Abstract:

This paper argues that mass incarceration is a central institution in the neoliberal social structures of accumulation. Mass incarceration as an institution plays a critical but under-appreciated role in channeling class conflict in the neoliberal SSA. Neoliberalism has produced a significant sector of the working class who are largely excluded from the formal labor market, for which the threat of unemployment is not a sufficient disciplining mechanism. At the same time, it has undermined the welfare systems that had managed such populations in either period. Finally, the racial hierarchy essential to capitalist hegemony in the United States was threatened with collapse with the end of Jim Crow laws. The paper argues that mass incarceration has played an essential role in overcoming all of these barriers to stable accumulation under neoliberalism.
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A. Introduction
Workers may be motivated by positive incentives, such as good working environment and high wages, or by negative sanctions, such as the threat of job loss. The discipline of the whip refers to the use of negative sanctions to elicit worker effort on the job. It calls for the removal of the kind of job protection and grievance provisions negotiated by unions, and for the reduction of unemployment compensation and other benefits available to workers who have lost their jobs, in order to reduce the availability and desirability of any alternative to disciplined performance on the job. The idea is to make the labor market—and particularly the threat of unemployment—do the work of disciplining workers. Unlike the trickle-down logic, which sweetens incentives for the rich, the logic of the whip favors the stick over the carrot in motivating workers.

—Samuel Bowles, David Gordon and Thomas Weisskopf, 1990

The social structures of accumulation (SSA) approach has served as one of the more powerful and widely applicable analytical prisms deriving from heterodox economic traditions. This approach seeks to understand how the socioeconomic institutions of a given economy manage inherent relationships of conflict and power in capitalist society and how these institutions provide the structural stability that allows for capitalist accumulation (Gordon et al, 1982; Bowles et al, 1990; Kotz et al 1994). In the recent past, there has been a revival of interest in this approach (McDonough et al. 2010), partly as a result of the now apparent fragility of what has been termed the "neoliberal social structure of accumulation." A wide range of research has sought to understand particular institutional configurations in this period, such as the nature of financialization, the importance of global forms of production and so on. Yet there has been limited attention to one key feature of the neoliberal SSA in the U.S -- the rise of an oppressive and institutionalized racism in the form of the mass incarceration since around 1980.

Loic Wacquant (2010) has criticized the use of the term “Mass Incarceration.” Wacquant argues that mass incarceration is a misleading term and he proposes the use of the term hyper incarceration. Mass incarceration is misleading because what exists in the US today is not mass incarceration as it does not concern large swaths of masses but instead is finely targeted by class, race and place. I partially agree with this critique of term “Mass Incarceration,” but will continue to use it with the lack of a better alternative. “Prison Industrial Complex” is also often used as an alternative to Mass Incarceration. Christian Parenti (1999) critiques the use of the Prison Industrial Complex because it suggest an interest group approach which looks for the direct involvement of specific economic interests instead of looking at the class system as a whole. I will remain to use the term “Mass Incarceration” since this is the term which has been used by scholars including Garland (2000), Wacquant (2001), Western (2005), Travis (2005), Clear (2008).

A notable exception is Carlson and Michalowski (2010), but they too elide—I suggest in this essay—key channels by which mass incarceration and neoliberal forms of accumulation are mutually reinforcing.
I wish to suggest two things in this essay: that mass incarceration should be seen as a central institution in the genesis and perpetuation of the neoliberal SSA in the United States and that the SSA framework is a useful way to understand the rise of mass incarceration in the United States. This is not to subscribe to a crude functionalism and claim that mass incarceration exists simply because it is necessary for the current patterns of capitalist accumulation, but rather to suggest that they are mutually reinforcing in at least three ways. First, the rise in mass incarceration may be seen as a response to the shaking up of a well established racial hierarchy—a destabilization that was explicitly framed by the actors in class terms—at the end of the preceding SSA. Second, mass incarceration is intimately linked with the rise in residential segregation in urban areas since the 1970s, and both serve to manage the social and economic inequalities that have been generated since the beginning of the neoliberal era. Residential segregation, marginal labor attachment and mass incarceration form a complex whereby populations that do not fit into the labor force are effectively managed. Third, mass incarceration serves to replace the welfare state in the management of economic stability. That is, where alternative social institutions may have sought to ameliorate the economic insecurity inherent in capitalism, mass incarceration has taken up this regulatory function by first separating and then locking up the most marginalized and vulnerable to the vicissitudes of capitalist growth. Finally, accumulation in the post-Jim Crow world requires a new basis for racial hierarchy that is compatible with the individualism that is a central feature of neoliberal ideology. Mass incarceration focuses to create a new ascriptive category, one that is formally based on individual acts while still managing populations. Furthermore, by magnifying the threat of crime in the minds of the working class, mass incarceration helps legitimate the defense of property as the overriding responsibility of the state.
From the other direction, if we wish to understand the recent phenomena of mass incarceration, the SSA framework is a way to situate the logic of incarceration within the logic of capitalist accumulation. There is growing evidence that mass incarceration does not reduce crime (Clear 1996, Western 2005, Clear 2008, Dhondt 2009 and 2010). Wacquant (2009), Parenti (1999) and Gilmore (2007) argue that social scientists need to break away from focusing on the crime-punishment paradigm in order to examine the rise and continuation of mass incarceration, and especially to explain the vast over-representation of Blacks in the prison population. This essay argues that analyzing mass incarceration through the SSA lens helps illuminate the dynamics of mass incarceration in capitalist society. Given the immense costs associated with the incarceration of millions of individuals, understanding of how the prison system functions within contemporary class and racial structures is an imperative task.

In what follows, I provide a narrative of mass incarceration and the ways in it has developed in conjunction with and support of the neoliberal SSA. The exact dating of the neoliberal SSA remains contentious, but the period of consideration is roughly from 1973 to present. The purpose of this essay is to synthesize research by other scholars coming from other frameworks and to relate it to the claim that the growth of the neoliberal mode of accumulation and the rise of the mass incarceration are mutually intertwined. I do not try to undertake any formal regression analysis or modeling, leaving that for more targeted research in the future.

