SOCIOLOGY 924
SEMINAR ON THE THEORY OF THE STATE
Fall Semster, 1995
Professor Erik Olin Wright
Department of Sociology University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

At the core of this seminar is a moral and political concern: to what extent is it possible to achieve a more egalitarian, humane and democratic society within a capitalist society? It is a fundamental tenet of Marxist theories of the state that the state in capitalist society is deeply shaped and constrained by the class relations of capitalism, but this leaves quite open the extent to which progressive change can be achieved within those constraints. At one extreme is classical Leninism, which sees the capitalist state as so profoundly imbued with a capitalist character that even where nominally democratic institutions exist, there is little prospect for progressive change. The state is fundamentally a "superstructure": its form and structures functionally reproduce the basic class relations of capitalism. As a result, to use Lenin's expression, the state must be smashed; serious reforms in an egalitarian direction will inevitably fail or be reversed. At the other extreme is classical social democracy which viewed state apparatuses as basically class neutral and regarded class structure as simply one among a variety of obstacles to be overcome. Popular mobilization, particularly when organized through a coordination of the labor movement and socialist parties, had the potential to gradually reform capitalism in a radically egalitarian direction through social democratic state policies. Between these extremes are a varietry of theoretical and political positions which see the constraints on radical change imposed by the capitalist state as variable, both in terms of the kinds of changes they permit and the extent to which struggles can transform the constraints themselves. The "contradictory functionality" of the state creates a complex, variable political space within which egalitarian, democratic, and even emancipatory politics can be pursued.

The central task of this seminar, then, is to explore a range of theoretical and empirical issues that bear on the problem of understanding ssuch possibilities for radical, egalitarian politics in capitalist societies. Above all we will focus on the problem of the complex interconnections between class, the economy, and the state. To develop the theoretical tools to approach these issues we will have to grapple with some fairly abstract of conceptual questions: what does it mean to say that the state has a "class character"? What is the difference between an external constraint on state actions imposed by class relations and an internal institutionalization of class constraints within the state itself? What does it mean to describe the state as having "autonomy" -- relative, potential, limited or absolute? The seminar, however, will not primarily grapple with these issues at a purely abstract conceptual level. Rather, in most of the sessions we will focus on specific historical/empirical problems through which we will refine the conceptual tools and build our theoretical understanding.

The seminar is divided into five main sections:

I. *Class Constraints on and in the State.* This section consists of two sessions in which we explore a number of the core concepts in the class analysis of the state. We will focus especially on the work of Goran Therborn and Claus Offe, but will also discuss a range of other contributions. These two sessions will set the stage for the more historical case studies which follow.

II. *The Formation of the Early Modern State*. One of the pivotal empirical ways of engaging the problem of the class nature of the state is to study states in periods of great transformations. The early formation of the state is particularly relevant to such invgestigations. In this section we will contrast two very different perspectives on the formation of the modern state -- Perry Anderson's reconstruction of a rather classic Marxist approach, and Charles Tilly's emphasis on the dialectic between warmarking and capital accumulation.

III. *The State in Developing Capitalist Economies*. By nearly everyone's account, in one way or another the state plays a critical role --- for good and ill -- in the fate of developing countries. Again we will contrast two different perspectives on the state in the third world: Nora Hamilton's Marxist account of the limits to the autonomy of the state in Mexico, and Peter Evans analysis of what he calls the "embedded autonomy" of the state in guiding projects of development.

IV. *The State in the Globalizing Capitalist Economy.* In these sessions we will engage one of the most crucial questions facing the developed democratic capitalist states: to what extent has the globalization of capitalism seriously undermined the capacity for the "affirmative state" to effectively intervene, regulate and redistribute within national contexts. There are many people, especially on the right but also sometimes on the left, who argue that the affirmative state is dead; the constraints of the international economy make interventionism nearly impossible. Others argue that these constraints are highly exaggerated, and that while the optimal forms of intervention may have changed, the remains considerable scope for the affirmative state, including one with a progressive agenda.

V. Capitalist Democracy and its Reconstruction. We will end the semester with a examination of the problem of democracy in capitalist states. The first session will examine the theoretical problem of how democracy actually works in capitalist democracies, in particular how the electoral "rules of the game" shape political agendas. This will be followed by an historical case study of the trajectory of American democracy in the 1940s. The semester will conclude with a discussion of a possible design for a radical reconstruction of democratic institutions in capitalist societies.

PREREQUISITES

This is an advanced graduate seminar. I do not want to the seminar discussions to serve as basic didactic introductions to the subject matter. As a result, it is important that participants have a fairly broad background in order to participate effectively in the discussion. This does not mean that it is necessary to have read deeply on the theory of the state as such, but it does mean that participants should have a pretty good foundation in contemporary Marxist theory -- the equivalent of Sociology 621 -- and at a background in political sociology equivalent to Sociology 624. I am assuming that participants have already read much of the material in the first two sessions and at least some of the material in the rest of the seminar. If you do not meet these criteria you must discuss with the professor whether or not it is appropriate for you to take the course.

REQUIREMENTS

There are three basic requirements for the seminar:

1) Preparation of weekly issue memos on seminar readings (2-3 pages)
2) Participation in a group presentation.
3) Term paper (about 20-25 pages)

1. Weekly Seminar Issue Memo

I believe strongly that it is important for students to engage the week's readings in written form prior to the seminar sessions. My experience is that this improves the quality of the discussion since students come to the sessions with an already thought out agenda.

I refer to these short written comments as "issue memos". They are not meant to be mini-papers on the readings. Rather, they are meant to be a think piece, reflecting your own intellectual engagement with the material: specifying what is obscure or confusing in the reading; taking issue with some core idea or argument; exploring some interesting ramification of an idea in the reading. These memos do not have to deal with the most profound, abstract or grandiose arguments in the readings; the point is that they should reflect what you find most engaging, exciting or puzzling.

This is a real requirement, and failing to hand in memos will affect your grade. I will read through the memos to see if they are "serious", but will not grade them for "quality". You must hand in one of these memos every week at the seminar session. Since the point of this exercise is to enhance discussions, late memos will not be accepted. If you have to miss a seminar session for some reason, you are still required to prepare an issue-memo for that session.

2. Group Presentation

About two-thirds of the sessions in the seminar will be introduced by student presentations. In the second session of the seminar, September 14, students will sign up for a seminar presentation. These presentations should be 15-20 minutes long and should try to establish a focused agenda for the discussion which follows. The point of the presentation is not to

comprehensively summarize the readings, but to present a critical evaluation of the arguments in the material under discussion as a way of launching the day's discussion. The group giving the presentation for a given session will meet with me the day before the seminar (i.e. sometime on Wednesday) so that I can hear the presentation in advance and offer suggestions.

3. Term paper/project

All participants taking the seminar for credit are expected to write a term paper on the state and politics. My strong preference is for papers to revolve around some historical or contemporary substantive problem -- a particular state policy, a particular example of state transformations, a case of a particular struggle over the state, etc. A Warning: The least satisfactory papers I have had from previous seminars have attempted to deal broadly with "The Theory of the State", trying to synthesize too much, too abstractly, and often too pretentiously. In general, therefore, while I want papers to engage systematically theoretical issues, I think that such theorizing should be linked to some more concrete substantive problem or puzzle. Collaboratively written papers are acceptable (in which case, of course, both students will receive the same grade for the paper).

I want to discuss each term paper with the student(s) involved by the middle of the semester. If a paper has not been formulated by mid-semester it is very unlikely that it will be completed by the end of the semester. All students must give me a 2-3 page statement about the topic of their term paper with an accompanying bibliography no later than October 12 (sixth week of the term). The final term papers are due by the last seminar session, Thursday, December 14. Late papers will not be accepted.

DATES TO REMEMBER:

Thursday, September 14:	Sign up for seminar presentations
Thursday, October 19:	Seminar paper proposal due
Thursday, December 14:	Term papers due

Note: Because the seminar falls on a Thursday, we would lose one seminar session unless we hold one seminar at a different time. We will discuss the timing for this extra session early in the semester, but I propose Tuesday, November 21.

GRADING

In an advanced seminar of this sort, I find grading an extremely aggravating task. I want the sessions and discussions to be a stimulating and exciting as possible, with a collegial and supportive atmosphere, and yet in the end I have to evaluate your work and assign a grade. This reinforces the ultimate authority relation that is lurking behind the social relations of the seminar.

My basic principle of grading is as follows: I put more emphasis on good faith, serious effort on the part of students than on sheer brilliance. If a student does all of the assignments seriously, then they will almost certainly receive at least a B for the course regardless of the "quality" of the work. The weekly issue memos and the verbal presentations will not be graded for quality, although I will keep track of whether or not they were completed.

The final grade will be based on a point system in which completion of all requirements can improve the seminar grade above the term paper grade. The points are as follows:

Assignment	Points for task
Weekly Issue Memos: 5 points each	70
Participation in group presentation	30
Total for ungraded assignments	100

Term paper: A = 100 points AB = 80 points B = 60 points BC = 40 points C = 20 points
Final Course grades: 181-200 = A 161-180 = AB 141-160 = B 121-140 = BC

PRINCIPLES FOR SEMINAR DISCUSSIONS:

The following guidelines are intended to facilitate seminar discussions. Some of them may sound obvious, but from past experience it is still important to make them explicit.

1. READINGS. At least for the first part of each seminar session the discussions should revolve around the weeks readings rather than simply the topic. There is a strong tendency in seminars, particularly among articulate graduate students, to turn every seminar into a general "bull session" in which participation need not be informed by the reading material in the course. The injunction to discuss the readings does not mean, of course, that other material is excluded from the discussion, but it does mean that the issues raised and problems analysed should focus on around the actual texts assigned for the week.

2. LISTEN. In a good seminar, interventions by different participants are linked one to another. A given point is followed up and the discussion therefore has some continuity. In many seminar discussions, however, each intervention is unconnected to what has been said before. Participants are more concerned with figuring out what brilliant comment they can make rather than listening to each other and reflecting on what is actually being said. In general, therefore, participants should add to what has just been said rather than launch a new train of thought,

unless a particular line of discussion has reached some sort of closure.

3. TYPES ON INTERVENTIONS. Not every seminar intervention has to be an earth-shattering comment or brilliant insight. One of the reasons why some students feel intimidated in seminars is that it seems that the stakes are so high, that the only legitimate comment is one that reveals complete mastery of the material. There are several general rules about comments that should facilitate broader participation:

a. No intervention should be regarded as "naive" or "stupid" as long as it reflects an attempt at seriously engaging the material. It is often the case that what seems at first glance to be a simple or superficial question turns out to be among the most intractable.
b. It is as appropriate to ask for clarification of readings or previous comments as it is to make a substantive point on the subject matter.
c. If the pace of the seminar discussion seems too fast to get a word in edgewise it is legitimate to ask for a brief pause to slow things down. It is fine for there actually to be moments of silence in a discussion!

