

New Research Perspectives in the Monetary Theory of Production

edited by
Stefano Lucarelli and Marco Passarella

Preface by
Alessandro Vercelli



BERGAMO UNIVERSITY PRESS

sestante edizioni

© 2012, Bergamo University Press

New Research Perspectives in the
Monetary Theory od Production
a cura di Stefano Lucarelli e Marco Passarella
p. 164 cm. 15x22
ISBN – 978-88-6642-075-0

Cura editoriale: Hervé Baron

Il libro raccoglie contributi sottoposti a double-blind refereeing.

L'immagine di copertina è disegnata da Costanza Carrivale, che ne detiene il copyright.

Sestante Edizioni - Bergamo
www.sestanteedizioni.it

Printed in Italy
by Sestanceinc - Bergamo

Contents

Preface (A. Vercelli)	7
1. New Research Perspectives in the Monetary Theory of Production: an Introduction (S. Lucarelli and M. Passarella)	13
2. The Legacy of Augusto Graziani and Luigi Lodovico Pasinetti in the Post Keynesian Research Tradition (A. Pacella and G. Tortorella Esposito)	23
3. Taylor Rule and Solvency Rule in a Monetary Scheme of Reproduction (E. Brancaccio and D. Suppa)	39
4. Division of Labour and Endogenous Labour Productivity in a Profit-Led Growth Regime (G. Forges Davanzati)	59
5. Credit Creation as Monetary Complement of Innovation. A Schumpeterian Approach to Monetary Theory of Production (S. Lucarelli)	71
6. Why Do We Have Business Cycles? A Stock Flow Consistent Explanation (A. Caiani, A. Godin and S. Lucarelli)	99
7. A Re-Formulation of Minsky's 'Two-Price Model' (M. Passarella)	109
8. Tax Evasion in a Monetary Circuit Model (P. Di Lorenzo)	127
General References	149

3. Taylor Rule and Solvency Rule in a Monetary Scheme of Reproduction[†]

Emiliano Brancaccio^{*}, Domenico Suppa^{*}

Abstract: If the neoclassical theoretical basis of the Taylor rule are called into question, it is possible to suggest a different view of monetary policy according to which the central banker sets interest rates in order to regulate the conditions of solvency of the economic system (Brancaccio and Fontana 2012). This alternative “solvency rule” is determined here within a two-sector monetary scheme of reproduction. The first version of this scheme contained some restrictive assumptions: see Brancaccio (2008). Here these assumptions are removed. The aim, among other things, is to examine the possible impact of the solvency rule on the financial positions of each sector of the economy.

Keywords: Taylor rule, solvency rule, monetary scheme of reproduction, surplus approach, monetary circuit

JEL Classification: B5, E5, G33, O41, O42

1. A theoretical background for the “solvency rule”

According to the conventional interpretations of monetary policy inspired by the works of John B. Taylor, the central bank follows a “rule” of conduct aimed at stabilising the economy around the “natural” rate of unemployment – or a “natural” GDP growth rate - and an implicit or explicit target for the inflation rate (Taylor 1993, 1999, 2000). The general theoretical framework for this rule can be found in the so-called New Consensus Macroeconomics (NCM) and its background ‘Dynamic Stochastic General Equilibrium’ (DSGE) representations (e.g. Clarida *et al.* 1999; Woodford 2003). This line of research rests on the conventional idea that monetary policy can lead to changes in the effective rate of interest around the “natural” interest rate and in this way is able to control inflation and fluctuations in unemployment around the natural equilibrium. Furthermore, this approach assumes that the natural

[†] A preliminary version of this work was presented at the X AISPE Conference (Treviso, march 28, 2008) and the VII STOREP Conference (Trento, June 1, 2010). We are grateful to Giancarlo Bertocco, Roberto Ciccone, Alessandro Vercelli, all the participants to the seminars and two anonymous referees for their helpful comments.

^{*} University of Sannio, Italy. Email: emiliano.brancaccio@unisannio.it

^{*} University “Federico II” of Naples, Italy. Email: domenico.suppa@unina.it

equilibrium levels of the interest rate and other macroeconomic variables are determined ultimately by the so-called neoclassical “fundamentals” of endowments, preferences and technology, which are considered independent from monetary policy. Because of these characteristics, the NCM and standard DSGE models analyze in depth the effects of monetary policy over the business cycle while denying its impact on those equilibrium positions in which expectations are confirmed.

As is known, the conception of monetary policy suggested by the NMC and standard DSGE models has enjoyed considerable success. In particular, the works devoted to the verification of the validity of the Taylor rule have been very numerous (see, for example, Castelnuovo and Surico 2003; Chinn 2008). In the literature, however, it is also possible to find some objections to the stability and even the existence of the relationship between monetary policy and the fluctuations of unemployment and inflation which is implicit in the Taylor rule (Krisler and Lavoie 2007). Moreover, the critique of the neoclassical theory of capital detects some inconsistencies in the so-called “fundamentals” (Pasinetti 2000; Petri 2004) on which the Taylor rule is based (Brancaccio 2009). The same critique also suggests a different conception of the economic system under which, among other things, monetary policy can affect the “equilibrium” or “normal” level of the interest rate¹.

If these criticisms are accepted, it becomes possible to argue that the effective monetary policy rule is not necessarily the one conventionally assumed. On the basis of a different theoretical framework it is in fact possible to show that the “rule” followed by the central banker is aimed at defining a minimum level of solvency of the system rather than pursuing the stabilisation of unemployment and an objective target for inflation (Brancaccio and Fontana 2012).

The interpretation of the monetary policy that comes from this alternative “solvency rule” seems to find interesting applications in many current discussions, not least those relating to the relationship between monetary policy and the solvency conditions of the member states of the European Monetary Union (Brancaccio and Fontana 2011). However, the idea that monetary policy affects the “equilibrium” or “normal” rate of interest and by this way can also affect the solvency conditions of an economic system, represents an unusual thesis. For this reason the representations of the “solvency rule” based only on macroeconomic models may be insufficient. A better support for this “rule” should result from a more general theory of prices and distribution. A landmark in this respect can be represented by a “monetary scheme of reproduction”

¹ On this point see Panico (1985) and Pivetti (1985), among others.

(Brancaccio 2008), which brings together some traditional features of the Post Keynesian macroeconomic analysis with a theory of prices and distribution deriving from the so-called Surplus approach (Garegnani 1990; Kurz and Salvadori 1995) and Monetary Circuit approach (Graziani 2003; on the ancestry of this line of research see Graziani 1984b). This program is not new². In fact it is inspired by a line of research driven by the hope of establishing a consistent link within “heterodox” schools of thought between the theories of relative prices, distribution and accumulation and the theories of money³. One of the main scopes of this line of thought is to examine the classic problem of reproduction of an economic system in terms not only physical but also monetary and financial. In this respect, as we shall see, the monetary scheme of reproduction gives a specific contribution by focusing on the deviations of utilization of productive capacity, prices and distribution from their respective “normal” levels and analyzing the impact of these deviations on the solvency of the economic system.

The first version of the monetary scheme of reproduction was based on some restrictive assumptions: the rate of interest on wages paid in advance was considered negligible and the rates of growth and profit in the various sectors were assumed to be uniform (Brancaccio 2008). In this paper we intend to show that these restrictions can be removed from the original framework without altering the conclusions, which are indeed enriched with further significance. In particular, we shall see that in a context where profit rates are not necessarily uniform the monetary policy “rule” of the central banker can also have an impact on the solvency of the single sectors of the economic system.

2. A monetary scheme of reproduction

We shall examine a capitalist system closed to trade with other countries. The actors involved in the analysis are workers, firms and their owners regarded as a whole, banks, the central bank and the possible addition of the public sector. As regards physical production, it is assumed that two

² Lunghini, Bianchi (2004); Halevi, Taouil (1998) See also the collections of essays edited by Deleplace, Nell (1996), Rochon, Rossi (2003) and Arena, Salvadori (2004) and their introductions.

³ This hope has been expressed in various circumstances but for a long time there have not been relevant advances in this sense. On this point, see the discussion contained in Kregel (1983); see also Minsky (1992, p. 368) and the debate with Garegnani in the same volume. More recently, however, there has been significant progress towards a constructive dialogue between the heterodox schools of thought, for example in order to delineate a shared link between the Surplus theory of value and distribution and the Post Keynesian theory of money. See Aspramourgous (2004) and Lavoie (2010), among others.

goods are produced, corn and iron in this instance, by means of the goods themselves and labour. It is also assumed that there is only one technology, which is given, and that the means of production last for only one period. Both goods are regarded as “basic goods” in that each serves as input in the production of itself and the other. As regards circulation of money, it is assumed that at the beginning of each period firms require monetary loans from banks in order to finance the nominal wages paid to workers in advance and the purchase of means of production. The monetary loans and relative interests must be repaid at the end of the same period with respect of nominal wages and the end of the next period as regards the monetary value of means of production. The variables used in analysis are listed below.

a_{jh}	Technical coefficients of production: the quantity of good j needed to produce one unit of good h
l_j	Coefficients of labour: the quantity of labour needed to produce one unit of good j
K_j	Quantity of good j used as input in the entire economy at the beginning of every period
X_j	Quantity of good j produced at the end of every period
p_j	Monetary price of the production of good j calculated in terms of the “normal” rate of profit and the corresponding monetary wage
q_j^α	Quantity of good j consumed by agent α (for $\alpha=L$ by workers; for $\alpha=K$ by capitalists; for $\alpha=Z$ by the public sector or other centre of autonomous expenditure not generating productive capacity)
K	Total monetary value of capital (i.e. of goods used as input)
W	Monetary wage per unit of labour
r	Normal rate of profit
i	Interest rate
g_j	Rate of accumulation of inputs needed to produce the output good of sector j
λ^α	Proportion of goods consumed by agent α
γ_j	Deviation of the rate of profit from its “normal” level r in sector j (if $\gamma=1$, the market rate of profit is equal to the “normal” rate)
δ_{jt}	Deviation in period t of the monetary price of good j from the price corresponding to “normal” distribution ($\delta_{jt}=1$ means no deviation)
u_j	Deviation in sector j of the degree of utilisation of productive

	capacity from its “normal” level ($u_j=1$ means no deviation)
s_k	Propensity to save of capitalists ($0 \leq s_k \leq 1$)
Y	Monetary value of total production gross of reinvestment
C	Monetary expenditure on consumption
I	Monetary expenditure on investment
Z	Autonomous monetary expenditure generating no productive capacity (e.g. public spending)

