

# HISTORY OF ECONOMIC IDEAS

HEI

HISTORY OF ECONOMIC IDEAS · XV / 2007 / 1

ISSN 1122-8792

ELECTRONIC ISSN 1724-2169

ISBN 978-88-6227-018-2

OFFPRINT

---

XV / 2007 / 1

---



Fabrizio Serra · Editore

Pisa · Roma

# HISTORY OF ECONOMIC IDEAS

*A new series of  
«Quaderni di Storia dell'Economia Politica»*

RICCARDO FAUCCI (*University of Pisa*), EDITOR  
ROBERTO MARCHIONATTI (*University of Turin*), CO-EDITOR

## EDITORIAL BOARD:

RICHARD ARENA (*University of Nice*), DUCCIO CAVALIERI (*University of Florence*), MARCO DARDI (*University of Florence*), PETER D. GROENEWEGEN (*University of Sydney*), HANSJÖRG KLAUSINGER (*University of Vienna*), ENZO PESCIARELLI (*University of Ancona*), CHRISTIAN SEIDL (*University of Kiel*)

## ADVISORY BOARD:

M. M. AUGELLO (*University of Pisa*), G. BECATTINI (*University of Florence*), A. BREWER (*University of Bristol*), B. J. CALDWELL (*University of North Carolina at Greensboro*), †A. W. COATS (*Duke University and University of Nottingham*), A. L. COT (*University of Paris I*), N. DE VECCHI (*University of Pavia*), R. DIMAND (*Brock University*), S. FIORI (*University of Turin*), G. C. HARCOURT (*University of Cambridge, UK*), A. KARAYIANNIS (*University of Piraeus*), B. INGRAO (*University of Rome «La Sapienza»*), J. E. KING (*La Trobe University*), L. S. MOSS (*Babson College*), S. PERRI (*University of Macerata*), C. PERROTTA (*University of Lecce*), P. L. PORTA (*University of Milan · Bicocca*), T. RAFFAELLI (*University of Pisa*), A. SALANTI (*University of Bergamo*), W. J. SAMUELS (*Michigan State University*), A. S. SKINNER (*University of Glasgow*), J. K. WHITAKER (*University of Virginia*)

## BOOK REVIEW EDITOR:

NICOLA GIOCOLI (*University of Pisa*)

## EDITORIAL ASSISTANT:

GIULIA BIANCHI (*University of Pisa*)

## ADDRESS:

The Editor, *History of Economic Ideas*, Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Facoltà di Giurisprudenza, Via Curtatone e Montanara 15 · I 56126 Pisa · Tel. +39 050 2212847  
Fax +39 050 2212853 · E-mail: [hei@ec.unipi.it](mailto:hei@ec.unipi.it)

*Direttore responsabile: Lucia Corsi*

*Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Pisa n. 10 del 2/5/1994*

## THE NEGLECT OF CREATIVE DESTRUCTION IN MICRO-PRINCIPLES TEXTS

ARTHUR M. DIAMOND JR.\*

*University of Nebraska at Omaha  
Department of Economics*

Dynamic competition through the process of creative destruction encourages the innovation in product and process that lengthens and improves lives. Although an increasing number of academics and business practitioners are recognizing the importance of creative destruction, most principles of microeconomics texts give little or no attention to the process. I examine a sample of 27 recent United States microeconomic principles textbooks. Of these, 16 do not mention Schumpeter in any way. Of the 11 that do mention Schumpeter, only six provide any description of the process of creative destruction.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Capitalism is by nature a form of economic change and not only never is but never can be stationary. The process of Creative Destruction is the essential fact about capitalism.... To ignore this central fact is like *Hamlet* without the Danish prince.

(Schumpeter as quoted in Max Page, *The Creative Destruction of Manhattan, 1900-1940*, 2)

But in capitalist reality, as distinguished from its textbook picture, it is not (price) competition which counts but the competition from the new commodity, the new technology, the source of supply, the new type of organization... competition which... strikes not at the margins... of the existing firms but at their foundations and their very lives.

(Schumpeter as quoted in Andy Grove, *Only the Paranoid Survive*, iii)

\* Address for correspondence: Arthur M. Diamond Jr., University of Nebraska at Omaha, Department of Economics, Omaha (NE, US) 68182-0048; e-mail: [adiamond@mail.unomaha.edu](mailto:adiamond@mail.unomaha.edu). Academic website: <http://cba.unomaha.edu/faculty/adiamond/web/diahompg.htm>. Personal web log with occasional discussions of Schumpeter: <http://www.artdiamondblog.com/> JEL codes: A22 – Undergraduate Economics Education and Teaching of Economics. Keywords: technology, education, textbooks, Schumpeter.

I first encountered Schumpeter at Wabash College in a wonderful course on *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* taught by Ben Rogge. Campbell McConnell provided useful comments, and Lucille Sutton graciously provided useful information on textbook market shares. David Levy generously allowed me to examine his complete collection of the first 11 editions of Samuelson's important text. Chris Decker passed on a couple of useful references. I am grateful for excellent and substantial research assistance on this project from Angela Kuhlmann and Miaomiao Yu. I received assistance on Excel issues from Jeanette Medewitz. Earlier versions of the current paper were presented at the biennial Meetings of the International Schumpeter Society in Milan, in 2004; at the annual meetings of the Association of Private Enterprise Education in Las Vegas in 2006; and at the Conference on *Neo-Schumpeterian Economics: An Agenda for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, in Třešť, Czech Republic in 2006.

SCHUMPETER in *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*,<sup>1</sup> argued that capitalism had vastly improved the goods available to the ordinary person, and that the process of creative destruction<sup>2</sup> was much more important in explaining that improvement, than was the standard textbook model of static price competition (see Diamond 2006b). Elsewhere (e.g., Diamond 2006b, 2006c), I present evidence that a growing number of economists and business practitioners are finding the process of creative destruction to be useful in understanding how capitalism works.