4. BREVITY. Everyone has been in seminars in which someone consistently gives long, overblown speeches. Sometimes these speeches may make some substantively interesting points, but frequently they meander without focus or direction. It is important to keep interventions short and to the point. One can always add elaborations if they are needed. This is not an absolute prohibition on long statements, but it does suggest that longer statements are generally too long.

5. EQUITY. While acknowledging that different personalities and different prior exposures to the material will necessarily lead to different levels of active participation in the seminar discussion, it should be our collective self-conscious goal to have as equitable participation as possible. This means that the chair of the discussion has the right to curtail the speeches by people who have dominated the discussion, if this seems necessary.

6. SPONTANEITY vs. ORDER. One of the traps of trying to have guidelines, rules, etc. in a discussion is that it can squelch the spontaneous flow of debate and interchange in a seminar. Sustained debate, sharpening of differences, etc., is desirable and it is important that the chair not prevent such debate from developing.

7. ARGUMENTS, COMPETITIVENESS, CONSENSUS. A perenniel problem in seminars revolves around styles of discussion. Feminists have often criticized discussions dominated by radical men as being aggressive, argumentative, competitive. Men, on the other hand, have at times been critical of what they see as the "feminist" model of discussion: searching for consensus and common positions rather highlighting differences, too much emphasis on process and not enough on content, and so on. Whether or not one regards such differences in approaches to discussion as gender-based, the differences are real and they cause problems in seminars. My

own view is the following: I think that it is important in seminar discussions to try to sharpen differences, to understand where the real disagreements lie, and to accomplish this is it generally necessary that participants "argue" with each other, in the sense of voicing disagreements and not always seeking consensus. On the other hand, there is no reason why argument, even heated argument, need by marked by aggressiveness, competitiveness, put-downs and the other tricks in the repertoire of male verbal domination. What I hope we can pursue is "cooperative conflict": theoretical advance comes out of conflict, but hopefully our conflicts can avoid being antagonistic.

8.CHAIRING DISCUSSIONS. In order for the discussions to have the kind of continuity, equity and dynamics mentioned above, it is necessary that the discussion be lead by a "strong chair." That is, the chair has to have the capacity to tell someone to hold off on a point if it seems unrelated to what is being discussed, to tell someone to cut a comment short if an intervention is rambling on and on, and so on. The difficulty, of course, is that such a chair may become heavy-handed and authoritarian, and therefore it is important that seminar participants take responsibility of letting the chair know when too much monitoring is going on.

9. PREPARATION FOR SEMINAR DISCUSSIONS. Good seminars depend to a great extent on the seriousness of preparation by students. The following generally helps:

a. Always come to the seminar discussion with at least one questions written down. These need not be grandiose questions on profound points. It is fine for them to deal with issues of clarification, meaning, interpretation, etc. They can be simple statements of what you don't understand. The point is to have some idea of something you would like to learn from a discussion before entering the discussion.

b. Whenever possible, write down your general reactions to the readings. It is generally more useful to write short critical "think pieces" about the reading than to simply record summarizing notes. But in any case, it is important to write something about what you've read rather than just to read.

c. Try to meet with at least one other student to discuss the weeks reading prior to the seminar session.

d. Above all: Do the reading carefully.

10. DISCUSSION FORMAT. In spite of these guidelines and good intentions, if the size of the seminar is too large it may simply prove impossible to have a satisfactory discussion with everyone at the same time. As a result, we may break down the full seminar into three or four smaller groups of 6-8 people for an hour or so during a seminar session in order to facilitate

more equal discussion.

11. SELF-CRITICISM. The success of a seminar is a collective responsibility of all participants. Professors cannot waive magic wands to promote intellectually productive settings. It is essential, therefore, that we treat the process of the seminar itself as something under our collective control, as something which can be challenged and transformed. Issues of competitiveness, male domination, elitism, bullshit, diffuseness, and other sins should be dealt with through open discussion. We will therefore have periodic self-criticism discussions (not "trash the professor" sessions, but self-evaluation discussions, hopefully) to try to improve the process of the seminar itself.

SCHEDULE OF COURSE TOPICS, SOCIOLOGY 924, SPRING 1995
* Sessions with student presentations are marked with an asterisk

Week 1. September 7: Introduction: setting the theoretical and political agenda

I. Conceptualizing Class Constraints On and In the State

Week 2. September 14: General theoretical and conceptual issues I: the class character of the state (Therborn, Jessop, Wright)

Week 3. September 21: General theoretical and conceptual issues II: Class, rationality, and the state (Offe)

II. The Emergence of the Modern State

*Week 4. September 28: A reconstructed Marxist Perspective: Perry Anderson, Lineages of the Absolutist State

*Week 5. October 5: An Eclectic approach to state formation: Charles Tilly, Coercion, Capital and European States

III. Class and State in Developing Capitalist Economies

*Week 6. October 12: A Marxist Approach to the State in the Third World: Nora Hamilton, The Limits of State Autonomy

*Week 7. October 19: A Neo-Weberian Approach: Peter Evans, Embedded Autonomy

IV. Class and the Welfare State
*Week 8. October 26: Class Coalitions and Social Democracy: Gosta Esping-Anderson, Politics Against Markets

*Week 9. November 2: Class formation and State capacity in explaining variability in the Welfare State: George Steinmetz, Regulating the Social: the welfare state and local politics in Imperial Germany

*Week 10. November 9: A Debate over the centrality of class analysis to understanding the New Deal state (Skocpol, Domhoff, Gilbert and Howe)

V. The State in the Globalizing Capitalist Economy

*Week 11. November 16: The argument for severe constraints on the state

*Week 12. November 23: The argument for the continuing capacity for the Affirmative State

VI. Democratic Institutions

Week 13. November 30: The Logic of Capitalist Democracy: Przeworski; Cohen & Rogers

Week 14. December 7: An historical case study of the transformations of American Democracy: Ira Katznelson, The Long 1940s (unpublished manuscript)

Week 15. December 14: Reconstructing Capitalist Democracy, Joshua Cohen & Joel Rogers, Associations and Democracy

READINGS FOR THEORY OF THE STATE SEMINAR

BOOKS, BOOKS, BOOKS

Arthur Stinchcombe once said to me that the most important thing students can discover in graduate school is a book that they wish they had written. If you can find such a book, then the task of educating yourself can have much greater focus: you apprentice yourself to a book a learn what you have to learn to be able to write such a work. In much of contemporary sociology, the model is very different: you apprentice yourself to articles, not books, and you learn to write short, well-focussed pieces on relatively narrow topics.

There is a tendency in many sociology courses for professors to assign lots of little bits and pieces from many sources: a chapter here, an article there, sometimes even just parts of chapters and articles. This reinforces an image of scholarly work that sees the article as the essential intellectual product. Books are usually not just long articles, nor (usually) just a series of articles stuck together; they are a different kind of intellectual product in which an extended argument can be developed and crafted.

When you read a book it is important to remember that someone sweated over it, that the author felt that she or he had a statement that required such treatment. The "reader's digest" approach to teaching that sees the synoptic summary of the "main idea" of an author as the essential task of assignments, I think, misses much that is important. The real excitement of much scholarly work lies in the details as much as in the simple punchlines.

Thus: for much of this seminar, I am assigning entire books
rather than chapters or articles. While I may indicate sections that are particularly important, I would encourage you to read the entire book, to understand the gestalt as well as the details.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR PURCHASE

The following books have been ordered as required books at the bookstore. Most of them should also be on reserve in the library. They are all worth having in your permanent library

1. Goran Therborn, What Does the Ruling Class Do When It Rules? (Verso)
2. Gosta Esping-Anderson, Politics Against Markets (Princeton) 3. Nora Hamilton, The Limits of State Autonomy (Princeton University Press)
4. Peter Evans The Embedded Autonomy of the State (Princeton University Press)
5. Adam Przeworksi, Capitalism and Social Democracy (Cambridge University Press)
6. Clyde Barrow, Critical Theories of the State (University of Wisconsin Press)
7. Perry Anderson, Lineages of the Absolutist State (Verso)
8. Charles Tilly, Coercion, Capital and European States: AD 990-1990 (Oxford: Blackwell).
9. Michael Stewart, The Age of Interdependence: Economic Policy in a Shrinking World (MIT Press)
10. Joshua Cohen and Joel Rogers, Associations and Democracy (Verso).
11. George Steinmetz, Regulating the Social: the welfare state and local politics in Imperial Germany (Princeton University Press, 1993).
12. Stephen Skowronek, Building a New American State (Cambridge University Press, 1982)
13. David Abrahams: The Fall of the Weimar Republic (Holmes and Meier)

PHOTOCOPIED COURSE READER:

Numbers in square brackets [ ] in the reading list below refer to items contained in the photocopied reader for the seminar. The package of readings is available in the Social Science Copy Center. Items 1-10 are available at the beginning of the semester; itemsd 11-21 will be available by the fourth week of the semester.

BACKGROUND READING FOR SEMINAR

The seminar assumes a general familiarity with Marxist and other thinking about the state, as well as a fairly good understanding of the broader Marxist tradition. If you need to brush up on this background, the following readings might be helpful:

Martin Carnoy, The State and Political Theory (Princeton University Press, 1984)
Bob Jessop, The Capitalist State: Marxist Theories and Methods (New York University Press: 1982)
Ralph Miliband, Marxism and Politics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977).
Albert Szymanski, The Capitalist State and the Politics of Class, (Winthrop, 1978)
David Gold, Clarence Lo and Erik Olin Wright, "Recent developments in Marxist Theories of

the State," Monthly Review, October and November, 1975.
Fred Block, "The Ruling Class Does Not Rule," Socialist Review No.33, 1977.
Gosta Esping-Anderson, Roger Friedland and Erik Olin Wright, "Modes of class struggle and the capitalist state", Kapitalistate #5, 1976.

PART I. CONCEPTUALIZING CLASS CONSTRAINTS ON AND IN THE STATE

Week 1. Introduction: Setting the Political and Theoretical Agenda

Over the past two decades there has been an extraordinary flowering of radical theory dealing with the state and politics. Initially most of this theoretical work was rooted in one way or another in the Marxist tradition; more recently there has emerged a growing body of radical theoretical work on the state which explicitly distances itself from Marxism. During the first two sessions we will review some of the major currents in these debates. This will be followed by three case studies which explore in different ways some of these general concepts.

There is a tendency in broad discussions of alternative theoretical approaches to focus on very abstract methodological and epistemological problems rather than on substantive theoretical issues. In effect, the discussion of the metatheoretical differences between approaches tends to pre-empt systematic analysis of the substantive differences. During our discussion of the various theorists in this section of the seminar I hope that we can maintain a reasonable balance between a concern with abstract methodological principles and more concrete theoretical themes.

In many ways the central problem in any theoretical endeavor is to figure out what are the critical questions. An unsatisfactory posing of questions can lead to endless fruitless debate regardless of the conceptual sophistication of the protagonists. The purpose of this initial seminar session will be to explore a range of salient questions that will help to guide the overall agenda of the seminar. Among other possible questions, the following clusters seem particularly important:

(1). In what ways and to what extent does the institutional form of the state in capitalist societies (a) constitute a systematic impediment to socialism or other projects of radical social change; (b) create opportunities for the radical transformation of capitalism?

