

Mixed economy

A **mixed economy** is variously defined as an economic system blending elements of market economies with elements of planned economies, free markets with state interventionism, or private enterprise with public enterprise.^[1] As such, there is no single definition of a mixed economy.^[2] One definition is about a mixture of markets with state interventionism, referring specifically to capitalist market

economies with strong regulatory oversight and extensive interventions into markets. The other definition is apolitical in nature, strictly referring to an economy containing a mixture of private enterprise with public enterprise.^[3]

In most cases, particularly with reference to Western economies, the term mixed economy refers to a capitalist economy characterized by the predominance of private ownership of the means of production with profit-seeking enterprise and the accumulation of capital as its fundamental driving force.^[4] In such a system, markets are subject to varying

degrees of regulatory control and governments wield indirect macroeconomic influence through fiscal and monetary policies with a view to counteracting capitalism's history of boom/bust cycles, unemployment and income disparities. In this framework, varying degrees of public utilities and essential services are provided by government, with state activity often limited to providing public goods and universal civic requirements. This includes healthcare, physical infrastructure and management of public lands.^{[4][5]} This contrasts with *laissez-faire* capitalism, where state activity is limited to providing

public goods and services as well as the infrastructure and legal framework to protect property rights and enforce contracts.^[6]

In reference to post-war Western European economic models as championed by Christian democrats and social democrats, the mixed economy is a form of capitalism where most industries are privately owned with only a small number of public utilities and essential services under public ownership. In the post-war era, European social democracy became associated with this economic model.^[7] As an economic ideal, mixed economies are supported by

people of various political persuasions, typically centre-left and centre-right such as Christian democrats or social democrats.^[8] The contemporary capitalist welfare state has been described as a type of mixed economy in the sense of state interventionism (as opposed to a mixture of planning and markets); planning was never a feature or key component of the welfare state.^[9]

Alternatively, a mixed economy can refer to a socialist economy that allows a substantial role for private enterprise and contracting within a dominant economic framework of public ownership. This can

extend to Soviet-type planned economies that have been reformed to incorporate a greater role for markets in the allocation of factors of production.^[10]

Etymology

There is not only one definition of a mixed economy.^[11] However, there are generally two major definitions, one being political and the other apolitical.

The political definition of a mixed economy refers to the degree of state interventionism in a market economy, portraying the state as encroaching onto the market under the assumption that the

market is the natural mechanism for allocating resources. The political definition is limited to capitalistic economies and precludes an extension to non-capitalist systems, being concerned with public policy and state influence in the market.^[12] On the other hand, the apolitical definition relates to patterns of ownership and management of economic enterprises in an economy.

The apolitical definition of mixed economy strictly refers to a mix of public and private ownership of enterprises in the economy and is unconcerned with political forms and public policy.^[13]

History

E...

The term mixed economy arose in the context of political debate in the United Kingdom in the postwar period, although the set of policies later associated with the term had been advocated from at least the 1930s.^[14] Supporters of the mixed economy, including R. H. Tawney,^[15] Anthony Crosland^[16] and Andrew Shonfield were mostly associated with the Labour Party, although similar views were expressed by Conservatives including Harold Macmillan. Critics of the mixed economy, including Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich von Hayek, argued that there can

be no lasting middle ground between economic planning and a market economy and any move in the direction of socialist planning is an unintentional move toward what Hilaire Bloc called "the servile state". [17]

Political philosophy

In the apolitical sense, the term mixed economy is used to describe economic systems which combine various elements of market economies and planned economies. As most political-economic ideologies are defined in an idealized sense, what is described rarely—if ever—

exists in practice. Most would not consider it unreasonable to label an economy that, while not being a perfect representation, very closely resembles an ideal by applying the rubric that denominates that ideal. When a system in question, however, diverges to a significant extent from an idealized economic model or ideology, the task of identifying it can become problematic. Hence, the term mixed economy was coined. As it is unlikely that an economy will contain a perfectly even mix, mixed economies are usually noted as being skewed towards either private ownership or public ownership, toward capitalism or socialism,

or toward a market economy or command economy in varying degrees.^[18]

Catholic social teaching

E...