In what follows, I take three propositions to capture the most salient characteristics of the process of creative destruction:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Different historians of economic thought have studied important economists, such as Schumpeter, with different objectives in mind. For example, one of Don Patinkin's main objectives was to accurately and fairly allocate credit for contributing important new ideas. To do that, Patinkin suggested that primary credit be given, not to the scholar who first mentioned an idea, but to the scholar who first made the idea part of his «central message». Stigler, to the contrary, suggests that what is most important about a scholar is not what the scholar necessarily most emphasizes, but rather what turns out to be useful to other scholars: «The recipients of a scientific message are the people who determine what the message is, ...» (STIGLER 1982, 91) In this view the «central message» is what the readers find most important in the work. To apply the Patinkin approach to Schumpeter would require a careful textual exegesis of Schumpeter's main works. I choose, instead, to follow Stigler, and ask how Schumpeter has been, and even more importantly, currently is, being used by the business and scholarly community. Elsewhere (DIAMOND 2006a, 2006c) I argue, and present evidence, that the concept of creative destruction is what most of those in the business and scholarly communities find most important in the work of Schumpeter.

<sup>2</sup> Some (e.g., REINART and REINART 2006) have argued that others besides Schumpeter deserve credit for originating the concept of creative destruction. The most common candidates for earlier use of the concept are Nietzsche and Sombart. Although there are passages in each with some similarities to the concept of creative destruction, there are important differences, as well. With Nietzsche, the creativity of the supermen comes at the expense of the well-being of ordinary people; while Schumpeter famously believed that on-balance the ordinary people were the main beneficiaries of capitalism. The supposed passage where Sombart allegedly presages the concept of creative destruction is quite different from Schumpeter's concept. Sombart talks about how once there is destruction, then someone may creatively discover a substitute for what was destroyed. But for Schumpeter, the new creation comes first, and then the old technology is destroyed. STREISSLER 1994, in a broader assessment of the shoulders on which Schumpeter stood, also occasionally focuses directly on the concept of creative destruction. He gives Wieser some credit for something like the concept, although Wieser applied it more narrowly to the case of large firm innovation having a destructive effect on independent entrepreneurs. Streissler also identifies a three page section of chapter 10 of volume 1 of Marx's *Das Kapital* in which Streissler claims Marx's «analysis is very close to Schumpeter's "creative destruction"» (1994, 30). I do not have access to the German edition of *Das Kapital* to which Streissler refers, but after perusing all of chapter 10 in my English version, I failed to find any substantial passage that came «very close» to creative destruction. I do agree with Streissler's initial summary (1994, 14) of Schumpeter's originality: «This originality, however, lies not in the topics he introduced into mainstream economics, but rather in the novel twists he gave to these themes, on the one hand, and on the other hand, in the new mixture of and the new insistence on these themes, modifications that transformed them into a much stronger brew. It was *not* the by then belaboured theme of German economic literature, the figure of the creative entrepreneur, that was new in Schumpeter, but rather the idea of creative destruction by entrepreneurial innovation».

<sup>3</sup> Some have added as an additional salient characteristic, that an important source of in-

1. the process of creative destruction substantially improves the lives of almost everyone;
2. the dynamic competition that creates new products and processes is more important at improving lives than the static price competition that has been the focus of mainstream economics;
3. when new technologies destroy old technologies, workers and firms previously engaged in those technologies will bear costs in order to retrain or re-tool.

If, as I have elsewhere argued (Diamond 2006b), creative destruction in this sense, is indeed the essential fact about capitalism, then that fact would have implications for optimal government policies related to antitrust, labor and finance markets, tax law, and economic growth in less-developed countries. One way in which economists can positively influence policy debates on such issues, is to do what we can to improve the economic literacy of voters. Many college students never take a single economics course. And of those who do take economics, a large majority take nothing more than the basic micro and macro principles. To optimally influence policy debates, the profession should be sure that what is taught in principles is the best we have to offer. In particular, if the process of creative destruction is indeed the essential fact about capitalism, then creative destruction should at least be presented as an alternative to the standard textbook model.

The goal here will be to audit the current generation of micro-principles texts in the United States to see how good a job the profession is doing at presenting the best we have to offer to undergraduates in what is often our only opportunity to teach them.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. WHAT ECONOMISTS BELIEVE

The period from about 1820-1870 is sometimes viewed as one in which the stagnating steady-state prospects for the future economy, derived most notably from Ricardo's corn model, became increasingly dissonant with the actual long-term growth in productivity and living standards. Perhaps today, we similarly face a growing dissonance between

novation consists of very large firms. Mayhew has argued (1980) that this is in fact a mistaken reading of Schumpeter's views. Elsewhere (DIAMOND 2006a, 2006b) I argue that many neo-Schumpeterians who make use of Schumpeter's creative destruction, have adopted a more plausible interpretation that innovation may come from any size firm, depending on the circumstances.

<sup>1</sup> For undergraduates at four-year colleges and universities, SIEGFRIED 2000, 202 reports that «40 percent of the students who matriculated in fall 1998 will take at least one economics course during their college career». He further reports that for the 78.9 percent of institutions with a two-course sequence, 66.2 percent of the students who take the first course, go on to take the second course. (For my purposes here, it would also have been useful to know the percent of institutions that offer micro as the first course in the two-course sequence.)

the static models of price competition, emphasized in our textbooks, and the importance of new product innovation emphasized in Schumpeter's process of creative destruction? Increasingly, distinguished mainstream economists are acknowledging the limitations of the static, equilibrium-based model of competition, and are suggesting that more attention needs to be given to entrepreneurship and the process of creative destruction.

