

Newsletter 1

September 2025



EAEPE

A pluralist forum since 1988

Content:

1. Editorial Letter
2. Interview with our Conference Keynote Speakers:
 - Susan Ariel Aaronson
 - Phoebe Moore
3. Introduction of co-opted Council Members
4. Interview with José Luis Oreiro
5. Call for Papers - Review of Evolutionary Political Economy (REPE)



Dear EAEPE Members,

Welcome to the **first issue of the EAEPE Newsletter**.

With this new initiative, we aim to strengthen communication within the Association, share important updates, and showcase the work and ideas of our members. The newsletter will offer regular information on EAEPE activities, events, and publications, while also serving as a platform to share members' stories and highlight relevant topics in our field.

On the occasion of this introductory note, I would like to emphasize the importance of interdisciplinarity and pluralism in addressing the complex challenges facing our societies today. Evolutionary and political economy approaches offer powerful tools for analyzing these challenges and for deepening our understanding of complex socio-economic phenomena.

This is also an opportunity to underline the need for all of us to contribute with our academic research and dialogue to the long-term goals of improving lives across the globe, fostering shared prosperity, and protecting the planet.

In this spirit, EAEPE is organizing its **annual conference** this year around the theme of emerging opportunities and threats in the AI-driven era. The 2025 conference, titled "**The Janus Face of AI: Opportunities and Threats**", will provide a space to critically explore AI not only as a technological development but as a broader socio-economic and political transformation. We aim to shed light on fundamental questions regarding how the rise of AI intersects with inequality, institutional structures, and power dynamics.

We are pleased to announce two **keynote speeches** at the conference and feature short **interviews** with them in this issue of the newsletter:

- **Susan Ariel Aaronson**, Research Professor of International Affairs at George - Washington University, will speak on "The Mixed Political Economy of AI"
- **Phoebe Moore**, Professor at Essex Business School, will present on "A manifesto for digital & AI rights from the left"

In addition, there will be a **roundtable discussion** titled "Challenges and Opportunities for AI Laggards: Bridging the AI Divide," aimed at generating practical insights and policy recommendations for countries striving to catch up in the global AI race while promoting equitable and sustainable development.

On a more somber note, the organization of this year's conference coincides with the passing of **Richard Nelson**, a pioneering figure in evolutionary economics and Honorary President of EAEPE. To honor his legacy, we have dedicated a special session to his work and contributions. **Franco Malerba**, Professor Emeritus at Bocconi University and a close collaborator of Nelson, will deliver the opening lecture, offering an academic and personal reflection titled "Richard's Nelson legacy"



Beyond this year's conference, the newsletter includes some more content:

First, we introduce the **two new members of the Council**, Jessica Palka and Anita Pelle who were co-opted this year to support the EAEPE activities. Both have already taken on a number of responsibilities, and we thank them for their active engagement.

We also feature an **interview with José Luis Oreiro**, coordinator of the EAEPE Research Area on Developmental Macroeconomics: Perspectives from the Global South. The interview reflects on the special tribute session Oreiro organised at the 2024 EAEPE Annual Conference in honour of Luis Carlos Bresser-Pereira, a leading figure in Brazilian heterodox economics. The conversation touches on Bresser-Pereira's intellectual and policy contributions—from the theory of inertial inflation to the foundations of New Developmentalism—and explores how these ideas resonate with current challenges in both the Global South and high-income economies.

Finally, we also would like to share the most recent **Call for Papers of EAEPE's Review of Political Economy**, please have a look at the final pages of the newsletter to see if you would like to contribute:

- Pluralism in Economics and Postcolonial Political Economy
- Complexity in Innovation, Management and Economics — The challenges of sustainability transition and digital transformation
- Value and Valuation Research: Advancing Understanding, Conceptualization, Practice, and Policy through Interdisciplinary Lenses
- Driving Socio-Economic Change through AI and Digitalization: Entrepreneurial Opportunities and Risks

We hope this newsletter will become a valuable space for exchange, inspiration, and community within EAEPE.

Warm regards,

Ioanna Kastelli
President of EAEPE



The Mixed Political Economy of AI

An Interview with Susan Ariel Aaronson



Susan Ariel Aaronson is a Research Professor of International Affairs at the Elliott School of International Affairs, George Washington University (GWU). She is also a GWU Public Interest Technology Scholar and co-Principal Investigator of the NSF-NIST Trustworthy AI Institute for Law and Society. At GWU, she directs the Digital Trade and Data Governance Hub, and she is a Senior Fellow in Economics at the Center for International Governance Innovation (CIGI).

