

Our brand is obvious. To *Review* is to better understand, evaluate and critique with the intention of change leading to improvement. In this Digital Age with so much public economic information instantaneously at hand, the apparent filters of ideological theories, assumptions and unobserved facts together with ongoing orthodox dogma affected ongoing peer-reviews of research papers and the like that perpetuated insular group-think, which apparently caused virtually no one in this self-esteemed expert community of macroeconomists to predict the Great Recession and understand nowadays the remaining instability in the macroeconomy. This is socially dangerous especially since the same folks who totally *missed it* are still in policy positions. Even worse, these erring and arrogant experts refer to their critics and decriers as *cry-babies*. Therefore, our mission is to debunk this class and add value in their place.

To not predict anything is to admit that you have no vision or science. Because so very few (only 12 voluble individuals out of a total estimated 60,000+ population of economists in the world) had a handle on the macroeconomy, recent critics of the profession have called it a *sham-science* and the *greatest scientific failure of all time* to not predict en masse its political-market underpinnings before it happened and the awful effects during and after the Great Recession. Macroeconomics must change. New tools and thinking are needed. Unlike other economic publications and blogs, non-partisan Macroeconomics Review is pragmatically focused on all those who *have* vision and science. As such, the wider mission of Macroeconomics Review is to seek out and aggregate other prescient and practical views and news pertaining to our political economy through a new spectrum of proven visionaries. This is the website for real predictors commenting on all sectors of the macroeconomy.

Our visionary contributors always win the high-ground. They know that the best forecasts come from the best perspectives to describe a pending change. When a prediction becomes a verity, it is because it first answered best *three leading questions*: (1) What is the comparative advantage of the available choices that are subject to change, substitution or extinguishment? (2) What is the total cost (real and social) of these choices?—also accounting for the suboptimal ones. (3) Does there exist any hard data and observed facts that are attached to the choices that are subject to change? When at least these questions are discussed and answered, useful economic predictions easily and accurately flow therefrom.

You may be divinatory. You may have useful insights. To become a prescient contributor to Macroeconomics Review, we invite you to read [About Us](#), our [Privacy Policy](#), [Terms of Use](#) and then [Contact Us](#). Get published. We are always keen to incorporate new heterodoxy into the website subject to our editorial standards, which would always include in your article addressing the requisite *three leading questions* being answered and proffering your resulting *reasoned prediction*.

-Jay Carlson, Editor-in-Chief

© 2017, J.W.Carlson