

**Social Structure of Accumulation Theory,
Marxist Theory,
and System Transformation**

David M. Kotz

Department of Economics, University of Massachusetts Amherst

and

School of Economics, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics

December, 2016

This paper was written for a panel on "Stability and Change in Capitalism" sponsored by the Union for Radical Political Economics at the ASSA Convention in Chicago, January 6, 2017.

1. Introduction

Social structure of accumulation (SSA) theory offers a stages analysis of the evolution of capitalist systems. Analysts who use SSA theory in their work do not always advertise -- or even recognize -- that theory's Marxist roots. However, the potential power of SSA theory is to a significant extent derived from the principles of Marxist theory that inspired its development. This is especially so for efforts to understand the current trajectory toward right wing "populist" nationalism around the world.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 argues that an analysis of successive stages of a social system has long occupied an important place in Marxist theory. Section 3 locates SSA theory in relation to traditional Marxism. Section 4 applies SSA theory to analyze the current trajectory of system transformation in the global system. Drawing lessons from the global crisis of the 1930s, this section uses SSA theory to illuminate the causes and possible consequences of the system transformation that now appears to be developing -- a transformation that may be replacing parliamentary democracies by right wing nationalist repressive regimes in many countries including the U.S. Section 5 offers concluding comments about the role of the left in the current political-economic context.

2. Stages Analysis in Marxism

Karl Marx proposed a theory of class society in general -- the theory of historical materialism -- and an analysis of one form of class society, capitalism. The initial statements of the theory of historical materialism interpreted the evolution of class society as a passage through a succession of long-lasting modes of production. Each mode of production has economic, political, and cultural/ideological aspects that initially promote the reproduction and development of that mode of production, where economic development is associated with development of the forces of production (technology, broadly construed). However, each mode of production is eventually

undermined by structural contradictions and class conflicts, giving rise to a transition to a qualitatively different and more "advanced" mode of production. This theory included a prediction as well as an account of the past: that the currently dominant capitalist mode of production would give rise to a socialist/communist system as a result of the processes of structural contradiction and class conflict.¹

In volume I of *Capital* Marx (1957) focused on the relation of exploitation of labor by capital, a relation that is rooted in the basic economic institutions of capitalism. Marx identified those economic institutions as commodity production and the wage labor relation. Marx explains how those institutions enable capital to appropriate surplus value from labor despite the absence of any right on the part of an individual capitalist to coerce a worker. However, in the background of this relation of exploitation is the power of capital as a whole over the working class, reinforced by the dominant political and cultural/ideological institutions of capitalism.

In the early twentieth century, two prominent Marxist theorists argued that capitalism had entered a new "stage." In 1910 Rudolf Hilferding (1981[1910]) introduced the concept of "finance capital" as a new stage of capitalism with important specific features. In 1917 V.I. Lenin (1985[1917]) argued that capitalism had entered a new stage of imperialism. He argued that the stage of imperialism, defined by several new structural features of capitalism, gave rise to an intensified drive on the part of the leading capitalist states to dominate as much of the world as possible. The imperialist stage periodically brings open warfare to resolve inter-imperial rivalries.² This work drew on world experience from the 1890s through 1917, near the end of World War I.

¹The above brief account of early Marxist theory omits the many debates about, and reinterpretations of, that theory in the later Marxist literature.

²The tendency for warfare to break out periodically was ascribed to a "law of uneven development" that causes late developing capitalist states to eventually catch up with earlier developers. As the late developers pursue a greater share of the global spoils while the earlier developers try to contain the later ones, open warfare is likely to break out.

After World War II an influential book by Marxist economists Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy (1966) argued that a new stage of capitalism called "monopoly capital" had emerged, with implications for the basic laws of motion of capitalism.³

However, stages analyses in Marxism predate the twentieth century examples cited above. Historical materialism is a stages theory of history. While *Capital* volume I focuses on the theory of the capital-labor relation under capitalism-in-general, Marx devoted three chapters of volume I to a stages analysis of the evolution of the labor process in England (Marx, 1957, chapter 13-15). That section of *Capital* analyzes the stages of simple cooperation (grouping skilled artisans in a capitalist workshop), manufacturing (division of labor in the workshop), and modern industry (mechanized production). Marx analyzes the role of a structural imperative -- the tendency of technology to advance -- in that evolution. Marx also emphasizes the role of class conflict in the evolution from one stage to another in that period, that is, the drive of capital to more fully control labor and the resistance to capital on the part of the new working class (Marx, 1957, chapters 14 and 15).

