

LOSING THE SIGHT OF THE WHOLE: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF
THREE SCHOOLS OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY ON
GLOBALISATION AND THE STATE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ZEYNEP NAZİKİOĞLU

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 2004

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof.Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof.Dr. Feride Acar
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assist.Prof.Dr. Galip Yalman
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist.Prof.Dr. Galip Yalman

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Tarık Şengül

Assist.Prof.Dr. Ferdan Ergut

ABSTRACT

LOSING THE SIGHT OF THE WHOLE: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THREE SCHOOLS OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY ON GLOBALISATION AND THE STATE

Nazikioğlu, Zeynep

M.Sc., Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assist.Prof.Dr. Galip Yalman

January 2004, 132 pages

Within this thesis, the dominant conceptualisations of the state/market and the national/global within international political economy are put into a critical scrutiny. It is emphasized that within most of the analyses of globalisation and the state, these conceptualisations are built in a dualist manner and that the internal relation between them is ignored. Within this context, it will be focused on three prominent approaches in contemporary international political economy literature, namely regulation approach, neo-Gramscian approach and open Marxism which scrutinise the relation between globalisation and the state.

Through an analysis of the methodological and conceptual frameworks of regulation and neo-Gramscian approaches with a particular focus on the relationship they posit between globalisation and the state, the political/

economic and the national/ global conceptualisations of these approaches will be criticised for being dualist. Such a criticism will be developed by deriving insights from open Marxist perspective which provides a relational conception of the political/economic and the global/national and, through emphasizing that globalism is inherent in capitalism and capital is a global social relation which cannot be taken as separate from labour, perceives the state and market as internally related forms of capitalist social relations of production.

Keywords: Globalisation, the state/market separation, the national/global separation, regulation approach, neo-Gramscian approach, internal relations, open Marxism.

ÖZ

BÜTÜNÜ GÖZDEN KAÇIRMAK: KÜRESELLEŞME VE DEVLET BAĞLAMINDA ÜÇ ULUSLARARASI SİYASAL İKTİSAT YAKLAŞIMININ ELEŞTİREL BİR DEĞERLENDİRMESİ

Nazikioğlu, Zeynep

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd.Doç.Dr. Galip Yalman

Ocak 2004, 131 sayfa

Bu çalışmada, uluslararası siyasal iktisada hakim olan devlet/piyasa ve ulusal/küresel kavramsallaştırmalarının eleştirel bir incelemesi yapılmaktadır. Küreselleşme ve devlet analizlerinin birçoğunda, bu kavramsallaştırmaların ikici bir şekilde kurulduğu, ve aralarındaki içsel ilişkinin göz ardı edildiği vurgulanmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, günümüz uluslararası siyasal iktisat literatüründe hakim bir konumda olan ve küreselleşme ve devlet ilişkisini irdeleyen üç yaklaşım, düzenleme yaklaşımı, yeni-Gramscigil yaklaşım ve Açık Marksizm ele alınacaktır.

Düzenleme ve yeni-Gramscigil yaklaşımlarının metodolojik ve kavramsal çerçevelerinin küreselleşme ve devlet arasında kurdukları ilişkiye de odaklanarak incelenmesiyle, söz konusu yaklaşımların devlet/piyasa ve ulusal/küresel kavramsallaştırmaları ikici olmakla eleştirilecektir. Söz konusu

eleştiri, ilişkisel bir devlet/piyasa ve ulusal/küresel kavramsallaştırmasına temel oluşturacak; ve küreselleşmenin kapitalizme içkin olduğu ve sermayenin emekten ayrı düşünölemeyecek küresel bir toplumsal ilişki olduğunun altını çizerek, devlet ve piyasayı kapitalist sosyal üretim ilişkilerinin içsel ilişkili formları olarak kavrayan Açık Marksist perspektiften çıkarımlar yapılarak geliştirilecektir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Küreselleşme, devlet/piyasa ayrımı, küresel/ulusal ayrımı, düzenleme yaklaşımı, yeni-Gramscigil yaklaşım, içsel ilişkiler, açık Marksizm.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe a special debt to Galip Yalman whose professional and personal existence in METU has made a great contribution to the route I have taken. For his valuable insights and profound support, I am truly grateful to him. I would like to express my appreciation to Tarık Şengül, whose academic challenge goes back to my undergraduate years, for his encouragement and criticisms through my graduate study. I would also like to thank Ferdan Ergut for his significant criticisms and insightful comments.

My immense appreciation is to Ebru Deniz Ozan and Asuman Göksel who made the years of my graduate study one of great pleasure and sincere academic challenge at the same time and thereby provided the setting to commit myself to my graduate study. Without them, METU would not mean what it means to me today. I am grateful to Çağan Çankırılı and Selin Özyürek for their contribution to my endless demands of library resources with great patience. I would also like to express my gratitude to İrem Aşçılı whose everlasting support and indispensable friendship for years took the form of patience and encouragement during writing this thesis.

My greatest debt is to my family, in the extended sense of the term, for their perpetual love and belief in me which made me who I am today. Nevertheless, it would be unfair not to reserve a particular gratitude to Neşe

Çankırılı for providing any kind of support in every moment of crisis of a graduate study and to Bilge and Alpay Nazikiođlu for being my closest ones through all the sequences of my life in addition to being a perfect mother and father. To all, who made this undertaking possible, this thesis is dedicated.

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date: 27.01.2004

Signature:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. REGULATION APPROACH.....	15
2.1 Methodological and Conceptual Foundations.....	16
2.2 Crisis.....	23
2.3 Applications of Regulationist Theorising.....	26
2.4 Regulationist Perspectives on State Restructuring and Globalisation: The Reformulation of State Theory.....	31
2.4.1 Hirsch: From State Derivation to an Intermediate Theorisation.....	32
2.4.2 Jessop’s Strategic Relational Analysis.....	35
2.4.3 Regulationist Analyses of Globalisation and the State.....	39
3. NEO-GRAMSCIAN IPE.....	46
3.1 Neo-Gramscian Hegemony as a Critique of Mainstream International Relations Theory.....	46
3.2 Coxian Historical Structure Approach.....	48
3.3 The Neo-Gramscian Account of Globalisation and the State	62

4. TOWARDS CATCHING THE WHOLE: A REVIEW OF RELATIONAL APPROACHES.....	73
4.1 A Relational Perspective on Social Totality.....	75
4.2 Open Marxism.....	80
4.2.1 Methodological and Conceptual Framework.....	80
4.2.2 Capitalism as a Global System of Class Domination	90
4.2.3 Open Marxism on Globalisation and the State.....	99
5. CONCLUSION.....	106
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	117

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Starting with the 1990s, globalisation has turned out to be the exhortation of all debates and analyses on contemporary social change. In the main, it is assumed that the present age is marked by the emergence of a genuinely global economy and society so that the international system of sovereign states has been rendered obsolete and the distinction between the national and international is waning. In other words, “The new reality is that the system of states is overlaid by a highly integrated, incompletely regulated, rapidly growing...global economy”¹. The contention that the power of the nation state is being eroded from above and below is the basis of the political rationale for globalisation. Within the theoretical and comparative studies of the phenomenon, the emphasis has been shifted towards different scales of political activity, so to say, sub-national, national, and supranational that flourishes as an indicator of a shift in methodology. Repercussions on the methodological studies starting from the 1990s, with an effort to conceptualise the relations between the European integration and globalisation can also be conceived as an end product of such an understanding of the new world order.

¹ Strange 1994: 212.

Discussions about the delegation of sovereignty to a higher/supranational political structure in the case of European integration can be seen as a response to the increasing pressures to reshape the economic relations between the nation states of Europe compiled in a supranational structure, hence there has been arguments within the regionalisation literature, on whether regionalisation is a stepping stone or stumbling bloc to globalisation.²

Within the globalist camp, globalisation is characterised by open markets, unrestricted flows of capital, goods and services. In other words, it is argued that a new world order will be created by the spread of the American capitalism, or what is called the new American Economy, shaped by lifting up government regulations on markets, privatisation and deregulation. With the end of the Cold War, it was believed that it was the starting point for an era of unprecedented prosperity, democracy and peace. It is asserted that the world has moved from the sharply divided international economy of the Cold War to an increasingly integrated global economy.³ In this sense, economic globalisation driven by technological innovations is characterised by an expansion of trade due to the elimination of trade barriers, a highly integrated international financial system and an enormous increase in the foreign direct investment related to the activities of multinational corporations accompanied by an inexorable logic of movement of ideas and communication. Within this

² Hettne 1999.

³ Gilpin 2000: 7.

line, globalists argue that there will be a convergence on neo-liberalism as the new global logic of capitalism has emerged.⁴

This camp broadly avers that the international economy of the 21st century will be based on market forces and argue that the integration of national markets and the export-oriented strategies in the emerging markets of the Third World evidence this point. In the same manner, seen as a technology driven development, globalisation is argued to provide an opportunity for the underdeveloped countries as far as they can catch up with technological innovations. Such objectivist perceptions of globalisation in terms of a novel, homogeneous and integrative process present it not only as a qualitative breaking point in the international system but also as an irreversible and irresistible condition on which human beings have no control, as if 'there is no alternative'. As a consequence of the demise of state regulation in economy as such, globalisation theories assert that the distinction between the national and international is waning, so national understandings of politics and economics have come to an end.

This hyper-globalist argument revolves around mainly two strands. In this regard, Ohmae argues that the nation state,

has become an unnatural, even dysfunctional unit for organising human activity and managing economic endeavour in a borderless world. It represents no genuine shared community of

⁴ Against such convergence arguments, there has emerged a wide literature on national distinctiveness, from a variety of positions. For an evaluation of historically different development of capitalism in different national settings, see Gray 1998, Coates 2000, Crouch and Streeck 1997.

economic interests; it defines no meaningful flows of economic activity.⁵

Put differently, this is the emergence of a borderless world⁶ accompanied by the process of the retreat of the state⁷ within which non-state actors such as transnational corporations and non-governmental organisations are taken to be increasingly decisive actors at the global level.⁸ The second strand presents that in addition to the undermining of the state as such, a system of international authority for the effective regulation and governance of the world economy has emerged.⁹ The arguments of the demise of the state by the globalists focus merely on the form of some current changes, ignore the socio-economic content of these developments and have severe deficiencies as their contentions are grounded on the separation between politics and economics in which states and markets are viewed as alternative mechanisms for resource allocation and on a zero-sum relationship between the national and global scales. So, globalisation is perceived as external to the nation state and the national state is perceived as resisting to it.

On the other hand, criticisms directed towards these arguments within empirical accounts maintain that the world economy is predominantly international and raise an objection questioning the transformation of the

⁵ Ohmae 1993: 78.

⁶ Ohmae 1990. See also Reich 1992.

⁷ Strange 1996.

⁸ Scholte 2000.

⁹ Keohane 1984; Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner 1999.

international to a global economy through raising doubts about the transnationalisation of production, the mobility of capital and the concomitant existence of multinational corporations. In this regard, Hirst and Thompson whose work has garnered great interest in recent years discard the emergence of a global economy above the state system on the grounds that the international economy was more open in the pre-1914 period than in the period from the 1970s onwards, that the global spread of foreign direct investment is not evenly distributed but rather concentrated on the Triad of North America, Japan and the European Economic Area and that the footloose character of the transnational corporations is highly debatable for there are only few corporations as such without the identification of a home country. Moreover, against the withering of the state arguments, it has been drawn attention to the relation between the stateness and openness of the economy.¹⁰ Based on this line of reasoning, it is contended that both a transition from the international to the global as such and the arguments of the powerless state is a myth¹¹. However, here also remains the distinction between the state and global civil society; the national and global scales are seen as mutually exclusive as far as they accept that there should be a necessary contradiction between globalisation and the sovereignty of the nation state. In their argument that states remain the core international actors and have not lost their power over the economy and international markets, an ahistorical ontological primacy is

¹⁰ Evans 1997.

¹¹ Hirst and Thompson, 1996; Weiss, 1997; Zysman 1996.

attributed to states considered to be the only international actors and all non-state actors are seen as confined to the domestic level.

Another current on the debates on globalisation, transformationalists, perceiving globalisation as a process rather than as an end product argue that though there has been a transformation towards globalisation, within which the emergence of a global economic system lays beyond the control of a single state, world is today in the midway between the international and the global and while the importance of the state has been decreased to some degree, it is still one of the crucial players in the globalising economy. So, this does not imply the end of the sovereignty of the nation state.¹² Thereby, national democratic regulation of the economy is no longer possible which necessitates a transnational democracy.¹³

Against the contention of the globalist orthodoxy presenting globalisation as an inevitable force to bring prosperity to whole world, there has been a variety of arguments drawing attention to the social dimension of this process. There emerged a wide range of studies conceding that globalisation rather creates an even more unjust global economic order. However, such criticisms obsessed with the negative repercussions of the process, do not present an analysis of the relations and structures of their enquiry in totality and fail to posit that uneven development is both the product and premise of capitalism¹⁴,

¹² Held et al. 1999.

¹³ Held 1995.

¹⁴ Smith 1984.

so to discern current changes in relation to the contradictory nature of the capital relation.

The remarkable thing about the accounts on globalisation and the state presented so far is that they are all trapped in nationalist understandings of society and economy, their various inclinations to treat either the global economy or the state as an independent variable notwithstanding. In this sense, they place a transition from the international to the global and are posited within the Great Divide in the sense that regional, global and national scales have a degree of autonomy¹⁵. This mainly stems from the lack of a theorisation between the world market and the national state. So, as regards the arguments presented above, it is important to emphasize that globalism is inherent in capitalism and thus, there has always been a territorial non-coincidence between global forces of accumulation and national states.¹⁶ In this regard, to traverse the great divide through historical materialism with an emphasis on capital as a global social relation provides a strong starting point.

The erosion of state power due to globalisation is not unique to the above mentioned hyper-globalist arguments. The analyses of neo-Gramscian and regulation approaches also portray the state as the object of the globalisation process giving way to its internationalisation due to the globalisation of civil

¹⁵ Clark 1998. For a critique of such a timeless account of territoriality, see Agnew 1994; Taylor 1994 and 1995.

¹⁶ Bromley 1996 and 1999; Bonefeld 2000.

society¹⁷ or its hollowing out due to the fall of Atlantic Fordism¹⁸. These arguments reveal that the exclusivity of globalisation and the national state characteristic of the liberal and realist approaches imposing their free market based or statist world visions without a transformative aptitude based on their ahistoric conceptions of the state and market abstracted from social relations is retained within Marxist analyses as well. On these grounds, one of the central concerns of this thesis would be an analysis of how these critical approaches conceptualise change.

Such an intention gains importance as far as it is taken into consideration that globalisation assumptions are an integral part of the new right's victorious view that after the end of the Cold War there is an "end to History"¹⁹, at the universalisation of Western liberal democracy and the freedom of capital from democratic accountability. Thereby, to put forward a methodological framework able to conceive change beyond capitalism turns out to be an indispensable, rather central, part of any understanding of globalisation. Moving from this point, it will be argued that it is wholly erroneous to counterpose globalisation to the state, as many increasingly sterile debates have done. The main reason for this false counterposition of the state and globalisation is that the debates rest on inadequate theorisations of the state due to their atomistic understanding of social phenomena. There is a danger of

¹⁷ Cox 1996c.

¹⁸ Jessop 1999a.

¹⁹ Fukuyama 1992.

reifying the state into a fixed set of institutional relations rather than a political form of social relations of capitalist production. Another intrinsic dimension for this fallacy is the lack of a theorisation of globalisation as a historical process rooted in the basic dynamics of capitalism and therefore, lack of a theorisation of the relation between the national state and the world market.²⁰ Thereby, the majority of the analyses produced have been partial and unable to grasp the problem in its totality. Put in these terms, such a consideration turns out to be to theorise capitalism as a totality, that is to say, to conceive the organic whole of social relations comprising global political economy. In this sense, it would be convenient to recall the insight underlined by Bromley that Marx's theory of capitalism "had no necessary national reference and his historical depiction of its emergence and consolidation was explicitly global in scope"²¹.

It can be seen that for all parties of the debate on globalisation, both proponents and opponents, capital is perceived as a thing that exists globally, and in the same manner global is taken to be capital free from social and political control.²² That is to say, capital is regarded in a fetishised form as a thing in itself instead of a social relationship. The conception of capital as a thing in itself indicates that it can exist independently. Contrary to such understandings, Ollman underlines Marx's view that capital is "nothing

²⁰ Boyle 1994, Bonefeld 2000.

²¹ Bromley 1999: 284.

²² Bonefeld 2000: 34.

without wage labour, value, money, price..etc.”²³ Thus, it is not a thing or factor of production, but a global social relation. Followingly, it is revealed that the relation between capital and the state cannot be grasped adequately unless labour, value, money, workers, class struggle etc., to which capital is in relation, is taken into account. Such an understanding invokes the importance of the conceptualisation of the internal and necessary relations between labour, state and capital, in order to go beyond the vague modes of argumentation on the state which is proliferated in globalisation studies.

As the main argument of the globalisation theses has been that the new global age has given way to the blurring of the boundaries between politics and economics and of that between domestic and international spheres; an analysis of these relations gain a significant importance. Against such binary understandings, it will be set forth that the state, conceived as a crucial form of capitalist society is not in a zero-sum relationship with the economy but has an internal relationship with other forms of the capitalist social relations of production. The conceptions of globalisation and the relationship between the state and globalisation they posit will be highlighted within this context. Therefore, the basic concern will be the distinction between the national and the global and that between politics and economics.

The main objective of this thesis, concerning methodological and political problems of the dominant, dualist understanding of the relation between the global and national scales, is providing a criticism of this dualism

²³ Ollman, 1993:32.

focusing on the conceptions which construct an alternative understanding of the relation between them. For such an analysis of globalisation, the central concern is not only the relation between national and global but also the relation between economics and politics. So, it will be attempted to critically review how this relationship is accounted within critical approaches to International Political Economy with an intention to conceive transformation engaged in an analysis of globalisation and the state, namely Regulation, Neo-Gramscian and Open Marxist approaches. It will be intended to put forward that neither the national and global scales nor the political and economic spheres are in a zero-sum relationship; but rather the relationship between them is internal. These arguments will be based on the analyses of the capitalist state putting emphasis on the historically specific differentiation of the economic and the political, as internally related forms of capitalist social relations of production, constantly reproduced through class struggle.

Within this framework, the second chapter focuses on Regulation Approach as an attempt to overcome the opacity posited on the part of subjects in Althusserian structuralism. After a presentation of methodological and conceptual framework of the overall approach, particular attention will be paid to their analysis of crisis and the state which occupy a central role in the relation they posit between regimes of accumulation and modes of regulation. Finally, it will be attempted to put forward their analysis of globalisation and the state, within which discussions on the fall of Fordism has a crucial position, within this framework.

The third chapter is organised around an analysis of a particular school of International Political Economy which takes a critical stance for the development of world orders with the introduction of a neo-Gramscian notion of hegemony. Within this context, the main focus will be Robert Cox's historical structure approach as an attempt to bring historical sensitivity to the study of world orders, within which Gramscian notions of historic bloc, extended state, etc. have been introduced to analysis. After presenting an overview of this framework, it will be intended to put forward the neo-Gramscian perspective on globalisation and the state in terms of the emergence of a transnational historic bloc and a concomitant internationalisation of the state.

Within the fourth chapter, it will be intended to put forward an alternative understanding as a solution to the problems of the relation between structure and contingency and the political and the economic through drawing insights from recent historical materialist accounts accentuating form analysis as the basic method of Marx. The accounts based on internal relations philosophy and Open Marxism can be considered as different strands within this context. An understanding of form can be found in the conceptualisations of forms of state within neo-Gramscian and regulationist analysis as well. However, such conceptualisations entail a totally different definition of the content of form

analysis in that they rather focus on form as species rather than form as mode of existence.²⁴

Within this framework, as far as the basic deficiency of both regulation and neo-Gramscian approaches in their conception of the relation between abstract and concrete is concerned, firstly it will be focused on the method employed so as to point out the historicity of social phenomena and their relations and thereby showing their construction by human beings. Such a reconceptualisation of phenomenal forms within their social relations and conceiving them as historical entities help avoid regarding them as natural and eternal categories and there arises a prospect for a new society and new economic and social formations.

Based on this framework, the conceptualisation of capitalism as a social totality which overcomes the base/superstructure model through understanding base as a social realm will be presented. Then, it will be intended to provide an overview of Open Marxism which perceives the relations between phenomenal forms as internal relations. The analyses which will be taken into consideration along these lines focus on the argument that the economic and the political are the fetishised forms of capitalist social relations of production. Within this perception, capital is seen as a global social relation, which can only exist in and through differentiated social forms and finds its institutional expression in the institutionally defined spheres of the political and the economic. In this sense, both the world market and the national state are seen as forms peculiar

²⁴ Bonefeld et al 1992.

to capitalist social relations of production. Such an understanding has important implications for transcending the sterile dichotomies of the state/ market and the national/ global underlying the globalisation debate and is crucial for any understanding of globalisation and the state.

CHAPTER 2

REGULATION APPROACH

The central concern for regulation approach¹ originated in the works of Aglietta and Palloix as an attempt to explore on the Golden Age of capitalism is to analyse the conditions of existence of capitalism in time and space elaborated through a critique of Althusserian structuralism. By means of such a concern, it is aimed to bring subjects back into analysis rather than treating them as merely bearers of relations of production and hence, to present a transformational analysis of social relations.² In this vein, Jessop argues that

Regulation Approach provides a retroductive account of the changing combinations of economic and extra-economic institutions, norms and practices that help to secure, if only temporarily and always in specific economic spaces, a certain stability and predictability in economic conduct and accumulation.³

As an extension of the intention to explore on regulation approach alongside this contention summarising the core of the position of regulation approach, the chapter is organised around an analysis of the following: the

¹ De Vroey notes that “it would be incorrect to regard the m as one homogenous school of thought” (De Vroey 1984: 45) and Jessop distinguishes seven different regulationist schools (1990b) and four principal directions of research within it (Jessop 1991a: 87-88).

