BRAZILIAN KEYNESIAN REVIEW

A Brazilian Keynesian Review é um periódico científico criado e mantido pela Associação Keynesiana Brasileira (AKB).

The Brazilian Keynesian Review (BKR) is a scientific journal created and maintained by the Brazilian Keynesian Association (AKB).

Editor-chefe

Caio Vilella

Coeditores

Hugo C. Iasco-Pereira
Rafael Saulo Marques Ribeiro
Julia Leal
Luiz Fernando Rodrigues de Paula
Fabrício Missio
Luciano Alencar Barros

Editores do Número Especial

Felipe Almeida
Rodrigo Jeronimo

Editor do Informativo da Associação Keynesiana Brasileira

Júlio Costa

Secretaria editorial

Arthur Henrique Delconte Ferreira Pavezzi
Maria Isabel da Silva Santos
Maria Luíza Cunha

Comitê Editorial

Adriana Moreira Amado
Ana Rosa Ribeiro de Mendonça
Alicia Giron
Anderson Tadeu Marques Cavalcante
Antônio José Alves Júnior
Barbara Fritz
Bianca Orsi
Carmem Feijó
Cristina Fróes de Borja Reis
Danielle Guizzo
Eliane Cristina Araújo
Fábio Henrique Bittes Terra
Felipe Almeida
Fernando Ferrari Filho
Fernanda Feil
Gary Dymski
Gilberto Tadeu Lima
Giuliano Contento de Oliveira
Lauro Mattei
Louis-Philippe Rochon
Marco Flávio da Cunha Resende
Nelson Marconi
Simone Silva de Deos
Vanessa da Costa Val
Vanessa Petrelli Corrêa

Brazilian Keynesian Review - www.braziliankeynesianreview.org
Associação Keynesiana Brasileira - www.associacaokeynesianabrasileira.org

BRAZILIAN
KEYNESIAN
REVIEW

EXPEDIENTE

A Brazilian Keynesian Review (BKR) é um periódico científico criado e mantido pela Associação Keynesiana Brasileira (AKB) e tem como objetivo publicar e divulgar estudos inéditos, teóricos e aplicados, sobre Economia Keynesiana e abordagens heterodoxas. Os artigos devem ser submetidos à apreciação da revista por iniciativa de seus autores ou a convite dos Editores. As deliberações editoriais serão pautadas exclusivamente por critérios de excelência acadêmica, tendo por base pareceres emitidos por especialistas, isto é, os artigos submetidos seguem avaliação cega pelos pares e, uma vez aprovados, serão publicados segundo sua ordem de aprovação.

A BKR adota uma orientação editorial heterodoxa pluralista, abrindo-se às diferentes áreas de pesquisa, desde que as contribuições apresentem interface com a economia pós-keynesiana, tais como as abordagens institucionalista, estruturalista, evolucionária, economia política, história do pensamento econômico e estudos aplicados etc. A BKR tem periodicidade semestral e acesso *online* irrestrito. Os trabalhos são publicados em português ou em inglês. A revista é comumente estruturada em até três partes. A primeira contém artigos acadêmicos na forma tradicional. A segunda parte contempla artigos mais curtos que tratam da conjuntura econômica brasileira ou mundial. Por fim, a BKR também passa a incorporar uma seção especial com resenhas de livros recentemente publicados e outras publicações de interesse da Associação Keynesiana Brasileira, desde que aprovados pelo Comitê Editorial da Revista.

O Corpo Editorial da revista é composto por um editor, coeditores, um Comitê Editorial e a secretaria editorial. O Corpo Editorial é composto pelo Editor-chefe, Caio Vilella, e outros Coeditores, a saber, Hugo Iasco-Pereira, Rafael Ribeiro, Fabrício José Missio e Luiz Fernando de Paula. Contamos ainda com o apoio crucial de Arthur Henrique Delconte Ferreira Pavezzi, Maria Luíza Cunha e Maria Isabel da Silva Santos na condução das atividades da Brazilian Keynesian Review (BKR). Além disso, a revista ainda conta com a assessoria de um Comitê Editorial atualmente composto por Adriana Moreira Amado, Ana Rosa Ribeiro de Mendonça, Alicia Giron, Anderson Tadeu Marques Cavalcante, Antônio José Alves Júnior, Barbara Fritz, Bianca Orsi, Carmem Feijó, Cristina Fróes de Borja Reis, Danielle Guizzo, Eliane Cristina Araújo, Fábio Henrique Bittes Terra, Felipe Almeida, Fernando Ferrari Filho, Fernanda Feil, Gary Dymski, Gilberto Tadeu Lima, Giuliano Contento de Oliveira, Lauro Mattei, Louis-Philippe Rochon, Marco Flávio da Cunha Resende, Nelson Marconi, Simone Silva de Deos, Vanessa da Costa Val e Vanessa Petrelli Corrêa.

