

Theoretical trajectories in geographical political economy

Fall 2019

Instructor: Jamie Peck (jamie.peck@ubc.ca)

Office hours: M and W, 11.15-12.30 (Geog 134); tel 604 822 0894

The theme of this seminar is an exploration of a series of currents in (and around) geographical political economy, going somewhat deeper and wider than is normally possible in a survey course. World-system, regulation, state, and socioeconomic theories will each be the focus of a two-week consideration. This will provide an opportunity to cover some of the territory between influential (earlier) treatments and more recent adaptations and critiques. Consideration of these four broad themes—each of which has its own (spatial) genealogy as well as its own take on spatiality—will be punctuated by interludes on uneven development, relationality, and conjunctural analysis. We will do some surveying of critical economic geography along the way, but just as importantly will seek to locate this eclectic and evolving project in the context of parallel and overlapping currents in political economy and socioeconomics.

		Convenors	Presentations
Sept 5	Orientations		
Sept 12	World-system theories I		
Sept 19	World-system theories II		Christophers visit
Sept 26	<i>No class today</i>		
Oct 3	Interlude I: Uneven development		
Oct 10	Regulation theories I		
Oct 17	Regulation theories II		
Oct 24	Interlude II: Relationality		
Oct 31	State theories I		
Nov 5	State theories II		
Nov 12	Interlude III: Conjunctures		
Nov 19	Socioeconomics I		
Nov 26	Socioeconomics II		

We will maintain a quite intensive reading and work schedule during the term, with the tradeoff of a somewhat shorter final term paper. Each student is required to (a) complete the assigned readings, drafting a 1-2pp reaction paper [summarizing the takeaway conclusions; talking and discussion points for the group] each week for submission (no later than 2pm Wednesday) to the Dropbox folder; (b) serve as a session convenor, reviewing and thematizing the reaction papers, co-chairing in-class discussions; (c) write a 3pp “profile” paper on a key figure in the field, presenting this in written and oral form to the class; (d) write a term paper on a topic of their choosing, related to the principal themes of the seminar, for submission one week after the final class.

Together, we will seek to create a positive, respectful, and open environment around our discussions in class (and in our encounters with the readings). There are going to be differences of opinion and perspective, not just across the readings but almost certainly within our own group. All students should feel comfortable in sharing their perspectives, even (and perhaps especially) if they sense that theirs might be a minority point of view. It is important for all of us to listen as well as talk when it comes to our discussions in class, which should not be confused with a race towards definitive conclusions or some imagined “consensus.” We can all learn from different ways of seeing problems and indeed the world.

PDFs will be made available of all the required readings. Dipping into the further readings is recommended. Most of these are easily accessible.

Profile paper: Each student will write a profile of a key figure in the field: Michel Aglietta, John Allen, Giovanni Arrighi, Jennifer Bair, Fred Block, Robert Boyer, Neil Brenner, Michael Burawoy, James Ferguson, Nancy Fraser, JK Gibson-Graham, Akhil Gupta, Gillian Hart, Stuart Hall, Bob Jessop, Greta Krippner, Alain Lipietz, Doreen Massey, Ralph Miliband, Timothy Mitchell, Karl Polanyi, Nicos Poulantzas, Immanuel Wallerstein, or a relevant author of their choosing. The profiles need not follow a fixed template, but should incorporate (i) a discussion of the full arc of the author’s research program and published contributions, (ii) an effort to situate this work socially, geographically, and historically, and (iii) a critical assessment of the author’s most significant contributions, be these theoretical, methodological, political or otherwise. The profiles should not exceed three pages supplemented by a brief bibliography of not more one page. They will be shared with other members of the class.

Term paper: topics for term papers are to be developed by students, relating to the principal themes and issues examined in the seminar. A one-page outline should be submitted for approval *no later than November 19*. Term papers should not exceed 18pp of 1.5 line-spaced text (with the bibliography being additional to this). Term papers are due one week after the final class. (Late papers will receive limited feedback beyond the grade.)

Assessment: overall class participation and weekly reaction papers 25%; profile paper 25%; term paper 50%.