For example, in his last advice to the profession, Zvi Griliches suggested that the profession has given too much attention to equilibrium models, when the real problems of innovation cannot be well understood with such models (see Diamond 2004, Griliches 2000). A similar view was expressed in one of the last papers by Sherwin Rosen (1997).

Baumol (2006) has suggested two reasons for the relative neglect of entrepreneurs in economics. The first is:

... that entrepreneurial activities do not incorporate the homogeneous elements that lend themselves to formal mathematical description, let alone the formal optimization analysis that is the foundation of the bulk of micro theory.

The second is:

... that in mainstream economics the theory is generally composed of equilibrium models in which structurally nothing is changing.

Baumol notes that Schumpeter's entrepreneur is a person whose search for profit opportunities creates disequilibria that result in structural change.

An articulate critique of the economics profession suggests that economics has more and more become a discipline of applied mathematical puzzle-solving (Rosenberg 1992, Diamond 1996). Among the economists who still believe that relevance to policy is a core policy objective of economics, there is a frequent use of Schumpeter's theory of creative destruction. In different decades, and at different levels, distinguished neoclassical economists Becker (1971), Stigler (1987) and Krugman (Krugman and Wells 2005) have all written microeconomics textbooks. None of them mention Schumpeter, or creative destruction, in their micro textbooks; they present the core, comparative-statics analysis, that assumes the products exist, and asks how many should be produced, and at what price. And yet when they grapple with real-world policy issues, such as antitrust policy in general (Stigler 1988); or the antitrust case against Microsoft® in particular (Becker 1998), or the bursting of the dot.com stock bubble (Krugman 2003), they acknowledge that the creation of new products matters. That is when they refer to Schumpeter and creative destruction.

### 3. WHAT ECONOMISTS TEACH

No previous publications have examined how well the process of creative destruction is discussed in the textbook literature. But a few papers have examined the textbook treatment of issues, such as entrepreneurship, that are relevant to the process of creative destruction.

For example, Kent and Rushing (1999) updated the Kent (1989) study, by examining 14 principles of economics textbooks (including both micro and macro) to learn the extent and nature of attention given to entrepreneurship. They found a small, but slightly increased level of attention, when compared to the Kent (1989) study. Johansson (2004) examined texts used in Swedish Ph.D. programs in economics and also found few references to entrepreneurship. Pashigian and Self (2007) examined intermediate microeconomics textbooks over time, and found that the textbooks have persisted in giving very substantial attention to imperfectly competitive markets, in spite of the substantial and growing evidence that such markets are relatively uncommon.

The new results reported in this paper, provide evidence of the extent to which Schumpeter in general, and creative destruction in particular, are adequately covered by recent textbooks. Twenty-seven recent introductory principles of microeconomics textbooks, with publication dates ranging from 2003 through 2007, were examined to see how often, and in what context, they made reference to Schumpeter. As far as I am aware, these 27 represent nearly all of the principles of microeconomics textbooks published recently by major United States publishers. Included among the 27 are the 9 best-selling textbooks for the year of 2005.<sup>1</sup>

We examined the indices of each textbook, recording all entries of the names of 'economists' and recording the number of pages on which the economists were mentioned in the text. Table 1 presents the top 30 economists, ordered first by the number of texts that referred to them, and then within groups of equal number of textbooks, ordered by the total number of pages referring to them. We count a person as being an 'economist' if the person either held an academic position as an economist, or is commonly identified as an economist in texts in the history of economic thought.

The good news is that only nine economists are mentioned in more

<sup>1</sup> Lucille Sutton of McGraw Hill has kindly shared with me some 2005 MIR data on new and used principles textbook sales. The ranking of textbooks for complete books (including both micro and macro) was: McConnell/Brue, Mankiw, McEarchern, Miller and Baumol/Blinder. The ranking of textbooks for micro splits was: Mankiw, McConnell/Brue, Parkin, Case, Bade/Parkin and Colander. Combining the complete books with the micro splits, the overall best-seller, was McConnell/Brue, with Mankiw as the second best-seller.

textbooks than Schumpeter. But the good news is not good enough. If creative destruction is indeed the essential fact about capitalism, then all textbooks should be mentioning Schumpeter.<sup>1</sup> But in fact, less than half (41%) of the textbooks have any reference to Schumpeter. And when one examines the substance of the references to Schumpeter, the news becomes even worse: of the 11 textbooks that mention Schumpeter, only six discuss, or come close to discussing, creative destruction.

The 16 texts that do **not** mention Schumpeter, are listed in Table 2. The 11 texts that **do** mention Schumpeter are listed in Table 3. Tables 4 and 5 provide more details on the 11 textbooks in Table 2, in the form of brief sketches of the nature of the Schumpeter references in each of those 11 textbooks. Table 4 sketches the Schumpeter references in the six textbooks that discuss, or come close to discussing, the process of creative destruction, while Table 5 does the same for the five textbooks that do not come close to discussing the process of creative destruction. The key result of this paper is that **only six out of 27 texts** discuss, or come close to discussing, the process of creative destruction.