(2). Does the state in capitalist societies have a distinctively capitalist form or is it simply constrained or influenced externally by its existence within capitalism?

(3). How should we conceptualize the specificities of the variations in the form of the state in capitalist societies? What are the salient dimensions of these variations? What defines the specificity of the "welfare state", the "laissez faire" state, the "interventionist" state?

(4). How should we explain the variability in forms of the capitalist state? Are these to be explained primarily by the changing functional requirements of capital accumulation? By the instrumental interests of the capitalist class? By class struggle? Or what?

(5). What are the implications of the above theoretical and conceptual issues for understanding the relationship between the state and gender oppression? or racial oppression? For example, does the state have a distinctively patriarchal or racial form?

READING ASSIGNMENT: No reading during the first week.

Week 2. General Theoretical and Conceptual Issues I: The Class Character of The State (Therborn, Jessop, Wright)

Probably more than any other Marxist theorist, Goran Therborn has attempted to elaborate a formal framework for specifying the class character of the very form of the state. Following on the work of Nicos Poulantzas, Therborn insists that the state should not be viewed simply as "a state in capitalist society" but must be understood as "a capitalist state", i.e. a state in which capitalist class relations are embodied in its very institutional form. However, whereas Poulantzas and most other theorists who make these claims leave them at a very abstract and general level, Therborn sticks his neck out and tries to develop a fairly comprehensive, concrete typology of the class character of formal aspects of state institutions. This enables him to also attempt to map out the ways in which these institutional properties of the state vary across a variety of different kinds of classstates: the feudal state, the capitalist state of competitive capitalism, the monopoly capitalist state, the socialist state. In this session we will examine in detail Therborn's claims. The readings by Barrow from a general overview of the theoretical context of Therborn's work. The readings by Wright and by Jessop provide additional commentary on the kind of analysis Therborn pursues.

READINGS ASSIGNMENT:

Goran Therborn, *What Does the Ruling Class Do When It Rules?*. Entire book
Clyde Barrow, *Critical Theories of the State*, Chapter Two, "Neo Marxism: the structuralist approach"

[1] Erik Olin Wright, "Class and Politics", chapter 5 in *Interrogating Inequality* (Verso: 1994). pp.88-106.

[2] Bob Jessop, "Putting States in their Place," pp.338-369 in Bob Jessop, *State Theory: putting capitalist states in their place* (Penn State University Press, 1990).

Week 3. General Theoretical and Conceptual Issues II: Class, Rationality and the State (Claus Offe)

Much traditional Marxist work on the state work has been rightfully criticized as emphasizing

the essential functionality of the relationship between the institutional form of the state and the requirements for the reproduction of capitalism. While there is often talk about "contradictions" in the functioning of the state, these are generally much less rigorously elaborated than are arguments about functionality. In contrast, Claus Offe has constantly stressed the problem of contradiction and the problematic functionality of the state. He has approached these issues both as a methodological problem and as a substantive problem.

Methodologically, Offe interrogates the meaning of the claim that the state has a distinctive, functionally specific class character which can be specified at the level of abstraction of the capitalist mode of production. Offe asks: by what criteria could we establish the truth of such claims? How can we distinguish a situation in which the state does not engage in anticapitalist practices because it is prevented from doing so by its form from a situation in which it does not engage in such practices simply because the balance of political power between contending forces in the society prevents it from doing so. This leads him to elaborate a systematic conceptualization of what he calls the "negative selectivity" of the state, that is, the properties of the state which exclude various options from state action. The methodological task, then, is to establish that these exclusions have a distinctive class logic to them. Framing the problem in this precise way opens up the possibility that these negative selections operate in a much more contradictory, less functional manner than the structural-Marxists generally acknowledge.

Substantively, Offe has explored a variety of ways in which the internal structures of the state and the problems it confronts in "civil society" lead it to act in quite contradictory ways. The forms of rationality which it institutionalizes to cope with certain demands are systematically dysfunctional for the accomplishment of new tasks thrust upon it by the development of capitalism. The end result is that far from being a well-oiled functional machine for reproducing capitalism, the state is, in his view, much more of an internally contradictory apparatus in which it is always uncertain the extent to which it will function optimally for capitalism.

READING ASSIGNMENT:

Clyde Barrow, Critical Theories of the State, Chapter four, "Post-Marxism I: The systems-analytic approach"

[3] Claus Offe, "Structural Problems of the Capitalist State: Class rule and the political system. On the selectiveness of political institutions", in Von Beyme (ed). German Political Studies, vol. I (Sage, 1974).pp.31-57

[4] Claus Offe, "The Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation", in Leon Lindberg (ed), Stress and Contradiction in Contemporary Capitalism (D.C. Heath, 1975)pp.125-144

[5] Claus Offe, "Theses on the theory of the State", in Contradictions of the Welfare State, by Claus Offe (MIT Press 1984), pp. 119-129

[6] Claus Offe, "Crises of Crisis Management: elements of a political crisis theory", International Journal of Politics, 6:3, Fall, 1976, pp.29-67

Further Readings:

John Keane, "The Legacy of Political Economy: thinking with and against Claus Offe," Canadian Journal of Political & Social Theory, 1978.
Claus Offe, Disorganized Capitalism (Oxford: Polity Press, 1985)

PART II. THE EMERGENCE OF THE MODERN STATE

Week 4. A Reconstructed Marxist Perspective: Perry Anderson, Lineages of the Absolutist State

One of the most celebrated historical studies of the class character of the state is Perry Anderson's Lineages of the Absolutist State. "Absolutism" has always been something of a puzzle for Marxists. If states are always class states, then the Absolutist state must either be a feudal state, a capitalist state or some peculiar amalgam characteristic of the transition period. Yet none of these characterizations is entirely satisfactory. Of these positions, the sharpest lines of debate have been between those who see the state in this period as fundamentally feudal in character (e.g. Perry Anderson) and those who see the Absolutist State as basically an early form of the capitalist state (e.g. Wallerstein). The theoretical puzzle for Anderson is derived from his steadfast commitment to the Marxist tradition: understanding how the "Absolutist State" could occur within a class structure that remained dominated by "feudalism". One of the hallmarks of feudalism is "parcellized sovereignty", whereas Absolutism constitutes a form of centralized, apparently unitary state power. Anderson's complex, comparative historical analysis attempts to reconcile these seemingly discordant conceptual elements.

READING ASSIGNMENT:

Perry Anderson, Lineages of the Absolutist State (London, NLB: 1974).

I recommend reading the entire book because the richness comes from the multiple iterations of the same themes within different comparative contexts. If you cannot read the entire book, be sure to read at least the following:

> Part I: pp.7-59 and at least two of the national case studies Part II. pp. 195-235 and at least two of the national case studies

Further Readings on the State in the Transition to Capitalism:

Immanuel Wallerstein, The Modern World System (Academic Press 1978), pages to be announced.
Gianfranco Poggi, The Development of the Modern State (London: Hutchinson)
Michael Hechter and William Brustein, "Regional Modes of Production and Patterns of State Formation in Western Europe," American Journal of Sociology, 85:5, 1980.

Week 5. An Eclectic approach: Charles Tilly, Coercion, Capital and European States

Whereas Perry Anderson resolutely tries to understand the emergence of the early modern state in terms of the class logics of different social systems Charles Tilly see class as only one of the forces impelling the development of state forms, and probably not the most central one. Tilly deploys an interesting, eclectic mix of Marxist and Weberian elements in a theory of state formation that places the state-centered dynamics of warmarking on a par with economic forces in explaining social change in general and the formation of the state in particular. His treatise covers a much longer period than does Anderson's -- 990-1990 rather than simply the early modern period -- but nevertheless the two works can be usefully compared as alternative strategies for understanding the trajectories of state forms.

READING ASSIGNMENT:

Charles Tilly, Coercion, Capital and European States: AD 990-1990 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990). Entire book.

PART III. CLASS AND STATE IN DEVELOPING CAPITALIST ECONOMIES

Week 6. A Marxist Approach to the State in the Third World: Nora Hamilton, The Limits of State Autonomy

Nora Hamilton's book is one of the first sustained attempts at applying the lessons of the state theory discussions of the 1970s to the problem of the state in developing societies. She is particularly concerned with the problem of the distinction between two distinct kinds of autonomy which the state might be said to have: instrumental autonomy (autonomy from direct manipulations by powerful class actors) and structural autonomy (autonomy from structural constraints imposed by the capitalist economy). It is limits to the latter kind of autonomy which she feels is most central to a Marxist class analysis. She develops these ideas in the context of a study of the Mexican Revolution and the attempt by the Mexican state to guide Mexican development.

READING ASSIGNMENT:

Nora Hamilton, *The Limits of State Autonomy: Post-Revolutionary Mexico* (Princeton University

Press, 1982)

Week 7. A Neo-Weberian Approach: Peter Evans, Embeded Autonomy

Peter Evans is also concerned with the problem of state autonomy in developing capitalist economies, but argues that states have greater capacity for autonomous initiative than most Marxists would allow. He offers an account of what he terms the "embedded autonomy" of the state, an autonomy (capacity for initiative and action) that comes from the specific forms of connection between state a society rather than from the isolation or separation of state from society. This concept is then used in a comparative study of the variability of autonomy in a specific empirical context.

READING ASSIGNMENT:

Peter Evans, Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation (Princeton University Press: 1995)

Further Readings on the State in the Third World:

H. Alavi, "The State in Post-Colonial Societies -- Pakistan and Bangladesh", New Left Review #74, 1972.
Alfred Stepan, "State Power and the Strength of Civil Society in the Southern Cone of Latin America", in Evans, et. al (eds). Bringing the State Back In, pp. 317-346
Peter Evans, "Transnational Linkages and the Economic Role of the State: an analysis of developing and industrialized nations in the post-World War II era", ibid. pp.192-226
Barbara Stallings, "International Lending and the Relative Autonomy of the State," Politics & Society, 1986
W. Zieman and M. Lanzendorfer, "The State in Peripheral Societies", Socialist Register, 1977.
B. Harrison, "The Chilean State After the Coup", The Socialist Register, 1977.
G. Therborn, "The Travail of Latin American Democracy," New Left Review, #113-114, 1979.
C. Leys, "The Overdeveloped Post-Colonial State: a reevaluation", Review of African Political Economy, #5.
G. O'Donnel,"Corporatism and the Question of the State," in Authoritarianism and Corporatism in Latin America (Malloy, ed.), 1976.
M. Mamdani, Politics and Class Formation in Uganda (MR Press)
Dietruich Rueschemeyer, Evelyne Huber Stephens and John D. Stephens, Capitalist Development and Democracy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992)

PART IV. CLASS AND THE WELFARE STATE

Week 8. Class Coalitions and Social Democracy: Gosta Esping-Anderson, Politics Against Markets

Esping-Anderson's study explores the importance of the stability of particular class coalitions in countering the structural constraints the capitalist economy imposes on the state. His books compares the fates of social democratic parties and policies in three Scandinavian countries -- Sweden, Norway and Denmark. There are two pivotal parts to his analysis: 1) He shows how different configurations of class coalition provide more or less solid foundations for social democratic rule, and 2) how the policies enacted by social democratic parties can either strengthen or undermine those foundations. The long success of Swedish Social democracy comes from a benevolent dialectic of these two processes: the class coalition that formed the base of the party was such as to generate policies which in turn solidified that base, whereas in Denmark the policies the party was forced to pursue by virtue of its class base had the long term effect of undermining the stability of social democratic rule.

