



嘉宾：杰米·派克（Jamie Peck），英属哥伦比亚大学地理学教授，制度政治经济学家

采访：徐南南，英属哥伦比亚大学城市规划系博士生

Breaking away from the Debilitating Market/State Dichotomy: Interviewing Professor Jamie Peck on Political Economy and Karl Polanyi

打破害人的“政府/市场”二元概念 ——杰米·派克教授谈政治经济学和卡尔·波兰尼

Jamie Peck is an institutional political economist, working on a range of issues relating to economic geography, urban restructuring, labor regulation, and statecraft. Much of his research is concerned with the ways in which ostensibly global processes—for example, forms of market-oriented governance (a.k.a. neoliberalization)—are (re)made through local sites, distanced networks, and grounded practices. He is currently working on the restructuring of contingent employment regimes, the dynamics of “fast policy,” and the fiscal transformation of the local state.

杰米·派克教授是制度政治经济学家，研究领域包括经济地理学、城市结构转型、劳工政策和国家治理。其研究关注所谓的全球化过程，如市场化改革（也称新自由主义化），如何影响地方、跨距离网络和当地实践。他近期的研究包括临时就业结构的转型、“快政策”的机制以及地方政府的财政结构转变。

Jamie Peck=JP, 徐南南=NX

NX: What does ‘political economy’ mean? Could you explain to Chinese planners the difference between political economy and the disciplines of economics and political science?

什么是“政治经济学”？可否给我们解释一下政治经济学与经济学和政治学的区别？

JP: To my mind, political economy denotes a critical and reflexive approach to economic analysis, one that is especially attentive to the role of power relations, social context, and institutions. Rather than treating “the economy” as a separate and autonomous sphere, with its own logic and laws of motion, political economists favor more “integral” modes of analysis in which the boundaries between the state and the market, for example, are neither fixed nor clear cut. The sharpest distinctions, in this respect, are to be drawn with neoclassical or orthodox economics, with its emphasis on rational action, utility maximization, and competitively induced equilibrium, which is really predicated on the idea of a singular and quite separate economy, governed by market forces. Political economy, in contrast, is a heterodox and pluralist field focused on an object of analysis, the economy, which is understood to be geographically diverse and

historically changeable. And rather than some separate sphere, with its own logic and laws of motion, the economy is also understood from this “integral” perspective as a socially embedded and institutionally regulated phenomenon.

在我看来，政治经济学是研究经济问题的一种批评性和反思性的方法，它特别关注权力关系、社会背景和制度的作用。政治经济学不把“经济”当作一个具有内在逻辑和运动规律的独立而自发的领域。相反，政治经济学家用整体的观点看待经济，认为国家和市场之间的边界既不是清晰的也不是不变的。在这一点上，政治经济学和新古典主义（或称主流经济学）大相径庭。后者强调理性行为、效用最大化、竞争导致均衡等，这些观点建立在经济是独立而分离的领域，由市场力量所主导。政治经济学与之相反，是非主流且多元的，其分析的对象——经济，被认为是地理上多样的，而在历史中是不断变迁的。并且，经济被认为是嵌入于社会中，并被各种制度所规制的现象。

Heterodox political economists—such as feminist economists, economic sociologists, (many) institutional and evolutionary economists, economic anthropologists, economic geographers—while they may disagree on some things and will often have different explanatory priorities, tend to have more in common with one another than with mainstream, neoclassical economists. This is not only when it comes to modes of analysis (there is less reliance methodological individualism, less formal modeling, not so much faith in quantification), but also to basic understandings of the economy itself (which political economists tend to see as a space of enduring power asymmetries and social contestation, and not necessarily trending towards equilibrium but instead buffeted by crises and by cumulative processes of restructuring). Overall, one might say that political economists are more prepared to confront complexity and contradiction in what they see as ongoing and indeterminate processes of economic transformation, much less likely to rely on simplified templates, like an idealized market economy in which social contexts and power relations are practically irrelevant, while the state is conceptualized as either absent or “interfering.”