Jesuit author David Hollenbach has argued that Catholic social teaching calls for a "new form" of mixed economy. He refers back to Pope Pius XI's statement that government "should supply help to the members of the social body, but may never destroy or absorb them".^[19] Hollenbach writes that a socially just mixed economy involves labour, management and the state working together through a

pluralistic system that distributes economic power widely.^[20]

However, subsequent scholars have noted that conceiving of subsidiarity as a "top-down, government-driven political exercise" requires a selective reading of 1960s encyclicals. A more comprehensive reading of Catholic social teaching suggests a conceptualization of subsidiarity as a "bottom-up concept" that is "rooted in recognition of a common humanity, not in the political equivalent of noblesse oblige".^[21]

Fascism

Although fascism is primarily a political ideology that stresses the importance of cultural and social issues over economics, fascism is generally supportive of a broadly capitalistic mixed economy. Fascism supports a state interventionism into markets and private enterprise, alongside a corporatist framework referred to as the "third position" that ostensibly aims to be a middle-ground between socialism and capitalism by mediating labour and business disputes to promote national unity. 20th century fascist regimes in Italy and Germany adopted large public works programs to stimulate their economies, state interventionism in

largely private-sector dominated economies to promote re-armament and national interests. Scholars have drawn parallels between the American New Deal and public works programs promoted by fascism, arguing that fascism similarly arose in response to the threat of socialist revolution and similarly aimed to "save capitalism" and private property.^[22]

Social democracy

E...

In the early post-war era in Western Europe, social democratic parties rejected the Stalinist political and economic model then current in the Soviet Union,

committing themselves either to an alternate path to socialism or to a compromise between capitalism and socialism.^[23] In this period, social democrats embraced a mixed economy based on the predominance of private property, with only a minority of essential utilities and public services under public ownership. As a result, social democracy became associated with Keynesian economics, state interventionism and the welfare state while abandoning the prior goal of replacing the capitalist system (factor markets, private property and wage labor)^[24] with a qualitatively different socialist economic system.^{[25][26][27]}

Socialism

E...

Mixed economies understood as a mixture of socially owned and private enterprise have been predicted and advocated by various socialists as a necessary transitional form between capitalism and socialism. Additionally, a number of proposals for socialist systems call for a mixture of different forms of enterprise ownership including a role for private enterprise. For example, Alexander Nove's conception of feasible socialism outlines an economic system based on a combination of state-enterprises for large industries, worker and consumer

cooperatives, private enterprises for small-scale operations and individually owned enterprises.^[28]

The social democratic theorist Eduard Bernstein advocated a form of mixed economy, believing that a mixed system of public, cooperative and private enterprise would be necessary for a long period of time before capitalism would evolve of its own accord into socialism.^[29]

The People's Republic of China adopted a socialist market economy which represents an early stage of socialist development according to the Communist

Party of China. The communist party takes the Marxist–Leninist position that an economic system containing diverse forms of ownership—but with the public sector playing a decisive role—is a necessary characteristic of an economy in the preliminary stage of developing socialism.^[30]

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam describes its economy as a socialist-oriented market economy that consists of a mixture of public, private and cooperative enterprise—a mixed economy that is oriented toward the long-term development of a socialist economy.

Typology

Mix of free markets and state intervention

E...

This meaning of a mixed economy refers to a combination of market forces with state intervention in the form of regulations, macroeconomic policies and social welfare interventions aimed at improving market outcomes. As such, this type of mixed economy falls under the framework of a capitalistic market economy, with macroeconomic interventions aimed at promoting the stability of capitalism.^[31] Other examples

of common government activity in this form of mixed economy include environmental protection, maintenance of employment standards, a standardized welfare system and maintenance of competition.

