



2025: TERM 3

\$115 Trillion
THE WORLD ECONOMY IN 2025

Country/Region	Projected GDP (2025)
USA	\$30.3T
CHN	\$19.5T
JPN	\$4.4T
IND	\$4.3T
RUS	\$2.2T
POL	\$0.5T
ITA	\$2.5T
DEU	\$4.9T
FRA	\$3.3T
NLD	\$1.3T
GBR	\$3.7T
ESP	\$1.8T
CAN	\$2.3T
MEX	\$1.8T
AUS	\$1.9T
BRA	\$2.3T
KOR	\$1.9T
TWN	\$0.4T
SGP	\$0.6T
PHL	\$0.6T
VNM	\$0.6T
KAZ	\$0.2T
IRN	\$0.4T
SAU	\$1.1T
TUR	\$1.5T
ISR	\$0.2T
ARE	\$0.9T
QAT	\$0.2T
KWT	\$0.2T
UAE	\$0.2T
OMN	\$0.2T
YEM	\$0.2T
EGY	\$0.2T
SDN	\$0.2T
IRQ	\$0.2T
AFG	\$0.4T
PER	\$2.0T
THA	\$2.5T
MYS	\$0.8T
BGD	\$0.8T
PAK	\$0.7T
Rest of Africa	\$1.3T
Rest of Europe	\$0.7T
Rest of Asia	\$1.0T
Rest of Americas	\$0.2T
Rest of Oceania	\$0.2T
Rest of Middle East	\$0.2T
Rest of Africa	\$1.3T
Rest of Europe	\$0.7T
Rest of Asia	\$1.0T
Rest of Americas	\$0.2T
Rest of Oceania	\$0.2T
Rest of Middle East	\$0.2T

Dr Cathy Gorham
(cmgorham@gmail.com)

Introduction

Welcome to the Industrial and Economic Policy module. This component of the Honours programme entails two seminars per week (Tuesday and Friday mornings, subject to negotiation), over six weeks.

To facilitate informative discussion and a comprehensive treatment of the topics, students must prepare for all sessions – i.e., read and take notes beforehand. Attendance is compulsory at all seminars. As higher degree students, you are instructed to read as widely as possible on the topics listed below, and to keep up with all compulsory readings.

Development

The past two centuries have seen radical, dramatic transformations in social, political and economic structures: industrialisation, proletarianization, commercialisation, capitalism, the modern state and the scientific revolution.

“Development” – an idea that has been given multiple meanings – has come to serve as the main aim of economic and political elites, and as the official aim of almost all states. Efforts at industrialisation have been integral to these development efforts. Therefore, it is important to ask:

- What models of industrial development have been used over the last century?
- What were their successes and failures?
- What made different models possible? How did ordinary people shape different types of development, and how were they affected by it, in turn?
- Do any of these models offer viable or desirable alternatives to the current neo-liberal hegemony?

Industrialisation

Industrialisation is the process of mechanising existing sectors of the economy (such as agriculture), and of shifting the balance of the economy to mechanised manufacturing (the mechanised processing of primary goods such as food, metals). What is distinctive here is that the machinery (structures that use power, apply force and control movement) used is based on non-human, non-animal power, using instead sources like fuel and electricity.

The desire of countries to attain industrialisation include: that it is a major determinant of the size of an economy, and so, of the resources potentially available to benefit people; that the level of industrialisation correlates directly with the level of average incomes and of wage levels; that industrial growth, unlike primary sector production, has no intrinsic limits to its expansion and no “sunset” when it is exhausted; and

that reliance on primary production has a great many inherent problems, including low average incomes bounded by relatively low productivity, limited job creation, heavy labour and a subordinate, vulnerable position in the world economy.

Strikingly, industrialisation has spread beyond its traditional, initial hub in north-western Europe. The first wave of “late” industrialisers emerged from the 1880s, notably Germany, Japan, and the United States of America. A second wave of “late” industrialisation started in the 1920s, this time outside of the West, and continued in the post-war transition, after 1945.

By the 1960s, this included large parts of the Eastern bloc, foremost among them the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR, including Russia). Russia in 1915 was a predominantly rural and illiterate empire, only recently emerged from feudalism, but 40 years later, it was a global superpower with a larger economy than Britain or France.

