



VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37235

TELEPHONE (615) 322-7311

Department of Economics & Business Administration • Direct phone 322-2871

October 18, 1988

Prokfeffor Giorgio Nebbia
Cattedra Di Merceologia
Universita' Di Bari
Facolta' Di Economia E Commercio
Via Camillo Rosalba, 53
70124 Bari
ITALY

Dear Professor Nebbia:

It was so good to have a letter from you and to learn about your project. Of course, I have known all the time of your scholarly interest in ecological problems.

Yes, you are right: I used "bioeconomics" first in my Yale University lecture of 8 November 1972. As I explained there, the suggestion for that term came from Dr. Jiri Zeman, an active member of the Czechoslovakian Academy of philosophy and sociology. He had been the editor on a valuable book Time in Science and Philosophy. On April 24, 1972 he invited me to contribute a paper to his next volume, Entropy and Information in Science and Philosophy. In that letter (copy enclosed) he mentioned my 1971 book and said that he supposed my article to be "oriented to bio-economics, not to political problems." (The last restriction was natural to be made by a person from a Communist regime.) At that time I realized that "bioeconomics" is a good descriptive label for my thesis. Consequently, on May 26 1972 I wrote him suggesting as a possible title of my paper "Bio-economic Aspects of Entropy" and asked for his reaction. With some delay, he agreed with my suggestion (copy of his letter of September 7, 1972, enclosed).

The volume that included my paper came out only in 1975. It was too late to reprint it in Energy and Economic Myths. But, in my opinion, the omission did not matter much: the other papers were more comprehensive.

Under separate cover, I am mailing a reprint from Zeman's volume together with a couple of reprints (in English, because those that were translated into Italian are already known to you from the efforts on my behalf by Professor Molesti). I am writing to the publisher to mail you a copy of volume by Demetrescu and Dragan about "bioeconomic paradigm."

CESKOSLOVENSKÁ AKADEMIE VĚD
ÚSTAV PRO EKONOMII A SOCIologii
Professor Giorgio Nebbia
October 18, 1988
Page Two

I thank you for your kind interest in my work and for your intellectual sympathy.

With my best collegial regards,

Sincerely and cordially,

Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen
Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen
Distinguished Professor of Economics,
Emeritus

NGR:ko
Enclosures

Dear Professor Nebbia,
Professor Richard Goodwin (Dept. of Applied Economics, Michigan State University) told me about your book "The Law and the Economic Process". I have edited by Kluwer Academic the volume "Law, Economics and Philosophy" and now I am preparing the volume "Economic and Information Systems and Philosophy" (authors from East and West). I should like to ask you if you could make a contribution for this volume concerning your topics. I suppose your article would be oriented to big-economics, not to political problems.
I am also interested in new writings or books of yourself.

Yours very sincerely,
Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen

P.S.: The extent of the article is about 20 pages, the close in November 1972.

Georges Roegen

DE LA SCIENCE ÉCONOMIQUE A LA BIOÉCONOMIE (*)

A Henri Guillon,
En hommage au savant et à l'homme.

Revue d'Économie Politique n° 3 (1978)

I. — Introduction

Le problème des relations de l'homme avec l'environnement ne peut être réduit à celui de savoir ce que devra être le prix de l'essence demain ou combien la France et les Etats-Unis, par exemple, devront importer de pétrole en l'an 2000. Ce problème n'est pas économique, dans ce sens étroit. Sa nature est bioéconomique (1), car il concerne le mode de vie particulier de l'humanité en tant qu'espèce biologique. Les choses vues dans cette perspective pourraient apparaître au premier abord comme une mosaïque sans structure. Mais dès que les relations entre tous les éléments afférents auront été établies et analysées, l'unité du tableau bioéconomique surgira d'elle-même en pleine vue.

C'est seulement en adoptant cette perspective plus large que nous pourrons guider nos pas vers l'avenir incertain, en pleine connaissance de la nature des problèmes dont nous avons pris conscience tout récemment sous la pression des événements, même

(*) Je tiens spécialement à exprimer ici ma sincère gratitude à M. Jean-Alain Héraud pour sa dévouée et patiente collaboration pour la rédaction de ce texte et pour beaucoup de suggestions utiles.

(1) Ce terme pour décrire ma vision de la nature du processus économique m'a été suggéré par Jiří Zeman. (Voir mon article « Bio-Economic Aspects of Entropy » in *Entropy and Information in Science and Philosophy*, ed. J. Zeman, Amsterdam, Elsevier, 1975, ainsi que mon volume, *Energy and Economic Myths*, p. 25.) Ultérieurement, j'ai appris par un article de H. Scott Gordon, « The Economic Theory of a Common-Property Resource : The Fishery », *Journal of Political Economy*, LXII (1954) : pp. 124-142, que le biologiste russe T. I. Baranoff avait employé « bioéconomique » déjà en 1925 (et probablement pour la première fois). Mais Baranoff entendait par ce terme une analyse économique de certains phénomènes biologiques et non la conception du processus économique comme une extension de l'évolution biologique.