I begin by providing a short historical overview of how class conflict has been managed in the U.S, through different SSAs, paying particular attention to the central role of race. I address some of the work done on SSAs and mass incarceration and point to some critical shortcomings of the approaches so far. I then move on to discuss the ways in which the mass incarceration complex manages conflict in the neoliberal era. In the final section I discuss the specific
ideological role played by incarceration under neoliberalism.

B. Channeling Class Conflict: A Brief Historical Review of SSA and Race

This story was not foreordained; rather, each generation of whites defined and redefined themselves in relation to black workers, and each generation of blacks struggled to resist the demands imposed upon them, whether by slave owners, landlords or employers. In devising political strategies to retain their economic advantages over blacks, whites drew upon various ideologies of racial superiority. Indeed, racism was not a primal prejudice but rather a fluid set of rationalizations, always shifting in response to considerations related to military defense, labor supply and demand, and technological innovation. Consequently, black people’s work outside their own homes and communities in large part reflected the self-interests of groups of whites, and those interests varied from place to place and changed over time.

Social Structures of Accumulation (SSA) refers to an approach which focuses on the broad social, legal-political and economic institutions which structure and facilitate capitalist accumulation during a given period. “Socioeconomic institutions shape relations between capitalists, workers, and other classes or groups of economic actors; they define the role of the state in the economy; and they determine the external relations of the capitalist sector with foreign capitalists and with other coexisting modes of production. The institutions of a given economy thus undergird relations of conflict and power between different classes of economic actors, and they thereby influence significantly the nature and pattern of economic change” (Bowles et al 1990, 8). The SSA approach examines the “complex of institutions which support the process of capital accumulation” (Kotz et al 1994, 1). Thus one of the key tasks of the SSA approach is to examine how institutions create social stability for long period of rapid capital accumulation. According to Kotz (1994) “what the social structure of accumulation does is to stabilize class conflict and channel it in directions that are not unduly disruptive of accumulation” (55).

The complex of institutions which make up an SSA undergo a life-cycle. SSAs are built, remain more or less stable for some period, and then decay. Once the new SSA is consolidated, there follows a long period of economic growth. Through its own contradictions this boom comes to an end and it is followed by a decay period in which the complex of new institutions are formed which will lead to a new SSA (Gordon et al 1982, Bowles et al 1990, Kotz et al 1994, McDonough et al 2010).

There has been some disagreement over how to understand the current period of neoliberalism. Is it a period of decay of the postwar SSA or is it a new SSA? Wolfson and Kotz (2010) and Kotz and McDonough (2010) persuasively argue that neoliberalism is not a continuation of the old postwar SSA but that it has constituted “a new, coherent, institutional structure that has been in existence since at least the early 1980s”(Wolfson and Kotz 2010, 73). Central to the SSA theory has been the idea that the consolidation of a new SSA will pave the way for rapid capital accumulation and rapid economic growth. While this rapid growth has not materialized under neoliberalism, neoliberalism should still be considered a new SSA since it has “promoted a rising share of profits in total income and, eventually, a rising rate of profit” (Wolfson and Kotz 2010, 79), and provided a “temporary stabilization of the contradictions of capitalism” (Wolfson and Kotz 2010, 80). Neoliberalism should be considered a new SSA since it is made up of a coherent, long-lasting set of institutions which promote profit-making and form a structure conducive to the accumulation of capital.

To understand the current period of neoliberalism, Wolfson and Kotz (2010) argue that SSAs come in two types: regulated and liberal. According to Wolfson and Kotz (2010), these two different varieties differ in five respects: (1) the manner in which the capital-labor contradiction is temporarily stabilized; (2) the state role in the economy; (3) the contradictions within capital;
(4) the contradictions within labor; (5) the character of the dominant ideology (Wolfson and Kotz 2010, 81). Compared with the regulated SSA where labor is relatively strong, in a liberal SSA, “capital does not compromise with labor, but instead achieves a high degree of dominance over it.” In the liberal SSA the state takes less of a role enforcing capitalist activity, inter-capitalist competition is more cut-throat, which leads to attacks on labor, and finance capital is more independent from productive capital. Workers are also more competitive, which strengthens the power of capital. And a new free-market ideology reinforces its core institutions (Wolfson and Kotz 2010, 81-85).

Kotz and McDonough (2010) describe the characteristics of the neoliberal SSA. They explore both the global and domestic characteristics of the neoliberal SSA. For the purpose of this paper, I will focus more on the domestic characteristics -- the capital-labor relation, the nature of the labor process and the role of the state -- since these bear more directly on mass incarceration. The first characteristic is a change in the process of how wages and working conditions are determined, from a process of collective bargaining to a process where the “employers are relatively free to determine wages and working conditions” (Kotz and McDonough 2010, 104). Relatedly, the neoliberal SSA has instituted “labor market flexibility” where employers have the flexibility to treat workers as they please and many primary labor-market jobs were transformed into secondary labor-market jobs with lower pay, limited benefits and little job security. The third characteristic is a shift in the labor process toward flexible specialization and just-in-time production. Fourth, improved communication and transportation technologies capital has been more effective in using the threat of moving production to control labor. The role of the state has also changed. Kotz and McDonough identify six specific changes. First, the state became less active in Keynesian aggregate demand management. Second,
there was a reduction in the social wage, with cutbacks to social programs such as retirement pensions, unemployment and disability insurance and educational subsidies. Third, the state shifted the burden for paying for public services from the rich to wage earners. Fourth was the privatization of services previously provided by the state; along with this, fifth, came the privatization and deregulation of natural monopolies. Sixth, the state has implemented more repressive policies of social control such as increased use of incarceration. (Kotz and McDonough 2010, 104-109)

Race, a historical and socially constructed category, also stabilizes class conflict and channels conflict in directions that are not unduly disruptive of accumulation. Race in the United States has gone through a variety of stages and variations (e.g. slavery and Jim Crow segregation). W.E.B Du Bois argues in Black Reconstruction and Dusk of Dawn that race is a cross-class alliance where the white working class aligns themselves with the capitalist class instead of the Black working class. Du Bois argues that this cross-class alliance between capitalists and the white proletariat is the key to understanding race. Du Bois argues that white workers received wages of whiteness, a set of public and psychological privileges. “They were given public deference and titles of courtesy because they were white. They were admitted freely with all classes of white people to public functions, public parks, and the best schools. The police were drawn from their ranks, and the courts, dependent upon their votes, treated them with such leniency as to encourage lawlessness. Their vote selected public officials, and while this had small effect upon the economic situation, it had great effect upon their personal treatment and the deference shown them” (Du Bois 1998, 700-701). White workers repress the Black worker because it benefits them in the short-term. But in exchange for these public and psychological wages the white worker helps to maintain the capitalist system which exploits them. Thus, race functions to channel class conflict.
James Baldwin wrote that “No one was white before he/she came to America” (Roediger 1999, 178). How did immigrants from Europe become white and get the benefit of those public and psychological wages? 