Associação Keynesiana Brasileira

Presidente: Anderson Tadeu Marques Cavalcante

Vice-presidente: Hugo Iasco-Pereira

Diretores(as):

Lilian Rolim

Luiz Fernando de Paula

Carmem Feijó

Vanessa da Costa Val

Laís Azevedo

Brazilian Keynesian Review - www.braziliankeynesianreview.org
Associação Keynesiana Brasileira - www.associacaokeynesianabrasileira.org

SPECIAL ISSUE: INSTITUTIONAL ECONOMICS

Post-Keynesian Economics, Original Institutional Economics, and the Possibility of Building Progressive Economics through Cross-Fertilization

GUEST EDITORS

Felipe Almeida

Universidade Federal do Paraná

Rodrigo Jeronimo

Universidade Estadual de São Paulo

If someone were to argue that there are good reasons to expect closer ties between Post-Keynesian Economics (PK) and Original Institutional Economics (OIE) in Brazil, based on several institutional initiatives, they would be right. One great example is the Fernando José Cardim de Carvalho Award for Doctoral Theses and Master's Dissertations, established in 2019 through a partnership between the Associação Keynesiana Brasileira (AKB) and the Association for Evolutionary Economics (AFEE). Founded in the United States in 1965 by scholars of the original institutionalist tradition (Cavalieri and Almeida 2017), AFEE is an international association that places considerable value on its connections with Brazil. The Fernando José Cardim de Carvalho Award was AFEE's first initiative in Brazil. It was followed by establishment of the AFEE Special Session as a regular feature of the AKB Conference in 2024. AKB also supported the organization of the first and second AFEE South American Conferences, held in 2024 and 2026, respectively, as well as the founding of the Associação Brasileira de Pesquisa em Economia Institucional Original (EINST). Together, these initiatives provide grounds for expecting closer engagement between PK and OIE in Brazil.

OIE first emerged as Institutional Economics and later came to be known as "Old" or "Original" Institutional Economics to distinguish it from other approaches that adopted, or were associated with, the institutionalist label. Hamilton (1919) was the first to employ the term "Institutional Economics" in the sense now associated with OIE, in a paper that Kaufman (2017) subsequently characterized as the tradition's founding manifesto. This characterization is reasonable, given that OIE had been developing a critical perspective on capitalism since the late nineteenth century. The tradition emerged within the pluralistic intellectual environment of American economics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth

centuries (Morgan and Rutherford 1998), becoming one of its most influential schools of thought and competing with the emerging neoclassical approach for intellectual dominance within the discipline (Hodgson 2004; Rutherford 2011).

Best understood as an evolutionary approach to economics, OIE deals with economic phenomena through the evolution of institutions. Its theoretical foundations draw primarily on the contributions of Thorstein Veblen and John Rogers Commons, the tradition's two foundational figures. Although their views on social provisioning differed, with Veblen advancing a revolutionary perspective (though not in a Marxist sense) and Commons favoring reform, both were revolutionary in their approach to economic theory, as they sought to develop an alternative to the marginalist-neoclassical framework, one that was fundamentally incompatible with its analytical foundations.

Across the Atlantic, John Maynard Keynes developed his own revolutionary approach to economics just a few years after the emergence of OIE. Although Veblen died in 1929, before the publication of Keynes's seminal works A Treatise on Money (1930) and The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money (1936), he reviewed Keynes's The Economic Consequences of the Peace (1919), praising Keynes's analytical competence (Veblen 1920). Commons, in turn, directly corresponded with Keynes, revealing significant intellectual affinities between the two economists. As Whalen (2008) shows, Keynes drew on Commons's periodization of economic history into the eras of scarcity, abundance, and stabilization in Am I a Liberal? (1925). Accordingly, their correspondence also revealed areas of agreement on monetary policy and price stabilization. Building on this historical connection, Neris Junior and Jeronimo (2025) argue that their affinities extended to a shared reformist mode of thought, characterized by the rejection of both laissez-faire and socialism in favor of institutional reforms aimed at stabilizing modern capitalism.

