

According to Kaldor's theory this theory does not hold, because the internal saving (or profits) ^{can} create only a temporary upswing which is necessarily ended by the creation of overcapacity or by the limit set by a ceiling (capacity, labour force, bottlenecks).

The question of the trend can then be formulated as follows: How is it possible that positive (net) investment continues in the long run without creating overcapacity (+ or - indebtedness?).

Perhaps it would help if the income effect of the investment were distributed over the whole life-time of the equipment, instead of being expended ~~even~~ before the capacity starts becoming effective?

One condition for it is evidently that the growth must not be so fast as to make it inevitable that the ceiling would be reached before there would be sufficient time to move this constant step ~~up~~ further & further upward.

This ~~not~~ would justify a conservative policy prescription which says that one should not let the boom start up above a ^{very} modest speed (but how to dampen a boom without killing it?). One could imagine a policy of limiting growth to one industry, and letting them grow in turn (analogous to the Japanese development policy).
It might seem then that the overhauling of the boom is based on the mutual stimulation of growing industries.