Article:
Ramnarain, S., Kesar, S., Mearman, A. orcid.org/0000-0003-0601-8060 et al. (3 more authors) (2025) Introduction to the Special Issue on Anti-Capitalist Pedagogies and Teaching Radical Economics. Review of Radical Political Economics. ISSN 0486-6134

https://doi.org/10.1177/04866134251345840

Introduction to the Special Issue on "*Anti-Capitalist Pedagogies and Teaching Radical Economics*"

Smita Ramnarain, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Rhode Island, USA.*
Surbhi Kesar, Senior Lecturer in Economics, School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), London UK
Andrew Mearman, Associate Professor of Economics (Teaching and Scholarship) Leeds University Business School, Leeds, UK.
Gary Mongiovi, Professor of Economics, St. John's University, USA.
Geoffrey Schneider, Presidential Professor of Economics, Bucknell University, USA.
Mary V. Wrenn, College Assistant Professor and Fellow in Economics, Lucy Cavendish College, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

Introduction

The objective of radical political economics has been to highlight social injustices inherent within capitalism and propose alternative, just, and equitable economic systems. Since inequality, exploitation, and power are central concerns for radical economists in their critical examination of capitalism, they cannot remain oblivious to how these aspects also operate in educational institutions, in classrooms, and within the neoliberal university where corporation-like calculations of costs and benefits govern all decisions. As such, teaching and pedagogy are central concerns for radical political economists. Indeed, pedagogy is especially important for radical economics since it is through teaching that radical economists can engage students in recognizing injustice and in conceptualizing alternatives. Therefore, for the radical economist, education itself is a deeply political act since it seeks to empower students to question the status quo, to challenge entrenched oppressive systems, and to work towards their transformation.

Radical political economics has a rich pedagogical history. In the 1960s and 70s, as college campuses became the sites for political protest—in support of civil rights and

* Corresponding author. sramnarain@uri.edu

wider democratic participation, and in opposition to the Vietnam War—the Union for Radical Political Economics (URPE) came into being at the American Economic Association meetings in 1968. URPE's objectives included the promotion of an interdisciplinary space for the development of courses that drew inspiration from Marx's analysis of capitalism, and sought to apply that analysis to modern-day issues such as poverty, inequality, discrimination and segmentation in the labor market, capitalist crisis, imperialism, environmental degradation, and anti-capitalist alternatives (Weisskopf 2012). While radical political economy has remained liminal within the discipline – a development Stiglitz (2002) has termed "the triumph of ideology over science" – Weisskopf (2012) argues that the most important role of existing radical political economists in economics (or other social science) departments has been to teach large numbers of undergraduate and some graduate students to examine capitalism critically as a source of inequality and oppression, and to hopefully motivate change. To this end, the RRPE published an occasional section on pedagogy edited by Peter Dorman to address some of the issues that arise in this endeavor, but this section has not appeared in recent issues for quite some time. One objective of this Special Issue, therefore, is to rekindle these discussions on teaching and pedagogy within radical political economics.

Two central questions emerge in terms of the pedagogy of radical political economy: first, what to teach, and second, how to teach it. The first question is especially salient, given that the content and quality of economics teaching has been the subject of much scrutiny in the last few decades. A vast majority of economics departments, in the US and elsewhere, teach economics using the fundamentals of the neoclassical framework. The moniker "mainstream"—to describe economics based on neoclassical tenets—serves to exclude, isolate, and stigmatize all other kinds of economic perspectives, which then are seen as non-standard, quirky, fringe, or simply unacceptable (Javdani and Chang 2019). Radical economists must, therefore, face both the challenge of teaching their courses in unfriendly or hostile contexts and departments and the paradox of teaching courses that critique capitalism within neoliberal universities or capitalist economies. In the US especially, the scrutiny in recent times of programs and courses that seek to critique discrimination, oppression, or socio-economic exclusion has compounded the dilemma of what can be taught, even though radical perspectives and alternatives are particularly indispensable in the given moment.

