

The Poverty of Terminology

5/4/2026 • Reading time: ~35 min.

[Download PDF \(in English\).](#)[Original \(PDF • in English\).](#)[Print](#)

ABSTRACT

This study provides a critical examination of the conceptual instability inherent in applying Western economic labels, such as “state capitalism,” to non-Western systems. Informed by the framework of polar Marxism, the analysis argues that these terms rely on fundamentally incompatible criteria—ranging from state ownership to geopolitical alignment—thereby lacking scientific rigor and functioning primarily as ideological markers for perceived “flawed” non-Western formations. By contrasting contemporary usage with the original Marxist intent of the terminology, the research demonstrates how descriptive labeling has substituted for systemic proof. Ultimately, the paper calls for the development of a new, objective scientific terminology in political economy capable of capturing the internal essence of non-Western realities without regional or ideological bias.

Keywords: state capitalism; authoritarian capitalism; bureaucratic collectivism; political economy; scientific terminology; marxism; polar marxism; comparative conceptual analysis; terminological critique; scientific classification

JEL Codes: B41; P16; P51

Introduction

The Problem of Scientific Naming

We have reached a state in political economy where Western scholars and their followers attach unstable labels—such as state capitalism, authoritarian capitalism, party-state capitalism, and state-permeated capitalism—to non-Western countries. Furthermore, they do so as if these terms possess inherent scientific substance and objective necessity.

In reality, such labels are often so broad, flexible, and overlapping—both with each other and with various global phenomena—that their use is not only ideologically charged toward Western liberalism but also fundamentally self-contradictory.

Perhaps their problem lies in attempting to describe what they cannot understand. They see what they do not notice; they perceive what they do not comprehend.

The problem here, as has become clear, lies not only in the confusing diversity of terms but also in the fact that each of these terms, as a whole, lacks any scientific foundation. They are introduced as descriptions without the construction of coherent systems that would clearly demonstrate where such a label belongs within them.

In many cases, authors describe a set of institutional, political, or economic features and then attach a name to the object thus described, without providing any grounds for such a designation. Description is thereby substituted for proof, and naming takes the place of scientific classification.

In this study, I examine this specific issue through a critical analysis of dominant labels. It should be noted that I will largely omit purely politicized labels, such as dictatorship or authoritarianism, though they may be addressed indirectly where necessary.

I will begin with the most popular general term, *state capitalism*, before moving on to its various modifications, including *authoritarian capitalism*, *party-state capitalism*, *Sino-capitalism*, *state-permeated capitalism*, and related formulations. Finally, I will address alternative designations that attempt to describe non-Western systems as distinct entities rather than mere variants of capitalism, specifically *bureaucratic collectivism*. The aim is not simply to catalogue competing expressions, but to assess the scientific weakness of the classificatory language itself.

I do not limit myself here to specific authors; instead, I emphasize the broader problem of labeling. Furthermore, I do not adopt the position of any of the mentioned authors, regardless of whether I agree or disagree with them. While my perspective is grounded in general Marxist thought, it is specifically informed by my own framework—*polar Marxism*.

The article is structured into three main chapters and several supplementary sections. Chapter One examines the foundational concept of state capitalism. Chapter Two focuses on modified labels, such as authoritarian capitalism and

party-state capitalism, while Chapter Three investigates alternative names for distinct systems. Finally, the quoted definitions and primary source references used in each respective part are collected in the appendices.

The Main Culprits

One Name, Many Meanings

As stated in the introduction, the primary issue with the term *state capitalism* is its inconsistency. It fundamentally refers to disparate objects; different authors employ the same label to describe varying structures, mechanisms, and levels of analysis. One might argue this is a sign of conceptual richness, but in reality, it indicates instability. The same term is used to convey meanings that are not equivalent.

For instance, a country may be labeled as state capitalist because the state owns firms, or because it directs investment, or because it utilizes the market for its own ends. It might also be used because the state subordinates private interests to general political priorities or simply because the country belongs to a specific geopolitical group. These criteria are not just different—they belong to different social worlds.

Thus, the problem begins long before examining the definitions themselves, as a major contradiction is already evident: the same term performs multiple functions simultaneously. It attempts to describe ownership, coordination, political power, class domination, geopolitical strategy, and regional difference all under the same heading. In this chapter, I will utilize the conceptual formulations as recorded in Appendix A.

A Cluster of Incompatible Criteria

Here, I examine specific representatives of the term *state capitalism*. Bremmer (2010) asserted that state capitalism occurs when the state utilizes the market for its own political ends—though it remains unclear what the root cause of these goals is; they are treated as if they simply exist.¹ For Musacchio and Lazzarini (2012), state capitalism is identified by broad government involvement through equity ownership, subsidized credit, and corporate privileges.² Alami et al. (2021)

spoke of administrative capital accumulation, which is again of unknown origin.³ Sperber (2019) noted that this label is frequently applied to non-Western countries.⁴ For Lyons (2008), it is sufficient for the state to hold strategic stakes,⁵ while Janjigian (2010) defines state capitalism as a state that utilizes capitalism for its own purposes to advance its interests.⁶

It might seem that these authors are attempting to describe the same thing—as if they all perceive “state capitalism” but merely define it differently. I do not dispute that some underlying essence may exist, but it is certainly not state capitalism. Nevertheless, their definitions employ entirely different categorical frameworks for classification. Some define it through ownership, others through control, and others through the purpose of markets. A fourth group focuses on elite power, capital accumulation, or geopolitical conduct, while others effectively use the term as a civilizational or regional marker. Once this is recognized, the term begins to lose its apparent solidity. It no longer defines a single form or denotes a unique phenomenon; instead, it becomes an expansive cluster of overlapping and often incompatible definitions.