The technical coefficient a_{jh} will serve here to indicate the quantity of the generic good j (input) needed to produce one unit of the generic good h (output). It should also be noted that in this system with just two sectors, the subscripts c and i will be adopted respectively for corn and iron. Every period corresponds to a period of production of the goods. The variables with no subscripts regard time t . The scheme consists of the following fifteen equations:

- (1) $p_c = (1+r)l_c w + (1+r)^2(p_c a_{cc} + p_i a_{ic})$
- (2) $p_i = (1+r)l_i w + (1+r)^2(p_c a_{ci} + p_i a_{ii})$
- (3) $Y = \delta_{ct} p_c u_c X_c + \delta_{it} p_i u_i X_i$
- (4) $Y = l_c u_c X_c w + l_i u_i X_i w + \gamma_c r l_c u_c X_c w + \gamma_i r l_i u_i X_i w +$
 $+ (1 + \gamma_c r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c) +$
 $+ (1 + \gamma_i r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i)$
- (5) $Y = C + I + Z$
- (6) $I = (1 + g_c)(\delta_{ct} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{it} p_i a_{ic} X_c) +$
 $+ (1 + g_i)(\delta_{ct} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{it} p_i a_{ii} X_i)$

$$\begin{aligned}
(7) \quad C = & (l_c u_c X_c + l_i u_i X_i)w + \\
& + (1 - s_k) [\gamma_c r (l_c u_c X_c)w + \\
& + (1 + \gamma_c r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c) + \\
& + \gamma_i r (l_i u_i X_i)w + \\
& + (1 + \gamma_i r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i)]
\end{aligned}$$

$$(8) \quad (l_c u_c X_c + l_i u_i X_i)w = \delta_{ct} p_c q_c^L + \delta_{it} p_i q_i^L$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(9) \quad (1 - s_k) [& \gamma_c r l_c u_c X_c w + \\
& + (1 + \gamma_c r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c) + \\
& + \gamma_i r l_i u_i X_i w + \\
& + (1 + \gamma_i r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i)] = \\
& = \delta_{ct} p_c q_c^K + \delta_{it} p_i q_i^K
\end{aligned}$$

$$(10) \quad Z = \delta_c p_c q_c^Z + \delta_i p_i q_i^Z$$

$$(11) \quad K_c = a_{cc} X_c + a_{ci} X_i$$

$$(12) \quad K_i = a_{ic} X_c + a_{ii} X_i$$

$$(13) \quad \lambda^Z = \frac{q_i^Z}{q_c^Z}$$

$$(14) \quad \lambda^L = \frac{q_i^L}{q_c^L}$$

$$(15) \quad \lambda^K = \frac{q_i^K}{q_c^K}$$

Equations (1) and (2) describe the system of prices. These are monetary prices determined as a function of the “normal” rate of profit and the

monetary wage. These prices are strictly related to those reported in the common systems of prices of production typical of the Surplus approach. It is of course possible at any moment to transform the prices represented in (1) and (2) in prices of production. Their presentation in nominal terms shall make it possible, however, to highlight the possible deviations of the variables from what is described in the Surplus approach as the “normal” or “long-period” position of the economic system. Furthermore, with respect to the common prices of production, the monetary prices analysed in this scheme incorporate rates of profit which are calculated on the monetary value of wages paid at the beginning of the current period, and on the monetary value of means of production paid at the beginning of the previous period⁴. Equation (3) indicates the value of national production, (4) the distribution of national income between wages and profits, (5) the macroeconomic equilibrium, (6) the expenditure on investments and (7) the total expenditure on consumption. Equations (8), (9) and (10) describe the expenditure on consumption on the part of workers, capitalists and the public sector, and equations (13), (14) and (15) the proportions of the goods involved in the same. Only for the sake of simplicity, in equation (8) it is assumed that workers spend all their income for consumption. Finally, equations (11) and (12) give the quantities of corn and iron employed as productive inputs at the beginning of every period. For given levels of K_c and K_i available as inputs, the corresponding levels of X_c and X_i will indicate the production that can be obtained in conditions of “normal” utilisation of productive capacity.

The structure of the system is largely the same as in Brancaccio (2008). With respect to the original version, however, two major simplifying assumptions are removed here, the first being that there are no differences between sectors in rates of accumulation, in deviations from normal prices and capacities, and hence also in market rates of profit. These variables can instead differ here between one sector and the other. The sectors will therefore have different rates of accumulation g , different deviations δ from normal prices, different deviations u from normal utilisation, and different deviations γ from the normal rate of

⁴ As we shall see, in this scheme monetary wages are paid at the beginning of each period while the basket of goods that make up the wage is bought at the end of the same period. For a different and more common setting, which also assumes that real wages are paid post-factum but does not consider advances of monetary wages, see Kurz and Salvadori (1995, p. 45). In any case, both the Surplus approach and the Monetary Circuit analysis can admit several hypotheses as regards the moment in which monetary and real wages are paid and spent. The important thing is to define precisely the monetary and physical concepts of “capital advanced” at the beginning of the production period and calculate the rates of interest and profit on it in a consistent way.

profit, all suitable specified by means of the respective subscripts. It should be clarified that the analysis of these deviations do not necessarily rule out the tendency towards uniformity of profit rates which is typical of the Surplus approach. Rather, this scheme can “photograph” the movements of the actual rates of profit around the single normal rate. It should also be noted that each of the rates of accumulation refers to the increase in the inputs required for the production of output in each sector⁵.

The second simplifying assumption eliminated here is that the rates of interest and profit are both negligible with respect to wages paid in advance. As a result, the mechanism for the financing of productive activities, the formation of profits and the repayment of loans is altered as follows. First of all, the interval between the employment of labour and the employment of means of production is confirmed and hence also the existence of two different intervals between loans and repayments, one for the wages paid in advance and the other for the funds needed to purchase means of production. It is assumed that the workers are paid at the beginning of every period and work and produce in that period. While the means of production are also bought and paid for at the beginning of every period, it is assumed that it takes exactly one period to produce them, which means that they can only be used in the following period. The length of the circuit of reimbursement is thus one period for wages and two for means of production. In other words, while a loan made at the beginning of a period will have to be repaid at the end of the same period in the case of wages paid in advance, it could be repaid at the end of the following period in the case of means of production. The rate of profit will therefore be calculated on wages or the value of means of production on the basis of different deadlines: a rate of profit on wages paid in advance that refers to a single period and a rate of profit on loans to purchase means of production that refers to two periods. This also holds of course for rates of interest⁶.

⁵ This means, for example, that g_c refers to the corn sector in the sense that it corresponds to the rate of accumulation of the inputs of iron and corn required to produce the output of corn.

⁶ In principle, these changes mean that we should admit as many rates of profit and interest as there are periods considered. It can, however, be assumed as an initial approximation that the rates of interest and profit are established within a span of two periods. As can be seen from the equations of the system, this makes it possible to distinguish the amounts of the rates of profit and interest for one period from those for two periods simply by squaring the latter. It should be pointed out that this assumption is in no way indispensable to attainment of the basic results of this scheme. It simply enables us to avoid uselessly overburdening the system with variables.

The last change with respect to the original scheme is that this version admits expenditure on consumer goods not only for workers but also for capitalists and the public sector. It is therefore necessary here to specify the distribution of the consumption of corn and iron of all three of the social parties considered.

3. A “snapshot” of the monetary circuit of reproduction

The system described has 15 equations and 38 variables. On the assumption that the conditions of existence for an economically significant solution are in force, solving the system will involve setting 23 exogenous variables in order to obtain the remaining 15 endogenous ones. Let us examine some possible mathematical solutions for this system. As we shall see, they represent a sort of “snapshots” of the monetary circuit that try to capture some aspects of the so-called «actual» or «market» values in the sense of the long-period method on which the Surplus approach is based (Kurz and Salvadori 1995, p. 20). Afterwards, we shall also analyse the “sequence” of the monetary circuit.

In attaining the solution of the system, as we shall see, an important role is played by the deviations u from the degree of “normal” utilisation of productive capacity and the deviations δ from monetary prices determined as a function of “normal” distribution. While the first kind of deviation has been widely addressed within the surplus approach (Garegnani 1992, Kurz 1994), the second one can be considered implicit in the monetary circuit (Graziani 2003) and also in the theoretical schemes which link accumulation and distribution by assuming a normal utilisation of capacity on the basis of a Cambridge equation (Brancaccio 2005). The choice between the one or the other option has usually been evaluated as a kind of theoretical crossroads between different ways of conceiving the macroeconomic adjustment. However, there is in principle no reason to consider these options as conflicting alternatives. In the present scheme, for this reason, both of them will be admitted. The solution of the system of equations can then be defined a snapshot because it captures “market values” which admit deviations from normal utilisation of capacity as in the “long-period” analysis, but can also differ from the “long-period” position because of deviations from monetary and relative prices corresponding to normal distribution⁷.