Most contemporary market-oriented economies fall under this category, including the economy of the United States.^{[32][33]} The term is also used to describe the economies of countries that feature extensive welfare states such as the Nordic model practiced by the Nordic countries which combine free markets with an extensive welfare state.^{[34][35]}

The German social market economy is the economic policy of modern Germany that steers a middle path between the goals of social democracy and capitalism within the framework of a private market economy and aims at maintaining a balance between a high rate of economic growth, low inflation, low levels of unemployment, good working conditions, public welfare and public services by using state intervention. Under its influence, Germany emerged from desolation and defeat to become an industrial giant within the European Union.^[36]

The American School is the economic philosophy that dominated United States national policies from the time of the American Civil War until the mid-twentieth century.^[37] It consisted of three core policy initiatives: protecting industry through high tariffs (1861–1932; changing to subsidies and reciprocity from 1932–1970s), government investment in infrastructure through internal improvements and a national bank to promote the growth of productive enterprises. During this period, the United States grew into the largest economy in the world, surpassing the United Kingdom by 1880, although not the British Empire.^{[38][39][40]}

Mix of private and public enterprise

E...

This type of mixed economy specifically refers to a mixture of private and public ownership of industry and the means of production. As such, it is sometimes described as a "middle path" or transitional state between capitalism and socialism, but it can also refer to a mixture of state capitalism with private capitalism.

Examples include the economies of China, Norway, Singapore and Vietnam—all of which feature large state-owned enterprise sectors operating alongside large private sectors. The French economy featured a

large state sector from 1945 until 1986, mixing a substantial amount of state-owned enterprises and nationalized firms with private enterprise.^[41]

Following the Chinese economic reforms initiated in 1978, the Chinese economy has reformed its state-owned enterprises and allowed greater scope for private enterprise to operate alongside the state and collective sectors. In the 1990s, the central government concentrated its ownership in strategic sectors of the economy, but local and provincial level state-owned enterprises continue to operate in almost every industry including

information technology, automobiles, machinery and hospitality. The latest round of state-owned enterprise reform initiated in 2013 stressed increased dividend payouts of state enterprises to the central government and mixed ownership reform which includes partial private investment into state-owned firms. As a result, many nominally private-sector firms are actually partially state-owned by various levels of government and state institutional investors; and many state-owned enterprises are partially privately owned resulting in a mixed ownership economy.^[42]

Mix of markets and economic planning

E...

This type of mixed economy refers to a combination of economic planning with market forces for the guiding of production in an economy and may coincide with a mixture of private and public enterprise. It can include capitalist economies with indicative macroeconomic planning policies and socialist planned economies that introduced market forces into their economies such as in Hungary.

Dirigisme was an economic policy initiated under Charles de Gaulle in France,

designating an economy where the government exerts strong directive influence through indicative economic planning. In the period of dirigisme, the French state used indicative economic planning to supplement market forces for guiding its market economy. It involved state control of industries such as transportation, energy and telecommunication infrastructures as well as various incentives for private corporations to merge or engage in certain projects. Under its influence, France experienced what is called Thirty Glorious Years of profound economic growth.^[36]

Hungary inaugurated the New Economic Mechanism reforms in 1968 that introduced market processes into its planned economy. Under this system, firms were still publicly owned but not subject to physical production targets and output quotas specified by a national plan. Firms were attached to state ministries which had the power to merge, dissolve and reorganize them and which established the firm's operating sector. Enterprises had to acquire their inputs and sell their outputs in markets, eventually eroding away at the Soviet-style planned economy.

In 2010, Australian economist John Quiggin wrote: "The experience of the twentieth century suggests that a mixed economy will outperform both central planning and laissez-faire. The real question for policy debates is one of determining the appropriate mix, and the way in which the public and private sectors should interact."^[43]

Criticism

Numerous economists have questioned the validity of the entire concept of a mixed economy when understood to be a mixture of capitalism and socialism.

