

Critical Sociology

<http://crs.sagepub.com>

Introduction and Overview: Actors, Obstacles and Social Change in European and Asian State Capitalist Societies

Vincent Kelly Pollard
Crit Sociol 2008; 34; 525
DOI: 10.1177/0896920508090307

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://crs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/34/4/525>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Critical Sociology* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://crs.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://crs.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Introduction and Overview: Actors, Obstacles and Social Change in European and Asian State Capitalist Societies

Vincent Kelly Pollard

University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Hawai'i, USA

Abstract

The social history of state capitalist analysis emerged at least four decades before the Bolshevik-led October Revolution. Despite this analytic tradition, epistemic communities using state capitalist analyses have interacted sporadically. Differences in language, locale and political commitments have contributed to the lack of sustained exchange. Sensitive to future social change in formerly Marxist-Leninist systems and elsewhere, contributors to this issue of *Critical Sociology* have applied complementary and competing state capitalist analyses to the pre-1917 Russian Empire, the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China (PRC), post-communist Russia and the PRC in the reform period. The contributing authors are convinced that clarifying the legacy of state capitalist analysis is a prerequisite for the success of social movements seeking to realize their preferred futures in Asia, the Pacific, Europe, Africa and the Americas. Setting the stage, the introductory essay also suggests issues for continuing debate.

Keywords

China, Marxism-Leninism, political theory, Russia, state capitalism

The theme of this issue of *Critical Sociology* is 'State Capitalism in Europe and Asia: From Cold War Conflict to Post-Globalization Futures'. The theme is as appropriate as ever. Time and again, millions of urban workers, unremunerated housewives, subsistence-level farmers, fisherfolk, ethnic minorities and others have forcefully acted together to improve their lives. When they succeeded in achieving their shared social futures, those efforts sometimes radically transformed the social landscape of Asia, the Pacific, Africa, Europe and the Americas.

As these changes were underway, intermittent and uneven tendencies towards greater state-led concentrations of capital under diverse political regimes – Left, Center and Right – have been lauded, endured and condemned since the late 19th century. Contemporary critiques of the deleterious effects of state control of capital are rooted in

the development of modern sociology and world politics. Indeed, scholars from traditions as diverse as anarchism, analytic Marxism, political economy, historical institutionalism and comparative sociology will find much of interest here. Following one of several pathways, state capitalist analysis first emerged from controversies and political splits between winners, losers and their respective supporters and sympathizers over the inner meanings of communism and capitalism in the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, China, Vietnam and Cuba. State capitalism is a highly centralized variant of capitalism. It was not clearly envisioned by classical political economist Adam Smith or by Karl Marx who gave his own stamp to Smith's labor theory of value. At best, discussions of accumulation in *Capital* and in the *Grundrisse* weakly prefigure dynamics of one type of state capitalism to emerge in the 20th century (Marx, 1971a [1887]: 713–19; Marx, 1971b [1894]: 246; Marx, 1973).

In the last quarter of the 19th century, comparative analysts of early and late industrializing societies in Europe noted emerging indicators of state capitalism. 'As long ago as 1877,' for example, 'Alfred Wagner, a German public finance theorist,' Francis Castles tells us, 'had advanced a "law of increasing state activity".' According to Wagner's Law as summarized by Castles, 'the very process of industrialization through which societies became more affluent produced problems which forced them to devote even greater proportions of national income to the provision of collective goods' (Castles, 2002: 218–19).¹

Without the subsequent rise and fall of the Soviet Union, it may be difficult to imagine this discussion taking place today. Indeed, Capital was more highly concentrated in late developing capitalism in the Russian Empire than in Germany or England.² And, in the second of two Russian revolutions in 1917, the Bolshevik faction of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party overthrew the Menshevik-led Provisional Government. The Bolsheviks did so with crucial assistance from the Left Social Revolutionaries to whose semi-anarchist tendencies Vladimir Lenin appealed (Lenin, 1965 [1917]: 391–5, 461). The overthrow proceeded with the active participatory support of the relatively small Russian working class. At the same time, the Bolsheviks' popular militant slogan 'Bread, land and peace!' was prominent in the war-stricken countryside where the agricultural majority of the population led miserable lives. But by the end of the ensuing Civil War in late 1921 and no later than early 1922, the degree of institutionalized working class influence over the Party leadership was severely attenuated (Hobson and Tabor, 1988: 3–21, 467–8, nn. 1–14),³ although the importance of this fact is still debated. Not unsympathetically, Michael Kort claims that 'the best guide available, and the one Lenin was using ... came from ... the sophisticated combination of private enterprise and state planning developed in capitalist Germany during World War I' (Kort, 2006: 119).