READING ASSIGNMENT:

Gosta Esping-Anderson, Politics Against Markets: The Social Democratic Road to Power (Princeton University Press, 1985)

Further Readings:

Michael Shalev, "The Social Democratic Model and Beyond: Two generations of comparative research on the welfare state" Comparative Social Research, vol. 6, 1984
Walter Korpi, The Working Class in Welfare Capitalism, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978)
Goran Therborn, et. al."Sweden Before and After Social Democracy: a first overview", Acta Sociologica 21 (supplement), 1978
Richard Scase, Social Democracy in Capitalist Society (London: Croom Helm, 1977)
Andrew Martin, The Politics of Economic Policy in the United States: a tentative view from a comparative perspective (Sage, 1973)
J.A. Fry, The Limits of the Welfare State: critical views on post-war Sweden, (Farnborough, England: Saxon House, 1979)
John Stephens, The Transition from Capitalism to Socialism (London: McMillan, 1979)

Week 9. Class formation and State capacity in explaining variability in the Welfare State: George Steinmetz, Regulating the Social

The study of innovation in state institutions is often a particular good context for studying contending general theories of the state. Steinmetz uses a peculiar fact about German history to examine in a fine-grained way the relationship between state capacity and class forces in shaping the state and state policies. In the 19th century a series of national enabling laws were passed which made it possible for German municipalities to introduce new forms of welfare provision, but which did not mandate that they do so. We therefore have a kind of controlled experiment: all German cities were operating under the same basic "rules of the game", but some rapidly introduced these new forms of welfare state provision while others did not. One hypothesis is that cities varied in their bureaucratic capacity for administering such programs, and this variability explains the variability of outcomes. A more Marxist hypothesis is that it was the balance of class forces and class struggles which explain the variability. And, of course, there is the possibility that the outcome reflects an interaction of the two. Steinmetz creatively explores these issues through a combination of quantitative and qualitative historical analysis.

READING ASSIGNMENT:

George Steinmetz, *Regulating the Social: the welfare state and local politics in Imperial Germany (*Princeton University Press, 1993)

Week 10. A Debate over the centrality of class analysis to understanding the New Deal state (Skocpol, Domhoff, Gilbert, Howe)

The New Deal has been a favorite object of debates within state theory. It offers an exceptionally good empirical setting for exploring many of the issues in class theories of the state. The New Deal reforms were vehemently opposed by many segments of the capitalist class and thus pose a prima facae challenge to strong Marxist accounts of the state. Here is an instance of a massive set of reforms in the practices -- and even the structure -- of the state in a capitalist society which, on the surface, was opposed by the dominant class. And yet, by most accounts, these reforms helped to stabilize and even strengthen American capitalism. The New Deal thus sharply poses the problem of the "relative autonomy" of the state: a state capable of (apparently) acting against the wishes of many powerful representatives of the bourgeoisie in order to serve the interests of the class as a whole. Alternatively, the New Deal reforms have been understood by some theorists as largely a statist project, driven by state elites and policy intellectuals, only weakly responsive to the "needs of capital" and much more preoccupied with the task of expanding state capacities in their own interests.

READING ASSIGNMENT:

[7] Skocpol, Theda, "Political Response to Capitalist Crisis: Neo-Marxist Theories of the state and the Case of the New Deal", Politics & Society 10:155-201

[8] Skocpol, Theda, and Kenneth Fiengold. 1982. "State Capa city and Economic Intervention in the Early New Deal," Political Science Quarterly, 97: 255-278

[9] G. William Domhoff. 1993. "Class Conflict or State Autonomy in New Deal Agricultural Policy: yet another counterattack on a theoretical delusion." Political Power and Social Theory, volume 8, pp.45-78

[10] Jess Gilbert and Carolyn Howe. 1991. "Beyond 'state vs society': theories of the state and New Deal Agricultural Policies". American Sociological Review 56, April: 204-220

PART V. THE STATE IN THE GLOBALIZING CAPITALIST ECONOMY

Week 11. The argument for severe constraints on the state
Week 12. The argument for continuing capacity for the Affirmative State

Few questions are of greater theoretical or political importance than the impact of the globalization of capital on the state. The dominant view at the moment is that globalization has virtually destroyed the possibilities for state serious intervention of almost any sort, but especially of progressive/egalitarian state intervention. The global mobility of capital, and particularly the ease and speed of international financial transactions, means that whenever policies are enacted which are unfavorable to the interests of capitalists, they simply shift their investments elsewhere. This not only erodes the possibilities of Keynesian macro-economic management, but of any redistributive policy relying on taxation. An alternative view states that while there may have been some tightening of the constraints on progressive reforms, there is still a significant scope for the affirmative in global capitalism. Pronouncements about constraints are to a significant extent strategic moves in an ideological battle over what is possible; if enough people believe that redistribution, progressive taxation, activist state interventions, and so on are impossible, then they become impossible. This is not because of political-economic constraints as such, but because of beliefs about such constraints. These are difficult questions and their resolution involves considerable debate over economic issues -- trade, international finance, capital mobility. We will not be able to fully explore these technical problems in two sessions but I hope we will be able to refine our understanding of what is at issue.

READING ASSIGNMENT:

Note: These are the readings for two weeks of the seminar. I will divide them into two sessions at least a week before the first of the sessions.

Michael Stewart, The Age of Interdependence: Economic Policy in a Shrinking World (MIT Press, 1983)

[11] Adrian Wood. 1994. North-South Trade, Employment and Inequality (Oxford: Clarnedon Press), ch 1, "Summary and Conclusions", and chapter 10, "Policy Options for the North", pp. 1-26, 346-394.

[12] Herman Schwartz, "Small States in Big Trouble: State reorganization in Australia, Denmark, New Zealand and Sweden in the 1980s", World Politics, July 1994, 46 (4) 527-55

[13] Bob Jessop, "Changing Forms and Functions of the State in an Era of Globalization and Regionalization," in Delorme & Dopfer (eds) The Political Economy of Diversity

[14] Paul Hirst & Thompson, "The Problem of Globalization..." in Economy and Society, Nov, 1992 357-396

[15] Eric Helleiner "Freeing Money: Why have states been more willing to liberalize capital controls than trade barriers?" Policy Sciences 27 (4) 1994 pp.39.9-318

[16] John Ikenberry, "Funk de Siecle: Impasses of Western Industrial Society at Century's End," Millenium (Spring, 1995)

[17] Ton Notermans. 1993. "The Abdication from National Policy Autonomy: why the macroeconomic policy regime has become so unfavorable to labor." Politics & Society, 21:3, 133-168

[18] Jonathan Moses.1994. "Abdication from National Policy Autonomy: what's left to leave?" Politics & Society. 22:2, 125-148

[19] Ton Notermans. 1994. "Social Democracy in Open Economies: a reply to Jonathan Moses" Politics & Society. 22:2, 149-164

[20] Andrew Glyn. 1995. "Social Democracy and Full Employment". New Left Review. #211. pp. 33-55

Further Readings on the state and Internationalization:

Alberto Martinelli and Eugenio Somaini, "Multinational Corporations and the Nation State," Kapitalistate #1, 1973.

Nicos Poulantzas, "International of Capitalist Relations and the Nation State", in Classes in Contemporary Capitalism (NLB, 1975), pp.38-88.

PART VI. DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Week 13. The Logic of Capitalist Democracy: Przeworski; Cohen & Rogers

In a famous passage from Class Struggles in France Marx portrayed the linkage of democracy and capitalism as an intensely contradictory couplet:

> The comprehensive contradiction of this constitution, however, consists in the following: the classes whose social slavery the constitution is to perpetuate, proletariat, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie, it puts into the possession of political power through universal suffrage. And from the class whose old social power it sanctions, the bourgeoisie, it withdraws the political guarantees of this power. It forces the political rule of the bourgeoisie into democratic conditions, which at every moment help the hostile classes to victory and jeopardize the very foundations of bourgeois society. (Marx/Engels, Selected Works in Three Volumes, vol.I, Moscow, pp.235-6)

Lenin, writing some sixty years later in The State and Revolution, claimed that parliamentary democracy was the "best possible shell" for the perpetuation of bourgeois rule. Can these two positions be reconciled? Do they reflect distinct theoretical stances towards the problem of "bourgeois democracy" or do they simply reflect the changing conditions of bourgeois rule from the mid-19th century to the twentieth century?

These issues are hardly simply questions of textual inter pretation: the debate over the class character of parliamentary democracy remains at the very heart of both theoretical and political debates over the state on the left today. Can the state be "used" by different classes in the pursuit of their class interests, or does the state have a monolithic class character? Does the parliamentary form of the capitalist state contain within itself contradictory principles? Particularly since the "problem of democracy" has become such a central political concern given the history of "actually existing socialist" states, the answers to such questions are of fundamental importance. In this session we will look at how capitalist democracies work, how they structure class struggle in such a way that they simultaneously contribute to social reproduction and open opportunities for potentially explosive social changes. Particular attention will be paid to the dynamics of electoral competition and the ways in which this shapes the possibilities of radical objectives.

READING ASSIGNMENT:

Adam Przeworski, Capitalism & Social Democracy, chapters 1, 3 and 5

[21]. Joshua Cohen and Joel Rogers, On Democracy (Penguin, 1983). Chapter 3, "Structure", pp.47-87

Further reading on Democratic Capitalism:

Bob Jessop, "Capitalism and Democracy: the Best Possible Shell?",in Littlejohn, et. al. (eds) Power and the State (London: Croom Helm, 1978).
Perry Anderson, "The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci", New Left Review #100, 1977.
Goran Therborn, "The Rule of Capital and the Rise of Democracy", New Left Review #103, May-June 1977.
Bob Jessop, "The Political Indeterminacy of Democracy", in Alan Hunt (ed) Marxism and Democracy, (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1980), pp. 55-80.
Erik Olin Wright, Class, Crisis and the State, (London: NLB,1978), chapter 4. "Bureaucracy and the State"
Barry Hindess, "Marxism and Parliamentary Democracy" in Hunt, op.cit., pp.21-54
Barry Hindess, "Democracy and the Limitations of Parliamentary Democracy in Britain," Politics & Power, #1 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980).
Bob Jessop, "Parliamentary Democracy: the limitations of Hindess", Politics & Power #2, 1980.
Barrington Moore, Jr. The Social Origins of Dictatorship and emocracy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966).
Andrew Levine, Liberal Democracy: a critique of its theory (New ork: Columbia University Press, 1981)

Week 14. An historical case study of the transformations of American Democracy: Ira Katznelson, The Long 1940s

In this session we will discuss an unpublished manuscript by Ira Katznelson. (Copies of the relevant portions of this manuscript will be made available at least a week before the session). The book revolves around a striking historical fact: the spectrum of legitimate policy debate in the 1930s during the heyday of the New Deal included policy options well within the gambit of social democracy, but by the 1950s this spectrum had drastically narrowed to include a range of policies much more tightly consistent with the interests of capital. How can we explain why "limits of possibility" perceived by political actors in the 1930s was much broader than in the 1950s? What political and institutional factors explain this narrowing of options? By exploring the trajectory of the narrowing of what options were "on the table" perhaps we will be able to better understand what is necessary to broaden the agenda of legitimate politics for the future.

