

PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE WITHOUT PERMISSION

forthcoming in David F. Ruccio, *Rethinking Planning, Development, and Globalization: Essays in Marxian Class Analysis* (Routledge)

CHAPTER 1

Rethinking Planning, Development, and Globalization from a Marxian Perspective

When it was first suggested to me that I edit a book of my own essays on planning, development, and international political economy, I was not all that enthusiastic. These were essays that I had written over the course of twenty years or so, since finishing my doctoral dissertation in 1984. I hadn't really gone back to look at them since they were written, and I wasn't convinced anyone else would want to either.

I will admit, I did like the idea of gathering in one place pieces that had been written for different occasions and published (most of them) in widely dispersed journals and books. I also thought of friends and colleagues, who knew about my work in one area—for example, on Marxian theory or postmodernism and economics—but not necessarily on these topics. As for me, I had always thought of my writings in these different areas as being inextricably related, each one drawing from and informing the others.

Most important, it was the new conjuncture that convinced me to take the time to assemble the essays in this book and to compose this introduction. The current crises of capitalism have certainly raised interest in Marxism and Marxian analyses of economic and social reality.¹ Perhaps not in the bastions of mainstream economics where, while the potential for a “crisis in economic thought” has certainly been noted, the discussion of theory and policy continues to take place within very narrow parameters. As the world now knows, neoclassical economists were for the most part caught unawares when the crises broke out (they certainly didn't predict them nor did they consider them a likely occurrence). And they didn't have much to offer after the crises did erupt and then expanded to other sectors and regions, threatening to bring down not only the U.S. economy but also the world economic order. The idea that capitalism itself was once again beset by crises and needed to be criticized and replaced has been far from their view—far from their initial hand-wringing about the realism of existing macroeconomic models and, later, their confident pronouncements that, perhaps with a bit of tinkering (such as government bailouts of financial institutions that were “too big to fail” and a moderate program of deficit spending or, for the more conservative, tax cuts), markets would right themselves and capitalist growth would soon resume.

But elsewhere, in other disciplines and outside the academy, there is a much more palpable sense both that the latest crises are endemic to capitalism and that mainstream economic thought (as taught in the academy and as practiced in think tanks and policymaking circles) needs to be radically questioned. Not surprisingly, Marxian theory—the concepts and analyses originally presented in *Capital* as well as the ideas

elaborated by contemporary Marxian economists and other social theorists—has received renewed attention.² A wide variety of mainstream periodicals, from the *Economist* to the *New York Times*, have used front-cover and front-page stories to highlight the radical questioning of capitalism, the fundamental problems with orthodox economics, and the resurgence of interest in Marxism. Marxist thinkers, especially those who have demonstrated the interest and ability to move beyond the classroom and the usual academic publications, such as Richard Wolff and David Harvey, have found themselves welcomed in new quarters and with unfamiliar enthusiasm.³ Students, in my experience and in that of many of my academic colleagues, have expressed a new inquisitiveness about and openness toward both dimensions of the Marxian critique of political economy: the critique of mainstream economic thought and the critique of capitalism. And workshops and conferences devoted to Marxian theory and ideas related to Marxism (from capitalist crises to the ideas of the commune and communism) have generated unprecedented levels of participation in the United States and around the world. Clearly, now as at earlier stages in its development, capitalism has called forth its Marxian other.

The new appreciation of the relevance of Marxian theory means a shift in focus from the analysis and critique of one form of capitalism—often referred to as free-market capitalism or neoliberalism—to any and all forms of capitalism. In other words, it represents a recognition that, historically and today, in the United States and around the world, there are many different kinds of capitalism. Some are more private, and based on private property and free markets; others are more oriented around the state, involving extensive government regulation and public property. Once this capitalist diversity is recognized, the problem is no longer one of the presence or absence of regulation—in the sense that the crises engendered by neoliberal free markets can be solved or fixed by bringing the state back in and by creating new forms of government regulation of financial and other markets—but with capitalism itself, with capitalist ways of organizing the economy, politics, and culture. That’s a major change in both analytical focus and political orientation.