Among issues of importance to epistemic communities favoring some version of state capitalist analysis are the following four:

- 1) the extent to which Marx's law of value has heuristic power;
- 2) the evidence for class domination and resistance to domination in state capitalist societies;

- 3) intra-firm and intra-ministry economic competition; and
- 4) who gets what, when, where and how in state capitalist societies.

In turn, these four issues have ontological, normative, methodological and policy implications. For example, to follow up on a distinction influenced by Hobson and Tabor (1988) but not necessarily accepted by other contributors to this issue, what fundamentally makes private property private is its institutionalized alienation from control by organizations of the working classes, that is, that it 'defines capitalist private property' as '*private from the working class*' (Pollard, 2001: 1595; italics in the original). Thus, nationalized property can facilitate exploitation of the Russian working class of the 1930s or Chinese workers of the 1960s as much (and even more so) as the monopolies owned by robber baron capitalists in the 1890s.

Literature responding to issues raised on the Left and in other political milieux reveals at least four historically discernible streams of policy-relevant state capitalist analysis. The first of these is pro-statist, that is, Marxist-Leninist, although many supporters of those regimes have been uncomfortable with the state capitalist label or reject it outright. Critically or not, it is at least implicitly supportive of historically communist regimes. Many of these have also been characterized as Stalinist.

A second stream is 'antimonopoly-reformist' – or 'state monopoly capitalist', as it has sometimes been styled by populist movements in the USA and elsewhere (Pollard, 2001: 1595).

A third is 'libertarian-Marxian' (Pollard 2001: 1595). In this theoretical stream, Raya Dunayevskaya was a pioneer. She moved away from Leon Trotsky's support for the Soviet Union as a 'degenerated workers' state' on the grounds (he argued) that industry and trade were controlled by Communist Party-led government and because efforts were made to implement national plans. A prolific collaborator with the Trinidad-born African-American revolutionist and scholar C.L.R. James in the 'libertarian-Marxian' stream, Dunayevskaya seems to have been of two minds as to how foresighted Marx was. 'The state-capitalism at issue is not the one theoretically envisioned by Karl Marx in 1867–1883,' she wrote, 'as the logical conclusion to the development of English competitive capitalism' (Dunayevskaya, 1967: 5) Later, Dunayevskaya would point out that Karl Marx had foreseen the trend toward state capitalism. In Dunayevskaya's view, Stalin and other self-described 'socialist' or 'communist' rulers of the USSR were a collective capitalist elite using nationalized property to control the masses while resisting direction from them. In response to official claims lacking supportive empirical evidence, she argued that human labor in the USSR became merely 'an object' to be manipulated by those rulers (Dunayevskaya, 1973). Thus, despite their bitterly argued differences, both Stalin and Trotsky were rather impressed by the technocratic magic of nationalized property. Suggesting an elective affinity with what Pollard later called the 'antimonopoly-reformist' stream (Pollard, 2001: 1595), Dunayevskaya also predicted that the USA 'is not exempt from State capitalism' (Dunayevskaya, 1982). The latter stream of analysis arose in reaction to increasing concentrations of economic power in 20th century capitalism, particularly in Western Europe, Canada and the USA (Melman, 1997: 1–11).

Influenced by Dunayevskaya and others, Christopher Hobson and Ronald Tabor applied Marx's law of value to reinterpret the social and political development of state capitalism in the Soviet Union (Hobson and Tabor, 1988: 421, 424–8, 434, 439). In contrast, Howard Davis and Richard Scase reject statist Marxist-Leninist and libertarian Marxian state capitalist analyses, instead referring to 'bureaucratic' and 'totalitarian' features of 'state socialism,' partly because pre-1989 Eastern Europe lacked familiar traditional capitalist institutions (Davis and Scase, 1985: 6–10). Robert Vincent Daniels agrees with those who 'emphasize the non-proletarian nature of the Stalinist system' but is unconvinced by James Burnham's and Milovan Djilas's claims that 'Soviet socialism' was a unique form of 'class society' (Daniels, 1991: 118), compare with Burnham (1941) and Djilas (1957). Much later, Tabor criticized the law of value itself as part of a closed belief system and not very helpful in explaining the causes of profit in modern capitalist systems (Tabor, 2001).

Finally, emerging more recently from the 'libertarian-Marxian' stream is a fourth, anarchist analysis of 'forms of highly centralized, stratified capitalism without the capitalist class, in other words state capitalism' and which mounts a radical critique of Marx's law of value (Tabor, 2001: 88).

Comparatively, state capitalist analysis has implications for the development of ideology, organization and leadership in communist and non-communist societies. At one time or another, variable concentrations of state-led capital concentrations in larger or smaller sectors of early and late industrializing societies have attracted attention from analysts who use the concept of state capitalism with sometimes frustrating diversity (Wilczynski, 1981: 566–7).