A significant number of formerly colonised countries had also made significant achievements. The latter countries, sometimes dubbed “newly industrialised countries” (NICs) from the 1970s, varied considerably. Several NICs, most notably the “Asian Tigers” (Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, and South Korea) moved into the top 15 economies worldwide. Even those less successful NICs, like Brazil and South Africa, made major strides. For example, the South African economy grew 4.5 times larger from 1948-1994, moving into the top 30 worldwide, with agriculture and mining falling to less than 15% of GDP by the 1970s.

More recently, mainland China has become the second largest economy in the world. Starting from a low base like that of 1910s Russia, with very little industry and a vast, poor rural population. By 2020, China was the largest trading partner of over 120 countries (including of South Africa), and has overtaken the United States of America as the biggest manufacturer in the world.

Inequalities between Countries

Despite these developments, massive inequality between countries and regions remains a central fact of the modern world. Relatively few countries have been able to successfully industrialise, and most countries have relatively tiny economies reliant on raw material production.

In the mid-1980s, Belgium (a tiny European state the size of the Eastern Cape in South Africa, and with a population of 12 million) had a larger economy than that of all sub-Saharan Africa combined, excluding South Africa. In the mid-2010s, the entire African economy (measured as the combined GDP of the 55 countries), was smaller than that of France. New York City, in the United States of America, has an economy four times larger than the entire South African GDP.

Africa is not a homogenous continent, nor is Europe. Around half of the total African GDP comes from just two countries: Egypt and South Africa, which comprise just 10% of the African population. South Africa has a

larger economy than 15 of the 50 European countries, including Portugal, which was once a world power that ruled large parts of Africa and South America. Nigeria has a larger economy than 17 European countries.

Inequalities within Countries: The Class Dimensions

What is also clear is that the benefits of development and industrialisation are extremely unequally distributed *within* countries. While we commonly speak of “rich” and “poor” countries, there is no rich country without any poor people, and no poor country without many rich people. Moreover, the popular classes – peasants and working-class people – have often paid the price of industrial development, with grim working conditions, low incomes and repressive political systems.

The United States of America, the richest country in human history and still the country with the largest economy, has a higher rate of inequality than Nigeria. This is not a recent development: 30 percent of children in New York City were malnourished in the mid-1980s. Nigeria is, by some measures, the largest African economy and one of the top oil exporters in the world. Recently, however, it has overtaken India as the country with the highest proportion of extremely poor people in the world.

In 2010, South Africa’s super-rich had more assets than the combined GDP of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) zone, which includes almost all countries south of the equator. The top 10% of households in South Africa own 87% of aggregate wealth in the country, the top 0.1% around 33%, and the top 0.01% – just 3,500 individuals – had 15% of total household net worth. This refers only to directly owned personal wealth, and is arguably an underestimate that leaves out, for example, control of state assets by small groups. In any event, this high level of inequality exists alongside the fact that South Africa is an industrialised country with the most sophisticated economy on the continent, including its own large multi-national corporations.

Industrialisation and Technology (as such) do not Create Inequality

Highly inegalitarian outcomes are not the consequence of technological change – of mechanisation or industrialisation – as such. The world economy continues to grow much faster than the world population, with total world output doubling from 1980 to 2002 alone, and this has been driven by industrialisation. For example, economies in Sub-Saharan Africa had economic growth averaging 5.7 per cent between 2001 and 2012. After a long period of decline, foreign direct investment (FDI) flows into Sub-Saharan Africa grew six-fold between 2004 and 2014.

This means that there are far more resources available to improve living conditions, and to abolish poverty and unemployment despite the rapid growth in human population. However, while the world is now three times richer in 1992, but 70% of people are denied universal social, protection, 84% of people say the

minimum wage is not enough to live on and 81% of countries have allowed violations of basic union rights.

Evidently, there is not a straight line from the technology to the inequality: rather, the costs and benefits of industrialisation are heavily shaped by the histories of specific countries, by the social structures that exists, and the balance of forces within those societies. This social context also helps to explain the demonstrable existence of multiple models of industrial development over the last century.

In short, there are considerable variations in the focus of industrialisation, in models of industrialisation, and in the distribution of wealth and power. This variation is, in turn, shaped by different balances of class forces, embedded in turn in specific configurations of state, capital and popular organisation. In other words, deeper social structures not only manifest in the distribution of incomes arising from industrialisation, but they also shape development possibilities, trajectories, and a range of other outcomes.

Institutions, Classes and Context

This course will grapple with these issues by using a broadly political economy approach, which focuses on the role of institutions (especially, the state and organised capital), classes (and class struggles), and the impact of historical context. This requires some engagement with the major approaches in the field.