The result is a term that is defined in various ways yet retains a semblance of real meaning only because its internal heterogeneity is left unexamined. A concept uniting state ownership, industrial policy, sovereign wealth funds, party control, geopolitical strategy, and non-Western development lacks scientific rigor unless their interconnections are proven. Features are simply listed, and the label is then applied as if it were self-evidently warranted.

A Historical Displacement of Meaning

But let us look briefly at the original use of the term *state capitalism* to contrast it with its contemporary politicized tone. When we return to the Marxist lineage, we find that the term originally had nothing to do with non-Western countries. In fact, it was used to understand the modern capitalism of that time. When Engels (1878) described the state of his era as the “ideal aggregate capitalist,” he was specifically defining the political concentration of the power of capital within the capitalist state, rather than exotic deviations of capitalism outside the West.⁷

One might object that the term is outdated, but I disagree. I contend that the term is not obsolete and that **state capitalism** is a label that should be applied to all countries of the Western world.

Lenin (1917) took this further, stating: “socialism is merely the next step forward from state-capitalist monopoly.”⁸ He reiterated the same point: capitalism inherently forms state capitalism. However, he then indicated that this structure must be seized, so to speak, to result in socialism. In his definition, whether on the “left” or the “right,” one finds state capitalism—it is simply that one is pro-capitalist and the other is pro-socialist. Yet today, state capitalism is reserved exclusively for the non-West and what the West perceives as flawed non-Western forms.

Ultimately, once we account for this historical correction, the modern meaning of the word becomes increasingly unstable. It is no longer part of a theory; it simply becomes an ever-shifting label dictated by political conjuncture. The relevant formulations from Engels and Lenin are reproduced in Appendix D.

The Objection from Within

Another classic side of this issue is found in Trotsky (1937), who stated:

*“The attempt to represent the Soviet bureaucracy as a class of ‘state capitalists’ will obviously not withstand criticism. The bureaucracy has neither stocks nor bonds. It is recruited, supplemented and renewed in the manner of an administrative hierarchy, independently of any special property relations of its own. The individual bureaucrat cannot transmit to his heirs his rights in the exploitation of the state apparatus.”*⁹

Essentially, even then, he pointed out the obvious: how can you use the word “capitalism” where there is no capital or where its power does not exist? I express the exact same concern regarding the use of this word in a modern context, where an apparently obvious characteristic of a system—such as the subordination of capital to the state—is presented as “capitalism” rather than something else. Clearly, one could use the word in the Leninist sense, suggesting that the USSR was “state capitalism not in the service of capital,” but I agree that the term itself describes something that was not there. To agree with this, one does not need to

be a follower of Trotsky; one simply needs to possess common sense and think critically rather than speaking in narratives. The relevant formulations from Trotsky are reproduced in Appendix D.

Why the Main Label Fails

Concluding, it must be said that besides Western ideological bias—a quite successful one, since initially this term was used against them—the obvious weakness of the term *state capitalism* is its instability: between meanings, and between meanings and reality. It gathers incompatible meanings within itself, jumps across different levels of analysis, and ultimately substitutes description for a proven concept. The term turns out to be such that it seemingly tries to explain something, but in the end, it results in a mere hodgepodge.

Therefore, for me, *state capitalism* is the main culprit. It is the broadest, most elastic, and most authoritative label in the field.

Modified Labels

From the Main Label to Its Repairs

If in Chapter One we dealt with this very “unstable king” of labeling terms denoting the non-West, then in this chapter we will discuss the refinement and modification of this term when authors realize it is no longer sufficient. Essentially, the question is as follows: what if authors begin to realize that this term is becoming too broad, or something of that nature, and consequently they cannot apply it precisely to a specific object—for instance, to a certain country—and thus conclude that a qualifying modifier is necessary?

They add new qualifiers, new prefixes, and new distinctions. As a result, we get various *authoritarian capitalisms*, not just *state capitalisms*, but *party-state capitalisms*, *state-permeated market economy*, *uneven and combined state capitalism*, and *authoritarian mixed capitalism*, and so on. We understand that these are not merely powerful but random innovations. No, these are specifically attempts to fix the weaknesses of the original “king of labels.”

This is a crucial point because when we discuss modified labels, we are talking not just about stylization, but about a deliberate attempt to escape the weaknesses already mentioned. Ultimately, it turns out they are trying to describe an object that the standard term *state capitalism* cannot explain; therefore, they introduce these terms, which further confirms that neither their new terms nor *state capitalism* itself truly describes the essence standing behind these seemingly important labels.

Consequently, instead of working with this essence and trying to understand it, they simply attempt to invent a more “correct” label—a more refined derivative of *state capitalism*. Relevant formulations for this chapter can be found in the appendix, specifically in Appendix B.

