

# The Many Faces of Unification and Pluralism in Economics

Franklin Odoom\*

Department of Economics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland UK

## Abstract

The demand for economic plurality has received a lot of support in recent years, but it is still being disputed for a variety of reasons. Although the majority of the literature on plurality in economics has focused on defending pluralism, this paper's main objective is to engage directly with criticism, which has not previously received enough attention. As a result, we add to the discussion of pluralism by going over five well-known and frequently made arguments against it. As a result, we present a new typology of critiques, in which some critique the pluralism movement while others reject the idea itself. Although we contend that the criticisms levelled at the movement are what we believe the arguments against pluralism as a concept to be less compelling, but they do include viable contributions that pluralists must deal with.

**Keywords:** Economic plurality • Pluralism • Economics

## Introduction

They must specifically push solutions to the (1) how can successful communication be achieved across diverse schools of thought?, and (2) the viability of conducting a quality assessment within the context of a pluralist economics community. Not all of the points presented in this article are new, despite the fact that they are all present in the current debate. 1 In actuality, the criticisms that we find most convincing have their origins in lengthy discussions of science philosophy. Similar to that, the responses given here frequently incorporate a synthesis of previously developed ideas. This article attempts to shift some of the public discussion on a more academic level and connect popular claims to more precise arguments made in the philosophy of science, in addition to providing a concise response to common critiques of the idea of plurality. By doing so, we, ideally, contribute to the enhancement of the debate's transparency and clarity as well as to an improvement of the concept of pluralism as such [1].

Second, we make a distinction between multiple pluralism and plurality aspects. The domains in which a plurality of goods could be prescribed or justified are described by pluralism's dimensions. Despite the lengthy (but not full) list Mäki gives, the current contribution will only cover the dimensions. Be aware that a person can call oneself a pluralist while holding pluralism about procedures but not about realities. Third, the same dimensions make it possible to classify pluralism's reasons. Pluralism necessitates references to specific justifications for a specific degree of plurality because it is a normative notion. These justifications may include epistemological, pragmatist, or ethical considerations. We believe that many misconceptions in the pluralism discussion result from authors not being considered experts in their fields [2].

## Description

According to some economics is already a pluralistic discipline. However, for some this means that any criticism of pluralists actually addresses a straw man. This does not, however, invalidate the concept of

pluralism as a whole. Research fields that have just formed, like behavioural economics, are frequently used as examples. However, in order to evaluate the claim that "economics is already pluralist," one must be clear about the scope and degree of plurality. Although EE is on the political agenda of the EU, especially during times when international projects and conferences increased environmental consciousness worldwide, its impact has been minimal and patchy. Neoclassical economics perspectives have tended to dominate EU policy since the 1980s, advancing the "win-win" argument between economic growth and environmental sustainability. Climate change has recently reignited EE concerns without challenging the dominant worldview [3].

Although methodological reflection and training are not given a particularly prominent role within the subject of economics, it is usually recognised as a social science that is very systematic and methodological. This might be the case because; following two clear "Methodenstreits," there is now general agreement that positivism gives us a reliable methodology that doesn't need to be further questioned. This is a relatively new viewpoint, though, and it is impossible to say that this broad consensus is the result of a thorough and in-depth theoretical discussion; instead, it has emerged as a result of efforts to professionalise and legitimise a developing discipline, in opposition to the USA's growing scientific hegemony, and particularly the power of a small group of elites who have the ability to set standards [4,5].

## Conclusion

A great "market for ideas" would also necessitate exposing economics students to a range of research methodologies. Young economists will only have a meaningful option in terms of their research orientation if the variety of diverse research programmes is made clear to them from the very beginning of their careers. If not, junior scientists would be predisposed toward a dominant approach to economics, even though dominance does not always imply a significant superiority. However, despite numerous student protests and associated initiatives like the "Exploring Economics" programme, economics classroom content is largely monistic.

## References

1. Azhar, Gulrez Shah, Ali Amir, Najam Khaliq and Zulfia Khan. "A study of determinants of use of healthcare services in India." *Int J Med Publ Health* 1 (2011).
2. Chauhan, Ramesh Chand. "Determinants of health care seeking behavior among rural population of a coastal area in South India." *Int J Sci Rep* 1 (2015):118-22.
3. Sarkar, Asok Kumar, and Sujana Singha. "Factors influencing health of

\*Address for Correspondence: Franklin Odoom, Department of Economics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland; E-mail: franklin.odoom11@helsinki.fi

**Copyright:** © 2022 Odoom F. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Date of Submission:** 02-Aug-2022, Manuscript No. BEJ-22-77899; **Editor Assigned:** 04-Aug-2022, PreQC No. P-77899; **Reviewed:** 15-Aug-2022, QC No. Q-77899; **Revised:** 20-Aug-2022, Manuscript No. R-77899; **Published:** 25-Aug-2022, DOI: 10.37421/2151-6219.2022.13.398

- the Santals: a study of selected villages of Birbhum." *Int J Community Soc Dev* 1 (2019): 58-74.
4. Willander, Erika. "Conditions for religious pluralism in Swedish hospital chaplaincy: A research note." *J Health Care Chaplain* 25 (2019): 99-109.
  5. Falisse, Jean-Benoît, Serena Masino and Raymond Ngenzebuhoro. "Indigenous medicine and biomedical health care in fragile settings: insights from Burundi." *Health Pol Plann* 33 (2018): 483-493.

**How to cite this article:** Odoom, Franklin. "The Many Faces of Unification and Pluralism in Economics." *Bus Econ J* 13 (2022): 398.