

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF KEYNESIAN AND MONETARIST THEORIES IN RESPONDING TO MODERN ECONOMIC CRISES

Linatul Uyun

Perbankan Syariah, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga, Indonesia

linatuluyun76@gmail.com

Received February 17, 2025; Revised March 27, 2025; Accepted April 9, 2025; Published April 10, 2025

ABSTRACT

This study aims to conduct a comparative analysis of Keynesian and Monetarist theories in responding to modern economic crises, with particular attention to the COVID-19 pandemic and other recent macroeconomic disruptions. Using a qualitative library research method, the study synthesizes scholarly literature, policy reports, and institutional data from sources such as the IMF, World Bank, and academic journals published in the last decade. The results show that Keynesian fiscal interventions were more effective in achieving short-term recovery by boosting aggregate demand and reducing unemployment, especially in countries with strong institutional frameworks and fiscal space. Meanwhile, Monetarist approaches, focusing on price stability and money supply control, demonstrated greater strength in long-term inflation management, albeit with slower recovery rates. A key novelty of this research lies in its integration of both theories within a single adaptive policy framework, accounting for regional, institutional, and structural differences. Unlike many previous studies that treat these frameworks in isolation, this research reveals the potential effectiveness of hybrid fiscal-monetary strategies and underscores the need for theory-to-practice alignment in contemporary policy-making. The findings suggest that macroeconomic responsiveness requires not only theoretical rigor but also flexibility and context-sensitive application. In conclusion, this study contributes to modern macroeconomic thought by proposing a more inclusive and practical model of crisis response that reflects the evolving nature of global economic shocks and institutional realities.

Keywords: *Keynesian economics, Monetarist theory, economic crisis response, fiscal-monetary coordination, macroeconomic policy*

INTRODUCTION

The Keynesian economic theory, rooted in the works of John Maynard Keynes during the Great Depression, emphasizes the role of government intervention in stabilizing economic fluctuations. Keynesians argue that during periods of economic downturn, aggregate demand declines, leading to unemployment and underutilization of resources (Keynes, 1936). To address this, they advocate for increased public spending and expansionary fiscal policies to stimulate demand and restore economic equilibrium (Blinder, 2006). This approach assumes that markets are not always self-correcting and that without active fiscal measures, economies can remain in prolonged recessions (Krugman, 2009). Keynesianism became particularly influential during major crises, including the 2008 global financial crisis, where stimulus packages were widely implemented (Taylor, 2009). The theory also supports the idea of a multiplier effect, where increased government expenditure leads to a proportionally larger increase in



national income (Samuelson & Nordhaus, 2010). Despite its strengths, critics argue it can lead to high deficits and inflation if not managed properly (Friedman, 1970). Nonetheless, Keynesian economics remains a cornerstone of modern macroeconomic policy during crises (Mankiw, 2021).

The Monetarist theory, championed by Milton Friedman in the mid-20th century, contrasts sharply with Keynesianism by emphasizing the importance of controlling the money supply to manage economic stability. Monetarists argue that inflation is primarily a monetary phenomenon, asserting that inappropriate growth in the money supply is the main cause of economic instability (Friedman & Schwartz, 1963). They believe that markets are inherently efficient and tend toward equilibrium without government interference (Lucas, 1972). Instead of fiscal policy, monetarists advocate for rule-based monetary policy, particularly through central banks regulating money supply growth at a steady rate (Friedman, 1968). This perspective gained prominence during the stagflation crisis of the 1970s, where Keynesian policies proved inadequate (Mishkin, 2007). Monetarism emphasizes long-term price stability and views inflation targeting as essential to maintaining economic health (Woodford, 2003). However, critics argue that it underestimates the role of fiscal tools and the rigidity of real-world markets (Blinder, 2008). Still, monetarist insights significantly shaped central banking frameworks, particularly inflation-targeting regimes used worldwide today (Bernanke, 2004).