September 5	Orientations
	<p>This will be an introductory session in which the character, origins, and evolution of geographical political economy will be discussed, in relation to the subdiscipline of economic geography in both an intellectual and a sociological sense. The modus operandi for the class and work assignments will also be discussed.</p> <p><i>Required readings:</i></p> <p>Mann G (2012) Release the hounds! The marvelous case of political economy. In Barnes TJ, Peck J and Sheppard E (eds) <i>The Wiley-Blackwell companion to economic geography</i>. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 61-73</p> <p>Sheppard E (2018) Heterodoxy as orthodoxy: prolegomenon for a geographical political economy. In Clark GL, Feldman MP, Gertler MS and Wójcik D (eds) <i>The</i></p>

new Oxford handbook of economic geography. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 159-178

Werner M (2012) Contesting power/knowledge in economic geography: learning from Latin America and the Caribbean. In Barnes TJ, Peck J and Sheppard E (eds) *The Wiley-Blackwell companion to economic geography*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 132-145

Further readings:

Amin A and Thrift N (2000) What kind of economic theory for what kind of economic geography? *Antipode* 32(1): 4–9

Barnes TJ and Sheppard E (2010) “Nothing includes everything”: towards engaged pluralism in Anglophone economic geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 34: 193–214

Peck J (2012) Economic geography: island life. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 2(2): 113-133

Scott AJ (2000) Economic geography: the great half-century. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 24: 483-504

September 12

World-system theories I

In this session, we will consider some of the foundational contributions to world-systems analysis, and some of the precursors to dependency theories, which have come primarily from historical sociology but which would acquire a wide reach and indeed impact following their early articulations in the 1970s.

Required readings:

Wallerstein I (1974) The rise and future demise of the world capitalist system: concepts for comparative analysis. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16(4): 387–415

Goldfrank WL (2000) Paradigm regained? The rules of Wallerstein’s world-system method. *Journal of World-Systems Research* 6(2): 150–195

Chase-Dunn C (2014) Continuities and transformations in the evolution of world-systems. *Journal of Globalization Studies* 5(1): 11–31

Arrighi G (2005) Globalization in world-systems perspective. In R P Appelbaum and W I Robinson (eds) *Critical Globalization Studies*. London: Routledge, 33–44

Kay C (2011) Andre Gunder Frank: “unity in diversity” from the development of underdevelopment to the world system. *New Political Economy* 16(4): 523-538

Bergesen A (1990) Turning world-system theory on its head. *Theory, Culture and Society* 7(2–3): 67–81

Further readings:

Aronowitz S (1981) A metatheoretical critique of Immanuel Wallerstein's the modern world system. *Theory and Society* 10(4): 503–520

Frank A G (1996) The underdevelopment of development, in S Chew and R Denmark (eds) *The underdevelopment of development*. London, Sage, 17–55

Skocpol T (1977) Wallerstein's world capitalist system: a theoretical and historical critique. *American Journal of Sociology* 82(5): 1075-1090

September 19

World-system theories II

After having surveyed some of the foundational arguments in world-system and dependency theories, this week we will delve into some of the debates around their application, adaptation, reception, and reformulation—considering the later life of these approaches. After being out of fashion for a while, much of this work is getting a new hearing (and reading).

We will be joined by Brett Christophers in the second part of the class, an opportunity to reflect on these and other takes on the phenomenon of financialization, its spatialities, geographies, and uneven development.

Required readings:

Cardoso FH (1977) The consumption of dependency theory in the United States. *Latin American Research Review* 12(3): 7–24

Velasco A (2002) Dependency theory. *Foreign Policy* 133: 44-45

Bracarense N (2013) Economic development in Latin America and the Methodenstreit: lessons from history of thought. *Journal of Economic Issues* 47(1): 113-134

Bair J and Werner M (2017) New geographies of uneven development in global formation: thinking with Chase-Dunn. *Journal of World-Systems Research* 23(2): 604–619

Moore JW (2010) Cheap food and bad money: food, frontiers, and financialization in the rise and demise of neoliberalism. *Review* 33(2/3): 225-261

Conversation with Brett Christophers:

Christophers B (2015) The limits to financialization. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 5(5): 183–200

Christophers B (2019) The rentierization of the United Kingdom economy. *EPA: Economy and Space* forthcoming

Further readings:

