

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Southern Political Science Association

Classes in Contemporary Capitalism. by Nicos Poulantzas; Class, Crisis and the State. by Erik Olin Wright

Review by: James Schmidt

The Journal of Politics, Vol. 41, No. 3 (Aug., 1979), pp. 992-994

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of the [Southern Political Science Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2129845>

Accessed: 04/02/2014 13:40

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and Southern Political Science Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Politics*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

givenness, and grace. The author also discards the sometimes assumed naivete of the idealistic Carter, asserting that the President is not sentimental, unpolitical, or unaware of the procedures that politics confronts in order to translate love into justice.

Carter grew up in rural, racist South Georgia, and the impact of his early Christian experience is significant. Miller believes that Carter had to know from his youth that those Christian beliefs, hymns, and teachings had an inescapable social application. Therefore, at the 200th anniversary of American independence, candidate Carter's post-Watergate themes were moral, personal, and symbolic, rather than legal, political, and institutional, and certainly not partisan or ideological.

If there are insights in Miller's analysis of Carter, they are that the President is unideological; is no man for lost causes; is a determined, willful person, and is a man who is his own priest. Miller would lead one to believe that Carter is not a religious politico bent upon fanaticism but a person who uses his religious groundings to act upon and to interpret the events of our times in a manner that will lead to wisdom, compassion, and sound statecraft.

JOHN E. ROUSE, JR., *Ball State University*

Classes in Contemporary Capitalism. By NICOS POULANTZAS. (London: Verso [dist. in U.S. by Schocken Books, New York], 1978. Pp. 336. \$6.75 paper.)

Class, Crisis and the State. By ERIK OLIN WRIGHT. (London: NLB [dist. in U.S. by Schocken Books, New York], 1978. Pp. 266. \$13.95.)

Poulantzas and Wright share the conviction that Marx's analyses can be carried forward to a discussion of the role of state and bureaucracy in advanced capitalism only on the basis of an understanding of classes which distinguishes rigorously between what they term "class positions" and individual "agents," or members of classes. The former are the object of an analysis of the modes of production which exist within a given society; the latter are the concern of discussions of processes of recruitment and education. Both authors are insistent that this distinction can in no way be reduced to what they see as a "Hegelian" dichotomy between an

economically deduced “class-in-itself” and a conscious, active “class-for-itself.”

Leaving aside the question of the adequacy of this distinction as an exegesis of Marx, how helpful is it in analyzing contemporary societies? Compared to more dogmatic approaches, Poulantzas and Wright are quite impressive. Neither falls into the blunder of assuming that Marx’s abstract discussion of the capitalist mode of production can simply be applied to concrete societies. Rather, by recognizing, like Marx in his political writings, that individual societies or “social formations” are marked by an overlapping of modes of production and a concomitant array of classes, both go to great lengths to illustrate the complexity of relationships between the various class positions that span the spectrum between bourgeois and proletariat. Equally suggestive is Poulantzas’s effort to break away from a narrow economism and define class locations on the basis of ideological and political considerations as well as economic location within the process of production.

However, some ambiguities emerge on this very point. Wright’s disagreement with Poulantzas over the definition of the proletariat is symptomatic. Poulantzas insists that although the “new petty bourgeoisie” (managers, technical personnel, etc.) share many of the economic features of the proletarian class position, they must be distinguished because of their divergence on the political and ideological levels of this position. Wright argues that this insistence undercuts the primacy of economic relations in the analysis of class and in any case does not make use of unambiguously “political” or “ideological” categories opposed to economic ones. What this disagreement suggests is a key problem in the analysis of class positions: the abstraction which removes consideration of agents seems to do so only at the cost of limiting itself, if not to an economic “class-in-itself,” at least to a definition of class that can only with great difficulty make use of categories other than economic location in the productive process. Can a discussion of political or ideological location be as abstracted from questions of agents as an analysis of economic location?

The way in which agency is worked back into the analysis is also rather problematic. For Wright, a discussion of “class interests” suffices, a category which to him is not a “normative claim” but rather a claim that “. . . if workers had a scientific understanding of the contradictions of capitalism, they would in fact engage in the struggles of socialism” (89). But this virtually ignores Marx’s

far more sophisticated—albeit Hegelian—notation that collective class interests are the end products of a process of formation and education carried out by individual agents interacting in civil society, and not an analytic abstraction of this sort. Similarly, Poulantzas's banishing of subjective factors results in a reliance on vague notions such as "class instinct" and a periodic invocation of "class struggle" as the ghost which keeps the machine of class locations from freezing into an Althusserian structuralism. Is this any less problematic than the *Geist* in Hegel's machine? Do we have adequate categories developed to enable us to talk about agency on levels other than individual intention?

Wright appears to broach this question in the "methodological introduction" to his book, which sets out the basic categories with which one can speak of structures acting on one another without recourse to individual intentions and without relapsing into a mechanistic language of cause and effect. But unfortunately the examples he gives to explain what notions like "structural limitation," "selection," "reproduction," etc. mean are for the most part taken from the very processes which he claims these definitions enable us to analyze. Hence, not surprisingly, the concluding discussion of the structure of advanced capitalism makes use of a model which had been produced *in the process of definition*, at the start of the argument. This is not quite a *petitio principii*, but a discussion of what these notions mean that does not beg the question through the use of examples which themselves are to be explained. would help matters greatly. Marx relied on Hegel to provide what he felt was an adequate capturing of the movement of categories—if Poulantzas and Wright wish to dispense with the Hegelian elements in Marx, they have to provide a more carefully elaborated alternative.

JAMES SCHMIDT, *University of Texas at Austin*

Organizing an Anarchy: Belief, Bureaucracy, and Politics in the National Institute of Education. By LEE SPROULL, STEPHEN WEINER, and DAVID WOLF. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978. Pp. xiii, 282. \$18.00.)

Sproull, Weiner and Wolf have executed an extraordinarily perceptive case analysis of the creation and early history of the Na-