各种政治经济学流派，如女性主义经济学、经济社会学、各种制度主义经济学、经济人类学、经济地理学等，虽然有许多观点不一样，但它们之间的相同性要大于它们与主流的新古典主义经济学的相同性。这种不同一方面是在研究方法上的（如更不依赖个体主义方法论，更少的数理模型，更不相信定量分析），另一方面是对于经济本身的理解。政治经济学家认为经济是一个持续的权力不平等和斗争的所在，并不必然会形成均衡，而是充满了危机和重建。总之，可以说政治经济学更有助于解释复杂性和矛盾，因为这些在政治经济学看来都是经济变革中持续而不可预测的过程。政治经济学不依赖简化的模型。在这样的模型中，市场经济就是一种社会背景和权力关系都不相干，政府要么不在场要么来“干预”的理想化状态。

Political economy is properly an interdisciplinary concern, in my view, so therefore it ought to have a presence not only inside economics departments and political science departments, but also history departments, geography departments, sociology departments, urban studies and planning programs. This said, political economy in the heterodox, critical sense that I have described above has not been flourishing in leading economics and political science programs in the Anglo-American world, which for a long time have favored more orthodox and rational-choice approaches to the exclusion of others. This is regrettable, particularly when it comes to economics proper, which pays insufficient attention to its own histories and geographies, and to alternative and multiple readings of the economic.

政治经济学是一个多学科的领域。所以它应当不仅仅存在于经济系或者政治系，而且也应当属于历史系、地理系、社会学系、城市研究和规划等。尽管如此，像我描述的这种政治经济学并不是盎格鲁-撒克逊世界经济系和政治系的主流，它们依然更偏爱主流经济学和理性选择路径。这很令人遗憾，特别是对于经济学而言。经济系对于它们本学科的历史和经济的地理背景都缺乏足够的关注，并缺少

NX: In China, political economists are usually in the departments of economics or Marxist research. But in the Anglo-American academia, we see many political economists being geographers, like you and David Harvey. Is that because geographers become political economists, or political economists become geographers? How did this happen?

中国研究政治经济学往往是在经济系或马克思主义学院。但在盎格鲁-撒克逊世界，政治经济学家往往是地理学家，比如您和大卫·哈维。是地理学家变成了政治经济学家还是政治经济学与地理结合了起来？这是怎样的一个过程？

对经济的多样化解读。

JP: Political economy (again, in the quite heterodox sense) has been the dominant current in economic geography since the early 1980s, initially under the influence of formative contributions from Doreen Massey, David Harvey and others working with neo-Marxist approaches. In the decades since, the field of economic geography has been repeatedly remade through contributions from feminism, institutionalism, post-structuralism and more, albeit never to the point of repudiating the legacies of the 1980s (and the so-called “restructuring” approach, based on core concepts like the spatial division of labor, with its emphasis on a more grounded understanding of regional transformations). As a result, there are many varieties of spatialized political economy in contemporary economic geography, and what Eric Sheppard calls “geographical political economy” arguably still defines the principal terrain for the field. This said, the past two decades have witnessed a resurgence in more orthodox and even neoclassical approaches to economic geography (sometimes known as “geographical economics”), so this is a more contested terrain than before.

从二十世纪八十年代初开始，政治经济学就成为了经济地理界的主流思潮。这是受到多琳·马西（Doreen Massey）、大卫·哈维（David Harvey）等新马克思主义者的带动。从那以后，经济地理学界一直被各种其他思潮所塑造，比如女性主义、制度主义、后结构主义等等，但八十年代的主流一直没有被撼动。这个主流不仅包括新马克思主义，也包括所谓的“转型”视角，即强调对空间劳动分工和对区域性变迁的认识。结果就是当代经济地理学界出现了多元化的空间政治经济学。埃里克·谢帕德（Eric Sheppard）所谓的“地理政治经济学”或许仍然主导这一领域，但称之为“地理经济学”的，采用主流甚至新古典主义经济学的研究路径，也有回潮之势。