⁷ On this concepts of “market” and “long-period” positions see Kurz and Salvadori (1995) and Petri (2004). Given that the “long period” position admits deviations from the normal utilization of productive capacity, it is important to distinguish it from the concept of stationary growth. On the differences between these definitions and the marginalist

The determination put forward below rests on the following exogenous variables⁸:

$$l_c, l_i, a_{cc}, a_{ci}, a_{ic}, a_{ii}, r, w, K_c, K_i, \delta_{i(t-1)}, \delta_{c(t-1)}, s_k, g_c, g_i, Z, \lambda^L, \lambda^K, \lambda^Z, \gamma_i, u_i, \delta_{ct}, \delta_{it}$$

The remaining 15 variables will therefore be endogenous:

$$p_c, p_i, X_c, X_i, \gamma_c, u_c, Y, C, I, q_c^L, q_i^L, q_c^K, q_i^K, q_c^Z, q_i^Z$$

Alternatively, u_c could be regarded as an exogenous variable and δ_{ct} as endogenous. In order to solve the system, we shall assign r, w and i the technical coefficients l_j and a_{jh} so that equations (1) and (2) determine the prices p_j . Given the inputs K_j too, equations (11) and (12) determine the quantities X_j that can be produced in conditions of the normal utilisation of productive capacity. By replacing equations (4), (6) and (7) in (5) and equation (3) in (4), we obtain a system of two equations, (5') and (4') respectively, which make it possible to express the following two functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_c &(\delta_{ct}, \delta_{it}, \gamma_i, u_i, \dots) \\ u_c &(\delta_{ct}, \delta_{it}, \gamma_i, u_i, \dots) \end{aligned}$$

The algebraic expressions of these two functions can be obtained by means of the solution procedure mentioned above, which is not discussed in full so as to avoid weighing down our exposition unduly. These functions make it possible to establish the macroeconomic equilibrium values both of the deviation γ_c of the market rate of profit in the corn sector with respect to the normal rate of profit, and of the deviation u_c from the normal productive capacity in the corn sector. Alternatively, if δ_{ct} is taken as an endogenous variable, (5') and (4') will be represented by the functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_c &(\delta_{it}, \gamma_i, u_c, u_i, \dots) \\ \delta_{ct} &(\delta_{it}, \gamma_i, u_c, u_i, \dots) \end{aligned}$$

concepts of “secular”, “long period” and “short period” (temporary and intertemporal) equilibrium, see also Brancaccio (2010).

⁸ As we shall see, taking the inputs K_j as exogenous variables does not mean joining the logic of the marginalist concept of “scarcity” because the prices corresponding to normal distribution remain determined so as to ensure the conditions of reproducibility of the system, and with no reference to the equilibrium between endowments of given resources and their respective demand which is typical of the marginalist theories (see also Brancaccio 2008, 2010).

which can be interpreted in the same way as the previous ones with the sole difference that the deviation u_c from the normal level of productive capacity in the corn sector is taken as exogenous in this case while the deviation δ_{ct} from the normal price p_c is determined endogenously.

If the mathematical conditions of existence are met, the above procedure is the one required in order to obtain a solution for the system. It may now prove useful, however, to focus attention on the link existing between the scheme examined here and the original analysis in Brancaccio (2008). This can be done by working back gradually from the former to the latter and reintroducing the eliminated simplifying assumptions one at a time. Among other things, this will make easier to elucidate the equations of the system and offer an opportunity to note some previously hidden characteristics of the theory. Let us begin by reintroducing the assumption that the rates of interest and profit calculated on the wages paid in advance are negligible. The system takes the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5') \quad 1 + \gamma_c r &= \frac{1}{s_k (\delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c + \delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c)} \\
 &\cdot [Z - s_k (1 + \gamma_i r) (\delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i) + \\
 &+ (1 + g_c) (\delta_{ct} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{it} p_i a_{ic} X_c) + \\
 &+ (1 + g_i) (\delta_{it} p_i a_{ii} X_i + \delta_{ct} p_c a_{ci} X_i)] \\
 (4') \quad \delta_{ct} p_c u_c X_c + \delta_{it} p_i u_i X_i &= (l_c u_c X_c + l_i u_i X_i) w + \\
 &+ (1 + \gamma_c r) (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c) + \\
 &+ (1 + \gamma_i r) (\delta_{i(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i)
 \end{aligned}$$

As stated above, given δ_{ct} , equation (5') makes it possible to determine γ_c . Once the values of δ_{ct} and γ_c are known, equation (4') therefore enables us to determine u_c . In more general terms, it can be said that equation (4') identifies all the combinations of u_c and δ_{ct} that are compatible with the macroeconomic equilibrium. It should be borne in mind, however, that it would also have been possible to assign a value to u_c and then use the system of (4') and (5') in order to obtain γ_c and δ_{ct} .

The values assumed by the variables δ_{jt} and u_j will depend on entrepreneurial decisions with respect to the various possible ways of bringing the value of production into line with monetary expenditure. Entrepreneurs can decide to deviate from normal prices, by modifying the

δ_{ji} , or from normal utilisation of productive capacity by means of the u_j . It is of course legitimate to assume that they will act on both fronts in reality, identifying the combinations of variations in price and quantities considered most appropriate case by case. In any case, we shall refrain from formulating any specific hypotheses as to entrepreneurial decisions on prices and quantities here, thus leaving the field open to changes in one or the other or both.

We now find ourselves with an intermediate solution midway between the present version of the scheme and the original one, having reintroduced the simplifying assumption of negligible rates of interest and profit on wages but maintained the possibility of different rates of growth and profit in each sector. This hybrid case makes it possible to discern an important property of the production system, namely the interdependence of sectors, which remained hidden in various respects in the original version. It should be noted in this connection that the decisions taken in one sector of production with regard to prices, quantities and rate of profit can have a crucial effect on the possible combinations of prices, quantity and profits in the other. One of the two sectors could even act as a driving force for the production system as a whole, forcing the other to adapt and keep in step. In formal terms, the predominant position of one sector with respect to the other could be represented through the appropriate selection of exogenous and endogenous variables (on this point see Lunghini and Bianchi 2004).

We can now complete the description of the procedure for the identification of a solution. Having obtained Y from equation (3) and C from (7), we can calculate I from (6). From equations (8), (9) and (10) together with (13), (14) and (15), it will then be possible to obtain the physical quantities of corn and iron consumed respectively by workers, capitalists and the public sector. Moreover, it can be ascertained at the strictly formal level that the consumption of workers, and hence also the real wages, constitute a residue determined at the end of the analysis. While the possibility of a change in normal real wages is not ruled out, in mathematical terms it will always take place through a change in the exogenous normal rate of profit, perhaps prompted by the constant pressure of monetary wage claims or coefficients of labour. The juxtaposition of equations (4') and (5') will now enable us to obtain the following equation, which describes the macroeconomic equilibrium:

$$\begin{aligned}
(6') \quad & Z + (1 + g_c)(\delta_{ct} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{it} p_i a_{ic} X_c) + \\
& + (1 + g_i)(\delta_{it} p_i a_{ii} X_i + \delta_{ct} p_c a_{ci} X_i) = \\
& = s_k [\delta_{ct} p_c u_c X_c + \delta_{it} p_i u_i X_i - (l_c u_c X_c + l_i u_i X_i) w]
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now reintroduce the other simplifying assumption of the original scheme, namely that the various γ_j , δ_{jt} , $\delta_{j(t-1)}$, u_j and g_j are the same in the two sectors. In this case, equation (5') is greatly simplified and can be written as follows:

$$(5'') \quad 1 + \gamma r = \frac{1}{s_k} \frac{\delta_t}{\delta_{t-1}} \left(\frac{Z}{\delta_t K} + 1 + g \right)$$

in which, by definition:

$$K = p_c a_{cc} X_c + p_c a_{ci} X_i + p_i a_{ic} X_c + p_i a_{ii} X_i = p_c K_c + p_i K_i$$

If it is also assumed that the propensity to save of capitalists is equal to 1, that $\delta_{jt} = \delta_{j(t-1)}$, and that the autonomous component of expenditure is zero, we obtain:

$$(5''') \quad \gamma r = g$$

Under these simplifying assumptions, macroeconomic equilibrium corresponds simply to equality between the market rate of profit and the rate of accumulation.

4. The “sequence” of the monetary circuit: loans and repayments

The mathematical solution described above is no more than a “snapshot” which captures the departures of the monetary circuit of reproduction from the “long-period” position. We shall now attempt to outline the “sequence” of the monetary circuit referred to the continuous reproduction of loans and repayments. First of all we shall focus on the start of the monetary circuit, which involves the loans made to firms by banks, and an initial definition of the macroeconomic equilibrium. Afterwards we shall examine the phase of the final repayment of these loans and especially the ability or otherwise of each sector to conclude the circuit of financing. It should be borne in mind that in describing the sequence of the monetary circuit, we shall again eliminate the simplifying assumptions contained in Brancaccio (2008) and return to a scheme

which envisages both differing rates of profit and accumulation in the different sectors and non-negligible rates of profit and interest on the wages paid in advance.

We shall maintain the assumption that the normal rate of profit and monetary wages are exogenous variables. It is also assumed initially that firms utilise their productive capacity at the normal level: $u_c = u_i = 1$. If the techniques a_{jh} are known and the quantities of initial inputs available K_j are given, the quantities X_j to be produced are therefore also known as well as the distribution of the inputs between the productive sectors. Let us assume that the prices also correspond originally to their “normal” level: $\delta_{jt} = \delta_{j(t-1)} = 1$. The sequence starts with the loan applications submitted by firms to banks. One category of loan will serve to cover the wages that firms will have to pay their workers in order to produce the quantities X_j . This will be equal to:

$$(l_c X_c + l_i X_i)w$$

A loan equal to:

$$(1 + g_c)(p_c a_{cc} X_c + p_i a_{ic} X_c) + (1 + g_i)(p_c a_{ci} X_i + p_i a_{ii} X_i)$$

will also be requested for the purchase of means of production as replenishment and investment. Let us now go on to analyse the macroeconomic equilibrium. If we assume for simplicity that the autonomous component of aggregate demand Z is zero, the replacement of (3), (6) and (7) in (5) will give the following condition of macroeconomic equilibrium⁹:

$$\begin{aligned} (7') \quad & \delta_{ct} p_c u_c X_c + \delta_{it} p_i u_i X_i = (l_c u_c X_c + l_i u_i X_i)w + \\ & + (1 - s_k) [\gamma_c r l_c u_c X_c w + \\ & + (1 + \gamma_c r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c) + \\ & + \gamma_i r l_i u_i X_i w + \\ & + (1 + \gamma_i r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i)] + \\ & + (1 + g_c) (\delta_{ct} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{it} p_i a_{ic} X_c) + \end{aligned}$$