² Lipietz 1993.

³ Jessop 2001a: 2.

epistemological and ontological assumptions of regulation approach and the overall conceptual framework, their conception of crisis, the applications of regulationist theorising and the introduction of an analysis of the state around the broad framework of regulationist analyses and the analysis of the relation between globalisation and the state within this framework.

2.1 Methodological and Conceptual Foundations

With the aim to construe the specificities of different periods of capitalism, to explore at a more concrete-complex level of analysis, Aglietta states that

concepts are never introduced once and for all at a single level of abstraction but are continually redefined in the movement from abstract to concrete-acquiring new forms and transcending the limits of their previous formulations.⁴

In this sense, it has been contended that the epistemological assumption underpinning the Approach, rejecting both subsumption and logical derivation and with an emphasis on the contingent actualisation of natural necessities, with a movement from abstract to concrete and from simple to complex is the method of articulation.⁵ That is to say, the objective should neither be the deduction of the concrete from a universal law nor the ‘verification of a finished theory’⁶ but rather the dialectical transformation of concepts through the study of the concrete. What this implies for the relation between theory and history in the study of capitalist development is that rather than being external

⁴ Aglietta 1979: 15-16, see also Lipietz 1987: 14.

⁵ Jessop 1982: 213-220; Jessop 2001a and for the problems which arise with the method of articulation see Bonefeld et al 1992a. Actually, Jessop draws attention to the affinities between regulationism and critical realism.

⁶ Aglietta 1979: 66.

to each other, “theoretical statements and evidential statements..confront and modify each other.”⁷ An inclination as such is precisely put forward in the regulationist conception of the social disposition of economy, that is to say, the denial of pure economy and is explicit in Aglietta’s assertion that economy is:

solely a methodological demarcation within the domain of social relations, one perpetually probed and shifted by the development of theoretical analysis itself. The study of capitalist regulation, therefore, cannot be a study of abstract economic laws. It is the study of the transformation of social relations as it creates new forms that are both economic and non-economic, that are organised in structures and themselves reproduce a determinate structure, the mode of production.⁸

In line with the intention to break from structuralism with an emphasis on the concrete, an independent ontological status was attributed to the social formation at a given period of time defined as “a complex structure of social relations intertwined at the economic, politico-juridical, and ideological instances presenting itself as an articulation of modes of production.”⁹ The implication of making such a contention was, in fact, not only to put forward a different understanding of theory and history and of society itself but also to locate capitalist development within a social and spatio-temporal framework.

Within such a framework, it is intended to put forward the existence of the abstract in the concrete, through the introduction of intermediate concepts seen as combining the abstract and the concrete. Put differently, it is aimed to put forward how the invariant and abstract takes on historically variant forms

⁷ Jessop 2001a: 7; see also Aglietta 1979: 20.

⁸ Aglietta 1979: 16.

⁹ Lipietz 1994: 24.

through mediating between the capitalist mode of production and the concrete social formation.¹⁰

The initial problem for the regulationists is the controversy between the capitalist tendency towards instability, crisis and change and its ability to stabilise and sustain growth and accumulation. In regulation approach, economy is not oriented toward “general equilibrium,” but rather to “phases of expansion and moderate cyclical fluctuations, followed by phases of stagnation and instability”.¹¹ Regulation is the category deployed by regulation school, to signify the conditions of reproduction of capitalism, to refer to the practices, norms and institutions supporting this limited and provisional stabilisation of the capital relation.¹² In this vein, regulation approach stresses two key concepts to distinguish between individual phases of capitalist development and variant forms of national capitalisms at a lower level of abstraction: the regime of accumulation and the mode of regulation.

In line with their aim to analyse the specificities of particular social formations on the basis of articulation of modes of production, and thereby the need to retroduce intermediate categories, the starting point for the regulationist analyses is different regimes of accumulation rather than accumulation in general because “in order to achieve a precise analysis of the forms of regulation under capitalism, it is necessary first to define an

¹⁰ See Boyer 1990: 21 and De Vroey 1984.

¹¹ Boyer 1990: 13.

¹² Jessop 1991a: 84.

intermediate concept, less abstract than the principle of accumulation so far introduced. This is the concept of the regime of accumulation.”¹³ The regime of accumulation describes a mode of division and reallocation of the social product towards a complementary pattern of production and consumption supporting a viable process of capital accumulation over long periods.¹⁴ As a social formation is contemplated in time and space, it is regarded in relation to forms of social production other than capitalism and other regimes of accumulation. Furthermore, various levels of capitalist development always exist side by side and thereby the concept of regime of accumulation is used to express the articulation of various levels of capitalist development under specific conditions of reproduction. The distinction between different regimes of accumulation as such is defined by the historically dominant form of surplus value production.¹⁵ Rejecting the asocial disposition of general equilibrium economics, regulationists accentuate the social embeddedness of the market. Given that capital itself undermines its own reproduction, the integration of accumulation cannot be secured only through economic mechanisms; rather there is always a social dimension to capital accumulation. Thereby, stable regimes of accumulation depend upon a coherent fit with a mode of regulation,

¹³ Aglietta 1979: 68; for the reproduction of intermediate concepts, see also Lipietz 1987:14.

¹⁴ Lipietz 1987: 14.

¹⁵ For a critique of this periodisation on the basis of the dominant form of surplus value production, see Brenner and Glick 1991: 58 and Clarke 1991c. For a critique of the regulationist conception of the succession of modes of development in that it entails binary histories, see Sayer 1989.

a set of regulatory mechanisms including the institutional ensemble of laws, agreements etc. as well as the cultural habits and norms that define the wage relation, the nature of competition, the management of the money system and the particular forms of state intervention in the economy securing capitalist reproduction as such.¹⁶ In other words, mode of regulation is perceived as mediations to keep the distortions created by capital accumulation in limits compatible with social cohesion, to manage the tension between “the expansive force of capital and the democratic principle.”¹⁷

Another concept of particular importance for the regulationists is the dominant industrial paradigm addressing patterns of industrial and work organisation, and includes the nature of technologies, management rules, division of tasks, industrial relations and wage relations. The articulation of a complementary regime of accumulation, mode of regulation and industrial paradigm to secure the conditions for a long wave of capitalist expansion defines the total pattern of development within an economy and is perceived as forming the historically concrete modes of development of capitalist societies. The articulation of a mode of regulation and regime of accumulation is determined by the specific social and spatio-temporal settings within which they are constructed. However, such an articulation is not an absolute solution to the problems of capitalism; rather the mode of regulation is a temporary

¹⁶ Boyer 1990: 37-48; Jessop 2001a:4; Harvey 1989: 122.

¹⁷ Aglietta 1998: 53.

mobilisation of political resources against the tendential laws of capitalism and hence, it only mitigates not eliminates conflicts.

In regulationist analyses, how accumulation takes place cannot be deduced from the logic of capitalism, rather it is subject to change within specific modes of development. In this sense, by denying any objective developmental logic of capital whilst arguing that the emergence of a new mode of development depends on class struggle, the separation between structure and struggle is retained.¹⁸

Even though Lipietz sees the emergence of modes of regulation as chance discoveries whereas Aglietta underlines the improbability of continued, sustained accumulation¹⁹, in regulation theory, the emergence of a mode of regulation corresponding to a regime of accumulation is conceived as a functional necessity for the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production. In other words, even though it is denied that a specific mode of regulation is determined by a particular accumulation regime through the presumption that each mode of regulation passes on its own distinctive structure and dynamic to the circuit of capital and that the genesis of specific modes of regulation is always historically contingent, the relation between the mode of regulation and the regime of accumulation can only be conceived through positing a functional integration between them.²⁰ In this manner, even though

¹⁸ Psychopedis 1991: 191.

¹⁹ Lipietz 1987: 20; Aglietta 1979; see also Jessop 2001a: f.n.12.

²⁰ Clarke 1991c; Bonefeld 1991 and 1992.

reproduction of the system is not taken as a warranty, the structural determinist notion that the structural forms and institutional mechanisms defuse the reproduction of the economic base is retained in regulation approach.²¹ Put differently, albeit the emergence of a fitting mode of regulation is not seen as a necessity, the historical element is brought through the regulation of an objective condition whose emergence is taken for granted. The regulationist conception of social embeddedness in that the reproduction of both capital and labour requires non-market mechanisms is reminiscent of institutional economics²², rather than a critical political economy of capitalism²³, through the social production of regimes of accumulation by modes of regulation. To presume any kind of a causal relation between them as the latter reproducing the economic base implies an external relation between the political and the economic and thereby fragments the elements in the relational whole. Moreover, positing that economic growth is only possible within a particular institutional regulatory framework provides neither an understanding of the reasons for the failure of competitive process nor the ways for its replacement by another form. As will be presented below, such functionalist tendencies in regulationist theorising was intended to be overcome with a greater emphasis

²¹ Bonefeld 1992: 97; Psychopedis 1991.

²² Such an affinity with institutionalism can mainly be drawn along Polanyi in his conception of the social embeddedness of the market implying the interaction between two institutionally distinct spheres of economic and extra-economic in his analysis of the market society as an artifice enforced by the state (Polanyi 1944). Such an influence is made explicit by Jessop (2000).

²³ Instead, as Clarke argues, regulationists put forward a sociological critique of the liberal theory of the market (Clarke 1990 and 1991c). See also Norton 1992 and Tickell and Peck 1992.

on class struggle by Hirsch and Jessop through the introduction of an analysis of the state within regulationist framework.

2.2 Crisis

As mentioned above, the starting point for regulationist analyses is the inherently contradictory nature of the capital relation. Hence, for an analysis of capitalist development, crisis is regarded as an essential basis and perceived as a mode of existence of capitalism. Given the different strands within regulationist theorising, there is also a differentiation in the conceptions of crisis in terms of the relation posited between general laws of motion and historical variants.²⁴ However, the common theme within all is that it is perceived as a crisis of dysfunctionality between the regime of accumulation and mode of regulation. In this vein, Lipietz contends that a crisis means that “the mode of regulation is not adequate to the regime of accumulation” or “the potential of the regime of accumulation has been exhausted given the prevailing mode of regulation”.²⁵ Within the regulationist conception, overaccumulation due to decrease in labour productivity is the main reason for crisis giving way to the tendency of the rate of profit to fall.

Alongside the regulationist emphasis on the ways in which the stability of the conditions of reproduction of capitalism is secured, the main focus is on

²⁴ Especially, it can be distinguished between the value-theoretical approach of Aglietta and Lipietz and the price-theoretical approach of Boyer. On these grounds, whilst the former focuses on general laws of motion unfolding in historically variant forms, Boyer rejects any general law and instead focuses on historical laws as such.

²⁵ Lipietz 1987: 34; see also De Vroey 1984.

how crisis tendencies vary from a mode of development to another. Aglietta's presentation of the crisis is a disproportionality theory of crisis between different branches of the economy namely that producing the means of production (Department I) and that producing the means of consumption (Department II).²⁶ What this implies is that the tendency to the overaccumulation of capital in Department I gives way to a disproportion between the two unless Department II absorbs more means of production and transforms them into capital invested in Department I. This entails that the barrier to accumulation in Department I is the labour process. This problem of disproportionality arises a two dimensional conception of the wage relation in terms of both a cost to production and a source of demand which requires a mode of regulation of the norms of production and consumption. Put in these terms, then, the source of crisis is located in the disproportionality between branches of production to the neglect of the social form of capitalist production itself, that is to say, to the uneven development of the forces of production within branches of production.²⁷ Thereby, the institutional forms of modes of regulation is seen as securing a proper balance between different departments of production so that the circuit of capital is stabilised and thereby is said to define different regimes of accumulation whose crisis is of a

²⁶ Clarke 1991c: 123; Callinicos 2001: 233.

²⁷ Clarke 1991c. Regulationist analysis were also criticised for falling to the Keynesian fallacy seeing overaccumulation and underconsumption as two sides of the same coin. (Clarke 1991: Callinicos 2001).

disproportionality.²⁸ Yet, that modes of regulation are not neutral mechanisms but reflect the changing balance of forces in a struggle for class domination is abandoned. Thereby, to the extent that a mode of regulation is not seen as institutional forms of class struggle, it would not be possible to depict its crisis as one in the forms of capitalist domination.²⁹ In this manner, for regulationists, in each period of expansion and growth, capitalist relations present different structural characteristics with their own internal contradictions leading to crises.³⁰ Therefore, the specific form of the crisis is determined by the regime of accumulation in question rather than the outcome of class struggle. Put succinctly, the presence of labour in the accumulation process is obscured.³¹

On the same grounds, from the view point of those engaged in introducing a theory of the state to regulationist analysis, any theory of the state should be based on crisis theory to reflect on the changes in historically distinct forms of state corresponding to specific accumulation regimes. As follows, Hirsch bases his diagnosis of the present crisis in his critique of a variety of approaches setting the political institutional relations at the centre of their explanation of crisis.³² Another point of departure was placed against the

²⁸ Actually, as Dunford asserts the emphasis is on the transformations within capitalism rather than its crises (Dunford 1990:300).

²⁹ Clarke 1991c: 127-128; Bonefeld 1991.

³⁰ There can be depicted to two variants to this argument as Aglietta and Lipietz puts emphasis on the historically variant forms of the unfolding of the general laws of motion whilst Boyer emphasizes only the historical forms to the neglect of general laws of motion.

³¹ Clarke 1991c; see also Clarke 1990.

³² Hirsch 1991.

mechanical and reductionist explanations of traditional crisis theories and hence, not only economic but also political and ideological factors are taken into account as relatively autonomous ones that influence crises of society. In this vein, within the terminology of the regulationist state theorists, if the historic bloc fails to mobilise the sufficient countertendencies, it is in crisis. However, since the countertendencies are divorced from their dialectical unity with the tendency of the rate of profit to fall, the political appears as an averting party rather than as a participant in the emergence of crisis.³³ Thereby, the general weakness of regulationist crisis theory, the emphasis on macroeconomic factors in periods of stability whereas in times of crisis, attribution of some degree of autonomy to political factors is not overcome.

2.3 Applications of Regulationist Theorising

Due to the regulationist tendency to study each national reality one by one, the intermediate categories of regulationists are deployed to emphasize national specificities as a result of class forces in specific national conjunctures. Within such an analysis, development of capitalism in a national formation is perceived as the result of inner class struggles giving way to the emergence of regimes of accumulation through the modes of regulation supported by the state. The relations with the external come to the fore as these national models of development and regimes of accumulation are in contact with each other. Hence, the modes of insertion of this formation to the world economy are

³³ Kenny 1999: 42.

considered as secondary to a development as such.³⁴ In this sense, globalisation is perceived within a context in which internal elements and inner struggles are accorded primacy. On these grounds, Lipietz claims that the central concern is to ‘study each national formation in its own right, using the weapons of history, statistics and even econometrics to identify its successive regimes of accumulation and modes of regulation’³⁵ for an analysis of the extent of the impact of external factors. As a result, the main emphasis is on national specificities, while the international level is only of secondary importance and so, it is difficult to integrate the relation between the global and national into analysis.³⁶ The international level is appended through the generalisation of the hegemon’s regime of accumulation. Along these lines, the post-war world order is named as Global Fordism.³⁷

Regulation Approach was mainly developed to explain the hegemony of the United States in terms of internal structures, the alleged successful mode of regulation, through definition of an ideal type named Fordism³⁸, within an

³⁴ Lipietz 1987:19.

³⁵ Lipietz 1987: 20; see also Aglietta 1979: 28-29.

³⁶ This can be taken as Lipietz’s refusal of Wallerstein’s overemphasis on the world system (1987: 19), with an ignorance of the units within it. Given ‘the pessimistic functionalism of world systems theory’ (Callinicos 2001: 234), international dominance in regulation approach is taken in terms of internal structures. See also Hirsch 2000:106. However, regulationist conception of the world system as an aggregation of national systems does not overcome the Wallersteinian fallacy to theorise the link between the two.

³⁷ Lipietz 1982.

³⁸ Regulationist analysis uses ideal types to account for actual positions. (Jessop 1990a; Aglietta 1979) For a critique of ideal type theorising as such, see Gunn 1991. For a detailed critique of Fordism, see Clarke 1990 and Gambino 1996.

analysis in which reproduction of capitalism is problematised differently. As part of an understanding viewing the post-war boom as a qualitatively different phase of accumulation, the period starting with 1970s is conceived as a transition from an old order to a new one with a transformed structure of capitalist reproduction. Regulation theorists describe the post-war boom as a change from the regime of extensive accumulation shaped by the production of absolute surplus value, that is to say, depending upon a relatively unchanging labour process and technological environment, towards an age of intensive regime of accumulation. Within the ideal typical account of Fordism in regulationist analyses, the Golden Age of capitalism is defined by the production of relative surplus value with monopolistic regulation of the economy. The Fordist regime of accumulation is shaped by the expansion of the consumption good industries which led to an expansion of capital goods industries and centred around inner demand led growth that is mass production of homogeneous products, using assembly line technology with Taylorist principles of labour organisation for mass consumption. Within the Fordist model of development, increased productivity is achieved through economies of scale and the deskilling, intensification and homogenization of labour. So, such a regime of accumulation required a mode of regulation of the wage relation through rising wages and social expenditure for mass consumption. The rise in wages through a system of collective bargaining with a prominent role of bureaucratic trade unions grew parallel to the productivity increases. Homogeneous consumption patterns reflect the homogenization of production

and provide a market for standardised commodities, while rising wages provide growing demand to match the growing supply. As an implication of the necessity for a regime of accumulation to be regulated, the need to sustain and balance expanding consumption to expanding production was undertaken by the state conceived in functionalist terms as a vehicle for social cohesion.³⁹ The balance between supply and demand is achieved through Keynesian macroeconomic policies, while the overall balance between wages and profits is achieved through a collective bargaining supervised by the state. This regulation to support rising living standards fortifying the increase in consumption levels was provided by the welfare state in the form of Keynesian demand management, productivity linked increases in real wages, welfare state provisions ... etc. The unification of these factors in the 1950s is argued to define a stage of rising living standards and rising productivity, rising wages and rising profits, economic stability and social harmony. As the spatio-temporal fix of Fordism was organised around the national state⁴⁰, Fordism was delineated as a mere juxtaposition of national regimes.

This world configuration matured under the auspices of the United States, as Pax Americana temporarily coordinated ‘a juxtaposition of similar regimes of accumulation with different growth rates..which were inserted into the international framework in different ways’.⁴¹ Through its spread as global

³⁹ Aglietta

⁴⁰ Aglietta 1979: 28-29 and Lipietz 1987: 19-20.

⁴¹ Lipietz 1987: 40.

Fordism, and generalisation to other locations in the world economy, the Fordist regime of accumulation is argued to shape the post-war economic growth the international regulation of which was maintained by the US hegemony⁴² and the acceptance of the US dollar as international currency under the Bretton Woods system. In this sense, the crisis of the 1970s was a crisis of Global Fordism due to the collapse of the Bretton Woods system and the fall of the US hegemony is seen as an important factor in the crisis of Fordism.⁴³ The common understanding of the crisis that stems from regulation approach is initiated by a crisis in the organisation of labour due to the social and technical limits of Fordism, namely the weaknesses of Taylorism and the increasing cost of mechanisation. These factors, then led to a decreasing rate of growth in productivity initiating overaccumulation of capital which gave way to a fall in the rate of profit. Moreover, the globalisation of the economy with the extension of mass production, made it harder to regulate the national economies. Thereby, the rigidity of wage contracts started to appear as a barrier. Following the crisis of Fordism as such, there emerges a transition to post-Fordism based on a flexible regime of accumulation. The new restructuration will take pace in the axis of the flexibility of labour markets and labour process against the rigidities of Fordism.⁴⁴

⁴² For a critique of adopting the breaking point of *Pax Americana* as such, see Burnham 1990: 4.

⁴³ Harvey 1990.

⁴⁴ As an implication of the central role given to the labour process, regulation approach has also been criticised for its technological determinism (Holloway and Palaez 1991).

2.4 Regulationist Perspectives on State Restructuring and Globalisation: The Reformulation of State Theory

Through the systematic discussion of the state within regulation school, the functionalist elements in regulationist analyses were expected to be overcome with a greater emphasis on class agency, with the introduction of a Gramscian analysis of hegemony, even though such an emphasis was present in the works of Aglietta and Lipietz as well in that the emergence of a mode of regulation is the outcome of struggles stabilised to form a hegemonic system that is class alliances based on consensus armoured by coercion shaping the interests of both the ruling and dominated classes into conformity with the accumulation regime.⁴⁵

The significance of regulationist analyses for a discussion of the state has been developed along two lines, by Hirsch and Roth and by Jessop in which a more concrete analysis of the state is presented through intermediate concepts. The historical transformation of state forms and state functions are analysed with reference to the regime of accumulation in question. Within this framework, Jessop highlighted the historically contingent outcome of the dialectic between structure and struggle and concerned with modes of regulation whereas Hirsch insisted on the law determinate development of capitalism in relation to class struggle and on the centrality of the particularisation of the state⁴⁶.

⁴⁵ Lipietz 1987:20.

⁴⁶ Bonefeld 1991.

