

University of Alberta

**Cultural Accumulation in Richard Münch's Theorization of Modernity,
Systems of Accumulation, and Action**

by

Pablo B. Markin



A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2008



Library and
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-46379-6

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-46379-6

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Abstract

As urban centers concentrate organizational, service, and communication infrastructures, amplifying both the influence of networks and the importance of global flows, the urban policy and theorization emphasis has to shift towards the performative, contingent and material aspects of cities. The theoretical effort of Münch reinforces the explanatory power of both theoretical research and practical problem solving by laying the foundations of a theory of modernity, systems of accumulation, and action.

Münch's sociology allows for the analytical and historical description of individual and collective action. Post-traditional connections among anthropology, philosophy, political economy, and history make possible interdisciplinary arenas of inquiry defined more by subject than by discipline guiding the process of clarification of links among multiple sites where researcher can pursue his or her subject matter using the methodology of multi-sited anthropology. Münch's theorization of interpenetration, systems, and action allows for the reconstruction of the relations between economy and culture as analytical ideal types that allow for variation and change. Münch's development of Parsons', Weber's and Durkheim's sociology theorizes modern development in terms that connect systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation into a dynamic structure of related contradictions showing historical and geographical variations.

In temporally, spatially, and socially specific ways, urban spaces actively contribute to the formation of economies, cultures, societies and polities. Cities serve as sites of strategic centrality, interrelated diversity, and mobile interconnection for

individual and collective actors entering into spatially, historically, and relationally specific interrelations. Arising from the strategies of urban development, cultural clusters are variously shaped by the dynamics and contradictions of the interrelations among individual organizations, available strategies, and cultural objectives. Notably aligned with the transformations afoot in global cities, art museums and biennials manifest urban structures of modern social order. Thus, art exhibitions are complex and contingent instances of social, cultural, political, and economic accumulation.

Table of Contents

Preface

Introduction.....	1
A. Richard Münch on Cultural Accumulation.....	1
B. The Contradictions and Dynamics of Modern Development.....	15
C. Theoretical Development of Münch's Sociology.....	18
D. Present Application of Münch's Sociology.....	21
 I. Economic and Cultural Accumulation in World Cities.....	 31
A. Cultural Accumulation in World Cities.....	31
B. World Cities in the Entrepreneurial Strategies of Urban Development.....	38
C. Poststructuralist Critiques: World City Policy-Making and Culture.....	41
 II. Culture and Economy in Sociological Theory.....	 47
A. Revitalization of European Sociological Theory.....	47
B. Historical Overview of European Sociological Traditions.....	52
C. Philosophical Foundations of Parsons' Social Theory.....	57
D. Systematization by Münch of European Classical Traditions.....	63
E. Concluding Overview.....	65

III. Theory of Action in American Sociological Tradition.....	68
A. Münch's Development of Action Theory.....	68
B. Parallels in American Sociology to Münch's Theorization.....	74
C. Individual and Collective Action in Sociological Research.....	79
D. Dynamics and Contradictions of Individual and Collective Action.....	81
IV. Operationalizing Münch I: A Methodological Excursus on Multi-Sited Anthropology.....	86
A. Multi-Sited Applications of Anthropological Methodology.....	86
B. Methodological Challenges of the Anthropology on Global Capitalism.....	94
C. Relevance and Shortcomings of Multi-Sited Anthropology.....	99
V. Operationalizing Münch II: Evaluating 'Spirits of Capitalism'.....	102
A. Ideal-Typical Relations between Economy and Culture.....	102
B. Culture and Economy as Historical Ideal Types.....	112
C. Analytical Ideal Types of Economy and Culture.....	125
VI. Modern Systems of Economic Accumulation.....	142
A. The System of Economic Accumulation in the Structure of Modernity.....	142
B. Varieties of Capitalism within the Structure of Modernity.....	151
C. Theorization of Varieties of Modernity.....	161
VII. The Spatial Analysis of Urban Modernity.....	172
A. The Spatial Theorization of Urban Modernity.....	172
B. The Historical Production of Urban Space.....	176
C. The Historiographical Critique of Spatial Analysis.....	179

D. Sociological Applications of Spatial Analysis.....	185
VIII. The Structure of Modernity in Cities.....	189
A. Economic and Cultural Accumulation in Cities.....	189
B. Economic, Cultural, Social and Political Accumulation in Cities.....	195
C. Urban Structure of Modernity, Accumulation and Action	201
IX. Strategies of Cultural Accumulation in Cities.....	210
A. Urban Strategies of Cultural Clustering.....	210
B. Cultural Accumulation via Cultural Clustering.....	218
C. Cultural Accumulation as Urban Development.....	225
X. Cultural Accumulation of Global Modernity.....	231
A. International Art Exhibitions as Cultural Accumulation.....	231
B. Philosophical Transition to Global Modernity.....	236
C. International Art Institutions vis-à-vis Social, Political, Economic, and Cultural Accumulation.....	240
D. Art Museums in the Urban Structure of Modernity.....	244
Conclusion.....	250
Bibliography.....	259

Preface

The original contribution of the present thesis lies in its applicability to multi-sited research on culture and economy. It introduces Richard Münch's (1982; 1984; 1986b-c; 1991b) works, which are only incompletely translated from the German language. Most are not available in English at all. I rely on my first-hand reading knowledge of his original publications. Münch's (1982) highly consistent development of Talcott Parsons', Max Weber's, and Emile Durkheim's sociological theories has proved to be of great relevance to my research on the relationships between economy and culture. Having access to his works both in German and English, I find Münch's theorization of cultural accumulation to be of key importance. In my thesis, I set out to conduct multi-sited research but have in the end focused more theoretically. I show how Münch's conceptualization of the structure of modernity, applied to scales ranging from macro to micro, bears upon understandings of cultural accumulation.

Within the context of this approach, I explore the applicability of the notion of 'cultural accumulation' as an analytical ideal type. The context for this research on cultural accumulation supplies secondary sources on transitions from deterministic policy-making to interdependent urban strategies, from planned urban environments to interconnected world cities, from structural functionalism to micro theorization, from historical empires to urban modernity, from industrial production to cultural clusters, and from art history to philosophy of art. Drawing on the methodological standpoint of multi-sited anthropology (Marcus 1995), in my thesis, I propose a translation of the notion of the structure of modernity to micro as well as macro scales. At the same time, I propose that the structural conception of cultural accumulation could be a topic for multi-sited research (Marcus 1995). This approach allows me to show on a limited range of secondary sources the relevance of Münch's (1982; 1984; 1986b-c) theorization of action, systems, and modernity to the urban scale in particular.

My multi-sited research of cultural accumulation has concentrated on urban space and global cities theorization. But this theoretical thesis also lays the basis for research at the scale of institutions and in specific cultural communities and fractions of urban societies. A significant part of my research process has involved research trips to New

York as a site of my scholarly research conducted during a visit in June 2006 and a research stay from May 29 to August 30, 2007. The research stay became possible with support from the Research Abroad Travel Grant awarded by the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, with an equal share of participation in its funding by the Faculty of Arts, of the University of Alberta. I wish to express deep gratitude to these bodies for their support of my research project. No less thankful I am to my Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies for nominating me for this research opportunity and for recruiting me to its doctoral program.

As a Visiting Scholar at Columbia University, I was principally concerned with the aim of working with hard to access publications in the following libraries: New York Public Library, Lehman Library of the Columbia University, Art History Holdings Library of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Reading Room of the Guggenheim Museum, Goethe Institute Library and Research Center, French Institute Alliance Française Library, and the Research and Study Centers of the Museum of Modern Art, New York. These sources and the urban space of New York have significantly shaped the theoretical positions, methodological choices, and subject matter of this thesis.

Prof. Andreas Huyssen, from the Department of Germanic Languages, graciously supported my Visiting Scholar application to Columbia University. In New York, I worked with sociological, art historical and theoretical sources yet to be translated into English language. These included *Die Erlebnisgesellschaft: Kultursoziologie der Gegenwart* (1992) by Gerhard Schulze, *Dialektik der Kommunikationsgesellschaft* (1991) by Richard Münch, *documenta: Mythos und Wirklichkeit* (1997) by Harald Kimpel, and *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft* (1997) by Niklas Luhmann along with other publications and periodicals. Additionally, my research stays in New York have made possible personal meetings with such scholars as Prof. Vera Zolberg, from the New School for Social Research, Prof. Paul Werner and Prof. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, from the New York University. Making contact with these scholars has been highly enriching intellectually.

Prof. Rob Shields, Henry Marshall Tory Chair at the Sociology and Art and Design Departments of the University of Alberta, has supervised my research project and doctoral thesis. His support and encouragement have played critical and invaluable role

in shaping my research efforts and directing my intellectual development as part of my interdisciplinary doctoral program at the Modern Languages and Cultural Studies Department. Such members of my supervisory committee as Prof. Massimo Verdicchio, from the Modern Languages and Cultural Studies Department, and Prof. Charles Barbour, from the Department of Sociology, have also played important mentor roles in the progress of my thesis and research. As crucial has been the role of Ms. Jane Wilson, Graduate Program Secretary of the Modern Languages and Cultural Studies Department, whose involvement at every stage of my doctoral program cannot be overestimated. I am also thankful for the guidance of Prof. Robert Thornberry, Graduate Chair of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies and for the assistance of the members of my Examining Committee.

I am deeply thankful to all of these people. In different ways each of them has made my progress towards completion of this doctoral thesis an unforgettable intellectual journey.

Introduction

Richard Münch on Cultural Accumulation

Drawing on the impetus that art museums and global cities, as points of initial departure for my research, gave to this thesis, I seek to understand the instances of culture-driven urban revitalization in analytical and historical terms. The growing role that art museums play in urban development raises the questions of how global capitalism, local communities, post-industrial cities, and art museums relate to each other. Thus, this thesis intends to explore how economy, culture, society and politics relate to each other on the urban level. The methodology of multi-sited anthropology guided my search for understanding how cities and culture relate to each other within an ideal-typical framework of theoretical reference that I borrow from Richard Münch (1982; 1987; 1988; 1991b). In this thesis, I explore the macro and micro applicability of the notion of 'cultural accumulation' as an ideal type. In the English-speaking urban studies, the terms of cultural accumulation (Ong 1992), urban order (Short 1996), flexible accumulation (Harvey 1987), cultural logic (Jameson 1991; Ong 1999), cultural economy (Gibson and Kong 2005; Scott 1999; Scott 2000b), cultural strategies (Griffiths 1995), accumulation strategies (Jessop 1995; 1997), global city (Sassen 1991), world city (Friedman 1995; Knox and Taylor 1995), postmodernity (Harvey 1989), and global capitalism (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005a; Harvey 2006; Sklair 1997) are used as historical typifications of micro and macro processes. Instead, I seek to establish whether the notion of cultural accumulation as an analytical ideal type can provide an explanatory frame of reference with regard to culture and economy in cities. My original contribution is to explore, in a multi-sited fashion, the analytical and historical applicability of the notion of cultural accumulation as an analytical ideal type.

In this thesis, exploring the relations between the processes of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation from an urban perspective, I rely throughout my thesis

on Richard Münch's theorization of modernity, systems, and action. The focal points of Richard Münch's sociological works are sociological theory, historical and comparative sociology, and sociological examination of contemporary society. In German sociology, Richard Münch continues the development of Parsons's theory of action. His theoretical orientation towards structural relations, systematic analysis, and theory building sets Münch apart from other streams of sociological theory such as symbolic interactionism, rational choice theory, and systems or functionalist theories. His reconstruction of theories of Parsons, Weber and Durkheim seeks to demonstrate that the perception of modernity as an outcome of a functional differentiation of its constituent systems is secondary to the integrative processes that are at the heart of modern social order. The claim that Parsons' theory of action has an excessive bias in favour of macro levels of social norms and structures Münch counters on the ground that the micro level of individual action is equally accounted for by Parsons' recognition that the coexistence of individual autonomy and social order is the central organizing principle of modernity. Moreover,

Parsons' theoretical work is important because it remains one of the very few attempts to locate what would be the minimal requirements for a genuinely general theory of the social sciences as such. Parsons wanted to establish the fundamental and elementary theoretical components of action theory which would become a general analytical paradigm for all the sciences of human action (in contrast to theories of behaviour). The unit act, the notions of interaction and social relations, the theory of social systems and so forth were contributions to a general theory of action which would embrace economics, sociology, political science, anthropology and psychology. In other words, Parsons sought a theoretical strategy whereby, *inter alia*, the insights of Freudian psychoanalysis, Marshallian and Keynesian economics, Durkheimian sociology, Meadian and Piagetian social psychology, the anthropology of Malinowski and Kroeber, and the philosophy of Kant could be brought within a single, but complex and evolving, theoretical system. (italics in the original, Robertson and Turner 1991: 14-15)

There is a history of serious engagement of Parsons' theory of action in European and especially German sociology (Robertson and Turner 1991). Owing to this, Münch's works on modernity, culture and action appear to explore the relations between the processes of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation to a great analytical and historical extent while avoiding to some extent the theoretical debates that have surrounded the legacy of Parsons in the English speaking sociology. Rather than proposing to develop Parsonian sociology in a direction of a reappraised grand theory of a functionalist or a structuralist cast, Münch attempts to reconnect Parsons' theory to its foundations in European sociology without discarding the efforts at theoretical systematization of the former. As a proponent of the theoretical importance of culture to economic, political and social action, Münch continues in the steps of Parsons whose

critique of utilitarian rationalist economism remains one of the most cogent attacks on the core logics of the positivistic variant of social science, which is as valid today as it was when Parsons published *The Structure of Social Action* in 1937. In contemporary social theory, there are still many variants of the utilitarian position, including rational choice theory, various forms of exchange theory and a number of other versions of economism, which embrace many of the assumptions which Parsons radically criticized in the 1930s. Parsons's critique provides a method of combining value-analysis with mainstream sociological theory, thereby also offering a possible solution to the fact-value distinction. Parsons's work cannot be criticized in terms of some simplistic adherence to a value-relevant and value-neutral dichotomy. This aspect of his sociology is very clearly illustrated by his philosophical relationship to the Kantian formulation of the categorical imperatives. (italics in the original, Robertson and Turner 1991: 15)

Born in 1945, Richard Münch conducted his both undergraduate and graduate studies in Sociology, Philosophy and Psychology at the Ruprecht Karls University of Heidelberg between 1965 and 1969. There he defended his doctoral degree in 1971. At the University of Augsburg, Richard Münch joined the faculty of the Sociology

Department in 1972. In years 1970-1974, Münch worked as an Assistant Professor at the Department of Sociology and Communication Studies of the University of Augsburg. He was Professor of Sociology at the University of Cologne between 1974 and 1976. He held a Professorship in Social Sciences at the Heinrich Heine University of Düsseldorf from 1976 to 1995. Since 1995, Richard Münch is a Chaired Professor of Sociology at the Otto Friedrich University in Bamberg, Germany. Between years 1985 and 1989, he held numerous guest professorships at the University of California, Los Angeles. Between 1982 and 2007, Richard Münch has served at the editorial boards of *American Journal of Sociology*, *Current Perspectives in Social Theory*, *Soziologische Revue*, and *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*. Currently he is the journal editor of *Sociological Theory*. Richard Münch is a professional advisor for social research at the Max Plank Institute, Cologne. He takes part in the work of the scholarly directorate of the Institute for European Policy-Making, Berlin. He is a board member of the German Society for Sociology. He is a professional advisor and spokesperson for “Markets and Social Spaces in Europe” – an interdisciplinary association for postgraduate students.

The theorization of interrelations among modernity, accumulation, and action proposed by Münch (1982; 1991b) offers a perspective that clarifies economic, social, cultural, and political transitions taking place in cities, as this thesis hopes to demonstrate. Processes of cultural accumulation involve multiple social, political, economic, and cultural agents in relations of interchange of money, expertise, reputation, and power (Münch 1991b). As theorized by Münch (1982; 1991b), the media of accumulation, such as reputation, money, power and expertise, stand in a dynamic and contradictory relationship with the processes of their interchange, such as inflationary or deflationary cycles of their accumulation. In this regard, Münch comments that

Analysing relations of interchange between subsystems by means of the theory of media permits us to grasp such dynamic processes as deflation or inflation of media. Deflation and inflation are crises which indicate a decrease in the ability of the system in question to fulfil its function. Deflation is a decrease in the demand for good, as this is expressed in money, which ultimately leads to a corresponding decrease in the capacity for production. In like manner, a deflation of value-

commitments is a decrease in the potential breadth of implementation of general values; it impairs the ability of the general value pattern to shape action in widely disparate areas of life. Monetary inflation is caused by a rise in demand which is not followed by an increase in production. In the same way, inflation of value-commitments occurs when the claims of value-commitments on various areas of life are not accompanied by a corresponding ability of these value-commitments ethically to shape action in these spheres. (Münch 1987: 86)

These relations of interchange draw attention to global cities where processes of accumulation occur. Münch's sociology theorizes these processes in connection to the notions of 'differentiation,' 'institutionalization,' 'rationalization' and 'interpenetration'. The latter terms, Münch applies based on his theorization of their analytical interrelations within the frame of reference that his development of the theory of action makes available. Münch defines the relations between action and the systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation in ideal-typical terms so that

[...] the decisions of a *corporate* actor and their implementation rest upon a *political* structure, that is, on the mobilization of legitimate power within the framework of an authority structure. This does not, however, mean that 'society' is definable only in political terms. The political aspect is so clearly in evidence only because the political structure is in closest contact with immediate collective decision and action. Before they can in fact be realized as concrete action, such decisions always need to fulfil a number of further preconditions. Material resources, cultural legitimation, collective solidarity and individual motivation are all factors which must be mobilized if a decision is to become collectively binding and then be carried out in reality. Only to the extent that these resources are actually brought together does collective action really take place and only then is it even possible to speak of the existence of a collective. Society is the name given to a collective which fulfils this requirement for collective action and also, amongst all comparable collectives, possesses the greatest scope for collective action. An actor acts in a situation. This is also true for society as a collective

actor. But we can also see society as a system of interdependent actions taking place in an environment. (*italics in the original*, Münch 1987: 65)

Based on this understanding of society vis-à-vis its environments that one may analytically describe as ideal-typical environments for action, such as politics, economy or culture, Münch, towards his theorization of interpenetration, states that

[i]f major problems are to be overcome there has to be an increased interaction between society and environment, which we can term *interpenetration*. This signifies that the environment, through the problems it poses, influences the society, and society for its own part influences the environment by developing certain regular, institutionalized actions, which shape environment without depriving it of its independent existence. The various regular actions form subsystems which mediate between society and the particular dimensions of the environment as zones of interpenetration. [...]

‘Interpenetration’ [,,] denotes a process in which a system has such an influence on the environment, and the environment such an influence on the system, that the two transform each other at the margin, without mutually changing their central cores. The more pronounced the marginal zones are, the more they tend to form definable subsystems which mediate between the system and the environment. The more closely they themselves are linked to each other, the more they together form a subsystem which combines within it aspects of the system and aspects of the environment [...]. (*italics in the original*, Münch 1987: 66-67)

This definition of interpenetration is closely linked, in Münch’s theorization, to the notion of differentiation. As terms of ideal typical reference, these processes can be conceptualized from high levels of analytical generality to as high levels of analytical particularity. For this feature of scalability of Münch’s abstract analytical paradigm that I interpret for my methodological purposes as ideal-typical frame of analysis, the following

quotation from Münch's theorization of systems provides an incomplete example only. Thus, Münch states that

[...] one can see that differentiation as described here occurs as a result of interpenetration. The process begins with the interpenetration of society and environment, leading to the differentiation into four basic systems, the interpenetration of which leads once again to the formation of sixteen subsystems. It should be understood that this differentiation is a differentiation beside which integration remains preserved. Society and environment thus have their mutual ties extended by further, finer chains. Even in the outward direction, the differentiation becomes more detailed through new interpenetrations. Between the centres of the economic, political, community and social-cultural systems and their respective environments, new subsystems interpose themselves which then become the new extreme points of the societal system:

The market is the mediating zone of interpenetration between economic action and the environmental shortage of economic resources.

Executive administration is the mediating zone of interpenetration between political action and the environment of external and internal conflicts of decision.

The constitutive affective community is the mediating zone of interpenetration between community action and the environment of particularized groups.

The constitutive symbolism of religion is the intermediary between discursive communication in the social-cultural sphere and the transcendental conditions of meaningful human existence.

Between the social system's extreme points listed above, further subsystems are generated by internal interpenetration as follows:

The penetration of economic system by the political orientation results in economic entrepreneurship.

The penetration of economic action by the community orientation results in economic (market) order.

The penetration of economic action by the social-cultural discursive orientation results in economic rationality in the form of rational calculation and rational technology.

The penetration of political action by the economic orientation results in political exchange between interested parties and representatives.

The penetration of political action by the social-cultural discursive orientation results in the political constitution, representing a discursive frame of reference for political action.

The penetration of political action by the community orientation results in the legal system, which forms a communal basis for political action.

The penetration of community action by the political orientation results in the political community of citizens.

The penetration of community action by the economic orientation results in the interest-based market community.

The penetration of community action by the social-cultural discursive orientation results in the cultural community.

The penetration of social-cultural discursive action by an adaptive, economic orientation results in rational science.

The penetration of social-cultural discursive action by the political orientation results in the professional complex, which combines discursive procedures with systems of authority based on differences in professional competence.

The penetration of social-cultural discursive action by community orientation results in normative culture. Cultural orientations obtain their normative binding force by being anchored in the community. (Münch 1987: 70-71)

As Münch highlights, for an adequate understanding of the notions of differentiation and interpenetration, it is important to bear in mind that

[t]he differentiation and integration achieved by interpenetration between society and environment, or between the societal, action and human condition subsystems, is still only one type of relationship among a number of other possibilities. These relationships vary according to how clearly formed and how strong society, environment and the subsystems are, and according to the degree of development attained by the mediating systems. (Münch 1987: 75)

With regard to the notion of rationalization, Münch clarifies the latter in the context of his theorization of modern social order. By his analysis of how other theories of modernity either fall short of or achieve their proclaimed aims and achievements, Münch proposes the following theorization of rationalization as an ideal-typical component of modern social order:

In contrast to the voluntarist concept of linking communal action to instrumental and rational action, Habermas is unable to offer an adequate solution to the problem of order in modern societies. He excludes the affectual component of solidarity from the life-world, expecting the validation of norms to stand solely on the frail rationalistic support provided by a discursive process of ethical rationalization. The rationality of discourse is the sole basis of normative order. But how can one be sure that individuals will also recognize the laws of discourse, and the laws of the universal justification of norms? In order to escape the pitfall of an infinite regression, or vicious circle, other bases of norms, or at the very least for the rules of discourse, are necessary. In the voluntaristic frame of reference it can be shown with the help of Durkheim that such an appropriate basis for universal rules can develop only if they are anchored in the affectual solidarity of a universal community. Communication only becomes possible once a community has been formed. It is evident in the approach to this crucial question that Habermas, compared to the more comprehensive voluntaristic theory of action, falls back on a rationalistic reduction of action theory which tries in vain to subject material rationalization to the control of idealistic

rationalization. But the crucial theoretical component of a developed theory of solidarity is lacking. The fact that Habermas's access to the latter area of theory is blocked manifests itself especially in his treatment of Durkheim's sociology; he strips it of all its affectual components, allowing it to culminate in the rationalistic idea of turning the sacred into secular speech. In no way should this be seen as a denial of the significance of discursive, argumentative procedures in establishing a value consensus; indeed Durkheim made a clear demonstration of this. What we are concerned with is simply that these procedures have the function of *securing the identity* of society through generalization and are not able to fulfil the further function of *attachment* to values and norms. Commitment to values and norms demands particular attachment to them arising out of a general quality of affectual attachment within a community. Under modern conditions this cannot be a particularistic community, but only an inclusive one. In this respect, inclusive processes are a special precondition for the attachment to universal norms, and they also have preconditions of their own. They cannot be substituted for by processes of discourse and argumentation. Inclusion cannot be reduced to the generalization of values. However, the alternative to the more comprehensive voluntaristic action theory offered by Habermas is an action theory bereft of this dimension of inclusive processes and human affectivity, and reduced to the rationalism and unresolved dualism represented by an idealistic developmental logic of the life-world and a positivistic developmental logic of systems – reduced, in other words, to a rationalistically 'bisected' theory of action. (italics in the original, Münch 1987: 142-43)

Münch understands modernity as a dynamic and contradictory process not having a teleological or evolutionary direction of development beyond the struggles among individual and collective actors. Hence, Münch puts the notion of institutionalization at the core of his theorizing how societies make transitions from one state of economic, cultural, social and political affairs to another, such as a transition from a managerial capitalism to global capitalism. In this regard, Münch provides the following context to the notion of institutionalization:

Within the framework of the voluntaristic theory of action, in which 'meaning' is the constitutive characteristic of human action and 'understanding' (*Verstehen*) is the corresponding method of explanation, sociocultural evolution, the evolution of action, cannot be understood as a quasi-naturalistic process. Parsons had already refuted a version of such a theory in 1937, in his critique of Darwinism as a radically anti-intellectualistic variant of positivism. Parsons held to this position up to the very end of his career. That means that we must give to the general categories of the theory of evolution a meaning consistent with the theory of action. Indeed, we can understand socio-cultural evolution as a sequence consisting of the constitution of genotypes out of a gene pool, the reproduction and variation of the genotypes, the construction and selection of phenotypes, and finally, the feedback effect of this process on the composition and structure of the gene pool. But what is important here is that these terms of be understood strictly in terms of the theory of action. So, by 'gene pool' we understand a value system, such as the modern Occidental value system rooted in Judao-Christian culture. The constitution of the genotypes corresponds to the *interpretation* of this value system, their reproduction and *variation* to the *traditionalization* and *socialization* of the interpretation and to *innovations* in it. The construction of phenotypes has to be conceived of as the application of value interpretations to specific subject matters. Their selection corresponds to the *institutionalization* of interpretations in social systems and their *internalization* in personality systems. As the theory of selection forms the core of every theory of evolution, so the theory of institutionalization and internalization forms the core of the theory of social-cultural evolution. That means that this theory of evolution grows out of a voluntaristic core [...]. (italics in the original, Münch 1987: 109)

In Münch's theorization of accumulation, the latter term of reference is inseparable from the ideal-typical structure of interrelations among the systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation. The differences between Münch's theorization of accumulation and more common theoretical applications of the latter term

come forward strongest when contrasted with Marx's understanding of original accumulation that Münch describes as falling short of the reality of historical capitalist development because

[t]he error of disregarding the working of noneconomic forces begins with Marx's account of original accumulation as the starting point of capitalist development. The original accumulation of capital in the process of expropriating peasants and of commercializing agriculture in England undoubtedly contributed to the economic beginnings of capitalism. However, this is only one factor in a much more complex process. Without the formation of strong nation states in Europe, without the backing of trade and industry by a system of civil law, and without the establishment of the work-ethic by Puritanism, no capitalism would have developed in Europe. Because such a unique convergence of different causes came about, Europe became the center of capitalist development. Outside of Europe all the material preconditions also existed, but not the legal, political, associational, and cultural preconditions. Therefore, no rational capitalism emerged outside Europe.

What is true for the emergence of capitalism holds true for its development. It is inseparably interrelated with different noneconomic institutions in a very complex way and not only shapes these institutions by its dynamics but also is framed by these institutions. Political intervention, the labor movement, the rise of the welfare state, the broadening of education, the rise of cultural standards of living, the working of the legal system in controlling capitalism, and the expansion of citizenship rights all exerted their own influence on capitalist development so that it did not completely correspond to Marx's derivation from its internal dynamics. Class compromise, rising standards of living, the broadening of education, a progressive shift from manufacturing to service industries, political guidance of the economy, and the welfare system have brought forth a complex system that no longer corresponds to the picture of capitalism drawn by Marx. (Volume 1, Münch 1994: 72-73)

In cities, cultural, political, social, and economic accumulation historically involved particular interests, identifiable individuals, and differentiated institutions. Since modernity is theorized by Münch (1984; 1991b) to set into motion the processes of differentiation, interpenetration, rationalization and institutionalization, variations of the structure of modernity have not only macro dynamics of and contradictions between systems of political, economic, cultural, and social accumulation, but also micro dynamics and contradictions of strategic relations among project-oriented groups, formalized organizations, and urban spaces. From such a perspective, cultural accumulation belongs to the structure of modernity as a continuous process of differentiation, interpenetration, rationalization and institutionalization (Münch 1982; 1987; 1988; 1991b).

In this thesis, I intend to follow Münch's notion of cultural accumulation on scales ranging from macro to micro. Thus, I take recourse to Münch's notion of the structure of modernity in order to open avenues to understanding how cultural accumulation may relate to the spheres of economy, society and politics. Münch, who will emerge as a key theorist in this text, defines cultural accumulation within the following context:

Cultural accumulation requires connection to ideas, norms, aesthetics, and knowledge. It develops in the field of cultural association. This connection to culture is a factor of social influence that via the reputation of social action will be transmitted to cultural communication and realized in cultural products. Willing to convince with arguments, one first of all needs those who would listen for a while to grant an advance of trust with their listening. And one needs the approval of those who at some point bring to a halt, for once, their critical calling into question. The one and the other do not proceed properly with arguments, but with good reputation. One ought to earn the latter via trustworthy handling of words and via listening in one's turn. One can also gain reputation with confidence-building, distance-bridging words. In this way, speech is deployed for the mobilization of reputation – a product of social action. (My translation, Münch 1991b: 352)

The theoretical importance of the notion of cultural accumulation lies in the larger context of the ideal-typical structure of modernity. The contradictions of modernity in the second half of the twentieth century Münch (1991b) explores via tracing the dynamics of development of media of interchange among systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation. Münch (1991b) describes the acceleration of the interchange of money, power, reputation and expertise as the growing predominance of communication in contemporary society. Münch relates the classical sociology of Weber, Durkheim, and Parsons to the present-day dynamics and contradictions of contemporary society. In this regard, cities stand out as historical crystallization points of cultural accumulation. Münch comments that

[i]t was, moreover, cities and the special nature of their life that has played a decisive role in a further renewal of Western culture: The Enlightenment and modernity were decisively brought forth through them. Thereby some cities also took over a leading function that has shone upon other cities. London developed into the first centre of the early Enlightenment in the seventeenth century. It was followed by the flowering of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century that was concentrated in Paris. In the nineteenth century, Berlin became an important site of the late Enlightenment. Over and beyond the phases in which they occupied a leading position in the cultural renewal, these cities retained at least a part of their splendour. Once created, culture gives to corresponding urban life a long-lasting continuity. In this century also, these cities still experienced periods of distinctive cultural crystallization, as, for example, did Berlin in the twenties, and Paris in the twenties, thirties and fifties. In the meantime, another city has moved into the center of cultural renewal – New York. It is the city of contemporary modernity *par excellence*. (My translation, Münch 1991b: 231)

The Contradictions and Dynamics of Modern Development

Münch (1991b) argues that the contradictions modernity produces increase in scope, scale, and intensity. The suffering, injustice, irrationality, and atomization appearing on the account of modern culture derive from striving to bring liberation via rationality, individualism, and solidarity.

The process of modernization receives additional impetus as remnants of traditional society clear the way for a more open and differentiated modernity. Class, religious, organizational, economical, and professional structures are replaced with the multiplicity of mutually interpenetrating associations of independent individuals. They form self-organized groups lying at the basis of the systems of markets, policy-making, communities, and discourses. These systems increase the areas of their overlap as the primary sites for social action dedicated to inter-systemic communication, networking, negotiations, and compromise building. The areas of overlap drive the processes of both inter-systemic and international communicative interconnection to become increasingly central (Münch 1991b: 15-16).

Via the intensification of communication, society is altered to an unprecedented extent. Society is constantly reorganized by the increasing circulation, application, and relevance of knowledge. No one can escape the pressure to take public attention and successful self-representation as reference points for fear of being forgotten, lost, and disadvantaged. In addition, integration into a modern culture of cultures hailing from all corners of the world creates contradictions. Cosmopolitan imperatives increase the complexity of the problems and demand higher standards of understanding for their solutions (Münch 1991b: 17).

The constantly increasing demand for influence on public awareness and attention makes public discourse increasingly central but creates inflationary waves of communication. The periodic inflation of communication causes relapses into less advanced forms of strategic conflict settlement such as confrontations between state forces and urban squatters (Münch 1991b: 17-18). Münch understands these confrontations as similar to recessionary crises of economic accumulation. The existing forms of regulation and coordination lose their effectiveness unless their complexity and

adaptability is increased to fulfill the function of symbolic and generalized communication. Language, money, power, and reputation serve as media of such communication. These communication media can cross previous dividing lines of solidarity (Münch 1991b: 18).

Wider information circulation and definition creation lie at the foundation of growing social complexity. Within the more complex circumstances of action, cooperation and support are regulated and coordinated by reputation. This is an instrument of inflation control, and creating widespread accountability for the purposes of discursive inclusion, communicative regulation, public discretion, discursive disarmament, closed negotiations, and crosscutting connections building. One needs these communicative means in order to create socially binding definitions of situations corresponding to the increasing level of social complexity.

The core of Münch's contribution is to argue that a scholarly grasp and analysis of the complexity of interdependencies is only possible with the help of theoretical points of view that bring the comprehensive scale of economic, political, social and cultural processes together. Without an integrative frame of social theoretical reference, accounts miss the relationally interwoven and socially dynamic existence of their subject matter (Münch 1991b: 19-20). Advancing from classical sociological theories, Münch's comparative macro studies foreground the interpenetration and interdependencies between various systems of accumulation that make up society and culture. His study of the culture of modern social order (Münch 1986b; 1986c) rests on comparative construction of the ideal-typical structures of modernity in England, the United States, France and Germany. These countries provide points of historical comparison throughout Münch's work. At present, Münch conducted a more detailed exploration of the contradictions (Münch 1991b) and dynamics (Münch 1995) of modernity of only one country – Germany.

Unfortunately, sociology has dissolved itself in countless specialized study areas while losing sight of large-scale topics. There is a growing demand for social theory able to counteract this shortcoming. In this thesis, I attempt to demonstrate how Münch contributes to satisfying this demand.

Münch conceives the development of modernity as a dialectical process that involves culture and society in a dynamic of contradictions not leading in a teleological direction of their resolution or synthesis. Even though, in German, Münch uses “*dialektik*” – “dialectics” in a literal translation into English –, his theorization does not subscribe to a Hegelian philosophy of a historical development of contradictions towards their eventual synthesis. Rather, Münch envisions an endless process of one set of contradictions replacing another via the economic, cultural, social and political dynamics that these contradictions set in motion. Therefore, throughout this thesis I use “contradictions” in place of “dialectics” or its derivatives in order to prevent misreading of Münch’s theoretical intentions.

The present development of modernity distinguishes itself by the extent of social contradictions between different facets of culture and social action. However, the crises that ensue from these contradictions increasingly exceed the coping capacity of capitalism, technology, democracy, bureaucracy, and law while problematising their deepest cultural foundations. Furthermore, in the process of these crises, Western culture increasingly needs to produce self-justifications via communication within a discursive interrelationship among different cultures of the world. The competition among Western, Islamic and Asian cultures leads to their participation in a shared discourse over meaning, value, and purpose of human existence (Münch 1991b: 21).

The present development of modernity brings about an unlimited reproduction, acceleration, compression, and globalization of communication. Permeating society to an unprecedented extent, communication deepens social contradictions via its unintended consequences. In the course of their representation and overcoming, social contradictions become more acute as continuous communication is integrated into modern culture. As controversies, conflicts, and disagreements become commonplace, the devaluation, inflation, and impoverishment of communication derail effective communication with violent reactions, power-accumulation strategies, and communication breakdowns coming in its stead (Münch 1991b: 22). A further contradiction of social development results from the unremitting expansion of the social spheres of economy, politics, association, and culture. These systems increasingly put interpenetration, overlap,

conflict, and competition across social domains, organizing principles, and communication media into the centre of communicative processes.

To a growing extent, the stable mediation between conflicting functions and orientations requires going beyond the mutual adjustment of economy, politics, society, and culture. Institutions of inter-systemic communication, such as litigation suits, out-of-court settlements and negotiation rounds, will be an ever more urgent need as conflicts over contradictions need to be productively translated into social development. In society increasingly defined by communication, the communicative mediation between systems of social, political, economic and cultural accumulation is achieved via their mutual interpenetration (Münch 1991b: 23-24).

Theoretical Development of Münch's Sociology

The findings that Münch (1991b) presents in his *Dialektik der Kommunikationsgesellschaft* are generalizable beyond the context of Germany he takes into conceptual consideration in as much as it is seen as a particular variation of a more general structure of modernity. For the understanding of modernity in system theoretical terms, Münch (1982) lays the groundwork in his *Theorie des Handelns*. It puts into a single volume the articles of Münch where he reconstructs the sociological contributions of Talcott Parsons, Emile Durkheim, and Max Weber to the theory of action. In this book, Münch proposes the solution of the problem of social order as a contradictory and dynamic structure of action in his process of theoretical movement from Parsons to Durkheim and Weber. Positivism and idealism lie at the foundation of the voluntaristic theory of action of Parsons. The tension between individual autonomy and social order leads to comparable theoretical treatment by Weber and Durkheim of the relations between capitalism and rationality. Münch offers to integrate the positivism of Durkheim and the idealism of Weber into a neo-Parsonian treatment of the theory action. Münch's use of the idea of dialectics also refers to the figure of Marx as another major contributor to the sociological theory of modernity and accumulation.

This reading of the classics of social theory allows Münch (1984) to further formulate the ideal-typical parameters of the structure of modernity in his *Die Struktur*

der Moderne: Grundmuster und differentielle Gestaltung des institutionellen Aufbaus der modernen Gesellschaften. This macro theoretical approach becomes contextualized in Münch's discussion of the place of culture in different structures of relations among the systems of accumulation constitutive of national variations of modernity. Notably, Münch's (1986) *Die Kultur der Moderne* explores the cultural variations of England, the United States, France and Germany. Both other countries and such other spheres as economy, politics, and society remain to be analyzed from Münch's theoretical perspective. Given Urry's (2000) criticism of the national bias of many works in sociology, one may argue for taking global systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation into research focus based on Münch's theoretical *oeuvre* that can be criticized for its historical commitment to a national perspective. Moreover, the tracing of the structure of modernity characteristic of a particular country does not exhaust the analytical potential of Münch's theory. The structure of modernity is defined not only by the dialectics of its contradictions but also by the dynamics of its development. The latter Münch (1995) demonstrates on the example of Germany in his *Dynamik der Kommunikationsgesellschaft*.

Within the context of the European Union, in his *Das Projekt Europa: Zwischen Nationalstaat, regionaler Autonomie und Weltgesellschaft*, Münch (1993) tentatively demonstrates the potential of his theoretical tools for the analysis of the challenges that the EU faces in attempting to resolve its contradictions and to promote its development. Parts of the latter work are adopted for their English translation as *Nation and citizenship in the global age: from national to transnational ties and identities* (Münch 2001). A restricted application of Münch's (2001) theoretical framework is his comparative analysis of the European legislation of environmental protection in his *The ethics of modernity: formation and transformation in Britain, France, Germany, and the United States* partially drawing upon his *Die Kultur der Moderne* (Münch 1986). Münch's (1994) *Sociological Theory* examines different national schools of sociology in both historical and comparative detail.

Since Münch is a largely bilingual sociologist, his works that have appeared in English represent a product of his collaboration with assistants and translators. Münch took primary responsibility both for the quality of translation and for its undertaking. In

many cases, his book chapters appeared in English sociological periodicals before being either collected in a reworked book form or in an expanded German translation. This is the case with Münch's *Theorie des Handelns* that reworks his earlier English articles and with his *Sociological Theory* that later appeared in a largely reworked German edition. From my experience of working with Münch's publications, working knowledge of the German language is required both to appreciate the development of his concepts over time and to appreciate the style of sociological analysis that best represents Münch's theoretical intentions. In some cases, it appears that Münch's works may easier lend themselves to an interpretation into a different terminological idiom rather than to a direct translation into English. The unique writing and presentation style of Münch's sociological works adds to the existing differences between the German and the English languages that make the work of translation even more difficult than otherwise. The latter is the case with the English version of Münch's *Sociological Theory* some passages from which I decided to translate anew for the sake of improved readability, even though his *Theory of Action* and *The Theory of Modernization* are translations of very high quality. This might explain that independent translations of Münch's works are yet to appear.

In *Soziologische Theorie*, Münch (2004) expands and reworks his *Sociological Theory* in order to include theoretical developments taking place over the intervening decade and to reflect the development of his approach to the gamut of topics the work covers. The major risk that is to be avoided in applying the concepts, theories, and frameworks of Münch is lack of sensitivity to the local variations of the structure of modernity. In his theoretical works, Münch explores how the notions of action, structure, contradictions, and dynamics apply to the ideal-typical structure of modernity. An adequate application of these concepts would have to rely on the knowledge of the corresponding texts. To date, only one of his major theoretical works – *Theorie des Handelns* (Münch 1982) – is exclusively available in English translation as two separate volumes of *Theory of action: towards a new synthesis going beyond Parsons* (Münch 1987) and *Understanding modernity: toward a new perspective going beyond Durkheim and Weber* (Münch 1988). Earlier versions of chapters of the two latter books have appeared in English-speaking sociological periodicals only. The majority of the works

representing the development of Münch's theorization remains inaccessible not only to the English-reading public but also to those reading other languages than German.

Such major theoretical contributions of Münch as *Die Theorie des Handelns* (Münch 1982), *Die Struktur der Moderne* (Münch 1984), *Die Kultur der Moderne* (Münch 1986), *Die Dialektik der Kommunikationsgesellschaft* (Münch 1991b) and *Die Dynamik der Kommunikationsgesellschaft* (Münch 1995) come in the wake of such his earlier works as *Gesellschaftstheorie und Ideologiekritik* (Münch 1973), *Legitimität und politische Macht* (Münch 1976), *Theorie sozialer Systeme: Eine Einführung in Grundbegriffe, Grundannahmen und logische Struktur* (Münch 1976), and *Basale Soziologie, Soziologie der Politik* (Münch 1982). Such German sociological classics as Marx, Tönnies, Simmel, Weber, and Elias are Münch's constant points of reference. Münch's technical style of writing may have impeded a wider acceptance of his contribution to sociology, especially within French, English and American sociological traditions. Building his works on the basis of thinking in axioms, theorems, and propositions, Münch draws theoretical conclusions in highly precise, formulaic, and logical manner. In translation of his publications into other languages, there is much to be gained from the introduction of Münch's works to a wider scholarly audience than has been the case heretofore.