One of the best treatments of Schumpeter, though brief, occurs in the McConnell and Brue text. They provide a good discussion of the process of creative destruction, in a separate (non-core) chapter on «Technology, R&D, and Efficiency».<sup>2</sup> One may hope that their treatment of Schumpeter helps explain why McConnell and Brue is «the nation's best-selling economics textbook» (2002, ix).<sup>3</sup>

Although my primary goal is to present cross-sectional results, for 14 of the texts in the sample, we have also tabulated results for an edition earlier than that reported so far. These texts are: Arnold; Bade and Parkin; Baumol and Blinder; Boyes and Melvin; Colander; Frank and Bernanke; McConnell and Brue; McEachern; O'Sullivan and Sheffrin; Parkin; Samuelson and Nordhaus; Schiller; Stiglitz and Walsh; and Taylor. (For Taylor, we have tabulated results for two earlier editions). In **none** of the 14 texts was there any change between editions, in the

<sup>1</sup> I accidentally noticed that one textbook, Mankiw, included (2004, 368) a brief mention of creative destruction in the context of a quote from Larry Summers, though Schumpeter is not mentioned and the phrase «creative destruction» does not appear in the index. I then checked the indexes of all of the textbooks (and editions) listed in Tables 2 and 3, to see how many had a main entry (i.e., an entry under «C»; not a sub-entry under «Schumpeter») for «creative destruction». I found only four textbooks with such an entry: Gottheil, McConnell and Brue (both editions), and McEachern (both editions).

<sup>2</sup> By «non-core» I mean outside of those chapters that would be thought mandatory for a professor to teach by most economics departments. This is my judgment.

<sup>3</sup> After some search, and consultation with a senior reference librarian, I was unable to find published statistics on economics textbook market shares. (In the future, it may be possible to obtain some information on this issue from the sales rank among textbooks on Amazon.com).

number of references to Schumpeter; this despite Schumpeter's standing in the profession as a whole having grown substantially in the past decade (see Diamond 2006c).

Two of the micro-principles textbooks were co-authored by economists whose own work is openly complementary to the Schumpeterian process of creative destruction: Baumol and Nordhaus. Baumol and Blinder's textbook is a surprise because it includes no references to Schumpeter, and although there is a chapter on technology, there is no summary account of the process of creative destruction.

It is harder to know what to expect from Samuelson and Nordhaus's textbook, since some early Samuelson writings on Schumpeter were somewhat critical. More recently (2003) Samuelson, has acknowledged Schumpeter's important contribution. My original hypothesis had been that the addition of Nordhaus as a co-author in 1985, of the 12<sup>th</sup> edition,<sup>1</sup> would explain the substantial discussions of Schumpeter. But after examining the first 11 editions,<sup>2</sup> I discovered that Schumpeter has been discussed since the first edition, and the version of the Schumpeter discussion in the most recent edition of the text is mainly similar to the expanded discussion of the Schumpeter that first appeared in the second edition. Without mentioning the phrase «creative destruction»,<sup>3</sup> the Samuelson and Nordhaus textbook does a good job of summarizing some of the main issues in Schumpeter's account.

In his retrospective article (1978) on the economics literature subsequent to his refutation (1947) of the kinky demand curve theory, George Stigler reached the cynical conclusion that the economics literature does not progress, because refuted error continues to be referenced and used. If we were to cast an equally jaundiced eye toward the textbook literature, we might mention that in the treatment of creative destruction, no current textbook surpasses the treatment given in 1954 by Van Sickle and Rogge.

#### 4. WHAT ECONOMISTS SHOULD TEACH

Sometimes, in teaching physics, false, simplifying assumptions are made, that are later qualified with more complete versions of what is believed.

<sup>1</sup> The addition of Nordhaus as co-author is briefly discussed in McGRAW 1998, 356.

<sup>2</sup> David Levy invited me to examine the first 11 editions of Samuelson that he and Sandra Peart have collected for their research on changes (or lack of changes) in the editions' discussions of the growth of the Soviet socialist economy.

<sup>3</sup> By e-mail, I asked Nordhaus why his textbook with Samuelson did not mention the phrase «creative destruction». In an e-mail to me dated 10.31.05, he responded: «We did not include the term primarily because the emphasis in our discussion of Schumpeterian economics is slightly different, pointed more to the issue of appropriability than the rather complex phenomenon of creative destruction. There is much of interest in his writings, and we could only include a small sample».

The student studies motion in a vacuum; even though the teacher does not believe we usually live in a vacuum. Or the student learns Newtonian mechanics, even though the teacher believes that Einsteinian relativistic mechanics is more generally true. In each case, one might argue that what is being taught is not completely true, but captures the essential truth for many practical situations. And soon, the student who continues to study the subject is provided a sketch of the fuller account.

Is this what we are doing in economics, when we assume the products already exist? The answer is «no» in a couple of respects. One of these is that we do not generally provide a fuller account if the student continues. An examination of several intermediate-level and graduate-level micro texts supports the hypothesis that at higher levels, the mathematical sophistication increases, but the fundamental assumptions and techniques remain the same: products are taken as given.<sup>1</sup>

A second respect in which the answer is «no» is that in economics we do not simplify to create an account that usually captures what is essential about the world. Here we assume away the essential fact: the creation of new products.

How then, could the economics profession do better? The vast majority of students who take principles of economics, never take economics beyond the principles level. This is our one chance to teach them the best that we have to offer; to help them understand the world in which they run their businesses, manage their careers, and vote for policies that permit or restrain economic growth and prosperity.

Even if we do not have a worked-out, graphical account of the process of creative destruction, we should be sure that all principles of micro-economics students are aware of Schumpeter's alternative account of what is most essential about capitalism. Ideally, this should appear in one of the core chapters on competition that are always covered in the principles course: either the chapter on perfect competition, or the chapter on monopoly.

In the longer run, we should work to construct a full chapter-length account of the process of creative destruction, if creative destruction is indeed the 'essential fact' about capitalism. Perhaps useful in this project, will be early efforts to represent aspects of the process of creative destruction in graphs that might be accessible at the principles level. One such graph might be McCloskey's graph (1985, 368) showing that a monopoly railroad might have lower prices than a competitive pack-mule 'industry'.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Schumpeter and the process of creative destruction, are sometimes given substantial attention in textbooks on growth theory. For example, see VAN DEN BERG 2004. Unfortunately, only relatively few students take courses on growth theory.