READING ASSIGNMENT:

Ira Katznelson, The Long 1940s (unpublished manuscript), selected chapters to be announced.

Week 15. Reconstructing Capitalist Democracy, Joshua Cohen & Joel Rogers, Associations & Democracy

Throughout the semester we have focused on the institutions of the capitalist state as they exist today and how they have developed historically. The fundamental point of a critical analysis of the state, however, is to expand our vision of alternative possibilities and sharpen our analysis of how to get there. Joshua Cohen and Joel Rogers have developed the outlines of a model of a radical democratic alternative to existing democratic institutions. The pivot of the model is a proposal to expand the role of various kinds of secondary associations -- organizations that stand between individual citizens and state apparatuses -in the democratic governance. This involves not merely deepening their role as vehicles for interest representation, but also involving them in the actual implementation and administration of public policy. In this session we will examine the Cohen and Rogers proposal and a range of criticism and amendments offered by various commentators on their project.

READING ASSIGNMENT:

Joshua Cohen & Joel Rogers, Associations & Democracy (Verso,1995)

FURTHER READINGS ON VARIOUS SUBSTANTIVE TOPICS IN STATE THEORY

The following is an extended set of readings on various topics. Some of these have been regular seminar sessions in previous years in which this seminar has been given. In some cases the specific bibliographic suggestions for a given topic may be a bit dated since this list has not been revised for several years.

A. GENERAL THEORETICAL ISSUES AND PERSPECTIVES

1. What is "Politics"? What is "the state"?

Many of the debates over the state and politics, both within Marxism and between Marxist and nonMarxist perspectives, are confused because the labels are being used to designate different phenomena, different concepts, different structures and processes. While it may seem somewhat scholastic to have a discussion centering entirely on what we mean by these terms, a sharp clarification of these issues is important.

CORE READINGS:

Ellen Meikins Woods, "The Separation of the Economic and the Political in Capitalism," New Left Review #127, 1981

Louis Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses", in Althusser, Lenin and Philosophy (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971)

Alan Wolfe, "New Directions in the Marxist Theory of Politics", Politics & Society, 4:2, 1974

Max Weber, "The Political Community", Economy and Society, chapter 9 in volume II (University of California Press edition, 1978).

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Erik Olin Wright, "The Status of the Political in the Concept of Class Structure", Politics & Society, 11:3, 1982.

Barry Hindess, "Classes and Politics in Marxist Theory," in Littlejohn,(ed), Power and the State, (London: Croom Helm, 1978)

Michael Albert and Robin Hahnel, Marxism and Socialist Theory (Boston: South End Press, 1981), chapter 3. "Politics and History."

Ernesto LaClau, "The Specificity of the Political", in LaClau, Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory
(London:NLB, 1977)

G.A. Cohen, "Base and Superstructure, powers and rights," chapter VIII in Cohen, Karl Marx's Theory of History (Princeton University Press, 1978).

Frederick Engels, The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State, especially part IX, "Barbarism and Civilization"

2. Conceptualizations of "Power".

Lurking behind the alternative concepts of politics and the state are divergent conceptualizations of "power." At least the following definitions of power appear in the literature:

(1). Behavioral definition: power is the ability of A to for B to do something over the objection of B or in spite of the resistence of B. (Weber)

(2). Power as limits: power is the ability of one actor to determine the limits of possibilities for action of another actor -- nonevents, nondecionmaking, negative selection, etc. (Offe, Bachrach and Baratz, "the two faces of power").

(3). Power and interests: Power is the capacity to realize one's interests against the actual or potential resistance of opposing interests. (Lukes, "the three faces of power")

(4). Power and action: Power is the capacity to act where that capacity depends upon mobilizing the intentionality of other actors for action. (Giddens)

There are undoubtedly other conceptualizations which could also be included here, but this captures some of the salient alternatives. The readings for this session encompass a fairly wide range of views on power. In assessing them it is important to continually ask: what real difference does one conceptualization or another make for the kinds of substantive questions one can ask and the problems one can investigate.

CORE READINGS:

Steven Lukes, Power: a Radical View (London: McMillan, 1974)
Anthony Giddens, Central Problems in Social Theory (University of California Press, 1979), pp.85-94
Anthony Giddens, "Domination, Power and Exploitation: a analysis", chapter 2 in A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism (University of California Press, 1981)
Goran Therborn, What Does the Ruling Class Do When It Rules?, pp.129-153.
Jeffery Isaac, "Beyond the Three Faces of Power: a realist critique (unpublished manuscript, 1982).

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Nicos Poulantzas, State, Power, Socialism (NLB, 1978), pp 3562, 123-154.
Roderick Martin, The Sociology of Power (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977
Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish (Vintage, 1979)

3. The State as Superstructure in Marx's theory of history.

It is very unfashionable these days to treat the state as a "superstructure". Partially because of the increasingly intense forms of involvement of the state in economic processes and partially because of the concerted attack on all forms of "economism" in theory, very few theorists are prepared to adopt the base-superstructure metaphor in their analyses of the state or anything else.

Nevertheless, the image of the state as a superstructure to the economic base was certainly present in Marx's more abstract discussion of the state. In this session we will examine what precisely this conceptualization means. To facilitate this analysis, we will also consider G.A. Cohen's discussion of the functional relation between superstructures and the base in historical

materialism. Particular attention should be paid to Cohen's account of functional explanation, since the issue of functionalism will occur many times during the semester.

CORE READING:

Karl Marx, "Preface" to A Contribution to a Critique of Political Economy (this text can be found on pp.viiviii in Cohen's book)

G.A. Cohen, Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defense, (Princeton University Press, 1978) chapter VIII, "Base and Superstructure, Powers and Rights", pp. 216-248

SUPPLEMENTARY:

G.A. Cohen, KMOTH, chapters IX and X (further elaborations on the logic of functional explanations in historical materialism)

F. Engels, The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State, section V, "The Rise of the Athenian State"

Bob Jessop, The Capitalist State (New York University Press, 1982), chapter 1, "Marx and Engels on the State", especially pp.9-12

4. "Structuralist" approaches to the State: Nicos Poulantzas

It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of Nicos Poulantzas' contribution to the development of the Marxist theory of the state. While there is a great deal to criticize in his work, both in terms of the form of exposition (opaque & marxiological) and many of his specific formulations, still his ideas have systematically shaped the analysis of the state of both his critics and supporters for more than a decade. In spite of its difficulty, therefore, it is important to become familiar with the central themes and theses of his work.

Although it is probably his most difficult work, we will focus on Poulantzas' most general theoretical statement on the state, Political Power and Social Classes, published originally in France in 1968 and translated into English in 1973. This book was the first major, comprehensive attempt at a construction of a rigorous Marxist theory of the state in the recent renaissance of Marxist theory, and it immediately sparked a great deal of debate.

The book comes out of the Althusserian philosophical framework, and was seen as a contribution to developing the basic insights of Althusser's Marxism around the problem of the state. Nevertheless, I think that it is important to read the work not simply as an "illustration" of Althusserian methodological principles, but as a substantive analysis of the nature and effects of the state in capitalist society.

Poulantzas's book is exceptionally difficult, especially for American students not used to the obliqueness of continental European writing. To facilitate the reading, I have included two "guides" to Poulantzas in the xeroxed course materials: the first is a general summary of Poulantzas's theoretical argument written by myself and Luca Perrone; the second is a section-by-section annotated guide to the book itself in which I indicate what the central issue or point of

a particular part of the book is. Hopefully these will make the reading somewhat less arduous.

BACKGROUND READINGS (summaries and exigeses of Poulantzas):

Erik Olin Wright and Luca Perrone, "The structuralist-Marxist approach", part 3 of "The Structuralist-Marxist and Parsonsian Theories of Politics", unpublished manuscript, 1973.

Erik Olin Wright, "A reading guide to Poulantzas' Political Power and Social Classes" (mimeo, 1977; updated, 1981)

Martin Carnoy, The State and Political Theory, op.cit., chapter 4, "Structuralism and the State: Althusser and Poulantzas"

Bob Jessop, The Capitalist State, op.cit., Chapter 4, "Hegemony, Force and State Power"

CORE READINGS:

Nicos Poulantzas, Political Power and Social Classes (NLB/Verso, 1973). Try to read the entire book, but you can focus on the following sections:

Required. 25-141 [especially: 25-33, 44-50, 73-77, 104-114, 130-137], 147-152; 187-194, 225-245 [especially 229-234], 255-289 [especially 275-289], 296-321 [especially: 317321].

Optional. 11-25, 142-146, 153-187, 195-224, 246-252, 290-295, 326-359

SUGGESTED READINGS:

A. Other work by Poulantzas

"The Problem of the Capitalist State," New Left Review #58, 1969.

Fascism and Dictatorship (London: NLB. 1974)

Classes in Contemporary Capitalism (NLB, 1975)

State, Power,Socialism (NLB,1978)

B. Work which explicitly adopts and extends Poulantzas' Framework.

Goran Therborn, What Does the Ruling Class Do When It Rules?

David Abraham, The Collapse of the Weimar Republic (Princeton University Press, 1981)

C. Critiques of Poulantzas :

Ralph Miliband, "Poulantzas and the Capitalist State", New Left Review #82, 1973

Ernesto LaClau, "The Specificity of the Political", in LaClau, Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory (NLB, 1977)

Simon Clarke, "Marxism, Sociology and Poulantzas' Theory of the State" Capital and Class #2, 1977.

_____,"Capital, Fractions of Capital and the State: Neo-Marxist Analysis of the South African State," Capital and Class #5, 1978.

Amy Bridges,"Nicos Poulantzas and the Marxist Theory of the State", Politics & Society

4:2, 1977.

John Solomos, "The Marxist Thoery of the State and the problem of Fractions: some theoretical and methodological remarks", Capital and Class #7, 1979.