In *Human Action*, Ludwig von Mises argued that there can be no mixture of capitalism and socialism—either market logic or economic planning must dominate an economy.^[44] Mises elaborated on this point by contending that even if a market economy contained numerous state-run or nationalized enterprises, this would not make the economy mixed because the existence of such organizations does not alter the fundamental characteristics of the market economy. These publicly owned enterprises would still be subject to market sovereignty as they would have to acquire capital goods through markets, strive to maximize profits or at the least try

to minimize costs and utilize monetary accounting for economic calculation.^[45]

Classical and orthodox Marxist theorists also dispute the viability of a mixed economy as a middle ground between socialism and capitalism. Irrespective of enterprise ownership, either the capitalist law of value and accumulation of capital drives the economy or conscious planning and non-monetary forms of valuation ultimately drive the economy. From the Great Depression onward, extant mixed economies in the Western world are still functionally capitalist because they

operate on the basis of capital accumulation.^[46]

See also

- Christian democracy
 - Distributism
 - Social credit
- Corporatism
- Dirigisme
- Economic planning
- Economic interventionism
- Keynesian economics
- Market economy
- National conservatism

- Neo-nationalism
- Political economy.
- Public-private partnership
- Public sector
- Regulation
- Social liberalism
- Third Way.
- Third Position
- Types of capitalism

Sources and notes

1. *See the following sources:*

- *Schiller, Bradley. The Micro Economy Today, McGraw-*

Hill/Irwin, 2010, p. 15. "Mixed economy - An economy that uses both market signals and government directives to allocate goods and resources." This follows immediately from a discussion on command economies and market mechanism.

- *Stilwell, Frank J. B. (2006). Political Economy: The Contest of Economic Ideas (2 ed.). Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780195551273. Retrieved 12 November 2018.*

- *Hendricks, Jean and Gaoreth D. Myles. Intermediate Public Economics, The MIT Press, 2006, p. 4 "the mixed economy where individual decisions are respected but the government attempts to affect these through the policies it implements".*
- *Gorman, Tom. The Complete Idiot's Guide to Economics, Alpha Books (2003), p. 9. "In a market economy, the private-sector businesses and consumers decide what they will produce and purchase, with little government intervention. [...] In a*

command economy, also known as a planned economy, the government largely determines what is produced and in what amounts. In a mixed economy, both market forces and government decisions determine which goods and services are produced and how they are distributed."

2. *"A variety of definitions for mixed economy" .*

3. *Brown, Douglas (November 11, 2011). Towards a Radical Democracy (Routledge Revivals): The Political*

Economy of the Budapest School.
Routledge. pp. 10–11. ISBN 978-0415608794. "The apolitical definition of 'mixed economy' generally refers to the mix of public and private ownership forms. [...] Here 'mixed economy' itself does not specify a political form. it means an economy characterized by a combination of public and private ownership as well as planning and markets."

- 4. Pollin, Robert (2007). "Resurrection of the Rentier" (July–August). Book review of Andrew Glyn's Capitalism Unleashed: Finance, Globalization*

and Welfare. In New Left Review (46): 141–142. "The underlying premise behind the mixed economy was straightforward. Keynes and like-minded reformers were not willing to give up on capitalism, and in particular, two of its basic features: that ownership and control of the economy's means of production would remain primarily in the hands of private capitalists; and that most economic activity would be guided by 'market forces', that is, the dynamic combination of material self-seeking and competition. More specifically, the driving force of the mixed

economy, as with free-market capitalism, should continue to be capitalists trying to make as much profit as they can. At the same time, Keynes was clear that in maintaining a profit-driven marketplace, it was also imperative to introduce policy interventions to counteract capitalism's inherent tendencies—demonstrated to devastating effect during the 1930s calamity—toward financial breakdowns, depressions, and mass unemployment. Keynes's framework also showed how full employment and social welfare interventions could be justified not

simply on grounds of social uplift, but could also promote the stability of capitalism."

5. Rees, Merlyn (1973). *The Public Sector in the Mixed Economy*.

Bratsford. p. 240. ISBN 978-0713413724.

