

- Theory Section Miniconference
- Book and Journal Announcements
- Call for Papers

- Space & Social Theory
- Willer Responds to Turner
- Marx on Globalization

**THE ASA
THEORY
SECTION
NEWSLETTER**

April 2002

Perspectives

VOLUME 25, NUMBER 2

Section Officers

CHAIR

Gary Alan Fine

CHAIR-ELECT

Linda D. Molm

PAST CHAIR

Douglas Heckathorn

SECRETARY-TREASURER

Murray Webster

COUNCIL

Robert J. Antonio

Jorge Arditi

Edward J. Lawler

Cecilia L. Ridgeway

Robin Stryker

Robin Wagner-Pacifi

SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY

EDITOR

Jonathan Turner

PERSPECTIVES EDITORS

J. David Knottnerus &

Jean Van Delinder

Submit news and commentary to:

J. David Knottnerus and

Jean Van Delinder

Department of Sociology

CLB 006

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, OK 74078-4062

(see inside for phone, fax, & e-mail)

Message from the Chair

Theory Section Miniconference: Sociological Theory and Empirical Research

Gary Alan Fine, Northwestern University

Once again at the 2002 Chicago ASA meetings the Theory Section will sponsor its now traditional mini-conference. This year the section has arranged three sessions dealing with "Sociological Theory and Empirical Research," an important and somewhat controversial topic. Often sociologists perceive - justly or not - a grand divide between scholars who do "research" and those who are "theorists" (sometimes denigrated as "only theorists"). Such a claim is like many claims both partly true and partly (mostly?) false. Some theorists focus on reading texts (which, too, might be considered research) and others synthesize their worldly experience in webs of subtle argumentation without a narrowly defined research topic or "site." In fact, theorists in general and members of the section in particular are deeply and prominently involved in empirical research endeavors. The methodologies selected range across the full range of methodologies used by those who do not claim the label of theorist: whether they, too, are theorists is a question best held for other venues.

See **MINICONFERENCE** on page 2

When Cultures Collide: Marx's Notes on Globalization

David N. Smith, University of Kansas

Rumors of Marx's intellectual death have flown freely in the nearly twelve decades since his physical demise, at the age of 64, in 1883. And just as often, Marx's disciples call these rumors exaggerated.

New cycles in this debate often pivot around new texts. As early as 1898, not long after the unfinished third volume of *Capital* appeared, the eminent socialist Eduard Bernstein argued that the very incompleteness of Marx's work testified "eloquently" to its inadequacy. Rosa Luxemburg, among others, objected. But fresh evidence on the subject remained scarce until the 1920s, when a new cycle of debate was spurred by the triumph of Social Democracy in Germany and Bolshevism in Russia. Now

See **MARX** on page 7

MINICONFERENCE *from page 1*

I contend that empirical research is and should be central to the doing of theory. To this end, I have requested that three of our prominent members - Michele Lamont, Murray Webster, and James Chriss organize sessions on the linkage of sociological theory and empirical research. Michele Lamont has organized a panel that deals with qualitative and historical research traditions and their relationship to theory. Murray Webster's panel covers formal, mathematical, and experimental research. Jim Chriss has selected the papers that were contributed for our open session into a general session on theory and research. As is usual in this case, he received many more fine papers than could be accommodated, and so the Theory Section Roundtables, organized by Jorge Ardit, include some of the overflow on the same theme.

While the mini-conference is as diverse as might be expected, given the membership of the section, and while some speakers talk about the theory of methodology and others present empirical research, the central thrust about the relationship between theory and empirical social science is sure to raise critical questions that theorists of all perspectives can debate.

In addition to the three mini-conference panels, I have arranged a fourth panel, "Theorizing Morality: Assessing the Contributions of Philip Rieff." I admit to some measure of special pleading in this selection in that Rieff was my theory teacher while I was an undergraduate at the University of Pennsylvania. His So-

cratic method of interrogating theory was an approach that I found compelling, if filled with challenge and some measure of intellectual danger. Add to this, the fact that my father was a Freudian analyst, and Rieff's *Freud: The Mind of the Moralizer* and *The Triumph of the Therapeutic* were personally liberating texts. As theorists, we are continually in danger of forgetting our brilliant colleagues, and it is our responsibility to insure that the contributions of past generations are not erased: a message that our students will do well to recall.