5. State Interests, State Capacities, State Managers: Theda Skocpol and Peter Evans

One of the most interesting and important theoretical developments in the past several years in discussions on the state has revolved around the problem of the state managers, state capacities, state interests and, more generally, the state as such as an actor (rather than just as a structure or a terrain of action/struggle). Particularly in the debates in the United States, a number of influential theorists -- Theda Skocpol and Fred Block, for example -- have argued for the centrality of state-centered interests and capacities in understanding the state and its effects. The core thesis of these theorists is that state managers have interests which are irreducible to class interests and state apparatuses have capacities which are at least partially autonomous from class power. This thesis comes in weak versions, in which no claim is made that these statecentered processes have greater importance than class-centered processes, to strong versions in which at least implicitly it is maintained that these state variables are more important than class.

CORE READINGS:

Theda Skocpol, "Bringing the State Back In: False Leads and Promising Starts in Current Theories and Research," in Peter Evans, Dietich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol, Bringing the State Back In (eds), Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 3-37.

Peter Evans, Dietich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol, "On the oad to a More Adequate Understanding of the State", ibid., pp. 347-366

Michael Mann, "The Autonomous Power of the State: its origins, mechanisms and results," Arch.Europ.sociol.XXV (1984)

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Martin Carnoy, The State, pp.217-223, 235-245

Kenneth Finegold and Theda Skocpol, "State, Party and Industry: From Business Recovery to the Wagner Act in America's New Deal," forthcoming in Charles C. Bright and Susan F. Harding (eds) Statemaking and Social Movements (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Fred Block, "Beyond Relative Autonomy: state managers as historical subjects", The Socialist Register, 1980.,pp.227242.

Theda Skocpol, "Political Response to Capitalist Crisis: NeoMarxist Theories of the State and the Case of the New Deal," Politics & Society, 10:2, 1980

Fred Block, "The Ruling Class Does Not Rule", Socialist Review, May-June, 1977

Ralph Miliband, "State Power and Class Interests" New Left Review #138, March-April, 1983.

Theda Skocpol and Ken Finegold, "Economic Intervention and the Early New Deal", Political Science Quarterly, 97:2, 1982, pp.255-278.

Theda Skocpol, States and Social Revolutions (Cambridge University Press: 1978)

Margaret Weir and Theda Skocpol, "State Structures and Social Keynesianism: responses to the Great Depression in Sweden and the United States", International Journal of Comparative Sociology, December, 1983.

6. Critical Theory approaches to the state: Habermas

Discussions of the state in the tradition of critical theory have been marked by two interconnected concerns: (1) the problem of state rationality; and (2) the problem of legitimation. Claus Offe's work (which we have discussed in several sessions) is particularly preoccupied with the first of these. He asks: given the formal, institutional separation of the state and economy in capitalist society, what (if anything) guarantees that the state will pursue policies that are rational from the point of view of the interests of the capitalist class? Habermas has also been concerned with analyzing rationality and the state, but his central focus has been on the question of legitimation, more specifically, for the tendencies for the contradictions of the capitalist economy to become displaced onto the political arena as the role of the state expands with capitalist development. The core of his work on the state thus concerns the dynamics of what he calls "crises of legitimacy." Although the idiom of his analysis often seems closer to sociological systems theory than to Marxism, nevertheless the underlying theoretical problems are closely linked to traditional Marxist concerns with contradictions, capitalist development and revolutionary transformation.

CORE READINGS:

Jurgen Habermas, Legitimation Crisis (Beacon Press, 1975), especially Part II and Part III.

Alan Wolfe, "New Directions in the Marxist Theory of Politics", Politics & Society, 4:2, 1974.

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Tony Woodiwiss, "Critical Theory and the Capitalist State", Economy and Society, 7:2, 1978.

Bertell Ollman, "The State as a Value Relation", in Alienation (Cambridge University Press, 1976, second edition, pp.212-220.

Jurgen Habermas, "The Public Sphere," Telos, 1:3, 1974

Paul Connerton (ed) Critical Sociology (Penguin, 1976), essay on "Legitimation" by Habermas

Goran Therborn, "A Critique of the Frankfurt School", New Left Review, #63, 1970.

7. The State as a "Condition of Existence" of Capital: Barry Hindess, Paul Hirst and "post-Althusserian" British Marxism.

The work of Poulantzas and Althusser had a particularly important impact on certain tendencies within British Marxism in the 1970s. In particular, a group of Marxists sometimes referred to as "post-Althusserians" (because of the way in which they have extended Althusser's framework and carried it to a logical extreme which resulted in a wholesale rejection of Althusser) have had a major influence among academic Marxists in sociology and related disciplines.

Within this group, the work of Barry Hindess and Paul Q. Hirst have been the most widely read and discussed. Their basic point in the analysis of the state is that attempts to derive any kind of "essence" of the state from the analysis of class relations must be rejected. The state, they argue, cannot be understood in terms of the fulfillment of necessary functions dictated by the class structure of capitalism or as the ideal expression of those class relations. Rather, the state must be understood in terms of the historically specific ways in which certain "conditions of existence" of capitalist production relations are secured. The securing of these conditions of existence, they argue, can never be taken for granted and is never guaranteed by the simple fact of capitalist class relations; rather, such conditions are only created through concrete struggle.

CORE READINGS:

Barry Hindess, "Classes and Politics in Marxist Theory", in Littlejohn (ed), Power and the State (Croom Helm, 1978)

Barry Hindess and Paul Q. Hirst, "Primitive Communism, Politics and the State", in Precapitalist Modes of Production (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975).

Anthony Cutler, Barry Hindess, Paul Hirst and Athar Hussain, "Mode of Production, Social Formation, Classes", chapter 6 in Marx's Capital and Capitalism Today vol I. (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977).

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Barry Hindess, "Marxism and Parliamentary Democracy", in Hunt (ed)Marxism and Democracy (Lawrence & Wishart, 1980).

Barry Hindess, "Democracy and the Limitations of Parliamentary Democracy in Britain," Politics & Power #1, 1980

8. Capital Logic and State Derivation Perspectives.

Perhaps the least familiar tradition in the Marxist theory of the state in North America is the tradition which attempts to derive the central features of the capitalist state from the "logic" or "form" of the capital relation. This tradition has been extremely influential in West Germany and Scandanavia, and has begun to have a certain influence in Britain as well among more "orthodox" Marxists.

The essential thrust of the approach is to attempt to derive logically various characteristics of the state from the analysis of capital accumulation and/or class struggle in Capital. These properties of the state are not, in general, derived on a functional basis, but on a logical/definitional basis. Take for example one of the properties of the state that is most frequently discussed: the formal institutional separation of the state from the economy (production). A functionalist argument would explain this by saying that such an institutional arrangement is functional for capitalism. The Capital logic school, in contrast, would simply argue that because of the definition of what makes capitalism "capitalism", from a logical point of view the system would not be capitalist unless this institutional separation existed. This separation is thus logically entailed by the concept of Capital.

Holloway and Picciotto provide a good overview of the approach in the introduction to their book, State and Capital, and the chapter by Hirsch is an example of the approach by one of the leading German proponents.

CORE READINGS:

John Holloway and Sol Picciotto, "Towards a Materialist Theory of the State", chapter 1 of State and Capital (University of Texas Press, 1978).

Joachim Hirsch, "The State Apparatus and Social Reproduction: elements of a theory of the Bourgeois state", in State and Capital ed by Holloway and Picciotto.

Bob Jessop, "Form and Functions of the State", chapter 3 in The Capitalist State

SUGGESTED READINGS:

John Holloway and Sol Picciotto, Capital, Crisis and the State", Capital and Class #2, 1977.

Margaret Fay, "Review of State and Capital", Kapitalistate #7, 1979

John Holloway and Sol Picciotto (eds), The State and Capital (University of Texas Press, 1978): an anthology of capital logic essays.

9. Gramsci and the State

Gramsci's fragmented work on the state has probably been more influential in shaping the

thinking of recent Continental discussions of the state than any other writer of the first half of the twentieth century other than Lenin. Because of the conditions under which he wrote (in a Fascist prison in the 1920s and 1930s) his work is often very difficult to decode, and the theoretical arguments are often elliptic and ambiguous. Nevertheless, his discussions of hegemony, war of position/war of manoeuvre, civil society and the state, intellectuals, passive revolution and various other topics have helped to define the terrain of much contemporary work.

CORE READINGS:

Antonio Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks (International Publishers, 1971),

especially the following essays:

"State and The Civil Society" (206-275)

"Problems of Marxism: Economy and Ideology" (pp.407-409)

"The formation of Intellectuals" (pp.5-14)

"The Modern Prince" (123-202)

OTHER READINGS ON GRAMSCI:

Perry Anderson,"The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci", New Left Review #100, 1977.

Carl Boggs, Gramsci's Marxism (Pluto Press, 1976)

Christine Buci-Gluksman, Gramsci and the State (hardback: Humanities Press, 1981; paperback: London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1981)

_____ "State, Transition and passive revolution". in Chantal Mouffe (ed) Gramsci and Marxist Theory, (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979)

Biagio de Giovanni, "Lenin and Gramsci: state, politics and party", in Mouffe, ibid.

Walter Adamson, Hegemony and Revolution: Antonio Gramsci's Political and Cultural Theory, especially chapter 7, "The Autonomy of Politics", pp. 202-228, (University of California Press, 1980)

Anne Showstack-Sassoon, Gramsci's Politics (Croom Helm, 1980)

Harvey Kaye, "Antonio Gramsci: an annotated bibliography of studies in English", Politics & Society, 10:3, 1981.

10. Bob Jessop: a "Strategic Relational" approach to the state

Bob Jessop is one of the best known commentators on state theory writing in English. His work

on the subject now spans the entire period of the growth of radical state theory since the early 1970s. His writing, at times, is somewhat difficult, but he has a sophisticated understanding of the range of issues of contemporary state theory and engaging his work will be helpful in giving a general overview of these problems. The readings in part I State Theory: Putting Capitalist States in their Place (chapters 1 and 3 in the asisgnment) survey a wide range of approaches to studying the capitalist state within the broadly defined Marxist tradition. Of particular importance is seeing how Jessop explores the problem economic determinism. The readings in Part II concern the problem of democracy and interest representation in the capitalist state, both as this relates to the interests of workers and the interests of capitalists. The readings at the end of the book criticizes various currents of post-Marxist "deconstructionist" approaches to the state and presents systematically his suggestions for how we should build a theory of the state. He tries to develop a theory of the state which manages to sustain the insight of post-Marxists that there is a great deal of contingency and indeterminacy in social processes without abandoning a class analysis of the state altogether. This is a tricky juggling act, and at times Jessop's solutions are not entirely clear, but I think it is worth grappling with his line of thinking.

READING ASSIGNMENT: Bob Jessop, *State Theory* (Penn State University Press)

11. Rational Action, Strategic Action and the State

The notion of strategic action (i.e. action in pursuit of goals based on the conscious, rational calculation of likely actions of others) has a relatively precarious place in Marxist theory. On the one hand, as is often noted, the ultimate purpose of Marxism is to "change the world", not simply to understand it, and this implies a central concern with agency and strategy. On the other hand, in the actual elaboration of theoretical positions about the state, Marxists have tended to marginalize the role of strategic action. When it is discussed, furthermore, the main focus is on the way in which dominant classes constitute strategic actors with respect to state institutions (especially in power structure research); relatively little systematic attention is given to the problem of strategic action by subordinate classes.