⁹ Despite the more general assumptions on which equation (7') is based, it can still be traced back to (6') by considering the fact that in (7') the value in square brackets is equal to the value of total production minus wages and that Z is equal to zero in (7').

$$+(1+g_i)(\delta_{it}p_c a_{ci}X_i + \delta_{it}p_i a_{ii}X_i)$$

As the assumption of cross-sector uniformity in the rates of growth and profit has been abandoned, the macroeconomic equilibrium described above is in no way tantamount to sectoral equilibrium. The individual sectors can in fact be in a state of imbalance while maintaining the equilibrium indicated by (7'). It is therefore necessary to solve the problems of indetermination caused by an exclusively aggregate approach. To this end, and so as not to make the algebraic exposition unduly cumbersome, we shall reintroduce some simplifying assumptions, namely that capitalists save all of their income ($s_k = 1$) and that the autonomous component of demand generating no productive capacity is zero ($Z = 0$). These assumptions obviously modify equations (5) and (7). At the same time, they make equations (9), (10), (13) and (15) meaningless, as there is no longer any problem regarding the consumption of capitalists or the public sector. The condition of macroeconomic equilibrium thus becomes:

$$(16) \delta_{ct}p_c u_c X_c + \delta_{it}p_i u_i X_i = (l_c u_c X_c + l_i u_i X_i)w + \\ + (1+g_c)(\delta_{ct}p_c a_{cc}X_c + \delta_{it}p_i a_{ic}X_c) + \\ + (1+g_i)(\delta_{it}p_c a_{ci}X_i + \delta_{it}p_i a_{ii}X_i)$$

The total value of production must be equal to the overall value of monetary expenditure, which corresponds to the total wage bill plus the demand for investments. As regards the sectoral equilibria of expenditure and income, their elucidation is not required for the purposes of our argument. Our objective now is to ascertain whether the firms are in a position to repay their loans, which can be done quite simply by comparing income and reimbursements regardless of the level and the distribution of the expenditure that generated them. The sectoral equilibria between expenditure and income can be elucidated here purely as an example. To this end, however, it will be necessary to introduce some simplifying assumptions with respect to the distribution of the workers' expenditure between corn and iron. If we assume for example that $\lambda_L = 0$, i.e. that workers spend all of their wages on corn, the sectoral equilibria of expenditure and production can be described by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
(17) \quad & (1 + \gamma_c r) l_c u_c X_c w + \\
& + (1 + \gamma_c r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c) = \\
& = l_c u_c X_c w + l_i u_i X_i w + \\
& + (1 + g_c) (\delta_{ct} p_c a_{cc} X_c) + (1 + g_i) (\delta_{ci} p_c a_{ci} X_i)
\end{aligned}$$

for the corn sector and:

$$\begin{aligned}
(18) \quad & (1 + \gamma_i r) l_i u_i X_i w + \\
& + (1 + \gamma_i r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i) = \\
& = (1 + g_i) (\delta_{ii} p_i a_{ii} X_i) + (1 + g_c) (\delta_{ii} p_i a_{ic} X_c)
\end{aligned}$$

for iron. The assumption as regards the sectoral distribution of workers' expenditure is of course arbitrary and can be replaced by any other. As pointed out, however, if our purpose is to ascertain the loan repayment capacity of each sector, then it is sufficient to compare reimbursements and income with no need whatsoever to consider expenditure and how it is divided between the goods produced. We shall therefore ignore demand and focus attention on the problem of the repayment of loans. In equations (17) and (18) total profit is calculated on the capital borrowed in the previous period, and hence in terms of the deviation δ_j for that period. Now, out of the income obtained through the sale of their production, the firms will have to make the following repayments to the banks, the first term regarding the payment of wages and the second expenditure on investments:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1+i)(l_c u_c X_c + l_i u_i X_i) w + \\
& + (1+i)^2 [(\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c) + \\
& + (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i)]
\end{aligned}$$

where i is the yearly rate of interests on bank loans. Only for the sake of simplicity we assume here that the interest rate is determined directly by the central bank. In other words, we assume that there is no difference between the interest rate that banks charge on loans and the rate of interest at which the central bank provides liquidity to banks. The reimbursements due respectively from the industries of corn and iron will be:

$$(1+i)l_c u_c X_c w + (1+i)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c)$$

and:

$$(1+i)l_i u_i X_i w + (1+i)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i)$$

As regards due dates, it should be remembered that there is an interval between the reimbursement of loans for the payment of wages and the reimbursement of loans for the purchase of means of production. It is in fact assumed that while the loans for wages contracted at the beginning of the period must be repaid at the end of the same, those for investments contracted at the beginning of a period can be repaid later, at the end not of the current period but the next, and that they will entail payment of a compound interest rate i set exogenously through negotiation between firms and banks. It should be noted in this connection that, net of the interest paid, the second term in the above expressions corresponds precisely to the investment of the previous period. In overall terms:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c) + \\ & + (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i) = \\ & = (1 + g_c) (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_{c(t-1)} + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_{c(t-1)}) + \\ & + (1 + g_i) (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_{i(t-1)} + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_{i(t-1)}) = I_{t-1} \end{aligned}$$

Broken down to the sectoral level, this gives the following respectively for the industries producing corn and iron:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c) = \\ & = (1 + g_c) (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_{c(t-1)} + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_{c(t-1)}) = I_{c(t-1)} \end{aligned}$$

and:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i) = \\ & = (1 + g_i) (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_{i(t-1)} + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_{i(t-1)}) = I_{i(t-1)} \end{aligned}$$

It should be pointed out that the only assumption essential to the results of the scheme is that for at least one type of loan, reimbursement takes place with a delay of one period. This makes it possible to avoid a problem that has given rise to a long dispute in debate on the circuit, namely the fact

that in a system where loans are to be made and repaid in the same period, it would be impossible to pay the interest owed to the banks in money. Moreover, the same assumption lends plausibility to the existence of a multiplier of autonomous expenditure within the monetary circuit (see Brancaccio 2005, 2008 for further discussion). All the other assumptions serve exclusively to simplify the algebra.

5. “Solvency rule” and sectors in a monetary scheme of reproduction

When the time comes to repay their loans with the associated interest, the firms will be left with non-negative net profits only if their income from sales is no lower than the reimbursements due. Only in this case can the firms be regarded as solvent. At the aggregate level, the following condition must be met:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (1 + \gamma_c r) l_c u_c X_c w + \\
 & + (1 + \gamma_c r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c) + \\
 & + (1 + \gamma_i r) l_i u_i X_i w + \\
 & + (1 + \gamma_i r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i) \geq \\
 & \geq (1+i) (l_c u_c X_c + l_i u_i X_i) w + \\
 & + (1+i)^2 [(\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c) + \\
 & + (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i)]
 \end{aligned}$$

This could be solved by replacing $\gamma_c r$ and $\gamma_i r$ with an average rate of profit. In order to ascertain the solvency of each individual industry, it will instead be necessary to focus on the difference between income and reimbursements in each sector. We will have therefore the following respectively for the industries producing corn and iron:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (1 + \gamma_c r) l_c u_c X_c w + \\
 & + (1 + \gamma_c r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c) \geq \\
 & \geq (1+i) l_c u_c X_c w + (1+i)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{cc} X_c + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ic} X_c)
 \end{aligned}$$

and:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 + \gamma_i r) l_i u_i X_i w + \\
& + (1 + \gamma_i r)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i) \geq \\
& \geq (1+i) l_i u_i X_i w + (1+i)^2 (\delta_{c(t-1)} p_c a_{ci} X_i + \delta_{i(t-1)} p_i a_{ii} X_i)
\end{aligned}$$

If now we posit:

$$x = \gamma_j r$$

$$L_j = l_j u_j X_j w$$

$$K_j = (\delta_{j(t-1)} p_j a_{jj} X_j + \delta_{h(t-1)} p_h a_{hj} X_j)$$

it can be ascertained that the equation

$$(1+x)L_j + (1+x)^2 K_j = (1+x)L_j + (1+x)^2 K_j$$

with x unknown, admits two roots:

$$x_1 = -\frac{L_j + (1+i)K_j}{K_j}, x_2 = i$$

If we discard the negative solutions for $\gamma_j r$, the two previous inequalities can only be satisfied if:

$$(19) \quad \gamma_c r \geq i$$

$$(20) \quad \gamma_i r \geq i$$

As can be seen from (5') or from (5''), for any given level of the deviation of the rate of profit in the iron sector, the deviation of the rate of profit in the corn sector depends on the rates of accumulation and the dynamics of prices. Then we can write: $\gamma_c = \gamma_c(g_c, g_i, \delta_{ct}, \delta_{c(t-1)}, \delta_{it}, \delta_{i(t-1)})$. If we now assume that the central bank's objective is to set a rate of interest consistent with the financial solvency of both sectors, then we can group (19) and (20) in the following condition:

$$(21) \quad i \leq \min[r\gamma_i; r\gamma_c(g_c, g_i, \delta_{ct}, \delta_{c(t-1)}, \delta_{it}, \delta_{i(t-1)})]$$

Condition (21) represents the “solvency rule” of the central banker which is derived from the monetary scheme of reproduction. This version of the rule differs from that contained in Brancaccio and Fontana (2012) in two respects. On the one hand, for the sake of simplicity this rule describes only “covered” financial positions in Minsky’s sense which entail the complete repayment of loans at the end of each period, while the other version takes also into account the existence of “speculative” and “ultra-speculative” positions. On the other hand, this version does not come from a simple macroeconomic model but arises from a two-sector scheme of reproduction. The advantage of the rule expressed by (21) is that it clarifies that if the rates of profit between sectors differ from each other, then the rule of the central banker should be tuned to the solvency conditions of the industry less profitable. Otherwise, monetary policy would not be neutral on the development paths of the sectors of the economy.

