Taylor & Francis
Online

Home ► All Journals ► Economics, Finance & Business ► Journal of Post Keynesian Economics
► List of Issues ► Volume 37, Issue 4 ► Piketty's paradox: a comparison to the K ....

Original Articles

Piketty's paradox: a comparison to the Keynesian paradox of thrift

Alan Day Haight

66 Cite this article ↗ https://doi.org/10.1080/01603477.2015.1049924

Check for updates

Sample our
Humanities
Journals

>> Sign in here to start your access
to the latest two volumes for 14 days

Full Article   Figures & data   References   Citations   Metrics

Reprints & Permissions   Read this article   Share

Abstract

In Piketty... ...ed and invested... ...nes's paradox... ...simply by changing... ...d strong forms of... ...es of the Piket...

Key word...

income ine...

⚠ View co...

Erratum

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 894 partners store and access personal data, like browsing data or unique identifiers, on your device. Selecting I Accept enables tracking technologies to support the purposes shown under we and our partners process data to provide. Selecting Reject All or withdrawing your consent will disable them. If trackers are disabled, some content and ads you see may not be as relevant to you. You can resurface this menu to change your choices or withdraw consent at any time by clicking the Show Purposes link on the bottom of the webpage .Your choices will have effect within our Website. For more details, refer to our Privacy Policy. Here

We and our partners process data to provide:

Use precise geolocation data. Actively scan device

I Accept

Reject All

Show Purpose

Notes

[1]Apparently Piketty (2014) does not explicitly state the paradox as such, nor does he presume to name it after himself. Similarly, Keynes ([1936]) did not state or name the "Keynesian" paradox of saving. Wright noted that "explicit reference to the paradox of thrift cannot be found in Keynes' General Theory…. One must look to the disciples for more explicit statement" (Wright, [1965]). The disciples Wright viewed as sources of the Keynesian paradox were Joan Robinson, Seymour Harris, and Paul Samuelson. Of course, Samuelson's ([1997]) textbook originated the (still controversial) graph that we call the "Keynesian cross.".

[2]Note the method used here for numbering equations: Equation (K-1) is the first equation in the Keynesian model, Equation (P-1) is the first equation in the Pikettian model, and so on.

[3]This assumption simplifies the comparisons by giving lowercase s the same meaning in the Keynesian notation (K-2) as in the Pikettian notation (P-1).

[4]Unlike Harrod ([1939]) and Domar ([1946]), Piketty (2014, p. 230) treats the growth rate as exogenous.

[5]In Piket   sets not tradition

[6]Or perh   Figure [2] but with Y/K   the vertical axis. Reg

[7]Reca

8

.

9

.

[10]Harrod (1939) and Domar (1946) viewed the capital–output ratio as exogenous; it was fixed by technology, in the classical tradition. That made

$$g = s\bar{\beta}$$

; the saving rate determined the growth rate. In the neoclassical approach taken by Piketty (2014, pp. 2030–2032), the capital/output ratio (where capital includes housing) is endogenous: the growth rate is exogenous, and the saving rate determines the capital/output ratio in (P-5).

[11]Recall that when the share actually saved and invested (s and i) is less than the growth-balancing saving and investment share $g\beta$, capital growth is insufficient to match Y growth, causing $\beta = K/Y$ to decline.

[12]See Kaldor ([1966](#)). Piketty himself sometimes uses saving propensities that differ by class or type of income: see, for example, Piketty (2012–13).

[13]In the extreme case where capital received all of the country's income, this would degenerate to

$$s = s_L + (s_K - s_L)1 = s_K$$

. If labor received all of the country's income, then

$$s = s_L + (s_K - s_L)0 = s_L$$

.

Addit

Notes

Alan Da

Ala
the
this pa
Keynes
2014.

Related research ⓘ