Regime Modifiers

The first family of modifications consists of so-called refinements based on political regimes. The most obvious of these is *authoritarian capitalism*. As I stated in the introduction, I will not engage deeply with these designations because they are maximally politicized. Nevertheless, it is worth addressing the use of the word “authoritarianism” here. In fact, authoritarianism is everything that is not Western democracy. That is why authoritarianism, in the Western understanding, is often essentially synonymous with *state capitalism*. Sometimes, of course, this synonym drifts further away and turns into “totalitarianism” or “dictatorship.” But broadly speaking, these all belong to the same family of names; the only one among them that possesses even a semblance of meaning is *state capitalism*—though, as you can see, I challenge that in this work.

Chen et al. (2023) define it as “a system lacking liberal democratic institutions, norms, and practices, while maintaining a market economy with scope for private firms.”¹⁰ Carney (2018) similarly argues that authoritarian leaders utilize, rather than reject, capitalism to sustain their power.¹¹ Witt and Redding (2012) use the term *authoritarian capitalism* in relation to China, implying that the Communist Party holds power over the system.¹² However, Xu et al. (2020) extend this logic of authoritarian capitalism to the interconnection between the political system and the economic model as a whole.¹³

Essentially, these authors do the following: their main priority is to retain the word *capitalism* in a strongly negative, significantly non-Western sense, and then attach the word *authoritarianism* to it. In doing so, both words reinforce each other, specifically highlighting the “deficiency” of Eastern or Global South formations.

Party, State, and the Search for the Real Agent

The second family of modifiers focuses on the institutional bearer of power. More precisely, they speak of so-called *party-state capitalism*. Pearson, Rithmire, and Tsai (2022) assert that to accurately understand China, one must view it not merely as *state capitalism*, but specifically as *party-state capitalism*.¹⁴ Following their logic, we can understand why they introduced this term: in reality, the state and the party in China have extended their roots throughout the entire economy, including within private capital, subordinating the whole economy to their goals, such as regime protection, security, and political control.

Nölke et al. (2019), for their part, introduced the so-called *state-permeated market economy*.¹⁵ For them, the most important aspect is the operation between state agents and business coalitions, rather than primarily an all-powerful, centralized bureaucracy. Alami et al. (2021)’s concept of *uneven and combined state capitalism* shifts analysis from static national models to a relational view of connected, co-evolving forms.³

Again, as with *authoritarian capitalism*, these authors are not merely decorating the term “state capitalism”; they are specifically attempting to find some logic that stands behind these terms—behind these labels, which is exactly what they remain.

When Modification Becomes Confession

Continuing to dive into this quagmire, it becomes clear—again and again—that the emergence and development of these terms are driven by the fact that they cannot adequately describe what they are attempting to describe. They speak of a phenomenon that is very broad and very powerful, yet they cannot grasp it; this is precisely why they invent different names and different ways to cling to it. Every one of their designations remains a label or, at best, a hypothesis. On one hand, they might speak of political regimes; on the other, of party control, sometimes of

accumulation, sometimes of institutional embeddedness, and sometimes of global relationality. Ultimately, all these terms differ from one another as they try to compensate for that central defect of the original term.

The original term simply cannot stand on its own; it cannot exist by itself, which is why these modifiers are required. But in the end, these modifiers can never reach a stable endpoint. This is because every new modifier focuses on one single aspect while neglecting all others.

This is why even hybrid formulations such as Raiklin (1989)'s *authoritarian mixed capitalism* matter.¹⁶ It would seem like just another descriptor rather than a proper term. Nevertheless, the most important thing here is the confirmation—the confirmation of the same problem. All these terms attempt to describe a phenomenon they do not understand. The words themselves are generally unsuitable for describing this phenomenon. Although they often try to capture certain meanings and do understand them, they ultimately employ terms that break those very meanings.

Alternative Systems

Beyond the Language of Capitalism

Unlike the previous chapters, in this chapter I will examine authors who chose to avoid the word “capitalism” altogether. There may be various reasons why they decided to move away from this word. Nevertheless, these authors chose not to modify *state capitalism* or *capitalism* in a negative sense, but rather to give a different name to the system they observe.

Evidently, based on what I have said before, one can conclude that they took this step toward a different name specifically in an attempt to more closely describe what they see. This is not to say they did so successfully, but they tried nonetheless. This suggests they moved a step closer to understanding the truth. Although we are, of course, speaking only of words, because frequently all the authors mentioned thus far spoke of important things and cited facts correctly, but then drew interesting conclusions that did not correlate with those facts.

Thus, the third chapter is precisely about them. And yes, perhaps these alternative names are not sufficiently complete and so on, but they nevertheless focus attention quite clearly on the central problem of all these terms: the impossibility of adequately naming what they see.

Bureaucratic Collectivism

The main alternative designation is so-called **bureaucratic collectivism**. The term is primarily linked to Rizzi (1939) and Shachtman (1962), later appearing and discussed in related forms by Macdonald (1953).¹⁷¹⁸¹⁹ The most important thing these authors did was not simply the name itself, but the very fact that they moved away from the word “capitalism” and began trying to understand, describe, and ultimately designate a new type of society where the bureaucracy emerges as the ruling stratum.

