

THE COLLECTED WORKS OF
ISRAEL M.
KIRZNER

Essays on Capital

and Interest

EDITED BY PETER J. BOETTKE AND FRÉDÉRIC SAUTET



ISRAEL M. KIRZNER

Essays on Capital and Interest

An Austrian Perspective


Edited and with an Introduction by

PETER J. BOETTKE and FRÉDÉRIC SAUTET



LIBERTY FUND Indianapolis

This book is published by Liberty Fund, Inc., a foundation established to encourage study of the ideal of a society of free and responsible individuals.



The cuneiform inscription that serves as our logo and as the design motif for our endpapers is the earliest-known written appearance of the word “freedom” (*amagi*), or “liberty.” It is taken from a clay document written about 2300 B.C. in the Sumerian city-state of Lagash.

Editors' introduction and index © 2010 by Liberty Fund, Inc.

Essays on Capital and Interest was first published by Edward Elgar Publishing in 1996.

Author's introduction to *Essays on Capital and Interest* © 1996 by Israel M. Kirzner.

Reprinted by permission.

“An Essay on Capital” © 1966 by Israel M. Kirzner. Reprinted by permission.

“Ludwig von Mises and the Theory of Capital and Interest” is reprinted from *The Economics of Ludwig von Mises: Toward a Critical Reappraisal*, edited by Laurence S. Moss (Kansas City: Sheed & Ward; Arlington: Institute for Humane Studies, 1976), 51–65. Reprinted by permission of the Institute for Humane Studies.

“The Pure Time-Preference Theory of Capital and Interest” is reprinted from *The Meaning of Ludwig von Mises: Contributions in Economics, Sociology, Epistemology, and Political Philosophy*, edited by Jeffrey M. Herbener (Norwell, Mass.: Kluwer Academic, 1993), 166–92. Reprinted with kind permission of Springer Science and Business Media.

“The Theory of Capital” is reprinted from *The Foundations of Modern Austrian Economics*, edited by Edwin G. Dolan (Kansas City: Sheed & Ward; Arlington: Institute for Humane Studies, 1976), 133–44. Reprinted by permission of the Institute for Humane Studies.

All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

C 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

P 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Kirzner, Israel M.

Essays on capital and interest : an Austrian perspective / edited and with an introduction by Peter J. Boettke and Frédéric Sautet.

p. cm. — (The collected works of Israel M. Kirzner)

“*Essays on Capital and Interest* was first published by Edward Elgar Publishing in 1996.”

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-86597-780-8 (hbk.: alk. paper)—

ISBN 978-0-86597-781-5 (pbk.: alk. paper)

1. Capital. 2. Interest. 3. Austrian school of economics. 4. Von Mises, Ludwig, 1881–1973. I. Boettke, Peter J. II. Sautet, Frédéric E. III. Title.

HB501 .K473 2012

332'.041—dc23

2012000553

LIBERTY FUND, INC.

8335 Allison Pointe Trail, Suite 300

Indianapolis, Indiana 46250-1684

**ESSAYS ON CAPITAL
AND INTEREST**

THE COLLECTED WORKS OF ISRAEL M. KIRZNER

The Economic Point of View

Market Theory and the Price System

Essays on Capital and Interest

Competition and Entrepreneurship

Austrian Subjectivism and the Emergence of

Entrepreneurship Theory

The Essence of Entrepreneurship and the Nature and

Significance of Market Process

Competition, Economic Planning, and the Knowledge Problem

Discovery, Capitalism, and Distributive Justice

Reflections on Ethics, Freedom, Welfare Economics, Policy,

and the Legacy of Austrian Economics

Ludwig von Mises: The Man and His Economics

B' EZRAS HASHEM

INTRODUCTION TO THE LIBERTY FUND EDITION

Explaining the nature of capital and the phenomenon of interest has been one of Israel Kirzner's goals in his work on pure theory. These themes were already present in *Market Theory and the Price System*, but it was with the publication of *An Essay on Capital* (essay 2 in this volume) in 1966 that the author tackled the subject directly. Subsequently, Kirzner published two other essays continuing the exploration of the same theme. "Ludwig von Mises and the Theory of Capital and Interest," published in 1976 (essay 3 in this volume), reflects on Ludwig von Mises's theory of capital and interest. "The Pure Time-Preference Theory of Interest," published in 1993 (essay 4 in this volume), attempts to clarify the difficult issue of the pure time-preference theory of interest (e.g., explaining why the price of a tree does not equal the value of the total fruit output). We are using in this volume the 1996 edition of *Essays on Capital and Interest* published by Edward Elgar, which gathered those three essays and an introduction (essay 1 in this volume). We have included Kirzner's 1966 preface before the text of essay 2, as well as, at the end of this volume, an article entitled *The Theory of Capital*, which was published in 1976.

