

A REJOINDER

BY NICHOLAS GEORGESCU-ROEGEN

MR. BERNARD'S new strictures on my paper prompt me to make the following observations:

1. Neither in my Remark 2, nor in any other place, do I indulge in a "rather intuitive passage to the limit," whatever this may mean. I use only the concept of limit as defined in mathematics, i.e., as *an operation over a variable*. This, in fact, constitutes the basis of my rebuttal of Mr. Bernard's explanation of how dialectical double counting can be derived from a tautological relation: if in his relation (14) one makes $\mu = 1$ (following Marx, to be sure), then there is no variable left to which the operation of limit can apply. This reminder of what "limit" means pertains also to Mr. Bernard's "simpler reasonings" for my theorems as well as to the view that taking the limit is only "*une commodité de notation*."

2. My distinction between dialectics and analysis refers to the Hegelian concepts of these two approaches; in my answer I quoted a passage from Hegel which is vital in this respect. A great deal more than a mere assertion is needed for proving that this distinction is "fallacious." Perhaps, Mr. Bernard in making this assertion has in mind other concepts than the Hegelian ones; but time and again he fails to give us any information about them.

3. This time Mr. Bernard no longer challenges my conclusions: on the contrary, he says that they are also his. He only claims that my way of reaching them is erroneous. The primary source of the difference between us is thus brought to the surface. As I have already explained, my argument follows the econometric pattern, just as Sweezy's. In contrast with this, Mr. Bernard only in some isolated instances explains to what specific model his remarks apply. An epitome of his pattern of argument is supplied by the remarks under (c) where he connects my Remark 2 to Theorem 4 in disregard of the fact that the two propositions do not apply to the same system: in one $l < 0$, in the other $l > 0$.

The method followed by Mr. Bernard makes it impossible to find out the precise sense of many of his remarks—especially, those under (b) and (e). Consequently I cannot discuss them. Obviously, the controversy derives mainly from the opposition between our methods. And to borrow one of Mr. Bernard's phrases, "*ce n'est pas la première fois que cela arrive*."

Vanderbilt University
(*Pro tempore: Hitotsubashi University*)