


Olesen, Finn


Working Paper

Lange and his 1938-contribution  An early Keynesian?

IME Working Paper, No. 74

Provided in Cooperation with:

Department of Environmental and Business Economics (IME), University of Southern Denmark

Suggested Citation: Olesen, Finn (2006) : Lange and his 1938-contribution  An early Keynesian?, IME Working Paper, No. 74, University of Southern Denmark, Department of Environmental and Business Economics (IME), Esbjerg

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/83092>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

**Lange and his 1938-contribution
– An early Keynesian?**

Finn Olesen

December 2006

All rights reserved. No part of this WORKING PAPER may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without the written permission of IME except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews.

© University of Southern Denmark, Esbjerg and the author, 2006

Editor: Eva Roth

Department of Environmental and Business Economics
IME WORKING PAPER 74/06

ISSN 1399-3224

Finn Olesen

Department of Environmental and Business Economics

University of Southern Denmark

Niels Bohrs Vej 9-10

DK-6700 Esbjerg

Tel.: +45 6550 1514

Fax: +45 6550 1091

E-mail: finn@sam.sdu.dk

Abstract

In February 1936 John Maynard Keynes gave birth to modern macroeconomics when he published *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*. In some ways Oskar Lange was seemingly also very critical of mainstream neoclassical thinking although known as a working marginalist for the greater part of his life. In this note we try to identify what Lange might have had to say of Keynesian nature especially in an important contribution from 1938.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Danuta Tomczak, Oestfold University College Remmen, Halden, Norway, and Heine Ruppert, Department of Environmental and Business Economics, for comments to an earlier draft of this paper.

Table of contents

1.	Introduction	7
2.	A short sum up of the General Theory	8
3.	Lange as a Keynesian?	11
4.	Concluding Remarks	18
5.	Literature	20

1. Introduction

As it is commonly known, when John Maynard Keynes published his book **The General Theory** on the 4th of February 1936 he gave birth to modern macroeconomics. In his book Keynes had his grand attack on economic mainstream. The neoclassical paradigm was rightly criticized for its lack of explanatory power when it came to explain why an economic crisis as the one in the early 1930's could occur and seemingly be maintained for a longer period. Keynes's answer was given within the framework of his macroeconomic model of chapter 3 on the principle of effective demand. And throughout his analysis in the book he focused upon how agents have to behave in an environment characterized by imperfect knowledge and imperfect expectations to an unknown future.

In some ways Oskar Lange was seemingly also very critical of mainstream neoclassical thinking in so far as a Marxist, he held according to Fisher (1966:734) – with a line of reasoning that seems to follow alongside that of Keynes when Keynes stated that economics is a moral science that has to do with a lot of very important qualitative factors¹ – that economics:

“is a valid social science only in combination with other social sciences, including history ... He regarded praxiological definitions of economics in terms of “maximizing”, or a “means-end” schema, as too restrictive and as part of a trend that withdraws economics from social science and from political economy broadly conceived”.

1 “Economics is a science of thinking in terms of models joined to the art of choosing models which are relevant to the contemporary world. It is compelled to be this, because, unlike the typical natural science, the material to which it is applied is, in too many respects, not homogeneous through time ... **Progress** in economics consists almost entirely in a progressive improvement in the choice of models ... I also want to emphasize strongly the point about economics being a moral science. I mentioned before that it deals with introspection and with values. I might have added that it deals with motives, expectations, psychological uncertainties. One has to be constantly on guard against treating the material as constant and homogeneous”; CW (XIV: 296 & 300).

But perhaps Lange after all was a bit dualistic on this matter. As a fact we know that he is mainly seen as a marginalist who for the greater part of his life worked within the framework of the neoclassical paradigm, as also noted by Fisher (1966:734):

*“But at the same time he did regard praxiology ... as a valid part of political economy, and felt that socialism could learn from this body of theory. As his writings testify, he understood and skillfully expounded it. Much of his writing contains a strong marginalist message”.*²

The primary purpose, therefore, of this paper is to try to identify what Lange might have had to say of a Keynesian nature especially in an important contribution from 1938 where he presented an early interpretation of the fundamental messages in **The General Theory**. Before we try to highlight Lange in this regard in Section 3, we give a short sum up of the main findings of Keynes’s book in the following section. Finally the paper is closed with some few concluding remarks in Section 4.

