

AUSTRALIAN POLITICAL EXCHANGE COUNCIL

VISIT REPORT

Individual study tour to the United States of America

Eliza Littleton

Australian Greens

May 19 to June 16, 2025

Contents

Executive summary	1
Purpose of study tour	1
Lessons	1
Heterodox economics: definitions, tools, and features	2
Critical of neoclassical assumptions.....	2
Focus on power, class, and institutions.....	2
Historical and normative analysis	2
Pluralist in methods and disciplines.....	3
Successes and failures	4
Structural barriers in academia and economics education	4
Fragmentation and lack of coherence within heterodox economics.....	4
Usefulness of the term heterodox	5
Power, hegemony, and the production of knowledge	5
Communication challenges and public narrative	5
Political weaknesses and movement strategy.....	5
Breakthrough moments for heterodoxy	6
Strategies for impact	7
Timing and strategic opportunity	7
Narrative and communication.....	7
Coalition-building and strategic allies	7
Expanding the range of voices	8
Engaging with social movements	8
Public education and reframing the economy.....	8
Research as a tool for change	8
Building an institutions	9
Stay focused on long-term goals and avoid harmful compromises	9
Take away for progressive political parties	10
Conclusion	11
Meetings	12
References	13

Executive summary

Economics is often wielded for political ends in Australia. Overreliance on a narrow neoclassical school of thought has armed politicians and powerful vested interests with unrealistic models, arguments, and jargon that mystify the public and can be used to justify the status quo. The pseudo-objectivity of mainstream economics has given power to the many baseless political arguments that conceal complex truths, including, the assumption that government intervention in markets is bad, that adequate welfare payments disincentivise work, that budgets must be balanced, that inequality is inevitable, and that climate change is too costly to address. The hegemony of mainstream economics and the deep embedding of its narratives are a major barrier to progressive change.

Heterodox economists, think tanks, and community groups around the world are working to challenge these trans-historical and “universal laws” to bring economics back from abstraction towards real-world analysis with a social justice purpose.

Purpose of study tour

The objective of my study tour was to explore heterodox economic frameworks and approaches to policy to better understand how the Australian Greens can challenge the mainstream and communicate alternative economics visions in our political agenda.

I travelled to the United States – New York, Amherst, and Washington DC – and conducted 16 meetings with 23 people. My conversations spanned heterodox economists based in academia and think tanks, as well as staffers, unionists, and media folk. I set out to explore several key questions: What is heterodox economics? Why has it struggled to displace mainstream orthodoxy? How can actors across a progressive policy and political ecosystem use alternative economic analysis to advance more equitable outcomes? And what might political parties do differently to more effectively realise their policy ambitions?

I arrived in the United States four months after Donald Trump took office, at a moment when the Democrats and the broader left were still grappling with electoral defeat. They were working to make sense of the loss, debating how to confront Trump-era politics, and searching for a path forward. In Australia, our own federal election had just wrapped up. Early in the campaign, it looked as though we might follow a similar trajectory, with a possible right-wing populist victory. Instead, the conservative vote collapsed, and Labor secured a decisive win.

Lessons

The fight to challenge mainstream economics is not just an academic project - it is a political one that progressive parties must also take up. Mainstream economic thinking is deeply embedded in the institutions, narratives, and power structures that shape public policy, media discourse, and societal norms. It lends a veneer of objectivity to political agendas while often masking vested interests, and its assumptions influence how people understand fairness, government, poverty, and climate change. Heterodox economics not only exposes these limitations but also offers an alternative vision grounded in justice, care, and sustainability. For progressive parties to achieve transformative change, they must advance this counter-narrative, build public trust in it, and win power to implement it. This requires elevating heterodox voices, developing policy and political strategy with this goal in mind, and seizing growing opportunities to intervene where the logic of unfettered markets doesn't resonate with peoples lived realities.

Heterodox economics: definitions, tools, and features

Heterodox economics or political economy is a broad umbrella of economic thought that challenges the dominant assumptions, methods, and goals of mainstream or neoclassical economics. Rather than adhering to a single framework, heterodox economics is a pluralist tradition comprising a diverse range of methods and schools of thought including Marxism, Feminism, Institutionalism, and Post-Keynesian traditions.