It should be noted that the solvency rule reveals some superficial similarities with the conventional Taylor rule. Suffice it to say that both rules determine the interest rate as a function of the same variables, such as inflation rates, or variables closely linked, as the rates of accumulation and growth rates of GDP, or variables conceptually substitutes, as the “normal” rate of profit and the “natural” rate of interest. However, the analogy between the two rules is only formal. In reality, they represent two alternative conceptions of monetary policy. Taylor sees his rule as indicating the intention of the central banker to calibrate interest rates in relation to the objective of ensuring the stability of inflation around the target rate, and the convergence of income towards its natural level determined on the basis of the neoclassical “fundamentals”. The alternative approach described here suggests that the central bank has the very different task of adjusting interest rates in order to ensure the solvency of the sectors of the economy considered. In a monetary scheme of reproduction there is no reason to prevent the central banker to act on interest rates in order to regulate the solvency of the system. In this sense, the interest rate which derives from (21) is a sort of benchmark: depending on whether the actual monetary policy is more or less restrictive with respect to that interest rate, the number of insolvent companies and entire industries may be higher or lower. The result is that any sort of “neutrality” of monetary policy must be excluded, both from the point of view of the scale and distribution of production, and from that of its sectoral composition.

General References

- Accoce, J-V. and Mouakil T. (2007), 'The monetary circuit approach: a stock-flow consistent model', in E. Hein and A. Truger (eds.), *Money, distribution and economic policy*, Cheltenham-Northampton: Edward Elgar, pp. 66-96.
- Akerlof, G. and Shiller R. (2009), *Animal spirits*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Alesina, A. and Giavazzi F. (2006), *Goodbye Europa*, Milano: Rizzoli.
- Alesina, A. and Perotti F. (1997), 'Fiscal adjustment in OECD countries: Composition and macroeconomic effects', *Staff papers*, n. 42, IMF.
- Amable, B. and Palombarini S. (2009), 'A Neorealist approach to institutional change and the diversity of capitalism', *Socio Economic Review*, 7(1), pp. 123-143.
- Arena, R. and Graziani A. (eds.) (1985), *Production circulation et monnaie*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Arena, R. and Salvadori N. (eds.) (2004), *Money, Credit and the Role of the State. Essays in Honour of Augusto Graziani*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Arestis, P. and Sawyer M. (eds.) (2006), *A handbook of alternative monetary economics*, Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- Arestis, P. and Sawyer M. (eds.) (2010), *21st century Keynesian Economics*, New York: Macmillan.
- Aspromourgos, T. (2004), 'Sraffian research programmes and unorthodox economics', *Review of Political Economy*, 16(2), pp. 179-206.
- Augello, M. M. (1990), *Joseph A. Schumpeter: A Reference Guide*, Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Baranzini, M. (1982), 'Can the Life-Cycle Theory Help in Explaining Income Distribution and Capital Accumulation?', in M. Baranzini (ed.), *Advances in Economic Theory*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 243-61.
- Baranzini, M. (1991), *A Theory of Wealth Distribution and Accumulation*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baranzini, M. (1996), 'Structural Change, Economic Growth and Unemployment in a Vertically Integrated Model', in A. Cencini and M. Baranzini (eds.), *Inflation and Unemployment*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 61-72.
- Baranzini, M. and Harcourt G. C. (eds.) (1994), *The Dynamics of the Wealth of Nations. Growth Distribution and Structural Change (Essays in honour of L. L. Pasinetti)*, London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Barrière, A. (1979), *Déséquilibres économiques et contre-révolution keynésienne*, Paris: Economica.
- Barrière, A. (1990), 'Signification générale du circuit: une interprétation', *Économies et Sociétés (Série Monnaie e Production)*, 2(6), pp. 9-34.
- Bellino, E. (1993), 'Continuous Switching of Techniques in Linear Production Models', *The Manchester School*, 61(2), pp. 185-201.

- Bellino, E. (1994), 'Gravitazione intorno all'equilibrio di lungo periodo', *Economia politica*, **11**(3), pp. 477-522.
- Bellino, E. (1999), 'Convergence to Long-Run Equilibrium. On some Recent Variations of the 'Pure' Cross-Dual Model of Gravitation', *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, **10**(2), pp. 225-237.
- Bellino, E. (2011a), 'Employment and Income Distribution from a Classical-Keynesian Point of View: Some Tools to Ground a Normative Analysis', in E. Brancaccio and G. Fontana (eds.), *The Global Economic Crisis. New Perspectives on the Critique of Economic Theory and Policy*, New York: Routledge, pp. 298-315.
- Bellino, E. (2011b), 'Gravitation of Market Prices towards Natural Prices', in R. Ciccone, C. Gehrke e G. Mongiovi (eds.), *Sraffa and Modern Economics*, London and New York: Routledge, vol. II, ch.5.
- Bellofiore, R. (1985), 'Money and development in Schumpeter', *Review of Radical Political Economics*, **17**(1-2), Spring/Summer, pp. 21-40.
- Bellofiore, R. (1989), 'A monetary labor theory of value', *Review of Radical Political Economics*, **21**(1-2), pp. 1-26.
- Bellofiore, R. (1999), 'Schumpeter's theory of innovation, development and cycles', in P. A. O'Hara (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Political Economy*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1006-1010.
- Bellofiore, R. (2002), 'Transformation' and the monetary circuit: Marx as a monetary theorist of production', in M. Campbell and G. Reuten (eds.), *The Culmination of Capital: Essays on Volume Three of Marx's Capital*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 102-127.
- Bellofiore, R. (2004), 'As if its body were by love possessed. Abstract Labour and the Monetary Circuit: A Macro-Social Reading of Marx's Labour Theory of Value', in R. Arena and N. Salvadori (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 89-114.
- Bellofiore, R. (2005), 'Monetary economics after Wicksell: alternative perspectives within the theory of the monetary circuit', in G. Fontana, and R. Realfonzo (eds.) (2005), *cit.*, pp. 39-51.
- Bellofiore, R. (ed.) (1997), 'Marxian theory: the Italian debate', special issue of the *International Journal of Political Economy*, **27**(2).
- Bellofiore, R. and Passarella M. (2009), 'Finance and the realization problem in Rosa Luxemburg: a 'circuitist' reappraisal', in J. F. Ponsot and S. Rossi (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 98-115.
- Bellofiore, R. and Realfonzo R. (1997), 'Finance and the Labor Theory of Value. Toward a Macroeconomic Theory of Distribution from a Monetary Perspective', *International Journal of Political Economy*, **27**(2), pp. 97-118.
- Bellofiore, R. and Realfonzo R. (2003), 'Money as finance and money as universal equivalent: re-reading Marxian monetary theory', in L. P. Rochon and S. Rossi (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 198-218.
- Bellofiore R., Forges Davanzati G. and Realfonzo R. (2000), 'Marx inside the circuit. Discipline device, wage bargaining and unemployment in a sequential monetary economy', *Review of Political Economy*, **12**(1), pp. 403-417.

- Bellofiore R., Halevi J. and Passarella M. (2010), 'Minsky in the 'new' capitalism. The new clothes of the Financial Instability Hypothesis', in D. Papadimitriou and L. R. Wray (eds.), *The Elgar Companion to Hyman Minsky*, Northampton: Edward Elgar, pp. 84-99.
- Bertocco, G. (2006), 'The characteristics of a monetary economy: a Keynes-Schumpeter approach', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, **31**(1), pp. 101-122.
- Bhaduri, A. and Marglin S. (1990), 'Unemployment and the real wage: The economic basis for contesting political ideologies', *The Cambridge Journal of Economics*, **14**(4), pp. 375-393.
- Bossone, B. (2000), 'What Makes Bank Special?', The World Bank Financial Sector Strategy and Policy Department, Policy Research Working Papers n. 2408, August.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis H. (1975), 'The problem with human capital theory – A Marxian critique', *The American Economic Review*, **65**(2), pp. 74-82.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis H. (1986), *Democracy and capitalism. Property, community and the contradictions of modern social thought*, New York: Routledge.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis H. (2008), 'Power', in *The New Palgrave Encyclopedia of Economics*, London and New York: Macmillan.
- Brancaccio, E. (2005), 'Un modello di teoria monetaria della produzione capitalistica', *Il Pensiero economico italiano*, **XIII**(1), pp. 91-122.
- Brancaccio, E. (2008), 'Solvency and labour effort in a monetary theory of reproduction', *European Journal of Economic and Social Systems*, **21**(2), pp. 195-211.
- Brancaccio, E. (2009), 'The central banker as regulator of distributive conflict', in G. FONTANA and M. SETTERFIELD (eds.), *Macroeconomic Theory and Macroeconomic Pedagogy*, London: Macmillan.
- Brancaccio, E. (2010), 'On the impossibility of reducing the 'Surplus Approach' to a Neo-Classical 'Special Case': A criticism of Hahn in a Solowian context', *Review of Political Economy*, **22**(3), pp. 405-418.
- Brancaccio, E. and Fontana G. (2011), 'The Taylor Rule, the Solvency Rule and Capital Centralisation in a Monetary Union', working paper presented at the 15th Conference of the Research Network "Macroeconomics and Macroeconomic Policies", Berlin, October.
- Brancaccio, E. and Fontana G. (2012), 'Solvency rule versus Taylor rule. An alternative interpretation of the relation between monetary policy and the economic crisis', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, forthcoming (DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cje/bes028>).
- Castelnuovo, E. and Surico, P. (2003), 'What Does Monetary Policy Reveal about a Central Bank's Preferences?', *Economic Notes*, **32**(3), 335-59.
- Cavalieri, D. (2003), 'On the closure of the monetary circuit', working paper presented at the conference on "The Monetary Theory of Production" (in Honour of Augusto Graziani), Benevento, Italy, December 5-6.

