

**Moving Beyond the Rhetoric of Pluralism:
Suggestions for an “Inside-the-Mainstream” Heterodoxy**

David Colander

Middlebury College

Most observers would agree that a healthy field of study needs diversity and a vibrant and open market for ideas. Thus, it would seem that calls for pluralism in economics, such as have been made by self-described heterodox economists, would be welcomed by the mainstream economics profession. They haven't been; the calls have been essentially ignored by the mainstream, leading some heterodox economists to argue that the mainstream of economics is unpluralistic, closed-minded, and ideologically biased. In turn, heterodox calls for pluralism are seen by many in the mainstream as simply calls for the mainstream to listen to the heterodox economist's particular point of view, and not as true calls for pluralism.

Because it fails to achieve the desired ends, I find the rhetoric of pluralism unhelpful. Heterodox calls for pluralism do not increase openness or foster communication between heterodox and mainstream economists because such calls suggest that mainstream economists somehow do not favor openness to alternative views, and that the reason why mainstream economists are not open to heterodox ideas is because mainstream economists are closed minded. Seeing the mainstream's rejection of their ideas as due to the mainstreams closed mindedness may make heterodox economists feel better, but it is not a way to open up dialog between mainstream and heterodoxy. Some mainstream economists may indeed be closed minded, just as some heterodox economists are. But that's life. Other mainstream economists are open-minded, and, in my view, it is toward those open-minded economists that heterodox economists should be directing their arguments. It is time for heterodox groups to move beyond the rhetoric of pluralism.

One can debate endlessly whether the mainstream of the profession is pluralistic. In some ways it is, and in other ways it isn't. For heterodox groups to dwell on ways in which the profession is unpluralistic doesn't gain them anything in terms of furthering their views with those mainstream economists who are open to change. While I agree with heterodox critics that mainstream economics has entrenched views, and has developed structures to protect those views, I do not see this as unusual, or something unique to the field of economics. It is simply how the real world works. The heterodox groups with which I am familiar have as entrenched views as does the mainstream, and oftentimes the institutional protections are stronger within heterodox groups than they are within mainstream groups. So, in my view, it makes little sense to rail against such structures that naturally develop within any ongoing system.

In this paper I advocate an alternative strategy--what might be called an inside-the-mainstream heterodoxy. As opposed to emphasizing the non-pluralistic aspects of the mainstream, this strategy emphasizes opening up dialog with that part of the mainstream

that is open to change. As we discuss in Colander, Holt and Rosser (2004) this part of the mainstream is much larger than is often portrayed by heterodox economists. Mainstream economics is not neoclassical, and cannot usefully be seen as a monolithic group with a single “orthodox” view. Instead it is a complex adaptive system of many competing views—views often as diverse as those held by heterodox economists. The mainstream is characterized by multiple layers of distinctions and grey areas of understanding about scope, method, and interpretation of results. At any one time, one view in the mainstream may be dominant, but that dominance does not necessarily reflect an entrenched orthodoxy, and it is not necessarily the view of all in the mainstream; it simply represents the way the intellectual forces play out at this particular time. Because of the multifacetedness of the mainstream, it is not *beliefs* that separate mainstream from heterodoxy; it is *attitude*, and willingness to compete within a given set of rules and institutional structures. Mainstream economists are willing to compete within those rules; heterodox economists aren't.

Because mainstream economists are limited by implicit and explicit institutional norms and rules, their beliefs, their research, and their teaching, all may differ. (Colander, 2005) For example, just because one works on general equilibrium models does not mean that one accepts that general equilibrium is an acceptable description of the economy. Similarly, just because one works on game theory does not mean that one believes most people are perfectly rational. Research and beliefs can differ. Mainstream researcher's decisions about the subject matter they will study, the methods they use, and what they teach, are part of a complicated set of practical, strategic decisions that do not necessarily reflect their deep views about how the economy works or what are interesting questions.