Second-generation original institutionalists addressed economic concerns similar to those of Keynes. Wesley Mitchell's writings contributed to the development of macroeconomics, as did Keynes's work. Both thinkers also developed their macroeconomic perspectives through debates on business cycles, although in different intellectual environments: Mitchell was involved in debates in the United States, whereas Keynes participated in those at the University of Cambridge in the United Kingdom. Recent work by Fucidji and Neris Jr. (2026) further highlights Mitchell's theoretical and methodological contributions, also emphasizing his role as a theorist of capitalism. John Maurice Clark examined the multiplier in connection with business cycles as well (Fiorito and Vernengo

2009). Taken together, these contributions suggest that original institutionalists and Keynes shared important economic concerns.

The cross-fertilization between PK and OIE took considerable time to develop. Before the twenty-first century, OIE was an intellectual movement largely confined to the US, while PK only reached the US in the 1970s (Almeida and Sposito 2024). An implicit intellectual exchange between the two traditions began to emerge during that decade (Whalen 2020), while Post-Keynesian Institutionalism (PKI) emerged in the 1980s (Whalen 2020). Whalen (2022a, 2022b) examines the Minskyian strand of PKI, while Almeida and Sposito (2024) identify John Kenneth Galbraith, Dudley Dillard, Alfred Eichner, and Fred Lee as other contributors to this approach. Sposito (2026), in particular, makes a compelling case for associating Eichner with OIE. The term PKI first appeared in Wilber and Jameson (1983), but it became a prominent topic in OIE scholarship only in the twenty-first century. This chronology suggests that original institutionalists have only recently begun to explore systematically the potential connections between the two traditions.

These connections are also reflected in their theoretical and methodological affinities. Both PK and OIE adopt non-ergodic perspectives and emphasize how individuals deal with socially shared knowledge. They also recognize the possibility of improving social provisioning through economic policy. King's (2002) historical account of PK further supports this interpretation, arguing that PK and OIE share a common methodology and core theoretical framework.

In addition to King's (2002) perspective, Arestis (1992, 1996) argues that OIE should be incorporated as a fundamental strand of PK, as it provides a theory of the endogenous formation of expectations and more coherent microeconomic foundations. A similar view is advanced by the British institutionalist Geoffrey Hodgson (1989, 1999). Lavoie (1992, 2022) proposes a taxonomy of PK that explicitly includes an "institutionalist" strand. Although he does not explicitly identify this strand with OIE, some original institutionalists feature among the thinkers he associates with it. In this special issue, Danielle Guizzo's contribution makes a particularly compelling case for cross-fertilization between OIE and PK. Taken together, these contributions show that scholars from both traditions recognize important common ground between them. Their dialogue offers an opportunity to advance a more pluralistic and socially engaged heterodox economics. In dark times, economics must be a form of progressive thinking!

This special issue of the Brazilian Keynesian Review brings together scholars from different countries and generations committed to advancing OIE worldwide. Its eleven papers explore a broad range of theoretical, methodological, and analytical dimensions of OIE, highlighting the richness and diversity of this intellectual tradition. Each contribution offers an original perspective that enriches the existing literature and opens new avenues for research and debate. In the remainder of this introduction, we present each contribution and highlight its specific engagement with OIE.

The first two papers in this special issue introduce the works of Thorstein Veblen and John Rogers Commons, the founding figures of original institutional economics. In "Thorstein Veblen's Theoretical System: A Consistent and Complete Evolutionary Reconstitution of Economics," Waller offers a comprehensive account of Veblen's theoretical contributions. Discussions of Veblen's work often focus on conspicuous consumption and the role of habits in shaping decision-making, a tendency particularly evident in Brazil. Waller moves beyond these familiar themes to examine Veblen's evolutionary methodology; his concepts of institutions and instincts; his analysis of business in relation to industry, finance, and capital, and his account of absentee ownership. He also revisits The Theory of the Leisure Class (TLC), interpreting it as an examination of the historical transition from barbarism to capitalism. From this perspective, consumption remains central to the book but is part of a broader account of social and economic evolution.

Eric Scorsone's "The Institutional Economics of John R. Commons," in turn, provides a broad overview of Commons's institutionalism and his contributions to economics. Scorsone guides readers through the core elements of Commons's framework, including working rules, transactions, and the five principles that structure his economics. He then examines three central themes in Commons's thought, namely, its behavioral foundations, his adaptation of Weber's ideal types, and his approach to conflict resolution. Often regarded as a difficult author, Commons can be challenging to approach, making Scorsone's paper a useful introduction to his work. At the same time, the paper highlights the continued relevance of Commons's framework for analyzing contemporary economic problems.

