Intertemporal coordination mechanism: Austrian insights on market coordination through time

Ashok M[1], V. Basil Hans[2]

[1] PhD Scholar, Srinivas University, Mangalore, India.
ORCID: 0009-0003-1163-1932; Email: ashok.21aug@gmail.com
[2] Research Professor, Srinivas University, Mangalore, India.
ORCID: 0000-0003-2713-2188 Email: vhans2011@gmail.com

Area/Section: Management
Type of the Paper: Regular Paper
Type of Review: Peer Reviewed as per |C|O|P|E| guidance.
Indexed in: OpenAIRE.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15233720
Google Scholar Citation: IJMTS

How to Cite this Paper:
Ashok, M. & V. Basil Hans(2025). Intertemporal coordination mechanism: Austrian insights on market coordination through time. *International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences (IJMTS)*, *10*(1), 154-171. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15233720

International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences (IJMTS)
A Refereed International Journal of Srinivas University, India.

CrossRef DOI: https://doi.org/10.47992/IJMTS.2581.6012.0379

Received on: 30/11/2024
Published on: 17/04/2025

Intertemporal coordination mechanism: Austrian insights on market coordination through time

Ashok M[1], V. Basil Hans[2]

[1] PhD Scholar, Srinivas University, Mangalore, India.
ORCID: 0009-0003-1163-1932; Email: ashok.21aug@gmail.com

[2] Research Professor, Srinivas University, Mangalore, India.
ORCID: 0000-0003-2713-2188 Email: vhans2011@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper explores temporal coordination mechanisms in market economies through the lens of Austrian Capital Theory, emphasizing how interest rates facilitate the alignment of complex intertemporal production plans across dispersed market participants. The study addresses the challenge of coordinating heterogeneous capital goods over time, a critical issue in dynamic economic systems where production spans multiple stages and horizons. Through a rigorous theoretical analysis and an extensive literature review, the research investigates the role of market processes in achieving this coordination, with a particular focus on how monetary policy influences these mechanisms. The analysis reveals that interest rates act as vital signals, aggregating dispersed knowledge and guiding entrepreneurial decisions to align production structures with consumers' time-preferences. However, monetary interventions, such as interest rate manipulations, are shown to distort these signals systematically, contributing to malinvestment—where resources are misallocated to unsustainable projects—and overconsumption during business cycles. Empirical evidence from the 2002–2009 period, including the U.S. Federal Reserve's monetary expansion, illustrates these effects, highlighting how negative real interest rates (2003–2005) falsified economic calculations, inflating household net worth by $21.7 trillion while reducing savings rates to below 1% by 2005, only to collapse by $13 trillion in 2008. This research synthesizes Austrian insights with emerging technological developments, particularly Web 3.0 technologies and decentralized systems like smart contracts and decentralized finance (DeFi), which may enhance market coordination by reducing reliance on central intermediaries and improving knowledge transmission. The originality lies in bridging classical economic theory with modern technological paradigms, offering a framework to assess how decentralized innovations can preserve Austrian principles of entrepreneurial discovery and spontaneous order. This theoretical analysis contributes to understanding the interplay between monetary policy, technology, and market dynamics, providing a foundation for future empirical studies on decentralized economic coordination.

Keywords: capital heterogeneity, entrepreneurial discovery, Austrian business cycle, time-preference

1. INTRODUCTION:

1.1 Background and Significance

The temporal coordination of production processes constitutes a central theoretical and empirical challenge in contemporary market economies, where intricate capital structures extend across multiple stages and time horizons. Austrian Capital Theory offers a sophisticated analytical framework for examining how dispersed market participants coordinate complex intertemporal plans through the interest rate mechanism (Mises, 1949) [1]. This coordination process is essential not only for aligning production structures with consumers' time-preferences but also for enabling rational economic calculation in an environment characterised by subjective valuations and heterogeneous capital goods. The challenge of achieving temporal coordination becomes particularly acute when Hayek's (Hayek, 1945) [2] insight into the

fundamentally dispersed nature of economic knowledge is presented—a condition that makes centralised planning of intertemporal processes inherently problematic.

The market interest rate emerges as the critical institutional mechanism for temporal coordination, functioning as an informational bridge between present and future market conditions while simultaneously guiding entrepreneurial decisions across various stages of production. When unimpeded, interest rates aggregate and transmit complex information about time-preferences, resource availability, and productive opportunities across the entire economic system. This price mechanism facilitates the transformation of heterogeneous capital goods into complementary productive structures that anticipate and align with future consumption patterns. As Mises (Mises, 1949) [1] demonstrated, intertemporal coordination through interest rates is indispensable for understanding the nature of economic calculation and entrepreneurial market processes in a dynamic economy.

1.2 Problem Statement and Objectives

The persistent challenge of achieving temporal coordination in modern capital markets presents a critical yet underexplored area of economic research. Although the interest rate mechanism theoretically coordinates intertemporal plans, Garrison (Garrison, 2000) [3] identified a fundamental tension between the market's natural coordination processes and contemporary monetary policy frameworks. This tension manifests in what Garrison (Garrison, 2000) [3] terms the "intertemporal discoordination problem" - where policy-induced interest rate manipulations systematically distort the temporal structure of production, leading to unsustainable capital configurations and boom-bust cycles. Despite the theoretical significance of this coordination problem, mainstream macroeconomic models continue to inadequately address the complex relationships between interest rates, capital structure, and time-preferences. This paper examines how policy interventions in interest rate markets affect temporal coordination mechanisms, with particular attention to the misallocation of capital across different stages of production and the resulting implications for economic stability.

The implications of this intertemporal coordination challenge acquire particular significance when contextualised within competing theoretical frameworks of capital and coordination mechanisms. While Keynesian analysis conceptualises capital as fundamentally homogeneous and emphasises the primacy of aggregate investment demand, the Austrian perspective, as Garrison (Garrison, 2000) [3], identifies capital as inherently heterogeneous and temporally structured. This theoretical distinction is crucial for analysing coordination phenomena. Whereas Keynesian theory posits that market coordination failures emerge principally from insufficient aggregate demand necessitating policy intervention, Austrian capital theory identifies monetary interventions themselves as the fundamental source of intertemporal discoordination. Horwitz (Horwitz, 2000) [4] comprehensively established that this analytical divergence transcends mere theoretical disputation and encompasses fundamentally distinct paradigms of market processes and temporal coordination. The classical school’s emphasis on long-run equilibrium similarly obscures the dynamic, process-oriented nature of capital coordination that Austrian analysis illuminates, particularly in explaining how entrepreneurial responses to interest rate signals systematically reshape the temporal structure of production.

Recent scholarship in Austrian economics has revealed a renewed focus on temporal coordination mechanisms, particularly as modern financial complexities challenge traditional theoretical frameworks. Building on Garrison’s (Garrison, 2000) [3] foundational analysis of capital structure and time, contemporary discourse has expanded to address novel coordination challenges in an era of unprecedented monetary interventions. Manish and Powell (Manish and Powell, 2014) [5] demonstrated in their examination of intertemporal coordination and economic growth that the interaction between capital markets, financial innovations, and monetary policy creates distinct patterns of temporal discoordination that warrant careful analysis. Of particular significance is the growing emphasis on how institutional frameworks and modern financial architectures either facilitate or impede the market's natural coordination mechanisms, especially in the context of negative interest rates and quantitative easing policies.

