

December 1st, 1959

Prof. Dr. Karl R. Popper
Fallowfield, Manor Road, Penn, Buckinghamshire

Dear Professor Popper:

Thank you very much for your letter of November 10 and for your photograph, which came just in time: tomorrow we shall perform the ceremony of inauguration, which includes the uncovering of 3 photos: Russell's, Einstein's, and Popper's.

The conditions you establish for rotaprinting part of your Logic of Scientific Discovery will be respected: (1) I will send you a copy of the translation as soon as it is ready, and you will put it at the disposal of a publisher or translator of the book; (2) the stencils and the remaining copies will be destroyed in case the book is published in Spanish.

I am very sorry to hear that the Spanish translation of your Poverty of Historicism (which I never saw) will be published in Spain; it ought to have been published elsewhere, say in Mexico - but, of course, this is not your fault. I suspect that the publishers were more interested in its use (in Spain) as a piece of anti-Communist propaganda than in its intrinsic scientific and philosophic merits. It must be both flattering and terrifying to realize that in the present world every single word one utters may be used.

Some days ago I sent you by surface mail a copy of Ciencia e Investigación containing a review of ISci.D. Unfortunately, several misprints and a mistake smuggled in it. However, I hear that it has aroused interest in the book. By the way, several sections of your book were discussed so many times in my course and in my seminar this year, that you have become quite popular among my students; one of them (the translator) is such an

enthusiast
-APS

December 1st, 1959

Prof. Dr. Karl R. Popper
Fallowfield, Manor Road, Penn, Buckinghamshire

Dear Professor Popper:

Thank you very much for your letter of November 10 and for your photograph, which came just in time: tomorrow we shall perform the ceremony of inauguration, which includes the uncovering of 3 photos: Russell's, Einstein's, and Popper's.

The conditions you establish for reprinting part of your Logic of Scientific Discovery will be respected: (1) I will send you a copy of the translation as soon as it is ready, and you will put it at the disposal of a publisher or translator or the book; (2) the translation and the remaining copies will be destroyed in case the book is published in Spanish.

I am very sorry to hear that the Spanish translation of your Logic of Historicism (which I never saw) will be published in Spain; it ought to have been published elsewhere, say in Mexico - but, of course, this is not your fault. I suspect that the publishers were more interested in its use (in Spain) as a piece of anti-Communist propaganda than in its intrinsic scientific and philosophic merits. It must be both flattering and terrifying to realize that in the present world every single word one utters may be used.

Some days ago I sent you by surface mail a copy of Genesis e Investigacion containing a review of Log. D. Unfortunately, several misprints and a mistake smuggled in it. However, I hear that it has aroused interest in the book. By the way, several sections of your book were discussed so many times in my course and in my seminar this year, that you have become quite popular among my students; one of them (the translator) is such an

2nd 826524 no
Cb 294-1

UNIVERSIDAD DE BUENOS AIRES
FACULTAD DE FILOSOFÍA Y LETRAS

//

that we call him Popper (his name is Pozzi).

It would be wonderful if you could come here in a program of chained visits of members of the London School of Economics and Social Science.

Have you seen the collective volume issued by S. Hook, Psychoanalysis, Scientific Method, and Philosophy (N.Y.: N.Y. University Press, 1959, \$5)? It contains at least 3 good papers, by Nagel, Hook, and Scriven. Nagel rightly insists that psychoanalysis does not comply with the requisite of refutability - but, strangely enough, he does not mention you. You are mentioned, on the other hand, by a defender of psychoanalysis, who may have confused refutability with actual refutation as a criterion of demarcation between science and non-science.

With best wishes for the new year, I am

sincerely yours,

Mario Bunge

5738
5-475

//

that we call him Popper (his name is Poppi).

It would be wonderful if you could come here in a program of chained

visits of members of the London School of Economics and Social Science.

Have you seen the collective volume issued by S. Hook, Psychoanalytically-

Scientific Method and Philosophy (N.Y.: N.Y. University Press, 1959,

?) It contains at least 3 good papers, by Nagel, Hook, and Scriven. Na-

gel rightly insists that psychoanalysis does not comply with the requisite

of refutability - but, strangely enough, he does not mention you. You are

mentioned, on the other hand, by a defender of psychoanalysis, who may

have confused refutability with actual refutation as a criterion of demar-

cation between science and non-science.

With best wishes for the new year, I am

sincerely yours,

Mario Bunge

ms 82652
Co 294-2