3. SSA Theory and Marxist Theory

SSA theory originated among Marxist economists in the U.S. in the late 1970s (Gordon 1978, 1980; Gordon et al., 1982).⁴ Over the following decades SSA theory has been applied by analysts in a number of disciplines, including sociology, political science, and criminology as well as economics. Some social scientists using SSA theory have not highlighted its Marxist origins, treating it as an institutionalist framework for analyzing capitalism. However, this paper argues that the

³The "monopoly capital" of Baran and Sweezy (1966) differs in several respects from Hilferding's finance capital and Lenin's imperialism. Other post-World War II Marxist works wrote about a stage of "state monopoly capitalism" after World War II.

⁴The early developers of SSA theory included David Gordon, Michael Reich, Richard Edwards, Thomas Weisskopf, and Sam Bowles.

insights of SSA theory ultimately depend on its connections to key principles of Marxist theory.

U.S. Marxist economists of every school interpreted the 1970s as a period of structural crisis of U.S. and global capitalism. The new SSA theory was intended as a means to explain that crisis -- and as a theory for analyzing capitalist structural crises in general. The SSA theory claimed that an SSA -- a coherent, long-lasting institutional structure -- forms the supporting basis for long periods of relatively rapid and stable capital accumulation. However, an SSA eventually turns from a promoter of accumulation into an obstacle to it, ushering in a long period of structural crisis of accumulation. The SSA school insisted that each SSA is made up not only of economic institutions but also of institutions in the political and cultural/ideological aspects of society, thus claiming to avoid what was seen as an overly materialist and mechanistic Marxism of the past. The post-World War II SSA of "regulated capitalism" contained economic institutions that promoted accumulation, such as "peaceful collective bargaining." However, that SSA also contained political institutions (a welfare state) and cultural/ideological features (Cold War ideology) that fostered capital accumulation.

Despite the protestations of having broken with "traditional" Marxism, the connections of SSA theory to long-time features of Marxist theory are not difficult to find. SSA theory was inspired by both the theory of historical materialism and by the Marxist theory of accumulation and crisis. The first book-length work of this school (Gordon et al., 1982) presented SSA theory using the circuit of capital framework (M-C-C'-M') to represent the accumulation process and the possible obstacles to accumulation. That framework, which is unknown to mainstream economics, was introduced in simplified form by Marx in chapter 4 of volume I of *Capital* and then expanded in volume II (Marx, 1957).⁵ Gordon et al. (1982) used the SSA theory developed in chapter 2 to

⁵The SSA theory of accumulation and crisis proposed in Gordon et al. (1982, chapter 2) showed some influence by Keynes as well as Marx.

interpret US history centered around periodic changes in the labor process -- that is, a series of new technologies (forces of production) -- in a context of class struggle between capital and labor. Later works by the originators of the SSA theory focused on the rate of profit as the key determinant of capital accumulation and crisis, a principle associated with the Marxist tradition that is not usually found in other approaches (Bowles et al., 1989).

SSA theory is a stages analysis, an approach that has a long and distinguished lineage in the Marxist theoretical tradition starting with Marx himself, as was observed in the preceding section. The logic of SSA theory is strikingly similar to that of traditional historical materialism, although it analyzes the evolution from stage to stage within the capitalist epoch rather than the evolution of class society from one mode of production to another. Simply replace "the development of the economic base" by "rapid capital accumulation" and the similarity of SSA theory to historical materialism becomes evident. In SSA theory, rapid accumulation is derailed when the SSA stops promoting it, resulting in an economic crisis and an eventual restructuring process leading to a new SSA.⁶ In historical materialist theory, the development of the forces of production is blocked by the no-longer-supportive social relations of production, political structures, and cultural/ideological institutions, resulting in a social crisis, revolution, and transition to a new mode of production. In both theories, structural contradictions and class conflicts play the key roles.