“...[B]y deciding they were white...white men—from Norway, for example, where they were Norwegians—became white by slaughtering the cattle, poisoning the wells, torching the houses, massacring Native Americans, raping Black women” (James Baldwin in Roediger 1999, 178). Alex Haley told a story about a time that Malcolm X made a similar comment about how immigrants defined and redefined themselves towards Blacks. “Waiting for my baggage, we witnessed a touching family reunion scene as part of which several cherubic little children romped and played, exclaiming in another language. 'By tomorrow night, they'll know how to say their first English word—nigger” (Haley 1965, 459). Both Malcolm X and James Baldwin are describing how race was produced and reproduced in different eras. Similarly, Ted Allen (1994) argues that racial slavery was the solution to two different problems in 17th century Virginia. First there was a labor shortage. Second there was a problem of insurrections, such as Bacon's Rebellion. Slavery was the solution to the first problem and racial slavery was the solution to the second. Racial slavery was maintained until the civil war when it was abolished and after a period of crisis and conflict, race was reconstituted in a system of segregation. 

During this latter period, Du Bois argues, “the Black man is a person who must ride 'Jim Crow' in Georgia” (Du Bois 1984, 153). This helps us understand what it means to Black under segregation or slavery. While slavery and legal segregation do not exist any more, this does not mean that race does not exist any more. But if Black and white identities were defined by the legal structures of Jim Crow, as Du Bois suggests, how do they function in the absence of those structures?

---

structures? That is, in the absence of explicit, legally-enforced racial hierarchies, how (if at all) is race reproduced in the contemporary period? And how is this related to the neoliberal SSA? This paper will argue that mass incarceration plays an important role in the reproduction of racial categories, in a way that fits with the characteristic ideology of neoliberalism.

B. SSA and the Criminal Justice System: Approaches thus Far.

The most important prior work on the relationship between SSAs and mass incarceration has is that of Carlson and Michalowski (Carlson and Michalowski 1997, Michalowski and Carlson 1999 and 2000, Carlson et al. 2010). Carlson and Michalowski (1997) examines the relationship between crime rates and unemployment rates across SSA phases. The authors found that this relationships differs across different SSA phases. Michalowski and Carlson (1999) examines the relationship between unemployment and imprisonment relationship across SSA phases. Michalowski and Carlson (2000) argues that an atomistic approach taken by most criminologists is inadequate and that criminologists need to examine the larger-scale sociological forces. An SSA approach, they argue, is useful way to study these larger-scale sociological forces in criminology. They specifically examine changes in the labor regimes and relate them to social control strategies in the 20th century.

Carlson et al. (2010) explores the connection between crime, the criminal justice system and historical shifts in the postwar SSA, and analyzes the exact nature of the relationship between the criminal justice system as a political institution and capital accumulation. Carlson et al. start from the premise that the state fills two contradictory roles. First, the state must maintain or create the conditions for capital accumulation. Second, the state performs a legitimization function, creating conditions for social harmony (Carlson et al. 2010, 241). The authors argue that the criminal justice
system legitimizes the capitalist legal order by defining and controlling property crime and elevating the sanctity of private property, and it supports both functions of the state by “minimizing violent crime and social disorder in order to secure social harmony necessary for system legitimacy and investor confidence” (Carlson et al. 2010, 241). The authors argue that the criminal justice system plays an important role in two steps of capital accumulation, first in the investment in means of production and labor power, and second in the profit realization step. This will vary historically depending on the “size, content, and perceived or real threat of the surplus population” and the “labor market conditions.” Thus when tightening labor markets increase capital's wage bill, the criminal justice system acts as a reserve army to alleviate this pressure by decriminalizing or lowering penalties for offenses. Similarly in periods of decay with weak labor markets, the criminal justice system absorbs the surplus labor population with higher and more severe penalties. The authors argue that mass incarceration has served capital accumulation in two ways: first, by ensuring that a surplus population beyond that needed for purposes of the reserve army does not pose public problems in the form of crime, and second, by directly serving as a vehicle for private profit realization.

Carlson et al. (2010) argue that “prison populations are the means to the end of profit realization” (253). This happens in two different ways: first, through demand created by employment in the criminal justice system, and second, as the expanded criminal justice system itself becomes a “lucrative market for goods and services produced/provided by private corporations. From the building supplies used to construct more prisons, to prison phone services provided by corporations like AT&T, to health services, to high-tech surveillance equipment, the corrections system became an important exploitable market” (Carlson et al. 2010, 250). In contrast to this view, Parenti (1999) and Gilmore (2007) argue that explanations of the rise of mass incarceration in terms of “Carceral Keynesianism” are misguided. They show that
prisons offer little Keynesian type stimulus since the theorized demand-side boost to output is never seen in reality. Rather, the real purpose of mass incarceration is social control and management of the conflicts inherent in capitalism.

While the Carlson and Michalowski papers are certainly pathbreaking, they elide three critical issues. First, their analysis fails to specifically situate mass incarceration within the neoliberal SSA. They do not speak of the neoliberal SSA as an SSA in its own right, preferring to speak of the period following 1979 as a period of 'decay' or 'exploration'. Thus, they analyze the rise of incarceration as a response to the breakdown of the postwar SSA. This periodization misses the way in which mass incarceration as labor discipline has been a key feature in the neoliberal SSA. Second, Carlson and Michalowski fail to connect the mass incarceration to the larger class and racial dynamics of the neoliberal period: the toxic combination of racial residential segregation, mass incarceration and the marginal labor attachment of criminalized populations. They also miss the fact that mass incarceration leads to a ratchet effect, whereby certain workers are permanently excluded from the labor force and cycle through the criminal justice system through the remainder of their lives. Finally, they do not consider the particular role of mass incarceration as a substitute for a welfare state—a substitution that is made primarily in the neoliberal SSA. It is to these concerns that I now turn.