Caporaso J A (1980) Dependency theory: continuities and discontinuities in development Studies. *International Organization* 34(4): 605–628

Friedmann H and Wayne J (1977) Dependency theory: a critique. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 2(4): 399-415

Kvangraven I H (2017) A dependency pioneer: Samir Amin. In U Kufakurinani, I H Kvangraven, F Santanta and M D Styve (eds) *Dialogues on development: volume 1—on dependency*. New York: INET, 12-17

Smith T (1979) The underdevelopment of development literature: the case of dependency theory. *World Politics* (2): 247–288

October 3

Interlude I: Uneven & combined development

Since we have no class on September 26, there are more readings than usual this week. We examine the foundational concept of uneven (and combined) development, axiomatic for most geographers and yet often taken for granted. Uneven development was actively problematized in the field of radical geography during the 1970s and 1980s, when it was a subject of explicit theoretical and empirical interrogation, but receded to the background for two decades after that. Uneven development appears to have “returned,” as a matter of explicit concern, in the past decade, where some of the more influential contributions have come from outside the discipline of geography, including international political economy, development studies, and political sociology.

Required readings:

Harvey D (2006) Notes towards a theory of uneven geographical development. In D Harvey, *Spaces of global capitalism: a theory of uneven geographical development*. London: Verso, 137-230

Massey D (1993) Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place. In J Bird, B Curtis, T Putnam and L Tickner (eds) *Mapping the futures: local cultures, global change*, London: Taylor and Francis, 59–69

Smith N (2006) The geography of uneven development. In B Dunn and H Radice (eds) *100 years of permanent revolution*. London: Pluto, 180–195

Arrighi G (2007) Globalization and uneven development. In I Rossi (ed) *Frontiers of globalization research*. New York: Springer, 185–201

Allinson J C and Anievas A (2009) The uses and misuses of uneven and combined development: an anatomy of a concept. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 22(1): 47–67

Makki F (2015) Reframing development theory: the significance of the idea of uneven and combined development. *Theory and Society* 44(5): 471–497

Kasimir S and Gill L (2018) No smooth surfaces. *Current Anthropology* 59(4): 355–377

Further readings:

- Anievas A and Nisancioglu K (2015) *How the West came to rule*. London: Pluto Press
- Elster J (1986) The theory of combined and uneven development: a critique. In J Roemer (ed) *Analytical Marxism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 54–63
- Massey D (2004) Uneven development: social change and spatial divisions of labor. In TJ Barnes, J Peck and E Sheppard (eds) *Reading economic geography*. Oxford: Wiley, 111–124
- Peck J (2019) Combination. In T Jazeel, A Kent, K McKittrick, N Theodore, S Chari, P Chatterton, V Gidwani, N Heynen, W Larner, J Peck, J Pickerill, M Werner & MW Wright (eds) *Keywords in radical geography: Antipode at 50*. Oxford: Wiley, 50-55

October 10

Regulation theories I

Regulation theories (especially their Parisian variants) exerted a considerable influence on radical political economy and economic geography, beginning in the late 1980s. They offer a particular perspective on the macro economy (notably at the nation-state scale), “integral” in scope and extending to the state, culture, politics, and more. This week we focus on some of these earlier contributions and their travels into geography.

Required readings:

- Lipietz A and Jenson J (1987) Rebel sons: the regulation school. *French Politics and Society* 5(4): 17-26
- Jessop B (1990) Regulation theories in retrospect and prospect. *Economy and Society* 19(2): 153–216
- Boyer R and Hollingsworth JR (1997) From national embeddedness to spatial and institutional nestedness. In R Boyer and JR Hollingsworth (eds) *Contemporary capitalism: the embeddedness of institutions*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 433–484
- Peck J and Tickell A (1994) Searching for a new institutional fix: the *after* Fordist crisis and global-local disorder. In A. Amin (ed) *Post-Fordism: a reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 280-316
- Graham J (1992) Post-Fordism as politics: the political consequences of narratives on the left. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10(4): 393–410

Further readings:

- Boyer R (1990) *The regulation school: a critical introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press