The insights of dependency theory, including the World Systems variant, will be noted, especially the emphasis placed upon the constraints imposed by imperial power and the terms of trade. It will, however, also be argued that this theory rests heavily on an untenable functionalist approach that assumes stability, and that obscures key changes. The argument for the primacy of external dynamics, like trade relations, as the primary determinant of development outcomes and, indeed, of national-level class structures and state forms, detracts from concrete analysis of national-level dynamics. As such, the model struggles to explain variation between countries facing essentially similar external situations, and to explain late industrialisation more generally.

These limitations are addressed by the “productionist” Marxist scholarship on development, which stresses the need to focus analysis on mapping class structures *within* countries and the effects of these structures on development and state form. From this perspective, dependency theory’s inability to explain variation in development arises from its “neo-Smithian” emphasis on trade, i.e., a “circulationist” rather than productionist understanding of exploitation as monopoly pricing rather than the extraction within production, and its substitution of “developed” and “underdeveloped” nations for classes like “capitalist” and “proletarian.” In contrast, productionist Marxism posits that variation in class structures between countries is the primary explanation for variations in development, and especially, why some countries industrialise, and why some fail.

Modernisation theory also has some insights that may be used, and in particular, its emphasis on the role

that can be played by effective states, modernising elites, and nationalist ideology in late industrialisation. The theory has often been caricatured, but the criticisms that it downplays the impact of external constraints on countries and tends to be more descriptive than explanatory when looking at how countries move through the “stages” of growth, will be noted.

These limitations are addressed by the Weberian-inspired literature on state-making and governance, which stresses the independent and irreducible impact of state form, state capacity and state policy on development. Both the dependency theorists and the productionist Marxists tend to a reductionist (and often functionalist) view of the state as a simply a reflection of external pressures, the world system or the class structure, respectively. The Weberian-inspired literature instead opens up the black box of the state, examining it as an institution with its own internal dynamics, history, contestations and capacities. Modernisation theory stresses the importance of effective states and modernising elites in development, but provides little in the way of explaining their features, or their emergence. By contrast, this Weberian-inspired literature posits that variations in state form, capacity and policy are the primary explanation for variations in development and seeks to explain why and how states vary so considerably.

The “new institutionalist” literature represents an important step forward in these debates, with a sort of Marxified Weberianism that brings together the work of the productionist Marxists and the Weberian-influenced analyses of the state. It emphasises the importance of trade, industrial and financial policy choices, as well as the importance of policy implementation and state capacity in shaping industrial development, and in explaining success and failure. In doing this, it looks at the character of the state, as well as the interaction between different sectors of ruling economic and political groups. It posits that the form, capacities, and actions of the state are deeply shaped by the class structure, but not simply determined by it.

But what even this impressive approach lacks – a failing it shares with dependency theory, modernisation theory, and Weberian-inspired work on the state – is a systematic engagement with the active role of working and poor people as agents of social and economic transformation. Ruling elites, whether economic or political, exist only in relation to the popular classes. Moreover, economic development, including industrialisation, increase the size and the potential power of the masses – most especially of urban working classes. Therefore, development needs to be understood as shaped, not by neutral policy decisions, but by class structures and the class struggles they enable.

Specifically, we cannot examine processes of industrial development simply by reference to elites, states, and corporations. It is essential to examine the role of labour in shaping development trajectories, in contesting development models, and in the elaboration and implementation of alternative development approaches.

Scope of the Module

This points to the need for a critical analysis of the notion of “development” itself, why it is seen as desirable (or not), how it is measured, achieved, and whether it can be completed. Second, understanding development requires understanding the political economy of specific countries, and moving beyond the sweeping generalisations characteristic of economic liberal approaches, as well as the crudities of alternative approaches like Dependency and World Systems Theories. Third, it requires understanding the enormous growth of the modern working class as a decisive factor in making and remaking development. There were more industrial workers in South Korea, alone, in 1998 than in the entire world when Karl Marx and Frederick Engels wrote the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848, and more people have been proletarianized since the 1940s than in all previous human history. Fourth, it requires an examination of the models that shaped the twentieth century, some of which labour movements have helped initiate, and all of which have had important effects on the popular classes:

- Import Substitution Industrialisation (ISI), linked to economic nationalism.
- The Soviet model associated with Marxism-Leninism.
- Social democracy with Keynesian welfare states (KWS).
- Anarchism/syndicalism and libertarian communism.