2. A short sum up of the General Theory

Ever since its publication Keynes’s book has been heavily interpreted and evaluated by many authors. And still today the debate is an ongoing one. What could be learned from Keynes’s economic universe? And how should one today conduct a macroeconomic analysis the right way when dealing with a modern economy? Seen from a Post Keynesian perspective the main findings of **The General Theory** has to do with at least the following three crucial aspects that are of vital importance even for modern economists: 1) economic agents have to act in an environment of true uncertainty (a kind of endogenous uncertainty that cannot be calculated as it is the case with risk); therefore they have to form

2 E.g. in Lange (1944) the macroeconomic analysis of price flexibility and employment is conducted within the framework of a general equilibrium model.

and act upon expectations about unknown future events that might be of an imperfect character; and 2) economic processes have to do with calendar time and as a consequence of this agents economic performances becomes path dependent,³ 3) so an economy's contextual institutional set up always matters, it may have indeed serious real economic effects.⁴ With Davidson (1984), Keynes provided a more general theory than that given by the mainstream economists when he rejected three major neoclassical mainstream axioms thereby acknowledging that the relevant economic world is one that is non-ergodic.⁵ And in such a world money would never become neutral. So according to Davidson (1984:572 & 574) we have that:

“Keynes ... rejected this view that past information from economic time series realizations provides reliable, useful data which permit stochastic predictions of the economic future. In a world with important non-ergodic circumstances – our economic world – liquidity matters, money is never neutral, and neither Say’s Law nor Walras’s Law is relevant ... when one is dealing with human activity and institutions, one may be, in the nature of things, outside of the realm of the formally precise. For Keynes as for Post Keynesians the guiding motto is “it is better to be roughly right than precisely wrong!””

-
- 3 With Davidson (1996:482): “Keynes’ uncertain future involves a creative economic reality in the sense that the future can be permanently changed in nature and substance by actions of individuals, groups (e.g., unions, cartels), and/or governments, often in ways not completely foreseeable by the creators of change”.
- 4 With Arestis (1996:114): “The economy operates subject to a *historical* process in an uncertain world, where *expectations* inevitably have significant effects on economic outcomes. Social, conventional, political and other *institutions* shape economic events, and their evolution is studied carefully”.
- 5 And in such a non-ergodic environment: “Keynes’ claim that there is nothing in a laissez-faire system that assures that endogenous forces in the economy will always automatically move the system to a full employment equilibrium is correct. When agents fear the unpredictable future and perceive nonproduced liquid assets (including money) as safe havens for their current claim on resources ... then there is a lack of effective demand and no endogenous force to restore full employment”; Davidson (1996:503).

And Keynes's economic thinking always reflected his fundamental methodological views. To him methodology and theory could not be separated. He was throughout his life inspired by his early views on philosophy and ethics. With Skidelsky (1983:133):

"Philosophy provided the foundation of Keynes's life. It came before economics; and the philosophy of ends came before the philosophy of means. Keynes's philosophy was worked out between 1903 and 1906, in his last two years as an undergraduate, and in his first and only postgraduate year".

Or as Keynes himself stated his views on the matter in the very famous essay **My Early Beliefs** from 1938:

"The attribution of rationality to human nature, instead of enriching it, now seems to me to have impoverished it. It ignored certain powerful and valuable springs of feeling. Some of the spontaneous, irrational outburst of human nature can have a sort of value from which our schematism was cut off"; Keynes (1938:448-49).⁶

Seen from the perspective of Keynes economic theory always had to deal with reality. Out there in the real world individuals may suffer as a consequence of a mismatch in expectations between suppliers and demanders not being able to bring about the optimal outcome of full employment in the economy. Out there they have to do the best they possibly can given their imperfect knowledge and imperfect expectations to a truly unknown future. In this way Keynes worked as a *realytic* economist throughout his entire life.⁷

6 Or as Meade (1975:82) has pointed out: "the fact that Keynes was trying continuously to relate his very extensive experiences in the real world of affairs in an intuitive manner to the revision of standard economic theory was of the essence of his genius. His thinking never stood still and his critique of the existing corpus of economic doctrine was constructed out of many and various ... components."

7 Landreth & Colander (1994:463): "A **realytic theory** is contextual; it blends inductive information about the economy with deductive logic. Reality guides the choice of assumptions".