While heterodox economics does not necessarily describe a unified discipline, generally the focus is on real experiences of how the economy works, analysis of morality, and a strong emphasis on systems of power. Heterodox economists seek to understand how economic outcomes are actually produced, not just through prices and preferences, but through politics, history, and institutions, and in doing so, it aims to build more equitable, and sustainable economic outcomes.

Critical of neoclassical assumptions

Perhaps the only unifying feature of heterodox economics is its critique of neoclassical theory, particularly core assumptions including the belief in rational, self-interested individuals, unregulated market efficiency, and equilibrium-based modelling. These assumptions are viewed as abstract and detached from reality, ignoring the structural forces, power relations, and social identities that shape economic outcomes.¹ Rather than treating markets as neutral mechanisms, heterodox economists view them as constructed systems shaped by history, policy, and power.²

Focus on power, class, and institutions

Heterodox economics foregrounds the role of power, class, and institutions in shaping economic outcomes. It seeks to understand how resources, decision-making authority, and opportunities are distributed across social groups, and how that distribution reflects systems of class, race, gender, and corporate influence.³ For example, the weakening of unions and the rise of monopolies are seen as drivers of inequality, not as deviations from a theoretical ideal but as direct results of political and institutional choices.

Rather than accepting the market is a natural, self-regulating system, heterodox economists ask what the economy is for, who it serves, and how it can be regulated. This includes framing the economy not as GDP or the stock market, but as the collective result of people's labour and time, spending, innovation, and policy/political choices.⁴

Analysis in this tradition often begins with groups, such as workers, employers, or social classes, rather than individual agents, and explores the conflict and cooperation between these groups in shaping outcomes.⁵ This includes analysing how coalitions form to bargain over the gains from cooperation, and how economic outcomes reflect both solidarity and struggle.

Historical and normative analysis

Heterodox economics treats history not as background but as essential to analysis and understanding. It is used to explain how economic, political, and social outcomes are

embedded and shaped by the past and present, how ideas and decisions are historically contingent, and how economies evolve over time.⁶

The tradition also tends to be more normative than mainstream economics, which often claims neutrality. Heterodox economists are generally more explicit about values and objectives, such as equity, sustainability, democracy, and care for future generations, and often treat inequality as a policy outcome, not a natural result of market forces.⁷ It's an analytical approach that is up front about centring people, not profits, and insists that the economy is both a moral and political project.

Pluralist in methods and disciplines

Methodologically, heterodox economics is pluralistic and interdisciplinary. It draws on a wide range of tools, from statistical analysis to historical case studies, institutional critique, and qualitative research, and often engages with insights from sociology, political science, philosophy, and gender studies.⁸ This stands in contrast to the mainstream's narrowing focus on causal inference and econometrics, which, while powerful in some contexts, is often poorly suited to answering big policy questions like inequality, climate change, or political polarisation.⁹

Successes and failures

Despite significant institutional and ideological barriers, heterodox economics has achieved moments of influence and breakthrough in shaping policy debates and shifting public discourse. For example, on issues like seller's inflation/profit price spiral, the value of care work, the green new deal, wage subsidies, and the unfair distributional outcomes of the stage 3 income tax cuts in Australia. However, the gains remain uneven and have not amounted to a paradigmatic shift or wholesale displacement of the mainstream. The primacy of mainstream economics remains relatively untouched, and heterodoxy continues to face significant structural, strategic, and communicative barriers which limit the scale and durability of advances.

Neoclassical economics continues to dominate the economics profession and the public's narrative about capitalism, despite some significant failures in its track record. For example, the mainstream failed to predict, prevent, and properly understand the Global Financial Crisis. Its models underestimated systemic risk, ignored the role of debt and incentives, and assumed markets were self-correcting - exposing a dangerous disconnect from real-world dynamics. More recently, the COVID pandemic surfaced the inadequacies of mainstream policy interventions such as fiscal restraint, balanced budgets, and austerity, instead compelling governments into large public spending on income security, health, and prioritising of human well-being over business bottom lines.