C. Mass Incarceration as Labor Discipline

Piven and Cloward's *Regulating the Poor* (1993) offers a good starting point for understanding the logic connecting labor discipline and mass incarceration. The problem to be solved for capitalist reproduction is not the existence of a “surplus population” as such – indeed, the standard Marxian argument is that the smooth reproduction of capitalism requires exactly such a surplus as a reserve
army of labor. The problem, rather, is the existence of a population that is weakly attached, or outright resistant, to wage labor. Starting in the late 1960s, they suggest, an increasing number of younger Blacks fell into this category: “People may stop working because for one reason they are unable to work, or they may repudiate the obligation to work, as the young black does who remains idle on the ground that blacks are denied any but the most menial jobs. Thievery is one way of surviving; but it may sometimes be justified on the ground that whites have always stolen from and exploited blacks, so reparations are due. … such a transformation took place during the 1960s” (228-29). Similarly, they suggest, the urban riots of the late 1960s were an expression, in part of a rejection of wage labor under prevailing conditions. Drawing on interviews conducted by the U.S. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, they note that “comparison between rioters and non-rioters reveal marked differences in attitudes toward political and economic arrangements. First, the rioters were much more likely than non-rioters to possess accurate information about the economic and political condition of blacks. They were also more resentful than non-rioters: “69 percent, as compared with 50 percent of the non-involved, felt that racial discrimination was the major obstacle to their finding better employment.’”

For Piven and Cloward, it is the “repudiation of the obligation to work”, rather than unemployment per se, that creates the need for mass incarceration to restore labor discipline. This repudiation was rooted both in the political climate of the times – especially the civil rights movement and rising Black militancy – and in the breakdown of regulated capitalism. In such transitions, “portions of the laboring population may be rendered obsolete... Market incentives... are simply not sufficient to compel people to abandon one way of living and working in favor of another” (6); consequently, more punitive measures are needed to reestablish the obligation to work. “Simply providing aid to quiet the unemployed will not stop disorder; it may even permit it to worsen, for … the trigger that sets off disorder is not economic distress itself but the deterioration of social control. To restore order, the society must create the means to reassert its authority”(7). Market incentives may fail
either because workers are attached to another "way of living and working," as Piven and Cloward suggest, or because the threat of unemployment has become less costly, or because wages and working conditions have deteriorated to the point that work no longer is attractive compared with unemployment. In any case, harsher measures will be needed to restore labor discipline. For workers at the bottom of the employment ladder, work can only be made attractive by supplementing the threat of unemployment with the threat of criminal sanctions: “To demean and punish those who do not work is to exalt by contrast even the meanest labor at the meanest wages”(3-4).

C1. Labor Discipline, Segregation and Inequality in the neoliberal SSA.

The inescapable conclusion is that society secretly wants crime, needs crime, and gains definite satisfaction from the present mishandling of it. —Karl Menniger, The Crime of Punishment

The restive Black populations described by Piven and Cloward were predominantly urban, but of course this was not always so. Indeed, the end of the postwar SSA roughly coincided with the end of an immense, long-lasting migration of African-Americans from rural areas. The flight of African Americans7 to more promising locales in the half-century after World War I meant that by 1960, most urban centers in the U.S. had experienced, or were experiencing, a dramatic increase in the African American share of the population.8 The combination of this demographic shift with the reassertiveness of African-Americans in the 1960s, the politicization of race relations, and the civil rights and the Black Power movements led to the end of segregation as official state policy with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Yet, this was only the beginning of a privately led segregation that continues to date. Kruse (2004) shows how Atlanta saw its urban landscape transformed starting in the mid-1960s, with the abandonment of certain parts of the cities by whites and

7 See Isabel Wilkerson (2010), The Warmth of Other Suns; August Meier and Elliott Rudwick (1976), From Plantation to Ghetto; and Nell Irvin Painter (1986) Exodusters on African American Migration from the South to the North.
8 African-Americans went North and West in two great waves of migration and went from a mostly rural population to a mostly urban population. By 1960 over 80% were urban, in 1996, 87% lived in urban areas.
their relocation to other areas. Kruse suggests that it was the process of white flight that began in the South which spread across the country in the following decades. The attendant reorientation of political concerns among whites towards greater emphasis on individualism and small government, an ideology that dovetails with neoliberalism, was similarly a direct response to the civil rights movement:.

Massey and Denton (1989) in their classic *American Apartheid* show that the process of white flight decreased the tax base available for the maintenance of urban neighborhoods, thereby creating Black ghettos that were perpetuated by the process of continued segregation as those who could afford to leave left. While residential segregation is not always straightforward to measure, multiple measures of segregation (measures of dissimilarity, isolation, delta, absolute centralization and spacial proximity) confirm that African Americans were highly and increasingly segregated in U.S cities during the 1980s. Denton (1994) confirms these findings through 1990 and suggests that these patterns extended to other cities as well. Wilkes and Iceland (2004) extend these results to 2000 and find the same central trends. An extensive study by the federal census bureau (Census 2001) of similar measures finds that Blacks were less likely to be evenly spread across the metropolitan area, less likely to share common neighborhoods, less concentrated in dense areas, less likely to be centralized and more likely to live near other Blacks. \(^9\) In this way, residential segregation has allowed for the geographical quarantining of undesirable or unmanageable populations, facilitating their more intensive management by the criminal justice system. The geographically segregation of undesirable populations plays an important role for how policing targets these populations. This residential segregation makes it possible for law enforcement to target certain neighborhoods and continue operating using racial categories but in a manner consistent with the individualist ideology of neoliberalism. For example, in the African-American neighborhood, Bedford-Stuyvesent, Brooklyn, a now former police officer recently released tapes of over a year of secret recordings of police to the Village Voice. The first installment of what

they called the NYPD tapes quoted a police lieutenant telling his officers during roll call: "You're not working in Midtown Manhattan, where people are walking around, smiling and being happy. You're working in Bed-Stuy, where everyone's probably got a warrant" (Rayman, Graham, may 4th 2010, The Village Voice).