3. Lange as a Keynesian?

As pointed out by Tomczak (2006) Oskar Lange (1904-1965) was more than just an ordinary economist. He was also a statistician, a politician and a diplomat. This is all well known and well documented. But did Lange also have something to say a possible contributor to what latter on became Keynesianism? At least he wrote what seems to be an important article in 1938 where he gave an interpretation of what he saw as the fundamental messages of **The General Theory**. In what follows not only the 1938-contribution is highlighted also some related works by Lange on Say's Law and on various aspects of the multiplier are briefly discussed.⁸

At the very beginning in Lange (1938:12) Keynes's new 1936 theoretical breakthrough is rightly recognized when Lange states:

“By introducing liquidity preference into the theory of interest Mr. Keynes has provided us with an analytical apparatus of great power to attack problems which hitherto have successfully resisted the intrusion of the economic theorist”.

And then Lange starts out presenting his own economic model – a model that he claims to be a more general model than that given by Keynes although of the same nature – with four macroeconomic equations and three diagrams.⁹

$$(1) \quad M = L(i, Y)$$

$$(2) \quad C = \Phi(Y, i)$$

$$(3) \quad I = F(i, C)$$

$$(4) \quad Y = C + I$$

8 Lange did this work when we was at the University of Chicago from 1939-1945, a period in his life that accordingly to Tomczak (2006:3) marked: “his very active publication period”.

9 These diagrams give us: the demand for money (Figure 1), the consumption function (Figure 2), and the investment function (Figure 3); Lange (1938:15 & 16).

Equation (1) is the liquidity preference function; equation (2) expresses the propensity to consume as a positive function of total income, and perhaps also as a function of the interest rate – “no general rule can be stated as to the reaction of this expenditure to a change in the rate of interest”; (op. cit. p. 13) – equation (3) is the investment function where investment is also positively depended upon the level of consumption,¹⁰ and finally, equation (4) give us the macro-economic identity.¹¹

Having put the apparatus at hand Lange then determines the interest rate, the level of consumption and investment in the economy. He argues as follows. With a given amount of money, M_0 , and a given initial level of income, say Y_0 , equation (1) gives us a rate of interest at i_0 . With Y_0 and i_0 given equation (2) determines the total consumption, C_0 , and then equation (3) can finally give us the level of investment. I_0 . Perhaps by chance we now have that the sum of total consumption and investment precisely equals the total of income – equation (4) is fulfilled – if not we must start a process of adjustment until an equilibrium position in the economy is finally established.¹²

Then Lange considers what happens if the marginal net productivity of capital increases and if the propensity to consume drops down. In the first case total income begins to go up and as a consequence of this so must also the interest rate. In the second case we have a decrease in both. And as Lange argues this is in

10 ”For the demand for investment goods is *derived* from the demand for consumers’ goods. The smaller the expenditure on consumption the smaller is the demand for consumers’ goods and, consequently, the lower is the rate of net return on investment. Thus, the rate of interest being constant, investment per unit of time is the larger the larger the total expenditure on consumption”; (Op. cit. p. 14).

11 Actually Lange also includes a fifth equation representing the quantity theory of money. In this respect Lange is certainly not following the line of argumentation made by Keynes himself. Talking about monetary matters **The General Theory** represents the defeat of the quantity theory of money and the victory of the liquidity preference function.

12 ”This process of *mutual adjustment* goes on until the curves in our three diagrams have reached a position compatible with each other and with the quantity of money given, i.e. until equilibrium is attained ... Whatever the investment and saving *decisions* are, the volume of total income always adjusts itself so as to equalize saving and investment *actually performed*”; (op. cit. p. 17 & 22).

good accordance with the statements of traditional theory: when the tendency to invest increases with a given level of savings in the economy we would expect the real interest rate to increase as well, and considering case number two, a drop in the propensity to consume is equivalent to an increase in the propensity to save and with a higher level of total savings (and a given level of investment) the real interest rate have to decrease in this situation. But these results cannot be stated with certainty. But if we have a build up of investment then the stock of capital is growing and so is the productivity within the economy. This might be expected to reduce costs lowering the price level and as a consequence of this the real money supply increases which in itself should make the rate of interest to decrease. And with a higher level of income we would also expect the total of savings to increase which would further breakdown the arguments given by the classical theory. And if the propensity to save increases as stated in the second case this will lower the level of total income and then we might get a drop down in the total amount actually saved. So perhaps the interest rate is not going to decrease after all as Lange argues.