- Chinn, M. D. (2008), 'Non-Linearities, Business Cycles and Exchange Rates', *Economic Notes*, **37**(3), 219-39.
- Clarida R., Gali J. and Gertert M. (1999), 'The science of monetary policy: A New Keynesian perspective, *Journal of Economic Literature*', **37**(4), pp. 1661-1707.
- Convenevo, R. (1977), *Processo inflazionistico e redistribuzione del reddito*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Costabile, L. (1980), *Malthus: sviluppo e ristagno della produzione capitalistica*, con un saggio introduttivo di Augusto Graziani, Torino: Einaudi.
- Court of Auditors (2011), 'Rapporto di coordinamento della finanza pubblica'.
- Crotty J., Epstein G. and Kelly P. (1995), 'Multinational corporations and technological change: global stagnation and unemployment', paper presented for the Economic Policy Institute's Conference on "Globalization and progressive economic policy: what are the real constraints? What are the real options?", Washington (D.C.), October 27-29.
- Davidson, P. (1982), 'Rational Expectations: a Fallacious Foundation for Studying Crucial Decision Making Process', *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, **5**(2), pp. 182-198.
- Davidson, P. (1988), 'A technical definition of uncertainty and the long-run non-neutrality of money', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, **12**(3), pp. 329-337.
- Deleplace, G. and Nell E. J. (eds.) (1996), *Money in motion*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- De Vecchi, N. (ed.) (1983), *La teoria austriaca del capitale e dell'interesse*, Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana.
- De Vecchi, N. (1995), *Entrepreneurs, Institutions and Economic Change: The Economic Thought of Joseph Schumpeter (1905-1925)*, Aldershot and Brookfield (Vermont): Edward Elgar (English Translation of *Schumpeter viennese*, Torino: Bollati Boringhieri, 1993).
- Di Gaspare, S. (2005), 'To buy or not to buy'. The Problem of Effective Demand in Abbatti's Theory', *Studi Economici*, **LX**(86), pp. 1-34.
- Dosi, G. (1990), 'Finance, innovation and industrial change', *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, **13**(3), pp. 299-319.
- Dosi G., Gaffard J.-L. and Nesta L. (2008), 'Schumpeterian themes on industrial evolution, structural change and their microfoundations: an introduction', *Industrial and Corporate Change*, **17**(4), pp. 601-609.
- Dos Santos, C. (2005), 'A stock-flow general consistent framework for formal Minskian analyses of closed economies', *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, **27**(4), pp. 711-35.
- Dos Santos, C. (2006), 'Keynesian theorizing during hard times: stock-flow consistent models as an unexplored 'frontier' of Keynesian Macroeconomics', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, **30**(4), pp. 541-65.
- Dos Santos C. and Zezza G. (2008), 'A simplified, 'benchmark', stock-flow consistent Post-Keynesian growth model', *Metroeconomica*, **59**(3), pp. 441-478.

- Dow, S. C. (1993), 'Methodology and the Analysis of a Monetary Economy', in S. C. Dow (ed.), *Money and Economic Process*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 5-25.
- Fanno, M. (1992), *Teoria del credito e della circolazione*, a cura di Riccardo Realfonzo e Augusto Graziani, Napoli: ESI.
- Fontana, G. (2009), *Money, Uncertainty and Time*, New York: Routledge.
- Fontana, G. and Realfonzo, R. (eds.) (2005), *The monetary theory of production*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Forges Davanzati, G. and Pacella A. (2008), 'Minimum wage, credit rationing and unemployment in a monetary economy', *European Journal of Economic and Social Systems*, **21**(2), pp. 179-194.
- Forges Davanzati, G. and Pacella A. (2010a), 'Emulation, indebtedness and income distribution: a monetary theory of production approach', *Intervention. European Journal of Economics and Economic Policies*, **7**(1), pp. 145-165.
- Forges Davanzati, G. and Pacella A. (2010b), 'The effect of unemployment benefits on income distribution in a monetary economy', Paper presented at the VII Storep Conference, Trento, May 30-June 1.
- Forges Davanzati, G. and Realfonzo R. (2004), 'Labour Market Deregulation and Unemployment in a Monetary Economy', in R. Arena and N. Salvadori (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 65-74.
- Forges Davanzati, G. and Realfonzo R. (2005), 'Bank Mergers, Monopoly Power and Unemployment: A Monetary Circuit Approach', in G. Fontana and R. Realfonzo (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 155-171.
- Forges Davanzati, G. and Realfonzo R. (2008), 'Aggregate demand, social conflict and unemployment. Towards a continuist interpretation of Keynes', in M. Caserta and S. Figuera (eds.), *Rileggere Keynes*, Milano: Giuffr , pp. 41-68.
- Forges Davanzati, G. and Realfonzo R. (2009), 'Money, capital turnover and the leisure class. Thorstein Veblen's tips for MTP models', in J. F. Ponsot and S. Rossi (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 116-137.
- Forges Davanzati, G. and Realfonzo R. (2011), 'Low Wages, Consumer Credit and the Crisis: A Monetary Theory of Production Approach', in E. Brancaccio and G. Fontana (eds.), *The Global Economic Crisis. New Perspectives on the Critique of Economic Theory and Policy*, New York: Routledge, pp. 144-163.
- Forges Davanzati, G. and Tortorella Esposito G. (2010), 'Low Wages, Private Indebtedness, and Crisis. A Monetary-Theory-of-Production Approach', *European Journal of Economic and Social Systems*, **23**(1), pp. 25-44.
- Fumagalli, A. (1995), *Moneta e tecnologia: le istituzioni instabili dell'economia capitalistica*, Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Fumagalli, A. (2008), 'Innovative activity as factor of instability in a monetary production economy', *European Journal of Economic and Social Systems*, **21**(2), pp. 265-286.

- Fumagalli, A. and Lucarelli S. (eds.) (2008), *Money and technological change: The role of financing in the process of evolution*, special issue of the *European Journal of Economic and Social Systems*, **21**(2), pp. 144-288.
- Fumagalli, A. and Lucarelli S. (2011), 'A Financialized Monetary Economy of Production', *International Journal of Political Economy*, **40**(1), pp. 48-68.
- Fumagalli A. and Lucarelli S. (2012) 'A Financialized Monetary Economy of Production: Some Further Reflections', *International Journal of Political Economy*, **41**(1), pp. 108-123.
- Gali, J. (1999), 'Technology Employment and the Business Cycle. Do Technology Shocks Explain Aggregate Fluctuations?', *American Economic Review* **89**(1), pp. 249-271.
- Garegnani, P. (1976), 'On a change in the Notion of Equilibrium in Recent Work on Value e Distribution', in M. Brown, K. Sato and P. Zarembka (eds.), *Essays in Modern Capital Theory*, Amsterdam: North Holland, pp. 25-45.
- Garegnani, P. (1979), *Valore e domanda effettiva. Keynes, la ripresa dell'economia classica e la critica ai marginalisti*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Garegnani, P. (1990), 'Classical versus Marginalist Analysis', in K. Bharadwaj and B. Schefold (eds.), *Essays on Piero Sraffa*, London: Routledge, pp. 112-140.
- Garegnani, P. (1992), 'Some notes for an analysis of accumulation', in J. Halevi, D. Laibman, E. J. Nell (eds.), *Beyond the Steady State: A Revival of Growth Theory*, New York: St Martin's Press.
- Gattei, G. (1993), *Il difficile equilibrio. Studi di storia sul pensiero economico moderno*, Torino: Giappichelli.
- Giavazzi F. and Pagano M. (1997), 'Non-keynesian effects of fiscal policy changes: international experience and Swedish experience', *Swedish Economic Policy Review*, n. 3, pp. 67-103.
- Godley, W. (1996), 'Money, finance, and national income determination: an integrated approach', Working Paper n. 167, The Levy Economics Institute.
- Godley, W. (1997), 'Macroeconomics without equilibrium or disequilibrium', Working Paper n. 205, The Levy Economics Institute.
- Godley, W. (1999a), 'Seven Unsustainable Processes: Medium-Term Prospects and Policies for the United States and the World', Strategic Analysis, January 1999 (revised October 2000), The Levy Economics Institute.
- Godley, W. (1999b), 'Money and credit in a Keynesian model of income determination', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, **23**(4), pp. 393-411.
- Godley, W. and Lavoie M. (2007a), *Monetary economics: an integrated approach to credit, money, income production and wealth*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Godley, W. and Lavoie M. (2007b), Fiscal Policy in a Stock-Flow Consistent (SFC) Model, Working Paper n. 494, The Levy Economics Institute.
- Godley, W. and Shaikh A. (2002), 'An important inconsistency at the heart of the standard macroeconomic model', *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, **24**(3), pp. 423-42.

- Graafland, J. J. (2007), *Economics, ethics and the market. Introduction and application*, New York: Routledge.
- Graziani, A. (1977a), 'Il processo capitalistico di J. A. Schumpeter', introduction to J. A. Schumpeter, *Il processo capitalistico. Cicli economici*, Torino: Boringhieri.
- Graziani, A. (1977b), 'Scambi simultanei e successione ciclica nel processo economico', *Quaderni Piacentini*, n. 64, pp. 113-137.
- Graziani, A. (1977c), "Recensione a mo' di premessa" a Roberto Convevole, *Processo inflazionistico e redistribuzione del reddito*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Graziani, A. (1982), 'L'analisi marxista e la struttura del capitalismo moderno', *Storia del marxismo*, vol. 4, Torino: Einaudi.
- Graziani, A. (1984a), 'Moneta senza crisi', *Studi Economici*, n. 24, pp. 3-37. [an early version of this paper has been published in *Materiali filosofici*, 1983, 7(1), pp. 95-112]
- Graziani, A. (1984b), 'The Debate on Keynes' Finance Motive', *Economic Notes*, n. 1, p. 5-34.
- Graziani, A. (1985), 'Monnaie, intérêt, dépense publique', *Economies et Sociétés* (Série Monnaie e Production), 19(2), pp. 87-114.
- Graziani, A. (1989), 'The Theory of the Monetary Circuit', *Thames Papers in Political Economy*, Spring, pp.1-26.
- Graziani, A. (1991), 'Nuove interpretazioni dell'analisi monetaria di Keynes', in J. Kregel (ed.), *Nuove interpretazioni dell'analisi monetaria di Keynes*, Bologna: Il Mulino, pp. 15-42.
- Graziani, A. (1994), *La teoria monetaria della produzione*, Arezzo: Banca Popolare dell'Etruria e del Lazio.
- Graziani, A. (1995), 'A proposito di un articolo di Duccio Cavalieri', *Studi Economici*, 55(1), pp. 181-97.
- Graziani, A. (1996), *La teoria del circuito monetario*, Milano: Jaca Book.
- Graziani, A. (1998), *Lo sviluppo dell'economia italiana. Dalla ricostruzione alla moneta europea*, Torino: Bollati Boringhieri.
- Graziani, A. (2001), *Teoria economica. Macroeconomica*, V edizione riveduta e ampliata, Napoli: ESI.
- Graziani, A. (2003), *The monetary theory of production*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Greenhagh, L. (1983), 'Managing the job insecurity crisis', *Human Resource Management*, 22(4), pp.431-444.
- Hahn, L. A. (1990), *Teoria economica del credito*, a cura di Lapo Berti, Napoli: ESI.
- Halevi, J. and Taoil R. (2002), 'On a Post-Keynesian Stream from France and Italy. The circuit approach', Working Papers in Economics, 98-08, University of Sidney, Department of Economics.
- Hanngsen, G. (2006), 'The transmission mechanism of monetary policy: a critical review', in P. Arestis and M. Sawyer (eds.) (2006), *cit.*, pp. 205-223.