Present Application of Münch's Sociology

Since the notion of cultural accumulation does not find a direct specification in the works of Münch, in a multi-sited fashion I follow this notion from macro to micro contexts of its analytical and historical specification. In as much as such theorists as Luhmann (1977a; 1978a; 1984; 1988; 1997) and Habermas (1965; 1967; 1973; 1976; 1978a; 1981; 1982; 1988) have more dominant positions in the contemporary German sociology than does Münch, his basic concepts need introduction into more general sociological discourse. The theoretical development of Münch's sociology and its interrelationships with both his contemporary sociologists and the classical works of sociological theory exceed the scope of this thesis. An interested reader can consult an earlier version of his work on sociological theory (Münch 1994) in English where he addresses other

sociological theories in a broadly comparative perspective. A later, reworked and expanded, version of the latter work is also available in German (Münch 2004).

In these volumes, Münch assesses strengths and weaknesses of a number of social theorists, while reformulating their key propositions in light of his larger project of comparative sociological theorization. In his opinion, careful reconstruction of the classical and contemporary sociological theories from the point of view of the state of the art of sociology should help through inter-theoretical discourse to sharpen the conceptual tools of distinct bodies of theorization coming into contact with each other. I restrict myself to operationalizing his theory within an ideal-typical frame of reference so that it can be applied at an urban and possibly an institutional scale. This takes the form of a multi-sited tracing of Münch's notion of cultural accumulation across its contexts. A larger scale engagement of Münch's sociology may be in order, especially in view of the significant body of his both theoretical and applied works that have accrued, as is shown above.

For my research purposes, I take recourse to Münch's notion of cultural accumulation which is a later development of what his earlier theorization terms as 'cultural system' (Münch 1982). Münch (1991b) further developed his notion of cultural system into the direction of its understanding as cultural accumulation taking place through the media of interchange. In this context, I pursue my multi-sited research of the notion of cultural accumulation across its global, national, urban and institutional contexts. In this, I follow in the steps of Münch's elaboration of Talcott Parsons' contribution to sociology in the direction of ideal-typical construction of systems of accumulation, their media of interchange, and their types of interrelations. While Parsons has intended to integrate the works by such founding figures of sociology as Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, and Sigmund Freud, Münch has undertaken a reformulation of Parsons' theory from the point of view of the later stage of development of the latter's body of works. Since a way to understand the eventual outcome of my multi-sited discussion of cultural accumulation would be in terms of its construction as an analytical ideal-type, which I tentatively apply in this thesis, I have found Münch's elaboration on the notion of ideal type, initially developed by Weber, of use for methodological purposes. Münch comments that Weber's

[...] concept of ideal type is another example of a synthetic approach on the metatheoretical level that remained just as unfinished [as his general theoretical model]. It is designed to integrate analytical abstraction with empirical-historical reality and especially rationalistic idealism with historical realism. According to Weber, an ideal type is construed by exaggerating particular features of a historical phenomenon to an extreme and by leaving out other concomitant features. Two varieties of ideal type can be distinguished, one closer to analytical abstraction, the other to historical reality: the analytical ideal type and the historical ideal type. (Münch 1988: 8).

Within these parameters, Münch defines the relation that the system of cultural accumulation has with such other ideal-typical systems of accumulation as the social, political, and economic ones. Parsons uses the complexity and contingency of action to set the analytical dimensions of his four-function paradigm – ‘Adaptation,’ ‘Goal attainment,’ ‘Integration’ and ‘Latent pattern maintenance,’ referred to within the Parsonian sociology as the AGIL schema. Based on its further analytical refinement, Münch develops his understanding of systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation as analytical ideal types that in their interrelations set the parameters for his understanding of the ideal-typical structure of modernity. More precisely formulated by Münch, the systems are theoretically derived from

[t]he development of the four-function paradigm [that] was progressively freed from its connection with the pattern variables, and the paradigm was progressively generalized beyond its originally limited area of application, so that it could be continually respecified and applied to new ranges of objects. In this way, the paradigm assumed more and more the character of a general theoretical instrument for the analytical differentiation of reality. From this point of view of the development of the theory as a whole, the most significant events of this period are the use of the four-function paradigm in the analytic differentiation of subsystems of action, the repeated application of the paradigm to the problem of

the internal differentiation of various individual subsystems and to the problem of the differentiation of levels of analysis having different system references, and the connection of the paradigm with the hierarchy of cybernetic controls. The application of the A-G-I-L schema to the subsystems of action, their environment and their microscopic-macroscopic ordering yield basic levels of analysis, each of which in turn could be further internally differentiated into a microscopic-macroscopic hierarchy:

1. The level of the 'human condition', which Parsons explored at the very end of his career, consists of : L – telic system, I – action system, G – human organic system, A – physicochemical system.
2. The level of the general system of action consists of: L – cultural system, I – social system, G – personality system, A – behavioural system.
3. The level of the social system consists of: L – social-cultural (fiduciary) system, I – societal community, G – political system, A – economic system. (Münch 1987: 52-54)

My application of Münch's theorization of modernity, systems, and action is limited to my own aims. I attempt to abstain from technical terminology or scientific jargon. At the same time, throughout my thesis, I apply basic terms of conceptual reference, such as systems of accumulation, media of interchange, and kinds of possible relations among systems of accumulation referred to as interpenetration, differentiation, rationalization and institutionalization. The latter terms do not denote actual historical processes. Rather, they refer to analytical ideal types of interrelations among systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation. My approach is likely not to do justice to the theoretical detail of analytical relations within the ideal-typical context of which Münch develops his theorization of modernity, systems and action. However, extensive quotations with his original formulations present Münch's theoretical positions in more detail. I follow Münch's concepts within the context of different scales of reference reaching from the macro theoretical level of modernity and capitalism to the micro level of cities and institutions. Münch justifies his recourse of the notions of systems and subsystems in the following way:

By defining the functions of systems through the classification of the relations between the elements of a system and their most abstract properties, one can justify the choice of these functions: at this level of abstraction the classification is exhaustive. The abstractness of the functions is what allows them to be specified for various subsystems, sub-subsystems, etc., without the danger of committing that error, so feared by Parsons, which Whitehead calls 'the fallacy of misplaced concreteness'. The microscopic-macroscopic, 'sliding scale' nature of the classificatory scheme allows for the drawing of ever finer distinctions and for the continual identification of intermediary types which lie in the zones of interpenetration of the basic types. The repeated application of the classificatory scheme performs here the function that in mathematics is performed by systems of numbers, of which the simplest is the binary system. By means of the repeated application of the same set of numbers, the binary system does everything the decimal system does. The four-function paradigm is this type of system, one which through the repeated application of a small group of basic categories is able to capture all aspects of reality. The four-function paradigm is itself a duplication of a simpler two-term schema (absence of orderedness vs. maximum of orderedness) through the application of this simpler schema to the two basic elements (symbols and actions). (Münch 1987: 60)

Even though the AGIL schema is associated with Parsons' sociology and its purported stress on value system or moral integration, his major contribution lies in the domain of social theory where disagreements among theoretical perspectives and critical differences among different bodies of theory are to be expected. While Parsonian theory was met with criticism in the English-speaking sociology (Bershady 1973; Dahrendorf 1958a; Gouldner 1970b; Merton 1967; Mills 1959), there were attempts at neofunctionalist (Alexander 1998b) or differentiation theory (Alexander and Colomy 1990) revival of Parsons' theory of action. However, it is in German sociology that Parsons' works earned him consistent attention both by his critics, such as Habermas and Luhmann, and intellectual heirs, such as Münch. Even through Luhmann (1994a; 1994b),

as a leading systems theorist in Germany, offered a critique of Münch's work, the latter, considering himself a theorist of modern social order who derives his premises from the analytical and historical foundations of classical sociology may better be approached as a developer of theorization of modernity, accumulation and action from a broadly ideal-typical standpoint. I hope to contribute to the recognition that Münch's *oeuvre* can have both analytical and comparative applications putting him widely outside of reductionist category of a systems theorist. The substantive issue of the relation between theory and reality may have found in the works of Parsons one of the more thorough examinations that sociology has to offer, as Münch suggests. Münch analytically separates such two dimensions of social reality as the contingency of action and symbolic complexity. This can help in analyzing a phenomenon from an ideal typical perspective. My tracing of cultural accumulation, while methodologically deriving from multi-sited anthropology, draws theoretically upon Münch's sociology.

Münch addresses insufficiencies in methodological foundations of the theorization of capitalism as a structure of interrelations among processes of accumulation. His works on the contradictions and dynamics of modernity, as they bear on the processes of political, economic, cultural, and social accumulation (Münch 1995; 1998), open theoretical avenues to the conceptualization of modernity on both macro and micro levels. Münch's theorization of modernity, systems, and action (Münch 1982) does not preclude carrying out, on its basis, of rigorous analyses of the relations in which individual and collective strategies are deployed by historical agents facing particular national traditions, political situations, economic practices, and cultural expressions (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 179-80). The specification of capitalism in terms of the structure of modernity (Münch 1984) may account for the historical dynamics of the disruptions that context-insensitive analyses of capitalist development may fail to do justice to.

The continued relevance of the analysis of the spirit of capitalism (Boltanski and Chiapello 1999; Castoriadis 1999), referring to the famous Weber's work *The Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism*, opens an opportunity for application of Münch's systematically elaborated analysis of the structure of modernity (Münch 1982; 1984; 1986) vis-à-vis its historical typology, changing configurations, and dynamic

interrelationships. The theory of the structure of modernity, as proposed by Münch (1986; 1984), responds to the main points of the conceptualization of multiple modernities (Schmidt 2006), while suggesting an approach that both addresses its substantive concerns and steers clear of its pitfalls. The theorization of the structure of modernity (Münch 1984) also provides the framework to conceptualize varieties of modernity (Münch 1986).

To account for dynamic social change, Münch (1982; 1984; 1991) re-established links to European sociology. The integrative conceptual approach resulting from Münch's systematization of Parson's sociology sheds light on unexplored possibilities of social theory building. Münch maintains that Parsons has provided a theoretical articulation of how the reconstruction of the interrelationships – in Parsons' terminology referred to as 'interpenetration' – among the institutions that compose social order can explain social change. The normative order characteristic of modernity with its co-existence of universalism and individualism, of rationalism and activism, and of its natural law and commercial law has institutional interpenetration as its major generative structure.

According to Münch (1981: 732), Weber discerned the origins of the generative structure of the West, whereas Parsons systematized it into the theory of action. As Münch (1980) highlights, the efforts of Parsons are directed at the creation of general theory. Matching in its importance the critical philosophy of Kant, the body of theory formulated by Parsons invites the examination of the substantive and methodological implications his theory has both for the adequate understanding of classical social theory and for the development of contemporary sociology, as is demonstrated by Münch (1980; 1981: 735).

In dialogue with Luhmann's systems theory, Münch argues that

[t]he empirical objection to Luhmann's theory of differentiation is that it is incapable of explaining the conclusive hallmarks of modern society. In the framework of his theory, Luhmann can only conceive of the development of the modern economy or modern political systems as a process of detachment from formerly existing close ties – the economy, for example, would become detached

from the household, and politics from religion. The economy goes beyond the boundaries of simple household management because of the expansion of the monetary system, and politics frees itself of the attachment to religious legitimation. Hence Luhmann fails to grasp the special features of the modern economy and modern political systems. The specific characteristics of the modern economy are in fact based not on differentiation but on interpenetration. (Münch 1988: 202).

To this Münch adds that

[w]ith this theory of differentiation, Luhmann does not manage to reach an adequate explanation of the essential constituent characteristics of modern society. Moreover in standing by this theory Luhmann misses the explanatory opportunities which would be available to him in Parsons' theory of interpenetration. His incorporation of the concept of interpenetration into functionalistic systems theory leave the theory of differentiation untouched and the theory as a whole therefore misses out on the crucial theoretical advances made by Parsons. In the one instance where Luhmann meets with a central concept in Parsons's interpretation of modern Western development as a process of increasing interpenetration, namely the concept of inclusion, he reshapes it to function as an element in the theory of pure systems differentiation. For inclusion – the opening up for all people in principle of participation in the most varied fields of action – is a substitute for population growth; both, he believes, generate the 'orders of magnitude' appropriate to the increased density of interaction necessary for functional differentiation. By interpreting it this way, Luhmann completely conceals the meaning Parsons attributed to 'inclusion'. Parsons interprets it as the universalization of community relations, which depends on the interpenetration of specific communities, just as it requires communal action to interpenetrate with other action spheres. (Münch 1988: 202-203)

Understanding cultural accumulation as just an analytical dimension of action, I likewise conceive of the system of cultural accumulation, which I borrow from Münch's (1982; 1991b) theorization, as an analytical ideal type in need of historical concretization. From this perspective, the system of cultural accumulation, like the systems of social, political, and economic accumulation, is a dimension of individual and collective action. Furthermore, with regard to the theoretical understanding of the place of culture in society, Münch comments that

[t]he theorem of the cybernetic relations of control and dynamization belongs to the Parsonian theory of action as a way of making more precise the theorem of interpenetration, as a way of analysing relations between subsystems. This theorem too should not be misunderstood as an assertion concerning *concrete* systems. It does not entail a 'cultural determinism' or a functional primacy of the cultural system in a concrete sense. The theorem of the high position of the cultural system as an *analytical* system in the cybernetic hierarchy applied to *social institutions* postulates that institutions can lay claim to a truly normative validity, as opposed to a mere empirical validity dependent on power and interest, only if they can establish themselves as specifications of a more general system of common values. I have given a still higher place in the hierarchy to the societal community because these culturally justifying institutions can possess normatively *binding* validity only if the value system is anchored in at least a possibly universal community of solidarity which, through the self-evidentness of the obligations it imposes, sets a limit to the potentially endless rational questioning and examining of the value system. This hypothesis is traceable to the theorem, already present in *The Structure of Social Action*, that the social order as *normative*, that is, as an order which includes the freedom of the individual rather than as a causally determined, empirical order, cannot be reduced to the interplay of power and interest. The Parsonian theory of action never denies the empirical effectiveness of power and interest, or of conflict, as is so often asserted. Conflict is a dynamic factor which tends toward the dissolution or reorganization of existing institutions. The reorganization of old institutions and the establishment

of wholly new ones, however, are subject to the same conditions as every other attempt to establish social order. (*italics in the original*, Münch 1987: 64)

Chapter One: Economic and Cultural Accumulation in World Cities

This chapter covers the following aspects of transition to global capitalism as it becomes reflected in economic, cultural, and urban policy-making:

- The institutional spaces of art museums represent the everyday reality of the social processes of differentiation, institutionalization, rationalization, and interpenetration of cultural accumulation regulated on the individual, organizational, and urban scales.
- World cities have been argued to now play a key political and economic role in global networks. This literature ignores the performative, contingent and material aspects and has been critiqued from poststructuralist and cultural theory positions.
- Attention to global flows and networks is important to understand these cities, formulate urban policy and theorize the complexity of their role in cultural, economic and political relations.

Cultural Accumulation in World Cities

Arguably embodying the dominant mode of cultural accumulation, New York is one of the cities, the level of intensity of the representation of which few others match. In the city, three museums are especially prominent – the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, and the Museum of Modern Art, New York. In the permanent collection exhibitions at the art museums of New York, the assumption of the radical otherness of the modernist moment of art history is at a spatial, institutional, and discursive distance from the expectation that art, architecture or exhibitions, as outcomes of collective practices, contribute to cultural accumulation on their own.

The modern and contemporary art galleries at the Museum of Modern Art, as well as other art museums of Manhattan, appear to contribute to cultural accumulation.

However, no terms of reference exist that the theory of art can lend to the understanding of cultural accumulation, as a cultural, social, political or economic phenomenon (Perniola 2004a). Masterworks by the major representatives of artistic avant-gardes, interwar artistic movements, postwar painting styles, and modern and contemporary art groups do not represent unquestionably an organizing scheme of interpretation of art. As art history continues to explore the limits of its inherited assumptions concerning the theory of art (Preziosi 1989; 2006), art exhibitions map the possibilities of artistic practice. For example, in the summer of 2007 the Metropolitan Museum of Art exhibited the paintings of Neo Rauch, a German contemporary artist from the East German city of Leipzig. The museum leaves it to the exhibition's visitors to connect the formal experiments with grid-like structures of the conceptual sculpture of the 1970s, which they can see on their way through the modern art galleries, with the nearly flat, fragmented pictorial spaces of his paintings. While consciously citing the representational conventions of painterly realism, these canvases leave gaps in their representational spaces, per Lefebvre's (1986; 1991) distinction among representational spaces, representations of space, and spatial practices, through which their self-consciously absurd forms and inscriptions break through. Across the memory of the aesthetic divide of the Cold War, Rauch's pictorial style refers to the historical citation of the simultaneity of pop art in the West and the socialist realism in the East that the space of the museum stages. Thus, the situated spaces of art exhibitions institutionally perform the inclusion into the museum's spaces of representation. This is done via de-politicized walking strategies (de Certeau 1984) of the museum visitors as they find their way from the Egyptian to the American wing of the Metropolitan Museum of Art – a palatial and an historical example of the increasingly spectacular architectural practices of world cities.

As museumgoers make their visit, their experience can apparently find an objectified validation at the end of the exhibition-walking route. There, a mini-supermarket of the commodified aesthetic experience waits for its customers. In the form of catalogues, posters, recordings, and decorations in their shopping bags, they can carry affordable tokens of the cultural memory that the museums represent, reproduce, and sell to their visitors. For their more inflexible dedication to civic and educational causes, ethnic and municipal museums of New York cede the high ground of commodification to

the art museums that strategically place shopping areas at the terminus points of their visitor walking tracks. These exhibition rooms of objects for immediate acquisition logically conclude the enfilades of exhibition rooms through which, for example, the Metropolitan Museum channels its visitors while asking after their voluntary contribution of their suggested attendance fees at the entrance.

Whether one observes the sprawling shopping center at the ground level, the stylish library-style bookshop at the second floor or the piles of merchandise in the best Bloomingdale's tradition at its top floor, the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) deploys commodification strategies of artistic experience to a great extent. Art museums commonly implement these strategies even though the generous endowments of the largest of them make these strategies unnecessary. Likewise, at the bottom and top floors of its spiralling upward exhibition space, the Guggenheim Museum has the smallest retail spaces of the three major art institutions of New York. The Whitney Museum, not least due to its decades-long scarcity of space and the reputation that holding exclusive biennial art exhibitions lends, has the least amount of areas purely dedicated to the pleasurable experience of shopping for distinction through the association with art that the related merchandise may offer. Its ratio of exchange value per use value of the real estate reaching skyscraper proportions, New York City serves as an emblematic backdrop to the interchange of cultural values for economic, political and social ones.

Bearing an archival debt to the history of cinema as a representational medium, film programs of different degrees of exclusivity run at all of the art museums. The Museum of Modern Art has one of the more developed approaches to the curatorial practice of film screening. The film screenings virtually turn into art exhibitions. Moreover, the MoMA serializes films into separately curated thematic sequences. The latter receive highlighted status in the film programs of the museum, extra booklet space for the overarching descriptions, and enhanced appeal to the audiences that, otherwise, are not necessarily museum going. At the MoMA, the film screening entrance lets people in long after the regular opening hours of the museum. As the museumgoers exit this differentiated spatial arrangement of the museum space they also pass through premises exhibiting the vintage movie posters from Europe. The glass walls of the passageway sometimes open onto the bow tie and evening gown crowd of exclusive museum member

events that take place regularly. Ubiquitously stationed guards and service persons make sure that the streams of visitors circulate seamlessly. These institutional spaces represent with singular vividness the everyday reality of the social processes of differentiation, institutionalization, rationalization, and interpenetration of cultural accumulation regulated on the individual, organizational, and urban scales.

Approached as virtual entities (Shields 2003), cities are neither concrete nor abstract but virtually constituted through the interrelations between economic, cultural, social and political accumulation. In art museums, urban economy, culture, society and politics become interrelated with cultural accumulation as an outcome of their differentiation, institutionalization, rationalization and interpenetration. A city, as an environment of cultural, social, political and economic accumulation, is a system of interconnected infrastructures (Amin and Thrift 2002). Urban space is the scene of interconnected processes of accumulation, and clearly an arena of inequalities, oppression and competition where some urban spaces are more autonomous and authoritative than others. New York, where different art museums form its cultural cluster, virtually serves as the most basic condition of possibility of these cultural institutions concretely positioned within its urban space and abstractly represented outside it at the same time.

As in the case of New York, global art museums accumulate especially high amounts of reputation, power, money, and expertise. These art museums lift New York to the status of one of the more important centers of cultural accumulation. Not incidentally, New York serves as a node in a globe-spanning system of the relations of cultural, social, political, and economic accumulation (Hardt and Negri 2000; Sassen 2006). Owing their emergence as institutions (Duncan 1995) to the economic, cultural, social and political revolutions of modernity, art museums belong the history of modern ideas (Foucault 1966), representation (Prior 2002), experience (Schulze 1992) and culture (Münch 1986b-c; 1991b). Münch's (1982; 1991b) theorization of modernity, accumulation and action offers a perspective that clarifies the economic, social, cultural, and political transitions taking place since the late twentieth century. Cultural accumulation involves multiple social, political, economic, and cultural agents entering into relations of interchange of money, expertise, reputation, and power (Münch 1991b). Art museums and biennials enjoy economic, political and social support from a wide variety of

individual and collective agents (Meyer 1979; Wu 2002). Consequently, across globally, regionally and nationally spread cities, art exhibition spaces are the sites of differentiation, institutionalization, rationalization and interpenetration of cultural accumulation.

These museum vignettes hint at the inspirations for this thesis' search for an adequate theory to explain the operation of contemporary extremes of cultural and economic accumulation. This search led well beyond the humanities and beyond notions of communities or artists, audiences and taste. As concretizations of aesthetic rationality (Preziosi 1989), art exhibitions represent the outcomes of accumulation of expertise, reputation, power, and money. It is the modern social order that provides the economic, cultural, social and political conditions of access to the spaces of art museums (Bennett 1995). As the dynamics and contradictions of modernity increase in their scope and scale (Münch 1991b), the interrelations between economy, culture, society, and politics increasingly take place over networks with global reach. In the increased circulation of artworks, density of art exhibition events and participation of museums and curators in art valorization, global cities, such as New York, participate as agents of cultural accumulation. An arguable trendsetter of urban development, New York structures its cultural accumulation around its cultural cluster of art museums. Since the late 1980s, New York has gone through a process of urban revitalization that reinstated its status as a global metropolis (Sassen 2001). World cities serve as nodal points for the circulation of money, expertise, reputation and power on a global scale (Sassen 2001; 2006). New York historically drew these means of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation into its specifically modern dynamics and contradictions since the late nineteenth century.

As art museums become more central to the processes of cultural accumulation (Perniola 1995; 2004a), they are increasingly embedded into various city-specific structures of accumulation. Art museums accumulate art works, lending agreements, pledges of posthumous estates, and shared ownership of actively collecting or exhibiting individuals or institutions. Art museums institutionally customize their operation by combining control over messages that circulate within their walls, pre-programmed routines of interaction between its exhibition halls attendants and visitors, and cultural appeal of art works on display (Perniola 2004b). As art museums increasingly become

primary sites of artistic representation (Plagens 2007), they concentrate the activities of exhibition publications, scholarly research, exhibition design, international cooperation, and conferences and workshops. Public, private, and governmental agencies pursue interrelated strategies connected to art exhibitions and cultural events. Art exhibitions increasingly involve loan agreements, traveling shows, special projects and artist residences. Thus, art museums and biennials become embedded into economic, cultural, social and political relations of regional, national, and urban scale. Interrelated with the processes of cultural, economic, political and social capital accumulation via their institutional strategies, art museums occupy a distinctive place in urban, regional, and global processes of accumulation. Therefore, the processes of cultural, economic, social, or political accumulation (Münch 1991b) via cultural clusters of art museums take divergent courses of development depending on specific urban configurations of their interrelations.

The attempts to turn metropolitan cities into centers of cultural accumulation date as far back as the 1970s (Meyer 1979). In discussions of curators' concerns (Perin 1992; Schubert 2000), in re-interpretations of visual canon (Crimp and Lawler 1993; Hooper-Greenhill 2000), and in public arguments over access and accessibility (Hooper-Greenhill 1992; Zolberg 1986) that attendance fees, disability access routes, and differential pricing for different audience groups create, art museums receive center-stage as focal points of cultural accumulation. Embedded into conventional city-visitor routes, art museums see coming through their halls groups of globe-trotting tourists and local cultural consumers alike. Moreover, global art museums appear to be central to a more general process of transformation in the dynamics and contradictions of modernity a more radical reading of which provides Schulze (1992; 1994; 2003). In his exploration of the limits of social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation, Schulze (2003; 2006) adumbrates the possibility of the exhaustion of the fund of ideas on which capitalism, and by extension modernity, has been running until the last decade of the twentieth century.

A corresponding argument is offered by the theory of postmodernism. As it applies to art, postmodern theories recognize the originality of the modernist moment as one of the rare peaks of creativity that has nearly exhausted the resources for artistic innovation for generations to come. Recombination, citation, and remake become

signature characteristics of the postmodern style that in the form of pastiche, intertextuality, and simulation has received attention from the circle of thinkers, philosophers and critics that put postmodernism at the global center stage of intellectual discourse (Baudrillard 1994; Foster 1983; Jencks 1987). Writing of art historians and curators acquires the quality of personalized accounts that have more in common with travelogues, diaries, and fiction (Perniola 2004a) than with a scientific program with either weak or strong claims to validity (Danto 1997). Critics and curators seem to create and promote their personal brand as much as artists do. In the field of artistic production, circulation, and valorization, cultural institutions, such as art museums, gain an unprecedented amount of institutional independence (Perniola 1995; 2004a). Furthermore, art museums connect into a network that includes into its mesh galleries, art schools, and independent spaces.

To this institutional network, growing in permanence and comprehensiveness as the number and size of art museums continued to grow over the twentieth century (Meyer 1979; Twitchell 2004), add art biennials that in a growing number of urban locations are highly mediatized events (Vanderlinden and Filipovic 2005). As the frequency with which art events – such as exhibitions, biennials, or film screenings – occupy public stages intensifies (Schulze 2000), world cities become especially culturally saturated. Concert events, classical music presentations, film retrospectives, book readings, club and association meetings make, in conjunction with their dedicated websites for the place, event, and particular series, urban spaces into busy intersections of the traffic of audiences, performers, sponsors, supporting personnel, and security services. Thus, world and global cities become centers of cultural accumulation.

As part of the dynamics and contradictions of the growing interrelation between the processes of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation, the architectural expansion of art museums takes place in the context of growing share of their space being dedicated to shopping, dining, and education purposes (Boeri, Koolhaas, Kwinter, Obrist, and Tazi 2000). Global art museums, such as the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum, act as stand-alone media attention triggers not least through their spectacular architecture. As global art museums become differentiated, institutionalized, rationalized and interdependent with regard to the processes of economic, cultural, social and political

accumulation, not infrequently they forge highly selective connections to local, regional and global communities. For example, critics of the museum island development in Abu Dhabi, the United Arab Emirates, have noted that the cultural cluster does not necessarily contribute to bridging the social, cultural, political and economic gaps among the diverse constituencies of the city, country, and region (Ostling 2007; Pes 2007), even though how art museums elsewhere may perform such role – as the decision of the Louvre Museum to open an Abu Dhabi satellite (Parry 2007; Pes 2007; Riding 2007a; 2007b) might exemplify – is not free from contradictions as well.

World Cities in the Entrepreneurial Strategies of Urban Development

World, or global, cities are defined by Doel and Hubbard (2002) as cities that perform key functions in the global economy that in the process of competition with other urban locations for capital accumulation obtain competitive advantage not from their indigenous infrastructure but from their strategic positions in networks of flows. Attempts at the introduction of entrepreneurial urban strategies (Jessop 1998) are oriented at improving the image of city. The achievement of that goal is sought by the reflexive design of urban spaces through the means of their association with emotion, art, and spectacle. However, these measures frequently leave the task of theoretical discourse, policy-making, and urban design to define the characteristics of world city unfulfilled (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 351; Harvey 1989; Leitner and Sheppard 1999). This is especially the case when that task is set in the context of a greater role of translocal economic relations on global scale (Amin and Thrift 2002). Place promotion and urban policy that seek to be effective on a global stage have to change their orientation away from the local-bounded essentialist perspective that counterpoises city to the world as an object or a flow. Urban policy-making has to adopt a world-bound relational approach to city as an entity distributed across performances, clusters, and scales (Brenner 1999; Law 2000) that in their sum achieve various degrees of urban existence as world-city (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 352).

Considered from a poststructural perspective (Gibson-Graham 2000), world-cities fall short of the requirements for turning their concept into an empirically specifiable

phenomenon (Markusen 1999). This leads to a necessity to explore to a greater extent the bearing that the theoretical construction of world-cities has on policy-making. Additionally, urban policy-making may have to become multi-scalar, context-sensitive, and process-oriented (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 352) in order to respond to a possibly greater role of sociological theorization. Since the central tenet of poststructuralism is the phenomenological attentiveness to the complexity level exhibited by any given research subject (Derrida 1988: 118), a theorization attempt commensurate with poststructuralist approach has to translate the complexity of the phenomenal world into its concepts. First coined in 1915, the notion of world city (Geddes 1915) has remained shaped by its original definition as a place "where a disproportionate amount of the world's business was conducted" (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 352) despite its subsequent qualifications, abstractions, applications, and quantifications. Even though the operational definition of world cities can require large-scale empirical support (Short, Kim, Kuus, and Wells 1996: 698), the commonly used world city attributes are transnational corporation (TNC) headquarters presence, service-sector employee numbers, foreign residents proportion, and equity market capitalization (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 353). The more comprehensive rankings are based on financial assets, transportation infrastructure, population size, business services, manufacture output, TNC headquarters, and international institutions presence (Friedmann 1986). The point estimates take the presence of internet domain names (Townsend 2001), public-private partnerships (Kresl 1995), and cultural vitality (Smith and Timberlake 1995) as world-city indicators.

Due to the epistemological, ontological, and methodological weakness of the notion of world cities (Markusen 1999), the leading criteria for ordering their hierarchy have experienced a shift from the economic and financial orientation to the focus on advanced producer services, credit ratings, multi-jurisdiction law, and risk management (Beaverstock, Smith, and Taylor 1999; Friedmann 1986; Short and Kim 1998; Taylor 1997). Such definitional flexibility follows from the irreducible polysemy of urban discourse, multiple urban contradictions and complex factor correlations of city life, and discontinuous, dispersed, and abstract character of the constitutive urban phenomena (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 353-54). From a relational perspective, world cities are conceptually assembled via "distanciated social relations" (Doel and Hubbard 2002:

354). In order to countervail the tradition of theorization of cities as fixed and bounded phenomena, the relational perspective emphasizes "clustering, agglomeration and localization" (Amin and Thrift 2002: 51) belying the structural underpinnings of such an approach. Based on dependency and world-systems theories, the analysis of the world economy highlights its structure and makes the function and composition of economic activities on different scales more important in explanatory terms to understanding how world cities operate as a global system affected in its turn by the stages of world capitalism (Storper and Walker 1989). At the same time, such forms of structural analysis are open to the charges of excessive macro bias, decontextualized functionalism, and teleological essentialism (Guattari 2000).

To understand the world importance of certain cities taking over command and control functions, a larger structure of strategic relations among cities "within a changing world system" (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 354) needs to be clarified. To this reorientation towards structural relations, the influence of the temporal and spatial dispersion of relations, time-space compression via media and communication, and the globalization of capital, migration, and knowledge all contribute (Harvey 1989; Virilio 1997). Arguing that globalization changes the structure of translocal flows, Castells (2000) gives priority to global networks at the basis of novel organizing principles of capitalism. While being built on information exchange, these networks significantly alter relationships among commodities, individuals, and institutions as they become complexly embedded into a networked space of flows. As capitalism acquires increasingly abstract and distributed qualities (Barnes 2001; Buck-Morss 1995; Gibson-Graham 1996), Castells offers diagrammatic representations of structural relations among world cities constituted through global flows. These flows link urban cores and peripheries into nodes of multiple networks that remain in need of further research on their nature (Bromley 1999), on their relation to developmental stages of global capitalism (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 355), and on their definition (Friedmann 1986).

Building on Castells' (2000) research on world city networks, additional attention to their performative, contingent, and material aspects may have to be paid (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 355), should the structural position of the production and reproduction of the formal structure of global flows be fore-grounded via a shift of theoretical attention.

To the formation of these structural processes contribute discourses on global capitalism (Gibson-Graham 1996; Thrift 2000), institutional, entrepreneurial, and organizational action (Amin and Thrift 2002), and interaction between global networks and urban hierarchies. To understand the structures of exchange that networks of global cities connect, both their contingency and complexity may have to be reduced via application of analytical ideal types. The scales of applicability of these models must range from macro to micro, if the emergent, process-dependent, and dynamic properties of global networks are to be accounted for. From this perspective, Castells' (2000: 10) theorization of the network as an integrated unit of global operation not reducible to the scale of cities comprising it makes important contribution to the theoretical understanding of the global space of flows (Taylor 1997). An analytical approach to global cities would stress the ideal-typical structure of exchange among different processes of accumulation that, within a global inter-urban network, constitute the functions of world cities that follow from their connectivity (Storper 1997), centrality, and nodality (Beaverstock, Smith, and Taylor 1999; Taylor 2000).

Poststructuralist Critiques: World City Policy-Making and Culture

While exhibiting greatest connectivity, London, New York, Paris and Tokyo claim dominant positions in global urban hierarchy. The structuring effects of connectivity as an ordering principle in the world economy promulgate themselves throughout urban networks to produce markedly different regional variations in the concentration of economic infrastructures (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 356; Taylor 2004). Within the geography of unequal globalization (Castells 2000: 10), these urban variations allow for a wider number of cities to play significant roles in national, regional, and global economies precisely because they are parts of the network of global flows. Castells' (2000) theorization presupposes a set structure of global economy where financial flows connect its nodes into a novel network. In contrast, the formulation of the structure of relations among actors active at different institutional, political, and territorial scales has to take a critical account of the wider range of processes, contexts, and concepts that constitute world cities (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 357). From poststructural perspective,

the global economy is emergently constituted in the movement of heterogeneous assemblages (Deleuze and Guattari 1983), in the configuration of carrying forces (Doel 1995), in the relational dynamics of flows among spaces (Doel 1999), and in the becoming, mutability, dissemination (Law 2000), and contradictions of network formations (Doel 1999).

As the relational properties of global networks receive greater attention, the heterogeneity of their constitution via the production of images, discourses, and organizations (Sayer 1994; Thrift 2000) increases. Corresponding parameters of the cultural, social, political, and economic accumulation in which the global spaces can be reconstructed also multiply (Amin and Thrift 2002: 61). Consequently, an overarching conception of globalization is replaced with an emphasis on its unstable geography emerging with the help of institutional reflexivity (Amin and Thrift 2002), fragmented practices, and relational performances (Rose 1999: 248). With practices of everyday life coming to the forefront of the poststructuralist analysis of globalization, the interpretation of world cities becomes attuned to interruptions and fluidities of their constitution (Gibson-Graham 1996; Guattari 2000), movements of displacement, intensities, and human and non-human actors (Amin and Thrift 2002; Brenner 1998; Murdoch 1997; Thrift 2000), spatial heterogeneities of global networks (Taylor 1997), irreducibility and incalculability of spatial practice (de Certeau 1984; Lefebvre 1991), and financial and legal services as translation practices (Beaverstock and Doel 2001). After the poststructuralist departure from excessive emphasis on macro theoretical factors (Thrift 1997: 143), the conceptualization of world cities gives equal weight to the microsociological reconstruction of urban phenomena and a multi-sited perspective (Thrift 1997: 143). Together with an institutional approach to network formation and reproduction (Beaverstock and Doel 2001; Bingham 1996) and the relational mapping of trans-local assemblages (Amin and Thrift 2002: 52), such a 'multi-sited' perspective avoids the reductive pitfalls of both atomistic and structuralist urban studies.

Urban agglomerations of know-how and capital have long been in the focus of policy-making approaches to the competitiveness of world cities (Amin and Thrift 2002). Correspondingly, entrepreneurial strategies on the local level are one of the areas of concentration for urban scholarship. These strategies, aimed to gain competitive

advantage (Kresl 1995; Porter 1998), not only couple the notion of world city with international competitiveness but also treat connectivity with regard to global networks and economic competitiveness as related phenomena (Castells 1996; Munck 2005: 62-65). Urban competitive success is widely accepted to derive from internal characteristics (Duffy 1995; Oatley 1998). Among the factors decisive for competitiveness are initial local conditions and individual entrepreneurial strategies (Deas and Giordano 2001: 1413), strategic economic complementarity (Krugman 1995: 28), untraded interdependence (Boddy 1999; Storper 1997), and entrepreneurial governance of city asset bases (Jessop 1998; Swyngedouw 1997). World cities serve as arenas for individual and collective action. They localize, cluster, and agglomerate a specifically-urban economy. They depend on such entrepreneurial strategies as growth coalitions between urban administrations and business communities (Hubbard 2002), coalitions of urban elites across business, real-estate, and political sectors (Logan and Molotch 1987), negotiated power clusters among dispersed urban spheres (Stone 1989), and non-hierarchical co-operation between governmental and non-governmental actors (Stoker 1995).

The major objective of world city promotion strategies is the creation of a "favourable environment for business and commerce" (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 360). These promotion strategies come to expression in new localism policies (Hall and Hubbard 1996; Valler, Wood, and North 2000), entrepreneurial place promotion (Gold and Ward 1994), communicational urban image marketing (Rutheiser 1996), and mixed-use urban quarters construction (Olds 1995). While meeting with criticism for the deliberate commodification of urban representations, these strategies seek to reinvent cities as centers of innovation, creativity, and exchange. In spite of the charges of standardization, polarization, and deleteriousness (Harvey 1989), the staging of international cultural, exposition, and sports events is geared to urban transition towards post-industrial development. That is achieved by means of the transformation of city infrastructure (Short 1999) and strategic urban investment even though without guaranteed success (Fainstein 1994; Leitner and Sheppard 1999; Loftman and Nevin 1996). To mutually integrate perspectives on world cities as either self-contained economic engines or innovation hubs in a space of flows, a perspective sensitive to

contradictions and dynamics of modernity, accumulation, and action is needed, as is offered by Münch (1982; 1991b). Münch's integrative development of sociological theorization allows one to bring an ideal-typical reconstruction of the links of institutional interchange to bear upon their particular informational, analytic, and legal translation among incommensurate networks, the division of labor among human and non-human actors, and the urban, place-based constellation of otherwise distantiated practices (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 361).

Understanding the global economy as a part of a global system of economic, cultural, social, and political relations, where world cities mediate heterogeneous flows, rather than as a hierarchical order of cities vying for access to economic gain (Amin and Thrift 2002), opens crucial possibilities for the sociological conceptualization of the urban economy. Accordingly, such a conceptualization would fill the gap in the sociological theorization of urban change. The development of the framework of collaboration and division of institutional labor allows the possibility for every participating urban center to enhance its global positioning, for global structural transformations to make greater contributions to urban network centrality than do national economies, and for integration into the global economy to be facilitated by proximity to world cities (Sassen 1991). The synergies obtainable among world cities do not obviate competition among them. To the extent that entrepreneurial strategies reflective of urban agency result from alliances between public and private agents (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 362), these strategies affect the relative standing of cities in the global economy in accordance to their success (Dicken 1992; Taylor 1997).

When taken to the urban level, Münch's notion of the structure of modernity may contribute to analytically sharper delineation of the place of world cities in the global structure of heterogeneous flows. where assemblages of mediating practices (Sassen 2006) variously perform integrative functions. The agents, objects, and relations making part of the trans-local circulation within the inter-urban networks participate in the construction of a world city's positioning. The agents critical to the latter process are local stakeholders (Stone 1989), urban institutions and agencies (Newman and Thornley 1997), globetrotting individuals and groups (Cox and Mair 1989), and practice-inventing highly mobile subjects (Thrift 2000).

Despite being embedded into global networks, world cities possess capabilities of urban agency that via connective, performative, and translative strategies can improve the relative standing a city has in these networks (Thrift 2000). Over alternative attempts to either reinforce the globality of the world versus the locality of cities or collapse the difference between the two (Massey 1999), place-based conceptions of world cities have to be corrected with a flow-based approach (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 363). In its emphasis on contingency and context-dependency, such a sociological approach would chart a theoretical course beyond infrastructure projects, multi-media spectacles, and local asset base investment towards the network-oriented urban policy of the global extension of its translation capabilities in heterogeneous environments. To build global networks, a corresponding investment into trans-local projects sited outside of world cities is necessary. Correspondingly, only non-hierarchical, non-bounded, and non-deterministic urban policy is able to include into its goal-setting the delivery of benefits unrestricted to narrow segments of urban population, evenly distributed across global networks, and propagating “their city networks into a multiplicity of sites” (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 364).

The adoption of the flow-oriented model of urban agency opens possibilities for mutually enhancing urban identities, growth promotion within an urban network as a whole, and knowledge transfer facilitation among cities. These goals are achievable by means of pursuing regional urban growth models (Terhorst and Van De Ven 1995), innovative transnational networking (Phelps 2000), and the trans-local involvement of policy-making (Church and Reid 1996). It remains to be seen whether the highly conditional model of national-scale place promotion or the fostering of transnationally collaborative and coalition-supportive networks will prove more successful in improving relative positions of world cities. The risks attendant to excessive dependence on a small number of world cities as financial, industrial, or cultural centers need to be mitigated by the balance between both the effects of the network development and the implications of the infrastructure investment. A sociological approach to urban policy-making, drawing upon Münch’s theorization of modernity, accumulation and action, may, therefore, prove to be more adaptable to a national, regional, and global situation where flexible hierarchies of world cities may appear (Doel and Hubbard 2002: 365). As established

relationships among world cities undergo change, theoretical attention towards the networked nature of cities can more adequately secure a gain in urban competitiveness. The latter is likely to be arrived at not by overly stressing the structural position of cities in existing global hierarchies or by narrowly restricting the possibilities of their differential positioning but by an emphasis on entrepreneurial strategies oriented towards the reflexive functions of translating among heterogeneous flows, mediating between wide-spanning networks, and the multi-sited performance of globally open city.

Chapter Two: Culture and Economy in Sociological Theory

This chapter reviews the historical composition, institutional development, and philosophical influences of sociological theory summarized in the following points:

- Through theoretical exchanges, American and European sociological theories can cover a wider range of social phenomena than any national tradition of sociology alone.
- Via its interrelated diversity, its theoretical integration, and its overlapping achievements, European social thought can compete with American sociological theories.
- By continuing the development of Parsons' theory of action, Münch's theorization of ideal types offers to supply theoretical constructions with historical contextualization and empirical research with frames of analytical reference.
- Münch integrates Parsons, Weber, and Durkheim into a theory of modernity, systems and action with wide analytical and historical reach.

