The Making of a Radical Economist

HOWARD J SHERMAN, University of California, Los Angeles
THE MAKING OF A RADICAL ECONOMIST

By Howard J. Sherman
Professor Emeritus in Economics at University of California, Riverside
And Visiting Scholar in Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles

Mailing address:
Howard Sherman, Apt. 506
10790 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, California 90024

Email: sherman@polisci.ucla.edu
THE MAKING OF A RADICAL ECONOMIST

This article answers two questions. First, how do radical economists develop? Second, how do radical departments develop? In order to answer these two questions, I use my own experience in becoming a radical economist and my own experience in developing a radical department. For biographies – and some autobiographies – of many radical economists, see the excellent collection on “dissenting economists” by Sawyer and Arestis, 1982. Their biographies show that the development of radical economists is affected by their political-economic and personal environment, but also by the intellectual environment provided by past economic ideas and by their teachers.

HOW DO RADICAL ECONOMISTS DEVELOP?

My father went bankrupt in the Great Depression. I heard a great deal about this fact and the horrors of the depression as I grew up. So I resolved to understand why depressions occur and how to get rid of them – and about half my research has been on this subject (see, e.g. Sherman, 1991, 2003). But being a radical is more than having a concern about such issues as depressions. When I studied economics, I found that neoclassical economists believed that the system worked well; it was merely subject to external shocks. Since the Great Depression revealed dramatically the instability of the system, since recessions keep occurring, and since all of them have many similar sequences of cause and effect, I rejected the neoclassical paradigm of a perfectly functioning system as an apologetic argument to protect vested interests in the system. My own research has therefore concentrated on the internal processes of the business
cycle, why it is unique to capitalism, and how drastic systemic changes are necessary to rid ourselves of this disease.

A second issue that influenced my early development was war. The Second World War was much discussed and dominated many movies of my early growing up. I believed that the Second World War was justified, but the horrors of tens of millions of people being killed gave me nightmares. I was an activist in the peace movement, taking part in hundreds of rallies from anti-nuclear weapons in 1948 to anti-Iraqi War in 2003. But I asked why the system generates wars. Neoclassical economists had no answers. I read everything I could on the theory of imperialism, from Hobson to Lenin to Schumpeter. Having witnessed more military interventions by the imperialist powers in my life than I can count, I have internalized the theory of imperialism and have written on war and imperialism as part of the general radical paradigm of capitalism. Whereas neoclassicals see war as unrelated to the economic system, the radical view recognizes that wars are generated by the political-economic system due to the class relations that make war profitable for some vested interests. Radicals recognize that war is different in different systems, for example, slave states make war for land and slaves. Hunting and gathering societies don’t have prolonged wars because no one can gain much, since there is almost no wealth and the productivity is too low for a slave to produce a surplus. Capitalist countries make war as part of their unrelenting drive to help capitalist profits.

Third, my family was Jewish, so I was much affected by the holocaust. We lost 31 relatives in Poland – and I can not stand seeing movies about it; they are much too
painful. The holocaust left me with a hatred of all discrimination. So I have always fought racism.

THE TIME OF HOPE

The winning of the war against fascism was the greatest victory for the Left in my life – and it was soon followed by the victorious Chinese revolution, which led to euphoria and great hopes on the Left. In the United States in the late 1940s, the Civil Rights movement got stronger, the Peace movement grew, and the Progressive Party in 1948 gave rise to high hopes.

I went as an undergraduate at the University of Chicago in 1947-1948. In that period the largest single organization on campus was the American Veteran’s Committee, composed of liberal veterans. These “elderly” men – mostly aged 25 to 30, whereas I was 15 when I started -- made my classes very exciting. The second largest organization on campus in 1948 was the Progressive Party. The Progressive Party was my first experience with the thrill of intensive third party politics – and it left me with the lasting idea that one’s theories should be combined with practical activity.

In addition, because I hated racism, I was Vice President of the National Association of Colored People (NAACP) chapter at the University of Chicago. In that organization, and many Left organizations, I underwent my share of criticism for my own prejudices – that experience shaped me so that anti-racism is a vital part of my viewpoint.

For many years as I studied economics, I was shocked that neoclassical economists ignored racism – even though the South was segregated and there were still many lynchings of African Americans. Though I have seldom written solely on racism, it
has been prominent in most of my books. I have criticized every kind of racism -- including Jewish racism against Arabs -- for which criticism I was attacked and even called anti-Semitic to the horror of my parents. The important point for the radical paradigm is not to be merely anti-racist, but to understand how a political economic system generates racism.

One of my role models was Paul Robeson. His example in fighting and winning against great odds influenced my life. He sacrificed a very lucrative career to struggle against McCarthyism as well as racism. I was lucky enough to have private dinner with him and his wife in 1948. Unfortunately, I was so awestruck that I remember nothing of the conversation, just an overwhelming impression of his enormous strength and dignity. From my experiences and reading, I came to agree with Robeson that racism, sexism, and fascism all are interconnected with the basic institutions and class relations of capitalism (see, e.g., Sherman, 1995, Chapter 3).

The University of Chicago College, where I was from age 15 to 17, was my formative academic experience. The College was a unique experience because it used no textbooks in most courses, but relied only on so-called Great Books. The Great Books included Aristotle, John Stuart Mill, Freud, Marx, and many more. Their ideas were discussed not only in class, but also at lunch among the students, an intensive experience. My own teaching and curriculum ideas were affected by the Chicago emphasis on the history of thought and on the integration of several different disciplines on each topic.

The faculty at Chicago were mostly liberal, but the only think I remember from their teaching was how much one can learn from a close, analytic study of Great Books.
My main teachers were radical students and radicals in the community. We studied current events, but we also studied the classics of Marxism. I read a lot of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. Marx’s Capital was difficult for me at that age level.

I got a great deal of formal economics from the books of Paul Sweezy and Maurice Dobb – from whom I learned about the exploitation of workers and about capitalist economic crises. Many years later, I spent one afternoon with Maurice Dobb at Cambridge. Most of our talk was social, but I did learn that the cold war gave him some difficulties in teaching the courses he wanted even at Cambridge (but we did not discuss the subject in detail). I have met Sweezy many times, but most meetings were social and limited to discussions of current politics. It was his books that had enormous influence on me.

