

will hopefully provide the seedbed for an increasingly militant working-class movement. The means to this goal includes the radical proposal to 'quit' the mainstream political grid: the rehabilitation of a vibrant left culture must, on Workman's score, be premised on the recognition that extant progressive parties, such as the NDP and the Green Party, do not 'offer anything that is politically redeemable' (p. 135).

It is regarding this issue that the chief shortcoming of the book becomes apparent. Despite the pains Workman has taken to describe Canadian neoliberalism in its multifarious economic, political and cultural moments, he ultimately relies on a theoretical schema that fails to conceptualise the state as a *form of capitalist social relations*. In Holloway and Picciotto's (1979) classic paradox of the state *in* capitalist society versus the *capitalist state*, Workman largely adopts the former view. Throughout, the state is portrayed operating fairly unproblematically in the interests of the ruling class, Marx and Engels' (2002: 221) 'executive committee of the bourgeoisie' *par excellence*. There is no notion of the state as a capitalist form riddled with its own contradictions – contradictions which could be intensified by concerted left action within the state. This theoretical lacuna directly informs Workman's exhortation to retreat entirely from mainstream political institutions, a call that shares a great deal with the syndicalist assessment that, being the reflex of the economic, the state can be abandoned to the capitalist class.

This flaw notwithstanding, Workman has produced a brilliant account of the unfolding of Canadian neoliberalism and the devastating impact it has had on workers, the unemployed and their communities. He systematically demonstrates that stagnating real wages, employment precarity and increasingly scanty social security have lined the pockets of a resurgent capitalist class. His call to arms to the Canadian left resonates in all the advanced capitalist countries; things cannot go on as they have. Only once the left has firmly placed class analysis, class culture and a post-capitalist alternative back on the table will it be able to make substantive headway against the depredations of capital.

References

- Holloway J, Picciotto S (eds.) (1978) *State and Capital: A Marxist Debate*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Marx K, Engels F (2002) *The Communist Manifesto*. London: Penguin Classics.

Author biography

Brett Heino is a Ph.D. student in the Faculty of Law, Humanities and the Arts at the University of Wollongong.

Dave Hill

Marxist Essays on Neoliberalism, Class, 'Race', Capitalism and Education, Institute for Education Policy Studies, Brighton, 2013; 204 pp.; 9780952204220, £15.

Reviewed by Bernard C. Moore
Michigan State University

This small volume is a compilation of seven essays authored or co-authored by the British classical Marxist scholar/activist Dave Hill. Most were published in the *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, of which he is the chief editor. Central to Hill's arguments is the need to return to a Marxist analysis of capital-labour relations as it pertains to the study of education in the UK and abroad (p. 7). Far too often, Hill argues, scholars of education deny a Marxist class analysis, substituting in its place an understanding of class as an effect of culture, or else a Weberian 'market situation' definition of class (p. 35). He also critiques 'parallelist' and 'tryptarch' models of inequality that equate class, gender and race. Hill argues that these analyses conceal labour relations and material inequalities within (p. 144). Hill contends that in order to understand the neoliberal restructuring of schools and pedagogy, one must understand the Marxist critique that education is inherently tied to existing political and economic structures.

Because the articles were originally published separately and make similar arguments, the chapters can seem a bit repetitive. That being said, there are two articles worth noting. Hill's fifth chapter, 'Globalisation and its educational discontents: Neoliberalism and its impacts on education workers' rights, pay and conditions', serves to contextualize some of the Marxist critiques of education under capitalism. Hill identifies 'Three educational plans of capital' (pp. 116-7): (1) 'Produce and reproduce a work force, citizenry and set of consumers fit for capital'; (2) 'Smooth the way for direct profit-taking/profitteering from education'; (3) Increase privatization of schools and support industries, and increase investment by multinational corporations and 'Edu-businesses'. He argues that one can contextualise these 'plans' through a Marxist analysis of capital-labour relations: under neoliberalism, education is mirroring other 'service industries' which support, amplify and sustain the extraction of surplus value.

In the seventh chapter, 'Immiseration capitalism, activism and education: Resistance, revolt and revenge', Hill identifies sixteen ways in which neoliberalism and austerity capitalism have restructured schools and education (pp. 172-4):

1. The privatisation/pre-privatisation of schooling, such as the development of charter schools.
2. Cuts in public spending on salaries, pensions, benefits – more dismissals.
3. Marketisation and competition between schools and universities.
4. 'Tracking' into technical and vocational training.
5. Brutalising management of the workforce.
6. Performance-based pay.
7. 'Precariatization' of public-sector workers.
8. Attacks on trade unions.
9. 'Management speak': students as customers.
10. Ideological attacks on the workforce.
11. Increased control of curricula.
12. Increased control of pedagogy.
13. Increased control of the student body.
14. Increased control of teachers/professors.
15. Appeals to a more 'ordered' past and 'traditional values'.
16. Application of 'brute force'.

Hill concludes the chapter with an appeal to those disillusioned with neoliberal education reforms: ‘we need anger, to feel anger, and to display *anger*, at austerity capitalism’ (p. 167).

The tediousness and repetitive nature of Hill’s articles drives home an important argument that would come off as strange to most educators unfamiliar with Marxist theory: that education is inherently tied to existing political and economic structures. It is not an apolitical, technocratic enterprise. According to Hill, this is central to Marxist analyses of education, and his book does an excellent job illustrating this. With that said, the book lacks educational case study analyses to complement Hill’s Marxist theoretical framework. Some attention is given to the 2002 UK Education Act, the 2001 US No Child Left Behind Act, and a few other smaller examples, but there could have been more case studies of schools and institutions to illustrate the analysis.

Despite these shortcomings, those interested in education, especially under neoliberalism, will find that Hill’s work provides an excellent primer. I would recommend, however, that readers look up some of the articles in Hill’s *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, rather than this book. The formatting of this text is poor, and typographical errors abound. Nevertheless, I urge those interested in Marxist analyses of education and neoliberalism to examine the work of Hill and his colleagues at the Institute for Education Policy Studies.

Author biography

Bernard C. Moore is pursuing his doctorate at Michigan State University.

Mylène Gaulard

Karl Marx à Pékin, les racines de la crise en Chine capitaliste, Demopolis, Paris, 2014; 2354570600, £16 (pbk)

Reviewed by Nathan Sperber

École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS), Paris

English-language, book-length studies of China’s political economy from a Marxist vantage point are distressingly rare. Within the tradition of critical political economy, one example from the past decade that readily comes to mind is Giovanni Arrighi’s (2007) *Adam Smith in Beijing*. Ironically, however, Arrighi’s embrace of China was the very occasion of his parting ways with Marxist analysis in favour of a Smithian interpretation of market society. His portrayal of China as a potential peaceful, market-based, yet non-capitalist global hegemon appeared at the time as disturbingly apologetic, and the book’s contentions on China were largely rejected by other scholars.

By entitling her work *Karl Marx à Pékin*, Mylène Gaulard is both nodding – disapprovingly – to Arrighi, and suggesting the need for a return to Marxian fundamentals in order to get a better grasp of Chinese developments. Gaulard is a junior economist based in Grenoble, whose doctoral research, completed in 2008, compared dynamics of capital accumulation and inequality in Brazil and China. Since then, she has maintained her