The second question of how to teach radical economics is also critical since, although a variety of efforts have emerged to pluralize economics teaching and introduce other perspectives, the aim of radical economics is to fundamentally transform economic systems. Empowering students to see the inequalities and injustices embedded in capitalism is a first step towards thinking about their transformation. Mearman (2007) outlines three approaches to teaching heterodox economics: the "orthodox-plus" approach which uses heterodox concepts to shed light on mainstream ideas; the "heterodox module" approach which designates a specific module to the teaching of heterodox concepts; and the "parallel perspectives" approach which entails comparative and critical treatments of both mainstream and heterodox ideas. The Special Issue therefore includes articles with ideas on how to teach both specialized topics or courses as well as on how radical and anti-capitalist concepts and ideas may be integrated into introductory and more standard economics courses.

In the same vein, teaching radical economics entails attention to radical teaching precepts and pedagogy. The drastic transformation of the educational landscape in the past few years and a greater cognizance of the deepening inequalities within and outside the classroom in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic necessitate fresh reckoning and reflection on the teaching practices and pedagogical approaches that radical political economists have experimented with and employed in their classrooms. If teaching is, as Gannon (2020: 5) argues, a "radical act of hope," then it follows that radical economists must also be radical teachers. This Special Issue provides a platform for such reckoning and reflection on the purpose of radical economists as educators.

The collection of papers in this Special Issue pertain to topics as wide-ranging as the use of particular pedagogical techniques and piquing student interest in radical themes through specific approaches, the use of assignments and assessment that might upend conventional classroom hierarchies and power structures, the radical treatment of topics courses, and how economics perspectives that challenge the capitalist order might be taught to conventional university students and to unconventional learners outside typical classroom settings. Indeed, many of the articles straddle more than one of the above themes.

Radical Pedagogical Strategies and Approaches

The volume begins with an article by Danish Khan and June Sanchez on "*Threshold Concepts in Economics,*" which posits that 'equality of opportunity' may be used effectively as a threshold concept to reformulate students' preconceived notions around inequality—especially as a challenge to neoclassical understandings that might attribute inequality to differences in productivity or posit inequality as a product of meritocracy—and transforming their understanding of inequality in a radical and irrevocable way. Threshold concepts were first introduced as a means of identifying certain disciplinary "conceptual gateways" to thinking about fundamental concepts within a discipline (Meyer and Land 2005: 373). Both economists, Meyer and Land (2003: 7) argued that introducing a new way of thinking about something-—previously "troublesome knowledge" in the sense of seeming illogical, incoherent, counter-intuitive, or alien-—might lead to cognitive leaps and irreversible transformative understanding, although perhaps not always a comfortable one on the part of students. A key element of threshold concepts is that they are also integrative, i.e. pointing to the inter-relatedness and interconnectedness of the concept, and allowing learners to make connections that were previously obscured (Cousin 2006). Of course, the process by which a threshold concept that is key to a discipline may be identified, can be fraught and controversial (Barradell 2013). The authors argue that "equality of opportunity" is a useful threshold concept because even as most people (students included) across the political spectrum might agree that it is important to ensure equality of opportunity in principle, they may not see the far-flung impacts of the *in*equality of opportunity on every other facet of economic life. Nor might they unequivocally see the government as part of the solution. If, however, the role of the government—from the provision of public goods, to running social welfare programs, implementing progressive taxation, and providing support to workers-owned cooperatives—was presented as an antidote to the inequality of opportunity, the authors argue that there might be greater agreement with respect to the necessity of intervention. Thus, "in the absence of equal opportunities, the role of government becomes a necessity rather than an option" (Khan and Sanchez, this issue). The authors find in their post-test survey that when government redistributive and pre-distributive policies were framed around the axis of "equality of opportunity" they were likely to garner greater support. Student reflections and group discussions

further allowed them to participate in the co-construction of what an equality-centric economy might look like.