"Mini-Conference I: Sociological Theory and Empirical Research: Qualitative Approaches"

Chair: Michele Lamont, Princeton University

Papers:

"Evidence and the Explanation of Action" - Richard Biernacki, University of California at San Diego and the Center for Advanced Research in the Behavioral Sciences

"Manufacturing Numbers" - Wendy Nelson Espeland, Northwestern University, and Mitchell L. Stevens, Hamilton College

"Categories and Criteria of Evaluation of Research Proposals in the Social Sciences and the Humanities." - Michele Lamont, Joshua Guetzkow and Gregoire Mallard, Princeton University

"On Poems, Novels, and Numbers: A Study of Bourgeois Virtues." - Deirdre N. McCloskey, University of Illinois at Chicago

Discussant: Margaret R. Somers, University of Michigan

See **MINICONFERENCE** *on page 4*

Journal Announcement***The Responsive Community: Rights and Responsibilities***

The Responsive Community: Rights and Responsibilities is offering a special subscription rate to readers of the *Perspectives* Newsletter—a one-year subscription for \$20, or a two-year subscription for \$30. The regular prices are \$27 and \$48, respectively.

The Responsive Community is an intellectual quarterly journal which tackles a wide range of social, moral and legal issues, typically from a communitarian viewpoint. Articles in recent issues include: Jean Bethke Elshtain on the just war tradition, Amitai Etzioni on legislating morality, Amy Goldstein and Roberto Suro on assimilation in American society, Laurence Tribe on a constitutional response to terrorism, and Alan Wolfe on the future of American society.

For more information about the journal, feel free to visit our website at

<http://www.gwu.edu/~ccps/rcq>

To receive a sample issue, or for more information about ordering *The Responsive Community*, please contact Deirdre Mead at dmead@gwu.edu or 202-994-3008 and be sure to mention this announcement in the *Perspectives* Newsletter. Or send a check payable to *The Responsive Community*, along with your mailing address and a copy of this announcement to The Responsive Community, 2130 H Street NW, Suite 703, Washington, DC 20052.

Perspectives is the newsletter of the Theory Section of the American Sociological Association. It is published quarterly in January, April, July, and October. The deadline for all submissions is the fifth day of the month before publication. We welcome news and commentary as well as announcements about conferences, journal information, calls for papers, position openings, and any other information of interest to section members.

Send submissions to: J. David Knottnerus and Jean Van Delinder, Department of Sociology, CLB 006, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078-4062; fax (405) 744-5780; phone (405) 744-6106 (Knottnerus) or (405) 744-4613 (Van Delinder); e-mail jdk2307@okstate.edu or jlvan@okstate.edu

So What Did Happen To Scientific Sociology?

David Willer, University of South Carolina

In the January issue of *Perspectives*, Jon Turner asked, “What has happened to Scientific Sociology” including the “theory construction movement” of the 1970s (2002:4). Jon cites six trends “that present roadblocks to scientific sociology” (2002:7): 1) hyper-differentiation of the field, 2) the anti-science movement, 3) political correctness, 4) worship of the masters, 5) introductory texts frozen in 1948 sociology, 6) perpetuation of unresolved debates.

Reprehensible these trends may be, but, as I explain below, none block scientific sociology. Today, the science of sociology is developing more rapidly than at any time in the past. That is to say, sociology is developing precise and parsimonious theories of rapidly expanding scope. What has been blocked is a wider understanding across the field that sociology is developing cumulative scientific knowledge and has been doing so for 25 years. I know that that understanding has been blocked because few have come forward to use these new, well tested theories. There is a blockage in sociology, but it is between those who build and test theory and those who could be—and should be—using that theory in their research and teaching.