Still, as I see it, this resurgence of interest in Marxism, while quite welcome, also presents a number of potential problems. Let me briefly mention three. First, Marx and latter-day Marxists are often credited, in stark contrast to their mainstream counterparts, with understanding the real possibility of capitalist crises—that the kinds of economic crises that exist now are not the product simply of mistakes and oversights (although, of course, there have been plenty) or exogenous events (usually, in the mainstream view, associated with unwarranted government intervention) but are systemic, part of the “normal” workings of capitalism. The danger, however, is forgetting about the other side of the Marxian critique of political economy, the critique of capitalism when it is working well. That is, the current crises have created new audiences for Marxian perspectives but Marxism involves both an analysis of how capitalism regularly enters into crisis and how, outside of periods of crisis, when financial institutions are solvent, employment is growing, and so on, capitalist development is both the condition and consequence of exploitation. Or, as I once explained to a gathering of students in the course of discussing the relevance of *Capital* to current economic events: “Marx’s view was that capitalism is a problem, both when it is working well and when it is not.” Only time will tell if that

particular dimension of the Marxist critique of political economy will transcend the current crises.

The second dilemma to which I want to draw attention is that the current “return to Marx” often involves a return to some of the most traditional, deterministic forms of Marxian theory. Much rethinking of Marxism has taken place since the 1960s—when, as now, many students, activists, and scholars rediscovered Marx—but it is sometimes difficult to detect the antideterministic moments of that rethinking in the appeals to Marxian “crisis theory” and much else in the current conjuncture. What I am referring to as traditional (or modernist) Marxian theory is based on the idea that capitalism has a “logic” (often identified as a set of “laws of motion” or a “drive,” e.g., to accumulate capital) that inevitably propels it toward crisis.⁴ According to the alternative (postmodern) version of Marxian theory (about which much more below), capitalism has a conjunctural history but no necessary trajectory. Therefore, whether or not crises occur depends on a whole host of nondeterministic factors; there’s no inevitability or inexorable working-out of a logic.⁵ So, while the current crises create the conditions for a new generation to discover Marx, there is also a risk of falling back on the more scientific, essentialist, and deterministic versions of Marxian theory and of losing sight of the rethinking of Marxism that has revitalized Marxian thought in recent decades.

The third issue I want to mention pertains to the application of Marxian theory. The campaign to bury Marx, especially in the discipline of economics, means that there is little familiarity with the concepts and methods of actually carrying out a Marxian critique of political economy. What does Marxian theory have to contribute to ongoing debates—in economics, development, and other areas and disciplines? What does it mean to conduct a Marxian analysis of economic and social reality? While Marx’s texts and latter-day interpretations of some of the basic concepts of Marxian theory are now widely available—in books, journals, and the Internet—it is not at all easy for students and others to figure out what a Marxian analysis actually looks like.

I would never demean the work of Marxian scholars in elaborating and debating contrasting interpretations of the categories and methodologies appropriate to Marxian theory (indeed, I have participated in some of these debates). However, it is still the case that concrete analyses of the current conjuncture—of the current crises of capitalism, the new left-wing governments in Latin America, the problem of global warming, the conflicts in Africa, and so on—are not well known or readily available.

That, in the end, is what convinced me to assemble and publish the essays in this volume. They provide a series of concrete examples of how Marxian theory can be used to intervene in existing debates—concerning planning, development, and globalization—and how Marxian theory can be extended to a wide variety of other issues and topics, in economics and beyond. They represent, therefore, not a complete inventory but a starting point, some specific examples of how Marxian class analysis and the critique of essentialism can be used both to interpret and change the world.

ASKING QUESTIONS

I want to use the rest of this introduction to look back over the essays collected here and provide an overview what it means to introduce Marxian class analysis into these debates. My aim is to provide readers with some context—autobiographical as well as political and intellectual—and to discuss both what I consider to be the relevance of each essay and the kind of work that remains to be done.