To Lange as something new and very important Keynes has made it clear that the demand for money is sometimes only dependent upon the rate of interest:

“For the change of the rate of interest which is necessary to balance a given change in the demand for liquidity caused by a change of total income is nil in this case. This is Mr. Keynes’ theory”; (op. cit. p. 19).

What is new in Keynes according to Lange is then the case of the liquidity trap. And in Lange’s own theoretical framework giving as he claims a more general model – equations (1)-(4) – this is one of two limiting outcomes. The other being the one where the demand for money is only dependent upon the level of income – that is in the case of the quantity theory of money.

And then Lange goes on to point out that to make the demand for money to depend only upon the rate of interest is far from a new phenomenon within eco-

conomic theory. He states that this is already what could be found in the writings of Walras:

“But whatever the shortcomings of his presentation, the liquidity preference function has been indicated clearly by Walras”; (op. cit. p. 21).

But this is not a fair interpretation of the liquidity preference function given by Keynes. In the Walrasian quotations given by Lange the motive of speculation is hardly present. What is essential in the writings of Keynes is that people who demand money have an expectation about the level of the rate of interest (or alternatively stated an expectation about what should be the price level on bonds). If you expect a lower interest rate than the one actually given by the market you should start to buy up bonds because in the future you would expect to get a capital gain on your stock of bonds (you would be able to sell them at a higher price). This aspect is precisely not to be found in the Walrasian quotations given by Lange.

Next Lange criticizes Keynes on the grounds that:

“Mr. Keynes treats investment and expenditure on consumption as two independent quantities and thinks that total income can be increased indiscriminately by expanding either of them. But it is a commonplace which can be read in any textbook of economics that the demand for investment goods is derived from the demand for consumption goods. The real argument of the underconsumption theories is that investment depends on the expenditure on consumption and, therefore, cannot be increased without an adequate increase of the latter, at least in a capitalist economy where investment is done for profit”; (op. cit. p. 23).

But regarding this aspect Lange has understood Keynes wrongly. Keynes would not deny that investment decisions are dependent upon what is consumed. On

the contrary the more that is consumed the higher level of total income and the more would have to be invested. But Keynes would argue that the decision to invest and the decision to consume are made by two different types of economic agents. And that the time horizons of the two kinds of decisions are very different indeed. When you decide to invest you need a perspective concerning the longer run whereas a decision to consume is a lot more shortsighted in its nature. So households and firms hold different types of expectations. Therefore, the decision to invest and the decision to consume have to be considered separately. On this aspect Keynes was right and Lange is wrong.

Then Lange finishes his paper by considering how the optimum propensity to save (or to consume) which would maximize the amount of investment in his model could be determined.¹³ In what Lange has termed the special case of Keynes we would reach the conclusion that:

“The rate of interest remaining constant, the optimum propensity to consume is when the expenditure on consumption is such that a further increase does not any more increase the marginal efficiency of investment. It has been mentioned already that this happens when the elasticity of supply of factors of production becomes zero, so that an increase of the expenditure on consumption only raises their prices but cannot increase investment”; (op. cit. p. 31).

Alternatively stated we have reached an economic outcome with full employment. Arguing along these lines Lange now seems to be in good accordance with Keynes. When he considers the severe restriction given by the monetary constraint and what could be done he also argues almost as Keynes himself did in **The General Theory**. Let us compare statements. Originally Keynes wrote:

¹³ The condition is given on page 26, equation (10), stating: *“the marginal rate of substitution between the rate of interest and total income as affecting the demand for liquidity is equal to the marginal rate of substitution between the rate of interest and expenditure on consumption as inducements to invest”*.

“Thus the remedy for the boom is not a higher rate of interest but a lower rate of interest! For that may enable the so-called boom to last. The right remedy for the trade cycle is not to be found in abolishing booms and thus keeping us permanently in a semi-slump; but in abolishing slumps and thus keeping us permanently in a quasi-boom”; Keynes (1936:322).

While Lange concludes his paper by pointing out:

“Therefore, if the propensity to save does exceed its optimum it need not be curbed to avoid its evil consequences. It can be made to benefit economic progress by an appropriate monetary policy which increases the quantity of money sufficiently to reduce the rate of interest so as to compensate the discouraging effect a high propensity to save has on investment. How far such a policy is possible depends on the structure of the monetary and of the whole economic system”; Lange (1938:32).