Because the mainstream has highly restrictive limitations on method and scope, for them, many ideas and issues are outside the purview of economics. But in the best of the mainstream economists, underneath any seeming orthodoxy is often an openness to ideas, and a desire to see the economics progress and consider these difficult issues. But to be open to any one else's ideas about such questions, these open-minded mainstream economists must be convinced that the person raising the questions understands the reasoning that led mainstream economics to avoid that question and to follow a more traditional mainstream approach.

In my view too many heterodox economists begin with the premise that mainstream economists don't understand the problems and limitations with “orthodox” mainstream arguments, and that it is the heterodox economist's job to point them out. That approach stops dialog. Such heterodox economists have little chance of communicating with open-minded mainstream economists since, almost by definition, that heterodox critic has not recognized the deep understanding of the issues that these open-minded mainstream economist have, or at least think they have. Communication fails, natural allies are kept apart, and entrenched views are reinforced rather than attacked.

The alternative strategy for heterodox economists that I support is a strategy built on opening lines of communication. It does not emphasize distinctions between

heterodoxy and mainstream, but rather deemphasizes them. It attempts to establish lines of communication among all economists. I suggest that young heterodox-leaning future economists will be more effective critics if they follow this alternative strategy.

Why a Change in Heterodox Approach is Needed

Mainstream economics would benefit from much more interaction with heterodox economists. That isn't happening. Heterodox economics is losing ground, and their ideas are not getting a hearing from the mainstream profession. In fact, heterodox economics is not only losing ground, it is not even holding its own; it is being squeezed out of the university academy, as deans and other decision makers respond to pressure from mainstream economists to support mainstream economics, not heterodox economics. The case of Notre Dame is but the most recent case, and now the squeeze on heterodox views is moving to Europe as well. This is leading to a loss in diversity in the profession, which I see as bad for economics.

In trying to understand what can be done about this squeeze, it is important to think about it from an administrator's perspective. Few administrators are in a position to make judgments about what economic ideas are best, so he or she naturally turns to a ranking, or to outside experts, for guidance. Numerous published rankings have developed, which all come the quite similar results because they all reflect the same natural science ranking system, which is a system that determines rankings on quality-weighted journal article publications and citations, in an attempt to determine importance and influence.

I fully agree with heterodox economists that the existing ranking approach that has developed in economics is far from optimal, and is in many ways perverse. It deemphasizes subjective valuation of ideas. It encourages fads. It directs research away from major ideas that will improve society, and directs research toward clever, but relatively unimportant, publishable articles. It gives no value to books, and little or no value to traditional publishing outlets for heterodox economists. It also gives no value to the many other contributions economists make, such as teaching and policy advising. It leads researchers to focus their research output on a selected set of journal article publications, even though efficient scholarly communication on many issues would take place through Internet discussion and postings.

Unfortunately, the system is what it is, and I am not sure how it can be changed without the development of an alternative ranking system. (That's why I think that developing alternative ranking systems that administrators would find both acceptable and compelling, as achieving the ends that they want to achieve, should be a front burner research issue for heterodox economics groups.) But despite any unfairness, even if the current ranking system is unfair, it is a system that heterodox economists will have to live with and operate within.

One reason why no better ranking system has developed is that it is extremely difficult to independently judge what is the "best" research in a field where empirical data is generally insufficient to guide researchers in choosing the "best" idea. What is "best"

will be, to some degree, internally defined within the profession and will have some degree of arbitrariness to it. The context within which the idea is expressed, and by whom it is expressed, will both contribute to its being considered a “good” idea. A second reason why is that, for all its faults, the current ranking system has a number of advantages. First, it is transparent. All economists, heterodox and orthodox, know what it is and how it is calculated, and can choose to play by it or not. Second, it is a ranking system that is not directly tied to any particular ideology. The higher you score on the “rankings” the more desirable you are to economics departments. To most departments it matters less what you have to say, and matters more that you have said it in the right journals. The ideology is there, as it inevitably will be in any research, but it is indirect, not direct.¹