One might therefore say that geographers “became” political economists beginning in the 1970s, and in the period since they have become different kinds of political economists, albeit still in a very geographical way. On the other hand, I would say that the wider field (or project) of political economy, outside the field of geography proper, has remained relatively impervious to “spatial” arguments and frameworks, which have not traveled as far as they might have done (indeed should have done!). Here I am thinking of the kinds of scholarship in various traditions of political economy that one encounters in sociology, anthropology, gender studies, and development studies, as well as in (some) political science and (some) economics departments. Methodological nationalism, for example, continues to hold sway across much of this diverse field of heterodox political economy outside the immediate influence of geographical scholarship, while geographers’ arguments about scale and relationality have only had limited purchase. While there was a noticeable “spatial turn” in cultural studies during the 1990s, there has yet to be a thoroughgoing spatial turn in political economy. Taking history seriously, taking institutions seriously, taking social embeddedness seriously ... these are all quite axiomatic positions across the field of heterodox political economy. One cannot (yet!) say the same about taking geography (along with questions of space and scale) seriously, however, which in large part remains the preserve of card-carrying Geographers. This said, there are projects in (economic) geography proper that are continuing to articulate a case for spatializing political economy in more general terms, including some of the work in evolutionary economic geography, and recent contributions under the rubrics of variegated capitalism and uneven development.

应当说自七十年代以来，地理学家逐渐“变成”了政治经济学家。他们的政治经济学观点各不相同，但总体来看都保持着地理学的关切。另一方面，我得说地理学界

以外的政治经济学领域并没怎么接受我们的“空间的”研究思路。他们实在是应该接受一些！对于在社会学、人类学、性别研究、发展研究，以及部分政治系、经济系见到的那些政治经济学研究来说，以国家为分析单位的方法论被广泛接受，但是地理学家们关于尺度和空间相对性的论调影响还十分有限。尽管九十年代在文化研究领域形成了“关注空间”的新趋势，而政治经济学领域并未出现彻底的转向。历史的视角、制度的视角、社会嵌入性的视角……这些都在政治经济学的各种流派中影响力巨大。至于地理的视角，却主要还限于地理学者自己的小圈子（空间的、尺度的同理）。在经济地理学中，我们仍在推动政治经济学的空间化，涉及演进经济地理学、多变的资本主义和非均衡发展等。

Based on a sympathetic critique of the “varieties of capitalism” framework associated principally with political science and economic sociology, the variegated capitalism approach seeks to balance an understanding of the interactions, interdependencies, and integrating tendencies in globalizing capitalism with an appreciation of its spatial, scalar, and situated dynamics. With varieties of capitalism scholars, it rejects the idea of a single, universal capitalism, but it is more skeptical of the value of ideal types, especially where these refer to an imagined spectrum running from “more” to “less” regulated versions capitalism, or from German to Anglo-American capitalism. An obvious point is that China does not easily fit into this schema! But rather than treating China as a variant of (Western) capitalism, on the one hand, or as an unclassifiable, exceptional case on the other, the variegated capitalism approach seeks to locate the Chinese model in relation to, and in connection with, its others. Principles of the variegated capitalism approach include the following: (a) rather than clearly demarcated (ideal) types, local as well as national capitalisms occupy distinctive (relative) positions within an unevenly developed and interconnected world system; (b) this state of mutual interdependence means that they cannot be defined solely according to “internal” institutional characteristics, but must be understood in relation to their others; and (c) never pure, actually existing capitalisms are always “mixed” economies, combining and synthesizing features often associated with different so-called models.