After two years at Chicago, I attended University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), as an undergraduate in 1948-1950 and completed the B.A. in Economics. At that time, most of the UCLA economists were liberals. In economics, Keynesian ideas were dominant. There were also many pro-labor economists in the field of Labor Economics. As a sectarian radical, I thought they were all conservative, so I learned less from them than I should have (and remember none of their names). Later, I realized that a radical must always remember that there are important differences between liberals and conservatives in both political practice and economic policy views. At UCLA I argued with all the teachers, but the only real conservative was in a class on the Soviet economy, in which the first half of the textbook was an attack on the Soviet Union and the last half
was an attack on Marx (mostly based on a version of Marx according to a book called What Marx Really Meant.

When I was an undergraduate in Economics at UCLA, I was the representative of a far Left journal called New Foundations, so I was attacked by a very nasty leaflet on campus. It appears that the leaflet was written by Bob Haldeman and John Erlichman, no doubt practicing for later dirty tricks, such as the Watergate break-in. In summary, both at Chicago and UCLA, the faculty were liberal and Keynesian, the Left was active, and everyone was very hopeful about the future.

A TIME OF DARKNESS AND DESPAIR

In spite of the beginnings of the Cold War, the late 1940s saw many Left victories around the world and some in the United States. But in June 1950 the Korean War began and the Cold War became hot and produced anti-Left hysteria. Any criticism of the Korean War was unpatriotic, un-American, and traitorous. It seemed to the far left that fascism had descended on the United States, an analytic error that led to many very unpleasant tactical errors, including a retreat from open political activity and stifling secrecy – which was especially silly because many FBI agents were in every organization.

I was at the University of Chicago Law School from 1950 to 1953, where I received the Jur. D. in 1953. There, I was President of the National Lawyer’s Guild chapter, an excellent Left lawyer’s association. I never went into law, but it was a big help in understanding many issues in economics, such as labor law, anti-trust law, and tax law. My teacher in anti-trust law, named Edward Levi, was a wonderful teacher and taught me how to use the dialectic method of question and answer in teaching. Once, I asked him
why the laws were so useless in preventing concentration. He replied that the laws were good, but the Attorney Generals who applied them were inept or cowardly. When Levi became Attorney General of the United States under Ford, he did even worse in applying the anti-trust laws than those who came before him. I conclude that trends in law are shaped by institutions and class relations, not primarily by good or bad individual values – an important point of view for radical economics.

FIGHTING THE ARMY

This section details my fight with the army, while the following section shows how it affected my radical economics. I was drafted into the U.S. army in 1953 during the Korean War. Thus began my long fight against the army. I found army life to be grim or funny, depending on your point of view. My first day in the army happened to be my birthday. I was roused out of bed at 5:00 am and set to washing spoons by hand in very hot water - a delightful way to spend my birthday!

The next day was more serious. The morning began with a multiple-choice test to see if you could read and answer questions. Since I had just finished law school, the test was easy and I walked out early. One soldier was already outside and we became friends, a friendship that lasted for many years. I once made the mistake of referring to him as my "friend" to other soldiers. They laughed and informed me that a "friend" referred to a homosexual relationship. To avoid laughter or more violent misunderstandings, I referred to him as my "buddy" after that.

He and I were assigned to clean the gutter behind the mess halls with little brooms. Then occurred my first act of defiance against the army. We agreed that only one man
should work at a time, while the other found a place to relax and read. If an officer came to check us, the person working would claim the other had gone to the restroom - and then whistle "Die Gedanken Sind Frei" (a German song meaning My Thoughts Are Free).

That afternoon, the real battle began. We had to sign a big stack of papers for the army. Near the bottom was the so-called Loyalty Oath. The Oath listed five hundred organizations - including the Committee Against the Loyalty Oath - all considered to be disloyal. Senator McCarthy had attacked the army for having Reds in it. A week after he started the attack, the army began requiring the Loyalty Oath - but the Army claimed this was pure coincidence.

The Oath required you to swear that you were not a member of any of the five hundred organizations, never had been a member, and had never had anything to do with them, including never having received their literature. Of course on a college campus you received literature from many organizations, so any college student was lying if he or she said they had never read any literature of these five hundred organizations.

The Oath also had an option to claim your "constitutional privilege" not to sign. Since I objected on civil liberties grounds - and since I had been a member of twenty or thirty of the organizations - I claimed my constitutional privilege. The reaction was interesting. The Corporal who was administering the Oath to me looked at me carefully. He saw a very young looking man, hair cut very short, runny nose, and looking tired. He asked me: "Kid, do you know what this is? You can get into big trouble if you don't sign it." Nobody I knew in the army ever was concerned with the principle of the Oath - they only wanted to avoid trouble. And they did not want an innocent, stupid "kid" to get into trouble.
The Corporal sent me to a Sergeant, who also worried that I would get into trouble - and so he sent me to a Lieutenant, who voiced the same concern. He sent me to the head of the Judge Advocate General Department, a Colonel. Faced with a complication, they all naturally passed the buck.

The Colonel had a huge stack of papers on his desk. As he started asking me questions, he pawed through his papers looking for my file. He too was convinced that I was young, dumb, and innocent, so he asked me, "Kid, did you drop out of high school?" I said "No sir" because we were told to say nothing but Yes Sir and No Sir to officers. The conversation went like this:

Colonel: "No? Wadda yuh mean?"

Sherman: "No sir, I did not drop out of high school."

Colonel: "But you did not go to college?"

Sherman: "No sir."

Colonel: "Wadda ya mean?"

Sherman: "No sir, I did go to college."

Colonel: "Then yuh dropped out of college?"

Sherman: "No sir, I graduated college."

He then stated, becoming annoyed and still looking for my record, "But that was the end of your education?"

Sherman: "No sir."

Colonel: "Wadda ya mean?"
Sherman: "No sir, I went on and graduated law school." By this time, he found my file and confirmed what I said. So he ordered: "Get the hell out of here."

That was my second day in the army, but things became still more interesting after that. {I took my basic training at Fort Ord in California.

In basic training, I was in a company of consisting mostly of mountain boys from the Rocky mountain states. They thought it was fun to take your "shootin iron" and go on a 20 mile hike, with a lot of double time (fast marching) to make it more interesting. (I had some trouble understanding the sergeant at first because when he said "double time, march" it sounded to me like "hub hit, hut".) Being from the city, I was exhausted every evening - so I immediately fell asleep regardless of all the banjo and radio music. I found out later that counter-intelligence interviewed the four men around me in basic training. They were all asked if I talked to them about politics. They all said the same thing: "Sherman never talked politics, he just slept."