Most mainstream journal editors would gladly create controversy and do not see themselves as promoting any specific orthodoxy, although implicitly, I agree they often do. They are open to new ideas if those ideas are expressed in the right form. That means that the ideas are embedded in a formal model, or are buttressed by rigorous statistical analysis (even if that analysis requires the use of poor proxies for what one is trying to measure), and/or are pushing the envelope on a statistical or analytical technique. As I discuss in Colander (2007) graduate economics students at top schools do not feel limited by any orthodoxy in what issues they look at, and the directions that the top mainstream economists convey to their graduate students is to “tell me something I don’t already know,” not to “tell me something that fits an orthodox mold.”²

I’m not saying that the mainstream is openly looking to modern heterodox economics for ideas. Telling anyone “something they don’t already know” is difficult, and telling extremely bright economists who have succeeded in the profession, and who are being given the accolades of the profession, “something they don’t already know” is very hard indeed. But I am saying that the best of the mainstream are open to new ideas, and will work hard to see that new ideas get nurtured, as long as those ideas fit their view of science and of what “good economics” are.³

It is that openness to competing ideas that has led to the recent turmoil within mainstream economics. Today, mainstream economics should not be thought of as a static entity, but rather as a complex adaptive system in which a variety of ideas and approaches compete. Within the mainstream, broadly defined, we have econophysicists developing models of zero-rationality agents, behavioral economists developing models of non-rational choice, and complexity economists arguing that the stochastic dynamic general equilibrium model is almost useless in providing insight into the macro economy. We also have experimental economists changing the way economics is done, and evolutionary game theorists changing the overall frame of vision of economics. The mainstream profession is abuzz with competing ideas and approaches. While almost none

¹ I discuss my view of how ideology enters mainstream economics in Colander (2004)

² There is, of course, no shortage of close-minded mainstream economists, just as there is no shortage of close-minded heterodox economists. In my considerations of mainstream and heterodox economists, I am talking about the best of both groups.

³ For example, it was Ken Arrow who guided and nurtured the Santa Fe complexity work, even though he was associated with the general equilibrium theory that it was meant to replace.

of these new ideas and approaches are core mainstream, they are acceptable to the mainstream, despite the fact that they are “heterodox” ideas in reference to the orthodox neoclassical thought, which is what most heterodox economists have in mind when they talk about orthodoxy.

In my use of the term “mainstream” I include all these ideas, and more. While many mainstream economists consider these new ideas stupid, and many of the closed-minded ones, of which I agree there are many, will not even consider them, the best of that mainstream will. What I am arguing is that heterodox economists should promote a dialog with this “best of the mainstream” group, and that there is an environment at the edge of the mainstream where heterodoxy can exist, and possibly even prosper.

“Inside-the-Mainstream” and “Outside-the-Mainstream” Heterodox

If the mainstream is open to heterodox ideas, at least on the edge of the mainstream, what accounts for the difficulty that most self-defined heterodox economists face? I see two reasons. The first is that all ideas face enormous competition in the economics profession; it is not easy getting one’s ideas heard. The top graduate schools recruit very bright students and train them in how to write papers with the right combination of technique and content that will get them a job, get them published, and get them tenure. They create graduates who will succeed in the existing environment. Heterodox programs have not done that; they have tended to see themselves as outside of the mainstream. Heterodox graduate programs generally have trained students in their particular heterodox tradition; and have not given significant training in the latest developments in mainstream economics, in advanced analytical or empirical techniques, or in how to write an article that will advance them in a mainstream-controlled environment.

That would be fine if these heterodox students were being sent out into an environment that valued that heterodox tradition, but all too often these heterodox students are sent out into an environment controlled by the mainstream that is hostile to the heterodox tradition, and to the way in which they were trained. All too often these heterodox students aren’t being equipped with the tools necessary to survive in that environment outside of some protected heterodox niches, which are becoming smaller generation by generation. Regardless of how bright these heterodox economists are, in competition with the mainstream-trained young economists who have been primed to exist in the existing environment, most of the young heterodox economists naturally lose out. The reality is that effective “inside-the-mainstream” heterodoxy requires not only solid technical skills, but rather superior technical skills. The only ones who are allowed to break to the rules are those who have demonstrated a full command of them.