In her keynote, Professor Aaronson will address competition in AI, the rise of AI nationalism, and the risks of overcapacity in the sector. She will argue that governments, determined to invest substantial amounts of taxpayer money in AI, may unintentionally generate overcapacity, dumping of AI, and less effective regulation.

The theme of this year's EAEPE conference refers to the "Janus face" of AI—its dual potential for empowerment and harm. How does this duality manifest in your own research and professional experience?

Aaronson: I see it every day in the US given the Trump Administration and Congress's unwillingness to regulate either the data, the business models, the companies or the technology of AI. I also see it in my own research. I am speaking here about AI overcapacity - producing too much AI could lead to the dumping of AI without guardrails. I am also researching what companies say about responsible AI on their websites, how they train their chatbots (as revealed by technical documents) and do they care about responsible AI; their user agreements and then we ask chatbots about how they are trained. We see a lot of hypocrisy.

As scholars working at the intersection of public interest, international affairs, and the future of work, what do you believe are the most urgent societal questions we should be asking about AI today?

Aaronson: How can AI help us as scholars? How will AI change how we connect as humans and how we connect ideas? Can we resist AI? How can we use AI to increase human capacity and not substitute for it?

What are the major obstacles to developing global norms for ethical AI, and how can they be overcome in a multipolar, often fragmented world order?

Aaronson: No one knows what ethical AI looks like. Ethical AI is normative. I am not a fan of "ethical" AI. I want to see AI be more responsible and ethical but what that means in reality is unclear.

What risks do you see in the growing concentration of AI capabilities within a few dominant corporate and state actors, particularly for emerging economies and marginalized communities?

Aaronson: I don't think this is true today, although it was last year. Many governments—for example, Switzerland most recently—have developed their own LLMs, which reduces the dominance of just a few actors.

How do you see your research contributing to the broader aims of EAEPE particularly in advancing institutional, heterodox approaches?

Aaronson: I hope my research contributes to our understanding of how institutions adapt to changing technologies and expectations of governance.

A manifesto for digital & AI rights from the left

An Interview with Phoebe Moore



Phoebe Moore, Professor at the Essex Business School will deliver one of the two keynote speeches at the 2025 EAEPE Conference.

Her talk on the social relations of AI production will focus on private and public sector bodies, and Big Tech companies that aggressively harvest personal data with a logic of extraction that mirrors historical forms of colonialism. Datasets are used to advance profits and shareholder interests, and managers feed the same data into machines, where new technological systems and tools advance the commodification of social relations. The hegemonic drive is for AI production, but data subjects experience a new violence, where any possibility for social relations outside of the restrictions of capitalism is disappearing.

Ultimately, workers' capacity to consent, both to data capture and to forms of profiling, are under threat. In this keynote talk Professor Moore will focus on increased coercion exceeding consent, the rise in inequalities and fall of autonomies in the social relations of AI production.

The theme of this year's EAEPE conference refers to the "Janus face" of AI—its dual potential for empowerment and harm. How does this duality manifest in your own research and professional experience?

Moore: I do not write about the potential benefits for AI, because I think forecasting such an overture is a cognitive error. 'Artificial intelligence' is 'artificial'. In my professional life, I do not frequently argue that something artificial is preferable to the 'real', unless the real has been damaged beyond comprehension for a fix that can also be maintained by processes within the real. I want to spend time on intentional human real time future building, and therefore, spending my research energies endorsing anything that cannot be transversally contrasted would lend itself to justifiable skepticism. I am staying with the trouble, in that I am revealing the real before relishing the replica or redeeming a ruse.



As a scholar working at the intersection of public interest, international affairs, and the future of work, what do you believe are the most urgent societal questions we should be asking about AI today?

Moore: The most urgent societal questions we should be asking about today, are not about AI. We should be asking why governments are funding ‘artificial intelligence’, rather than funding the welfare state, education, housing, eliminating climate change, and fighting the far right. Funding AI development is akin to the promotion of Big Tech norms, promoting the rupture of green spaces for data centers, and providing a decorated but eminently obvious pipeline for automation of some aspects of work, but not all jobs.

We hear about the displacement of jobs due to AI. What does the rise of AI mean for workplace autonomy and dignity?