To conclude, in some respects Lange (1938) is quite Keynes-like in its content.¹⁴ In others it seems as if Lange is still arguing along the lines of the classical thinking without a full understanding of Keynes’s breakaway from mainstream orthodoxy. Whatever could be said about the analysis given by Lange his theoretical model seems not to be very much inferior to the one given by John Hicks. But in one respect at least Hicks (1937) was way ahead of Lange. The simplicity of his famous IS/LM model by far beats that of Lange’s model.

In Lange (1939) we are told that the way Keynes talks about saving and investment is not inferior to the way this item is dealt with by Robertson and the Swedish school of ex-ante/ex-post. Actually Lange points out that:

14 As Fisher (1966:735) somewhat overstates it: “His “Rate of Interest and the Optimum Propensity to Consume” has been widely regarded as making Keynes clearer than did Keynes himself”. How widely though this is a correct statement seems rather debatably at least at present times.

“There now seems to be substantial agreement that Mr. Keynes’ definition of saving, which makes savings identically equal to investment, has the advantage of simplicity”; Lange (1939:620).

Once again Lange is not only polite towards Keynes he also acknowledged the strength of the analysis made by Keynes concerning the process of how savings and investment match one another.

In Lange (1942) Say’s Law is critically examined.¹⁵ This is done with a historical perspective in so far that the controversy between the two close friends David Ricardo and Thomas Malthus is taken into account. The presentation in Lange (1942) is rather technical and do not present any convincing evidence of being a major theoretical contribution in a Keynes-like tradition although the analysis given by Lange includes an analysis of a monetary equilibrium.

Finally let us highlight some aspects of the discussion of the multiplier given in Lange (1943). Lange starts out by presenting what he calls simple multipliers focusing upon the investment and the consumption multipliers. Then he points out the existence of a possible crowding in effect when government activity takes place. Contrary to the statements of the classical theory we find that increases in either public investment and/or public consumption do not bring about a decline in private investment or in private consumption:

“An initial government investment leads, as a rule, to induced private investment and the multiplicand dI must include the latter ... The same limitation of the multiplier arises with regard to the effect upon national income of an initial increment in governmental consumption expenditure ... The multiplicand dC includes, in addition to the in-

15 Among others we are told that: ”From its very first enunciation Say’s law has been associated with the proposition that there can be no ”universal glut” or ”general overproduction” in the sense of all entrepreneurs suffering losses ... Thus total entrepreneurial receipts are, under Say’s law, identically equal to total cost plus planned total profit”; Lange (1942:53 & 57).

crease in the government's expenditure, all the induced increases in private consumption"; Lange (1943:229).

As a consequence of this fact Lange next tries to put forward the relevant multipliers which he calls compound multipliers. Further on he develops multipliers representing an open economy where we have to take into account the leakage that arises from imports. Then he goes on to discuss the aspects of dynamics. Hitherto the multipliers developed in the paper have not taken historical time into account.¹⁶ But we must do so Lange argues. We have to have knowledge not only about equilibrium positions but also of cause of the path of transition from one equilibrium position to another. But to do so is a rather complicated and mathematical advanced task as could be seen from the presentation of the relevant formulae of the multipliers in the latter part of Lange (1943).

4. Concluding Remarks

The purpose of this paper has been to try to find out if the earlier writings of Lange contain some elements of a Keynes-like nature. As stated above this is especially the case with Lange (1938). Had he continued his work on macroeconomics within the framework of the model presented in that paper he might have got his reputation in the history of economic thought as one of the economists in what is later became known as the Keynesian Revolution.

Why then did Lange not try to take a more prominent position within the camp of Keynesian macroeconomists? Perhaps his economic focus changed as a consequence of him coming to the States to work at The University of Chicago. Here he might have been under influence of a much more traditional economic mainstream thinking than that of Keynes and the Keynesians. Although he made some other contributions of a macroeconomic character during the war they were really not in essence Keynesian in their content. And when Lange re-

16 "The procedure is merely one of comparative statics. But whether we recognize it in our formulae or not, the effect of a change of one economic variable upon the value of another does operate in time"; Lange (1943:237).

turned to Europe at the end of the war then perhaps as indicated by Tomczak (2006) the politician and the diplomat took over when Poland had to be rebuild anew. First later on in 1955 he once again took up his career as an economist being appointed professor at the Faculty of Political Economy at the University of Warsaw. By then the Keynesian Revolution was well under way and ahead of the contributions made by Lange in his earlier years and he had himself become well known as a marginalist rather than as a Keynesian. So it might be only natural that he in 1955 put his intellectual forces into matters of a different kind than that of macroeconomics.