In "*Teaching the Labor Theory of Value,*" Mengting Ma takes a novel approach towards teaching a key element of Marxian Economics – the labor theory of value – to students in a large political economy course in China. *Don't Starve* (https://www.klei.com/games/dont-starve) and *Don't Starve Together* (https://www.klei.com/games/dont-starve-together) are stark wilderness survival video games – single- and multi-player respectively – where the chief protagonist, a "gentleman scientist" named Wilson, must find ways to stay alive, be fed, and stay sane for as long as possible, using the resources provided by the environment. The multi-player version introduces some other characters that Wilson could collaborate with to achieve these goals. The game is used to introduce students to key concepts such as necessary and surplus labor, capital accumulation, and economic growth. The use of the game allows the instructor to scaffold learning through multiple scenarios. Initially, the player may have control over their surplus labor, but then an unequal power relation may be introduced by which the surplus is appropriated by an authority. Then commodity exchange can be introduced. A fourth scenario can commodify labor power itself, while a fifth can introduce a cooperative framework. The video game thus provides an entry point to imparting an understanding of the social relations of production and surplus generation to students. Teaching effectiveness is demonstrated through pre- and post-course surveys. A large proportion of students come to rethink their preconceived notions of Marxian economics as "ideological" as opposed to "value-neutral" neoclassical economics: they realize that scarcity is contextual and frequently originates from uneven power relations, that social division of labor precedes commodity exchange rather than emerging from it, and that commodity transactions transform individual to social labor.

Teresa Perry's article, "*Marx and the Big Mac"* describes how introductory economics courses can be made more relevant to engage students via examination of real phenomena and related data. Such an approach has become popular, for instance via the CORE resources, but Perry adds a stronger pluralist twist by asking students to use the lens of Marxian theory of exploitation. The choice of the Big Mac is (presumably, deliberately) ironic given its common deployment in economics teaching

via the Big Mac index; but rather than discuss relative price levels, the article discusses using data from the annual report of McDonald's to calculate a rate of exploitation, and how this inquiry can be a useful launchpad from which to discuss broader social questions. The class activity is dialogic, inviting students to estimate how many Big Macs a McDonald's worker might produce, facilitating a rough calculation of the costs, revenues, where the benefits of production go, and thus the exploitation rate. The article describes step-by-step how the class is run, which includes a preamble to the data analysis, in which key Marxian theoretical concepts are introduced. Students are then prompted to explore the data via formulating a research question. Perry explains how the activity fosters students' analytical and technical competencies, offers opportunities to work collaboratively, and demonstrates to students how open inquiries can be: the class activities had no predefined end-point and were contingent on how the class group discussions went. The article also shows how the class design helps students develop key capacities of critical thinking, not least by interrogating their own contexts and pre-conceptions.

In "*Enhancing the Teaching of Radical Political Economy Through Multimedia Integration*", Swayamsiddha Sarangi addresses the persistent marginalization of radical political economy—particularly Marxian economics—within contemporary economics curricula, shaped by neoliberal university structures, funding models, and ideological resistance to critiques of capitalism. She proposes a pedagogical framework that integrates multimedia tools, such as films, documentaries, audio clips to revitalize the teaching of radical political economy. Drawing on teaching experiences from two undergraduate courses—*Marxian Economics* and *Capitalism and Socialism*—at the University of Utah, the author illustrates how multimedia can help students not only engage more deeply with Marxist concepts, such as surplus extraction, exploitation, class struggle, alienation of labour, but also cultivate critical thinking and analytical skills necessary for understanding capitalism's complexities and contradictions, such as role of global inequalities and role of power in sustaining capitalism. These visual materials are complemented with structured pedagogical tools such as discussion prompts, group assignments, and short-answer quizzes that reinforce students' engagement with the theory and its application. The article provides a fascinating list of resources along with a discussion on how those can be employed in the classroom. Sarangi argues that this approach not only makes complex theory accessible, but also positions the classroom as a space of political engagement. Students are encouraged to

connect abstract theory with contemporary and historical realities of capitalism, power, and resistance. Importantly, the article underscores that many students do not encounter Marxist texts in standard economics courses, making such pedagogy vital for broadening intellectual exposure. The article contributes both a theoretical rationale and practical roadmap for enhancing the teaching of radical political economy in increasingly constrained academic environments.

