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Institutional economics has suffered many slings and arrows because it is asserted that it has no body of theory. It has some interesting critiques, but when there is work to be done we are stuck with neo-classical economics. This charge will be countered with three arguments: (1) Institutional economics has several types of theory which if not distinguished appear as a hodge-podge; (2) It doesn't have a welfare economics which mainstream economics wants, but which institutional economics denies; (3) It does need some further theoretical development which is progressing--thus the title of this paper, "neo-institutional theory".

Types of Theory

Several types of institutional theories will be distinguished: developmental, impact, and welfare. It is also useful to distinguish theories of behavior vs. theories of advantage and to note the place of institutional analysis in a more general policy analysis (i.e. institutional economics is a complementary good for much economics, at the same time that it is a substitute (or antidote) for some bad economics.

Developmental institutional economics is probably the best known subset. When historians of economic thought speak of the evolutionary theme as being typical of this school, they are describing developmental theories. Developmental theory is long run and involves learning, while impact theory is short run where the human response to incentives is fixed and only the amount and kind of incentive is altered. In developmental theory, institutions are both independent and dependent variables (Samuels, 1971). It involves such tensions as that between continuity and change. This theory is practiced by many in the profession who teach comparative systems but do not see themselves as members of any school (an example is Wiles, 1977). Many of these are theories of advantage and explain institutional change by reference to changing profitability generated by changing tastes or technology which may or not be endogenous to the model (examples are North and Thomas, 1973, Schultz, 1968, Hayami and Ruttan, 1985, pp. 94-114, and Schotter, 1981). It is easy to slip from this to welfare economics legitimating certain paths of institutional change and condemning others.

Impact theory is concerned with predicting the substantive performance of an alternative proposed institution, and not with predicting what institutions are coming next. However, if we believe that intelligence guides choice of institutions, then the product of impact theories will eventually affect the path of change.

Welfare economics is not concerned with predicting anything. That is its beauty, since nothing that happens can directly challenge its conclusions on what is better to do. There is much confusion here since the Veblen branch of institutional thought has a
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welfare economics while the Commons' branch does not. Each of the three types of institutional theory will be illustrated in detail below after noting some of their roots in the work of John R. Commons.

Themes From Commons

John R. Commons is a useful base from which to develop a neo-institutional economics because he practiced both developmental and impact analysis and many of his concepts are applicable to both. It is not possible in a paper to catalog all of Common's themes, but a selection drawn from Parsons (1985) is suggestive.

1. Economy as a universe of human relations (not just a universe of commodities): Seeing property rights as a relation of one person to another (rather that a person-thing relationship) is fundamental to both developmental and impact theories as well as to critique a value presumptive welfare economics.

2. Transactions as the unit of analysis: This is a complement to the above category which permits seeing that one person's opportunities are another's limits and obligations. It allows property rights to be classified according to relative opportunities and prevents a lot of silly prattle by both some other institutionalists and neo-classicals about institutions being the enemy of freedom. Common's categories of bargained, managerial and rationing transactions are echoed and neo-institutionalized by many from Polanyi (1957), Heilbroner (1962), Boulding (1973) to Solo (1967).

3. Search for the limiting factor: This is at the heart of a pragmatic inquiry. Note it is a search for the limiting factor to achieve a given objective and not for the efficient factor or the factor restoring equilibrium.

4. Recognizing conflict: If you don't presume some natural harmony, one is led to the question of what right makes whose will effective. This is central to impact analysis. Failure to understand this theme also leads to a lot of inanities where the only conflict is seen to be that of driving a hard bargain rather than the question of what one has to bargain with. Out of conflict comes the chosen order with its rules, opportunities and exposures--or it brings war and the current near-wars we are so familiar with.

5. Importance of collective action: Commons saw collective action as the instrument to increase power over nature rather than as only imbecile ceremonies that denied us the beneficence of technology and freedom (Parsons, 1985, p.767). If the individual consumer is to be sovereign, some cases require collective action.

6. Working Rules of Going Concerns: The different types of transactions come together in the going concern. Definition of the firm has plagued economists of all schools. Commons' attention to the consequences of the mix of administrative-managerial transactions with bargaining is quite consistent with the perspective of Coase (1924) and Williamson (1975) which sees the firm's boundaries determined by transaction costs.