After basic training, the army noticed my background in law and economics, so they, of course, put me into weapons supply and maintenance. The army, I concluded, has a carefully constructed table - which is top secret -- to place people in jobs. According to that secret table, if you were a truck driver in civilian life, you are put into electronics;, but if you were in electronics, they make you a cook. I had never used a weapon in my life and have zero mechanical aptitude. Therefore, the army decided to make me a weapons specialist.

In weapons school, the class consisted of me and seven sergeants. Every sergeant could take apart and fix a weapon in the dark. I could never take off the first piece, which
was called the lock screw. So the teaching assistant always went to help me. He would toss the weapon against the wall to break it apart and tell me to put it together. Since I never could do it, he would grudgingly do it for me. Finally, after eight weeks we were given a multiple-choice written exam. The hour before the exam I finally got worried, so I read the weapons manual twice. I walked out of the exam after a half hour, while the sergeants stayed to the end. The sergeants all said: don't worry, being sent to the infantry is not so bad - and that is what will happen to you when you flunk out.

The sergeants, however, were only marginal readers, so their highest score was 23 out of 100. Since the only thing I knew how to do in life was to take exams, I got a 96 if I recall correctly - any college student could have done as well. So according to the army, the sergeants knew nothing about weapons and I was an expert - which shows the wonderful discerning power of army tests.

After I graduated so gloriously from weapons school, I was assigned to a position in weapons and supply in a training company at Ford Ord. I could not be sent anywhere else outside of Fort Ord and its outlying camps because my politics prohibited it. I therefore began my army career in weapons and supply work at Fort Ord. But one day, the Captain came and said he needed a clerk-typist and could anyone type? I could hunt and peck at about ten words a minute, so I volunteered. Henceforth, I was a clerk-typist. I was put in for promotion from private 2 to Private First Class - with me writing the promotion memo and the Captain signing it - 14 times. I was always rejected however because my politics made me a dangerous security threat and a possible danger to the army.
All this is the necessary background to the main fight. After seven or eight months, I was handed a list of 21 charges against me to be answered at a hearing. The most important thing I learned in law school was that you should get yourself a good lawyer - never be foolish enough to defend yourself. Ben Margolis, an outstanding civil liberties lawyer, agreed to represent me.

At the hearing, we were supposed to present evidence proving that I had never had a thought critical of the army or the US government and had never been disloyal in any way. Since one cannot prove a universal negative, my lawyer did not put me on the stand. Instead, he discussed the weaknesses of each charge. Every charge took the form: "An informant says that Private Sherman..." On each charge, my lawyer asked that the army put the informants on the stand to prove the charge. He asked that we be allowed to cross-examine each witness. The tribunal - a colonel and two majors -- took that under consideration and promised to ask Washington for a decision on the point.

The charges were a strange mixture. Remember that this was not a court martial, so they did not have to and did not even try to prove that I had committed a crime. The army claimed that they could discharge anyone at their convenience if they were not fully satisfied with them.

The first charge was that I had refused to sign the Oath - even though this was my constitutional right. The second charge was that I had refused to sign the Oath a second time when they invited me to join the Judge Advocate General Department. I would have liked to practice law in the army, but I would not sign the Oath. This application in fact had a much more elaborate Oath and more detailed questions than the ordinary Oath.
The question that struck me as most fascinating was: "Has your mother-in-law ever been a member of the Communist Party?"

Another charge alleged that I had been a delegate to the convention of the Independent Progressive Party in New York City. I had never been in New York in my life and that party was a California party that never met in New York! My lawyer pressed for evidence of its truth, but none was ever given.

Another charge alleged that I wrote a letter to a Chicago labor newspaper advocating proportional representation in the election of Chicago aldermen. My article showed that the Republicans had taken a large percentage of the vote, but had only elected a few alderman. So I concluded that proportional representation would be much fairer. According to the army, this was a purely Communist position.

Most charges were supported by only one informant, but one charge included two informants. It read: "At the University of Chicago Law School one informant says that Sherman is a radical, but not so radical as to be a Communist (a second informant says that the first informant signed a petition in favor of pardoning the Rosenbergs)." I am not sure if the statement in parentheses was intended to imply that I was more radical than the first informant said or was intended to condemn me by virtue of my knowing the first informant.

Still another charge was that I had been invited to the home of a man in Berkeley, "whose mother often had Negroes to her home." Why did it jeopardize US security to have "Negroes" to your home? Also note the fact that the army used the word "invited" - when in fact I did visit him. To say "invited" rather than "visited" indicated that the
information came from a phone tap and that some poor soldier had to listen to all the calls we made from the phone room at Fort Ord.

Some men had even more marvelous charges against them. One soldier was charged with advocating recognition of China. My favorite, however, was that a soldier "intimately knew" Mrs. Jones, who it was said "was a Communist in the Peace movement and was lying low." In fact, Mrs. Jones was his mother-in-law and she had died eight years before he met his wife - so she was lying very low.

After my lawyer asked for evidence at my first hearing, it took several months for the army to reply. Their response was a list of 20 new charges. They were the same type as the first bunch and again offered no evidence. Then came a second hearing. I brought a witness to vouch for my character. He was the Company Clerk and I was his assistant. They asked him what we talked about and he said "battleship." The judges gloated and looked hopeful of finding a smoking gun to show that I was a spy. to their disappointment, he explained that we played a game called Battleship, in which one makes a bunch of squares on paper, then puts an X for a submarine, two Xs for a cruiser and three Xs for a battleship. Each player keeps the locations a secret. Then the other player guesses which squares contain the ships. Not a very intellectual game, but it passes the time.

Then they asked him where I went on weekend leaves. He said that Sherman always goes to Los Angeles. The judges again looked hopeful. They asked "Why does he go to Los Angeles?" The witness looked puzzled and said:

"Because his girlfriend lives there, of course."
One morning, several months after the second hearing, the Sergeant woke me at 6:00 AM to tell me that I was being kicked out of the army that day. He said he was sorry - and I mumbled "yeah," but I was ecstatic and could hardly keep a straight face. At that time it usually took three days to discharge a man, but I was special! After a long 20 months and 19 days, they decided I was a threat to the army, so a Lieutenant spent hours pushing me through the process as fast as possible. I was glad to be out, but if they had not kicked me out, the draft law allowed me to get out anyway at the end of the month to go back to school.