The SSA theorists sought to explain the failure of capitalism so far to produce its own grave diggers, in the form of a revolutionary proletariat, by means of an analysis of how capitalist evolution has divided the working class rather than uniting it against capital. If capitalism was not producing a revolutionary agent, then reform of capitalism would seem to be the only means of achieving some

⁶The SSA school's analyses of particular structural crises have taken account of traditional Marxist "crisis tendencies" such as profit squeeze, rising organic composition of capital, underconsumption, and over-investment (Weisskopf 1979; Kotz 2011).

kind of social progress. The early SSA school consisted of reluctant social reformers. Socialism had their hearts, but their analysis suggested that the 1970s economic crisis, like those in the past, would be resolved by another period of capitalist reform that would again promote rapid accumulation. At the time, many in the SSA school expected that the resolution of the structural crisis of the 1970s would be found in the emergence of a form of capitalism still more centralized than the preceding regulated capitalism. This would be a "corporatist" form with tri-partite planning bodies representing labor, capital, and the state, which would resolve the contradictions of the only partially planned regulated capitalism.⁷

The SSA school at first assumed that the rapid rise of neoliberal ("free market") economic ideas and policies starting in 1979 was a temporary step backward, driven by big business searching for an ideology and policies that could be used to crush the relatively strong labor movement of that era. That would soon set the stage for the new corporatist regime to follow, with an appropriately chastised labor movement ready to work cooperatively with capital. As we now know, the actual direction of restructuring that followed the crisis of the 1970s instead was based on capital, with assistance from the state, crushing the labor movement rather than cooperating with it.

4. System Transformation Reconsidered

During the late 1990s to early 2000s, neoliberalism began to appear to be a new SSA rather than a temporary step backward. As neoliberal restructuring only deepened over time in many countries despite occasional political victories by nominally anti-neoliberal political parties, most SSA theorists concluded that the neoliberal transformation had given rise to a new SSA. The new SSA of neoliberal capitalism had been installed in many countries and also in the institutions of the

⁷The leading agent of this imagined transformation was thought to be Felix Rohatyn, a New York investment banker, who seemed to be promoting such a corporatist direction of restructuring, perhaps in league with the "liberal Republican" Rockefeller interests.

global economy (Kotz and McDonough 2010; Wolfson and Kotz 2010; Lippit 2010).⁸ This new stage of capitalism has had a coherent, long-lasting institutional structure that has formed the basis for capital accumulation since around 1980. Although economic growth has not been rapid by comparison to past stages of capitalism, neoliberal capitalism brought a recovery of the rate of profit and stabilized the accumulation process, bringing 25 years of long economic expansions punctuated by relatively brief recessions (until 2008) along with low inflation.

In 2008 neoliberal capitalism entered its structural crisis phase, a development that fit well in the SSA analyses of the trajectory of neoliberal capitalism since the mid 2000s. The severe phase of the crisis in 2008-09, in the form of the Great Recession and the financial crisis, seemed to point toward a rapid collapse of the neoliberal stage of capitalism. Many analysts, from various perspectives, noted the striking similarities to the Great Depression of the 1930s. Some SSA theorists argued that there was a reason why the current structural crisis of capitalism had many similarities to the Great Depression of the 1930s: that both crises emerged from a preceding liberal stage of capitalism, the former in the 1920s and the latter from around 1980 to 2007.⁹

An important difference in 2008, compared to 1929, was the presence of big states that could -- and did -- intervene on a large scale with Keynesian stimulus programs, bank bailouts, and huge expansions of money and credit. In 2008-09 the mass media reported the arrival of a "Keynes moment," as some long-time neoliberals suddenly sounded like Keynesians. Some mass media even worried about a possible resurgence of Marxism.

Kotz (2010, 2015 chapter 7) argued that the outcome of a structural crisis such as that of

⁸Not all SSA theorists agree that the neoliberal era brought a new SSA; see O'Hara (2002, 2004).

