Economic Ideas in Context: A Comparative Framework for Reading the History of Economic Thought

Jesigen Lunag

Abstract

The history of economic thought is often taught as a sequence of famous economists and increasingly sophisticated theories. That sequence is useful, but it can encourage presentism: earlier writers are judged mainly by how closely they anticipated modern economics, while the institutional problems and moral vocabularies that gave their arguments meaning disappear. This historical-conceptual article develops a comparative framework for reading economic ideas in context. It reorganizes an instructional manuscript, History of Economic Thought: Then and Beyond, around five questions: What historical context made an economic problem salient? What problem was the writer trying to explain? What assumptions were made about persons, institutions, and knowledge? What mechanism connected causes to outcomes? What practical or normative prescription followed? Applied from ancient and medieval reflections through mercantilism, classical political economy, marginalism, Keynesian macroeconomics, and postwar pluralism, the framework reveals both discontinuity and cumulative insight. Economic thought did not advance through a simple replacement of error by truth; it changed as the object of inquiry moved among household governance, commercial power, production and distribution, allocation, aggregate instability, institutions, and bounded choice. The framework supports historically responsible comparison without treating all doctrines as equally valid. For teaching, it turns chronology into structured analytical practice. For policy analysis, it clarifies that disagreements frequently arise from different problem definitions and institutional assumptions, not only from competing estimates. The article concludes that history of economic thought remains useful when it is taught as contextual reasoning rather than as a museum of discarded ideas.

Keywords: history of economic thought; economic methodology; economic education; contextual analysis; political economy; pluralism

Introduction

Economic theories are answers to questions, but the questions are historically selected. A doctrine about just exchange in a stratified agrarian society, an argument about trade under interstate rivalry, and a model of unemployment in an industrial monetary economy do not address the same object. Reading them as successive attempts to solve one timeless allocation problem obscures both their achievements and their limits. It also encourages a misleading history in which the present appears as the predetermined destination of all earlier inquiry.

The history of economic thought offers a corrective because it connects concepts to the problems, institutions, and controversies from which they emerged. Schumpeter (1954) argued that knowledge of earlier problems and methods improves understanding of current analysis. Vaughn (1993) likewise defended the pedagogical value of history, while Blaug (2001) warned that economists lose intellectual resources when they treat the history of ideas as peripheral. Roncaglia (2005) goes further: rival conceptual representations of the economy can organize the same evidence differently, so historical study helps analysts see the assumptions built into apparently neutral categories.

The source instructional manuscript, History of Economic Thought: Then and Beyond (2023), provides a broad chronological scaffold extending from ancient and medieval writings to mercantilism, classical and socialist political economy, neoclassical analysis, Keynesian economics, monetarism, and behavioral economics. Its breadth is valuable for teaching, but its textbook structure—learning outcomes, activities, summaries, and encyclopedic exposition—does not itself constitute a journal argument. This article therefore transforms the material into a focused conceptual contribution. It does not report empirical data and does not claim to be a systematic review. Instead, it proposes and demonstrates a reusable method for comparing economic ideas without detaching them from their historical purposes.

Purpose of the Article

The article has three objectives: (a) to explain why chronological coverage alone is insufficient for understanding the development of economic thought; (b) to develop a context–problem–assumption–mechanism–prescription framework for disciplined comparison; and (c) to show how the framework can improve economics teaching and policy reasoning. The guiding question is: How can major traditions be compared in a common analytical language without erasing the historical differences among them?

Analytical Approach

Design and Source Base

This is a historical-conceptual synthesis. The instructional manuscript supplied the initial periodization and list of traditions. Canonical works and established histories of economic analysis were then used to clarify each tradition's central problem and conceptual structure. The discussion is selective rather than exhaustive. It emphasizes representative transformations in the object of economic inquiry, not a complete genealogy of every school or thinker. This design is appropriate to theory-building and pedagogy, but it should not be mistaken for a bibliometric, systematic, or comprehensive historiographic study.