Zengping He, in "*Debate as a Pedagogical Tool for Pluralist Economics Education*," describes his experience using classroom debates to foster within students a pluralistic attitude toward economic thinking. The author's experiment with classroom debates was sparked by difficulties encountered in motivating students of a course on the History of Economic Thought to explore non-mainstream analytical traditions. By requiring students to argue different sides of a preselected topic, the author sought to develop students' critical-thinking and to cultivate an appreciation of the value of a pluralistic outlook in economics. In the course, the author would, for example, present the ideas of the classical economists and the Physiocrats, and then ask students to draw upon those ideas in a formal debate on the question of whether modern mainstream economics is a system of natural laws. The article thus provides ways by which the rich tradition of classroom debates discussed in other mainstream and heterodox economics education contexts—such as Wolla (2018) and Provencher and Ramnarain (2019)—may be used in history of economic thought classes to reinforce students' grasp of alternative analytical frameworks and of real-world economic phenomena.

In addition to the use of multimedia and debates, role-play proves an effective student engagement strategy in Ric McIntyre's undergraduate course in the history of economic thought and contemporary heterodox economics, as he details in "*Teaching Technological Unemployment Through Role-Play: The Luddite Rebellion*." Each student is assigned to play the part of a member of one of the socioeconomic classes whose interests were in contention in Manchester, England in the years immediately following the Luddite movement: landowners, factory owners, workers, craftspeople, journalists, the clergy and so forth. In playing their parts, the students are required to engage with the impact of labor-displacing machinery on the lives of their own characters and on the lives of other members of the community. The exercise gives students insights into the manifold effects—both

beneficial and disruptive—of technological change, providing a concrete basis from which to reflect on the exploitative and oppressive conditions of early industrial capitalism, and shedding light on the various ways that ideas and the material conditions of production interact with one another.

Radical Assignments and Assessment

Two papers in the Special Issue provide useful reflection on and evidence of the outcomes from ungrading. Both articles invoke Freirean conscientization, and dialogic education, and emphasize the notion of empowering students through facilitating their voice.

In "*Bringing Radical Assessment into Radical Political Economy: An Ungrading Experiment*," Smita Ramnarain and Anna Santucci argue for a rejection of the conventional, capitalism-friendly grading system that ranks students and leans into competitive behavior, while demonstrating how to put into practice the radical assessment strategy of ungrading. Using their experience with ungrading in a course titled *Economics of Class, Race, and Gender,* Ramnarain and Santucci build a compelling case for the practice. Through a thoughtful description of the structure of the class, they offer a loose blueprint which might be tailored across a variety of economics classes and further strengthens the case for ungrading with qualitative feedback from students, feedback that underscores how much richer an educational experience students received. Ramnarain and Santucci also offer clear-eyed analysis of potential objections and/or critiques which might arise and address each in turn. Evidence from student work is offered to underscore the writing students produced that connected their own lived experiences to capitalism, exploitation, and discrimination, and the creative projects students came up with to attempt to effect change in their immediate environments. The authors argue that ungrading allows instructors to move beyond the teaching of radical ideas by proposing a means by which they might begin to 'walk to walk' in their own practice. More importantly, students can experience an education that is more meaningful, empowering, and collaborative.

Ungrading appears again as Tim Koechlin presents a critical reflection on his use of a series of short, ungraded essays that he deployed recently in his classroom in the article *"The "I" in Capitalism: Radical Pedagogy and the Stories Our Students Tell about*

Capitalism and Inequality". Whilst Koechlin's impetus for innovating was to try to establish a connection with students rendered distant by COVID-19, he found that the essays had other benefits, particularly in creating open spaces for discussions about capitalism. The article describes how Koechlin offered students the chance to write short, ungraded essays about their location in current capitalism. In this way, teacher and student engage in a more authentic, grounded, and less hierarchical conversation, in which students were invited to reveal themselves, and in so doing, offer insight on their world, and subsequently what this implied about capitalism. Koechlin explains how his offer was couched, including how he undertook to read essays with care, and would reply in writing. The article draws on testimonies Koechlin collected via email from students who wrote the essays submitted to him. These responses suggested that the essays had benefited students by helping them feel heard and valued, and by increasing their confidence that they could contribute to the wider discussion about economics, and that they did understand economics and the economy. Importantly, too, Koechlin reflects on what he has learned *from* the students, about themselves but also about capitalism, once again blurring the distinction between 'experts' and the rest.