In each case—for each article, chapter, or presentation (many of which, to my surprise, even got published)—I found myself asking two key sets of questions:

1. What was the debate? What were the key terms of debate? What was the existing common sense? What were the dominant perspectives, both mainstream and radical?
2. What was new and different that Marxism—Marxian class analysis—could add to the discussion? In what ways did it depart from the mainstream and radical common senses, and what new light could it shed on the issue at hand?

In all these cases, my orientation was less about giving advice “there” and more about shifting the terms of discourse “here.” I have never been involved in economic policymaking, and I never considered offering advice to government or nongovernmental movements, especially in Latin America where I have spent considerable time and have conducted a great deal of field research. I have been involved in many political activities and movements over the years. But I’ve always understood the work embodied in these essays as operating at the level of ideas. I set out to intervene in a set of intellectual debates—to identify and disrupt the existing terms of debate, from a Marxian perspective—and not to offer conventionally conceived policy advice.

However, as a Marxist, I also understand the materiality of ideas. Thoughts form an integral part of social life; they are both conditions and consequences of what happens in the rest of society. Louis Althusser once referred to philosophy as “class struggle in theory” (1971, 18). The same is true of any contest of ideas, perhaps especially in economics, where different economic discourses—inside and outside the academy—both shape and are shaped by the development of capitalism. So, yes, I admit that, directly and indirectly, intervening in intellectual debates cannot but have policy implications, in relation to the changing contours of the class struggle. Thus, Marxian ideas do lend themselves to policies, not just to find equilibrium exchange-rates or the appropriate level of wages but to radically transform the way society is organized around and through existing forms of class exploitation.

The debates about planning, development, and globalization are what interest me in the ideas contained in this book. And, of course, during the 25 years or so during which these essays were originally composed, the debates and the terms of debate have certainly changed. Just to give three examples: when I entered graduate school, planning was a central topic; it was discussed and debated by mainstream and Marxian economists alike. Then, after the demise of the neoclassical synthesis (and the rise of new forms of

neoclassical theory, such as rational expectations, and the resurgence of previous forms, such as Austrian economics) and the Fall of the Wall (at least in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe), planning quickly faded from view. By the same token, development was one of the most vibrant areas of economic analysis, the place where the limits of mainstream economics were readily acknowledged and discussions were necessarily interdisciplinary. Now, development economics has mostly been folded back into the discipline, with the resurgence of stages of growth and incentive-based microeconomic experiments. Finally, globalization didn't even exist when I got started—or, more accurately, the idea of globalization as it became a central problematic of orthodox economists (such as Jagdish Bhagwati and Dani Rodrik), radical thinkers and activists (especially those involved in the World Social Forum), and mainstream pundits (the most famous of whom, of course, is Thomas Friedman). Some of us worked on topics of international political economy, which we self-consciously counterposed both to the traditional international economics of trade and finance and the combination of mainstream economics and politics that became a growth area in political science.

The context, of course, has changed since I left graduate school. But even as the discipline of economics has become more orthodox and less open to alternative perspectives, the intellectual and political landscape has produced new problems and challenges that harken back to the issues I take up in these essays. The crises of capitalism—not just the current financial crisis but also the many others, such as those pertaining to the distribution of income and wealth, the environment, energy, and urban areas—have placed the issue of planning back on the agenda (not to mention the fact that multinational corporations conduct their own kind of planning on a global scale). Similarly, the demise of neoliberalism and the rise of left-wing governments across Latin America (beginning with Lula and the Workers Party in Brazil and extending through Venezuela, Uruguay, Bolivia, and Ecuador and beyond) have presented a range of alternatives to the theory and policies of mainstream development economics. And, of course, the original Gulf War as well as the ongoing occupations of Iraq and Afghanistan, the rise of intranational military conflicts, and the antisweatshop movement have disrupted the idea of a homogeneous, seamless world order and placed issues like imperialism and unequal global transfers of value back on the agenda.