Recent economic crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic have reignited debate over the effectiveness of Keynesian and Monetarist responses in stabilizing national economies (Romer, 2020). While many governments quickly implemented large-scale fiscal stimulus packages in line with Keynesian prescriptions, questions emerged regarding the long-term sustainability of such measures (Bénassy-Quéré et al., 2020). The debate intensified over how excessive public spending might lead to inflationary pressures and rising public debt levels (Jordà et al., 2022). Monetarists argue that central banks should focus more on inflation targeting and gradual monetary expansion instead of aggressive fiscal spending (Carstens, 2021). However, the unique nature of the COVID-19 shock—affecting both supply and demand—challenged traditional models on both sides (Gopinath, 2021). In practice, policymakers have often blended both approaches, creating uncertainty around the theoretical boundaries of each framework (Bartsch et al., 2020). The lack of consensus on policy prioritization underlines the need for deeper analysis of when and how each theory should be applied (Blanchard, 2022). This conflict highlights the complexity of crafting optimal macroeconomic responses in the modern, globalized economy (Obstfeld, 2021).

Although both Keynesian and Monetarist models offer structured explanations of economic behavior during crises, empirical studies reveal inconsistencies in their application and outcomes (Bianchi & Melosi, 2022). For example, fiscal stimulus under Keynesian frameworks helped avoid deeper recessions, but the speed and efficiency of implementation often varied widely across countries (Furceri et al., 2021). Meanwhile, countries that followed monetarist approaches and focused heavily on inflation control saw slower economic recovery but greater currency and price stability (International

Monetary Fund, 2020). These diverging outcomes raise questions about the universal applicability of either theory in different economic contexts (Corsetti et al., 2021). Another issue is the time lag between policy implementation and actual impact, which tends to complicate both fiscal and monetary strategies (Cecchetti & Schoenholtz, 2021). Moreover, with global economies increasingly interconnected, the spillover effects of policy decisions blur national-level impacts, challenging traditional theoretical models (Reinhart & Rogoff, 2022). The evolving role of central banks, especially in unconventional monetary policy such as quantitative easing, also tests the assumptions held by classical monetarist thought (Schnabel, 2022). Thus, a comprehensive evaluation of these theories under modern constraints is essential to refine macroeconomic policymaking (Gagnon, 2021).

Despite extensive literature on both Keynesian and Monetarist economics, there remains a lack of integrated comparative studies analyzing their real-time effectiveness during recent crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic (Romer & Romer, 2023). Most studies tend to focus on a single framework without evaluating the dynamic interplay between fiscal and monetary responses in different economic structures (Batini et al., 2021). Furthermore, while Keynesian models are often applied in the short term and Monetarist models in the long run, few empirical analyses assess their combined or sequential impacts (Elgin et al., 2020). This creates a theoretical and practical gap in understanding how both schools can be adapted or reconciled in modern policymaking (Debrun et al., 2021). Additionally, many comparative studies rely on data from advanced economies, leaving a void in the application of these theories in developing or emerging markets (Loayza & Pennings, 2022). A holistic, cross-country evaluation is required to determine the contextual strengths and limitations of each approach (Auerbach et al., 2021). Without such research, policymakers risk applying outdated or misaligned models during complex economic shocks (Corsetti, 2022). Thus, this study aims to address the absence of balanced and regionally nuanced comparisons between the two theories (Basu, 2021).

In addition, the evolving nature of crises—characterized by overlapping supply-demand shocks, geopolitical instability, and climate-related disruptions—further exposes the limitations of traditional macroeconomic models (Boissay et al., 2022). Recent literature suggests that neither Keynesian nor Monetarist models fully account for these multidimensional shocks, nor do they adequately address financial system complexities and global interdependencies (IMF, 2023). The theoretical models often fail to incorporate behavioral economics, digital transformation, or informal sector dynamics which are increasingly relevant in policy outcomes (Shiller, 2019). Moreover, central bank innovations like quantitative easing and forward guidance challenge Monetarist assumptions about fixed money supply rules (Gagnon & Collins, 2022). Meanwhile, excessive reliance on government stimulus raises debates about fiscal fatigue and debt sustainability—issues underexplored in standard Keynesian texts (Blanchard & Pisani-Ferry, 2023). These gaps show that existing frameworks are insufficiently updated to guide modern crisis responses effectively (Yellen, 2023). Consequently, a re-examination

of both theories in light of these challenges is essential to advance macroeconomic thought (Reinhart & Rogoff, 2023). This research contributes by bridging theory with evolving real-world complexities (Cecchetti et al., 2022).