Radical Economics Courses and Topics

The teaching of specific courses within economics—such as health economics, labor and race, macroeconomics, and even econometrics—in new and thought-provoking radical ways is the focus of several articles in this Special Issue.

In "*Introducing Economics Students to Marxist Political Economy: Mental and Physical Health in the Workplace*", Kevin Deane and Julia Chukwuma lay out a simple template for introducing Marxian concepts into a conventional introductory economics course. Deane and Chukwuma approach the teaching of Marx from a health economics perspective, an angle that serves to reinforce the practical relevance of the commodification of labor. As the authors note, most undergraduate students pursue a degree with the aim of obtaining a qualification for employment in the private sector. The premise of this paper is that understanding what Marx had to say about the workplace will help students to be more effective and more humane managers. A central feature of work under capitalism is the imbalance of power between employer and employee. This power imbalance cannot be eliminated—it's a defining feature of

the economic system—but understanding how it works can lead to a better work environment for workers and their supervisors. Engels, after all, managed a textile factory for his father, and was by all accounts quite good at it. The case studies presented in the paper involve the toll that the modern workplace takes on mental health; exploitation and alienation inflict upon workers not only economic distress but also serious emotional damage. One reason to teach Marx, the paper makes clear, is to enhance the critical-thinking and leadership skills of students in order to be better able to understand and resist these afflictions of the capitalist workplace.

In the short paper, "*Solidarity. . . Forever? Teaching Labor and Race at a Predominantly White and Emerging Hispanic Serving Institution with Games*," Robert Haggar describes how he uses Prisoner's Dilemma and Stag-Hunt games to teach predominantly white students about how racism can interfere with labor organizing. Haggar structures the game payouts in the Prisoner's Dilemma game to introduce power asymmetry analogous to white supremacy in a workplace and thereby demonstrate how tenuous the stability of cooperation in the workplace can be. He then adapts the Stag-Hunt game to become various forms of a "Strike-Scab" game in which the emergence of a white "labor aristocrat" undercuts the ability for workers to organize. Haggar finds that students tend to opt for cooperative outcomes until power asymmetries are introduced, when these tendencies are undercut. Haggar thus provides a very interesting pedagogical method for getting students to confront a thorny issue in radical political economy, namely, the lack of labor solidarity in a racialized society. Many instructors may find these games useful to incorporate in their own classes.

In "*Justice matters: Matters: Equality-Efficiency Tradeoff in Principles of Macroeconomics*," Tanadej Vechsuruck demonstrates how he teaches students to think critically about the mainstream binary of efficiency versus equity, as well as the mainstream valorization of the former. By walking us through his lecture plan, from pre- through to post-lecture, Vechsuruck demonstrates how he is able to lead students through the process of reflecting, questioning, and re-evaluating their own understanding and position on the mainstream framing of the tradeoff. Anonymous examples of student reflections illustrate the power of this approach. Through this method, not only is Vechsuruck teaching students to think critically, he is also giving them permission and empowering them to incorporate ethical considerations and moral judgment into their study of the economy, and as such, restore economics to its moral science origins.

In the article, *"Teaching macroeconomics using a multi-paradigmatic, problem-based-learning approach,"* the author, Finn Olesen, describes how problem-based learning can be used to foster pluralism and critical thinking. By establishing a curriculum that begins with the history of economic thought and methodology, and structuring courses around inquiry-based learning drawing from heterodox and mainstream theories, this approach encourages students to find their own answers and approaches to complex contemporary issues. Although the process can be frustrating for students used to a more canned approach to teaching, and it can be a significant amount of work for instructors, the students can produce remarkably advanced work utilizing this approach. In the process, students acquire a facility with critical thinking and complex analysis via a multi-paradigmatic lens, and become well-educated, critically minded economists with a sophisticated skill set.