Two safeguards guide interpretation. First, anachronism is avoided by distinguishing economic reflection from economics as a later specialized discipline. Aristotle and Ibn Khaldun, for example, considered production, exchange, taxation, and governance within larger accounts of ethics and political order; they were not neoclassical economists writing before the terminology existed. Second, contextual explanation is separated from endorsement. Understanding why a doctrine appeared plausible in its setting does not establish its present validity or moral acceptability.

The Comparative Framework

The proposed framework uses five linked questions. Context identifies the political, technological, legal, and social arrangements that made a topic urgent. Problem names the phenomenon the author sought to explain or regulate. Assumptions identify claims about motivation, knowledge, classes, resources, and institutions. Mechanism specifies how the argument connects causes to outcomes. Prescription identifies the policy, institutional arrangement, or evaluative conclusion that follows. The initials form CPAMP: context, problem, assumptions, mechanism, and prescription.

CPAMP is not a scoring rubric and does not assume that every work contains a formal model. It is a reading protocol. In a mathematical text, the mechanism may be an explicit system of equations; in a moral or institutional text, it may be a causal narrative about authority, convention, or power. The framework asks readers to reconstruct an argument on its own terms before comparing it with alternatives. It thereby combines historical reconstruction with analytical evaluation.

Historical-Conceptual Findings

From Household Order to Commercial Power

Ancient and medieval reflections embedded material life within ethics, household governance, and political authority. Aristotle distinguished household provisioning from unlimited acquisition and examined exchange within an account of the good life and the polis (Aristotle, 1995). Later traditions considered price, money, taxation, labor, and public order through religious and administrative vocabularies. Ibn Khaldun's analysis linked labor, taxation, state expenditure, urban prosperity, and dynastic change in a historically dynamic account (Ibn Khaldun, 1967). The relevant unit was not an abstract market populated by isolated optimizers; it was an ordered community whose material practices could sustain or corrupt social life.

Mercantilist writing shifted attention toward the fiscal and strategic requirements of emerging states. Overseas trade, specie, shipping, manufacturing, and national power became central. Thomas Mun's argument for a favorable balance of foreign trade illustrates a mechanism in which commercial policy and national accounting supported state strength (Mun, 1664/1895). The mercantilist object was therefore not simply 'the market.' It was the politically organized national economy competing in an unequal international environment. Later criticism of mercantilism was analytically important, but treating the tradition only as a confusion of money with wealth misses the geopolitical problem it attempted to solve.

Production, Distribution, and Industrial Society

Classical political economy redefined wealth around production, specialization, accumulation, and distribution. Smith (1776/1976) placed the division of labor at the center of productivity while also attending to institutions, public works, education, justice, and the moral hazards of commercial society. Ricardo (1817/2004) focused more sharply on the distribution of output among wages, profits, and rent under conditions of accumulation and diminishing returns. Mill (1848/1909) distinguished laws of production from socially alterable arrangements of distribution, making institutional reform compatible with parts of the classical analytical structure.

The classical tradition's importance lies not in a single doctrine of laissez-faire but in a problem field: how a commercial and increasingly industrial society produces a surplus, distributes it among social groups, and reproduces itself over time. Marx (1867/1976) retained the classical focus on production and accumulation while reconstructing the mechanism through value, exploitation, class relations, and technological change. His critique makes power and property constitutive of economic outcomes rather than external disturbances to an otherwise self-contained exchange system. The disagreement is therefore partly about causal architecture: whether distribution is explained principally through scarcity and exchange or through social relations governing production and ownership.

Allocation, Equilibrium, and the Marginal Turn

The marginal and neoclassical turn changed the dominant question from the reproduction and distribution of a social surplus to the allocation of scarce means among competing ends. Value was increasingly explained through marginal choice, and equilibrium analysis connected individual decisions to market-level coordination. Marshall (1890/1920) integrated demand, supply, time, substitution, and industrial organization in a framework that became foundational for price theory. This analytical shift enabled precision and clarified many market mechanisms, but it also narrowed the visibility of institutions and historical change when assumptions were mistaken for universal descriptions.

