APPENDIX B Heterodox Economics at Three Other Universities
It is interesting to compare the experience in reference to radical political economics at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst with that in economics departments at other universities. Now, as has been pointed out earlier in this book, the PhD program in the Economics Department on the Amherst campus of the University of Massachusetts was unique from the early 1970s through the mid 1980s in its single-minded, intense focus on radical political economics. PhD programs in economics departments at other universities having radical political economists on their faculties were more generally heterodox in character. (The phrase heterodox economics has been recently introduced to refer to approaches to economic thought and analysis that are considered to lie outside of the purview of mainstream economics, or what is taken to be economics by the economics establishment. Currently, radical political economics as defined in Chapter 1, including Marxian economics, along with such fields as post-Keynesian economics, institutional economics, and feminist economics are deemed to fall under the heterodox rubric.) In perusing the following descriptions of contrasting departments, this distinction between the tightly focused PhD program in the University of Massachusetts Department and the more diverse avenues of thought present in the PhD programs in other departments should be kept in mind. Experiences in economics departments at three universities—the University of California at Riverside, the University of Notre Dame, and the New School for Social Research—are presented only in very brief outline with many details omitted.\(^1\) In the first instance, the heterodox group still sits uneasily with an establishment group; in the second, the heterodox group was recently disbanded by the university administration; and in (p.188) the third, the department has always been comfortably heterodox in overall character. Because, with respect to the third, the Economics Department at the New School has, since its inception, been devoted to the development of various avenues of heterodox economics, it will be useful, in what follows, to trace somewhat more fully the historical development of that department's academic programs than what is presented in the other cases.

**University of California at Riverside** At the University of California Riverside, the graduate PhD program in economics was administered in a tricameral way. There were three distinct groups of economists on campus who were involved:
(1) those who were in the Economics Department and who were, by the late 1980s, all heterodox economists (not necessarily Marxist or radical political economists) in various ways, (2) those in the School of Business Administration who were establishment or mainstream economists specializing to a considerable extent in econometrics and microeconomic and macroeconomic theory, and (3) a small group of environmental economists located in the Environmental Studies Department and who were also mainstream economists. Policy decisions about curriculum in the economics PhD program were decided by a vote, where each group (not each economist) had one vote. Because the business school and environmental economists voted in the same way on important curricular decisions, they would always defeat the heterodox economists in the Economics Department who had the largest number of faculty constituting in most years a slight majority of all participating economists. This was an unstable situation that led to considerable tension, struggling, and bad feelings, particularly in relation to the nature of the core courses in the economics PhD program. Circumstances changed in 1992, when the economists from the business school were merged with those in the Economics Department. The environmental economists remained outside of the Department and continued to offer courses in the PhD program, but they no longer voted on matters relating to it. Although the governance structure became more democratic with one faculty member now having one vote, the battle over the core courses has persisted. To this day the core is still a very mainstream sequence of courses.

University of Notre Dame At the University of Notre Dame, the history of the Department of Economics as a department open to different perspectives (consisting of both mainstream and heterodox theories and approaches) began in 1975 when Charles Wilber was hired away from American University to serve as the chair of the Notre Dame department. Wilber and subsequent chairs worked to keep that tradition alive, in both the undergraduate and graduate programs. Over the years, the Department focused on key areas, such as economic development, labor, history of economic thought, and public policy that were not necessarily cultivated in mainstream economics departments. It also included, in addition to mainstream theory and methods, a wide range of theories (including Marxian, post-Keynesian, and
in institutionalist economics) and methods (including case studies, history, and textual interpretation). The rationale of the department as one that was open to divergent theories and methods was twofold: It served as an alternative to programs that were purely mainstream in nature, and it corresponded to the Catholic character at Notre Dame, especially in emphasizing the heterodox issues of economic and social justice.

Beginning in the 1980s, the Department came under pressure from the university administration to become more mainstream. The Department successfully resisted that pressure until, in 2003, the administration decided to split the Department by creating a new department of economics devoted solely to neoclassical economics that was called the Department of Economics and Econometrics (with five faculty), and to rename the existing department as the Department of Economics and Policy Studies (with sixteen faculty). The administration also decreed that the economics PhD program and all subsequent faculty hires in economics would go to the new department, and the renamed department was barred from obtaining new faculty and from participating in the doctoral program. Then, in February of 2010, the university administration dissolved the Department of Economics and Policy Studies, scattered its faculty elsewhere in the University, and renamed the mainstream department the Department of Economics.