Amongst the people I interviewed there were mixed views on whether heterodox economics has been successful at making inroads to supplant mainstream economics or it has failed in this mission. Understanding both the breakthroughs and the persistent constraints is essential for charting a more effective path forward.

Structural barriers in academia and economics education

Heterodox economics has struggled to supplant the mainstream largely because of entrenched institutional hierarchies. Elite university departments, journals, and hiring practices overwhelmingly favour neoclassical approaches, making it difficult for heterodox scholars to gain tenure, reproduce their work, or mentor new generations.¹⁰ As a result, heterodox thinking is often confined to a few isolated hubs, with limited influence on core academic institutions, for example the University of Massachusetts Amherst and The New School.

Consequently, economic curriculums are dominated by neoclassical theory and quantitative methods, creating a pipeline that systematically marginalises alternative approaches.¹¹ This dynamic creates disciplinary funnel where curriculums reinforce orthodoxy from the undergraduate level through to PhDs, making it structurally difficult to challenge mainstream ideas and reinforcing the primacy of the mainstream among future economists.

Fragmentation and lack of coherence within heterodox economics

Many pointed to internal divisions within heterodox economics making it harder to scale or institutionalise. The field encompasses diverse traditions, including Marxist, post-Keynesian, feminist, and ecological economics, but lacks a unified theoretical or methodological framework.¹² These divisions often manifest as sectarian conflict, even within the same institution and leave the movement vulnerable to being seen as disorganised or reactive. The larger the group of disempowered people, the more divided they often are "the system pits

subgroups of the disempowered against each other,” while the dominant orthodoxy is unified and resourced.¹³ Some interviewees stressed the need for heterodox thinkers to spend less time critiquing the mainstream and more time articulating compelling, proactive alternatives.

Usefulness of the term heterodox

Several interviewees raised concerns about the usefulness of the term heterodox. While it serves as a shorthand for approaches outside the neoclassical mainstream, it is ultimately a negative definition, describing what it is not, rather than what it is.¹⁴ By defining the traditions only in opposition to the mainstream we implicitly accept the dominant position of neoclassical economics as the norm and risk reinforcing marginalisation by positioning these perspectives as peripheral.

This framing can obscure the diversity and richness of the alternative traditions it encompasses. Some suggested that it may be more productive to focus on pluralism or political economy as more affirmative and inclusive terms that highlight the normative, institutional, and interdisciplinary commitments of these approaches.

Power, hegemony, and the production of knowledge

The role of power, both political and economic, is central to understanding why neoclassical economics continues to dominate. Knowledge is shaped by those with the resources to produce and disseminate it - from corporate influence over university funding to the dominance of mainstream voices in media and policymaking.¹⁵ Any critique that challenges the power relations of the status quo is going to struggle to get a foothold.

Whereas the right has long understood how to institutionalise economic narratives, through endowed chairs, stacking boards, founding journals and think tanks, funding training programs for journalists, and even pre-written legislation. For example, Mont Pelerin Society. Neoclassical models also align with and legitimise existing power structures, reinforcing the interests of capital by presenting market outcomes as natural and efficient.¹⁶

Communication challenges and public narrative

Neoclassical economics benefits from simple, intuitive narratives, such as supply and demand, that are easy to teach, replicate, and communicate in media environments. Even when empirical data contradicts it for example, that raising the minimum wage doesn't lead to job losses.

By contrast, heterodox explanations tend to be more complex, rooted in history, and less quantifiable concepts like power, the value of care work or social reproduction, and are harder to summarise or visualise. As a result, progressive economic narratives struggle to gain traction in a media environment that demands fast, clear messaging.¹⁷ This is compounded by the fact that most people are unaware of the orthodox/heterodox divide, making it difficult to build broader public support.

Political weaknesses and movement strategy

Interviewees repeatedly emphasised that ideas alone are not enough, movements are needed to carry them forward.¹⁸ In the United States, there are many left-wing intellectuals but fewer organised, durable social movements capable of translating heterodox ideas into political

power. Australia, by contrast, may have weaker academic infrastructure but stronger movement capacity.