A related reason why young heterodox economists have such a hard time is that while the mainstream is open to ideas, it is not open to the form that those ideas take. Mainstream economics is a highly restricted conversation, with a strong commitment to limiting the conversation to those ideas that fit into a formal mathematical model, and which allow econometric consideration. To enter the mainstream conversation, models

and econometrics have to be blended in just the right way to convince the mainstream profession that the author has something to add.

This limitation of form of expression leads mainstream economists to work on only those set of ideas that their tools can shed some light on. Other issues are not worked on, not because they are not considered important, but because the mainstream economists believe that they cannot say anything about them in a way that can enter the economics conversation. Mainstream graduate students recognize that the conventions that have developed in economics are highly limiting. As one graduate student noted in discussions with me, sociologists look at important issues that they can't say anything about, while economics look at unimportant issues that they can say something about.

Heterodox economists rail against these conventions, and they violate them; they choose to talk about what they consider important issues, even if they don't have the tools to do it in a manner that fits the mainstream conventions. That unwillingness to accept mainstream conventions about form is, in large part, what separates out what might be called an "inside-the-mainstream" heterodox economist for an "outside-the-mainstream" heterodox economist. In my view, it is primarily heterodox economist's unwillingness to accept the mainstream conventions about form, less than the particular ideas or ideology that they hold, that is the distinguishing characteristic of the "outside-the-mainstream" heterodox economics.

I am not criticizing heterodox economists for not accepting mainstream conventions; I am simply pointing out that in doing so they are essentially shutting themselves out of the mainstream conversation, and making it very difficult for them, and more importantly for their students, to succeed in an environment controlled by the mainstream.⁴

Despite my concerns, my preferred form of communication is much closer to the heterodox approach than it is to the mainstream economic approach. Thus, I am highly sympathetic to the heterodox complaints about form. I agree that just because the available tools can't handle an issue does not mean that the issue should not be considered by economists. I also agree that somehow the profession should be broad enough to include multiple frames of communication, so that when the tools become available, that there is a framework of economic thought to tie together with those tools. The question is how the best bring that about.

Here is where I differ from most heterodox economists. Even though I share many of the concerns of self-described heterodox economists, I work hard to carry on a dialog with the mainstream, and to put the heterodox concerns in a way that the mainstream will

⁴ Were mainstream economists to accept this broader form of communication, new methods of deciding what is good or not, and new rankings, would have to develop. I suspect that these alternative rankings and methods of choosing among ideas would likely be *as* discriminatory to heterodox ideas and to heterodox economists, *or more so*, than the current ones. In any case, the economics profession would be a far different profession than it is now. But I am not sure that it would be a better profession. From the vantage point of a supporter of heterodox ideas, a commitment to form over content in limiting the conversation has much to be said for it.

hear and will consider. I admit; I seldom succeed, but at least they will talk to me.⁵ My approach is different from that of many self-described heterodox economists. They carry on their own conversation, and seldom enter into the mainstream conversation. In the long run, I suspect that for most heterodox groups, it is a losing strategy—a strategy that will result in heterodox traditions being further squeezed from the profession. Hence, I suggest that heterodox groups consider an alternative “inside-the-mainstream” strategy. Specifically, my suggested approach is that some heterodox economists consider seeing themselves within this environment, rather than seeing themselves as existing solely in the heterodox environment. Essentially, I am suggesting a Fattah-type approach to the mainstream rather than a Hammas-type approach. This “inside-the-mainstream” approach would engage the mainstream as much as possible, and be more open to accepting mainstream conventions about form than most heterodox economists are willing to do.

I don’t expect many of those who are established in the heterodox movement to choose this approach. The wounds of the battles are too raw. And it is true that they are providing an important service; there are benefits to the profession from an “outside-the-mainstream” heterodoxy that points out its foibles and creates an alternative—benefits that do not exist for an “inside-the-mainstream” heterodoxy, who are always close to being co-opted. But being an outside-the-mainstream heterodox economist is a tough life, especially for young heterodox economists. I present these ideas in the hope that some of the younger heterodox economists will consider it as an alternative.