My point is not that, over the course of recent decades, there has been a return to previous issues or theoretical perspectives, just that ideas that appear to have been settled at one point in time become unsettled at another point. We are in the midst of one such unsettling right now, as mainstream ideas are being challenged and alternatives being imagined and enacted. The Marxian critique of political economy has played a key role in defining those challenges and alternatives, and the renewed attention to Marxian theory gives these essays a fresh relevance.

A BIT OF AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Like many in my generation, I became involved in these debates at a relatively early age, in the context of the Vietnam War. That's when many of us “discovered” colonialism and imperialism—as a way of making sense of events “here” and “there,”

during that time as well as historically, and of contesting the terms of debate between prowar hawks and antiwar doves. What it provided us with was a structural explanation, instead of seeing the war as a policy option, a misguided decision on the part of politicians and generals; we came to understand the war in the context of the history of U.S. foreign policy and the growth of the military-industrial-academic complex. It made us anticapitalist instead of merely antiwar. That's how many of us got started in the 1960s. As fledgling members of the so-called New Left, we also discovered Marxian theory and socialism as viable alternatives to liberal economic and social thought and capitalist imperialism. North Vietnam, the Cuban Revolution, the Cultural Revolution in China—all had an impact on us in terms of imagining socialist ways of organizing the economy and society and, in particular, the possibility of a socialism different from the one that had been constructed in the Soviet Union.

For other generations, things of course are different, although not completely unrelated. The immediately preceding generation (my professors in college and graduate school) had witnessed U.S. involvement in the Korean War and been active in the civil rights and early student movements. The next generations (my students over the course of the past 27 years) have lived through the Gulf War, the current wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the alter-globalization movement. These events, and the attempt to make sense of them, serve as conditions of existence for becoming interested in and doing the kind of work contained in this volume.

In my case, the fact that I spent a year in Brazil as an exchange student (1970-71), during the worst year of the military dictatorship, and then a year each in Peru (while in college) and in Portugal (after college), had an enormous impact on my life and thinking. They allowed me to see, experience, and attempt to make sense of what was going on in different parts of the world and to think about their connection to what was transpiring in my home country. So, for example, I began the process of analyzing the combination of political repression and economic inequality in Brazil, Peru, and pre-revolutionary Portugal in relation to the history of capitalism in those countries and the changing contours of capitalism in the United States and around the world. And, of course, I was assisted in this project by the books and journals I chanced upon at the time, since little of this was assigned in my courses (but, fortunately, they were available in bookstores and libraries): Herbert Marcuse's *Essay on Liberation*, the North American Congress on Latin America's *Latin America and Empire Report*, William Appleman Williams's *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*, *Monthly Review*, *Science and Society*, volume 1 of *Capital*, Althusser's *Reading Capital*, Barry Hindess and Paul Hirst's *Precapitalist Modes of Production*, and the *Review of Radical Political Economics*.⁶ In fact, I went to my first Union of Radical Political Economists' summer conference in 1976, after graduating from college. It became clear to me there that, within URPE, there was a great deal of interest in Marxism—along with considerable non-Marxist and even anti-Marxist sentiment. I quickly discovered that this has been persistent tension in radical thought, including radical political economy, especially in the United States. It has been a tension based on both theoretical and methodological differences: for example, while some heterodox economics used radical or left-Keynesian theory, others turned to the Marxian tradition; a focus on unequal power stood in contrast to investigating the conditions and

consequences of class exploitation; and while some emphasized “economic analysis” as defined by the mainstream of the discipline, others adopted a more interdisciplinary orientation. Such differences persist today among heterodox economists.

