
Theory

The newsletter of the Research Committee on Social Theory
International Sociological Association

Autumn 1994

CURRENT BOARD

Co-chairs

Ron Eyerman
Hans Joas
Bryan Turner

Other Boardmembers

Luc Boltanski
Craig Calhoun
Franco Crespi
Birgitta Nedelmann
Goran Therborn
Johannes Weiss

ex-officio

Jeffrey Alexander
Piotr Sztopka

Address for Correspondence

Ron Eyerman
Department of Sociology
University of Lund
Box 114
221 00 LUND
Sweden
Tel: 46-46- 10 88 64
Fax: 46-46- 10 47 94

or for Newsletter

Kenneth Thompson
The Open University
Walton Hall
Milton Keynes
MK 7 6AA
U.K.
Tel: 44-908-740 66
Fax: 44-908-654488

This newsletter has two main functions: to inform members about developments in this ISA Research Committee 16, and to promote discussion and debate about developments in social theory. This is the first issue since the ISA World Congress at Bielefeld and there are several things to report. Firstly, our sessions were highly successful and were some of the best attended. At the business meeting the results of the elections to the new Board were announced and the new co-chairs took over - Eyerman, Joas and Turner. At its first meeting the new Board decided on a set of by-laws (see the next issue of the Newsletter). It also decided to hold its mid-term conference on the subject of 'Sociological Theory Between Difference and Integration' in the final week of July, 1996, in Melbourne, Australia. It will be organized by Bryan Turner

and sponsored by Deakin University, Faculty of Arts, the Ashworth Centre for Theory at Melbourne University, and the Departments of Sociology and Anthropology at La Trobe University and Monash University.

A new debate about trends in social theory has been provoked by Richard Munch's article on 'The Contribution of German Social Theory to European Sociology' in the ISA publication *Sociology in Europe: In Search of Identity*. We publish below a response from Jeff Alexander, especially written for this journal. We will publish further contributions from Bryan Turner, and others who may wish to contribute, in subsequent issues.

Ken Thompson

How 'National' Is Social Theory? A note on some worrying trends in the recent theorizing of Richard Munch¹

Within every universalizing cultural endeavour there are national trends. 'Universalistic and particularistic orientations in science are in continuous tension,' Nedelmann and Sztompka (1994: 9) point out in their introduction to *Sociology*

in Europe: In Search of Identity, the edited volume distributed free of charge to every registered participant in last summer's World Congress of Sociology in Bielefeld, Germany. They go on to describe this tension between universal and particular, quite rightly in my view, as 'stimulating [to] scientific development.' Yet, while empirically inevitable and theoretically stimulating, as Hegel himself well knows the particularistic side of this productive tension need not, and should not, be applauded regardless of its form. Indeed, my point in the following note is to argue that in a recent and highly visible essay Richard Munch introduces the particularistic moment in a one-sided, distorted, often chauvinistic way. By challenging the universalist aspirations of social theory in this manner, Munch has opened the door to more virulent exercises in particularism that he himself would certainly abhor.²

In marked contrast to the volume's other contributions, 'The Contribution of German Social Theory to European Sociology' (Munch, 1994) dwells at length on the superiority of European ideas and dismisses American sociology in a disdainful way. I

will not dispute here these evaluations. While I myself have made many criticisms of American sociology, I doubt whether many impartial observers of sociology on either side of the Atlantic would agree with the empirical evaluations Munch makes (e.g., Tominaga, 1994). In this brief response, I am interested not in the substance of the charges *per se* but rather in the theoretical framework which allows them to be made. For in making them Munch does not engage in theoretical argument as such. He relies, instead, on a broadly reductionist sociology of knowledge, one that gives an exaggerated and dangerous primacy to geopolitical forces like 'nation'.

Lurking just beneath the surface of Munch's arguments, in fact, one finds the suggestion that social theory is national, the contention that, while theorists may aspire to universalism, most of their (our) ideas actually reflect the social structures and ideologies within which they (we) live. Munch's position argues, in effect, that most sociological theories function as supporting ideologies for the struggles of their regions and nation states. Not only are theories instruments in the struggle and competition of national powers, but their varying intellectual

influence, Munch clearly suggests, depends upon the relative economic and political power of their respective nations. Such arguments to be sure, are not novel in the history of social theory. Nonetheless, they are something new in the history of post-war theoretical sociology, and they seem particularly threatening when against the background of the political cultural conflicts that have emerged in the post-Cold War world in which we live and think today.