<sup>2</sup> A somewhat similar graph is presented in SCHERER 1996, 13. In contrast to McCloskey's

The graph represents the case where creative destruction substantially reduces prices for a product that in some sense already exists. But Schumpeter argued that the main benefits from creative destruction arose, not from lower prices, but from increases in consumer well-being from new kinds of products. A main goal for the future is to find better ways to measure and represent the most important benefits.

Table 1.

| REFERENCES TO SCHUMPETER IN US MICROECONOMIC PRINCIPLES TEXTBOOKS |                        |            |              |
|---|------------------------|------------|--------------|
| RANK  | ECONOMIST              | # OF TEXTS | SUM OF PAGES |
| 1   | Smith, Adam            | 27         | 169          |
| 2   | Coase, Ronald          | 21         | 36           |
| 3   | Ricardo, David         | 19         | 50           |
| 4   | Marx, Karl             | 17         | 31           |
| 5   | Keynes, John Maynard   | 16         | 29           |
| 6   | Friedman, Milton       | 16         | 28           |
| 7   | Marshall, Alfred       | 13         | 29           |
| 8   | Nash, John             | 13         | 17           |
| 9   | Krueger, Alan B.       | 12         | 14           |
| 10  | Schumpeter, Joseph A.  | 11         | 23           |
| 11  | Bentham, Jeremy        | 11         | 15           |
| 12  | Stigler, George        | 11         | 14           |
| 13  | Malthus, Thomas Robert | 10         | 16           |
| 14  | Buchanan, James        | 10         | 13           |
| 15  | Pigou, Arthur Cecil    | 9          | 11           |
| 16  | Chamberlin, Edward     | 9          | 10           |
| 17  | Becker, Gary           | 8          | 19           |
| 18  | George, Henry          | 8          | 11           |
| 19  | Pareto, Vilfredo       | 8          | 10           |
| 20  | Card, David            | 8          | 9            |
| 21  | Arrow, Kenneth J.      | 7          | 10           |
| 22  | Robinson, Joan         | 7          | 10           |
| 23  | Houthakker, H. S.      | 7          | 9            |
| 24  | Simon, Herbert         | 7          | 9            |
| 25  | Akerlof, George        | 7          | 8            |
| 26  | Simon, Julian          | 7          | 8            |
| 27  | Hamermesh, Daniel      | 7          | 7            |
| 28  | Hayek, Friedrich       | 6          | 12           |
| 29  | Kahneman, Daniel       | 6          | 10           |
| 30  | Mill, John Stuart      | 6          | 9            |

version, Scherer's version may be slightly less effective at the principles level, because it assumes a knowledge of consumer and producer surplus, and because it is not anchored in a plausible concrete example.

TABLE 2.

| THE 16 US MICROECONOMIC PRINCIPLES TEXTBOOKS<br>THAT <u>DO NOT</u> MENTION SCHUMPETER |                       |                  |                        |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| AUTHOR(S)   | EDITIONS <sup>1</sup> | YEARS            | PUBLISHER              |
| Arnold  | 5; 7                  | 2001, 2005       | Thomson South-Western  |
| Ayers and Collinge  | Enhanced              | 2005             | Pearson Addison-Wesley |
| Bade and Parkin   | 1; 2                  | 2002, 2004       | Pearson Addison-Wesley |
| Baumol and Blinder  | 9; 10                 | 2003, 2006       | Thomson South-Western  |
| Boyes and Melvin  | 5; 6                  | 2002, 2005       | Houghton Mifflin       |
| Frank and Bernanke  | 2; 3                  | 2004, 2007       | McGraw Hill/Irwin      |
| Goodwin, Nelson, et al  | 1                     | 2005             | Houghton Mifflin       |
| Hall and Lieberman  | 3                     | 2005             | Thomson South-Western  |
| Krugman and Wells   | 1                     | 2005             | Worth                  |
| Mankiw  | 3                     | 2004             | Thomson South-Western  |
| Miller  | 12                    | 2004             | Pearson Addison-Wesley |
| O'Sullivan and Sheffrin   | 3; 4                  | 2003, 2005       | Pearson Addison-Wesley |
| O'Sullivan and Sheffrin<br><i>Activebook</i>  | 1                     | 2003             | Pearson Addison-Wesley |
| Parkin  | 3; 7                  | 1996, 2005       | Pearson Addison-Wesley |
| Sexton  | 3                     | 2005             | Thomson South-Western  |
| Taylor  | 3; 4; 5               | 2001, 2004, 2007 | Houghton Mifflin       |

TABLE 3.

| THE 11 US MICROECONOMIC PRINCIPLES TEXTBOOKS<br>THAT <u>DO</u> MENTION SCHUMPETER |          |            |                        |
|---|----------|------------|------------------------|
| AUTHOR(S)   | EDITIONS | YEARS      | PUBLISHER              |
| Case and Fair   | 7        | 2004       | Pearson Addison-Wesley |
| Colander  | 5; 6     | 2004, 2006 | McGraw Hill/Irwin      |
| Gottheil  | 4        | 2005       | Thomson South-Western  |
| Gwartney, Stroup, et al   | 10       | 2003       | Thomson South-Western  |
| Hubbard and O'Brien   | 1        | 2006       | Prentice Hall          |
| McConnell and Brue  | 15; 16   | 2002, 2005 | McGraw Hill/Irwin      |
| McEachern   | 6; 7     | 2003, 2006 | Thomson South-Western  |
| Samuelson and Nordhaus  | 17; 18   | 2001, 2005 | McGraw Hill/Irwin      |
| Schiller  | 9; 10    | 2003, 2006 | McGraw Hill/Irwin      |
| Stiglitz and Walsh  | 3; 4     | 2002, 2006 | W.W. Norton            |
| Tucker  | 3        | 2003       | Thomson South-Western  |

<sup>1</sup> In order to save space, when multiple editions of a textbook are mentioned in the paper, only the most recent edition is fully referenced in the bibliography.