Which leads me to my arrival at the University of Massachusetts in 1977. The reason I originally went there was to study Marxism, not to become a professor (since, among other things, as the first person in my family to go to college, I had little idea what an advanced degree really was). My thinking was, after a few years, I’d have to leave my studies and get a paying job doing something else. (I really didn’t know what that was but, unlike many of my students today, I didn’t really worry about it. The world was different then.) A couple of years in, and having completed my course work and passed my comprehensive examinations, I learned that my fellow doctoral students were actually getting teaching jobs. And there might even be the possibility of tenure! In other words, I went to UMass originally to study, not to receive training for any kind of job or career, and certainly not to become an economist, much less a member of the American Economic Association.

RETHINKING MARXISM

As it turns out, I arrived at UMass at a particularly exciting time. In the late-1970s, there was a general agreement, among both faculty and students, that what the department was primarily concerned with extending the frontiers of radical political economy. There certainly was no unanimity, among either the students or the faculty, about the particular direction radical political economy should take, about what the focus of expanding the boundaries would and could be. However, we did share the general idea that, in our different ways, our task was to use our time in the UMass program to push radical political economy in new directions.

I and many others were most excited about and drawn to the theoretical work Richard Wolff and Stephen Resnick were engaged in, for at least three reasons. First, it was clear they took Marxism and the Marxian tradition seriously, and were not interested in following others who were moving outside and away from that tradition. Second, while they expressed respect for some of the key thinkers and texts in that tradition, they had also begun the process of rethinking some of the key concepts and conceptual strategies of the received wisdom. Third, they emphasized Marxian theory, reading and working in an interdisciplinary fashion (taking up especially the ideas being forged within post-analytic philosophy), instead of adhering to the protocols of “doing economics.”

At the time I arrived, Resnick and Wolff were working their way through recent books by Althusser, Hindess and Hirst, and others who were producing a new kind of Marxian approach to the analysis of social formations. They had collaborated with their new colleagues to create the premier department of radical political economy in the United States, and now they were engaged with graduate students (as well as teaching undergraduate students) in a collective project to revise and reinvigorate Marxian theory.

Over the course of the past thirty years, their work, as well as that of former students and colleagues who were drawn to the project, has grown and expanded to encompass a wide range of themes and concerns.⁷ However, from the very beginning, three ideas were central to the goal of rethinking Marxism.⁸

First, the theory of knowledge appropriate for Marxian theory represented a radical break from both forms of traditional epistemology, empiricism and rationalism. Instead of relying on a notion of absolute truth, a Marxian approach was better characterized as a partisan relativism: relativism, in the sense that it involved a recognition that different truths were produced within different discourses, and there was no way of stepping outside the realm of knowledge to declare one or another theory to be the correct one; and partisan, because different knowledges had different social consequences, and arguing on behalf of one theory over others represented a stance in favor of one set of social consequences over others. Thus, for example, it became possible to argue both that Marxian and neoclassical economic theories produced different, relative truths and that Marxian theory was preferable to neoclassical theory because of their different implications for the economic and social world.

Second, Marxian theory was not based on an economic determinism. The focus on the economic dimensions of social formations such as capitalism was a contingent, conjunctural phenomenon, a result partly of the fact that our work was situated in and around the discipline of economics and partly because class was defined as an economic phenomena. But no causal priority was attached to this focus. Indeed, extending the concept of overdetermination Althusser had initially borrowed from Freud's interpretation of dreams, Resnick and Wolff's rethinking of Marxism eschewed any and all causal essences. Conducting a class analysis meant attributing discursive but not causal priority to class; it also involved analyzing the ways the existing class structure was both cause and effect of all the other nonclass aspects of society.