⁹See Wolfson and Kotz (2010) and Kotz (2015). The claim that the U.S. in the 1920s had a distinct liberal SSA runs counter to the stages dating in Gordon et al. (1982), which presents the whole period from around 1900 through around World War II as having a single SSA.

today can give rise any one of three different directions of restructuring: 1) a right-wing nationalist regime with statist and repressive features and an aggressive posture in the global system; 2) a reformed capitalism based on capital-labor compromise; 3) a transition to socialism. According to SSA theory, the actual direction is decided by struggles among various groups and classes in the context of an unresolved economic crisis. Some signs of leftwing upsurge did emerge with the Occupy Wall Street demonstrations in 2010, the Arab Spring uprisings in 2011, the rise electoral victory of the radical socialist movement Syriza in Greece in 2015, the takeover of the British Labor Party by "unreconstructed socialist" Jeremy Corbin in 2015, and the 12 million votes for self-described socialist Senator Bernie Sanders in the US Presidential primary election in 2016.

However, a remarkably rapid turn toward the opposite direction of restructuring has taken hold in many countries around the world. Right wing "populist" nationalists have risen to power in Poland, Hungary, Turkey, India, and the Philippines, and even in the U.S. Such groups and leaders are contending for power in many other countries as well. This suggests that the first of the three possible directions of restructuring noted above is, at this time, the dominant trajectory in global capitalism.

The Great Depression offers lessons that are relevant today. The Great depression actually began in the 1920s in Germany, Italy, and the UK, while the US had rapid economic growth in that decade spurred by a wave of speculative lending and big asset bubbles. The structural crisis of that period lingered for many years in the form of severe stagnation, very high unemployment, and in some countries severe macroeconomic instability. The eventual resolution of that structural crisis of global capitalism took the form of the three trajectories noted above. Right wing nationalist repressive regimes emerged in Germany, Italy, Spain, and Japan, which did bring rapid economic growth and imperialist expansion before they were overthrown by the Allied victors in World War II. Reformed capitalist regimes ("regulated capitalism") emerged in the 1930s in Scandinavia and

after World War II in the U.S., the UK, and most of continental Western Europe.¹⁰ Also, state socialism (Soviet model) was consolidated in the USSR and spread to Eastern Europe, China, and northern Korea and northern Vietnam. State socialism, while having significant distortions as a form of socialism, did represent a transition to a post-capitalist system brought about by political parties claiming adherence to socialism.

An SSA theory based comparison of the conditions present in the 1920s-40s to those characterizing the period since 2008 can offer a tentative explanation for the remarkable, and retrograde, rush toward right wing nationalist repressive regimes in many countries today. In the 1920-30s there was a militant trade union movement in much of the developed capitalist world, along with significant socialist parties with a base in the working class and as well as in other segments of society -- examples were Germany, France, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Greece, and even the U.S. Toward the end of World War II and in its aftermath, state socialism spread to many new countries, in some cases imposed by the Soviet occupation authorities, and in others installed by domestic Communist organizations that had led the fight against foreign occupation. In the capitalist parts of the world, both Socialist parties and Communist parties contending for state power presented a vision of an alternative socialist society to that of capitalism. The global capitalist class was facing an advancing socialist alternative, as well as then widespread fear that the end of the huge wartime spending would bring a return of the Great Depression to the capitalist countries.

The above political conditions posed a serious threat to the core interest of capital -- the preservation of capitalism. Such a threat appears to be the only force that has previously prodded big capital to enter a major compromise with labor, allowing a progressive reformed capitalism to

¹⁰In the U.S. the New Deal began in the 1930s but a new stage of "regulated capitalism" was not consolidated, with support from most of big business, until shortly after World War II (Kotz, 2015, chapter 3).

emerge. In some cases reformed capitalism was imposed on the capitalist class by strong socialist parties in that period, as in Scandinavia and the U.K.. In other cases reformed capitalism resulted from a coalition between big business and organized labor, with big business the senior party to the compromise, as in the U.S. (Kotz, 2015, chapter 3).¹¹

This suggests an SSA-based explanation for the sudden rise of right wing nationalist demagogues and political parties. Neoliberal capitalism has been oppressive to the majority since it was installed around 1980. In 2008-09 crisis, neoliberal capitalism became even more oppressive, while its ideological justifications were undermined among the majority as states bailed out big capital while further squeezing working people in most countries. Austerity regimes since 2010 -- an intensification of neoliberalism -- have brought continuing stagnation while in some countries inequality has increased even further. Meanwhile, the ruling political elites have offered no solution for working people. This persistent unresolved crisis of neoliberal capitalism is a breeding ground for political polarization to the left and right.