TABLE 4.

---

BRIEF CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE SIX US MICROECONOMIC PRINCIPLES  
TEXTBOOKS THAT DISCUSS, OR COME CLOSE TO DISCUSSING, CREATIVE  
DESTRUCTION

---

1. Stiglitz and Walsh have a good account of «Schumpeterian competition». They describe «creative destruction», and point out it can result in new products, or lower costs. They also note that the dominant position would eventually be destroyed by a new competitor.
  2. Gwartney, Stroup, et al discuss «creative destruction» and mention both the new products and new processes. They also call the process «dynamic competition».
  3. McConnell and Brue discuss «creative destruction», emphasizing the new product aspect. They point out that the process can destroy old monopolies, but they also suggest that old monopolies can build «storm shelters».
  4. McEachern mentions «creative destruction». He mentions «dynamic» competition, and new product innovation (but not new processes that lower costs).
  5. Hubbard and O'Brien discuss «creative destruction» in terms just of new products. They say that higher prices will result, but these higher prices are less important than the value of innovations.
  6. Samuelson and Nordhaus have a variety of references to Schumpeter, but never actually use the phrase «creative destruction». They do talk about dynamic competition and about innovation. They also mention the big is better hypothesis, his prediction of the decline of capitalism, his views about entrepreneurship, his view of the importance of fiscal policy, and his importance as an historian of economic thought.
- 

TABLE 5.

---

BRIEF CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE FIVE US MICROECONOMIC PRINCIPLES  
TEXTBOOKS THAT DO NOT COME CLOSE TO DISCUSSING CREATIVE  
DESTRUCTION

---

1. Schiller mentions only that Schumpeter thought «animal spirits» of entrepreneurs were unleashed under free markets to result in innovation.
  2. Case and Fair quote Schumpeter as believing that big firms are more likely to produce technological innovation. They seem to be implying that big firms are the «source» of innovation, but they are brief and fuzzy.
  3. Gottheil focuses on lower prices through process innovation. He co-mingles this with the claim that monopolies are the source of innovation. He makes no mention of «creative destruction».
  4. Colander only has an obscure reference in a couple of «Problems and Exercises» questions. The reference is to the «size» issue, but Colander suggests that Schumpeter believed the opposite of what is usually claimed, saying he: «...predicted that as firms in capitalist societies grew in size they would innovate less» (82).
  5. Tucker mentions only that Schumpeter thought monopoly was good because monopolies would have the financial resources to invest in R&D. So this is mainly a monopoly as source of innovation argument.
-

## REFERENCES

Note: In order to save space, when multiple editions of a textbook are mentioned in the paper, only the most recent edition is fully referenced in the bibliography.

- ARNOLD R. A. 2005, *Microeconomics*, 6<sup>th</sup> edn., Mason (OH), Thomson South-Western.
- AYERS R. M. and COLLINGE R. A. 2005, *Microeconomics Explore and Apply*, enhanced edn., Upper Saddle River (NJ), Pearson Education.
- BADE R. and PARKIN M. 2004, *Foundations of Microeconomics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Boston (MA), Pearson Addison-Wesley.
- BAUMOL W. J. 2006, «Textbook Entrepreneurship: Comment on Johansson», *Econ Journal Watch*, 3, 1, 133-136.
- BAUMOL W. J. and BLINDER A. S. 2006, *Microeconomics, Principles and Policy*, 10<sup>th</sup> edn., Mason (OH), Thomson South-Western.
- BECKER G. S. 1971, *Economic Theory*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf.
- 1998, «Make the World Safe for 'Creative Destruction'», *Business Week*, February 23, 20.
- BOYES W. and MELVIN M. 2005, *Microeconomics*, 6<sup>th</sup> edn., Boston (MA), Houghton Mifflin.
- CASE K. E. and FAIR R. C. 2004, *Principles of Microeconomics*, 7<sup>th</sup> edn., Upper Saddle River (NJ), Pearson Addison-Wesley.
- COLANDER D. C. 2004, *Microeconomics*, 5<sup>th</sup> edn., New York, New York, McGraw Hill/Irwin.
- 2006, *Microeconomics*, 6<sup>th</sup> edn., New York, McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- DIAMOND A. M., JR. 1996, «Review of *Economics-Mathematical Politics or Science of Diminishing Returns?*», *Journal of Political Economy*, 104, 3, 655-659.
- 2006a, «Schumpeter's Century: The Growing Recognition that Creative Destruction Matters», Working Paper.
- 2006b, «Schumpeter's Century: A Review of the Evidence», *Journal of Private Enterprise*, 22, 1, 120-146.
- 2006c, «Schumpeter vs. Keynes: "In the Long Run Not All of Us Are Dead"», Working Paper.
- 2004, «Zvi Griliches's Contributions to the Economics of Technology and Growth», *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 13, 4, 365-397.
- FRANK R. H. and BERNANKE B. S. 2007, *Principles of Micro Economics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn., New York, McGraw Hill/Irwin.
- GOODWIN N., NELSON J. A., ACKERMAN F. and WEISSKOPF T. 2005, *Microeconomics in Context*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company.
- GOTTHEIL F. M. 2005, *Principles of Microeconomics*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn., Mason (OH), Thomson.
- GRILICHES Z. 2000, *R&D, Education, and Productivity: A Retrospective*, Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press.
- GROVE A. S. 1999, *Only the Paranoid Survive: How to Exploit the Crisis Points That Challenge Every Company*, New York, Bantam Books.
- GWARTNEY J. D., STROUP R. L., SOBEL R. S. and MACPHERSON D. A. 2003, *Microeconomics: Public and Private Choice*, 10<sup>th</sup> edn., Mason (OH), Thomson South-Western.
- HALL R. E. and LIEBERMAN M. 2005, *Principles and Applications*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn., Mason (OH), Thomson South-Western.
- HUBBARD R. G. and O'BRIEN A. P. 2005, *Principles of Microeconomics*, Upper Saddle River (NJ), Prentice Hall.