We will also examine, fifth, an attempted alternative to current neo-liberal orthodoxies:

- Southern African labour’s progressive-competitive model.

The mixed experiences – including failures – of all of these models in practice have played a key role in the rise of neo-liberalism to the dominant “development” model today – the perception that “there is no alternative” is critical to this domination. All of these models therefore need to be critically interrogated, in developing (or perhaps recovering and discovering) alternative development trajectories, and new trade union and working-class struggles.

The Module will Examine:

- The meaning of “development” in these different models.
- The experience of these models in the twentieth century, with case studies.
- How different “development” trajectories have affected labour movements.
- How working-class people and unions have in turn affected “development” trajectories.
- Alternative models of “development” that labour and popular class movements have developed or

promoted.

- Some possible lessons from these models, for today: past experiences are not just of historical interest but of practical, contemporary relevance.

Seminar Times and Days

There are two (in-person) seminars per week (subject to negotiation) on Tuesdays and Fridays at 10h30, which are three hours in duration. There will be one topic per week, covered in two seminars. It is expected that students will have read and be prepared to comment upon the key readings for each seminar.

Course Assessment

Continuous assessment: Half of the mark for this module consists of submitted written work. There will be weekly submissions of work, to be emailed directly to me. In addition, students will be required to do two presentations of these papers each and to contribute to the discussion of papers in class. The options will be discussed in the first seminar.

The issues to be covered in each paper will be:

- The core features of the model of industrial development being discussed that week.
- Its core strengths.
- Its core weaknesses.
- Its effects on, and the impact of, the working-class, including unions.

The short papers must be in an essay format, including proper referencing and a bibliography. Essays must use a prescribed citation and referencing system (see the *Sociology Handbook*).

Readings

All compulsory and additional readings are online at the RUConnected page for the course. Students are required to read all the compulsory readings for each week, *before* the first seminar of the week.

Examination

The remainder of the module mark (50%) will comprise of the exam.

Plagiarism, use of AI and Referencing Policy

Please consult the *Sociology Handbook* for an outline of the University's policy on plagiarism, guidelines on the formatting and writing of assignments, the departmental rules regarding citations and references, and the criteria for assessing written work. The ethics and use of AI such as ChatGPT will be discussed in the first seminar. All written submissions must be based on your own critical reading, writing and reflection on seminar discussions. A copy of the Assignment Cover Sheet, which must accompany all assignments submitted to the Sociology Department, is also available in the Handbook, and can be found at the RUConnected page for this module.

Module Evaluation

As the Department of Sociology, we are committed to reflecting on our teaching practices and module content to strengthen our courses. Towards the end of the term, you will be asked to participate in a module evaluation process. Please take this seriously and evaluate the module honestly and comprehensively. Your input will be highly appreciated and make a real contribution to enhancing teaching and learning in the Department.

Consultations

Students are advised to consult the lecturer between classes. Times and days will be arranged in consultation with the class or can be scheduled by contacting the lecturer.

Topic 1: Introduction - Class, State and Development

Compulsory readings (read in the order listed):

- Webster, A. (1990). *Introduction to the sociology of development* (second edition). Basingstoke: Macmillan. [Chapter 2]
- Kemp, T. (1989). *Industrialization in the non-Western world*. London: Longman. [Chapter 1]
- Webster, A. (1990). *Introduction to the sociology of development* (second edition). Basingstoke: Macmillan. [Chapter 3]
- Leys, C. (1996). *The rise and fall of development theory*. London: James Currey. [Chapter 2]
- Skocpol, T. (1977). Review — Wallerstein's *World Capitalist System*: A theoretical and historical critique. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 82 (5), pp. 1075-1090.

Additional readings:

- Babu, A.M. (1981). *African Socialism or Socialist Africa?* London: Zed Books. [Chapter 3]

- Blomström, M. & Hettne, B. (1984). *Development theory in transition: The dependency debate and beyond – Third World responses*. London: Zed Books. [Chapters 1, 4]
- Coetzee, J.K. (2001). Modernisation theory. In: Coetzee, J.K., Graaff, J., Hendricks, F. and Wood, G. (eds.) *Development: Theory, policy and practice*, pp. 26-43. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Higgot, R.A. (1983). *Political development theory: The contemporary debate*. London, New York: Routledge. [Chapter 3]
- Laclau, E. (1971). Feudalism and capitalism in Latin America. *New Left Review*, No 61, pp. 19-38.
- Rueschemeyer, D. & Evans, P.B. (1985). The state and economic transformation: Towards an analysis of the conditions underlying effective intervention. In: Evans, P.B., Rueschemeyer, D. & Skocpol T. (eds.) *Bringing the state back in*, pp. 44-77. Cambridge, Madrid, Melbourne, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rostow, W.W. (1960). *The stages of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto*. London: Cambridge University Press. [Chapters 1, 2, 3]
- Warren, B. (1980). *Imperialism: Pioneer of capitalism*. Verso: London. [Chapter 7]

