these scholars know well their limitations. Rather, it is others who foist the role of truth-producers upon them. The best users of mathematics can always move to a related field and do their research; it is the hordes of practitioners with lesser abilities who feel it essential to insist upon the value of mathematical methods.

I have argued that the criticisms expressed by Georgescu-Roegen are substantially true, but that it is hopeless to expect the profession to change unless some institutional changes are made. What should these be? Perhaps there should be less emphasis on publication, perhaps junior faculty should be given five-year initial contracts so that they have enough time to produce significant publications, perhaps it should be required that senior faculty spend more time guiding, and perhaps collaborating with, junior faculty. I do not know the answer.

Salim Rashid

The author is Assistant Professor of Economics, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.

Note

1. Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen, "Methods in Economic Science," *Journal of Economic Issues* 13 (June 1979): 317–28.

Methods in Economic Science: A Rejoinder

In his Comment, Salim Rashid touches many issues, rather in an amalgam fashion, ranging from my being "unfair" to T. C. Koopmans to the present predicament of the academic economist faced with the "publish or perish" rule.

To begin with, Rashid claims that my objection to mathematical exercises based on the assumption that traders (three-dimensional objects!) form a set having a power equal to or greater than the arithmetical continuum is "questionable." And he proceeds to explain why by using the Edgeworth box as a basis for his argument.[1] His conclusion is that my "reference to Cantor's theorem . . . is misplaced."

The fatal fault of my critic is that he tackled a mathematical issue without the necessary knowledge for the task. To understand why I invoked Cantor's theorem, he should have first tried to look up Cantor's *Contribu-*