2.4.1 Hirsch: from state derivation to an intermediate theorisation

Hirsch, one of the leading figures in the state derivation debate of 1970s⁴⁷, attempts to historicise his theory of the state by adopting regulation approach so as to figure out the interrelation of the laws of capitalist development and class struggle. In his earlier accounts, Hirsch argues that the form of bourgeois state should be derived from the abstraction of relations of force from the immediate process of production.⁴⁸ As far as the state is theorised through an analysis of the basic structure of the capitalist society, with an emphasis on its class nature from the very beginning, it is defined not just an instrument of class rule, but ‘as the expression of a specific historical form of class rule’⁴⁹, form of the social relations of exploitation not simply bearer of particular social functions. In the same manner, he contends that the structural relation of the state to society reproduces the contradictions of society in the state apparatuses and that the continued existence of the state is determined by the reproduction of capital accumulation. So, the development of the state is derived from the rate of profit to fall as the dynamic behind the capital accumulation process and from the need to develop counter-tendencies

⁴⁷ The state derivation debate also comprises the basis of Open Marxist accounts to be presented in the next chapter. Hirsch’s later works can be seen as a break from this tradition, even though his initial attempt in historical derivation was to emphasize the development of class relations and class struggle against the logical derivation of the state. However, as will be presented Open Marxist analysis provides an insightful ground to resolve the tension between logical and historical derivation as such. In this sense, there can be depicted two traditions taking their cue from this debate (Bonefeld and Holloway 1991; Clarke 1991a). For a collection of the essays within the framework of this debate, see Holloway and Picciotto 1978.

⁴⁸ Hirsch 1978: 62.

⁴⁹ Hirsch 1978: 63.

against it. Hence, in Hirsch's analysis, the limits to the state is seen as external, determined by the tendency of the rate of profit to fall, while explaining the state form either as a logical response to the needs of capital or as the historical result of past struggles.

In Hirsch's account, the state not only appears as endowed with an autonomy for its self-reproduction, rather than as a fetishised form of appearance of capitalist social relations of production emerging out of the struggles over its reproduction but also its separation from the civil society becomes an essential feature of capitalism.⁵⁰ The development of the relationship between the state and civil society was then determined primarily by the tendency for the rate of profit to fall and the available countertendencies. However, the separation of the economic and the political cannot be comprehended as an inherent structural feature of capitalism but is both the object and the result of class struggle.⁵¹ In this sense, in Hirsch's analysis, the role of class struggle is restrained within and subordinate to the structure and to the integrative functions of the state.⁵²

In his articulation of the materialist state theory and regulationism, different from his attempt in 1970s with an emphasis on the necessity of deriving the form of the state, Hirsch concentrates on forms of the state so as to

⁵⁰ Hirsch 1978: 65; Clarke 1991a: 9 (fn. 8) and 44.

⁵¹ On the separation of the state from its unity with society as a constant process of class struggle, see Holloway 1995: 121; Holloway 1991a and Clarke 1991a: 42.

⁵² Bonefeld 1991.

conceive the historically variable concrete institutional forms of the state.⁵³ Along these lines, following the regulationist contention of the crisis of capitalism in 1970s as a shift in the regime of accumulation requiring a shift in the mode of regulation, Hirsch argued for a change in the state form through the statification of the Fordist state to a post-Fordist state with a distinct form of labour subordination and capital organisation. As a consequence of the development of Fordist regime of accumulation and with the breakdown of the means of capitalist domination, the state is argued to undertake the functions of capital and the social disintegration caused by the crisis of accumulation is remedied through the penetration of the state to civil society. Thereby, new forms of conflict arose due to the new form of capitalist exploitation manifest themselves along the state. Hirsch conceptualises such a statification in the 1970s and 80s as the Fordist security state oriented toward a coherent social and economic development within national boundaries, whereas the political configurations particular to post-Fordism is conceived as the emergence or “the self transformation of states to competitive states”⁵⁴, which points out a decrease in their capacity for economic and social intervention with a shift in emphasis to the mobilisation of productive forces for international competition.⁵⁵

⁵³ Hirsch 2000.

⁵⁴ Hirsch 2003: 3; see also Hirsch 1995.

⁵⁵ Hirsch 2000: 113.

However, in his attempt to bring a historical dimension to his analysis, Hirsch takes many of the concepts of Poulantzas and reverts into structuralism revealed in his conception of the post-Fordist era as an inevitable outcome of the objective laws of capitalism: “it is always capital itself and the structures which it imposes ‘objectively’, on the backs of the protagonists, that sets in motion the decisive conditions of class struggles and of processes of crisis”⁵⁶ The Poulantzian influence according primacy to the state external to the capital relation and the incessant class struggles around that relation, has given way to a politicist analysis deriving from the reification of the various fetishised institutional forms of capitalism and leading to voluntarism in theory and practice.⁵⁷ That is to say, the definition of the particularisation of the state “as an historical act which, once accomplished, could be regarded as complete” neglects the determining role of the capital relation and fails to see that the separation of the economic and the political is reproduced through class struggle and that they actually comprise a dialectical separation-in-unity rather than two distinct institutional spheres.⁵⁸

2.4.2 Jessop’s Strategic-relational analysis

The other line of discussion of the state within regulation approach is the strategic-relational analysis of Jessop. Following Poulantzas, he defines the

⁵⁶ Quoted in Gambino 1996:12.

⁵⁷ Bonefeld 1991; see also Clarke 1977 and 1991a. Actually this is seen as the fortification of the above mentioned politicist elements in his derivation of the state (Holloway 1991b; Bonefeld 1991).

⁵⁸ See Holloway 1991; Bonefeld 1991.

state as a social relation whose power is both relational, historically contingent, and selective, favouring class struggle. Criticising Poulantzas on his argument on state's selectivity, he argues that no general argument on state power can be made. As an implication of the intention to evade the primacy of both class and capital, he accepts that it is a social relation and maintains that it remains both structurally and strategically selective. Jessop contends that:

state power is capitalist to the extent that it creates, maintains and restores the conditions necessary for capital accumulation in a given situation. It is non-capitalist to the extent that these conditions are not realised. This view radically displaces our theoretical focus from the search for guarantees that the state apparatus and its functions are necessarily capitalist in all aspects to a concern with the many and contingent effects of state power on accumulation in specific conjunctures⁵⁹

In order to overcome the taken for granted status of the emergence of a regime of accumulation, the emphasis is put on alternative logics of capital⁶⁰ and thereby, to underline the alternative paths of accumulation to be pursued together with different hegemonic projects for various regimes of accumulation, it was developed an account of accumulation strategies by developing analogies between Gramsci's account of the integral state and the integral economy. So, combining Gramsci's definition of the state in its inclusive sense⁶¹ as political society plus civil society and conception of state

⁵⁹ Jessop 1990: 354. Actually, this contention can be seen as the hallmark of Jessop's analysis on the political and the economic in the sense that the state may be dissociates from the whole.

⁶⁰ Jessop 1990a:198 and 1990b: 187

⁶¹ Integral state is also defined as "an ensemble of socially embedded, socially regularized, and strategically selected, institutions, organizations, social forces, and

power as based on hegemony armoured by coercion with regulationist accounts, it is meant to interpret the economy in its inclusive sense as comprising an accumulation regime, social mode of economic regulation and capital accumulation as involving the self-valorisation of capital in and through regulation.⁶² Along with the integration of a hegemonic project in a hegemonic bloc to determine the dominant accumulation strategy, the correspondence between a regime of accumulation and a mode of regulation is conceptualised as a historic bloc.⁶³ Historic bloc is understood in terms of

the path-dependent structural coupling of two operationally autonomous but substantively interdependent subsystems, the path-shaping efforts of economic and political forces to influence (or govern) the nature and direction of this co-evolution, and the ecological dominance of the market-mediated, self-valorising capitalist economy.⁶⁴

It is maintained that any unity of the state depends on the relationship between accumulation strategies, state forms and hegemonic projects. This does not mean the denial of state autonomy but rather that, as an implication of its conception as a social relation, its power derives from the particular political structures and strategies both shaping and being shaped by the state. For the capitalist state form, policy is taken around hegemonic projects with crucial links to the regime of accumulation. In this manner, such an emphasis on

activities around..making collectively binding decisions for an imagined political community.”(Jessop 1999a: 1).

⁶² Jessop 1997; Hirsch 1991; cf. Psychopedis 1991.

⁶³ Jessop 1990b: 179; Jessop 1997.

⁶⁴ Jessop 2001b: 6

structural coupling for the mode of articulation of the political and the economic systems forming the historically concrete modes of development of capitalist societies through the hegemonic projects of capital raises problems in terms of the unity of the social as the concepts of hegemonic projects and accumulation strategies implies that the social is comprised of distinct parts without a unity until they are coordinated into a strategy.⁶⁵

Within the overall reformulation debate, the historical content of structure is perceived as the result of class struggles; however struggle as such is not that of capital and labour but of different fractions of capital.⁶⁶ This is explicit in Hirsch's notice that:

the concept of strategy must not be misunderstood as implying a theory of agency: the implementation of an accumulation and hegemonic structure is always the result of structurally determined and contradictory class and group action, and thus a process without a subject."⁶⁷

In this regard, Clarke maintains that the Poulantzasian interest in the relative power of different fractions of capital in the power bloc tended towards instrumentalism and voluntarism and ignored the underlying objective, contradictory dynamic of capital accumulation.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ Bonefeld 1991: 46. See also Bonefeld 1992: 95-98.

⁶⁶ Psychopedis 1991; Bonefeld 1991 and 1992; see also Clarke 1991a.

⁶⁷ Hirsch 1991: 13.

⁶⁸ Clarke 1977 and 1982a; see also Holloway and Picciotto 1978 and Burnham 1990: 180-183.

2.4.3 Regulationist Analyses of Globalisation and the State

Within this theoretical framework, it is contended that the emergent post-Fordist regime or in Jessop's terminology the Schumpeterian Workfare Post-national Regime should be taken into consideration as a consequence of the economic crisis in Fordism and of a political one in the Fordist mode of regulation and Fordist mass society giving way to the restructuring of both the state's economic activities and instruments through the global neo-liberal project, the significant features of which is denationalisation, destatization or privatisation, and internationalisation.⁶⁹ The accumulation strategy taken up in this project is based on privatisation, liberalisation, de-regulation, the introduction of market proxies and benchmarking in the public sector, tax cuts, and internationalisation. In this new regime, different from the demand management of the welfare state, the state intervention started to take place on the supply-side to promote permanent innovation and flexibility and to strengthen competitiveness, rather than full employment, in relevant economic spaces. This means that, in terms of social reproduction, social policy to enhance welfare rights at the national scale is subordinated to labour market flexibility and competitiveness based on cost-saving concerns. The economic sphere is redefined and socioeconomic fields are subordinated to the economic ones as labour has started to be perceived as a cost of production rather than a source of demand and as the circulation of money as an international currency gained prominence over national. In this sense, the change in the perception of

⁶⁹ Jessop 1999a: 3; Hirsch 2003.

competitiveness with the accelerating importance of transnational economic relations is argued to transform the boundaries between the economic and the political. That is to say, given the denationalisation of economy, national states start to compete with each other to increase the existence of global capital within their territories and turn out to be competition states⁷⁰. Comprehending Fordism as an “apogee of the nation state”⁷¹, Jessop interprets these developments as leading to the relativisation of scale, in other words the shift to a post-national one in which no scale is dominant, however with an implication that the national one lost its taken-for granted supremacy in determining the economic and social functions of the extra-economic. This is interpreted as the hollowing out or denationalisation of the state⁷² through the transfer of state capacities to supra and subnational bodies, in other words re-territorialisation at regional, local and global scales⁷³. Moreover, apart from this spatial diffusion, the growing influence of networked, partnership-based economic, political and social governance as an alternative to the centrality of government which is conceptualised as the destatization of politics, in other words, as a movement from government to governance is underscored.

⁷⁰ Hirsch 1997 and 2003; Cerny 1990.

⁷¹ Jessop 1999a: 4. See also Jessop 2000.

⁷² Jessop 1999a: 8; see also Brenner 1998a; a similar understanding of re-scaling is Cerny’s whipsaw effect (1995: 618).

⁷³ Brenner 1999. Actually, these re-scaling arguments reveals the functionalism inherent in regulationism as exposed in Brenner’s suggestion that “the current wave of state re-scaling can be interpreted as a strategy of political restructuring that aims to enhance the locationally specific productive forces of each level of state organization” (1998b: 66)

The analysis of Fordism within which the working class has been seen as integrated within the Fordist security state by means of trade unions and social democratic parties leads to the assumption that class struggle has started to be undertaken by the marginalised and new social movements. The political implications of such an analysis based on the separation of the economic and the political as such is that since the mid 1970s we are faced with a new reality imposed by the capital on the state taking these changes as given rather than as an object of class struggle.

Building upon this elaboration, it can be contended that regulationist theorising exaggerates the discontinuities within their model of successive phases of structural integration and disintegration⁷⁴ and thereby, overestimates the global/national divide, in other words, the primacy of the national state as the spatio-temporal matrix of capital accumulation in the Fordist period and the novelty of the current process. The starting point for regulationist analyses is national formations, and the emergence of similar socioeconomic changes in different countries in nationally defined concepts of Fordism and post-Fordism with a sensitivity to their variations leaving aside theorising the unity on which these analyses are based.⁷⁵ That is to say, an analysis as such is based on a conception of the relation between national states as external which rather than positing the national state within the global social relations of production. Moreover, derivation of the Post-Fordist state form from the needs of the

⁷⁴ Callinicos 2001: 236; Burnham 2000: 12.

⁷⁵ Holloway 1995: 118 and Clarke 1991c.

accumulation regime, that is to say the interest in the role the state plays in managing the crisis, falls back on determinism. Even though functionalism, reductionism and economic determinism have been rejected by all regulationists, the conception of the state within the literature focuses on the restructuring of the state as a response to the shifts in the global economy. The formulation of a shift from a Fordist to a post-Fordist regulation implies that the state will be restructured to ensure accumulation in the new phase of global economy. In this manner, the analysis of the relation between globalisation and the state turns out to be that international competition due to globalisation caused a shift in state policies.

The account of the state within the overall reformulation literature puts emphasis on the imperatives of global economic restructuring. Likewise, alongside the opacity posited on the part of both labour and the state during present social changes through the emphasis on different accumulation strategies of capital, class struggle is theorised as external to the route of change. The conclusion that the boundaries between the economic and the political are redefined in favour of the former is a reflection of an external understanding between the two, obscuring the class content within such a restructuring. Such a transition from Keynesian welfare state to a Schumpeterian workfare state or a competition state is posited due to the above mentioned lack of a theorisation of the relation between capital and the state and between world market and the national state, which brings to the fore an external relation between the political and the economic and the national and

the global. Taken in these terms, it cannot be pointed out that institutional restructuring was a form of class struggle, of which both the state and labour were integral parts, implying a restitution of control over the labour process within the crisis of capitalism, that is to say, a shift from a politicised to a de-politicised form of regulation rather than a change in the regime of accumulation.

It becomes conspicuous that in Regulation School development of capitalism is shaped by the evolution of structures that is not dialectically related to general categories and antagonisms, in other words, entails a one sided understanding of structure and agency. The percipience of world economy as an aggregation of national capitalisms alleviates an understanding of nationally specific institutional settings, however obscures a perspicacity of the tendencies and structure of capitalism. It is in this sense that Brenner and Glick conclude that:

the general weakness of Regulation Theory, paradoxical though this may seem, is its failure to take adequately into account the broader system of capitalist social-property relations that form the backdrop to their succession of institutionally defined phases.⁷⁶

Even though the general framework of regulation approach has an aspiration to emphasize class struggle and historical processes, as shown above, in their analyses they are overseen. This mainly stems from a compartmentalisation of

⁷⁶ Brenner and Glick 1991: 105; likewise, Gambino states in his critique of regulationism that “the centre of gravity of its interests lays in the analysis not so much of the social relations of production, but rather of the economic/state institutions which oversee them” (Gambino 1996: 3).

the social object into distinct regions within the line of argumentation taking the structure in technical and economical terms to the neglect of their being the forms of the very same class relations and thereby placing a dividing line between structure and agency.

As far as the historically concrete political and social content of regime of accumulation which is considered as “a pre-social economic realm”⁷⁷ is given through its interaction with superstructural forms, be they historic bloc or mode of regulation, it is not possible to put forward the essential link between structure and historical specificity.⁷⁸ With an emphasis on mode of development as such, then, it may be argued that structuralist analyses were transcended by regulation approach without posing an economic argument. However, the ability to account for change is limited as far as the analysis is confined within a dichotomy between structure and contingency. In the same manner, as far as the methodological movement is seen from abstract to concrete, from simple to complex, through the use of intermediate categories, it is fallen to the fallacy of the mystification of abstraction.⁷⁹ Put differently, to mediate between the concrete analysis of the social formation or mode of development and the capitalist mode of production, to bring historical specificity with the introduction

⁷⁷ Boyle 1994: 352.

⁷⁸ See Clarke 1992: 149 and Bonefeld et.al. 1992a.

⁷⁹ Sayer 1987.

of intermediate categories as such⁸⁰ cannot point out a solution to structuralism and contingency but instead gives way to a cleavage between functionalist and voluntarist explanations of the model of development in question.⁸¹

⁸⁰ For a critique of intermediate concept formation for entailing a theory/practice split, see Gunn 1991: 202-204.

⁸¹ Bonefeld 1992: 97; Psychopedis 1991: 190-191. For a critique of stadial approaches to capitalism as such, see Clarke 1992.

CHAPTER 3

NEO-GRAMSCIAN APPROACH¹

3.1 Neo-Gramscian Hegemony as a Critique of Mainstream International Relations Theory

Over the last two decades, as an implication of the attempts to introduce a new theoretical inquiry into the study of world orders as an ontological and epistemological critique of the state-centrism of conventional approaches in International Relations theory, an alternative approach has gained prominence inspired by the works of Antonio Gramsci. According to Gill and Law, alongside the extension of Gramscian concepts at the international level, a new ontology has been developed with its basic unit of analysis being global political economy. What this concept implies is “..an integrated system of knowledge, production and exchange, and includes the dialectical relations between capitalist systems and states-ecological, ethical, and other aspects of the whole.”²

For Gill and Law, such an ontological shift arises from the way the world order is conceived, which has been taken in a different manner within the

¹ The neo-Gramscian understanding of the international system has also been referred to as transnational historical materialism (Burnham 1990; Gill and Law 1998) and as the Italian School (Gill 1993a).

² Gill 1994: 73.

realist camp. Firstly, by the realist ‘theory of hegemonic stability’ assuming that the presence of a single, strongly preponderant actor, the hegemonic state, in international politics is sufficient for cooperation in the anarchical world system³ and secondly, by the liberal institutionalist theory of ‘after hegemony’ still based on realist premises maintaining that even though anarchy constrains cooperation, the institutional structure of such a cooperation would be sustained after the decline of the hegemonic power of the leader state, in the sense that the reproduction of the world order is undertaken by international institutions.⁴ However, such statist paradigms are criticised for their deficiencies in terms of their ahistorical and abstract conceptions of the state. Given the disenchantment with the underestimation of economic and ideological processes within such paradigms reducing hegemony to a uni-directional dominance, another approach was introduced to International Political Economy grounded in the Gramscian understanding of hegemony different from that of the realist perception in the sense that the meaning of politics is broadened beyond the immediate struggle for control of the means of coercion, taking into consideration, the activities of organising consent on the part of the dominated and the ideological mechanisms within the reproduction of consent as such. This non-structuralist historicism⁵ is argued to provide a framework to overcome the limitations of statist approaches.

³ Kindleberger 1981; Gilpin 1973 and 1987.

⁴ Keohane 1984; Keohane and Nye 1996.

⁵ Gill 1993b: 55.

For an analysis of this neo-Gramscian approach, within this framework, it will be focused on Cox's critical theory based on his historical structure approach organised around the concepts of historic bloc and hegemony and then a review of the neo-Gramscian analyses of global relations in the late twentieth century which focus on the internationalisation of the state as the reorganisation of the relation between the state and civil society⁶ based on the global aspects of hegemony, the formation of transnational class and bloc formations will be presented.

3.2 Coxian Historical Structure Approach

In developing a critical approach in International Political Economy problematising social transformation with the introduction of the Gramscian concept of hegemony to international studies, the pioneering works of Robert Cox with the objective of an analysis of the social forces in the making of history is of great significance.⁷ The integration of two aims of a theory, the first one being to deal with the specific problems in existing conditions and the other one being to put forward a critical way of thinking to point out the genesis of that order and to create an alternative vision of world order, is argued to be essential for critical theory.⁸ Along these lines, within neo-Gramscian analysis, positivist epistemology bounded by the Cartesian duality

⁶ Cox 1997; van der Pijl 1995.

⁷ Even though his work has been classified within the neo-Gramscian approach, as Mittelman underlines, works of Vico, Weber, Sorel, Braudel and Polanyi are highly influential on Cox's approach (1998: 2-3).

⁸ Cox 1995: 32 and 1981: 129.

of subject and object, so putting forward synchronic accounts within which an objective account of reality independent of values is seen possible is refuted and instead, critical and historical tradition with an identity of subject and object is pursued.⁹ This contention, in turn, indicates that mainstream approaches turns out to be problem-solving theory as such and

takes the worlds as it finds it, with the prevailing social and power relationships and the institutions into which they are organised, as the given framework for action. The general aim of problem-solving theory is to make these relationships and institutions work smoothly by dealing effectively with particular sources of trouble.¹⁰

Following his criticism of positivism for being synchronic, Cox criticises the notion of power of problem solving theory for being context specific lacking historical and structural analysis with a restricted notion of state dominance. Within this framework, hegemony is endorsed by a state's preponderance of economic and military capabilities. Such an understanding obscures significant elements of structural change and ignores social forces operating in and across civil society, such as transnational class formations and transnational social forces.¹¹ Moreover, he argues that

there is a Marxism which reasons historically and seeks to explain, as well as to promote, changes in social relations; there is also a Marxism, designed as a framework for the analysis of the capitalist state and society, which turns its back on historical knowledge in favour of a more static and abstract conceptualization of the mode of production.¹²

⁹ Gill 1993a and Cox 1993a.

¹⁰ Cox 1981: 128.1986: 208-209.

¹¹ van der Pijl 1997b and 1998.