The impression is sometimes given that there was a theory construction movement. There certainly was a series of books, Zetterberg (1954), Willer (1967), Stinchcombe (1968), Blalock (1969), Dubin (1969), Mullins (1971), Reynolds (1971), Wallace (1971), Gibbs (1972), Hage (1972), Chafetz (1978), and finally, perhaps the best of the bunch, Cohen (1989). These books all had much the

same goal—to be a methodology for a theoretically driven sociology. Nevertheless, examining these works clearly shows that all worked independently. None built on others. In fact, many of these authors never met. For example, I know most if not all who are developing and testing formal theory in sociology, but, of my eleven fellow theory constructors above, to this day I have met only three. Twelve authors working separately does not a movement make.

Nevertheless, there is a movement for the development of sociology as a science and it can be dated quite precisely to August 1988 when the first annual Group Process conference was hosted at Emory University by Linda Molm and Karen Hegtvedt. Since that time, Group Process has been held just before or just after the American Sociological Association meetings each year with larger and larger numbers participating. I date the development of sociology as a science from that conference, not only because that development is a movement, but because science is a social process. In fact, science must be a social process. It is only the softer side of sociology that can be done in splendid isolation.

Science must be a social process because scientific objectivity is the outcome, not of the individual striving to be objective, but of a social process with two components. First, much work in science is joint work where many cooperate in both research and authorship. As an example, my most recent book, *Network Exchange Theory*, is not my book alone, but is shared by seven contributors all working with the same theory. Recently six contributed to a 13 page paper published in the millennial edition of *Social Psychology Quarterly* reporting on the progress of that theory. This and other work is joint because partners find and correct errors of inference, faulty research practices and the array of other mispractices into which each of us may fall.

The second and undoubtedly the more

important component of the social process of science is theory competition. Just as in competitive markets, there is an “invisible hand” working in theory competition. Certainly science advances best when there is a love of truth. But it will also advance when private ambition produces the public good of better and better theory. In spite of some rather bad philosophizing about science that will remain unnamed here, there is no mystery how and why theory competition works. Science is the enterprise that explains and, when possible, predicts. Competition furthers that enterprise by selecting theories that are free of contraction. Theories that are broader in scope and more precise are selected over those which are less so. Were there two logically consistent theories of equal scope and precision, then the more parsimonious is preferred.

If it is a mark of the maturity of a science that theories compete, then sociology is a mature science and has been for some time. To take an example with which I am well acquainted, ten years ago I edited a special edition of the journal *Social Networks* where four competing theories of exchange networks were published. One year later, the first test checking the relative precision of these theories was published (Skvoretz and Willer 1993). Since that time, competition to demonstrate broader scope has been ongoing. Theory competition and theory development are so transforming the area of social networks that its theories are becoming more and more general theories of social structure.

Jon Turner called for a scientific sociology that seeks out the “generic forces that drive the formation of social and cultural structures” and then develops “models and principles that explain their operative dynamics” (2002:7). I want to assure him that what he calls for is not at all the utopia he takes it to be but a growing reality. The growth of scientific sociology is apparently a well kept secret, so well kept that readers may only now be hearing of it. Perhaps some will be attracted and

Space and Social Theory

Kevin Fox Gotham, Tulane University

In recent years, we have witnessed the emergence of a broad ranging debate over the role of space in social theory (for recent overviews, see Benko and Strohmayr 1997; Casey 1997; Gotham 2001; Soja 2000; Wilson and Moss 1997). In this brief essay, I want to explore the role of space in social theory with reference to three considerations, ontological (space as a container), theoretical (space as a constitutive dimension of social action and conflict), and empirical (the relationship between space, place, and globalization).

Over the past three decades, theorists interested in space have attempted to develop a series of conceptual frameworks for understanding the spatial embeddedness of social action, human agency, and social structure. Henri Lefebvre (1991) argues space can be a political instrument, an object of consumption, and a crucial element in revolutionary political struggles. Pierre Bourdieu (1993) suggests space helps to generate the "habitus" of everyday life for local residents producing place-specific forms of identity, consciousness, and knowledge. Similarly, Michel Foucault (1986) developed the concept "heterotopias" to refer to those oppositional spaces that form within relations of domination and subordination and serve as the birthing place for political mobilization and revolution. Anthony Giddens' (1984) uses his "structuration" approach where agency and structure are a duality embedded in and reproduced through specific rules, procedures, and social relationships in time and space. The work of these theorists helped launch a wave of transdisciplinary scholarship that has led scholars to rethink basic social categories such as time, class, and power through the prism of space.

