

Fallowfield,
Manor Road,
Peru, Buckinghamshire,
January 23rd, 1961.

Dear Mario,

I have read your article 'The
Place of Induction in Science' today: I
was very unwell, and had pains (owing
to two 'slipped disks') when inclining my
head for reading or writing. I still
have pains - for example, as a conse-
quence of writing this letter - but
it is a little better.

(At this stage ^{of writing} my pains got so bad
that I decided to continue by dictating
to Hennie.)

Yours ever,
Karl.

Albany, N.Y.
January 23rd, 1941

Dear Mr. ...

I have just received your letter of the 21st and am glad to hear that you are interested in the ...

... of the ...

... and I am sure you will find it of interest.

I am sure you will find it of interest.

I am sure you will find it of interest.

I am sure you will find it of interest.

I am sure you will find it of interest.

I am sure you will find it of interest.

I am sure you will find it of interest.

I am sure you will find it of interest.

I am sure you will find it of interest.

Now I come to your paper on "The Place of Induction in Science". First let me say where I feel that I can agree with you. In section 22 of my L. of Sc. D., in fact, in the last sentence of this section, I formulated a position which I think is correct but which needs elaboration and it may be that the elaboration would be somewhat on the lines of your article. I suppose a glance at this section will make it clear to you what I mean;

I can further agree that, as a historical and genetic psychological fact, something like induction may play a rôle, somewhat in the way you describe, in our arriving at low order hypotheses; just as intuition, or the "grinking" of black coffee, may play a causal rôle in this process. However, I doubt very much whether a deeper analysis of the historical and psychological processes involved will not show that even the causal rôle of induction is extremely small, and that in almost all cases we proceed in a different way (compare my "Personal Report" - have you got it? pp. 166-181, and especially 169f., and 175f). I have gone into this matter fairly deeply, and have at times lectured about it at great length. But I don't think I have published more than these remarks in the Personal Report about the psychological aspect.

As to the question of induction in the sense of validation or justification, I do not see exactly where our differences lie (apart from the fact that some of your suggestions may perhaps provide an acceptable amendment ~~xxxx~~ to, or improvement of, my section 22). I am clear that your article is very condensed, but as a consequence there are a few points in which I am not clear as to your position. This is especially due to the fact that you don't even mention corroboration (incidentally, you describe, top of p. 268, the term "confirmation" as "the pass word of inductivism". This is puzzling in view of my footnote in the L. of Sc. D., p. 251-52, from which you will see that it was originally, and especially in Carnap's "Testability and Meaning" simply a translation of my deductivist term "Bewährung"). How good would it be to be able to have a really thorough discussion of all these matters.

Many thanks and love to you and Martha,

Yours ever

Karl.

Dear Professor Bunge,

Did you get the offprints you asked for (and also the snapshot)? The newly typed and corrected version of "What is Dialectic?" will be ready in a few days, and I shall then send it at once.

Hennie Popper.

DW 82659

Co 301-2