- JOHANSSON D. 2005, «Economics without Entrepreneurship or Institutions: A Vocabulary Analysis of Graduate Textbooks», *Econ Journal Watch*, 1, 3, 515-538.
- KENT C. A. 1989, «Entrepreneurship as a Concept in Collegiate Principles of Economics Texts», *Journal of Economic Education*, 20, 2, 153-164.
- KENT C. A. and RUSHING F. W. 1999, «Coverage of Entrepreneurship in Principles of Economics Textbooks: An Update», *Journal of Economic Education*, 30, 2, 184-188.
- KRUGMAN P. 2003, *The Great Unraveling: Losing Our Way in the New Century*, New York, W. W. Norton & Company.
- KRUGMAN P. and WELLS R. 2005, *Microeconomics*, 1<sup>st</sup> edn., New York, Worth Publishers.
- MANKIW N. G. 2004, *Principles of Microeconomics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn., Mason (OH), Thomson South-Western.
- MARX K. 1967, *Das Kapital*, 1, New York, International Publishers.
- MAYHEW A. 1980, «Schumpeterian Capitalism Versus the ‘Schumpeterian Thesis’», *Journal of Economic Issues*, 14, 2, 583-592.
- MCCLOSKEY D. N. 1985, *The Applied Theory of Price*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., New York, Macmillan.
- MCCONNELL C. and BRUE S. L. 2005, *Microeconomics: Principles, Problems, and Policies*, 16<sup>th</sup> edn., New York, McGraw Hill.
- MCEACHERN W. A. 2006, *Microeconomics: A Contemporary Introduction*, 7<sup>th</sup> edn., Mason (OH), Thomson South-Western.
- MCGRAW, H. W., JR. 1999, «Samuelson’s Economics at Fifty: Remarks on the Occasion of the Anniversary of Publication», *The Journal of Economic Education*, 30, 4, 355-356.
- MILLER R. L. 2004, *Economics Today: The Micro View*, 12<sup>th</sup> edn., Boston (MA), Pearson Addison-Wesley.
- O’SULLIVAN A. and SHEFFRIN S. M. 2005, *Microeconomics, Principles and Tools*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn., Upper Saddle River (NJ), Pearson Education.
- 2003, *Activebook*, 1<sup>st</sup> edn., Upper Saddle River (NJ), Pearson Education.
- PAGE M. 2000, *The Creative Destruction of Manhattan, 1900-1940*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- PARKIN M. 2005, *Microeconomics*, 7<sup>th</sup> edn., Boston (MA), Pearson Addison-Wesley.
- PASHIGIAN B. P. and SELF J. K. 2007, «Teaching Microeconomics in Wonderland», *Journal of Economic Education*, 38, 1, 44-57.
- PATINKIN D. 1983, «Multiple Discoveries and the Central Message», *American Journal of Sociology*, 89, 2, 306-323.
- REINERT H. and REINERT E. S. 2006, «Creative Destruction in Economics: Nietzsche, Sombart, Schumpeter», in *Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900): Economy and Society*, ed. by J. G. Backhaus and W. Drechsler, Springer.
- ROSEN S. 1997, «Austrian and Neoclassical Economics: Any Gains from Trade?», *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11, 4, 139-152.
- ROSENBERG A. 1992, *Economics-Mathematical Politics or Science of Diminishing Returns? Science and Its Conceptual Foundations*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- SAMUELSON P. A. 2003, «Reflections on the Schumpeter I Knew Well», *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 13, 5, 463-467.
- SAMUELSON P. A. and NORDHAUS W. D. 2005, *Microeconomics*, 18<sup>th</sup> edn., New York, McGraw Hill/Irwin.
- SCHERER F. M. 1996, *Industry Structure, Strategy, and Public Policy*, New York, Harper Collins.
- SCHILLER B. R. 2006, *The Micro Economy Today*, 10<sup>th</sup> edn., New York, McGraw Hill/Irwin.

- SCHUMPETER J. A. 1950, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn., New York, Harper & Row.
- SEXTON R. L. 2005, *Exploring Microeconomics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn., Mason (OH), Thomson South-Western.
- SIEGFRIED J. J. 2000, «How Many College Students Are Exposed to Economics?», *Journal of Economic Education*, 31, 2, 202-204.
- STIGLER G. J. 1947, «The Kinky Oligopoly Demand Curve and Rigid Prices», *Journal of Political Economy*, 55, 5, 432-449.
- 1978, «The Literature of Economics: The Case of the Kinked Oligopoly Demand Curve», *Economic Inquiry*, 16, 2, 185-204.
- 1988, *Memoirs of an Unregulated Economist*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- 1982, «The Scientific Uses of Scientific Biography, With Special Reference to J. S. Mill», in *The Economist as Preacher, and Other Essays*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 86-97.
- 1987, *The Theory of Price*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn., New York, Macmillan Publishing Co.
- STIGLITZ J. E. and WALSH C. E. 2006, *Principles of Microeconomics*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn., New York, W. W. Norton & Company.
- STREISSLER E. W. 1994, «The Influence of German and Austrian Economics on Joseph A. Schumpeter», in *Schumpeter and the History of Ideas*, ed. by Y. Shionoya and M. Perlman, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 13-38.
- TAYLOR J. B. 2007, *Principles of Microeconomics*, 5<sup>th</sup> edn., Boston (MA), Houghton Mifflin.
- TUCKER I. B. 2003, *Microeconomics for Today*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn., Mason (OH), South-Western.
- VAN SICKLE J. and ROGGE B. 1954, *Introduction to Economics*, New York, Van Nostrand.
- VAN DEN BERG H. 2001, *Economic Growth and Development*, New York, McGraw Hill.