Below, I list some suggestions for those in the heterodox community who are interested in exploring this approach or in opening a dialog with the mainstream and becoming part of the “inside-the-mainstream” heterodoxy.⁶

Some Suggestions for an “Inside-the-Mainstream” Heterodoxy

Criticize the best of the profession, not the worst. As I have discussed above, the economics profession has much diversity of thought and play of ideas. Heterodox criticisms of a mainstream orthodoxy that do not take that diversity into account are unlikely to be heard. Criticisms that see the profession as a complex adaptive system are much more likely to be heard. Whenever I hear a heterodox economist criticizing the “neoclassical orthodoxy”, I can only feel that they are speaking to the converted, and will not have any chance of entering into a conversation with the mainstream.

Concentrate on areas where you can make a difference. As I have argued in Colander (2005) principles textbooks are full of neoclassical ideas, and often are not consistent with much of the latest thinking in the profession. One of the reasons textbooks are inconsistent with the best thinking in the profession is that the mainstream does not focus on teaching or pedagogy. This lack of concern about teaching by the

⁵ My tendency to try to promote dialog between different groups has made me the only white male Anglo Saxon protestant token that I know of. When heterodox economists are looking for a token mainstream economist to talk to they often invite me. When mainstream economists are looking for a token heterodox economist to invite, they often invite me.

⁶ The suggestions here are an expansion of the argument developed in Colander, 2003, and Colander, Holt and Rosser, forthcoming)

mainstream leaves an opening for “inside-the-mainstream” heterodox economists. By addressing their arguments to the narrow issue of what economists teach in their textbooks, and not to the issue of economist’s research, heterodox economists are on much firmer ground, and can get a better hearing from mainstream journals.

See the heterodox conversation as an incubator for ideas. I am sympathetic to those heterodox economists who want to stay out of the mainstream debate. Ideas need nurturing, and the environment for ideas within mainstream economics is unfriendly. Its requirement that ideas be formally modeled make it hard for novel ideas to develop. Heterodox economics communities provide an incubator environment within which ideas can germinate and sprout. They develop their own institutional structure which provides institutional validation of their ideas, and support mechanisms which allow the ideas to thrive within its limited environment. They are wonderful idea incubators, which allow people to have more friendly critics around, who treat their ideas more gently than the would be treated in mainstream economics. This gentle treatment gives the ideas a chance to germinate and perhaps even to sprout. Thus, the “outside-the-mainstream” heterodox community plays an important role.

Be preparing your ideas to leave the incubator. Ideas cannot remain in the incubator forever, and for the heterodox communities to serve the function of incubator, its must transfer the idea, developed in heterodoxy, up to the mainstream. All too often, what happens with ideas developed in heterodox economics is that they remain in their incubator and do not cross-pollinate with mainstream ideas. Both heterodox and mainstream economics are worse off for it. Thus, for the most part, the new ideas that have entered the mainstream in recent years, even though they parallel ideas heterodox economists have pushed for years, did not enter through heterodoxy, and the mainstream work almost never cites heterodox work.

For example, until recently the analytic tools to consider uncertainty were not developed, and Post Keynesian economics who emphasized uncertainty fell outside-the-mainstream conversation. With the development of complexity tools in mathematics, today the ideas of Post Keynesians are being integrated without any reference to Post Keynesians. Similarly, with Institutional Economics’ concern with socioeconomic aspects and institutional feedback on individuals. Before the development of evolutionary game theory, such concerns could not be integrated into mainstream theory; today they can be, and are. But it is being done with almost no reference to Institutionalists who kept these ideas alive as mainstream economics completely ignored them.

To make the transfer from the heterodox incubator to the mainstream, the ideas must be developed in a formal model and buttressed by technical empirical work. This transfer is difficult; often, the reason the mainstream has shied away from the complicated issues that heterodox economists see as important is highly likely to have been that mainstream economists thought the issues were intractable given the existing tools, not because the mainstream did not believe such issues are important. What this means is that for the heterodox ideas to enter the mainstream, the tools much change. They can only be dealt with formally by bringing more sophisticated mathematics and statistics to bear on the issue than the mainstream is currently using.