Today, space is at the center of social explanation. It is thus something constitutive

rather than reflective of exogenous processes, active rather than passive, and a constructor rather than a container of social action. Although urban scholars disagree about how space influences social relations, they agree in viewing space as a means of production (i.e., land and real estate), a basis of identity, and a geographical site of social action. They examine topics as diverse as gendered spaces, racialized spaces, the social organization of gang activity, the spatial attributes of corporate interlocking directorates, social movements, the militarization of urban space and metropolitan development. Further, scholars have delineated why space is important and how the consideration of socio-spatial relations and land-use conflicts can illuminate our understanding of social change. A common theme running through these different and diverse studies is the attempt to connect space and social processes in a way that highlights their interconnectedness and mutually constitutive character. Moreover, these studies attempt to move beyond viewing space in strictly in geometric terms, or as a backdrop or passive setting where social relations and conflicts happen. As Lefebvre (1979, 1991) has recognized, the power of the state and capital continuously to refashion land-uses can spearhead the mobilization of local people and organizations to redefine space, to assign new meanings and definitions. This has generated an "explosion of spaces" concerning the diverse ways people challenge, negotiate, and renegotiate meanings of urban space to produce new individual and collective identities and solidarities.

One debate that has significant implications for space and social theory and which appear to be increasingly high on scholars' empirical agenda overall are that of globalization and its impact upon place. As space invested with meaning, place has become a major topic of debate among architects, anthropologists, geographers, and sociologists (for overviews, see Cox 1997; Gieryn 2000). In many respects, the problem of place is a global

MINICONFERENCE *from page 2*

"Mini-Conference II: Sociological Theory and Empirical Research: Formal/Mathematical/Experimental Approaches"

Chair: Murray Webster, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Papers:

"Sociological Theory in the 21st Century"

- David Wagner, SUNY-Albany

"Developing Status Construction Theory"

- Cecilia L. Ridgeway, Stanford University

"Theoretical Comparison of Forms of Exchange" - Linda Molm, University of Arizona

"Theory and Methods in Graduate Education of Sociologists" - Barry Markovsky, University of South Carolina

Mini-Conference III: Sociological Theory and Empirical Research (Open Submission Session)

Chair: James J. Chriss, Cleveland State University

Presenters:

"Causal Mechanisms, Correlations, and a Power Theory of Sociology" - James Mahoney, Brown University

"Conformity and Self-Direction in the Daily Life of Children: An Ethnographic Extension of Kohn" - Annette Lareau and Elliot Weininger, Temple University

"The Cause of Continuity and Discontinuity in Postsocialist Inequality" - Victor Nee, Cornell University, and Yang Cao, Louisiana State University

"Theorizing Goffman's Method" - Neil McLaughlin, McMaster University, and Robert Alford, City University of New York

"The Idea of Outcome" - Andrew Abbott, University of Chicago

"Special Session: Theorizing Morality: Assessing the Contributions of Philip Rieff"

Chair: Gary Alan Fine, Northwestern University

Papers:

"The Ideology of Moral Freedom" - Alan Woolfolk, Oglethorpe University

*See **SPACE** on page 5*

*See **MINICONFERENCE** on page 7*

SPACE *from page 4*

phenomenon that connects with issues of culture, identity, and metropolitan organization. In his recent trilogy on the rise of the global network society, Manuel Castells (1996, 1998) argues that a new technological paradigm based on information and electronic technologies is creating a globalized network society in which the "space of flows" crushes the "space of places." In this process, placelessness becomes the essential feature of the

contemporary world as spatial boundaries, agents, and structures disappear and are subsumed in the logic of the meta-network. In addition, new metaphors of mobility (diaspora, displacement, delocalization, translocalization, traveling, deterritorialization, erasure, border crossing, hybridity, nomadology) are singled out in the globalization literature as suggesting the loss of place, culture, and identity. Yet the questions abound: Why is space becoming more important as a focal point of conflict and mobilization in an era of diminishing spatial barriers to communication, exchange, and movement? How do different groups, from grassroots organizations to powerful corporate actors, interpret globalization? To what extent can we use space and place as a rallying point for theory construction and political action? Is it possible to find in spatial practices a critique of power and domination without losing sight of their embeddedness in the social relations of patriarchy, capital, and bureaucracy?