I was given an Undesirable Discharge and reduced in rank from Private 2 to Private 1. The army had five types of discharges then. The Bad Conduct and Dishonorable both required a Court Martial and proof of a crime. Since I had committed no crime, even according to the army, they could not court martial me. They claimed the Undesirable just meant that you were undesirable to the army and that it could be given at their convenience with absolutely no proof of anything. My draft card was changed to 4F, with an additional symbol indicating that I was discharged for being either a homosexual or a subversive. You could tell a potential employer, who asked to see it, that you were not subversive, but only homosexual! In the 1950s, they were equally bad. In fact, it never created a problem except when I applied for graduate school at Harvard. Harvard wanted to know the type of discharge I had. So, instead, I went to Berkeley for graduate school.

A class action suit was brought for all the approximately one thousand men who had refused to sign the Oath and were therefore given Undesirable discharges. After spending a lot of money for lawyers and fighting the legal battle for eight years, we won in the
1960s. The Supreme Court declared that the army must give discharges based on the nature of army service, not on previous political activity or beliefs.

So I went down to the Veterans' Administration office and demanded my new discharge. They said "right away" - and only a year later they gave it to me. It turned out to be a General Discharge under Honorable Conditions. Such discharges are given for many reasons, such as illness, and bear no stigma - they also entitle you to all benefits the army may confer on soldiers. The army claimed that they did not have to give me an Honorable Discharge because that discharge conferred no additional benefits. They also claimed that the Honorable Discharge was given only to exceptional men who performed in an outstanding way. My marks merely said that I performed well. Of course, we know that the Honorable Discharge is given to 99.9 percent of all soldiers, including all kinds of screw-ups.

During much of nine years till the discharge was changed, I had gone to graduate school for the MA (University of Southern California) and then for the PhD (U. C. Berkeley). Each month I went down to the Veterans' Administration (VA) and demanded to be paid my GI Bill for going to school. Each month the VA marked my application REFUSED since my type of discharge did not entitle me to those benefits. After nine years, I brought my whole stack of rejected applications to the VA and asked for my money. They said "certainly, right away," as soon as they could process it. That took another year. Finally, they gave me my GI bill all at once, but of course I could have starved to death in the mean time.
For about a year after the army, I had nightmares. It was always the same. I was back in the army and they had lost my discharge papers. They would not believe me when I told them I had been discharged. Now that was a real nightmare! How did the whole nightmare experience of the army affect the development of my radical economics?

HOW THE ARMY INFLUENCED MY RADICAL ECONOMICS

There are those who view the history of thought as being only on the intellectual level, in which one idea in economics leads to another. Most radicals would agree that radical economists may also be shaped by their experiences in progressive movements – as illustrated in earlier sections of this paper. It is, however, an important hypothesis of this paper that many radicals are also shaped by some defining life experience. Karl Marx was not only shaped by the prior movements and revolution of 1848, but also by his personal experience of growing up in an affluent family and then being subjected to grinding poverty in London. I grew up in an affluence family whose ideas were shaped by the Great Depression, the Second World War, and the Holocaust.

But after spending most of my early life in the pleasant atmosphere of schools and universities, I was drafted in the U. S. army and suddenly subjected to a whole new view of reality, which has ever since affected my economics. In addition to the usual army experience, I was attacked as subversive and eventually thrown out of the army because I did not sign the Loyalty Oath and because of my prior political activities.

How did this affect my radical economics? First, it has made me extremely anti-authoritarian and extremely clear on the awful effects of dictatorship, an issue which I have treated almost obsessively in my political economy. Second, the army helped me
understand the Soviet Union, not only in its dictatorial aspects, but in its inefficient economic aspects. Remember that the U. S. army was second in size of its planned economy only to the Soviet economy. They had very similar problems, which I cannot detail here.

Third, where my previous experience was a pleasant academic life, the army was a bath in ice water. My previous radicalism was bookish, but the army made me several magnitudes more radical by making a very unpleasant slice of reality a permanent part of my innermost thoughts. The army inadvertently aided radical economics by giving me a clear purpose and a compulsive drive to publish radical economics. Fourth, more specifically, my political economy has often centered on the reasons for loss of civil liberties and the causes of dictatorship – as well as the effects of dictatorship. Fifth, because of the army experience as well as other factors in my life, I have often studied militarism and war with a sense of immediacy.

Sixth, my army experience not only taught me that loss of civil liberties – as happened in the 1950s --is a terrible thing both for the individual and for society. It also taught me that it is possible for a progressive movement (and the individuals in it) to fight and win against an enormously powerful institution - but it often takes a long battle. Seventh, the army experience also changed the word “alienation” from an abstract mystery to a horrifying reality: the army is a place where one feels weak, helpless, and with no control over the institution in which one lives. Eighth, the army experience also made clear the human effects of the instability of our economy because most career soldiers are there so that they do not have to worry about food, clothing and shelter.
Finally, the existence of McCarthyite repression in the army showed how the ruling class makes use of government, which makes use of all the institutions within it, including the army.

My description of the army has both its grim side and its humorous side, but I hope it makes it clear in detail how these nine points of political economy arose from my army experience. Furthermore, since McCarthyism was an important factor harming radical political economy, I hope my army experience makes McCarthyism clearer from the point of view of those who suffered from it.

AFTER THE ARMY

From 1955 to 1956, I was a graduate student in Economics at University of Southern California (USC) and got the M.A. in 1957. USC was amazingly conservative at that time as well as having a low quality faculty. In graduate Macroeconomics, the textbook was a right-wing attack on Keynes – and the Professor’s first lecture was devoted to telling us what Communist books we should not read, including anything from UNICEF or several other UN agencies. The only good thing at USC in those days was that they thought the best graduate Microeconomics text was Alfred Marshall, so I learned Marshall in detail, which is useful.

While at USC, I was a member of far left youth organizations, which were strongly influenced by the Communist Party. We had a strong feeling of comradeship and togetherness. Under McCarthyism, we tried to do everything in secret, which made the activities feel exhilarating and even fun. We were on a crusade to end inequality and
poverty, war, racism, and sexism. The feeling of comradeship and the idealistic goals of the Left have helped me through many difficult periods.

I am aware that in the 1960s, much of the old and new left were accused of some racism and a lot of sexism. But that did not seem to be the case in the small club of a far left youth organization that I was in. We were constantly aware of the problem of racism and sexism. Every little action was examined for racism and sexism. Although some of the criticisms given for racism or sexism seemed way overstated, the constant attention to it did make me become anti-sexist and anti-racist down to the my core, so that view became part of me forever. Both the comradeship and the anti-racism and anti-sexism have influenced by views and behavior as a radical economist.

