

moving beyond an intersectional approach to engage with Indigenous struggles on their own terms. This is, of course, by no means easy, but Walia offers us some ideas about the messy practice of solidarity, the contradictions she has come across in her organizing work with No One is Illegal and ways to think about and deal with the various contradictions and challenges. She encourages non-Natives to both decentre themselves/ourselves so as to learn and to engage from a place of responsibility, rather than a feeling of guilt, but at the same time to recognize our own part in colonial processes and hence our responsibility to participate in processes of decolonization. She ends the chapter with an argument that the process of decolonization requires a move beyond solidarity activism to “a radical terrain of struggle where our common visions for justice do not erase our different social locations, and similarly, that our differing identities do not prevent us from walking together toward transformation and mutual respect” (252). This is but one of the critical lessons this substantial collection of essays has to offer.

McNally, David. 2011. *Monsters of the Market: Zombies, Vampires and Global Capitalism*. Leiden: Brill. ISBN 978-9-00420-157-6. Cloth: 136.00 USD. Pages: 296. [Paperback published in 2012 by Haymarket Books. ISBN 978-1-60846-233-9. 28.00 USD.]

Reviewed by Mark Neocleous
Brunel University

Capitalist society overflows with monsters. The two that most occupy the cultural and political imagination are the vampire and the zombie. David McNally's book explores these and related figures in the dialectic of modernity.

The strengths of the book lie in the way it moves easily across the history of ideas, the critique of political economy, social theory, literary criticism and critical anthropology, and does so in a way which takes in early capitalist formation and the enclosures movement, agrarian riots, industrialization, colonial violence and postcolonial formations. In so doing it does a good job of showing why any analysis of capital really does need to take into account capital's monsters and, conversely, why the analysis of monstrosity really does need to take into account capital. It is insightful, well-written, and for the most part powerfully argued across three core chapters: on *Frankenstein*, political anatomy and the rise of capitalism; on the vampire-capital; and on African vampires in the age of globalisation.

Yet the broad historical scope and the fascinating moves across disciplines generate tensions which run through the central argument of the book.

McNally claims that we must move from the corporeal to the political register of monstrosity, on the grounds that secularization and science brought about a shift away from “corporeal distortion and abnormality” as indicators of monstrosity to other indicators: social behaviour of greed and enclosure on one side and riot and treason on the other. Yet this historical thesis is somewhat undermined by the centrality of the corporeal to the text. For the book is as much about the body politic and its anatomy than anything else: from the body of the hanged, the buying and selling of body parts, through to the discussion of Marx’s “persistent use of body-imagery” – “body of value,” the “body of iron,” the “body of the coat,” and so on. Thus although the monsters of global capitalism might no longer be the deformed bodies of pre-modernity, they are nonetheless still very corporeal in their monstrosity. When one writes about monstrosity it is almost impossible not to write about the body.

Likewise, when one writes about monstrosity it is almost impossible not to sound like one is writing cultural studies. That in itself is a problem as McNally seeks to distance his argument from “postmodern cultural” accounts of monstrosity which “lack a critical theory of capitalism” and which tend to simply be on the side of the monstrous “Other.” Yet despite McNally’s own powerfully argued insistence that we must root the monstrous in the political economy of capital, he nonetheless sometimes sounds as though he wants to be writing “postmodern cultural” analyses. Thus, for example, the view of *Frankenstein* as a warning to the ruling class of the monster it has created – “the Luddite revolts and the repression they induced are pivotal to the context in which *Frankenstein* took shape;” Shelly drew upon a “rich tradition of popular rebellion,” etc – is surely in tension with the claim that “Victor Frankenstein’s troubles originate with the death of his mother,” and it is a tension that is never worked out. The strong reading of the Frankenstein monster as a *monster of the market* is somewhat undermined by veering into the very ritual codes of the cultural studies industry from which McNally seeks to simultaneously distance himself. This tension is even more pronounced in the chapter on African vampires.

This in turn generates an additional problem. The book is a strong statement of Marxist categories and their applicability to the study of the monsters of capital and, likewise, an equally strong account of why Marx himself was interested in the monstrous, especially the vampire-capital. McNally is surely right to suggest that “part of the genuine radicalism of Marx’s critical theory resides in its insistence on tracking and naming the monsters of modernity,” and cites Franco Moretti’s suggestion that “the literature of terror is born out of terror of a split society and out of the desire to heal it.” But is “healing” really the communist project as envisaged by Marx? Similarly, the “subjugation and exploitation” imposed on human beings by capital are described here as “genuinely traumatic.” But surely the problem of capital is not that it *traumatizes* us. Such claims

sound more like “postmodern cultural” studies than Marxism. For Marxism, the problem of exploitation is the problem of exploitation; it is not the *trauma* of exploitation or alienation that is the issue. (For, otherwise, there is a very easy capitalist and therapeutic solution: let’s ensure that people have the chance to work through their traumas).