7. Futurity: Many ideas can be organized under the concept of futurity, ranging from the role of security of expectations to money and banking.

8. The volitional will: Particularly important for developmental analysis is the role of rights in defining areas for creative choice by people. The universe of commodities perspective misses the fact that the MVP of labor is affected by people's sense of participation and fairness.
9. Inter-relations of economy and polity: stress on evolutionary change rather than equilibrium.

10. And on and on. The problem may be too much rather than too little theory. Can these ideas be condensed and rationalized further? Perhaps, but if the world is complex, it takes complex theories.

**Developmental Theory**

Institutional economics will be more coherent if the research agenda of developmental theory is distinguished from other types of theory. To add to what has already been said, several propositions of developmental theory are discussed.

1. Intangible property is exposed in a market economy. Put even more bluntly, pecuniary dis-economies hurt as much an any physical trespasser or thief ever did and require different kinds of rights to control it. Commons studied the situation of the American shoemaker over 250 years. This certainly sounds like developmental analysis. He could have used it to predict that institutions can change without any technological change. Yet, his use of this experience does not seem primarily to predict the next institutional change or to understand the impact of learning. If he made any developmental use of it, it was as part of the consent building process. If you can show that what is happening today has been going on for a long while and certain institutions were used to control it, then extensions of those same institutions do not seem so foreign. Thus is the wisdom of the evolving common law.

The main use of the experience, however, seems as an input into impact analysis. There are contemporary issues of exposure of assets to pecuniary externalities which will be further noted below.

2. The marginal value product of labor is not a given, but is influenced by institutions. Parsons (1982) argues that development has a lot to do with whether people feel that what they do can make a difference in their lives. How hard and creatively people work is not just a matter of fear of lower wages and the transaction cost of supervision to prevent slacking. It depends on what Commons called willing participation.

A neo-institutional version of this theme is being developed by Thurow (1983, Ch. 7). He notes that productivity and work stoppages are related to people's learned sense of the fairness of their wages relative to others. Instead of hypothesizing that people are paid according to their MVP, Thurow turns it on its head and suggests that MVP depends on what people are paid. It is a developmental question how people form their concept of what is fair. It is an impact question whether a particular rights change which would result in different relative wages would today change MVP. A good example would be to ask, if women were given the right to comparable worth, how would it affect their productivity (and of course those rights would determine what is to be regarded as productive). Thurow essentially makes a Commons type argument when he observes that relative wages of many occupations can't be explained by anything except that certain jobs have rights attached. Commons put it by saying that cost is not something naturally determined but institutionally determined. He invited us to shift our attention from costs to shares. A major institutional economics theme is that prices and allocations derive from more than preferences and production functions -- power and public choice must be noted.
3. Experience with collective action builds trust which contributes to control of opportunistic behavior in the face of high exclusion costs. Albert Hirschman (1984) has observed that groups which are successful in obtaining a high exclusion cost good have had previous experience in collective action (also see Favero, 1977). Even if past attempts were unsuccessful, it increases the probability of future success. This is a good example of a developmental theory which involves learning.

4. The economy and polity are inter-related and change is marked by evolution rather than movement to an equilibrium. One illustration of this is known as the political business cycle (Fry 1978 & Galeotti 1980). Governments do not just compensate for the business cycle but contribute to it by manipulation of government spending and transfers just prior to presidential elections.

5. People save during their working years so that they can spend during retirement. You will recognize this as the life-cycle savings hypothesis that helped win the Nobel Prize for Franco Modigliani. Paul Samuelson (1986) says, "I believe it to be the best single explainer, across time and space, of saving and investing behavior and their responsiveness to various policy programs. From its deceptive simplicity, novel and testable expectations emerge." It is curious to me why this proposition is so widely honored and the others above are critiqued as being soft headed and dismissed as imprecise story-telling. Partly it is a matter of data. We have a lot of numbers on savings so it attracts the econometricians. It is on a subject that fits the prevailing ideology that honors individual savings as the source of economic growth.

In contrast, the property rights theory of Commons allows us to see that when we give banks the right to create money via new loans, there is a collective saving (Schmid, 1985a). Non-borrowers find that they consume less as new money re-allocates current consumption to investment. The individual piggy bank is quite irrelevant in a system of fractional reserves. Commons and the famed institutional monetary theorist, Irving Fisher, went on to advocate zero interest public debt during periods of unemployment. This is heretical stuff and the rugged individualistic ideologues won't want to admit that banking is collective action—thus this won't win any Nobel prize for a while.