From the beginning of his contribution to *Sociology in Europe*, Munch approaches theoretical issues in national terms. Referring to the role of voluntarism and consensus in functionalist theorizing, for example, he describes Merton and Parsons as having 'assimilated *European* social theory to genuine *American* thought' (p.45, this and all subsequent italics added, unless noted otherwise). In itself this observation certainly is not objectionable. It begins to be, however, when it is linked to Munch's objection that this assimilation 'narrowed down the variety of *European* social theory' (46). The pejorative implications become fully evident, however, when Munch approaches the anti-functional micro and macro

challenges of the late 1950s and 1960s, not in terms of their theoretical innovations, but in terms of the national origins of their theories. These primarily American theorists were able to mount this challenge, Munch argues, only because they could 'draw upon the greater sharpness and distinctness of *European* social theories' (46). Rather than speaking about the theoretical and empirical references of these challenges to functionalism in scientific terms, Munch represents them geopolitically, describing as contributions that strengthened, not American, but European thought. He writes, for example, that 'Coser, Dahrendorf, and later on Collins revitalized *European* conflict theory from Marx to Pareto, Weber and Simmel'!

Yet, according to Munch, these macro and micro challenges ultimately failed to overcome the theoretical limitations of functionalism. Why? Because they had not made a sharp enough break from American society and thought. Because 'they all [still] related [their] variety of theories to *American* thought and reality,' their theories actually continued the simplifying 'Americanization' of *European* social theory that Merton and Parsons had begun. Other observers (e.g., Szompka, 1994, Ritzer and Gindoff, 1994)

have viewed this new wave of micro and macro-historical work as marking a theoretical golden age. Munch disagrees. These theorists incorporated the *forms* of European thinking but not the real content. 'In terms of content,' he insists, these American theorists actually distorted European social theory. The point of Munch's argument, it seems, is to argue that such distortion was inevitable; according to emphasis on the nation, 'American social theory' can only be 'a reflection of American thought and its relationship to American reality.' Neither America's thought nor its social reality 'correspond to the whole variety of thought and reality in the different European countries.'

One must begin to pay careful attention here to the way in which Munch homogenized two binary relationships. In the pointed contrasts he makes between America and Europe, he evokes, time and time again, the contrast between homogeneity and variety. In doing so, he is suggesting the following analogy: America is to homogeneity as Europe is to variety (America: homogeneity: : Europe: variety). Constructing this kind of complex analogy represents cultural, not just social-scientific work. Rather

than merely empirical observations, these contrasts and homologies are strongly evaluative. They establish frameworks of sacred and profane, purity and danger, categories that legitimate pollution and exclusion (Alexander, 1993). This conflation of cognitive and evaluative strategies is clear when Munch argues that a series of well-established empirical facts - the 'professionalization of sociology' in America, its 'well-equipped leading departments and journals,' the 'establishment of a unified national discourse' in America, its competitive and individualistic social structure - have combined to produce a constraining 'standardization' (47) in American empirical research and theorizes. Mixing condescension, disappointment, surprise, and criticism, Munch describes post-war American sociology, not simply as homogeneous and standardized, but as bland and impoverished. The discipline's character is exemplified by what he calls 'the uniform standard article' typically published in the *American Journal of Sociology* and the *American Sociological Review*. For Munch, American sociology becomes the paradigm case for the de-magicalization that Weber described as the bane of modernity. In American

sociology, he rues, 'there is little space for the extraordinary, whether in the negative or in the positive sense. 'His analogical series has now been further stretched. It reads, American: Europe: :American sociology: European sociology::homogeneity:variety::Standardization:creativity: :uniformity:extraordinary.

What a misfortune that the intellectual challenges to functionalism originated, not in Europe, but in America, the standardized, homogenized, and de-magicalized country of the common, ordinary man! But what good fortune that the world's geopolitical situation, the regional and national distribution of power, is now undergoing such significant change. The antidote Munch offers to the deplorable condition of American sociology rests, in other words, on geopolitics rather than social theory. 'With Europe's rise to the level of one of three superpowers' - Munch notes East Asia in passing - European sociology has regained the material power 'to challenge the American hegemony in world sociology'. Only a strong and united Europe can purify the pollution of social theory that its debilitating sojourn in America has caused.