- Dunford, M. (1990) Theories of regulation. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 8(3): 297–321
- Jenson J (1989) “Different” but not “exceptional”: Canada’s permeable Fordism. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne de Sociologie* 26(1): 69–94
- Leborgne D and Lipietz A (1992) Conceptual fallacies and open questions on post-Fordism. In M Storper and AJ Scott (eds) *Pathways to industrialization and regional development*. London: Routledge, 332–348
- Lipietz A (1988) Reflections on a tale: the Marxist foundations of the concepts of regulation and accumulation. *Studies in Political Economy* 26: 7–36
- Tickell A and Peck J (1992) Accumulation, regulation and the geographies of post-Fordism: missing links in regulationist research. *Progress in Human Geography* 16(2): 190–218

October 17

Regulation theories II

We continue with the regulationist theme, looking into some of the more recent iterations of this style of inquiry. Some would say that regulation theory lost its way around the turn of the century, but in recent years there has been a notable return at least to its problematics (concerned with the social regulation of long-run patterns of development, their hegemonic forms, the effects of different forms of crisis, etcetera) if not necessarily its methods.

Required readings:

- Aglietta M (1998) Capitalism at the turn of the century: regulation theory and the challenge of social change. *New Left Review* 232: 41–90
- Boyer R (2000) The political in the era of globalization and finance: focus on some regulation school research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24(2): 274–322
- McDonough T, Reich M and Kotz DM (2010) Introduction. In T McDonough, M Reich and DM Kotz (eds) *Contemporary capitalism and its crises: social structure of accumulation theory for the 21st Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Jessop B and Sum N-L (2007) Regenerating the regulation approach. In B Jessop and N-L Sum, *Beyond the regulation approach: putting capitalist economies in their place*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar, 213–246

Further readings:

- Boyer R (2005) How and why capitalisms differ. *Economy and Society* 34(4): 509–557
- MacLeod G (1997) Globalizing Parisian thought-waves: recent advances in the study of social regulation, politics, discourse and space. *Progress in Human Geography* 21(4): 530–553

Peck J (2000) Doing regulation. In GL Clark, MP Feldman and MS Gertler (eds) *The Oxford handbook of economic geography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 61-80

October 24

Interlude II: Relationality

In this second “interlude” we focus on the theme of relationality, which has been fundamental to geographical political economy in many of its forms. Doreen Massey’s characteristic styles of theorizing, explanation, and exposition are a crucial touchstone here, and her reflections on *Spatial divisions of labour*, a decade after its original publication deserve especially close attention.

Required readings:

Massey D (1995) Reflections on debates over a decade. In D Massey, *Spatial Divisions of Labour: Social Structures and the Geography of Production*, 2nd edition. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 296-354

Jessop B, Brenner N, Jones M and MacLeod G (2008) Theorizing sociospatial relations. *Environment and Planning. D, Society and Space* 26(3): 389-401

Sunley P (2008) Relational economic geography: a partial understanding or a new paradigm? *Economic Geography* 84(1): 1–26

Jones M (2009) Phase space: geography, relational thinking, and beyond. *Progress in Human Geography* 33(4): 487–506

Allen JR and Cochrane A (2007) Beyond the territorial fix: regional assemblages, politics and power. *Regional Studies* 41(9): 1161-1175

Hart G (2018) Relational comparison revisited: Marxist postcolonial geographies in practice, *Progress in Human Geography* 42: 371-394

Further readings:

Allen J (2004) The whereabouts of power: politics, government and space. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 86(1): 19–32

Yeung Y (2005) Rethinking relational economic geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30(1): 37–51

October 31

State theories I

State theories have a reputation, some of it thoroughly deserved, for being excessively abstract and quite detached from the messy realities of statecraft and “state effects” in practice. We dip into this literature in this first week by way of a brief survey of some of the foundational contributions to contemporary state theory, beginning with the Miliband-Poulantzas debate, before moving on to some of the later discussions, including work that has sought to “spatialize” state theory.