Others argued that progressive politics suffers from unclear economic messaging. While conservatives clearly articulate a neoliberal vision, progressives often pursue “wish list politics” or fragmented policy platforms that fail to connect with the values and concerns of working-class voters.¹⁹

Breakthrough moments for heterodoxy

Despite the substantial barriers, heterodox economics has had some moments of meaningful influence. Issues once marginal to the discipline - such as inequality, gender and labour market participation, monopoly and monopsony, and the care economy - have become part of the mainstream policy conversation, even if not branded as heterodox. Recent U.S. domestic policy under the Biden administration was notably more progressive than that of the Obama era, reflecting a shift in the underlying economic thinking and priorities, including his proposals for the Child Tax Subsidy, the Inflation Reduction Act, and raising the federal minimum wage.²⁰

In the realm of politics, there have been examples of successful messaging and agenda-setting by the left. A key factor in these successes has been a relentless focus on specific issues, which can cut through the complexity and noise of public discourse. Politicians like Bernie Sanders, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, and Zohran Mamdani have also shown that relentless focus on clear, populist economic issues - such as Medicare for All or housing justice - can reshape public debates.²¹ By focusing on rent and housing, Zohran made that people’s number one issue in the recent mayoral primary. The right has long been shaping public opinion and not just responding to it for example, around death taxes. In the United States there have been left figures replicating this model with some success.

There has also been progress in making concepts like social reproduction, care work, and systemic inequality visible and unavoidable in policy discussions - issues that originate in feminist, post-Keynesian, and Marxian schools of thought.²² Feminist economists have long criticised mainstream models for ignoring the economic value of unpaid domestic labour, care work, and social reproduction. The pandemic offered an opportunity to challenge neoclassical assumptions about individual responsibility and market self-correction, and in some instances, this window was used to create a shared appreciation for essential workers and effectively to push for institutional responses like unemployment insurance and stimulus spending.

More broadly, there is evidence that public discourse is becoming more open to structural critiques of capitalism, corporate power, and economic inequality, even among centrist or moderate actors. These shifts suggest that heterodox ideas are not only surviving but slowly reshaping the narrative terrain in which economic policy is debated.²³ For example, the attention garnered by Stephaine Kelton and the Modern Monetary Theorists and the rethinking of the role of the state by Mariana Mazzucato’s work. The left’s challenge is to consolidate these advances and continue building the infrastructure necessary to replicate them at scale.

Strategies for impact

Progressive economists, researchers, and organisations are employing a range of strategies to shift economic thinking, influence policy, and connect with social movements. While structural barriers to change remain formidable, these actors are finding new ways to exert influence - from seizing opportune political moments, and building coalitions, to reshaping public narratives, platforming marginalised voices, and developing research that supports political advocacy.

Timing and strategic opportunity

Moments of crisis or disruption can open space for heterodox ideas to gain traction. For example, a high-profile critique of seller's inflation and call for price controls during the post-COVID inflation surge gained public attention through alternative media channels, despite backlash from orthodox economists.²⁴ These moments should be seized to challenge orthodox narratives, particularly when real-world outcomes - like corporate executives openly admitting price-setting - expose the limitations of neoclassical explanations of prices.²⁵ However, even significant wins, such as the expanded child tax credit during COVID, can be quickly undone, reminding progressives that success is often fragile without consideration of other elements required for durable change.²⁶

Narrative and communication

Telling compelling economic stories is central to shifting public understanding. Real-world solutions, storytelling, and diverse formats, such as illustrations, journalism, poetry, and documentaries, are powerful tools for reaching audiences outside academia and policy circles.²⁷ Framing narratives around lived experiences helps expose systemic problems and move beyond abstract models - a mission at the heart of the Economic Hardship Reporting Project (EHRP).