This is logical: if we are talking about an economy dominated by bureaucratic control—collectively, a new form of political-economic domination—then the language should reflect this rather than attempting to draw a backward conclusion. Yes, the term *bureaucratic collectivism* may not fully grasp or precisely describe the exact phenomenon they are attempting to portray. They may face the same problem of focusing on a single aspect out of an infinite multitude of aspects of this phenomenon, just like the previous terms, but it does not devolve into labeling these aspects as simply “state” or any other kind of “bad” capitalism.

Evidently, the limitations of this term are apparent, as they do not present a stable scientific framework. This new ruling stratum itself might be over-described, and the concept could ultimately become too broad and indefinite, much like all the previous ones. Nevertheless, I am personally grateful to the authors for deviating, if only for a moment, from the dogma of calling everything non-Western “capitalism” with a modifier in a negative sense.

Conclusion

Toward Scientific Terminology

One could continue indefinitely attempting to account for all Western and Western-aligned terms, or rather, labels. However, I believe I have already proven my argument directly. The dominant labels do not constitute a consistent scientific vocabulary. The central term, *state capitalism*, as has been shown, possesses too many incompatible meanings to function as a stable analytical category. It is used to describe state ownership, political control, the strategic use of markets, administrative capital accumulation, and even more broadly, it is used to brand all non-Western political economies. Thus, a term that covers too many objects cannot serve as a precise scientific designation—not to mention that the original meaning of this word was entirely different and was directed toward the West, rather than the other way around.

Modified labels attempted to solve this problem, but in the end, they only confirmed it. By trying to describe the phenomenon they observe more accurately, they merely confirmed that both they and the term *state capitalism* are insufficient and inadequate. They were simply trying to patch the original term, but the very fact that the original term needs patching already indicates its insufficiency. No matter how many times we try to patch it, we will ultimately arrive nowhere. This is because the term itself is inherently biased from the start; it is fundamentally skewed. For this reason, we will always only capture reality superficially.

For instance, the alternative designation discussed in Chapter Three, *bureaucratic collectivism*, attempted to move even further away from naming what they see with the word “capitalism” in a negative sense. Yet even they did not provide a definitive answer or a truly scientific theory. Rather, they adopted the same method of selecting one specific aspect and deriving a name based on it. But while previous authors took “capitalism” and added an aspect—such as authoritarianism—these authors chose to modify both words.

Ultimately, none of these authors managed to approach the reality of what they see. This is not only because their designations lack meaning, but also because they failed to create a sufficiently scientific framework to describe anything objectively. They simply lack the language at a fundamental level, let alone at the level of labels, to describe anything. Consequently, to solve this problem and provide a real designation for the non-Western reality we observe, it is necessary to create a

genuine, consistent scientific theory capable of capturing all aspects and understanding the essence of the phenomenon—and only then providing a scientific and precise definition, ideally without negative connotations.

Thus, the critique deployed in this work is not an end in itself. In reality, it is a necessary step before we construct a true scientific theory and a genuine scientific term that can describe all the non-Western phenomena we observe. The poverty of terminology is not merely a linguistic problem; it is a broader scientific problem—a problem of scientific classification, of scientific knowledge, and of science within political economy.

Appendix A

Appendix to Chapter One: Quoted Definitions and Related Formulations of State Capitalism

1. Ian Bremmer

Original work: Bremmer, *The End of the Free Market: Who Wins the War Between States and Corporations?* (2010).¹

Found in the present source base in: Ghaleb, *Natural Gas as an Instrument of Russian State Power* (2011).²⁰

Citation relation: Alexander Ghaleb quotes Ian Bremmer.

“in which the state plays the role of the leading economic actor and uses markets primarily for political gain”

2. Ian Bremmer

Original work: Bremmer, *The End of the Free Market: Who Wins the War Between States and Corporations?* (2010).¹

Found in the present source base in: Ghaleb, *Natural Gas as an Instrument of Russian State Power* (2011).²⁰

Citation relation: Alexander Ghaleb quotes Ian Bremmer.

“State capitalists see markets primarily as a tool that serves national interests, or at least those of ruling elites, rather than as an engine of opportunity for the individual. State capitalists use markets to extend their own political and economic leverage – both within society and on the international stage. State capitalism is not an ideology. It’s not simply Communism by another name or an updated form of central planning. It embraces capitalism, but for its own purposes.”

3. Nathan Sperber

Original work: Sperber, *The Many Lives of State Capitalism: From Classical Marxism to Free-Market Advocacy* (2019).⁴

Found in the present source base in: Ediger, Bowlus, and Dursun, *State Capitalism and Hydrocarbon Security in China and Russia* (2021).²¹

Citation relation: Volkan S. Ediger, John V. Bowlus, and Ahmet Faruk Dursun quote Nathan Sperber.

“[State capitalism] mostly serves to denote, in the present period, the political economies of a subset of non-Western countries, including Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Russia, India, Singapore and – primus inter pares – China.”

4. G. Lyons

Original work: Lyons, *State Capitalism: The Rise of Sovereign Wealth Funds* (2008).⁵

Found in the present source base in: Ediger, Bowlus, and Dursun, *State Capitalism and Hydrocarbon Security in China and Russia* (2021).²¹

Citation relation: Volkan S. Ediger, John V. Bowlus, and Ahmet Faruk Dursun quote G. Lyons.