在政治学和经济社会学的“多元资本主义”研究框架下，多变资本主义的视角试图平衡地关注到全球化资本主义的相互作用、相互依赖和整合趋势与地域性、尺度性和情景化的动态过程。与“多元资本主义”相同，多变资本主义不认为有唯一的、普世的资本主义形态，但是它也质疑典型形态的价值。所谓典型形态，就是认为有一个资本主义的光谱，从光谱一端的盎格鲁-撒克逊资本主义到另一端的德意志资本主义，政府管制的程度由浅入深。一个典型的例子就是中国，中国放不进这个光谱中！不过我们既不认为中国是（西方式）资本主义的变种，也不认为它是一个无法分类的案例，而是希望把中国模式和其他资本主义生产方式的关系、联系讲清楚。多变资本主义的原理有如下几个：第一，地方和国家的资本主义生产方式在非均衡却相互联系的世界系统中具有独特性；第二，这种相互依赖性的特点意味着一地的生产方式无法完全由“内在的”体制特点决定，而是必须放在和其他地方的关系中来理解；第三，所谓“资本主义”从来不是一个纯粹的生产方式，而是“混合经济”，融合着其他的模式。

NX: You have been doing researches and publishing a lot about neoliberalism. Can you briefly explain what neoliberalism is and how this differs from ‘neoliberalization’? 您一直研究新自由主义。可否简要介绍一下新自由主义，以及它与“新自由主义化”的关系？

JP: Conventionally, “neoliberalism” refers to a combination of the free market and the small state, although more in ideological discourse than in reality. In policy terms, it is associated with privatization, free trade, low taxes, and corporate-friendly regulation. I have long made the argument that the study of “neoliberalization,” as an ongoing and contradictory process of state-facilitated marketization, should take precedence over conceptions of “neoliberalism” as a system, order or era. If we are to understand the word “neoliberal” to designate a variegated form of market rule, then from my perspective it is more

appropriate to apply this to the process of regulatory transformation itself, not some presumed “outcome” like a regime. And if we think in such processual terms, a distinction can be drawn between two moments in the movement of neoliberalization, which speak to its creatively destructive character: there is a “roll-back” moment, in which the target is the dissolution of alternative institutions and modes of regulation (such as welfarist, state-socialist, or developmental state structures) and which is often portrayed in terms of privatization or deregulation, and there is a “roll-out” moment, which is neoliberalism’s own institution-building moment, involving often improvised or experimental forms of market-complementing governance. In practice, these two moments are not so easily separable, although in the Anglo-American world the roll-back or deregulatory moment was the dominant one during the 1980s, while various programs of roll-out neoliberalization, characterized by repeated crises, overruns, and unmanaged contradictions have in the decades since acquired a kind of hegemony in many parts of the world.

一般来说，“新自由主义”意味着自由市场加小政府，这更多是一种意识形态的话语体系而远非事实。在政策层面，它意味着私有化、自由贸易、低税率和公司友好型政府管制。我一直呼吁对于“新自由主义化”的研究应当优先于对“新自由主义”这一概念、系统、秩序和时代的研究，因为“新自由主义化”是一个持续的、矛盾的国家推动的市场化过程。如果我们把“新自由主义”理解为不同形态的市场规则，那么在我看来，更应当应用到体制改革的过程，而不是某些预想的“结果”。如果这么理解的话，那实际上“新自由主义化”从它创造性破坏的角度出发可以分为两种不同的形态。一种是“撤回”式，旨在去除既有的体制，比如福利国家、国家社会主义或者发展型国家等，典型的政策是私有化和去除管制。另一种是“展开”式，它是“新自由主义”建构自己的过程，也就是那些即兴的或规划而成的完善市场机制的治理实践。在实践中，这两种形态是密不可分的。八十年代以来的盎格鲁-撒克逊世界中，“撤回”式的发展是主导。但近几十年的世界各地的情况是“展开”式为主，特点是反复出现的危机和失控的矛盾状态。