6. Yu-Shan Wu (1995). *Comparative Economic Transformations: Mainland China, Hungary, the Soviet Union, and Taiwan*. Stanford University Press.

p. 8. "In laissez-faire capitalism, the state restricts itself to providing public goods and services that the economy cannot generate by itself

and to safeguarding private ownership and the smooth operation of the self-regulating market."

- 7. Craig, Edward (June 1998). Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Volume 8. Routledge. p. 827. ISBN 978-0415187138. "In the second, mainly post-war, phase, social democrats came to believe that their ideals and values could be achieved by reforming capitalism rather than abolishing it. They favored a mixed economy in which most industries would be privately owned, with only a small number of utilities and other*

essential services in public ownership."

8. *"Social democracy". Jason P. Abbot. Routledge Encyclopedia of International Political Economy. Ed. R. J. Barry Jones. Taylor & Francis, 2001. 1410*

9. *O'Hara, Phillip Anthony, ed. (1999). "Welfare state". Encyclopedia of Political Economy. Routledge. p. 1247. ISBN 0-415-24187-1. "The welfare state emerged in the twentieth century as one institutional form of this socially protective response. In the 1930s, the*

responses of emerging welfare states to the Great Depression were to the immediate circumstances of massive unemployment, lost output, and collapse of the financial and trading systems. Planning was not a key element in the response to the crisis of capitalism. Instead the character of welfare state intervention can best be described as an 'interventionist drift', reflecting the spontaneous, uncoordinated reactions of the protective response."

10. Young, Greg. "Mixed Economy" .
Encyclopædia Britannica Online.
Retrieved March 15, 2020.

"Alternatively, a mixed economy can emerge when a socialist government makes exceptions to the rule of state ownership to capture economic benefits from private ownership and free market incentives."

11. *"A variety of definitions for mixed economy" .*
12. *Brown, Douglas (November 11, 2011). Towards a Radical Democracy (Routledge Revivals): The Political Economy of the Budapest School. Routledge. pp. 10–11. ISBN 978-0415608794. "There are in general two broad yet distinguishable*

definitions of 'mixed economy': a political definition and an apolitical definition. The political definition refers to the degree of state intervention in what is basically a market economy. Thus this definition 'portray[s] the phenomenon in terms of state encroaching upon the market and thereby suggest[s] that market is the natural or preferable mechanism. [...] The political definition of 'mixed economy' precludes extending it to non-capitalist systems."

13. *Brown, Douglas (November 11, 2011). Towards a Radical Democracy (Routledge Revivals): The Political*

Economy of the Budapest School.
Routledge. pp. 10–11. ISBN 978-0415608794. "The apolitical definition of 'mixed economy' generally refers to the mix of public and private ownership forms. [...] Here 'mixed economy' itself does not specify a political form. it means an economy characterized by a combination of public and private ownership as well as planning and markets."

14. *Reisman, David A. Theories of the Mixed Economy (Theories of the mixed economy). Pickering & Chatto Ltd. ISBN 1-85196-214-X.*

15. *Tawney, R. H. (1964). Equality. London: Allen and Unwin. ISBN 0-04-323014-8.*
16. *Crosland, A. (1977). The Future of socialism. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press. ISBN 0-8371-9586-1.*
17. *Gardner, Martin. Whys of a Philosophical Scrivener St. Martin's Press (1991), p. 126*
18. *Vuong, Quan-Hoang. Financial Markets in Vietnam's Transition Economy: Facts, Insights, Implications . ISBN 978-3-639-23383-*

4, VDM Verlag, February 2010, 66123 Saarbrücken, Germany.

19. *Pius XI, Quadragesimo Anno , para 79, published 15 May 1931, accessed 12 August 2018; the papal text refers to "every social activity", not only to government.*

20. *David Hollenbach, S.J. (1984). "Unemployment and Jobs: A Theological and Ethical Perspective". In Houck, John; Williams, Oliver (eds.). Catholic social teaching and the United States economy: working papers for a bishops' pastoral.*

University Press of America. pp. 132–133.