The expansion of government services and enterprises for longer and shorter periods of time in otherwise politically and socially diverse countries has attracted attention from practitioners of state capitalist analysis. Exemplars range from Australia and New Zealand (Doherty, 1997) to the Soviet Union.⁴ Other political and economic systems characterized as state capitalist have included Nazi Germany (see Neumann, 1944), the People's Republic of China before the 1956 Congress of the Communist Party of China (see Mao, 1977 [1953]: 101), Italy (see Payne, 1995), France's 'nationalization' and 'state-guided economic planning' in that country's 'mixed economy' during 1936–50 (Chapman, 1991: 8–9, 70–71, 294–5) the US national security state since World War II (Harris, 1991; Melman, 1997: 1–11) post-independence India (Parthasarathy, 2004), and Canada with comparisons to eight other countries during 1973–79 (Laux and Molot, 1998: 12, 13, Table 1) and contemporary Japan (Katzenstein, 2003).

While one may distinguish multiple interpretative streams of state capitalist analysis from one another, engaged intellectual exchange across the full range of state capitalist theories occurred infrequently after the 1917 October Revolution and during most of the Cold War. As one might expect, political conservatives outside the libertarian milieu usually resisted any suggestion of shared underlying fundamental dynamics in the workings of capitalism East and West.

On the other side, their opponents on the Left often assumed those differences as axiomatic and inherently beneficial. In contradistinction, conceptualizations of capitalism by influential

sources like the Chicago School of Economics are limiting, as well. Even though competition matters (Friedman, 1982: 13–14), discussions emphasizing competition can lead to slighting the surprisingly different historical forms under which it has occurred.⁵ And, conflicting political agendas were the most common disincentive to communication. Thus, whether state capitalism was considered vibrant, threatening or happily moribund depended on one's broader philosophical and political commitments. Acknowledging a contentious intellectual history, contributors to this special issue of *Critical Sociology* have taken a step towards a more engaged debate by framing issues in a way that permits fundamental questions to be addressed.

So, we may ask: what can happen when the ruling party controls most or a large proportion of the society's capital? And what has happened?

How does centralization of capital and attempted national planning in communist, transitional and formerly communist countries differ from capital concentration and government intervention in non-communist societies? And to what extent does competition between national, regional and local state organizations and parastatal institutions in communist societies mirror competition between firms in traditional European and American capitalism? Before the 1980s, were state capitalist societies the best available alternative for the societies whose social histories we are examining? In the 1980s and later, how have state capitalist ideologies, organizational forms and leadership guided, shaped or enhanced transitions towards more representative government and other democratic changes? Conversely, have they led in a different direction?

Clarity about one's level of analysis matters (Singer, 1961: 77–92). From different levels of analysis, the contributing authors of the remaining four articles in this thematic issue describe and explain the pathways and prospects of capitalism and state capitalism in the former Soviet Union, People's Republic of China, and elsewhere.

In the first article in this Symposium section of *Critical Sociology*, Satya Gabriel, Stephen Resnick and Richard Wolff collaborate to emphasize commonalities between the Soviet Union and China. They tackle the thematic question 'state capitalism versus communism: what happened in the USSR and the PRC?' For them, attentive participant-observers desiring to learn from history of the USSR and the PRC should learn from 'Marx's focus on the social organization of the surplus who produces a surplus, who gets it, and what they do with it' (Gabriel et al., 2008).

The second and third articles discuss the former Soviet Union and China, respectively. Separately authored, each emphasizes different issues and overlapping levels of analysis. Their approaches veer from that taken by Gabriel, Resnick and Wolff. In the second article, Michael J. Haynes covers a broad sweep of Russian social history from the late 19th century until early in the 21st century in his discussion of labor, exploitation and capitalism in Russia before and after 1991. For Haynes, the exploitation of the Russian working classes before, during and after the state capitalism of the USSR must be grounded in the context of global capitalism (Haynes, 2008).

In the third article, Rummy Hasan's article on the impact on China's policy from the retreat of state capitalism reflects on the ways in which 'the retreat of state capitalism' in China has affected the Chinese political system. For Hasan, a state capitalist analysis draws attention to the impact of 'military competition and concomitant development of

the heavy industrial sectors', the gradual retreat of state control over the economy and the adoption of a 'dual track' approach. Hasan proceeds to explain how the Chinese economy has achieved an unprecedented growth rate. According to his argument, a retreating Chinese state capitalism has had effects not intended by the ruling Communist Party, especially a 'reconfiguration of classes' (Hasan, 2008).