Topic 2: Import Substitution Industrialisation (ISI)

Compulsory readings (read in the order listed):

Waterbury, J. (1999). The long gestation and brief triumph of import-substituting industrialisation. *World Development*, Vol. 27 (2), pp. 323-341.

Warren, B. (1980). *Imperialism: Pioneer of capitalism*. Verso: London. [Chapter 7]

Evans, P.B. (1989). Predatory, developmental, and other apparatuses: A comparative political economy perspective on the Third World state. *Sociological Forum*, Vol. 4 (4), pp. 561-587.

Sandbrook, R. (1985). *The politics of Africa's economic stagnation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 2]

Kemp, T. (1991). *Historical patterns of industrialisation* (second edition). London: Longman. [Chapter 12]

Seidman, G. (1998). Oppositional identities in Brazil and South Africa: Unions and the transition to democracy. In: R. Greenstein (ed.) *Comparative Perspectives on South Africa*, pp. 243-259. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Additional readings:

Ake, C. (1983). Explanatory notes on the political economy of Africa. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 2

(3), pp. 1-23.

Akwetey, E. & Kraus, J. (2007). Trade unions, development and democratisation in Zambia: The continuing struggle. In: Kraus, J. (ed.). *Trade unions and the coming of democracy in Africa*, pp. 123-156. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bruton, H. (1989). Import substitution. In: Chenery, H.B. & T.N. Srinivasan (eds.) *Handbook of development economics*, 2, pp. 1601-1644. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Cooper, D. (1991). Locating South Africa in the Third World: Comparative perspectives on patterns of industrialisation and political trade unionism in South America. *Social Dynamics*, Vol. 17 (2), pp. 1-40.

Freund, B. (1988). *The African worker*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 5]

Freund, B. (2019). *Twentieth-century South Africa: A developmental history*. Cambridge UK, New York: Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 1 and Conclusion].

Levi-Faur, D. (1997). Economic nationalism: From Friedrich List to Robert Reich. *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 23 (30), pp. 359-370.

Mkandawire, T. (2001). Thinking about developmental states in Africa. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 25 (3), pp. 289-313.

Brown, W & Wuyts, M. (eds), *Making the International: Economic Interdependence and Political Order*, pp. 291-329. London: Pluto Press.

Nkrumah, K. (1963). *Africa must unite*. London, Melbourne, Toronto: Heinemann. [Chapter 12]

Onimode, B. (1988). *A political economy of the African crisis*. London: Zed Books. [Chapter 6]

Moll, T.C. (1991). Did the apartheid economy “fail”? *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 17 (4), pp. 271-291.

Samson, A. (1987). *Black and gold: Tycoons, revolutionaries and apartheid*. London. Coronet. [Chapter 6]

Saunders, R. (2007). Trade union struggles for autonomy and democracy in Zimbabwe. In: Kraus, J. (ed.). *Trade unions and the coming of democracy in Africa*, pp. 157-198. Basingstoke, UK and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Southall, R. (1985). Monopoly capital and industrial unionism in the South African motor industry. *Labour, Capital and Society / Travail, capital et société*, Vol. 18 (2), pp. 304-342.

Vogel, E.F. (1991). *The Four Little Dragons: The spread of industrialisation In East Asia*. London: Harvard University Press. [Chapter 2]

Wallerstein, I. (1967). Implicit ideology in Africa: A review of books by Kwame Nkrumah. *Journal of Conflict*

Topic 3: Marxism-Leninism and the Centrally Planned Economy

Compulsory readings (read in the order listed):

- . Sherlock, S. (1998). Berlin, Moscow and Bombay: The Marxism that India inherited. *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. 21 (1), pp. 63-76.
- . Kemp, T. (1989). *Industrialization in the non-Western world*. London: Longman. [Chapter 3]
- . Steele, C.N. (2002). The Soviet experiment: Lessons for development. In: Morris, J. (ed.) *Sustainable development: Promoting progress or perpetuating poverty?* pp. 102- 125. London: Profile Books.
- . Bloom, J.M. (2013). *Seeing through the eyes of the Polish revolution: Solidarity and the struggle against communism in Poland*. Boston: Leiden. [Chapter 1]
- . Barker, C. 1987. Poland 1980-81: The self-limiting revolution. In: Barker. C. (ed), *Revolutionary rehearsals*, pp. 169-216. London, Chicago and Melbourne: Bookmarks.
- . O'Meara, D. (1991). The collapse of Mozambican socialism. *Transformation*, No. 14, pp. 82-103.

