'Genius in Science'. I enjoyed reading it very much although I have to confess that your Feyerabendian ending (a sermon for epistemological anarchism) surprised me. I am afraid again I am unable to publish your paper because of a negative Rylean reason. Of course, you don't understand what a negative Rylean reason is. Let me explain. I submitted 'Proofs and Refutations' in 1962 to Mind. Ryle replied that he read pp. 30-33 of my paper and found it so interesting that had he not had a headache he would have gone on. On the other hand, having seen the enormous number of footnotes he anyway had to make up his mind pragmatically that it would be unpublishable. Now my negative Rylean reason is that I cannot possibly publish a paper without one single footnote. Moreover I marked in my copy about 23 sources which all would require footnote references. Do you realise that I just got a research grant for three full-time assistants to search for Boyle's Law in Boyle? Incidentally, where does Kuhn tell us of sleepless nights? Where does he hint that the rebel is quite a genius? Where does Polanyi disapprovingly quote Russell that there is no authority in matters scientific? Also, in an established journal one expects to demarcate sharply what is (available background knowledge and what is) novelty and conferred by the paper. Incidentally, the paper is unpublishable already on the sole ground that the word 'Popper' does not occur in it. I read it through four times because I thought I must have missed it, but no, the word does not occur. But surely his demarcation between activist and passivist epistemologies is crucial for your argument.

Anyway Polanyi's paper was published a couple of weeks ago in the recent number of Encounter and since they do not insist on footnotes I am sure that they will be delighted to publish your paper and even pay you for it.

I hope you realise that where my letter sounds arrogant it is only despairing since I would like nothing better than to finally publish a paper from you in the BJPS without, however, giving up my bloody editorial doctrines. Not that I can keep consistently to them; in the February issue I am publishing two papers against my principles but I have vowed never to do so again or resign. I shall probably opt very soon for the latter since if I consistently stick to my principles I cannot fill this bloody journal.

.../

Incidentally, you probably heard that I had an accident in July helping Marjorie Grene into a taxi. I hit my head against a sharp edge and it hurt. Three weeks later it was diagnosed as a brain concussion and three months later when it got much worse as damage to some of my cervical vertebrae, and now I have to wear a cervical collar, take strong drugs and I haven't done anything else for six months but reject papers. I am on sick leave from the LSE and I last lectured last March.

You probably know that Mary Hesse was elected to the British Academy and John Watkins was voted down. Otherwise there is no news.

Yours ever,

Imre