Finally, in 'State Capitalism as a Response to Global Challenges: Market Sense and the New Economics of the State', Lawrence C. Katzenstein has sought to review 'one purely theoretical work and two applied works that would deal with the issue of globalization and state intervention'. Evaluating recent books by Philip Kozel, Satya Gabriel, and Anjan Chakrabarti and Stephen Cullenberg, Katzenstein concludes, 'The role of the state in promoting the economic greater good has never been more confused or constrained. However those of us who seek the goals of fairer distribution and equity have much to learn about our ideals by examining these works.' (Katzenstein, 2008)

These articles should provoke further discussion. Regarding the level of analysis, Tony Saich raises a relevant concern. Centralized state capitalism in China has loosened up considerably. However, 'in many cases, even local states that appear to fit the model of "local state corporatism" may turn out to be predatory and developmental at the same time' (Saich, 2002: 99). He goes on to plead:

We need to pay more attention to disaggregating the interests of the state at the local level both in terms of different government agencies at different levels horizontally and vertically and to society at large in terms of responsiveness. This will move us toward more open-ended explanations rather than the clear-cut ones that social scientists prefer ... Each specific local state is the process of complex negotiation and we need to develop explanations that allow for the shifting complexities of the current system and the institutional fluidity, ambiguity and messiness that operate at all levels in China and that are most pronounced at the local level. This does not negate the need for comparison, but will provide a more reliable base for comparison (Saich, 2002: 99).

Thus, local and regional events are best understood as early indicators to be monitored for insight into emerging issues, like Graham Molitor's 'leading ideas', 'leading events', 'leading authorities/advocates', 'leading literature', 'leading organizations', and 'political jurisdictions' (Molitor, 1977). Since 'trends should be identified before they become trends' (Dator, 2005: 204) if they are to be of use to participant observer scholars in emerging social movements, what can we learn from these articles?

For social theorists and for scholarly participant-observers, these three articles raise important challenges about the limits of possible social change in the next 20 to 30 years.

'Globalization refers to change', and more specifically, 'to powerful transformative processes influencing social organizations and individual lives across the planet Earth ... For better and for worse, these processes have reduced distance and time for conflict and cooperation opportunities between countries, governments and smaller social units.' Moreover, 'ideas' are among those globe-traveling agents of change (Pollard, 2004b: 1). Among those ideas are illusions based on unexamined histories of past struggles.

In the People's Republic of China, for example, workers were resisting workplace discipline and interfering with production and going on strike before, during and after the Cultural Revolution (1966–76). And with pressures from the World Trade Organization and current government policies since 2001 (Sheehan, 2003), there is little reason to expect that workplace labor slowdowns and strikes of the past 20 years will significantly subside. According to published governmental 'public-order disturbances', urban and rural workers' protests and those by other Chinese have been as follows for the following selected recent years. 'Public-order disturbances' are a broad category embracing organized and unorganized activities. Along with peaceful protests, wildcat strikes, riots and uprisings are included. If Ministry of Public Security data are comparatively valid, the numbers reflect an almost ninefold increase from 10,000 in 1994 to 87,000 in 2005.⁶ With relevant nuance, Andrew Wedeman (2005) has drawn attention to the variation in state repression of those 'public-order disturbances' caused by Chinese workers in contrast to sometimes harsher repression of other groups in China during recent years like Falun Dafa (Falun Gong).

But in one alternative future, what will increasingly radicalized Chinese workers do at the point where localized job-related protests become regional? As they become radicalized, will Chinese workers confront opportunities reminiscent of strike waves in which their great-grandparents' generation participated during 1919–27?⁷

Other fundamental challenges to some forms of state capitalist analysis remain. In part, the critique of the law of value by Austrian economist Eugen von Böhm-Bawerk focused on Marx's views of nature and the environment (Böhm-Bawerk, 1975[1889]: 67–8, 74). Understandably, the former's influence on the Left has been minimal. On the one hand, the often-shunned Austrian School advocated an alternative that would not likely have been perceived as meaningful by radical working class activists. On the other hand, Böhm-Bawerk's critique of Marx distantly preceded the environmentalist movements of the past 40 years. Thus, as suggested by Foster (2000), later environmentalist critiques by Kolakowski (1978) and others have had greater impact on the environmentalist movement's tendency to reject the relevance of the law of value as anti-Nature.

Also, this debate has another corollary. What are the limits of Marxian analysis of self-styled Marxist-Leninist regimes? Did the conviction that the law of value is an effective covering explanation for the workings of capitalism desensitize ruling communist elites to policies destructive of the environment? For example, Marx asserts in Volume I of *Capital*, 'Physical forces like steam, water etc., when appropriated to productive processes, cost nothing' (Marx, 1971a [1887]: 365).⁸ This 'wastage' (Schurmann, 1968: 361) has not escaped comment by Chung (2004), Shapiro (2001), Tabor (2001: 67, 70, 72, 80, 84–5, 88), and many others. But even for those like John Bellamy Foster who are convinced of the value of rehabilitating Marx on this point (Foster, 2000) explaining away environmental disasters in the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China seems a daunting task.