“the use of government-controlled funds to acquire strategic stakes around the world”

5. Vahan Janjigian

Original work: Janjigian, *Communism Is Dead, but State Capitalism Thrives* (2010).⁶

Found in the present source base in: Ediger, Bowlus, and Dursun, *State Capitalism and Hydrocarbon Security in China and Russia* (2021).²¹

Citation relation: Volkan S. Ediger, John V. Bowlus, and Ahmet Faruk Dursun quote Vahan Janjigian.

“a system in which governments use capitalism and free markets to advance their own power and interests”

6. Aldo Musacchio and Sergio G. Lazzarini

Original work: Musacchio and Lazzarini, *Leviathan in Business: Varieties of State Capitalism and Their Implications for Economic Performance* (2012).²

Found in the present source base in: Ediger, Bowlus, and Dursun, *State Capitalism and Hydrocarbon Security in China and Russia* (2021).²¹

Citation relation: Volkan S. Ediger, John V. Bowlus, and Ahmet Faruk Dursun quote Aldo Musacchio and Sergio G. Lazzarini.

“widespread influence of the government in the economy, either by owning majority or minority equity positions in companies and/or through the provision of subsidized credit and/or other privileges to private companies”

7. Ilias Alami and Adam D. Dixon

Original work: Alami et al., *Geopolitics and the ‘New’ State Capitalism* (2021).³

Found in the present source base in: archival markdown version of Alami et al., *Geopolitics and the ‘New’ State Capitalism* (2021).²²

Citation relation: direct quotation from the original work.

“State capitalism broadly refers to configurations of capitalism where the state plays a strong role in supervising and administering capital accumulation, or in directly owning and controlling capital.”

8. Adam Buick and John Crump

Original work: Buick and Crump, *State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management* (1986).²³

Found in the present source base in: archival markdown version of Buick and Crump, *State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management* (1986).²⁴
Citation relation: direct quotation from the original work.

“The substitution of state for private (individual or corporate) ownership does not mean the abolition of capitalism, since it leaves unchanged commodity production and both wage labour and the accumulation of capital.”

9. Adam Buick and John Crump

Original work: Buick and Crump, *State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management* (1986).²³

Found in the present source base in: archival markdown version of Buick and Crump, *State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management* (1986).²⁴
Citation relation: direct quotation from the original work.

“The most appropriate term for describing this situation is state capitalism.”

10. Immanuel Wallerstein

Original work: Wallerstein, *The Capitalist World-Economy* (1979).²⁵

Found in the present source base in: Buick and Crump, *State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management* (1986).²⁴

Citation relation: Adam Buick and John Crump quote Immanuel Wallerstein.

“A state which collectively owns all the means of production is merely a collective capitalist firm as long as it remains – as all such states are, in fact, presently compelled to remain – a participant in the market of the capitalist world-economy.”

1. Vladimir I. Lenin

Original work: Lenin, *To the Fourth Congress of the Communist International and to the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Red Army Deputies* (1922).²⁶

Found in the present source base in: Zhang, *Is China Socialist? Theorising the Political Economy of China* (2023).²⁷

Citation relation: Xinwen Zhang reproduces Vladimir I. Lenin.

“our state capitalism differs from state capitalism in the literal sense of the term in that our proletarian state not only owns the land, but also all the vital branches of industry.”

2. Satya Gabriel, Stephen A. Resnick, and Richard D. Wolff

Original work: Gabriel, Resnick, and Wolff, *State Capitalism versus Communism: What Happened in the USSR?* (2011).²⁸

Found in the present source base in: *State Capitalism, Contentious Politics and Large-Scale Social Change* (2011; ed. Vincent Kelly Pollard).²⁹

Citation relation: direct quotation from the original chapter reproduced in the archival volume.

“we use ‘state capitalism’ to refer only to societies where the state form of capitalism prevails, where state officials appropriate most surpluses.”

3. Otto Rühle

Original work: Rühle, *From the Bourgeois to the Proletarian Revolution* (1974).³⁰

Found in the present source base in: Buick and Crump, *State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management* (1986).²⁴

Citation relation: Adam Buick and John Crump quote Otto Rühle.

“The dictatorship of the party is commissar-despotism, is state capitalism.”

4. Otto Rühle

Original work: Rühle, *From the Bourgeois to the Proletarian Revolution* (1974).³⁰

Found in the present source base in: Buick and Crump, *State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management* (1986).²⁴

Citation relation: Adam Buick and John Crump quote Otto Rühle.

“Through nationalisation you can arrive at a large-scale, tightly centrally-run state capitalism ... Only it is still capitalism.”

5. Socialist Party of Great Britain

Original work: Socialist Party of Great Britain, *Russia 1917–1967: A Socialist Analysis* (1967).³¹

Found in the present source base in: Buick and Crump, *State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management* (1986).²⁴

Citation relation: Adam Buick and John Crump quote the Socialist Party of Great Britain.

“The social system in Russia can be described as capitalist since the essential features of capitalism predominate: class monopoly of the means of production, commodity production, wage-labour and capital accumulation.”