How was it that centers of vital industry in the earlier decades collapsed during this period and became places to house the poor and marginalized? Here again the role of neoliberalism cannot be ignored. Neoliberalism (re-)commodified housing by eliminating regulations and policies which supported housing in non-market ways. Wacquant (2010) also provides some answers in terms of particular tendencies within neoliberalism--the freedom of capital to move to low wage areas, the fact that low-skill immigrants served as competition for low-skilled African Americans and therefore made them relatively dispensable. Frazier (1957) argued that African American upward mobility was linked to the availability of industrial jobs. But neoliberal restructuring eliminated those jobs. Wilson (1996) argued that what was left behind when the jobs disappeared was a new urban poverty. By “the new urban poverty, I mean poor, segregated neighborhoods in which a substantial majority of individual adults are either unemployed or have dropped out of the labor force altogether. For example, in 1990 only one in three adults ages 16 and over in twelve Chicago communities held a job in a typical week of the year." (Wilson 1996, 19) The threat of unemployment is unlikely to provide effective social discipline in such neighborhoods, not so much -- as Piven and Cloward describe for the earlier period -- because workers actively resist wage labor, but simply because formal employment is largely unavailable in any case. Thus an alternative means to enforce social order and discipline potential workers is needed.

Criminologists have long been interested in the causes and consequences of residential segregation. Most scholars are now agreed that crime and punishment are highly localized and that examinations of these patterns at the neighborhood level can yield much better understandings than
more aggregative studies. That said, there have been relatively few studies that have examined the degree to which residential segregation and incarceration are correlated, because collecting data on incarceration at neighborhood levels has been difficult, and what data exists is largely proprietary to the penal system. Massey and Denton suggest some evidence for a link between incarceration and segregation, and one can see *prima facie* evidence that incarceration is highly correlated with neighborhoods that are primarily African American simply by looking at maps of two or three key areas. Figure 1 and 2 show maps of New York from the *New York Times* which map race by block. Figure 3 shows a map by the Justice Mapping Center of men admitted to prison. These maps show a clear concentration of incarceration in neighborhoods that are predominantly African American and Latino.

How is one to understand the segregation and development of the ghetto, militarized Black neighborhoods and the concomitant rise of the penal state in relation to the neoliberal SSA? There are at least two important connections. First, there is the fact that the neoliberal SSA unleashed a rise in inequality across the country and in urban centers as well. Figure 4 - drawn from the census shows the take off of the incomes of the rich starting around the beginning of the period and the stagnation of incomes of the bottom fifth. Researchers examining the neoliberal SSA have pointed to this as being a distinguishing feature of the period. Yet, there have been few examinations by these researchers on how these dramatic changes in distribution have been felt in terms of the urban geography. Watson (2009) provides some compelling evidence to suggest that rising inequality has further strengthened segregation. She finds that inequality at the top of the distribution is associated with more segregation of the rich, while inequality at the bottom and declines in labor demand for less-skilled men are associated with residential isolation of the poor. Given that black neighborhoods are much more likely to be poor, the implications are clear. Under the neoliberal SSA three mutually reinforcing processes

---

10 Maps are based on American Community Survey 2005-2009.
go together- greater inequality, racialized residential segregation and geographically targeted mass incarceration.

The general idea that mass incarceration is a way of managing a marginally attached and vulnerable population is provided some support by a cursory examination of the social position of the incarcerated in the early part of the neoliberal SSA as compared with the later years. The relevant data is summarized in Table 1 below. In 1974, 55% of the prison population in state prisons were non-white. By 2004, the number had climbed to 66%. Those who had no high school education had climbed from 29% to 37%, while the corresponding proportion of the general population who had no high school education declined from 38% to 15%. The average personal income of prisoners in 1974 was slightly higher than that of the general population ($4500 vs. $4445), but by 2004, the average personal income of prisoners was only about 2/3rds that of the general population ($15,600 vs. $23857). In short, before the 1980s the prison system did not preferentially target those at the bottom of the labor force -- prisoners had somewhat higher wages and education than the working class as a whole. This suggests that in the regulated SSA, the criminal justice system did not play a central role in labor discipline. Rather, it played a more generalized role in maintaining social order. Under the neoliberal SSA, however, the focus of the criminal justice system turned increasingly to specific segments of the working class that had been marginalized by the liberalization of the labor market and the rise in inequality. Perhaps the most telling indication of this shift in the criminal justice system from targeting acts to targeting populations is provided by the last row. In 1974 one in ten prisoners had a parent who was incarcerated. By 2004, this had risen to over one in three. Nor was this restricted to parents alone. A survey of jail inmates in 2002 shows that 46% of inmates had a family member incarcerated.

C2. The Ratchet Effect:

*When the punishment is imprisonment under our system, atrophies his power of fending for himself in the world. Now this*
would not materially hurt anyone but himself if, when he had been duly made an example of, he were killed like a vivisected
dog. But he is not killed. He is, at the expiration of his sentence, flung out of the prison into the streets to earn his living in
a labor market where nobody will employ an ex-prisoner, betraying himself at every turn by his ignorance of the common
news of the months or years he has passed without newspapers, lamed in speech, and terrified at the unaccustomed task of
providing food and lodging for himself. The is only one lucrative occupation available for him; and that is crime.
—George Bernard Shaw

While there are no long time series data available on prisoner releases, Travis (2005) estimates
that about 170,000 people were released from prison in 1980. The number today is over 750,000
(Travis 2009). How does incarceration affect labor market outcomes and the ability of former inmates
to successfully re-integrate into capitalist production? This question has been studied fairly extensively
by sociologists in the recent past. Devah Pager (2007) provides a startling statistic in this regard, using
matched applicants applying for a position, she finds that a criminal record is associated with a 50
percent reduction in employment opportunities for whites and a 64 percent reduction for blacks. In
other words incarceration provides a sharp penalty to reintegration, to the point, perhaps, of leaving few
sources of income open for ex-prisoners other than criminal activities. Indeed, while recidivism rates
have always been high, there is some evidence that they have increased over time. In the earliest
available data on recidivism from the Bureau of Criminal Justice Statistics, recidivism was around 62
percent. By 2000, this number had climbed to 68 percent. In short, the ratchet effect alluded to in the
Shaw quote is an important explanation for the continued growth of the prison population throughout
the neoliberal SSA, even once the new forms of labor discipline were firmly established and the sort of
active resistance to wage labor described by Piven and Cloward had largely disappeared. Indeed, recent
work (Dhondt 2010) suggests that crime is positively correlated with incarceration, further
strengthening the argument that a positive-feedback or ratchet effect is present, with increased
incarceration driving further increases.