Revitalization of European Sociological Theory

Cultural backgrounds affect social forms of theory production shaping traditions of social theory in the United States, Britain, France and Germany. The change in their contributions to world sociology can be summarized as a revitalization of European social theory. As respective influences of American, Asian, and European culture rearrange to reflect the shifting international balance among the three regions, sociological discipline also participates in the process where European social thought undergoes revitalization vis-à-vis a long period when American sociology prevailed. According to Münch, after World War II, the United States established a significant presence in sociology for the following reasons. It developed a world-leading academic

system, dominated the world in political affairs, expanded to commercially encompass the world economy, and forged major international organizations (Münch 1991a: 314). The dominance of American sociology was based on the integration of research and teaching on the level of graduate schools and on the institutionalized competition of academic institutions at the national scale. The failure of European universities to introduce research-oriented graduate training, the lack of market competition among their academic schools, and isolation within and across national boundaries of their scientific schools account for their simultaneous decline (Münch 1991a: 314). In this context, American sociology has established itself as a professionalized discipline whereas European sociology, by contrast, has not had access to the comparable organizational resources of large competitive departments:

It is therefore better to follow another way of integration of sociological knowledge than the way of the reduction of diversity via the monopoly of the corseting paradigm of a unified science. This way consists in ascertaining, with the most possible exactitude, which investigative purposes and which objects of inquiry are particularly suitable for a theoretical designation and correspondingly a research direction or a research method, and to integrate different paradigms into a network with the help of which an as broad as possible and as internally differentiated as possible spectrum of social reality can be captured. A network of more differentiated paradigms takes the place of this hierarchy of assumptions and derived hypotheses of a paradigmatically restricted unified science. Thereby, advancements of knowledge will be attained, in as much as connecting paradigms through the loose ends between them is successful. In order that social reality could be reconstructed in greater breadth, differentiation, and depth it is necessary to eliminate lacunae in the network through linkages and to pull the network more closely together. This primarily succeeds via the inter-linkage of paradigms in close mutual interrelation. In as much as they complement each other for the most part, through their inter-connection, certain parts of social reality can be grasped in more precision than only with the help of one paradigm. Besides, in a more narrowly delimited field of investigation, in addition to the division of labour, a

further degree of competition can arise and compel the specification of propositions. Furthermore, inter-linkages among paradigms more distantly positioned from each other are also necessary, in order to investigate the interaction of different forces in specific phenomena. (My translation, Münch 2004: 11-12)

However, more recently, within an economically, politically, and culturally polycentric world, the European Union reemerges on the basis of dramatically intensified “economic transactions, concerted political decision-making, communal ties, and cultural communication” (Münch 1991a: 315) among its constituent nations. Together European nations engage in a non-ideological competition with the United States and Asia in the areas of economy, politics, society, and culture. Consequently, it seems logical to hypothesize that the world preeminence of American sociology will be replaced by a horizontally polycentric system where European sociology becomes once again one of the leading schools of the discipline. The rise to preeminence of American sociology has historically been accompanied by the dominance of the structural functionalist paradigm (Merton 1949; 1968; Parsons 1937; 1951; 1967b; 1977; 1978a; [1937] 1968) and positivistic quantitative methodology (Lazarsfeld and Rosenberg 1955). This was reinforced via the control of the leading journals organizing the scientific community – *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, and *Social Forces* – a unified academic market with the controlling agency of the journals, and the highly reputed academic institutions promoting them – Harvard and Columbia Universities (Münch 1991a: 315).

Synthesized out of British anthropology, Anglo-Saxon empiricism, Italian positivism, French positivism and organicism, and German historicism and idealism, structural functionalism (Merton 1949; 1968; Parsons 1937; [1937] 1968) has reflected the American society of institutionalized individualism, instrumental activism, intersecting voluntary associations, common citizenship, institutionalized political democracy, party competition, minor political cleavages, and capitalist mass production (Münch 1991a: 315-16). While each European sociological tradition had only partial ability to account for the historical variability of social phenomena, the complementary

diversity of European social thought continues to resist attempts at its homogenization or integration into a mainstream social theory. As opposed to European social theory, structural functionalism (Parsons 1937; 1951; 1966; 1967b; 1969d; 1971; 1977; 1978a) has arguably lost connection with the intellectual contradictions of its European origins. As the empirical grasp of structural functionalism on the social reality it sought to describe slipped, the voices of its critics raised in the 1950s led to its demise as a leading theoretical paradigm in the 1960s. To account for dynamic social change, links to diverse European traditions were reestablished by Münch (1982; 1984; 1991) with European sociology, by Coser (1956; 1967) and Dahrendorf (1958a; 1958b) with European conflict theory, by Homans (1961; 1974) with European neoclassical economics, by Blumer (1969) with German hermeneutics, by Garfinkel (1967) with German phenomenology, and by Gouldner (1970a; 1980) and Wallerstein (1974; 1980; 1984; 1989) with German political economy.

Save for Gouldner and Wallerstein, the institutionalization of the plurality of microsociological models (Ritzer 1985) has replaced the Parsons' attempt to build a unified theoretical framework with multiple adaptations of European thought to the empirical concerns of American sociology. Without recourse to broad comparative approaches, American sociology offered few alternatives to the complexity of structural functionalism (Münch 1991a: 317). In all its variety of conflict theory (Collins 1975), rational choice theory (Coleman 1990), symbolic interactionism (Blumer 1969; Strauss 1978), and ethnomethodology (Garfinkel 1967), American sociology spells out basic structures of the societies it studies. The society of the United States is constituted of "the many activities of free, independent agents who realize their individual selves through competition, exchange, negotiation, and cooperation" (Münch 1991a: 317). The globally dominant position of American sociology after World War II affected the development of sociological theory around the world. There its academic system exerts a standardizing effect on European sociology (Münch 1986a). The sociological periodicals of the United States impose, through their editors and reviews, format and quality requirements upon their widely disseminated distribution network marked by uniform professionalism not unlike other global franchises from the United States (Ritzer 1983).

Münch's position is that the American system of sociological education in its dedication to professional standards has led to greatly narrowing the range of deviation from average scholarly quality. This is not the case in Europe where exceptional diversity of its sociological traditions has made it possible to produce works of a much higher level of excellence (Münch 1991a: 318). Correspondingly, as economic paradigm is increasingly ascendant in American sociology (Coleman 1990), claiming to represent a defining direction of theoretical development, as did structural functionalism (Parsons 1937), the major source of inspiration for the current economic turn is neoclassical economics exclusively built around rational choice theory. Such an economic paradigm of sociology excludes other aspects of social phenomena that are not only no less important than economic calculation but also exercise reciprocal impact on the latter (Münch 1994):

This is the point where culture, another dimension of social life that does not establish substantial presence in the world of rational choice theory, comes into play. Just as this theory does not succeed in dealing appropriately with the non-rational elements of social life when it comes to revealing the roots of trust, common norms, and binding decisions, it also fails to deal appropriately with the concept of rationality itself. It reduces rationality to the narrow concept of instrumental economic rationality or goal rationality. Yet that leaves out of account the world of ideas, values, cognitions, norms, and expressions as the subject of interpersonal communication. Both ideas and communication stand in relation to each other according to laws that cannot be understood in terms of rational choice. People live in a world where what they believe in, what they perceive, and what they share with each other determines very strongly what they view as their own legitimate self-interest and that of others and whether they respect the self-interest of other people. Whether I ultimately honor the rights of other ethnic groups to have equal access to any public good that my group enjoys depends largely on the culture within which I live. This culture entails the values, norms, and cognitions that that can be mobilized for the support of a specific right. This is a cultural relationship of the logical derivation of rights from values,

norms, and ideas and of consistency or inconsistency between rights, on the one hand, and values or norms, on the other. In rational choice theory, there is no language for dealing with this aspect of the world. (My translation, Münch 2004b: 124)

Economic sociology, in common with conflict theory, social interactionism, and ethnomethodology, puts transactions between free individuals at the center of its construction of social reality. Its theoretical parsimony, empirical applicability, and basis in the common sense of American economy have contributed to its dominant position in social theory. This puts at a disadvantage other directions of theoretical development overshadowed by the prolonged centrality of American sociology in the world (Münch 1991a: 319).

As “the most exactly and precisely formulated theory” (Münch 1991a: 319), rational choice theory enjoys wide-spread recognition and success that its exact reproducibility, wide applicability, and high quality ensure for it around the world. Despite minimal instruction in the cultural, theoretical, or philosophical underpinnings of rational choice theory, the latter finds its reflection in the global expansion of Western capitalism. However, rational choice paradigm represents a reductive synthesis of other sociological theories that encompass diverse aspects of social life going far beyond the common denominator of economic perspective (Münch 1991a: 320). To rebalance international relations among intellectual traditions of America, Europe and Asia it is necessary to cover a wider range of social phenomena than any single scholarly tradition is able to. In Europe, multiple theoretical schools have historically coexisted that, “based on their own philosophical principles and methodological rules” (Münch 1991a: 320), neither put any single paradigm at the center of their sociological traditions nor professionalize themselves as a discipline.

Historical Overview of European Sociological Traditions

Münch proposes a concerted effort is required to mobilize European theoretical traditions in order to achieve an account of reality that would be sociologically comprehensive in its

dealing with the diversity of social phenomena. For him, the more important contributions to social theory come from British, French, and German traditions (Münch 1986a; 1986b; 1986c; 1989). As British sociology displaced Spencer's (1897; 1975; Spencer and Collins 1914) liberalism, utilitarianism, and evolutionism after World War II, it has developed its own school of Marxist class-conflict theory. This was done by such scholars as Rex (1962; 1981), Lockwood (1958), Goldthorpe (1968; Goldthorpe, Llewellyn, and Payne 1980), Miliband (1982), and Giddens (1984), amongst others, that do not evince a philosophical influence of Hegel as does German Marxism. In Britain, Marxist sociologists, without giving much weight to theory development, have acted in alliance with established power structures to apply class-conflict theory to labor politics, the extension of rights and welfare services, and the regulation of industrial production (Münch 1991a: 321). The British labor politics of compromise secured existing class hierarchy by utilizing the power of mobilization through organizations and unions to bring improvements in the social conditions of working classes emphasizing thereby the solidarity and community.

Münch reads the workers' struggle in Britain within a structure of solidarity among their classes where "tutelage from above and deference from below" (Münch 1991a: 322) ensured the acceptance of the existing class structure. Consequently, the latter has inhibited technology-related productivity increases, individual achievement, and job requirements change. The Thatcherist policy of curbing union power and appealing to individualism has weakened solidarity both within and among classes. While allowing change and innovation to promote the economic development of British society, the implementation of Thatcherist policy-making has made it necessary to restore inter-class consensus. The vibrancy of Marxist sociology in Britain has made an important historical contribution to the establishment of social consensus among classes.

In contrast, French sociologists belong to a flourishing intellectual elite with a wide audience appreciative of their works appearing in the course of rapidly changing cycles of intellectual fashion (Münch 1991a: 323). Works of Saint-Simon (1800; 1865), Comte (1998a; 1830; 1853), and Durkheim (1897; 1973a) continue to exert a definitive impact on French sociology. French sociology envisions society as an organic whole governed from the top of its hierarchic organization. There, every class has specialized

functions that in their sum promote social development, individual liberation, and general well-being.

After World War II, structuralism (Lévi-Strauss 1949; 1962) and Marxism (Althusser and Balibar 1968; 1970; Lefebvre 1959; 1966) gave an impetus to the development of French sociology by highlighting the constitutive role of autonomous structures. The development of French sociology was carried forth by poststructuralism (Foucault 1969; 1971; 1975), deconstructionism (Derrida 1967), and postmodernism (Lyotard 1979; 1983; Zylberberg and Baudrillard 1986). The latter interpreted social domination in terms of the relations between power and discourse, of the mutual implication of social structures and texts, and of the “plurality of aesthetic projects” (Münch 1991a: 324). Beginning with Descartes ([1618-1637] 1963), in French thought power is perceived abstractly so that the access to its manifestation lies in textual structures that only intellectuals can contest as they struggle for the achievement of universal freedom explicitly pursued by actionist sociology (Touraine 1973; 1978). French sociology of Crozier (1964), Bourricaud (1976), Bourdieu (1979), and Boudon (1977) combines the standardized empirical approach of American rational choice theories with an emphasis on social structures thus continuing the positivistic tradition of Durkheim and Parsons. Not without a precedent in Tocqueville (1856; 1967), for French sociologists social structure is represented by the positional power of individuals within bureaucracies (Crozier 1964), capital cities (Bourricaud 1976), and economic, social, and cultural capital structures (Bourdieu 1979; 1984; 1985). In this tradition, social structure serves the mobilization of “appropriate resources in the power struggle” (Münch 1991a: 325).

From the three above sociological traditions, German sociology, from Münch’s perspective, differs in the drawbacks and advantages that set it aside as an important counter-hegemonic intellectual tradition. Drawing upon the cumulative development of philosophy and social thought since the German Enlightenment of the late 18th and early 19th century, German sociology operates under the conditions of academic autonomy where theories, concepts and ideas provide its exclusive environment. This has made possible its “conceptual sharpness, theoretical consistency, and logical conclusiveness” (Münch 1991a: 326). In contrast to French sociology, the academic consistency of

German social theory lacks innovation and spontaneity. This leads to its theoretical development by way of either reinterpretation of classical and contemporary works (Habermas 1971; 1973; 1981) or return to classical problems and solutions whenever a radical break with tradition is attempted (Luhmann 1984; 1986; 1988). The impact of philosophical idealism on German social thought expresses itself in rendering modern society understandable via the dynamics of dialectical contradictions located in culture and institutions. For Kant (1966), moral universalism and moral particularism tend to converge while never coinciding, whereas, for Hegel (1957; 1972), the freedom of reason and the necessity of reality can merge by gradual resolution of the contradictions between them. In an ideal sense, the state can be the embodiment of the resolution of these contradictions whenever philosophical thinkers acting under autonomous academic conditions guide its rulings. This Hegelian position on the role of academic intellectuals is in stark contrast to the engaged proletariat that Marx ([1843] 1956; [1867] 1962; [1885] 1963; [1894] 1964) expected to perform a homologous function as agents of historical change within capitalist economy.

With tragic consequences, Nazism and Stalinism represent totalitarian extremisms that German idealism could not contain within its synthetic logic. The Nazi state sought to exterminate social contradictions of capitalism while the Soviet state pursued the eradication of economic contradictions of communism. Both of these regimes led to total domination by a party elite. For the suffering that these two totalitarian regimes inflicted in the 20th century German social theory carries responsibility because it lent them intellectual legitimation, however minor it may be (Münch 1991a: 327). However, the contradictions of modernity have nowhere found their as deep and as sharp elucidations as in the works of such German social theorists as Simmel (1890; 1900; 1908; [1914] 1926) and Weber ([1920] 1972; [1921] 1972; [1922] 1973; [1922] 1976). They have made an unparalleled contribution to the sociology of institutions (Schluchter 1971; 1972). Münch argues that their theoretical importance is growing (Schluchter 1979; 1988) after a long period of narrow political reception (Hennis 1987; Mommsen 1959; 1974).

In German critical theory, instrumental reason prevents Enlightenment-based modernity from realizing its claims for a full realization of human potential (Horkheimer

1967; Horkheimer and Adorno 1947). For this, either the objectification of conceptual thought (Adorno 1966; 1973) or the regulatory colonization of communicative life-worlds (Habermas 1971; 1973; 1981) are held responsible, with aesthetic criticism and communicative rationality being respectively proposed remedies.

Though Habermas argues that discursive procedures should serve as institutionalized connective links among specialized social domains, only together with the “procedures of negotiation, compromise, and conflict settlement” (Münch 1991a: 329) can they contribute to managing the complexity of modern societies. The autopoietic systems, i.e. self-organizing systems, (Luhmann 1984; 1986; 1988) that modern societies are composed of should be approached as institutionalized functional domains contingently interpenetrating each other while leaving room for individual and collective action (Münch 1991b) and for critical reflection (Beck 1986; 1988; Willke 1983; 1989). To maintain the relevance of distinct contributions of European social thought to the discipline of sociology, it is necessary to integrate its perspectives and its variety into sociological theory. This, however, should be achieved not via the path of the standardization of sociology towards its professionalization as a discipline but via the preservation of its interrelated diversity (Münch 1991a: 329). The comparative advantage of American sociology in empirical research should be combined with the strengths of European theoretical achievements, in order to integrate distinct contributions of diverse national traditions into world sociology.

Exchange, cooperation and migration have always contributed to creating areas of overlap between sociological traditions. These traditions were carried by the wave of refugees from Nazi Germany in the 1930s, the movement of such British Marxist and class conflict theorists as Moore (1966), Skocpol (1979), and Wallerstein (1974; 1980; 1984), and the reception of European sociology by Alexander (1982; 1987b). Nevertheless, the need for integration between American and European sociology remains. No less necessary is the mutual integration of European theoretical traditions that have more developed communication and exchange with American sociology than with each other. An integrative approach to sociological theorization has to rest on the interrelated diversity of European schools of social thought should the latter exert a long-lasting theoretical influence (Münch 1991a: 330).

Philosophical Foundations of Parsons' Social Theory

The general theory of action of Parsons shares with the critical philosophy of Kant its basic structure and method, its epistemological assumptions, and its object theory. The core of Parsons' theory is that "concrete action is to be explained as a result of the inner laws and the characteristic interrelations of analytically distinct subsystems of action" (Münch 1981: 709). The response of Parsons to the problem of social order lying in interpenetration derives from Kantian transcendental philosophy.

Parsons takes normative orientation to be fundamental to the conceptualization of action. The latter he understands as an "effort to conform with norms" (Parsons [1937] 1968: 76-77) conceived of in relational terms that map it onto a space of regularities. Towards the latter, the epistemological intention of Parsons is comparable in its manner to how physical laws aim to capture the regularities of the physical world. The relation between an individual action and the environments that affect it is formulated by Parsons within a framework of "transcendental normative conditions" (Parsons 1978a: 370-71) in clear cognizance of Kant's constitutive impact on both the Durkheim's and Weber's theorization of social structure. In the field of applied sociology, Parsons' work begins with the analysis of Weber's and Sombart's concepts of capitalism (Parsons 1928; 1929), extends to economic theories of Marshall (Parsons 1931; 1932) and Pareto (Parsons 1936; [1933] 1968), culminates in the discussion of social action within classic sociology (Parsons [1937] 1968), and leads to the elaboration of action theory (Parsons 1978a). Consequently, Parsons' work demands discussion as a classical contribution to social theory in its own right.

Although Parsons' sociology has been associated with conservatism (Dahrendorf 1955; 1958a; Gouldner 1970a; Mills 1959), complicated model building, and theoretical reifications, the adequacy of his theory has barely been tested to explore the range and limits of its application. Nevertheless, the groundwork for the constructive interpretation (Münch 1976a; 1976b; 1978a; 1978b) of and the conceptual contributions (Parsons and Loubser 1976) to Parsons' action theory has been laid. Though the importance of Parsons' work has been ranked very high (Faris 1953; House 1939; 1950), the abstruse

style of his writing has led to his theories attracting few followers. This happened not least because its complexity has continued to increase over time. This, however, does not diminish his contribution to sociology. Similar to philosophy, it needs to pay systematic attention to its theoretical foundations, as Münch argues (1981: 710-11). Neither general arguments nor global judgments make it possible to assess the explanatory power of Parsons' theory. His theory draws its fruitfulness from the "joining of opposites – of general theory development with empirical-practical analysis" (Münch 1981: 711) that continually systematizes its formulation of relations between theoretical logic and social practice.

Parsons has demonstrated that when applied to diverse particular cases his theoretical framework had the effect of bringing "considerable clarity, consistency, and continuity" (Parsons 1970: 868) to the mutual clarification of both formal definitions of theoretical problems and empirical insights deriving from research proceeding in a manner not unlike a legal adjudication. The theoretical effort of Parsons has primary importance for the mutual reinforcement of the explanatory power of both theoretical research and practical problem-solving that can supply theoretical constructions with content and empirical intuitions with frames of conceptual reference (Münch 1981: 712). The interpenetration of theoretical concepts and intuitive experience finds its earliest explication in the works of Kant. The latter had profound importance for the development of Parsons' theories of action and social systems. Via repeated engagement with Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781; 1956), Parsons structured his engagement with sociological discourse through the lens of Kantian thinking (Parsons 1970: 876). Taking his point of departure from the Kant's duality of theoretical categories and empirical knowledge exemplified in practical ethics or aesthetic judgment, Parsons expands this duality across other fields of science to formulate theoretical structure as "an a priori set of conditions without which the phenomena in question could not be conceived" (Parsons 1978b: 355-56) systematically. Parsons' theorization of action and social systems follows the conceptual track of development of its structure and method that is parallel to the critical philosophy of Kant. Consequently, according to Münch (1981: 713), the deficiency in historical contextualization that Parsons' work exhibits can be rectified by

utilizing Kantian philosophical perspective for the sake of various concretizations of the theoretical framework of Parsons' sociology.

Previous attempts at assessing correspondences between theories of Parsons and Kant (Bershady 1973) have committed the error of conceiving of Parsons' action theory in narrowly functionalist, evolutionist, and historicist terms. In contrast, Parsons' work stresses the "interpenetration between categories of [...] understanding and sense data, between the categorical imperative and hypothetical imperative, between the teleological principle and concrete judgments" (Münch 1981: 713). These contributions form the underlying conceptual structure that informs without undergoing a major change its expansion in Parsons' subsequent writing career.

In contrast to Kant, Hume's (1739; 1740; 1978; [1748] 1902) empiricism and skepticism reduce knowledge to sense perceptions that bear no intrinsic connection to causal laws formulated by science. The latter finds support for its claims of necessary correspondence between its generalizations and regularities of experience in belief. For Kant, the possibility of scientific knowledge has as its transcendental condition the interaction between theory and experience that reciprocally verify intellection by empirical data and perception by universal categories without reducing the one to Descartes' rationalism or the other to Hume's empiricism (Münch 1981: 715). The hallmark of the interpenetration of abstract knowledge and empirical data is the rational experiment of Western science developed from the Italian renaissance and the English scientific movement. Central to the critical philosophy of Kant is the transcendental argument that only established connection between *a priori* categories of judgment and sensory experience grants universal validity (Kant [1790] 2001: 22, 61-68). Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason* ([1788] 2003) rejects utilitarian moral theories on the basis of the impossibility of deriving the objective necessity of moral law from individual calculations of utility. Thus, he concludes that a judgment founded upon general rules though producing on average correct practical decisions cannot make claims for the universal validity necessary for the formulation of practical laws (Kant 1956: 37).

For Kant, binding moral laws only derive from the "linking of abstract categories and empirical ethical problems" (Münch 1981: 717) since practical validity cannot approximate universal validity. The former are not falsifiable on particular grounds.

Consequently, the recourse to theoretical categories is indispensable should universally valid and order-producing laws be established (Kant 1956: 30). The philosophical foundations of the Kantian categorical imperative allow it to organize particular rules according to their universal validity. Through the interpenetration of logical abstraction and practical utility, the categorical imperative leads to a universal moral order. Such an order is impossible unless the incommensurability of conceptual systems is mutually reconciled (Münch 1981: 717). However, social development does not inevitably end in such an interpenetration, as Weber ([1920] 1972: 435-38; [1921] 1972: 143-46) has demonstrated, since whereas the concept of natural law has consistently evolved in the West, both in China and in India abstract moral theory and practical regulation were kept in isolation from one another (Münch 1981: 717). In Münch's (1981) opinion, Kant's philosophy providing the presuppositions of modern scientific and moral judgment allows for a reassessment of the Parsons' treatment of Durkheim, Weber and Freud. The integrative conceptual approach resulting from Münch's systematization of Parson's sociology sheds light on unexplored possibilities of social theory building.

Drawing upon Kant's transcendental conditions of judgment, Parsons ([1937] 1968) developed his theory of action with the aim of establishing its universal validity. This concern Parsons shared with Durkheim, Weber, Marshall, and Pareto, as he recognized that social ordering directly links to the level of human action. Seeking to arrive at an adequate theory of action, Parsons recognized human agency as conforming to the criteria of transcendental judgment as much as the conceptual foundations of social theories do (Parsons 1978b: 370-71). Enlarging upon the works of Pareto, Marshall, Weber, and Durkheim, since his earliest attempts at sociological theory Parsons sought to reconcile the general theory of action with particular social systems in their interrelationship. Parsons' contribution to the theory of action is not unlike Kant's development of critical philosophy. One of the earliest philosophical theorists of the action underpinnings of social order, Hobbes (1651; 1966) anchors social order in the shared patterns of behavior that form a system of rational expectations to prevent a war of all against all. Individual calculations of utility can neither rule out nor minimize the possible negative effects of anarchy in situations where a 'prisoner's dilemma' applies. Social order is only achievable when a certain distribution of rights is universalized

(Münch 1981: 719). For Parsons ([1937] 1968: 89-94), utilitarian action not only does not prevent but is also socially conducive to irrational and destructive consequences. The normative distribution of rights and duties prevents these negative consequences by putting the principle of adherence to norms above utility calculation, should a normative order become a reality.

In Hobbes' (1651; 1966) view, a consistent utilitarianism has as its own limit the rational realization by actors that, should lasting security be achieved, only a sovereign rule can guarantee the common order to which their individual power should be transferred. Parsons ([1937] 1968: 93) contests Hobbes' position on the grounds that rationality is limited to the individual rather than the collective level. The circumstances of action by multiple individuals are impossible to calculate on a collective level in utilitarian terms. As long as normative limitations to their utility calculations do not obtain, a normative order is impossible to establish through the force of agreement alone. For this reason, the Hobbesian conception of sovereignty makes authority unconditional as a guarantor of legal accountability (Münch 1981: 720). Therefore, utilitarian calculations cannot provide a basis for social order. Hobbes (1651; 1966) demonstrates this when he opposes the state of nature, when trust is absent, and social order, when the latter is arrived at through external sanctions. For Coleman (1971; 1973; 1974), social exchange fails to produce social order other than via collective resources. For Vanberg (1978), social order is impossible, when centralized power to make binding decisions collapses norms into decisions supported by force. Even though, according to utilitarian models, the individual motivation to accept a social order based on centralized decision-making can come from an ability to impose sanctions, the limitless field of purely utilitarian calculations undermines the possibility of a stable order. Changes in the distribution of power resources can undermine an institutionalized hierarchy of power unless a normative limit to utilitarian calculation is posed to prevent an "unlimited struggle for power" (Parsons [1937] 1968: 94).

Arguing that utilitarianism does not explain social order, Parsons follows the Kantian critique of skepticism in postulating that even an incomplete realization of social order requires an explanation of its existence. This is the case especially once utilitarian solutions to the problem of order (Ellis 1971; Schütte 1977; Vanberg 1975; 1978) prove

to not give an adequate account of its conditions of possibility, as is argued by Münch (1981: 721-22). Neither a utilitarian nor a normativist, Parsons' solution to the problem of order is a voluntarist one that makes it possible to represent society as not "a completely causally determined factual order" (Münch 1981: 722) but as one where voluntary consent requires a rational justification of the norms that interpenetrate with means-ends rationality (Parsons [1937] 1968: 82). This interpenetration means, just as it does for Kant, the existence of a normative boundary to the calculation of utility. Consequently, together they form the necessary structure that makes a rational action possible. In parallel to Kant's treatment of universal validity, logical consistency, and causal laws as following from structured perception, cognitive boundedness, concept formation, and logical conclusions, Parsons examines action as consisting of ends, available means, given conditions, and selection principles (Parsons [1937] 1968: 77-82). These he considers to be systemically generative of social order or lack thereof (Münch 1981: 724).

As a condition of possibility of social order, only categorical principles of action can serve. By combining the normative with conditional grounds for action, categorical principles offer basic dimensions for an analytical description of how action takes place (Parsons [1937] 1968: 76-77). The categories of space and time perform a similar analytical function for Kant's discussion of classical mechanics (Münch 1981: 724). As a matter of Kantian categorical rule, an action based on normative principles of action can only lead to social order under the following conditions. The exclusion of the use of force and fraud should be unconditional. The peaceful means of exchange should not be enforced by external sanctions. In addition, motives for action should remain constant whether one is in a position of power and authority or not. To explain how social order is possible, Parsons maintains that it is necessary to step outside of the utilitarian framework of explanation. The action based on categorical principles does not follow from common norms, social exchange, or centralized authority (Coleman 1971; Ellis 1971; Vanberg 1978) but from a situation where "categorical obligation toward common norms" (Münch 1981: 725) is constitutive of a social system. Neither means-ends rationality nor an obligation to categorical norms can alone produce existing social order. However, the historical interpenetration of utilitarian rationality and categorical norms depends on the

specific conditions promoting or impeding social order that an adequate theoretical framework can reconstruct. Münch maintains that Parsons has provided a theoretical articulation of how the reconstruction of the interpenetration among the systems that compose social order can explain social change. At the same time, it remains to be determined to what extent the notion of dialectics, present both in works of Kant and Hegel, affects the development of Parsons' and Münch's sociology.

Systematization by Münch of European Classical Traditions

Both Kant's and Whitehead's ([1925] 1967) epistemology enable sociology to formulate analytical realism (Bershady 1973; 1977; Parsons 1977a) consisting in foregrounding the role that theoretical frames play in the definition, interpretation, and classification of empirical phenomena (Parsons [1937] 1968: 30). The latter participate in the "interpenetration of empirical observation and a theoretical frame of reference" (Münch 1981: 727) that reciprocally differentiates reality, examines causal relations, and develops abstractions. Since the interplay between abstraction from particulars and particularization of abstractions is at the foundation of Parsons' theory, the latter remains inaccessible unless his philosophical background is brought to bear on the elucidation of the "function of analytical schematization" (Münch 1981: 728). Derived from Kant's and Whitehead's epistemology, Parsons' concept of analytical realism seeks to account selectively for empirical phenomena in the theoretical terms of reference specific to sociology (Münch 1987: 21). In his sociological theorization, Parsons adopted substantively sociological, idealist, and biological aspects of the conceptualization of action from Durkheim, Weber, and Freud respectively. In Münch's opinion, these conceptual aspects neither represent nor lead to reductivism.

As opposed to the utilitarianism of Spencer, Durkheim ([1893] 1998) asserts the importance of categorically binding rules. In forming the precondition for social exchange, categorical rules should not be subject to utility calculation if societies were to avoid the moral crises associated with the erosion of normative authority. For Durkheim, normative order depends not only on the obligation but also on the desire to accept norms. That essentially poses interpenetration between society and personality. Making

the observance of norms dependent on group belonging, Durkheim (1973a; 1973b; Parsons 1967a; [1937] 1968: 324-408) excessively particularized the connection between personality and society. This connection breaks down either whenever social ties become overly weak (Durkheim [1897] 1952) or whenever the institutionalization of norms is insufficient (Durkheim [1893] 1964: 1-31). Durkheim also demonstrated that norm internalization and personality development do not exclude, nor take place at the expense of, each other. This holds since the division of labor and the autonomy from primary group reinforce each other to the point where comprehensive normative order and individualization presuppose one another. Durkheim's position corresponds to how Parsons conceptualizes the interpenetration of social institutions and personality (Münch 1981: 729).

In his comparative study of religion, Weber ([1920] 1972) also refers to interpenetration to explain social change and historical development. The interpenetration produces four types of the interrelation between religious ethics and the world. They include accommodation, isolation, reconciliation, and mutual penetration (Münch 1981: 730; Parsons 1963a). Weberian worldly accommodation is prevalent in societies where groups promoting categorical norms are not separate from practical life and social hierarchies, for example Chinese literati (Weber [1920] 1972: 276- 536). Accommodation leads to the dominance of utilitarian rationality. Weberian reconciliation is characteristic of societies separated into internally organized social spheres, such as castes (Weber [1921] 1972). Weak symbolic integration among these spheres makes general normative order impossible. Weberian isolation results from the separation of categorical norms as a subject of intellectual discourse from the conduct of everyday life, as is characteristic of Buddhism (Weber [1921] 1972). This leads to the impossibility of generalized normative rules that could exercise a regulatory function across society. Weberian mutual penetration brings institutionally independent spheres under the normative control that limits utilitarian calculation with ethical regulation, as was the case for Protestant capitalism (Weber [1920] 1972: 17-237).

The formation of the medieval city gave a strong impulse to the process of interpenetration among religion, economy, and politics (Weber [1922] 1976: 727-814). By bringing respective religious, economic, and political communities into proximity,

medieval cities increased interaction among them. This gradually lead to polarizing tensions. After the Reformation these tensions alternatively strengthened either the absolutism of dominant worldly interests or the Puritanism of universal ethical conduct (Münch 1981: 731). The normative order characteristic of modernity with its co-existence of universalism and individualism, of rationalism and activism, and of its natural law and commercial law has institutional interpenetration as its major generative structure. According to Münch (1981: 732), Weber discerned the origins of the generative structure in the West whereas Parsons systematized it into the theory of action.

Münch finds in Freud a psychological perspective on the theory of the interpenetration of society and personality. This psychological perspective Parsons (1953: 15) saw as important as the sociological perspective of Durkheim. The Freud's analysis of personality differentiates the latter into the categories of 'id', 'ego', and 'superego'. These categories respectively represent libidinal drives, external reality, and cultural norms (Freud 1972). By emphasizing their interpenetration, Parsons points out that they are equally affected by their interrelationship with each other and their social environment (Münch 1981: 732). In the process of socialization, Freud identifies the forms of object cathexis transfer and the differentiation of libidinal objects that are at the basis of the progressive internalization of cultural norms and of growing individual autonomy. These processes Parsons summarizes as their mutually reinforcing interpenetration (Parsons 1955a; 1955b; 1964b; 1964c; Parsons and Bales 1955).

Concluding Overview

Parsons lays the foundations of the theory of interpenetration by constructively integrating Durkheim, Weber, and Freud into his theory of action. Over the course of its refinement, the theory of action has exhibited wide-reaching analytical accounts of the relations of interpenetration of subsystems. While possessing their own institutional autonomy, these interrelated systems allow both for their reconstruction as ideal types and for the exploration of the "nature and extent of their interpenetration" (Münch 1981: 734). Only in their interaction do these systems allow for new levels of interrelated

systemic development, of the containment of tensions among social systems, and of the reproduction of institutional unity and identity (Luhmann 1977a; 1977b; 1978a; 1978b).

As Münch (1980) highlights, the efforts of Parsons are directed at the creation of general theory. The theoretical integration of classical sociological perspectives accomplished by Parsons retains its sociological relevance. However, other attempts at theoretical generalizations mostly reduce Weber to historicist conflict theory (Bendix and Roth 1971), reinterpret Durkheim and Weber in realist and utilitarian terms (Pope 1973; Pope, Cohen, and Hazelrigg 1975; Warner 1978), produce an idealist reading of Weber's sociology (Tenbruck 1975), and restrict Weber to the dialectics between ideas and interests (Schluchter 1976; 1978; 1979).

Different systems do not have to exhibit complete autonomy of their rules and laws to claim their independence since they usually rest on different social groups, promote distinct social practices, and enter into relations of practical interpenetration while remaining analytically separable, as ethics and business are. To grasp the dialectics of systemic interpenetration, attention has to be paid to the phenomenon of the 'zone of intersection' between institutionalized spheres, Münch theorizes it. There, the interpenetration between them should not be equated with the incorporation of one sphere into another, institutional incompatibility, and the expansion of one system at the expense of another (Münch 1981: 735). The dialectics, whereby the power and scope of each system is enhanced in the process of interpenetration, should not be interpreted in crude functionalist terms of economic determinism (van den Berghe 1963). Rather, the process of interpenetration proceeds in the direction of emancipatory development towards the growing autonomy and interdependence (Nelson 1969). Over the successive stages of his theoretical development, Parsons has refined his approach to the analytical differentiation of social systems (Parsons 1951; Parsons and Shils 1951), to the differentiation of systemic development, and to the theorization of macro-micro link (Parsons, Bales, and Shils 1953). In addition, Parsons systemically specified the relations of control and interchange among society (Parsons 1969a; 1969b; 1969c; Parsons and Smelser 1956), action (Parsons 1977c; Parsons and Platt 1973), and personality (Parsons 1978b). Matching in its importance the critical philosophy of Kant, the body of theory formulated by Parsons invites the examination of its substantive and methodological implications

both for the adequate understanding of classical social theory and for the development of contemporary sociology, as is demonstrated by Münch (1980; 1981: 735).

Chapter Three: Theory of Action in American Sociological Tradition

This chapter shows the relevance of Münch's theory of action to the individual and collective dynamics of modern social order in the following analytically, relationally, and discursively relevant ways:

- Münch's theorization of modernity, systems and accumulation allows for the analytical and historical description of individual and collective action.
- The notions of differentiation, institutionalization, rationalization and interpenetration may facilitate the analytical construction of ideal types of the interchange of power, reputation, expertise and money.
- Institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration of pre-existing structures conceptually describe the organizational construction, the justification of change, and the deployment of representation.

Münch's Development of Action Theory

The general theory of action originally formulated by Parsons (1937; 1971) and developed in a comparative and dialectical direction by Münch (1982; 1984; 1986b-c) provides accounts of the structure of modernity, accumulation systems, and their developmental dynamics in terms that conform to rigorous principles of analytical realism. Since the 1980s, in German-speaking sociology the theoretical schools centering on Luhmann's systems theory, phenomenology of Luckmann and Schutz, rational choice theory, and sociology of knowledge have been dominant. Nevertheless, given the close relation of Parsonian theory to German-speaking economic sociology (Alexander 1984), Münch's works may provide one of the more insightful elaborations on the social theorization of the former. Münch (1982) argues that Parsons' theory provides the basis to adequately account for modernity, systems, and action. Parsonian theory gave

theoretical impetus for historical and comparative research on social differentiation by Münch (1984; 1986b-c). Based on his reconstruction of Parsons' theory, Münch has analysed changes in contradictions and dynamics of modernity within a single society (Münch 1991b; 1995). Economy and culture can exemplify the interrelations between distinct systems of accumulation. In discussions of respective transitions from Fordism to post-Fordism and from modernism to postmodernism (Harvey 1989; Jameson 1991), economy and culture may allow for a tentative demonstration of the applicability of Münch's theorization of modernity, systems, and action. Within such a perspective, cities cease become sites where ideal-typical structures of modernity become historically concrete. Cities increasingly claim for themselves the status of decisive sites of particular relations among the processes of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation to the effect that on the urban level rules and laws of neither economy, nor culture, nor society, nor politics apply in complete autonomy, but have to take into account the fact of their mutual interconnectedness, in the process of their achievement of new levels of development. Thus, the analytical ideal-typical frameworks of Münch's theorization of modernity, systems, and action have bearing that spans from macro to micro levels.

Even though a micro analytical perspective taking into account institutional projects, organization building, and support enlistment strategies claims to provide a corrective to the analytical frame of reference originally developed by Parsons (Colomy and Rhoades 1994), the theoretical intention of Parsons' theory of action does not exclude "comparative and historical case studies of structural change" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 547) as his detractors argue. Despite claims that macro and micro levels involve analytic or empirical reduction (Blau 1987; Collins 1981), the recognition of their mutual relevance has given significant impetus to develop a comprehensive perspective that seeks to resolve the conceptual distinction between these levels of analysis via integrative theoretical frameworks (Münch and Smelser 1987; Ritzer 1990a; 1990b). Conceptual and empirical shortcomings of either macro or micro approaches open possibilities for their theoretical integration within a single frame of analytical reference, as has arguably been done by Münch in his elaboration upon Parson's theory of action. Having applicability from macro to micro levels of analysis as is evidenced in the topical range of his works, Münch's theorization of modernity, systems, and action represents a

largely overlooked direction of theoretical development. Even though the structure of modernity, the interpenetration between systems of accumulation, and a developed structure of micro-macro links between systems of action constitute the theoretical core of Münch's works, such micro-inspired theorizations of the notion of institutional entrepreneurs, the theory of social movements, and the studies of comparative and historical structural change (Colomy and Rhoades 1994) do not refute Münch's theoretical approach.

Within American sociological tradition, Alexander (1987a) reformulates Parson's (1937) means and ends conceptualization as a "micro-translation of norms and conditions" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 548) into a theory of social agency where micro and macro levels of analysis are linked. Such a reconceptualization of social agency incorporates microsociological theories. It emphasizes individual coordinations between micro and macro levels. Rational choice theory conceptualizes the macro-micro link as immediate costs calculation, phenomenological sociology and ethnomethodology conceives it as order-seeking activity, and symbolic interactionism conceives it as individual interpretation (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 548). Whereas micro theories treat macro structures as residual categories contingent on but distinct from action, macro theories "specify their pertinent dimensions" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 549). From the perspective of American sociology, hermeneutic, structural, Durkheimian, and Weberian theories refer to macro levels in terms of normative complexes while conflict and Marxist theories refer in terms of conditional elements (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 548-49). Micro theories can be shown to describe social action along two complementary dimensions of interpretation and strategization (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 549). The former of these includes typification and invention processes while the latter includes reward maximization and cost minimization (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 549).

The two dimensions of action interact, since interpretative understanding contributes to the production of relevant knowledge for strategic action at the same time as interpretive efforts extend to the phenomena manipulated by strategic action. Because emergent qualities and constraining effects of social order cannot find adequate explanation by means of micro theories, it has lead to attempts at their contingent integration with macro theories via conditional effects of macro environments on

individual action that reflexively reproduces them. Parsons' (1951) division of the social systems into society, culture, and personality corresponds to the dimensions of social differentiation and political institutions, of solidarity bonds and the sense of community, and of social roles and norms and sanctions. The cultural systems, as different historical concretizations of ideal-typical forms of action, affect action along both interpretation and strategization dimensions by supplying reality descriptions, drawing moral boundaries, and institutionalizing value classifications. Capacities of interpretation and strategization of personal systems vary both over life cycle and across social systems, as ideal-typically different forms of action. The dimensions of interpretation and strategization "enable actors to formulate new courses of action and recreate their environments" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 550) at the same time as the latter limit contingent action.

Within the sociological programs of American micro theories, micro refers to activities of individuals and groups that propose and implement structural alterations into an institutional order while macro characterizes environmental conditions informing and constraining these activities. Without the conceptual model of action, as is found in its Münch's theorization, macro environments are treated as actors in Marxist, neo-Marxist, and Weberian theoretical reifications of social classes and the state even though they are incisive as macro accounts of social transformation (Evans, Rueschemeyer, and Skocpol 1985; Hindess 1986; Skocpol 1985). The weak theorization of macro processes shifts the analytical balance in favor of micro level exemplified by hypervoluntarist treatments of party politics in Marxist tradition (Lenin [1902] 1969) or of charismatic leadership in Weberian tradition (Dow 1968; Fagen 1965). Overlooking micro implications of Parsons' theory of action, micro-oriented American sociological theory (Alexander 1992) has largely treated environments as causal actors and has attributed the contingency of individual action to systemic agency. A classical work of social theory, Durkheim's *The Division of Labor in Society* ([1893] 1964) connects greater social complexity to higher levels of specialization while it attributes structural adjustments in resource distribution to environmental pressures rather than to individual and group contributions.

