Paul Krugman eta Hyman Minsky: Randall Wray, Stephanie Kelton eta Warren Molser

Hasiera:

R. Wray eta Krugman

Randall Wray-ek Paul Krugman-i buruz

W. Mosler eta Krugman

Paul Krugman eta Warren Mosler

Paul Krugman eta Warren Mosler (Who is Who?)

Paul Krugman eta Warren Mosler, zorrari buruz

Mosler eta neokeynestarrak

DTM eta Krugman

Krugman: 15 urte igaro ondoren

Segida:

(a) Hona twitter batzuk:

Stephanie Kelton @StephanieKelton

From his latest book. Wray on Krugman on Minsky. http://www.amazon.com/Why-Minsky-Matters-Introduction-Economist-ebook/dp/800XNZA8CO ...

Introduction . 11 As this book makes clear, however, Krugman makes two fundamental errors. First, he does not understand banking. By contrast, Minsky had a deep understanding of bank operations, gained in part from his Wall Street connections and as well from his experience sitting on the board of a St. Louis bank. That is a topic for chapter 4. More importantly, Krugman and other mainstream economists do not understand Minsky's "beef" with orthodoxy. For Minsky, the main problem is not that orthodoxy failed to "notice" the rise of shadow banks; he would argue that their theory cannot be made good by adding this detail to their analysis. Minsky's critique was much more fundamental than that: mainstream economics begins with the presumption that the economy is naturally stable. Market forces are supposed to move the economy back to "equilibrium"—where demand equals supply. This is precisely what Minsky rejected.

Stephanie Kelton@StephanieKelton api. 27

conomists at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton) and "freshwater" (U.S. east coast (University of Chicago) economists. The former believe that there are stubborn "frictions" that forestall the return to equilibrium, whereas the latter believe that the equilibrating forces are strong. As a result, saltwater economists advocate a greater role for government to remove or counteract such frictions; freshwater economists think that government policy would be impotent or even make matters worse.

By contrast, Minsky argued that the internal dynamics of our modern economy are not equilibrium-seeking. There's no invisible hand operating that way. Furthermore, if we ever did achieve the mainstream's beloved "equilibrium," those internal dynamics would push us away—the system is not stable. And if by some miracle we were to get twice lucky—achieving an equilibrium that was stable—stability is destabilizing.

This is because quiescence changes behavior, policy making, and business opportunities. Chairman Bernanke's "Great Moderation" could not have been a stable equilibrium because market participants took into account the "moderation," discounting

Warren B. Mosler @wbmosler

<u>@StephanieKelton</u> But fundamentally because the currency itself is a (public) monopoly. Once that is appreciated there is no dispute...;)

(b) Eta ondoko hauek:

Stephanie Kelton @StephanieKelton

From his latest book. Wray on Krugman on Minsky. http://www.amazon.com/Why-Minsky-Matters-Introduction-Economist-ebook/dp/800XNZA8CO ...

Introduction . 11 As this book makes clear, however, Krugman makes two fundamental errors. First, he does not understand banking. By contrast, Minsky had a deep understanding of bank operations gained in part from his Wall Street connections and as well from his experience sitting on the board of a St. Louis bank. That is a topic for chapter 4. More importantly, Krugman and other mainstream economists do not understand Minsky's "beef" with orthodoxy. For Minsky, the main problem is not that orthodoxy failed to "notice" the rise of shadow banks; he would argue that their theory cannot be made good by adding this detail to their analysis. Minsky's critique was much more fundamental than that: mainstream economics begins with the presumption that the economy is naturally stable. Market forces are supposed to move the economy back to "equilibrium"—where demand equals supply. This is precisely what Minsky rejected.

Warren B. Mosler @wbmosler

 $\underline{ @ Stephanie Kelton } \ AKA, the \ private \ sector \ is \ necessarily \ pro \ cyclical... \ ;)$