Early in the book McNally suggests that not all monsters are equal, and that we need to differentiate distinct forms of monstrosity. The intention is to distinguish between the zombie as a beast of burden, crushed by work, mercilessly exploited and thus a life destroyed, and the vampire, constantly sucking the blood of the living and thus destroying lives. Yet this distinction is sometimes confused by the fact that McNally keeps getting attracted by other forms of monstrosity or cognate issues which don’t easily fit into this frame. Thus the monster motif is meant to “equip us with a form of night-vision that illuminates the neoliberal world of wild money.” But is “wildness” the same as monstrosity? This problem is skirted over, but wildness is then used as an opening for a discussion of the shift from the gold standard to derivatives and forms the basis of a discussion of Enron as a case-study in the “occult economy of late capitalism.” But is the occult the same as the wild? Likewise, “occult economy” includes not just Enron’s derivatives but also the recent genre of urban African witchcraft-tales and an analysis of beliefs in “economic witchcraft.” “Occult economy” and “economic witchcraft” are being made to do rather a lot of work as categories and do not fit easily into the zombie versus vampire frame. Moreover, the African peoples discussed here believe in the occult economy in a way in which the subjects of the western world don’t, at least as far as their own conscious and deliberate practices would suggest. Hence the attempt to locate the vampire within the African witchcraft genre more widely does not really succeed; one senses the monstrous motifs getting out of McNally’s own control.

There is also a noticeable absence of an engagement with the concept of the undead. Only when he introduces the zombie does McNally get around to addressing the fact that one of the underlying facts about the monstrous is that they are the “living dead.” McNally deals with this in relation to the zombie yet never addresses this in relation to the vampire. Yet the whole point of the vampire is that it is an undead creature. Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* was published with that title in June 1897, but even as late as the end of May that year he was still using his working title for the novel: *The Un-Dead*. And this undead nature of the vampire is crucial to Marx’s use of the vampire to understand capital as (un)dead labour. This is never explored by McNally, and hence an opportunity to pursue the contrasting nature of these monsters is rather lost.

One might note this loss of opportunity in another way. Edmund Burke’s use of the monstrous is said to be “significant for mobilising plebeian anxieties about grave-robbing and dissection,” and “mobilising popular idioms.” The justification provided for this is Burke’s occasional reference to tombs. But there is a far more likely source of Burke’s imagery, lying in Burke’s own politics of the dead. Burke famously argued that if society is a contract then the contract must in part be with the dead as well as those yet to

be born. The monster of revolution might be a problem for Burke, then, because the monster is undead and thus somehow breaks what is implicit in our contract with the dead: that the dead do live on, but only as national tradition and not as revolution.

This mention of Burke points to a more general problem. McNally suggests that Mary Shelly recoiled from the ugliness of the monster, but that working-class radicals would come to *affirm* proletarian monstrosity in a way that would be claimed by Marx. “Part of the genuine radicalism of Marx’s critical theory resides in its insistence on tracking and naming the monsters of modernity.” That might be true, but Marxism is hardly the only politics to try and track and name the monsters of modernity (see my own *The Monstrous and the Dead*, University of Wales Press, 2005). Burke’s work is replete with monsters – far more than is alluded to by McNally and possibly far more even than Marx. And it might equally be said that fascism also seeks to track and name what it sees as the monsters of modernity. Marx was far from alone in thinking politically about the monstrous.

Eagleton, Terry. 2011. *Why Marx Was Right*. New Haven: Yale University Press. ISBN 978-0-300-18153-1. Paperback: 16.00 USD. Pages: 258.

Reviewed by Charles Post

Borough of Manhattan Community College, City University of New York

During the years of “high neo-liberalism” – from approximately 1979 to the early years of the twenty-first century – capitalism seemed politically and ideologically unassailable. Under the banner “There is No Alternative,” pro-capitalist politicians and “public intellectuals” (or more accurately apologists) proclaimed that the “free market system” was not only the best of all possible worlds, but the inevitable outcome of all of human history. In this period, no thinker was subject to more vilification, falsification or condescending disregard than Karl Marx. Marxism was dismissed as “outdated” and “naive” at best, if not a nefarious theory that had only produced tyranny, poverty and human misery on a mass scale. Even on the left, Marx’s theories were rejected as variants of Enlightenment thinking with its totalitarian “grand narrative,” in favour of new variants of idealism and causal pluralism – post-structuralism and post-modernism.

The neo-liberal consensus began to unravel in the mid and late 1990s as the Zapatista rebellion in Mexico against the North American Free Trade Agreement, the mass strikes in defence of public pensions in France and the rise of the global justice