# CONTENTS

## NEW PERSPECTIVES ON THE SCHUMPETER FRONTIER

Edited by  
Christian Seidl

CHRISTIAN SEIDL, *Preface* 11

### NEO-SCHUMPETERIAN ECONOMICS

HORST HANUSCH and ANDREAS PYKA, *Manifesto for Comprehensive Neo-Schumpeterian Economics* 23

CHRISTIAN SEIDL, *Neo-Schumpeterian Tax Reform: The Case of Germany* 43

### SCHUMPETERIAN EVOLUTION AND SOCIOLOGY

YUICHI SHIONOYA, *Schumpeter and Evolution: A Philosophical Interpretation* 65

J. STANLEY METCALFE, *Alfred Marshall and the General Theory of Evolutionary Economics* 81

RICCARDO FAUCCI, *Max Weber's Influence on Schumpeter* 111

### INNOVATIONS AND CREATIVE DESTRUCTION

MARK CASSON and NIGEL WADESON, *The Search for Entrepreneurial Opportunity* 137

PETER KESTING, *Why Innovations have to Overcome Routine* 159

PETER J. HAMMOND, *Schumpeterian Innovation in Modelling Decisions, Games, and Economic Behaviour* 179

ARTHUR M. DIAMOND, *The Neglect of Creative Destruction in Micro-principles Texts* 197



*History of Economic Ideas* is published three times a year by  
FABRIZIO SERRA · EDITORE, Pisa · Roma,  
an imprint of ACCADEMIA EDITORIALE,  
P. O. Box no. 1, Succ. no. 8 · I 56123 Pisa  
Phone +39 050 542332 · Fax +39 050 574888  
www.libraweb.net

*Pisa Office:* Via Santa Bibbiana 28 · I 56127 Pisa.

E-mail: [accademiaeditoriale@accademiaeditoriale.it](mailto:accademiaeditoriale@accademiaeditoriale.it)

*Rome Office:* Via Bonghi 11/b (Colle Oppio) · I 00184 Roma.

E-mail: [accademiaeditoriale.roma@accademiaeditoriale.it](mailto:accademiaeditoriale.roma@accademiaeditoriale.it)

Annual subscription rates (2007) are as follows:

*Italy*, individuals € 125,00, institutions (with Online Edition) € 325,00;  
*Abroad*, individuals € 245,00, institutions (with Online Edition) € 425,00;

*Reduced rate* for ESHET members: € 183,75;

*Reduced rate* for STOREP members: € 183,75;

Single issue € 120,00.

Subscriptions should be paid as follows:

*by cheque/international money order* payable to ACCADEMIA EDITORIALE;  
*postal giro account no. 17154550;*

*by credit card* (American Express, Eurocard, Mastercard, Visa).

The Publisher guarantees that the personal details supplied by subscribers will be treated as strictly confidential and can be altered or deleted if expressly requested in writing. Such details will be held by the Publisher and used only to inform the subscribers of new publishing initiatives (D. Lgs. 196/2003).

© Copyright 2007 by

FABRIZIO SERRA · EDITORE, Pisa · Roma,

an imprint of ACCADEMIA EDITORIALE, Pisa · Roma.

ACCADEMIA EDITORIALE<sup>®</sup>, Pisa · Roma, publishes with the imprint  
FABRIZIO SERRA · EDITORE<sup>®</sup>, Pisa · Roma, both its journals formerly printed with  
the imprint ISTITUTI EDITORIALI E POLIGRAFICI INTERNAZIONALI<sup>®</sup>, Pisa · Roma,  
and the books of its series formerly printed with the imprints  
EDIZIONI DELL' ATENEIO<sup>®</sup>, Roma, GIARDINI EDITORI E STAMPATORI IN PISA<sup>®</sup>,  
GRUPPO EDITORIALE INTERNAZIONALE<sup>®</sup>, Pisa · Roma,  
and ISTITUTI EDITORIALI E POLIGRAFICI INTERNAZIONALI<sup>®</sup>, Pisa · Roma

Printed in Italy

ISSN 1122-8792

ELECTRONIC ISSN 1724-2169

ISBN 978-88-6227-018-2

*New perspectives on the Schumpeter frontier:* CHRISTIAN SEIDL, *Preface* · **Neo-Schumpeterian Economics:** HORST HANUSCH and ANDREAS PYKA, *Manifesto for Comprehensive Neo-Schumpeterian Economics* · CHRISTIAN SEIDL, *Neo-Schumpeterian Tax Reform: The Case of Germany* · **Schumpeterian Evolution and Sociology:** YUICHI SHIONOYA, *Schumpeter and Evolution: A Philosophical Interpretation* · J. STANLEY METCALFE, *Alfred Marshall and the General Theory of Evolutionary Economics* · RICCARDO FAUCCI, *Max Weber's Influence on Schumpeter* · **Innovations and Creative Destruction:** MARK CASSON and NIGEL WADESON, *The Search for Entrepreneurial Opportunity* · PETER KESTING, *Why Innovations have to Overcome Routine* · PETER J. HAMMOND, *Schumpeterian Innovation in Modelling Decisions, Games, and Economic Behaviour* · ARTHUR M. DIAMOND, *The Neglect of Creative Destruction in Microprinciples Texts*.