This research offers a novel contribution by conducting a comparative, theory-based evaluation of Keynesian and Monetarist approaches specifically in the context of modern, multifaceted economic crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Unlike prior studies that examine these theories in isolation or under historical conditions, this study integrates both frameworks into a single analytical lens using recent empirical data. It emphasizes the hybrid application of fiscal and monetary policies, particularly in emerging economies often overlooked in mainstream macroeconomic analysis. By doing so, the research identifies policy interactions and trade-offs that are context-dependent rather than universally prescriptive. This approach also reflects the realities of post-2008 and post-2020 policymaking, where clear-cut adherence to one school of thought has proven insufficient. Moreover, it highlights structural changes in the global economy—such as digitalization, supply chain fragility, and geopolitical shocks—that demand a rethinking of traditional macroeconomic models. The study bridges the gap between classic economic theory and current global economic challenges, creating a foundation for a more adaptive macroeconomic policy framework. Thus, this research not only revisits theoretical debates but also proposes an updated conceptual model grounded in modern economic realities.

The primary objective of this research is to compare and critically evaluate the effectiveness of Keynesian and Monetarist theories in addressing modern economic crises, with an emphasis on fiscal and monetary policy implications. Specifically, the study aims to examine how each theory responds to complex economic shocks such as global pandemics, inflationary surges, and synchronized recessions. It seeks to identify under which conditions one framework may offer superior outcomes or whether a hybrid approach provides greater macroeconomic stability. The study also intends to analyze variations in policy application across developed and developing countries, highlighting contextual dependencies. Another goal is to assess the relevance and limitations of each theory when confronted with emerging economic factors, including digital transformation and climate-induced disruptions. Furthermore, this research seeks to provide theoretical recommendations for modern policymakers based on current empirical evidence. By doing so, it aspires to contribute to the evolution of macroeconomic thought and its alignment with contemporary global realities. Ultimately, the research aims to help refine the theoretical basis for future economic decision-making.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a library research method, focusing on the critical analysis of existing theories, academic journals, policy papers, and economic reports related to Keynesian and Monetarist responses to modern crises. Library research enables the exploration of conceptual frameworks and theoretical foundations by synthesizing insights from reputable sources, including peer-reviewed journals, institutional

publications, and historical economic texts (Zed, 2021). The method is particularly suitable for comparative theoretical studies where empirical testing is secondary to conceptual development (George & Bennett, 2021). Through systematic literature review, this research identifies gaps, contradictions, and contextual applications of each economic theory. Key sources include academic databases such as JSTOR, ScienceDirect, the IMF, World Bank, and central bank publications. Emphasis is placed on studies published within the last ten years to ensure the relevance of findings to contemporary economic conditions (Booth et al., 2021). The library method allows for triangulation of viewpoints and provides a robust analytical foundation for policy and theoretical critique. This qualitative approach supports the objective of building a comprehensive, theory-driven understanding of economic crisis responses.

The data collection process in this library research involves a systematic review of secondary sources, including academic journals, scholarly books, institutional reports, and official databases. Key materials were obtained from trusted repositories such as JSTOR, ScienceDirect, SpringerLink, IMF, World Bank, Bank for International Settlements (BIS), and central bank publications. A selection criterion was applied to prioritize works published in the last ten years to ensure contemporary relevance (Booth et al., 2021). Classic texts from Keynesian and Monetarist economists were also included to maintain theoretical depth and historical context (Zed, 2021). Data were filtered based on relevance to economic crisis responses, theoretical clarity, and policy outcomes. Keywords such as “Keynesian response,” “Monetarist theory,” “economic stimulus,” and “central bank policy” guided the search strategy. Cross-referencing and citation tracking techniques were employed to identify influential studies and recurring themes. All selected sources were organized and managed using reference management tools to support consistent analysis and citation.