Additional readings:

- . Bettelheim, C. (1994). *Class struggles in the USSR, Third Period, 1930-1941 - Part one: The dominated*, pp. 171-180, 194. Madras: T.R. Publications.
- . Bloom, J.M. (2013). *Seeing through the eyes of the Polish revolution: Solidarity and the struggle against communism in Poland*. Boston: Leiden. Chapter?
- . Castoriadis, C. (1978/1979). The social regime in Russia. *Telos*, Vol. 38, pp. 32-47.
- . Crump, J. & Buick, A. (1987). *State capitalism: The wages system under new management*. Basingstoke: Macmillan. [Chapter 4]
- . Frank A. G. (1992). Economic ironies in Europe: a world economic interpretation of East-West European politics. *International Social Science Journal*, No. 131, pp. 41-56.
- . Harman, C. (1983), *Class struggles in Eastern Europe, 1945-83* (second edition). London and Sydney: Pluto Press.
- . Kautsky, J.H. (1968). *Communism and the politics of development: Persistent myths and changing behaviour*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. [Chapter 4]
- . Munslow, B. (ed). 1985. *Samora Machel, An African revolutionary: Selected speeches and writings*. London: Zed Books. [Chapters 4, 5, 7, 8, 14]

- Raiklin, E. (2005). Pre-Soviet, Soviet and post-Soviet models of economic growth and development. *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 32 (11), pp. 968-1010 (ignore post-1991-model).
- Sanchez-Sibony, O. (2015), *Red globalisation: The political economy of the Soviet Cold War from Stalin to Khrushchev*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 1]
- Simis, K. (1982). *USSR: The corrupt society*. New York: Simon and Schuster. [Chapters 2, 5, 8, 9]
- van Ree, E. (2002). *The political thought of Joseph Stalin: A study in twentieth-century revolutionary patriotism*. London, New York: Routledge Curzon. [Chapters 3, 4, 7, 8, 11]

Topic 4: Social Democracy and the Keynesian Welfare State

Compulsory readings (read in the order listed):

- Wilks, S. (1996). Class compromise and the international economy: The rise and fall of Swedish social democracy. *Capital and Class*, No. 58, pp. 89-111.
- Pontusson, J. (1992). At the end of the Third Road: Swedish social democracy in crisis. *Politics and Society*, Vol. 20 (3), pp. 305-332.
- Swenson, P. (1991). Bringing capital back in: Employer power, cross-class alliances, and centralization of industrial relations in Denmark and Sweden. *World Politics*, Vol. 43 (4), pp. 513-544.
- Birchall, I. (1987). France 1968: "All power to the imagination." In: Barker, C. (ed), *Revolutionary rehearsals*, pp. 5-40. London, Chicago and Melbourne: Bookmarks.
- Teeple, G. (2000). *Globalization and the decline of social reform*. New York: Humanity Books. [Chapters 2, 3]

Additional readings:

- Edlund, J & Lindh, A. (2015). The democratic class struggle revisited: The welfare state, social cohesion and political conflict. *Acta Sociologica*, Vol. 58 (4), pp. 311–328.
- Korpi, W., & Shalev, M. (1979). Strikes, industrial relations and class conflict in capitalist societies. *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 30 (2), pp. 164-187.
- Meyer, T. (1981). *Democratic socialism in 36 theses*. Bonn: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung. [extract]
- Panitch, L. (1986). *Working class politics in crisis: Essays on labour and the state*. London: Verso. [Chapter 5]
- Perjus, B. (1992). The Swedish model: Past, present and future. *South African Labour Bulletin*, Vol. 16 (7), pp. 62-65.
- Potgieter-Gqubule, F. (2010). Social democracy. In: B. Turok (ed.) *The historical roots of the ANC*, pp. 111-123. Johannesburg: Jacana.