Pluralism and Heterodox Economics

See mathematicians and technical economists as your allies, not your nemesis. Mainstream economics is a formal modeling field; it is not going to change. It has chosen the issues it has because the tools it has available could be used to shed light on those issues. Advanced mathematicians can bring in new ideas because they have new ways of looking at issues that mainstream economists know were important, but shied away from because they didn't have the techniques to handle them. Thus, there is a natural symbiosis of heterodox economics with advanced applied mathematical economics and statistics. That symbiosis has not been developed, in part because heterodox economists have been anti-math. In my view heterodox economists should be precisely the opposite—they should welcome higher and higher levels of mathematical and statistical formalization into economics because that is what will allow the formal consideration of the issues they want considered.

Most heterodox economists don't have the skills to do that formal mathematical work, and I am not arguing that they should develop them. But I am arguing that “inside-the-mainstream” heterodox economics should have a working knowledge of what is going on in high-level mathematics and statistics, with an eye to see if new analytic techniques may be able to address some of the issues they believe should be addressed. Where there are, the “inside-the-mainstream” heterodox economists should be exploring possibilities for joint work with ultra mathematicians and ultra statisticians, who do have the skills, and the interest in ideas. There is a natural connection between these two groups.

Become involved in mainstream organizations. Organization such as the American Economic Association and Eastern Economic Association are generally controlled in theory by the members, but in practice they are controlled by a small group of mainstream economists. Few people vote in elections, and the nominating committees keep the control in the hands of a small group of elite graduate school economists. Whereas individual departments and economists don't have to be pluralistic, these organizations must at least appear to be. “Inside-the-mainstream” heterodox economists would become involved in these organizations; they would vote in them and, if they have enough support, would influence the profession through their role in these organizations. I see heterodox economists volunteering to serve on committees and coming up with suggestions for new programs to “broaden” the education and training of economists that could get support in the broader mainstream community.

Worry less about methodology. Many heterodox economists focus on methodological issues. For an “inside-the-mainstream” heterodox economist, that is a mistake. Unless he or she is a philosopher specializing in methodology, just about everything to be said about methodology has been said. To think that anyone but a specialist is going to have much to add on methodology is similar to a neophyte thinking he can do better than an index fund in investing.

Instead of complaining or discussing methodological problems, an “inside-the-mainstream” heterodox economists would be working on specific institutional problems that both underlie and affect methodology, such as creating an alternative ranking system. If the current ranking system does not put heterodox research in an appropriate light, he

or she would develop an research agenda designed to create an alternative ranking system that does, and explain why it is a better system. There are many foibles with the current ranking systems, especially as a ranking system for economists who are primarily teachers of economics, or are involved in “hands-on” applied policy. Heterodox interests fit much better into what undergraduate teaching needs and were a separate “teaching-oriented” ranking system developed, heterodox economics would come out much better in the rankings.

Don't dwell on unfairness. If there is to be a dialog, it has to originate from heterodox economists. The mainstream has the power, and has little incentive to give it up, and for the most part is totally unaware of the existence of a heterodoxy even existing.⁷ Heterodox economists today find themselves in precarious positions, and are being squeezed out institutionally both in the U.S. and in Europe. Is it fair that most of the effort toward communication will have to be on the heterodox economist's side? Absolutely not. But so what? Regardless of how unfair the profession is to you, it does not help to feel sorry for yourself.

I fully agree, heterodox economics are discriminated against and ill-treated. But complaining about it will not change the situation when the other side has the power. So, I see no other option than to live with it. If you define your role in a way that allows you to succeed within the institutions that exist, you have more of a chance of changing the institutions than you do if you are marginalized. Toward that end, I do not see it as especially helpful to distinguish oneself as a heterodox economist, and not just as an economist who has certain beliefs. To differentiate oneself as heterodox places one in opposition to an orthodoxy that the mainstream doesn't believe exists, and thereby reduces the possibility of communication with the very people whom I believe heterodox economists should be communicating with.