In a qualitative version of multivariate analysis, the question may be elaborated so as to account for multiple influences: In addition to domestically fatal effects associated with extreme concentrations of power during 1900–1987 (Rummel, 1994), does the

rulers' belief in the law of value add to their sense of invincibility in one-party monopoly rule of a country in Leninist party authoritarian states? In turn, does it leave them relatively indifferent to the impact of their decisions on the quality of the land, water, air and to the quality of lives led by humans and other creatures affected by the quality of the environment?

Global capital has been cutting a wide swath throughout the world, extending the power of capital while also stimulating resistance. Thus, among others, Jackie Sheehan also cautions us against exaggerating the implications of change in societies like China for the self-organization of the Chinese working classes (Sheehan, 2003).⁹ As suggested by Michael Leaf's research in Quanzhou, Fujian Province, (2002) a comparison of the degree to which the Chinese communist *hukou* (household registration) regime and *danwei* (workplace) systems have been disassembled in different provinces and special regions may help illuminate the degree to which state capitalism has retreated – or simply been subcontracted to provincial and city governments.

All social structures – class, leadership, surplus, state capitalism – reflect conscious and unconscious decisions and actions – purposeful or not – of living, breathing human beings. Among them are leaders. In Antonio Gramsci's *The Modern Prince: Essays on the Science of Politics in the Modern Age*, the Italian communist organizer argued, 'In the formation of leaders the premise is fundamental: does one wish there always to be rulers and ruled, or does one wish to create the conditions where the necessity for the existence of this division disappears?' (Gramsci, 1970 [1937]: 143).

But that 'premise' did not reappear during the decade of Stalin's Great Purge while Gramsci wrote those lines. Framing the issue in a longer historical perspective, Manfred Henningsen summarized competing perspectives of Europe's 'utopian movements' rising up a century before Gramsci, that is, 'from the 1820s to the 1840s'. 'They absorbed many of the radical political impulses that had emerged within the working class.' And, Henningsen tells us, they sought 'to actualize a new vision of universal emancipation with limited utopian experiments, mostly in America.' His summary continues:

But these experiments also failed. Their record of failure was used by Marx and Engels to indict alternative strategies of early socialism as illusive and counter-revolutionary. With Marx and Engels' indictment of early socialism in *The German Ideology* begins the history of the erasure of politics from radical European thinking. ... The erasure of politics ... entails more than the banning of all utopian experiments as exercises of egomaniacal gurus and their deluded groupies ... The ridicule of the early socialists resulted in the intellectual undermining of the possibility of the freedom of human agency. (Henningsen, 1989: 33)

Then, referring to lively social organizing in the Soviet Union and China during 1989, Henningsen suggests, 'The contemporary democracy debates in the USSR and the PRC can be seen as ... a late but dramatic victory of agency over structure' (Henningsen, 1989: 33).

With those social conflicts in mind, challenges to the state from participant-observer anarchist theorists (Tabor, 2001) and pacifists (Paige, 2002) need to be addressed systematically by state capitalist analysis. For example, is social transformation possible without Weberian reliance on a state's implicit and overt threat of violence? Conversely, can any social movement that naively, tacitly or enthusiastically relies on a future state's asserted monopoly of killing power – police, courts, judges, prisons, armies, executions – credibly expect to create a better future?

Claims argued by Gabriel, Resnick, Wolff, Haynes, Hasan, and Katzenstein will provoke and inform broader debates. A better grounding in these understandings will also aid participant-observer scholars – theoreticians and practitioners in peace and justice campaigns and the broader anti-capitalist movements – in articulating and achieving preferred futures that press beyond the limits of contemporary capitalism. Living on a planet squeezed by sharp contrasts of wealth and poverty, abundance and hunger, information and ignorance, opportunities and prejudices, we are convinced of this. These issues matter.

Still other questions might be asked. For example, might state capitalism prepare the way for other authoritarian forms of capitalism? Under what circumstances? How has a state capitalist perspective helped ruling and non-ruling communist parties navigate pressures towards more open economies and more representative democratic political systems since the mid-1970s? How much do particular circumstances of revolutionary parties, social movements, governments and their leaders account for the different pathways taken by state capitalist societies? Does a state capitalist perspective help ruling and non-ruling communist parties navigate pressures towards more open economies and representative democratic political systems? How much do particular circumstances of revolutionary parties, social movements, governments and their leaders account for different pathways taken by communist and non-communist state capitalist societies in Asia and elsewhere (Pollard, 2004a)?

Readers are invited to join and enlarge this ongoing discussion in any way they see fit, for example, by debating whether the evidence, concepts and arguments made in these articles extend beyond the examples discussed, as suggested by methodological concerns raised by Latin Americanist and political scientist Barbara Geddes (2003: 89–173). Answers to these questions can enhance the outlook of theoreticians, practitioners and leaders of future social movements for ameliorative change in the next two or three decades. As Arif Dirlik writes in the *Introduction* to a recently published collection of his research on the history, sociology and politics of modern and contemporary China:

The globalization of capital with the fall of socialism has also produced new conditions for the search for alternatives in the course of popular struggles for survival and justice, which draw on some legacies of the past while creating new possibilities of their own. Unlike in the past, moreover, when socialist goals were easily yoked to national visions there are also strong signs of the globalization of dissent and struggle, as more and more people are similarly subjected to the contradictions of capitalist modernity as modernity goes global. But now the search for alternatives looks to solutions that are concretely place-based rather than aspiring to a universal blueprint or even a national solution (2005: 12).