Objectives: This paper examines how policy interventions in interest rate markets affect temporal coordination mechanisms, with particular attention to the misallocation of capital across different stages of

production and the resulting implications for economic stability. This study aims to address the intertemporal coordination challenge by analysing the role of interest rates as signals for aligning production structures with consumer time-preferences in a market economy, assessing the impact of monetary policy interventions on temporal coordination with a focus on distortions such as malinvestment and overconsumption, and exploring how emerging technologies, such as Web 3.0 and decentralized finance (DeFi), can enhance intertemporal coordination by reducing reliance on centralized intermediaries.

1.3 Contributions to Literature

The development of temporal coordination theory within Austrian economics has advanced significantly through a series of influential journal contributions. Garrison's (Garrison, 1984) [6] seminal work in the Journal of Macroeconomics established fundamental connections between time-preferences and monetary phenomena, laying crucial groundwork for understanding coordination mechanisms in capital markets. Building on this foundation, Lewin (Lewin, 2016) [7], in The Review of Austrian Economics, provided critical insights into the spontaneous emergence of plan coordination in complex market processes. The theoretical framework was further enriched by Carilli and Dempster (Carilli and Dempster, 2001) [8], who applied expectation theory to Austrian business cycle analysis and demonstrated how interest rate distortions affect temporal coordination through their influence on entrepreneurial expectations. These contributions collectively advance our understanding of how market processes facilitate or impede intertemporal coordination, particularly in the context of monetary interventions and capital structure formation.

The further development of temporal coordination theory benefited substantially from critical analyses that refined the relationship between market processes and monetary phenomena. Salerno's (Salerno, 1993) [9] influential study in The Review of Austrian Economics sharpened the theoretical distinctions between Misesian and Hayekian approaches to market coordination and provided crucial insights into how different interpretations of the price mechanism affect our understanding of temporal alignment. Horwitz's (2000) [4] research expanded our understanding of how monetary systems affect economic coordination over time. He focused on the mechanisms that connect individual time-preferences to the broader structure of capital investments, especially in modern economic systems.

Building on these theoretical foundations, contemporary analysis has revealed increasingly sophisticated challenges to the Austrian conceptualisation of temporal coordination. Although interest rates constitute the primary mechanism for intertemporal coordination in Austrian capital theory, the emergence of complex feedback loops and persistent information asymmetries in modern financial markets requires critical theoretical refinement. Carilli and Dempster (Carilli and Dempster, 2001) [8] demonstrated through their application of expectations theory that self-reinforcing feedback mechanisms can systematically amplify or attenuate interest rate signals independently of monetary intervention, suggesting a more nuanced approach to temporal coordination than traditional Austrian frameworks encompass. This analytical complexity is further illuminated by Lewin's (Lewin, 2016) [7] examination of knowledge dispersion and plan coordination in contemporary capital markets, revealing inherent limitations in the conventional Austrian proposition that undistorted interest rates alone can effectively synchronise intertemporal plans. The theoretical progress implies that despite the Austrian focus on synchronising time as a fundamental aspect, the mechanism's operation is much more intricate and encounters more substantial internal obstacles than initially predicted.

1.4 Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, theoretical approach rooted in Austrian Capital Theory to investigate intertemporal coordination mechanisms in market economies. The methodology consists of three primary components:

Theoretical Synthesis: The research synthesizes foundational Austrian insights—drawing from scholars such as Mises (Hayek, 1949), Hayek (Hayek, 1945), and Garrison (Garrison, 2000)—to construct a framework for understanding how interest rates coordinate production structures over time. This involves

a critical review of historical and contemporary literature on capital heterogeneity, time-preference, and market processes.

Historical Analysis: To illustrate theoretical arguments, the study incorporates secondary empirical evidence from the 2002–2009 U.S. economic cycle, leveraging data on monetary expansion, household net worth, and savings rates (e.g., Salerno, 2012) to demonstrate the effects of policy-induced distortions.

Exploratory Assessment: The analysis extends to emerging technological paradigms, particularly Web 3.0 and decentralized finance (DeFi), using conceptual extrapolation to evaluate their potential to enhance market coordination based on Austrian principles of spontaneous order and entrepreneurial discovery.

No primary data collection or econometric modelling is conducted; instead, the study relies on deductive reasoning and qualitative interpretation of existing theoretical and historical material to address the specified objectives.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:

2.1 Austrian Time-Preference Theory

Time preference theory, foundational to Austrian capital and interest analysis, emerges from Böhm-Bawerk's (Bohm-Bawerk, 1890/1959) [10] seminal insight that individuals systematically value present goods more than future goods of similar kind and quantity. This temporal dimension of human valuation, developed through Böhm-Bawerk's comprehensive analysis of interest theory, establishes the psychological and praxeological basis for understanding interest as a market phenomenon. Rothbard (Rothbard, 1962/2004) [11] significantly advanced this theoretical framework by demonstrating how time-preference necessarily emerges from human action, arguing that every action implies the preference of a more immediately available satisfaction over a more remote one. Through this synthesis, Rothbard establishes time-preference not merely as a psychological tendency but as a categorical requirement of human action, thereby providing a robust theoretical foundation for understanding both the origin of interest rates and their crucial role in coordinating intertemporal market processes.

The intellectual foundation of temporal coordination in capital theory emerges from Böhm-Bawerk's (Böhm-Bawerk, 1890/1959) [10] sophisticated analysis of capital and production processes. As he meticulously demonstrates, "The transformation of means of production into products always demands a certain period of time, sometimes long, sometimes short" and requires that productive goods be bound together "in the process of production over the whole period of time". This temporal dimension is crucial for understanding capital value, as Böhm-Bawerk explains that "capital is nothing else than a sum of 'complementary goods' of higher rank". Significantly, he identifies a fundamental value relationship wherein the anticipated product's value determines the value of its means of production, yet "real capital is not valued as highly as its product". This value differential emerging from the temporal structure of production provides a theoretical foundation for interest rates and their role in coordinating production processes. Through this analysis, Böhm-Bawerk definitively shifts the interest problem "from a production problem, which it is not, to a value problem, which it is", establishing the crucial link between time, value, and production in capital theory.

The theoretical framework of temporal coordination is further refined through Rothbard's (Rothbard, 1962/2004) [11] analysis of the pure rate of interest and capital market dynamics. In the evenly rotating economy (ERE), Rothbard demonstrates that "the rate of net return on the investment of money capital will, in the ERE, be the same in every line of production", establishing a crucial benchmark for understanding temporal coordination mechanisms. This uniformity principle illuminates how competitive market processes drive the equalisation of returns across different production periods and structures. Rothbard explains, "Money, the general medium of exchange, is precisely nonspecific", enabling capital to flow freely towards its most valued uses across the temporal structure of production. This analysis reveals how the price system, through the pure rate of interest, facilitates the coordination of production processes across both time and space, while simultaneously highlighting how "competition extends throughout the length and breadth of the production structure", ensuring dynamic efficiency in capital allocation across different temporal stages.

Rothbard's (Rothbard, 1962/2004) [11] critique of Böhm-Bawerk's roundabout production theory offers crucial refinements to Austrian capital theory, particularly challenging the direct correlation between roundaboutness and productivity. Rothbard argues, "The point is, however, that all short and ultra productive processes will be the first ones to be invested in and established", revealing how production structures naturally evolve towards optimal efficiency rather than merely extending in time. This insight fundamentally reconfigures our understanding of capital accumulation and demonstrates that entrepreneurs prioritise value productivity over temporal length in production processes. The famous Crusoe example, where "building a net should not be considered as a 'more roundabout method of catching fish,' but as the 'most direct method for catching 100 fish a day'", illustrates how production methods emerge through entrepreneurial discovery of more efficient, albeit sometimes lengthier processes.