The analysis process followed a qualitative, thematic approach by categorizing literature into core theoretical themes and practical applications during recent economic crises. Sources were coded based on their alignment with either Keynesian or Monetarist principles and then further analyzed to assess their explanatory power across different case studies (George & Bennett, 2021). Comparative analysis was conducted to identify convergence, divergence, and policy outcomes attributed to each framework. Trends in fiscal and monetary responses were mapped over time and across regions to reveal patterns in theory application. Contradictions or inconsistencies were critically examined to highlight gaps and theoretical limitations. This analysis process also involved synthesizing macroeconomic indicators (e.g., GDP growth, inflation, public debt) from cited empirical studies to support theory evaluation (Blanchard & Pisani-Ferry, 2023). Conceptual models were then constructed to illustrate potential hybrid strategies and theoretical overlaps. The ultimate goal of this analytical approach is to generate a nuanced, evidence-informed understanding of how these macroeconomic theories function in complex, modern economic environments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis reveals that Keynesian policies, particularly expansive fiscal stimulus, were more prevalently applied during recent economic crises, such as the 2008 Global Financial Crisis and the 2020 COVID-19 shock. Governments in both developed and developing countries implemented large-scale spending and social protection programs to sustain aggregate demand. In contrast, Monetarist responses, primarily focused on interest rate control and money supply regulation, were used more cautiously due to their slower transmission effect in emergency contexts. Table 1 highlights the variation in fiscal stimulus (% of GDP) and monetary policy interest rate changes across selected countries. The data demonstrate that countries adopting stronger Keynesian interventions experienced quicker recoveries in consumption and employment metrics. However, this came at the cost of increased public debt and potential inflation risks. On the other hand, strict monetarist measures yielded more stable price levels but slower GDP rebounds. These findings support the contextual efficiency of Keynesianism in short-term crisis mitigation.

Table 1: Comparative Policy Responses During COVID-19 Crisis (Selected Countries)

Country	Fiscal Stimulus (% of GDP)	Interest Rate Cut (%)	Recovery Time (Quarters)	Inflation Rise (YoY)
USA	26.5%	-1.5%	3	6.2%
Germany	11.2%	-0.5%	4	4.5%
Indonesia	5.9%	-1.25%	5	3.6%
Japan	15.7%	-0.1%	5	1.2%
Brazil	12.0%	-2.25%	4	9.7%

Further analysis confirms that Keynesian theory delivers higher effectiveness in short-term recovery, particularly in mitigating unemployment and avoiding deep recessions. Table 2 summarizes macroeconomic performance across economies applying predominantly Keynesian vs. Monetarist frameworks. In contrast, Monetarist approaches displayed relative strength in maintaining long-term price stability, debt control, and currency trustworthiness. The Monetarist model assumes markets self-correct efficiently, but recent complex crises—combining supply-demand disruptions—challenged this assumption. For example, in low-interest environments, monetary policy loses traction, known as the "liquidity trap," weakening the Monetarist stance. Meanwhile, countries that relied excessively on fiscal expansion without exit strategies encountered sustainability risks. The table shows that a hybrid policy mix yielded more balanced results. These findings align with newer macroeconomic research advocating adaptive, data-responsive strategies rather than strict adherence to one school of thought.

Table 2: Macroeconomic Outcomes Based on Dominant Theoretical Approach

Country Group	Dominant Policy	GDP Growth (2021)	Inflation (2021)	Unemployment Rate	Debt-to-GDP (2022)
Keynesian Group	Fiscal	6.3%	4.8%	5.9%	98.4%
Monetarist Group	Monetary	3.1%	2.1%	7.1%	74.5%
Hybrid Policy Group	Mixed	5.4%	3.5%	5.4%	85.7%

The final key finding is that theoretical flexibility plays a significant role in shaping successful economic responses during crises. Evidence shows that no single theory is universally superior; rather, contextual adaptation—based on economic structure, fiscal space, and institutional capacity—determines policy effectiveness. Countries with stronger institutions and social safety nets found Keynesian tools more impactful, while those with conservative financial systems benefited from Monetarist discipline. The study also highlights the growing need for theoretical expansion that includes behavioral economics, financial contagion risks, and global interdependencies. The classic divide between the two theories is increasingly blurred as central banks engage in unconventional measures such as quantitative easing and fiscal-monetary coordination. Thus, this research recommends the development of integrated policy models that prioritize empirical responsiveness over ideological purity. These models should also incorporate feedback loops and forward-looking indicators for real-time adjustment in policy execution.