5. Literature

- [1] Arestis, Philip (1996): *Post-Keynesian economics: towards coherence*, Cambridge Journal of Economics 1996, pp. 111-35.
- [2] Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes Vol. XIV: *The General Theory and After – Part II: Defense and Development*, Macmillan & Cambridge University Press 1973.
- [3] Davidson, Paul (1996): *Reality and economic theory*, Journal of Post Keynesian Economics, Summer 1996, pp. 479-508.
- [4] Davidson, Paul (1984): *Reviving Keynes's revolution*, Journal of Post Keynesian Economics, Summer 1984, pp. 561-75.
- [5] Fisher, Walter D. (1966): *Oskar Ryszard Lange, 1904-1965*, Econometrica, October 1966, pp. 733-38.
- [6] Hicks, John (1937): *Mr. Keynes and the "Classics"; A Suggested Interpretation*, Econometrica 1937, pp. 147-59.
- [7] Keynes, John Maynard (1938): *My Early Beliefs*, The Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes Vol. X: *Essays in Biography*, Macmillan & St. Martin's Press 1972, pp. 433-50.
- [8] Keynes, John Maynard (1936): *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, The Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes Vol. VII, Macmillan & Cambridge University Press 1973.
- [9] Landreth, Harry & Colander, David (1994): *History of Economic Thought*, Houghton Mifflin Company 1994.

- [10] Lange, Oskar (1944): *Price Flexibility and Employment*, Cowles Commission for Research in Economics, Monograph No. 8, Greenwood Press Connecticut 1978.
- [11] Lange, Oskar (1943): *The Theory of the Multiplier*, *Econometrica*, July - October 1943, pp. 227-45.
- [12] Lange, Oskar (1942): *Say's Law: A restatement and criticism*, in Lange, McIntyre and Yntema (eds.) **Studies in Mathematical Economics and Econometrics**, University of Chicago Press 1942, pp. 49-68.
- [13] Lange, Oskar (1939): *Saving and Investment: Saving in Process Analysis*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, August 1939, pp. 620-22.
- [14] Lange, Oskar (1938): *The rate of Interest and the Optimum Propensity to Consume*, *Economica*, Februar 1938, pp. 12-32.
- [15] Meade, James (1975): *The Keynesian Revolution* fra bogen *Essays on John Maynard Keynes* edited by Milo Keynes, Cambridge University Press 1975, pp. 82-88.
- [16] Skidelsky, Robert (1983): *John Maynard Keynes – Volume One: Hopes Betrayed, 1883-1920*, Macmillan 1983.
- [17] Tomczak, Danuta A. (2006): *Oskar Lange – a hundred years perspective*, paper presented at the 9th Nordic Conference on History of Economic Thought, Stockholm University, 25th - 27th 2006.

Department of Environmental and Business Economics
Institut for Miljø- og Erhvervsøkonomi (IME)

IME WORKING PAPERS

ISSN: 1399-3224

Issued working papers from IME

Udgivne arbejdsrapporter fra IME

No.

1/99	Frank Jensen Niels Vestergaard Hans Frost	<i>Asymmetrisk information og regulering af forurening</i>
2/99	Finn Olesen	<i>Monetær integration i EU</i>
3/99	Frank Jensen Niels Vestergaard	<i>Regulation of Renewable Resources in Federal Systems: The Case of Fishery in the EU</i>
4/99	Villy Søgaard	<i>The Development of Organic Farming in Europe</i>
5/99	Teit Lüthje Finn Olesen	<i>EU som handelsskabende faktor?</i>
6/99	Carsten Lynge Jensen	<i>A Critical Review of the Common Fisheries Policy</i>
7/00	Carsten Lynge Jensen	<i>Output Substitution in a Regulated Fishery</i>
8/00	Finn Olesen	<i>Jørgen Henrik Gelting – En betydende dansk keynesianer</i>
9/00	Frank Jensen Niels Vestergaard	<i>Moral Hazard Problems in Fisheries Regulation: The Case of Illegal Landings</i>
10/00	Finn Olesen	<i>Moral, etik og økonomi</i>