Required readings:

Poulantzas N (1969) The problem of the capitalist state. *New Left Review* 58(1): 67–78

Miliband R (1973) Poulantzas and the capitalist state. *New Left Review* 82(1): 83–93

Block F (1977) The ruling class does not rule: notes on the Marxist theory of the state. *Socialist Revolution* 7: 6–28

Jessop B (1977) Recent theories of the capitalist state. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 1(4): 353–373

Jessop B, Brenner N, Jones M and MacLeod G (2008) Introduction: state space in question. In B Jessop, N Brenner, M Jones and G MacLeod, *State/space: a reader*. John Wiley & Sons, 1–26

Further readings:

Bowles S and Gintis H (1982) The crisis of liberal democratic capitalism: the case of the United States. *Politics and Society* 11(1): 51–93

Gold DA, Lo C and Wright EO (1975) Recent developments in Marxist theories of the capitalist state. *Monthly Review* 27(5): 29–43

Jessop B (2000) The crisis of the national spatio-temporal fix and the tendential ecological dominance of globalizing capitalism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24(2): 323–360

November 5

State theories II

In this second week on the state, we follow some of the vectors of more recent work, including in geography, sociology, and anthropology. This has raised all kinds of questions about dominant understandings of the state and state power, delving into questions of territorialization, spatiality, geography, and scalar structure.

Required readings:

O'Neill PM (1997) Bringing the qualitative state into economic geography. In R Lee and J Wills (eds) *Geographies of economies*. London: Arnold, 290–301

Steinmetz G (1999) Introduction: culture and the state. In G Steinmetz (ed) *State/culture: state-formation after the cultural turn*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1–49

Glassman J (1999) State power beyond the “territorial trap”: the internationalization of the state.” *Political Geography* 18(6): 669–696

Mitchell T (1991) The limits of the state: beyond statist approaches and their critics. *American Political Science Review* 85(1): 77–96

Ferguson J and Gupta A (2002) Spatializing states: toward an ethnography of neoliberal governmentality. *American Ethnologist* 29(4): 981–100

Brenner N (2009) Open questions on state rescaling. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 2(1): 123–139

Allen J and Cochrane A (2010) Assemblages of state power: topological shifts in the organization of government and politics. *Antipode* 42(5): 1071–1089

Jayasuriya K (2005) Beyond institutional fetishism: from the developmental to the regulatory state. *New Political Economy* 10(3): 381–387

Further readings:

Block F (2008) Swimming against the current: the rise of a hidden developmental state in the United States. *Politics & Society* 36(2): 169–206

Brenner N (1998) Global cities, glocal states: global city formation and state territorial restructuring in contemporary Europe. *Review of International Political Economy* 5(1): 1–37

Chibber V (2002) Bureaucratic rationality and the developmental state. *American Journal of Sociology* 107(4): 951–989

Jones MR (1997) Spatial selectivity of the state? The regulationist enigma and local struggles over economic governance. *Environment and Planning A* 29(5): 831–864

November 12

Interlude III: Conjunctures

Conjunctural analysis was a defining feature of Gramsci's approach, reflecting the later Marx among other influences. Via Raymond Williams and (especially) Stuart Hall, the provenance and practices of conjunctural analysis were expanded and elaborated, although they have never been codified in an explicit way. In this session, we will explore the issue of theorizing capitalism "conjuncturally," seeking to recover the methodology along the way.

Required readings:

Howell C (2003) Varieties of capitalism: and then there was one? *Comparative Politics* 36(1): 103–124

Peck J and Zhang J (2013) A variety of capitalism ... with Chinese characteristics? *Journal of Economic Geography* 13(3): 357–396

Fraser N (2018) Roepke lecture in economic geography—from exploitation to expropriation: historic geographies of racialized capitalism. *Economic Geography* 94(1): 1–17

Nederveen Pieterse J (2014) Rethinking modernity and capitalism: add context and stir. *Sociopedia.isa*

Koivisto J and Lahtinen M (2012) Conjuncture, historico-political. *Historical Materialism* 20(1): 267–277

Grossberg L (2019) Cultural Studies in search of a method, or looking for conjunctural analysis. *New Formations* 96: 38–68

Further readings:

Brenner N, Peck J and Theodore N (2010) Variegated neoliberalization: geographies, modalities, pathways. *Global Networks* 10(2): 182–222

Bruff I (2011) What about the elephant in the room? Varieties of capitalism, varieties in capitalism. *New Political Economy* 16(4): 481–500

Bruff I and Ebenau M (2014) Critical political economy and the critique of comparative capitalisms scholarship on capitalist diversity. *Capital & Class* 38(1): 3–15