The complexity of temporal coordination is further evident in Rothbard's (Rothbard, 1962/2004) [11] analysis of time-preference and interest rates. He demonstrates that "any new investment will therefore be in a longer and more productive method of production", while acknowledging that technological advancement can modify this relationship. However, his framework may underestimate the interconnected nature of modern production processes, creating unexpected patterns of temporal coordination. When Rothbard observes that "technological advance is one of the most dramatic features of the world of change", he opens the door to examining how innovations might cascade through the production structure in ways that complicate the linear progression from shorter to longer processes.

The theoretical development of the time-preference theory reveals important refinements in understanding temporal coordination. Lewin (Lewin, 1999) [12] notes that while Böhm-Bawerk's theory establishes "the primacy of time-preference" in explaining interest, his inclusion of "productivity of capital" among the justifications for positive time-preference created theoretical tensions that subsequent scholars needed to address. This apparent conflict between time-preference and productivity in interest rate determination became increasingly significant as economic theory evolved, prompting deeper examination of the Austrian framework.

The theoretical resolution emerged through the contributions of Mises and Rothbard. Mises (Mises, 1949) [1] demonstrated that a positive interest rate emerges from human action, making additional explanatory factors superfluous and potentially contradictory. He particularly emphasised that "Time preference is a categorial requisite of human action" (Mises, 1949), establishing it as an inherent characteristic of human action rather than a purely psychological or technological phenomenon. This theoretical clarification, further developed by Rothbard (Rothbard, 1962/2004) [11], strengthens our understanding of how interest rates facilitate intertemporal coordination in modern capital markets.

2.2 Capital Heterogeneity

The concept of capital heterogeneity emerges as a fundamental characteristic of modern production structures, where capital goods manifest distinctly different attributes, both in their temporal dimension and productive capabilities. Hayek in The Pure Theory of Capital (Hayek, 1941/2009) [13] meticulously demonstrates that capital goods differ not merely in their durability but in their entire productive character, with "different durable goods existing in an economic system will be of very different degrees of durability". This heterogeneity manifests in how capital goods progress through production stages, where some goods advance "bodily from stage to stage", while others remain embodied in the same material units while rendering services at different temporal points. Such differentiation becomes particularly significant when considering that "Every such good has thus to be regarded as consisting of units of future services which will mature at different dates and therefore belong to different 'stages'", emphasising how capital heterogeneity intertwines with both the temporal structure of production and the complex relationships between different types of capital goods.

The theoretical conceptualisation of capital heterogeneity extends beyond mere physical differentiation to encompass complex functional and structural relationships within the production process. In The Pure Theory of Capital, Hayek (Hayek, 1941/2009) [13] discusses how capital goods operate across multiple production stages, drawing on Marshall's observation that "a good may belong to several orders at the same time. For instance, a railway train may be carrying people on a pleasure excursion, and so far it is a good

of the first order; if it happens to be carrying at the same time some milling machinery and some machinery that is used for making milling machinery, it is at the same time a good of the second, third, and fourth order" (Marshall, 1890, p.109, as cited in Hayek, 1941, p.132).

Lachmann, in Capital and Its Structure (Lachmann, 1956) [14] advanced this analysis by highlighting that even physically identical capital goods serve distinctly different functions within the production structure. "Physical homogeneity, we see, is not incompatible with functional difference" (Lachmann, 1956) [14]. This functional heterogeneity manifests through what Lachmann terms "plan complementarity" and "structural complementarity" (Lachmann, 1956) [14], providing a more nuanced understanding than Hayek's temporal stages analysis. The complementarity concept becomes particularly significant when considering that capital goods not only serve multiple functions simultaneously, as Hayek observes in The Pure Theory of Capital (Hayek, 1941/2009) [13], but also form what Lachmann describes as "constant composition of the capital combinations which form the material backbone of production plans" (Lachmann, 1956) [14]. This synthesis highlights how capital heterogeneity emerges not merely from physical or temporal differences, but from the complex web of relationships and functions that capital goods fulfil within the broader production structure.

The dynamic implications of capital heterogeneity extend beyond static complementarity relationships and reveal how historical capital combinations constrain and shape future production possibilities. Although Hayek in The Pure Theory of Capital (Hayek, 1941/2009) [13] and Lachmann in Capital and Its Structure (Lachmann, 1956) [14] recognised the importance of capital combinations, their analysis may underestimate how existing capital structures create persistent patterns that influence subsequent investment decisions. Lachmann's observation that "In the social sciences we mean by 'structure' a complex of relationships sufficiently stable in varying circumstances to display the firm outline of a clear and distinguishable pattern" (Lachmann, 1956) [14] hints at this temporal lock-in effect. The interrelated nature of capital goods means that once certain production methods are established, the cost and complexity of fundamental reorganisation can make alternative configurations economically unfeasible, even if theoretically more efficient. This structural rigidity challenges the assumption that capital combinations can be freely reorganised in response to market signals, suggesting instead that the historical evolution of capital structures creates enduring patterns that may persist even in the face of technological or market changes.

The divergence in understanding financial markets' roles stems from fundamentally different theoretical foundations. For Keynes, as articulated in The General Theory (Keynes, 1936) [15], interest in financial markets emerged from his observation that "when the capital development of a country becomes a by-product of the activities of a casino, the job is likely to be ill-done" (Keynes, 1936) [15]. However, the Austrian perspective, which is particularly evident in Lachmann's analysis, views financial markets, especially the Stock Exchange, as sophisticated institutions that "spread knowledge not about what is or has been, but about what people think will be" (Lachmann, 1956) [14]. This distinction is crucial: while Keynes saw financial markets as potentially destabilising forces requiring oversight, comparing investment markets to "newspaper competitions in which the competitors have to pick out the six prettiest faces" (Keynes, 1936) [15], Austrian theory recognises them as essential mechanisms for "bringing long-term expectations into consistency with each other" (Lachmann, 1956) [14], facilitating intertemporal coordination through forward trading and continuous price discovery. This stark contrast reflects Keynes' view of markets as driven by "animal spirits" (Keynes, 1936) [15] versus the Austrian emphasis on markets as knowledge-transmission mechanisms.

This institutional role extends beyond mere price discovery to facilitate what Lachmann terms the "exchange of knowledge," (Lachmann, 1956) [14], a perspective further developed by Horwitz's (Horwitz, 2000) [4] analysis of how market processes coordinate dispersed knowledge in complex economic systems. Rather than viewing capital markets as institutions through which entrepreneurs who "can read the signs of the times" can outperform "those who cannot," Lachmann emphasises how markets promote "consistent capital change and therefore economic progress" (Lachmann, 1956) [14] through the continuous reevaluation of yield streams and adjustment of expectations. This viewpoint implies a more complex understanding of how capital markets enable knowledge dissemination and structural element adaptation.

The divergence between Keynes and Lachmann is particularly obvious in their treatment of the roles of market participants. Keynes's division of actors into "skilled investors" and "ignorant game-players" fails to recognise the market's function as a knowledge-transmission mechanism (Lachmann, 1956) [14]. Carilli and Dempster (Carilli and Dempster, 2001) [8], using Austrian business cycle theory, showed how markets coordinate diverse entrepreneurial plans by transmitting knowledge through price signals and expectations.