Based on Weber's analysis of social institutions, Parsons (1966; 1971) pays more attention to historical detail than does Durkheim. At the same time, from the perspective

of American micro sociology, Parsons appears to neglect individual and group impact on structural change while he is depicted to overly concentrate on the macro dynamics of institutions and societies. Likewise, offering a sophisticated theoretical model of social differentiation, Smelser (1959) is, nevertheless, "almost exclusively concerned with the interface between subsystems and their environments" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 552) as a form of interplay between institutions and social structures. Adopting an interest oriented explanatory model, Smelser (1991; 1974; 1985; 1990) has combined the functionalist analysis of macro environments with de Tocqueville's notion of estates and with primordial groups. Smelser's theoretical approach allowed him to discuss micro dynamics more compellingly even though not without avoiding the conflation of macro and micro dimensions. From a post-Parsonian perspective, Luhmann (1982; 1990; 1992) explains the transition from stratificatory differentiation to functional differentiation via "movement to greater structural complexity" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 552) of the social systems that undergo self-referential evolution triggered by interaction with their environments. In this regard, Münch (1985), favours in his analysis the interaction between systems without disprivileging, however, individual and group agency. In keeping with Parsons' analysis of action, systems and institutions, Münch (1985) offers a theorization of modernity, systems, and action sensitive to their contradictions and dynamics in a broadly comparative perspective amenable both to micro and macro analyses. However, the reception of his work in American micro sociology has stressed the model-building, value-oriented, and system differentiation features of his theorization (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 553). This has missed the import of Münch's work both for the understanding of Parsons' contribution to social theory and for the implications his theorization of modernity, systems and action has for grasping contradictions and dynamics on macro and micro scales. In micro sociology, an area where has arguably has an important contribution to make, a North American view of Münch's theorization emphasizes his putative preoccupation with "existing traditions, consistency with general values, directedness towards collective goals, and adaptability to changing situations" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 553).

Charging Parsons' theory of action with limited empirical support, the micro bias of American sociology follows from representing Parsons' theorization as treating

systems as agents responding to changes in their environments thus arguably causing this micro perspective to see systems to differentiate over and above individual and group efforts. The focus of American sociology both on individual actors and on structural differentiation, has restricted its theoretical attention to how historical systems "select one course of institutional change over another" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 553). In contrast, Münch's theorization contributes to ideal-typical analysis of different forms of action as they relate to economic, cultural, social and political accumulation. Rather than concentrating on the impact that individual and group action has on structural change (Champagne 1992b; Colomy 1990a), amounting to a micro interpretation of structural differentiation, Münch's theorization offers one of the more consistent developments of classical sociology in light of Parsons's theory of action that places excessive emphasis neither on macro structures nor on their differentiation. On the contrary, as opposed to theorizations of blunted differentiation (Smelser 1990), unequal differentiation (Champagne 1990), uneven differentiation (Champagne 1992a; Colomy 1985), dedifferentiation (Lechner 1990; Tiryakian 1992), and incomplete differentiation (Surace 1992), both Parsons and Münch pay significant theoretical attention to the interpenetration among different ideal-typical forms of action as a matter of their analytical reconstruction. Far from being theorists of differentiation, Parsons and Münch offer explanatory frameworks that pay equal attention both to the micro and macro processes. It is only when understood as the consequences of differentiation that "coalition formation, negotiation, and group conflict" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 554) become positioned in the center of the micro-theoretical attention of American sociology. For the latter, social differentiation includes, alongside its positive effect on flexibility, adaptiveness, and effectiveness, its corresponding negative effects (Colomy 1990b; Rhoades 1990; Smelser 1974; 1985). However, the sociological understanding of social reality remains incomplete without taking into account the interpenetration among different ideal-types of action described in the theoretical terms of Parsons as the economic, cultural, social, and political systems. Münch's attention to the roots of Parsons' theorization in the classical works of Weber, Durkheim, and Freud, opens a possibility for me to explore these systems of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation as analytical ideal types. In the following chapters, I attempt to concretize

these analytical ideal types of accumulation in the contexts ranging from macro to micro levels of analysis.

Parallels in American Sociology to Münch's Theorization

Münch's theorization of systems and action introduces such correctives into Parsons' theory of action that extend the empirical and conceptual applicability of the explanatory framework of the latter to the comparative study of individual and collective action. This allows the parallels between Münch's theorization of systems and action with the emphasis on differentiation of American sociology to emerge. For Münch (1988: 223)

[...] differentiation is also an inevitable consequence of action being rationalized for the purpose of achieving specific goals, whether they be the fulfillment of economic needs, the maintenance of internal and external security, the solution of a technical or craft problem, or the solution of a problem in thought. The greater the tendency of such spheres of action to be rationalized for achieving specific purposes, the more they will necessarily follow their own laws, and the more they will come into conflict with the original community norms. While relations with those outside the community, through economic exchange or political action, are marked as norm-free territory from the start, the rationalization of action in relation to different purposes breaks up the unity of collective thought, feeling and action, so that all three split into a number of variants. The more rationalization of different action spheres according to their own inner laws is accompanied as a result by specialization of work tasks which are then always performed by the same fixed groups, the more society will split up into special communities with norms of their own, having no commonly valid order to span between them. (Münch 1988: 223)

Given that for Münch, as for Weber, a theoretical distinction exists between the analytical and historical ideal types of action, the historical formation of the systems of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation demands attention not only to their historical

contradictions but also to their dynamics. A pioneering work in this regard is Eisenstadt's (1964; 1965; 1971; 1973; 1980). It identifies institutional entrepreneurs as groups of agents that initiate and direct economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation. By taking the lead in promoting structural change, they "crystallize broad symbolic orientations in new ways, articulate specific goals, and construct novel normative and organizational frameworks" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 554). In contrast to Marx's notion of class, Weber's of the state, and Smelser's of estate, institutional entrepreneurs are groups that are "usually small in number, communicate regularly, share a corporate identity and culture, and are mobilized in pursuit of an identifiable program" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 554). Eisenstadt approaches economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation as an outcome of struggles and alliances among groups (Alexander and Colomy 1985a; 1985b), making the process of social change fraught with uncertainty and problems. Thus, the historical formation of the systems of accumulation as a process of differentiation of social structure depends less on rational response to systemic environments than on "relatively autonomous processes of group formation and functioning and of goal articulation" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 555).

Eisenstadt avoids micro reductionism by recognizing the limits that environments impose on institutional entrepreneurship; actors pursue their ends as part of entrepreneurial conduct. In his understanding, entrepreneurial conduct comprises "agentic processes of typification, invention, and strategization" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 555). While the notion of institutional entrepreneurship has been applied to explain the rise of bureaucratic empires (Eisenstadt 1963) and the development of ancient civilizations (Eisenstadt 1982; 1985; 1990), rather than being interpreted as a contribution to the "study of micro dynamics affecting differentiation" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 555) it can be considered as a case in point that Parsonian theory of action accounts for. Consequently, one may rely on such Parsons' analytical systems of action, and their further systematization by Munch, as the economic, cultural, social, and political systems, in order to identify the ideal-typical dimensions of the corresponding processes of accumulation. Analytically, such aspects of action of institutional entrepreneurs as project articulation, organization development to support new projects, and the cooptation of other groups and organizations correspond to the systems of cultural, political, and social

accumulation respectively. Deriving from existential Marxism (Sartre 1963: 91-166), the notion of institutional project facilitates sociological generalizations by combining the construction of organizational or institutional niche, the identification of pretexts for change, the recommendation of new differentiation levels, the employment of institutional prototypes, and the elaboration of appropriate imagery (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 555-56). By proposing institutional projects, entrepreneurial groups open a space unfolding between their actions and their macro environments (Sartre 1963: 91). Through contingent interaction with the processes of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation on the micro level, entrepreneurial groups steer the course of the crystallization of new institutions. Institutional projects instrumentalize, as their pretexts, the process of the legitimization of structural change. The legitimization process includes the condemnation of existing conditions (Turner and Killian 1987: 242-45, 66-72) and evaluative contrasting of institutions (Shibutani 1970). This is shown by empirical studies of feminist strategies of institutional change in urban police departments (Rose 1977; Turner and Colomy 1988).

Most significantly, an institutional project is defined by the type of advocated differentiation, the scope of promoted change, and proposed "interchange relations between the focal institutions and other subsystems" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 556). In the process of its definition, an institutional project specifies social sectors of change, indicates its functions, outlines its structure, and makes authority claims. Among the forms of differentiation that institutional project may advance are autonomous mass media (Alexander 1990b), differentiated public sphere (Mayhew 1990), uneven political party differentiation (Colomy 1990b), unequal functional differentiation (Champagne 1990), and dedifferentiating syndromes (Lechner 1985). The scope of entrepreneurial projects exhibits wide range. Their variations include historical revolutions (Eisenstadt 1978), backlash and fundamentalist movements (Lipset and Raab 1978), ethical prophecies (Weber [1922] 1963), cultural revolutions and fundamentalisms (Lechner 1990), and incremental change (Colomy and Rhoades 1994). Interchange relations between focal institutions and their environment take forms of interpenetration (Münch 1987; 1988). Being more widespread, institutional interpenetration can take a variety of configurations. The latter are exemplified by the interdependent relations between

educational institutions and the state (Tyack and Hansot 1982), the domination of absolutist states (Anderson 1974), one-party states (Bendix 1978), sectarian dictatorships (Miller 1956), and unencumbered capitalism (Polanyi 1944), and the isolation corresponding to self-sufficient communities (Berger 1981).

Entrepreneurial projects confront their macro environment as a given element of their institutional programs. For instance, educational entrepreneurs have endeavored to temper consequences of political economy (Haskell 1984). The former represented public high school as a means for the differential nationalization of immigrants (Tyack and Hansot 1982). They reproduced social and historical patterns of marginalization (Anderson 1988). They attempted to impart national and moral values to immigrants (Tyack and Hansot 1980). They tried to counteract urban criminality and social problems (Dreeben 1971). They allocated students into occupational niches (Tyack and Hansot 1980). They expanded the social and territorial reach of common schooling (Cremin 1988; Meyer, Tyack, Nagel, and Gordon 1979; Tyack and Hansot 1982). Finally, they promoted social rights by expanding educational system and social services (Green and Rodman 1964; Perkin 1981; Sabine 1961). To extend and justify their project, institutional entrepreneurs employ prototyping based on metaphors giving direction to their activities. Frames of reference for innovators and potential supporters represent another form of prototyping. To prototyping also belong value-giving archetypes serving as a symbolic resource of institutional legitimization.

Cross-societal prototyping occurs in situations of perceived competitive disadvantage vis-à-vis another country, community, or group. This is the case when educational systems of industrially advanced and commercially successful countries become models for emulation (Cremin 1961). Cross-institutional prototyping involves “selective borrowing from other institutional spheres in the same society” (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 559). Such prototyping is accomplished by the introduction of respected practices and metaphors, in order to gain legitimacy (Tyack 1974), and by the active adaptation of assimilated exemplars (Diggins 1978). Revivalistic prototyping draws on historical exemplars to stress the continuity between advocated institutional project and previously existing forms that lend legitimacy by providing a stable frame of reference (Kass 1965). Prototyping takes course over the innovative and derivative phases of its

implementation (Colomy 1985). In the first phase of prototyping strategy, institutional entrepreneurial group articulates, specifies and constructs an altered institutional order. In the second phase, a developing institutional structure itself serves as a point of evaluative reference for other reformers (Tyack and Hansot 1982). Typifying processes build upon the cultural content of institutional projects that usually refers, in separate or conjoint manner, to the injustice of existing arrangements and to the legitimization of alternative structures. This is illustrated by the formation of differentiated political parties (Wallace 1968).

New cultural frameworks facilitate the inventive dynamics of institutional project implementation. This occurs when long-standing conditions become the subject of a critical reassessment and when more satisfactory alternatives receive expression in the social movements for their advocacy (Blumer 1953; Smelser 1991; Turner and Killian 1987). Cultural themes and symbols strategically legitimate the introduction of alternatives to institutional order. Institutional projects are subject to continuous revision under the influence of communicative feedback within the entrepreneurial group. The reconciliation of disagreements over project's objectives is another cause of project revision. Coalition-making with groups championing other projects alters original projects. Projects are modified to appease or undermine opposition. Changes in the opportunities structure of macro environments also instigate project modification (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 560). Institutional projects require group coordination as part of the mobilization of means for their realization that also reflects efforts to articulate the objectives of innovative action. While below a certain threshold of contention, internal conflict is not inimical to effective project organization (Shibutani 1978). However, when dissent stalls institutional change, a more cohesive constellation of actors has to carry forward and sustain the organization. Preexisting communication networks, organizations, and communities are either redeployed in the process of construction of organizations around institutional projects or substantially altered within the emergent relations. Organizational reorganization "typically involves modification of conventional modes of interaction and the articulation of new relationships" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 561).

Individual and Collective Action in Sociological Research

In organization building, either the redeployment or emergence of relations usually predominates to the extent that attempts to implement both these types undermine supporting social foundations of an entrepreneurial project (Calhoun 1983). However, as it promotes a structural change, an institutional project redeploying organizations, networks, and communities undergoes a significant transformation. This transformation is triggered by emergent processes within the organization built around a project (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 562). The redeployment of institutional frameworks has emergent effects on the organizations and communities involved in an institutional project of structural change. The project of change subordinates these frameworks to the imperatives of the emergent organization that takes shape on existing but changing institutional base. This was the case with the anti-segregation project of more inclusive society (Morris 1981). The emergent dynamics are amplified "when two or more networks, organizations, and/or communities are simultaneously redeployed toward a common end" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 562) to sometimes create a new institutional structure. The latter can accumulate power and authority in its own right (Branch 1988).

The emergent dynamics of institutional entrepreneurship culminates in the creation of a clearly separate organization that features distinct leadership group and institutional project setting it apart from preexisting structures (Killian 1984). In the absence of significant barriers to collective action, the redeployment of existing structures rather than the creation of new ones incurs less expense (Morris 1981). The redeployment also follows the strategic consideration of micro-macro dynamics favoring either redeployment or emergence in organization building. Consequently, organizations, networks and communities rule out their redeployment in support of an institutional project that can negatively affect ties with their organizational environments. This promotes predominantly emergent and innovative organization building for projects that meet with hostility (Freeman 1973; Hole and Levine 1971). Institutional projects also require the creation of new organizations when overcoming the resistance of existing organizations and networks can exhaust resources of an entrepreneurial group. However, the assessment of how worthwhile a redeployment may prove to be depends on the

“collective definition of a situation” (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 563). By changing interpretive understanding of the macro environment where the organization building occurs, definition of a situation also alters the perception of the strategic interest upon which other groups act (Freeman 1973).

Among the changes in macro environments that can diminish the obstacles to organization building and thus precipitate its formation are the unraveling of political and economic alliances, electoral realignments caused by migrations, and international politics (McAdam 1982). The reconstitution of the macro environment of networks and communities can foster organization building. This can be accomplished through, for example, new channels of communication, characteristic culture, increase in similar organizations, identities organized around shared norms (Bledstein 1976; Haskell 1977) and network-related channels of influence (Tyack 1974; Tyack and Hansot 1982). The deployment of these macro channels for organization building can enable the implementation of related institutional projects. Via the reconfiguration of social ties, changes in macro environments make available new resources for organization building. In response to the environment marked by political fragmentation, weak centralization, and local diversity, arise decentralized organizations. Decentralization enables organizations to flexibly react to local conditions, to cope with unanticipated events, to confront mobilized opposition, and to disseminate local project or strategy modifications (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 565).

The incentives that relate to their purposes, material rewards, and solidarity serve as internal environments for institutional projects. These incentives provide support for the motivation committed by members of an entrepreneurial group. Through internalization and public circulation of its motives, a group generates support among its adherents and macro environments (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 565). When envisioned project aims at collective good, rewards for the associated effort reaped by a mobilized group (Olson 1965) include material advantages to its leaders. These material advantages take the form of control over significant patronage (Colomy 1985), powerful administrative posts (Tyack 1974), and such intangible benefits as prestige, elite social circles membership, and public recognition (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 565). Enduring organization is built on the basis of either redeployment or emergence of cohesive groups

around institutional projects for their members. Regardless of organization size (Olson 1965), cohesive groups provide solidarity incentives of friendship, mutual identification, esteem and expressive gratification. These solidarity incentives are bound with respective sanctions and such forms of commitment as sacrifice, investment, renunciation and communion (Kanter 1972).

Taking sustained part in activities of an institutional project group and in the struggle for realization of its goals can fundamentally change how personal strategic calculations are made. This is achieved by reconstructing participants' schemes of interpretation, conceptions of rewards and risks, and views of continued organizational involvement (McAdam 1988). Internal adaptation carries influence on the type of organization that a project group eventually translates into its structure as it affirms shared values of the group (Rothschild-Whitt 1979). Disagreements over the character of a project, its implementation strategies, and organization structure drive the need for compromise by means of program modifications to enlist internal support and accommodations to opposition or recalcitrant environment (Turner and Killian 1987). To arrive at a compromise, it is necessary for an entrepreneurial group to articulate in its institution building either consistency, coherence, and continuity (Berger 1981) or coercion, exception, denial, and concealment (Pestello 1991). When project amendments or new strategies are proposed, affective responses are the common consequence of compromise (Hochschild 1983). Giving rise to perceptions of the unfair redistribution of power or the abandonment of core ideas, compromise may “endanger concerted action within the entrepreneurial group and the success of the institutional project” (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 567). Typically, compromise calls for the reassessment of misgivings, project prioritization, and the mobilization of group cohesion.

Dynamics and Contradictions of Individual and Collective Action

To implement an institutional project, its leaders need legitimization, power, and resources. The latter require capacity both to garner the agreement of various groups and to surmount opposition. The efficacy of leadership is conditional on macro environments. Since strategic action takes recourse to interpretive frameworks and macro structures, the

theoretical reconstruction of the calculation behind it cannot be restricted to the micro level of rewards and costs. The mobilization of support takes the typified form of a repertoire of collective action (Tilly 1978) that relies on the slow change of action strategies, perceptions of obviousness, and meeting acceptability expectations. Nevertheless, collective action leaves room for its reflexive application. This makes tactical adjustments, innovation, and novel action forms possible. The selection process of action tactics from within a group's repertoire is guided by probable success calculation, associated costs, and response estimates. The lack of success, high cost, project incompatibility, or trenchant opposition prompts the selection of an alternative or the invention of new courses of action.

The structure of opportunities, the configuration of macro environment, and the power of opposing groups condition the propensity for the invention of action repertoire. Therefore, the greater levels of differentiation are, the more dispersed support resources are. The more differentiated and inclusive society is, the more likely cross-cutting coalitions are. Finally, the more differentiated symbol systems are, the more likely to arise alternative structures respectively are (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 568). The openness of opportunity structure depends on the relative position that entrepreneurial groups, their supporting bodies and their larger constituencies occupy. Consequently, higher levels of local social differentiation create more openings for mobility and inclusion enabling minority groups to improve their position (Alexander 1990a). Under the conditions of closed opportunity structure, institutional projects promoting greater levels of differentiation have to rely on innovative strategies of action to reach the accommodation of their program by political authorities and various elites (Piven and Cloward 1977). The success of entrepreneurial projects leads their strategies to be subsequently conventionalized, added to action repertoire, and appropriated for other projects.

The tactical dynamics obtaining between groups associated with an institutional project and their opponents influences the choice or invention of a particular strategy. The adoption and redeployment of tactical innovations prompts tactical counters by their opponents. Opposition neutralizes old and stimulates further strategic inventions (McAdam 1983). Exchange mechanisms facilitate support for an institutional project on

the premise of benefits deriving from it. Such benefits can include offers of situational advantages, valuable information, and public legitimization for its allies (Tierney 1982). The application of negative inducement strategies in reaction to intractable constituencies, uncongenial elites, and obstinate opposition relies on the following perceptions. The outcome of pressure is perceived more effective than restraint from coercion (Turner and Killian 1987). The cessation of attack tactics is seen to provide sufficient incentive for concessions (McAdam 1982). These macro environments are expected to "worsen their condition unless compliance is granted" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 570).

The relative amount and structure of resources under the control of institutional entrepreneurs conditions their ability to remunerate supporters and to penalize opponents. Resource structure gives inherent advantage to the proponents of institutional projects most richly supplied with resources to become successful entrepreneurs. This explains disproportionate elite representation among the latter (Eisenstadt 1964). Under the circumstances of rapid transformations undermining political stability, resource-poor groups can occasionally bring about significant institutional changes by taking recourse to diverse forms of mass disobedience (Piven and Cloward 1977). The process of institutional change is reciprocally amplified within an even minimal opportunity structure by the accumulation of resources. An entrepreneurial group can accumulate resources by appealing to constituencies, networks, and organizations sympathetic to their project (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 570). Entrepreneurs interpretatively align the framing of their institutional project towards complementarities with orientations of their constituencies. These complementarities sometimes appeal in universalistic terms beyond the situational advantage of entrepreneurs (Parsons 1963b; 1963c; 1968). The employed frames of these appeals usually succeed by meeting "a vital but unmet need, presenting a favorable benefit-cost ratio, invoking solidary ties, and appealing to common value commitments" (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 571).

The alternatives proposed by institutional projects employ adaptive frames of salient claim to argue for the inadequacy of the existing level of differentiation. The complementary argument for differentiation is that promoted program meets poorly recognized needs more adequately (Knowles 1991). Often institutional entrepreneurs

depict their project as a suitable investment, exaggerate anticipated benefits, and underestimate probable costs (Smelser 1991). Institutional entrepreneurs rely on solidarity-based identification by highlighting commonalities that putatively obtain between themselves, their constituencies, and their potential allies. Typically, entrepreneurs possess an acute awareness of dominant values and motive vocabularies of their time (Mills 1940). Exchange processes can modify the initial project of institutional innovators. Seeking its generalized support in broad outline, they modify their program implementation in response to demands of the outside groups on whom the access to support and resources is contingent (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 572). Established authorities may seek to undermine an institutional innovation project by the assimilation of entrepreneurial organization, the cooptation of its leaders, and the negotiated exchange of concessions on both sides (Piven and Cloward 1977).

While resistance commonly accompanies the efforts to change an institutional order, related group conflict does not have a direct impact on resultant structural differentiation. A possible range of outcomes of opposition to an entrepreneurial project stretches from the failure to even partially realize its goals to a nearly complete institutionalization. To derail institutional projects, their opponents typically deploy countervailing strategies, allies and resources, challenge entrepreneurial frames, and furnish oppositional frames of reference (Colomy 1990a). When the institutional project advancing a greater degree of differentiation receives public, formal and legal affirmation, powerful constituencies can empty it of practical substance by subverting its objectives. Thus, these constituencies convert structural change into a symbolic achievement (Rhoades 1990). An incomplete differentiation is a likely outcome of the competition between groups with approximately equal power struggling to control particular functions and disputing rival claims to exclusive authority (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 573; Surace 1992). In the macro environments divided by lines of primordial belonging, competition between entrepreneurial groups creates parallel structures (Smelser 1991: 107; Tyack 1966).

In case institutional entrepreneurs considerably gain in support and resources, the persistent struggle by opponents to institutional change leads to the eventual adoption by the opponents of constituent elements of an entrepreneurial project. By this the opponents

aim to partially appropriate the resources mobilized by innovators and to polarize their differences from an innovative project. However, the unintended consequence of the partial adoption of an entrepreneurial project is the modification of existing order (Colomy 1985; Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 573-74). In the long run, the implementation of an institutional project may meet with success or changes in macro environments that can produce a favorable opportunity structure (Smelser 1991). In the short run, the attempts at the introduction of new levels of differentiation usually evoke staunch opposition. Even though causing an entrepreneurial group to fail, opposition can prompt the former to redouble its efforts, modify its project, and revise its strategy (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 574). Should efforts at structural differentiation succeed, its legitimacy and viability may be questioned by its critics on the grounds of divergence from society's most fundamental principles, the defense of traditional rights and privileges and of public welfare, and perceived inadequacy in addressing emergent problems (Colomy and Rhoades 1994: 574).

Thus, Parsons' theorization of different ideal-types of action, analytically mapped against its dimensions of complexity and contingency, may have a contribution to make to the micro sociology of individual and collective action. In this chapter different forms of strategic action are outlined. To varying degrees, they involve adaptation, goal attainment, integration, and latent pattern maintenance. Even though the exploration of the limits of theoretical and empirical applicability of Parsons' AGIL schema is outside of the scope of this thesis, my intention is to tentatively demonstrate that the analytical approach developed in Parsons' theory of action may have a bearing on efforts to theorize individual, group, and institutional action. Moreover, the theory of action of Parsons may be amenable to the systematic and comparative study of both macro and micro level phenomena, as its development by Münch demonstrates. However, to examine particular configurations of relations among different ideal-types of action, a tenable theory of the transformation of modernity, as a configuration among different processes of accumulation, has to operate with specific and concrete terms (Alexander 1992). In the following chapters, I argue that Münch's theorization of modernity, accumulation, and action makes possible such a transition from the analytical ideal types of modernity towards their historical varieties.

Chapter Four: Operationalizing Münch I: A Methodological Excursus on Multi-Sited Anthropology

This chapter discusses the epistemological, interdisciplinary, and analytical implications that multi-sited anthropology driven by subject matter, critical reflexivity, and multiple contexts has for research:

- To remedy normalizing effects of the social production of knowledge, anthropology needs to connect micro social processes with institutional frameworks of contemporary capitalism through critically reflexive research practice rooted in the actuality of the social world.
- Post-traditional connections among anthropology, philosophy, political economy, and history make possible interdisciplinary arenas of inquiry defined more by subject than by discipline guiding the process of clarification of links among multiple sites where researcher can pursue his or her subject matter using the methodology of multi-sited anthropology.
- As the importance of capitalism as a regime of economic accumulation and regulation grows, it is imperative to explore how the analytically graspable structure of economic relations changes over time via anthropological research based on the conceptual articulation of its multiple contexts.

Multi-Sited Applications of Anthropological Methodology

An analytical extension of the conceptual contribution of Münch may hold a promise of shedding an interpretive light on processes of the accumulation of money, power, expertise, and reputation on both macro and micro scales. Münch addresses insufficiencies in the theoretical foundations of the theorization of capitalism as a structure of interrelations among processes of accumulation. His works on the dynamic

impact of modernization processes on the political, economic, cultural, and social systems of accumulation (Münch 1995; 1998) open theoretical avenues to the conceptualization of modernity on the regional, national and urban levels. Moreover, in concert with the sociological theorization of power in the global age (Beck 2005), recourse to conceptual frameworks of the theory of action (Münch 1982) and of the theory of modernity (Münch 1984; 1991b) opens possibilities for a ‘multi-sited’ investigation of how cities make claims for culturally, socially, politically, and economically dominant positioning.

Contemporary anthropology relies on a wide range of data sources among which are content analysis, interviews, questionnaires, and life histories. In consequence, anthropological practice has not been limited to a single methodology. Among anthropological approaches, the mutually constitutive relation connecting “researcher, research process and its product” (Jordan and Yeomans 1995: 394) places an emphasis on the reflexivity of research act (Hammersley and Atkinson 1983) while rooting it in epistemology and modern hermeneutics (Gallagher 1992). Higher sensitivity of such epistemological approach to social change has made it central to postmodern and multi-sited anthropology (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Marcus and Fischer 1986; Tyler 1986). The crisis of anthropocentric methodological paradigm has led to the conception of anthropology as performative practice not unrelated to poetics, new sensibilities and inventive writing (Clifford 1986; Marcus and Fischer 1986). This dissolution of the discursive authority of narrative realism has opened the way for anthropology to allow for polyphonic text to take the place of realism instead (Tyler 1986). Reflexive sensitivity to changed cultural, social, and economic conditions restores to postmodern and multi-sited anthropology the position of engaged relativism (Marcus and Fischer 1986). However, feminist perspectives on anthropological practice (hooks 1990; Mascia-Lees, Sharpe, and Cohen 1989) have challenged the decontextualized approach of postmodern research on the grounds of continued relevance of the hierarchies that shoot through gender, class and international relations (Rieff 1993). This demand for reflexivity calls upon critical anthropology to address the larger theoretical context of its practice.

Beyond moving towards the inclusion of a plurality of research locations, multi-sited anthropology brings into effect a methodological shift in the direction of

multidisciplinary research that brings existing and emerging areas of inquiry into dialogue. Single sites provided the historical context of anthropological methodology application that through its theoretical positioning within the larger system of capitalist relations has given voice to subaltern subjects as they found their reflection in the categories of class, gender, or ethnicity. As the cultural forms to which anthropological research gave expression have evolved beyond primary categories of macrotheoretical description, distinctions among them gave way to attention to the fluid temporal and spatial scales that research attention can turn to for sets of subjects theoretically transcending limits of a single research site. Relations among sites have entered into theoretical construction by means of anthropology of their structural aspects. In response to "transformed locations of cultural production" (Marcus 1995: 97), multi-sited anthropology provides suitable methodological framework for integrating latest cultural, social, and economic developments into explanatory endeavours commensurate with the present moment.

Anthropology has moved from more traditional connections between anthropology, on the one hand, and philosophy, political economy and history, on the other hand, towards interdisciplinary arenas of inquiry defined more by subject than by discipline. Consequently, the very process of the clarification of links among multiple sites, where anthropology can pursue its subject matter, has become the methodology of multi-sited anthropology. In the 1970s, Wallerstein (1976) has given an initial impulse to the eventual development of multi-sited anthropology, as he provided the systematic background on which numerous single-site anthropological projects were carried out. In view of post-WWII "international regimes of political economy" (Marcus 1995: 98) – among the descriptions of which are post-Fordism, time-space compression, flexible specialization, the end of organized capitalism, and globalization – a comprehensive theoretical framework of reference for capitalism remains to be introduced into scholarly discourse. As historically inherited metanarratives fragmented into localized perspectives, anthropological concerns with agency, culture and practice have become starting points for forging theoretical connections among the multiple sites in which emergent research subjects react to global changes. In contrast to recent stress on ethics, commitment, and activism in anthropological research, the formulation of most valuable contribution that

multi-sited anthropology can make to scholarly discourse takes place via its methodology.

Multi-sited anthropology transcends such concerns of traditional ethnography as its methodological limits, its explanatory power, and its association with the subaltern. As multi-sited anthropology embeds in its research design emergent relations across multiple sites it appropriates abstract models and aggregate statistics into its methodology (Marcus 1995: 99). The possibilities for the institutional recognition of multi-sited anthropology increase as disciplinary perceptions evolve to recognize interactions among related sites of work. The contemporary mobility of researchers draws increased attention to how recognized historical research has always relied on fragmented, reconstructive, and relational methods. Tracing relations across sites where composite processes unfold takes theoretical precedence over traditional concerns of anthropology with the intensity and quality of engagement with research site. Multi-sited anthropology takes upon itself the “function of translation from one cultural idiom or language to another” (Marcus 1995: 100). As the process of fieldwork becomes qualified, displaced, and decentered, anthropology explores across several sites “unexpected and even dissonant fractures of social location” (Marcus 1995: 100).

Making connections among distinctive discourses becomes the contribution of multi-sited anthropology, as it maps the broader field of its inquiry. In line with traditional fieldwork, where the command of foreign languages has constituted professional requirement, anthropology intending to translate conditions of its research from multiple sites into a single explanatory framework maintains to even greater degree the importance of language translation for its integrity. The long privileged focus of anthropology on the subaltern becomes problematized, as gender, economic, and social mobilities come to fuller theoretical account within the discipline of anthropology (Haraway 1991a). The movement beyond the concentration on the subaltern leads to the ethnography of the shape of systemic processes in the “reconfigured space of multiple sites of cultural production” (Marcus 1995: 101). Multi-sited anthropology constructs a new object of study as it maps an expanded field of theoretical attention. This expanded scholarly mandate of anthropology opens possibilities for comparisons that encompass units of research with greater conceptual complexity than controlled comparisons of

traditional anthropology have allowed in the past. Multi-sited anthropology produces conditions for new objects of study to emerge out of the complexity of the sites of investigation for which it ventures to develop descriptive models out of “logics of relations, translation, and association among these sites” (Marcus 1995: 102).

Among important precedents for multi-sited anthropology, as it reconstitutes the received vocabulary of theoretical reference within multiple methods, complexities, and mobilities, are Foucault’s power/knowledge and heterotopia (Dreyfus, Rabinow, and Foucault 1983), Deleuze and Guattari’s (1980; 1988) rhizome, Derrida’s (1972; 1981) dissemination, and Lyotard’s juxtaposition (Readings 1991). However, theoretical developments remain subordinated to exigencies of conducting anthropological research that brings the potential of interdisciplinary arenas to bear on reconfigured subjects of research. Among the first areas where multi-sited research has taken its initial form were media and audience studies where distinct genres of inquiry have developed around the functions of interdisciplinarity, multi-locality, and methodological pluralism. In anthropology, this tendency has taken the form of the transition from ethnographic film towards indigenous media (Ginsburg 1993; 1994; 1995). Latour (1987; 1988) and Haraway (1991a) have effected the movement of anthropology from single research sites in the direction of intersections of time and space where juxtaposition plays important role in the theoretical constitution of subjects of research having a higher order of complexity.

Multi-sited anthropological research has been more prevalent in subject areas of reproductive technologies (Ginsburg and Rapp 1995), epidemiology (Balshem 1993), electronic communication (Escobar, Hess, Licha, Sibley, Strathern, and Sutz 1994; Marcus 1996), environmentalism and toxic disasters (Laughlin 1995; Stewart 1995; Zonabend 1993), and biotechnology (Teitelman 1989). In the United States, the area of cultural studies has provided a springboard for the theoretical elaboration of international cultural production in connection to macro-social processes via the *Public Culture* journal under the leadership of Arjun Appadurai and Carol Breckenridge. Appadurai’s (1990) path-breaking essay on global cultural production has championed complexly multi-sited approach that multi-sited anthropology seeks to build upon. The theoretical rethinking of the concept of space in geography (Friedland and Boden 1994), sociology

(Soja 1989), and anthropology (Ginsburg 1994) has opened research on borders, exile, and diasporas (Clifford 1994; Gilroy 1993; Ong 1993) to the elaboration of local-global link in a manner that continues the multi-sited direction of research in media studies (Abu-Lughod 1993). The major contribution of these developments to anthropology is in “modes of constructing multi-sited spaces of investigation within individual projects” (Marcus 1995: 105) that should become a signal feature of multi-sited anthropological methodology.

Haraway’s (1991a) and Appadurai’s (1990) contributions to the anthropological discussion of subjectivities and spaces remain in need of methodological translation into how constructions of multi-sited research space may proceed. Explicit methodological discussions are rare in the field of anthropological research, while when they occur (Strathern 1991) they tend to have a highly theoretical nature that overlooks the task of building bridges to research practice. Due to its positioning at the intersection of paths, threads, juxtapositions and conjunctions, multi-sited anthropology takes inspiration from artistic, modernist and, especially, avant-garde practices that register in their works momentous social changes (Petric 1987). Multi-sited ethnographies posit objects of their study in terms that allow starting from a given entry point in order to undertake a tracing movement within different settings. There, complex cultural phenomena gradually become constructed through apposite research techniques. Following the people belongs to classical techniques of anthropology (Malinowski 1922) that with its elaboration towards multi-sited methodology has led to applications in migration (Grasmuck and Pessar 1991), diaspora (Rouse 1996) and cultural studies (Gupta and Ferguson 1992).

The technique of following the people allows for its foreshortening when on-site data collection is combined with knowledge about subjects of research available off-site to reconstruct a system of relationships that research subjects materialize in their movements, trajectories, and portraits. Following the thing is another, possibly the most widely spread, anthropological technique that through tracing of the circulation of objects, rights, and relations constructs multi-sited research space where large-scale generalizations are possible (Wallerstein 1991b). For this technique Appadurai (1986) has provided an important methodological blueprint that seeks to discover systemic relationships via the anthropological and speculative research of the circulation of things

in and through contexts (Coombe 1995; Miller 1994; Mintz 1985). Artistic worlds research has made the most explicit use of multi-sited methodology as it traced the circulation of indigenous artworks (Myers 1992), emergent music genres (Feld 1994), and cultural tastes (Savigliano 1995; Silverman 1986).

Among the most influential works that follow the object of their research across multiple disciplines are those by Latour (1987; 1988) that map humans, machines and organisms on the same plane of investigation. Following the metaphor is the technique that traces the “circulation of signs, symbols, and metaphors” (Marcus 1995: 108) that within anthropological research design acquires the form of the construction of social correlates and groundings of associations on the basis of the documentation of language use, print, visual, and electronic media. One of key advantages of this technique is discovering the metaphoric associations that bring theoretical elaborations of complexity theory to bear on the discursive organization that encompasses the production of knowledge, governmental institutions, and economic regulation (Martin 1994). Such approach has special potential for theorizing sites of cultural production. Anthropological methodology can persuasively argue for empirical connections among sites of cultural production on emerging landscapes of accumulation, circulation, and exchange.

Following the plot, story, or allegory is the technique that embeds single-site fieldwork in the multi-sited process of the reconstruction of situated social landscapes (Brooks 1984). This technique for conducting multi-sited anthropology has found renewed impulse in studies of social memory that map social struggles over the definition of collective reality (Boyarin 1994). As a special case of following the plot, life stories and biographies have served as sources of ethnographic data for multi-sited research oriented to the materialization of historical cultural formations (Fischer 1991; Fischer and Abedi 1990). Life history accounts, through their unexpected or emergent associations between sites and social contexts, can provide a means for ethnographic delineations of the systemic relations that existing categorical distinctions may obscure. Following the conflict has mostly guided research in the anthropology of law, as extended case method (Burawoy 1991), while ethnography has gradually taken over this technique (Sarat and Kearns 1993) to define the multi-sited construction of work that straddles the “spheres of everyday life, legal institutions, and mass media” (Marcus 1995: 110).

Strategically situated single-site ethnography may represent the technique that without actually engaging researcher in travel lends itself to embedding into multi-sited context (Willis 1980). Other contexts that impinge on research site do so in a contingent, rather than assumed, manner when what happens in other locales directs the frame of anthropological research towards the trans-local connections that obtain through localized reconstruction via research design. The methodological aim of strategically situated ethnography is to reveal the systemic relations that go beyond the location where it is conducted, for which reason it should be regarded as one of the techniques of multi-sited anthropology, since conventional anthropology situates its fieldwork in larger theoretical context differently. Multi-sited anthropology allows a distinctive probing of the local knowledges that local subjects articulate in relation to other sites where research field is constructed in the process of fieldwork. Comparative translation among research sites is a distinctive methodological characteristic of multi-sited anthropology (DeLillo 1985; Marcus and Hall 1992). Ethnographic subjects supply in the forms of their thoughts and actions indications for the interpenetration among different levels of theoretical analysis. They range from the micro-level of individual experience to the macro-processes of political economy. Different multi-sited investigations have grasped the interpenetration between macro and micro theoretical levels in terms of Walter Benjamin's "mimetic faculty" (Taussig 1992; 1993), Karl Marx's notion of fetishism (Pietz 1993), and varieties of *fin-de-siècle* consciousness and sensibilities (Marcus 1993; 1996).

The researcher's standpoint does not escape from the process of mapping that multi-sited anthropology sets into motion as it traverses its research contexts. In reciprocal fashion these contexts position researcher within relations of knowledge, power, and authority the necessity for reflexive going about with which has been originally formulated by Haraway (1991b). As contexts of fieldwork undergo change, researcher's practice makes necessary that his or her identity be renegotiated accordingly in relation to research subjects and contexts brought together in the multi-sited juxtaposition of ethnographic landscapes. There anthropological privilege and authority are suspended until presentation in the form of written publication. The Haraway's discussion of positioning is relevant to tensions between the objective status of researcher in the system of relations and the subjective reflexivity of anthropological methodology

that he or she explores in the process of research practice. These tensions reveal multi-sited anthropology as inherently mobile, self-critical, and recalibrating interaction with contexts and subjects of research.

In the practice of anthropologists, the political circumstances of multiple research contexts create specific and circumscribed forms of political agency in the collision with the anthropological persona of researcher that are different from usual activist positions. Personal commitments inevitably crosscut and contradict their intersections within multi-sited research framework. This forces anthropologist to renegotiate identities in different sites. Gradually developing circumstantial activism that multi-sited anthropology embeds into its program contributes to the transition from anthropological detachment to an actively informed grasp of large-scale systemic relations. As sets of subjects change with contexts of investigation, the overlapping working of the process of anthropological positioning has immediate effect on the researcher's sense of relation to the subject of research that explores rather than dissolves the contradictions inherent in the unstable positioning of fieldworker. Multi-sited anthropological fieldwork does reserve possibilities for identification, affiliation, and activism. Fieldwork, however, always retains nomadic elements of the movable feast for anthropological senses that has been the signal feature of the traditional practice of anthropology.

Methodological Challenges of the Anthropology on Global Capitalism

Neo-Weberian, neo-institutional and neo-Marxist approaches to the analysis of modernity make increasing contributions to understanding structural variability in modern societies. By the end of the 1990s, research on capitalism has gained wide currency in anthropology. Over the second half of the 20th century, anthropological contribution to the scholarship of capitalism has exhibited four-fold increase. Though not all anthropological research contributes to the "understanding of capitalism in the late modern world" (Blim 2000: 26) in equal manner, in the 1990s there has occurred a structural shift in the anthropological investigation of modernity. Three sets of alternative interpretative approaches to late capitalism originate in the revised application of Marxist, Weberian, and institutional economic explanatory schema that give to respective

anthropological accounts their advantages and disadvantages pertaining to each approach. These neo-institutional, neo-Weberian and neo-Marxist approaches, however, have arisen in the context of mutual awareness by researchers pursuing various explanations of capitalist transformations in the late 20th century, which lends common theoretical ground to the three approaches. Weber ([1922] 1968: 164-65) theorizes capitalism as a phenomenon grounded in a variety of historically specific types that included not only free markets but also state monopolies, political favoritism, and colonialism that as forms of the causal explanation of particular economic structures are just a sub-set of possible ideal types of capitalism. Braudel's (1982) concept of capitalism places restrictions on Weber's ideal types of economic relations within the two countervailing poles of egalitarian economic relations, in the form of free markets and economic self-provisioning, and hierarchical economic structures connected to monopolies, financial speculation, and political regulation. While Weber's stress on value-free sociological inquiry allows for the recognition of ideal types of capitalism within a wide variety of configurations, the contribution of Braudel's historical research lies in giving a broad comparative basis to the recent anthropology of capitalism.