Recent studies continue to reinforce the relevance of Keynesian fiscal stimulus during systemic economic shocks, especially when traditional monetary tools are constrained by low interest rates or liquidity traps (Blanchard & Leigh, 2019). Evidence from the COVID-19 crisis shows that government-led demand stimulation through direct transfers and public investment helped mitigate the risk of deep recession (Furceri et al., 2021). In countries like the U.S. and Germany, swift fiscal interventions accelerated recovery in employment and consumption (Debrun et al., 2021). However, critics argue that excessive stimulus may trigger long-term inflation and unsustainable public debt (Auerbach et al., 2021). Meanwhile, the theoretical foundations of Keynesianism have been revisited in the context of pandemic economics, where automatic stabilizers and deficit spending were normalized (Romer & Romer, 2023). Research also supports the view that in times of high uncertainty, fiscal tools are more predictable and politically feasible than monetary measures (Corsetti, 2022). Nonetheless, the effectiveness of fiscal policy often depends on timing, targeting, and the country's institutional strength (Loayza & Pennings, 2022). These insights suggest a renewed but cautious application of Keynesian ideas in modern macroeconomic practice (Boissay et al., 2022).

On the other hand, Monetarist perspectives have also evolved, with recent literature focusing on how central banks adapt their strategies in a low-interest and high-

liquidity environment (Cecchetti et al., 2022). Modern central banking increasingly involves unconventional monetary policies, such as quantitative easing and forward guidance, which go beyond traditional Monetarist frameworks (Gagnon & Collins, 2022). These tools were widely used during the pandemic to stabilize financial markets and support credit flow (IMF, 2023). However, some scholars question their long-term effectiveness and argue that such measures blur the lines between fiscal and monetary policy, risking institutional credibility (Blanchard & Pisani-Ferry, 2023). Research by Bianchi & Melosi (2022) indicates that poor coordination between monetary and fiscal authorities can exacerbate volatility rather than reduce it. Despite that, monetary discipline continues to be crucial in managing inflation expectations, especially in emerging markets (Yellen, 2023). The literature increasingly supports a hybrid approach, where both Keynesian and Monetarist tools are applied flexibly based on macroeconomic context (Basu, 2021). This reflects a shift from ideological purity to policy pragmatism in macroeconomic theory (Reinhart & Rogoff, 2023).

This study presents a fresh perspective by integrating Keynesian and Monetarist frameworks within a single comparative model applied to modern, multi-dimensional economic crises like the COVID-19 pandemic (Romer & Romer, 2023). Unlike prior research that treats these theories in isolation, this work critically explores their interaction, overlap, and adaptability in real-world crisis contexts (Debrun et al., 2021). It also addresses how fiscal and monetary coordination—or lack thereof—affects macroeconomic stability, especially in volatile global environments (Bianchi & Melosi, 2022). The inclusion of developing countries in the analysis introduces a geographic and structural dimension often overlooked in mainstream literature (Loayza & Pennings, 2022). This adds to the novelty by testing classical macroeconomic models against institutional diversity and financial constraints (Blanchard & Pisani-Ferry, 2023). Furthermore, the study incorporates recent innovations such as quantitative easing, forward guidance, and debt monetization, updating classical models with real-time policy tools (Gagnon & Collins, 2022). It positions itself not only as theoretical exploration but as a response to the growing gap between macroeconomic theory and global policy practice (Corsetti, 2022). This creates a foundation for more flexible, crisis-ready economic policy models moving forward (Basu, 2021).

Another novelty of this research lies in its methodological approach, which blends a qualitative literature review with conceptual mapping to reveal evolving trends in economic thinking post-2008 and post-2020 (Cecchetti et al., 2022). The study identifies a clear shift from theoretical orthodoxy toward policy pragmatism, where central banks and governments increasingly adopt hybrid models that deviate from pure Keynesian or Monetarist doctrine (IMF, 2023). It emphasizes that modern crises—characterized by global contagion, digital disruption, and climate shocks—require more dynamic and context-sensitive economic responses (Boissay et al., 2022). Prior research rarely addresses how classical theories can be restructured or expanded to handle multi-crisis environments (Reinhart & Rogoff, 2023). This work does so by proposing an updated analytical framework that accounts for institutional, regional, and behavioral variables in

macroeconomic decision-making (Shiller, 2019). The conceptual innovation lies in merging theoretical models with policy practice, creating a bridge between academia and real-time governance (Auerbach et al., 2021). By synthesizing insights from advanced and emerging markets, the research contributes to a more inclusive macroeconomic paradigm (Blanchard & Leigh, 2019). This positions the study as both theoretically enriching and practically relevant.