Thinking of neoliberalization in processual terms, as opposed to a static idea of neoliberalism, also implies that one should not seek, or expect to find, clear-cut cases either of “pure” or absent neoliberalism. As a transformative process, style of governance, or tendency in regulatory restructuring, neoliberalization has some kind of presence in much of the world at the present time. As a result, it should be analyzed in qualitative terms, in shades of gray, rather than in terms of black-and-white simplifications—as if neoliberal governance represents the natural order in some parts of the world, while being alien or absent elsewhere. As a promiscuous mode of governance, “neoliberalism” is itself present in all kinds of combinations and configurations, which coexist and interpenetrate in complex ways. In turn, this multiplicity of “local” forms of neoliberalism shapes the “meta” or more-than-the-sum-of-the-parts character of “global” neoliberalism. This is why I advocate the study of neoliberalization between or across social formations, institutions, regions, and so forth, rather than just as an “internal” characteristic of particular countries or regimes. Several implications follow from this. First, it is a mistake to reduce neoliberalism just to one original, pure or dominant model. Second, neoliberalism’s varied and variegated form can only be revealed in such “patterned” ways, across multiple sites and situations. And third, these differences in connection constitute the basis of an emergent, “global” form of neoliberalism, which should not be read unilaterally, as a top-down imposition, but as more than the sum of its diverse parts.

考察作为过程的“新自由主义化”而不是关注静止概念的“新自由主义”，也意味着不要一刀切地认为新自由主义存在或者就不存在。作为一个变革过程、治理形态和管制调整，新自由主义化在世界各地都有存在。其结果就是，应当质地地分析而

不是非黑即白地看待——不应当认为新自由主义的治理模式代表世界某些地方的自然状态，而对于其他地区则是陌生的或不存在的。作为治理模式的混杂的过程，“新自由主义”代表了各种不同的政策和制度组合，以复杂的方式共存和相互渗透。另一方面，这种多元化的新自由主义的地方形态也代表着超越各部分之加总的“全球性”新自由主义。这就是为什么我主张要研究超越社会形态、体制、区域等的新自由主义化，而不是把它理解为某些国家或某种政治制度下的特色。这样就有几个推论：一是不能把新自由主义还原为某种纯粹单一的模式；二是新自由主义的多元和多变形态的共性只能通过比较不同具体情况来揭示；三是这些相互联系的不同情况构成了新自由主义的“全球”形态，它不是一个单一维度的自上而下的布置过程，而是各个组成部分的总合。

NX: In your 2013 paper with Professor Zhang, ‘A variety of capitalism... with Chinese characteristics?’, you conclude with ‘Karl Polanyi in Beijing’. Who is Karl Polanyi? Why is his perspective useful to understand the Chinese political economy?

在您2013年和张军教授合著的《资本主义的多元化……中国特色？》一文中，您的结论是“波兰尼在北京”。波兰尼是谁？为什么他的观点对于理解中国的政治经济学很有意义？

JP: Karl Polanyi (1886-1964) was in some ways the epitome of a heterodox political economist, being variously read as a social theorist, an institutional economist, an economic historian, an economic anthropologist, an economic sociologist, and (more generously) as an economic geographer. There is some debate about whether Polanyi was a Marxist or post-Marxist thinker, but I think that any attempt to pigeon-hole him reduces the power and scope of his insights which were original, potent, and post-disciplinary in their implications. Above all, perhaps, he was a critic of market fundamentalism, as Fred Block and Margaret Somers have always emphasized in their work in the Polanyian tradition. He resisted the practice of imposing a singular “market shape of things” both in economic analysis and in economic policy. For Polanyi, all economies are variegated, hybrid economies, composites of (market) exchange, (state) redistribution and reciprocal systems; he was one of the original theorists of the “diverse” economy. These insights are useful in breaking away from the debilitating market/state dichotomy, for example, in which these are typically presented as mutually independent, antithetical, or antipodean phenomena, as they underscore the importance, instead, of analyzing actually existing economic formations, “mixed” economies, and different combinations of state-and-market. This is especially relevant in the Chinese case, which exhibits both prodigious state capacities and extensive marketization, since it is the complex coexistence of these forms that we need to understand in that case, not to presume that one unilaterally governs or effectively overrides the other.