In framing the state capitalism debate broadly, the introductory essay has raised far more questions than it has answered. But if contributions to this issue of *Critical Sociology* and other research are indicators of emerging trends, the success of social movements in the coming decades will benefit, in my view, from collaborative diachronous, multilevel, cross-national studies examining successful resistance to state strength and state capitalism in the effort to create a just and humane society.

Acknowledgements

The editor of this issue of *Critical Sociology* and authors of the following articles are indebted to 11 anonymous reviewers. In an earlier phase of this enterprise, Lawrence C. Katzenstein (University of Minnesota and Rutgers University) made useful comments as discussant on the panel 'State Capitalism: Obstacle or Transmission Belt to Democratization' at the 44th Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, 2003. So, too, did Paul Midford (Kwansei Gakuin University and Norwegian University of Science and Technology) on the panel 'Ideology, Organization, Leadership and Resistance in Communist and Noncommunist Asian State Capitalist Societies' of the 56th Annual Meeting of The Association for Asian Studies, 2004. With funding from the Ford Foundation, the Association for Asian Studies generously supported our 2004 conference panel with a *Border-crossing* grant. Consistently helpful guidance and advice from Editor, David Fasenfest and Managing Editor, Denis Wall has been deeply appreciated at every stage of the proposal, writing, editing and copyediting process.

Notes

- 1 Compare with Payne (1995: 55).
- 2 See especially Carr (1966: 55) and Fainsod (1967: 25).
- 3 Compare with Reed (1919).
- 4 See Bettelheim (1976: 16–17, 57, 62, 480–83, and 508–11), Dunayevskaya (1944a, 1944b, 1967, 1973, 1982), James (1969), Nicolaus (1975). For a rebuttal, see critiques by Bettelheim (1976), Goldfield and Rothenberg (1980: 56–76, 81–93) and Nicolaus (1975).
- 5 Compare with Marx (1971b [1894]: 853–76).
- 6 See Beech (2006: 28); China Daily Staff (2006); Kahn (2006); South China Morning Post Staff (2005).
- 7 See Cai (1988: 3, 14, 22); Chou (1960: 37–40, 364, 380–81, 388–9); Clubb (1966: 136); Isaacs (1938: 48, 57, 69–71, 75–9, 83–5, 93, 103, 118–20, 128, 139–40, 148–61, 174, 193); Leong (1976: 286–7); Nassonov et al. (1962 [1932 {1927}]: 402–3, 415–16); Pantsov (2000: 27, 59, 90, 127–8, 132).
- 8 Compare with Marx (1971a [1887]: 173–6, 179, 356–7, 365–6, 475–6, 565, 567).
- 9 Compare with Wedeman (2005).