Moore: If there is no job, one cannot imagine autonomy nor dignity. However, as has been proven repeatedly, AI does not replace jobs in all industries. Technologies replace jobs and indeed, should replace jobs. Robots work in factories now where people once worked, but that is better for humans, where there is retraining, upskilling and job mobility on the cards (it often is not). Managers use slide deck-powered ‘AI salvation’ strategizing with higher skilled workers, where the middle-tier of skilled workers in IT work have seen their workloads not reduced, and their jobs not replaced as such, but instead, their workloads have intensified. Introducing new ‘AI’ software usually leads to work intensification for a few workers, deskilling of a few workers, and the worsening of work for a lot of workers.

How can trade unions, worker advocacy groups, and policymakers respond effectively to algorithmic control and the changing nature of labour?

Moore: Trade unions are responding to the issues of digitalization internationally. A good way to find out about this is to look at our AI Observatory for Work in the Digital Economy, where in the journal I edit, *Global Political Economy*, I am publishing the Symposium on AI and the world of work in the September edition. We are publishing updates about what a series of countries and jurisdictions are enacting and also are dealing with, in the face of AI advancements internationally. See: <https://www.essex.ac.uk/research-projects/ai-policy-observatory-for-the-world-of-work>

Our Brazil case report, by Grohmann, Parana, Valente, and Figaro, explores Brazil’s AI governance as a political battleground. While the Brazilian Artificial Intelligence Plan (2024–2028) emphasizes innovation and digital sovereignty, labour rights are largely overlooked. The authors call for inclusive governance centred on labour protections. In our India report, Roy and Das Sarma highlight fragmented yet fast-evolving AI policy amid inequality and informality. Weak regulation ignores worker rights, fueling precarity and surveillance. Cohesive, labour-centred regulation is urgently needed. Donoghue’s essay on China notes strong state-led AI development, focusing on societal risks but neglecting workers’ rights. In our Canada country report, Hung et al. critique techno-nationalist AI narratives, urging a shift toward public-interest governance, labour inclusion, and accountability. In our report about the EU, I argue, with Petrucci, and Muldoon, that AI is treated as an inevitable advancement, driven by economic goals and business interests. Current regulation promotes innovation but avoids deeper political debate. We are overall calling for political resistance, worker-led governance, and urgent engagement with how AI is reshaping labour and the future of work.

Warm Welcome to our new Council Members

We are very glad to introduce Jessica Palka and Anita Pelle as part of the current EAEPE Council. They have been coopted till the next elections to help EAEPE with the many small tasks that the operation of our association requires and to move forward in a number of a important initiatives.



My name is **Jessica Palka**, and I am a PhD researcher at the **University of Duisburg-Essen's** Institute for Socioeconomics, currently finalising my dissertation on **participatory social economics, community-based knowledge generation, and feminist methodologies**.

I first engaged with EAEPE during the online pre-conference in 2021, where I enjoyed the open, critical and highly engaging discussions and presentations. As an EAEPE council member, my goal is to advance the Association's mission of promoting interdisciplinarity and methodological diversity while supporting our members, especially those who face obstacles to participating. In this regard, I'm working on developing criteria for travel and funding support to increase participation of researchers from the Global South, young scholars, and Global North scholars with limited institutional support.

If you would like to get in touch, please connect:

- [LinkedIn](#)
- [ORCID](#)



Anita Pelle is the Head of the **Institute of International Economics and Business at the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, University of Szeged**. She is an Associate Professor and Jean Monnet Chair at the university, an expert in **European economic integration and comparative economics**. She has been researching and teaching on the economy of the European Union, especially the following fields: competition in the internal market, competition regulation, research and development and innovation policies and performance, competition and innovation, competitiveness, and the internal competitiveness divide.

Her Jean Monnet Chair project, "**Need for a Competitiveness Union in the EU**" highlights her commitment to exploring the EU's structural challenges and advancing a cohesive European economic policy. She has also led European Social Fund-supported research initiatives on building intelligent and inclusive societies, addressing policy issues associated with the digital economy and the fourth industrial revolution.

If you would like to get in touch, please connect:

- [LinkedIn](#)

New Developmental Macroeconomics After the End of Washington Consensus: a Tribute to Bresser-Pereira

An Interview with José Luis Oreiro



José Luis Oreiro is a professor of economics at the University of Brasília in Brazil, the University of the Basque Country in Spain, and the University of Tuscia in Italy. He also is a Research Associate at the Center for New Developmentalism Studies at the Getúlio Vargas Foundation.

Together with Raghavendran Srinivasan he coordinates the [DM] Developmental Macroeconomics: Perspectives from the Global South Research Area

At the 2024 EAEPE Conference he organised the Special Session 'New Developmental Macroeconomics After the End of Washington Consensus: a Tribute to Bresser-Pereira' to shed light on the work and legacy of one of Brazil's most influential economist of the recent decades.