One of the consequences of marginalizing the strategic practices of workers and other subordinate groups is that the role of the state in reproducing class relations tends to be viewed either as primarily involving repression or ideology (in the sense of mystification). In the former case, strategic action is unimportant because there are no real choices available to workers; in the latter case, strategic action is unimportant because the state engenders forms of subjectivity which render choices illusory.

Recently, a number of theorists have placed the issue of strategic action at the center of their analysis of the state. Of particular importance for the general study of politics in this regard is the work of Adam Przeworski. He treats workers (and other potential collectively organized actors) as rational, strategic actors in pursuit of interests under a specified set of "rules of the game". These rules are determined both by the underlying property relations of the society and by the institutional characteristics of the state. His fundamental argument is that in developed

capitalist democracies these rules help to create the conditions for a hegemonic system in which the interests of exploited classes are objectively coordinated with the interests of dominant classes through the rational, strategic choices and practices of workers. This hegemonic system cannot be viewed as primarily the result of repression of struggles or ideological distortions of subjectivities; it is the result of the way rational, strategic choices are structured within the social conflicts of the society.

In this session we will look at a number of nonMarxist and Marxist treatments of rational action as it pertains to the analysis of the state. North uses a range of principles from neoclassical economics to understand the sources of stability and instability, growth and decline, in the interactions between state and economy. His focus is on the ruler as a utility or wealth maximizer, and the implications of ruler strategies for the trajectory of changes in state institutions. While North's arguments are not embedded in the Marxist (or other radical) tradition, nevertheless, they have been used by radical scholars in the elaboration of what is sometimes called the "predatory theory of the state". Levi then uses this general perspective on the predatory state to approach the specific problem of how states acquire revenues. She is particularly concerned with the puzzle of why people pay taxes given that the enforcement capacity of the state is usually too low to coercively insure tax payments. She solves this puzzle by examining the nature of the strategic interactions of rulers and ruled in terms of what she calls "quasi-voluntary compliance" Cohen and Rogers analyze the political dynamics of the liberal democratic capitalist state from the vantage point of the rational action of potential challengers to the state (rather than the rational action of rulers). In particular, they are concerned with the ways in which it structures the feasible courses of action and time horizons of different kinds of actors are shaped by the rules of the game of political conflict. Finally, James Buchanan and Frederick Hayek present neo-conservative views of the state and democracy, in which strategic rationality under unconstrasined democratic institutions generates (in his views) oppressive state apparatuses. All of these writers deploy rational action models, but with very different political and theoretical objectives.

CORE READINGS:

Douglas North, "A Neoclassical Theory of the State", in Jon Elster (ed) Rational Choice (NYU Press, 1986), pp.248-260

James Buchanan, "The Threat of Levianthan", in The Limits of Liberty (University of Chicago Press, 1975), pp.147-165

Margaret Levi, Of Rule and Revenue (University of California Press, 1988) pp.10-40,48-70.

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Adam Przeworski, Democracy and the Market (Cambridge)

Adam Przeworski, "Marxism and Rational Choice, " Politics & Society, 1986, 14:379-409

Adam Przeworski, The State and Economy under Capitalism (Harwood Academic Publishers, 1990)
Frederick Hayek, "Majority Opinion and Contemporary Democracy", c.12 in Law, Legislation and Liberty (vol.3 of The Political Order of a Free People), Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979
R.D. Tollison, "Rent-seeking: a survey", Kyklos 35 (1982): 575-602
Douglas North and Robert Thomas, The Rise of the Western World (Cambridge University Press, 1973)
Robert Ekelund and Robert Tollison, Mercantilism as a rentseeking society (Texas A&M University Press, 1982)
Richard Emerson, "State Formation in Baltistan," forthcoming in Politics and Society, 1984.
Anthony Downs, An Economic Theory of Democracy (New York: Harper and Row, 1957),pp.3-74
Michael Hechter and William Brustein, "Regional Modes of Production and Patterns of State Formation in Western Europe," American Journal of Sociology, 85:5, 1980.
Jon Elster, "Marxism, Functionalism and Game Theory," Theory and Society, July, 1982
_____ Ulysses and the Sirens (Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp.1-36.
Brian Barry, Sociologists, Economists and Democracy (Collier McMillan, 1970).

12. An Attempt at a Mega-Synthesis: Robert Alford and Roger Friedland

Grand syntheses of theoretical disputes are generally precarious enterprises. Typically, they either involve systematic distortions of the diverse perspectives being synthesized, or the "synthesis" takes the form of an eclectic juxtaposition of distinct theories without any serious integration into a unified, coherent framework.

In these terms, the recent book by Robert Alford and Roger Friedland, The Powers of Theory, represents a bold and stimulating effort. They propose a meta-framework within which the distinct logics of what they term pluralist, managerialist and class theories of the state and politics can be subsumed, and they do so without serious distortion of each of the theories they discuss. More specifically, they argue that each of these theories has a home "domain" in which their concepts are coherent and powerful: pluralism is a theory of what they term the situational domain; managerial theories of the organizational or institutional domain; and class theories of the systemic domain. The task of a general framework for the study of the state and politics is to establish the relationships among these domains and to integrate the distinct theories of the basis of those interconnections. While I think that there are problems with this proposed synthesis, nevertheless it needs to be engaged seriously.

CORE READING:

Robert Alford and Roger Friedland, The Powers of Theory (Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 1-58, 136-183, 223249, 271-287, 387-443

B. ADDITIONAL SUBSTANTIVE TOPICS

13. The State and the Oppression of Women

The development of feminist theory in recent years has posed a significant challenge to Marxism. Is it possible to understand the specificity of the oppression of women within a theory that revolves around the concept of class? Does Marxism ultimately entail some kind of reduction of gender oppression to class relations? These and related questions have underwritten a wide ranging and lively debate which has, I think, enriched both Marxism and feminism.

Relatively little of the dialogue between Marxists and feminists, however, has centered on the state. The site of the debate has been much more on the family and work. Yet, in many ways the analysis of the state should be an especially fertile terrain for trying to understand the relationship between class and gender. The challenge to feminists in terms of the theory of the state would be: Can the state be understood as a form of patriarchal domination/relations? Can the state become a theoretical object within the conceptual framework of feminist theory as it now stands? In answering these questions it is not enough to simply document the effects of the state in reproducing male domination (any more than in a class theory of the state is a catalogue of the class-effects of the state sufficient). What is needed is a theory of the mechanisms which generate and reproduce such effects. To use a familar expression: is the state just a state in patriarchal society, or is it in some theoretically coherent sense a patriarchal state?

The challenge of these issues for Marxists, on the other hand, would be: Can a theory of the state which understands the structures, mechanisms and effects of the state in terms of class provide an account of the state's role in the reproduction of gender relations? Does such an attempt inevitably lead to a class functionalism within which sexual domination can be understood only in terms of the ways in which it contributes to class domination?

CORE READINGS:

Catherine A. MacKinnon, "Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State: toward Feminist Jurisprudence", Signs, 8:4, 1983, pp. 635-658. (Note: this is part II of a two part essay. Part I is cited in the suggested readings below)

Catherine A. MacKinnon, Towards a Feminist Theory of the State (Harvard University Press, 1989)

Lena Bruselid, "Women, Class and State: evaluating social policy and political demands", in Work and Inequality, ed by Paul Boreham and Geoff Dow (Melbourne: McMillan of Australia, 1980).

Mary McIntosh, "The State and the Oppression of Women," in Feminism and Materialism, ed. by A. Kuhn and A. Wolpe (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978).

Michael Mann, "A Crisis in Stratification Theory? Persons, Households\Families\Lineages, Genders, Classes and Nations", in Gender and Stratification

Anne Philips, Engendering Democracy (Polity Press, 1991)

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Jalna Hanmer, "Violence and the Social Control of Women," in Littlejohn (ed). Power and the State (Croom Helm, 1978)

Rayna Reiter, "Men and Women in the South of France: public and private domaines," in Towards and Anthropology of Women, ed. by Reiter, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975).

Lesley Caldwell, "Church, State and Family: the women's movement in Italy," in Feminism and Materialism, op.cit.

Ann Corine Hill, "The Protection of Women Workers and the Courts: a case history," Feminist Studies, 5:2, pp.247274

J. Humphries, "Protective Legislation, the Capitalist State, and Working class men," Feminist Review, #7, 1981.

Diana L. Barker, "The Regulation of Marriage: repressive benevolence" in Littlejohn, (ed), op.cit.

Linda Gordan, Woman's Body, Woman's Right, esp. pp.313-402

14. The Crisis of the Democratic Capitalist State I: Legitimation and Accumulation

Perhaps the most common general explanation for the current crisis of the welfare state found in Marxist discussions is that the crisis reflects a deep contradiction between the legitimation and accumulation functions of the state. In this line of thought, the welfare activities of the state expanded largely out of the need for the capitalist state to create legitimacy (either for itself or for capitalism) among subordinate groups/classes. This expansion was possible so long as such

policies did not conflict with the requirements of capital accumulation. Eventually, however, the expansion of welfare spending began to undermine accumulation itself for various reasons -- it was a drain on surplus value because it was unproductive; it reduced the effectiveness of the reserve army of labor and thus resulted in a lowering of the rate of exploitation; it directly raised the value of labor power by transferring income to the working class (raising the "social wage"). The result, then, is a particular kind of economic crisis -- "stagflation" -- combined with a particular kind of political crisis -- initially a fiscal crisis of the state, followed by a concerted assault on welfare state programs. In this session we will examine a number of versions of the legitimation/accumulation contradiction thesis.

BACKGROUND READINGS:

Erik Olin Wright, Class, Crisis and the State, chapter 3, "Historical Transformations of Capitalist Crisis Tendencies"

CORE READINGS:

Ian Gough, The Political Economy of the Welfare State, chapter 6. "The Welfare State and the Capitalist Economy" and chapter 7. "The Welfare State and the Crisis", pp.102-152

James O'Connor, The Fiscal Crisis of the State (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973), pp.5-12, 40-64, 97-178, 221-260

Sam Bowles and Herb Gintis, "The Crisis of Capital and the Crisis of Liberal Democracy: the case of the United States", Politics & Society, vol.11:1,1982, pp. 51-94.

Alan Wolfe, "The Legitimation Crisis of the State", chapter 10 in The Limits of Legitimacy (New York: Basic Books, 1977)

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Alan Wolfe, The Limits of Legitimacy, pp.214-321

Claus Offe, "Competitive Party Democracy and the Keynesian Welfare State", Policy Sciences, 15, 1983, pp.225-246. reprinted in Offe, Contradictions in the Welfare State, op.cit.