Anthropological research on the global spread of capitalism has not followed closely Weber's methodology of ideal type construction. Consequently, anthropological research on capitalism has claimed to identify such ideal-types of capitalism as "organic" capitalism (Miller 1997), "diaspora capitalism" (Cooper and Jiang 1998; Lever-Tracy, Ip, and Tracy 1996), "patronal" or "comprador" capitalism (Hefner 1998a; 1998b), "bureaucratic capitalism" (Bestor 1998a; 1998b; 2004), "political capitalism" (Verdery 1996), "booty" capitalism (Hutchcroft 1998), and ceremonially oriented capitalism (Yang 2000). Such anthropological typifications of capitalism frequently fail to specify how features of each type causally produce the described configuration of economic relations. These inaccuracies in ideal-typical construction lead to the excessively localizing use of the concept of capitalism (Smart 1999), to taking the local variation of economic relations for the varieties of capitalism (Hefner 1998c), and to conflating historically specific capitalist formations with the abstract concept of economic theory (Sahlins 1994). From the perspective of ideal types of capitalism, the "structuring of the exchange relations within capitalist activities" (Blim 2000: 28) does not affect distinctive characteristics that

make up each ideal type. For the establishment of distinct ideal types of capitalism, the causal efficacy of recurring social practices aimed at the maintenance of economic exchange should be examined in comparative context, which, of necessity, must avoid assertions of structural equivalence (Alexander 1998c). The anthropological study of the systemic and comparative significance of institutional or inter-institutional differences will significantly contribute to establishing whether a single ideal type of capitalism suffices to describe the economies of the United States, Germany and Japan (Stiglitz 1994). Alternatively, variations in relations among banks, firms and policies may warrant a specification of distinct ideal types of capitalism, as could be the case in Asia (Wade and Veneroso 1998).

Institutional approaches to the “study of economies as social as well as economic structures” (Blim 2000: 29) receives growing currency (Hodgson 1994). The institutional approach reaches back to Veblen’s (1919; 1927) seminal works on class distinctions and capitalist institutions the theory of which has found only limited application in economics despite attempts at the conceptual embedding of economies into social-structural relations (Granovetter 1985). Neo-institutionalism has found a wide application in anthropology in terms both of its theoretical elaboration (Acheson 1994), and of its successful application to anthropological topics (Acheson 1998; Acheson, Knight, Acheson, and Knight 2000). Numerous applications of neo-institutional approach in anthropological research include works on the mitigating effects of personal relations on risk-laden transactions (Plattner 1998), on rent-seeking behavior in Chinese boom towns (Smart 1993), on relative costs in Tokyo fish marketplaces (Bestor 1998a; 1999; 2004), and on social intentions in Shanghai stock market (Hertz 1998). Attempts at formulating economic anthropology (Wilk 1996) by attributing rationality to all economic behaviour find their limitation in certain resistance that time- and place-specific differences exhibit in relation to such overarching generalizations. Applications of causal explanations in anthropological research guided by neo-institutional approach, while less wide-spread than in sociology, remain tethered to micro-level re-descriptive rather than analytical accounts, even though they have the benefit of drawing on multiple cultural contexts (Blim 2000).

In the early 1990s, neo-Marxian anthropological analyses have highlighted a rise in capitalist variability, in contexts of anthropological research on industrial

decentralization (Nash 1989), on the labour of women and former peasants (Cook and Binford 1990), on the globalization of economic peripheries (Blim 1990), on gender and household work (Harrison 1997; Ong 1987) and on petty capitalism in China (Gates 1996). Across anthropological research, recognition grew that a new global regime of flexible accumulation (Harvey 1989) stands in a causal relationship (Ong 1991) to such emerging forms of economic activity as policies dealing with Mexican economic crises (Rothstein 1996; 1999), industrial restructuring in Canada (Leach 1998), the instrumentalization of NAFTA in Mexico (Gledhill 1998), downstream women labour in Caribbean (Freeman 1998), and economic collapse in formerly socialist countries (Verdery 1996). Neo-liberalism as an array of policies implementing flexible accumulation has found its critics that argue that it has crippled national economies (Babb 1998; Buechler, Buechler, Buechler, and Buechler 1998) and led to exploitative welfare and homelessness policies (Susser 1997). However, universalistic assumptions of neo-Marxist approach in anthropology are undermined by its frequent failure to go beyond case-study focus towards comparative investigation (Blim 2000).

Though the respective Weberian, institutional, and Marxist approaches have their shortcomings, the renewed anthropological interest in the understanding of the worldwide spread of capitalism may lead to calls to “reimagine them as complementary devices in the task of understanding a complex phenomenon” (Blim 2000: 31). The shortcomings of the current theoretical understanding of capitalism may also lead to a consideration of alternative theoretical routes to the understanding of capitalism, such as can be gained from a systematic reconstruction of classical sociological theories, as is done, for example, by Münch. As the relative social importance of capitalism, as a regime of economic accumulation and regulation, grows, it becomes imperative to explore how the analytically graspable structure of economic relations particular to capitalism changes over time. As Arrighi (1994) contends, capitalism makes part of the world system of states that, in concert with Weber’s, Marx’s, and Braudel’s insights, puts an unequal concentration of power in direct relation to capitalism, as its reciprocally supporting regime, that through globally distributed governance is dynamically affected (Arrighi, Silver, and Ahmad 1999; Blim 1996; 1997) by the hegemony of such countries as the United States. The historical uniqueness of the United States’ hegemony in the world

economy (Arrighi, Silver, and Ahmad 1999) lies in the “unprecedented control over international organizations that regulate the international flows of capital, banking, and trade” (Blim 2000: 32). In view of the controversial involvement of IMF and World Bank in the 1997 Asian financial crisis (Krugman 1999: 109-17; Sachs 1998: 81-82), the United States’ hegemony makes local capitalisms viable to the extent that they either are in agreement with U.S.-backed international norms or are able to successfully withstand the hegemonic pressure of U.S.

Among anthropological efforts to formulate the criteria for the variability of capitalism, neo-institutional approach fails to the greatest extent, as opposed to neo-Weberian or neo-Marxist ones, since it does not offer its own theory of economic relations, let alone establish a sufficiently different configuration of causal mechanisms of capitalism (Blim 2000). Consequently, anthropological neo-institutionalism both lacks a theoretical definition of capitalism as an object of investigation and remains in need of borrowing a consistent conceptual apparatus from neo-Weberian and neo-Marxist approaches that would go beyond the lowest common theoretical denominator (Münch 1982; 1984; 1991b). Similarly, despite its widely recognized record in the theorization of capitalism, neo-Marxist approach needs to develop a comparative reflexivity to variants of capitalism, to which neo-Weberian research has been more sensitive, in order to construct, not too different from the Braudel’s manner, causally convincing accounts of local economies. As “mechanisms of capitalist governance need anthropological attention” (Blim 2000: 33), further research on variation in ideal types of economic relations should contribute to promoting anthropological fieldwork on international markets for capital (Braudel 1982), on the institutional impact of management education (Thrift 1998), and on rising transnational classes (Sklair 2001).

With respect to the theorization of capitalism, there is a growing demand for the conceptualization of action, as anthropological research turns to anti-hegemonic consumption practices (Miller 1997; 1998), to corporate marketers’ effect on capitalist production (Appelbaum 2000; Appelbaum, Belk, Clammer, Dilley, McDonald, Miller, and Orlove 1998), to commodity chain organization by consumer tastes (Roseberry 1996), and to global demand reorganization (Schneider 1994). As opposed to overly localizing critiques of the theorization of collective action (Carrier and Heyman 1997),

anthropological research should integrate the conceptual articulation of its multiple contexts with their “structural relationships to the operation of capitalism as a world economic system” (Blim 2000: 34). Weber’s ([1922] 1968) conceptualization of how economic agency differences lead to variation in structures of capitalism demands renewed attention, as Marxist models of capitalism insufficiently account for economic crises (Baran and Sweezy 1966; Hobsbawm 1954a; 1954b; Krugman 1999). Theoretical challenges of integrating anthropological research with conceptually sensitive accounts of global capitalism call for comparative studies of capitalist systems on the basis of renewed attention to the legacy of the sociological research of capitalism (Blim 2000).

An analytical extension of the conceptual contribution of Münch to the theorization of action (Münch 1982), of the structure of modernity (Münch 1984), of the variation of the structure of modernity in England, United States, Germany, and France (Münch 1986b-c), and of the effects of the modernization of modernity on accumulation processes (Münch 1991b) to the conceptualization of the varieties of capitalism as both analytical and historical ideal types may hold a promise of shedding an interpretive light on processes of the accumulation of money, power, discourse, and reputation on both macro and micro scales. Münch addresses insufficiencies in the theoretical foundations of the theorization of capitalism as a structure of interrelations among processes of accumulation. His works on the dynamic impact of modernization processes on the political, economic, cultural, and social systems of accumulation (Münch 1995; 1998) open theoretical avenues to the conceptualization of modernity on the regional, national and urban levels. Moreover, in concert with the sociological theorization of power in the global age (Beck 2005), recourse to conceptual frameworks of the theory of action (Münch 1982) and of the theory of modernity (Münch 1984; 1991b) opens possibilities for a multi-sited investigation of how cities make claims for culturally, socially, politically, and economically dominant positioning.

Relevance and Shortcomings of Multi-Sited Anthropology

For this thesis, the methodological tools of multi-sited research that anthropology offers are starting points for a sociological reflection over how the theoretical frameworks and

economic, cultural, social and political processes relate to each other. In the previous section, Blim highlights the apparent inadequacy of anthropological methodologies to dealing with the varieties of capitalism. Blim shows the latter to remain under-theorized from the perspective of neo-Marxist, neo-Weberian and neo-institutional approaches. The anthropological research on the local varieties of capitalism already carried out represents valid applications of anthropological methodologies and methods used. However, the issue of theoretical significance these research findings have remains unresolved, as Blim argues. At the same time, these anthropological findings are significant in documenting the differences that, for example, economic accumulation can exhibit across space and time. Consequently, to account for the variation in economic, cultural, social and political accumulation, for example, on the urban level, I decided to follow the concept of the structure of modernity, as an ideal-typical structure of relations among the processes of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation across their existing research on levels macro and micro.

This approach finds its support in the methodology of multi-sited anthropology. The latter states that following trans-local connections among theoretically relevant processes does not exclude work with secondary sources. Since, for my research on cultural accumulation, I rely on Münch's theorization of modernity, systems and action, I seek to explore the limits of applicability of his sociological approach. From Münch's perspective, capitalism is a product of a particular structure of interrelations among the systems of accumulation. This structure of interrelations I approach as an ideal-typical structure of modernity. This way, Blim's discussion of the anthropological research of capitalism leads, as he points out, to the theoretical discussion of ideal types and their analytical and historical construction. A larger theoretical discussion of capitalism, modernity and accumulation exceeds my methodological aims of exploring how the locally found variations of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation may be approached as historical ideal types.

Münch's theorization of modernity, accumulation and action allows building their analytical structure as ideal-types. Subsequently, these ideal types can be contextualized in a specific historical setting with regard to the structure of interrelations among the processes of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation existing in particular

time and place. From this perspective, global art museums and biennials cease being micro instances of a macro process of globalization that a multi-sited ethnography might reveal. Art museums and biennials become local outcomes of historically specific strategies of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation. Blim returns the discussion of the varieties of capitalism to the question of the theoretical construction of analytical ideal-types. Hence, a question of analytical importance that a multi-sited anthropology of global art museums may have becomes a theoretical question. Given that Weber's sociology is the starting point of theorization of ideal types, there is a need to sociologically operationalize Münch's theorization of modernity, accumulation and action vis-à-vis existing sociological research of capitalism.

Chapter Five: Operationalizing Münch II: Evaluating ‘Spirits of Capitalism’

This chapter tentatively demonstrates the applicability of Münch’s theorization of interpenetration, systems, and action on the example of France’s transition to global capitalism analyzed by Boltanski and Chiapello. Within the theoretical framework of historical ideal types, similarities to and differences from Münch’s approach of Boltanski and Chiapello’s research will be shown:

- A perspective on the interrelations between culture and economy based on their construction as historical ideal types may gain in analytical precision from an approach based on their elaboration as analytical ideal types.
- Boltanski and Chiapello follow Weber in constructing their ideal types of economy and culture as historical inductions subject to the exigencies of their research.
- Münch’s theorization of interpenetration, systems, and action allows for the reconstruction of the relations between economy and culture as analytical ideal types that allow for variation and change.

Ideal-Typical Relations between Economy and Culture

Among the more remarkable economic changes taking place in France between the 1960s and the 1990s are the disappearance, erosion, and diminution of active social movements, involved trade unions, real wage increases, high market positioning, upward productivity trends, and rapport between labor and management. The period starting in the 1990s witnessed minimal social movements, defensive and passive social unions, spreading precarious employment, growing income disparity, decreasing strikes and social conflicts, growing work discipline, and improvements in industrial production. Such a wide-ranging transition in economic relations taking place with an unprecedented rapidity

and without meeting with significant resistance has provoked sociological attempts, such as Boltanski and Chiapello's (1999; 2005a), to provide an explanation of underlying factors driving such historical change. In this regard, theoretical attention to the potential of an ideal-typical analysis of the relations among different processes of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation can be instructive. Regarding the applicability of an ideal-typical analysis, Münch (1988: 9) comments that

[w]hen one says that an ideal type is never fully realized, as a rule, in the real world but is always mixed with other ideal types, this does not mean that the corresponding theory is wrong and is never valid for the real world. What is meant is far more that the conditions for analytically pure statements are rarely present in full and that therefore reality always has to be explained by the combination of various ideal types. In order to do so one requires a comprehensive theoretical model that the individual ideal types can be integrated into and in which the relations between the various ideal types can be defined more precisely. Weber did not however reach this deeper level of theorizing. His ideal types form relatively isolated creations and their mutual relations and order remain undefined. This shortcoming results directly from the way Weber constructs ideal types through the exaggeration and exclusion of the features of empirical-historical phenomena. Without a comprehensive model, the method remains relatively arbitrary and disordered. Criteria for the exaggeration and exclusion of features are completely undefined. Weber's only answer here is the selection of features according to research interests. (Münch 1988: 9)

Within Münch's analytical frame of reference, the relations between culture and economy are conceived of as ideal-typical relations among economic, cultural, strategic, and personal systems, as analytical dimensions of individual and collective action. This has its correspondences in the formal structure of Münch's theory of action:

The theory of action does not consist of a conceptual scheme, as has been frequently asserted. The theory has its roots in the most basic problem of modern

science and philosophy: How is the analytical order of the world possible? This problem is itself rooted in an anthropological constant: human life is possible only as meaningful life. And the meaningfulness of human life is, for the *modern* mind, closely tied to a belief in a conceptually comprehensible order of the world, an order which can be grasped by human understanding. Parsons is indebted to Whitehead's analytical realism for this metaphysical belief. The instrument through which this belief is applied to reality and is made fruitful is the paradigm of ordering and dynamizing forces. This paradigm is the distilled result of the development from the duality of normative and conditional factors through the A-G-I-L schema to the cybernetic hierarchy and the theory of the generalized media of interchange.

Because of the extremely inclusive character of the action theory paradigm, which ultimately encompasses the whole human condition, the propositions which constitute its theoretical core must be formulated abstractly enough so that they can be given different interpretations on different system levels and in relation to different components on the same level. This means that the epistemological interpretation of the paradigm can vary from the hermeneutic to the causal, and from transcendental to teleonomic methods of explanation, depending on the field to which the paradigm is being applied. The paradigm consists of a theoretical calculus, theorems, and interpretations for the various levels [...] (italics in the original, Münch 1987: 149-50)

Adopting this analytical standpoint, I tentatively surmise that systemic contradictions between personal and economic systems, between economic and cultural systems, and between strategic and economic systems (Münch 1982: 94) threaten to undermine collective action they give rise to. This relates to Boltanski and Thevenot's (1991; 2006) research on the regimes of justification via the differences in the distribution of economic rewards, requirements of long-term commitment, and the necessity of justification that can be correspondingly specified in analytical terms pertaining to each of these systems, as Münch's theorization proposes. The economic, cultural, social and political causes for Boltanski and Thevenot's theorization of the

regimes of justification become, therefore, historical ideal types that specify analytically possible interrelations among the respective systems of accumulation into, in this case, an unequal structure of economic, social and cultural relations. According to Münch's (1982: 94) analytical schema of the human condition, the economic system is both integrated with and differentiated from other systems. Consequently, as an analytical ideal type, via the interchange of the media of accumulation of power, money, expertise and reputation, the political system needs to mobilize economic resources for collective purposes in a self-perpetuating process of the effective allocation and accumulation of capital. In the ideal-typical structure of systemic interrelations, via the accumulation of power, money, expertise and reputation, the system of social accumulation competes for resources and demand satisfaction thus creating concern for meeting market standards and for economic means. Within culturally defined economic relations, the system of economic accumulation needs to purchase labor power for wages and to exchange produced goods in response to consumer demand (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 162; Münch 1982: 129, 31). To clarify the relations among systems of accumulation and interchange, Münch explains that

[a]nyone attempting to foist a systems functionalist perspective on Parsons virtually has to ignore everything Parsons has written on the subject of the relationships between action subsystems. To illustrate this, let us simply take one relationship as analysed in the theory of media: that between the social-cultural and economic systems, as empirically differentiated systems. Their differentiation demands the institutionalization of appropriate normative codes (discourse and exchange) and the media attributed to them (value commitments and money). The social-cultural regulation of economic action by way of value commitments means in this instance that general value commitments are the means by which *normative limits* are set for economic calculation, and that economic action receives a positive normative orientation. In that they are institutionalized in a discursive social-cultural order, value commitments are kept apart from the calculation of utility, and in that they are transmitted to economic action, they attach the latter to norms. The processes require the building of discursive,

practical bridges between the purely social-cultural and the economic contexts. These bridges are provided by, for example, practical discourse directed toward economic problems. Should such practical discussions not take place, or remain confined simply to the ideal or to the economic plane, then social-cultural and economic action will grow apart. This is where pathological phenomena then come to light. Conversely money is the carrier-medium which mobilizes economic resources for cultural purposes. (*italics in the original*, Münch 1987: 134-35)

In this regard, it is instructive to observe the parallels that exist between the sociological research on the spirit of capitalism – a term originally derived from Weber ([1905] 1934) – by Boltanski and Chiapello and the elaboration of the theory of action by Münch in the direction of specifying analytical ideal types of the systems of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation. The premise of the sociological research of managerial discourse that Boltanski and Chiapello (2005a) undertook is that practices promoted by it have more influence on general economy than their direct field of application in around one fifth of leading and multinational companies. The latter companies usually apply best practices later adopted by other firms, governmental agencies, and non-profit organizations (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 162). Denoting an ideal-typical relation between culture and economy, the spirit of capitalism has changed in correspondence with the structural differentiation of the area of overlap between the value system and economic system that had developed over the last decades of the twentieth century. Systemic interpenetration can be argued to have taken place since the economic transformation of the period has not met with a sustained value-based resistance that should have occurred if the value system had remained unaffected. The social dynamics encompassing capitalist economic organization, the interpenetration of economy and culture, and the value system lend themselves to modeling general relations among these components in the specific form their configuration has taken in France over the period from the 1970s to the 1990s. The analysis of transition to post-Fordism in France contextualizes the transformation of relations between economy and culture partly shared by developed industrial economies and partly specific to these particular relations

and their development within a single country's history (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 162). The tentative specification of the relations among the systems of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation I undertake finds its ideal-typical specification in analytical terms in Münch's theory of action:

In modern societies the instrumental-economic subsystem is 'carried' by the values of economic rationality, the norms of market order, the roles of producers, consumers, employers, employees, sellers, buyers, etc., and by the collectives of employers' and employees' associations. The political subsystem is represented by the values of democracy, the norms of the democratic parliamentary decision-making process, the roles of members of the government and of parliament, voters and lobbyists, and by the collectives of political parties and interest groups. The community system comprises the values of human and civil rights, the norms of compromise-seeking and settlement of disputes through the legal system, the role of citizen, and the collectives of classes, social strata and religious, professional, ethnic, linguistic, regional and other groups. The social-cultural system is based on the values of intellectual rationality, the norms of discourse, the roles of intellectuals, experts, clients, laymen, etc., and on the collectives of intellectual and professional associations. The interpenetration of these societal subsystems requires the interaction of the above role carriers. The more regularly the interactions take place – in joint councils, for example – the more they too tend to form subsystems between the societal subsystems, Hence new subsystems have interposed themselves between the first subsystems,. Once the process is completed society has been broken down from four basic systems into sixteen more finely *differentiated* subsystems. (italics in the original, Münch 1987: 69-70)

Weber's ([1905] 1934) formulation of interpenetration between economy and culture broke the ground for the historical contextualization of economic development. He also explored the integration of the economic system with other systems in view of the growing interpenetration of economic action with the principles of equity and ethical responsibility. In response to restitutive sanctions and organized activism, as association

and goal-setting systems interpenetrate, and to universalistic ethics and rational action, as cultural and association systems interpenetrate (Münch 1982: 94, 534), the modern process of economic accumulation became increasingly affected by all segments of the action system connected to norms of justice, rationality, and governmentality (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 163). Reductively Marxist approaches to economic accumulation cannot adequately account for such a central characteristic of capitalism as the interpenetration of culture and economy (Münch 1991b). This is the case for the reason that, rather than lacking restraint, the economic system shows itself to be integrated into the action system that, via placing restraints upon economic activity, integrates economic system into the rest of the social system. This takes place by means of the recognition of the legitimacy and legality of the community system that personality, cultural and strategic systems have to internalize in their turn (Münch 1982). In order that the larger social structure maintains its integration, the discursive means of justification and normative steering of the social order have to be mobilized (Münch 1982). Münch introduces his theorization of the interpenetration of the social subsystems via media of interchange following

Parsons [who] reached a new stage in the analysis of analytically differentiated subsystems with the introduction of the theory of the generalized media of interchange, which he formulated successively for the subsystems of the *social system* (money, political power, influence, value-commitments), the *action system* (definition of the situation, affect, performance capacity, intelligence), and finally the system of the *human condition* (transcendental ordering, meaning, health, empirical ordering). The starting point for this theoretical development was a renewed encounter with economic theory, occasioned by an invitation from the Department of Economics at Cambridge University to deliver a guest lecture in honour of the memory of Alfred Marshall. This invitation led to an intensive period of work with Neil J. Smelser, out of which emerged the coauthored *Economy and Society* in 1956. In this book, Parsons and Smelser developed a theory of the economic system and a theory of money within the framework of the general theory of action. The theories differed from pure economic theory in that

they viewed economic action as mediated through the interpenetration of analytically differentiated social subsystems – the economic system, the political system, the integrative system and the cultural system. In the foreground of the analysis stood the relations between the economic system and the other three subsystems. These relations appeared here, for the first time, as relations of interchange, in which money as a generalized medium of interchange played a central role. And next to money, the medium of interchange anchored in the economic system, there began to emerge indications of the concepts of political power, influence and value-commitments as media anchored in the political system, the integrative system, and the cultural system, respectively. (italics in the original, Münch 1987: 76-77)

Conventional economic theory neglects the interpenetration of the economic system with other systems of collective action, since it restricts economy to narrowly defined links between technological progress and economic order, between entrepreneurial activity and rational economic association, and between economic market and the system of rights and liberties (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 163; Münch 1982: 113). Such an economistic definition of the economic system does not allow for theoretical sensitivity to regional variation and historical change. From a system-theoretical perspective, variation and change mainly occur in affective and cultural components of the cultural system, in normative and professional components of the community system, and in justification and administrative components of political system (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 163; Münch 1982: 113). The economic system interpenetrates with the cultural system via the exchange of individual commitment for the possibilities offered by money. The economic system interpenetrates with the community system via the exchange of economic security for the commitment it generates on resource markets. The economic system interpenetrates with the political system via the exchange of money for political power establishing the rules for justice, fairness, and common good (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 163; Münch 1982: 131). Münch comments that

The significance of money and value-commitment lies in that fact that through their characteristics of being institutionally anchored and possessing specific qualities they become the conservators of the institutional cores of their respective subsystems, while through their characteristics of circulability, symbolization and generalization they make possible the interpenetration of their systems of origin with other systems while protecting their own system's integrity. The institutional binding of money to the order of property and of value-commitments to the value pattern is the basis of the differentiation of the two systems. The fact that these media circulate permits the entrance of cultural demands into the economic system. Their symbolic and generalized character is what allows them to make connections with the concrete demands of systems other than their system of origin. It is only the generalized character of money that permits the distinctive linking of differentiated subsystems which we refer to as interpenetration. As a generalized medium of interchange, money can be used however one likes, in accordance with concrete cultural standards, in the service of the goal of consumption. From its anchoring in the economic system develops the external space of its application to the goals of consumption. Culturally formed desires for consumption provide the material which is given *form* through submission to the laws of the economically rational employment of money. If there were no generalized medium, there would be no basis for rational economic calculation and economic activity would be overwhelmed by concrete standards of consumption that would be inaccessible to rational calculation. We can see this in all primordial forms of economy which lack that coherence which can be provided only by the use of money. (italics in the original, Münch 1987: 85)

Seen in this perspective, the interpenetration of the economic system with the rest of the action system as a historical process may be said to have gone through the following developmental stages. The stage of bourgeois capitalism stressed the cultural system via entrepreneurial firms, bourgeois culture and morality, interest association politics, and personal assistance and charity societies. The stage of large corporation capitalism stressed the community system via professional management, welfare state, career

development, and merit and credentials culture. The stage of contemporary capitalism stresses the political system via executive administration, political exchange, legal system, and governmental policies (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 164; Münch 1982: 113).

Business practices texts used by Boltanski and Chiapello (2005a) to carry out their analysis of the configuration of the structure of modernity in France illustrate the change in interpenetration between economy and culture occurring between the 1960s and the 1990s. Boltanski and Chiapello work with a representative sample of French managerial discourse represented by two sets of managerial literature composed in the respective decades. The literature largely addresses concerns of French economy. The analysis that Boltanski and Chiapello (2005a) produce of this managerial literature delineates the particular configuration of interrelations among societal, economic, association, and political systems found in France. These systems are exemplified by professional environments, work conditions, organizational forms, and management types that respectively correspond to the 1960s and the 1990s. In historical perspective, Münch summarizes the changes to the normative culture that have taken place in terms of different ideal types in the following form:

If normative culture is based on a combination of education and political decision-making authority – as was the case under Confucianism and to some extent under German idealism right into the twentieth century – then it will place little value as a component of prestige on access to economic opportunity; here the differentiation of prestige is more likely to be determined according to the congruence of the educational and the bureaucratic hierarchies. The combination of property, political decision-making authority and education is dismissive of those with the opportunity to make economic acquisitions in the market, and also of those who have obtained an education, if they do not also have property – this was particularly true of the European aristocracy before the bourgeois revolution. In contrast, the commercially-oriented bourgeoisie brought an emphatically economic culture into being and, in particular, managed to place a greater value on economic success in comparison to political influence and education.

However, this bourgeois economic culture was again modified by democratization in both politics and education, in favour of a higher valuation of political decision-making authority and, even more so, of education. Modern normative culture is characterized by a revaluing of education, both in relation to the distribution of economic and political opportunities and in relation to the distribution of prestige, yet it has not pushed economic and political opportunity completely into the background. (Münch 1987: 118)

Culture and Economy as Historical Ideal Types

The content analysis by Boltanski and Chiapello (1999; 2005a) of the two samples of professional literature has sought to uncover prevalent formulations, problems, solutions, and negations of managerial discourse. Additionally, for the two text samples the frequencies of the usage of key terms of analysis were computed (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 165). Among the conclusions that the analysis of the configuration of relations between economy and culture in the 1990s has arrived at are the emergence of flexible organizations, project-centric work environments, hierarchies-replacing networks, freely circulating flows, loose organizational integration, horizontal firm structures, and bureaucracy minimization (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 165-66). The problems of the 1960s' managerial literature centering on dissatisfaction with restricted decision-making, narrowly defined roles, powerful management, bureaucratic organization, and large dominating companies became replaced in the 1990s with non-hierarchical organization, diffuse power structure, self-guiding workforce, competitive culture, and permanent organizational change. The solutions of the 1960s centered on decentralization, meritocracy, objectives-driven management, competent management, and hierarchical control, while the 1990s advised on adoption of lean restructured companies, network- or project-centric organization, flexibility, innovation, competence, motivational leadership, expertise- and counsel-oriented management, self-reflexivity, client-orientation, and trust. The 1960s rejected private sphere, personal judgment, nepotism, political promotions, personal ties, and privileges, while the 1990s decried old-

style management, bureaucracy, and separation between private and professional spheres (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 165). Boltanski and Chiapello comment that

[t]he attraction exercised by the network model over 1990s management authors is based in large measure on the fact that it is opposed precisely to the 'industrial' world of the 1960s. In the industrial world, people are respected only to the extent that they perform certain duties and occupy certain pre-existent posts in an organizational structure designed in specialist departments. They are judged on their functional character – that is to say, the efficiency with which they perform their job. Work relations are prescribed by the structure, and the same goes on the whole for methods, supervised by regulations and procedures.

In a connexionist world, people are called upon to move around, to forge the links they use in their work themselves – links that cannot, by definition, be pre-established in advance – and to distrust any structure and post designed in advance, which risk confining them to an overfamiliar universe. Their flexibility, their ability to adapt and learn continuously, become major advantages, which take precedence over their technical expertise (knowledge changes so quickly) and their experience. Personality make-up, the qualities of communication, listening and openness to differences, thus count for more than efficiency as measured by the ability to achieved predefined objectives. Work methods are developed in line with constantly changing needs: people organize themselves and invent local rules that are not amenable to totalization and comprehensive rationalization by some putative organization department. (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005a: 125)

Requirements for job security have shifted from merit-based approach based on agreed-upon targets of the 1960s to the project-oriented experience accumulation of the 1990s. The managerial discourse of the 1990s proposes organization models, structures, and strategies that suggest by their contrast to the established organizational culture of the 1960s a different structure of economic relations. Between the two periods, the structure of systemic relations that the economic system is embedded into has significantly

changed. In the history of the process of interpenetration between culture and economy, the contemporary configuration of relations between these systems correspondingly involves a change in the type of interpenetration that obtains between economic and community systems. The reason for this development is that the relations between association and community systems have significantly altered the acceptable definition of work situation, the justifiable treatment of employees, and desirable forms of entrepreneurial strategies (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 166). Correspondingly, in accordance with the argument made by Boltanski and Chiapello (2005b: 166), in a historical perspective, the economic system has predominantly comprised family-owned firms in the nineteenth century, large professionally managed companies from the late nineteenth to late twentieth century, and networked, start-up, financial, and niche companies beginning in the 1980s. For their periodization of capitalism, Boltanski and Chiapello make use of the notion of the 'spirit of capitalism' that approaches the characteristics of an historical ideal type:

While following the Weberian tradition, we put the ideologies on which capitalism rests at the centre of our analyses, we shall employ the notion of the spirit of capitalism in a way that departs from canonical usages. In fact, in Weber the notion of spirit take its place in an analysis of the 'types of practical rational behaviour', the 'practical incentives to action', which, constitutive of a new *ethos*, made possible break with traditional practices, generalization of the tendency to calculation, the lifting of moral condemnations of profit, and the switch to the process of unlimited accumulation. Our perspective – intent not upon explaining the genesis of capitalism but on understanding the conditions in which it can once again secure for itself the actors required for profit creation – will be different. We shall set aside the predispositions towards the world required to participate in capitalism as a cosmos – means-ends compatibility, practical rationality, aptitude for calculation, autonomization of economic activities, an instrumental relation to nature, and so on – as well as the more general justifications of capitalism produced in the main by economic science, which we shall touch on later. Today, at least among economic actors in the Western world, they pertain to the common

skills which, in accordance with institutional constraints imposed as it were from without, are constantly reproduced through processes of familial and educational socialization. They constitute the ideological platform from which historical variations can be observed, even if we cannot exclude the possibility that changes in the spirit of capitalism sometimes involve the metamorphosis of certain of its most enduring aspects. *Our intention is to study observed variations, not to offer an exhaustive description of all the constituents of the spirit of capitalism.* This will lead us to detach the category of spirit of capitalism from the substantial content, in terms of *ethos*, which it is bound up with in Weber, in order to treat it as a form that can contain different things at different points in the development of the models of organizing firms and processes of extracting capitalist profit. We shall thus seek to integrate some very diverse historical expressions of the spirit of capitalism into a single framework, and pose the question of their transformation. We shall highlight the way in which an existence attuned to the requirements of accumulation must be marked out for a large number of actors to deem it worth the effort of being lived.

We shall, however, remain faithful throughout this historical journey to the methodology of Weberian ideal types in systematizing and underlining what seems to us to be specific about one epoch by comparison with those that preceded it, and in attaching more importance to variations than constants, but without ignoring the stable features of capitalism. (italics in the original, Boltanski and Chiapello 2005a: 11-12)

In the period of bourgeois capitalism, the association system emphasized independence from local communities and progress. During the phase of managerial capitalism, career development, organizational power, and industrial efficiency came to the forefront of societal relations with political, economic, and cultural systems. The transition to global capitalism favored non-authoritarian management, fuzzy organizations, creativity and innovation, and permanent change to become the normative culture of the community system. The community system before the managerial spirit of capitalism, in the terminology of Boltanski and Chiapello (2005a: 19) who see it

preceded by the bourgeois and succeeded by the global spirits of capitalism, consisted of domestic and market-based normative culture. During the managerial spirit of capitalism, merit-based professionalism, scientific effectiveness, and objectives-oriented management gained dominance. After the demise of managerial capitalism, professional mobility, network compatibility, project-centric normative culture, and experience-based employability took center-stage. The bourgeois political system revolved around personal property, personal relations, charity, and paternalism. The managerial political system allowed long-term planning, career-based management, and welfare state. The global political system is largely built around ideas of mobility, adaptability, self-reflexive administration, self-reliance capabilities, and self-help policies. These systemic changes encompass community, political, economic, and cultural systems forming via their interrelationships the structure of modernity in its historical dynamics particular to France in the 1960s and the 1990s (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 166; Münch 1982: 113). Boltanski and Chiapello summarize the differences between the three spirits of capitalism in the following way:

The ‘first’ spirit of capitalism – associated, as we have seen, with the figure of the bourgeois – was in tune with the essentially familial forms of capitalism of an age when gigantic size was rarely sought after. Owners and employers were personally known to their employees; the fate and life of the firm were closely associated with those of a family. As for the ‘second’ spirit, which was organized around the central figure of the director (or salaried manager) and *cadres*, it was bound up with a capitalism of large firms, already sufficiently imposing for bureaucratization and the use of an abundant, increasingly academically qualified managerial staff to be a central element. But only some of them (a minority) may be characterized as multinationals. Shareholding became more impersonal, with numerous firms finding themselves detached from the name and destiny of a particular family. The ‘third’ spirit, in its turn, will have to be isomorphic with a ‘globalized’ capitalism employing new technologies, to cite only the two aspects most frequently mentioned as characteristic of capitalism today. (italics in the original, Boltanski and Chiapello 2005a: 19)

For the purposes of the sociological study of managerial discourse they conducted, Boltanski and Chiapello (2005a) have denoted the place in the social system that normative culture occupies with respect to communities, professions, sciences, and cultural discourses via the notion of justificatory regime (Boltanski and Thevenot 1991; 2006). Translated into the terms of Münch's (1982; 1991b) theoretical framework, Boltanski and Chiapello's notion of justificatory regime corresponds in its import to the normative validity of meaningful argumentation, the communal anchoring of commitment, and socially binding fairness and legitimacy (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 167; Münch 1982: 617). To bring idealist and positivist strands of sociology into a common conceptual framework, changes to normative culture as a justificatory regime should be considered as a process of interpenetration among the component systems of the structure of modernity. In the process of mutually accepted interchange, the structure of systemic interpenetration analytically corresponds to developments in specifically involved systems. Thus, the analysis of the structure of modernity combines both hermeneutic understanding and causal explanation into the methodology of the general theory of action and of social systems. In this regard, addressing the reciprocal relationships among the systems of accumulation, Münch adds that

[i]n the context of the relationship between the *social-cultural* and *political* systems we find the specification of cultural value patterns and the generalization and legitimation of collective goals. Here the *operative responsibility* of political representatives for the implementation of cultural values in political decisions represents a factor input from the political to the social-cultural system, controlled by political power. The exercise of political responsibility is dependent on the transfer of political power. Nevertheless the integration of political decisions into the cultural frame of reference, or their exclusion from it, is a matter for social-cultural discursive procedures. In the opposite direction the *legitimation of authority* is a factor input from the social-cultural to the political system, controlled by value-commitments (arguments). Authority is not able to legitimize itself. It is only ever legitimized in as far as social-cultural discursive procedures

allow it to be justified through rational argument based on general values. Turning now to the level of products, the *moral responsibility* of political representatives *for collective interest* should be seen as a product output from the political and into the social-cultural system. Cultural political decisions determine a frame of reference within which social-cultural action in schools, universities, theatres, concert halls and the like, takes place. The way in which these products are 'consumed' is determined, in the context of social-cultural action, by value-commitments (arguments). In the opposite direction the *legality of powers of office* should be viewed as a product output from the social-cultural to the political system. The legality of decision-making authority is dependent on the ability to justify it rationally and discursively in the context of the cultural pattern of values. In political action this legality of decision-making authority is consumed in every-day decisions, for when they are carried out this implies the application of political power. (italics in the original, Münch 1987: 87)

Many theoretical frameworks emerge from rather than guide a research process. Offering an emergent theoretical framework, the sociological research on the spirit of capitalism by Boltanski and Chiapello has parallels with developments in the field of sociology that arrive at similar theoretical conclusions by following a different methodological path. There are corresponding lines of theoretical development, such as those followed by Münch (1982: 254), that can shed interpretative light on issues shared by their research. Standardized procedures of tests that form one of the central findings of the ethnographic research by Boltanski and Chiapello (2005b: 167) correspond to the justificatory regimes that they identify to be at the basis of the historical configurations of social order. Considered within the system of Weber's traditional, charismatic, legal-rational, and value-rational authority types, justificatory regimes could tentatively be said to occupy different analytical positions in the areas of their interpenetration. These areas are the inspirational area between charismatic and value-rational authority, the domestic area between traditional and charismatic authority, the renown area between traditional and legal-rational authority, the civic area between traditional and value-rational authority, the market area between charismatic and legal-rational authority, and the

industrial area between value-rational and legal-rational authority (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 167; Münch 1982: 562). Using the notion of the ‘city’, developed in Boltanski and Thevenot’s (1991) work on justification, for the construction of their justificatory regimes, Boltanski and Chiapello (1999; 2005a) introduce the basic concepts of their research as follows.

Inasmuch as they are subject to an imperative of justification, social arrangements tend to incorporate reference to a kind of very general convention directed towards a common good, and claiming universal validity, which has been modeled on the concept of the *city*. Capitalism is no exception to this rule. What we have called the spirit of capitalism necessarily contains reference to such conventions, at least in those of its dimensions that are directed towards justice. In other words, considered from a pragmatic point of view, the spirit of capitalism assumes reference to two different logical events. The first contains an agent capable of actions conducive to profit creation, whereas the second contains an agent equipped with a greater degree of reflexivity, who judges the actions of the first in the name of universal principles. These two agents obviously denote the same actor, described as capable of engaging in operations of increasing generality. Without this competence, it would in fact be impossible for actors to understand the critiques directed at capitalism in so far as it is profit-oriented, or to construct justifications to foil such critiques.

In view of the central character of the concept of the city here, we are now going to go back over the work where the model of cities was presented. The concept of the city is orientated towards the question of justice. It is intended to be modeled on the kind of operations that actors engage in during disputes with one another, when they are faced with a demand for justification. This demand for justification is inextricably linked to the possibility of critique. The justification is necessary to back up the critique, or to answer it when it condemns the unjust character of some specific situation. (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005a: 22)

The justificatory regimes identified by Boltanski and Chiapello generate their specific standards of comparison through evaluation, testing, categorization, and ordering. These standards of comparison produce distributions of individuals on the legitimate scale of worth corresponding to an assessment procedure. Consequently, such regimes of justification emphasize their respective types of normative culture (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 167-68; Münch 1982: 562). The inspirational regime of justification deriving from value specification and affective generalization emphasizes spirituality and authenticity. The domestic regime of justification deriving from affective selection and affective bonding emphasizes subordination and allegiance. The renown regime of justification deriving from norm connection openness and normative constraint emphasizes popularity and esteem. The civic regime of justification deriving from norm generalization and value boundedness emphasizes representation and collective will. The market regime of justification deriving from means mobilization and goal setting emphasizes competition and opportunities. And the industrial regime of justification deriving from rational learning and ethical control emphasizes efficiency and professionalism. These justificatory regimes are specified in accordance with the comparison principles encompassing human, natural, action, and symbolic systems, with the scale of worth where relative positions are defined, with the interpenetration among human, action, symbolic and natural systems, with the structure of social relations deriving from relations of worth, with the relations of exchange reproducing the structure of worth, with a standard test establishing a person's worth, and with the ideal-typical social order corresponding to the distribution of worth (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 168; Münch 1982: 163). In more detail, this theoretical development by Boltanski and Chiapello finds its parallels in the approach of Münch to the differentiation of systems and subsystems each having its distinct characteristics as a consequence of the process of construction and selection of phenotypes of systems of action. To illustrate this, Münch takes a value system for its analysis as an ideal-type:

More specifically, we can say that the selection of phenotypes in this system is determined by the kind of relation obtaining between the interpretations of the value system as the L-component of the four-dimensional action framework and

the other three poles: community (I), goal attainment (G) and the articulation of interests (A). Selection is determined, in its content, by the content of the interpretations (L) and the content of the societal varieties (I), goals (G) and interests (A) involved, as well as the relations between all of these, which may cover the full range of possible relations between potentially ordering and dynamizing systems: accommodation, reconciliation, mutual isolation, interpenetration, domination of one system by the other, Evolutionary development presupposes interpenetration, which leads to higher orders of complexity. The selection of a phenotype requires the communal anchoring of the interpretations of a value system, their rational specification to goals and the normative limitation of interests by the values, as well as the opening of the value system to the articulation of interests, the demands of goal attainment, and the rules which the societal community holds to be self-evident. From the perspective of goal-oriented societal activities and personalities, which approach the G-pole of the action framework, evolutionary development means increased interpenetration with the material, social, and symbolic environment.