After providing comprehensive introductions to the institutionalism of Veblen and Commons, this special issue turns to two methodological debates. In "What's Left for Economic Methodology? A Realist-Pragmatist Agenda for the Polycrisis," Danielle Guizzo proposes an OIE-PK framework based on a realist-pragmatist methodological agenda for

analyzing contemporary socioeconomic phenomena, including the polycrisis. She argues that this framework can provide the foundations for a realistic, pluralistic, institutionally grounded, and ethically committed approach to economics oriented towards social well-being. To develop this proposal, Guizzo draws on social ontology to establish an ontological convergence between OIE and PK and argues that a social theory of value can emerge from the connection between these two traditions. She then turns to pragmatist philosophy to develop a broader argument about the purpose of economic inquiry. Guizzo illustrates the implications of this methodological approach by examining the contemporary crisis facing universities in the US and the UK.

In "Processes, Social Provisioning, and Invidious Distinction: Central Concepts in Heterodox Economics," Zdravka Todorova argues that heterodox traditions share an economic paradigm that explicitly encompasses OIE and PK. This paradigm rests on three central concepts developed within OIE: processes, social provisioning, and invidious distinction. Processes refer to understanding the economy as a historical, evolutionary system characterized by cumulative causation and interconnected phenomena. Social provisioning involves conceiving the economy as an interconnected system of production, consumption, distribution, and resource creation, embedded in social relations and nature. Invidious distinction, in turn, concerns the analysis of social hierarchies, relations of domination and exploitation, and economic stratification. Todorova's contribution also connects with Guizzo's preceding paper, as both explore the common ground between OIE and other heterodox traditions. Guizzo develops a shared methodological agenda between OIE and PK, emphasizing their complementarity, while Todorova identifies conceptual foundations shared across a broader range of heterodox traditions.

The remainder of the issue comprises theoretical pieces on other OIE authors, contemporary approaches, and applied works. For instance, Beliza Borba de Almeida and Jacob Powell's "Locating Radical Institutionalism: Reviving a Critical Tradition" examines Radical Institutionalism as a distinct analytical tradition within OIE. The authors trace the evolution of OIE through four major stages associated with Veblen, Commons, Clarence Ayres, and William Dugger and the Radical Institutionalists. Against this historical background, they explain how Radical Institutionalists sought to recover Veblen's critical perspective while addressing what they regarded as the limitations of Ayres's contributions. Building on this account, Almeida and Powell identify the analysis of hegemonic power and social domination as Radical Institutionalism's distinctive contribution to OIE. They

conclude by proposing a decolonial, intersectional, and materially grounded research agenda to revitalize the tradition.

"From Habits to Institutions and Back: A Modern Institutionalist View on Socioeconomic Dynamics," by Huáscar Pessali and Alexandre Ottoni Teatini Salles, clarifies key OIE concepts, including institutions, habits, and instincts. The authors also discuss other OIE contributions, such as circular and cumulative causation, upward and downward causation, power, and the Commonsian notion of transaction. By contrasting the OIE perspective with approaches that treat institutions primarily as constraints on utility-maximizing individuals, Pessali and Salles highlight the tradition's distinctive features. They organize these features around three dimensions: (1) institutions as systems of socially transmitted rules that structure interactions and exercise collective power; (2) agency as habit-driven and institutionally embedded, with individual actions both shaped by and contributing to institutional arrangements; and (3) institutional evolution as the outcome of reciprocal upward and downward causation, generating historical processes of continuity and transformation.

"Corporate Fascism: A Radical Interpretation of the Far Right and Its Contradictory Behavior," by Fernando Krauzer, Matyas Szabo, Manuel Ramon Souza Luz, and Ramon Garcia Fernandez, applies OIE to analyze contemporary far-right movements. Drawing on Thorstein Veblen, Karl Polanyi, and Radical Institutionalism, the authors examine an apparent contradiction in far-right economic policies. On the one hand, these movements advocate protectionism and the defense of national economic interests, as illustrated by Donald Trump's policies in the United States. On the other hand, they promote radical economic liberalization, as seen in Brazil under Jair Bolsonaro and Argentina under Javier Milei. Krauzer et al. argue that these seemingly contradictory strategies are functionally complementary, as both ultimately serve the interests of large corporations. Their analysis connects contemporary far-right movements to Polanyi's account of fascism and Veblen's critique of corporate power.