CPAMP makes the shift visible. The context remained industrial capitalism, yet the problem became decentralized allocation; the representative assumptions concerned preferences, constraints, knowledge, and substitution; the mechanism was marginal adjustment toward equilibrium; and the prescription often favored market coordination subject to identified failures. Such a reconstruction avoids two errors: dismissing neoclassical analysis because it abstracts, and treating its abstractions as context-free truths. Abstraction is indispensable, but its usefulness depends on whether the selected mechanism fits the problem.

Aggregate Instability and Macroeconomic Management

The Great Depression exposed the limits of explanations that moved too quickly from individual market adjustment to economy-wide coordination. Keynes (1936) made aggregate demand, expectations, liquidity preference, and involuntary unemployment central. In this framework, flexible prices and wages did not guarantee rapid restoration of full employment because investment depended on uncertain expectations and monetary conditions. The practical prescription was not permanent state control of all allocation, but deliberate stabilization when private spending was insufficient.

Postwar disputes over inflation and stabilization reworked the same problem. Friedman (1968) emphasized the limits of discretionary monetary intervention and challenged the idea of a permanent long-run trade-off between inflation and unemployment. The Keynesian–monetarist disagreement was not simply 'government versus market.' It involved competing assumptions about expectations, lags, information, nominal adjustment, and the stability of behavioral relationships. CPAMP directs attention to those underlying claims, making the controversy more analytically useful than a list of policy labels.

Institutions, Bounded Choice, and Contemporary Pluralism

Later developments broadened the domain of economic explanation. Simon (1955) replaced global optimization with bounded rationality and satisficing when information and computational capacity are limited. Kahneman and Tversky (1979) showed that choices under risk display systematic patterns inconsistent with standard expected-utility formulations. Institutional analysis demonstrated that collective-action problems cannot be understood by assuming only markets or centralized states; communities can develop durable rules for governing shared resources under identifiable conditions

(Ostrom, 1990). Sen (1999) shifted development evaluation from income alone toward substantive capabilities and freedoms.

These approaches do not form one unified successor theory. Their common significance is methodological: they reopen assumptions about the decision maker, the institution, and the outcome that matters. Contemporary pluralism is therefore best treated as a portfolio of problem-dependent mechanisms rather than as an indiscriminate celebration of multiple viewpoints. A behavioral model may be appropriate for judgment under uncertainty; an institutional model for rule-governed collective action; a Keynesian model for aggregate demand; and a classical or structural approach for distribution and accumulation. Comparison should be disciplined by explanatory purpose and evidence.

Table 1

CPAMP comparison of major traditions in economic thought

Tradition	Context and problem	Key assumptions / mechanism	Typical prescription
Ancient and medieval	Household, polity, moral and religious order; justice in provisioning and exchange	Economic activity is embedded in ethical, legal, and hierarchical institutions	Restrain harmful acquisition; govern exchange and taxation toward public order
Mercantilist	State formation, overseas rivalry, fiscal capacity, trade	National power is strengthened through managed commerce, shipping, and monetary inflows	Promote exports, strategic industries, navigation, and state capacity
Classical political economy	Commercial and industrial expansion; production, growth, and distribution	Division of labor, accumulation, class distribution, competition, and surplus	Secure exchange and productive investment; debate public works and distributional reform
Socialist and critical	Industrial conflict, property concentration, recurring crisis	Ownership and class relations structure production, surplus, and power	Transform ownership, labor relations, and social provision
Marginal / neoclassical	Decentralized allocation under scarcity	Preferences, constraints, substitution, marginal adjustment, and equilibrium	Rely on market coordination; correct specified failures
Keynesian / monetarist	Mass unemployment, inflation, and macroeconomic instability	Aggregate demand, expectations, money, policy lags, and nominal adjustment	Use stabilization policy, with disagreement over instruments, timing, and limits
Institutional / behavioral / capability	Collective action, bounded choice, development, and nonmarket institutions	Rules, cognitive limits, social context, and multidimensional welfare shape outcomes	Match institutional design and policy tools to behavior, governance, and valued capabilities

Note. The table identifies dominant analytical tendencies; individual writers within each tradition differ, and the categories should not be treated as closed or mutually exclusive.