Yet, a tension exists between simplicity and nuance - while simple slogans like "tax the rich" are memorable, they risk missing the broader systemic critique needed to build lasting and united movements.²⁸ In this context, well thought through strategies of "non-reformist reform" - those that challenge the foundations of the capitalist logic while advancing achievable material gains in the present - offers a crucial pathway between narrow reformism and utopian revolution.²⁹

Erik Olin Wright argued, the left has often faltered not for lack of vision, but for failing to develop and communicate a pathway that makes transformative change plausible. His concept of non-reformist reforms calls for intervention that erodes the foundations of capitalism from within while building scaffolding for a more emancipatory future.³⁰ For example, for governments to fund/build non-market alternatives for the deliver of services, sectoral bargaining, worker cooperatives, decommodification of public goods, and participatory budgeting. This is important to the communication of economic ideas because it bridges the gap between vision and reality, it makes structural critique tangible, contains a message of hope, and lays the ideological foundation for the larger and longer-term goals.

Coalition-building and strategic allies

Collaboration across sectors, disciplines, and constituencies is essential. Successful public interventions often emerge from partnerships, for instance, economic researchers working with communication focused advocacy groups to bring heterodox analysis to public debates.³¹

Organisations and academics can support advocates and policymakers by supplying research, strategic messaging, and data to strengthen their campaigns. This includes working with sympathetic actors in business, marginal decision-makers, and using credentialed economists (e.g. Nobel laureates) to gain legitimacy with mainstream media and policymakers.³²

For example, in late 2024 during the presidential campaign in the United States, Karmala Harris introduced plans to crack down on price gouging in the grocery sector. The campaign called on economist Isabella Weber, known for the concept of sellers' inflation, to support their policy and publicly discuss the evidence. Other advocates, including Senator Bob Casey and Senator Elizabeth Warren praised Harris' position.

Expanding the range of voices

Efforts to democratise who gets to speak on economic issues are key. Projects like economic speaker bureaus a project of the Groundwork Collaborative that elevate younger, racially diverse economists help break the monopoly of elite, white, male voices in economic discourse. Likewise, platforms that amplify people with lived experience of economic hardship - tenants, frontline workers, immigrants - challenge dominant narratives and offer more authentic accounts of inequality.³³

The media has enormous power in shaping public views, and progressives must work to ensure it features different perspectives and problems than those typically elevated. The EHRP engage in a practice they call culture jamming, which involves creative, often subversive media tactics to challenge dominant narratives around poverty, inequality and economic injustice. The stories and analysis are written by people with lived experiences of being economically marginalised to give economic issues a face, challenges stereotypes and elite economic discourse, our expectations of perspectives featured in traditional media (e.g. a tenant rather than a landlord) and disrupts the stories that capitalism tells about itself.

Engaging with social movements

Research and analysis has limited impact unless connected to organised movements. Activist-oriented research that supports union campaigns or grassroots coalitions has proven to be both credible and effective in delivering real policy change, such as legislating paid domestic violence leave.³⁴ This model has proved success in the context of the Center for Future Work. This model requires humility and alignment between intellectual work and the needs of movements. Yet, pressures particularly within academia - like publishing demands and funding constraints - often make sustained engagement with organising difficult.³⁵

Public education and reframing the economy

Educating the public, particularly through non-traditional means, was a recurring strategy in the meetings I conducted. Economics training for unionists, direct teaching at universities, and social media outreach are some methods used to reshape how people understand the economy.³⁶ Shifting away from the narrative that success depends solely on hard work, toward one that highlights structural constraints and the design of markets, opens space for policy solutions and collective action.³⁷

Research as a tool for change

Rigorous research, particularly when paired with effective communication, remains a foundation of progressive strategy. In an era of disinformation, research that exposes the

mechanics of inequality and counters dominant narratives is essential.³⁸ Providing tools and interpretive frameworks - such as historical context for racial disparities, how minimum wages don't cause higher unemployment or the decoupling of wages from productivity - empowers advocates and the public to see through misleading claims.³⁹ Supporting independent journalism is also part of this infrastructure - equipping writers and storytellers to influence mainstream media and public debate.⁴⁰

Building an institutions

Several interviewees concluded that long-term success requires more than critique - it requires institutions. Heterodox economics needs its own infrastructure: funding, chairs, think tanks, journals, public education campaigns, and templates for policy.⁴¹ Weber agreed, "we need an army of heterodox economists who will fight back," starting with changes to hiring practices at elite universities.