Questions from Daniel Moura da Costa Teixeira, Ph.D. Candidate in Economics at the University of Brasília and EAEPE Member

What was the main purpose and motivation to organise this special session at the last conference?

J.L. Oreiro: The immediate purpose was to honor Professor Luis Carlos Bresser-Pereira – the greatest Brazilian economist alive – on his 90th anniversary. Professor Bresser-Pereira played a critical role in the development of the theory of inertial inflation in the early 1980s, which was fundamentally important for the success of the Real Plan (1993-1994) that finally ended the problem of high or strato-inflation (using the terminology created by my former PhD supervisor, Fernando Cardim de Carvalho).

Bresser-Pereira is also the founding father of the Brazilian New-Developmentalist School, which has attracted the attention of many young scholars in Brazil, Latin America, and Europe in the last 10 years. Finally, Professor Bresser-Pereira was also a policy-maker: he was appointed Minister of State in Brazil three times, first under José Sarney's administration as Minister of Finance and Economics (1987), then as Minister of Public Management and State Reform (1995-1998) under the first term of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso's administration, and finally as Minister of Science and Technology (1999) under the second term of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso's administration.



What have been the contribution of the selected participants and the session overall?

J.L. Oreiro: I think that the selected scholars – including myself – showed how the ideas developed by Professor Bresser-Pereira have spread not only in Brazil but throughout the entire Western world. As a matter of fact, new-developmentalism, with its emphasis on the links between structural change, industrialization, macroeconomic policies, and real exchange rate, is important not only for Latin American economies but even for high-income countries in Europe that are now facing the problems of deindustrialization and decreasing international competitiveness.

Moreover, Europe can learn from the Theory of Inertial Inflation how to fight inflation without an unnecessary increase in the rate of unemployment with a tight monetary policy. During the Real Plan, Brazil was able to reduce the rate of inflation very quickly while economic growth accelerated due to increases in real wages. The key to success is to reduce the level by which current inflation is determined by past inflation. Income policies are the key to accomplishing this.

What is the importance of this special session within the context of the EAEPE Annual Conference?

J.L. Oreiro: I think this special session was a unique opportunity for European economists to discover the originality and relevance of economic theory developed in Latin America, particularly in Brazil. Economics has traditionally been considered a British-American science: the so-called “rest” – to use the expression created by Alice Amsden – are supposed to learn from the books and articles produced by economists working in the USA and the United Kingdom.

Although it is impossible to deny the great importance of American and British universities in developing economic thought in the last 100 years – for better or worse – Latin America, since Raul Prebisch and ECLAC, has played an important role in creating a school of thought regarding economic development.

New-Developmentalism is, on one side, an attempt to create a developmental theory that is compatible with the new reality of Latin America, after the Washington Consensus and the rise of China. On the other side, New-Developmentalism is also a synthesis – in Hegel’s sense – between Classical Development Theory, Latin-American Structuralism, and the Post-Keynesian Theory of Demand-Led Growth. So new-developmentalism can be an important bridge to connect Europe with Latin America.

Could you discuss the importance of pluralism, the integration of Global North and South perspectives, and Professor Bresser-Pereira’s contributions to the development of economic theory?

J.L. Oreiro: During the annual meeting of the Association for Evolutionary Economics (AFEE) in which Bresser-Pereira received the James Street Scholar for 2012 and participated in the panel “Institutionalism and the Great Crisis”, Bresser delivered a lecture entitled “Why Economics must be a modest and reasonable science”. The major subject of the paper is to discuss the nature and method of economic thinking.



For Bresser, economics or political economy, as he prefers to call our field of expertise, is a major science “because it has as its object something that is central to human life: the economic system, how people organize labor and production, and how they allocate income – in other words, because men and women dedicate a large part of their existence to work and make a living in market-coordinated economic systems that economics seeks to understand and explain” (Bresser-Pereira, 2012).

But economics must also be a modest science “because, as with all other social sciences, its best models – the models that really make sense – are simple and open; or because its predictive power is limited in so far as (thank God) men and women continue to be free individuals making choices under uncertainty and according to criteria that are not constant. Consequently, economists or policymakers should also be modest and reasonable; they must acknowledge that they have a limited capacity to predict the future” (Bresser-Pereira, 2012).

To be a modest science requires the acknowledgment that economics is not a hard science like Physics, in which there is a clear and defined frontier of knowledge created by a positive resolution of controversies between economists.