In this manner, Coxian critical theory not only conceives, on the basis of concrete historical cases, the articulation between forms of state, social forces and world order but also “rejects the notion of objective laws of history and focuses upon class struggle [be they intra-class or inter-class] as the heuristic model for the understanding of structural change”.¹³ Thereby, the aim of the neo-Gramscian introduction of hegemony to the study of the international is twofold: first, to break from the state-centrism of mainstream theories and to avoid the limitations of economistic and ahistorical Marxism in order to point out the historical construction of society. What this implies is the potential attributed to the transformative capacity of human beings for alternative forms of development.¹⁴ In this way, Cox attempts to bridge the gap between subjective and objective aspects of analysis, to overcome the dichotomy of agent and structure through his historical structure approach providing a reflexive critical theory.

Cox presents a diagnosis of the production and reproduction of the world order based on a Gramscian conception of hegemony through which the dialectical interaction of the inner and external elements can be grasped. Social reality is analysed in terms of social forces in the making of history¹⁵ and these social forces are depicted at three levels: ideas, material capabilities and

¹² Cox 1981: 135-138.

¹³ Cox and Sinclair, 1996: 57-58.

¹⁴ Cox 1995: 32.

¹⁵ Cox 1987.

institutions.¹⁶ These three levels of social forces are in a dialectical interaction, and no determinism exists between them.¹⁷ In turn, these social forces are analysed at the level of production, in relation to state/civil society complexes and at the level of the world order. Hegemony in a historical structure is founded on, Cox maintains, the social forces generated by the production process, forms of state derived from state/civil society complexes and world orders.¹⁸ In this manner, for the identification of structural contradictions and potentials for collective transformative action in an epoch, Cox differentiates his historicist approach from structuralism in the interplay of structure and agency in a historical structure approach with an emphasis on collective human action. The aim is to put forward the construction of society by collective human action, within which human nature and social structure are transformed by the agency of social forces on the basis of existing social relations. Such an understanding implies that theory is dependent on concrete historical context, and thereby, embedded in a social and political setting.¹⁹

Cox adopts historical structures as ideal types, the functional fit between which is analysed in synchronic terms. However, “this construct has its own internal contradictions-an inherent dialectic. The resolution of these

¹⁶ Cox 1981: 136.

¹⁷ Cox 1986: 218; see also Gill and Law 1998.

¹⁸ Cox 1981: 128.

¹⁹ Cox 1995: 31-33. See also Cox 1986: 207 and 1993a.

contradictions explains the diachronic moment.”²⁰ With an emphasis on agency, Cox attempts to contrast ideal types with real historical contradictions.²¹ In this sense, Cox' s objective is to ground his approach in the conjuncture, with its patterns varying over time, forming historical structures.

Within this framework, capitalism has been theorised as a particular mode of development in which considerations of profit maximisation determine investments in a market context rather than a particular relation of production since it cannot be seen as a single mode of production in that it entails several different modes of social relations of production²². Mode of social relations of production is one of the central concepts of Cox developed for the analysis of the concrete. The ideal types he developed along these lines²³ are then linked to other real historical sets of social relations of production, less abstract than the mode of production, which can coexist even though one predominates in a given social formation. Hence, actual social formations are not organised by only one mode of social relations of production, but combine modes of social relations of production in a different

²⁰ Mittelman 1998: 11.

²¹ Cox 2002: 32.

²² Cox 1987: 406-407.

²³ Cox specifies twelve patterns of production relations: subsistence, peasant-lord, primitive labour market, house-hold, self-employment, enterprise labour market, bipartism, enterprise corporatism, tripartism, state corporatism, communal and central planning (1987: 32).

way and also include those other than capitalism.²⁴ In this vein, what stems from his argument that “the social map of the world can be plotted as a hierarchy of interconnected modes of social relations of production”²⁵, is that in addition to actual social formations, these relations can be taken as the basis for the analysis of the world order as well. These production relations are conceived in such a way to include the social structure of accumulation through which class analysis and production relations are linked to the forms of state and world order. In this manner, Cox suggests that

the hierarchy established among types of production relations..one of the tasks undertaken by the state..constitutes a structure of accumulation. The extraction of surplus flows from the subordinate and weaker levels of production to the dominant and stronger²⁶.

That is to say, the historical constitution of these hierarchical relations is determined by the social structure of accumulation, the successful implementation of which is based on the articulation of a historic bloc.²⁷

The sphere of production, Cox argues, “creates the material basis for all forms of social existence, and the ways in which human efforts are combined in productive processes affect all other aspects of social life, including the

²⁴ As pointed out by Drainville, such a conception is reminiscent of Althusserian overdetermination (1994: p.114).

²⁵ Cox 1989: 40.

²⁶ Cox 1987: 5.

²⁷ Cox 1987: 11 and 5. Cf. Burnham 1991. Such an emphasis on social structure of accumulation can be taken as a similarity between a strand of regulationist theorising and Coxian analysis. Indeed, Jessop classifies the Coxian inspired works of van der Pijl and Overbeek, which is widely referred as the Amsterdam School, as a current in regulation approach dealing with transnational class formation (Jessop 1990a: 308). For a similarity on an analysis of Atlantic Fordism as such, see Jessop 1999c: 5.

polity”²⁸. That is, the relations which organise material production are considered to be crucial for the wider institutional reproduction of social orders on both a national and an international level but as a reflection of his denial of economism, it is argued that the focus of analysis should always be on the politics of production. This is theorised in the mutual relationship between power and politics in that “production generates power but power determines the manner in which production takes place”²⁹. In order to examine the reciprocal relationship between production and power, it is distinguished between different modes of social relations of production which makes it possible to consider how changing relations of production give rise to particular social forces which become the bases of power within and across states and how this shapes a specific world order.³⁰

Cox’s state/society complexes find their expression in the forms of state in his analysis and through the scrutiny of various forms of states as such³¹, it is intended to show that the *raison d’état* of the state cannot be separated from society, as it depends on the configuration of social forces at the state level. As a refusal of the notion that structures of society have distinct logics on the basis of the nature of economy or the *raison d’etat* of the state without any

²⁸ Cox 1987: 1.

²⁹ Cox 1987: 1.

³⁰ Cox 1987: 4.

³¹ He distinguishes among forms of state such as the old-regime bureaucratic state, the liberal state, the welfare-nationalist state, the redistributive state, the neo-liberal state, and the neo-mercantilist developmental state.

interaction, Cox puts such a link through the Gramscian concept of historic bloc. “The historic[al] bloc is the term applied to the particular configuration of social classes and ideology that gives content to a historical state”³² and, thus, forms a complex, politically contestable and dynamic ensemble of social relations which includes economic, political and cultural aspects. Formulated in this manner, as the extended concept of the state, the relationship between structure and superstructure is argued to be reciprocal. Cox considers historic blocs to be forms of historical structures, that is to say, they vary in time and space. As an implication of the contention that the state cannot be taken as a given institutional category, the analysis of forms of state is presented in terms of the apparatus of administration and of the historical bloc, class configuration that delineates the *raison d'état* for that form³³. In this manner, the definition of a historic bloc sustaining power is achieved through forms of state and forms of social relations of production. The presumption is that the functions of a specific form of state are ascribed to it by the particular social forces managed to present their purposes as universal.³⁴ With the formulation of forms of state as such, it is intended to show the variations among them in terms of the degree of autonomy to the inter-state system and world economy, and different degrees of control of their societies.

³² Cox 1987: 409.

³³ Cox 1987: 105 and 1989: 41.

³⁴ Cox 1993b: 58.

In this vein, Cox has taken Gramsci's concept of historic bloc and extended it into the analysis of the international and transnational spheres. With the introduction of the neo-Gramscian concepts of historic bloc and hegemony, class analysis and production relations were linked to not only the forms of state but also world order. Various social forces may attempt to form an historical bloc to establish preferable forms of governance at the national and/or international level. Thereby, for Cox, hegemony points out the production and reproduction of world order which cannot be adequately conceived as far as it is abstracted from the prevailing power relations. Hegemony describes a type of rule, which predominantly relies on consent, not on coercion which

is based on a coherent conjunction or fit between a configuration of material power, the prevalent collective image of world order (including certain norms) and a set of institutions which administer the order with a certain semblance of universality³⁵.

Along these lines, Cox contends that international structures of accumulation are constituted by international hegemonic projects and conceptualises the integration of national economies to the international as such. He sought to model the political and economic relations within and between states in terms of the hegemonic projects of specific social classes which operate on a national and global scale. International hegemony is not seen simply as the dominance of a particular state, in addition to the political and economic power of the hegemonic state which he perceives as necessary

³⁵ Cox 1981: 139.

for the production of a hegemonic world order but not sufficient for its reproduction³⁶, Cox discerns international hegemony as based on consensus and ideological incorporation. Hegemonic world order is composed of not only the states but also the inner dynamics of the societal structure within which states take place. In this sense, international hegemony is based on the outward expansion of domestic historic bloc of the hegemonic state³⁷ and is argued to be

not merely an order among states. It is an order within a world economy with a dominant mode of production, which penetrates to all countries and links into other subordinate modes of production. It is also a complex of international social relationships which connect the social classes of the different countries. World hegemony is describable as a social structure, an economic structure, and a political structure; and cannot be simply one of these things but must be all three. World hegemony, furthermore, is expressed in universal norms, institutions and mechanisms which lay down general rules of behaviour for states and for those forces of civil society that act across national boundaries...rules which support the dominant mode of production³⁸.

In this sense, as hegemonic practices are related to the purposes of the historical bloc, hegemony is seen as always for a specific project of capitalist accumulation reflecting the balance of power between domestic classes, between states and between transnational classes. Formulated as such, Cox's

³⁶ Cox 1981:139.

³⁷ Cox 1993a: 61.

³⁸ Cox 1993a: 61-62. Such a conceptualisation can be taken as a critique of Wallersteinian world system theory's reductionism and ahistorical conception of the state and its inability to put forward a conception of change and discontinuity by Cox (1981). See also Gill 1993b and Rupert 1995: 8-10.

discernment of international hegemony, takes as its point of reference the hierarchical relations in the world market and the inter-state system, constituted through the internationalisation of a specific historic bloc.

As an implication of his contention that theory should never take abstract as its starting point but should always be based on concrete historical context; at the level of world order, Cox periodises world history along historical structures as an implication of ruptures between historic blocs setting the framework of each epoch, consisting of different patterns of social relations of production, forms of state and world order, constituting the world economy in different ways bearing benefits to the hegemonic state/society complex.³⁹ Following the scheme of Braudel, he posits historical blocs as the *longue-durée*. On this basis, in his criticism of Ruggie's positing of the transition from medieval to modern as the breaking point of the world order, he places further breaking points as those of mercantilist, liberal, neo-imperialist and neo-liberal orders.⁴⁰ Within this scheme, the autonomy of the world economy is placed within Pax Britannica through which the state policies are constrained through the emergence of international finance.⁴¹ However, the emergence of a world economy as such constraining the policies of national states are taken for granted and the social dynamics giving way to such a separation is obscured. Hence, the underlying unity, the emergence of the world market as a

³⁹ Cox 1987: 396-398.

⁴⁰ Cox 1996b: 55.

⁴¹ Cox 1981: 107.

particularly different form of society is not pointed out but it is rather seen as something imposed upon society in the ninetieth century.⁴²

Yet, the above mentioned considerations reveal that in his attempt to elucidate the historical specificity of the period in question, Cox fails to theorise capitalism itself. Coxian analysis does not even take into consideration any connection between capitalism in the abstract and capitalism in the concrete. As the above analysis presents, the basic deficiency of Coxian conceptualisation is the maintenance of the material/social divide, that is to say conceiving the economic base asocially which is historicised by the superstructural forms and positing a dichotomy between structure and struggle. The structuralist conception of material base is replaced by a historicist one⁴³ and thereby, even though Cox overcomes the functionalism of regulationist analyses based on the same divide, this was made through the ignorance of the structure itself. The dynamic social processes fundamental to the international system underlying his hegemonic epochs are concealed.

This is explicit in his above mentioned theorisation of capitalism based on profit maximisation in market context. Such a market definition of capitalism, that is to say, in terms of production oriented toward market has a rather limited view of capitalism as the historical specificity of social relations

⁴² Cox 1993b: 261 cited in Boyle 1994: 254. Such a formulation can be taken as the Polanyian lineage shaping the IPE literature. See Polanyi 1947 and for the adoption of a similar framework in IPE Strange 1988. For a critique, see Wood 1999b: 19-25.

⁴³ See Mittelman 1998: 4; for a critique of the mutually exclusive forms of historical contingency and structural inevitability see Clarke 1992: 149; see also Bonefeld et al. 1992.

which gave rise to a market as such is not specified.⁴⁴ As an implication of this contention, the modern international system, for Cox, is understood as the separation of the world market from the state system. Conceptualised in this way, he seeks to analyse the interaction between two institutionally distinct spheres of politics and economics, between power and production. Whilst the compatibility of these levels indicate conditions of stability, periods of pax hegemonica, the dysfunctionality between them gives way to periods of instability. It is on these grounds that despite its Gramscian foundations, Coxian political economy turns out to be Weberian.⁴⁵ As Burnham argues, in Coxian conception not only the state but also the world market appears as “content empty”. Unless production relations interact with the state as such, they are treated as purely economic ones. The social content of economy is given by the structure of accumulation undertaken by the state.⁴⁶ That is to say, in neo-Gramscian political economy both forms of state and the international state system and world economy are detached from their capitalist form and thereby, there is no basis to theorise the necessarily ‘capitalist’ form of the state or the international state system. Historic blocs in this sense appear as referring to distinct periods of history, that is to say forms of historical structures, rather than referring to ‘capitalist’ social relations of production. So long as the

⁴⁴ Cf. Wood 1994. In this sense, it can be argued that Coxian analysis is trapped within a Smithian understanding and does not overcome the limitations of Wallersteinian analysis. For a critique see Brenner 1977.

⁴⁵ Boyle 1994. Cf. Bonefeld 2000: 42-51.

⁴⁶ Burnham 1991: 89; see also Boyle 1994.

emphasis was on the construction of a historical bloc as such in the transition from one historical structure to another, its relation to the contradictory form of the capital relation is obscured.

As far as the historical bloc as such is taken as the structure which gives its historical content to the state and in this manner, given the forms of state to be determined through the historic blocs as forms of the historical structures in question, then the alleged characteristics of a form of state turns out to be its purely contingent features rather than its capitalist form. What this implies deriving from the ignorance of capitalism for the historicisation of the international system is that there is only a conceptualisation of forms of state.⁴⁷ The lack of a theory of the state and thereby, of an internal relation posited between class and the state raises problems for neo-Gramscian analysis. The relations both between the national state and the world market and thereby, between nation-states, are not conceptualised. Therefore, Bromley asserts, along these lines, that:

the neo-Gramscians have singularly failed to develop a theoretical as opposed to a descriptive, specification of the principal structures of the international system. For no amount of discussion of such themes as hegemony, historic blocs and transnational capital adds up to a theory of the modern states system or of the world market⁴⁸.

⁴⁷ Such a conception of forms of state can be found in the work of Poulantzas as well so as to concretise his analysis and draw attention to the historically specific form of the state in terms of the concrete form the relation between the state and the economy takes and in terms of that of the relation between the state and class, that is to say, an emphasis on forms of state in terms of the condensation of balance of forces between classes. However, different from Cox, these are posited as forms of the 'bourgeois' type of state. (Poulantzas 1978).

⁴⁸ Bromley 1995: 232.

3.3 The Neo-Gramscian Account of Globalisation and the State

Put in neo-Gramscian terms, the post war period under the US hegemony was characterised by the Keynesian structure of accumulation of which integration is based on the articulation of the ideals of the corporate liberal international historic bloc which integrated fractions of capital, the state and labour in a trans-Atlantic alliance.⁴⁹ Based on this framework, then, in the current period, it is witnessed a new hegemony organised around monetarist principles.

As globalisation is taken into consideration within the above mentioned framework, it is argued that the transnationalisation of production and finance has engendered new transnational social forces. As a result, Cox “has noted that ... there may be an emerging transnational historic bloc”⁵⁰, led by transnational capital. According to neo-Gramscians, the current phase of globalisation represents a movement from the nationally bounded historic blocs characteristic of the earlier period towards a transnational historic bloc of capitalists, state managers and intellectuals seeking to construct a new transnational world order through establishing its neo-liberal ideas of free trade and a deregulatory economy as generally accepted truths, promoted by institutions like the World Bank, IMF, OECD and G7.

⁴⁹ Cox 1987: 219-230. See also van der Pijl 1984 and 1998. Within the neo-Gramscian framework, then, the crisis of 1970s is interpreted as a clash of interests between industrial and financial capital and consequently, the rise of monetarism as the triumph of the latter over the former. For a critique of fractionalist accounts as such in terms of the superficiality of such a conflict between fractions of capital, see Clarke 1982a and 1988.

⁵⁰ Gill and Law 1998: 65.

As it is posited that production was organised on a necessarily national basis in the post-war era, significant parts have been transnationalised since the early 1970s as part of the globalisation processes. As a consequence, capitalist accumulation is not necessarily any longer inscribed in national paths of economic development. A basic distinction can, therefore, be drawn between transnational social forces of capital and labour, engendered by those production sectors, which are organised on a transnational scale, and national social forces of capital and labour stemming from national production sectors.⁵¹ It is this fractionalisation, that is to say, change in the social forces constituting the form of state due to globalisation, which has been taken as the basis for the analysis of the current period.

In Gill's terms, the transnational historic bloc pursues new constitutionalism regarded as "a legal and political strategy for separating economic forces and policies from broad political accountability, securing management of the economy in the hands of the central bankers and technocrats responsive to transnational capital"⁵² Gill identifies three components of new constitutionalism: disciplinary neo-liberalism, panopticism and market civilisation which requires a transformation in national state to support global capital accumulation⁵³, a process which Cox refers as the

⁵¹ See Holman and van der Pijl 1996 for an application of such a perspective on European integration.

⁵² Gill 1997: 1.

⁵³ Gill 2000.

internationalisation of the state.⁵⁴ Thereby, “the function of the nation-state is shifting from the formulation of national policies to the administration of policies formulated by the transnational elite acting through supranational institutions.”⁵⁵

Cox calls this powerful drive towards the realisation of a market utopia on a world scale, with the opening of national economies, liberalisation, and privatisation “global perestroika”, a process within which

states will nilly become more effectively accountable to a nebulous personified as the global economy; and they were constrained to mystify this external accountability in the eyes and ears of their own publics through the new vocabulary of globalisation, interdependence and competitiveness.⁵⁶

As far as capitalist accumulation is seen as not necessarily ‘any longer’ inscribed in national paths of economic development⁵⁷, the current situation is understood as the reflection of a contradiction between the global economy and the Westphalian, territorially demarcated mode of political organisation. In this context, globalisation is conceived as leading from a Westphalian to a post-Westphalian system, to a world order no longer based on sovereignty.⁵⁸ The basic deficiency of such an argument, calling for a transition to a social order characterised by the demise of exclusive territoriality is to take sovereignty or

⁵⁴ Cox 1987.

⁵⁵ Robinson 1996a: 373.

⁵⁶ Cox 1992: 27.

⁵⁷ Radice, 1997: 5.

⁵⁸ Cox 1993a: 142-144 and Gill 1993b: 61-62.

territoriality of the state as the defining characteristic of the modern international system to which it cannot be attributed a single historical dynamic in the period from 1500 to 1980.⁵⁹ This mainly stems from the above mentioned lack of a historicised theorisation of the world market and the international state system as forms of capitalist social relations of production.

Moreover, the current transformations are argued to give way to the emergence of a global civil society according to whose demands the state adjusts national society to the requirements of global production and accumulation. Cox defines this internationalisation of the state as the transformation of the state

into an agency for adjusting national economic practices and policies to the perceived exigencies of the global economy. The state becomes a transmission belt from the global to the national economy where heretofore it had acted as the bulwark defending domestic welfare from external disturbances⁶⁰.

This is the process of the internationalisation of the state indicating the reorganisation of the relation between the state and economy.⁶¹ With the impact of this external pressure, there has been an institutional restructuring with a transfer of power from regulatory institutions engaged in social policy to market oriented ones enhancing possibilities for global accumulation. In this sense, then the state is actively included in the globalisation process through liberating the economy from social regulations. However, such a perception

⁵⁹ Rosenberg 2001; see also Bromley 1996 for a similar argumentation.

⁶⁰ Cox 1996c: 302; see also Cox 1995: 39.

⁶¹ Cox 1989 and 1996c; van der Pijl 1995 and 1998.

presents the relation between the state and global forces as one of confrontation as if the state is subject to the requirements of a global economy beyond its reach, it is being internationalised from outside in.⁶² That is to say, within such a formulation, the relation between world market and the state is seen as an external one. The implication of such a conception is that the internationalised state, through the promotion of neo-liberal strategies secures the national economy's survival, as they adapt national political and economic life to the global economy. In this sense, it is argued that global capitalism requires the existence of states as such and, as if globalisation is authored by the states.

Conceptualisation of transnational hegemony giving way to the internationalisation of the state as the national state becomes a transmission belt for global capital undermines the impact of class struggle; labour is ignored within such an analysis. Along these lines, it is argued that such a conception is prone to totalise hegemony as Germain and Kenny criticises neo-Gramscians in that they

see this hegemony largely as a one dimensional power relationship; hegemony is fashioned by this elite transnational class on its own terms and then forced or imposed on subaltern classes. These subaltern classes in turn either resist such frontal assaults as best they can or capitulate.⁶³

⁶² Panitch 1996.

⁶³ Germain and Kenny 1998: 18. In this sense, what gets lost in neo-Gramscian conception of hegemony is its relation to class struggle with their overemphasis on capitalist fractions. Even though it certainly goes beyond the limits of this thesis, such a conceptualisation is a misreading of Gramsci as well. For a relational interpretation, see Ozan 2000.