Clarke J (2018) Finding place in the conjuncture: a dialogue with Doreen. In M. Werner, J. Peck, R. Lave and B. Christophers (eds.) *Doreen Massey: critical dialogues*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Agenda Publishing, xxx-xxx

Jessop B (2018) The world market, “North-South” relations, and neoliberalism. *Alternative Routes* 29: 207-228

Peck J and Theodore N (2007) Variegated capitalism. *Progress in Human Geography* 31(6): 731-772

November 19

Socioeconomics I

As one of the pathways into theorizing *socio*-economically, we will trace some of the influences of Karl Polanyi in and around geography. Polanyi’s “substantivist” approach to the analysis of economic worlds, lives, and modes of coordination has never been an “exclusive” mode of inquiry, and as such is often placed in conversation with complementary or parallel approaches, including Marxism, feminism, political ecology, and economic sociology. There is more than one kind of “socioeconomics,” however, as we will see.

Required readings:

Polanyi K (1957) The economy as instituted process. In K Polanyi, CM Arensberg and HW Pearson (eds) *Trade and market in the early empires: economies in history and theory*. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 243-269

Granovetter M (1985) Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology* 91(3): 481–510

Block F and Somers MR (2014) *The power of market fundamentalism: Karl Polanyi’s critique*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, chapter 1, 1-43

Peck J (2005) Economic sociologies in space. *Economic Geography* 81(2): 129–175

Silver BJ and Arrighi G (2003) Polanyi’s “double movement”: the belle epoques of British and US hegemony compared. *Politics and Society* 31(2): 325–355

Further readings:

Grabher G (2006) Trading routes, bypasses, and risky intersections: mapping the travels of networks between economic sociology and economic geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 30(2): 163–189

Hess M (2004) “Spatial” relationships? Towards a reconceptualization of embeddedness. *Progress in Human Geography* 28(2): 165–186

Martin R (2000) Institutional approaches in economic geography. In Sheppard E and Barnes TJ (eds) *A companion to economic geography*. Oxford: Blackwell, 77–94

Sunley P (1996) Context in economic geography: the relevance of pragmatism. *Progress in Human Geography* 20(3): 338–355

Vidal M and Peck J (2012) Sociological institutionalism and the socially constructed economy. In Barnes TJ, Peck J and Sheppard E (eds) *The Wiley-Blackwell companion to economic geography*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 594–611

November 26

Socioeconomics II

Pursuing some of the through lines of neoPolanyian thought, this final session will consider complementarities and contradictions between this family of approaches and those associated with feminism, Marxism, and economic sociology.

Required readings:

Krippner G, Granovetter M, Block F, Biggart B, Beamish Y, Hsing Y, Hart G et al (2004) Polanyi symposium: a conversation on embeddedness. *Socio-Economic Review* 2(1): 109–135

Nagar R, Lawson V, McDowell L and Hanson S (2002) Locating globalization: feminist (re)readings of the subjects and spaces of globalization. *Economic Geography* 78(3): 257–284

Fraser N (2013) A triple movement? Parsing the politics of crisis after Polanyi. *New Left Review* 81: 119–132

Burawoy M (2003) For a sociological Marxism: the complementary convergence of Antonio Gramsci and Karl Polanyi. *Politics and Society* 31(2): 193–261

Further readings:

Berndt C, Werner M and Fernández VR (2019) Postneoliberalism as institutional recalibration: reading Polanyi through Argentina’s soy boom. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* online first

MacKinnon D, Cumbers A, Pike A, Birch K and McMaster R (2009) Evolution in economic geography: institutions, political economy, and adaptation. *Economic Geography* 85: 129–150

- Muellerleile C (2013) Turning financial markets inside out: Polanyi, performativity and disembeddedness. *Environment and Planning A* 45(7): 1625-1642
- Peck J (2013) For Polanyian economic geographies. *Environment and Planning A* 45(7): 1545–1568
- Rossi U (2013) On the varying ontologies of capitalism: embeddedness, dispossession, subsumption. *Progress in Human Geography* 37: 348–365
- Werner M, Strauss K, Parker B, Orzeck R, Derickson K and Bonds A (2017) Feminist political economy in geography: why now, what is different, and what for? *Geoforum* 79: 1–4