Conclusion

I do not expect my suggestions to be well received by the heterodox community, just as my ideas are generally not well received in the mainstream community. I offer them in the hope of establishing better lines of communication between the mainstream and heterodox economists. I am not arguing that all, or even most, established heterodox economists should become “inside-the-mainstream” heterodox economists. Most established heterodox economists have found a comfortable institutional niche for themselves, which allows them to expound their ideas to a friendly group of fellow economists and students. They can do quite well as an “out of the mainstream” heterodox economist.

The reason I wrote this paper is that the trend I see occurring in the profession is one in which the heterodox community is increasingly marginalized. It is becoming harder and harder for heterodox students to exist in the “outside-the-mainstream” heterodox niches. In my view, the heterodox niche that currently exists may not be a

⁷ I initially entitled this paper “What Does Mainstream Economics Think of Heterodox Economics?” I changed it because my honest answer to that question was that they don't think about it. For the most part, the mainstream is unaware of the existence of an “outside-the-mainstream” heterodoxy.

Pluralism and Heterodox Economics

sustainable niche within the economics profession. In any case heterodox students should expect that the niche will come under increasing competitive pressures from the mainstream. Unless the heterodox program expands within the economic profession, or otherwise grows through interdisciplinary programs, which establish themselves outside of economist's normal niches (as feminist economics has done) heterodox students will generally have a harder time than their professors, and their student's students will have an even harder time existing in that niche.

In my view a dynamic profession is a blend of many different ideas, all competing to be heard. Currently self-described heterodox ideas are not being heard. The "inside-the-mainstream" heterodoxy approach suggested in this paper offers a way for young heterodox economics to exist in the mainstream environment, and for heterodox ideas to become blended in with mainstream ideas. It is a heterodoxy that is continually changing, and multifaceted. It is opportunistic and concentrates on those niches where heterodox ideas can flourish. The theoretical part of this heterodoxy would likely integrate with researchers from physics, math and statistics programs that allow heterodox economists to push the frontier of techniques as well as ideas. The non-technical part of this heterodoxy would concentrate on teaching undergraduate economics, and would provide an undergraduate teaching of economics that is much broader than that which is currently taught. Improving that teaching would be a major contribution to both the profession and the society.

References

Colander, David, "Post Walrasian Macroeconomics and Heterodoxy: Thinking Outside the Heterodox Box" *International Journal of Political Economy*, Summer 2003, Vol. 33, 2.

Colander, David, "Economics as an Ideologically Challenged Science" *Revue de Philosophie Economique*, 2004/1.

Colander, David, "What Economists Teach and What Economists Do," *Journal of Economic Education*. Summer, 2005 (36/3).

Colander, David, *The Making of an Economist Redux*, Princeton University Press, 2007.

Colander, David, Richard Holt and Barkley Rosser, Jr. *The Changing Face of Economics: Conversations with Cutting Edge Economists*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 2004.

Colander, David, Richard Holt and Barkley Rosser, Jr. "Live and Dead Issues in the Methodology of Economics" *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*. Forthcoming.

Abstract

**Pluralism and Heterodox Economics:
Suggestions for an “Inside-the-mainstream” Heterodoxy**

David Colander

Middlebury College

This paper discusses an “inside-the-mainstream” heterodoxy approach that offers a way for young heterodox economics to exist in the mainstream environment, and for heterodox ideas to become blended in with mainstream ideas. It suggests that there is a need for a heterodoxy that is continually changing, multifaceted, and opportunistic in the sense that it concentrates on niches where heterodox ideas can flourish.

About the Author

David Colander received his Ph.D. from Columbia University and has been the Christian A Johnson Distinguished Professor of Economics at Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont since 1982. In 2001-2002 he was the Kelly Professor of Distinguished Teaching at Princeton University. He has authored, co-authored, or edited over 35 books and 100 articles on a wide range of topics. His books have been, or are being, translated into a number of different languages, including Chinese, Bulgarian, Polish, Italian, and Spanish. He has been president of both the Eastern Economic Association and History of Economic Thought Society and is, or has been, on the editorial boards of numerous journals, including *Journal of Economic Perspectives* and the *Journal of Economic Education*.