- Harcourt, G. C. (1988), 'Post Keynesian Economics', in J. Eatwell, M. Milgate, P. Newman (eds.), *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, London: Macmillan, vol. 3, p. 924.
- Hayek, F. (1988), *Prezzi e produzione. Il dibattito sulla moneta*, a cura di Marina Colonna, Napoli: ESI.
- Hein, E. and Tarassow A. (2009), 'Distribution, aggregate demand and productivity growth: Theory and empirical results for six OECD countries based on a Post-Kaleckian model', *The Cambridge Journal of Economics*, **34**(6), pp. 727-754.
- Humphrey, T. M. (1987), 'The theory of multiple expansion of deposits: what it is and whence it came', *Economic Review*, March/April, pp. 3-11.
- Kalecki, M. (1971), *Selected Essays on the Dynamics of the Capitalist Economy, 1933-1970*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Kalecki, M. (1975), 'Le determinanti dei profitti', in Kalecki, M., *Sulla dinamica dell'economia capitalista. Saggi scelti 1933-1970*, a cura di C. Boffito, Torino: Einaudi.
- Keen, S. (2009), 'The dynamics of the monetary circuit', in J. F. Ponsot and S. Rossi (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 161-187.
- Keynes, J. M. (1973 [1921]), *Treatise on Probability*, London: Macmillan, St. Martin's Press and Cambridge University Press.
- Keynes, J. M. (1971 [1930]), *A Treatise on Money: vol. I. The Pure Theory of Money*, London: Macmillan, St. Martin's Press and Cambridge University Press.
- Keynes, J. M. (1973 [1936]), *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, London: Macmillan, St. Martin's Press and Cambridge University Press.
- Keynes, J. M. (1973), *The Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes*, vol. 13, London, Macmillan.
- King, R. G. and Plosser C. I. (1984), 'Money, Credit and Prices in a Real Business Cycle', *American Economic Review*, **74**(3), pp. 363-380.
- Kregel, J. A. (ed.) (1983), *Distribution, effective demand & international economic relations*, London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Kriesler, P. and Lavoie M. (2007), 'The New Consensus on monetary policy and its Post-Keynesian critique', *Review of Political Economy*, **19**(3), pp. 387-404.
- Kurz, H. (1994), 'Growth and distribution', *Review of Political Economy*, **6**(4), pp. 393-420.
- Kurz, H. and Salvadori N. (1995), *Theory of Production*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Kydalnd, F. E. and Prescott E. C. (1982), 'Time to Build and Aggregate Fluctuations', *Econometrica*, **50**(6), pp. 1345-1370.
- Lakatos, I. (1970), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.

- Landesmann, M. A. and Scazzieri R. (eds.) (1996), *Production and Economic Dynamics*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Laudan, L. (1977), *Progress and its Problems*, Berkley: University of California Press.
- Lavoie, M. (1986-87), 'Systemic financial fragility: a simplified view', *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, **9**(2), pp. 258-66.
- Lavoie, M. (1987), 'Monnaie et production. Une synthèse de la théorie du circuit', *Economies et Sociétés* (Série Monnaie et Production), **XXI**(2), pp. 169– 195.
- Lavoie, M. (1992), *Foundations of Post Keynesian economic analysis*, Aldershot: Elgar.
- Lavoie, M. (1996), 'Horizontalism, structuralism, liquidity preference and the principle of increasing risk', *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, **43**(3), pp. 275-300.
- Lavoie, M. (2004), 'Circuit and Coherent Stock-Flow Accounting', in R. Arena and N. Salvadori (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 136-151.
- Lavoie, M. (2006), *Introduction to Post-Keynesian Economics*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lavoie, M. (2010), 'Should Sraffian economics be dropped out of the Post-Keynesian school?', Paper prepared for the Conference "Sraffa's Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities 1960–2010", University of Roma Tre, December 2-4.
- Lavoie, M. and Godley W. (2001-02), 'Kaleckian models of growth in a coherent stock-flow monetary framework: a Kaldorian view', *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, **24**(2), pp. 277-311.
- Lavoie, M. and Seccareccia M. (2001), 'Minsky's financial fragility hypothesis: a missing macroeconomic link?', in R. Bellofiore and P. Ferri (eds.), *Financial Fragility and Investment in the Capitalist Economy: the Economic Legacy of Hyman Minsky*, Vol. II, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 76-96.
- Lawson, T. (1997), *Economics and Reality*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Le Bourva, J. (1962), 'Création de la monnaie et multiplicateur du crédit', *Revue économique*, **13**(1), pp. 29-56.
- Lucarelli, S. (2012), 'The 1973-1978 workgroup on money of the journal 'Primo Maggio'. An example of pluralist critique to political economy', *International Journal of Pluralism and Economics Education*, forthcoming.
- Lucas, R. E. (1972), 'Expectations and the Neutrality of Money', *Journal of Economic Theory*, **4**(2), pp. 103-124.
- Lunghini, G. and Bianchi C. (2004), 'The Monetary Circuit and Income Distribution: Bankers as Landlords?', in R. Arena and N. Salvadori (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 152-174.
- Marx, K. (1978 [1885]), *Capital. A critique of Political Economy*, Volume II, London and New York: Penguin Books Ltd in association with New Left Review.

- Marx, K. (1981 [1894]), *Capital. A critique of Political Economy*, Volume III, London and New York: Penguin Books Ltd in association with New Left Review.
- Messori, M. (1983), Moneta senza crisi: un commento, *Materiali filosofici*, 7(1), pp. 113-156.
- Messori, M. (ed.) (1988), *Moneta e produzione*, Einaudi, Torino.
- Messori, M. (1996), 'Schumpeter's analysis of the credit market', *mimeo*.
- Messori, M. (2004), 'Credit and Money in Schumpeter's Theory', in R. Arena and N. Salvadori (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 173-198.
- Messori, M. and Zazzaro A. (2005), 'Single-period analysis: financial markets, firms' failure and closure of the monetary circuit', in G. Fontana and R. Realfonzo (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 111-123.
- Michell, J. (2011), 'Speculation, Financial Innovation and Stock-Flow Consistency', Paper presented in the cycle of seminars on Monetary Economics organized by R. Bellofiore at the University of Bergamo, 16th May.
- Minsky, H. P. (1976), *John Maynard Keynes*, London: Macmillan.
- Minsky, H. P. (1977), 'The financial instability hypothesis: an interpretation of Keynes and an alternative to 'standard' theory', *Challenge*, March-April, pp. 20-27.
- Minsky, H. P. (1986), *Stabilizing an unstable economy*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Minsky, H. P. (1992), 'Effective demand in the long run', in K. Bharadwaj and B. Schefold (eds.), *Essays on Piero Sraffa*, London: Routledge.
- Mises, L. (1999), *Teoria della moneta e dei mezzi di circolazione*, a cura di Riccardo Bellofiore, Napoli: ESI.
- Napoleoni, C. (1976), *Valore*, Milano: ISEDI.
- North, D. (1990), *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Ohno, T. (2010), 'Models of competition between firms: Reconsidering the Kaleckian model', paper presented at the XIV IMK Conference – Berlin, November.
- O'Sullivan, M. (2005), 'Finance and innovation', in J. Fagerberg, D. C. Mowery and R. R. Nelson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*, Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 240-264.
- Pacella, A. (2008), 'The effects of labour market flexibility in the monetary theory of production', *Metroeconomica*, 59(4), pp. 608-632.
- Pacella, A. (2009), *We Have What We Are. Veblen and The Conflictual Nature of Monetary Economies*, Saarbrücken, Germany, VDM Verlag Dr. Müller e.K.
- Panico, C. (1985), 'Market forces and the relation between the rates of interest and profit', *Contributions to Political Economy*, 4(1), pp. 37-60.
- Papadimitriou B. and Wray L. R. (2008), 'Minsky's stabilizing an unstable economy: two decades later', in H. P. Minsky, *Stabilizing an Unstable Economy*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Parguez, A. (1975), *Monnaie et macroéconomie*, Paris: Economica.
- Parguez, A. (1996), 'Beyond scarcity: a reappraisal of the theory of the monetary circuit', in G. Deleplace and E. Nell (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 155-99.
- Parguez, A. (2000), 'A Monetary Theory of Public Finance', *International Journal of Political Economy*, **XXXII**(3), pp. 80-97.
- Parguez, A. (2001), 'Money without scarcity: from the horizontalist revolution to the theory of the monetary circuit', in L. P. Rochon and M. Vernengo (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 69-103.
- PARGUEZ, A. (2004), 'THE SOLUTION OF THE PARADOX OF PROFITS', in R. Arena and N. Salvadori (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 257-270.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (1962), 'Rate of Profit and Income Distribution in relation to the Rate of Economic Growth', *The Review of Economic Studies*, **29**(4), pp. 267-279.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (1965), 'A new theoretical approach to the problem of economic growth', *Pontificiae Academiae Scientiarum Scripta Varia*, n. 28, pp. 571-696.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (1966), 'Changes in the Rate of Profit and Switches of Techniques', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **LXXX**(4), pp. 503-517.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (1969), 'Switches of Techniques and the 'Rate of Return' in Capital Theory', *Economic Journal*, **79**(315), pp. 508-531.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (1974), *Growth and Income Distribution – Essays in Economic Theory*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (1981), *Structural change and economic growth – a theoretical essay on the dynamics of the wealth of nations*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (1991), 'Dal Treatise on Money alla General Theory: continuità o rottura?', in J. Kregel (ed.), *Nuove interpretazioni dell'analisi monetaria di Keynes*, Bologna: Il Mulino, pp. 43-51.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (1993), *Structural economic dynamics, A theory of the economic consequences of human learning*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (2000), 'Critique of the neoclassical theory of growth and distribution', *Banca Nazionale del Lavoro Quarterly Review*, **53**(215), pp. 383-431.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (2005), 'The Cambridge School of Keynesian Economics', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, **29**(6), pp. 837-848.
- Pasinetti, L. L. and Scazzieri R. (2008), 'Capital theory (paradoxes)', in S. N. Durlauf and L. E. Blume (eds.) *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, London: Macmillan, pp. 675-684.
- Passarella, M. (2010), 'The paradox of tranquility revisited. A Lotka-Volterra model of the financial instability', *Rivista Italiana degli Economisti*, **15**(1), pp. 69-104.
- Passarella, M. (2012a), 'A simplified stock-flow consistent dynamic model of the systemic financial fragility in the 'New Capitalism'', *Journal of Economic*