Despite the challenges, there are signs of progress - the task now is to institutionalise those gains, develop coherent alternatives, and link them to movements capable of delivering political power. Creating institutions that outlast electoral cycles is essential for durable impact. For example, Spain's Business Margins Observatory, was created to monitor corporate profits over time, and it is now used by unions in wage bargaining and represents a model for institutionalising economic oversight.⁴² Feminist economics and MMT show how good communication, coalition-building, strategic timing, and sustained advocacy can shift both academic discourse and public debate, that have shifted the way people think about the economy and governments.

Stay focused on long-term goals and avoid harmful compromises

While short-term compromises are often necessary, they can risk entrenching the very systems progressives seek to transform. We must continue asking ourselves what they are giving up when they opt for pragmatism. Some compromises - like market-based retirement systems or a poorly designed universal basic income - may originate as progressive ideas but in effect entrench inequality or harm marginalised demographics in the longer run.⁴³ It is important to have a clear vision of long-term goals and avoid internalising the short-term focus typical of mainstream economic logic.

Be bold and make moral arguments

Progressive parties need to make strong moral arguments and ask for what they actually want, especially when they have the evidence on their side.⁴⁴ Too often, the left limits its ambitions from the outset, whereas the right articulates maximalist demands and shifts the debate. Heterodox economics can offer a more persuasive moral and analytical basis for policy, especially when framed around justice, care, and well-being.

Take away for progressive political parties

The struggle of heterodox economics to displace mainstream orthodoxy is not just an academic battle, it is a political project that progressive parties must also win. Mainstream economics is deeply embedded in how governments, media, civil society, and corporations understand and justify political choices. Though it presents itself as neutral and scientific, it often functions as a legitimating tool for vested interests and ideological agendas.

Mainstream economists are routinely called upon by governments and the media to provide evidence, forecasts, and credibility. These economic arguments are wielded to defend political decisions, obscure harmful policy effects, and frame market outcomes as natural or inevitable. Yet no economic theory is neutral. All models are historically contingent, built on assumptions, informed by ideology, and geared toward conclusions about how the economy should function. The pairing of mainstream economic theory and the conservative political agenda protect the status quo of capital accumulation in the hands of a few has significant power in preventing progressive political/policy visions from coming to fruition.

The supremacy and ubiquity of mainstream ideas shape the way the public views the economy, the fairness of how resources are distributed, how prices are determined, the role of government, the causes of poverty, and the solutions to climate change. Unless we challenge and change the economic narratives, we tell ourselves we cannot expand what is considered politically possible.

Heterodox economics plays a crucial role here, not only by exposing the limitations and masking functions of mainstream arguments, but by offering alternative narratives grounded in justice, ecological sustainability, and social value.

Just as heterodox economists work to build a more realistic and humane understanding of the economy, progressive political parties must win public trust and power to advance policies grounded in that vision. The two goals are intertwined: without political wins, alternative economic ideas remain marginal, and without compelling economic narratives, progressive politics will struggle to achieve big necessary structural change we need. We must not lose sight that while Parliament may be our day-to-day battle, ideology is the war.

There are increasing opportunities for advancing heterodox economic analysis and agendas as growing dissatisfaction with GDP and profit driven policy creates space for alternative narratives. The global up take of “well-being economy” language - including by some governments - signals an appetite for values that heterodox economists have long championed. One of the most powerful entry points is care. Framing care not just as a labour market issue but as foundational to human flourishing reframes what the economy is for: not endless growth, but improving people’s capabilities, long-term health, and connection to others. This also exposes a core failure of markets, their inability to reward work that generates social and future-oriented value. Elevating care highlights the deep connections between economic justice and ecological sustainability, as both rely on valuing public goods that the market systematically devalues.

The underrepresentation of heterodox economists in key advisory and decision-making roles results in missed opportunities for better, fairer policy. Progressive parties should invest in identifying, training, and promoting heterodox voices - for example, by offering media training, fellowships, and exposure to parliamentary processes.⁴⁵ A more pluralistic economic conversation improves the quality of outcomes and helps dismantle the dominance of orthodox approaches.

