FROM CRITICISM TO COHESION?

Keynesianism, the Schools, the Winter of 1930-31

10. Keynes' kaleidoscopic framework: cohesion?

Perhaps the most important aspect of Keynes' framework is its ability to cohere despite its contradictions. Keynesian economics, as it evolved, was characterized by a series of interconnected theories that were often presented as mutually reinforcing. This coherence was not achieved through a rigidly structured system but rather through a series of informal, yet powerful, ideas that were collectively known as the Keynesian revolution.

The Keynesian framework was built around the idea that aggregate demand, or the overall level of spending in the economy, was a critical determinant of output and employment. Keynes argued that this demand could be stimulated through government spending, taxation, and monetary policy. This idea was encapsulated in the famous Phillips curve, which suggested that there was a trade-off between inflation and unemployment.

Keynesian economics also emphasized the importance of liquidity preferences and the role of the banking system in managing economic activity. The concept of the liquidity trap, where interest rates could not fall sufficiently to stimulate demand, was central to understanding why economic recovery might be slow and why fiscal policy might be effective in maintaining aggregate demand.

The Keynesian revolution was not limited to economics; it also influenced fields such as politics and sociology. The idea of the state as an active participant in the economy was embraced by governments around the world, leading to the creation of nationalized industries and social welfare programs.

In conclusion, Keynes' framework was a coherent and influential synthesis of economic thought that provided a new way of thinking about the economy. Its resilience was due to its ability to adapt and evolve in response to changing conditions, making it a vital component of modern economic policy.
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model. Hayekian methodology has provided a much more plausible empistic model. Both the Hayekian approach and the neoclassical approach neglect the role of tacit knowledge and the role of expectations. The Hayekian approach is based on a purely rational and perfectly informed market mechanism. The neoclassical approach, on the other hand, relies on a perfectly competitive market mechanism. Both approaches are based on assumptions that are not consistent with empirical evidence.

To reconcile these differences, Keynesian economists have suggested that the role of expectations is crucial. Keynesian economists argue that expectations are formed based on past experiences and can be influenced by various factors, such as government policies and market conditions. The role of expectations is also important in explaining why markets may not always behave as predicted by classical or neoclassical models.

Keynesian economists also emphasize the role of government intervention in the economy. They argue that government policies can be used to stabilize the economy and prevent fluctuations that could lead to economic crises. Keynesian economists also suggest that government intervention can be used to promote economic growth and reduce poverty.

In conclusion, Keynesian economists have provided a much more plausible approach to understanding economic behavior. They have emphasized the role of expectations and the importance of government intervention in the economy. Their approach has been influential in shaping economic policy and continues to be relevant today.
economic theory:

As economic theory developed for the first time, it envisaged a查看更多内容
Keynesian economics is an economic framework that emphasizes the importance of government intervention in the economy to stabilize economic activity. Keynesian economists believe that during economic downturns, the government should increase spending to stimulate economic growth. This is because, according to Keynesian theory, during recessions, people tend to save more and spend less, which reduces overall demand and slows down economic activity. To counteract this, the government can increase its spending on public works, such as building roads or providing social services, to stimulate consumption and investment.

In contrast, monetarists believe that changes in the money supply are the key driver of economic activity. Monetarists argue that the government should focus on maintaining stable inflation and interest rates, rather than intervening in the economy to stimulate growth. According to monetarists, changes in government spending and taxation can lead to inflation or deflation, which can disrupt economic growth.

The debate between Keynesians and monetarists has been ongoing for several decades, with each side arguing the merits of their approach. While Keynesian theory has been influential in shaping government economic policy, monetarist ideas have also had a significant impact on economic thinking.
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between the two schools:

The synthesis according to Keynes (1930) and the distribution according to Keynes (1933). The latter is based on the theory that the distribution of income is determined by the forces of supply and demand, while the former is based on the theory that the distribution of income is determined by the forces of supply and demand. The former is more closely aligned with the classical economists, while the latter is more closely aligned with the Keynesian economists. The latter is more closely aligned with the Keynesian economists, while the former is more closely aligned with the classical economists.

The Synthesizers

The synthesis according to Keynes (1930) and the distribution according to Keynes (1933). The latter is based on the theory that the distribution of income is determined by the forces of supply and demand, while the former is based on the theory that the distribution of income is determined by the forces of supply and demand. The former is more closely aligned with the classical economists, while the latter is more closely aligned with the Keynesian economists. The latter is more closely aligned with the Keynesian economists, while the former is more closely aligned with the classical economists.
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Phillip Arestis
in his 1999 textbook The Post-Keynesian Approach to Economics

This was his intention:

the task was to demonstrate the feasibility of the Keynesian model of monetary and fiscal policy to achieve full employment and economic growth in a dynamic economy with a wage-setting mechanism that is flexible in the short run but rigid in the long run. The Keynesian model aimed to provide a framework for understanding the role of government in economic policy, particularly in the context of fluctuations in output and employment. It emphasized the importance of aggregate demand in determining economic outcomes and advocated for active government intervention in the economy to stabilize output and employment. The Keynesian model also laid the groundwork for later developments in economic theory, such as the New Keynesian model.
FROM CONCLUSION TO CRITICISM

The Keynesian paradigm has also been criticized for its shortcomings. The model's reliance on the concept of liquidity preference and the idea that the economy is self-regulating have been questioned. The assumption that the economy will always return to equilibrium has been criticized. The model's predictions have often been inaccurate, and it has been criticized for its inability to explain economic recessions and depressions. The model's reliance on monetary policy as the primary tool for economic stabilization has been questioned, as it has been argued that fiscal policy is more effective in stabilizing the economy.

System thinkers: Opponents of the Keynesian paradigm argue that the model is too simplistic and fails to take into account the complex interactions between different economic agents. They argue that the model is too focused on aggregate demand and too little on the supply side of the economy. Opponents also argue that the model is too focused on short-term fluctuations and too little on long-term trends.

System thinkers propose a different approach to understanding the economy. They argue that the economy is a complex system, and that it is necessary to take a holistic approach to understanding it. They argue that the economy is not a single entity, but rather a network of interconnected systems. They argue that the economy is not a closed system, but rather one that is open to external influences.

In conclusion, the Keynesian paradigm has been criticized for its shortcomings. The model's reliance on the concept of liquidity preference and the idea that the economy is self-regulating have been questioned. The assumption that the economy will always return to equilibrium has been criticized. The model's predictions have often been inaccurate, and it has been criticized for its inability to explain economic recessions and depressions. The model's reliance on monetary policy as the primary tool for economic stabilization has been questioned, as it has been argued that fiscal policy is more effective in stabilizing the economy. Opponents of the Keynesian paradigm argue that the model is too simplistic and fails to take into account the complex interactions between different economic agents. They argue that the model is too focused on aggregate demand and too little on the supply side of the economy. They argue that the model is too focused on short-term fluctuations and too little on long-term trends. System thinkers propose a different approach to understanding the economy. They argue that the economy is a complex system, and that it is necessary to take a holistic approach to understanding it. They argue that the economy is not a single entity, but rather a network of interconnected systems. They argue that the economy is not a closed system, but rather one that is open to external influences.
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1. Post Keynesians and other developments

Border Contlicts

(sawyer 1988, pp. 4-5)

It is not possible to draw a bright boundary around post-Keynesian economics, where any single area of post-Keynesian monetary economics (and developments there are many) around post-Keynesian economics, and
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