Discussion

What Changes Across the History of Economic Thought

The comparison shows that the object called 'the economy' is historically variable. Early reflections examined material provision within household and political order. Mercantilist authors foregrounded state power and external trade. Classical political economy analyzed production, accumulation, and distribution among social groups. Marginal analysis centered choice and allocation. Keynesian economics established aggregate instability as a distinct problem. Institutional, behavioral, and capability approaches challenged restrictive assumptions about governance, cognition, and welfare. These changes are not merely terminological. Each reorganizes what counts as a cause, an outcome, and an admissible intervention.

This finding qualifies both triumphalist and relativist histories. A triumphalist account treats past doctrines as failed approximations to the present. It overlooks lost questions—such as power, production, or institutional formation—that may remain relevant even when older mechanisms are rejected. A relativist account, by contrast, can reduce theories to artifacts of context and make evaluation impossible. CPAMP provides a middle path. Historical reconstruction explains why an argument was framed as it was; analytical evaluation then asks whether its assumptions and mechanisms remain adequate for the present problem.

The framework also reveals continuity. Scarcity, coordination, distribution, uncertainty, and governance recur, but they are recombined. Smith's commercial society is not Marshall's partial equilibrium, yet both examine coordination. Ricardo's distribution among classes is not Sen's capability approach, yet both ask how economic arrangements affect differentiated human outcomes. Keynesian uncertainty and behavioral departures from expected utility are not identical, yet both challenge simple accounts of fully informed adjustment. Historical knowledge makes these continuities available without flattening them into sameness.

Implications for Economics Education

A course organized only by names and dates encourages memorization. CPAMP turns each reading into an act of reconstruction. Students can be asked to identify the triggering context, state the problem in one sentence, list the necessary assumptions, diagram the mechanism, and evaluate the prescription. The same protocol can be applied to a canonical chapter, a contemporary model, or a policy brief. This creates a bridge between history and analytical practice.

The method also improves comparison. Instead of asking whether Keynes 'believed in government' and Friedman 'believed in markets,' students examine what each assumed about expectations, adjustment, information, and time. Instead of treating Smith as a slogan for laissez-faire, they distinguish his mechanism of specialization from his analysis of institutions and public responsibilities. Instead of labeling behavioral economics as a rejection of choice theory, they identify which assumptions are revised and which analytical commitments remain. Such exercises strengthen conceptual literacy: the ability to see what a theory must assume in order for its conclusion to follow.

Assessment can likewise move beyond recall. A student might compare two traditions using the five dimensions, diagnose which dimension explains a policy disagreement, or rewrite a historical prescription for a new institutional context. Rubrics can reward textual evidence, causal clarity, historical accuracy, and recognition of scope conditions. The goal is not to produce agreement but to make disagreement intelligible and accountable.

Implications for Policy Reasoning

Policy debates often appear empirical while concealing differences in problem definition. A labor-market proposal may treat unemployment as a price-adjustment issue, an aggregate-demand failure, a bargaining-power problem, or a mismatch between capabilities and opportunity. Evidence remains essential, but evidence is collected and interpreted within these frames. CPAMP makes the frame explicit before instruments are chosen. Analysts can ask whether the mechanism corresponds to the institutional setting, whether assumed behavior is plausible, and whether the prescription targets the identified cause.