Conclusion

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to the Australian Political Exchange Council for affording me the opportunity to conduct this study tour. I am very grateful to the staff for their help and support with tour arrangements, in particular to Connor who went above and beyond to make this trip special. Thank you also to the Australian Greens and the party room who saw value in my project and especially to Senator Barbara Pocock for your generosity and constant support.

The experience of visiting the United States and meeting so many interesting and strategic people has been truly rewarding. I look forward to applying my learning in an Australian context to further our political discourse, policy development, and political strategy.

Meetings

Name	Organisation	Position
Teresa Ghillarducci	The New School	Professor of Economics and Policy Analysis and Chair of Economics
Mark Setterfield	The New School	Leo Model Professor of Economics
Paulo dos Santos	The New School	Associate Professor of Economics
Margaret Hallock	University of Oregon	Economists and founding director Wayne Morse Centre for Law and Politics
Jim Stanford	The Center for Future Work	Director and Economist
Glen Weyl	Plural Technology Collaboratory at Microsoft	Social technologist and economist, founder of RxC, PTC and Plurality Institute
Maire O'Malley	The Economic Hardship Reporting Project	Chief Operating Officer
Stephen Nunez	The Roosevelt Institute	Director of stratification economics
Nancy Folbre	The University of Massachusetts Amherst	Professor emerita of economics
Isabella Weber	The University of Massachusetts Amherst	Associate Professor of Economics
Alez Jacquez	Groundwork Collaborative	Chief of Policy and Advocacy
Emily DiVito	Groundwork Collaborative	Senior Advisor for Economic Policy
Elise Gould	The Economic Policy Institute	Senior economist
Kyle Moore	The Economic Policy Institute	Economist, Program on Race, Ethnicity, and the Economy
Adam Hersh	The Economic Policy Institute	Senior economist
Monique Morrissey	The Economic Policy Institute	Senior economist
Dean Baker	The Center for Economic and Policy Research	Senior economist and co-founder
Neel Brown	Progressive Policy Institute	Managing Director
Ben Ritz	Progressive Policy Institute	Vice President of Policy Development
Kate Bahn	The Institute of Women's Policy Research	Chief Economist and Senior Vice President
Melissa Mohoney	The Institute of Women's Policy Research	Senior Research Economist
David Madland	The Center for American Progress	Senior fellow and adviser
Leslie Frane	The Service Employee International Union	Executive Vice President

References

Unless otherwise stated, the information referenced is drawn from interviews I conducted, with individuals or organisations named where appropriate.

¹ Stanford; New School; Weber

² New School; EPI; IWPR

³ EPI; IWPR; Groundwork

⁴ Groundwork

⁵ Folbre

⁶ Stanford; New School

⁷ EPI; Folbre; Groundwork

⁸ IWPR; New School

⁹ Weber

¹⁰ Weber; New School

¹¹ New School; EPI

¹² New School; Stanford

¹³ Weber

¹⁴ Weber; Stanford; New School

¹⁵ Stanford; EPI

¹⁶ IWPR; EPI

¹⁷ Groundwork; EPI

¹⁸ Stanford, Folbre

¹⁹ PPI; Groundwork

²⁰ EPI; Groundwork; Roosevelt Institute; IWPR

²¹ Groundwork

²² EPI; Folbre

²³ EPI; Weber

²⁴ Weber

²⁵ Weber; Groundwork

²⁶ Folbre

²⁷ Weber; IWPR; EHPR

²⁸ Folbre

²⁹ Folbre

³⁰ Erik Olin Wright (2019) *How to Be an Anticapitalist in the Twenty-First Century*, Verso Books

³¹ Weber; Groundwork

³² IWPR

³³ EHPR

³⁴ Stanford

³⁵ Stanford; Folbre

³⁶ Stanford; EPI; Folbre

³⁷ Groundwork

³⁸ IWPR; EPI

³⁹ EPI

⁴⁰ EHPR

⁴¹ EPI

⁴² Weber

⁴³ IWPR

⁴⁴ EPI

⁴⁵ Weber

Another source used was Ghilarducci, T., Knauss, Z., McGahey, R., Milberg, W., & Landes, D. (2023). The future of heterodox economics. *Journal of Philosophical Economics*, 16(1), 1–26.