To what extent has this effect been functional neoliberal capitalism? Perhaps the most

11 From George Bernard Shaw (1946), The Crime of Imprisonment. Was originally written shortly after World War I.
convincing answer comes from the work of Western (1999) and Western and Pettit (1999). Western (1999) argues that “high incarceration rates lower conventional unemployment statistics by hiding joblessness but create pressure for rising unemployment once inmates are released. Sustained low unemployment depends, in part, not just on a large stage intervention through incarceration but on a continuous increase in the magnitude of this intervention”(1053). Western and Pettit argue the point even more strongly. They suggest that the prison population should be added to measured unemployment to provide a more honest and less sanguine picture of the employment performance of the U.S. in the 1980s and 1990s. But they also suggest that although mass incarceration can mask a poor labor market performance in the short run, it is not a long term solution to handling unemployment, since in the long run, social survey data show that incarceration raises unemployment by reducing the job prospects of ex-convicts.

Western (2005) makes a clear and compelling case that mass incarceration has emerged as a new stage in the 'life course' of young, less educated black men. He shows that where a 'normal' life trajectory in the U.S has certain set milestones (school, university, moving away, work, marriage, owning a home, becoming a parent and so on), the pervasiveness of the penal system in particular racially segregated neighborhoods has meant that an alternate and concurrent life course is created for young black men. In other words, the prison system disconnects African-American men from the labor force not just through the direct effect on employment prospects of individuals with a criminal record, but by disrupting the process of socialization that prepares young adults to be part of the labor force under capitalism. Incarceration interrupts and changes the potential for individuals to engage fully in mainstream existence, reinforcing the ratchet effect.

In order to keep Black people down, you hold down large numbers of white people. You can shut down any program in this country saying it is good for Black people. What about welfare? Black people, Black people! The Majority of people on welfare are white. White people don't get benefits because of this. To stop the program you show a Black face. Then they tell you it is Black people's fault.

—John Bracey, *The Cost of Racism to White America*, Greenfield Community College

Glenn Loury (2008) points to an astonishing statistic with respect to race and welfare. Between 1950 and 1965, attitudes towards welfare and attitudes towards race were essentially uncorrelated ($r=0.03$). After 1965, with the passing of the Civil Rights act and the beginning of Great Society legislation, the correlation rose very sharply ($r=0.68$). In other words, welfare began to be seen less as a safety net and more as a subsidy to African Americans in particular, and these attitudes hardened with the end of the postwar SSA. Political scientists have consistently found that the belief that welfare programs disproportionately benefit African-Americans has only become stronger since the mid-1960s. In fact, despite more tolerant attitudes in general among whites, Wilkens and Iceland (2004) show that with respect to welfare reform undertaken in the 1990s, attitudes were as strongly racialized in 2004 as they were a decade earlier.

What are the implications of these attitudes? In an environment where blacks (and later Latinos) are both segregated away from the white population and seen as subsisting off them through transfers, it is perhaps not surprising that resistance to welfare grows and attitudes towards social vulnerabilities become less forgiving. A relatively recent line of research has attempted to see whether these attitudes and the attendant political realignments have led to a "bars vs. butter" dynamic, where social provision is replaced with incarceration. Such a shift in the regulatory functions of the state is consistent with the larger transition from the regulated SSA to the liberal SSA, since the role of the state shifts from including some responsibility for the vulnerable to being more exclusively responsible for the sanctity of private property and production. Some early studies provide some suggestive evidence for the "bars and butters" tradeoff. For example researchers have found that states with more generous welfare programs tend to have lower incarceration rates (Beckett and Western 2001; Fording 2001; Greenberg
and West 2001; Stucky, Heimer, and Lang 2005). Perhaps the most detailed study of this comes from Goutzkow (2006) who examines welfare spending and spending in U.S states for a panel from 1970-2006. He finds very strong evidence that there is a trade-off between the level of resources used for prisons on the one hand and welfare on the other, even though this does not translate directly to differences in the number of individuals on the rolls of each.\textsuperscript{12} Figure 5, drawn from the paper “Bars vs Butter,” shows trends in expenditure on incarceration and welfare. It is clear that around 1980, when the neoliberal SSA was consolidated, spending on incarceration and corrections essentially swapped places with spending on welfare as a way to maintain and control those marginalized from the labor market.

The Justice Mapping Center mapped TANF caseloads and adult men admission to prison for Brooklyn, NY. Figure 6 shows adult men admitted to prison and areas with high concentrations of TANF caseloads. The map visually shows that high concentrations of TANF caseloads are strongly correlated with high concentrations of adult men's incarceration. This is a vivid illustration of how the declining welfare system and expanding criminal justice system target the same geographically-defined poor and non-white populations.

Internationally there exists a negative correlation between welfare spending and incarceration rates. Table 2 shows 18 industrial nations, with incarceration rates and welfare expenditures as a percentage of GDP\textsuperscript{13}. There is a strong negative (-0.49) correlation between incarceration rates and welfare expenditures. Figure 7 shows the incarceration rates and welfare spending in a scatter plot. The U.S. has the highest incarceration rates and the lowest welfare expenditures, but the correlation remains strong even when the U.S. is removed from the data. Figure 8 shows the incarceration and

\textsuperscript{12} As might be expected in a more insecure time, the rolls of both welfare recipients and prisoners rise beginning in 1980 and continue that way until Clinton's welfare reform in 1996.

welfare expenditures in 1988 and 1998. Strikingly the coefficient is much larger in 1998 than in 1988, suggesting a tightening of the substitution of welfare for incarceration over time.