21. *Denis O'Brien (2014). "Subsidiarity and Solidarity". In Booth, Phillip (ed.). Catholic social teaching and the market economy. The Institute of Economic Affairs. p. 454.*
22. *The Political Economy of Fascism, by Gupta, Dipankar. 1977. Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 12, No. 25 (June 18, 1977), pp. 987–992.*
23. *Adams 1993, pp. 102-103: "The emergence of social democracy was partly a result of the Cold War. People argued that if the Stalinist Soviet*

empire, where the state controlled everything, showed socialism in action, then socialism was not worth having. [...] The consensus policies of a mixed and managed economy and the welfare state, developed by the post-war Labour government, seemed in themselves to provide a basis for a viable socialism that would combine prosperity and freedom with social justice and the possibility of a full life for everyone. They could be seen as a compromise between socialism and capitalism."

24. *Weisskopf 1992, p. 10: "Thus social democrats do not try to do away with*

either the market or private property ownership; instead, they attempt to create conditions in which the operation of a capitalist market economy will lead to more egalitarian outcomes and encourage more democratic and more solidaristic practices than would a more conventional capitalist system."

25. *Miller 1998, p. 827: "In the second, mainly post-war, phase, social democrats came to believe that their ideals and values could be achieved by reforming capitalism rather than abolishing it. They favored a mixed economy in which most industries*

would be privately owned, with only a small number of utilities and other essential services in public ownership."

26. *Jones 2001, p. 1410: "In addition, particularly since World War II, distinctions have sometimes been made between social democrats and socialists on the basis that the former have accepted the permanence of the mixed economy and have abandoned the idea of replacing the capitalist system with a qualitatively different socialist society."*

27. *Heywood 2012, pp. 125–128: "As an ideological stance, social democracy took shape around the mid-twentieth century, resulting from the tendency among western socialist parties not only to adopt parliamentary strategies, but also to revise their socialist goals. In particular, they abandoned the goal of abolishing capitalism and sought instead to reform or 'humanize' it. Social democracy therefore came to stand for a broad balance between the market economy, on the one hand, and state intervention, on the other."*

28. *Feasible Socialism: Market or Plan – Or Both:*
<http://www.whatnextjournal.co.uk/Pages/Ratner/Feassoc.html>
29. *Steger, Manfred B. The Quest for Evolutionary Socialism: Eduard Bernstein And Social Democracy.* Cambridge, England, UK; New York, New York, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1997. pg. 146.
30. *"Socialist Market Economic System" . Ministry of Commerce of the People's Republic of China. June 25, 2004. Retrieved February 8, 2018. "The development of the economic system*

with public ownership playing a dominant role and diverse forms of ownership developing side by side is a basic characteristic of the socialist economic system at the preliminary stage. This is decided by the quality of socialism and the national situation in preliminary stage: first, China, as a socialist country, should persist in public ownership as the base of the socialist economy; second, China, as in its preliminary stage, should develop diverse forms of ownership on condition that the public ownership plays a dominant role"

31. *Pollin, Robert (2007). "Resurrection of the Rentier" (July–August). Book review of Andrew Glyn's Capitalism Unleashed: Finance, Globalization and Welfare. In New Left Review (46): 141–142. "The underlying premise behind the mixed economy was straightforward. Keynes and like-minded reformers were not willing to give up on capitalism, and in particular, two of its basic features: that ownership and control of the economy's means of production would remain primarily in the hands of private capitalists; and that most economic activity would be guided by*

'market forces', that is, the dynamic combination of material self-seeking and competition. More specifically, the driving force of the mixed economy, as with free-market capitalism, should continue to be capitalists trying to make as much profit as they can. At the same time, Keynes was clear that in maintaining a profit-driven marketplace, it was also imperative to introduce policy interventions to counteract capitalism's inherent tendencies—demonstrated to devastating effect during the 1930s calamity—toward financial breakdowns, depressions,

and mass unemployment. Keynes's framework also showed how full employment and social welfare interventions could be justified not simply on grounds of social uplift, but could also promote the stability of capitalism."