Historical comparison also discourages one-tool reasoning. Mercantilist concerns about strategic capacity may reappear in debates over supply chains, but historical recognition does not validate blanket protectionism. Classical concerns about distribution may illuminate growth strategies, but they do not eliminate the need for modern measurement. Keynesian stabilization may address demand shortfalls, while institutional reforms address implementation and behavioral tools address take-up. The practical lesson is disciplined pluralism: use multiple traditions when the problem has multiple mechanisms, but specify the role and evidentiary burden of each.

Boundaries of the Framework

CPAMP is deliberately economical, and its clarity has costs. It can understate rhetoric, biography, mathematical technique, colonial relations, gender, race, and the circulation of ideas across languages and regions. Its chronological demonstration also reflects the conventional canon inherited from the source manuscript and from widely used histories. The framework should therefore be expanded with readings from traditions and communities excluded by that canon. Its purpose is not to close historiographic debate but to give students and analysts a transparent starting structure.

A fuller research program could test the framework in classroom settings, compare student reasoning before and after its use, and examine whether it improves transfer from historical texts to contemporary policy analysis. Such work would require a defined curriculum, validated measures, transparent sampling, and ethical review. No claims about educational effectiveness are made here.

Conclusion

The history of economic thought is most valuable when it is neither a ceremonial catalogue of great names nor a search for primitive versions of current theory. It is a disciplined study of how societies define economic problems and construct explanations under particular institutional conditions. The CPAMP framework—context, problem, assumptions, mechanism, and prescription—makes that discipline teachable.

Applied across major traditions, the framework shows that economic inquiry has repeatedly changed its central object: moral provisioning, commercial power, production and distribution, allocation, aggregate instability, institutional governance, bounded choice, and human capability. These transformations preserve useful questions even when particular answers are superseded. For education, the framework converts chronology into analytical comparison. For policy, it exposes the assumptions beneath familiar labels and supports problem-dependent pluralism. Economic history thus remains part of economic reasoning itself: a resource for choosing better questions before asserting answers.

References

Aristotle. (1995). Politics (E. Barker, Trans.; R. F. Stalley, Rev.). Oxford University Press. (Original work composed ca. fourth century BCE)

Backhouse, R. E. (2002). The Penguin history of economics. Penguin.

Blaug, M. (2001). No history of ideas, please, we're economists. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 15(1), 145–164. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.15.1.145

Friedman, M. (1968). The role of monetary policy. American Economic Review, 58(1), 1–17.

History of economic thought: Then and beyond. (2023). Unpublished instructional manuscript.

Ibn Khaldun. (1967). The Muqaddimah: An introduction to history (F. Rosenthal, Trans.; 2nd ed.). Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1377)

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263–291. https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185

Keynes, J. M. (1936). The general theory of employment, interest and money. Macmillan.

Marshall, A. (1920). Principles of economics (8th ed.). Macmillan. (Original work published 1890)

Marx, K. (1976). Capital: A critique of political economy (Vol. 1; B. Fowkes, Trans.). Penguin. (Original work published 1867)

Mill, J. S. (1909). Principles of political economy with some of their applications to social philosophy (W. J. Ashley, Ed.; 7th ed.). Longmans, Green. (Original work published 1848)

Mun, T. (1895). England's treasure by forraign trade (J. R. McCulloch, Ed.). Macmillan. (Original work published 1664)

Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action. Cambridge University Press.

Polanyi, K. (2001). The great transformation: The political and economic origins of our time. Beacon Press. (Original work published 1944)

Ricardo, D. (2004). On the principles of political economy and taxation. Dover. (Original work published 1817)

Roncaglia, A. (2005). The wealth of ideas: A history of economic thought. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511492341

Schumpeter, J. A. (1954). History of economic analysis (E. B. Schumpeter, Ed.). Oxford University Press.

Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Alfred A. Knopf.

Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 69(1), 99–118. https://doi.org/10.2307/1884852

Smith, A. (1976). An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations (R. H. Campbell & A. S. Skinner, Eds.). Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1776)

Vaughn, K. I. (1993). Why teach the history of economics? Journal of the History of Economic Thought, 15(2), 174–183.