When left-wing groups have ridden this wave into power, as in Greece in 2015, they have so far been unable to move beyond neoliberal capitalism.¹² In the absence of a strong left movement with an alternative program, the same economic conditions promote the rise of right wing nationalist demagogues. They can gain power in a parliamentary democracy by promising to finally relieve the economic pain of working people through a statist program of job creation and economic growth; by attacking existing "elites" who have in fact been unable to address the problems of working

¹¹In the U.S. a more limited form of progressive reformed capitalism emerged in the so-called "Progressive Era" in 1900-1916, when the new giant corporations faced a rebellion by small farmers and middle class social reformers on the one hand and a rapidly growing Socialist Party on the other. See Kotz (2015, chapter 6).

¹²The Chavez regime in Venezuela was an early exception, in that it did begin moving beyond capitalism in the early 2000s. After some early successes, it has been undermined by the death of Chavez and the collapse of oil prices.

people; by blaming minority racial, ethnic, religious, and/or national groups for the economic suffering of majority groups; and by warning against malicious foreign forces. Nationalism, and the promise of restoration of past national greatness, is the ideology that can hold together the contradictory base of such a movement. Appeals to violence and expressions of contempt for democratic norms and established laws excite its mass base. Fear of terrorist attacks makes people ready to give up their civil rights for the goal of establishing "order."

In the last wave of right wing nationalist regimes in the 1920s and 1930s, some Marxist analysts attributed them to a decision by big capital to "use" fascism to crush the militant labor and socialist movements of that period. However, that might not be essential to the rise of such regimes. Today it appears that such regimes are emerging from individual demagogues and political parties lacking any significant political support from the long-standing ruling class of big corporations and banks, at least initially. It may be sufficient to have a continuing unresolved stagnation affecting much of the working class combined with some source of cultural and political stress, such as changing population demographics, and a source of disorder such as comes from periodic acts of terrorism.

Thus, we may be seeing the beginning of a new stage of global capitalism characterized by two new features: 1) a transition from neoliberal capitalism as we have known it to a regime in which the state intervenes directly in the economy in new ways; and 2) a political "shell" of a rightwing nationalist repressive regime replacing the parliamentary democracy that has provided the political structure for developed capitalism for a long period of time. The possibility that such a form of capitalism may be installed in the US nuclear armed superpower, at a time when the number two nuclear armed power -- post-Soviet Russia -- already has a well-established right wing nationalist

repressive regime -- is a dangerous prospect for the world.¹³

In the U.S. it is too early to predict what form the incoming Trump Administration will take. The group of Trump cabinet appointees to date have many contradictions. They include a contradictory mix of extreme neoliberal ideologues, privatizers, ideologically flexible corporate executives, investment bankers, corporate raiders, budget cutters, no-nothings, and retired generals. The Republican controlled Congress is still dominated by dedicated neoliberals. What will emerge from this stew is impossible to predict at this time. It might be an intensified neoliberal program of privatization, gutting of social programs, and more tax cuts for the rich -- which would only intensify the economic stagnation. It might be a turn toward a statist economic expansion program based on infrastructure and military spending, although so far Trump's infrastructure program appears to consist mainly of the privatization of public assets with the claim that private owners of such assets will invest in them if given big incentives from the public treasury. Still another possibility is four more years of government gridlock as the opposing factions in Congress and the executive branch battle one another.

One puzzle about the continuing economic stagnation might shed light on the current drive toward right wing nationalist regimes. In the U.S. the rate of profit bounced back up to a long-term high after 2009, yet the rate of capital accumulation remains severely depressed (Kotz and Basu, 2017). Traditional Marxist theory, and its SSA theory variant, agree that accumulation should respond strongly to movements in the rate of profit.¹⁴ This raises the question of why such a conjuncture, of a high rate of profit and low rate of accumulation, should represent a "crisis" in need

¹³The Putin regime in Russia combines a rightwing nationalist repressive state with a neoliberal economic model. The continuing neoliberal economic model is responsible for the internal weakness of the regime in Russia today.