A constant theme in Kirzner's work is methodological subjectivism. As early as his doctoral work under the mentorship of Ludwig von Mises, Kirzner realized the importance of a subjective approach to understanding economic phenomena. Kirzner often cites Hayek's famous statement in *The Counter-revolution of Science*: "And it is probably no exaggeration to say that every important advance in economic theory during the last hundred years was a further step in the consistent application of subjectivism."¹ Kirzner's theoretical research on the nature of capital and interest is an early application of subjectivism in his work.

Austrian economists have always pursued a subjectivist approach to interest and its relationship to capital, going back to Carl Menger's emphasis that resources could not be intrinsically productive. Menger saw interest as the result of subjective valuations rather than an intrinsic property concerning the physical nature of capital. Kirzner put it in a thoroughly subjectivist manner: "In exactly the same way as Austrian value theory had no

1. See Friedrich A. Hayek (1979), *The Counter-revolution of Science: Studies on the Abuse of Reason*, 2d ed. (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund), p. 51.

place for 'cost of production' as an independent explanatory element . . . in the causation of economic value, a Mengerian capital and interest theory could have no place for the productivity of capital as an independent explanatory element in accounting for the structure of prices. . . . All prices, including interest, are brought about strictly by the actions expressing the valuations of purposeful human beings."² Austrian economists view the phenomenon of interest as the result of time preference and not as some intrinsic property of capital goods. The interest rate is merely a price, albeit one "particular kind of price—the intertemporal price—that is determined, along with all the other market phenomena, by the multiperiod plans that are being made by market participants."³

Mark Blaug concisely summarized the contribution of Kirzner's original *Essay on Capital* as follows: "Capital theory should never lose touch with its microeconomic foundations in acts of individual choice and must be viewed as consisting essentially of the economics of multi-period production planning."⁴ If *Market Theory and the Price System* examines how relative prices adjust to changing circumstances to guide production and consumption decisions so that the coordination of economic activity results, then *An Essay on Capital* focuses on the concept of the "plan": the multiperiod production plans that actors initiate, revise in the wake of new knowledge, and sometimes leave unfinished. It is this notion of the "plan" that opens up the intellectual space for Kirzner's later work on entrepreneurship and his more mature understanding of the entrepreneurial market process.

One can find parallels between Kirzner's work on entrepreneurship (after 1973) and his work on capital and the existence of interest. Kirzner's work on interest builds on Eugen von Böhm-Bawerk's and Mises's views in the same way that his work on entrepreneurship builds on Hayek's and Mises's research. Just as he sought to enrich Mises's view of the entrepreneur, he sought to clarify the work of Mises on interest. In doing so, Kirzner emphasized the following points: (a) future streams of output do not automatically flow from present resources (i.e., capital does not possess a productivity of its own), (b) capital goods at a given time are the results of past plans because all production is planned production (i.e., human purpose gives value to capital goods), and (c) production plans

2. See p. 4, below.

3. See p. 49, below.

4. See Mark Blaug (1969), "An Essay on Capital," *Econometrica* 37 (1), p. 158.

imply the sacrifice of present resources in order to obtain future ones (i.e., the value that this sacrifice represents to the individual gives rise to the phenomenon of interest).

The original 1966 *Essay* contains only one reference to entrepreneurship.⁵ A literal reading of Kirzner's original work on capital and interest would conclude that it does not have much to do with his work on entrepreneurship. This is because his work on capital and interest was published before entrepreneurship became the focus in his career and he probably did not see any reason to develop an entrepreneurial theory of the phenomenon of interest and the capital structure. At another level, however, Kirzner's theory of capital and interest is about decision-making, plans, and projects of many individuals in a multiperiod context. In other words, it covers ground similar to that covered by market process theory. So while the two subjects of capital and entrepreneurship are analytically distinct, Kirzner's research on capital theory gave him the raw material for his future work on the issue of coordination and entrepreneurship in market process theory.

