

# Comparing the Classical, Neoclassical, Marxist, Austrian, and Keynesian Schools of Economic Thought

**Dr. Clayton H. Hawkins**

Associate Professor, Political Economy, Signum Magnum College

## Abstract

The major schools of economic thought, including classical, neoclassical, Marxist, Austrian, and Keynesian, offer competing explanations of how markets function, how resources are allocated, and what role governments should play in managing economic activity. Classical economics emphasizes self-regulating markets driven by supply, demand, and competition. Neoclassical economics formalizes these insights through rational choice, marginal analysis, and monetary policy aimed at price stability. Marxist economics rejects market allocation as inherently unequal and advocates collective ownership and centralized planning to resolve class conflict. The Austrian school focuses on individual choice, decentralized knowledge, and business cycles generated by credit expansion and policy intervention. Keynesian economics emphasizes aggregate demand and supports active government intervention to stabilize production and employment during economic downturns. This paper compares these schools by examining their historical development, core assumptions, and leading contributors. While each differs in its treatment of markets and government intervention, all address the fundamental problem of economic coordination and equilibrium. Understanding these perspectives remains essential for evaluating debates over inflation, inequality, and economic governance.

**Keywords:** economic thought, classical economics, Keynesian economics, Austrian school, Marxism

## Introduction

Economic theory has long been shaped by debates over whether government intervention improves or undermines economic outcomes. Rather than offering predictive certainty, economic schools of thought provide analytical perspectives that emphasize how people and markets coordinate their actions, how economic systems are organized, and what limits institutions face when trying to manage or control economic activity. From the emergence of classical political economy during the Industrial Revolution to the development of Keynesian macroeconomics in response to the Great Depression, schools of economic thought have evolved in response to changing social, political, and technological conditions. Despite their differences, each school seeks to explain how prices are set, resources are allocated, and how stability or instability occurs in an economy.

Comparing the major economic schools remains relevant in today's policy debates involving inflation control, fiscal stimulus, inequality, globalization, and government intervention. Disagreements over interest rates, government spending, and market regulation often reflect the theoretical divisions between economic thought. This paper examines five major schools of economics: classical, neoclassical, Marxist,

Austrian, and Keynesian, by reviewing their foundational assumptions, principal theorists, and views on markets and government intervention. By presenting these perspectives, the paper highlights the theoretical differences between market coordination and centralized control.

### **Classical Economics**

Classical economics emerged in Great Britain during the Industrial Revolution. It reflects a shift away from mercantilism and monarchical government to market-based coordination. Classical economists emphasized free-market competition, consumer sovereignty, and limited government intervention, commonly described as *laissez-faire* economics (Smith, 1776).

Adam Smith (1723–1790), a Scottish economist and philosopher, is widely regarded as the founder of classical political economy (Backhouse, 2017). In *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759), Smith argued that moral behavior arises from both self-interest and sympathy. While people seek their own benefit, they also naturally consider how their actions make others feel, which guides them toward moral conduct. In *The Wealth of Nations* (1776), Smith observed that individuals pursue self-interest through voluntary exchange, leading to specialization and the division of labor. This process, he argued, promotes economic growth and social prosperity.

Smith's concept of the "invisible hand" describes how market interactions generate socially beneficial outcomes without government control. Prices adjust through competition until supply equals demand, producing market equilibrium (Varian, 1992). Classical economists argued that government interventions such as tariffs, price controls, or monopolistic protections distort prices and raise costs (Butler, 2012).

Although protectionist policies may preserve short-term employment during periods of declining economic activity, they increase long-term costs by reducing competition and innovation (Kutlina-Dimitrova & Lakatos, 2017). In comparison, competition and deregulation lower prices and expand consumer choice (Poole, 2004). Classical economics, therefore, encourages minimal government intervention and trusts that markets are self-correcting through price competition.

### **Neoclassical Economics**

Neoclassical economics builds upon classical foundations by formalizing supply and demand through marginal analysis, rational choice theory, and mathematical modeling. The term *neoclassical economics* was first used by Thorstein Veblen (1900) to describe this emerging analytical framework.

Neoclassical economics assumes that people make decisions by weighing the additional benefits of an action against its additional costs and choosing the option that gives them the greatest satisfaction (Varian, 1992). Prices emerge from the mutual exchange between buyers and sellers, while consumption reflects consumers' purchasing preferences and attitudes (Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

Milton Friedman (1912–2006), a leading figure of the Chicago School, significantly influenced neoclassical macroeconomic theory through monetarism. Friedman argued that inflation and price instability primarily result from excessive growth in the money supply (Jahan & Papageorgiou, 2014). He argued that stable monetary rules, rather than discretionary government policy, are necessary to maintain price stability and preserve the value of currency (Friedman, 1968).