As Pérsio Arida states in his classical essay of 1983 about rhetoric in economics, the history of economic thought tells us that controversies in economics end not because a final conclusion is reached but by the exhaustion of the sides under dispute. Due to this fundamental shortcoming, economics must be a plural science: different paradigms must compete with each other to increase the understanding of the functioning of the economic system. Diversity, as it occurs in biology, is a very good thing for economic reasoning.

What advice would you offer to young scholars and students who are keen on the topics covered in this special session?

J.L. Oreiro: Always keep an open mind for new ideas and approaches, and realize that economic issues can differ between North and South countries. For example, among European post-Keynesian economists, a theme of fundamental importance is to discuss the relation of income distribution between wages and profits and the level of aggregate demand and the rate of economic growth.

This can be an important issue for mature economies in the sense of Kaldor (1967), where the main limit for economic growth may be due to a lack of effective demand; but this is not the case for dual or peripheral economies in Latin America, Africa, and Asia where structural transformation is far from complete. The way that a mature economy works is not the same as a peripheral economy. This is a fundamental tenet of Latin American structuralism, which has recently been recognized by post-Keynesian economist Peter Skott.



Review of Evolutionary Political Economy (REPE)

• Collections and Call for Papers

Finally, we would like to draw attention to the current [Call for Papers](#) of the Review of Evolutionary Political Economy (REPE). The next approaching submission deadline is for the special issue of “Pluralism in Economics and Postcolonial Political Economy” on this page and further three issues with submission deadlines in the beginning of the next year on the next page:

Please note: the given deadlines are the final submission deadlines, and proposals might must be send earlier. Find more information by clicking on the link in the respective headline

Pluralism in Economics and Postcolonial Political Economy

There is an emerging debate between heterodox economics and post-and decolonial scholarship. This special issue interrogates their possible common terrain and invites papers that explore the relationship between pluralism, evolutionary political economy and post-/decoloniality. The main aim is to provide a space for the current debates on post-/decoloniality and their relevance for economics, political economy and pluralism.

Status:

Open

Deadline:

31 January 2026

This special issue explores the intersection of pluralist economics and post-/decolonial political economy. It aims to open a space for foundational and applied reflections on how pluralism and decoloniality can jointly contribute to transforming economic thought and institutions.

While both traditions have gained visibility through academic and activist movements, their relationship remains underexplored. This issue invites contributions that interrogate their conceptual affinities, tensions, and potential for mutual enrichment, as well as empirical work that draws from both perspectives to analyze contemporary socio-economic challenges.

Potential Questions:

- What is the conceptual relationship between pluralism and postcolonial scholarship? Where do these concepts complement each other, and what are possible tensions?
- What are colonial elements in heterodox schools of thought, such as evolutionary political economy, and how can they be addressed?
- How can the decolonial debate benefit from taking into account insights from heterodox economics in general, or evolutionary political economy in particular?
- How does scholarship that qualifies as de- and postcolonial allow us to understand capitalist dynamics differently?
- How would a decolonialized economic history of the Global South look like and how can it benefit from heterodox economic approaches?
- The contributions of non-Western thinkers to heterodox economics
- How adequate are the categories of ‘Global South’ and ‘Global North’ to understand historical and contemporary dynamics of global capitalism?
- How were empires organized economically and what does that tell us about capitalist dynamics?



Review of Evolutionary Political Economy (REPE) • Collections and Call for Papers

Complexity in Innovation, Management and Economics — The challenges of sustainability transition and digital transformation

This special issue focuses on sustainability transitions and digital transformation as complex, uncertain processes requiring new analytical approaches. It invites contributions that apply complexity theory and agent-based modelling to study drivers, impacts, and policies at micro, meso, and macro levels. Papers may explore technological diffusion, innovation systems, and socially sustainable pathways.

Status:

Open

Deadline:

31 March 2026

Value and Valuation Research: Advancing Understanding, Conceptualization, Practice, and Policy through Interdisciplinary Lenses

This special issue explores value and valuation as central categories across economics and the social sciences. It invites interdisciplinary contributions on conceptual debates (e.g. subjective vs. objective value, economic ideology, non-economic values) and on practices and policies (e.g. valuation standards, institutions, crises of value orders).

Status:

Open

Deadline:

30 June 2026

Driving Socio-Economic Change through AI and Digitalization: Entrepreneurial Opportunities and Risks

This call for papers examines the interplay between digitalization, artificial intelligence, and entrepreneurship in shaping socio-economic outcomes. It seeks contributions on how emerging technologies transform business models, innovation, and market structures, while also generating societal, economic, and environmental impacts.

Status:

Open

Deadline:

31 August 2026