In 1966 Kirzner thought of the market as a system of interlocking individual plans using capital goods over multiple periods. Some of these plans "interlock" well with others and some do not. At any given time, some plans are finished, others are being revised, and new ones are emerging. A theory of capital based on purposeful human decisions is a key element in understanding the market process. In this sense, Kirzner realized that capital theory was much more than simply a "mere adjunct to the theory of interest." The idea of the market as a process, which became the focus of his work at the end of the 1960s, was already present in Kirzner's 1966 work on capital and interest.

In addition, Kirzner's theory of capital and interest further elaborates the bridge between the logic of choice in microeconomics and the emerging structure of the macroeconomy. In his review of the 1996 *Essays on Capital and Interest*, Roger Garrison went so far as to offer a warning to all economists of the Austrian persuasion:

No Austrian economist who takes his subjectivism seriously should draw a Hayekian triangle until he has read Professor Kirzner's *Essays*! There is no inherent clash between the macroeconomic theorizing that the Hayekian triangles facilitate (including the Austrian theory of the business cycle) and the Kirznerian perspective that keeps the triangle

5. See pp. 41–42, below.

adequately subjectivized. Quite to the contrary, it is precisely our understanding of the process that Professor Kirzner elucidates, the ongoing attempts on the part of many entrepreneurs to carry out their individual multiperiod plans (as guided by market rates of interest or as misguided by the central bank's rate of interest), that breathes subjectivist life into those otherwise meaningless triangles.⁶

Garrison went on to argue that Kirzner's work does more than just give meaning to the Hayekian analytics; it paves the way for the reconstruction of modern macroeconomics along capital-theoretic grounds. Kirzner builds the bridge between choice-theoretic market process theory and capital-theoretic macroeconomic analysis.

After reading Kirzner's *Essay on Capital* and Donald Dewey's *Modern Capital Theory* in the 1960s, Ludwig Lachmann half-jokingly asked Kirzner whether the economists at New York University and those at Columbia University ever talked to one another. Admittedly there is something of the tone and method of an isolated scholar in *Essay on Capital*. One might think that Kirzner was simply trying to work through the material in capital theory and figure it out for himself without much interest in engaging his contemporary peers in economic debate. But Kirzner's focus on older "debates" in capital theory related to the works of Böhm-Bawerk, Irving Fisher, and Frank Knight, as well as his discussion of "waiting" and "capital measurement," provide the tools necessary to address more contemporary debates such as the "Cambridge Controversy" as well as increasing returns and path dependency. Ralph Pfouts's review of Kirzner's *Essay* for the *American Economic Review* points out a key Kirzner insight: one cannot ignore the subjective "element of decision making which can be encompassed only by the multi-period planning approach to capital theory."⁷

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would first like to thank wholeheartedly Israel Kirzner for his unparalleled contribution to economic science. Kirzner's research program has deeply enriched the discipline and has shed light on some of eco-

6. See Roger Garrison (1997), "The Undiscountable Professor Kirzner," *The Freeman* 47 (8), pp. 511–13.

7. See Ralph W. Pfouts (1968), "Review of *An Essay on Capital* by Israel Kirzner," *American Economic Review* 58 (1), p. 196.

nomics' most difficult puzzles. Economists owe him an immense intellectual debt.

The publication of *The Collected Works of Israel M. Kirzner* would not be a reality without the participation of Liberty Fund, Inc. We are extremely grateful to Liberty Fund, and especially to Emilio Pacheco, for making this project possible. To republish Kirzner's unique oeuvre has been on our minds since our time spent at New York University in the 1990s—where one of us was a professor (Peter) and the other was a post-doctoral student (Frédéric). We are thrilled to know that current and future generations of economists and other scholars will have easy access to Kirzner's works.

Finally, we wish to thank Rosemarie Fike for her invaluable help in the publication of this volume.