Appendix B

Appendix to Chapter Two: Quoted Definitions and Related Formulations of Modified Labels

1. Ling S. Chen, Xiuyu Li, and Kellee S. Tsai

Original work: Chen, Li, and Tsai, *Pathways to Authoritarian Capitalism* (2023).¹⁰

Found in the present source base in: archival markdown version of the same work.

Citation relation: direct quotation from the original work.

“Authoritarian capitalism thus refers to a system lacking liberal democratic institutions, norms, and practices, while maintaining a market economy with scope for private firms.”

2. Richard W. Carney

Original work: Carney, *Authoritarian Capitalism: Sovereign Wealth Funds and State-Owned Enterprises in East Asia and Beyond* (2018).¹¹

Found in the present source base in: archival markdown version of the same work.

Citation relation: direct quotation from the original work.

“Rather than rejecting capitalism, authoritarian leaders harness it to uphold their rule.”

3. Michael A. Witt and Gordon Redding

Original work: Witt and Redding, *China: Authoritarian Capitalism* (2012).¹²

Found in the present source base in: archival markdown version of the same work.

Citation relation: direct quotation from the original work.

“Our analysis suggests a form of authoritarian capitalism, with the Communist Party retaining pervasive influence throughout the system.”

4. Jianhua Xu, Qipu Hu, and Anli Jiang

Original work: Xu, Hu, and Jiang, *Authoritarian Capitalism and Policing Studies in China* (2020).¹³

Found in the present source base in: archival markdown version of the same work.

Citation relation: direct quotation from the original work.

“Putting China’s economic model and political system together, the nature of the PRC could arguably be understood as authoritarian capitalism.”

5. Margaret M. Pearson, Meg Rithmire, and Kellee S. Tsai

Original work: Pearson, Rithmire, and Tsai, *China’s Party-State Capitalism and International Backlash: From Interdependence to Insecurity* (2022).¹⁴

Found in the present source base in: archival markdown version of the same work.

Citation relation: direct quotation from the original work.

“Moreover, we contend that explaining the backlash against China requires understanding the evolution of its economic model to what we call ‘party-state capitalism.’ Since the end of the first decade of the 2000s, China’s political economy has shifted from a familiar form of state capitalism to one in which the party-state has adjusted and expanded its role in the economy.”

6. Margaret M. Pearson, Meg Rithmire, and Kellee S. Tsai

Original work: Pearson, Rithmire, and Tsai, *China’s Party-State Capitalism and International Backlash: From Interdependence to Insecurity* (2022).¹⁴

Found in the present source base in: archival markdown version of the same work.

Citation relation: direct quotation from the original work.

“We identify two signature manifestations of ‘party-state capitalism’: (1) significant expansion of party-state authority in firms through changes in corporate governance and state-led financial instruments; and (2) drawing political ‘red lines’ to enforce political fealty by various economic actors.”

7. **Andreas Nölke, Tobias ten Brink, Christian May, and Simone Claar**

Original work: Nölke, ten Brink, May, and Claar, *State-permeated Capitalism in Large Emerging Economies* (2019).¹⁵

Found in the present source base in: archival markdown version of the same work.

Citation relation: direct quotation from the original work.

“Rather, its activity is based on close cooperation and competition between various state and domestic business coalitions at the national and subnational levels. For this reason, we speak of ‘state-permeated market economies’ (SME).”

8. **Andreas Nölke, Tobias ten Brink, Christian May, and Simone Claar**

Original work: Nölke, ten Brink, May, and Claar, *State-permeated Capitalism in Large Emerging Economies* (2019).¹⁵

Found in the present source base in: archival markdown version of the same work.

Citation relation: direct quotation from the original work.

“We maintain that large emerging economies can continue their growth trajectories if they adhere to the model of state-permeated capitalism notwithstanding serious challenges, external shocks and other contingent global economic conjunctures.”

9. **Ilias Alami and Adam D. Dixon**

Original work: Alami et al., *Geopolitics and the ‘New’ State Capitalism* (2021).³

Found in the present source base in: archival markdown version of the same

work.²²

Citation relation: direct quotation from the original work.

“We call this reorientation in the study of state capitalism and its geopolitics ‘uneven and combined state capitalism.’ Importantly, we see the latter as a research agenda and methodological predisposition, rather than a unified theory or approach.”

0. Ernest Raiklin

Original work: Raiklin, *After Gorbachev? A Mechanism for the Transformation of Totalitarian State Capitalism into Authoritarian Mixed Capitalism* (1989).¹⁶

Found in the present source base in: Ghaleb, *Natural Gas as an Instrument of Russian State Power* (2011).²⁰

Citation relation: Alexander Ghaleb quotes Ernest Raiklin.

“authoritarian mixed capitalism,” which combines central strategic planning and the lack of political democracy with Western capitalism.

Appendix C

Appendix to Chapter Three: Quoted Definitions and Related Formulations of Alternative Systems

1. Bruno Rizzi

Original work: Rizzi, *La Bureaucratisation du Monde* (1939).¹⁷

Found in the present source base in: *State Capitalism, Contentious Politics and Large-Scale Social Change* (2011; ed. Vincent Kelly Pollard).²⁹

Citation relation: Vincent Kelly Pollard attributes the coining of the term to Bruno Rizzi and summarizes his position.