References

- Beech, H. [with Hua, Bu and Susan Jakes, Susan] (2006) Inside the Pitchfork Revolution. *Time* 167(11): 28–30.
- Bettelheim, C. (1976) *Class Struggles in the USSR*. Translated by B. Pearce. Monthly Review Press: New York.
- Burnham, J. (1941) *The Managerial Revolution*. John Day: New York.
- Cai, S.Q. (1988) Secret Societies and Labor Organizations in the Early History of the Chinese Communist Party. Translated by R. Kunst. *Working Papers in Asian Pacific Studies*. Duke University: Durham, NC.
- Carr, E.H. (1966) *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917–1923, Volume 1: A History of Russia*. Penguin: Baltimore.
- Castles, F.G. (2002) Policy Performance in the Democratic State: An Emergent Field of Study. H. Keman (ed.) *Comparative Democratic Politics: A Guide to Contemporary Theory and Research*, pp. 215–32. Sage: London.
- Chapman, H. (1991) *State Capitalism and Working-Class Radicalism in the French Aircraft Industry*. University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- China Daily Staff (2006) Riot Farmers Sentenced in S China Provi[n]ce. *People's Daily*. URL (consulted 24 May 2006): http://english.people.com.cn/200605/26/eng20060526_268769.html
- Chou, T.T. (1960) *The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge.
- Chung, Y.T.J. (2004) The 'Develop the West' Campaigns and Their Environmental Impacts: The Post-Socialist Condition in China. Mimeo, 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies, San Diego, CA.
- Clubb, O.E. (1966) *Twentieth Century China*. Columbia University Press: New York and London.
- Daniels, R.V. (1991) *Trotsky, Stalin and Socialism*. Westview: Boulder.
- Dator, J.A. (2005) Universities without 'Quality' and Quality without Universities. *On the Horizon* 13(4):199–215.
- Davis, H. and Scase, R. (1985) *Western Capitalism and State Capitalism: An Introduction*. Basil Blackwell: Oxford and New York.
- Dirlik, A. (2005) *Marxism in the Chinese Revolution*. Rowman and Littlefield: Lanham.
- Djilas, M. (1957) *The New Class: An Analysis of the Communist System*. Praeger: New York.
- Doherty, J.C. (1997) Socialism Without Doctrine. J.C. Doherty (ed.) *Historical Dictionary of Socialism*, p. 213. Scarecrow Press: Lanham.
- Dunayevskaya, R. (1944a) Teaching of Economics in the Soviet Union. *American Economic Review* 34(3): 501–30.
- Dunayevskaya, R. (1944b) A New Revision of Marxian Economics. *American Economic Review* 34(3): 531–7.
- Dunayevskaya, R. (1967) *State Capitalism and Marx's Humanism or Philosophy and Revolution*. News and Letters: Detroit.
- Dunayevskaya, R. (1973) *Philosophy and Revolution: From Hegel to Sartre, and from Marx to Mao*. Delacorte Press: New York.
- Dunayevskaya, R. (1982) *Marxism and Freedom from 1776 until Today*, 4th Edition. Harvester Press: New Jersey.
- Fainsod, M. (1967) *How Russia Is Ruled*, Revised Edition. Harvard University Press: Cambridge.
- Foster, J.B. (2000) Marx's Ecological Value Analysis: Review of Paul Burkett, *Marx and Nature: A Red and Green Perspective*. *Monthly Review* 52(4):39–47.

- Friedman, M. [with Friedman, R.D.] (1982) *Capitalism and Freedom*, 2nd Edition. University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Gabriel, S., Resnick, S. and Wolff, R. (2008) State Capitalism versus Communism: What Happened in the USSR and the PRC? *Critical Sociology* 34(4). [In this issue]
- Geddes, B. (2003) *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor.
- Goldfield, M. and Rothenberg, M. (1980) *The Myth of Capitalism Reborn: A Marxist Critique of Theories of Capitalist Restoration in the USSR*. Line of March Publications, for the Soviet Union Study Project: San Francisco.
- Gramsci, A. (1970 [1937]) The Modern Prince: Essays on the Science of Politics in the Modern Age. A. Gramsci *The Modern Prince and other Writings*, pp. 133–188. Translated by L. Marks. International Publishers: New York.
- Harris, L. (1991) State Monopoly Capitalism. T. Bottomore (ed.) *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, 2nd Revised Edition, pp. 515–26. Blackwell Reference: Oxford.
- Hasan, R. (2008) Reflections on the Impact upon China's Polity from the Retreat of State Capitalism. *Critical Sociology* 34(4). [In this issue]
- Haynes, M.J. (2008) Labor, Exploitation and Capitalism in Russia before and after 1991. *Critical Sociology* 34(4). [In this issue]
- Henningsen, M. (1989) Democracy: The Future of a Western Political Formation. *Alternatives* 14(3): 327–42.
- Hobson, C.Z. and Tabor, R.D. (1988) *Trotskyism and the Dilemma of Socialism*. Greenwood Press: New York.
- Isaacs, H.R. (1938) *The Tragedy of the Chinese Revolution*. Secker and Warburg: London.
- James, C.L.R. (1969) *State Capitalism and World Revolution*. Facing Reality: Detroit.
- Kahn, J. (2006) Pace and Scope of Protest Accelerated in '05. *The New York Times* 20 January 2006. URL (consulted 20 June 2006): <http://taiwansecurity.org/NYT/2006/NYT-200106.htm>.
- Katzenstein, L.C. (2003) The Emerging Coalition for Capital Reform in Japan. Mimeo, 44th Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Portland, Oregon.
- Katzenstein, L.C. (2008) State Capitalism as a Response to Global Challenges: Market Sense and the New Economics of the State. Review Essay. *Critical Sociology* 34(4). [In this issue]
- Kolakowski, L. (1978) *Main Currents of Marxism*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Kort, M. (2006) *The Soviet Colossus: History and Aftermath*, 6th Edition. Sharpe: Armonk.
- Laux, J.K. and Molot, M.A. (1998) *State Capitalism: Public Enterprise in Canada*. Cornell University Press: Ithaca.
- Leaf, M. (2002) Urban Development and the Search for Civil Society in China: A View from Quanzhou. S. Sargeson (ed.) *Collective Goods, Collective Futures in Asia*, pp. 179–96. Routledge: London and New York.
- Lenin, V. (1965 [1917]) State and Revolution. V. Lenin, *Collected Works, Volume 25*: pp. 381–532. Progress Publishers: Moscow.
- Leong, S.-T. (1976) *Sino-Soviet Diplomatic Relations 1917–1926*. University Press of Hawaii and Research Corporation of the University of Hawaii: Honolulu.
- Mao, T.T. (1977 [1953]) On State Capitalism. *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Volume 5*: 101. Foreign Languages Press, for People's Publishing House: Beijing.
- Marx, K. (1971a [1887]) *Capital, Volume 1*. Progress Publishers: Moscow.
- Marx, K. (1971b [1894]) *Capital, Volume 3*. Progress Publishers: Moscow.
- Marx, K. (1973) *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*. Translated by M. Nicolaus. Random House: New York.