"Unionism and the Labor Movement in São Paulo's Agriculture Between 1930–1989: Notes from a Commonsian Perspective," by Sebastião Neto Ribeiro Guedes and Rodrigo Constantino Jeronimo, presents an applied OIE case study of the history of rural unionism in Brazil. In the vein of Commons's seminal study of the evolution of the shoemaking industry and his historiography of the American labor movement, both of which emphasize changing transactions and shifts in bargaining power, and drawing on his theory of unions

as collective responses to such changes, Guedes and Jeronimo reinterpret the trajectory of rural labor in São Paulo, Brazil. The authors examine how market expansion and agricultural industrialization transformed transactions between farmers and rural workers, particularly through the transition from the colonato regime to wage labor. By doing so, the authors examine how these transformations, along with the state's role, shaped workers' capacity for collective action and their forms of organization over six decades.

"Interaction Between Theory and Observation in Wesley C. Mitchell's Methodology," by Celso Neris Jr. and José Ricardo Fucidji, introduces Wesley Mitchell's institutionalist approach by examining his methodological perspective. Neris and Fucidji demonstrate that Mitchell developed a distinctive methodological approach grounded in empirical observation, OIE, and pragmatist philosophy. Thus, the paper challenges the view that Mitchell's empirical research consisted of measurement without theory, as it was once characterized. Instead, the authors argue that Mitchell's approach was theoretically grounded in OIE and pragmatist philosophy. A central argument is that, rather than treating theory and observation as distinct stages of research, Mitchell understood them as mutually constitutive elements of scientific inquiry. Mitchell's empirical investigations helped refine the OIE perspective on capitalism, particularly regarding business cycles, while also helping establish macroeconomics as a distinct field.

Maríndia Brites, Solange Regina Marin, and Felipe Almeida revisit Charlotte Perkins Gilman's contributions to institutionalist thought in "Gender and Institutions: Charlotte Perkins Gilman's Contributions to Feminist Institutionalism," making the case for recognizing her as a precursor of Feminist Institutionalism alongside Veblen. Their analysis highlights Gilman's institutionalist understanding of gender relations and the role of social institutions in reproducing women's economic dependence and subordination. The article explores three dimensions of her writings: (1) gender as a socially constructed institution; (2) the American home as an archaic institution that perpetuates women's subordination; and (3) institutional change and progress, including the differences between Gilman's perspective and OIE.

In "Veblen and Keynes on War and Peace," Roberto Resende Simiqueli compares Veblen's and Keynes's interpretations of the First World War and the difficulties of establishing lasting peace in its aftermath. According to Simiqueli, Veblen's analysis rested on an original institutionalist understanding of capitalism's evolution, particularly the relationships among technological change, political authority, nationalism, and vested

interests. Keynes's interpretation, in turn, emphasized the economic consequences of the peace settlement and the failures of political leadership. By bringing these perspectives together, Simiqueli shows how Veblen and Keynes developed different but complementary interpretations of the crisis of international relations following the First World War.

Taken together, these contributions broaden our understanding of OIE and demonstrate its continuing relevance to contemporary economic inquiry. The dialogue between OIE and PK opens new avenues for theoretical development and research, while strengthening the foundations of a more pluralistic and progressive economics. We hope that readers will find this special issue intellectually stimulating and that it will encourage further engagement with the richness of original institutionalist thought and its connections with other heterodox traditions.

References

Almeida, Felipe and Sposito, Theodoro. 2024. "A Hidden Approach in the Origins of Post Keynesian Institutionalism" Paper presented during the XVII Meeting of the Brazilian Keynesian Association.

Arestis, Philip. 1992. The Post-Keynesian Approach to Economics. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Arestis, Philip. 1996. "Post-Keynesian Economics: Towards Coherence." Cambridge Journal of Economics 20 (1): 111–135.

Cavalieri, Marco and Almeida, Felipe. 2017. "A History of the Foundation and the Early Years of AFEE: Pluralism and Eclecticism in Dissenting" Journal of Economic Issues 51(3): 613–634.

Dimand, Robert. 2004. "Interwar monetary and business cycle theory: Macroeconomics before Keynes" Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology, 21(Part 1): 121-148.

Fiorito, Luca and Vernengo, Matías. 2009. "The Other J.M.: John Maurice Clark and the Keynesian Revolution" Journal of Economic Issues 43 (4): 899–916.

Fucidji, José Ricardo; Neris Jr., Celso Pereira. 2026. "Another look at Wesley C. Mitchell's economic methodology" Journal of Economic Issues, 60 (3): 748–764.