Furthermore, neo-Gramscian political economy directly deals with class relations in globalisation, arguing that the developments in the current period are seen as “an essentially transnational process. The social forces involved in this process, their international linkages, and their responses ..take the dialectical process of global class formation as its point of departure”⁶⁴. Thereby, the politics of neo liberalism, as far as it is conceived within the framework of the restructuring of world capitalism, has “to be understood as a transnational phenomenon rather than as a series of basically unrelated national developments”⁶⁵ Conceptualised as such, global economy is seen as something invisible to which national states are accountable. In the same line of argumentation, Drainville pointed out the instrumentalist elements of neo-Gramscian theorising in putting emphasis on the new bourgeois ideals imposing its interests in the form of a new set of economic, political and world order structures.⁶⁶ Globalisation, thus, is not only understood as an exogenous factor to which states and labour can only respond but also as something merely facilitated by transnational forces of capitalist class bringing about global structural change at the same time. In this vein, even though neo-Gramscian perspectives offers a problematisation of the national level, their notion of ‘transnational hegemony’ undermines the relation of domestic class

⁶⁴ Overbeek 1993.

⁶⁵ Overbeek 1993: xvi.

⁶⁶ Drainville 1994: 114 as he underlines that neo-Gramscian analysis overestimates the coherence of neo-liberalism due to their overemphasis on “an organic unity of global elites, and political cogency of transnational concepts of control” (1994: 111).

conflicts, so globalisation is presented as something beyond the politics of internal actors.⁶⁷

As far as a correspondence is posited between the internationalisation of economy and the internationalisation of the state as such, their conception of hegemony turns out to be deterministic, which can also be taken as undermining the strength of Gramsci's work, its "non-deterministic yet structurally grounded explanation of change"⁶⁸. This mainly stems from the lack of an understanding of capital as a global social relation and of an internal relationship posited between the state, capital and labour. In neo-Gramscian analysis, the focus on the articulation of the ideology of the ruling class fraction shifts attention from identifying the specific form of the contradictions of the capital relation and there arises a danger of reifying the state into a fixed set of institutional relations rather than a political form of the capital relation subject to contestation and struggle.

That class struggle at the international level can 'no longer' be studied as a struggle between states, but has to be analysed how different social forces operate at the national and international level, requires an ontological shift for neo-Gramscians⁶⁹. As pointed by Mittelman⁷⁰ as the Weberian aspect of Coxian

⁶⁷ Cf. Moran 1999.

⁶⁸ Germain and Kenny 1998:5.

⁶⁹ Gill 1997: 5.

⁷⁰ Mittelman 1998: 14.

methodology in terms of his argument that “periods of fundamental changes”⁷¹ necessitate the redefinition of categories, within neo-Gramscians, it was implied that what problematises state centric thinking is current changes, namely globalisation. Such an implication gives way to an understanding that society was a nationally bounded realm before the beginning of the so-called global age. This problem, namely his methodological pluralism,⁷² obscures Coxian analysis as far as the relation between the state, capital and labour is not theorised.

With the introduction of hegemony intertwining coercion and consent in maintaining international order, neo-Gramscian approach certainly goes beyond the limits of the prevalent neo-realist and neo-liberal theories which obscure processes of legitimation in international society as remnants of power or interest. The analysis of political and economic relations within and between states through the hegemonic projects of social classes operating on a global and national scale directs attention to social relations and processes neglected by mainstream neo-realism and world-systems theory and hence, provides an understanding of the winners and losers of the process. Yet, neither the world market nor the state system is theorised as forms of a particular social relation of production, that is to say, it failed to posit the analysis within the capitalist

⁷¹ Cox 1993c: 259.

⁷² Burnham 1991: 77.

social relations of production and hence, to theorise how such forms are transformed over the course of capitalist development by class struggle.⁷³

Hence, neo-Gramscian approach can provide an insight in terms of the changes among historical structures. Nonetheless, having conceptualised world order on the basis of historical structures as an extension of his call for greater historical sensibility, Cox's commitment to depict the origins of social and power relations and world order and to point out the forces with emancipatory potential to transform the prevailing order⁷⁴, turns out to be, in fact, no more than a variation within the prevailing order diminishing the aptitude to point out transformation beyond capitalism as far as the social constitution of the global relations of capital is not conceived. What implies from Mittelman's argument that "Cox's taxonomic innovations" combining Marxist and Weberian aspects, result in a "more static and comparative framework rather than a fully dynamic and historical materialist" conception is that his historical structures refers only to the conceptualisation of the period in question without any relation to the unity of capitalist development itself. This, in turn, indicates an implicit instrumentalist conception, as this struggle for hegemony at the world order becomes the key factor in explaining the dynamics of transitions, which recognizes no possibility of conceiving any major transformation of the state form and the world order, except in terms of changing forms of the state

⁷³ For a relational conception of hegemony on a global scale going beyond the shortcomings of the sort of neo-Gramscian theorising presented in this chapter through conceiving the state as internally related to the class based organisation of production in civil society, and integrating an analysis of labour in the construction of hegemony see Rupert 1995 and 2001.

⁷⁴ Cox 1981: 135.

or historical structures. The ideal typical concept formation of Cox, in this sense, only intensifies the distinction between the abstract and the concrete. In this manner, it can be argued that neo-Gramscian analysis can be taken into consideration in continuity with regulationist theorising, which has been elaborated in the preceding chapter, in that the challenge to economism as such finds its expression in an extremely voluntarist form. The deficiency of structuralism is conquered through distinguishing the incorporation of social reality determined by multiple causes, incorporation of which is achieved by the imposition of a hegemonic fraction of capital. Yet, such a conception fails to elaborate on the complexity of an increasingly interdependent global political economy governed by the law of value, in which social relations between people take the form of relations between things and remains trapped in an abstract and functionalist account of the world system within the analysis of the mechanic interaction between the political and the economic.⁷⁵

To the extent that social relations of production are taken as another sphere to be considered alongside ideological and political 'levels', as far as it is focused on the fetishized compartmentalised forms without accounting for the underlying unity, such an intention of overcoming economism and structuralism turns out to be the ignorance of the specifically 'capitalist' social relations of production. Such a shortcoming is finally overcome, as will be presented in the next chapter, with theorising social world as a totality through taking the capital, perceived as a social relation in terms of the class

⁷⁵ Boyle 1994; Burnham 1991.

antagonism of capital and labour, as the basis of the valorisation process on which the whole construction of capitalism is built considering the relations of production not as the economic level anymore.

CHAPTER 4

TOWARDS CATCHING THE WHOLE: A REVIEW OF RELATIONAL APPROACHES

Recent accounts within International Political Economy are based on a historical analysis of capitalist social forms which emerged from a critical approach entailing a historical analysis of the reified and mystified concepts of the economy and the state.¹ In this regard, the differentiation of both the economy and the state and with them the world market and nation states as independent orders are exposed to scrutiny within the emergence and consolidation of capitalist social relations of production on an increasingly global basis. That is to say, it is revealed that only in capitalism, social relations of production manifest themselves in the form of independent economic and political spheres. Economy, thus, is seen as a particular form of social organisation along with other capitalist social forms emerged when capitalist social relations came into existence.²

The attempts towards a non-reductionist Marxist theorising, in this regard, have been based on problematising the capitalist international system as

¹ For an overview of the debates providing the background for this grasp, see Clarke 1991a: 32-34. The political Marxism of Wood, internal relations philosophy and Open Marxism can be taken as the main proponents of such an undertaking.

² Sayer 1985: 64.

a social form. The basic concern is to ground the social form of the international in the capital relation and to discern its character as the specific expression of determinate class relations. In this sense, the historically specific separation of the economic and the political is central to theorising the international system; and the fundamental concern is to depict the underlying social relations which gave rise to this specific separation.³ Then, different from the perceptions in the preceding chapters, the starting point turns out to be rather than the interaction of the political and the economic, the internal and historical relation between them as fetishised forms of the social relations of capitalist production. Along these lines, the chapter will focus first on the relational conceptualisation of social totality based on internal relations philosophy and the method they employ entailing a different relation between the abstract and the concrete from the analyses presented so far; and then will take into consideration the Open Marxist accounts which follow the same line of argumentation with a conception of the internal relations between phenomena. However, the former route rather entails a debate restricted to method and there cannot be found a discussion on current processes. Therefore, after presenting their differentiation in terms of open Marxism's particular emphasis on class struggle alongside the method of abstraction they employ, it will be focused on the Open Marxist account of globalisation and the state based on their analysis of the social constitution of the state and world market.

³ Burnham 1994 and 1995b; Rosenberg 1994; Rupert 1993 and 1995; Boyle 1995.

4.1 A Relational Perspective on Social Totality

Against the reductionist and causalist interpretations built on the distinction of the base and the superstructure in traditional Marxist terms, there have been attempts to overcome the dualistic conceptions of the state/capital, state/class, state/economy to show that the material and social dimensions are internally related and thereby, that superstructures constitute the base itself. It is argued that the material base consists of all social relations constituting the mode in which production and distribution is organised in a historical form of society. The main aim turns out to be a turn to Marx in his redefinition of economic relations and thus to put forward that the sphere of economy, the production relations cannot be grasped in purely economic terms.

As Derek Sayer notes, the base should be discerned as

comprising the totality of social relations, whatever these may be, which make particular forms of production, and thus of property, possible. These social relations are simultaneously forms of material relation of human beings to nature. This totality is Marx's 'groundwork of society', and its extensiveness indicates why he could plausibly treat material production as being synonymous with production of 'the society itself, i.e. the human being in its social relations'⁴.

In the discussion showing the meagreness of enhancing the economic base with social superstructures, it is put forward that the process through which capitalist class relations emerged was the process through which relations of domination were abstracted from the processes of exploitation and

⁴ Sayer 1989: 77. As Wood puts forward, Marx's radical innovation on bourgeois political economy was to define the mode of production and economic laws themselves as social factors. 'The economic structure of society was for him a very different and a much broader-totality of social relations than is normally recognised.'(Wood 1995a: 24).

allocation.⁵ In this sense, the apparent separation of both the political and the economic can be seen as social forms of capitalist social relations of production.

The framework for this undertaking has been provided by the internal relations philosophy of Ollman discerning the apparent separation of the dialectical whole through a conceptualisation of an internal relation between these forms of appearance.⁶ Against the understanding of these forms as demarcated, externally related and homogenous in themselves, within this alternative understanding, these spheres are considered as complementary, internally related changing forms of social relations. Thus, rather than abstracting politics and economics from this relationship attributing an independent ontological reality to them, politics and economics are seen as the differentiated elements of relation, as moments of one process but not levels with a determinist relation among them. The emphasis then turns out to depict the interrelation of these forms with a historically specific analysis of the concrete independent of a definite logic.

In order to comprehend such an undertaking, it is first necessary to review the method in this understanding, which is different from the regulationist method of articulation from abstract to concrete through their

⁵ Wood 1995a: 36-40.

⁶ Ollman 1993: 26-40. Internal relations philosophy can be considered as a strand within Critical Realism, conceiving the social reality as consisting of internal or essential relations in which object is dependent on its relation to the other and of external or contingent relations which can exist without the other. On these grounds, philosophy of internal relations and Jessop can be differentiated in that the former puts emphasis on internal/ essential relations whereas the latter to external/contingent relations. Jessop 1990a: 103.

intermediate concepts, and from the neo-Gramscian positioning of the historical structure without the theorisation of its relation to capitalism, in a somewhat similar ideal-type construction; however, both based on the separation between the generic and the specific and thereby unable to provide an understanding of the necessary relation between the abstract and the concrete⁷.

Along these lines, Ollman and Derek Sayer's analysis of Marx's method regards that Marx's critique starts with the imagined or real concrete, that is the given world of phenomenal forms or the world as it presents itself to us, moving to the abstract, that is the concepts of essential relations which express these forms or the intellectual activity of breaking this whole down into the mental units with which we think about it and then to the thought concrete, that is a production of the concrete by way of thought, or the reconstituted and now understood whole present in the mind.⁸ They argue that it is through this method that Marx deconstructs immediate phenomenal forms into their constitutive/essential relations for an explanation of their phenomenal forms and for a historical account of what these relations in fact comprise. Starting from the real-concrete phenomenon which takes place empirically within definite social relations is argued to make it possible to highlight the essential relations able to explain its phenomenal form. These relations are not taken in terms of a regularity between separate phenomena or objects as taken by

⁷ Bonefeld et al. 1992a: xvi.

⁸ Sayer 1987:131; Ollman 1993: 24.

positivists, but about “what an object or the phenomena is like and what it can do and only derivatively what it will do in any particular situation”.⁹ To reconceptualise the phenomena as a relation and to find the essential relation in which phenomena exist opens up the possibility of moving back again, to the imagined concrete, but this time it is grasped as “a rich totality of many determinations and relations”.¹⁰

On these grounds, it has been contended that through the historical analysis establishing the historicity of the phenomena with which it deals could Marx show that their existence depends on relations, which themselves are historical products. Exploring on the origins of any phenomena is to seek out the origins of “a definite social production relation, belonging to a definite historical formation of society and which manifested in a thing and lends this thing (phenomenon) a specific social character.”¹¹ The implication of the historicity of these phenomena and their relations is to reveal their construction by human beings and their potential of being changed. Such a method of reconceptualising phenomenal forms in their social relations and conceiving them as historical entities is argued to avoid regarding them as natural, ahistorical categories and to open the way for the prospect of a new society. Such an analysis is intended to show that the abstract concept of capitalism

⁹ Sayer 1992: 159.

¹⁰ Sayer 1987:135. Actually, this method can be argued to have some similarities with Jessop’s depiction of an inherent critical realist methodology in Regulation School. However, rather than such a triple movement, Jessop’s interpretation of retroduction is similar to an Althusserian inclination in holding up a movement from abstract to concrete. Cf. Jessop 2001a.

¹¹ Corrigan et al. 1978: 30.

cannot be taken as an independent variable, causally linked to the concrete and that concrete cannot be understood as isolated, the meaning of which transpires only within historical totalities to which they have to be related in thought.

This conceptual framework allows for an understanding of institutional forms like the state and the market as social relations of production. Thereby, both the capitalist state and market can be seen as forms of social relations of production, as products of the abstraction of political power from the process of surplus appropriation. The capital relation, in this sense, is not an economic relation but can only exist in and through differentiated social forms such as the state and market. It is on these grounds that Open Marxism perceives that state is a form of capitalist social relations of production as well.

However, Open Marxism is said to differ from internal relations philosophy in that the method of abstraction as defined above, that is the abstraction of concepts from reality to point out the essential relations between them implies an understanding that these essential relations can operate independent from human praxis which undermines the unity of theory and practice.¹² On the other hand, as will be presented below, Open Marxism posits an internal relation between theory and practice in a different manner and calls for practical reflexivity within this framework.¹³ Their conception of

¹² Such a critique is mainly based on the affinities of the method of internal relations with the Critical Realism of Bhaskar for its Kantian roots. For a critique of the realist method for being ahistorical, see Roberts 1999 and for a further elaboration in this vein, see Gunn 1991 and 1992; Psychopedis 1991.

¹³ Gunn 1991: 196; see also Roberts 1999.

abstraction is essentially taken “to imply different modes of motion of the fundamental class antagonism of capital and labour”¹⁴. Following from this, the form analysis presented by Open Marxism perceives form as mode of existence and thereby, intends to put forward the inner connection between modes of existence, which opens the way to see reality as a contradictory form of class struggle. In this sense, they argue that method should “inhere within, emerge from and reflect upon” specific social relations and the social forms which those social relations produce.¹⁵ Put differently, the main contention is that “dialectical thinking conceptualises itself within, and as a moment of, its object.”¹⁶ Their emphasis on praxis and class struggle through their insistence on the unity of theory and practice in this regard, reveals their theoretical commitment to change the world.

4.2 Open Marxism

4.2.1 Methodological and Conceptual Framework

Having defined Closed Marxism as a closure both in terms of categories and methodologies with the impact of scientism, indicating the acceptance of reality uncritically which “accepts the horizons of a given world as its own theoretical horizons and announces a determinism which is causalist or teleological”¹⁷, Open Marxism pursues an approach in which reality is seen as

¹⁴ Bonefeld 1992: 107.

¹⁵ Gunn 1991 and 1992. Roberts depicts this shift in method from a triple move as one from reproduction, with ahistorical premises, to retroaction (1999).

¹⁶ Bonefeld 1992: 99; see also Gunn 1992.

a contradictory and complex process. So, it cannot be conceived through Cartesian dualities such as subject/object, is /ought to be and theory/practice. For regularity is a form of contradiction inherent in reality, Marxism is seen as “a theory of the contradictions of social reality”¹⁸. As far as social reality is seen as contradictory in and through class struggle, to conceive this reality requires an openness of categories. Theory should be open as well as the social reality itself, as the idea that the world moves through stable periods that can be methodologically analysed through transhistorical and dualist categories is refuted. So, it should concern its position within the social and historical relations of production and thus be open to practice as well.

Within his critique of the fetishism of Closed Marxism¹⁹, Psychopedis argues that internal relations between categories were disconnected through

the disconnection of the axiological from the descriptive elements of theoretical analysis, the disconnection of the conceptual constitution of the historical object from the idea of the historicity of the conceptual framework, the disconnection of the empirical element from the social theory which concerns its constitution and..the disconnection of the structural from the spontaneous elements in social action²⁰.

¹⁷ Bonefeld et al 1992a: xii.

¹⁸ Bonefeld 1992: 104.

¹⁹ Open Marxist approach labels all forms of scientism, Rational Choice Marxism and Analytical Marxism, Critical Realism, structuralist and regulationist analysis, as Closed Marxism in their inability to comprehend change due to the determinist premises, neo-Kantian roots and separation of theory and practice and instead develops a Hegelian approach (Bonefeld et al 1992a and 1992b).

²⁰ Psychopedis 1991: 177.

As social phenomena are perceived as the contradictory unity of different forms, their interrelation can only be grasped through determinate, that is to say substantive, abstraction. What is to be undertaken is:

substantive abstraction which constitutes their social reality as interconnected, as complex forms different from but united to each other...in order to theorise this interconnection, the theoretical approach has to specify the historical process which constitutes the common element that makes social phenomena different from each other in unity.²¹

In this regard, the attempt then becomes to uncover the abstract and generic existence in the concrete without reducing the latter to a product of the former which opens the way for a practically reflexive theorising overcoming the theory/practice and metatheory/theory distinction. Determinate abstraction opens way for reflexivity, when theoretically engaged within a practical context. This is a type of reflexivity in which ‘the theorisation of its object, of its presence within its object and the validity of its categories (as categories appropriate to the theorisation of precisely that object) are not three conceptual moves but a single totalisation’²²

Open Marxists start their analysis from a rejection of marginalist accounts of society with their argument of economy as a self-contained system, and thereby division of society to the economy, polity and civil society.²³ Inspired by the marginalist revolution, conventional approaches in

²¹ Bonefeld 1992: 99; Bonefeld 2001. See also Gunn’s conception of determinate abstraction based upon abstraction in time referring to abstraction within the confines of a specific mode of production (Gunn 1992: 16)

²² Gunn 1989: 93.

²³ Clarke 1982b; Burnham 1994.

International Political Economy take the state and market in the form of two separate entities as their starting point of investigation. The inability of mainstream approaches to consider change beyond capitalism is an aspect of the reification of the state and market, taking the political and the economic, as ahistorical entities.

The starting point for Open Marxist analysis is Marx's theory of value in that value is not an economic relation but as far as it refers to the relation between capital and labour, it is a social relation 'which combines inextricably economic, political and ideological dimensions in the sense that it is a relation simultaneously of exploitation, of domination and of ideological struggle.'²⁴ Thereby, it is aimed to demystify the social constitution of relations appearing as those between things so as to reveal the human content, so their analysis turns out to be the critique of social form, which as Bonefeld contends 'amounts to a critique of economic categories and it does so by revealing the human content that these forms render invisible at the same time as which the existence of capital rests in its entirety on human social practice.'²⁵ Along these lines, in contrast to regulationist and neo-Gramscian theorising, the focus is on the value form as a critique of global social relations.

Open Marxism suggests, following Marx, to take the social relations of production as starting point. The state is grasped as an integral aspect of the set

²⁴ Clarke 1991a: 9; see also Bonefeld 2001. Actually, this was the basis of the State Derivation Debate of the 1970s, within which Hirsch's historical derivation of the state had a central place.

²⁵ Bonefeld 2002: 53.

of social relations whose overall form is determined by the manner in which the extraction of the surplus from the immediate producer is secured. On this basis, the historical specificity of state forms is analysed in terms of the social organisation of production in class societies. Consequently, the central concern for the capitalist state form turns out to be ‘what it is about the relations of production under capitalism that makes them assume separate economic and political forms’²⁶. Thereby, the focus of analysis resorts to the way the social relations of production are organised in capitalism. In contrast to feudalism, when economic and political authority was overlapping and economic exploitation was enforced politically, class domination in capitalism is mediated through commodity exchange. Based on the institution of private property, society is split in the bourgeoisie and labour and thus, economic exploitation is not politically enforced, but the result of the free sale and purchase of labour power.

This abstraction of relations of force from the immediate process of production and their necessary location (since class domination must ultimately rest on force) in an instance separated from individual capitals constitutes (historically and logically) the economic and the political as distinct, particularised forms of capitalist domination²⁷.

Taken in these terms, the capitalist state is understood as the historically specific particularisation of the political in capitalism. The apparent separation of the state and market in capitalism does not imply, however, that there is not

²⁶ Holloway and Picciotto 1977: 78.