“The term itself was apparently coined by one Bruno Rizzi (‘Bruno R.’), whose book, *La Bureaucratisation du Monde*, appeared in Paris in 1939 ... However, Rizzi favored the development of rational, planned states, including the New Deal, Stalinism, and Mussolini’s fascism, as an alternative to a decaying capitalism.”

2. Max Shachtman

Original work: Shachtman, *The Bureaucratic Revolution: The Rise of the Stalinist State* (1962).¹⁸

Found in the present source base in: *State Capitalism, Contentious Politics and Large-Scale Social Change* (2011; ed. Vincent Kelly Pollard).²⁹

Citation relation: Vincent Kelly Pollard quotes Max Shachtman.

“The social rule of the proletariat cannot express itself in private ownership of capital, but only in its ‘ownership’ of the state in whose hands is concentrated all the decisive economic power. Hence, its social power lies in its political power. In bourgeois society, the two can be and are divorced; in the proletarian state, they are inseparable ... In the Soviet Union the proletarian is master of property only if he is master of the state which is its repository ... (therefore the) political expropriation of the proletariat ... is nothing more or less than the destruction of the class rule of the workers, the end of the Soviet Union as a workers’ state.”

3. Max Shachtman

Original work: Shachtman, *The Bureaucratic Revolution: The Rise of the Stalinist State* (1962).¹⁸

Found in the present source base in: *State Capitalism, Contentious Politics and Large-Scale Social Change* (2011; ed. Vincent Kelly Pollard).²⁹

Citation relation: Vincent Kelly Pollard summarizes the theory associated with Max Shachtman.

“The theory of bureaucratic collectivism stated that a new ruling class had developed in the Soviet Union. This new class was neither a bourgeoisie nor a working class, but against them both and for itself, as a collectivity, that is, in control of a state that owned and controlled the economy. It was a third alternative to both capitalism and socialism.”

4. Dwight Macdonald

Original work: Macdonald, *The Root Is Man* (1953).¹⁹

Found in the present source base in: *State Capitalism, Contentious Politics and*

Large-Scale Social Change (2011; ed. Vincent Kelly Pollard).²⁹

Citation relation: Vincent Kelly Pollard quotes Dwight Macdonald.

“a form of society has come into being which is not Socialism but rather an even more oppressive form of class society than Capitalism and yet which has resolved those economic contradictions on which Marx based his expectations of progress to socialism. It is a ‘third alternative’ to both capitalism and socialism.”

Appendix D

General Appendix: Quoted Conceptual Formulations and Critical Objections

1. Friedrich Engels

Original work: Engels, *Anti-Dühring* (1878).⁷

Found in the present source base in: Zhuravlev and Matveev, *Gosudarstvennyi kapitalizm v Rossii: sostoianie issledovaniia (chast' 1)* (2022).³²

Citation relation: Oleg M. Zhuravlev and Ilya A. Matveev reproduce Friedrich Engels.

“The modern state, whatever its form, is an essentially capitalist machine, the state of the capitalists, the ideal aggregate capitalist.”

2. Vladimir I. Lenin

Original work: Lenin, *The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It* (1917).⁸

Found in the present source base in: Buick and Crump, *State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management* (1986).²⁴

Citation relation: Adam Buick and John Crump quote and discuss Vladimir I. Lenin.

“For socialism is merely the next step forward from state-capitalist monopoly. Or, in other words, socialism is merely state-capitalist monopoly which is made to serve the interests of the whole people and has to that extent ceased to be capitalist monopoly.”

3. Leon Trotsky

Original work: Trotsky, *The Revolution Betrayed* (1937).⁹

Found in the present source base in: Buick and Crump, *State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management* (1986).²⁴

Citation relation: Adam Buick and John Crump quote Leon Trotsky.

“The attempt to represent the Soviet bureaucracy as a class of ‘state capitalists’ will obviously not withstand criticism. The bureaucracy has neither stocks nor bonds. It is recruited, supplemented and renewed in the manner of an administrative hierarchy, independently of any special property relations of its own. The individual bureaucrat cannot transmit to his heirs his rights in the exploitation of the state apparatus.”

Footnotes

1. Ian Bremmer, *The End of the Free Market: Who Wins the War Between States and Corporations?* New York: Portfolio, 2010. ↩ ↩² ↩³
2. Aldo Musacchio and Sergio G. Lazzarini, *Leviathan in Business: Varieties of State Capitalism and Their Implications for Economic Performance*. Harvard Business School Working Paper, 2012. ↩ ↩²
3. Ilias Alami, Adam D. Dixon, Ruben Gonzalez-Vicente, Milan Babic, Seung-Ook Lee, Ingrid A. Medby, and Nana de Graaff, “Geopolitics and the ‘New’ State Capitalism,” *Geopolitics*, 2021. ↩ ↩² ↩³ ↩⁴
4. Nathan Sperber, “The Many Lives of State Capitalism: From Classical Marxism to Free-Market Advocacy,” *History of the Human Sciences* 32, no. 3, 2019, 100–124. ↩ ↩²
5. G. Lyons, “State Capitalism: The Rise of Sovereign Wealth Funds,” *Law and Business Review of the Americas* 14, 2008, 119–146. ↩ ↩²
6. Vahan Janjigian, “Communism Is Dead, but State Capitalism Thrives,” *Forbes*, 2010. ↩ ↩²
7. Friedrich Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, 1878. ↩ ↩²
8. Vladimir I. Lenin, *The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It*, 1917. ↩ ↩²
9. Leon Trotsky, *The Revolution Betrayed*, 1937. ↩ ↩²
10. Ling S. Chen, Xiuyu Li, and Kellee S. Tsai, *Pathways to Authoritarian Capitalism*, 2023. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `AuthoritarianCapitalism_Published59.md`. ↩ ↩²
11. Richard W. Carney, *Authoritarian Capitalism: Sovereign Wealth Funds and State-Owned Enterprises in East Asia and Beyond*, 2018. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `Authoritarian Capitalism Sovereign Wealth Funds and State-Owned Enterprises in East Asia and Beyond_2018-07-08__compiled.md`. ↩ ↩²