Peter J. Boettke and Frédéric Sautet

**ESSAYS ON CAPITAL
AND INTEREST**

CONTENTS

Introduction to the Liberty Fund Edition ix
by Peter J. Boettke and Frédéric Sautet

ESSAY I. INTRODUCTION I

The Mengerian Legacy 3
Mengerian Austrianism and the Cambridge Controversy 5
Subjectivism, Reswitching Paradoxes and All That 8
Complete and Incomplete Subjectivism in the
Theory of Capital and Interest 12

ESSAY 2. AN ESSAY ON CAPITAL 14

Preface to the 1966 Edition of *An Essay on Capital* 14

Chapter I. Unfinished Plans 15

Introduction 15
A Digression on Method 16
Individual Decisions and the Market 17
The Decisions of Crusoe: Multiperiod Decisions 18
The Half-Finished Project 24
Crusoe and an Overlapping Sequence of Plans 31
Multiperiod Planning by the Individual in a Market Economy 34
Interacting Plans 38
The "State of Affairs" of an Economy 42
Some Remarks on the Theory of Capital 44
Is a Theory of Capital Really Necessary? 47

Chapter 2. Stocks and Flows 50

The "Presence" of Capital Stocks 50
Stock Demand and Flow Demand 53
Are Capital Goods "Used Up" in Production? 55
Hicks and the Stock-Flow Production Function: A Digression 59
Capital Stocks and Income Flows 60
Knight and the Permanence of Capital 62
A Critique of the Knightian View 65
Capital and Income 68

Chapter 3. Capital and Waiting 75

Capitalistic Production as Exchange across Time 76
Lags vs. Simultaneity in Capitalistic Production 78
A Criticism of the Synchronization View 80

The Period of Production Concept in the Contemporary Literature	83
Capital and Waiting	88
Is "Waiting" a Factor of Production?	94
Chapter 4. Measuring Capital	101
A Discussion of the Problem of Capital Measurement	101
The Capital Measurement Problem in the Literature	117
ESSAY 3. LUDWIG VON MISES AND THE THEORY OF CAPITAL AND INTEREST	134
Mises on Capital and on Interest	135
Mises and Böhm-Bawerkian Theory	137
Mises and the Clark-Knight Tradition	141
Mises, Capitalists, and Entrepreneurship	145
ESSAY 4. THE PURE TIME-PREFERENCE THEORY OF INTEREST: AN ATTEMPT AT CLARIFICATION	147
The Interest Problem	147
The Pure Time-Preference Theory of Interest	151
Sheep, Rice, and Austrian Hocus-Pocus	152
Interest, Own-Rates of Interest, and Intertemporal Exchange	155
The Interest Problem That Calls for Solution: The Competing Versions	158
The Existence of Interest vs. the Rate of Interest	161
Some Remarks on Methodological Essentialism	163
Science and Ideology: The Cambridge Controversy and PTPT	165
Conclusion	167
ESSAY 5. THE THEORY OF CAPITAL	169
Hicks, Materialists, and Fundists	169
Fundists: A Terminological Puzzle	170
Hicksian Fundism	171
Austrians, Materialists, and Fundists	173
On Measuring Capital: The Individual	174
Measuring Capital: The Economy	176
On the Notion of the Quantity of Capital per Head	177
References	179
Index	187

ESSAY 1 INTRODUCTION

The republication of the three essays which make up the body of this book offers an opportunity to place these papers in the context of more widely known twentieth-century developments in the area of capital and interest theory. As the sub-title of this book announces, each of these papers was written in the spirit of the Austrian tradition in economics, and specifically in order to clarify and develop what I have understood to be the Misesian position on these issues. The first of the three essays (Essay 2 in this book) was published in 1966, and dealt only with capital theory. Mises was still alive and active at that time, and he reviewed the essay before its publication. The second essay, published in 1976 (Essay 3 in this book), had been written in 1974 as a contribution to a symposium on the economics of Ludwig von Mises, who had died about a year earlier; the essay covered Mises's views on both capital and interest. The third essay (published in 1993) had been written in the late 1980s in an attempt to clarify (as much for myself as for others) what Mises (and of course Fetter) could possibly have meant by a theory of interest which recognized only time preference as the root cause of the phenomenon of interest, with what seems to be no recognition at all for any productivity-of-capital element in causing the interest phenomenon.

At the time the first of these three essays was written the Austrian tradition was widely perceived as having long died out. The subjectivist concerns which inspired that essay were almost invariably brushed aside in the profession generally as, at best, purist worries holding only trivial implications for economic theory, let alone policy. By the time the third essay was published, Austrian subjectivism had, in a resurgence quite remarkable in the history of economic thought, once again captured the attention of many (especially younger) economists. The insights of Ludwig von Mises are today no longer dismissed as old-fashioned economic philosophizing (or worse). It is now recognized that the methodological tenets which have shaped the course of mid-twentieth-century neoclassical economics have diverted the attention of economists from key insights which are essential for understanding the way in which economies in fact work. A number of these insights have, during the past two decades, been rediscovered in the work of Mises and the Austrian tradition (including, particularly, the contributions of Friedrich Hayek).