Corresponding to these three dimensions, one can understand the three concepts of 'adaptive upgrading' (G-A), 'value generalization' (G-L), and 'inclusion' (G-I) as so many specifications of interpenetration. The fourth concept, 'structural differentiation', refers to the product of this increasing interpenetration: this concept denotes a normatively integrated form of differentiation, the mechanism of which is the formation of continually expanding zones of interpenetration between the components of the action space. We can see that a voluntaristic theory of evolution includes as essential components not only constellations of interest and power, but also the processes of the formation of community and the processes of the discursive grounding of norms. This kind of relation which obtains among these elements, how much weight each has and what effect each has on the others, can be discovered by using the model of possible relations between the subsystems of action. (Münch 1987: 111)

By applying Münch's theoretical framework to the sociological research of Boltanski and Chiapello, I tentatively show the justificatory regimes identified by the latter to be indicative of underlying structural change. Boltanski and Chiapello's (2005a) sociological study of capitalism while offering a highly developed theoretical framework has significant parallels with such other theoretical developments such as that of Münch (1982). What, within the theoretical framework of Münch, can be shown to be the cases of systemic interpenetration, apparently corresponds to Boltanski and Chiapello's typological identification of the regimes of justification. Boltanski and Chiapello have identified a "new and increasingly influential justificatory logic" (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 168) where mobility, availability, and networks are indicators of a projects-oriented justificatory logic. Operating within Münch's frame of theoretical reference, I argue that the justificatory logic, as identified by Boltanski and Chiapello, represents the normative culture of network society. They specify a projects-oriented justificatory regime in terms of the following analytical dimensions. The assessment dimension of justificatory logic is specified by activity, project involvement, and network connections. The low worth dimension of justificatory logic is connected to passivity, close-mindedness, authoritarianism, rigidity, and parochialism. The high worth dimension of justificatory logic is specified by adaptability, flexibility, sincerity, supportiveness, and leadership. The subjects dimension of justificatory logic is specified by managers, mentors, and innovators. The objects dimension of justificatory logic is specified by information technologies and work structures of sub-contracting, flexibility, outsourcing, autonomy, and franchises. The relations dimension of justificatory logic is specified by trust, communication, and adaptability. The worth structure dimension of justificatory logic is specified by employability within project organization. The exchange structure dimension of justificatory logic is specified by availability and short-term planning. The standard test dimension of justificatory logic is specified by mobility between projects. And the corresponding ideal-typical order dimension of justificatory logic is specified by network society (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 169). Boltanski and Chiapello place their concepts of tests or challenges in relation to their theorization of modernity in the following way:

The notion of test breaks with a narrowly determinist conception of the social, whether based on the omnipotence of structures or, in a culturalist perspective, the domination of internalized norms. From the viewpoint of action, it puts the emphasis on the various degrees of uncertainty haunting situations in social life.

For our project, the notion of the test has the advantage of allowing us to circulate between relations of force and legitimate orders with the same theoretical instruments. The test is always a test of strength. That is to say, it is an event during which beings, in pitting themselves against one another (think of an arm-wrestling match between two people, or the confrontation between a fisherman and the trout that seeks to elude him), reveal what they are capable of and, more profoundly, what they are made of. But when the situation is subject to justificatory constraints, and when the protagonists judge that these constraints are being genuinely respected, the test of strength will be regarded as legitimate.

We shall say in the first instance (the test of strength) that at its conclusion the disclosure of power is conveyed by the determination of a certain degree of *strength*; and in the second (the legitimate test), by a judgement as to the respective *status* of people. Whereas the attribution of strength defines a state of affairs without any moral implications, the attribution of a status assumes a judgement that bears not only on the respective strength of the opposing parties, but also on the just character of the order disclosed by the test. (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005a: 30-31)

The underlying argument behind the sociological identification by Boltanski and Chiapello of a new, network-oriented, justificatory regime consists in the differentiation of an autonomous agency of networking as an “art of connecting and making use of the most diverse and furthest ties” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 168). However, this argument does not amount to asserting the novelty of networks as such or of their wide reach achieved in the late 1970s. The activity serving as the general standard of project-oriented justificatory regime differs from industrial standard in its departure from steady and salaried work towards the diffusion of distinctions between work and leisure, stability and unsteadiness, earning and volunteering, and productivity and performance.

A project- and network-oriented justificatory regime progressively takes hold as the movement between projects increases in value, as activity becomes a permanent state, and as encounters are structured around project-orientation (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 169). The duration of projects is structured according to short-term timelines that promote, motivate, and maintain the networking and contact accumulation of their participants. A project-oriented systemic logic values adaptability, flexibility, polyvalence, mobility, initiative, autonomy, risk-taking, and openness to new people, possibilities, and information (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 169). Boltanski and Chiapello comment that

[i]n a connexionist world, the tension between the requirement of *flexibility* and the need to be someone – that is, to possess a self endowed with *specificity* (a ‘personality’) and a certain *permanency* in time – is a constant source of anxiety. The slogan that sums up the ideal of a successful life as *becoming oneself* – that is, changing in order to bring out and discover what one potentially was, so that one is no longer the same person while nevertheless evincing conformity to an original self – is the typical expression of this tension.

To adjust to a connexionist world, people must prove sufficiently malleable to pass through different universes while changing properties. The logic of the temporary rental or loan can be extended from material properties to personal properties, to the attributes of persons – that is to say, to qualities which, stripped of their permanent character, are then assumed in particular situations. The skill to recognize what a situation consists in, and to activate the properties it requires of the self, is what primarily makes it possible to adopt modes of action tailored to this world. Adaptability – that is, the ability to treat one’s own person in the manner of a text that can be translated into different languages – is in fact a basic requirement for circulating in networks, guaranteeing the transit through heterogeneity of a being minimally defined by a body and the proper noun attached to it. Considered from the standpoint of this new model of excellence, permanency and especially constancy to oneself, or enduring attachment to various ‘values’, are open to criticism as misplaced, even pathological

inflexibility and, depending on the context, as inefficiency, rudeness, intolerance, and an inability to communicate. (*italics in the original*, Boltanski and Chiapello 2005a: 461)

A project-oriented justificatory regime defines personal worth in the non-instrumental terms that encourage contribution to common good, trust generation, non-authoritarian leadership, tolerant management, respect for differences, connections sharing, and general employability enhancement. Since each justificatory regime is represented by a specific vocabulary, the content analysis of the management literature samples chosen by Boltanski and Chiapello for their sociological study has uncovered the frequencies of appearance of key terms in the respective bodies of literature (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 170). Unsurprisingly, industrial justificatory logic dominates textual samples both for the 1960s and for the 1990s. Its criticism has increased between the two periods. Its proportion to other logics of justification has decreased in the 1990s with network logic becoming more represented. Its next-ranked logic changed from domestic in the 1960s to project-oriented in the 1990s. From the 1960s to the 1990s, the latter logic has doubled its weight in the overall ranking structure of logics of justification (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 170). Therefore, the greatest discursive changes between the managerial capitalism and global capitalism are the following. Network logic has risen to second ranking place in its frequency. Market logic has increased its presence in response to the more competitive, restructured and client-driven macro environment of the economic system in the 1990s. An inspirational logic grew in strength as innovation, risk-taking, and personalization gain in traction. And domestic and civic logics have lost in their relative frequency of appearance in management literature to even greater degree than did an industrial justificatory logic over the studied period (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 170).

Analytical Ideal Types of Economy and Culture

The transition of France's capitalism from a managerial to a global capitalism was accompanied by the restructuring of the systems of value, legitimacy, and relevance as

people, things, and situations have become embedded into normative culture, organization types, and entrepreneurial strategies corresponding to a transformed justificatory regime. By changing standard tests, the latter alters its own systemic logic (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 171). As a part of theoretical framework for the analysis of normative change, standard tests are subdivided into tests of strength and legitimate tests (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 171). A legitimate test (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 171) is a kind of test for which the justificatory regime it belongs to supplies legitimacy by clearly stating the strength type, testing device, and test definition used for carrying out its procedure, should unambiguous, qualifiable and categorizable results be obtained. In contrast, while dependent on the decision over its success or failure, a test of strength (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 171) does not prohibit the mobilization of as many capabilities as possible, offers no preliminary specifications or instructions, and the possibilities of what course the test process takes are unlimited. In the economic system, a legitimate test is embedded in the dominant mode of accumulation via normative culture that exerts both constraining and legitimizing influence on corporate activities, organizational models, and general management. In this regard, Münch comments that

[t]he normative control of action in all social spheres is inconceivable unless all the actors from these spheres are included in a community; conversely the development of representations for the various spheres in a common basic pattern of norms is just as inconceivable unless economic, political and social-cultural action are included in community relations. In this sense it is communal action's interpenetration with economic, political and social-cultural action which has an essential significance for modern normative order.

[...] In the *interchange of factors* between the community system and the economic system, involving the former's claims on resources and the latter's standards of resource allocation, the development of a market community results from the penetration of economic action by communal association. The latter's relevance to economic action can only be born out of the economic actors' commitment to a community embracing all market relations. And it is only on the

basis of such a market community that regulated exchange is possible. (*italics in the original*, Münch 1988: 110-11)

Within a market-oriented justificatory regime, normative culture provides the existing mode of accumulation with legitimization by applying the criteria of equality of chances, of merit-based success, of market opportunities, and of competitive advantage. At the same time, the balance of power, “dominant positions, previous agreements and cartels” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 172) prevent income distribution in the economic system from taking a form solely attributable to market forces that are not either identical with or reducible to normative culture. In the structure of interpenetration, both integrating and differentiating its constitutive systems, normative culture, when it is institutionalized in its legitimate tests, does not allow to any of the economic, cultural, community, and political systems to play a predominant role in their interrelationships that constitute their structure as a whole, even though particular entrepreneurial groups or individuals may possess strategic means to exploit the opportunities arising in situations where independent criteria of systemic evaluation diminish their strengths (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 172; Münch 1982: 131). There are situations in which tests of strengths and legitimate tests, without ever being completely separate, either coincide or are related to each other thus putting into question the legitimacy regime they avowedly reproduce, as does correlation between socioeconomic background and scholastic aptitude (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 172). To analyze the changes in the spirit of capitalism that the transition from a managerial to a global capitalism has wrought, Boltanski and Chiapello rely on the notion of tests in the following way:

When we set up the concept of test in the introduction to this work, we maintained that a society (or a state of society) may be defined by the nature of the tests it sets – tests through which social selection is performed – and by disputes over the more or less just character of these tests. Now, in this respect, the transformation that this book seeks to explain is radical. Tests connected with work (selection, promotion, matching of people and posts, determination of pay, etc.) were strongly institutionalized in the 1960s around the organization of long careers;

and these were framed by relatively constraining collective agreements and a significant trade-union presence capable of enforcing compliance with them. The distribution of income between wage-earners was administered within large collectives where only wage-earners attached to the same employer worked. This simultaneously made it possible to bring out commonalities of condition and interest, and to establish a formalized, negotiated justice associating an income with a level of qualification. The only employment contract possible was the permanent contract, the others being subject to very tight restrictions.

Thirty years on, this edifice has been dismantled. The determination of pay occurs largely via an unbalanced relation of forces on the market, which brings face to face an individualized wage-earner who needs work in order to live and a highly structured firm that is capable of seizing all the opportunities afforded by the deregulation of labour law. With careers much less organized, people are compelled to keep returning to the market, where their value is assessed at different stages of their working life. The transformation of large collectives into flotillas of small structures, and the proliferation of different conditions for wage-earners (types of contract, types of employer, hours, applicable collective agreements, etc.), have shattered a unified space of calculation into a multiplicity of particular situations that can no longer be easily aggregated to obtain an overall image. The proliferation of local calculation eclipses the main distributions in the network, which are difficult to totalize. (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005a: 313-14)

A legitimate test can become embedded into the structure of relations between the systems of accumulation, as a macro environment for action, as its mode of categorization since it involves public, explicit, and institutionalized judgment that is independent of the situation of its application. A test of strength can represent a mode of displacement (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 172) corresponding within the structure of systemic interrelationships to the entrepreneurial strategies oriented at changing the macro environments in which situational, singular, and dynamic circumstances call for entrepreneurial action rather than rule-based judgment. Systemic change usually involves

institutional innovation by entrepreneurial groups or individuals that seeking to improve their structural position reduce the binding power of legitimate tests via strategic action involving risk, opportunity, and institutional innovation. The success of such entrepreneurial strategies gradually shifts definition criteria of normative culture from legitimate tests to the tests of strength in any given institutional environment where novel, covert, and unregulated relationships consequently gain in importance (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 172). However, the entrepreneurial strategies that prove to be effective in their action environment entail their institutionalization as the change in the structure of relations of accumulation they have triggered takes the form of new legitimate tests in case the change is intended to be either widely accepted or reproduced in other institutional contexts (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 173). With respect to the relations into which the processes of institutionalization and change of normative culture enter, Münch comments that

[t]he interpenetrating subsystems possess different qualities, but they are 'homologues' of one another. This means that elements of one system can become elements of the other. In the zone of interpenetration thus created, a new quality appears, which forms a bridge between the previously separate subsystems of action. Each individual action is now seen as a product of the interpenetration of these subsystems. The reciprocal penetration of instrumental action and normatively obligated action requires the *institutionalization* of normative culture in the social system and the *internalization* of normative culture in the personality system.

A normative culture as a general system of values – for example, the fusion of individualism, universalism, rationalism and activism which characterizes modern society – can be understood as a symbolic code, which undergoes continuous modification through the course of its history by means of its interpenetration with the social and personality systems. Its function is to provide for the possibility of variation while preserving the specific cluster of values which characterizes the action system (pattern consistency). This cluster or pattern of values must therefore be sufficiently generalized to permit a given type

of action system to adjust to new conditions without having to alter its fundamental structure. The scope for variation which this code grants to action is therefore too broad to guarantee the orderedness of social interaction in any given situation. As a result, social order cannot be conceived of as simply the consequence of the existence of a normative culture. The culture must be institutionalized in a social system, and this means that it must be specified as a set of binding obligations. (italics in the original, Münch 1987: 35-36)

The actors benefiting from entrepreneurial innovation tend to describe such institutional change in terms of a justificatory regime that puts high worth value on their structural position thus rendering their achievements transparent, moral, and justifiable. Institutional change in the process of its legitimization employs legal regulation to draw boundaries between the acceptable and unacceptable utilization of new opportunities, resources, and strategies. In this respect, a justificatory regime appears to derive from a process of an institutionalization of a wide-ranging transformation. In the case of transition to the mode of regulation of global capitalism such institutionalization has made network- and project-oriented individual and collective action into the subject of discursive legitimization enabling and restricting the reproduction of global capitalist accumulation at the same time (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 173). The change of justificatory regimes depends on dual influences of the balance of power and legitimate relations. In their interplay, these influences make use of the criticism of the existing system to either promote a desirable situation different from status quo or put into question existing normative foundations. Thus, the discrepancies between the actual state of affairs and a justificatory regime constitute a part of the self-reflexive dynamic of their transformation (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 173). In this theoretical regard, Münch comments that

[t]he extent to which society contains a comprehensive community with a common normative culture, and to which the economic, political, administrative and intellectual spheres are integrated with this culture, becomes especially apparent in the character of the system of social stratification, in the degree of

legitimacy accorded to it, and in the conforming or deviating reactions to it. In an extreme case, social stratification can result purely from the rules behind the distribution of economic, political and intellectual opportunity within economic, political and educational institutions, without any formative influence on these rules of distribution coming from common distributive *values* in a societal community. This can come about either because common values of distribution do not exist at all and society is instead divided into particularized communities which each have their own view of legitimate distributive values, or because the economic, political and intellectual institutions in their distributing function constitute separate spheres from normative culture, and these spheres do not mutually penetrate. If social stratification is attributable only to the distributive rules of the economic, political and intellectual institutions, it will soon conflict with the distributive values of individuals, of particular communities, or of a comprehensive societal community. Congruence between social stratification and distributive values can be expected only if there is interpenetration between distributing institutions on the one hand and distributive values on the other, that is between the economic, political and intellectual spheres and the comprehensive normative culture of a societal community. Only if this congruence exists will the social stratification be regarded as legitimate and attain acceptance. Conversely, incongruence between a given system of stratification and distributive values will lead to doubts as to the stratification's legitimacy, to alienation, deviation from institutionally issued rules on acquisition of opportunity, to protest, conflict, and also to change in the distributive institutions. (*italics in the original*, Münch 1987: 113-14)

In the action system, criticism and testing practices are interrelated in as much as, on the one hand, entrepreneurial groups and individuals put into question the legitimacy of social structure while, on the other hand, testing procedures legitimize the distribution of individuals within the social structure. Corrective criticism of tests aims to maintain them within the boundaries of normative culture. By that means the application of tests and the distribution of strengths in the action system adequately reproduce its guiding

principles. These principles are assured via the methodological, conventional, legal, and regulatory means used for the institutionalization of test coherence, openness, and improvement (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 174). Radical criticism of tests may aim at their elimination or replacement on the grounds that their validity is in question. Based on the legitimacy principles of relevant justificatory regime, a corrective criticism of tests institutionalized within the action system may call either for the refutation of legitimacy by recourse to evidence or for bringing criticism to bear on a testing procedure. Also, corrective criticism can elicit a strategic action oriented at the circumvention of, rather than direct reaction to, possible loss in legitimacy of a test. In this case, the trade-off between test improvement and its marginalization is decided in favor of the transformation of a legitimate test into a test of strength where costs are shifted to test-takers (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 174).

For the economic system, cost displacement strategies deployed in response to contradictory pressures for both higher profits and increased wages can involve the following entrepreneurial strategies. These strategies include geographic relocation into regions with labor relations or environmental regulations favorable for employers, a redefinition of career-management policy by dropping its expensive components, and the transition to informal recruitment techniques to avoid testing and screening costs (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 174-75). These entrepreneurial strategies of displacement alter the action system as a whole so that the criticism of its justificatory regimes can no longer be waged based on a previous normative culture. This is the case because the configuration of interpenetration between societal, economic, association, and political systems necessitates the elaboration of new critical concepts. These concepts are called to account for the emergent interrelationships whose “recognition, institutionalisation, codification or categorization” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 175) is yet to crystallize into standard tests that criticism can apply to. Criticism, therefore, can have a bearing on testing processes. That can be achieved by categorizing tests by their legitimacy and measured strengths in order to show their role in the structural and functional differentiation of individuals. Testing processes can be controlled by ensuring the conformity of tests to the precepts of normative culture via regulation, oversight, and correction. Control over tests can be exercised by maintaining the centrality of legitimate

tests to the reproduction of the action system according to its normative culture. Finally, criticism can be brought to bear by eliminating the tests that are widely perceived to impede a desirable social change (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 175). Boltanski and Chiapello comment that

[c]ritique is not monolithic. Thus, we have identified two major critical registers that have pursued their course since the mid-nineteenth century, in different forms and subject to variation: the social critique and the artistic critique. Depending upon the historical conjuncture, they join together or experience tension. [...] [W]e also saw that the critical emphasis could sometimes be placed on a test's nonconformity with the status order underlying it (a critique that we have called corrective); and sometimes on actually challenging the test, in that it is based on principles of equivalence whose validity is rejected in the kind of situation with which this test is associated (the so-called radical critique). Finally, critique is no more immutable than capitalism. It is displaced in accordance with procedures of extension to new subjects of anxiety as to the fair or unfair character of everyday situations. It can therefore be focused on moments that had not hitherto been formalized in terms of tests, engaging beings whose suffering or unjust condition had not been registered.

Given this plurality, and the fact that critiques are sometimes contradictory, it is possible for displacements in capitalism to answer some demands while circumventing the tests that are of the utmost importance for another aspect of critique. This has the effect of winning a section of the oppositional forces over to the displacements that are under way, and making changes difficult to reverse. (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005a: 503)

The form of interpenetration characteristic of a particular action system finds its reflection in the legitimate tests applied in its economic system. Interpenetration among societal, economic, association and political systems dates to the beginning of modernity. The latter employs justificatory regimes for its reproduction. Criticism as an integral part of a justificatory regime focuses on inequality, exploitation, and individualism when it is

oriented qua social criticism at the community system. There it calls labor movements to life. The criticism of the economic system takes the form of artistic criticism (Chiapello 1998) when it derives from the aesthetic critique of oppressive discipline, mass society, standardization, and commodification in defense of the ideals of liberation, autonomy, originality, and authenticity (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 175-76). The transition from a managerial to a global capitalism has as its underpinning the changing configuration of interpenetration within the action system. This systemic change goes beyond the impact of globalization, economic development, or technological change. Based on the example of France, the process of systemic interpenetration exemplifies the dynamics common to industrial economies. According to Boltanski and Chiapello (1999; 2005a), in France, the transition to global capitalism began with the crisis in its normative culture in the 1960s. Then the criticism of its justificatory regimes reached its peak of labor strikes and violent confrontations. With the disorganization of industrial production, when product quality fell and labor costs rose, there occurred a pervasive loss of the legitimacy of standard tests establishing the distribution of wages and profits, justifying power relations and social hierarchies, and reproducing educational, economic, and social institutions (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 176).

The criticisms raised against the action system of the managerial capitalism centered on the crisis of its normative culture. That is reflected in the corruption of standard tests, since both legitimate tests were growing more marginal to the actual reproduction of the social structure and the tests of strength were gaining in centrality within the action system. Leaders of institutions and organizations within the economic system have imputed responsibility for the crisis of normative culture to the failure of the labor force to uphold discipline and common goals and to the inadequate socialization of younger entrants into job market (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 176). For the crisis of 1968 in France both artistic and social criticism played equally important role. This is the case because in the previous decade cultural capital stopped being restricted to narrow social circles. Consequently, cultural capital became available to rapidly increasing student numbers. Subsequently these students filled managerial, professional, and technological positions in the economic system. In France, artistic criticism demanding self-management, personal autonomy, and creativity was supported by holders of

executive, professional and technical education while social criticism had its primary base of support among skilled and manual workers (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 176-77).

The first stage of the transition to global capitalism, taking place between 1968 and 1973, has responded to social criticism by reliance on the established procedures of collective bargaining only. These bargaining procedures involved the state, unions, and employer organizations. As a result of these negotiations, improvements in minimum wage, income equality, and job security were achieved. At the same time, the allocation of authority was brought into closer alignment with the normative culture of meritocracy (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 177). Thus the centrality of legitimate tests to the action system was restored by increasing penalties for undue advantages. The second stage of global capitalist transition commenced in 1975 after the crisis of managerial capitalism has continued to deepen. This happened because the justificatory regimes of managerial capitalism failed to regain legitimacy as profits of industrial production continued to fall. Consequently, the normative culture of managerial capitalism started to be abandoned. By the late 1970s, large companies had changed their labor relations and working conditions based on the best practices developed by sociologists and consultants. The latter groups, together with employer organizations, had implemented a global capitalist mode of regulation emerging out of the crises of the previous decade (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 177). With regard to the systemic limits of economic accumulation that the example of France illustrates, Münch comments that

[a]s is already the case when the law of value is used to explain general alienation in commodity production, the application of the labor theory of value in explaining the alienation of waged labor gives rise to misinterpretations of the basic structural problems in modern societies which are independent of the mode of production. The first weakness to become clear has to do with the application of the labor theory of value to labor itself, for in principle *any* level of wages can be made to agree with the theory, making it unsuitable for explaining either the tendency toward pauperization or the placing of an upper limit on wage levels by the need to maintain at least a minimal amount of capital self-expansion. The

essence of this weakness is that Marx treats the quantity and quality of goods and services thought in a particular society to be necessary for maintaining the capacity to work as a matter depending on the culturally defined level of needs and hence having no *immanent* limit to it. It is only the principle of competition which actually sets those limits in that any owner of capital whose cost of reproducing labor power – i.e. wage costs – are so high as to produce losses and prevent further capital expansion will be eliminated from the market. This, however, means that one must have recourse to a subjective theory of value, in conjunction with the conditions governing the effects the complex network of expectations within market association can have under free competition, if one wants to explain Marx's assumed law that the price of labor power may never reach a level at which capital expansion is no longer possible – i.e. which would allow no profitability. Here again the labor theory of value proves inadequate for the explanation Marx is aiming at. Accordingly, Marx repeatedly deviated from the labor theory of value to resort to a supply-and-demand theorem. (italics in the original, Münch 1988: 182)

In the economic system, the disintegration of the system of accumulation characteristic of managerial capitalism into “autonomous teams, flexible schedules, bonuses, efficiency-related salaries” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 177) has spread across the economic structure. From management to production organization, the economic system of managerial capitalism was broken down into networks of small, contract-connected, project-oriented units on the periphery of companies' core activities. In the economic system, the second stage of the transition to global capitalism has involved replacing legitimate tests with tests of strength. Less amenable to criticism, the predominance in global capitalism of tests of strength is due to the incapacity of the normative culture of managerial capitalism of “qualification, categorisation, and regulation” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 178) of these tests. In the 1980s, the economic system of global capitalism has consolidated around networks discourse, effective labor force control, and reinvigorated economic expansion. Since the normative culture of global capitalism has failed to form, the transition to global capitalism was not

met with criticism. Moreover, the configuration of the interpenetration among economic, cultural, community and political systems of global capitalism has left social criticism by labor unions without an independent object because worker movement has lost its “isomorphic relationship to its opponent, the large integrated firm” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 178).

There was no artistic criticism of global capitalism (Lyotard 1988). This has happened because artistic criticism has achieved its economic, social, political and cultural goals. The frame of reference that artistic criticism applies cannot account for the systemic interpenetration replacing the structures of managerial capitalism. Additionally, proponents of artistic criticism have become integrated into dominant positions across the social structure in France (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 178). In the 1980s, economic growth stems from the overcoming of the limitations of managerial capitalism, from the systemic interpenetration of diverse macro environments, and the transformation of normative culture. With tests of strength at its center, this normative culture has led to rising inequality, precarious employment, and worker impoverishment. In the economic system, negative effects of global capitalism brought social criticism and labor strikes of the 1990s to bear upon the efforts to introduce legitimate tests into project-based normative culture. This was attempted by new regulatory means seeking to governmentally structure flexibility, to stabilize precarious work conditions, and to mutually integrate the profit and non-profit organization of labor relations (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 178). The configuration of the action system in France is defined by the network-oriented transformation led by socialist governments responsive to the artistic criticism of the economic system. In other countries, as in the Great Britain, where Thatcher government implemented market-oriented reforms, models of systemic interpenetration have exhibited variation dependent on the outcome of collective struggles, dominant normative cultures, and legitimate justificatory regimes (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 178-79). Particular structures of systemic interpenetration vary according to historical interrelationships among institutional components of their respectively constitutive systems. In this regard, Münch comments that

[a] feature which is especially typical of modern social orders is the *relatively* high degree of combination between this characteristic *binding quality* and other major characteristics, namely *adaptivity*, the specifying factor of implementation in action's *execution*, and the *preservation of identity*. These latter must be explained in terms of other factors which are either more opening in their effect, such as science and economic action, more selective such as the professional or political specification of normative culture, or more generalizing such as cultural discourse. All of these factors explain only *particular aspects* of social orders. The combination of these aspects which makes modern social orders stand out in relation to others is attributable to interpenetration, which is just one of the possible types of relationship between the appropriate factors (or action systems), the others being accommodation, isolation, reconciliation and domination. Deviations from this model result from individual factors having a disproportionate weight, hence forcing social order in the direction, depending on the factor involved, of total closure, utilitarian or scientific opening, pure intellectual generalization unrelated to practicalities, or purely political enforcement through power and with no point of anchoring in consensus; alternatively, the opposing factors tear the social order apart. The social order will not be able to combine within itself binding ties, openness to change, identity and practical implementation and execution, unless the relevant action subsystems mutually penetrate each other. To take this simply as an example, it means that intellectual discourse and political action, communal association and economic action must certainly exist independently of each other, but must at the same time be linked together by way of social association. (italics in the original, Münch 1988: 51)

On the basis of my drawing of parallels between Münch's (1982) analytical framework and the work by Boltanski and Chiapello of France's transition to global capitalism (Boltanski and Chiapello 1999; 2005a), I have hopefully demonstrated the applicability of Münch's theorization of interpenetration, systems and action both to the theorization of capitalism and to the sociological research of micro environments of

action (Colomy and Rhoades 1994). As an original direction of conceptualization of capitalism, Boltanski and Chiapello's (2005b) theorization of France's transition to global capitalism may benefit from the analytical precision that Munch's theorization of interpenetration, systems, and action offers for comparative research between different periods and countries. Boltanski and Chiapello's research as a secondary source of data allows me to explore the crisis of French Fordism vis-à-vis the systemic dimensions of its transition towards a framework of systemic interpenetration of global capitalism dynamically articulating its structure of inter-systemic relations and the interpenetration among its constitutive systems as its analytical dimensions. Within the theoretical framework of Münch, I have placed an emphasis on the analytical aspect of entrepreneurial strategies that collective and individual agents undertake within the specific macro environments they confront. In my secondary analysis of France's transition to global capitalism, I bring into an analytical focus the effects that collective struggles have on historical change in a particular configuration of systemic interpenetration. Finally, I intend to tentatively demonstrate the feasibility of the analytical application of Munch's theorization of interpenetration, systems, and action

Boltanski and Chiapello's (2005a) sociological research on capitalism has important parallels with Münch's (1982; 1991b) theorization of interpenetration, systems, and action. Using their frame of conceptual reference, Boltanski and Chiapello take capitalism as a subject of theoretical reflection and embed the theorization of economic change into a framework of systematically related concepts. However, their theoretical treatment of capitalism leaves it without a clear analytical relation to historical change and comparable developments in other countries. It is hoped that Münch's approach to capitalism as a structure of modernity, understood as a structure of historical relations among analytical ideal types of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation, could provide such a point of theoretical reference. Additionally, Münch's theorization of interpenetration, systems, and action could clarify concrete historical situations by elaborating on ideal-typical relations among the systems constitutive of the structure of modernity in the direction of its historical configurations. In this regard, Münch's development of classical sociology allows him to arrive at different analytical ideal-types

that also lend themselves to comparative historical concretizations on the basis of which he, for instance, concludes that

[...] the institutionalization of the modern basic normative pattern was faced with quite different underlying conditions in the societies whose modern development came slightly later, France and Germany both being examples. Absolutism's long persisting predominance, and the institutional bureaucratic church, whether Catholic or Lutheran, implanted traditionalism deeply into both societies. It took much longer here for a middle-class culture to develop which was also open to the working classes. In neither society is culture integrated into practical spheres of life; rather, it is the concern of relatively isolated intellectual strata. Hence they both lack interpenetration of their particular communities on a scale comparable to the original modern societies and also, therefore, a comparable universalization of the community-forming process to provide an obligatory basis for a common pattern of values; finally, they lack any comparable interpenetration between such a universalized community and the other spheres of action. The consequence is that the assertion of the modern pattern of values has involved a great deal more conflict, and that it must compete with traditionalistic attitudes; another consequence is a far wider-ranging interpretation of the modern value pattern, reaching into the realms of radicalism, by an intellectual culture which is rather remote from responsibility in practice. The spheres of action are separated from one another and there is a more acute conflict between them. (Münch 1988: 247)

My recourse to France's example of the more general phenomenon of the transition to global capitalism has served to outline an analysis of the structure of systemic relations of interpenetration that the economic system can enter in the process of historical change. In an attempt at an ideal-typical construction of France's structure of relations among the economic, cultural, community, and political systems, I make a tentative application of Münch's (1982) theory of interpenetration, systems, and action to the historical relations within which France's transition to global capitalism took place. Within the macro environment of France's structure of inter-systemic relations,

individual and collective entrepreneurial strategies are deployed by historical agents facing particular national traditions, political situations, economic practices, and ideological expressions (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005b: 179-80).

Chapter Six: Modern Systems of Economic Accumulation

This chapter puts the theoretical, historical, and geographical discussion of capitalism into the context of Münch's theoretical approach to modernity as a structure of ideal-typical relations between economy, culture, society, and politics:

- To understand the dynamics and contradictions of modern social order, it is necessary not to reduce the latter to institutions, but to define it as a constellation of contingent, variable and complex forces that allow for its variation and change.
- Münch's development of Parsons', Weber's and Durkheim's sociology theorizes modern development in terms that connect systems of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation into a dynamic structure of related contradictions showing historical and geographical variations.
- This approach to modernity allows for the historical concretization of its analytically defined ideal typical relations that can enter into multiple constellations on the global, regional, national, and urban level.

The System of Economic Accumulation in the Structure of Modernity

While discourse on capitalism may be tantamount to discourse on modernity (Jameson 1991), it may also be based on determinist and reductivist premises (Harvey 1989). Münch's theorization of modernity, systems, and action might provide a perspective on how economy, culture, society, and politics can be related as analytical ideal types. In this chapter the reconstruction of the structure of modernity in historical perspective (Arnason 2001: 99) is considered based on the contributions of Weber ([1905] 1934), Sombart (1913; 1928), Castoriadis (1988; 1999a), Boltanski and Chiapello (1999; 2005a), and Braudel (1977; 1979a; 1979b; 1979c). Weber, Marx, and Durkheim produced

comparative accounts of the rapid development of industrial capitalism in the last two centuries.

Weber described capitalism as the most decisive influence on modernity as the former took its distinctively disruptive and transformative form. Marx described capitalism as dynamic force behind the development of modernity. Durkheim described capitalism as the division of labour unprecedentedly having both positive and negative social effects (Arnason 2001: 99-100). Theorizations of global deregulation (Lash and Urry 1987), capitalist development (Marx and Engels 1848), and world system (Wallerstein 1995) provide highly visible examples of the conflation of capitalism with modernity. This ascribes to the economic system an increasingly pervasive social influence. From this point of view, contradictions of capitalist logic dictate the course of events around the world increasing thereby the reach of modern social order (Arnason 2001: 100). Regarding the construction of modern social order as an analytical ideal type, Münch comments that

[i]n this context the central question in the discussion is not simply the ‘influence’ that interests, power, conflict, common cognitions or common norms have upon action or upon the creation of order, but something much more precise, namely the *nature* of the effect these factors have on action or on the constitution of order. To answer such a question, we require a frame of reference which does more than simply place the factors indistinctively alongside each other; it must actually arrange them in a theoretically determined order according to the type of effect they exert on action. An initial solution to this *theoretical* problem is offered by Parsons’ concept of the *interaction* of normative and conditional factors influencing action as set out in the *The Structure of Social Action*; this initial solution was substantially refined in continuing theoretical development, and especially by the introduction of his analytical AGIL schema and the cybernetic hierarchy of conditions and controls. Determining the type of effect the above-mentioned factors have within a theoretical schema is of fundamental import for any sociological explanation, and this can be well recognized in Max Weber’s own explanation of the birth of modern society. The entire conception of

his comparative studies on the sociology of religion – with their analysis of the latent structures and the different interpretations of world religions and of their anchoring either in purely intellectual communities or in much larger communities incorporating the broad masses – is inconceivable if we cannot recognize the fundamental role played by the creation of a unified normative culture and the rooting of it in a universal community, in contrast to that of mere power and interest constellations. Without this frame of reference, Weber's entire work is incomprehensible. (italics in the original, Münch 1988: 70-71)

When identified with modernity (Baechler 1995a; 1995b), capitalism leaves to democracy the political role of an adequate reflection of institutionalized utilitarian individualism in the capitalist economic system. By virtue of its inherent efficiency, the system of economic accumulation rules out a post-capitalist transition. At the same time, the development of capitalism from late medieval Europe via the modern transformation of Western Europe towards its global expansion by the end of the twentieth century remains driven by economic dynamics (Arnason 2001: 100-01). The relation of capitalism, as a particular configuration of economic accumulation, to the structure of modernity as a modern social order constituted by the interrelations among its systems of accumulation (Münch 1982: 94) may need to be considered in the tension between the construction of its analytical ideal types and their historical contextualization. Thus, the institutionalization of modernity does not change the structure of relations among the systems of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation but provides a uniquely different macro environment for individual and collective action (Baechler 1995a; 1995b). Approaches to modernity as a primarily economic phenomenon cannot but have an affinity with the Marx's theory of capitalism that while providing common conceptual premises drew fault lines for political divisions and struggles (Arnason 2001: 102).

The specification of capitalism in terms of the structure of interpenetration among the systems of accumulation (Münch 1984) accounts for the historical dynamics of disruptions that context-insensitive analyses of capitalist development do not do justice to. The theoretical approach of Münch to the analysis of capitalism counters the arguments imputing to Parsons' (1937; 1966; 1971) an excessive emphasis on functional

integration, adaptive upgrading, and cybernetic control. It also avoids both Habermas' (1973; 1981) rational integration of contradictions between modernity and capitalism, and the reduction of modernity and capitalism to each other of theories of modernity, as Arnason (2001: 102) among its theorists argues. The concept of capitalism in classical and post-classical economic theory does not allow to go beyond the definitional reduction of capitalism as a historical process to the basic mechanisms of markets and property rights (Albert 1993). Since the understanding of capitalism as a historical phenomenon is open to debate and interpretation, as Arnason (2001: 102) argues, the concept of capitalism has to be put into the context of contrasting approaches to its evolving theorization (Baechler and Wallerstein 1997). In this regard, Münch comments that

[a]ccording to Marxian theory, the anatomy of *bourgeois* society can be found in the structure of modern capitalism. The patterns in the latter's development, and its tendencies toward crisis, can be explained by capital's 'laws of motion'. The smallest unit in this structure is comprised of the commodity and exchange of commodities as production expands. One could say as a counter-point to this perspective that, according to the theory of action based on Max Weber, the anatomy of *modern* society may be sought in modern occidental rationalism. In this case, the patterns of development and tendencies toward crisis can be explained by the 'inner laws' of rationalization of the dimensions and social spheres of means-end rational action. In the structure of modern occidental rationalism, the smallest unit is means-end rational action aimed at world domination. In the context of this theory, economically rational action – i.e., the optimal allocation of scarce resources in response to a complex of needs – represents just one among a variety of forms of means-end rational action as a whole. (*italics in the original*, Münch 1988: 164)

In parallel to the thesis of Münch's (1982: 94) theory of action, Baechler's perspective constructs capitalism as an interrelationship among the systems of property rights, markets, utilitarian actions, and cultures that are oriented at the maximization of economic growth (Baechler and Wallerstein 1997: 14). By contrast, Wallerstein only

needs “the permanent accumulation of capital” (Arnason 2001: 103) for his definition of capitalism. Upon gaining an unprecedented autonomy as an economic system, capitalism has imposed its normative culture on all other systems constitutive of society and action (Baechler and Wallerstein 1997: 15). Within the structure of their interrelations, these systems can nevertheless change strategies of collective action in accordance with their own systemic logic, as did the political systems of former communist states. Even though particular social and action systems may play a key role in the constitution of capitalism, they do not do that alone but in concert with other systems. Rather than standing in deterministic relations to each other, these systems, understood as historical ideal types, may enter into the relations of interpenetration with each other via a historically dynamic structure of their relationships. Consequently, capital accumulation, technological progress, and economic growth are subject to the “unpredictable patterns of change” (Arnason 2001: 104) while being part of capitalism as a process of the subsumption of human activity in the form of abstract wealth, according to Marx ([1867] 1962; [1885] 1963; [1894] 1964). More historical attention to the relations between economy and culture may be needed for the sociological analysis of capitalism in order to go beyond a narrow focus on capital accumulation or economic growth. This may be the case because neither the institutionalization of democracy (Baechler 1995a; 1995b) nor power struggles among ruling classes (Wallerstein 1995) sufficiently explain the rapidity or stages of capitalist development (Arnason 2001: 104-05)

Likewise, an adequate understanding of the dynamics of interrelationships among the systems constitutive of the structure of modernity demands not the reduction of the systems to institutions but their definition as the constellations of forces that allow for variation and change (Deleuze and Guattari 1972; 1980; Latour 2005). For this reason, capitalism cannot be stabilized within a single institutional configuration. Moreover, capitalism has to be seen as a recursive process involving in its reproduction the structure of modernity as a whole (Münch 1984; 1991b) that is as contingent, variable, and self-reflexive as individual and collective actors themselves (Arnason 2001: 105). The justification of capitalism by its economic rationality, as Castoriadis (1999b) contends, appears more properly to belong to the structure of modern social order in so far as it bears on individual and collective action (Münch 1982: 94). That is case since in the its

structure of differentiation, interpenetration, and institutionalization vis-à-vis other systems of accumulation, economic system maintains complex and dynamic relationships with systems where discourse on, institutionalization of, and action governed by rationality become related to capitalist accumulation – as elaborations on neoclassical economic theory attest to (Arnason 2001: 106; Williamson 1985). Only the reformulation of capitalist accumulation as a process belonging to the structure of modern social order where economic system is embedded (Arnason 2001: 106-07; Münch 1982; 1984) allows us to avoid extreme theoretical positions. These theoretical extremes state that either there is only a capitalist optimum point of economic equilibrium possible between rationality and development (Baechler 1995a: 91; 1995b: 160-66) or there is no equilibrium to achieve because capitalism stands for unequal relations of social power mediated by struggles, institutions, and culture (Wallerstein 1995: 84). In this respect, Münch comments that

Marxist analyses only ever see value antinomies as a characteristic of the capitalist mode of production and hence blind themselves to the fact that the value antinomies belong to any society once it has trodden the path toward modernity. Thus the antinomy between the owner of capital's interest in a more rapid expansion of capital and the workers' interest in a higher reward for their labor power is only one of a number of manifestations of the antinomy between an interest in raising the ability to satisfy *future* needs and an interest in satisfying present needs. [...]

The Marxian perspective also lacks any appreciation of the fact that it is only possible to mediate between these value antinomies by institutionalizing structures mutually penetrating each other and oriented to different problems – e.g. overcoming scarcity, solidarity, decision-making which is collectively and territorially binding, and conveying definitions of situation. *Each society may find its own way of mediating between the value antinomies, and each of these has its own consequences and tendencies to develop crises.* The latter manifest themselves in inflationary tendencies with regard to the communicative media of money, political power, expertise and influence.

Another of the Marxian approach's false judgements stems from its failure, due to its predilection for the inner laws of commodity production, to even perceive the institutionalization of other sets of inner laws, as the example of collective bargaining over the price of labor shows. (*italics in the original*, Münch 1988: 192-93)

From its earliest formulations, the concept of the spirit of capitalism corresponds to the defining configuration of the interrelations between economy, culture, society and politics. Such a configuration of relations between systems of accumulation is argued to set modernity apart from other historical macro environments for individual and collective action. The processes of "orientation, justification and motivation" (Arnason 2001: 107) developing within these macro environments reinforce capitalist economic growth within the structure of contradictions of modernity (Boltanski and Chiapello 1999: 41). This happens at the same time as strategies, goals, and conditions of action become increasingly mediated by the systems that are external to, autonomous from, and integrated with their participants (Arnason 2001: 108). The processes of differentiation, interpenetration, and institutionalization tying the systems of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation into a structure find their earliest theoretical reflection in the absolute, objective, and subjective determinants of action defined by Hegel as the absolute spirit, objective spirit, and subjective spirit. Within sociological context (Hintze 1987: 328), these kinds of spirit respectively consist in religious, philosophical, secular, and scientific discourses, in economic, social, and cultural institutions, and in motivations, values, and orientations (Arnason 2001: 108). Weber's thesis on the spirit of capitalism represents the interrelations between economy, culture, society and politics as an under-defined interconnection between protestant ethic and traditional values conceived of within a conceptual framework of historical ideal types while excluding its institutional context. This institutional context only receives its credit for capitalist development as modern bureaucracy (Arnason 2001: 108-09). Weber's later analyses of capitalism concentrate on historical and institutional preconditions of economic systems' differentiation (Collins 1986; Swedberg 1998). In this connection, Collins (1986: 39) argues that

[...] Marx and most of his followers have devoted their attention primarily to showing the dynamics of capitalism, not to the preconditions for its emergence. Weber's concerns were almost entirely the reverse. Hence, it is possible that the two analyses could be complementary, Marx's taking up where Weber's leaves off. Only in the 1970s have there been efforts comparable to Weber's from within the Marxian tradition, notably that of Wallerstein (1974). Interestingly enough, Weber anticipated Wallerstein's major points in the *General Economic History*. On the other side, Wallerstein's revision of Marxism is in many ways a movement toward a more Weberian mode of analysis, stressing the importance of external relations among states. (Collins 1986: 39).