In 1956, Soviet Premier Khrushchev revealed the enormous crimes of Stalin and the Soviet state. When I read his speech, it was a traumatic moment and started me on the road to critical Marxism – and began my intense reaction against any kind of dogmatism. I wrote an essay arguing the need for democracy in every aspect of socialism and in the Left movement – and that has been central to my writing ever since.

After the revelations of Stalin’s crimes in 1956, I always attacked both neoclassical economics and dogmatic Soviet-style economics in all of my work. Radical economists need to avoid both types of dogmatic apologies for US capitalism and for Soviet dictatorship. The Soviet Union was once seen by many as a wonderful model to be followed, so it’s decline and fall were interpreted as harmful to the Left. But it seems to me that in its later years, the fact that the Soviet Union was a dictatorship was the
greatest obstacle to the advance of socialism around the world. So it’s end offers a
greater opportunity for democratic socialism.

During the Fall of 1956, as a result of the revelations about the Soviet Union and
the Soviet invasion of Hungary, the Communist-dominated youth organization
disappeared so fast that I never found anyone to accept a resignation. I met only one
leader of the organization many years later, but he had become a leading neoclassical
economist (whose name I will not reveal). While I was associated with the organization,
I did attend a lecture on Marxist economics at a two-day Marxist school, but the teacher
was incompetent, the material was dogmatic (a simplistic explanation of the labor theory
of value), and I was very bored.

All of my foundation learning in radical economics came from my own reading,
though discussions with other leftists helped. In addition to reading Sweezy and Dobb, I
learned most from Paul Baran. Later, in 1957-1960, I was fortunate in having lengthy
conversations with Baran. Our discussions centered on the role of the rate of profit with
respect to both monopoly and instability – but Baran’s encyclopedic knowledge and wide
interests meant that he often brought in a variety of subjects.

In 1956, I spoke to Joan Robinson over lunch. She was very concerned about the
problem of how the government budget affected the economy, not only by its amount
and deficit spending, but also its composition, especially the amount of military spending
and other wasteful spending.
I took my doctoral graduate work at the University of California, Berkeley from 1957 to 1960, with a Ph.D. in Economics in 1960. The teacher who most influenced me was Robert A. Gordon, father of David and Robert Gordon. a very good instructor, though dignified and not flashy. Gordon was an institutionalist, similar in some ways to Veblen. His specialty was the business cycle and his approach to it was based on the work of Wesley Mitchell, a disciple of Veblen. Gordon used no neoclassical techniques, but rather analyzed the real world through a vast amount of data. My introduction to Mitchell led me to base all of my work on the business cycle over several decades on Mitchell’s method of measurement, though my hypotheses all stemmed from Marx (Mitchell’s method is explained in Sherman, 1991). Mitchell, Gordon, and Marx taught me to see the cycle as endogenous, with shocks being secondary (see Sherman, 1991 and 2003).

I was also influenced at U. C. Berkeley by Andreas Papandreou, who later became Socialist Prime Minister of Greece -- and who was the best lecturer I have ever heard. Papandreou even made graduate macro-economic theory exciting as a battle between Keynesians and neoclassicals, arguing that Keynes was correct. Papandreou’s beginning graduate course in macro-economics taught me that models can be useful weapons against neoclassical economics. My later reading of Kalecki taught me that models can show the strength of Marxist macro-dynamics when used appropriately. Both Gordon and Papandreou were mainstream Keynesians at that time -- those that Joan Robinson called Bastard Keynesians. They were very limited, but they were a lot better than the dominant conservative neoclassicals of today. Both Gordon and Papandreou were limited by their lack of attention to class conflict -- though Papandreou learned the
reality of class conflict when he went into Greek politics and was imprisoned by a conservative junta for a while.

In my time at Berkeley, the remnants of McCarthyism were still strong, so I participated in a massive demonstration in San Francisco in 1959 against the House Un-American Activities Committee, in which all of the leaders, including myself, were teaching assistants at University of California, Berkeley. On the first day the demonstrators were attacked by the police with water hoses, so we got five times as many demonstrators the next day.

Ideologically, I had believed in Soviet Marxism (whose dominant author was Stalin) from about 1946 to 1956, though I always interpreted it my own way and had many doubts about dogmas. I have spent a lot of time in the rest of my life attacking Soviet Marxism as a total distortion of Marx, designed as an apologia for a dictatorship. In all of the books and articles I have written, I have tried to attack both neoclassical economics and Soviet (Stalinist) Marxism - they are equally bad in different ways. Both were designed as semi-religious dogmas to be learned word for word and repeated endlessly. Both had punishments for dissenters institutionalized in the society. Each was the ideological weapon of a particular political-economic system. I always tried to show that critical Marxism is an extremely useful tool, but has no relation at all to Soviet Marxism.

Some lessons I learned on the Left in the 1940s and 1950s that have affected my activity as a radical economist included the following. To do good work, one must feel a comradeship with the working class, women, minorities, and every other ordinary person in the world – that knowledge of which side you are on is the basis of
radical ethics. Second, one must fight hard to avoid or unlearn all dogma. Third, criticism should be given fully, but gently to one’s comrades and one’s colleagues. Always emphasize positive achievements and constructive suggestions – that is a good point for RRPE editors. Fourth, democracy cannot be shunted aside as a mere means to the end; no good end will be achieved without the practice of democracy and advocacy of democracy at all times. Fifth, it pays to see the humor of the situation – for example, I found McCarthyism surreal and our attempts at secrecy rather silly, which helped my sense of proportion at a bad time. (The section on the army shows how I also found the US army to be amusing in some respects.) Sixth, one cannot fight every battle, but must choose carefully the battle which is best to fight at a given time – both in practical work and in theoretical work. Seventh, one should never take oneself too seriously, but always be willing to accept constructive criticism. Even when I congratulate myself for writing what I think is a great masterpiece, I find that friendly criticism makes me change it in fundamental ways before the final draft. My publications would have been terrible without a great deal of excellent criticism.