I suggest that turning to the work of Henri Lefebvre provides an important resource for theorizing the continuing significance of place as well as understanding the connectedness of space, place, and globalization (for recent programmatic statements, see Brenner 2000; Crang 1999). Lefebvre conceptualizes space as including "representational of spaces," "spatial practices," and "representations

of space." His conceptual model distinguishes professional planning activities and elite images of urban reality (representations of space) from the manner in which "everyday life" gives form and meaning to urban space (spatial practices) from

Although we may conceive of global space at the theoretical level, spatial practices connect to an array of economic and political power structures that have global reach and effect.

space "directly lived through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of 'inhabitants' and 'users,'" (representational spaces) (for overviews see Gotham 1998; Harvey 1989; Liggett and Perry 1995; Soja 1989). These spatial registers offer a way to conceptualize globalization that is more nuanced than is often the case. At the level of representational spaces, globalization is "conceived space" consisting of formal models, theoretical understandings of changes in states and societies, or a neoliberal market ideology imposed on the world by corporate interests (Antonio and Bonanno 2001). At the level of spatial practices, globalization is "perceived space" consisting of trends and changes in the world economic system that genuinely challenge the balance between national and global influences. Although we may conceive of global space at the theoretical level, spatial practices connect to an array of economic and political power structures that have global reach and effect. At the level of representational spaces, globalization is "lived space" consisting of new forms of local cultural identity and political mobilization that are casually bound up with globalizing processes.

In short, Lefebvre's spatial registers provide a theoretical check on aspatial theoretical agendas that overemphasize the spacelessness and timeless of globalization. Geographers Erik Swyngedow

(1997) and Neil Brenner (1999) suggest that "glocal" can be a middle range concept for moving towards understanding the localization of the global and the globalization of the local. Local environmental movements are globalized in some ways, for instance, to the extent that they communicate with supporters in other areas of the world and employ discourses of identity, the environment, and global destruction as ammunition against their corporate ad-

versaries. In addition, commercial interests commodify and package many forms of the local for global consumption, from ethnicity and culture to music and ecotourism (for a recent overview, see Judd and Fainstein 1999). To paraphrase Escobar (1996), the global sits in places, even as the former becomes more distant and impersonal and the later becomes more fleeting and ephemeral. Giddens' (1996) explanation of globalization as an "in here" and "out there" phenomenon suggests we all remain indissolubly linked to both local and extralocal places through different networks even as major transformations alter old forms of action and constitute new forms of identity and self-expression. The point here is to theorize the global-local nexus as consisting of powerful "spatializing effects." This is to suggest that we bring together objective and subjective understandings of space by tracing them both back to the process in which individuals and groups produce space. It also suggests that we cannot view materiality and representation as separate spheres and privilege one realm - e.g., class, race, gender, global, local, and so on - over another. As Virilio (1999:112) put it, "I love the local when it enables you to see the global, and I love the local when you can see it from the global."

A fuller version of this paper and a complete bibliography is available upon request from the author - kgotham@tulane.edu

SCIENTIFIC *from page 3*

search for a book giving the methodology for the growing scientific sociology. That none will be found is yet one further indicator of the growing maturity of sociology as a science.

That there are no methods books for the growing science of sociology is a quality it shares with advanced sciences. Forty years ago when those who would be authors of books on theory construction went to their libraries to find the methods books of physics, chemistry and biology none were found. Instead, they had to settle for study of the philosophy of science. And philosophers of science insist that their field is not the methodology of science. Successful sciences have no methods books and need none because *theory is the method of the sciences*.

