

1990.11.20

Professor Hector J Sussmann
Department of Mathematics
Rutgers University

Dear Hector:

Thanks for yours of the 21st.

I greatly appreciate your frankness and I understand your position. However, as you might have guessed, I too have grounds for indicting Hawkins and mainstream economics, though I had no room in that particular paper for expounding those grounds. But I agree that, without seeing such arguments, my position looks dogmatic.

If interested, you may see my reasons for rejecting Dawkins's views in Vol. 7, Part II, , p. 37 of my *Treatise on Basic Philosophy*. As for mainstream economics, see op. cit., pp. 178-193, and p. 28-294. Also, my book *Economía y filosofía*, 2nd ed (Madrid: Tecnos, 1985), which has a long Preface by Raul Prebisch, the father of CEPAL.

Most evolutionary biologists reject Dawkins' views for being inconsistent with evolutionary biology, according to which whole organisms (and even better entire biopopulations), not individual genes, or even genomes, are the units of evolution.

As you know, many good economists (among others Robinson, Leontief, Kaldor, Galbraith, Perroux, and Thurow) are just as highly critical of mainstream economics as of Marxist economics. Among other reasons because it postulates that the market is self-regulating (Adams Smith's famous "invisible hand"), which is blatantly false in view of unemployment, inflation, and

1945

1946

1947

1948

1949

1950

1951

1952

1953

1954

1955

1956

1957

1958

1959

1960

1961

1962

1963

1964

1965

1966

1967

1968

1969

1970

1971

1972

1973

1974

1975

1976

1977

1978

1979

1980

1981

1982

1983

1984

1985

1986

1987

1988

1989

1990

1991

1992

1993

1994

1995

1996

1997

1998

1999

2000

2001

2002

2003

2004

2005

2006

2007

2008

2009

2010

2011

2012

2013

2014

2015

2016

2017

2018

2019

2020

2021

2022

2023

2024

2025

subsidies and regulations of all kinds, without which the economy would be in even worse shape.

But of course I agree completely with you that the epithet 'pseudoscientific' should not be applied irresponsibly. One should indeed study the ideas one defends or criticizes. And one should do so in the light of definite criteria of scientificity.

Thanks again for having considered joining in the fray, and for having refrained from doing so out of personal consideration.

Cordially

Mario Bunge