In *A Theory of the Consumption Function* (1957), Friedman introduced the permanent income hypothesis. Friedman argued that households base their spending decisions on long-term expected income rather than short-term income. As a result, income from temporary government stimulus programs may have only a limited effect on consumption if individuals do not believe it is permanent.

Neoclassical economists, therefore, assume that people usually make purchasing choices by weighing what they gain against what it costs and choosing the option that benefits them the most.

### **Marxist School of Economics**

The Marxist school of economics was developed in the nineteenth century by Karl Marx (1818–1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820–1895). Marx argued that economic systems, including who owns productive resources and how labor and power are organized in society, are driven by conflict between social classes. This leads to unequal ownership of property, assets, and resources (Marx & Engels, 2007).

According to Marx, capitalism divides society into the bourgeoisie, who control capital, and the proletariat, who sell their labor. Marx argued that these conditions are shaped by ownership and institutional constraints. This relationship encourages the exploitation of the working class through the extraction of surplus value, or the difference between the value produced by labor and the actual wages paid to workers (Marx, 1891). Marx viewed capitalism as structurally unstable and morally destructive, promoting social inequality and alienation.

To resolve class conflicts, Marx advocated socialism, encouraging the collective ownership of property and resources and centralized economic planning. In this system, production and distribution are based on social need rather than competitive market prices. Marx believed that abolishing private ownership would eliminate social inequality and encourage economic freedom (Wolff, 2012; Elster, 1985).

### **Austrian School of Economics**

The Austrian School emphasizes methodological individualism, subjective value, and the limits of centralized knowledge. However, a central contribution of the school is the Austrian Business Cycle Theory (ABCT), developed by Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich Hayek (Mises, 1949; Garrison, 2001).

According to the Austrian Business Cycle Theory, business financial cycles result from artificial credit expansion caused by the lack of policy control over interest rates. When interest rates are held below market levels, excessive investment occurs, leading to unsustainable economic growth and eventually a recession (Murphy, 2011).

In *The Road to Serfdom* (1944), Hayek warned that persistent government intervention in the market undermines market coordination and individual freedom. Although intervention may stabilize consumption in the short term, it distorts prices, reduces competition, and increases long-term costs (Boudreaux, 2014). Hayek argued that free markets are effective because they reflect widespread public information and naturally adjust to changing conditions.

In *The Constitution of Liberty* (1960), Hayek defined liberty as freedom from coercion. Prices, he argued, can only be determined through free and competitive markets. Without them, rational economic calculation is impossible (Hamowy, 1978).

### **Keynesian School of Economics**

The Keynesian School of Economics originated from John Maynard Keynes (1883–1946) and his response to the Great Depression. In *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money* (1936), Keynes argued that overall economic performance depends on total spending in the economy, which can remain too low for extended periods.

Keynes rejected the assumption that markets are self-correcting, particularly under conditions of uncertainty. During recessions, for example, widespread declines in economic activity occur, causing firms

to cut employment and production (Abberger & Nierhaus, 2008). In response, Keynes advocated government intervention by increasing the money supply and credit and implementing fiscal stimulus programs to stabilize production and employment (Jahan et al., 2014).

Keynes also argued that government intervention can be weakened by policy lags, which can delay the recognition of economic problems, an appropriate response, and the implementation of policy action (Blinder, 2019). Despite these limitations, Keynes argued that government intervention is preferable to prolonged unemployment and economic stagnation, particularly during periods of severe economic decline (Skidelsky, 2018; Akerlof & Shiller, 2009).

**Comparison of Economic Schools**

School of Thought	Core Assumptions	Role of Markets	Role of Government	Primary Critiques
Classical	Markets are self-regulating; individuals pursue self-interest	Prices coordinate supply and demand through competition	Minimal; protect property contracts	Ignores market failures and distributional effects
Neoclassical	Rational choice; marginal analysis; equilibrium	Efficient allocation under conditions	Limited stabilization monetary policy	Unrealistic via assumptions of perfect rationality
Marxist	Class conflict drives economic outcomes	Markets produce inequality	Central planning and ownership	Incentive problems; information constraints
Austrian	Subjective dispersed knowledge; entrepreneurship	Discovery process; coordinating knowledge	Very limited; rules over discretion	Limited formal modeling; impracticality critiques
Keynesian	Aggregate demand drives output and employment	Prone to instability in the short run	Active fiscal and monetary intervention	Policy lags; long-term inflation risk