Consequently, Arnason (2001: 109) argues that an economic sociology of capitalism remains to be developed from Weber's and Simmel's (1900; 2004) contributions to the topic.

Centering on the psychological analysis of the relations between economy and culture, Sombart (1928) describes entrepreneurial individuals that, driven by enterprise-oriented goals, propel economic growth into an historically unprecedented social centrality. Economic growth combines utilitarian calculation with the limitlessness of economic development, lacking, however, in normative culture to steer its direction (Arnason 2001: 109-10). Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) intend to develop Weber's thesis within a more abstract framework of economic institutions and cultural logic that in their conjunction justify and legitimize economic accumulation. However, economic accumulation exhibits regional and historical variation hardly accounted for by the concept of the spirit of capitalism. As a system of culture that historically underwent bourgeois, managerial, and network periods of development, the spirit of capitalism has an ambiguous relation to capitalism as an economic system (Arnason 2001: 110). Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) extrapolate and abstract the political justification of capitalism from shared orders of worth (Boltanski and Thevenot 1999). As a product of structural relations among economy, politics, society and culture, such political justification played in the early modern Europe (Hirschman 1977) the role of

argumentation in favour of capitalism. Under contemporary conditions, the concept of the regime of justification developed by Boltanski and Thevenot (1991; 2006) corresponds to the project-oriented principle of legitimization representing a rupture with previously dominant civic, market, or industrial regimes of the justification of capitalism (Arnason 2001: 110).

Since the concept of the spirit of capitalism implies causal interrelations between economy and culture, the critique of capitalism has accompanied the dynamics of economic development. The critique took active part in the process of modernization via the entrepreneurial strategies of collective actors, the institutionalized contestation of its organizational foundations, and the structural integration into its self-reflexive reproduction. In the dynamics of the transformation of the spirit of capitalism (Boltanski and Chiapello 1999: 82), aesthetic and social critique have been differently related to the development of capitalism. In its express concern with the impact of capitalist society on individuals, aesthetic criticism stresses disenchantment, inauthenticity, and oppression. Decrying the collective effects of capitalism, social criticism opposes misery, inequality, opportunism, and egoism (Arnason 2001: 111). Exhibiting close affinity to the anthropological critique of capitalism as ideology (Dumont 1967; 1976; 1983), Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) have primarily contributed to the sociological study of how contemporary capitalism integrated aesthetic critique, global capitalism, and organizational innovation into its structure (Arnason 2001: 111-12). The theoretical discussion of the variability of capitalist development, of the systemic relations between economy, culture, politics and society, and of the conceptual frameworks capable of capturing the specificity of the structures constitutive of modern social order may be aided by a consistent development of both analytical ideal types and of their historical contextualization vis-à-vis different systems of accumulation. In this connection, Münch comments that

[g]iven the problems posed by the political, economic and symbolic spheres, particular structures will have a higher rationality with regard to particular problems, as they are better suited to solving them than other structures. Ideal-typical notions can therefore be construed of the rational structures

appropriate for solving the above problems. Modern societies, molded by modern Western rationalism's world-view with its purpose of normatively mastering the world with which it deals (*Weltbeherrschung*), tend to at least partially exhibit the development of these structures. The ideal-typical construction can be used to explain tensions arising out of the value antinomies in the various dimensions and to explain crisis tendencies resulting either from one sphere becoming rationally more advanced than the others and exerting a dominance over them or from specific deficiencies of rationality in individual spheres. Thus tensions and crisis tendencies resulting from the respective structures actually existing in individual societies can be explained. They will inevitably have realized just one of a number of possible relationships and ways of mediating between value antinomies, and this will have a typical set of consequences. Within the rationalized structures, inner laws evolve such that means-end rational action pays due regard to the validity of the values, norms and roles which go to make up those structures. Thus every structure has its own form of means-end rational action. (italics in the original, Münch 1988: 195)

Varieties of Capitalism within the Structure of Modernity

The interrelationships between economy and culture do not cease to be variously debated as the spirit of capitalism (Boltanski and Chiapello 1999), as capitalist modernity (Marx and Engels 1848), and as the social and historical contingency of economic development (Weber [1922] 1976). However, the contradictions of the structure of modern social order (Castoriadis 1988; Münch 1991b) go beyond Marx's theory of capitalism. Capitalism increasingly depends on the growing role of rationality of its institutions. In the theorization of these institutions, Marx and Weber's contributions have to be systemically integrated to account for institution-driven economic, social, and cultural development. This systemic development encompasses both autonomy and interdependence as its goals (Arnason 2001: 112-13; Münch 1981). In the structure of modernity, as an analytical structure of ideal-typical relationships, the system of economic accumulation does not occupy a central position (Münch 1991b: 94) because "the key to the structural problems

of modern society does not lie solely in the anatomy and the laws of motion applying to commodity production, but in the anatomy, inner laws and value antinomies of modern occidental rationalism” (Münch 1988: 194). Consequently, the location of conflict, struggle, and critique in the theoretical discussion of modernity (Castoriadis 1999b) is determined by the systematic analysis of the historical process of interpenetration of the economic system with other systems governing social, cultural and political accumulation. These systems put rationality, autonomy, and variability of capitalism into reciprocal relation to the transformations in the structure of modern social order (Arnason 2001: 113).

The defining impact of rationality on the modern form of interrelations between economy and culture results from the historical process long preceding the chronology of modernity. Therefore, the structure of modernity has had variant realizations in much earlier historical periods. The corresponding collective and individual action oriented at mastery and conquest became translated within the structure of modern social order into the domination of nature, the rationalization of society, and the maximization of economic growth harnessing other social systems to the imperatives of economic accumulation (Arnason 2001: 113-14). The interpenetration of economy and culture involves positive feedback between different analytical levels of action, as political, social, and cultural accumulation systems develop interdependencies within the structure of modern social order. Via technological innovation, scientific knowledge, and capital investment, the structure of modernity puts rationality into the historical context of economic accumulation. Economic accumulation depends on mobilizing myths (Castoriadis 1999b; Deutschmann 1999; 2002) as much as it does on expanding rationalization (Arnason 2001: 114). The emergence of modern social order is coterminous with the institutionalization of territorial states. The competing fiscal, administrative, and military development of territorial states has connected capitalism with the myths of absolutism (Henshall 1992), virtual state (Rosecrance 1999), and nation (Castoriadis 1999b). Thus, economic accumulation is joined with such cultural frames as the demarcation, regulation, and rationalization of national, modern, and capitalist spaces (Arnason 2001: 114). These spaces bring about a restructuring of individual and collective action. In this regard, Münch comments that

[e]xplaining the unique quality and the development of modern Western society is a classical theme of sociology. Of the great classic authors in the field, Karl Marx formulated the logically most consistent explanation, but he did so at the expense of theoretical scope and of historical accuracy. Max Weber left the most historically detailed explanation, but at the expense of theoretical coherence. For sociology as a theoretical science in its own right, the most fruitful contribution was provided by Emile Durkheim, but this lacked the historical concreteness which Weber achieved. Any attempt we may make today to reach a satisfactory explanation of modern occidental development is impossible without an appropriate integration of Weber's historical and sociological explanatory contribution with Durkheim's theoretical perspective. Talcott Parsons made a major step forward with the integration of Weber and Durkheim. The voluntaristic theory of action is the theoretical centerpiece of his integrative work, and at its own center is the theory of interpenetration. Any present-day explanation of modern Western development which does not make use of a theory of interpenetration represents a theoretical retrogression back behind Parsons. This is confirmed if one reads Weber in the light of Parsons' theory of interpenetration, which only then lends theoretical coherence to his work whilst preserving its historical concreteness; it is further corroborated by the explanatory deficiencies in theoretical approaches which take account neither of Weber nor Parsons in their formulation, and by attempts at reconstructing Weber's explanation either without the backing of Parsons, or indeed contrary to Parsons' approach. The latter deficiency also especially applies to the theory of rationalization which predominates in interpretations of Weber. (Münch 1988: 197)

The dual movement of capitalist development towards both autonomy and interdependence took place amid social conflict, radical critique, and political divisions (Castoriadis 1988; 1999b: 75). Rather than driving capitalism and democracy to mutual negation, these social, cultural and political transformations (Arnason 2001: 115) have seen the differentiation, interpenetration, and institutionalization of the respective

systems of accumulation into the dynamic structure of the related contradictions of economic, political, social, and cultural development. Though he recognizes capitalism, autonomy, and modernity as interrelated phenomena, Castoriadis, nevertheless, does not establish theoretically systematic relations among structures, logics, and variants of modernity (Wagner 1994). In the theoretical perspective of Castoriadis, these aspects of modernity, closely related to capitalism, do not allow an institutional alternative to it. Moreover, Castoriadis' lack of the criteria for specifying the social and historical meaning of an alternative modernity rules out the existence of a radically different structure of modernity (Arnason 2001: 115). The permanent processes of the growth of autonomy, rationality, and economy relies on their mutual interpenetration (Castoriadis 1999b). The ideal-typical relations, realizing themselves in a variety of historical configurations, between economy and culture as interrelated systems of accumulation are part of the mediating structure of modernity (Boltanski and Chiapello 1999). Consequently, democratic politics, consumer choice, and individual autonomy are system-specific institutionalizations of the stage of economic development that makes them possible (Arnason 2001: 115-16; Simmel 1900).

The reproduction of capitalism within the structure of modernity encompasses the totality of its constitutive systems and interrelationships. The structure of modernity integrates autonomy, authority and rationality into the dynamics of economic accumulation (Castoriadis 1988: 180). Economic accumulation transforms productive forces, financial capital and commercial markets into continually expanding means for the exercise of power, regulation and mobilization (Arnason 2001: 116; Braudel 1979a; 1979b; 1979c; Deutschmann 1999). The unfettered process of inter-institutional communication makes the proliferation of entrepreneurial collective projects across the structure of modernity into both the consequence of and the precondition for its further development (Arnason 2001: 116-17). Consequently, differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration, being among the organizing principles of the structure of modernity, account for the political, social, and cultural contestations of capitalism as the side-effects of its development (Baechler 1995b: 268; Bauman 1995). The continued relevance of Weber's analysis of the spirit of capitalism (Boltanski and Chiapello 1999; Castoriadis 1999b) opens the opportunity for application of the systematically elaborated modeling of

the structure of modernity, as proposed by Münch (1982; 1986b-c; 1984), vis-à-vis its historical typology, changing configurations and dynamic interrelationships. The variations of the structure of modernity, bearing upon the developmental trajectories and inter-systemic exchanges within their constitutive structures, serve as macro environments for the engagement of individual and collective action (Arnason 2001: 117). In this regard, Munch comments that

[t]he monopolization of force can never allow us to explain why political authority binds itself to the law, something which has become a hallmark of modern social order and which does not have its roots in absolutism, but in the authority of English common law over Crown and Parliament; the latter signified the penetration of both political and economic spheres by the system of law rooted in the community. Conversely, due to the fact that it was shaped by lawyers committed to their clients, common law was also naturally influenced by economic interests, yet not to the extent that it served as a mere legitimation for those interests, for they themselves had to comply with the law. [...]

To move the *process* by which certain characteristics of societies and individuals arise into the center of their sociological explanation is not by any means to possess a set of theoretical tools capable of explaining the effects of various types of process; this, however, is what [Norbert] Elias claims in the introduction to the second edition of his study *The Civilizing Process*, in contrast to the supposedly prevailing ‘static sociology’ formulated by Parsons. If, however, Elias actually had at his command the theoretical instruments of a more comprehensive action theory, he would not explain the ‘civilizing process’ as a simple effect of the growth in the interdependence of action and of the monopolization of force. (italics in the original, Münch 1988: 198-99)

In this perspective, it is possible to interpret the theoretical discussion on the varieties of capitalism as part of a broader analysis of the structure of modern social order (Arnason 2001: 118). In classical sociology, Weber ([1905] 1934) has adumbrated the typology of capitalism. In Weber’s view, the gain-seeking, rationalizing, organizing, and

commercial activity is constitutive of capitalism. Weber distinguished six ideal types of capitalism that are defined by their respective economic instrumentalization of politics, war, trade, investment, industry, and finance (Weber [1922] 1976). The institutional implications of these ideal types of capitalism for individual and collective action (Swedberg 1999) remain to be complemented with a comprehensive analytical framework. From this analytical perspective, industrial and financial capitalist economies are particular institutional realizations of the structure of modernity. Weber's ideal types of capitalism can be differentiated with respect to the extent that rationality is made a salient feature of the interpenetration between culture and economy in each type (Arnason 2001: 118). Varieties of capitalism are mainly theorized based on contemporary regional and economic variation (Orri 1997) conceived of in terms of economic regimes, economic structures, capitalist institutions, functional integration, power structures, and institutional formations. These conceptualizations of the varieties of capitalism are in need of a theory of action that would establish analytical relations between historical structures and individual and collective agents (Arnason 2001: 118-19; Hall and Soskice 2001).

To capture the complexity of institutional patterns, historical backgrounds, and path-dependent developments, a theoretical reconstruction of the variants of economic system such as national economies, macro-economic models (Coates 2000), regional configurations, and civilizational contexts (Eisenstadt 1996; Hamilton 1994) is in order. Economic variation has to be conceptualized within the structure of modernity as a phenomenon that is as much dependent on its constituent systems as the latter on their autonomous and interactive dynamics (Arnason 2001: 119-20). Consequently, the influence of the structure of modernity on the system of economic accumulation obtains within the more general configuration of relations (Elias 1939; 1978). This configuration involves the institutional development of the relations of interchange among systems mediated in their interrelations by the structure of ideal-typically defined factors and products of these systems. These relations are both internal and external to the organization of economic institutions, social contexts, and state structures. These institutions, contexts, and structures have effects that are contingent on their relative position in the structure of modernity, in the process of its development, and in the

emergent relations of inter-systemic interaction (Arnason 2001: 120). Given the interrelationships between economy and culture, the plurality of economic systems has to be theorized in the context of the corresponding variability of the structure of modernity. The concept of the structure of modernity has to elaborate on Weber's rather than Marx's framework, should the analysis of capitalism in comparative and historical perspective adequately account for the varieties of regional, national, and urban economies (Arnason 2001: 120; Braudel 1979a; 1979b; 1979c; Frank 1970; 1978; 1998; Wallerstein 1979; 1984; 1991a; 1995; 2004). In this regard, Münch comments that

[...] in France and Spain, for example, [...] the lack of private property rights impeded economic development, in contrast to Great Britain where the early development of the legal guarantee of property rights was the crucial precondition for economic development. [...]

The existence of state-guaranteed property rights requires economically interested parties and political bodies to attach themselves *categorically* to the law regardless of the respective profits and losses they each expect to flow from it, and this voluntary commitment does not originate out of unstable coalitions of interests, but out of a sense of duty. The only reason that commitment to the law was able to prevail both for economic interests and for political agencies in seventeenth-century Britain was that the necessary preconditions were already in existence, in that ethics had uniformly penetrated the two spheres. The initial stimulus in this direction was given by the convergence between the orientations to life of the urban bourgeois strata and the rural aristocracy resulting from the early commercialization of agriculture; this interpenetration gave birth to the 'gentleman idea'. [...] The ethical penetration of the economic and political sphere was reinforced by Puritanism, which was able to have such an effect on the ethical determination of life primarily because of the rigorism of its teachings, its radical elimination of the distinction between virtuoso and lay ethics, and because it was organized in the form of free religious communities. Only the interpenetration which this facilitated between the religious and communal spheres on the one hand and the economic and political spheres on the other can

help us to explain why economic interests and political agencies abide by the law, and why indeed the law itself is 'economically relevant'. However, the economic approach does not possess the theoretical tools, i.e. a theory of how orders are institutionalized and internalized under conditions of social differentiation, needed to carry out such an explanation. (Münch 1988: 199-200)

While economic accumulation as a sum of economic activities and relations has existed long before the rapid changes that the institutionalization of the structure of modern social order has introduced (Swedberg 1999: 9), the internal and the interactive systemic changes that have defined the modern period need to be seen in a broad comparative perspective (Arnason 2001: 120-21). The structure of modernity as a macro environment for each of its systems of accumulation also follows a long-term period of development (Braudel 1979c: 532). This development proceeds via differentiation towards the autonomous interpenetration of systems of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation. Changing the structure of their relations rather than replacing each other over the course of their mutual development, these systems of accumulation, as analytical ideal types, are formally separable from their constitutive relations. In their configuration that is characteristic of modern social order, these inter-systemic relations make autonomous individual and collective action possible (Braudel 1979b: 353) as much as its interpenetration with the systems of accumulation (Arnason 2001: 121; Braudel 1979b: 355). The institutionalization, interpenetration, and differentiation of the system of economic accumulation with regard to other systems lead not only to the coordination between their systemic logics but also to their conflicts. Economic circulation, accumulation, and regulation forges strong systemic linkages with association, political, and community systems (Braudel 1977: 111; Münch 1982: 94). These linkages put purely economic action into the structure of interpenetration obtaining from the larger structure of systemic relations. In these systems of accumulation, monopolies, state patronage, and global trade have historically participated in already constituted economic worlds (Arnason 2001: 121-22; Braudel 1977: 62).

The dynamics of economic accumulation brings geographically different economic systems into contact with each other. Different economies historically develop

specific forms of systemic interpenetration, differentiation and institutionalization. These particularities of economic, cultural, social, and political spheres extend to the process of development by the respective systems of their particular structures of social order. Through the cultural, social, political, and economic processes of overlapping, learning, and integration, these various structures of social order transmit ideas, devices, and organizations, as historically did Islamic and European civilizations and economies (Braudel 1979b: 495-99). In the process of the growing complexity both of their inter-relations, as systems of accumulation, and of their intra-systemic organization, the regional, national, and urban structures of social order gave rise to the differentiation, interpenetration, and institutionalization of the respective systems (Arnason 2001: 122; Braudel 1979b: 515). Therefore, the analysis of the structure of modern social order (Münch 1982; 1984) may also be applicable to the historical and geographical varieties of social order that could be captured in the ideal-typical terms of Münch's theorization of modernity, systems, and action. This could especially be the case, given the salience of the social changes associated with the historical transitions to modernity (Braudel 1979c: 540; Münch 1986b-c). The processes of modernization have historically occurred in concert with economic, technological, or industrial developments (Braudel 1979b: 216). Consequently, the dominance of economic accumulation may largely be owed to "social structures, political forces and cultural frameworks" (Arnason 2001: 123). These structures, forces, and frameworks put the diverse configurations of durable inter-relations between systems of accumulation into the context of their comparative conceptualization. For this reason, the conceptualization of systemic coordination, differentiated networks, social institutions, communication infrastructures, entrepreneurial strategies and power accumulation has to take into account the particular ideal-typical configurations of the environments where individual and collective action unfolds (Braudel 1977: 63). In this regard, Münch comments that

It is equally impossible to understand the modern occidental development in terms of the creation of a specific *order*, if one regards it as no more in essence than the profitable application of rationalism to the capitalist mode of production. How then are we to explain in this view the crucial difference between modern

occidental commercial life or the modern occidental state and commercial life and the state elsewhere, namely the development of both economic and political *order*? To do this we must have a theory of institutionalization which is more than just a functionalistic combination of material and ideal factors offering no integration into a coherent theoretical approach. To arrive at the institutionalization theory needed here, Habermas would have had to devote more time to Parsons in the course of his attempt; what he in fact does at this point is to reduce Parsons' theoretical program to functionalism and systems theory, somewhat hastily dismissing it as having being superseded by Luhmann's work. In common with Luhmann therefore, Habermas is blind to Parsons' theory of institutionalization which, as it relates to differentiated societies, is a theory of interpenetration and has long since progressed beyond the idea of functionalistic explanation where Luhmann and Habermas remain trapped. This theory provides the framework for explaining the unique nature of modern Western development in terms of the formation of a new *order* which is the *product* of complex processes of interpenetration. Within this theory's frame of reference the many individual factors involved in these processes are not simply collected together without any connection of meaning but, instead, can be slotted into a coherent system of explanation. There is also no need within this theory's frame of reference to use Marx to improve on the explanations arrived at by Marx Weber, as Habermas would contend; all one needs to do is to reconstruct Weber's explanation of modern occidental development within the voluntaristic theory of action's frame of reference, and it will be enough to see that Weber had already progressed much farther than a simple functionalistic model combining ideal and material factors, to reach an explanation which contained its deeper meaning in a concept of interpenetration. (italics in the original, Münch 1988: 205-06)

In order to analyze the interrelations of culture and economy from an ideal-typical perspective on the structure of modern social order (Münch 1984), the latter may have to be both historically contextualized, within the regional, national, and urban dynamics of its differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration, and analytically reconstructed,

within a frame of theoretical reference to the systems of economic, social, political, and cultural accumulation (Braudel 1979a; 1979b; 1979c; Castoriadis 1999b; Sombart 1928; Weber [1922] 1976). Such an analytical approach may make it possible to uncover the contingent, evolving, and comparable patterns of the multiple varieties of the inter-relations among systems of accumulation that are definitive both of their respective historical development and of the emergent structures of modernity (Arnason 2001: 123-24).

Theorization of Varieties of Modernity

A growing conceptual attention to multiple modernities, though insufficiently theorized and lacking in empirical support, gives an impetus to the theoretical reconciliation between a single ideal-typical structure of modernity and the diversity of its local realizations within the conceptual framework of varieties of modernity. Similar to institutional analysis of the varieties of capitalism, the theorization of the varieties of modernity allows for the comparative application of the concept of the structure of modernity to the comprehensive formulation of its institutional, ideal-typical, and contextual variation (Schmidt 2006: 77). In the 1990s, the emergence of the concept of multiple modernities (Wittrock 2000) has marked a departure from the homogenizing assumptions of modernization theory, from the normative privileging of Western modernity, and from the oversimplification of empirically divergent processes. The departure from these assumptions made it imperative to theorize historical trajectories, sociocultural backgrounds, and distinctive modernities in terms of irreducible institutional multiplicity (Schmidt 2006: 77-78). However, modernization theory (Huntington 1971) has of necessity developed amid the diversity of paths of modern development. Via its meanings, its degrees, and its patterns, modernization determined the historical variation of the ideal-typical structure of modernity. How persistent vis-à-vis institutional change, how compatible with local conditions, and how deeply entrenched in societies, cultures, polities, and economies modernity ultimately is (Schmidt 2006: 78) cannot be determined on purely theoretical or empirical grounds alone.

Modernization theory has both its supporters and detractors. To offer alternative definitions to modernization theory, and to shed analytical light upon its claims to validity, the conceptualization of multiple modernities (Hefner 1998d; Spohn 2003) may have to participate in the theoretical discussion of modernity (Weber [1920] 1972). The theorization of modernity, as opposed to a narrow focus on culture and politics, addresses modern society in its totality, the processes constitutive of the emergence of modernity and the processes constitutive of the ideal-typical structure of modernity (Schmidt 2006: 78). The theorization of modernity, systems, and action, as proposed by Münch (1986b-c; 1984), may respond to the main points of the conceptualization of multiple modernities, while suggesting an approach that both addresses its substantive concerns and steers clear of its pitfalls. Modernity conceived of as the multiplicity of cultural rather than institutional projects (Eisenstadt 2000b) anchors the associated with it transformations of "the industrial revolution, the urban revolution, the scientific revolution, the political revolution, the educational revolution" (Schmidt 2006: 79) in the rupture with pre-modern epistemic assumptions (Wittrock 2000). European Enlightenment has laid basis for modernity. As a contingent social order, modernity includes political democracy, the secular state, the rule of law, individual rights, market economy, civil society, and intellectual freedoms into its structure (Schmidt 2006: 79). In this regard, Münch comments that,

[i]n reality, access to an adequate understanding of the deep structure of Weber's explanatory system has so far been closed off, not only by the predominating interpretation from the perspective of rationalization, but also by interpretation from the perspective of the power struggle between status groups. This can be clearly illustrated by examining power-and-conflict theoretical interpretation as presented by Bendix, as well as a number of different variants of the theory of rationalization, such as the '*materialistic*' variant attempted by Breuer, the '*intellectualistic*' stressed by Tenbruck, and the '*dialectic*' which is Schluchter's objective. [...] Weber's concept of rationalization can be seen to offer an overall perspective, in the form of the programmatic sketches he presented in the preface to *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, the introduction to his essay

‘The Social Psychology of the World Religions’ and in his ‘*Zwischenbetrachtung*’ (intermediate observation) which carries the English title ‘Religious Rejections of the World and their Directions’. But this too is a misleading perspective at it encourages an immediate *empirical* interpretation of *analytical* differentiations and *analytical* constructs of inner laws or of the tensions between autonomous spheres. However if we wish to apply these constructs empirically we must use a further model, namely the model of empirical relationships between autonomous spheres which Weber used to investigate the relationship between ethics and the world. Within its perspective it is not the process of rationalization which is at the core of modern accidental development, but the process of increasing interpenetration between autonomous spheres, and this is the perspective of explanation which provides a frame of reference in which Weber’s various explanatory contributions can yield a unified meaning. (italics in the original, Münch 1988: 206-08)

Modernization is primarily associated with industrial revolution, the ascendancy of bourgeoisie, continuous development (Kumar 1999), and the expansion of capitalism from the West to the rest of the world. The process of modernization is identified with the project of modernity (Bendix 1996: 410; Habermas 1973; 1981; 1988; Marx 1967: 13; Parsons 1964a). As Schmidt (2006: 79) argues, counterpoised to this project, stands the multiple modernities perspective. From the theoretical perspective of the variations of modernity (Schmidt 2006: 79-80), the controversial consequences that modernization has in various societies (Giddens 1990) tend to be interpreted by modernization theorists as indicators of the convergent development of modern societies whereas proponents of multiple modernities draw attention to how irreducible differences are undiminished by modernity. A multiple modernities position ranges in its applicability from states to civilizations (Huntington 1996) where diverse social institutions do not allow a uniform classification according to a single set of analytical categories of modernization (Schmidt 2006: 80; Wittrock 2000). However, the validity of culture or religion as criteria of classification into separate modernities (Tabari 2003; Weiss 2003) does not have any theoretical or empirical support in so far as the comparison of the ideal-typical structure

of respective modernities is concerned (Eisenstadt 2000a). As a consequence, the ideal-typical structure of modernity tolerant to variations of its particular realization (Luhmann 1992a; 1998; 2002) can be a more adequate framework for the comparative conceptualization of institutional, historical, and structural differences, as Schmidt (2006: 80-81) proposes.

To the extent that the transition to modernity has radically revolutionary social, economic, political, and cultural effects (Nisbet 1966), the existence of multiple modernities is irreconcilable with modernization as a process more defined by its ruptures rather than its continuities. Though dependent on the terms of inter-institutional, inter-state, or inter-regional comparison, the disruptive effects of modernization define modernity as a relative not an absolute condition, as a singular not a multiple event, and as a variable not a constant phenomenon (Schmidt 2006: 81). For this reason, the definition and the magnitude of differences out of which multiple modernities could be constructed are insufficient to invalidate the theorization of the ideal-typical structure of modernity, such as that of Münch (1982; 1984; 1991b). Consequently, the structure of modernity theorization may successfully address its criticisms by accounting for existing differences in terms of the variation of the ideal-typical structure of systemic interrelationships common to modern societies (Schmidt 2006: 81). An approach to modernity as a singular phenomenon theoretically permits us to select the decisive differences upon which the claims to its comparable variation can be empirically based. Elaborating upon the varieties of capitalism approach (Hall and Soskice 2001; Streeck and Yamamura 2001; Yamamura and Streeck 2003), the varieties of modernity theorization emphasizes the spatial, institutional, and temporal differences that encompass the structure of modernity as a whole (Münch 1982; 1984; Weber [1905] 1979) rather than restrict themselves to any of its spheres (Schmidt 2006: 81-82). In this regard, Münch comments that

[e]mpirical and statistical methods establish causal adequacy. This, in turn, shows belief in a particular religion and the dissemination of that religion to be factors that, when compared with other relevant factors such as level of economic development, political centralization and bureaucratization, constellations of

interest and power, etc., correlate significantly with social facts such as ambition in one's career, obedience to contractual rules and the institutionalization of free contractual relations. Adequacy of meaning, established hermeneutically, enables us to say something about the nature and direction of the correlation. Combined with empirical-statistical methods, it also enables us to say something about the deeper-lying interrelationships at the heart of the correlation between religion and economic action. This can, however, not be done just by empirical induction. What are required are general theoretical models linked interpretively to the empirical generalizations. Religion as a factor is then interpreted in a particular way within the framework of a theoretical model. If, for example, we base our interpretation on the voluntaristic theory of action we must presume that the *institutionalization* of modern capitalism's economic *order*, particularly as expressed in free contractual relations, cannot be explained purely as a result of constellations of interest and power, which vary substantially over time. The economic order was only able to be institutionalized because it was affectually anchored in a moral community which had kept pace with the spread of economic relations, and because it was discursively anchored in general meaning attitudes and value attitudes which enabled it to retain an identity whilst permitting a large number of detailed changes. On this point, the appropriate structural laws state that a number of functional relationships will exist as follows: the degree to which an order is institutionalized will depend on the degree of communal association; the degree of continuity under change will depend on the extent to which the order is discursively grounded in a consensus on general values; the rapidity of change and dissolution of an order will result from the weight of interest constellations; finally, the extent to which order can be enforced in case of conflict will depend on the concentration of power. (italics in the original, Münch 1988: 6-7)

The varieties of capitalism theorization puts the differences pertaining to cases taken for comparative analysis into the structures capturing the typological features pertaining to collective action and its environments in order to describe each of the ideal

types of capitalism (Schmidt 2006: 82). Thus one can classify capitalism into liberal and coordinated or into market, managed, and state-capitalist varieties (Schmidt 2002). Importantly, the institutional configurations of capitalism can serve to form the groups of states belonging to the same ideal type. Likewise, the systems of accumulation in the ideal-typical structure of modernity can provide independent criteria for classification by similarities among them. Examples of such classification criteria can include different social policy regimes employed by welfare states (Esping-Andersen 1990; Jones 1993), influences of the Western models of capitalism on Asian welfare states (Holliday 2000; Hort and Kuhnle 2000; McLaughlin 1993), the typological distinctiveness of democratic regimes (Kaiser 1997), and different legal systems across national jurisdictions (Röhl 1997). These system-specific differences may be embedded into the varieties of their respective ideal-typical structures of modernity (Schmidt 2006: 82-83). Consequently, comparative analyses can only draw their precision from the “concrete form and functioning” (Schmidt 2006: 83) of the institutions composing the ideal-typical structures of modernity. From this perspective, the theorization of the ideal-typical structure of modernity may aid in analysis of characteristics that different countries as its regional varieties, historical realizations, or common types have vis-à-vis selected theoretical models.

In the case of the institution of science, the uniform benchmarks used to evaluate its results, the competition in the publication market and the universality of scientific principles ensure that the differences among countries or regions are marginal. This is the case even though the structures of access to professional positions can produce variations. These variations depend on the degree of the differentiation, institutionalization, and interpenetration of national social structures. For example, the system of science of the United States is more open than that of Germany having a correspondingly more closed social structure (Schmidt 2001; 2006: 83). Likewise, institutionalized medicine (Lock 2002) does not exhibit significant differences among modern societies. Respective social structures contribute more to inter-state differences than would the existence of multiple modernities *per se* (Chirot 2001). The inter-state differences among similar institutions have to be recognized as the varieties of the implementation of the structure of modernity in historically, socially, politically, economically, and culturally specific circumstances

(Schmidt 2006: 83-84). The modernization of the countries presently belonging to the European Union has proceeded at an uneven pace across their systems of accumulation. Consequently, other regions, nations, and cities are also likely to reproduce the structure of modernity while preserving their institutional differences even as their value systems, social structures, and possibilities distributions gradually become more similar. Around the world, countries increase their alignment with such regionally or globally prevalent practices, principles, and arrangements as democracy (O'Donnell 1993), women rights (Drèze and Sen 1995), and universal suffrage (Phillips 1999). Such developments follow the convergent direction of the processes of institutionalization suggested by the thesis of the varieties of modernity rather than by the multiple modernities argument (Schmidt 2006: 84).

The departure from the multiple modernities perspective may also allow taking of cities and regions rather than of nations and civilizations into the focus of theoretical attention. This puts sub-national economic, political and cultural differences into explanatory context drawing on the ideal-typical structure of modernity in its local and urban variations (Heller 1999; Putnam, Leonardi, and Nanetti 1993). For example, the relatively similar positioning of the northern Italy, Kerala state, India, the city-state of Singapore, the region of Taiwan, the state of Luxemburg, and the city of Berlin vis-à-vis the process of modernization allows them to be grouped together as all having a more advanced implementation of the ideal-typical structure of modern social order. Exemplifying a comparable structure of modernity, these regions, states, and cities are also representative of wider processes of differentiation, interpenetration, and institutionalization on regional, national, and urban scales (Schmidt 2006: 84-85). Without identifying convergence with homogenization, the process of modernization involves all of the accumulation systems of the structure of modernity as a singular phenomenon (Inglehart 1995; Inglehart and Baker 2000). Qualitatively different from a pre-industrial condition, the structure of modernity under the influence of the implementation of modern institutions (Meyer, Boli, Thomas, and Ramirez 1997) gives rise to the structural commonalities that despite their local histories exhibit a comparable structure of systemic relations (Jepperson 2002; Weiming 2000). Among such comparable structural relations that are definitive of modern societies are mass

consumption (Schmidt and Lim 2004), institutionalized individualism (Beck 1986), and post-traditional development (Phillips 1993; Schmidt 2006: 85-86; Senghaas 1998).

The multiple modernities approach does not advance understanding of modernity beyond historical development towards a modern condition. Modernization theories do not include into their conceptual purview a systematic analysis of modernity (Schmidt 2006: 86). Over the course of modernization, variations of the ideal-typical structure of modernity exhibit convergent institutional development towards the prevalence of democracy, market economy, and capitalism (Rodrick 2000: 86; Sachs 2000; Schmidt 2006; Wilensky 1974). In the global structure of international relations, the competitive advantage of early industrial countries has been replaced by that of late industrial nations led by China (Firebaugh 2003; Qian 2003: 298). While restoring the centrality of East and Pacific Asia to global capitalism, late industrial countries are becoming integrated into the international structure of modernity. As the most commonly shared condition (Diallo 2003), the international structure of modernity imposes the dynamics of differentiation, interpenetration, and institutionalization upon the systems of accumulation involved in the process of modernization (Bell 2000). For instance, in China the process of modernization strengthens legal-rational bureaucratic institutions, promotes the freedoms of thought and speech, bolsters the autonomy of scientific, legal, and economic institutions, and provides legal basis for property rights (Fang 2007; Schmidt 2006: 86-87). In this regard, Münch comments that

[w]hether [...] [modern] development is characterized by an increasing rift between normative culture and instrumental spheres of action or whether the latter are more firmly locked together by interpenetration is not a question which can be answered straight from the theory, but one which solely requires the empirical establishment of facts. There is no theoretical presupposition which can determine the facts established. Whether the spheres become more firmly locked together, and if so how much, depends on contingent factors which can be explained by the theory through interpretive specification; however, the fact that these factors come into play cannot in any way be postulated by reference to the theory. As has been shown, there are truly substantial differences in this respect between

different modern societies, and it cannot be said of any of them that they have been so successful in intertwining normative culture and the instrumental spheres as to simultaneously achieve a *maximum* of discursive generalization and instrumental success. Another set of conditions we can specify within the theoretical model are those under which the inner dynamics of instrumental action determines the development of society: either normative discourse and inclusive communal association have insufficient autonomy so that they are too closely bound to the instrumental, practical spheres (accommodation) or, although they are indeed autonomous, they are separate from the instrumental spheres (isolation), or the two sets of spheres coexist side by side with no mutual influence (reconciliation). There is no denying that these tendencies [...] are in evidence in present-day modern societies. The *empirical* observation that there is a higher degree of interpenetration has no *absolute* validity, but only a *relative* one when the comparison is made to extra-occidental societies, or to past epochs of modern Western societies themselves. There can be no question of the theory predicting that universalistic values will inevitably be realized. (italics in the original, Münch 1988: 249-50)

The implications of the varieties of modernity thesis may require further exploration in light of Münch's (1982; 1986b-c; 1984) theorization of interpenetration, systems and action as a basis for comparative study of cities, nations, and regions. The transition to modernity being the most fundamental driver of social, economic and cultural change has released the dynamics of the interrelationships among the systems of accumulation that compose the ideal-typical structure of modernity. The structure of modern social order has consistently outweighed pre-modern differences in steering the course of development that different countries have followed towards a degree of institutional convergence (Schmidt 2006: 87-88). The theorization of the ideal-typical structure of modernity (Münch 1984) may provide a framework to conceptualize varieties of modern social order (Münch 1986b-c). The varieties of modernity conceptualization promises to accommodate existing differences among cities, nations and regions, explicate relations among economic, political, cultural and social spheres, delineate ideal-

typical structures of societies in their analytical and historical specificity, and account for the differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of modern institutions (Luhmann 1997; Münch 1984; Schmidt 2006: 88). The analytical and historical comparison of the ideal-typical structures of modernity may aid in forming the clusters of cities, countries and regions based on empirical analytical criteria. From the varieties of modernity perspective, the examination of structural differentiation, systemic interpenetration and collective agency as its benchmarks may serve analytical delimitation, classification and assessment of a large variety of institutions, spheres and structures.

Varieties of modernity can refer to the clusters of societies sharing the patterns of their institutional configurations and representative relations. A reinterpretation of Weber's approach to capitalism can put the structure of modernity theorization (Münch 1982; 1984; 1986b-c) into context by building upon interdisciplinary theoretical developments and by attempting to establish conceptual connections among different schools of sociology. Only thus can the varieties of modernity approach be applied to such sub-national entities as cities. Cities may have to be seen as representative of the ideal-typical structures of modernity composed of locally coherent institutional patterns forming clusters of structures of relations among their component spheres of action. In cities, these spheres enter into specific relations potentially explanatory of economic, political, cultural and social accumulation. Münch's (1982; 1984) theorization of modernity, systems, and action promises to adequately address the issues raised by theories of both multiple modernities and varieties of modernity as structures of ideal-typical relations. Münch's theorization furnishes both analytical and historical models of ideal-typical relations characterizing cultural, economic, political and societal spheres. The interrelationships among and within these spheres can variously exhibit properties of differentiation, interpenetration, and institutionalization under conditions supplied by their analytical ideal-types and their historical contextualization (Münch 1982). The potential of Münch's theorization goes beyond both clustering and classification of institutional patterns (Schmidt 2006: 89). The existing empirical grounding of Münch's (1984) theorization shows the applicability of his theoretical framework on scales ranging from macro to micro. Thus, to specify the ideal-typical structure of modern social order

on the urban level it may have to be brought into communication with urban theories, contemporary conceptualizations of urban change and emerging patterns of relations between economic, cultural, political and social spheres.

Chapter Seven: The Spatial Analysis of Urban Modernity

This chapter explores the theoretical purchase of spatial analysis, as proposed by Henri Lefebvre among other urban theorists, as it applies to urban social order, collective action, and causal relations:

- Cities and regions are important for both theorists of modernity, such as Weber and Pirenne, and of capitalism, such as Lefebvre, to link analytical concepts to historical variation.
- For Lefebvre, the modern subordination of space to the needs of capitalist reproduction legitimizes, regulates, and materializes spatial relations. This allows for the analytical differentiation of spatial practices, representations of space and representational space.
- In time-, place-, and society-specific ways, urban spaces actively contribute to the formation of economies, cultures, societies and polities.

The Spatial Theorization of Urban Modernity

In the social sciences, the concept of space has been widely used to address capitalism, modernization and globalization via the examination of political, material, legal and urban space. Among social scientists, the concept of space has remained overly theoretical in its insufficient treatment of empirical record and its underdeveloped conceptualization of concrete historical situations (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 515). The process of bringing space into the center of theoretical attention aids in assembling the generative structure of historical change arising from analytical and historical ideal types of action. The respective spatial relations derive from the political, social, cultural and economic dimensions of the ideal-typical relations attendant to individual and collective action. The recuperation of urban spaces from historiographic

reification, causal insignificance and subsumption into social networks has to take place without, however, breaking with existing scholarly traditions. Sharing an interdisciplinary momentum, these scholarly traditions increasingly turn to space from more empirically grounded positions (Boone and Stabel 2000; Hanawalt and Kobialka 2000; Maire Vigueur 1989). During late capitalism, the notion of space underlies the accounts of the formation and disintegration of modern metropolitan centers, of the rising pre-eminence of global spaces, and of spatial erasures, resistances and contradictions. The scholarly understanding of these urban processes owes the most in its theoretical underpinnings to Lefebvre (1974; 1991) whose Marxist theorization of the relations between space and capitalism has made one of the greater explanatory contributions to their understanding.

According to Lefebvre, the transition to modernity has been conjoint with the subordination of space to the needs of capitalist reproduction. Capitalist reproduction presupposes, mobilizes, and expresses the spatial relations participating in the legitimization, regulation and materialization of action. In the recursive process of the production of space, the ideal-typical structure of modernity may be understood using the analytical differentiation of 'spatial practices', 'representations of space', and 'representational or lived space' (Gottdiener 1985; Lefebvre 1991). By defining the latter three types of space, Lefebvre offers a point of critical reflection on diverse sociological traditions registering the effects of the transition to modernity in urban space. For German sociology (Tönnies 1887; 1957), the transition to modernity was accompanied by the institutionalization of abstract and complex interpersonal ties. Building on this, the Chicago school of sociology (Park 1926; 1969) has made human interaction into the site of social reproduction. And for more recent ethnographers (Rotenberg and McDonogh 1993), the transition to modernity has meant the reorganization of affective relations within the structure of the urban grid. From Lefebvre's (1991) perspective, the conventional treatments of space conceive of it as a passive, pre-existing container. Due to a lack of theoretical attention, space has been variously conflated with geographical place, a sphere of activity, and with mental abstraction. Such a dedifferentiated treatment of space overlooks its actively generative aspects. Social sciences, by rendering space as a product rather than an agent of capitalist production, have evidenced this shortcoming (Lefebvre 1991: 15).