2.3 Market Process Theory

Market process theory conceptualises economic coordination as a dynamic mechanism driven by entrepreneurial discovery rather than parametric price adjustments. This study posits that temporal misalignment between underlying variables—taste, technology, and resource endowments—create profit opportunities that entrepreneurs discover and act upon. This entrepreneurial action serves as the primary mechanism through which dispersed knowledge is transmitted through the economic system, progressively aligning resource allocation with consumer preferences. Unlike equilibrium-focused approaches, market process theory emphasises the continuous nature of discovery and adjustment, where coordination emerges through iterative entrepreneurial responses to profit-loss signals rather than through instantaneous market clearing. This framework provides analytical insight into how markets coordinate complex economic activities under uncertainty and dispersed knowledge.

Market process theory provides a framework for understanding temporal coordination in complex economies through entrepreneurial discovery. Boettke (Boettke, 2012) [16] notes that "The brilliance of Kirzner rests in the way he opened the closed framework of traditional microeconomics by introducing the entrepreneurial element". This entrepreneurial element is crucial because "the underlying variables, including tastes, technology, resource endowment, and the induced variables of profit and loss accounting, are in a lagged but determinant relationship". This insight reveals how market processes facilitate adjustment over time, with entrepreneurs acting as key agents in detecting and responding to misalignments between underlying and induced variables. The emphasis on process over equilibrium states highlights how temporal coordination emerges not from a perfect alignment of variables but through continuous entrepreneurial discovery and adaptation to changing market conditions.

Unlike the Walrasian approach, which treats prices as mere parameters, the market process theory explains how entrepreneurs actively discover and act upon price discrepancies, coordinating heterogeneous capital goods across time. In traditional neoclassical theory, "agents are passive in the sense that they do not originate change, they just respond like robots to the situation of the market and the incentives offered by parametric prices" (Boettke, 2012) [16]. In an analysis of Kirzner's contribution to market process theory, Boettke observes that "the market discovery process provides the mechanism through which coordination moves in the direction of the underlying variables". This understanding of entrepreneurial discovery and market coordination synthesises two key Austrian insights: the knowledge problem and the temporal coordination mechanism (Boettke & Horwitz, 2005) [17], demonstrating how market processes facilitate both the discovery and intertemporal transmission of dispersed knowledge (Boettke, 2002) [18].

3. TEMPORAL COORDINATION MECHANISM:

3.1 Core Principles

The intertemporal production structure, central to Austrian capital theory, represents a complex framework of entrepreneurial plans coordinated through market processes. As Garrison (Garrison, 2000) [3] demonstrated through his capital-based macroeconomics, systematic inconsistencies in market signals—particularly interest rates—can cause the market process to turn against itself, leading to unsustainable production patterns. The temporal element becomes crucial in understanding how production takes time and involves a sequence of stages; exchanges among producers operating at different stages, as well as sales to consumers at the final stage, are facilitated through a common medium of exchange. This structure, while often visualised through the Hayekian triangle, encompasses a broader understanding of how resources are allocated across time through entrepreneurial planning and market coordination.

The coordination of capital through time requires more than entrepreneurial foresight and dispersed knowledge. As Salerno (Salerno, 1994) [19] emphasised, it demands a "genuinely competitive and social market process" that transforms subjective valuations into objective price appraisements. This process enables evaluation of time-consuming production methods and integration of entrepreneurial plans into a coherent production structure. The Austrian emphasis thus extends beyond mere subjectivism to recognise that capital goods derive their value through their place in a system of monetary calculation that facilitates intertemporal coordination through market processes.

3.2 Price System's Role

Hayek's seminal contribution in "The Use of Knowledge in Society" (Hayek, 1945) [2] fundamentally reshapes our understanding of how temporal coordination emerges through the price system. The knowledge problem Hayek articulates is intrinsically linked to the temporal structure of production, where the dispersed knowledge of "particular circumstances of time and place" must somehow be coordinated across multiple stages of production. The price system serves as a mechanism for communicating information about relative scarcities and subjective valuations, enabling entrepreneurs to adjust their plans in response to changing market conditions. This dynamic process of knowledge-transmission through prices is essential for understanding how temporal coordination can emerge without a central direction, as market participants adapt their production plans based on price signals that encode information about both current conditions and expected future states.

The temporal dimension of the knowledge problem is particularly salient when considering the production structure over time. Hayek (Hayek, 1941/2009) [13] emphasised how production processes consist of "many separate branches of different lengths which gradually join up together to form the main stream". This complex structure means that adjustments in production must account for numerous simultaneous processes with varying time horizons, transforming capital coordination from a purely structural concern to one that emphasises the epistemological challenges of aligning production plans across time. The price system, serving as "a kind of machinery for registering change" (Hayek, 1945) [2], facilitates the coordination of dispersed knowledge through time, enabling entrepreneurs to discover and act upon information that no central authority could possibly possess. This market process fundamentally connects to what Mises (Mises, 1949) [1] identifies as the role of capital in economic calculation, where capital becomes "the foremost mental tool of the conduct of affairs in the market economy". Through this lens, the entrepreneur's task extends beyond physical resource allocation to include the crucial function of evaluating and preserving capital while coordinating production processes across time through monetary calculation.

Hayek's analysis of equilibrium and knowledge processes, as discussed by Horwitz (Horwitz, 2000) [4], is significant for understanding temporal coordination mechanisms. Hayek (Hayek, 1937) [20] showed that equilibrium analysis can only be meaningfully understood if it is considered in light of the knowledge possessed by individuals assumed to be in equilibrium. This epistemological dimension is crucial for temporal coordination because individual plans must be coordinated not only in terms of their immediate actions but also their knowledge states through time. The market synchronises production schedules with consumer preferences over time. This relates to how the market coordinates production plans with consumption preferences through time.

This understanding is fundamentally connected to temporal coordination because it highlights how market processes must reconcile not only current actions but expected future states. Hayek (Hayek, 1937) [20] notes that "equilibrium makes sense if it is true that the actions of all members of society over a period are all execution of their respective individual plans on which each decided at the beginning of the period". This perspective enhances our understanding of capital coordination by emphasising that the alignment of plans through time critically depends on how knowledge is acquired, communicated, and acted upon by market participants.

3.3 Interest Rates as Signals

Mises' (Mises, 1949) [1] conception of originary interest as a category inherent in human action fundamentally differs from both neoclassical interpretations and Böhm-Bawerk's productivity-based

explanations. Hayek (Hayek, 1941/2009) [13] elaborated that interest emerges not merely from physical productivity but from the temporal structure of production and consumption plans. This temporal element is critical: originary interest represents the universal discount of future goods against present goods that exist before and is independent of any monetary or institutional arrangements (Mises, 1949) [1]. The phenomenon continues to exist even within hypothetical models such as the evenly rotating economy, indicating its fundamental characteristics as a praxeological rather than an empirical category.

Garrison (Garrison, 2000) [3] built on this foundation to demonstrate how originary interest plays a crucial coordination mechanism in the capital structure. As elucidated by Lewin and Cachanosky (Lewin and Cachanosky, 2019) [21], the Austrian perspective uniquely positions interest as both an expression of time-preference and a signal guiding the intertemporal coordination of production processes. This contrasts starkly with classical economists' treatment of interest as mere return on capital goods or land. Mises' (Mises, 1949) [1] analysis reveals that interest is not simply a market phenomenon but a categorical requirement of human action involving choice across time. It is a manifestation of time-preference rather than mere measurement or expression. Mises states, "Originary interest is a category of human action".