Finally, Resnick and Wolff redefined what it meant to conduct a Marxian class analysis. In particular, they connected Marx's theorization of class across the three volumes of *Capital* and produced a notion of class processes: aspects of society in and through which surplus labor was performed, appropriated, distributed, and received. Thus, for example, under capitalism, surplus labor was performed by wage-laborers, appropriated (as a form of social theft) by capitalists, and distributed by them to still others (such as other capitalists, banks, the government, etc.). In addition, individuals might occupy more than one class position (thus complicating notions of the working-class, the capitalist class, etc.) and societies might have more than one class structure (such as capitalism, feudalism, slavery, etc.). Thus, conducting a Marxian class analysis became a matter of analyzing the various forms surplus labor took in any given society (like the United States or Brazil) or institution (such as an enterprise, household, or the state), how those class processes affected and were affected in a contradictory fashion by the nonclass processes in society, and how as a result the class structure was changing over time.

Those were the three innovations that initially drew me to Resnick and Wolff's rethinking of Marxism, and which are reflected in the remaining essays in this volume. Later, as I began to think about a dissertation project, I became interested in two main areas: methodology (especially the whole panoply of issues surrounding the role of mathematical models in economic theory) and development (especially in Latin America). And that's what inspired my dissertation. The original idea was to investigate the role of planning in socialist Cuba (I had received permission from the Cubans to spend a year there but, alas, no funding from the Social Science Research Council). So, like many initial dissertation ideas, it became something else: a critical analysis of what was then called optimal planning theory, the use of static and dynamic optimizing models in planning a socialist economy. This required learning the mathematics (I had focused my studies elsewhere in college) and thinking critically, from a Marxian perspective, about the use of such mathematical models in building socialism.

That was my doctoral dissertation, and the basis of my first publications—after being hired in 1982 by one of the small number of other economics programs where, until now, students have been encouraged to study both mainstream and heterodox approaches, the Department of Economics at the University of Notre Dame.⁹

IN LIEU OF A CONCLUSION

I have included a short introduction at the beginning of each of the three sections into which the remainder of this book is divided. There, I explain the context for the essays contained in those sections and the questions I was attempting to address. Here, I want to identify some of the main themes that run through and across the chapters.

First and foremost, this work demonstrates that a Marxian class analysis leads to theoretical perspectives, empirical investigations, and policy proposals that represent a sharp break from mainstream economics, both liberal and conservative. Whether the focus is on individual decisionmaking and the celebration of private property and free markets (which, until recently, was hegemonic in the discipline of economics) or on economic and social structures and a positive role for government intervention (the previous liberal orthodoxy, and the one that is now ascendant in the wake of the current crises), conventional economic discourse simply does not permit the perspectives and approaches that stem from the Marxian critique of political economy.

I also hope to have shown that Marxian theory is different from other heterodox approaches. In my view, it's not enough for radical economists to emphasize such problems as the growth of financial institutions, the power of multinational corporations, and the persistence of poverty or to seek solutions to these problems by promoting the accumulation of capital, regulating financial transactions, or encouraging higher levels of foreign aid. It is incumbent upon us to connect our explanations to the complex class dynamics of the societies we're analyzing. Marxian analysis not only allows us to pose different questions—for example, about the relationship between the class structure of national and global economies and such problems as “hot money,” the internationalized structure of investment and production, and inequalities in the distribution of income and

wealth—it also encourages us to place the transformation of class structures on the agenda of economic and social change.

By the same token, we can't confine ourselves to a purely economic analysis. The issues of knowledge, causality, and subject formation are always implicated in the transdisciplinary orientation of Marxian theory. The Marxian critique of political economy comprises, among other things, a critique of the idea that the economy and economics are closed, self-contained entities. In addition, a Marxian approach (like all forms of economic analysis) is more than an attempt to understand what is going on “out there”; it is also always constructive of the social subjectivities and political imaginaries of economists and economic agents.

Finally, while I don't expect this kind of research to have direct policy implications, at least as understood in conventional policymaking circles, I do think it generates new understandings of what policy can be and broadens our sense of what policies are desirable. When class serves as the starting point of investigation—when the goal is to produce a Marxian class analysis, without invoking class as a causal essence—it becomes possible both to see how the existing class structure is a condition of economic and social problems and to imagine in concrete ways how a fundamental change in that class structure needs to and can take place.