A NEW PERIOD OF HOPE

In the late 1950s, McCarthy was censured by the US Senate and Soviet Premier Khrushchev criticized Stalin’s bloody deeds. A new era of hope dawned. In the United States, the period witnessed the victories of the Civil Rights movement, the rise of the women’s movement, and the rise of the New Left in the anti-war movement. As one who was trained in analysis by the Old Left, I had expected McCarthyism to continue indefinitely. Thus, I was unprepared for and pleasantly shocked by the victories of the
new left, all of which I worked very hard to support. New leaders came out of the New Left and formed URPE, among other organizations. I did not participate in its founding because I was not asked, but I did join immediately, contributed an article to the first issue of the RRPE, contributed many more articles to RRPE over the years, was on the editorial board for many years, and am presently on the editorial board again.

After getting a Ph.D. in Economics, I spent the year 1960-1961 at Brookings Institution in Washington. I did not get to know any of the permanent economists at Brookings, though I read their publications, which were quite liberal and interesting. I did get to know the other Fellows, who were well trained and all very liberal; we did social activity together, but discussed only politics, not economics. Through my connection to the Fellows. I went to some parties and met some of the younger political elite of Washington. Many of the elite – though not all – seemed, in my idealist eyes, addicted to power and money. On the Left at the same time, I found many people whose goal was to do as much as one can to change the world for the better. A deeply held view of changing the world gives one the ability to survive and actually feel happy under all kinds of difficulties.

I taught at Wayne State University in Detroit for a year in 1961-1962. It made me appreciate reality, since the University was surrounded at a short distance by the ghetto, with high unemployment and terrible housing conditions. When I taught a class on cyclical unemployment in the afternoon, the middle class students did not connect to the issue. But when I taught about unemployment in a night class, I found that a large part of my class was unemployed or had unemployed friends - which made the discussion very
lively. Among the faculty at Wayne State, I encountered for the first time serious liberal scholars studying the environment, so I became far more sensitized to environmental issues than previously.

I then got an opportunity to teach at California Institute of Technology, where I remained for two years from 1962 to 1964. It was the exact opposite type of experience from Wayne State. Most students were brilliant in the natural sciences, but saw only the mathematical problems in economics, which they thought were very simple - they mostly had no knowledge of life or social problems. Even in the beginning class, they complained that the text (Samuelson) was not mathematical enough and continued to complain of too many words no matter how much math I gave them. Teaching about real problems was very difficult - but I learned the lesson that economic education must be taught with a very broad base in the social sciences, not in a narrow manner. There were also some very fine faculty at Cal Tech, but none were radicals, so I mostly learned how to deepened my use of mathematics from them. I next taught at the University of California, Berkeley, as a lecturer for two years, 1964-1966. These were fateful years because of the free speech movement at Berkeley, which meant that one could get tear gassed from airplanes at any time – but the students won a victory, so it taught me what could be accomplished. In the Economics department, I had little contact with the senior professors, but did get to know three assistant professors. One incident is revealing of the state of the profession. I had written an article on Marxist mathematical models of the business cycle, so I showed it to the other three junior faculty for comments. They all said that the math was okay, but not fancy enough. And they all said that they had never
read Marx -- and when I asked, it turned out that none of the three had ever read Keynes! One then asked me: “Howard, I have this new mathematical tool; can you suggest a subject to use it on?” I was amazed.

In the later teach-ins at Berkeley, I met Isaac Deutcher and had dinner with him. I asked a few questions and he gave long, wonderful monologues. His books, especially the biographies of Stalin and Trotsky, are among the best ever written on the Soviet Union – they contained the hypothesis that the Soviet Union was not democratic, but that industrialization would lead to the conditions for a democratic revolution. Deutscher complained to me that he had been unable to get an academic appointment, so he had to earn money by journalism – and therefore never found time to complete his main project, a biography of Lenin.

THE WARS OF ACADME

What happened at University of California. Riverside, must be seen in the light of the general class politics of the United States. Sherman’s law claims that progressive advances in academia can occur only when there is a broad progressive movement in society. When reaction is in the saddle nationally and the power of labor and progressives has generally declined, academic programs by progressives come under attack and may stagnate or decline. Of course, this law must be modified according to the idiosyncrasies of a given university and the idiosyncrasies of given administrators and given progressives.

In general progressive activity was at its height in the 1960s. By the end of the 1960s, there was a powerful anti-war movement, a powerful civil rights movement, and a
powerful women’s movement. Most progressive graduate students and most progressive economists in later years emerged out of those three movements. Their experience in those movements radicalized them and motivated them. Thus the first wave of radicals at UCR came in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Of course, how radicals thought depended partly on the intellectual history of economics to that date.

After the Vietnam war ended, the anti-war movement died for the most part. After formal civil rights were won for African Americans, the civil rights movement slowly lost steam and lost members. After women achieved formal rights, the women’s movement retreated from frantic and successful activity at a high level to more routine politics. Because of the decline in the progressive movement, it became harder and harder over the years to attract good radical students.

In general trends, the UCR Economics department reflected the changes in the movement. We expanded the progressive faculty in the late 1960s. Then we faced greater hostility and were greatly reduced in numbers when our recruiting was limited for political reasons in the 1970s and 1980s – though this decline also had to do with demographic changes in the population. Because we had tenure, we did not disappear. Eventually, when the Cold War decreased in intensity and finally disappeared, administrators wanted an Economics department and we achieved our highest number of progressive economists in the 1990s. But the reaction to our success included a forced merger with many neoclassical, mathematical economists from the Business School, a blow from which the department has never recovered and progressives lost much ground. Of course, similar trends occurred at a number of other universities, but that is beyond
the scope of this paper. What follows is the detailed evolution and the deeds of some specific people.

When I was hired at University of California, Riverside (UCR) in 1967, I was given tenure and made Chair of the Economics Department. Since I had only temporary jobs till then, I was astonished at the change. A month after I arrived, I argued against the Vietnam War in a public debate in which a person from Rand Corporation defended the war, but with many reservations. I then became Chair of the Faculty Against the War. Eventually, I also became President of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, local at UCR.