Mises' (Mises, 1949) [1] treatment of originary interest as a category inherent in human action is in stark contrast to both Wicksell's natural rate theory and Fisher's time-preference framework. While Wicksell (Wicksell, 1898/1936) [22] posited a natural rate that equilibrates saving and investment, Mises argued that the originary interest is independent of market conditions. Fisher's (Fisher, 1930) [23] characterisation of time-preference as "human impatience" and his emphasis on "investment opportunity" as distinct elements fundamentally differ from Mises' unified praxeological approach. As Festré (Festré, 2012) [24] demonstrated, this epistemological distinction shapes how we understand interest's role in economic coordination.

Fisher's (Fisher, 1930) [23] emphasis on time-preference as the "effective desire for accumulation" aligns with Böhm-Bawerk's analysis of intertemporal valuation. Böhm-Bawerk (Böhm-Bawerk, 1890/1959) [10] notes, "present goods invariably possess a greater value than future goods of the same number and kind, and therefore a definite sum of present goods can, as a rule, only be purchased by a larger sum of future goods. Present goods possess an agio in future goods. This agio is interest". Fisher conceptualised time-preference as the "percentage excess" of present over future goods, whereas Mises (Mises, 1949) [1] posits it as a categorical praxeological necessity. Fisher's quantitative approach, emphasising "early enjoyment income over deferred enjoyment income", contrasts with Mises's view of time-preference as a fundamental category of human purposiveness that transcends empirical measurement.

3.4 Entrepreneurial Discovery

Entrepreneurial action serves as a vital temporal coordination mechanism, operating through the competitive discovery and transmission of market information. Entrepreneurs, through their alertness to profit opportunities, facilitate intertemporal coordination by identifying and acting upon temporal misalignments in resource allocation. As Kirzner (Kirzner, 1973) [25] demonstrates, even in scenarios where market participants are "unable to learn from their market experience," entrepreneurs who "are able to perceive opportunities for entrepreneurial profits" emerge as crucial coordinators of market activities. This entrepreneurial process is inherently competitive, as 'competition between the entrepreneurs as buyers, and again as sellers, will succeed in communicating to market participants a correct estimate' of market conditions across time, thereby enabling effective temporal coordination through the continuous discovery and exploitation of profit opportunities.

While entrepreneurial discovery facilitates temporal coordination through market information transmission, Mises (Mises, 1949) [1] further illuminates how uncertainty fundamentally shapes this coordination process. As he explained, "The ultimate source from which entrepreneurial profit and loss are derived is the uncertainty of the future constellation of demand and supply". This uncertainty is intrinsic to temporal coordination because entrepreneurs must invest resources in the present based on anticipated future conditions. In Mises' analysis, entrepreneurial profits emerge precisely because perfect temporal coordination is impossible: "If all entrepreneurs were to anticipate correctly the future state of the market, there would be neither profits nor losses". This observation reinforces how entrepreneurial action, driven

by profit and loss dynamics, serves as a crucial temporal coordination mechanism by continuously adjusting resource allocation in response to uncertain future conditions.

The temporal coordination process becomes even more complex when the heterogeneous nature of capital goods is considered. Lachmann (Lachmann, 1956) [14] emphasised that 'capital goods have to be used together', and this heterogeneity 'implies complementarity in use'. This complementarity is crucial for temporal coordination because entrepreneurs must not only anticipate future conditions but also make decisions about specific combinations of heterogeneous capital goods. The process is inherently dynamic, as 'capital regrouping' or 'a variation in the mode of complementarity of the capital goods used' occurs when entrepreneurial plans require revision. This insight extends our understanding of temporal coordination mechanisms beyond pure entrepreneurial discovery and uncertainty, highlighting how the concrete manifestation of entrepreneurial decisions in capital combinations affects the market's temporal order.

4. MARKET PROCESS AND COORDINATION FAILURES:

4.1 Austrian Business Cycle Theory

The Monetarist and Austrian approaches to business cycle theory represent distinct analytical frameworks in macroeconomic thought, particularly in their treatment of capital structure and temporal coordination. As Garrison (Garrison, 2000) [3] notes, "The Monetarist vision of boom and bust does not entail any essential distinction between consumption and investment", highlighting a fundamental departure from Austrian capital theory. This framework-independent approach allows Monetarists to analyse output fluctuations without detailed attention to capital structure or intertemporal relationships.

While mainstream institutions like the IMF have begun recognising Austrian insights regarding monetary policy and malinvestment—a significant shift from earlier rejections of Austrian theory in the mid-20th century—fundamental theoretical differences persist. In an IMF Working Paper, Oppers (Oppers, 2002) [28] emphasises, "During upturns, credit created with the help of central bank liquidity would fuel investment demand beyond society's long-term willingness to save, thus generating a mismatch between the economy's productive capacity and consumers' intertemporal spending plans". This recognition of Austrian perspectives on capital structure misalignment and monetary policy effects represents a notable evolution in mainstream economic thought, particularly given the historical scepticism towards Austrian ideas following the Keynesian revolution.

4.2 Capital Structure Misalignment and Time-Preference Distortions

This theoretical divergence between Monetarist and Austrian approaches is particularly salient when examining the role of capital structure and monetary calculation. While the Monetarist framework emphasises aggregate output movements, the Austrian analysis reveals that business cycles are characterised by both malinvestment and overconsumption rather than simple overinvestment (Garrison, 2000) [3]. According to Salerno (Salerno, 2012) [29], credit expansion distorts monetary assessments, causing entrepreneurs to overestimate their earnings and households to misjudge their actual wealth. This dual distortion manifests in what Mises (Mises, 1949) [1] termed the "falsification of business calculation", where capital allocation and consumption decisions become systematically skewed.

The empirical evidence from the 2002-2009 period, as documented by Salerno (Salerno, 2012) [29], strongly supports this Austrian perspective on simultaneous malinvestment and overconsumption. The period of monetary expansion by the Federal Reserve led to a negative real interest rate between 2003 and 2005. During this period, household assets rose by $21.7 trillion, whereas liabilities increased by $4.5 trillion. The ratio of household net worth to GDP surged above 450 percent, compared to its historical range of 300-350 percent maintained from 1952 to the mid-1990s (Salerno, 2012) [29]. This monetary expansion led households to reduce their personal savings rate from over 4% after the 2001 recession to less than 1% by 2005, while simultaneously increasing their debt service payments to 15% of disposable personal income by 2007. The subsequent collapse resulted in household net worth declining by $13 trillion in 2008 alone, revealing the extent of capital consumption during the boom phase.

As evidenced by the 2002-2009 crisis, the severity of capital consumption and impoverishment becomes apparent when examining the Wilshire 5000 Total Market Index, which showed no net capital accumulation from 1999 to 2009, implying extensive capital consumption or misdirection of investments (Salerno, 2012) [29]. This observation aligns with Mises' (Mises, 1949) [1] assertion that inflation-induced distortions in monetary calculations lead to systematic errors in investment and consumption decisions. The subsequent weak recovery, characterised by continued contraction in the capital structure despite expansionary monetary policy, validates the Austrian perspective that policy interventions that prevent necessary price adjustments can prolong economic malaise.