Institutional creativity and innovation are a hallmark of the institutionalist (Shaffer, 1969). This tradition did not stop with Commons' students and the innovations in workmens' compensation and social security, or even New Deal agricultural programs. Some modern examples are people like Joseph Sax (1976) who created and got the Michigan legislature to adopt a citizen suit law to stop environmental damage and Julian Levy (1966) who did the same for enforcement of housing codes in Chicago. There are many unsung agricultural extension specialists who are practicing institutional economics by helping groups design and implement collective action.

This is only a sample indicating the continuity of a body of ideas and theory of developing institutions. There are a number of other scholars working on these and similar themes such as Richard Norgaard (1985), Willard Hurst (1956), Bruno Frey (1983), and Don Kanel (1974) whether or not they see themselves as institutionalists.

Welfare Economics

Welfare economics refers to theories from which the analyst deduces that one institution is globally better than another, i.e., it maximizes welfare and production. The reader of the works of the purported founders of American institutionalism have reason to be confused and conclude that institutionalists are confusing since Veblen and Commons are so different in this regard.
Veblen (1904) and Ayres (1962) while critical of neo-classical welfare economics had a substitute (for the neo-Veblenians, see Tool, 1979). Veblen was quite willing to pronounce certain (in fact most) institutions as bad. He saw a natural imperative in technology and the instinct of workmanship. If you got rid of ceremonial institutions, the good would win out. This has certain parallels with neo-classical theory which sees costs as natural phenomena rather than derivatives of rights. Here, technology and workmanship are natural and need no chosen institutions to select among them or organize them. This sounds a lot like the Chicago School's insistence that if government were minimized, the good in mankind would jump out to the benefit of all. It is also similar to Mancur Olson's (1982) idea that if there were no rent seeking interest groups, there would be no productivity inhibiting institutions and all would be nirvana. While my own values are sympathetic with many of Veblen's, it is hard to go from nature to values. The words "ceremonial" and "rent-seeking" remain little more than labels for what you don't like (see Samuels and Mercuro, 1984).

The John R. Commons branch of institutionalism is quite different. To be sure, Commons was a reformer, but he was forthright. When he suggested workman's compensation and liability laws, he did not argue that it would increase efficiency, but rather that it would achieve a certain substantive performance of fewer accidents. Rather than insisting on his vision of the natural, he just said, try this on for size. This is not to say that Commons' view of reality and his research agenda were not influenced by his social preferences, but he did not have a welfare economics that made a general argument for what is better to do on the basis of grand efficiency or freedom. And for this infamy, he was accused of having no theory at all.

The continuity in this line of analysis from the classical institutionalists to neo-institutionalists is well illustrated by Michael Carter's (1985) discussion of Yellow Dog Contracts. The neo-classical analysis of such labor contracts would defend them as Pareto-better trades. The contract would not have been made if both parties were not better off than before. Any change is seen as a welfare decreasing restriction.

Commons would proceed differently. First, he did some developmental institutional economics be analysing why the impact of the law of "exclusive holding for self" was different in an interdependent market economy than in self-sufficiency. Next, he was an open reformer with announced sympathy for workers. Then he had to expose the presumptiveness of the neo-classical analysis both as to how the law evolved and its correctness. As Carter (p.808) puts it, "Commons was not preoccupied with the question of whether exchange was Pareto efficient. The more salient question ... is, What determines the reservation utility" of the workers. In other words, the issue is what one has to trade in the first place and just because people trade, it does not mean that they accept what they brought to the trade.

Commons (1924) didn't use the Pareto-better language, but he knew that you can't logically argue for a given efficient solution (from among many) without arguing for the interests its right give effect to. In his words, the court's decision can be explained "not as a matter of logic but as a matter of beliefs and this belief is none other than the habitual wish of the judge who decides and who...can always find precedents and logic to back up what he wishes"(p. 298).

Carter casts the argument in terms of exploitation and force. He objects to the neo-classicals' description of the yellow dog contract as being a voluntary acceptance of the result. But, since the essence of any right in the face of scarcity is that someone is forced, this argument cuts both ways. We can't label something as exploitative or not without an explicit value judgement of who in the particular case can force whom (i.e.
who has what to sell and can "force" a bid from non owners). By the way, the Marxists have this same problem with their presumptive use of the term exploitation (see Samuels, 1982).