I was part of and influenced by two quite different constituencies during my years at UCR. One was the progressive movement on campus and especially the progressives in Economics. I have always viewed the social sciences as a unity, as should any radical economist. So I was always pleased to get to know people in Anthropology, Political Science, Sociology, History, and Philosophy -- I had good friends in each of these and they were a great help in developing my own work in political economy. In addition, I was at first very lonely in the Economics Department, so I consciously developed correspondence with radical economists all over the country. I exchanged drafts of manuscripts with them and could not have survived or written without them. Of course, I later came to thank God for email! Even when there were more radicals in the department, we bonded on departmental issues and met socially, but few were in my specialized fields, so I have continued my US network to this day.
In addition to Marxists and other radicals in URPE, I have spent a lot of time at conventions and on the internet with the radical institutionalist members of the Association For Evolutionary Economics (AFEE). Thus I have been strongly influenced by Marxists and Post Keynesians for a long time, but I have also been strongly influenced by the followers of Thorstein Veblen, our most famous radical economist. My close ties with the institutionalist community is evidenced by the fact that in 2004 I received the Veblen-Commons Award from AFEE – and the fact that I spent many years on the editorial board of their journal, the Journal of Economic Issues (JEI), and have published many articles in JEI. I believe that URPE and AFEE are on convergent paths – and have done all I could to convert AFEE to radical thinking and URPE to institutionalist thinking, since I see no contradiction.

It is also worth noting that as soon as we had three or four radicals at UCR, we formed an URPE club. For some time, the club met once a week, heard a paper, and then socialized – influencing me both by the intellectual discussions and by the comradeship. It grew so popular that many liberal graduate students and liberal faculty joined it. Unfortunately, a group of Stalinist graduate students battled with a group of Trotskyist graduate students for control of the URPE club – and succeeded in destroying it. Ever since, the department has had weekly colloquia in Political Economy (with others in Development and in neoclassical Theory), but formal colloquia are no substitute for an informal URPE club.

I was Chair of the Economics Department in 1967-1968 and two more times, amounting to five years in total. In 1967, I was told to hire anyone I wanted and to
consult my old friends to find someone suitable - no Affirmative Action laws at that time! Then I got a letter from Martin Bronfenbrenner, who had written an article saying that there are no more political problems in hiring economists. Victor Perlo, the chief economist of the Communist Party, had written to Bronfenbrenner asking him to help find an academic job for Perlo. Bronfenbrenner wrote to twelve chairs, but I believe I was the only one who answered. When I brought Perlo's vita to the Associate Dean (who was also chair of the local ACLU), he looked over the vita - which included 23 books and 121 articles - and said it seemed to lack academic research. When I questioned this absurd statement, he said he would talk to the Dean. The next day he gave me eight reasons for not hiring Perlo, including lack of money in the budget (which was not a problem earlier nor for later candidates), the wrong field (though no field had been mentioned to me), and so forth. None of the objections mentioned politics or the Communist Party.

In the meantime, I had met A. K. Sen and was awed by him. So I suggested him for Professor and Chair of the department, since I did not like being Chair. The Dean looked at his impressive vita and said: "He could not possibly be Chair at UCR." I asked why not. He said: "I am not prejudiced, but the local business community would never accept an Indian as Chair." Since there were no Affirmative Action laws, I gave up. So poor A. K. Sen, who later got the Nobel Prize, never even knew he was discussed at UCR - and had to choose that year between Harvard and Oxford.

In spite of the administration, we found a good, liberal Chair to replace me and hired some excellent people over time. One was E. K. Hunt, who was at UCR from 1969 to 1978, and became my co-author and best friend. Hunt got tenure with no trouble
because his articles on the history of thought looked erudite and harmless. By the time Hunt came up for Professor, he had written more radical sounding titles. One neoclassical bothered to read his articles, decided Hunt knew nothing about economics and wrote too much about imperialism - so the neoclassical Professor wrote a thirty page diatribe against Hunt, all based on implicit and explicit political criteria of the right-wing.

Another neoclassical Professor attacked Hunt because of Hunt’s critique of empiricism. The neoclassical Professor was an econometrician, so he thought that Hunt’s attack on empiricism was really an attack on his econometrics! The University of California criteria for promotion are research, teaching and university service – politics is not a legitimate criterion. Hunt had trouble getting promoted, so decided to accept an excellent offer from Utah, where he built a good, radical faculty.

While Hunt was at UCR, we thought that it was sad that only neoclassical texts were available at the beginning level, so we wrote "Economics: Introduction to Traditional and Radical Views" (Hunt and Sherman, 1972) as a weapon for radicals. To our complete surprise, it went through six editions and eventually sold a total of more than a quarter million copies.

The Department developed a graduate program and, after a number of years, graduated over a hundred Ph.D.s with training in radical economics. All of the conservatives on campus hated our program because it had a radical component and it was too successful. In the fight over many years, the radical faculty worked together as a team for the survival of the program and for our own survival. Many graduate students gave full support and worked equally hard for the program. In addition to many
graduate students, we also had the highest ratio of undergraduate students to faculty in our college.

To keep our program from the mid 1970s to the early 1980s, we fought with some of the neoclassicals in our department, with the Dean of the Graduate Division and a conservative faculty committee under his supervision, and with the higher administration. Slowly, they reduced our faculty by refusing to let us hire new faculty. The pressure became more and more intense and the department was almost destroyed. They even threatened to make us a separate department of Political Economy with no undergraduate program in economics – this has some similarities with the attack on heterodox economists at Notre Dame.

In 1982-1983 there was a routine evaluation of the department by an outside committee of professors from other universities. We secured a good evaluation committee with Sam Bowles on it. But Sam called me one day - since I was Chair again - to ask to change the time of the evaluation. I said I would pass on his message to the Dean of the Graduate Division, who handled evaluation committees. So I innocently called the Dean, who decided that the call represented fraternization between the department and the committee. The Dean tossed Bowles off the committee and appointed a conservative from the Business School at U. C. Berkeley. The majority of the Committee gave us a good review, suggesting we needed more faculty. The conservative, however, wrote a minority report that said our department was dangerous and irresponsible, so outsiders should be put in control of it to change it's content.

The Dean and his subservient committee decided not to follow the two
distinguished economists of the majority. Instead they followed the brief, McCarthyite note of the conservative. Our graduate program was suspended and we were placed in receivership in 1984 and given a conservative sociologist as our Chair.

These unpleasant events partly reflected the end of most mass progressive movements in the country and the normal incompetent and cowardly administrators. But the Graduate Dean did the most damage and he was a special case. He was elderly and set in his ways; he was also a Christian fundamentalist who hated all radicals as spawn of the devil. Such an individual was not determined by general social trends and was an exception among the administrators – the rule among administrators was rather incompetence and only mild conservatism. As soon as they left power, many became nice folk and mildly liberal.

After a difficult battle, a new administration fired the sociologist running the receivership of our department in 1984 as an incompetent and made me Chair again. During all of this time, we went around chewing our nails and not sleeping at night, but we did develop a close comradeship in the department. Although all of our small band cooperated, the person on whom I relied most was Robert Pollin, who has a genius for politics and organization and was willing to work very hard at it.