The Austrian Business Cycle Theory (ABCT) provides a comprehensive framework for understanding both the destruction and renewal of capital structures and monetary calculations during business cycles. Salerno's (Salerno, 2012) [29] reformulation demonstrates that unprecedented monetary interventions by the Federal Reserve coupled with significant fiscal deficits explain the precarious nature of economic recoveries. The theory's strength lies in its explanation of the asymmetry between boom-and-bust phases, particularly through what Rothbard (Rothbard, 1963/2000) [30] terms the "cluster of entrepreneurial errors", where malinvestment and overconsumption occur simultaneously rather than sequentially.

However, this interpretation may warrant further examination. Markets and economic actors have demonstrated remarkable adaptability to policy interventions over time, developing sophisticated hedging mechanisms and alternative coordination frameworks that potentially mitigate some effects of monetary distortions. Although the Austrian framework correctly identified fundamental distortions in monetary calculations, it may underestimate the market's capacity for endogenous correction and adaptation, even during policy interventions. This suggests that although recovery requires the restoration of sound monetary calculations and the realignment of the production structure with actual consumer time-preferences, the adjustment process might be more nuanced and self-stabilising than conventionally understood.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 Criticism of the Current Framework

The evolution of monetary institutions from commodity-based to sophisticated financial systems has revealed fundamental tensions in how money supply and purchasing power influence the capital structure. While Hume's (Hume, 2007) [31] price-specie-flow mechanism provided natural equilibration under gold standards, modern fiat-based monetary systems introduce distinct challenges for economic calculation and capital coordination. This theoretical concern extends beyond the traditional free banking–central banking debate (White, 1999) [32] and includes questions about how monetary institutions affect the temporal structure of production. According to the Austrian perspective, as outlined by Selgin and White (Selgin and White, 1994) [33], the key challenge in monetary systems lies in ensuring effective calculation even when currency issuance is not legally restricted. This becomes particularly evident when examining how credit expansion distorts both capital allocation and consumption decisions, leading to what Garrison (Garrison, 2000) [3] calls simultaneous malinvestment and overconsumption rather than simple overinvestment. Such systematic distortions in monetary calculations, especially during periods of significant policy intervention, raise fundamental questions about the capacity of current institutional frameworks to facilitate sustainable economic coordination.

5.2 Reform Proposals

Free banking is a monetary system characterised by competitive note issuance and clearing arrangements that emerged spontaneously through market processes, without centralised planning, as detailed in Selgin and White's seminal paper "The Evolution of a Free Banking System" (Selgin and White, 1987) [34]. The American experience of the antebellum provides compelling historical evidence of this system's viability, particularly in the decades preceding the Civil War. As Dowd documents in "The Experience of Free Banking" (Dowd, 1992) [35], free banking spread rapidly across the United States during the 1850s, with more than half of the states adopting some form of free banking legislation. The system demonstrated notable improvements in efficiency, as evidenced by the growth in per capita bank money from $7.64 in

1840 to $14.21 in 1860 (Rockoff, 1975) [36]. However, this evolutionary process was disrupted by the Civil War, when the federal government's National Banking legislation of 1863-5 effectively ended state-level note issuance through taxation, primarily driven by wartime fiscal necessities rather than any fundamental dissatisfaction with the existing banking system (Horwitz, 1992) [37]. This historical event illustrates how institutional banking development can be shaped by political exigencies rather than market efficiency. From a temporal coordination perspective, the free banking era demonstrated how decentralised banking institutions could effectively facilitate intertemporal exchange through market-determined monetary arrangements (O'Driscoll & Rizzo, 1985) [38], an approach that was subsequently disrupted by centralised control of money and banking.

The theoretical foundations of modern free banking proposals are traced to Wicksell's insights, developed through various Austrian approaches. Hayek (Hayek, 1967) [39] advocated for maintaining the stability of total spending (MV, where M represents money supply and V its velocity), and Rothbard (Rothbard, 1963/2000) [30] argued for absolute monetary supply stability. The fundamental problem with centralised monetary policy is its inability to effectively coordinate economic activity through the price system. Hayek (Hayek, 1990) [41] argued, "A single monopolistic governmental agency can neither possess the information which should govern the supply of money nor would it, if it knew what it ought to do in the general interest, usually be in a position to act in that manner". This underscores the advantages of competitive banking arrangements in enabling market coordination via price signals. The challenges of centralised monetary policy are evident in its impact on price coordination. Selgin (Selgin, 1996) [42] explains: "Rules for monetary management generally fail to rule out disequilibrating price disturbances; in particular, an improper supply of central bank money disturbs interest rates, because the extension of loanable funds by the banking system ceases to agree with the voluntary savings decisions of individuals. This particular variety of relative price distortion, a distortion of intertemporal rates of exchange, results either in a boom-and-bust cycle (inflationary case) or in more immediate depression (deflationary case)".

However, Brand, Bielecki, and Penalver's (Brand et al., 2018) [43] conducted research on natural interest rates and offered a nuanced counternarrative to the view that monetary distortions stem primarily from central bank interventions. Their empirical analysis indicates that the decrease in equilibrium real interest rates is driven by more fundamental underlying factors. These factors—the ongoing demographic transition, a shift towards safe-haven assets, global disparities in saving and investment, and sluggish productivity growth—collectively contribute to this challenge. It is also essential to acknowledge that these factors are not controlled by central banks. The study emphasises that "a return to higher natural rates would have to come from pension reform (i.e. increasing retirement age in combination with measures to sustain human capital of ageing populations), a reversal in the pricing of risk, a boost in productivity, or a combination of these factors".

Although structural forces such as demographics and productivity appear to drive natural rates, the actual transmission mechanisms of monetary policy reveal more complex dynamics. The evidence shows that accommodative policy creates persistent divergences between financial and physical returns, supporting Mises' (Mises, 1949) [1] position that monetary interventions alter not just price levels but the entire structure of production through relative price changes. Borio et al. (Borio et al., 2017) [44] further substantiated that monetary policy itself can drive the natural rate of interest, creating path dependencies that challenge conventional policy assumptions.

Current policy frameworks, based on Woodford-style models that treat the economy as having complete markets and period-by-period equilibrium (Woodford, 2003) [45], fail to capture temporal coordination dynamics. Tamborini et al. (Tamborini et al., 2014) [46] explained that these models assume that investment equals savings in every period, excluding persistent saving-investment imbalances by construction. The resulting policy stance may worsen intertemporal discoordination, similar to how a faulty navigation system that ignores terrain changes leads travellers further off course. Mises' analysis in "The Theory of Money and Credit" suggests that credit expansion initially flows towards intermediate goods, fundamentally altering relative prices and the time structure of production (Mises, 1981) [47]. Mises elaborates this point, explaining how 'the intervention of the banks..." the intervention of the banks has brought about a redistribution of property, and on the other hand because the automatic recovery of the loan market involves

certain signs of the loss of some of the capital invested in the excessively lengthened roundabout processes of production". It further states that "it is not practicable to transfer all the production goods from those uses that have proved unprofitable to other avenues of employment; a part of them cannot be withdrawn and must therefore either be left entirely unused or at least be used less economically".

5.3 Implementation Challenges

The implementation of free banking systems in contemporary financial markets presents distinct theoretical, practical, and legal challenges that extend beyond historical precedents. As Dowd (Dowd, 1992) [35], "free banking was far more widespread than economists have hitherto recognised" with "approximately sixty cases of it", yet modern implementation faces unique regulatory hurdles. Network externalities in modern payment systems create substantial barriers to entry for new competitive note issuers, while technological infrastructure requirements introduce novel coordination problems that are absent in traditional free banking episodes (Selgin, 2020) [48]. The historical evidence suggests that "free banking was stable" with only "a handful of episodes did the banking systems as a whole suffer runs or suspend convertibility" (Dowd, 1992) [35], yet the path dependency generated by decades of central banking operations manifests in institutional structures that systematically resist decentralised monetary arrangements.