32. *"U.S. Economy - Basic Conditions & Resources" . U.S. Diplomatic Mission to Germany. "The United States is said to have a mixed economy because privately owned businesses and government both play important roles." Retrieved October 24, 2011.*

33. (4) *Outline of the U.S. Economy – (2) How the U.S. Economy Works . U.S. Embassy Information Resource Center. "As a result, the American economy is perhaps better described as a "mixed" economy, with government playing an important role along with private enterprise. Although Americans often disagree about exactly where to draw the line between their beliefs in both free enterprise and government management, the mixed economy they have developed has been remarkably successful." Retrieved October 24, 2011.*

34. *Lahti, Arto. Globalization & the Nordic Success Model: Part II. 2010. Arto Lahti & Ventus Publishing ApS. p 60. ISBN 978-87-7681-550-9.*
35. *Eds. Johan Fritzell, Bjorn Hvinden, Mikko Kautto, Jon Kvist, Hannu Uusitalo. Nordic Welfare States in the European Context. 2001. Routledge. p 3. ISBN 0-415-24161-8.*
36. *(Gardner)*
37. *"The Progressive Movement" . United States History. Retrieved February 12, 2011.*
38. *The Making of Modern British Politics, Martin Pugh*

39. *Global Political Economy, Robert O'Brien and Marc Williams*

40. *See the following sources:*

- *Gill: "By 1880 the United States of America had overtaken and surpassed the UK as industrial leader of the world.: (from Trade Wars Against America: A History of United States Trade and Monetary Policy Chapter 6 titled "America becomes Number 1" pg. 39–49 – published 1990 by Praeger Publishers in the USA – ISBN 0-275-93316-4)*

- *Lind: "Lincoln and his successors in the Republican party of 1865–1932, by presiding over the industrialization of the United State, foreclosed the option that the United States would remain a rural society with an agrarian economy, as so many Jeffersonians had hoped." and "Hamiltonian side ... the Federalists; the National Republicans; the Whigs, the Republicans; the Progressives." (from Hamilton's Republic Introduction pg. xiv–xv – published 1997 by Free Press,*

Simon & Schuster division in the USA – ISBN 0-684-83160-0)

- *Lind: "During the nineteenth century the dominant school of American political economy was the "American School" of developmental economic nationalism. [...] The patron saint of the American School was Alexander Hamilton, whose Report on Manufactures (1791) had called for federal government activism in sponsoring infrastructure development and industrialization behind tariff*

walls that would keep out British manufactured goods. [...] The American School, elaborated in the nineteenth century by economists like Henry Carey (who advised President Lincoln), inspired the "American System" of Henry Clay and the protectionist import-substitution policies of Lincoln and his successors in the Republican party well into the twentieth century." (from Hamilton's Republic Part III "The American School of National Economy" pg. 229–230 published 1997 by Free

*Press, Simon & Schuster division
in the USA – ISBN 0-684-83160-
0)*

- *Richardson: "By 1865, the
Republicans had developed a
series of high tariffs and taxes
that reflected the economic
theories of Carey and Wayland
and were designed to strengthen
and benefit all parts of the
American economy, raising the
standard of living for everyone.
As a Republican concluded [...] "
Congress must shape its
legislation as to incidentally aid
all branches of industry, render*

the people prosperous, and enable them to pay taxes [...] for ordinary expenses of Government." (from "The Greatest Nation of the Earth" Chapter 4 titled "Directing the Legislation of the Country to the Improvement of the Country: Tariff and Tax Legislation" pg. 136-137 published 1997 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College in the USA – ISBN 0-674-36213-6)