The University administration then developed a "compromise" in which our graduate program would be restored, but neoclassical economists would be hired in the Business School and they would teach the basic graduate theory courses. The Dean of the Business School wanted us to move into the Business School, so he could control
economics. Eventually, we did agree on a division of labor, which deprived us of graduate theory.

Actually, the agreement first said that the neoclassicals would teach four of the theory courses and we would teach two - but it was no sooner passed as a compromise than they took over all six theory courses (each one quarter long). When we objected, the leading neoclassical stated in a letter that we were not teaching neoclassical theory. He claimed that neoclassical theory is the only correct theory and is non-controversial because its conclusions all follow mathematically from its assumptions!

Things looked very dismal. Then we were ordered to hire a new Chair, with a Search committee that had a majority of neoclassicals from the Business School. Fortunately for us, their candidates were such incompetents that the administration laughed at them.

But where were we to find a Chair who would be acceptable to both us and the administration? Our colleague, Victor Lippit, had the inspiration that saved us. He suggested the name of Keith Griffin, who was then President of Magdalen College at Oxford and Chair of the Board of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. So his credentials are unassailable and his ability to administrate proven. Yet he is also an institutionalist, very concerned with the downtrodden of the earth, and his job talk was about world hunger. Griffin has an open mind toward other points of view, so he can work with radicals. After a fight with the neoclassicals, who used every tactic to delay his consideration and assumed he would eventually say no, the administration gave him a good offer and he accepted, beginning in July 1988. Among
other things, his offer stated that we could hire five new people in any field he wished, so we hired in development and political economy. Eventually Griffin was allowed to hire a total of ten people, all non-neoclassical. It was a wonderfully pleasant time in the department, which finally had 15 non-neoclassical economics and no neoclassicals. Although normal issues arose as in any department, we all remained very good friends. We included faculty who were Marxists, institutionalists, feminists, Post Keynesians, and a follower of Henry George.

Throughout the 1980s, we continued to have problems with the neoclassicals in the Business School, who tried to make it impossible for anyone to pass the graduate Micro and Macro theory exams. They also were so mathematical and unreal that even the MBA students signed a petition against them in the teaching of business. They also caused fights with the traditional business faculty over the curriculum and hiring.

Since they caused problems in the business School, the administration asked itself where they could put the nine neoclassical theorists who had been hired, all highly mathematical, unreal, and not interested in teaching undergraduates. The administration decided to merge this large group of pure theorists with the Economics Department -- and did so in July 1991.

Needless to say, that merger led to a bitterly divided department. Although most people remained civil to one another, the department remained totally divided over every major issue. Very ugly politics ruled. Most of our graduate students were radicals, but the faculty has become more and more neoclassical.
What exactly were the issues that divided the department, neoclassical versus heterodox (with some trying to stay in between)? It should be emphasized that the division had nothing to do with personality, since most – though not all – of the department was friendly to each other. The battles were merciless because we were fighting about which paradigm should prevail in four areas: undergraduate program, graduate program, hiring, and promotion.

In the undergraduate program, the neoclassicals wanted more required math, econometrics, and intermediate theory – while the radicals and the center agreed on less math and theory, but more history and social science. The neoclassicals won, mainly because Academic Senate committees always prefer more math to less. The result was a very large decline in numbers of undergraduates. Heterodox economists continued to teach the beginning courses, but the neoclassicals taught the required intermediate micro theory and the required econometrics. Many students hated the intermediate micro theory courses and continued to leave the department in droves. We had endless battles over reforming the undergraduate requirements.

In the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s, our biggest fight was over the graduate program. The neoclassicals wanted tons of theory required, with them teaching all of it. Radicals wanted options, so that radical graduate students could do the neoclassical theory courses, but not a comprehensive exam. Instead of two neoclassical theory exams, radical graduate students could take a requirement in political economy and a comprehensive in political economy. When the neoclassicals took over the whole theory sequence, they made it so difficult that most graduate students had to take the
Written Exam in Micro and Macro twice, using about two years to get through the neoclassical theory. There was never any agreement that students had an option, so most radical students took a long time to get through neoclassical theory, then wanted to finish their fields as fast as possible. The lack of a coherent political economy requirement or option meant that students often lost interest in the program and left before taking political economy. The clash of paradigms over the graduate program was fierce – and the lack of a coherent solution led to a large decline in graduate students.

Because of their difference in paradigms, the two sides had no agreement as to who would be a good candidate if we had a job opening. Some liberals think that rational people can always reach a compromise on a “qualified” candidate. The truth was that our difference in paradigms meant that the gulf was too great for any agreement because there is not even agreement on what is economics, let alone what are the “best” journals or how to judge a book – many of our neoclassicals could not write books because of their narrow paradigm, so they sneered at books. We hired mostly by political compromises, with some neoclassical winners and some liberal center winners, but no radicals ever since the merger.

The fights about promotions were also bloody because of a complete difference of paradigm as to what kind of work a candidate should do, how to judge it, the worth of journals, and many other factors all dominated by the fight between paradigms. Often people got promotions through political compromises. Political compromises meant giving promotion to some pretty weak neoclassicals.
The struggles in all four areas -- hiring, promotion, undergraduate program, and graduate program -- tended to pit heterodox faculty and graduate students against neoclassical faculty and the administration. The administration usually won. With fights in all of these areas and a decline in good graduate students, the department was no longer pleasant. So after three decades of fighting (with some very good periods and some very bad periods), I was happy to retire when my partner got an excellent job for herself elsewhere. I am now free to do more radical research than ever before, I am on the editorial board of RRPE, and I participate in the anti-war movement in any way I can. I pay no attention to the department at UCR and am not sure how the battle has progressed in recent years.

CONCLUSIONS

My experience indicates that radical economists are mainly shaped by the nature of class relations and class conflict in their years of development – though personal environment is important and the form and concepts used in one’s work always reflect the intellectual ideas current in the discipline. The history of the Economics Department at UCR shows that it is very difficult to build and maintain a department which is different in any large degree from the dominant neoclassical model. Heterodox departments flourish only when there is a flourishing progressive movement in the country.
FOOTNOTE. I am very grateful for constructive criticism from Bill Dugger, Keith Griffin, Fred Lee, Gary Mongiovi, Phil O'Hara, Bruce Pietrykowski, Robert Pollin, and Barbara Sinclair.
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