11/00	Birgit Nahrstedt	<i>Legal Aspect of Border Commuting in the Danish-German Border Region</i>
12/00	Finn Olesen	<i>Om Økonomi, matematik og videnskabelighed - et bud på provokation</i>
13/00	Finn Olesen Jørgen Drud Hansen	<i>European Integration: Some stylised facts</i>
14/01	Lone Grønbæk	<i>Fishery Economics and Game Theory</i>
15/01	Finn Olesen	<i>Jørgen Pedersen on fiscal policy - A note</i>
16/01	Frank Jensen	<i>A Critical Review of the Fisheries Policy: Total Allowable Catches and Rations for Cod in the North Sea</i>
17/01	Urs Steiner Brandt	<i>Are uniform solutions focal? The case of international environmental agreements</i>
18/01	Urs Steiner Brandt	<i>Group Uniform Solutions</i>
19/01	Frank Jensen	<i>Prices versus Quantities for Common Pool Resources</i>
20/01	Urs Steiner Brandt	<i>Uniform Reductions are not that Bad</i>
21/01	Finn Olesen Frank Jensen	<i>A note on Marx</i>
22/01	Urs Steiner Brandt Gert Tinggaard Svendsen	<i>Hot air in Kyoto, cold air in The Hague</i>
23/01	Finn Olesen	<i>Den marginalistiske revolution: En dansk spire der ikke slog rod?</i>
24/01	Tommy Poulsen	<i>Skattekonkurrence og EU's skattestruktur</i>
25/01	Knud Sinding	<i>Environmental Management Systems as Sources of Competitive Advantage</i>
26/01	Finn Olesen	<i>On Machinery. Tog Ricardo fejl?</i>
27/01	Finn Olesen	<i>Ernst Brandes: Samfundsspørgsmaal - en kritik af Malthus og Ricardo</i>
28/01	Henrik Herlau Helge Tetzschner	<i>Securing Knowledge Assets in the Early Phase of Innovation</i>
29/02	Finn Olesen	<i>Økonomisk teorihistorie Overflødig information eller brugbar ballast?</i>

30/02	Finn Olesen	<i>Om god økonomisk metode – beskrivelse af et lukket eller et åbent socialt system?</i>
31/02	Lone Grønbæk Kronbak	<i>The Dynamics of an Open Access: The case of the Baltic Sea Cod Fishery – A Strategic Approach -</i>
32/02	Niels Vestergaard Dale Squires Frank Jensen Jesper Levring Andersen	<i>Technical Efficiency of the Danish Trawl fleet: Are the Industrial Vessels Better Than Others?</i>
33/02	Birgit Nahrstedt Henning P. Jørgensen Ayoe Hoff	<i>Estimation of Production Functions on Fishery: A Danish Survey</i>
34/02	Hans Jørgen Skriver	<i>Organisationskulturens betydning for vidensdelingen mellem daginstitutionsledere i Varde Kommune</i>
35/02	Urs Steiner Brandt Gert Tinggaard Svendsen	<i>Rent-seeking and grandfathering: The case of GHG trade in the EU</i>
36/02	Philip Peck Knud Sinding	<i>Environmental and Social Disclosure and Data-Richness in the Mining Industry</i>
37/03	Urs Steiner Brandt Gert Tinggaard Svendsen	<i>Fighting windmills? EU industrial interests and global climate negotiations</i>
38/03	Finn Olesen	<i>Ivar Jantzen – ingeniøren, som beskæftigede sig med økonomi</i>
39/03	Finn Olesen	<i>Jens Warming: den miskendte økonom</i>
40/03	Urs Steiner Brandt	<i>Unilateral actions, the case of international environmental problems</i>
41/03	Finn Olesen	<i>Isi Grünbaum: den politiske økonom</i>
42/03	Urs Steiner Brandt Gert Tinggaard Svendsen	<i>Hot Air as an Implicit Side Payment Arrangement: Could a Hot Air Provision have Saved the Kyoto-Agreement?</i>