- Melman, S. (1997) From Private to State Capitalism: How the Permanent War Economy Transformed the Institutions of American Capitalism. *Journal of Economic Issues* 31(2): 311–30.
- Molitor, G.T.T. (1977) How to Anticipate Public-Policy Changes. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal* 42(3):4–13.
- Nassonov, N., Fokine, N. and Albrecht, A. (1962 [1932{1927}]) The Letter from Shanghai. L. Trotsky *Problems of the Chinese Revolution*, translated by M. Schachtman, 2nd Edition, pp. 397–432. Paragon Book Gallery: New York.
- Neumann, F.L. (1944) *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism, 1933–1944*. Oxford University Press: Toronto and New York.
- Nicolaus, M. (1975) *The Restoration of Capitalism in the USSR*. Liberator Books: Chicago.
- Paige, G.D. (2002) *Nonkilling Global Political Science*. XLibris: Philadelphia.
- Pantsov, A. (2000) *The Bolsheviks and the Chinese Revolution, 1917–1927*. University of Hawai'i Press: Honolulu.
- Parthasarathy, D. (2004) Planning, Economic Liberalization, and the Fate of State Democracy: State, Capital, and Governance in India. Mimeo, 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies, San Diego, CA.
- Payne, S.G. (1995) *A History of Fascism, 1914–1945*. University of Wisconsin Press: Madison.
- Pollard, V.K. (2001) State Capitalism. J. Michie (ed.) *Reader's Guide to the Social Sciences*, pp. 1594–96. Fitzroy Dearborn: London and Chicago.
- Pollard, V.K. (2004a) State Capitalism and the Debacle of the Communist Party of the Philippines. Mimeo, 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies, San Diego, CA.
- Pollard, V.K. (2004b) *Globalization, Democratization and Asian Leadership: Power Sharing, Foreign Policy and Society in the Philippines and Japan*. Ashgate: Aldershot.
- Reed, J. (1919) *Ten Days That Shook The World*. Boni and Liveright: New York.
- Rummel, R.J. (1994) *Death by Government*. Transactions: New Brunswick.
- Saich, T. (2002) The Blind Man and the Elephant: Analysing the Local State in China. L. Tomba (ed.) *East Asian Capitalism: Conflicts, Growth and Crisis*, pp. 75–99. Feltrinelli Editore Milano: Milan.
- Schurmann, H.F. (1968) *Ideology and Organization in Communist China*. 2nd Edition, enlarged. University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Shapiro, J. (2001) *Mao's War against Nature: Politics and the Environment in Revolutionary China*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge and New York.
- Sheehan, J. (2003) Labor Organization and Representation under State Capitalism in China. Mimeo, 44th Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Portland, Oregon.
- Singer, J.D. (1961) The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations. *World Politics* 14(1): 77–92.
- South China Morning Post Staff (2005) Senior Chinese Officials Acknowledge Rising Social Unrest, But Rule Out Political Liberalization. *South China Morning Post* 4 July 2005. URL (consulted 28 May 2006): http://archive.scmp.com/login.php?prev_url=/showarticles.php
- Tabor, R.D. (2001) An Anarchist Critique of Marxism: Marx's Theory of Capital, Part II. *The Utopian* 2: 61–90. URL (consulted 1 March 2002): <http://www.utopianmag.com/archives/dec2001/marxist-critique.pdf>
- Von Böhm-Bawerk, E. (1975 [1889]) *Theory of Socialism-Communism: The Idea That All Unearned Income (Rent, Interest and Profit) Involves Economic Injustice – An Extract*. 3rd Revised Edition. Libertarian Press: South Holland.
- Wedeman, A. (2005) Challenging Hegemony: Strategic Repression and Heterodoxy in China. Mimeo, 18th Annual Conference of the Association of Chinese Political Studies, San Francisco, CA.

Wilczynski, J. (1981) State Capitalism. J. Wilczynski *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Marxism, Socialism and Communism*, pp. 566–7. MacMillan: London and Basingstoke.

For correspondence: Vincent K. Pollard, Asian Studies Program, Moore Hall 416, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Honolulu, 96822, HI, USA. Email: pollard@hawaii.edu.