**New School for Social Research** The New School for Social Research\(^2\) was founded in 1919 by a distinguished group of intellectuals, some of whom were teaching at Columbia University in New York City during the World War I. Fervent pacifists, they took a public stand against the war and were censured by the Columbia's president. The outspoken professors responded by resigning from Columbia and later opening up their own university for adults in New York's Chelsea district as a place where people could exchange ideas freely with scholars and artists representing a wide range of intellectual, aesthetic, and political orientations. The original faculty included Charles A. Beard, Thorstein B. Veblen, James Harvey Robinson, Wesley Clair Mitchell, John Dewey, and Alvin S. Johnson.
With unorthodox economists like Veblen, Robinson, and Mitchell on the faculty, it is not surprising that the history of heterodox economics in the Economics Department extends back to the very beginning of the New School. An influx from Germany and France in the 1930s brought a new group of progressive (and unorthodox) European scholars into the picture: Adolph Lowe, Hans P. Neisser, Gerhard Colm, Jacob Marschak, Emil Lederer, Hans Staudinger, Eduard Heimann, and Abba P. Lerner were among the foreign economists who arrived at the New School at that time. John Maynard Keynes, visiting from England, lectured in the Department in 1931, and Franco Modigliani, an Italian student, received his doctorate under Marschak's supervision in 1944.

This phase lasted into the 1960s, at which point a different heterodox current began to appear in the Department through the interests of faculty members Robert L. Heilbroner, Michael Hudson, and Stephen H. Hymer. That current was an American-grown tradition, which, in part, made the history of thought central to the Department, and focused on the United States in a global context. Edward J. Nell added an important Keynesian and Cambridge (UK) link, which has been maintained to the present day. The long-standing European connections noted earlier were extended to Italy in keeping with the economic debates of the times. Anwar M. Shaikh, David Gordon, and Ross Thomson brought radical and Marxian economics to the Department in the early 1970s, Willi Semmler added a strong mathematical orientation in the early 1980s, and, during the same period, Heidi Hartmann, Gita Sen, Nancy Folbre, and Rhonda M. Williams made gender and race central to the curriculum. There was also a corresponding change in the student body, whose composition shifted toward the Third World, with a strong representation of Turks, Iranians, Mexicans, and Brazilians. The political struggles across the world were reflected in the Economics Department in lively theoretical debates between Keynesians, Marxians, neo-Ricardians, and institutionalists.

However, by the late 1980s, the rapidly rising net cost of a New School education significantly shrank the international (and more radical) component of the student body. At the same time, the Department came under increasing pressure from the administration to change. Gender and race substantially vanished as a field of study. In keeping with the times,
mathematics, microeconomics, game theory, and econometrics became more important, and history of economic thought and Marxian economics correspondingly less so. But international trade, economic development, and Keynesian theory remained central throughout, and they were strengthened by the arrival of William S. Milberg and Lance Taylor in the 1990s. John L. Eatwell reinforced the Cambridge view and connection during that time. He was also instrumental in forming the Center for Economic Policy Analysis (CEPA) near the end of the period, with the aim of furthering alternative perspectives on global economic policy. Duncan K. Foley’s arrival in the early 2000s greatly enhanced the offerings in game theory, microeconomics, and agent-based simulation. On the other hand, what had been a full two-year graduate sequence in Reading and Using Marx’s Capital, which ran for two decades, essentially disappeared from the curriculum by the end of the 1990s. However, these themes remain alive, albeit in reduced form, in seminars and occasional courses by Shaikh and Foley. In recent times, the student interest in them seems to have reawakened. Most recently, Teresa Ghilarducci joined the Department as the head of the Schwartz Center for Policy Analysis (formerly the CEPA) in the mid-2000s, reorienting its focus on U.S. concerns in a global context. Finally, the program in economic development and international inequality have been particularly strengthened through the arrival of Sanjay Reddy and Lopamudra Banerjee. (p.192)

Notes:

(1.) Except as noted, the descriptions that follow were provided (subject to my editing) by, respectively, Steven E. Cullenberg, David F. Ruccio, and Anwar M. Shaikh.

(2.) This paragraph was taken from the New School’s web site.
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