D. Mass incarceration, the Reproduction of Racial Categories and Neoliberal Ideology

Neoliberal ideology is marked by glorification of individual choice, markets, and private property; a view of the state as inherently an enemy of individual freedom and economic efficiency; and an extreme individualist conception of society.

—David Kotz and Terrence McDonough

In addition to its direct role in maintaining labor discipline and substituting for welfare as a tool for marginalized populations, mass incarceration also plays a critical ideological role in the neoliberal SSA. This role is shaped by the history of race in the US, which distinguishes the operation of neoliberalism here from otherwise similar systems elsewhere in the world. More particularly, the role of whiteness as an overarching ideological category winning compliance from the working class means that the end of legally-enforced racial hierarchies in the 1960s posed a major challenge for the legitimation of capitalism in the United States. Mass incarceration has played an essential role as the replacement from the formal discrimination of the Jim Crow era, both as a means of formalizing and enforcing racial boundaries, and as a way of maintaining capitalist hegemony by convincing workers that they share an interest in the defense of property with the ruling class. In this final section, I explore this ideological role, starting from the historical literature on the development and maintenance of whiteness.

Ted Allen, Noel Ignatiev, David Roediger and Alexander Saxton built upon the classic work by C.L.R. James and W.E.B Du Bois to develop a new field of studies referred to as “whiteness” studies. They study the composition of the American working class in the 17th, 18th and 19th century to explain why a section of the working class (the white worker) often sided with the capitalist class against

14 Quote from Kotz and McDonough 2010, page 94
another section of the working class (the Black worker). Race is viewed as a cross-class alliance between the white working class and the capitalist class. Racial oppression exists when the state denies certain rights and privileges to this one section and gives those rights and privileges to another section of the working class in exchange for their alliance to the capitalist class. Anthony Marx argues that this cross-class alliance created the stability needed for growth. “To hold together the nation-state, preserving stability needed for growth, whites were unified across class by race ... Economic interests were subordinated to white racial unity, with this class compromise made explicit and enforced by state policy varying in response to ongoing class tensions” (Marx 1998, 14-15). Stanley Greenberg argues that despite conflicts over the details of racial domination under segregation, “Each [class sector] calls on the state to take control of the subordinate worker, to draw racial lines somewhere in society and economy” (Greenberg 1980, 26-27).

During slavery and Jim Crow, this cross-class alliance was enforced through an explicit juridical system. Race was defined through official state policy. Du Bois wrote that during segregation one does not have to ride “Jim Crow” because one is Black, but instead “the black man is a person who must ride “Jim Crow” in Georgia” (Du Bois 1984, 153). Similarly, one belongs to the white race if one does not have to ride “Jim Crow.” It is important to point to the fact that not all people of African-Americans were slaves or had to ride “Jim Crow.” There were always “free Blacks” and it is an often repeated story that the best way to not have to ride “Jim Crow” was to put on a turban. But a point to the fact that the president of the United States in Black does not mean that race does not exist anymore but instead that Jim Crow is dead. Under the whole racial regime, who had to ride “Jim Crow” defined who was Black and who belonged to the white race. While capitalist accumulation in the United States has always relied on maintaining a cross-class alliance, by the mid-1960s Black struggle had broken down the rules that had defined this cross-class alliance. Thus as “Jim Crow” ceased to be official state policy, there was the need for a new way of maintaining the racial hierarchy
that has always been a condition for the smooth accumulation of capital in the United States.

While race is central to the operation of mass incarceration under the liberal SSA, it plays a broader ideological function as well. The following quote from Karl Marx on transitions in what we now call hegemony gives some insight into this process.

No class of civil society can play this [dominant] role without arousing a moment of enthusiasm in itself and in the masses, a moment in which it fraternizes and merges with society in general, becomes confused with it and is perceived and acknowledged as its general representative, a moment in which its claims and rights are truly the claims and rights of society itself, a moment in which it is truly the social head and the social heart. Only in the name of the general rights of society can a particular class vindicate for itself general domination. For the storming of this emancipatory position, and hence for the political exploitation of all sections of society in the interests of its own section, revolutionary energy and spiritual self-feeling alone are not sufficient. For the revolution of a nation, and the emancipation of a particular class of civil society to coincide, for one estate to be acknowledged as the estate of the whole society, all the defects of society must conversely be concentrated in another class, a particular estate must be the estate of the general stumbling-block, the incorporation of the general limitation, a particular social sphere must be recognized as the notorious crime of the whole of society, so that liberation from that sphere appears as general self-liberation. For one estate to be par excellence the estate of liberation, another estate must conversely be the obvious estate of oppression. The negative general significance of the French nobility and the French clergy determined the positive general significance of the nearest neighboring and opposed class of the bourgeoisie.15

This quote by Marx anticipates very clearly later arguments by Gramsci on hegemony. But the importance of a negative class or common social enemy is notable, since it is not often emphasized in discussions of hegemony. During slavery and “Jim Crow” segregation the social enemy was clearly defined by laws ostensibly meant to defend the white race. But in the post-segregation era, how is the negative class defined? The recomposition of this negative class does not happen in a vacuum, but under the constraints imposed by a changed capitalism, neoliberalism. As applied to neoliberalism, this suggests the importance of establishing criminals as the "estate of oppression" for the bourgeoisie to reestablish hegemony over the working class. The bourgeoisie needs to make private property the general condition of freedom and social existence, since private property is the condition of its own existence. The working class must be made to feel that its own property is under threat, so that it will support the protection of private property as the central function of the state. The criminal then becomes the threat to private property, and increasing fear of loss or violation of property by

15 Quote from Marx 1844, Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right.
"criminals" builds support for the protection of property in general.