Fortunately, the growing science of sociology is not a closed society. There are many ways to join its social process and perhaps one of the best is to attend the next Group Process meeting. That meeting will be in Chicago just before the American Sociological Association Meetings. To attend, contact the organizer, Michael Lovaglia at the University of Iowa (lovaglia@blue.weeg.uiowa.edu). Come ready to join in a construction project, the project of building and using theory to construct more scientific sociology.

References

- Blalock, Hubert M. 1969. *Theory Construction: From Verbal to Mathematical Formulation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Chafetz, Janet Saltzman. 1978. *A Primer on the Construction and Testing of Theories in Sociology*. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- Cohen, Bernard P. 1989. *Developing Sociological Theory*. Chicago: Nelson Hall.
- Dubin, Robert. 1969. *Theory Building*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gibbs, Jack. 1972. *Sociological Theory Construction*. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press.
- Hage, Jerald. 1972. *Techniques and Problems of Theory Construction in Sociology*. New York: Wiley.

Mullins, Nicholas. 1971. *The Art of Theory Construction and Use*. New York: Harper and Row.

Reynolds, Paul D. 1971. *A Primer in Theory Construction*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Skvoretz, John and David Willer. 1993. "Exclusion and Power: A Test of Four Theories of Power in Exchange Networks." *American Sociological Review* 58: 801-18.

Stinchcombe, Arthur. 1968. *Constructing Social Theory*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Turner, John. 2002. "What Has Happened to Scientific Sociology?" *Perspectives* 25:1-7.

Wallace, Walter. 1971. *The Logic of Science in Sociology*. New York: Aldine.

Willer, David. 1967. *Scientific Sociology: Theory and Method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Zetterberg, Hans L. 1954. *On Theory and Verification in Sociology*. Totowa, NJ: Bedminster Press.

Books Available***The Active Society******The New Golden Rule***

The Institute for Communitarian Policy Studies at George Washington University and the Communitarian Network have a few copies of *The Active Society* by Amitai Etzioni, which are long out of print. They can be purchased for \$15 each (while supplies last). We also have copies of Amitai Etzioni's *The New Golden Rule* for \$9.

Please make checks payable to the Communitarian Network, and send orders to the attention of Deirdre Mead at The Communitarian Network, 2130 H Street NW, Suite 703, Washington, DC 20052. For further information, please contact Deirdre at dmead@gwu.edu or 202.994.3008.

Herbert Spencer's *The Principles of Sociology*

Jonathan Turner, University of California-Riverside

Herbert Spencer's monumental work has just be republished by Transaction Publishers. It contains a sixty page introduction by me, and thus, it has something to offer beyond the old second hand copies that are still available. It is published on acid free paper and, hence, will last. Although the four volumes are in paperback, they are still expensive because the costs involved in production were very high. I am requesting that members of the theory section order a copy for their library. To my surprise, many libraries do not have a complete copy of *The Principles of Sociology*, including my own (which had various abridged editions). The ISBN for this new edition is: 0-7658-0750-5

I realize that most sociologists consider Spencer to be an embarrassment to the field, but I think a fair reading of his work demonstrates that he is every bit the equal of Marx, Durkheim, and Weber. Most who think such a pronouncement to be ridiculous have, in my experience, never read Spencer; or if they have, they have read the twenty pages or so outlining the organismic analogy. There are over two thousand pages in *The Principles*, and they are filled with insights that are still useful. Thus, even if theorists do not take up my challenge and read Spencer, I hope that you will make a contemporary edition available to your students by ordering the book for your library. If we cannot get scholars in our field to order books of this nature, publishers will be more reluctant to take on large and expensive tasks like this edition of *The Principles*.

MARX *from page 1*

Marx, the ultimate iconoclast, became an icon himself. This small irony of history had immediate exegetic effects, since the new Russian and German rulers, eager to burnish their intellectual and political credentials, soon joined forces to unearth many hitherto unknown Marxian manuscripts. And since they sought, above all, to consolidate their top-down authority and speed economic growth, they published Marx selectively, with an eye to their own interests.