2. Michael A. Witt and Gordon Redding, *China: Authoritarian Capitalism*, 2012. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `WittReddingChina2012.md`. ↩ ↩²
3. Jianhua Xu, Qipu Hu, and Anli Jiang, *Authoritarian Capitalism and Policing Studies in China*, 2020. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `2020Xu-AuthortarianCapitalismandpolicingstudiesinChina.md`. ↩ ↩²
4. Margaret M. Pearson, Meg Rithmire, and Kellee S. Tsai, *China's Party-State Capitalism and International Backlash: From Interdependence to Insecurity*, 2022. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `M. Pearson - China's Party-State Capitalism and International Backlash From Interdependence to Insecurity [2022].md`. ↩ ↩² ↩³
5. Andreas Nölke, Tobias ten Brink, Christian May, and Simone Claar, *State-permeated Capitalism in Large Emerging Economies*, 2019. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `A. Nölke - State-permeated Capitalism in Large Emerging Economies [2019].md`. ↩ ↩² ↩³
6. Ernest Raiklin, *After Gorbachev? A Mechanism for the Transformation of Totalitarian State Capitalism into Authoritarian Mixed Capitalism*. Washington, DC: Council for Social and Economic Studies, 1989. ↩ ↩²
7. Bruno Rizzi, *La Bureaucratisation du Monde*. Paris, 1939. ↩ ↩²
8. Max Shachtman, *The Bureaucratic Revolution: The Rise of the Stalinist State*, 1962. ↩ ↩² ↩³
9. Dwight Macdonald, *The Root Is Man*, 1953. ↩ ↩²
0. Alexander Ghaleb, *Natural Gas as an Instrument of Russian State Power*, 2011. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `pub1088__compiled.md`. ↩ ↩² ↩³
1. Volkan S. Ediger, John V. Bowlus, and Ahmet Faruk Dursun, *State Capitalism and Hydrocarbon Security in China and Russia*, 2021. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `1-s2.0-S2211467X21001115-main.md`. ↩ ↩² ↩³ ↩⁴

2. Ilias Alami, Adam D. Dixon, Ruben Gonzalez-Vicente, Milan Babic, Seung-Ook Lee, Ingrid A. Medby, and Nana de Graaff, *Geopolitics and the 'New' State Capitalism*, 2021. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `Ilias Alami - Geopolitics and the 'New' State Capitalism [2021].md`. ↩ ↩²
3. Adam Buick and John Crump, *State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986. ↩ ↩²
4. Adam Buick and John Crump, *State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management*, 1986. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `state-capitalism__compiled.md`. ↩ ↩² ↩³ ↩⁴ ↩⁵ ↩⁶ ↩⁷ ↩⁸
5. Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Capitalist World-Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979. ↩
6. Vladimir I. Lenin, *To the Fourth Congress of the Communist International and to the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Red Army Deputies*, 1922. ↩
7. Xinwen Zhang, *Is China Socialist? Theorising the Political Economy of China*, 2023. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `[Политэкономия, социализм] Является ли Китай социалистическим - политэкономия.md`. ↩
8. Satya Gabriel, Stephen A. Resnick, and Richard D. Wolff, "State Capitalism versus Communism: What Happened in the USSR?" in *State Capitalism, Contentious Politics and Large-Scale Social Change*, ed. Vincent Kelly Pollard. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011. ↩
9. Vincent Kelly Pollard, ed., *State Capitalism, Contentious Politics and Large-Scale Social Change*, 2011. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `DOKUME~1.MD`. ↩ ↩² ↩³ ↩⁴ ↩⁵
10. Otto Rühle, *From the Bourgeois to the Proletarian Revolution*, 1974. ↩ ↩²
11. Socialist Party of Great Britain, *Russia 1917–1967: A Socialist Analysis*. London: SPGB, 1967. ↩
12. O. M. Zhuravlev and I. A. Matveev, *Gosudarstvennyi kapitalizm v Rossii: sostoianie issledovaniia (chast' 1)*, 2022. Markdown file in personal research archive; file name: `O. Zhuravlev - State Capitalism in Russia A Review Article (Part 1) [2022].md`. ↩

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

Vilen Isteni (2026). "The Poverty of Terminology." Polar Marxism.
<https://polarmarxism.com/en/research/poverty-of-terminology>



READ ONLINE