Thereza Balliester Reis and Yaerin Yoon ask the question: "*Can Econometrics Incorporate a Critical Pedagogy Praxis?*" Answering in the affirmative, they show how a critical pedagogy approach can be applied to the teaching of an advanced undergraduate econometrics course. The authors report the findings of a case study involving third-year undergraduates at a UK university. Critical pedagogy fosters collaborative and democratic learning to help students develop the tools needed to confront power imbalances, entrenched ideologies and social injustice. Balliester Reis and Yoon redesigned an online *Applied Econometrics* module into an in-person workshop in which the technical problems students encountered in designing their research projects and in working with data and software were discussed in a collaborative setting. Democratic processes were adopted in the selection of the theme of the students' research projects, the effects of unemployment on household debt. Students participated in peer-assessed practice presentations of their analyses. The authors challenged students to reflect upon whether quantitative methods are truly "value-free," and assigned non-mainstream readings that led some students to connect their research findings to post-Keynesian and Marxian insights. Comparing student outcomes for the class taught using their critical pedagogy approach to student outcomes in prior teaching terms, Balliester Reis and Yoon find that the critical pedagogy approach produced better outcomes in grades, attendance, and engagement. Moreover, the critical approach appears to have made students more receptive to incorporating non-mainstream thinking into their analytical work.

Radical Economics Pedagogies Within and Outside the Conventional Classroom

Finally, the Special Issue includes five papers that speak to dismantling hierarchies in formal classrooms or unconventional settings for radical education, both within and outside the university walls. The first three papers deal with popular education efforts by radical political economists, the fourth paper reflects on the experiences of the authors in terms of decolonizing economics education through feminist and decolonization pedagogies, while the last paper pertains to an unconventional setting for radical education, namely, a strike.

In "*Researching Postcapitalist Possibilities: Pedagogy as Resubjectivation,*" the pedagogical and theoretical contributions of the Community Economies Institute (CEI) through its Summer/Winter School on "Researching Postcapitalist Possibilities" are outlined by the authors, Jenny Cameron and Katherine Gibson. Grounded in three decades of place-based action research and inspired by anti-essentialist Marxism and poststructuralist feminism, the CEI approach—especially the work of J.K. Gibson-Graham—challenges the dominance of capitalocentric economic discourse. The authors argue that transformative economic research begins with reshaping how researchers think of themselves and their role in producing knowledge and political action—a process they call "resubjectivation." The School's curriculum draws on the Community Economies framework, emphasizing the concept of the "diverse economy," which foregrounds the multiplicity of economic forms and the plurality of economic practices that coexist with capitalism—such as cooperatives, unpaid labor, mutual aid, and community enterprises. The program invites participants—graduate students, academics, activists, and artists—to adopt experimental, appreciative, and collaborative pedagogies that encourage them to imagine and enact postcapitalist futures. Pedagogically, the School is structured around experiential and participatory learning, emphasizing co-learning, reflexivity, and ethical engagement. Key principles include "reading for difference" (noticing what is often overlooked or devalued in mainstream analysis), disrupting critique as a default mode, and valuing the affective and embodied aspects of learning. Exercises like discourse mapping, collective inquiry, and site-based reflections invite learners to shift their focus from diagnosing capitalist failure to identifying and amplifying postcapitalist possibilities already in

motion. Participants are prompted to interrogate the power of dominant economic narratives and explore non-capitalist practices already present in their communities. Ultimately, the School seeks to cultivate a new kind of researcher-self—one oriented not toward describing the world as it is, but co-creating the world as it could be. By decentering capitalism and highlighting alternative economic assemblages, the CEI pedagogy supports a broader vision of postcapitalist politics grounded in ethics, diversity, and collective imagination.