Digital transformation fundamentally alters the implementation dynamics of competitive note issues, introducing multifaceted challenges in settlement finality, regulatory compliance, and cross-border coordination. Dowd's (1992) [35] observation that "central banking was an imposition, not the outcome of the natural evolution of free banking" becomes particularly relevant when considering modern transition challenges. The historical pattern where "many systems saw a similar pattern of a large number of banks entering the field in early years, only to fail or merge with others until few were left" (Dowd, 1992) [35] suggests potential consolidation pressures in modern digital banking markets.

Current legal frameworks designed primarily for centralised monetary systems present significant obstacles to competitive note issuance. Arner et al. (Arner et al., 2020) [49] argued that regulatory requirements for payment systems and monetary policy implementation create substantial entry barriers for potential competitive currency issuers. The existing legal framework, combined with the technological intricacies of contemporary payment systems, implies that putting free banking principles into practise necessitates significant revisions to current financial statutes and regulatory frameworks.

6. SYNTHESIS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS:

6.1 Technology revolution

The rise of Web 3.0 technologies, built upon principles of decentralisation and peer-to-peer coordination, has converged with key insights from Austrian economic thought. Thinkers like Hayek (Hayek, 1945) [2] emphasised the importance of distributed knowledge and spontaneous order in facilitating economic activity. This alignment is evident in the development of smart contracts and decentralised applications (DApps), which operationalise Hayek's ideas by enabling direct coordination between economic actors without reliance on central intermediaries (Buterin, 2014) [50].

Moreover, the growth of decentralised finance (DeFi) protocols exemplifies what Mises (Mises, 1949) [1] termed "catallactic" processes, where monetary order arises organically from voluntary exchange rather than centralised planning. This vision of technological advancement fostering greater individual economic freedom aligns with Rothbard (Rothbard, 1992) [51] and other Austrian economists. The convergence of Web 3.0 technologies with these foundational Austrian principles demonstrates how decentralised systems can enhance market coordination and economic dynamism.

Digital contracts and protocols strengthen property rights protection through formalised security mechanisms (Szabo, 1997) [52], whereas token economies create new mechanisms for price discovery that echo Hayek's (Hayek, 1990) [41] advocacy for competing private currencies. This technological infrastructure reduces information asymmetries and coordination costs that Kirzner (Kirzner, 1973) [25] identified as barriers to entrepreneurial discovery, creating a more efficient marketplace for decentralised

exchange and value coordination. decentralised price feeds mirror Hayek's distributed knowledge concept, that is, multiple independent data sources aggregate real market prices rather than central planning. Smart contracts based on oracle data represent market participants acting on price signals, enabling faster coordination through code (Buterin, 2014) [50].

The quantum computing paradigm challenges the cryptographic foundations that enable decentralised coordination in blockchain networks (NIST, 2022) [53]. This technological shift necessitates fundamental changes in how digital property rights are secured and verified, potentially altering the mechanisms through which market participants engage in a spontaneous order (Alagic et al., 2022) [54]. The evolution of post-quantum cryptography is crucial for preserving the integrity of decentralised economic coordination.

6.2 Research Opportunities

The intersection of computational processes and economic coordination provides a rich theoretical foundation for extending Austrian principles. At its core, economics deals with human action, value scales, and exchange (Mises, 1949) [1], whereas computer science addresses algorithms, state transitions, and information processing. Smart contracts and decentralised networks offer new mechanisms for knowledge coordination, with algorithmic protocols managing value transfers much like market prices coordinate dispersed information. Digital assets and stablecoins challenge traditional monetary theory by introducing programmatic scarcity and automated markets that parallel spontaneous market order. The temporal structure of production (Garrison, 2000) [3] is a new expression in blockchain's immutable transaction ordering and consensus mechanisms. Yet fundamental Austrian insights into subjective value and human action remain critical: computation enhances rather than replaces market discovery processes. This synthesis proposes a closer look at how technological capabilities either enhance or limit economic coordination while maintaining key perspectives on knowledge, calculation, and the discovery process of entrepreneurship.

7. CONCLUSION:

This study of intertemporal coordination mechanisms reveals how interest rates serve as critical signals for aligning complex production structures across time in market economies. This coordination process is essential for transforming heterogeneous capital goods into complementary productive structures that anticipate future consumption patterns. Although monetary interventions can systematically distort these coordination mechanisms, leading to both malinvestment and overconsumption during business cycles, the market price system continues to facilitate knowledge transmission and entrepreneurial discovery. The empirical evidence, particularly from significant economic events, demonstrates that monetary expansion can falsify economic calculations, affecting both entrepreneurial profit estimates and household wealth perceptions. Looking ahead, while technological innovations like Web 3.0 and decentralised systems offer new tools for market coordination, the fundamental principles of temporal coordination through price signals and interest rates remain central to understanding how dispersed market participants align their production plans across time.

REFERENCES:

[1] Mises, L. V. (1949). *Human action*. Ludwig von Mises Institute. Google Scholar↗

[2] Hayek, F. A. (1945). The use of knowledge in society. *American Economic Review, 35(4),* 519-530. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1809376

[3] Garrison, R.W. (2000). *Time and money: The macroeconomics of capital structure (1st ed.).* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203208083

[4] Horwitz, S. (2000). *Microfoundations and macroeconomics: An Austrian perspective (1st ed.).* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203456309

[5] Manish, G. P., & Powell, B. (2014). Capital theory and the process of inter-temporal coordination: The Austrian contribution to the theory of economic growth. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, *42*(2), 133-142. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11293-014-9404-8

[6] Garrison, R. W. (1984). Time and money: the universals of macroeconomic theorizing. *Journal of Macroeconomics*, *6*(2), 197-213. https://doi.org/10.1016/0164-0704(84)90005-3

[7] Lewin, P. (2016). Plan-coordination: Who needs it? *The Review of Austrian Economics*, *29*, 299-313. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11138-015-0312-1

[8] Carilli, A. M., & Dempster, G. M. (2001). Expectations in Austrian business cycle theory: an application of the prisoner's dilemma. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, *14*(4), 319-330. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011985113936

[9] Salerno, J. T. (1993). Mises and Hayek dehomogenized. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, *6*(2), 113-146. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00842707

[10] Böhm-Bawerk, E. v. (1890/1959). *Capital and interest: A critical history of economic theory* (W. Smart, Trans.). Macmillan and Co and New York Press. https://cdn.mises.org/Capital%20and%20Interest_0.pdf

[11] Rothbard, M. N. (1962/2004). *Man, economy, and state with power and market*. Ludwig von Mises Institute. https://mises.org/library/book/man-economy-and-state-power-and-market

[12] Lewin, P. (1999). *Capital in disequilibrium: The role of capital in a changing world (2nd ed.).* Routledge. https://cdn.mises.org/Capital%20in%20Disequilibrium_2.pdf

[13] Hayek, F.A. (1941/2009). *The pure theory of capital*. Routledge. https://mises-media.s3.amazonaws.com/Pure%20Theory%20of%20Capital_4.pdf