While my main point in this discussion has been to highlight the reductionism that underlays Munch's argument rather than to criticize the argument as such, in closing I cannot resist offering a few observations about the contents of his claims. If post-war American social scientists have often been guilty of a presentist chauvinism that neglects the importance of European theoretical and empirical work, Munch and some of the other contributors to this debate (e.g., Albrow, 1994) are guilty of an equally one-sided Eurochauvinism. There is no doubt, of course, that American developments have been highly stimulated by classical and contemporary European ideas. Yet neither is there any doubt that virtually every strand of contemporary European sociological theory builds in fundamental ways upon American post-war thought. Boudon would be unthinkable without the influence of Homans, Blau, Merton, and Coleman. Bourdieu formed his post-1972 praxis theory as much from his encounter with Goffman and Garfinkel as from anything else. Giddens' structuration theory is deeply dependent on the pragmatist and interactionist American traditions. As for Habermass and Luhmann, the representative cases for

Munch's claims about the superiority of contemporary German thought, their ideas could be read as efforts to 'Europeanize' Parsons if this nation-based nomenclature were acceptable, which I believe it is not. Despite the fact that Luhmann has made original and important theoretical innovations, his thought stands firmly upon Parsons' in the most elaborate and apparent ways. Habermas' later critical theory of communicative action builds upon Luhmann and in many ways 'corrects' his systems technicism by drawing upon, and revising, the developmental cognitive and moral emphases of Parsons himself. And the very theoretical framework Munch himself employs to analyze American and European sociology represents merely a variation, albeit an innovative one, on the interchange model that organized Parsons' later work. This is not even to mention, of course, the high degree of interpenetration that exists among European and American sociologies across a large number of more specialized subfields, including social problems, social movements, mobility, historical and comparative sociology, religion, organizations, media, gender and politics.

Albrow's (1994: 89) suggestion that between European and American sociologies there is 'limited exchange and enduring tension' appears, then, to be quite as mistaken as Munch's claims for the utterly derivative quality of American work. Scaff's (1994: 215) observation that, since 1945, 'the flow of ideas and personnel in both directions has created a disciplinary matrix' gets much closer to the truth. Whether one considers networks or ideas, empirical fields or general theories, one sees an extraordinary efflorescence of international communication between European and American sociology. One may ask, in fact, whether it is tenable any longer even to speak of such a bounded entity as 'European' or 'American' sociology. I have argued here, indeed, that one confidently can do so only if one is willing to subsume ideation to social structure, to replace theoretical with geopolitical thinking, and to understand nations or regions themselves in an unrealistically isolated, culturally distinct, and internally homogeneous way.

Notes

¹This note is drawn from a substantially longer discussion of the nationalist trend in Munch's recent work, which

includes an analysis of an earlier article (Munch, 1991) from which Munch 1994 is largely drawn. This longer discussion is available from the author: Department of Sociology, UCLA, Los Angeles, California, 90024. FAX: 310-825-9838. E-mail:Alexande@soc.sscnet.ucla.edu.

²Speaking of Munch 'himself', I should say that the following can be read, not only as a theoretical criticism, but as a query made by an old friend to a former comrade-in-arms, one who had seemed to be as reflexive about his 'German' theoretical identity as I have tried to be about my 'American' one. In this sense, I am asking 'Richard', as compared to 'Munch', the following questions: Am I merely a provincial American, confined by my isolated country's naivete and blinded by its own chauvinism, or has your work, in fact, taken a decidedly nationalist turn? If so, what has happened to change your mind about social theory, about the bases of its construction, about its American forms? What kind of influence do you want your new work to have?

Jeffrey C. Alexander

References

- Albrow, Martin. 1994. 'the Changing British Role in European Sociology', pp.81-98 in Birgitta Nedelmann and Piotr Sztompka, eds., *Sociology in Europe: In Search of Identity*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C. 1993. 'The Promise of a Cultural Sociology: The Computer as a Sacred and Profane Information Machine', pp. in Neil Smelser and Richard Munch, eds., *Theory of Culture*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Munch, Richard. 1994. 'The Contribution of German Social Theory to European Sociology', pp.45-66 in Birgitta Nedelmann and Piotr Sztompka, eds., *Sociology in Europe: In Search for Identity*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Nedelmann, Birgitta and Piotr Sztompka, eds. 1994, *Sociology in Europe: In Search of Identity*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ritzer, George and Pamela Gindoff. 1994 'Agency-Structure, Micro-Macro, Individualism-Holism-Relationism: A Metatheoretical Explanation of Theoretical Convergence between the United States and Europe', pp.3-23 in Piotr Sztompka, ed., *Agency and Structure: Reorienting Social Theory*. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach.
- Scaff, Lawrence A. 1994. 'Europe and America in Search of Sociology: Reflections on a Partnership', pp.213-223 in Nedelmann and Sztompka, eds., *Sociology in Europe: In Search for Identity*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Sztompka, Piotr. 1994. 'Evolving Focus on Human Agency - Contemporary Social Theory', pp.25-60 in Sztompka, ed., *Agency and Structure: Reorienting Social Theory*. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach.
- Tominaga, Ken'ichi. 1994. 'European Sociology and the Modernization of Japan', pp.191-212 in Nedelmann and Sztompka, eds., *Sociology in Europe: In Search for Identity*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.