"Economics for Emancipation(E4E): Advancing Radical Economics Through Popular Education with Economic Justice Activists," by authors Francisco Perez and Sarah Wang provides an in-depth case study of popular education in radical economics. The article details the authors' experiences with designing the curriculum and delivery of workshops for non-academic audiences—economic justice advocates and activists in non-governmental and non-profit spaces—by the Center for Popular Education (CPE) and the Center for Economic Democracy (CED). The paper presents the popular education loop based on Freirean principles, by which the experiences and existing knowledge of participants become the starting point of learning. A variety of interactive activities and a wide range of resources—as opposed to academic readings —are then used to enhance participants' knowledge of the economy. Such an approach, the authors note, not only allows activists to demystify the economy and build more confidence, but also attracts groups—such as women, people of color, and non-binary persons—that conventional economics classrooms have tended to neglect. Evidence of learning from the E4E workshops demonstrates the participants' growth of knowledge. The best practices distilled by the authors for popular education in radical economics can undoubtedly also travel to more conventional classroom settings. At the same time, the authors also bring to the fore some unresolved issues and dilemmas that presented themselves in their endeavors, which highlight the difficulties that radical economists must be cognizant of as they engage with popular education.

In a similar vein, in the article, *"Popular Education: Teaching Economics to Communities,"* Marlene Kim reflects on her extensive experience with economic literacy and social transformation through popular education, particularly targeting lay communities historically marginalized by formal academic systems. Drawing on the Freirean tradition, the article offers both a theoretical foundation and practical insights into

pedagogical methods for teaching economics rooted in social justice, experiential learning, and community empowerment. The foundation of the pedagogical approach lies in Paulo Freire's theory of education for liberation, where knowledge is co-created through dialogical and participatory processes rather than imposed from above. Freirean pedagogy assumes that learners are not blank slates but agents with valuable lived experience. The author affirms that teaching economics effectively in oppressed communities demands a commitment to equality in the educator-student relationship, critical consciousness, and a rejection of "banking models" of education. Participants must see themselves as capable of changing their economic conditions, not merely understanding them. Through vivid examples, the article shows how economic concepts are taught using metaphors, role plays, and physical demonstrations. For instance, the "ten chairs" exercise powerfully illustrates wealth inequality, and a "jobs pyramid" conveys structural employment hierarchies. These tools make abstract macroeconomic processes (such as structural adjustment programs or capital mobility) accessible and emotionally resonant. Role-playing in fictional contexts like "Saliagua" helps participants grasp global economic structures and their local implications. These trainings were conducted with varied audiences—union members, women's NGOs, religious groups, and immigrant workers—demonstrating how economic pedagogy must be tailored to the audience's social realities. The article concludes with reflections on key lessons learned: the importance of visual tools, respectful dialogue, adapting content to context, updating materials, and working with existing organizations. Importantly, the author notes how capitalist funding structures often constrain transformative education, underscoring the need for independent support to sustain radical pedagogy. This work powerfully advocates for popular economics education as an indispensable tool for community empowerment and systemic change.

Caro Janse van Rensburg, and Michelle Groenewald, in "*Towards Decolonizing and Feminist Pedagogies in Transforming Economics Classrooms,*" detail their experiences in terms of employing decolonizing and feminist pedagogies in their classroom over several years of teaching in South Africa, and distill lessons for others interested in dismantling the typical hierarchies that prevail between the teacher and the tought. Organizing their critique of traditional economics (and economics teaching) along three axes—namely the neglect of questions of power, disciplinary insularity, and over-emphasis on formalistic economic modeling—the authors provide concrete

strategies rooted in the intersection between feminist and decolonizing pedagogies that move away from hierarchical models of education and allow students to emerge as co-creators of the curriculum. Using critical self-reflection, the article details points of discomfort for instructors as they let go of typical classroom conventions and power. The authors also describe how complex issues of positionality may arise in the classroom, and carefully nuance the takeaways from their own experiences.

The Special Issue concludes with "*A Strike: Lessons in Solidarity,*" which shares a fascinating story about how Daniel Rosenberg, as a contingent faculty member, found ways to support striking clerical workers on his university campus despite his precarity and incorporate the strike into his teaching. While students and tenured faculty were able to support the strikers more directly, joining picket lines and participating in the strike, Rosenberg found additional compelling ways to support the labor action. This included a form of labor slow down, and providing food to strikers. Particularly effective was a paper assignment in which students were asked to analyze and compare arguments from both sides in the strike, by interviewing three strikers and three administrators (whose phone numbers were conveniently provided in the assignment!). This assignment and campus activism earned the ire of the university President, who wanted to fire Rosenberg, but was persuaded not to by a Dean, in the interest of supporting principles of academic freedom and open inquiry. The article demonstrates the importance of solidarity, even on the part of those in a precarious position themselves, and offers some insights for how radical political economists may need to strategically and actively engage in educating and organizing students and colleagues even as the academy comes increasingly under attack from neoliberal forces.