Carter goes on to offer a neo-institutionalist critique of Braverman and Stiglitz's (1982) presumption of the legitimacy of certain sharecropper-landlord contracts as Pareto-efficient solutions to a high information cost situation. Similar neo-institutionalist analysis is made by such scholars as Randall (1972), Bromley (1982), Samuels (1981), Schmid (1978, ch. 11) and Lang (1980). Again, demolition of these presumptive neo-classical arguments should not be interpreted as proving that these sharecropper contracts were exploitive. Getting rid of one presumption should not give license to another. You must take your stand as a naked normativist, as Commons did.

If the neo-institutionalists destroy welfare economics (including that of Veblen and Marx), what will they put in its place. It is critical to understand that the destruction was not made to erect another presumption in its place. Indeed, the whole point is that global welfare maximization is meaningless. In the words of that eminent neo-institutionalist, Joan Robinson (1963) "there is no better 'ole to go to". The only honest position is the pragmatic naked normativist who says "this is my moral judgment" informed by reason and experience, but with no pretense of global maximization of anything.

Commons made it clear whose side he was on. But, he wanted to get things done and not just be known as being on the right side by his friends. That made him a pragmatist in public policy. He needed to use knowledge to suggest a compromise among conflicting normativists that had a good probability of being acceptable (workable). This is where his development analysis was handy in suggesting continuity with past trends and what he regarded as the best of existing practice.

To conclude this section, if to be called a theory, a paradigm must lead to global welfare maximization, then the neo-institutional paradigm will never be acceptable. This explains why Veblen was more interesting than Commons to the quasi-neo-classical David Seckler (1975) since Veblen had what pretended to be a scientific basis for choosing the best institutions for everyone. Commons' suggestion of reasonable value is quite different. It is a pragmatic suggestion offered to the conflicting parties for their consideration, not under threat of being labeled irrational. The resolution is something to be created by the parties, not discovered by high priest analysts (see Dewey, 1927) and the neo-pragmatist Bogholt (1956).

**Institutional Impact Theory**

Impact theory predicts the substantive consequences of institutional alternatives. This theory is composed of a three part sequence of situation, structure and performance (Schmid, 1978). The structure and performance part has its roots in industrial organization theory. The structural alternatives considered in I-O theory have been broadening, but the SSP paradigm goes further and includes administrative structures as well as market structures. While there are many roots in classical institutional studies, the main neo-institutional element is an explicit classification of the situational characteristics of goods which cause human interdependence (Kiser and Ostrom, 1982, pp. 195-8).

The situational categories include incompatible use, economies of scale, joint impact goods, high exclusion cost goods, high information cost goods, and surpluses (rents). In developmental theory, these features are the dynamic result of social and
technical change, but for impact analysis, they are given. They are independent of the structural institutional alternative being analyzed. The theory posits that if you understand what is it about a good that makes it possible for one person's acts to affect another, you can hypothesize how this is controlled by the institutional structure and thus predict performance. It follows that the same structure will have different effects when combined with different situations. The utility of the situational classification is that if you understand how one member of a situational class performs when combined with a given type of structure, you have the basis for hypothesizing how another member of the class will perform with the same institution. This is what theory is for—namely, to make it possible to learn more from our experience.

As already indicated, industrial organization studies are a type of impact analysis ranging from the classical studies of Berle and Means to the neo-institutional work of Fritz Mueller and Bruce Marion (1985). Classical studies in land economics which asked of the impact of alternative tenures on income and its distribution are impact analyses (see Parsons and Waples, 1945). These studies implicitly considered different characteristics of the resources being analyzed. It is argued here that institutional impact theory would be more unified and we would learn more from it if these goods characteristics were made more explicit. There is no space enough here to enumerate all of these situational variables but a sample will be presented. This sample will include completed work and yet to be tested hypothesis.

Economies of Scale

Goods produced under economies of scale have always constituted a special case in economics (Glasner, 1957). The term natural monopolies is applied to instances where the low point on the average cost curve is not reached for a single firm in the relevant range of demand. Commons devoted much time to predicting the consequences of public utility regulation such as whether a franchise granted by a city was temporary or could be repurchased by the public. The modern industrial organization literature is concerned with alternative rights that control the trade-offs between achieving economies of scale and the accompanying implications for economic and political power.