43/03	Frank Jensen Max Nielsen Eva Roth	<i>Application of the Inverse Almost Ideal Demand System to Welfare Analysis</i>
44/03	Finn Olesen	<i>Rudolf Christiani – en interessant rigsdagsmand?</i>
45/03	Finn Olesen	<i>Kjeld Philip – en økonom som også blev politiker</i>
46/03	Urs Steiner Brandt Gert Tinggaard Svendsen	<i>Bureaucratic Rent-Seeking in the European Union</i>
47/03	Bodil Stilling Blichfeldt	<i>Unmanageable Tourism Destination Brands?</i>
48/03	Eva Roth Susanne Jensen	<i>Impact of recreational fishery on the formal Danish economy</i>
49/03	Helge Tetzschner Henrik Herlau	<i>Innovation and social entrepreneurship in tourism - A potential for local business development?</i>
50/03	Lone Grønbæk Kronbak Marko Lindroos	<i>An Enforcement-Coalition Model: Fishermen and Authorities forming Coalitions</i>
51/03	Urs Steiner Brandt Gert Tinggaard Svendsen	<i>The Political Economy of Climate Change Policy in the EU: Auction and Grandfathering</i>
52/03	Tipparat Pongthanapanich	<i>Review of Mathematical Programming for Coastal Land Use Optimization</i>
53/04	Max Nielsen Frank Jensen Eva Roth	<i>A Cost-Benefit Analysis of a Public Labelling Scheme of Fish Quality</i>
54/04	Frank Jensen Niels Vestergaard	<i>Fisheries Management with Multiple Market Failures</i>
55/04	Lone Grønbæk Kronbak	<i>A Coalition Game of the Baltic Sea Cod Fishery</i>

56/04	Bodil Stilling Blichfeldt	<i>Approaches of Fast Moving Consumer Good Brand Manufacturers Product Development “Safe players” versus “Producers”: Implications for Retailers’ Management of Manufacturer Relations</i>
57/04	Svend Ole Madsen Ole Stegmann Mikkelsen	<i>Interactions between HQ and divisions in a MNC - Some consequences of IT implementation on organizing supply activities</i>
58/04	Urs Steiner Brandt Frank Jensen Lars Gårn Hansen Niels Vestergaard	<i>Ratcheting in Renewable Resources Contracting</i>
59/04	Pernille Eskerod Anna Lund Jepsen	<i>Voluntary Enrolment – A Viable Way of Staffing Projects?</i>
60/04	Finn Olesen	<i>Den prækeynesianske Malthus</i>
61/05	Ragnar Arnason Leif K. Sandal Stein Ivar Steinshamn Niels Vestergaard	<i>Actual versus Optimal Fisheries Policies: An Evaluation of the Cod Fishing Policies of Denmark, Iceland and Norway</i>
62/05	Bodil Stilling Blichfeldt Jesper Rank Andersen	<i>On Research in Action and Action in Research</i>
63/05	Urs Steiner Brandt	<i>Lobbyism and Climate Change in Fisheries: A Political Support Function Approach</i>
64/05	Tipparat Pongthanapanich	<i>An Optimal Corrective Tax for Thai Shrimp Farming</i>
65/05	Henning P. Jørgensen Kurt Hjort-Gregersen	<i>Socio-economic impact in a region in the southern part of Jutland by the establishment of a plant for processing of bio ethanol</i>
66/05	Tipparat Pongthanapanich	<i>Options and Tradeoffs in Krabi’s Coastal Land Use</i>
67/06	Tipparat Pongthanapanich	<i>Optimal Coastal Land Use and Management in Krabi, Thailand: Compromise Programming Approach</i>

68/06	Anna Lund Jepsen Svend Ole Madsen	<i>Developing competences designed to create customer value</i>
69/06	Finn Olesen	<i>Værdifri samfundsvidenskab? - nogle refleksioner om økonomi</i>
70/06	Tipparat Pongthanapanich	<i>Toward Environmental Responsibility of Thai Shrimp Farming through a Voluntary Management Scheme</i>
71/06	Finn Olesen	<i>Rational Economic Man og Bounded Rationality – Nogle betragtninger over rationalitetsbegrebet i økonomisk teori</i>
72/06	Urs Steiner Brandt	<i>The Effect of Climate Change on the Probability of Conservation: Fisheries Regulation as a Policy Contest</i>
73/06	Urs Steiner Brandt Lone Grønbæk Kronbak	<i>Robustness of Sharing Rules under Climate Change. The Case of International Fisheries Agreements</i>
74/06	Finn Olesen	<i>Lange and his 1938-contribution – An early Keynesian</i>