- *Boritt: "Lincoln thus had the pleasure of signing into law much of the program he had*

worked for through the better part of his political life. And this, as Leornard P. Curry, the historian of the legislation has aptly written, amounted to a "blueprint for modern America. [...] The man Lincoln selected for the sensitive position of Secretary of the Treasury, Salmon P. Chase, was an ex-Democrat, but of the moderate cariety on economics, one whom Joseph Dorfman could even describe as 'a good Hamiltonian, and a western progressive of the Lincoln stamp in everything from

*a tariff to a national bank." (from
Lincoln and the Economics of
the American Dream Chapter 14
titled "The Whig in the White
House" pg. 196–197 published
1994 by University of Illinois
Press in the USA – ISBN 0-252-
06445-3*

41. *Rosser, Mariana V. and J Barkley Jr.
(2004). Comparative Economics in a
Transforming World Economy. MIT
Press. p. 187. ISBN 978-0262182348.
"After World War II a wave of
nationalizations occurred, affecting
the Bank of France, the four largest
commercial banks, the four leading*

groups of insurance companies, all electric power and gas producers, the coal mining industry, Air France, and the Renault automobile company (the last specifically because of wartime collaboration with the Nazis by its owner). Until 1981 no other firms were nationalized, although occasionally new public enterprises were created from scratch or the government bought part of ownership, as it did with Dassault Aircraft in 1978. Until 1986 none of these industries were denationalized."

42. *Fan, He (January 9, 2015). "The long march to the mixed economy in China" . East Asia Forum. East Asia Forum. Retrieved February 9, 2018.*
43. *Zombie Economics: How Dead Ideas Still Walk among Us , John Quiggin, Princeton University Press, 2010, page 78. The author made this statement in his chapter which is sharply critical of the strong version of "The Efficient Market Hypothesis," esp. as it pertains to financial markets.*
44. *Mises, Ludwig (2007). Human Action: A Treatise on Economics. Liberty*

Fund. p. 259. ISBN 978-0865976313.

"There is no mixture of the two systems possible or thinkable; there is no such thing as a mixed economy, a system that would be in part capitalistic and in part socialist."

45. *Mises, Ludwig (2007). Human Action:*

A Treatise on Economics. Liberty

Fund. p. 259. ISBN 978-0865976313.

"The fact that the state or municipalities own and operate some plants does not alter the characteristic features of a market economy. These publicly owned and operated enterprises are subject to the sovereignty of the market. They

must fit themselves, as buyers of raw materials, equipment, and labour, and as sellers of goods and services, into the scheme of the market economy. They are subject to the laws of the market and thereby depend on the consumers who may or may not patronize them. They must strive for profits, or at least, to avoid losses."

46. *Paul Mattick (1969). "The Limits of the Mixed Economy" . Marxism.org. Retrieved 17 January 2014. "To be sure, 'orthodox Marxism' maintains that the mixed economy is still the capitalism of old, just as 'orthodox' bourgeois theory insists that the*

mixed economy is a camouflaged form of socialism. Generally, however, both the state-capitalist and mixed economies are recognized as economic systems adhering to the principle of progress by way of capital accumulation."

Further reading

- Buchanan, James M. (1986) *Liberty, Market and State: Political Economy in the 1980s*
New York University Press.
- Buckwitz, George D. (1991) *America's Welfare State: From Roosevelt to Reagan.*
The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Derthick, Martha and Paul J. Quirk (1985) *The Politics of Deregulation*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Gross, Kyle B. (1991) *The Politics of State Expansion: War, State and Society in Twentieth-Century Britain*. New York: Routledge.
- Rosin, Kirk (“Economic theory and the welfare state: a survey and interpretation.” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 30(2): 741-803. 1992, a review essay looking at the economics literature
- Sanford Ikeda; *Dynamics of the Mixed Economy: Toward a Theory of Interventionism* London: Routledge 1997

External links

- Mixed economy at Encyclopædia Britannica Online

Retrieved from

"https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Mixed_economy&oldid=965033462"

Last edited 9 days ago by Vif12vf

Content is available under CC BY-SA 3.0 unless otherwise noted.