**Conclusion**

This paper compared the classical, neoclassical, Marxist, Austrian, and Keynesian schools of economic thought, highlighting their distinct assumptions about markets, coordination, and government intervention. Classical and Austrian economists emphasize decentralized markets and the limits of centralized knowledge, while Marxist and Keynesian frameworks support varying degrees of collective control to address inequality and instability. Neoclassical economics occupies a middle position, formalizing market behavior while recognizing a constrained stabilizing role for policy. The comparative framework illustrates that disagreements among the schools are not merely technical but reflect deeper philosophical divisions over liberty, equality, and the capacity of institutions to manage complex economic conditions. These enduring differences continue to shape contemporary debates over inflation, economic growth, and government intervention. In today's U.S. economy, each school would offer a distinct interpretation of persistent inflation, fiscal expansion, monetary tightening, and rising inequality. Classical and Austrian perspectives emphasize that markets have become distorted by ongoing government intervention and

credit expansion, while Keynesian economists advocate government intervention to stabilize markets during periods of uncertainty. Neoclassical approaches would focus on expectations, incentives, and policy credibility, whereas Marxist interpretations would emphasize inequality and capital concentration. Rather than resolving policy debates among the economic schools, these competing interpretations highlight the trade-offs inherent in modern economic governance.

## References

1. Abberger, K., & Nierhaus, W. (2008). How to define a recession. *CESifo Forum*, 9(4), 74–76. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227361321>
2. Akerlof, G. A., & Shiller, R. J. (2009). *Animal spirits: How human psychology drives the economy, and why it matters for global capitalism*. Princeton University Press.
3. Backhouse, R. E. (2017). *The history of economic thought* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
4. Blinder, A. S. (2019). Keynesian economics. *Library of Economics and Liberty*. <https://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/KeynesianEconomics.html>
5. Boudreaux, D. J. (2014). *The essential Hayek*. Fraser Institute. [https://www.fraserinstitute.org/sites/default/files/essential-hayek\\_0.pdf](https://www.fraserinstitute.org/sites/default/files/essential-hayek_0.pdf)
6. Butler, E. (2012). *The condensed Wealth of Nations*. Adam Smith Institute. <https://www.adamsmith.org/research/the-condensed-wealth-of-nations>
7. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). The costs and benefits of consuming. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(2), 267–272. <https://doi.org/10.1086/314324>
8. Elster, J. (1985). *Making sense of Marx*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Friedman, M. (1968). *The role of monetary policy*. *American Economic Review*, 58(1), 1–17. <https://www.aeaweb.org/aer/top20/58.1.1-17.pdf>
10. Friedman, M. (1957). *A theory of the consumption function*. Princeton University Press.
11. Garrison, R. W. (2001). *Time and money: The macroeconomics of capital structure*. Routledge.
12. Hamowy, R. (1978). Law and the liberal society: Hayek's *Constitution of Liberty*. *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 2(4), 287–297. [https://cdn.mises.org/2\\_4\\_1\\_0.pdf](https://cdn.mises.org/2_4_1_0.pdf)
13. Jahan, S., Mahmud, A. S., & Papageorgiou, C. (2014). What is Keynesian economics? *Finance & Development*, 51(3), 53–54. <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2014/09/basics.htm>
14. Jahan, S., & Papageorgiou, C. (2014). What is monetarism? *Finance & Development*, 51(1), 38–39 <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2014/03/basics.htm>
15. Kutlina-Dimitrova, Z., & Lakatos, C. (2017). *The global costs of protectionism* (World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 8277). World Bank. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322235265\\_The\\_Global\\_Costs\\_of\\_Protectionism](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322235265_The_Global_Costs_of_Protectionism)
16. Marx, K. (1891). *Critique of the Gotha program*. [https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx\\_Critique\\_of\\_the\\_Gotha\\_Programme.pdf](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_Critique_of_the_Gotha_Programme.pdf)
17. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2007). *The communist manifesto*. Filiquarian Publishing.
18. Mises, L. von. (1949). *Human action: A treatise on economics*. Yale University Press.
19. Murphy, R. P. (2011). My reply to Krugman on Austrian business cycle theory. *Mises Institute*. <https://mises.org/library/my-reply-krugman-austrian-business-cycle-theory>

20. Poole, W. (2004). Free trade: Why are economists and non-economists so far apart? *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review*. <https://research.stlouisfed.org/publications/review/2004/09/01/free-trade-why-are-economists-and-noneconomists-so-far-apart/>
21. Skidelsky, R. (2018). *Money and government: The past and future of economics*. Yale University Press.
22. Smith, A. (1776). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. Oxford University Press.
23. Varian, H. R. (1992). *Microeconomic analysis* (3rd ed.). W. W. Norton & Company.
24. Veblen, T. (1900). The preconceptions of economic science. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 14(2), 240–269. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1883770>
25. Wolff, R. D. (2012). *Democracy at work: A cure for capitalism*. Haymarket Books.