Sam Bowles, "Have Capitalism and Democracy come to a Parting of the Ways?" in U.R.P.E., Capitalism in Crisis (URPE, 1978)

Jurgen Habermas, Legitimation Crisis (Boston: Beacon, 1975)

15. Crisis of the Democratic Capitalist State II: form and function

While the central theme of most analyses of the current crisis of the state is some sort of

version of the legitimation/accumulation contradiction, there is a second line of thought that has emerged which focuses more on the internal organization of state apparatuses -- what Therborn calls their "administrative technologies" -- and the tasks required of those apparatuses. In this case, instead of their being a contradiction between two functions of the state, there is a contradiction between its form and its functions. The implication of this perspective is that the resolution of the crisis requires more than just a change of state policies -- elimination or reduction of programs, changes in emphases among types of state spending, etc. -- but a structural reorganization of the apparatuses as well.

CORE READINGS:

Claus Offe, "The Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation", in Leon Lindberg (ed), Stress and Contradiction in Contemporary Capitalism (D.C. Heath, 1975)

Stephen Skorownek, "National Railroad Regulation and the Problem of State Building: interests and institutions in late nineteenth century America", Politics & Society, 10:3, 1981

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Stephan Leibfried, "The Bureaucracy of the 'Statist Reserve': the case of the U.S.A." Western Societies Program Occasional Paper No. 12 (Center for International Studies, Cornell University, 1979)

David Abraham, "State and Classes in Weimar Germany," Politics & Society, 7:3, 1977

16. Resolutions of the Crisis: New forms of Representation and State Intervention.

The readings in the previous two topics focussed on two faces of the contemporary crisis: the dimension of the crisis which revolves around the welfare activities of the state -- what the state does -- and the dimension which revolves around the institutional form of the state, specifically is "bourgeois democratic" forms of representation.

As one would expect, the discussions about the possible resolutions to the current crisis also revolve around these two dimensions. On the one hand there are discussions which focus primarily on the new types of state intervention needed in the context of global, transnational capitalism. The emphasis here is on new forms of state regulation and management of investment, state coordination of productivity changes, new kinds of manpower-planning, etc. On the other hand, there has been considerable discussion about the new form of the state needed to accomplish these tasks while simultaneously containing the new forms of social conflict characteristic of advanced capitalism. The heart of this discussion has been around "neo-

corporatism" -the various institutional arrangements in which organizations representing different social categories (unions, business, consumers, the handicapped, etc.) are represented on government decision-making bodies. Instead of representing citizens as atomized individuals as in parliamentary democracy, corporatism is a system of representing categories of individuals who are already organized into some sort of corporate entity.

In this session we will focus on the debate over neocorporatism. To what extent are neocorporatist arrangements actually replacing traditional parliamentary democratic forms of representation? Is it plausible that such forms will eventually become the central institutional form of legitimation-representation in advanced capitalist societies? Under what conditions are such neocorporatist forms likely to be stable and under what conditions unstable and ineffective? Overall, are corporatist institutions a more or less favorable terrain for struggles for socialism?

CORE READINGS:

Philippe Schmitter and Gerhard Lehmbruch (eds), Trends Towards Corporatist Intermediation (Beverly Hills: SAGE. 1979), Especially the following essays:

Philippe Schmitter, "Modes of Interest Intermediation and Models of Social Change in Western Europe", pp.63-95

Leo Panitch, "The Development of Corporatism in Liberal Democracies", pp. 119-146

Bob Jessop, "Corporatism, Parliamentarism and Social Democracy", pp. 185-212

Leo Panitch, "Trade Unions and the Capitalist State," New Left Review #125, pp.21-43, January-February, 1981.

Ian Gough, The Political Economy of the Welfare State, pp.146-152.

Nicos Poulantzas, "The Decline of Democracy: authoritarian statism" in State, Power and Socialism by Nicos Poulantzas (London: NLB, 1978).pp. 203-247

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Adam Przeworski and Michael Wallerstein, "Democratic Capitalism at the crossroads", Democracy, July, 1982

Bob Jessop, "Capitalism and Democracy: the best possible shell?" (concluding section, pp.40-49) in Littlejohn, (ed), Power and the State (London: Croom Helm, 1978).

J. Westergaard, "Class, Inequality and 'Corporatism'" in A. Hunt,(ed) Class and Class Structure (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1977)

Leo Panitch, "Recent Theorizations of Corporatism: reflections on a growth industry," British Journal of Sociology, June 1980

Peter Katzenstein, "Corporatism and the Politics of Industry" (paper presented at the annaul meeting of the American Political Science Association, 1982)

M.Crozier, et.al., The Crisis of Democracy (NYU Press, 1975)

17. The State and Racism

Most Marxist discussions of racism focus primarily on how racial divisions serve the interests of the capitalist class, both economically (superexploitation) and politically (divide and conquer). Where the state is included in the analysis it is typically in a relatively instrumentalist way: the bourgeoisie has interests in racism and unproblematically translates those interests into state policies. It is only recently that a more concerted analysis of the specificity of the state's relationship to racism has begun. Much of this analysis has centered on debates over the South African state, since South Africa is the modern example of a state organized to its core systematically around the issue of race, but similar analyses have appeared for the U.S. South, Northern Ireland and a variety of other places. In this session we will explore this basic question: how should we understand the specificity of the role of the state in the production and reproduction of racial (or ethnic, or national, etc.) oppression? Is there a racist form of the state, or does the state simply engage in racist policies contingently?

[Note: The readings below do not reflect a thorough knowledge on my part of the literature on race and the state. If students chose this topic as an optional topic for the seminar, therefore, I will try to identify any additional readings that would be important to include]

CORE READINGS:

Michael Burawoy, "The Capitalist State in South Africa: Marxist and Sociological Perspectives on Race and Class," in Zeitlin (ed), Political Power and Social Theory, vol. 2, 1981. (JAI Press).

Gideon Ben-Tovim, et. al., "Race, Left Strategies and the State" Politics & Power #3, 1981

Manning Marabel, "Black Politicians and Bourgeois Democracy," chapter 3 in Black American Politics (London: Verso, 1985)

SUGGESTED READINGS:

David James, The Resistence to the Civil Rights Movement in the South (unpublished PhD Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, 1981).

Stanley Greenberg, Race and State in Capitalist Development (Yale University Press, 1980)

Michael Burawoy, "State and Social Revolution in South Africa: reflections on the comparative perspectives of Greenberg and Skocpol," Kapitalistate #9, 1981

Harold Wolpe, "Towards an Analysis of the South African State", International Journal of Sociology of Law, 8:4, 1980

18. The State and the Labor Process

The labor process constitutes one of the most fundamental categories of Marxist analysis, and yet there is very little theoretical or empirical work which attempts to link this category to the problem of the state. Michael Burawoy argues that it is impossible to satisfactorily understand either the logic of development of the labor process itself or the nature of political struggle around the state without a structural investigation of the linkage between the two. The state helps to define the rules of the game of struggles in the labor process; the nature of the labor process, its contradictions and dilemmas helps to define the development of the state.

CORE READINGS:

Michael Burawoy, "The Production of Politics and the Politics of Production", in Political Power and Social Theory, vol. I (JAI Press, 1979).

Michael Burawoy, The Politics of Production (Verso, 1985)

19. Historical Studies of State Formation

There are two historical circumstances in which the "experimental" conditions exist for potentially observing the formation of the class character of state apparatuses: First, in the historical periods in which states are initially formed, and second in periods in which they undergo rapid, radical transformations. When states are formed, many of the institutional properties which later become taken for granted are objects of conscious choice, objects of struggle and debate, and thus the classspecificity of those choices may become observable. Similarly, in periods of rapid transformation, the structural properties of institutional forms are likely to be objects of debate and contestation, and in such contestation the class logics of the

alternatives may be revealed In this session we will examine a number of historical case studies which try to investigate the class character of the state in periods of formation and transformation.

CORE READINGS:

Stephen Skowronek, Building a New American State (Cambridge University Press, 1982), especially, pp. 1-46, 121-176, 248-292

Carolyn Baylies, The Formation of the State in Zambia (unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, 1978), excerpts to be made available in class.

David Abraham, The Collapse of the Weimar Republic (Princeton University Press, 1981)

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Margaret Fay and Margit Mayer, "The Formation of the American Nation-State", Kapitalistate #6, 1977, pp.39-90

20. Quantitative Research on the State

Marxists have generally been quantophobic. Nevertheless, in recent years a number of interesting quantitative studies of state questions have emerged, many of them from graduate students in the Wisconsin sociology department. The danger of such research, of course, is that in attempting to use statistical techniques, the substantive theoretical preoccupations of the research become subordinated to the constraints of the research technologies: dynamic processes become emptied of any "dialectic", the contingencies of historical processes become obliterated in the search for regularities, etc. In the end, it sometimes seems that after the expenditure of such enormous effort, we really do not learn anything very new from quantitative research. On the other hand, there may be situations in which the only effective way of adjudicating between contending claims is to subject those claims to quantitative scrutiny.

CORE READINGS:

Roger Friedland, Class Power and Social Control The War on Poverty", Politics and Society, 6:4, 1976.

Gosta Esping-Anderson, Social Class, Social Democracy and the State: housing policy in Denmark and Sweden", Comparative Politics, Fall, 1978.

Alexander Hicks, et. al., "Class Power and State Policy", The American Sociological Review, vol. 43, 1978.

David R. Cameron, "The Expansion of the Public Economy: a Comparative Analysis", The American Political Science Review, 72:4, 1978.

Michael Mann, "State and Society, 1130-1815: an analysis of English State Financies", in Zeitlin (ed.) Political Power and Social Theory, vol. I, 1980, pp.165-208.

21. Law and the State

The law and the legal system have rarely been systematically studied by Marxists. Most investigations have either collapsed the discussion of the law into the discussion of ideology, seeing law as simply one variety of legitimating ideology, Or, the problem of the law has been collapsed into the theory of the repressive apparatus of the state, seeing the legal system as simply the technical form through which repression is exercised in capitalist society. Relatively little attention has been given to law in its own right, as a structure or set of practices and relations within which struggles take place and contradictions of a specific sort develop. This session will try to identify some of the key features that a Marxist theory of law should develop.

CORE READINGS:

Bob Jessop, "On Recent Marxist Theories of Law, the State and Juridico-Political Ideology," International Journal of the Sociology of Law, 8:4, Nov. 1980.
Issac Balbus, "Commodity Form and Legal Form," Law & Society Review, 1977.

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Bernard Edelman, Ownership of the Image: Elements for a Marxist theory of Law, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979).
Pashukanis, Selected Writings on Marxism and Law, ed. and introduced by P. Bierne and R. Sharlet, (Academic Press, 1979).
Maureen Cain and Alan Hunt, Marx and Engels on Law (Academic Press, 1979)
Colin Sumner, Reading Ideologies: an investigation into the Marxist Theory of Law and Ideology (Academic Press, 1979)
Isaac Balbus, The Dialectics of Legal Repression
Erik Olin Wright, The Politics of Punishment (New York: Harper and Row, 1973).
Mark Tushnet, "A Marxist Analysis of American Law," Marxist Perspectives, 1978.
Boaventura Santos, "Law and Community: the changing nature of state power in law capitalism," Int. jour. of the Sociology of Law, 8:4, 980.