For the most part, the rediscovery of Misesian subjectivism has tended to illuminate modern Austrian understanding of the market process, without regard to intertemporal considerations. Relatively little modern Austrian attention has been paid to further developing Misesian insights into the role of capital in the full market process, and into the theory of interest.¹ (A good deal of recent attention has of course been paid to refining and restating the Hayekian theory of the business cycle. And certainly this theory is deeply embedded in Böhm-Bawerkian capital-theoretic insights. However, a fairly strong case can be made that when Hayek developed that theory at the end of the 1920s from the sketched outline offered many years earlier by Mises, he was not yet as fully alive to the subjectivism of Mises's general approach as he was later to become. It is this which, for this writer, explains why the recent Austrian work on Hayekian cycle theory seems, on the whole, to fail to draw on the subjectivist, Misesian, tradition which the contemporary Austrian resurgence has done so much to revive.) So the Misesian approach to problems of capital and interest developed in the essays in this book may be able to make a contribution to that broader, subjectivist understanding of economic processes and relationships which is emerging from the contemporary revival of the Austrian tradition in economic thought.

During the second half of the twentieth century (that is, the period since the publication of Mises's *Human Action*) a number of developments in the treatment of capital and interest problems occurred, of course, outside Austrian economics. In particular a celebrated "grand debate" arose (mainly during the 1960s) between the defenders of neo-classical orthodoxy in the theory of capitalist distribution, and the radical critics of that theory (the latter often identified as the Italian-Cambridge School—the Cambridge being, of course, the UK Cambridge).² In this debate, with its unmistakably ideological overtones,³ the neoclassical defenders were largely relying on Irving Fisher's theory of interest with its related framework of capital theory, a framework in which productivity elements were prominently present. The Austrian (that is, the Böhm-

1. For an example of recent attention to subjectivist theory in the area of capital and interest problems, see Garrison (1985).

2. The term "grand debate" was applied by Ludwig Lachmann (1973a). An account of the debate from a protagonist of the Cambridge (UK) side is given in Harcourt (1972). An assessment from the other side is provided by Blaug (1974).

3. For a comment on the ideological overtones of the debate, see Solow (1975).

Bawerkian) roots of this neoclassical framework were to some extent recognized in that debate. What was not recognized at all was that that neoclassical “Austrian” framework was by no means the only intellectual progeny of Böhm-Bawerk’s seminal work on capital and interest. Alongside the better known Fisherian development of Böhm-Bawerkian doctrine there emerged an entirely separate filiation of Austrian ideas in regard, especially, to the theory of interest. This tradition emerged particularly in the pure time-preference theory of interest espoused by Fetter and later Mises. While this second Austrian tradition, too, derived in large part from Böhm-Bawerk, its more consistent subjectivism seems attributable also to more sensitive appreciation of the Menderian legacy. We shall argue below that the failure of the two sides in the above “grand debate” to recognize the existence and relevance of a third option—the more subjective version of Austrian theory—rendered that debate both incomplete and inconclusive.

THE MENDERIAN LEGACY

For the Austrian tradition subjectivism was, of course, the key, revolutionary, insight. The classical economists had attributed the regularities governing economic phenomena to the objective physical and biological conditions under which societies exist. The Austrians, on the other hand, found these regularities to have their roots in the valuations and the decisions of acting human beings. For other marginalist schools of economic thought in the post-1870 era, economic regularities reflected the interplay of both the objective physical conditions governing production and supply and the subjective preferences underlying consumer demand. The Menderian view, however, relegated the objective conditions governing production to the passive background upon which the actions of purposeful human beings impinged. What *actively* shaped subsequent economic phenomena was seen to be *only* the actions of such purposeful human beings. This way of seeing the economic process was expressed perhaps most clearly in Menger’s well-known conception of “orders” of productive factors.

Goods which confer utility directly to the consumer are “goods of lowest order”; resources which produce consumer goods are “goods of higher order” (in an ascending ranking which treats the resources most remote from the finally consumed good as goods of highest order). For Menger the significance, the economic value, attached to productive factors was