What Radical Means

The Special Issue is rounded out with two contributions to the RRPE's "What Radical Means in the 21st Century?" feature, one by Fikret Adaman of Boğaziçi University in Turkey, the other by Snehashish Bhattacharya of South Asian University in New Delhi.

Focusing on conditions in Turkey, Adaman shows how an alignment between the forces of neoliberalism and authoritarianism have placed intellectual life and

knowledge production, particularly in educational institutions, under immense pressure. Radical economists have felt this pressure with particular intensity. Bhattacharya examines the challenges that now confront radical academics after the political and economic developments of the past half century. He argues that the difficulties faced by tenured faculty in the modern university are the consequence of the ideological role the university has come to play in buttressing capitalism. To equip themselves to push back against their own marginalization, radical academics, he concludes, must recognize that the tolerance for dissent that had once been instrumental in legitimizing capitalism's enlightened image no longer serves its earlier systemic purpose.

Conclusion

Putting together this Special Issue has reinforced for us the importance of the mission of radical economics instructors. The incredible response received to the Call for Papers for this issue is, in particular, a reason for much hope. As recent developments continue to make the terrain of education a very difficult one and radical perspectives increasingly come under attack, we hope that the readers of this Special Issue will be heartened by the collection of articles presented here, as we are, with regard to the future of radical political economics within and outside the classroom, in different parts of the world such as China, South Africa, India, the United Kingdom, the United States, among others.

One aspect that almost all articles bring to light is the immense student enthusiasm for some of the topics and strategies presented in the papers. As students struggle to make sense of the world in these challenging times, we can be sure that radical political economics provides a meaningful framework to underscore the real problem, i.e. capitalism, and offers ways for students to see, challenge, and resist its worst impulses and consequences, in small and large ways. As teachers of radical political economics, we can be part of the resistance in this way.

References

Barradell, Sarah. "The identification of threshold concepts: A review of theoretical complexities and methodological challenges." *Higher education* 65 (2013): 265-276.

Cousin, Glynis. "An introduction to threshold concepts." *Planet* 17, no. 1 (2006): 4-5.

Gannon, Kevin. 2020. *Radical Hope: A Teaching Manifesto*, Morgantown: West Virginia University Press.

Javdani, Mohsen and Ha-Joon Chang. 2019. "Ideology is Dead! Long Live Ideology." *Institute for New Economic Thinking*, accessed at: https://www.ineteconomics.org/perspectives/blog/ideology-is-dead-long-live-ideology

Mearman, Andrew. 2007. "Teaching heterodox economics concepts." ***Handbook for Economics Lecturers*** 5: 1-40.

Meyer, Jan, and Ray Land. 2003. *Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Linkages to ways of thinking and practicing within the disciplines. In Improving Student Learning: Theory and Practice—Ten Years*, ed. Chris Rust, 412–424. Oxford: Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Meyer, Jan, and Ray Land. 2005. "Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (2): Epistemological considerations and a conceptual framework for teaching and learning." *Higher education* 49: 373-388.

Provencher, Ashley, and Smita Ramnarain. 2019. "Class debates in intermediate microeconomics: Social economics and pluralist perspectives." *Forum for Social Economics* 48 (4): 354-372.

Stiglitz, Joseph. 2002. "There is No Invisible Hand," The Guardian, Dec 20. Accessed at: https://www.theguardian.com/education/2002/dec/20/highereducation.uk1

Weisskopf, Thomas. 2012. "The Origins and Evolution of Radical Political Economics." Talk presented at the University of Michigan, September 25. Accessed at: https://sites.lsa.umich.edu/tomweisskopf/wp-content/uploads/sites/278/2015/06/weisskopf.port_huron_talk.pdf

Wolla, Scott A. 2018. "Yours, mine, and the truth: Using a structured minimum wage debate in the economics classroom." *The American Economist* 63 (2): 245-259.