In 1924, calling one-sided attention to Marx's early views on the inevitability of economic progress, Bolshevik editors rescued an unfinished essay from the obscurity of the vault and offered it to the world as the centerpiece of a newfound text, *The German Ideology* (1845-1846), which they published in full in 1932. Despite its wholly fragmentary character, which made it almost a jigsaw puzzle for its editors, this essay has since become one of the most celebrated of all Marxian texts, renowned, in part, for its narrowly deterministic stage theory of history. Socialism, it was argued, succeeds capitalism just as night follows day. For many party loyalists, this was taken to imply that 'actually existing socialism' is not only necessary but irreversible. Few readers will have trouble grasping why this line of argument proved appealing.

Other new texts, many of which appeared in the *Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe* (MEGA, 1927-1935), were received in sometimes opposite ways. Those which seemed to echo the evolutionary naturalism of *The German Ideology*, like Engels's *Dialectics of Nature*, were welcomed into the canon. Those, however, which stressed the dehumanizing effects of inequality and bureaucracy in the factory and economy were initially neglected. Only a few mavericks, like Erich Fromm and Herbert Marcuse of the Frankfurt School, were drawn to the *Economic and Philosophic*

Manuscripts of 1844 when they first appeared in 1932. So too the *Grundrisse* of 1857-1858 – the massive “rough draft” of the whole of Marx's projected critique of political economy, of which *Capital* was only the first of six parts - was overlooked for nearly three decades

Marx's reputation suffered many blows in the interval between the publication of the 1844 manuscripts and the birth of the New Left.

after it first appeared in 1939-1941.

Marx's reputation suffered many blows in the interval between the publication of the 1844 manuscripts and the birth of the New Left. This was partly a function of sheer power politics - Hitler's victory over German labor, Stalin's purges, the rise of McCarthyism - but it was also a product of the clear failure of the stage theory of history. Given the epic travails of both Russia and Germany, it was hard for even unregenerate Old Leftists to insist that the arrow of history flies straight to its goal. Increasingly, many spoke now of a future beyond “ideology” - which, plainly, was a virtual synonym for Marxism.

And then came the Sixties. As new movements sprang to life, Marx was *au courant* once again, and the *Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts* in particular fed an avid hunger for radical humanism. Ultimately, even the comparatively abstruse *Grundrisse* won an audience. “Whole passages from the *Grundrisse*,” Daniel Singer wrote with pardonable exaggeration, “...could be taken as the refrain for the protest movement spreading from San Francisco to Tokyo across Europe.” Many noted that, unlike many better known texts, the *Grundrisse* did not overlook the autonomy of non-capitalist cultures. Rather than positing the outside world as a null zone for capitalist expansion - rather than assuming, *à la* stage theory, that “feudalism” simply yields to capitalism everywhere - Marx probed the matter concretely.

Further inquiry of this type appeared in a series of late manuscripts, some of which were published, in 1972, by Lawrence Krader as *The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx*. Unlike the *Grundrisse*, however, this volume attracted only modest attention. Why? Partly, I believe, because the text *per se* - fragmentary notes written in several languages - is simply difficult. But even more salient, perhaps, is the recession of the New Left

that began in this period. Other texts that appeared then - including a long essay that Marx had planned as a bridge between Vols. 1 & 2 of *Capital* and a rare defense of his value-theory in response to a critic - fell swiftly into oblivion. Rising with the New Left, Marx fell with the New Left. Later, when the Berlin wall collapsed, Marx's appeal declined still further. Almost as if history were repeating itself, ideology (and even history) was declared *passé*.

So, who now reads Marx? And why?

The short answer is that, now as always, Marx sparks interest in connection with changes in the *Zeitgeist* and the economy. No sooner did Fukuyama declare history defunct than “globalization” burst on the scene, and soon afterwards, “anti-globalization.” The unity of the world's economy became clearer than ever - a unity spurred, plainly, by the very kind of globalized capital accumulation that Marx pre-

See MARX on page 8

MINICONFERENCE *from page 4*

- “From Positive to Negative Community: Rieff's Theory of Contemporary Cultural Change” - Philip Manning, Cleveland State University
- “Philip Rieff's Mission” - Lauren Langman, Loyola University of Chicago
- “Do Data Rise to Meet Theories or Give Rise to Them? Philip Rieff's Enduring Challenge to Theory” - Jonathan B. Imber, Wellesley College
- Discussant: Charles Camic, University of Wisconsin

MARX *from page 7*

dicted long ago. (My colleague Bob Antonio is editing a Blackwell reader [2002] illustrating this premise.)