My aim in this book is to present various examples of how one might apply Marxian class analysis to issues in planning, development, and globalization. These are certainly not the only ways nor do they represent a complete list of possible topics. I consider them merely a starting point, for my own work and that of others. If they suggest to readers the power of Marxian class analysis in these and other areas—even when the approach I adopt is criticized or superseded—then I will consider it a success.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have reproduced the appropriate acknowledgements at the end of each chapter. Here, I want to thank the following individuals: Routledge's Robert Langham, for encouraging me to bring this volume into print, and Simon Holt, for careful editorial assistance; Snehashish Bhattacharya, for helping me produce electronic versions of the original essays; Nick Krafft and Sean Mallin, for reading over and offering helpful suggestions on this chapter; Mecamutanterio, for enthusiastically granting permission to use the cover illustration; my various coauthors, for stimulating collaborations and kind permission to use our joint work here; and Stephen Resnick and Richard Wolff, for agreeing to contribute a thoughtful foreword and for being such committed and generous teachers, comrades, and friends over more than three decades.

I also want to thank the following journals and publishers for permission to use previously published material: *Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology*, *Research in Political Economy*, Allen & Unwin, *Latin American Perspectives*, Random House, Westview Press, *World Development*, Kluwer-Nijhoff, M. E. Sharpe, Duke University Press, *Review of Radical Political Economics*, *Economy and Society*, and *Rethinking Marxism*.

NOTES

1. I use the plural “crises” deliberately, to indicate both that the problems that currently beset capitalism are many in number and that there is no single cause of those problems.
2. Marx is not the only “forgotten figure” who has resurfaced in current discussions. The ideas of other past critics of mainstream economics, especially John Maynard Keynes, Karl Polanyi, and Hyman Minsky, have also been rescued from the obscurity created by neoclassical economists’ obsession with individual choice, private property, and free markets and celebration of capitalism.
3. Both Wolff and Harvey speak to audiences of students, scholars, and activists, on and off campus, on a regular basis. In addition, each has made Marxian theory accessible in other formats: Wolff, in a DVD and new book, both titled *Capitalism Hits the Fan* (information available at <http://www.rdwolff.com/>); while Harvey has produced 13 video lectures on *Capital* (available at <http://davidharvey.org/>).
4. This idea of an economic logic driving the system is closely connected to the traditional base-superstructure interpretation of Marxian theory, in which the economic base determines—in the first or last instance—all other aspects or “levels” of society. Unfortunately, many who refer to Marx (both supportive and dismissive) continue to invoke such an economic interpretation.
5. Both versions of Marxian theory—modernist and postmodern—are discussed at length in chapter 6 of Ruccio and Amariglio (2003).
6. The one exception was a remarkable opportunity, in my final semester, to co-teach a course on *Capital* with one of my undergraduate professors, David Vail, to whom I owe an enormous debt.
7. Early on, the project assumed an institutional form, first as the “journal group” (a monthly seminar in which the work being produced by Resnick, Wolff, and interested graduate students was discussed, with the goal of eventually starting a journal dedicated to the rethinking of Marxism) and then as the Association for Economic and Social Analysis, which has sponsored a series of local, national, and international conferences. Later, the group established *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture & Society*, which began publication in 1988. I have been a member of the editorial board from the very beginning and served as the editor from 1997 to 2009.
8. The original ideas are presented in Resnick and Wolff (1982 and 1983a) and then further elaborated in Resnick and Wolff (1987b).
9. The university decided in 2003 to divide the existing department into two: one, the Department of Economics and Econometrics, to focus exclusively on neoclassical

economics; the other, the Department of Economics and Policy Studies, to continue the broader approach for which the department had become well known in the United States and around the world. As I was in the midst of writing this chapter, in January 2010, the university announced its intention to eliminate Economics and Policy Studies and, with it, the long tradition of theoretical pluralism and social justice in economics at Notre Dame.