卡尔·波兰尼（1886-1964）是正面反击正统经济学的典型代表。他有许多头衔：社会理论家、制度经济学家、经济史学家、经济人类学家、经济社会学家，以及（更普遍意义上的）经济地理学家。波兰尼是否是马克思主义者或者后马克思主义思想家，有争议；但是我认为任何把他硬性归类的做法都贬低了其求思之深之广的洞察力。他的思想其实是超越学科分界的。正如弗雷德·布洛克（Fred Block）和玛格丽特·萨默斯（Margaret Somers）在他们波兰尼主义的著作中所强调的，他首先是市场原教旨主义的批判者。波兰尼反对用市场分析来进行所有的经济研究和经济政策制定。对波兰尼来说，经济体永远是多变的、混合的，包括（市场的）交换、（政府的）再分配和互惠等经济模式。他是“多元”经济理论的创始人之一。这些观点有助于打破既有的市场/国家的二分法，这种二分法认为政府和市场是相互独立的、矛盾的、二元的现象。而波兰尼则认为应当强调分析实际存在的经济现象、“混合式”经济、不同的市场和政府的组合。这一观点对于我们理解中国特别有价值。中国的特点是强大的政府干预和广泛的市场化同时存在。我们应当去解释这种共存的复杂性而不是带着既成的观点去评判政府和市场哪一个更胜于另一个。

Polanyi was an institutionalist but one who nevertheless placed particular emphasize on understanding the sphere of exchange, market systems, and what he called “market societies.” In contrast to orthodox Marxism, he did not theorize from the point of production, the profit motive, or from the ownership of the means of production, but focused instead on the market/state nexus, in its many historical

and geographical configurations. He would not have been quick to declare that the Chinese case was sui generis or exceptional, but neither would he have been content to slot it into a universalist or teleological framework. Rather, I think that he would have regarded it as a historically important “combinatorial” formation, as a significant location in the contemporary grid of economic difference and interdependence.

波兰尼是制度主义者，但很关注经济的交换领域、市场系统，以及他所谓的“市场社会”。不同于马克思主义，他不从生产的角度出发，不研究利润的动机或者生产资料的所有制，而是关注市场和社会的联系，及其在不同历史和空间条件下的形态。他如果研究中国，不会认为中国是独具一格或具有例外性，而是把它看作当代国际经济相互依赖之下的一个历史性的组合形式。

The project that Polanyi was launching in the final years of his life, which he called “comparative economy,” and which we might today associate with the research program of economic geography, consequently stands to be enriched by the close and critical study of the Chinese case. For Polanyi, the project of comparative economy was about not only documenting but widening what he called “the areas of fruitful comparison.” What he had in mind was for economic anthropologists and economic historians to work together on this project, but to this list one would surely today add economic geography, economic sociology, feminist economics, political ecology, and indeed the entire field of heterodox political economy. (Polanyi’s methodological approach might even enable the belated “spatial turn” in heterodox political economy that I referred to earlier.) Finally, Polanyi also advocated what he called “substantivism,” the analysis of actually existing economic formations, past and present and in all their variety, over the formalism of orthodox economics. I remain convinced that this should serve as the remit not just for economic geography, but for heterodox political economy more generally.

波兰尼晚年开启了“比较经济”的研究议程，我们今天认为是跟经济地理学的研究框架相关。对于中国的深入和批判性的研究将极大地丰富这一议程的内涵。对于波兰尼来说，比较经济不仅要记录而且要扩展他称之为“有价值的比较”的研究领域。他希望的是经济人类学家和经济史学家在这个领域上通力合作，但现在来看还得加上如下这些学科：经济地理学、经济社会学、女性经济学、政治生态学以及整个政治经济学领域。（波兰尼的研究视角也许还有助于向政治经济学引入我之前所讲的地理的空间路径）最后，波兰尼也推崇他所谓的“实质主义”研究路径，这一路径相对于正统经济学而言更强调对于实际存在的经济形成过程、过去和现在以及其各种变化的研究。我很确定，这（研究实际的经济问题）仍是经济地理学的使命，更是更广泛意义上的政治经济学的使命。✎

责任编辑：刘晓玲