¹⁴Kotz and Basu (2017) offer an explanation, based on SSA theory, for the unexpected divergence between the rate of profit and the rate of accumulation since 2008.

of resolution from the viewpoint of capital. As long as the rate of profit is high, and the income flowing to big capitalists remains high, why should a low rate of accumulation call for restructuring? Why should neoliberal capitalism not remain stable for the long-run under such circumstances?

We may be seeing the answer to that question in the recent political developments, which draws on the traditional Marxist theory from which SSA theory emerged. Capitalism is not just an economic system. It is a form of society, with an economic aspect and also important political and cultural/ideological institutions that are necessary for its reproduction.¹⁵ History suggests that parliamentary democracy, with its associated values and ideological principles, is in some sense the "best" political shell for capitalism. That political form has proven its ability to deflect or absorb challenges to it from the left over a long period of time.

A stagnating capitalism threatens the survival of that political form. A stagnating neoliberal capitalism may eventually lead, for political reasons arising from the growing anger of the working class and other groups, to a transition to a quite different stage of capitalism: a transition from neoliberal parliamentary democracy to an authoritarian regime with a statist economic program. Such a stage of capitalism need not arise with the initial support of the previous group of big corporate and financial interests that have constituted the active ruling class over the very long run, although such a regime would probably have to coopt significant sections of big business and banking if it is to survive. While Trump may turn out to be incapable of actually installing an effective right wing nationalist regime to replace the existing stage of neoliberal capitalism, failure by the Trump Administration might lead to the emergence four years down the road of a more capable demagogic leader, who does not have the obvious defects of Donald Trump.

¹⁵ There is a reason why URPE chose the term "political economics" for its original definition.

5. Concluding Comment

A Marxist analysis that includes a stages theory such as SSA theory can explain the current retrograde trajectory in the world and in the U.S. However, SSA theory argues that the future is not determined by any iron law of economics. As was noted above, struggles among classes and groups, in the context of an existing structural crisis, determine the outcome. At this time the future looks bleak, more so than could have been imagined even one year ago. However, the above analysis does suggest that similar conditions to those prevailing today could give rise to either of the other two possible trajectories mentioned above, a new stage of progressive reformed capitalism or a transition beyond capitalism to an alternative socialist system.

There are two missing elements from the current context that could lead to either of the latter two directions. One is the emergence of a section of the political center, and the class base of the political center, that is prepared to push aggressively for a progressive reformed capitalism. Such a centrist grouping, if it decisively abandoned neoliberalism, could win over key parts of the current right wing nationalist mass base of support. In the U.S. Bernie Sanders' campaign platform offered a largely coherent program for the progressive reform of contemporary U.S. capitalism. Sanders admitted this when he said his goal was to do what FDR did. However, during the primary election season the existing ruling groups, and their mass media, evidently saw Sanders' reform movement as a bigger threat than Trump's neo-fascist appeal. Perhaps the prospect of the "loss of the American republic," as New York Times columnist Paul Krugman warns is happening, might propel some centrist groups and institutions toward advocacy of a progressive reform of capitalism.

The second missing element is a militant trade union movement along with a significant socialist left. Some progressive U.S. trade unions have recently organized coordinated nationwide protests by low wage workers demanding a decent wage. Public opinion surveys since 2009 have

shown a potential mass base for a socialist movement in the U.S., especially among young people.¹⁶ If economic stagnation continues, and if the right wing demagogues in office fail to fulfill their false promises to working people, that might create conditions in which both the labor movement and the socialist left can grow rapidly.

The growth of labor and socialist movements may be the key to shifting the trajectory toward a more hopeful future. Without that, the center groups might not even mount an effective defense of parliamentary democracy. Growing labor and left movements may be the only force that can pull the center groups toward effective resistance to the current right wing trajectory. If a labor upsurge joins with a growing socialist movement, that might bring a center-left coalition that could shift the trajectory of restructuring toward progressive reform of capitalism, a process that has happened before in history. While capitalism of any form inevitably exploits the working class and oppresses many groups, as well as threatening the survival of human civilization in the long-run due to global climate change, a reformed capitalism might be the best trajectory that is realistically possible in the current context.