Ryner, M. (1999). Neo-liberal globalisation and the crisis of Swedish social democracy. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, Vol. 20 (4), pp. 39-79.

Singer, D. (1970). *Prelude to revolution: France in May 1968*. New York: Hill and Wang, [esp. Parts 2, 3]

van der Walt, L. (1997). Against corporatism: The limits and pitfalls of corporatism for South African trade unions. Paper at the *African Studies Association of South Africa Third Biennial International Conference*. Broederstroom: Magaliesberg Conference Centre, 8-10 September.

Vinen, R. (2018). *The Long '68: Radical protest and its enemies*. London: Penguin, [Chapters 5, 9]

Topic 5: Anarchism/ Syndicalism and Libertarian Communism

Compulsory readings (read in the order listed):

Albert, M. & Hahnel, R. (1992). Socialism as it was always meant to be. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, Vol. 24 (3-4), pp. 46-66.

Acklesberg, M.A. (1985). Revolution and community: Mobilization, depoliticization and perceptions of change in Civil War Spain. In: S.C. Bourque & R. Divine (eds.) *Women living change: Cross-cultural perspectives*, pp. 85-115. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Amsden, J. (1978). Industrial collectivisation under workers' control: Catalonia, 1936- 1939. *Antipode*, Vol. 10/11 (3/4), pp. 99-113.

Gorostiza, S., March, H. & Saurim, D. (2012). Servicing customers in revolutionary times: The experience of the collectivised Barcelona Water Company during the Spanish Civil War. *Antipode*, Vol. 45 (4), pp. 908-925.

Rocker, R. ([1938] 1989). *Anarcho-syndicalism*. London: Pluto. [Chapter 4].

Additional readings:

Bekken, J. (2009). Peter Kropotkin's anarchist economics for a new society. In: F.S. Lee & J. Bekken (eds.), *Radical economics and labour: Essays inspired by the IWW centennial*, pp. 27-45. London, New York: Routledge.

Breitbart, M.N. (1978). Anarchist decentralism in rural Spain, 1936-1939: The integration of community and environment. *Antipode*, Vol. 10/11 (3/4), pp. 83-98.

Demaria, F., Kothari, A. (2017). The post-development dictionary agenda: Paths to the pluriverse. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 38 (12), pp. 2588-2599.

Guérin, D. (1971). *Anarchism: From theory to practice*. New York: Monthly Review Press. [Chapter 3]

Knowles, R. (2004). *Political economy from below: Economic thought in communitarian anarchism, 1840-*

1914. Oxfordshire, New York: Routledge. [Chapter 8]

Majavu, M. (2008). Africa: Life after colonialism. In: C. Spannos. (ed.) *Real utopia: Participatory society for the 21st century*, pp. 112-129. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Ovejero, A. (2010). Spanish libertarian collectives: A unique historical case of worker self-management. *Working USA: The journal of labour and society*, Vol. 13 (4), pp. 521-535.

Topic 6: Southern African Labour's Progressive-Competitive Alternative: the "High Road" not Taken

Compulsory readings (read in the order listed):

Webster, E. & Adler, G. (2000). Consolidating democracy in a liberalising world: Trade unions and democratisation in South Africa. In: G. Adler & E. Webster (eds.) *Trade unions and democratisation in South Africa, 1985-1997*, pp. 1-19. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Forrest, K. (2007). Out of time: The National Union of Metalworkers' pursuit of power, 1989-1995. *African Studies*, Vol. 66 (2/3), pp. 365-382.

McGregor, W. (2019). Economic policy from below: COSATU unions' "radical reform" project. In: van der Walt, L & Reynolds, J. (eds.). *Strategy: Debating politics within and at a distance from the state*, pp. 78-83. Makhanda, South Africa: Neil Aggett Labour Studies Unit (NALSU), Rhodes University.

Pape, J. (1997). From Asian Tiger to African Lion? *Debate: voices from the South African left* (first series), No. 2, pp. 68-81.

van der Walt, L. (2019). *Beyond decent work: Fighting for unions and equality in Africa*. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung. Available at: <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/iez/15592.pdf> [Accessed 30 June 2019]

Buhlungu, S. (2010). *A paradox of victory: COSATU and the democratic transformation in South Africa*. Scottsville, South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press. [Chapter 1].

Additional readings:

Adler, G. & Webster, E. (1997). Bargained liberalisation: The labour movement, policy-making and transition in Zambia and South Africa. Paper at the *Institute for Advanced Social Research, African Studies Seminar series*. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand, 4 August.