²⁷ Holloway and Picciotto 1977: 79

an internal relation between the two. Rather, ‘it is an institutionalised illusion’²⁸ as Burnham asserts,

Despite the ‘separation’ between the ‘moment of coercion’ and the ‘moment of appropriation’ in capitalism, absolute private property, the contractual relation which binds producer to appropriator and the process of generalised commodity exchange itself are all maintained through legal and political forms. In this way in bourgeois civil society, the ‘economic’ rests firmly on the ‘political’ despite their ‘differentiation’. Hence, the contradictory internal unity of state and market in capitalism.²⁹

Grounded in this understanding, the underlying unity of differentiated forms of capitalist power is based on Marx’s theory of value, which is itself unified and regulated through capitalist property and money as the most abstract form of capital whose power is institutionalised in the law enforced by the state.³⁰

As an implication of the conception of social reality as based on contradiction, which is class struggle, Open Marxists differentiate themselves from other relational approaches as they perceive relation on the basis of class relation between capital and labour. In other words, social forms are seen as a mode of existence of presence of labour within capital. State, labour and capital are the fetishised forms of this class relation³¹. However, class itself is a historical category as well. Moreover, it is argued that ‘capital cannot exist

²⁸ Burnham 1995: 101.

²⁹ Burnham 1995: 145.

³⁰ Bonefeld 1992; Clarke 1982b.

³¹ As a detailed analysis of open Marxist method goes beyond the limits of this thesis, for a critique of not positing different levels of abstraction giving way to reductionist tendencies in open Marxism with their exclusive concern with the capital-labour relation neglecting the qualitative differences between social forms, see Roberts 2003: 78.

without the state..the state mediates capital's dependence on the reproduction of labour power within the limits of capital."³² This implies that, capital, like class, should be perceived as a social relation. It is neither a thing nor only a factor of production and can only be analysed taking into consideration the presence of labour within capital.³³

The main emphasis in Open Marxist analyses is the reification of the moment of labour's struggle against the alienating world of capitalist power. The basic concern in this regard is that it is only through the alienated power of labour that the circuit of capital begins. Capital exists only in and through labour; and thereby, social forms are contradictory and open to change as labour asserts its own power in and against capitalist forms of alienation. It is on these grounds that a possibility of crisis is inherent in the accumulation cycle.³⁴

Such perceptions imply a different understanding of capitalism, going beyond the regulationist and neo-Gramscian attempts to bring historical sensitivity, which is revealed in Clarke's contention that 'capitalist production is not a structure with a given foundation but a process whose reproduction depends on its reproducing its own foundations"³⁵. On these grounds, an emphasis on laws of capitalist development is the imposition of methodological

³² Bonefeld 1992: 119.

³³ Bonefeld 1992 and 2001.

³⁴ Burnham 2000a: 104.

³⁵ Clarke 1991b: 190.

categories to social reality in the sense that these laws are perceived as the results of these struggles rather than as forms through and in which class antagonism exists. This implies an external relation between categories. Thus, Open Marxism, through its emphasis on the role of social and political struggles contends that historical periodisations of capitalism, such as those of Fordism and post-Fordism, have severe limitations in that it is drawn demarcation lines and turning points between different periods of capitalism with an implication that history has a linear and logical flow.

To posit an external relationship between structures and laws of capitalist development on one hand and class antagonisms on the other is to fall into fetishism.³⁶ Rather, “structures are modes of existence of the class antagonism of capital and labour. The laws of capitalist development are..the movement of the class struggle.”³⁷ As far as the crisis tendencies is perceived as implicit in the class relation, structures then turns out to be inherent in the form of class struggle.³⁸ Therefore, Hirsch’s and Jessop’s positing of a dialectical relation between structure and struggle, presented in the second chapter, is criticised on the grounds that positing such a dialectical relation would lead to a neglect of their internality. However, rather than the “explicit focus of analysis, the development of the working class and of working class struggle is an inherent part of the development of the analysis of capital.” It is argued that class

³⁶ Holloway, 1991: p.100.

³⁷ Bonefeld 1992: 98.

³⁸ Bonefeld 1991; Clarke 1991c.

relations have no existence by itself but exist only in and through forms. Social phenomena are put in a historical mode of existence by social relations of production. In this regard, class is perceived as a contradictory and antagonistic social relation, within which class relations are perceived as not only economic but also political and cultural relations.³⁹ Alongside the contention that labour can exist in and against capital whereas capital exists only in and through labour; economic, political and ideological are conceived as forms in and through which class antagonism exists. They are moments of one process but not levels with a determinist relation among them. The interrelation of these forms should be put forward with a historically specific analysis of the concrete independent of a definite logic.

In light of these arguments, through form analysis suggested by Open Marxists, it is possible to conceive the state and the market as forms of social relations of a particular type of society. Along these lines, both the capitalist state and the capitalist market are seen as social forms assumed by the capital relation as the institutional products of the abstraction of coercive power from the process of surplus appropriation. However, they are not only the forms of appearance of capital but also its modes of existence.⁴⁰ In this manner, the capital relation is not an economic relation with an existence by itself, rather exists in and through different social forms like the state and the market. The

³⁹ Bonefeld et al 1992b: xiii; Gerstenberger 1992.

⁴⁰ Bonefeld et al 1992a; Holloway 1991a.

economic, political and ideological are forms which are taken by the relations of production but relations of production are not understood purely in technical or economic terms. They cannot be conceptualised independently of one another and the concept relations of production expressing their essential unity and complementarity. Therefore, as Clarke argues:

the economic, in the narrow sense, the political and ideological are not defined abstractly as frameworks within which relations of production are subsequently to be defined, as politically and ideologically constituted and reproduced relations within which material production takes place. Rather, the economic, political and ideological are forms which are taken by the relations of production. Political and ideological are as much as relations of production as are strictly economic relations within which production takes place.⁴¹

As expressed in its relational understanding of social phenomena, Open Marxism strongly objects to the reification of the state. In other words, it is impossible to accept any ontological distinction within social phenomena, between the state, capital and class. The aim is to conceptualise the internal framework of capitalist social relations of production. Alongside the Open Marxist contention that the economic and the political should be regarded as constituting a contradictory unity, whose separation is a process of class struggle; the state is seen as a rigidified form of social relations of production, as a historical process of class struggle.⁴² Within this methodological framework, the focus of attention turns from taking the particularisation of the

⁴¹ Clarke 1991b: 84-85.

⁴² Bonefeld 1992: 100 and Clarke 1991a: 46.

state as its essential character and from the necessity of deriving the logical necessity of the state to an understanding based on seeing the capitalist state form as a form of capitalist social relations of production in which the reproduction of the state is both the object and the result of a permanent class struggle.⁴³ The state “is a relation between people which does not appear to be a relation between people, a social relation which exists in the form of something external to social relations” In this sense, with form analysis it is intended to demystify, that is to say, “to dissolve the state as a category...to understand the state not as a thing in itself but as a form of social relations.”⁴⁴

Taken in these terms, the state cannot resolve the contradictions of capital accumulation but articulates them in a political form and thereby, political institutions are not neutral mechanisms capable of articulating class compromise⁴⁵ but institutional forms of class domination which express a particular configuration of class struggle.⁴⁶ The failure to recognise the nature of the state as such, its internal relation to capital, threatens to weaken the potency of oppositional movements.

4.2.2 Capitalism as a Global System of Class Domination

The basic characteristic of Open Marxism, as defined above, is the priority given to the class relation between capital and labour which makes it

⁴³ Clarke 1991a:9; Holloway 1995: 122.

⁴⁴ Holloway 1995: 119-120.

⁴⁵ Such an understanding can be derived from the methodological fallacies of regulation and neo-Gramscian approaches which have been presented in the preceding chapters.

⁴⁶ Clarke 1991c: 127-128.

possible to analyse the relation between the economic and political as the complementary forms of class relation. The power of the capitalist state in its liberal form is embodied in the rule of law and money as the most appropriate form to serve the expansion of capitalist social relations since the social power of the bourgeoisie is embodied in the form of money. In this manner, the presence of state management is based on the need to regulate the contradictory relationship between capital and labour.

By the same token, the complexity of an increasingly interdependent global political economy governed by the law of value in which social relations between people take the form of relations between things is taken as the starting point for a critique of world market. In this regard, in order to demystify the globalisation arguments, the starting point for Open Marxists is a conceptualisation of the relation between capital and labour, theorisation of class relation as a global social relationship and national states as moments in the global flow of capital.⁴⁷ Holloway argues that:

all of these approaches treat capital as though it could be understood in terms of its personal, institutional or local attachment instead of seeing these attachments as transitory moments, staging posts in the incessant flow of capital..The relative immobility of the national state and extremely high mobility of capital makes it possible to establish such a simple relation between a national state and any particular part of world capital.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Bonefeld 1992: 122-123.

⁴⁸ Holloway 1995: 126.

In this sense, it is put forward that capital is neither a thing nor just a factor of production, but a global social relation of capital and labour. Thus, the relation between the state and capital can not be understood without taking into consideration labour, value, money, workers, class struggle etc., to which capital is in relation. In the same manner, world market appears as an objective force only when it is abstracted from the capitalist social relations of production. On the contrary, within open Marxist accounts, world market is posited within an analysis of relations of exploitation that is the presence of labour within capital. World market, hence, constituted by the presence of labour within capital should be perceived as a global relation of class struggle. World market as such is also the basis through which all categories subsist, the historical condition of capitalist social relations of production and constitutes the totality of capitalist existence.⁴⁹ Conceived in this manner, it is not an objective force on its own but rather a crisis ridden relation of class struggle. Only because the relations between people is structured in such a way that capitals have to compete with each other in the market that money become self expansive. Against the reified conceptions of money as a thing, it is put forward that it is a phenomenon specific to a historical form of labour. It is the capital relation between the owners of property in the means of production and wage labourers which constitutes such a system of market dependence.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Bonefeld 2000: 51

⁵⁰ Bonefeld 2000: 42; Burnham 1990.

Taken in these terms, world market ‘is the presupposition, premise and result of the capitalist exploitation of labour’⁵¹ Once constituted as such, inherent in the concept of capital is the innate necessity of creating an ever expanding market to expand its value. In this manner, the contradictory basis of capitalist accumulation unfolds on a global scale, the primary contradiction being the capitalist tendency to develop the productive forces without limit and the need to confine accumulation within the limits of the social relations of production.⁵² Thus, the percipience of crisis is that the foundation of the crisis of capitalist accumulation is the integration of labour as a productive factor in the capital relation. The expansion of capital is not just the universalisation of exchange relations but also the expansion of capitalist social relations, generating a system of universal interdependence mediated by things. In this manner, capitalist social relations of production gave rise to a market which is not only apparently separate from political control but also beyond a differentiation of the internal and external⁵³. Thereby, capitalism is theorised as a system of power relations which were not confined by the territories of states. As capitalism is premised on the abstraction of the political from the economic, the national state and the world market are necessary social forms through which the capital relation is constituted.⁵⁴ On these grounds, it is asserted that

⁵¹ Bonefeld 2000: 50.

⁵² Clarke 2001: 203; 1999. See also Burnham 1990.

⁵³ Clarke 1988 177-180.

“The world market... stands not just for the global expansion of capital but..for the universality of the class antagonism between capital and labour and therewith the totality of its own contradictory constitution.”⁵⁵

In this manner, to understand the development of any particular state can only be in the context of the global development of capitalist social relations which is a historical contradictory process. To posit a relation between national states in terms of internal/ external or inside/outside and politics/economics would be a reproduction of the fetishisation of social relations. As far as an analysis starts with the ontological fallacy seeing the nation state in its rigidified form, then international relations are seen as a relation between states and world appears as the sum of national states. Such an analysis can posit that a national state can intervene in the domestic policies of another or that a national state can direct the policies of another. Against such understandings, Open Marxist analysis poses the question of whether it is plausible to put a distinction between the internal and external of a state. For example, as far as the ontological fallacy in reification of the state is repeated in that of capital and the market, the relations between people are reduced to relations between things and particularly in this manner that it becomes possible to set forth that a state is regulated by global civil society or according to the commands of the

⁵⁴ Bonefeld 2000; Burnham 1994. In Wallerstein’s world system analysis, it is the international division of labour derived from the world market which defined the position of core and periphery and the relations of exploitation and the form of the state. However, in open Marxist accounts this Smithian basis is overcome through positing national states as nodes within the global social relations of production (Holloway 1995 and Burnham 2000a: 107). See also Rosenberg 1991: 91-92 and 102.

⁵⁵ Bonefeld 2000: 49.

IMF.⁵⁶ In the same sense that a theory arguing for state intervention in the economy, based on an understanding that there is an external relation between them intends to explain the conditions under which the state intervenes in the economy.⁵⁷ On these grounds, the historical analysis of the concrete depicting internal relations between phenomena gains importance.

The world system is seen neither as one of an aggregation of national states nor as a world market on one hand and system of sovereign states on the other but as a global economy and a system of nation-states which are separation in unity of the capital relation.⁵⁸ In this sense, ‘rather the fractured existence of political as nation states decomposes the world into so many apparently autonomous states.’⁵⁹ The global and the national are perceived as separation in unity as moments of the capital relation constituting them as distinct forms of existence. To conceptualise the relation between the national state and global social relations of production as such, opens way for an understanding of the competition between national states not as a struggle between states but as that between national states to attract a share of global

⁵⁶ For a critique of this line of argumentation for the post war reconstruction, analysing the period in concern in terms of American hegemony imposing its model of development to the rest of the world, particularly of what Burnham calls capitulation thesis of the neo-Gramscians; see Burnham 1990.

⁵⁷ Within such formulations, as Burnham contends, ‘States and markets are treated as self-evident entities and no attempt is made either to develop or relate to existing theories of the ‘state’ or to consider the inner connection (rather than the apparent external relationship) between ‘the state’ and ‘the market’. Instead ‘the state’ is fetishised whilst ‘the market’ is dehistoricised and viewed as a technical arena in which the ‘external’ state ‘intervenes’ ’ (1995: 136).

⁵⁸ Bonefeld 2000: 40; Holloway 1995.

⁵⁹ Holloway, 1995: 124. See also Bonefeld 2000: 37.

capital.⁶⁰ For that, the national state must on one hand ensure favourable conditions of reproduction of capital within its boundaries and provide international support to capital operating within its boundaries.⁶¹ In this manner, to understand the development of any particular state can only be in the context of the global development of capitalist social relations which is a historical contradictory process. That is to say, capitalist social relations of production not only involve the apparent separation of the political and the economic but also are beyond territorial constraint:

The freeing of the worker from a particular exploiter, the freeing of the exploiter from a particular group of workers, implied the establishment of social relations in which geographical location was absolutely contingent, in which capital could, and did, flow all over the world.⁶²

Following such a conceptualisation, the novelty of the contradiction between the national form of the political and the global character of capital is refuted and it is revealed that this contradiction has been an inherent feature of capitalism which becomes explicit in periods of crisis.⁶³ Thereby, although the character of accumulation is global, the conditions of exploitation are

⁶⁰ This implies that “Competition between capitals, however, is not confined within a domestic economy. The accumulation of capital within the domestic economy depends on the accumulation of capital on a world scale. The role of the capitalist state is to express the ‘general interest’ of capital. However, the national form of the state implies that the state can only constitute this ‘general interest’ on a national basis. Nation-states therefore have a similar relation of conflict and collaboration as individual capitals” (Burnham 1990: 185).

⁶¹ Holloway 1995; Burnham 1995.

⁶² Holloway 1995: 123. See also Bonefeld 2000: 42.

⁶³ Clarke 2001. For an analogy between the crisis of 1847 and the current crisis on these grounds, see Clarke 1999. See also Clarke 1988.

standardised at the national political level which implies that capital cannot be conceptualised at the national level. On these grounds, it is contended that capitalist society has always been a world society in which

sovereign states via the exchange rate mechanism, are interlocked internationally into a hierarchy of price systems ...; national states therefore founded on the rule of money and law are at the same time confined within limits imposed by the accumulation of capital on a world scale – the most obvious and important manifestation of which is their subordination to world money.⁶⁴

By this means, globalism has always been inherent in capitalism, realisation of surplus value had never been bounded by territorial states⁶⁵ and thus, there has always been a territorial non-coincidence between global society and national states, as states strive to internalise the conditions under which they have to remove barriers to the capital flows in and through their territories.⁶⁶

Within the same line of argumentation, national economy cannot be seen as independent or as in relation to the world market but rather subsists in and through the world market.⁶⁷ Peter Burnham suggests that international relations should be perceived as a moment of ‘the national processing of global class relations’.⁶⁸ Given the contradictory nature of the capital relation, the national

⁶⁴ Burnham 1995b: 103.

⁶⁵ Bonefeld 2000.

⁶⁶ Burnham 2000a. See also, Bromley 1996 and 1999; Bonefeld 2000.

⁶⁷ Bonefeld 2000: 41; see also Burnham 2000: and Holloway 1995.

⁶⁸ Burnham 1995: 94.

state attempts to mobilise resources and to change international economic and political relations. The contemporary changes are, thus not a transition from the national to the global economy but rather a change in the form of global existence of capital, the liquefaction of capital, following the crisis of overaccumulation.⁶⁹

‘The development of nation states, their relation to each other and their existence as moments of global capital can be understood only in the context of the crisis-ridden development of class struggle.’⁷⁰ In this sense, the change in the character of the state’s integration to the world economy is confined in their ability to enhance accumulation and manage class struggle both nationally and globally. On these grounds, it is asserted that:

the dilemma facing national states is that, whilst participation in multilateral trade rounds and financial summits is necessary to enhance the accumulation of capital on the global level, such participation is also a potential source of disadvantage which can seriously undermine a particular national states’ economic strategy. The history of the modern international system is the history of the playing out of this tension⁷¹

Based on these arguments, this methodological stance, rather than on specific institutional characteristics, focuses on the political form and draws attention to the management of labour and money as the central points of state intervention in capitalist societies.

⁶⁹ Holloway 1995: 133; see also Clarke 2001.

⁷⁰ Holloway 1995:

⁷¹ Burnham 1995a: 149.

4.2.3 Open Marxism on Globalisation and the State

Open Marxism contends that such a transition to a new form of capitalism, characteristic of all the approaches in the preceding chapters is based on a misconception of the Keynesian state of the post-war period as the nationally bounded site of social welfare with an overemphasis on the stability of this period. As an implication of this understanding, what is obscured is the necessarily capitalist form of the state, as if the state in the post-war period acquired some positive functions. Yet, within open Marxist diagnosis the post-war developments cannot be seen as succession of regimes of accumulation, from Fordism to post-Fordism. Rather, there has only been a change in the modes of domination of labour. Hence, Keynesianism and monetarism were political answers to the insubordinate power of labour.⁷² Additionally, the relative stability of capital in this period gave way to the conceptualisations of national politics and national economies abstracted from their unity in the global social relations of production. However, conceived within Open Marxist premises, this was a period of “restructuring accumulation within a context of inter-imperialist rivalry in which nation-states seek temporarily to overcome the contradictions of the capital relation which are manifest in uneven development.”⁷³ In this regard, as Clarke shows, to periodise the state form

⁷² Bonefeld and Holloway 1995. For an overview of the global overaccumulation of capital and class struggle and the role of class struggle on the implementation of state policies in this context, see Clarke 2001.

⁷³ Burnham 1991: 85 and 1995. That is to say, both protectionism and free trade policies can be taken as the expression of the global existence of capital as both are designed to attract capital (Holloway 1995: 137 f.n. 15; Bonefeld 2000: 40-41).

according to its functions is misleading that regardless of the historical form of government, the bourgeois state has always been a liberal-bourgeois state.⁷⁴ In this manner, then the Keynesian welfare state of the post-war era neither contained its national economy and international economy which is now transcended by a global social and economic system.

Within Open Marxist diagnosis, the crisis of Keynesianism is seen as an expression of the underlying contradiction of the capitalist state form in the face of a global crisis of overaccumulation, which appeared as a conflict between the power of money and the power of the state, as the institutionalised forms of class collaboration increasingly appeared as a barrier to the accumulation of capital and the aspirations of the working class, and so took the form of a class struggle over the form of the state. On the same grounds, then, the rise of monetarism is argued to express the provisional triumph of capital in this struggle as the subordination of the institutional forms of the Keynesian welfare state to the power of money confined the aspirations of the working class within the limits of capital.⁷⁵

Put in this perspective, the reason for crisis is not the internationalisation of capital but rather the growing overaccumulation of capital on a world scale, and crisis is a manifestation that internationalisation as such has reached its limits.⁷⁶ As far as the root of the crisis is posited within the integration of

⁷⁴ Clarke 1992; see also Burnham 1990 and Bromley 1996 for a similar line of argumentation.

⁷⁵ Clarke 1988; Bonefeld and Holloway 1995.

⁷⁶ Clarke 2001.

labour in the capital relation, that is to say, in the insufficiency of relations of exploitation, the current processes of restructuring can be seen as a response to the expression of crisis in the form of the flight of capital in money form from the insufficiency of its own subordination of the power of labour.⁷⁷ That is to say, capitalist crises assert themselves in the form of unemployed capital that fails to make profit from exploiting labour and has spilled over to speculative channels. The rise of monetarism, then, is seen as a response to the inconvertibility of money into expanded command over labour. Thereby, such a change does not amount to a new type of capitalism but rather emphasizes the dependence of capital on labour. Moreover, this change in form implies a change in the mobility of capital and thereby in that between the immobile state and the increasingly mobile capital. However, at some moment it has a spatial location and the relation of particular states to global capital is mediated through the process of competition for the immobilisation of capital as such within their territories.

In these terms, then, what underlies the expansionary policies of late 1960s and early 70s was the need to transform class conflict into demand and full employment guarantees. Thus, stagflation in 1970s is seen as an expression of global balance of class forces as working class pressure curtailed the pursuit of deflationary policies.⁷⁸ Hence, the pursuit of neo-liberal policies cannot be

⁷⁷ Bonefeld and Holloway 1995; Holloway 1995. Within open Marxist accounts, based on this premise, money is understood as a form of class struggle. For a further elaboration see Marazzi 1995.

⁷⁸ Clarke 2001; Bonefeld 1995.

taken as an obstruction of the national state by international capital but the success of the new right in channelling working class in the attempts to overcome crisis.

As far as the national state is conceived as a node in the global capital relation, it is revealed that it cannot stand above the law of value. On these grounds, it is put forward that it is the limits of the national form of the state which ensure that the actions of the state are confined within the limits of capital and that the state cannot resolve the inherent contradictions of capital accumulation. This cannot be seen as an external economic constraint but inherent in the form of the state as a national state.⁷⁹ Within this context, it is asserted that global capitalism is still an international system and the changes argued to characterise the global economy introduced by states in attempts to solve problems that have their roots in the contradictory constitution of the capital relation, that is the conflict between labour and capital, are an integral part of the process.⁸⁰ Thereby, neither states nor labour can be seen as simply the object of this process, they are integral elements of the crisis of the social whole.

The conceptualisation of the relation between the national states and the global relations of social production as such reveals how the apparent dichotomy of internal and external is employed as policy tools as if something imposed from external. National states, in turn, are not seen as merely

⁷⁹ Clarke 1988.

⁸⁰ Burnham 2000; Holloway 1995.

influenced by globalisation but as an integral part of the crisis of the social whole. In this manner, they should rather be understood as an aspect of the integration of the national and global political conflict. Thereby, the present age is “the recomposition of labour/capital relations expressed as the restructuring of relations of conflict and collaboration between national states”⁸¹.

Put in terms of the open Marxist conception, then, the current changes can be approached as one from a politicised mode of management to a depoliticised one or as a change from an inflationary to a deflationary reproduction of labour into capital relation.⁸² On these grounds, the anti-labour policy is de-politicised as it is represented as an external economic rationality.⁸³

Within open Marxist diagnosis, the differentiation of both the economy and the state and with them the world market and nation states as distinct orders are accounted for by the emergence and consolidation of capitalist social relations of production on an increasingly global basis. Then, open Marxism could come to terms that all social relations, including the system of states and the world market are historically constructed and politically contestable. The particular form taken by the relation of politics and economics or national and global is then seen as being determined by the outcomes of class struggle.

⁸¹ Bonefeld et al 1995: 31; see also Burnham 2000b.

⁸² Bonefeld 1995.

⁸³ Burnham 2000b. For a further discussion and elaboration of these features in the context of Britain, see Burnham 2001.

One of the important remarks to be made about open Marxist approach is that their emphasis on class struggle should not be understood as imposing a subjectivist scheme. Their conception of class struggle refers to the objective antagonism between capital and labour within the accumulation process and in these terms, lays the emphasis on the delicacy of capitalism as a system of class domination.

A main criticism towards open Marxism may be that even though there is an emphasis on the ideological role of social forms reflecting the contradiction between capital and labour, they do not provide the necessary conceptual tools for such an analysis. On these grounds, Roberts criticises open Marxism in that “they do not ...demonstrate with equal insight how social forms also refract this contradiction in their own unique and qualitative way.”⁸⁴ Such a shortcoming may be overcome with the inclusion of a conception of hegemony within open Marxist analysis, which has been ignored as its Poulantzian conception has been strongly criticised for launching into politicism.⁸⁵ In this sense, to refrain from an overemphasis in ideology, should not lead to a denial of the ways these forms refract these contradictions. The conceptualisations of class struggle and praxis in terms of capital and labour relation in open Marxism provides a ground on which a conception of hegemony going beyond structure and agency dichotomy can be integrated.⁸⁶ Such a conception of

⁸⁴ Roberts 2003: 88.

⁸⁵ Clarke 1977.

⁸⁶ See Joseph 2002, for a similar line of argumentation within critical realism.

hegemony would provide a fertile ground for further Open Marxist diagnoses⁸⁷. Another context, which can be emphasized within the same line, is the need for sensitivity towards the spatio-temporal framework of the social relations of production, especially within the context of the geographical expressions of uneven development of capitalism.

⁸⁷ See Rupert 1995 with a similar aspiration and Rupert 2000 for an analysis of ideologies of globalisation as such.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The starting point for this thesis was that the arguments on globalisation, both those calling for a transition to a global age and the concomitant demise of state power and those stating that globalisation is a myth and that states preserve their central role in economic activity are based on a dichotomic conception of the relation between both the national and the global and between the political and the economic. Within the thesis, it was contended that such a shortcoming cannot be overcome unless world economy is conceptualised as a social realm, that is to say, unless the world market and the national state is conceptualised as forms of capitalist social relations of production. Such a theorisation provides a convenient ground to overcome the dichotomic understanding of the national and the global and the political and the economic and it becomes possible to conceptualise the internal relations between the state, labour and capital.

Within the second chapter, it was intended to put forward an analysis of Regulation Approach as an attempt to overcome the opacity posited on the part of subjects in Althusserian structuralism and the methodological and conceptual framework of Regulation approach was elaborated alongside their

analyses of crisis and hegemony, which has a central role in the relation they posit between regimes of accumulation and modes of regulation. Accompanying the intention to get beyond structuralism through reformulation of reproduction within regulation as such have been efforts to engage in an intermediate theorising, the concretisation of the abstract as such, in search of an approach that would facilitate to highlight historical variety as well as national specificity in the analysis of capitalist development.

Nonetheless, it would be passable to say that such a reformulation of reproduction within regulationist accounts has given rise to a functionalist account in as much as the mode of regulation is conceived as institutions to secure balanced growth rather than the reproduction of class domination. The attempts by Hirsch and Jessop to overcome such a functionalism retained the cleavage between instrumentalism and functionalism as far as the relational nature of the whole is fragmented. Hence, within this context, due to the lack of an analysis of an internal relationship between labour and political domination, the current processes of recomposition has been portrayed as a hollowing out of the state without a possibility of highlighting that such a shift in regulation imposes a different way of integrating the labour in the capital relation hiding the political character of decision making.

The third chapter was an analysis of the introduction of a critical approach to the study of International Political Economy organised around the neo-Gramscian notion of hegemony. Within this context, by presenting the basic position of Robert Cox's historical structure approach, it was intended to

put forward that the main problem of such an analysis is that there is a compartmentalisation of capitalist development into successive historical structures without theorising the relation of these historical structures to the capitalist social relations of production. Thereby, neither the capitalist state nor the world market is taken to be the forms of capitalist social relations of production. While Cox's analysis emphasizes the importance of changing forms of state for the production and reproduction of the world order, such an analysis fails to take into consideration the contradictory form of capital relation. In short, despite the employment of the concept of state form, it remains neither theorised nor historicised. Such an inclination gives way to an autonomous view of the state devoid of the constraints inherent in its form as an integral aspect of capitalist social relations of production.

In this sense, the contention that the developments started by 1970s lead to an ontological shift since "the nature of these developments indicates contradictions between the logic of globalising forces and the political conditions of existence for the operation of these forces"¹, implies that society was a nationally bounded realm prior to this breaking point and fails to conceive that these contradictions are intrinsic to capitalism itself.

It can be contended that introduction of hegemony, by neo-Gramscian approach, as intertwining coercion and consent in maintaining international order, certainly provides a challenge to mainstream state-centric visions as far as their analysis makes it possible to interpret relations and processes obscured

¹ Gill 1993: 12.

in the latter. However, such a challenge fails to escape the limitations of conventional statist approaches in as much as the analysis is not posited within the social categories of capitalism; and thereby cannot theorise how such categories are transformed over the course of the contradictions inherent in the capitalist class exploitation.

In this manner, this approach directs our attention to the social forces which impose specific purposes and functions to given institutions, rather than specify the social relations which constitute the social forms themselves. That is to say, the presentation of global forces within neo-Gramscians is not conceptualised within their relation to historically specific relations. The world market and the state system are not taken as expressions of particularly capitalist social relations of production. The emphasis is on the emergence of an autonomous market, disembedded from political power, rather than focusing on the social relations giving way to the emergence of an economic domain free from political constraints. What is obscured in this manner is that the self-regulating market is a form of a specific social relation of production with the emergence of wage labour and its separation is no more than apparent. Conceived as detached from its capitalist form and its economy being subordinated to the impulses of a global economy, the national state then turns out to be a transmission belt in the so-called era of globalisation.

The analysis presented within the chapters on regulation and neo-Gramscian approaches reveals that the extremes of voluntarism and determinism would not be transcended as far as the analysis is confined within

the contingent relation between the economic and the political, as a legacy of structuralism. It was sought to show that the attempts to overcome the deterministic implications of structuralist Marxism through the theorisation of the concrete, fails to escape such limitations as far as it is focused on the 'interaction' between two contingently related realms of the economic and the political instead of conceiving the economic and the political as forms of capitalist social relations of production, that is to say, forms taken by class struggle in capitalist society. In this manner, historical specificity is posited within an increasingly exclusive relation between capitalism in the abstract and capitalism in the concrete, that is to say, in the mutually exclusive forms of structural determinacy and historical contingency. It has been contended that such shortcomings can be superseded through the rejection of the dichotomy between the material and social aspects of social totality, instead arguing for their internal relation and thereby, providing an understanding that base comprises the totality of social relations.

Based on this understanding, in the fourth chapter, it was elaborated on an alternative understanding as a solution to the problems of the relation between structure and contingency and the political and the economic through drawing insights from recent form-theoretical historical materialist accounts. In this regard, as far as the basic deficiency of both the regulation and neo-Gramscian approaches in their conception of the relation between the abstract and the concrete is concerned, firstly it was focused on the method pointing out the historicity of social phenomena and their relations and thereby showing

their construction by human beings. Based on this framework, the conceptualisation of capitalism which overcomes the base/superstructure model through understanding base as a social realm was presented. Then, it was intended to provide an overview of Open Marxism which perceives the relations between phenomenal forms as internal relations. The analyses taken into consideration along these lines focus on the argument that capitalism not only involves the historical separation of the economic and the political but also implies their internal relation. Within this perception, capital is seen as not an economic but a social relation, which could only exist in and through differentiated social forms and finds its institutional expression in the institutionally defined spheres of the political and the economic. It is revealed that, contrary to the debate on globalisation, the state and the economy are not two separate social entities, one of which determines the other. By drawing upon and developing Marx's conceptualisation of the world market and his critique of fetishism, open Marxist accounts present that both the political and the economic and the global and the national are different in unity. Such an understanding provides an insightful position for transcending the sterile dichotomies of the state/market and the national/global underlying the globalisation debate and is crucial for any understanding of globalisation and the state. Through presenting the social constitution of the world market as such, it becomes possible to conceive the internal relation between the state, capital and labour and between the global and national.

In this manner, then, through conceiving the transnational nature of capitalism and states as moments in this structure, and going beyond the understandings of a nationally bounded society or economy, it is revealed that capitalist social relations of production are both transnational and national. Such a conceptualisation highlighting the national and transnational aspects of capitalism makes it possible to develop a conception of the different organisations of capitalist space produced in the national processing of global capitalism and to put forward the changing forms the relation between the global and national takes.

Building upon the elaboration on and evaluation of the different approaches to the study of globalisation it would be possible to argue that an approach seeing the state and market as forms of capitalist social relations of production, realising that these social relations are inherently global provides a strong insight in terms of the national state's role in the current phase. Following such an insight, it would be adequate to argue that the emphasis should be on social totality rather than on the interaction of different levels. As far as the internal relations between the state, capital and labour is taken as a basis, it becomes possible to analyse the current processes in terms of the recomposition of the organic whole. In this sense, rather than positing the problem as a loss of power on the part of states to markets, the point turns out to be an exploration of the change in the institutional form of this relationship based on the historical character of the class struggle.

In this manner, global capitalism can be conceived still as an antagonistic state system in which many of the changes that characterise the global economy are introduced by states within their endeavour to solve problems which have their roots in the contradictory constitution of the capital relation that is the presence of labour within capital. Yet, neither regulationist nor neo-Gramscian accounts were able to embark upon with such an understanding because of the lack of a conceptualisation of the social totality implying the lack of a theorisation between the national state and the world market and thereby, of an internal relation posited between the state, capital and labour. Either way, the effect of the debate on globalisation and the state turns out to be a reiteration of the cleavage between global forces and national states to the extent that the relationship between the national state and world market is conceptualised as an external one, thereby implying that the nature of that relationship was more confrontational rather than consensual.

This is not to deny that profound political and economic changes are taking place, to undermine the developments in contemporary era but rather to argue that the turn towards global economic integration was not a transition from the international to the global or a transfer of power from the state to the market but a recomposition of capitalism. Put in these terms, the present stage is not a process of the undermining of the state due to globalisation but it is the spatial recomposition of the global capital relation. Moreover, such an understanding allows us to consider the dialectical relation between scales and the social relations in question. Such an analysis brings a solution to the

analyses of the twin problems of globalisation and European integration as mentioned before and in this manner, it becomes possible to conceive globalisation and European integration in terms of the form taken by the neo-liberal restructuring of the capital relation. Thereby, it becomes meaningless to talk about European integration as a 'stepping stone' or 'stumbling bloc' to globalisation.

Henceforth, it can be contended that globalisation has not marginalised the state but intensified a specific form of class domination as far as the current changes are presented as an external economic rationality. In the context of neo-liberal globalisation, capital needs the state more than ever and the locus of class struggle in contemporary society remains focused on a struggle over the form of the state. The socio-spatial restructuring of the state form associated with globalisation and European integration can be seen an attempt to demobilise the labour movement by shifting the terrain of struggle beyond the national scale and thus beyond the geographical unit in which labour has traditionally been organised.

Perceived in this manner, the axis of analysis shifts from the internationalisation or hollowing out of the state to how the contradictions of global capitalism may be shaped by states in political and economic competition with each other. As far as it is seen that the global scale and the national scale are different in unity, it would be misplaced to ask how one determines the other. In this sense, the focus of analysis should be how the interrelation of these scales has changed in historically specific circumstances.

Hence, through emphasizing that globalism is inherent in capitalism and that there has been a constant source of tension due to the non-coincidence of the spatialities of authority and accumulation, as states strive to internalise the conditions under which they have to secure the reproduction of their capitals, it becomes possible to conceive them as a social totality². One of the main conclusions to be drawn is that in current period, state intervention in the economy is not reduced but the state is one of the main actors in the period of restructuring. In this manner, rather than a hollowing out, what is witnessed is a recomposition in this regard. However, to argue that states are important aspects of current global restructuring does not mean that their policies can be grasped in terms of an autonomous logic of its own or of strategies of the capitalist class; rather they arise out of class struggles and crises of accumulation. That is to say, the change in the integration of national states to the world economy cannot be understood unless it is situated within an analysis of the management of accumulation and class struggle both at the global and national scales. Within such a context that it is revealed to conceive the state, labour and capital as internally related, in other words, as forms of social relations of capitalist production. These social relations engender different manners through which the relationship between the national and global is constituted.

Put in these terms, both the system of sovereign states and the world market, taken as separate units, by neo-Gramscians and regulationists alike,

² Bromley 1999; Bonefeld 2000.

can instead be understood as aspects of the historically specific social organisation of production under capitalism, as embodying relations of exploitation and as transcendable. While analytical distinctions may be made between the global and the national and the political and the economic, the reification of these levels of analysis fragments the field of political action as well in that there may arise arguments to use these fetishised forms for constructing a strategy for emancipatory struggles, and thereby obviating critique and transformative practice.

It is obvious that even the approaches discussed so far positing globalisation as a capitalist assault, fail to theorise the relationship between the national state and globalisation. Thereby, there arise assessments of transition to a global age, which portray the 1970s as a watershed initiating a process of transformation not only in the economic sphere, but equally, in the ideological sphere by corroding any struggle at the national scale. This thesis is part of an intention to accentuate that instead of trying to develop certain strategies for social transformation based on the distinction between the economic and the political on the one hand and the national and global on the other, any study on the current processes of spatial restructuring, should conceive the totality of the global capital relation and the existence of national states as nodes within this totality and hence, the importance of struggle and resistance at national scale though global in scope.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aglietta, M. (1979): **A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The US Experience**, London: Verso.

Aglietta, M. (1998): "Capitalism at the Turn of the Century: Regulation Theory and the Challenge of Social Change", **New Left Review**, 232.

Agnew, J. (1994): "The Territorial Trap", **Review of International Political Economy**, 1, (1).

Agnew, J. A. (1994): "Timeless Space and State-Centrism: The Geographical Assumptions of International Relations Theory", in S.Rosow et al (eds.), **The Global Economy as Political Space**, London: Lynne Rienner.

Agnew, J. and S. Corbridge (1995): **Mastering Space: Hegemony, Territory and International Political Economy**, London: Routledge.

Agnoli, J. (2000): "The Market, the State, and the End of History", in W. Bonefeld and K. Psychopedis (eds.), **The Politics of Change: Globalization, Ideology and Critique**, London: Palgrave.

Albrow, M. (1996): **The Global Age: State and Society Beyond Modernity**, Oxford: Polity.

Baker, A. (1999): "Nébuleuse and the 'Internationalization of the State' in the UK?", **Review of International Political Economy**, 6 (1).

Bonefeld, W. (1991): "Reformulation of State Theory", in Bonefeld and Holloway (eds.), **Post-Fordism and Social Form**, London: Macmillan.

Bonefeld, W. (1992): "Social Constitution and the Form of the Capitalist State", in W. Bonefeld, R.Gunn and Kosmas Psychopedis (eds.), **Open Marxism, Vol.1: Dialectics and History**, London: Pluto Press.

Bonefeld, W. (1995): "Monetarism and Crisis", in W. Bonefeld and J. Holloway (eds.), **Global Capital, National State and the Politics of Money**, London: Macmillan.

- Bonefeld, W. (2000): "The Spectre of Globalization: On the Form and Content of the World Market", in W. Bonefeld and K. Psychopedis (eds.), **The Politics of Change: Globalization, Ideology and Critique**, London: Palgrave.
- Bonefeld, W. (2001): "Kapital and Its Subtitle: A Note on the Meaning of Critique", **Capital and Class**, 75.
- Bonefeld, W. and J. Holloway (1991): "Introduction", in Bonefeld and Holloway (eds.), **Post-Fordism and Social Form**, London: Macmillan.
- Bonefeld, W. and J. Holloway (1995): "Introduction: The Politics of Money", in W. Bonefeld and J. Holloway (eds.), **Global Capital, National State and the Politics of Money**, London: Macmillan.
- Bonefeld, W., R. Gunn and K. Psychopedis (1992a): "Introduction", in W. Bonefeld, R. Gunn and Kosmas Psychopedis (eds.), **Open Marxism, Vol.1: Dialectics and History**, London: Pluto Press.
- Bonefeld, W. R., Gunn and K. Psychopedis (1992b): "Introduction", in W. Bonefeld, R. Gunn and Kosmas Psychopedis (eds.), **Open Marxism, Vol.2: Theory and Practice**, London: Pluto Press.
- Boyer, R. (1990): **The Regulation School: A Critical Introduction**, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Boyer, R. and D. Drache (eds.) (1996): **States Against Markets**, London: Routledge.
- 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).
- Boyle, C. (1994): "Imagining the World Market: IPE and the Task of Social Theory", **Millenium: The Journal of International Studies**, 23 (2).
- Brenner, N. (1998a): "Global Cities, Glocal States: Global City Formation and State Territorial Restructuring in Contemporary Europe", **Review of International Political Economy**, 5.
- Brenner, N. (1998b): "Beyond State-Centrism? Space, Territoriality, and Geographical Scale in Globalization Studies", **Theory and Society**, 28 (1).
- Brenner, N. (1999): "Globalisation as Reterritorialisation: The Re-Scaling of Urban Governance in the European Union", **Urban Studies**, 36 (3).

Brenner, R. (1977): 'The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism', **New Left Review**, 104.

Brenner, R. and M. Glick (1991): 'The Regulation Approach: Theory and History', **New Left Review**, 188.

Bromley, S. (1995): 'Rethinking International Political Economy', in J. Macmillan and A. Linklater (eds.), **Boundaries in Question: New Directions in International Relations**, London: Pinter Publishers.

Bromley, S. (1996): 'Globalization?', **Radical Philosophy**, 80.

Bromley, S. (1999): 'Marxism and Globalization', in A. Gamble, D. Marsh and T. Tant (eds.), **Marxism and Social Science**, Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Burbach, R. and W.I. Robinson (1999): 'The Fin De Siecle Debate: Globalization as Epochal Shift', **Science and Society**, 63 (1).

Burnham, P. (1990): **The Political Economy of Postwar Reconstruction**, London: Macmillan.

Burnham, P. (1991): 'Neo-Gramscian Hegemony and the International Order', **Capital and Class**, 45.

Burnham, P. (1994): 'Open Marxism and Vulgar International Political Economy', **Review of International Political Economy**, 1 (2).

Burnham, P. (1995a): 'State and Market in International Political Economy: Towards a Marxist Alternative', **Studies in Marxism**, 2.

Burnham, P. (1995b): 'Capital, Crisis and the International State System', in W. Bonefeld and J. Holloway (eds.), **Global Capital, National State and the Politics of Money**, London: Macmillan.

Burnham, P. (1997): 'Globalization: States, Markets and Class Relations', **Historical Materialism**, 1.

Burnham, P. (2000a): 'Marx, International Political Economy and Globalisation', **Capital and Class**, 75.

Burnham, P. (2000b): 'Globalization, Depoliticisation and Modern Economic Management', in W. Bonefeld and K. Psychopedis (eds.), **The Politics of Change: Globalization, Ideology and Critique**, London: Palgrave.