However, the left around the world continues to suffer from an inability to present a viable alternative to capitalism, whether aiming for power or in power. The recovery of a vision of a socialist alternative to capitalism, that takes account of the problems of past efforts to build socialism, is a necessary basis for an effective left, even one that might only be able to contribute to reforming capitalism once again at this time. The left must find a way to simultaneously resist the prospect of right wing nationalist regimes while fighting for a vision of a socialist future that embodies the values of cooperation, equality, individual rights, economic security, a peaceful world

¹⁶In February of 2016, 43% of likely Iowa Democratic caucus participants said their political identity was "socialist" in response to a survey by Iowa's leading public opinion survey company.

order, and last but not least environmental sustainability. Even if the left cannot achieve more than capitalist reform in this period, in the future capitalism will no doubt periodically produce such retrograde trajectories as we are seeing today. The only way to finally safeguard the future of humanity is to pass beyond the capitalist system, which always places profit and the endless accumulation of capital ahead of human needs and wants.

References

- Baran, P. and Sweezy, P. *Monopoly Capital*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Bowles, S., Gordon, D.M., and Weisskopf, T.E. 1989. Business Ascendancy and Economic Impasse: A Structural Perspective on Conservative Economics, 1979-87. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* (winter):107-134.
- Gordon, D.M. 1978. Up and Down the Long Roller Coaster, in *US Capitalism in Crisis*, URPE reader,, pp. 22-35.
- _____. 1980. Stages of Accumulation and Long Economic Cycles, in *Processes of the World System*, ed. T. Hopkins and I. Wallerstein, pp. 9-45.
- Gordon, D.M., Edwards, R., and Reich, M. 1982. *Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The Historical Transformation of Labor in the United States*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hilferding, R. 1981[1910]. *Finance Capital: A Study of the Latest Phase of Capitalist Development*. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Kotz, D.M. 2010. The Final Conflict: What Can Cause a System-Threatening Crisis of Capitalism? *Science and Society*, 74(3) (July): 362-279.
- _____. 2011. The Current Financial and Economic Crisis and the Prospects for the Socialist Movement, *International Critical Thought*, 1:3, September, 257-266.
- _____. 2015. *The Rise and Fall of Neoliberal Capitalism*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Kotz, D.M., and Basu, D. 2017. Stagnation and Institutional Structures. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, forthcoming
- Kotz, D.M., and McDonough, T. 2010. Global Neoliberalism and the Contemporary Social Structure of Accumulation. In Terrence McDonough, Michael Reich, and David M. Kotz, eds., *Contemporary Capitalism and Its Crises: Social Structure of Accumulation Theory for the Twenty First Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 93-120.
- Lenin, V.I. 1985[1917]. *Imperialism: the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Lippit, V. 2010. Social Structure of Accumulation Theory. In Terrence McDonough, Michael Reich, and David M. Kotz, eds., *Contemporary Capitalism and Its Crises: Social Structure of Accumulation Theory for the Twenty First Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 45-71.
- Marx, K. 1957. *Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production*. Volumes I and II. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.
- O'Hara, P.A. 2002. A New Financial Social Structure of Accumulation in the United States for Long Wave Upswing? *Review of Radical Political Economics* 34(3): (summer): 295-302.
- _____. 2004. A New Transnational Corporate Social Structure of Accumulation for the Long-Wave Upswing in the World Economy? *Review of Radical Political Economics* 36:3 (summer): 328-335.
- Weisskopf, T.E. 1979. Marxian Crisis Theory and the Rate of Profit in the Postwar U.S. Economy. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 3(4), December, 341-378.
- Wolfson, M., and Kotz., D.M. 2010. A Re conceptualization of Social Structure of Accumulation Theory. In T. McDonough, M. Reich, and D.M. Kotz (eds), *Contemporary Capitalism and Its Crises: Social Structure of Accumulation Theory for the Twenty First Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 72-90.