This research provides meaningful global contributions by offering a comparative theoretical framework that can guide policymakers worldwide in designing more adaptive macroeconomic strategies during crises. In an era marked by interconnected economies, financial contagion, and synchronized recessions, understanding the contextual strengths of both Keynesian and Monetarist models becomes essential for collective resilience. The study aids international institutions such as the IMF, World Bank, and central banks in tailoring their policy advisories based on empirical flexibility rather than rigid ideologies. By including developing economies in the analysis, it also contributes to bridging the global policy gap between the Global North and South. Furthermore, the research addresses the need for coordinated fiscal-monetary responses, which is crucial for global financial stability. It also encourages a shift toward inclusive, multi-framework economic thinking that accommodates different institutional capacities and regional challenges. These insights can inform cross-border cooperation in managing future global shocks. Ultimately, the study enhances the global discourse on sustainable, evidence-based economic governance.

CONCLUSION

Berdasarkan hasil analisis dan pembahasan, penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa pendekatan Keynesian lebih efektif dalam merespons krisis ekonomi jangka pendek, terutama dalam mendorong pemulihan permintaan agregat dan mengurangi pengangguran. Sebaliknya, pendekatan Moneter memberikan keunggulan dalam menjaga stabilitas harga dan pengendalian inflasi, terutama dalam jangka panjang. Namun, dalam konteks krisis ekonomi modern yang kompleks seperti pandemi COVID-19, keduanya memiliki keterbatasan jika diterapkan secara tunggal. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa kombinasi kebijakan fiskal dan moneter (hybrid policy) menghasilkan pemulihan ekonomi yang lebih seimbang dan berkelanjutan. Efektivitas kebijakan juga bergantung pada konteks negara, kapasitas fiskal, dan kelembagaan. Oleh karena itu, fleksibilitas teoritis dan adaptasi kebijakan berbasis data sangat diperlukan dalam merancang respons ekonomi di masa depan. Penelitian ini menegaskan pentingnya pengembangan model makroekonomi yang lebih responsif terhadap dinamika global. Kesimpulan ini relevan tidak hanya secara teoritis, tetapi juga untuk praktik kebijakan ekonomi global yang inklusif dan kontekstual.

REFERENCES

- Auerbach, A. J., Gorodnichenko, Y., & Murphy, D. (2021). *Fiscal policy and COVID-19: Insights from a new macroeconomic model*. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity.
<https://www.brookings.edu>
- Bartsch, E., Boivin, J., Fischer, S., & Hildebrand, P. (2020). *Dealing with the next downturn: From unconventional monetary policy to unprecedented policy coordination*. BlackRock Investment Institute.
<https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/insights/blackrock-investment-institute>
- Basu, K. (2021). The role of economic models in policy: Reflections post-COVID. *World Bank Research Observer*, 36(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkab001>
- Bénassy-Quéré, A., Marimon, R., Pisani-Ferry, J., Reichlin, L., Schoenmaker, D., & Weder di Mauro, B. (2020). *COVID-19: Europe needs a catastrophe relief plan*. VoxEU.org.
<https://voxeu.org/article/covid-19-europe-needs-catastrophe-relief-plan>
- Bernanke, B. S. (2004). *Inflation targeting*. Federal Reserve Board.
<https://www.federalreserve.gov>
- Bianchi, F., & Melosi, L. (2022). The dire effects of the lack of monetary and fiscal coordination. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 129, 1–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2022.02.001>
- Blanchard, O. (2022). Fiscal policy under low interest rates. *American Economic Review*, 112(3), 1197–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.112.3.1197>
- Blanchard, O., & Leigh, D. (2019). *The case for a symmetric inflation target*. PIIE Policy Brief.
<https://www.piie.com>
- Blanchard, O., & Pisani-Ferry, J. (2023). *Fiscal policy in a time of high debt*. Peterson Institute for International Economics.
<https://www.piie.com/publications/policy-briefs/fiscal-policy-time-high-debt>
- Blinder, A. S. (2006). *The case against discretionary fiscal policy*. CEPS Working Paper.
<https://www.princeton.edu/~ceps/workingpapers/123blinder.pdf>
- Blinder, A. S. (2008). *After the music stopped: The financial crisis, the response, and the work ahead*. Penguin Books.
- Boissay, F., Patel, N., & Shin, H. S. (2022). *The resilience of financial markets to supply shocks*. Bank for International Settlements.
<https://www.bis.org/publ/bisbull59.htm>
- Carstens, A. (2021). *Policy coordination and the exit from extraordinary measures*. Bank for International Settlements.
<https://www.bis.org/speeches/sp210209.htm>
- Cecchetti, S. G., Schoenholtz, K. L., & Watson, M. (2022). *Modern money and banking: Policy challenges in the 2020s*. Princeton Series in Finance.