One aspect of the interdependence created by the situation of economies of scale is illustrated by the case of copyright structure applied to computer operating systems and applications software. Copyright has usually been a very limited grant of monopoly power. It gave exclusive rights to a particular expression of an idea, but many near substitutes were possible. When faced with an extension of this institution in the modern world of computers, copyright was granted for applications software. When the issue of extending this further in the case of computer operating systems was before the court, the court evidently applied its past experience and predicted that the copyright of disk operating systems would encourage their development, but only at the expense of a limited monopoly.

Using the neo-institutional impact theory, I would predict that the same right applied to applications and operating systems software will produce a different performance because the goods situation is different (Schmid, 1985b). Operating systems because of their unique linkage to applications programs have extreme economies of scale. The cost of using an applications program for another brand of computer is zero if it uses the same operating system. In other words, it is very costly to write applications programs for more than one operating system. This means that a copyrighted operating system such as Apple incorporated into their computers could have a substantial monopoly even if that system was only slightly different than a host of competitors. That slight difference with a unique fit to available applications programs gave Apple a
great competitive advantage. Either this relationship of situation, structure, performance was not understood by the court or their policy objective was to distribute income toward Apple (Apple Computer v. Franklin Computer, 714 Fed. Rep. 2nd 1240, 1983).

In the above case, the institutional design problem was how to control the distributive consequences of economies of scale when they have been achieved. There are a host of situations where the problem is how to achieve economies of scale in the first place. I believe that standardization of some products is one of the major opportunities and limiting factors in modern economic growth. A good example is the cost savings that could be achieved in the transportation and warehousing of food products if every one used a common shipping container (carton) so it would fit on the standard pallet (Abdalla, 1985).

Policy analysis requires both micro and institutional economics. The micro-economics of shipping containers is easy. Incidentally, there is no institutional economics to replace calculation of least cost resource combinations. But, the institutional analysis problem is to understand how incentives work to achieve a given performance. And, in this case the problem is to predict how alternative distributions of the cost of change affect the pattern of change. Food manufacturers have investments in current packing box and pallet size which would be lost if they had to change. While the cost savings in total are great enough to exceed these losses, there is no institution available for sharing them to which enough agree. A Commons' type study of other similar situations where industry standards have been achieved seems in order. This illustrates the role of theory to know what to look for. If you want to help the food industry, you may have to study other goods with similar situational features such as the history of the railroad or communications industry as they have achieved economies of scale by standardization (Schmid, 1985b).

Exclusion Cost

The interdependence created by high exclusion cost goods is most troublesome for institutional design. If a market structure is chosen, free riders may prevent the good from being produced. If an administrative structure is chosen the tax may mean unwilling riders pay who truly do not want the good and are not being opportunistic. The public choice theorists such as Olson (1965) have done some good work in explaining why certain lobby groups such as the American Medical Association or the Farm Bureau are more successful than consumer groups. One of the best pieces of empirical work is that by Pincus (1977) who tried to explain the structure of tariff rates implemented in 1824. Since a tariff is available to everyone in an industry whether or not they helped pay for the lobbying effort, Pincus tried to explain relative tariffs by group size, location, etc. which affect the group's ability to control opportunistic behavior.

While this work is very useful in explanation, it doesn't solve many problems of institutional design if you want to change performance. In fact Olson regards the person who voluntarily contributes to a high exclusion cost good as irrational. And in his latest book (1982) he regards all pressure groups as rent seeking thieves, so he is not likely to create any new institutions! The institutional economist is not so scared of sociological variables, so at least they have a chance. There is much relevant literature here such as Morrison (1971), Badelt (1985), Rich (1980) and Sproule-Jones (1974). But, much work remains. This may be one area where there may not be any short run answers and developmental institutional theory is needed to suggest what learning environments produce Olson's "irrational person". This suggests a need for research in the direction of Hirschman's work noted above.
Information Costs

The interdependence created by information costs has long been noted in neoclassical economics. Its role has been primarily to qualify the welfare conclusions of the purely competitive model. Much effort is devoted to showing that while information may not be perfect, it is good enough for the welfare deductions to hold. Institutional economics asks a different question. Given that information is not perfect and that different people have different information costs, how do institutional alternatives affect who gets what. One of the problems of imperfect information is that investors can make mistakes in creating immobile assets. Galbraith's (1967) technological imperative for planning is a recognition that modern industry can't afford too much uncertainty. Neo-classical theory selectively accepts capital losses as the cost of signaling resource allocation and a needed learning so people make fewer mistakes in the future. This misses the point of the longer run dynamic of the situation, and understanding requires a combination of developmental and impact analysis.