At the same time, liberation from formal, legal racial hierarchy does not mean liberation from racial oppression in general. Karl Marx argued that there exists a difference between political emancipation and human emancipation in his 1843 essay “On the Jewish Question” (Tucker 1978). Marx argues that when property is abolished in the public sphere it still thrives in the private sphere, where, under capitalism, real power rests. Olson (2004) argues that the civil rights movement achieved something akin to political emancipation. “Once 'emancipated' from the state, race is cast into the private realm” (Olson 2004, 72). Olson argues that this emancipation of race removed the cross-class alliance from the public sphere into the private sphere. “Rather than eliminating race, the color-blind state makes it prepolitical: it understands race as formed prior to the public sphere through essentially “private” or natural means such as biology, ancestry, culture or even personal choice. ... Nevertheless, transforming race into a prepolitical category does not abolish its political influence” (Olson 2004, 72). Olson argues that in the post-segregation era whiteness is normalized. “Rather than a form of public standing, whiteness in the color-blind state functions as a norm in which racial privilege is sedimented into the background of social life as the “natural outcome” of ordinary practices and individual choices, making it difficult to discern any systematic explanation for the advantages whites continue to enjoy after the civil rights movement” (Olson 2004, 74). Instead of whiteness being reproduced as a form of standing, it is reproduced through processes of normalization in the post-segregation era. This transformation of race into a prepolitical category fits in perfectly with neoliberal ideology since social outcomes now appear to be based on individual choices, or individual wrongdoing in the particular case of crime. But it is critical to understand that this is merely the ideological appearance of the operation of the criminal justice system; in reality, its role in the neoliberal SSA depends precisely on the fact that it both targets and creates populations. In effect, the object of the system is not the crime, but the criminal as an ascriptive category.
In the seminal book, *The New Jim Crow*, lawyer Michelle Alexander (2010) argues that mass incarceration is the way racial categories are reproduced in the contemporary period. Like slavery and Jim Crow, mass incarceration locks “a stigmatized racial group into an inferior position by law and custom” (Alexander 2010, 12). Mass incarceration “is a system that locks people not only behind actual bars in actual prisons, but also behind virtual bars and virtual walls—walls that are invisible to the naked eye but function nearly as effective as Jim Crow laws once did at locking people of color into a permanent second-class citizenship. The term *mass incarceration* refers not only to the criminal justice system but also to the larger web of laws, rules, policies, and customs that control those labeled criminals both in and out of prison. Once released, former prisoners enter a hidden underworld of legalized discrimination and permanent social exclusion” (Alexander 2010, 12-13). The social exclusion and legalized discrimination of these ex-felons is the key for Alexander argument. We can see the extent of this social exclusion on the African-American community if one considers that 12% of Black men between the ages of twenty-five and twenty-nine are currently locked up; that one in three Black men and over half of all those who do not have a high school diploma will go to prison in their lifetimes; that 95% of all those who go to prison will be released back into society. “Black men are more likely to go to prison than to attend college, serve in the military, or, in the case of high school dropouts, be in the labor market (Pager 2007, 3). These social outcomes do not seem as the result of public policy but instead of individual choices. Thus, mass incarceration diverts attention away from a critical evaluation of the institutions and performance of the economic system. By understanding mass incarceration as a central institution which reproduces racial categories in the neoliberal SSA, we can better understand why the working class has swallowed the bitter pill of neoliberal restructuring.

E. Conclusion
The neoliberal social structure of accumulation has been analyzed as unique and particular period of U.S. capitalism, one which has seen the growth of financialization, liberal ideology, imperial reassertion, increasing income inequality, privatization and so on. I have argued that the normal list of features typically misses or glosses over a key aspect of the period—the growth of the mass incarceration complex that functions as a way to manage the bitter social and class conflicts that arise from the particular nature of accumulation. The system dovetails cleanly with the demands of an individualistic capitalism by segregating, controlling and removing large populations—primarily young African-American men who are not otherwise easily accommodated into the capitalist production process. The inequalities generated by neoliberal capitalism fall hardest on these populations who are made increasingly vulnerable and are therefore trapped in a vicious and expanding cycle of poverty and incarceration. Finally, the ideological underpinnings of neoliberalism—an (imagined) individualism and a distrust of government assistance—means that the role of the state is altered from that of providing welfare and support for reintegration into the labor market to simply penalizing and locking up poorer and more vulnerable populations. I show some evidence for this from the relevant statistics. The SSA framework, I have also argued, helps shed light on why the issue is not simply one of another 'racial caste system' (Alexander 2010) to control African-Americans per se, but rather a way in which the distinct class dynamics of neoliberalism are managed.

Such an exercise, however, opens up just as many questions as it answers, and suggests a number of pressing questions for future work. For example, this analysis applies primarily to the U.S case, while neoliberalism is a global phenomenon. Mass incarceration does not seem, on first glance, to be a major institution in other societies to manage class conflict. Is the U.S case simply a social experiment that is
showing the way to other countries as Wacquant (2009) appears to suggest? Does the particular history of racial relations in the U.S make mass incarceration unique to the country in this era? Alternatively, do the longer and deeper traditions of welfare in other advanced industrialized economies make mass incarceration less appealing in these countries? Finally, how might the relationship between mass incarceration and neoliberalism play itself out in the future? As with all previous phases of capitalist growth, this one too runs into increasing contradictions. At the current juncture in the midst of an epochal economic crisis that has threatened it at its core, the neoliberal SSA may be in a process of re-armament or conversely at the beginning of a stage of decay. Whichever way this goes, it will involve some sort of reconfiguration of the role of mass incarceration to calibrate and assuage social conflicts.

Table 1: Characteristics of State Prisoners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Non-White Prisoners</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners with No High School</td>
<td>29.80%</td>
<td>37.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Population with No High School</td>
<td>38.40%</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners Average Personal Income</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>15600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Population Average Personal Income</td>
<td>4445</td>
<td>23857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners with Parent Incarcerated</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>34.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2: Descriptive Statistics on Imprisonment, GDP and Welfare Across Countries, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Imprisonment Ranking</th>
<th>Incarceration Rate</th>
<th>% GDP spent on Welfare</th>
<th>Welfare Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Correlation between Imprisonment rates and Welfare Spending is -.49 with the U.S. and -.43
without the U.S.

Note: This table is drawn from Downes, David and Hansen, Kirstine (2006) Welfare and punishment in comparative perspective. In: Armstrong, Sarah and McAra, Lesley, (eds.) Perspectives on punishment: the contours of control. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 133-154. Incarceration rates are per 100,000 of the population age 15 and above. Welfare score is the proportion of GDP spent in a particular nation-state compared to the mean of all 18 nations. Correlations are author's calculations.
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Note: Census tract 1 is Rikers Island, the NYC jail. 

Figure 2: Map of racial residential segregation in Southern New York City. 
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