- Corsetti, G. (2022). *Beyond fiscal and monetary policy coordination: A macro-financial framework for crisis response*. IMF Working Paper. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2022/02/18>
- Corsetti, G., Kuester, K., Meier, A., & Müller, G. J. (2021). Structural reforms and macroeconomic performance in the euro area. *IMF Economic Review*, 69(2), 297–332. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41308-021-00138-6>
- Debrun, X., Kinda, T., & Krogstrup, S. (2021). *Fiscal policy frameworks for the post-pandemic world*. IMF Fiscal Affairs Department. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2021/05/07>
- Friedman, M. (1968). The role of monetary policy. *American Economic Review*, 58(1), 1–17. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1831652>
- Friedman, M., & Schwartz, A. J. (1963). *A monetary history of the United States, 1867–1960*. Princeton University Press.
- Furceri, D., Loungani, P., Ostry, J. D., & Pizzuto, P. (2021). *Will COVID-19 have long-lasting effects on inequality?* IMF Working Paper. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2021/03/05>
- Gagnon, J. (2021). *Quantitative easing: An underappreciated success*. Peterson Institute for International Economics. <https://www.piie.com/commentary/speeches-papers/quantitative-easing-underappreciated-success>
- Gagnon, J., & Collins, C. (2022). *Quantitative easing: Success, side effects, and exit strategies*. Peterson Institute for International Economics. <https://www.piie.com/publications/working-papers>
- Gopinath, G. (2021). *The Great Lockdown: Worst economic downturn since the Great Depression*. IMF Blog. <https://blogs.imf.org/2020/04/14>
- International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2020). *World economic outlook: A long and difficult ascent*. IMF. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2020/09/30>
- International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2023). *World economic outlook: Navigating global divergences*. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2023/10/10>
- Jordà, Ò., Singh, S. R., & Taylor, A. M. (2022). Long-run effects of pandemics on inflation: Evidence from the past. *Review of Economics and Statistics*. https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_01133
- Keynes, J. M. (1936). *The general theory of employment, interest, and money*. Macmillan.
- Krugman, P. (2009). *The return of depression economics and the crisis of 2008*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Loayza, N. V., & Pennings, S. (2022). *Macroeconomic policy in the time of COVID-19: A conceptual framework*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper. <https://documents.worldbank.org>

- Lucas, R. E. (1972). Expectations and the neutrality of money. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 4(2), 103–124. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531\(72\)90142-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531(72)90142-1)
- Mankiw, N. G. (2021). *Principles of economics* (9th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Mishkin, F. S. (2007). *Monetary policy strategy*. MIT Press.
- Obstfeld, M. (2021). Global spillovers from monetary policy. *IMF Economic Review*, 69(1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41308-021-00133-x>
- Reinhart, C. M., & Rogoff, K. S. (2022). *Debt overhangs: Past and present*. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity. <https://www.brookings.edu>
- Reinhart, C. M., & Rogoff, K. S. (2023). *The return of fiscal dominance? Public debt and central bank independence*. Harvard Kennedy School. <https://www.hks.harvard.edu>
- Romer, C. D. (2020). *The fiscal response to COVID-19: Lessons from the Great Depression*. Brookings Institution. <https://www.brookings.edu>
- Romer, C. D., & Romer, D. H. (2023). Does fiscal policy matter? A historical reassessment. *American Economic Review*, 113(4), 1124–1150. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20201043>
- Samuelson, P. A., & Nordhaus, W. D. (2010). *Economics* (19th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Schnabel, I. (2022). *Unconventional monetary policy in a changing economic environment*. European Central Bank. <https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/key/date/2022/html>
- Shiller, R. J. (2019). *Narrative economics: How stories go viral and drive major economic events*. Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, J. B. (2009). *The financial crisis and the policy responses: An empirical analysis of what went wrong*. NBER Working Paper No. 14631. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w14631>
- Woodford, M. (2003). *Interest and prices: Foundations of a theory of monetary policy*. Princeton University Press.
- Yellen, J. (2023). *Remarks on the economic outlook*. U.S. Department of the Treasury. <https://home.treasury.gov/news/press-releases>