Akwetey, E. & Kraus, J. (2007). Trade unions, development and democratisation in Zambia: The continuing struggle. In: Kraus, J. (ed.) *Trade unions and the coming of democracy in Africa*, pp. 123-156. Basingstoke, UK and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Buhlungu, S. (2003). The state of trade unionism in post-apartheid South Africa. In: Daniels, J., Habib, A &

- Southall, R. (eds.) *State of the nation: South Africa, 2003-2004*, pp. 184-203. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Callinicos, A. (1992). *Between apartheid and capitalism: Conversations with South African socialists*. London: Bookmarks. [Chapter 7]
- Callinicos, A. (1992). Social democratic dreams or class struggle realism? A reply to Enoch Godongwana. *South African Labour Bulletin*, Vol. 16 (6), pp. 64-67
- Dibben, P., Klerck, G. & Wood, G. (2015). The ending of southern Africa's tripartite dream: The cases of South Africa, Namibia and Mozambique. *Business History*, Vol. 57 (3), pp. 461-483.
- Freund, B. (1995). Southern Africa: Is structural reform viable? *Transformation*, Vol. 27, pp. 102-104.
- Gallin, D. (1996). The challenge of globalisation: Options for the labour movement. *Workers World News* (Cape Town), January/February, pp. 2-4.
- Godongwana, E. (1992). Industrial restructuring and the social contract: Reforming capitalism or building blocks for socialism? *South African Labour Bulletin*, Vol. 16 (4), pp. 20-23.
- Harris, L. (1993). South Africa's economic and social transformation: From 'No Middle Road' to 'No Alternative.' *Review of African Political Economy*, No. 57: 91-103.
- Mohamed, Y. (1989). Worker participation: A Trojan horse? *South African Labour Bulletin*, Vol. 14 (5), pp. 93-100.
- NEDLAC Labour Caucus. (1996). *Social Equity and Job Creation: The Key to a Stable Future – Proposal by the South African Labour Movement*. Johannesburg.
- Neocosmos, M. (1996). From people's politics to state politics: Aspects of national liberation in South Africa, 1984-1994. *Politeia*, Vol. 15 (3), pp. 73-119.
- Panitch, L. (1996). COSATU and corporatism: A response to Eddie Webster. *Southern Africa Report*, Vol. 11 (3), pp. 6-8.
- Saunders, R. (2007). Trade union struggles for autonomy and democracy in Zimbabwe. In: Kraus, J. (ed.). *Trade unions and the coming of democracy in Africa*, pp. 157-198. Basingstoke, UK and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Southall, R. (2010). South Africa 2010: From short-term success to long-term decline? In: Southall, R., Pillay, D., Naidoo, P. & Daniel, J. (eds.). *New South African Review 1 – 2010: Development or decline?* pp. 1-23. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Teeple, G. (2000). *Globalization and the decline of social reform*. New York: Humanity Books.
- van der Walt, L. (1997). Against corporatism: The limits and pitfalls of corporatism for South African trade unions. Paper at the *African Studies Association of South Africa Third Biennial International Conference*.

Broederstroom: Magaliesberg Conference Centre, 8-10 September.

van der Walt, L. (1998). Victory for Zimbabwean workers? *South African Labour Bulletin*, Vol. 22 (6), pp. 89-90.

van der Walt, L. (2011). COSATU's response to the crisis: An anarcho-syndicalist assessment and alternative. *Anarcho-syndicalist Review*, No. 56, pp. 11-13.

van Driel, M. (2005). Social dialogue, neo-liberalism and the trade unions in South Africa. *Khanya: A journal for activists*, No. 8, pp. 28-30.

Walton, J. & Seddon, D. (1991). *Free markets and food riots: The politics of global adjustment*. Oxford UK, Cambridge USA: Blackwell. [Chapter 1]

Webster, E. (1996). COSATU: Old alliances, new strategies. *Southern Africa Report*, Vol. 11 (3), pp. 3-6.

Webster, E. & Sikwebu, D. (2010). Tripartism and economic reforms in South Africa and Zimbabwe. In: Fraile, L. (ed.), *Blunting neo-liberalism: Tripartism and economic reforms in the developing world*, pp. 176-223. Basingstoke, UK and New York/ Geneva: Palgrave Macmillan/ ILO.

Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU). (1996). *Beyond ESAP: Framework for a Long-Term Development Strategy*. Harare: Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions.