



Bard College  
Bard Digital Commons

---

Hyman P. Minsky Archive

Levy Economics Institute of Bard College

---

1986

## Keynesian Socialism

Hyman P. Minsky Ph.D.

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/hm\\_archive](https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/hm_archive)

 Part of the [Economic History Commons](#), [Economic Theory Commons](#), and the [Macroeconomics Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Minsky, Hyman P. Ph.D., "Keynesian Socialism" (1986). *Hyman P. Minsky Archive*. 16.  
[https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/hm\\_archive/16](https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/hm_archive/16)

---

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Levy Economics Institute of Bard College at Bard Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Hyman P. Minsky Archive by an authorized administrator of Bard Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@bard.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@bard.edu).



## Keynesian Socialism.

Keynes was not a Socialist. Nevertheless his economics have profound implications for Socialists. Keynes showed that if Capitalism is to be successful, it has to be managed: the "market", if left to its own devices will breed great depressions and widespread impoverishment. But once, <sup>it is determined that</sup> market Capitalism needs to <sup>is well</sup> be managed, the questions of how and for whom <sup>it is to be managed</sup> come to the fore.

We are now in an era when privatization is a meaningful and legitimate political movement. Under Reagan and Thatcher, and to a somewhat lesser extent in other countries, movements to ~~let the government~~ diminish the government's involvement in the economy are potent political forces. The public involvement in ~~the capitalist~~ economy seems to be inefficient and <sup>if</sup> many of the movements have lost their reason for being.

A serious Socialist of the last part of the Twentieth Century has to accept assimilate the failures of the economic system put into place by Lenin and Stalin as well as the qualified success of the interventionist

## Keynesian Socialism

(2)

capitalist economies over the past year since World War-II ended. This means that Socialists have to return to the roots of Socialism, before there was an in place economy that was called Socialist, and ask what ~~the~~ a Socialist economy is to look like.

The roots of Socialism as a philosophy and a political movement are in the democratic and egalitarian movements of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century. The smashing of the system of privilege and status, which disenfranchised and exploited workers and women, was a prime objective. That property and property rights were part of the system of abuse, meant that inheritance of status and wealth was a barrier that had to be overcome. The new legal and organizational structure of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century, ~~the corporation~~, for Socialists was a problem, for while promoting the concentration of capital the corporation also seemed like it could be a model for the organization of a Socialist economy.

In the political arena, the Socialist parties often sought alliances with small and independent business

men. In the United States, which had a significant and interesting socialist movement before World War I, the promotion of family farms and independent business was part of the Socialist program. Socialism did not look back in fear before the Russian

not have only a burgeoning collectivist and communist economy face before World War I. In today's age, when we understand the strengths and weaknesses of both market and non-market ways of organizing economies better than in earlier eras, we can start to ~~institute~~ a new deal

with the recognition that a socialist state economy will combine planning and markets, will have public and private enterprises ~~but~~ and is distinguished more by the ~~more~~ political social and political ~~areas~~ ends it seeks than by the mechanical details of ownership of property.

Keynes, who was born in 1883, reached his maturity during the era when the liberal wing establishment - to whom he gravitated as a young man - looked forward to and welcomed the spread of Democracy, free trade, trade union rights and enlightened legislation to protect workers. Poverty was to be eliminated by Progress, and enlightened legislation would one by one remove the barriers to democracy and equality. The first World War and the Great Depression that soon followed, threw that benign view into the dustbin. Harsh realities of war and depression - of new waves of repression and of the clear signs of the tyranny of Stalin seemed to concentrate the mind: out of this drama of illusion and delusion ~~the general theory was born~~

Keynes' General Theory was born. This was a theory that demands tested the triumphs that capitalism naturally and normally would generate Great Depression; 1929-33 was not an anomaly or (2) but the process can be aborted by a proper system of intervention and control.

The essential element in the Keynesian system of intervention and control is the positive use of government spending and taxing to assure that sufficient

demand is generated so that a close approximation to full employment is achieved. When George Orwell, after all his disillusionment in Catalonia and his recognition of the tyranny that Stalin had erected, explained why he remained a Socialist he wrote of the "hunting fee of unemployment." That is the lot of the working man. Keynes ~~is~~ the person that followed from the analysis of the General Theory believed that ~~it was~~ it would lift this hunting fee, and therefore liberate the working class from the tyranny of Capitalism.

### The

In the concluding Notes (Chapter 17) to The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money, Keynes noted that his theory "was moderately conservative in its implications" — for one we "— succeed in establishing an aggregate volume of output corresponding to full employment as nearly as is practicable — then there is no objection to be raised against the classical analysis of the manner in which private self interest will determine what in particular is produced, in what proportion the factors of production will be combined to produce it, and how the value of the final product will be distributed between them" [p. 378-379 of ST)