[14] Lachmann, L. M. (1956). *Capital and its structure*. Sheed Andrews and McMeel, Inc. https://cdn.mises.org/Capital%20and%20Its%20Structure_2.pdf

[15] Keynes, J. M. (1936). The general theory of employment, interest and money. https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/economics/keynes/general-theory/

[16] Boettke, P. J. (2012). *Living economics*. Oakland, CA: Independent Institute. Google Scholar↗

[17] Horwitz, S., & Boettke, P. J. (2005). The limits of economic expertise: Prophets, engineers, and the state in the history of development economics. *History of Political Economy, 37 (Suppl 1),* 10-39. Google Scholar↗

[18] Boettke, P. J. (2002). Relevance as a virtue in economics. *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics, 5(4)*. 31-36. https://cdn.mises.org/qjae5_4_3.pdf

[19] Salerno, J. T. (1994). Reply to Leland B. Yeager on "Mises and Hayek on Calculation and Knowledge". *The Review of Austrian Economics*, *7*(2), 111-125. Google Scholar↗

[20] Hayek, F. A. (1937). Economics and knowledge. *Economica*, *4*(13), 33-54. https://mises.org/articles-interest/economics-and-knowledge

[21] Lewin, P., & Cachanosky, N. (2019). The average period of production: The history and rehabilitation of an idea. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought, 41(4),* 595-613. Google Scholar↗

[22] Wicksell, K. (1898/1936). *Interest and prices*. Originally published in 1898. Translation published by the Royal Economic Society, London, 1936. https://mises.org/library/book/interest-and-prices

[23] Fisher, I. (1930). *The Theory of interest, as determined by impatience to spend income and opportunity to invest it.* Macmillan, 1930. http://files.libertyfund.org/files/1416/Fisher_0219.pdf

[24] Agnès Festré. Knowledge and individual behaviour in the Austrian tradition of business cycles: von Mises vs. Hayek. *History of Economic Ideas, 2003, 11* (1), 13-45. https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00272394/document

[25] Kirzner, I. M. (1973). *Competition and entrepreneurship*. University of Chicago Press. Google Scholar↗

[26] Cowen, T. (1997). *Risk and business cycles*: *New and old Austrian perspectives*. Routledge. Google Scholar↗

[27] Hayek, F. A. (1931). *Prices and production.* Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.275518/page/n1/mode/2up

[28] Oppers, S. E. (2002). The Austrian theory of business cycles: Old lessons for modern economic policy? *(IMF Working Paper No. 02/2). International Monetary Fund*. https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2002/wp0202.pdf

[29] Salerno, J. T. (2012). A reformulation of Austrian business cycle theory in light of the financial crisis. *The Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics, 15(1),* 3-44. https://mises.org/quarterly-journal-austrian-economics/reformulation-austrian-business-cycle-theory-light-financial-crisis

[30] Rothbard, M. N. (1963/2000). *America's great depression* (5th ed.). Ludwig von Mises Institute. https://mises.org/library/book/americas-great-depression

[31] Hume, D. (2007). *Writings on Economics (1st ed.)*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315136004

[32] White, L. H. (1999). *The theory of monetary institutions*. Blackwell Publishers. Google Scholar↗

[33] Selgin, G. A., & White, L. H. (1994). How would the invisible hand handle money? *Journal of Economic Literature, 32*(4), 1718-1749. Google Scholar↗

[34] Selgin, G. A., & White, L. H. (1987). The evolution of a free banking system. *Economic Inquiry*, *25*(3), 439-457. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7295.1987.tb00752.x

[35] Dowd, K. (1992). *The experience of free banking*. Routledge. Google Scholar↗

[36] Rockoff, H. (1975). The free banking era: A reexamination. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, 7*(2), 141-167. https://ideas.repec.org/a/mcb/jmoncb/v6y1974i2p141-67.html

[37] Horwitz, S. (1992). *Monetary evolution, free banking, and economic order*. Westview Press. Google Scholar↗

[38] O'Driscoll, G. P., & Rizzo, M. J. (1985). *The economics of time and ignorance*. Basil Blackwell. https://cdn.mises.org/RAE1_1_11.pdf

[39] Hayek, F. A. (1967). *Prices and production and other works: F. A. Hayek on money, the business cycle, and the gold standard.* Ludwig von Mises Institute. https://cdn.mises.org/prices_and_production_and_other_works.pdf

[40] White, L. H. (1984). *Free banking in Britain: Theory, experience and debate, 1800-1845.* Cambridge University Press. Google Scholar↗

[41] Hayek, F. A. (1990). *Denationalisation of money: The argument refined.* The Institute of Economic Affairs. https://cdn.mises.org/Denationalisation%20of%20Money%20The%20Argument%20Refined_5.pdf

[42] Selgin, G. (1996). *Bank deregulation and monetary order*. Routledge. Google Scholar↗

[43] Brand, K., Bielecki, M., & Penalver, A. (2018). The natural rate of interest: Estimates, drivers, and challenges to monetary policy. *Occasional Papers 217, European Central Bank*. https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/scpops/ecb.op217.en.pdf

[44] Borio, C., Disyatat, P., & Rungcharoenkitkul, P. (2017). Why so low for so long? A long-term view of real interest rates. *BIS Working Papers 685, Bank for International Settlements.* https://www.bis.org/publ/work685.htm

[45] Woodford, M. (2003). *Interest and prices: Foundations of a theory of monetary policy.* Princeton University Press. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/4857098_Interest_and_Prices_Foundations_of_a_Theory_of_Monetary_Policy

[46] Tamborini, R., Mazzocchi, R., & Trautwein, H.M. (2014). Wicksell, Keynes, and the new neoclassical synthesis: What can we learn for monetary policy? *Economic Notes, 43(2),* 79-114. https://www.academia.edu/42004367/Wicksell_Keynes_and_the_New_Neoclassical_Synthesis_What_Can_We_Learn_for_Monetary_Policy

[47] Mises, L. (1981). *The theory of money and credit*. Ludwig von Mises Institute. https://mises.org/library/book/theory-money-and-credit

[48] Selgin, G. (2020). The rise and fall of the gold standard in the United States. *Cato Journal, 33(2),* 19-20. https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa729_web.pdf

[49] Arner, D. W., Buckley, R. P., Zetzsche, D. A., & Didenko, A. N. (2020). After Libra, digital yuan and COVID-19: Central bank digital currencies and the new world of money and payment systems. *(EBI Working Paper Series No. 66), European Banking Institute,* 36-37. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3622311

[50] Buterin, V. (2014). A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform [White paper]. *Ethereum Foundation*. https://ethereum.org/en/whitepaper/

[51] Rothbard, M. N. (1992). Freedom, inequality, primitivism, and the division of labor. *Mises Institute*. https://mises.org/mises-daily/freedom-inequality-primitivism-and-division-labor

[52] Szabo, N. (1997). Formalizing and securing relationships on public networks. *First Monday*, *2*(9) para 2. https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v2i9.548

[53] National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2022). Post-quantum cryptography PQC standardization process [White paper]. *National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce*. https://csrc.nist.gov/pqc-standardization

[54] Alagic, G., Apon, D., Cooper, D., Dang, Q., Dang, T., Kelsey, J., Lichtinger, J., Miller, C., Moody, D., Peralta, R., Perlner, R., Robinson, A., Smith-Tone, D., & Liu, Y.-K. (2022). Status report on the third round of the NIST post-quantum cryptography standardization process (NIST IR 8413-upd1), p.1, *National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce*. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8413-upd1