Don Kanel (1985) has analyzed the cost of adjusting to a new technology such as the substitution of rayon for silk. Some market rules mean that the security provided by the previous caste, feudal, or other non-market system is no longer available. The issue is sometimes seen as a conflict between consumers who benefit from technological change and the investors and workers who lose. But, one wonders if the consumer if well served if the response of investors is to reduce investment in immobile capital or fight political battles to get subsidies or to protect themselves from competition. This may be part of the answer to why the Japanese with their longer planning horizons and coordination of public and private investments in complementary fields were so successful in automobiles and electronics (Solo, 1984). Those scholars working in what is now called industrial policy are part of a long line of institutional impact analysts.

The current policy of buying out dairy farmers is a laboratory to test the effect of alternative institutions for distributing the costs of what is now known to be investment mistakes. If we take the substantive performance objective to be prevention of continuing asset losses in agriculture, then we shall have to modify farmer incentives. These incentives are now provided by the use of supported market prices combined with the situation of unpredictable demand and supply and immobile assets. The owners of immobile assets try to meet income objectives by further investments in new technology. Unless policy adopts explicit rights to market sharing we will remain on the agricultural treadmill (Cochrane, 1979) with some producers going broke while others are still adding to already surplus supplies. Another alternative is forward deliverable contract markets (Kauffman and Shaffer, 1985). We could use some institutional creativity here.

In the natural resources field, one of the major problems is due to imperfect information on the long run consequences of irrigation on soil and water salinity. Major portions of western irrigated land are becoming dangerously close to crop salinity tolerance and the run-off is polluting drinking water and killing wildlife, such as in the Kesterson Marsh in California. If we reduce, irrigation, some very large farmers are going to lose some big fixed assets.

Could developmental theory be used to predict what will happen? One hypothesis would be that these big farmers will get the government to make some very expensive engineering works to forestall the problem. In seeking a high exclusion cost good like legislation, small groups with concentrated pay-offs have an advantage over large diffuse groups where benefits are large in the aggregate, but individually small. Could impact theory suggest some institutional alternatives? One answer lies in consumers sharing
some of the costs of these past mistakes -- buy out some of the irrigators and don't allow any new ones.

The big problem with empirical impact analysis is to find any institutional variation to observe. Can we find any industries that have created institutions for sharing the costs of mistakes from imperfect information? The institutional agricultural economists may have to go far afield to find the answer.

Conclusion

Commons defined theory as a system of ideas which provides insight into the complementary and strategic factors affecting performance. In that sense, the neo-institutional economist has a lot of theory. We just need to get on with it, carefully distinguishing developmental and impact analysis. The institutionalists have no welfare theory and if that is what is needed to be respectable, so much the worse for modern economics. We need to develop some categories for our analysis such as those suggested above for impact theory so that we can see that common themes are being investigated and so that we can learn more from our experience.

Not everyone working in these fields wants to be known as a neo-institutionalist even if they qualify. Old labels carry unavoidable excess symbolic baggage. Perhaps we should just speak of modern political economy (Fry, 1978). Progress would be enhanced if more realized they were working on some common themes. Undue product differentiation should not keep us from this realization. What unites the institutionalists is a rich theory and an approach which produces probabilistic and directional predictions and pragmatic suggestions, as contrasted to the neo-classical determinate predictions and optimal presumptions.

Whatever the label, as Bromley (1985) has suggested, let's get on with trying to understand how institutions affect what and how much is produced and who gets it. As a part of that, I would emphasize the creative enlargement of the supply of new institutions from which to choose. The institutionalist knows that institutions do not just arise from nature when the price is right. And, since pseudo-scientific obfuscation is a fact of life, there will be a continuing role for a critique of neo-classical welfare economics. That is what institutional economics is about, and it is alive and well.
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