

September 17, 1957

Dear Professor Popper:

Thank you very much for your kind letter of August 14th, in relation to quotations from The Open Society in my Causality.

The Open Society has been wonderfully translated into Spanish. I do not think many books have had the luck of yours in this respect. Only a few misinterpretations of technical terms can be found here and there, but save in one case (in one of the notes) they are not essential. All in all, it is the best translation of a scientific or philosophic book that I have seen for several years. (I should add that I am not acquainted with the translator.)

I knew that the Logik der Forschung was in the press, and I am eager to see it at last. (I ordered it unsuccessfully many times.) Some of its theses I know, of course, mainly through Wisdom's writings. Moreover, Popper's principle of refutability has been discussed in detail in my course on the philosophy of science; every one of my students has written a paper on the question whether the search for unfavourable instances is as important as the search for favourable ones. Most of them have been convinced, but a few stubborn ones still believe that verification just consists in amassing instances.

Three days ago I raised the question in the bimonthly colloquium of the Agrupación Rioplatense de Lógica y Filosofía Científica I recalled your principle - not too well known

September 17, 1951

Dear Professor Popper:

Thank you very much for your kind letter of August 17th to my society to answer some from the Dear Society in the Can-
ada.

The Dear Society was per-
mitted to translate it into English. I do not
think many people have had time to come to this issue. Only a few minutes before the press, but
perhaps it can be found here and there (in one case it is one of the best pieces of science-
writing I have seen). All in all it is the best piece of science-
writing of a scientific or philosophical book first
written by a scientist (I should say this
I have seen for several years). I am not satisfied with the translation.

I will first the logic of

Popper's was in the press, and I am eager to
see if it is just. (I ordered it immediately
many times). Some of it is press I know of course,
mainly through Miyamoto & Miyazaki. Moreover, Popper,
but incapable of left-wing politics was never dissociated from
leftism in his course on the philosophy of science;
never one of the students was better on
the question whether the search for material cause
is as important as the search for laws.
In fact he seems to me more concerned with
a few abstract ones still believe first revolution
just contains no丝毫 influence.

This gave me the
impression in the philosophy of science of the
position Röder's as follows: a thesis & thesis's
I classify your principle - not too many I know
that contains no丝毫 influence.

And again
82644
Co 286-1

Fri 9/19/51
Folio F.N.G.B.

Dear Friends 1951
Dawn

among us - and asked whether it should also be required of every philosophical hypothesis. In my opinion this is not the case: there are principles of scientific philosophy, such as the principle of lawfulness (legality), which are irrefutable though confirmable. (One can always change the law statements so that they be made to fit the facts, so that no failure of a given law statement can be regarded to refute the hypothesis that every single fact occurs according to laws.) In short, in my opinion philosophic principles should be regarded as verifiable hypotheses, but some of them may be as irrefutable (hence unscientific) as theological dogmas. I should be greatly honoured to hear your comment on this problem.

On the other hand, I must say in all fairness that I do not share many of your points in The Open Society. In my Causality I only deal with two of them: your ideas on causality, and your thesis about history as a non-generalizing science; I quarrel with both. This may give the inaccurate and unfortunate impression that I disagree with the whole book; but there will be plenty of occasions to show my agreements with most of your theses on methodology.

1955, at

By the way, I would like to tell how how I came across your Open Society: I saw it for the first time in the Lincoln Library, of the USA Information Service, in Santiago, Chile. I found it so important that I could not help swallowing it in a few days; I immediately quoted it in a course I was delivering at the Universidad de Chile (at that time I was not in the Buenos Aires University owing to Perón). And I wrote to several historians friends saying this was the greatest challenge historicism ever received; particularly, I told a few Marxists here and in the USA that they had better studying

some air has been taken off the ground so far -
 during the time of every biological laboratory. In the
 opinion first at the top of the class: there are biologicals
 of scientific biology, such as the biology of
 mammals (zoology), which are relatively simple
 examples. (One can study a range of the same
 matter so that they can be made to fit the scope, so that
 one is limited in a given law statement can be used
 to reflect the properties of every single fact
 occurs according to law). In addition,
 biological properties should be used as well
 - types of properties, but some of them may be
 simple (hence mechanics) as biological ones. I
 should be greatly honored to meet your comment on
 this paper.

On the other hand, I want you to tell
 me what I do not expect much of your coming to
 the Open Society. In the class I only ask
 you to know about some of our society; I am
 also interested in our non-governmental society; I
 am sorry about myself. This may give the impression that
 majority of people I discuss with you
 would speak but rarely of associations or
 groups in the same way with most of your friends on
 the other side.

At the USA, I would like to tell you
 how I came across your Open Society: I was at the
 time first time to the International Library of the USA
 International Service, in Santiago, Chile. I found
 it important that I could not find anything
 a few days; I immediately dropped in to see
 what was happening; I was surprised to find
 that there were a few books on the shelves
 about the United Nations. At this time I was
 told I was not the only person who had
 come to the library. A man from the
 University of Peru. And I thought
 that he had better go to the International Library. I told a few
 words, received; I left a few minutes
 later and in the USA part they had already

MARIO BUNGE

your book, trying to understand it before attempting to take it to pieces. But events may have been more effective, in destroying many of the dogmas of historicism, than ideas: and this is, of course, in support of the main hypothesis of historicism, which in my opinion deserves being renewed but not thrown away.

Hoping that you will forgive me for this somewhat long letter, I am

yours very truly ,

your poor trying to understand it before assembling
to take it to pieces. But always make your work
descriptive in describing work of the goods or material
which you have: and this is of course to support
the main body of material which is the
obligation of the manufacturer not towards us.

Hoping you will forgive me for
writing long letter I am

Yours very truly

Aug 24
82644
Q286-3

Folio 8 N.C.B.

Dec 24 1874