In this context Marx's views on the world economy gain a new relevance. I would argue, moreover, that these views are expressed not only in Marx's writings on capital per se, but in several ancillary texts. These include Marx's "ethnological" manuscripts, which I am editing for an all-English edition to appear in the near future, and a mass of hitherto unknown but thematically related notes which, with NEH support, I am editing a special volume for the new Marx-Engels *Gesamtausgabe* in partnership with Kevin Anderson of Northern Illinois University and Jurgen Rojahn of the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam. All of these texts, which explore many aspects of culture and social structure in Asia, Africa, Oceania, the Americas, classical antiquity and medieval Europe, were written late in Marx's life, at a crucial moment in his struggle to finish *Capital*. Several influential critics have thought that Marx's interest in this phase wandered from the central themes of *Capital*, but, in fact, Marx at this time was working on precisely the section of *Capital* which deals with the extension of capital from the domestic sphere to the world economy.

This was exactly the moment, in other words, when the logic of Marx's work on *Capital* led him to examine non-capitalist cultures. To what extent did such cultures present opportunities for accumulation? To what extent did they present obstacles? Experience had long since shown that, rather than simply bowing before the power of capital, non-capitalist cultures are endowed with inertial powers of *resistance*. However powerful capital may be, non-capitalist cultures do not simply wait, with folded hands, for "the next stage of history" to engulf them. When cultures collide, the result is not a foregone conclusion.

Hence to know, in concrete detail, how

Experience had long since shown that, rather than simply bowing before the power of capital, non-capitalist cultures are endowed with inertial powers of *resistance*.

capitalism might fare in its outward odyssey, Marx needed systematic insight into the non-capitalist world. By 1880, it had become clear that capital accumulation would soon extend qualitatively beyond the Euro-Atlantic world. Hence Marx's deep interest in the analyses of colonial expansion offered by Phear, Money, Kovalovsky, and others. Hence his interest in the probing accounts of non-capitalist social structure offered by Lange, Bücher, Friedländer, Sohm, and Morgan. In these studies, and others, Marx found a wealth of information and insight into the global reach and power of patriarchy and property, clan and class, mana and money.

Nowhere in these manuscripts, it should

be stressed, does Marx elaborate a systematic theory. Yet his concerns are so well defined, and he offers so many searching observations along the way, that few attentive readers will fail to come away with a greatly heightened sensitivity to the cultural and conceptual problems that engaged Marx's attention in the final years of his life. These problems, I would argue, are even more pressing now than they were in 1880. Globalization has reached a very advanced stage, and Marx's writings on this subject are more relevant now than ever.

A fuller version of this paper, with endnotes and a bibliography, is available upon request from the author (emerald@ku.edu).

Call for Papers

Charles Camic and Franklin Wilson, Editors, American Sociological Review

The *American Sociological Review* invites manuscripts from members of the Section on Theory. *ASR*'s mission is to publish the best contemporary scholarship from all areas of sociology. Without a healthy volume of submissions in the theory area, this goal is seriously compromised. We thus encourage members of the Section on Theory to submit their work for possible publication in *ASR*. The *ASR*'s Deputy Editors and the members of the journal's Editorial Board for 2002 comprise the largest and most intellectually diverse editorial team in *ASR*'s history. The editorial team joins the Editors in welcoming a wide range of theoretical and methodological approaches and contributions from all substantive areas of the discipline. Also, *ASR*'s current editorial policies are highly flexible as to form and can accommodate manuscripts of various lengths and styles. (Full information about manuscript requirements is available in the August 2001 and February 2002 issues of the journal, at the *ASR* website (<http://www.pop.psu.edu/ASR/asr.htm>), or upon request to (asr@ssc.wisc.edu).

As a result of these editorial arrangements, we hope to publish more than our fair share of the best contemporary work in sociological theory. We therefore strongly encourage Section members to submit their manuscripts to the *American Sociological Review*.