- Behavior & Organization*, forthcoming (DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2012.05.011>).
- Passarella, M. (2012b), 'Financialisation and the monetary circuit: a macro-accounting heterodox approach', *mimeo*.
- Patinkin, D. (1975), 'The Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes; From the Tract to the General Theory', *Economic Journal*, **85**(338), pp. 249-271.
- Perez, C. (2007), 'Finance and Technical Change: a Long-term View', in H. Hanusch and A. Pyka (eds.), *Elgar Companion to Neo-Schumpeterian Economics*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 775-799.
- Petri, F. (2004), *General Equilibrium, Capital and Macroeconomics*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Pivetti, M. (1985), 'On the monetary explanation of distribution', *Political Economy: Studies in the Surplus Approach*, **1**(2), pp. 73-103.
- Ponsot, J. F. and Rossi S. (eds.) (2009), *The Political Economy of Monetary Circuits: Tradition and Change in Post-Keynesian Economics*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Poulon, F. (1982), *Macroéconomie approfondie, Equilibre, Déséquilibre, Circuit*, Paris: Cujas.
- Realfonzo, R. (1998), *Money and banking: theory and debate*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Realfonzo, R. (2003), 'Circuit theory', in J. E. King (ed.), *The Elgar Companion to Post Keynesian Economics*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 60-64.
- Realfonzo, R. (2006), 'The Italian circuitist approach', in P. Arestis and M. Sawyer (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 105-120.
- Reckon (2009), 'Study to quantify and analyse the VAT gap in the EU-25 Member States', in *Directorate General Taxation and Customs Union*, European Commission.
- Robertson, D. H. (1993), *Politica bancaria e livello dei prezzi. Con altri scritti sulla moneta*, a cura di Lilia Costabile, Napoli: ESI.
- Robinson, J. (1956), *The accumulation of capital*, London: Macmillan.
- Robinson, J. (1962), *Essays in the Theory of Economic Growth*, London: Macmillan.
- Rochon, L. P. (1999), *Credit, Money and Production: An Alternative Post-Keynesian Approach*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Rochon, L. P. and Rossi S. (eds.) (2003), *Modern theories of money. The nature and role of money in capitalist economies*, Cheltenham (UK) ; Northampton (Mass.): Edward Elgar.
- Rochon, L. P. and M. Vernengo (eds.) (2001), *Credit, interest rates and the open economy*, Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- Roncaglia, A. (1991), 'The Sraffian schools', *Review of Political Economy*, **3**(2), pp. 187-219.
- Rousseas, S. (1986), *Post Keynesian Monetary Economics*, London: Macmillan.

- Ryoo, S. (2010), 'Long waves and short cycles in a model of endogenous financial fragility', *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, **74**(3), pp. 163-186.
- Samuelson, P. (1968), 'What Classical and Neoclassical Monetary Theory Really Was', *Canadian Journal of Economics*, **1**(1), pp. 1-15.
- Scazzieri, R. (1993), *A Theory of Production. Tasks, Processes, and Technical Practices*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Scazzieri, R. (1996), 'Pasinetti's structural economic dynamics: A symposium', *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, **7**(2), pp. 123-125.
- Scazzieri, R. and Witt U. (2005), 'Approaches to production theory: Introduction', *Structural change and economic dynamics*, **16**(2), pp. 159-163.
- Schmitt, B. (1960), *La formation du pouvoir d'achat: l'investissement de la monnaie*, Paris: Sirey.
- Schmitt, B. (1972), *Macroeconomic theory, a fundamental revision*, Albeuve: Castella.
- Schmitt, B. (1975), *Théorie unitaire de la monnaie, nationale et internationale*, Albeuve: Castella.
- Schmitt, B. (1984), *Inflation, chômage et malformations du capital*, Paris and Albeuve: Economica and Castella.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934 [1912]). *The Theory of Economic Development*, Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1956 [1917-18]), 'Money and the Social Product', *International Economic Papers*, n. 6, p. 148-211.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1964 [1939]). *Business Cycle. A Theoretical, Historical and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process* (abridged edn), New York: McGraw Hill.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1996), *Trattato della moneta: capitoli inediti. Con altri scritti sulla moneta*, a cura di Lapo Berti e Marcello Messori, Napoli: ESI.
- Setterfield, M. (2007), 'The rise, decline and rise of income policies in the US during the post-war era: An Institutional-analytical explanation of the functional income distribution', *Journal of Institutional Economics*, **3**(2), pp.127-146.
- Silverberg G., Dosi G. and Orsenigo L. (1988), 'Innovation, Diversity and Diffusion: a Self-Organisation Model', *Economic Journal*, **98**(393), pp. 1043-1078.
- Simiand, F. (1991), *La moneta realtà sociale e altri scritti*, a cura di Luca Meldolesi, Napoli: ESI.
- Stockhammer, E and Ramskogler P. (2007), 'Uncertainty and exploitation in history', Working Paper series n. 104, Vienna University of Economics, Department of Economics.
- Stockhammer, E. and Stehler R. (2009), 'Goodwin or Kalecki in Demand? Functional income distribution and aggregate demand in the short run', Working Paper n. 203, PERI.

- Sweezy, P. M. (1939), 'Demand Under Conditions of Oligopoly', in *Journal of Political Economy*, **47**(4), pp. 568-573.
- Sylos Labini, P. (1971), 'Introduzione all'edizione italiana', in J. A. Schumpeter, *Teoria dello sviluppo capitalistico*, Firenze: Sansoni.
- Sylos Labini, P. (1981), 'Technological change under contemporary conditions: An economist's view', *Economic Papers*, **1**(66), pp. 1-17.
- Sylos Labini, P. (1983), 'La Teoria Generale: riflessioni critiche suggerite da alcuni grandi problemi del nostro tempo', in F. Vicarelli (ed.), *Attualità di Keynes*, Roma-Bari: Laterza, pp.253-287.
- Sraffa, P. (1960), *Produzione di merci a mezzo merci*, Torino: Einaudi Editore.
- Tadeu Lima, G. and Setterfield M. (2010), 'Pricing behaviour and the cost-push channel of monetary policy', *Review of Political Economy*, **22**(1), pp. 19-40.
- Taylor, J. B. (ed.) (1999), *Monetary Policy Rules*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, J. B. (1993), 'Discretion versus policy rules in practice', North Holland, Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy, n. 39, pp. 195-214.
- Taylor, J. B. (2000), 'Teaching macroeconomics at the principles level', *American Economic Review*, **90**(2), pp. 90-94.
- Toporowski, J. (2000), *The End of Finance. Capital Market Inflation, Financial Derivatives and Pension Fund Capitalism*, London: Routledge.
- Toporowski, J. (2008), 'Minsky's 'induced investment and business cycles'', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, **32**(5), pp. 725-737.
- Toporowski, J. (2010), 'Excess debt and asset deflation', in S. Kates (ed.), *Macroeconomic Theory and Its Failings. Alternative Perspectives on the World Financial Crisis*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, chapter 13.
- Trezza, B. (1975), *Economia e moneta*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Tugan-Baranovskij, M. I. (1987), *Cartamoneta e metallo*, a cura di Augusto Graziani e Andrea Preziosi, Napoli: ESI.
- Vercelli, A. (1985), 'Money and production Schumpeter and Keynes: Two dichotomies', in R. Arena and A. Graziani (eds.) (1985), *cit.*, pp. 31-45.
- Wicksell, K. (1934 [1898]), *Interest and Prices*, London: Macmillan.
- Winter, S. (1984), 'Schumpeterian Competition in Alternative Technological Regimes', *Journal of Economic Behaviour and Organization*, **5**(3-4), pp. 287-320.
- Woodford, M. (2003), *Interest and Prices: Foundations of a Theory of Monetary Policy*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Wray, R. (1998), *Understanding modern money: the key to full employment and price stability*, Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- Zanini, A. (2000), *Joseph A. Schumpeter*, Milano: Bruno Mondadori.
- Zazzaro, A. (2003), 'How Heterodox is the Heterodoxy of Monetary Circuit Theory? The Nature of Money and the Microeconomics of the Circuit', in L. P. Rochon and S. Rossi (eds.), *cit.*, pp. 219-245.
- Zeza, G. (2004), 'Some simple, consistent models of the monetary circuit', Working Paper n. 405, The Levy Economics Institute.

Zeza, G. (2012), 'Godley and Graziani: stock-flow consistent monetary circuits', in D. B. Papadimitriou and G. Zeza (eds.), *Contribution in Stock-flow Modeling. Essays in Honour of Wynne Godley*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 154-72.

Finito di stampare
nel mese di ottobre 2012