

Fallowfield, Manor Rd,
PENN, Buckinghamshire
England

January 22nd 1966

My dear Mario,

Your letter of January 18th was a great joy for me, because of your understanding, agreement, and, especially, your excellent criticism.

I think that you are right in all three points of your criticisms; let me, nevertheless, comment on them.

(1) You must understand the problem-situation: I was, at the time of the Logik der Folgerung (1934) a ^(highly) critical Misesian. ^{Richard von} Mises was still alive when I turned to propinquity; and these papers may be said, almost, to be addressed to him (or to my former self).

Now I found that the propinquity interpretation could be used as an interpretation of Mises's mathematics; but, ^{also} that it fitted better ^{as an interpretation of} the set-theoretic approach — precisely for the reason given by yourself in your point (3), and also for the reasons explained in the new Appendices *IV to *VIII of L. Sc. D. Actually, the formal system expounded in *IV-V can be interpreted set-theoretically, & Mises-way, & ~~the~~ propinquity way; but the Mises' interpretation is a bit too narrow for the propinquity.

You will see that I use the word interpretation in a kind of relativistic sense: to apply to the step from a formal system to its mathematical interpretation, but also from the latter to ~~the~~ physical interpretation(s).

(2) Yes, of course, I am not a subjectivist! Things-in-situations is excellent! I should even say: things-in-problem-situations, where 'problem' refers not to our subjective interest, but to the objective interest that depends on our (objective) theories and the 'things' which these theories make interesting or problematic.

(3) I have answered this under (1).

You see, though replying to your criticism, I accept it completely.

If you want the copy you returned for keeping it, you can have it: there will be few to make better use of it.

I should like to know your opinion on quite a few points of my L.Sc.D.; but don't bother if you have not enough time. I mean, especially, Chapter IX on Quantum Theory (less the ~~experiment~~ of section 77 which is mistaken), and the new appendices *III to VIII, and, especially, *XI.

Many thanks again for your letter,
Yours ever

Karl

P.S. If you want to refer to any point of this letter - I have a carbon copy. Also, you are (though I don't expect you will want to) free to refer to it in your book.