Hodgson, Geoffrey. 1989. "Post-Keynesianism and Institutionalism: The Missing Link." In New Directions in Post-Keynesian Economics, edited by J. Pheby, 94–123. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Hodgson, Geoffrey. 1999. "Post-Keynesianism and Institutionalism: Another Look at the Link." In Growth, Employment and Inflation: Essays in Honour of John Cornwall, edited by Mark Setterfield, 72–87. London: Macmillan.

Hodgson, Geoffrey. 2004. The Evolution of Institutional Economics: agency, structure and Darwinism in American institutionalism. London: Routledge.

Kaufman, Bruce. 2017. "The origins and theoretical foundation of Original Institucional Economics Reconsidered" Journal of the History of Economic Thought 39(3): 293-322.

King, John E. 2002. A History of Post Keynesian Economics since 1936. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Lavoie, Marc. 2022. Post-Keynesian Economics: New Foundations. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Morgan, Mary and Rutherford, Malcolm. 1998. "American Economics: The Character of the Transformation" History of Political Economy 30 (suplement): 1–26.

Neris Jr., Celso Pereira, and Rodrigo Constantino Jeronimo. 2025. "Commons Cited by Keynes: Intersections in the Reformist Mode of Thought." Nova Economia 35 (3): 1-24.

Rutherford, Malcolm. 2011. The Institutionalist Movement in American Economics, 1918-1947: Science and Social Control. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sposito, Theodoro. 2026. "The Hidden Institutional Architecture of Alfred Eichner's Economics." Review of Political Economy, preprint, April, 1–31.

Veblen, Thorstein. 1920. "Review of John Maynard Keynes's The Economic Consequences of the Peace" Political Science Quarterly, 35(3): 467-472.

Whalen, Charles. 2008. "John R. Commons and John Maynard Keynes on economic history and policy: The 1920s and today" Journal of Economic Issues, 42 (1), 225-242.

Whalen, Charles. 2020. "Post-Keynesian Institutionalism: Past, Present, and Future." Evolutionary and Institutional Economics Review, 17: 71–92.

Whalen, Charles. 2022a. "Grappling with an Ever-Changing Economy: The Evolution of Post-Keynesian Institutionalism." In Institutional Economics: Perspectives and Methods in

Pursuit of a Better World, edited by Charles Whalen. London (UK) and New York (US): Routledge.

Whalen, Charles. 2022b. Reforming Capitalism for the Common Good: Essays in Institutional and Post-Keynesian Economics. London (UK) and New York (US): Routledge.

Wilber, Charles, and Kenneth Jameson. 1983. An Inquiry into the Poverty of Economics. Notre Dame (US): University of Notre Dame Press.

SUMÁRIO/SUMMARY

1 - 27 **Thorstein Veblen's Theoretical System – A consistent and complete evolutionary reconstitution of economics**

Wiliam Waller

28 - 50 **The Institutional Economics of John R. Commons**

Eric Scorsone

51 - 74 **What's left for economic methodology? A Realist-Pragmatist agenda for the Polycrisis**

Danielle Guizzo

75 - 95 **Processes, Social Provisioning, and Invidious Distinction: Central Concepts in Heterodox Economics**

Zdravka Todorova

96 - 128 **Locating Radical Institutionalism: Reviving a Critical Tradition**

Beliza Borba de Almeida, Jacob Powell

129-155 **From habits to institutions and back: a modern institutionalist view on socioeconomic dynamics**

Huáscar Pessali, Alexandre Ottoni Teatini Salles

156 - 180 **Corporate Fascism: a radical interpretation of the far right and its contradictory behavior**

Fernando Krauzer, Matyas Szabo, Manuel Ramon Souza Luz, Ramon Garcia Fernandez

181 - 203 **Unionism and the labor movement in São Paulo's agriculture between 1930-1984: notes from a commonsian perspective**

Sebastião Neto Ribeiro Guedes, Rodrigo Constantino Jerônimo

204 - 228 **Interaction between theory and observation in Wesley C. Mitchell's Methodology**

Celso Pereira Neris Jr., José Ricardo Fucidji

229 - 248 **Gender and Institutions: Charlotte Perkins Gilman's Contributions to Feminist Institutionalism**

Maríndia Brites, Solange Regina Marin, Felipe Almeida

249 - 285 **Veblen, Keynes and the impossibility of peace in the aftermath of World War I**

Roberto Simiqueli