- Burnham, P. (2001): 'New Labour and the Politics of Depoliticisation', **British Journal of Politics and International Relations**, 3(2).
- Callinicos, A. (2001): 'Periodizing Capitalism and Analyzing Imperialism: Classical Marxism and Capitalist Evolution', in R. Albritton (et.al eds.), **Phases of Capitalist Development: Booms, Crises and Globalizations**, Palgrave.
- Cerny, P. (1989): **The Changing Architecture of the State**, London: Sage.
- Cerny, P. (1995): 'Globalization and the Changing Logic of Collective Action', **International Organization**, 49.
- Cerny, P. (2000): 'Restructuring the Political Arena: Globalisation and the Paradoxes of the Competition State', in R.D. Germain (ed.), **Globalisation and Its Critiques: Perspectives From Political Economy**, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Chase-Dunn, C. (1991): **Global Formation: Structures of the World Economy**, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Clark, I. (1998): 'Beyond the Great Divide: Globalization and the Theory of International Relations', **Review of International Studies**, 24.
- Clarke, S. (1977): 'Marxism, Sociology, and Poulantzas' s Theory of the State', **Capital & Class**, 2.
- Clarke, S. (1982a): 'Capital, Fractions of Capital and the State', **Capital and Class**, 5.
- Clarke, S. (1982b): **Marx, Marginalism and Modern Sociology**, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Clarke, S. (1988): **Keynesianism, Monetarism and the Crisis of the State**, Aldershot: Edward Elgar.
- Clarke, S. (1990): 'The Crisis of Fordism or the Crisis of Social Democracy', **Telos**, 83.
- Clarke, S. (1991a): 'The State Debate', in S. Clarke (ed.), **The State Debate**, London: Macmillan.
- Clarke, S. (1991b): 'State, Class Struggle and the Reproduction of Capital', in S. Clarke (ed.), **The State Debate**, London: Macmillan.

Clarke, S. (1991c): ‘Overaccumulation, Class Struggle and the Regulation Approach’, in Bonefeld and Holloway (eds.), **Post-Fordism and Social Form**, London: Macmillan.

Clarke, S. (1992): ‘The Global Accumulation of Capital and the Periodisation of the Capitalist State Form’, in W. Bonefeld, R.Gunn and Kosmas Psychopedis (eds.), **Open Marxism, Vol.1: Dialectics and History**, London: Pluto Press.

Clarke, S. (1999): ‘The Globalization of Capital, Crisis and Class Struggle’, **Capital and Class**, pp.93-101.

Clarke, S. (2001): ‘Class Struggle and the Global Overaccumulation of Capital’, in R.Albritton (et.al eds.), **Phases of Capitalist Development: Booms, Crises and Globalizations**, Palgrave.

Coates, D. (2000): **Models of Capitalism: Growth and Stagnation in the Modern Era**, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Corrigan, P. et al (1978): ‘Remarks on Historical Materialism’, in P.Corrigan et al (ed.), **Socialist Construction and Marxist Theory**, London: Macmillan.

Cox, R.W. (1981): ‘Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory’, **Millenium**, 10.

Cox, R.W. (1987): **Production, Power and the World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History**, New York: Columbia University Press.

Cox, R. W. (1989): ‘Production, the State and Change in World Order’, in E.O. Czempiel and J. N. Rosenau (eds.), **Global Changes and Theoretical Challenges: Approaches to World Politics for the 1990s**, Toronto: Lexington Books.

Cox, R. W. (1992a): ‘Global Perestroika’, in R. Miliband and L.Panitch (eds.) **The Socialist Register 1992: A New World Order**, London: Merlin.

Cox, R.W. (1992b): ‘Towards a Post-Hegemonic Conceptualization of World Order: Reflections on the Relevancy of Ibn Khaldun’, in J.Rosenau (ed.), **Governance Without Government**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cox, R.W. (1993a): ‘Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay in Method’, in S. Gill (ed.), **Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cox, R.W. (1993b): ‘Structural Issues of Global Governance: Implications for Europe, in S. Gill (ed.), **Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cox, R. (1995): ‘Critical Political Economy’, in B. Hettne (ed.), **International Political Economy: Understanding Global Disorder**, London: Zed Books.

Cox, R.W. (1996b): ‘Realism, Positivism and Historicism’, in R.W. Cox and T. J. Sinclair (eds.), **Approaches to World Order**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cox, R.W. (1996c): ‘A Perspective on Globalization’, in J.H. Mitchell (ed.), **Globalization: Critical Reflections**, London: Lynne Rienner.

Cox, R.W. (1999): ‘Civil Society at the Turn of the Millennium: Prospects for an Alternative World Order’, **Review of International Studies**, 25 (1), pp. 3–28.

Cox, R. W. (2002): ‘Reflections and Transitions’, in R.Cox and M. G. Schechter (eds.), **The Political Economy of a Plural World: Critical Reflections on Power, Morals and Civilizations**, London: Routledge.

Crouch, C and W, Streeck (1997): **Political Economy of Modern Capitalism: Mapping Convergence and Diversity**, London: Sage.

De Vroey, M. (1984): ‘A Regulation Approach Interpretation of Contemporary Crisis’, **Capital & Class**, 23.

Drainville, A. C. (1994): ‘International Political Economy in the Age of Open Marxism’, **Review of International Political Economy**, 1(1).

Dunford, M. (1990): "Theories of Regulation", **Environment and Planning D: Society and Space**, 8.

Evans, P. (1997): ‘The Eclipse of the State? Reflections on Stateness in an Era of Globalization’, **World Politics**, 50 (1).

Fukuyama, F. (1992): **The End of History and the Last Man**, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gambino, F. (1996): ‘A Critique of the Fordism of the Regulation School’, downloadable at www.wildcat-www.de/en/zirkular/28/z28e_gam.htm.

Germain, R.D. and M. Kenny (1998): ‘Engaging Gramsci: International Relations Theory and the New Gramscians’, **Review of International Studies**, 24, (2).

Gerstenberger, H. (1978): ‘Class Conflict, Competition and State Functions’, in in J. Holloway and S. Picciotto (eds.), **State and Capital: A Marxist Debate**, London: Edward Arnold.

Gerstenberger, H. (1992): ‘The Bourgeois State Form Revisited’, in Bonefeld et al. (eds.), **Open Marxism: Dialectic and History**, London: Pluto Press.

Gill, S. (1993a): ‘Epistemology, Ontology and the Italian School’, in S. Gill (ed.), **Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gill, S. (1993b): ‘Historical Materialism, Gramsci and International Political Economy’, in S. Gill (ed.), **Theoretical Foundations of a New IPE**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 51-75.

Gill, S. (1997): ‘Analysing New Forms of Authority: New Constitutionalism, Panopticism and Market Civilization’, paper presented to the Non-State Actors and Authority in The Global System Conference, October 31- November 1.

Gill, S. (2000): ‘The Constitution of Global Capitalism’, paper presented to a Panel: The Capitalist World, Past and Present at the International Studies Association Annual Convention, Los Angeles.

Gill, S. and D. Law (1998): **The Global Political Economy: Perspectives, Problems and Policies**, London: Wheatsheaf.

Gilpin, R. (1973): ‘The Politics of Transnational Economic Relations’, in R.O.Keohane and J.S. Nye (eds.), **Transnational Relations and World Politics**.

Gilpin, R. (1987): **The Political Economy of International Relations**, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gilpin, R. (2000): **The Challenge of Global Capitalism**, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gray, J. (1998): **False Dawn**, London: Granta Books.

Gunn, R. (1989): ‘Marxism and Philosophy’, **Capital & Class**, 37.

Gunn, R. (1991): 'Marxism, Metatheory and Critique', in Bonefeld and Holloway (eds.), **Post-Fordism and Social Form**, London: Macmillan.

Gunn, R. (1992): 'Against Historical Materialism: Marxism as a First Order Discourse', in W. Bonefeld, R. Gunn and K. Pschopedis (eds.), **Open Marxism, vol 2: Theory and Practice**, Pluto Press: London.

Hay, C. (2002): 'Globalisation as a Problem of Political Analysis: Restoring Agents to a 'Process without a Subject' and Politics to a Logic of Economic Compulsion', **Cambridge Review of International Affairs**, 15(3).

Held, D. (1995): **Democracy and the Global Order**, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Held, D., A. McGrew, D. Goldblatt and J. Perraton (1999): **Global Transformations: Politics, Economics, and Culture**, Cambridge: Polity.

Hettne, B. (1999): 'Globalization and the New Regionalism: The Second Great Transformation', in **Globalization and New Regionalism**.

Hirsch, J. (1978): 'The State Apparatus and Social Reproduction: Elements of a Theory of the Bourgeois State', in J. Holloway and S. Picciotto (eds.), **State and Capital: A Marxist Debate**, London: Edward Arnold.

Hirsch, J. (1991): 'Fordism and Post-Fordism: The Present Social Crisis and its Consequences', in W. Bonefeld and J. Holloway (eds.), **Post-Fordism and Social Form: A Marxist Debate on the Post-Fordist State**.

Hirsch, J. (1995): 'Nation State, International Regulation and the Question of Democracy', **Review of International Political Economy**, 2.

Hirsch J. (1997): 'Globalisation of Capital, Nation-States and Democracy', **Studies in Political Economy**, 54.

Hirsch, J. (2000): 'The Concept of Materialist State Theory and Regulation Theory', in J.D. Schmidt and J. Hersh (eds.), **Globalization and Social Change**, London: Routledge.

Hirsch, J. (2003): 'Internationalization of the State: A Challenge for Materialist State Theory', paper presented to the State and Globalisation: Perspectives from Germany and Turkey Conference, Frankfurt Wolfgang Goethe University, July, 10-11 2003.

Hirst, P. and G. Thompson (1999): **Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance**, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Holloway, J. (1991a): ‘The State and Everyday Struggle’, in S. Clarke (ed.), **The State Debate**, London: Macmillan.

Holloway, J. (1991b): ‘The Great Bear, Post-Fordism and Class Struggle: a Comment on Bonefeld and Jessop’, in W. Bonefeld and J. Holloway (eds.), **Post-Fordism and Social Form: A Marxist Debate on the Post-Fordist State**, London: Macmillan.

Holloway, J. (1995): ‘Global Capital and the National State’, in W. Bonefeld and J. Holloway (eds.), **Global Capital, National State and the Politics of Money**, London: Macmillan.

Holloway, J. and E. Palaez (1991): ‘Learning to Bow: Post Fordism and Technological Determinism’, in W. Bonefeld and J. Holloway (eds.), **Post-Fordism and Social Form: A Marxist Debate on the Post-Fordist State**.

Holloway, J. and S. Picciotto (1978): ‘Introduction: Towards a Materialist Theory of the State’ in J. Holloway and S. Picciotto (eds.), **State and Capital: A Marxist Debate**, London: Edward Arnold.

Holloway, J. and S. Picciotto (1991): ‘Capital, Crisis and the State’, in S. Clarke (ed.), **The State Debate**, London: Macmillan.

Holman, O. & K. van der Pijl (1996): ‘The Capitalist Class in the European Union’ in G. Kourvetaris & A.Mochonas (eds.), **The Impact of European Integration: Political, Sociological and Economic Changes**, London: Prager.

Jessop, B. (1982): **The Capitalist State: Marxist Theories and Methods**, New York: New York University Press.

Jessop, B. (1990a): **State Theory: Putting Capitalist States in Their Place**, Polity Press.

Jessop, B. (1990b): ‘Regulation Theories in Retrospect and Prospect’, **Economy and Society**, 19 (2).

Jessop, B. (1991a): ‘Regulation Theory, Post Fordism and the State: More than a Reply to Werner Bonefeld’, in W. Bonefeld and J. Holloway (eds.), **Post-Fordism and Social Form: A Marxist Debate on the Post-Fordist State**, London: Macmillan.

Jessop, B. (1991b): ‘Polar Bears and the Class Struggle: Much More Than a Self Criticism’, in W. Bonefeld and J. Holloway (eds.), **Post-Fordism and**

Social Form: A Marxist Debate on the Post-Fordist State, London: Macmillan.

Jessop, B. (1997): ‘L’Economia Integrale, Fordism, and Post -Fordism’, paper presented to the Italian-Japanese Conference on Gramsci, Tokyo, 15-16th November 1997.

Jessop, B. (1998): ‘The Governance of Complexity and the Complexity of Governance: Preliminary Remarks on some Problems and Limits of Economic Guidance’, published by the Department of Sociology, Lancaster University at: <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/soc024rj.html>.

Jessop, B. (1999a): ‘Narrating the Future of the National Economy and the National State? Remarks on Remapping Regulation and Reinventing Governance’, published by the Department of Sociology, Lancaster University at: <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/soc014rj.html>.

Jessop, B. (1999b): ‘The Social Embeddedness of the Economy and its Implications for Economic Governance’, published by the Department of Sociology Lancaster University at: <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/soc016rj.html>.

Jessop, B. (1999c): ‘Globalization and the National State’, published by the Department of Sociology Lancaster University at: <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/soc012rj.html>

Jessop, B. (2000): ‘The Crisis of the National Spatio -Temporal Fix and the Ecological Dominance of Globalizing Capitalism’, published by the Department of Sociology Lancaster University at: <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/soc043rj.html>.

Jessop, B. (2001a): ‘Capitalism, the Regulation Approach and Critical Realism’, published by the Department of Sociology, Lancaster University at: <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/soc071rj.html>.

Jessop, B. (2001b): ‘On the Spatio -Temporal Logics of Capital’s Globalization and their Manifold Implications for State Power’, published by the Department of Sociology Lancaster University at: <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/soc072rj.html>.

Joseph, J. (2002): **Hegemony: A Realist Interpretation**, London: Routledge.

Katzenstein, P. J., R. O. Keohane and S. D. Krasner (1999): ‘International Organisation and the Study of World Politics’, in P.J. Katzenstein, R.O.

Keohane and S.D. Krasner (eds.), **Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics**, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Kenny, M. (1999): 'Marxism and Regulation Theory', in A. Gamble, D. Marsh and T. Tant (eds.), **Marxism and Social Science**, Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Kelly, P.F. (1999): 'The Geographies and Politics of Globalization', **Progress in Human Geography**, 23, (3).

Keohane, R. (1984): **After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy**, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Keohane, R. O. and J.S. Nye (1996): 'Realism and Complex Inredependence', in Goddard, Passe-Smith and Conklu (eds.), **International Political Economy**, London.

Kindleberger, C. (1981): 'Dominance and Leadership in the International Economy', **International Studies Quarterly**, 25.

Lipshütz, R. D. (1992): 'Reconstructing World Politics: The Emergence of a Global Civil Society', **Millennium: Journal of International Studies**, 21(3).

Lipietz, A. (1982): 'Towards Global Fordism: Marx or Rostow?', **New Left Review**, 132.

Lipietz, A. (1986): 'Behind the Crisis: The Exhaustion of a Regime of Accumulation. A 'Regulation School' Perspective on Some French Empirical Work', **Review of Radical Political Economics**, 18.

Lipietz, A. (1987): **Mirages and Miracles: The Crisis of Global Fordism**: London: Verso.

Lipietz, A. (1993): 'From Althusserianism to Regulation Theory', in E.A. Kaplan and M. Sprinker (eds.), **The Althusserian Legacy**, London: Verso.

Lipietz, A. (1994): 'The National and the Regional: Their Autonomy vis -a-vis the Capitalist World Crisis' in R.Palan and B. Gills (eds.), **Transcending the State Global Divide: A Neostructuralist Agenda in International Relations**, Lynne Rienner, Boulder (COL).

Lipietz, A. (2001): 'The Fortunes and Misfortunes of Post-Fordism', in R.Albritton (et.al eds.), **Phases of Capitalist Development: Booms, Crises and Globalizations**, Palgrave.

Mac Load, G. (1997): ‘Globalizing Parisien Thought-Waves: Recent Advances in the Study of Social Regulation, Politics, Discourse and Space’, **Progress in Human Geography**, 21 (4).

Marazzi, C. (1995): ‘Money in the World Crisis: The New Basis of Capitalist Power’, in W. Bonefeld and J. Holloway (eds.), **Global Capital, National State and the Politics of Money**, London: Macmillan.

Miliband, R. and L. Panitch (1992): **New World Order**, Socialist Register.

Mittelman, J.H. (1998): ‘Coxian Historicism as an Alternative Perspective in International Studies’, <http://www.ebsco.com> .

Moran, J. (1999): ‘The Dynamics of Class Politics and National Economies in Globalization: The Marginalization of the Unacceptable’, **Capital and Class**, 66.

Ohmae, K. (1990): **The Borderless World**, London: Harper.

Ohmae, K. (1995): **The End of the Nation State**, New York: The Free Press.

Ollman, B. (1993): **Dialectical Investigations**, New York: Routledge.

Overbeek, H. (1990): **Global Capitalism and National Decline: The Thatcher Decade in Historical Perspective**, London: Routledge.

Ozan, E.D. (2000): **Towards a Relational Understanding of the State-Civil Society Relation: Deriving Insights from Realist and Gramscian Perspectives**, unpublished

Painter, J. (1997): ‘Regulation, Regime and Practice in Urban Politics’, in M. Lauria (ed.), **Reconstructing Regime Theory: Regulating Urban Politics in a Global Economy**, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Panitch, L. (1994): ‘Globalization and the State’, in R. Miliband and L. Panitch (eds.), **The Socialist Register 1994: Between Globalism and Nationalism**, London: Merlin.

Panitch, L. (1996): ‘Rethinking the Role of the State’, in J.H. Mittelman (ed.), **Globalization: Critical Reflections**, London: Lynne Rienner.

Picciotto, S. (1991): ‘The Internationalization of Capital and the International State System’, in S. Clarke (ed.), **The State Debate**, London: Macmillan.

Pijl, K. v. d. (1984): **The Making of an Atlantic Ruling Class**, London: Verso.

Pijl, K. v. d. (1995): ‘The Second Glorious Revolution: Globalizing Elite s and Historical Change’, in B. Hettne (ed.), **International Political Economy: Understanding Global Disorder**, London: Zed Books.

Pijl, K. v.d. (1998): **Transnational Classes and International Relations**, London: Routledge.

Polanyi, K. (1944): **The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time**, Boston: Beacon Press.

Poulantzas, N. (1978): **State, Power and Socialism**, London: Verso.

Psychopedis, K. (1991): ‘Crisis of Theory in the Contemporary Social Sciences’, in W. Bonefeld and J. Holloway (eds.), **Post-Fordism and Social Form: A Marxist Debate on the Post-Fordist State**.

Radice, H. (1997): ‘Globalization and National Differences’, **paper presented to the ESF-EMOT Workshop: Globalization and Industrial Transformation in Europe**, Malaga/Spain, 9 - 12 January.

Reich, R. (1992): **The Work of Nations**, New York: Vintage.

Roberts J. M. (1999): ‘Marxism and Critical Realism: The Same, Similar or Just Plain Different’, **Capital and Class**, 68.

Roberts, J.M. (2002): ‘From Reflection to Refraction: Opening up Open Marxism’, **Capital and Class**, 78.

Robinson, W. I. (1996a): **Promoting Polyarchy: Globalization, US Intervention and Hegemony**, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, W. I. (1996b): ‘Globalisation: Nine Theses on our Epoch’, **Race and Class**, 38, (2).

Robinson, W. I. (1998): ‘Beyond Nation-State Paradigms: Globalization, Sociology, and the Challenge of Transnational Studies’, **Sociological Forum**, 13, (4).

Rosenberg, J. (1994): **The Empire of Civil Society: A Critique of the Realist Theory of International Relations**, London: Verso.

Rosenberg, J. (2001): **Follies of Globalization**, London: Verso.

Rupert, M. (1993): "Alienation, Capitalism and the Inter-State System: Towards a Marxian/Gramscian Critique", in S. Gill (ed.), **Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rupert, M. (1995): **Producing Hegemony: The Politics of Mass Production and American Global Power**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rupert, M. (2000): **Ideologies of Globalization: Contending Visions of a New World Order**, London: Routledge.

Sayer, A. (1989): "Postfordism in Question", **International Journal of Urban and Regional Research**, 13 (4).

Sayer, A. (1992): **Method in Social Science: A Realist Approach**, London: Routledge.

Sayer, D. (1985): "The Critique of Politics and Political Economy", **Sociological Review**, 33.

Sayer, D. (1987): **The Violence of Abstraction: The Analytical Foundations of Historical Materialism**, Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

Scholte, J. A. (2000): "In the Foothills: Relations between the IMF and Civil Society", in R. Higgot et al. (eds.), **Non-State Actors and Authority in the Global System**, London: Routledge.

Shaw, M. (1994): **Global Society and International Relations**, Oxford: Polity Press.

Shaw, M. (1999): "The Global Revolution and The Twenty-First Century: From International Relations to Global Politics", in Stephen Chan and Jarrod Wiener (eds.), **International History and the Twentieth Century**, London: IB Taurus.

Sinclair, T. (1996): "Beyond International Relations Theory: Robert Cox and Approaches to World Order", in R.W. Cox and T. J. Sinclair (eds.), **Approaches to World Order**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, N. (1984): **Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space**, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Strange, S. (1988): **States and Markets**, London: Pinter.

Strange, S. (1994): "Wake up Krasner! The World Has Changed", **Review of International Political Economy** 1, 2.

Strange, S. (1996): **The Retreat of the State**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, P. J. (1994): "The State as Container: Territoriality in the Modern World System", **Progress in Human Geography**, 18 (2).

Taylor, P. J. (1995): "Beyond Containers: Internationality, Interstateness, Interterritoriality", **Progress in Human Geography**, 19 (1).

Tickell, A. and J.A. Peck (1992): "Accumulation, Regulation and the Geographies of Post-Fordism: Missing Links in Regulationist Research", **Progress in Human Geography**, 16(2).

Weiss, L. (1997): "Globalization and the Myth of the Powerless State", **New Left Review**, 225.

Wood, E.M. (1994): "From Opportunity to Imperative: The History of the Market", **Monthly Review**, 46 (3).

Wood, E.M. (1995a): "The Separation of the Economic and the Political in Capitalism", in E. M. Wood (ed.), **Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wood, E.M. (1995b): "Rethinking Base and Superstructure", in her **Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wood, E.M. (1997a): "Modernity, Postmodernity or Capitalism", **Review of International Political Economy**, 4 (3).

Wood, E.M. (1999a): "Unhappy Families: Global Capitalism in a World of Nation-States", **Monthly Review**, 51 (3).

Wood, E.M.(1999b): **The Origin of Capitalism**, New York: Monthly Review.

Zysman, J. (1996): "The Myth of the 'Global' Economy: Enduring National Foundations and Emerging Regional Realities", **New Political Economy**, 1 (1).