Lefebvre's reading of capitalism allocates to space the status of an independent factor of production. Space is under the control of property relations as are other productive forces. In an attempt to restore historicity to the category of space, Lefebvre puts the successive transitions to the pre-modern, modern, and postmodern city in Europe at the center of his theoretical attention. By tracing the formation of the abstract space of capitalism as an effect of a regime of accumulation, he draws attention to the concomitant process of the production of spaces corresponding to each of the stages of economic development (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 519). In accordance with this logic, merchant capitalism and industrial revolution had transformed urban space in its material, discursive and practical dimensions (Lefebvre 1991: 265, 71). Lefebvre's historical analyses contextualize modernity's rupture with traditional societies in terms that qualify the claim that national formation has diminished the importance of place in favour of the recovery of the continued relevance of spatial relations (Agnew 1989). In North America, the decline of public space offers a corroboration of Lefebvre's theorization with concrete examples. Urban sprawl, shopping malls, advanced communications and commercialized entertainment facilities have their independent effects on urban space. The decline of public space has bearing on the positions that different groups can claim within the current mode of capitalist accumulation (Leach 1999; Sorkin 1992). Economic accumulation generates its characteristic spatial, emotional and social structures.

Sennett (1990; 1994), in historically superimposing classical Athens and contemporary New York, shows that modern urban life is defined by subjective estrangement as a function of the "interaction between the individual, the community, and the built environment" (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 520). This interaction follows the dynamics of modernization in spatially recreating the grid of interrelations. These reflect in their form the structure of relations among disconnected communities rather than indicating the connection between individual and society experientially exposed to each other (Sennett 1990; 1994). Sennett's emphasis on culture brings him into proximity with the postmodern theorization of space. Sennett treats space as incommensurable with time. However, postmodern theorization does not rule out an historical analysis of spatial relations (Foucault 1980: 149). In their postmodern separation, the categories of time and space invite the charges of meta-narrative. At the

intersection of cultural geography and critical theory, Soja (Scott and Soja 1996; Soja 1989) and Dear (2000) develop their heuristics of spatiality. As part of the programme of the Los Angeles school of urban studies, Soja and Dear aim to bring a historical corrective to bear on the urban geography of late capitalist postmodernism (Schneider 2000). The approach that they pursue is in clear departure from the Chicago school functionalist interpretation of the structures of metropolitan life.

As opposed to epistemologically privileging antiquity as a point of comparison for the urban studies of modern cities, Lefebvre suggests we recognize the medieval cities of Western Europe as more immediate predecessors of modernization. Lefebvre's suggestion shifts the ground of the understanding of modernization from traditional subjects of humanities, as does Sennett, towards actual urban spaces – where the commercial, industrial and social preconditions for modernity were forged (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 522). Lefebvre pays significant attention to the place of cities in medieval and early modern history. This, however, does not come at the expense of blurring such distinct theoretical aspects of space as the historical production of space, the conceptual multivalency of space and the social construction of space. In its actual and imagined experience, material and discursive reification, and physical and ideological perception, space falls into differentiated structures. Lefebvre's concept of space refers to these structures. The production of space receives its historical significance in the comparative perspective that follows the conceptual typology of spaces rather than their historical chronology. Consequently, such kinds of space as the “legal space, ritual space, or mental space” (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 523) allow for the theoretical superimposition and differentiation of these reconstructed urban spaces.

The instances of the construction and realization of legal space as a consequence of specific claims-making practices expose both the indeterminacy of space-centric interpretations and the power of space to make possible and generate the realities of politics and ideology (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 523). In the history of European cities, property rights reveal a complex course of development, as they do in London (Harding 2002). In the history of property rights, any claim to private ownership has hardly implied the clear-cut definition of rights, the inviolability of their exercise, or

the freedom from their contestation. In the legal space of cities, conflicts, overlapping jurisdictions and unstable demarcations are commonplace rather than exceptional. Consequently, the exercise of property rights has involved the strategic action of the organization, distribution and positioning of legal claims within cultural, social and physical dimensions of urban space. As the inverse of private property in definition, public domain has correspondingly been shapeless and illimitable. Consequently, the notion of public domain has been insufficient to serve as a legal basis to claims on space in its strict sense. To the extent that unpredictability and redefinition had been characteristic of pre-modern forms of urban governance, they have led to a more unambiguous definition of rights, applications and ownership only under the pressure of economic crises (Camille 2000; Harding 2002).

The Historical Production of Urban Space

The transition from the contested jurisdictions of medieval cities towards the discursive production of urban space took place in the course of the competition among institutions and interest groups seeking authority over the control of residents, legal titles and physical space (Attreed 2002). Leading to protracted legal adjudication, these institutions and groups have called to life strategies of the narrative organization of competing claims to rights, privileges and powers elaborated in the “process of negotiation, dispute, compromise, challenge, and counter-challenge” (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 524). The initial conceptualization by historians and anthropologists of separate political, legal and ritual spaces is in line with a functional differentiation approach (Biersack and Hunt 1989; Davis 1975). This conceptual differentiation of spaces is complemented by the evidence that these spaces interpenetrate each other as the social actors, practices and relations generated by them draw on spaces of their action to acquire legitimacy, power and resonance (Boone 2002; Estabrook 2002). For example, to the extent that types of space correspond to operation effects of systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation, the political space of early modern England has been forged in the struggles over ritual spaces. The actors representing governmental, religious and monarchical systems fought over these spaces during civil war (Estabrook 2002) as the

mutual effects of cities, politics, religion and law have contributed to a more generally shared redefinition of the corresponding institutions.

Over the course of the seventeenth century, the struggle against the subordination of religion to political authority in England has led to an increase in the institutional autonomy of both. The sphere of religion and the sphere of politics became more autonomous at the price of their more regulated interrelationship. At the same time, even though secular authority over sacred spaces has been reasserted, both spheres became more differentiated, institutionalized and interpenetrated no longer sharing rights over religious spaces while becoming integrated through the recognition of exclusive rights of political authority in sacred spaces (Estabrook 2002). However, historiographical applications of the notion of space clearly show its limitations. The notion of space may need to be approached from an analytical standpoint on historical ideal-types of relations within which social change and strategic action occur. Consequently, processes of the production of space undergo performative reduction to collective struggles over rights. The power over the exercise of these rights may be sufficiently explained as the power to perform rights in corresponding spaces. The relationships between power and ritual appear to exclude spaces from their reproduction as mutually constitutive performances (Estabrook 2002). Similarly, the explanation of the struggles over urban spaces of the medieval Low Countries has to make a corrective to Pirenne's (1914) imposition of the collective dynamics of class analysis upon economic relations. The effect of this superimposition is that economy as a macro environment for action cannot be recognized to produce an impact on the micro level of individual and group action before its differentiation from other medieval systems of accumulation takes place (Boone 2002). This is recognized by Lefebvre (1991: 263-75) as he refers to the mediating role of such cities as Ghent in the production of economic space.

The contestation of ritual spaces in the medieval Low Countries was part of the struggles among competing citizen groups to accumulate power in order to claim existing spaces for communal use, to demolish physical spaces of rival groups, and to construct architectural structures symbolizing communal space. Under the conditions of undifferentiated relations between capital and labour, the winning party in these struggles accrued significant economic benefits (Boone 2002). Political space underlies the

transition to the guild rule as the constitutive mechanism of the legitimization of the political power of artisanal corporations (Boone 2002). However, the effects of space are insufficient to explain the departure from class struggle terminology that historical discourse has to make to account for the institutional continuity of political, ritual and economic spaces across social change (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 526-27). As scenes for struggles over ducal authority in Burgundy exemplify (Boone 2002), urban spaces of medieval cities are subordinate to the strategies for gaining sovereign power by seizures into possession, symbolic appropriations and demolitions of selectively chosen sites. Though reducing action to performance (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 527), historiography, nevertheless, connects banner marches, kneeling ceremonies, royal inaugurations, public beheadings, church burnings and charter destructions with the analytical structure of Lefebvre's abstract, concrete and representational spaces. These spaces serve as macro environments reciprocally dependent on individual and collective action.

Without recognizing historical change as an outcome of the interplay between action and its environments, Lefebvre's concept of space may be at a loss to theoretically restrict or specify the process of the discursive production of distinctly legal, ritual or material spaces on its own (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 527). This is the case also because the basic classification of spaces by Lefebvre into imagined, practiced and representational also folds into them capabilities to confer social power. For example, individual, discursive and institutional action by such female patrons of Catholicism in England as Queen Henrietta Maria may have had as its outcome the characterization of early modern Catholicism as feminine. However, these actors were more dependent for the success of their activity on social spheres of religion, family and royalty than on gendered spaces or classifications (Dolan 2002). Likewise, the environment of hostility to Catholicism in the periods of its disestablishment had the effect of restricting its practice to private households thus causing its association with women-related spaces. Consequently, the historiographical discourse that takes spaces into the narrow focus of discourse on the production of space not only may fail to explain the causal mechanisms behind historical change but may also offer a tautological explanation for the constitution of spaces in their rhetorical construction (Dolan 2002). From a perspective rooted in the

theory of action, as it is developed in sociology from its classical to the contemporary period, the rhetorical construction of spaces is only an aspect of strategic action.

A consistent application of the notion of mental space to the history of medieval Christianity shows the following contradictions. The origins of Christianity in Greek and Roman cities contradict its anti-urban ethos. The contradictory influences of aristocratic and monastic strategies of institutional action have led to the polarization of Christianity. And, finally, the Roman empire as an historical environment for the Church contradicts Christendom as an otherworldly community (Milis 2002). The process of the production of space cannot explain these contradictions. Christian discourse on urban life exhibits significant continuity from antiquity to the middle ages, informs the physical constitution of religious spaces, and consistently structures monastic and canonical texts (Milis 2002). However, there are no explanatory relations among spaces, as conceptualized by Lefebvre, beyond the self-constituted agency of their production or the developmental factors that an analysis of spaces could uncover (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 529). As an example of representational space, medieval romances and didactic literature in the Low Countries do not constitute an autonomous space where acts of imagination would be unaffected by commercial, pragmatic and entrepreneurial urban influences. On the contrary, these influences have restructured the literary canon of aristocracy in order to redraw the distinctions between city and the countryside (Lefebvre 1991: 268) according to the emerging language of capitalism (Pleij 2002).

The Historiographical Critique of Spatial Analysis

The discursive and rhetorical reconstruction of representational space that was constituted in medieval cities (Pleij 2002) draws its reality from the struggles between burghers and peasants, between aristocracy and bourgeoisie, between commerce and agriculture, and between social norms of traditional respectability and the “energy, intelligence, and wit” (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 530) of the nascent capitalism. Consequently, the methodological implications of the theory of action, modernity, and accumulation as it applies to the investigation of the role of cities in the processes constitutive of transformations of capitalism have to rest on historical, comparative and analytical

studies of urban space. Due to the special role of exemplars that the cities of medieval and Renaissance Europe play in sociological theories of modernity, an attention to comparative urban studies also provides a historical basis for the contemporary theorization of the changing “nature of urban space” (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 530). This is especially the case given that late medieval cities in Northern Europe were capable of challenging the strongest hierarchies of power of the period (Ennen 1972; 1979). In the history of the Middle Ages, the definition of city drew its boundary in the zone where city walls separated it from the rest of the world. These walls performed defensive, legal and social functions; urban rights only applied within demarcated urban space. Consequently, the civil equality of cities sharply contrasted with the feudal system of serfdom in force in the countryside. Moreover, city-dwellers had constitutionally guaranteed political autonomy and self-governance. These urban rights thus provided the blueprint for Western social and political modernization (Ennen 1972; 1979).

Medieval cities were not merely the sites of the introduction of innovative political or legal practices. The uniqueness of medieval cities consisted in the high geographical and social mobility of their populations. Compared to the countryside, cities had a more differentiated and complex scale of social stratification based on economic hierarchy, social divisions and cultural practices. Cities were exclusive sites hosting nascent industrial production and specialized occupations. Cities served as nodes in world-spanning merchant networks, and pursued mercantilist trade policies. And, finally, cities regulated economic exchange both within city walls and with the countryside around urban markets (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 531). Consequently, late medieval city can be said to have produced its urban space as a special environment for action. Action took its preconditions from wall defences, the multiplicity of consumer and producer services, and the proximity of locations dedicated to production, commerce, exchange, politics, sociability and culture (de Certeau 1984; Kobialka 2000). However, the tradition of representing late medieval cities as sites with distinctive spatial qualities dates from the mid-nineteenth century. At that time, Marx (1978) and von Gierke (1868; 1954) sweepingly concluded that cities had a higher historical significance than the countryside for the processes of capital accumulation, bolstering market relations and creating a more egalitarian socio-political community (DuPlessis 1997).

The most lasting historiographical impact on theories of cities is that of Pirenne (1939; 1951) and Weber ([1922] 1968: 1212-372). Pirenne's (1939; 1951) explanatory structure of urban social, political and cultural life makes recourse to the centrality of marketplace, distinct privileges and universal urban rights (Prevenier 1986; van Uytven 1986; Verhulst 1987; 1999). Weber ([1922] 1968: 1212-372) casts late medieval Northern European cities into an ideal type of Western cities as bounded, corporative and self-governing spaces (Callies 1975; Nippel 1991; Schreiner 1986). Urban studies not only follows in the steps of this historical scholarship. It bears the stamp of the penchant for theoretical reflection and for associating markets with progress prevalent in the nineteenth century. Urban studies also shares the strategies of the representation of cities, as early as the thirteenth century, that defend special urban rights of citizens by constructing the urban space of their republics as orderly, independent and civic enclosures surrounded by socially, culturally and politically alien territory (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 533). Reflecting powerful legal and political interests, the representational strategies of cities gave rise to collective action taking form of such spatial practices as construction projects, legislative acts and documentary records. These spatial practices aimed at turning urban distinction into the reality of physical space, cultural production and abstract classifications designed to separate cities from the hinterland (Pleij 2002).

Within complex geographies of urban jurisdictions, detailed legal regulation drew many boundaries restricting access to citizenship, guilds and crafts, property ownership and residence. These legal boundaries created the space where cities enjoyed self-governance, collected independent taxation, enforced market rules, maintained police force and provided freedom from feudal obligations (Postan 1966; Rörig 1955; Société Jean Bodin 1958). Therefore, rather than differentiating itself into an abstract space for decontextualized action, according to Lefebvre's approach, actual urban space has always been part of the structure of relations among its processes of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation. These relations integrated urban community with lordly manors, suburbs and countryside as economic, demographic, commercial and financial flows constantly connected cities to their outside (Britnell 1996; Nicholas 1971; Reynolds 1984; Stabel 1997). On the general level of preconditions for action, cities have

been integrated with the country by kindred religious beliefs and organizations (Rubin 1992), by mutual support ties between urban liberties and territorial sovereigns (Chevalier 1982), and by strategic alliances and struggles. These organizations, alliances and struggles played out in the institutional environment inclusive of both feudal and urban spaces alike (Mundy and Riesenbergr 1958). An attention to this dynamics between cities and the countryside may reveal the theoretical importance of individual and collective action that the concentration on abstract, physical or representational spaces alone cannot replace.

The institutionalized interrelations between cities and the country do not equal, however, the integration between them. It is not their aggregate qualities as concentrations of people, but their institutional characteristics, that made cities into important nodes of relations with the feudal countryside, into novel forms of social organization and into focal points of struggles ranging far outside urban limits. The integration of social practices, representations of space, and social spaces into a comprehensive conceptual framework may have to proceed by paying attention to discursive, material and social conditions of action within an environment of diverse systems of accumulation.

From Münch's perspective, systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation can be specified in terms of their development, interpenetration, autonomy and effectiveness (Münch 1982; 1984). A particular urban space can be contextualized as "a site of radical experimentation, distinct powers, and privileged actors" (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 535). An attempt at understanding urban space from a perspective of Münch's theorization of modernity, systems and action may hope to bridge the gap of incommensurability between different areas of research. For example, two such research areas are urban studies of the society, politics, culture and economy of the Italian Renaissance (Emlen, Raaflaub, and Molho 1991; Muir 1995) and traditions of institutional and social historical studies of Northern Europe (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 535-36).

For the study of modernity and urban space, Burckhardt's (Burckhardt 1990; [1860] 1985) work on Renaissance Italy has been a path-breaking account of the transition from medieval to modern governmentality. The transition replaced parochial

allegiances with wider civic collectivities that gave rise to economic, political and cultural modernization (Baron 1955; 1966; Becker 1981; Fubini 1992; Goldthwaite 1980; 1993; Molho and Tedeschi 1970; Muir and Weissman 1989). However, an overly sharp distinction between medieval and early modern cities, as environments offering distinctively different conditions for action, overlooks the similarities in the urban spaces of cities. According to formulations by Weber and Pirenne, cities are characteristic of each historical mode of governmentality. However, urban spaces ideal-typically representative of modern social order can be equally likely found both in Renaissance Italy and Northern Europe (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 537). Decoupled from the decontextualized theorization of space, the conceptualization of modernity took inspiration from detailed archival research of extended time-periods. This research was aided by sociological and anthropological theories dealing with “how people experienced their cities, formed alliances, established social identities, and claimed authority” (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 537). Consequently, the claim to exceptional importance of Renaissance Italy to the process of transition to modernity has been debunked in favour of reasserting the role of urban contexts, networks and identities in individual and collective action. Research of cities from a perspective stressing the interplay between action and its environments gives no modernizing function to European urban space (Brucker 1969).

Renaissance Italian cities do not distinguish themselves with respect to modernization. The overlapping, situated networks of Renaissance Italy have been overwhelmingly constitutive of the action environments of these cities (Hughes 1977; Klapisch-Zuber 1985). In Renaissance Italy, the usage of urban space was subordinated to the imperatives of individual and collective action geared to gaining control over these cities (Muir 1981; Romano 1989; Trexler 1980; Weissman 1981; 1989). Collective actors of Renaissance Italy maximized the efficiency of cities’ exploitation and rationally divided them into zones of influence. Thus, both collective actors and cities reciprocally reinforced their symbolic and political power (Crouzet-Paven 2000; Davis 1998). The association of cities of Renaissance Italy with modernity has increasingly come into question (Vitale and Scafoglio 1995). Moreover, the cessation of long-standing social, cultural and ritual practices receives its appropriate recognition as a crucial factor in the

process of modernization (Crouzet-Pavan 1992; Davis 1994). In the form of the obviation of previous spatial hierarchies and local networks, the process of modernization took from the medieval period until the modern developments of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to fulfill (Burckhardt [1861] 2007; White 1973). The predominant historical understanding of cities in Renaissance Italy tends to concur with Münch's theorization of modernity, systems, and action because their urban spaces have been particularly instrumental to the cultural, social, economic and political achievements of the epoch. Contrary to the presupposition of rupture with the structures and functions of medieval cities, urban spaces of the latter have not been merely integrated into an overarching dynamics of modernization. Comparable processes of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration can be found in late medieval Northern Europe where urban law attests to both growth in the autonomy and interdependence of urban spaces (Dolan 2002; Harding 2002).

During the Middle Ages and Renaissance, urban space played an important role in struggles among urban communities and feudal hierarchies for the control of cities. Their possession and deployment of city symbols came into being only after a protracted conflict over urbanity, privileges and related claims. Spaces carried the memory of previous struggles in the legitimacy they conferred on their occupants, in the meanings that on-going negotiations of power added, and in the power relations stemming from monopoly on urban spaces and symbols. Spaces reveal themselves as embedded into environments for action since the historical research of particular places shows them to be "the result of specific contests, specific institutional changes, and specific responses to chance occurrences" (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 540). Historical research building upon Lefebvre's generalization of the production of space in medieval cities of Europe fills the concepts of representational space, spatial practices, and physical space with documentary detail. Documentary research replaces the emphasis on the participation of space in differentiation, interpenetration and institutionalization with the concern with "historical change, causality, and agency" (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 540).

A growing attention to space follows this tendency to provide a context-specific corrective to largely macro oriented discourses. A historical corrective to theories of

urban modernization accounts for reciprocities between macro and micro processes, describes structural change in terms appropriate to its scale and scope, and makes an analytical transition from case studies towards generative structures of historical processes. The study of cities, rather than personify, or de-historicize their change, as it bears on their interrelations, processes and environments, via references to Renaissance city or urban democracy, has to approach them as embedded into historical social orders, systems of accumulation, and individual and collective action. Departing from utilitarian, teleological and deterministic assumptions, spatial history foregrounds “power, intentionality, and agency” (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 541). Thus, the history of urban spaces opens theoretical avenues to reflect actions of individual actors, to weigh historical causes of experience, to trace the structural impact of institutions, to interpret the collective meaning of change, to contextualize legal practices, to map geographies of economic exchange, and to draw pictures of military confrontations. The process of the production of space articulates the structure of its differentiation, interpenetration, and institutionalization according to specificities fully belonging to places where it becomes physically, discursively and experientially visible as an abstract category. These urban relations ground particular places in architectures, infrastructures, communications, distinctions, functions and structures.

Sociological Applications of Spatial Analysis

Mental, material and practical aspects of space do not pass into each other unmediated (Milis 2002; Pleij 2002) but belong to struggles over spaces, to appropriations of space, to collective confrontations, to the regulation of practices, to competing representations and to emergent meanings and expectations (Dolan 2002). The introduction of the notions of the production of space and of urban space into scholarship on cities opens new avenues of inquiry into economic, gender and public relations. How these relations find their reflection in the legal, literary and other kinds of record of collective and individual agents bears an imprint of urban history. Without displacing the importance of economic relations, the formative influence of economy on cities has to be complemented with attention to space-specific accounts of urban development (Boone 2002). Never

alien to cities of medieval Europe, markets were subject to urban regulation via the physical space of market places and the architecture of market halls, tolls and warehouses, the abstract space of legal discourse, and the lived space of political decisions. Consequently, traded goods, transaction type, and traders' identity differentiated, institutionalized, and interpenetrated urban marketplaces. Within the structure of individual mediations of market relations, of the micro equilibration of supply and demand, and of the particularized oversight of economy, urban marketplaces were geared to everyday life and local industry (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 543).

Marketplaces have also interpenetrated with the space of medieval cities. However, numerous other sites have claimed their place in the economic structure of these cities. This structure neither privileged formalized economic exchange nor kept its institutional form unaffected by social change (Braudel 1992). Cities as sites of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration brought into medieval marketplaces the logic of participation restrictions, prescribed exchange rules, production controls and innovation prohibitions. This restrictive logic operated jointly with the unrestrained freedom of action within the rules prescribed by cities thus allowing the exercise of rational choice to individuals considered equal and free within these spaces (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 544). However, the focus on spaces leaves the process of transition to modern societies unexplained as open societies of modernity have replaced the medieval structure of closed places. Medieval cities have been historical sites of multiple urban cultures that within the inclusive spaces of marketplaces, streets, fairgrounds and shops have claimed legitimate participation in the production of urban space (Stabel 1999). The subsequent differentiation of spaces, practices and representations was coupled with the transformation of the structure of gender, social and economic relations. This modern process of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration demands the elaboration of a larger ideal-typical framework of spatial reorganization cutting across public, private and market spheres (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 545).

Significantly, the process of the creation of European domesticity has proceeded via differentiation, institutionalization, and interpenetration. Within the emerging spatial structure of modern social, gender and property relations, domestic space has been

separated from public spaces, sleeping rooms from dining halls, servant rooms from bath rooms, and salons and guest rooms from private chambers (Goldthwaite 1980). Of special importance to the modern production of space is the spatial differentiation between domestic and business spaces. While not beginning until the Industrial Revolution, this differentiation has become combined with the legal regulation of production for the market, with the gendered integration of households into economic exchange, with the institutionalization of trade on corporate principles, and with the transformation of firms into permanent capital-holding entities (Howell 1986; Wiesner 1993). Marketplace was equally connected to the formation of public sphere. Public sphere became associated with physical space, legal protection and legitimating power. However, the medieval conception of common good reflected in the shared market of corporate community served as the precursor of much later ideas of public space (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 546; Harding 2002).

Additionally, public space derives its history from the police regulation undertaken as part of political efforts by medieval princes and municipalities to constitute, legitimate, and secure public good in streets and marketplaces (Weidenfeld 1996). As a part of urban economic policies, these regulatory measures insured “set weights and measures, fixed time and place of commerce, established quality standards and controls, determined currency exchange rates, guaranteed safety in travel, and registered and enforced contracts” (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 547). Consequently, the control over public spaces has been inextricably connected to the political power that municipal governments, urban institutions, and corporate bodies and confraternities claimed by regularly staging symbolic appropriations of common spaces. In display and celebration of their authority, these collective agents symbolically appropriated urban space through festive, ceremonial and ritual performances of collective action (Arnade 1996; Kertzer 1988; Kipling 1998). As city lost its sovereignty to the territorial state, urban space has become a stake in hegemonic struggles. These struggles facilitated the transition from the ritual appropriation of the right to perform the emergent state in public towards the integration of urban space into the state. No longer in need of legitimization via urban spectacle, the state replaced the space of urban autonomy with the space of state authority (Arnade, Howell, and Simons 2002: 548).

Consequently, urban spaces have actively participated in dramatic historical changes in time-, place-, and society-specific ways. Via their formative influence on changing structures, cultures and communities, urban spaces participate in collective struggles. In this way, the institutional interplay between increasingly interrelated and autonomous environments and individual and collective action reproduces spaces of cities across their history as active agents in the relations of power, exchange and accumulation.

Chapter Eight: The Structure of Modernity in Cities

This chapter examines such urban aspects of the transition to global capitalism as networks and flows, structures and nodes, and strategies and interests:

- Transition to global capitalism has shifted the urban policy emphasis from industrial production towards investment, development, and accumulation as urban centers concentrate organizational, service, and communication infrastructures amplifying both the influence of networks and the importance of global flows.
- Cities serve as sites of strategic centrality, interrelated diversity, and mobile interconnection for individual and collective actors entering into spatially, historically, and relationally specific interrelations.
- Urban strategies have to be guided by the dynamics and contradictions occurring between systems of accumulation, between individual and collective action and between media of interchange.

Economic and Cultural Accumulation in Global Cities

The discourse on globalization, world-scale flows, advanced telecommunications, and transportation networks has reasserted the centrality of cities to world economy. These processes contribute to the dynamics of differentiation, institutionalization and interdependence whereby cities assume key positions in the design, management, and creativity functions of world economy. These functions put urban centers into structures of economic exchange, institutional policy-making, and individual and collective action (Amin and Graham 1997: 411). Consequently, cities have been attracting an increasing amount of attention (Jencks 1996) from social scientists and policy makers adopting structuralist and post-structuralist approaches. Moreover, urban crises and regeneration

strategies become increasingly addressed by national research programs, international organizations, and interdisciplinary conferences oriented towards metropolitan dynamics (Amin and Graham 1997: 411). However, the emergence of urban studies as an independent field of inquiry has not been connected to a central theory of contemporary cities, of their multiple structures, and of their changing functions. Consequently, as a number of economic, social, political, and cultural transitions occur, there is a demand for conceptual means to group cities into clusters with shared urban trends. The theoretical framework that integrates such elements as cultural, associational, political, and economic spheres into the structure of analytical and historical ideal-types (Münch 1982: 431, 555-57) may be found in Münch's (1982) theorization of modernity, systems, and action. I hope to demonstrate that Münch's contribution to sociological theory would allow one to determine the factors of urban regeneration or decline (Amin and Graham 1997: 411-12).

Despite the multiplication of global flows, cities possess assets that contribute to the reflexivity and facilitation of urban regeneration: the diversification of economic, social, and cultural institutions; and the collective action oriented at the implementation of entrepreneurial projects ranging from urban policy to social justice (Amin and Graham 1997: 412). The spread of telecommunications in the 1960s gave rise to the expectations of the eventual demise of cities no longer exclusively offering the proximity (Boden and Molotch 1994) needed for connecting the political, economic, social, and cultural spheres into an integrated structure. Consequently, the spatial basis for differentiation, institutionalization and interdependence of political, economic, social and cultural accumulation was expected to be replaced with the communications infrastructure (Toffler 1980), making possible the dispersal of activities across space. Due to the spatial dispersal, the distinction among residential, industrial, and managerial districts was expected to eventually blur (Amin and Graham 1997: 412; Pascal 1987: 602). As electronic networks increasingly mediate interpersonal communication, the average size of cities was expected to fall. This expectation arose because both the personal and the collective integration into the structure of modern social order was becoming decoupled from the constraints of space (Naisbitt and Aburdene 1990: 329). These urban development trends predicted the transition from cities to global villages (McLuhan

1967) as the place-based determinants of action became replaced by communications-based flows (Amin and Graham 1997: 412; Virilio 1987: 18).

The processes of urban restructuring, such as deindustrialization, inner-city unemployment, and urban crises, have been mapped and measured by urban economics, geography, and planning (Castells 1996; Martin and Rowthorn 1986; McKay and Cox 1979). Albeit not reaching interdisciplinary conclusions about underlying causes, structures, or implications of the transformation wrought by global capitalism (Amin and Graham 1997: 412; Castells 1996), these disciplines have contributed to urban policy making. However, the growing relevance of urban space, policy, and economy to the understanding of representation and symbolization (Westwood and Williams 1997), identity politics (Keith and Pile 1993), collective memory (Boyer 1994), and consumption (Ellin 1996) has led to overcoming (Collins 1995; Shields 1992) the deterministic theorization of urban dynamics (Sorkin 1992a; Virilio 1987). The recent development of the theorization has favored conceiving of cities as the sites of differentiation, institutionalization and interdependence involving visual media (Robins 1996), situated individuals (Pile 1996), and social struggles (Zukin 1995) into reciprocally implicative relations (Amin and Graham 1997: 412-13). The pressure for economic competitiveness under conditions of flexible specialization (Amin 1994; Scott 1988) has reasserted the centrality of social networks to global economy. The importance of face-to-face interaction has reinforced the role of cities as the nodal points in the geography of global flows (Amin and Graham 1997: 413; Thrift and Olds 1996: 314-14).

The growing urbanization of the world, the regeneration of formerly industrial cities, and the globally increasing proportion of urban population (Parkinson 1994) have spurred reinterpretations of cities as structures of opportunity, going beyond narrow definitions of economic sphere (Amin and Graham 1997: 413; Jencks 1996). The extant theoretical attention to cities has mainly stressed their centrality to national economic development. At the same time, the increasing prominence of urban milieus in tapping the economic potential of cultural, educational, and research institutions has started to redefine the conceptualization of the structure of relations in which cities participate (Amin and Graham 1997: 413). Consequently, metropolitan centers are affirmed in the importance that their respective locations in the global structure of the relations of

command and control, financial operations, industrial production, corporate governance, business services, cultural institutions, international organizations, governmental agencies, and infrastructural development have. The structural position of these cities in the global structure of relations is critical for maintaining the asset base of their urban, national, and regional competitiveness (Amin and Graham 1997: 413; Castells 1989; Friedman 1995; Parkinson 1994: 7; Sassen 1991; 1994).

In contrast to the territorial dispersal of the operation of transnational corporations (TNCs), their headquarters have become concentrated in few urban centers. There multiple inter-personal, inter-organizational, inter-urban, inter-national, and inter-regional networks converge (Fitzpatrick 1997). The spatial convergence of these networks explains the global prominence of London, New York, and Tokyo (Castells 1996; Sassen 1991; 1994). These cities have risen in their urban hierarchies due to the polarizing influence of spatial decentralization (Amin and Graham 1997: 413; Graham 1997; Massey 2007; Massey and Jess 1995). The reliance of global capitalism on the networks of “[t]rust, reciprocity, reflexivity, and minimization of risk” (Amin and Graham 1997: 414) steeply increases the centrality of global cities to the processes of management of the structures of the positive and negative opportunities (Massey 2007; Massey and Jess 1995; Mitchelson and Wheeler 1994: 88). The liberalized regulation of the financial, industrial, labor and consumption markets has made it possible to apply economies of scale to the management of investments, risks, services, infrastructures, and assets from global cities. Global cities have the positional advantage of offering a high level of the differentiation, institutionalization and interrelatedness that distinguishes global economic institutions standing in the relations of cumulative causation with each other (Amin and Graham 1997: 414; Massey 2007).

International financial centers concentrate organizational, service, and communication infrastructures. These infrastructures bring the environments of reflexive workforce, organization culture, and global management (Thrift 1994) into the relations of positive feedback. These feedback relations amplify both the influence of the networks into which the global cities are embedded and the share of the global flows that enter into the relations of exchange, translation, and coordination (Thrift 1996). The struggles over the access to these global relations via personal networks, up-to-date interpretations, and

real-time information play out in such global cities as London (Amin and Graham 1997: 414). The transition to the economic relations characteristic of global capitalism has also changed the perception that cities represent liability by absorbing public spending on urban problems. As a consequence of the transition, the logic of accumulation of global capitalism has shifted its base from industrial production towards cities as the media of investment, development, and accumulation (Amin and Graham 1997: 414; Jacobs 1984; Sclar 1992). Correspondingly, policy-making groups of global capitalism involved in urban development have changed the frame of their discourse from that of regulating industry to that of regulating investment. As they participate in global capitalism, cities are increasingly seen as the conglomerates of labor force, profit opportunities, capital funds, circulating goods, service clusters, and organizational networks (Amin and Graham 1997: 414; Cisneros and Assembly 1993: 21).

Global cities become integrated into economic, cultural, social and political accumulation of global capitalism not via the economic instrumentalization of the industrial economic sphere and relations but via the mobilization of capital. The physical, social, and financial infrastructures of global cities can yield opportunities for capital mobilization as the respective investment, development, and speculation bases (Amin and Graham 1997: 414; Cisneros and Assembly 1993: 21). The accumulation model of global capitalism has formed in response to the profitability decreases caused by research and development costs, flexible specialization, and volatile demand. Consequently, the valorization of cities as the sites of agglomeration economies can be considered to form a part of the corresponding collective entrepreneurial strategies of cost minimization. In post-industrial cities, knowledge, services, and information are sourced from the dense urban networks nurtured by a variety of institutional relations among economic, societal, associational, and political spheres (Knight 1995; Knight and Gappert 1989; Münch 1982: 94; Ryser 1994). Within the urban structure of their relations these social spheres increase the competitiveness, creativity, and connectivity of collective actors (Amin and Graham 1997: 414-15; Lash and Urry 1994). The reflexive accumulation of global capitalism involves its structure of modernity, accumulation, and action in its entirety (Münch 1982) in that the processes of differentiation, institutionalization and interdependence tying its systems of accumulation together become the primary

processes compensating for the decline of industrial capitalism. In the early industrial countries, these processes of differentiation, institutionalization and interdependence are reflected by the structure of interchange among the corporate, media, arts, educational, scientific, and municipal institutions (Amin and Graham 1997: 415; Knight 1995: 259).

The transition to global capitalism in the 1980s has shifted the flexibly organized industrial production to few metropolitan areas. In these areas, smaller firms form the clusters of innovation, knowledge, and specialization environments (Scott 1988; Storper 1995). On the one hand, these clusters are dependent on the global transportation and communication networks that reduce the economic risk and transaction costs by selecting from widely diverse information, labor, and supply-chain sources (Amin and Thrift 1992). On the other hand, the accelerated accumulation and circulation of these resources increasingly depends on the existence of spatial entrepreneurial agglomerations (Amin and Graham 1997: 415; Malmberg and Maskell 1997). The policy and planning discourse on urban renewal (Bianchini 1988; Montgomery 1995) reasserts the importance of creative cities (Landry and Comedia 2000). In creative cities, the spheres of urban culture, media, entertainment, sport, and education undergo institutionalization, differentiation, and interpenetration. The social systems constituted by the respective institutional processes meet the crises of global capitalism with the strategies of experience society (Schulze 1992). These strategies are organized around the practices of cultural consumption and production, information and communication networks, and spatial clustering (Amin and Graham 1997: 415; Griffiths 1995; Lash and Urry 1994).

The deregulated dynamics of global capitalism enlists the repudiation of modernist city planning (Jacobs 1961) in favor of density, diversity, stimulation, and interaction (Montgomery 1995: 102). The urban planning geared to global capitalism promotes shared spaces, public realms, mixed-use landscapes, and intercultural activities locations. These spaces are called to remedy the urban alienation, decay, polarization, and privatization processes (Bianchini and Schwengel 1991; Worpole 1992). Failing to recognize cities as sites of interdependence, differentiation and institutionalization (Münch 1991b), the collective action aimed at rectifying the problems besetting post-industrial cities reinforces the feedback cycle of disorganized capitalism via the aesthetic critique of its effects (Amin and Graham 1997: 415-16). Consequently, in the urban

context of the transition to global capitalism, urban assets have drawn theoretical, political, and economic attention. However, responding to the needs of global capitalism, the policy-making promising revitalization of the cities most affected by the decline of industrial capitalism cannot but perpetuate the crises of the post-industrial capitalism that has inherited urban infrastructures only partially adaptable to the imperatives of flexible accumulation (Amin and Graham 1997: 416). The strategies of flexible accumulation mainly focus on advanced management, services, design, culture, and finance. The networks constitutive of these activities may have to be seen in an analytical and historical perspective seeking to formulate ideal typical relations constitutive of global capitalism in order to allow a comprehensive analytical approach to urban change (Thrift and Olds 1996: 312).

Economic, Cultural, Social and Political Accumulation in Cities

At this point, it is worth turning briefly to the literature on urban studies and policy making in order to explore how cities may be approached from Münch's theoretical perspective on modernity, systems, and action. For an analysis of urban change, an historical concretization of ideal-types of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation, their interrelationships, and their variation constitutive of the structure of modernity may be necessary in order to conceptualize both the dynamic and structural changes occurring in cities. The differences in how various cities respond to transformations in service industries, information infrastructures, locational policies, flows architectures, and finance (Amin and Graham 1997: 416; Storper 1995: 28) may constitute patterns of urban change that an analytical movement between analytical ideal-types and historical ideal-types of accumulation processes might clarify. The methodological tendencies to overgeneralize from case studies and to overemphasize the relevance of ethnographic conclusions (Thrift 2000b) have to be controlled by a theoretical framework connecting the "particular spaces, senses of time and partial representations" (Amin and Graham 1997: 416) into variable urban structures. The reasons for the prominence of cities vis-à-vis global flows may only find their formulation with the help of theoretical reconstruction of the structure of global and local

relations. Cities are integrated into the structures of these relations (Münch 1982; 1984; 1986b-c). The urban environments of cities may have to be approached as paradigmatic examples of their diversely particular interrelationships (Münch 1991b). These interrelationships would allow for only an analytical rather than an historical reconstruction (Amin and Graham 1997: 416). Therefore, the specificity of post-modern urban change (Soja 1989), global networks (Knox and Taylor 1995), national economic motors (Storper 1995), and creative cities (Griffiths 1995) may have to be approached from analytical rather than historical perspectives.

Different cities can occupy dissimilar positions in the structures of inter-urban relations. Consequently, changes to urban assets, appropriate policy recommendations, and leading economic sectors (Amin and Graham 1997: 417) have to be identified in accordance with the analysis of inter-urban dynamics that the urban change indicates. However, cities cannot be reconstructed in either descriptive or comparative terms as long as they are approached as agglomerations of spaces, temporalities, and representations lacking in an overarching structure, stable interrelationships, or systemic impact on action (Dematteis 1988; Healey 1995b). The frame of reference of sociological research on cities may have to change from sampling of single paradigmatic sites to a multi-sited construction of historically grounded analytical ideal types of local processes of accumulation. Such an ideal-typical analysis of accumulation processes may possibly combine the methodological framework of multi-sited anthropology (Marcus 1995) with the theoretical specification of modernity, accumulation, and action (Münch 1982; 1986b-c). Consequently, an application of the methodology of multi-sited anthropology (Marcus 1995) to urban studies may facilitate the historical concretization of the structure of modernity, as an analytical system of ideal-typical relations. For instance, a possible direction of such application is the research process of analytically connecting global financial centers, technological and organizational innovation, and social and cultural institutions into a trans-local structure of urban relations (Amin and Graham 1997: 417).

From the theoretical perspective of Münch's ideal-typical analysis of the structure of modernity it becomes possible not only to derive national variations (Münch 1984) of the structure of modernity (Münch 1986b-c). One may also derive the urban structures (Münch 1991b: 232-44) of the relations, processes, and institutions that form the

spatially, historically, and relationally specific structures of modernity. As an ideal-typical description of action, Münch's theorization of the structure of modernity offers an analytical framework that can be applied on scales ranging from macro to micro. Corresponding to the micro level of analysis, cities serve as sites of strategic centrality, interrelated diversity, and mobile interconnection (Amin and Graham 1997: 417; Shields 1996). Similar to how the aesthetic critique of capitalism reinforces economic deregulation, the post-structural critique of cities (Shields 1996: 245) may add to the "dominance of partial interpretations" (Amin and Graham 1997: 417) of the urban multiplicity. This may be the case precisely because the post-structural critique lays stress on its methodological and theoretical instability. The theoretical instability combined with the complexity of globalizing networks (Dematteis 1988) hardly makes reconstruction of the structures of urban relations more accessible methodologically and conceptually. The ideal-typical dimensions of the analytical structure of modernity (Münch 1982; 1986b-c) represent within it a structure of relationships involving latent structures, adaptive closure of its strategies, and oriented selection of goals. An historical concretization of the structure of modernity as an analytical ideal-typical structure of systemic relations may bring an explanatory perspective to the urban multiplicity of individual and collective actions. The dynamic and contradictory structure of modernity arises from the processes of economic (Engels [1845] 1996), cultural (Amin and Graham 1997: 418), social (LeGates and Stout 1996), and political (Mumford [1937] 1996) accumulation (Münch 1982: 94).

The irreconcilable contradictions of modernity (Münch 1991b) find their parallels in urban life (Amin and Graham 1997: 418; Davis 1990; Sennett 1970; Wilson 1991). The modern individualism implies both the freedom of anonymity and subjection to anomie (Münch 1991b: 31-32). Modern universalism results in both unhindered transparency and diminished involvement (Münch 1991b: 32-34). Modern rationalism produces both spectacular wealth and abject poverty (Münch 1991b: 29-30). Modern instrumental activism leads both to declining compassion and to expanding solidarity (Münch 1991b: 34-37). Correspondingly, the concretization of the structure of modernity on the urban level (Amin and Graham 1997: 418) may be taking place as a transition from analytical systems of ideal-typical relations towards a particular structure of the

interrelationships of historic processes of economic, cultural, solidarity, and political accumulation. Via their respective investment of money, expertise, reputation, and power, these processes of accumulation give rise to the structure of dynamic, interwoven, and contingent relations (Münch 1991b: 371). However, the lengthening of interdependence chains among the individual and collective agents cannot explain the systemic differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of accumulation processes taking place via the participation of these agents (Münch 1982: 473). By the same token, the statement that the spatial properties of cities are the wellspring of their special place in the structure of social, economic, cultural, and political relations (Adams 1995: 279; Amin and Graham 1997: 418; Boden and Molotch 1994: 259; Thrift 1996) may have to be analytically qualified. Alone the spatial structures of cities may not necessarily be able to explain the historical, technological, social, legal, or economic dynamics of modernity on either an urban or global scale (Münch 1982).

The embedding of the city-based structure of relations into the global structure of modernity has assumed a growing importance in urban theorization and policy making (Amin and Graham 1997: 418). The circuits of financial, cultural, and economic exchange have developed from systemic differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration between the local and the global scale towards an interdependent structure of disembedded communication networks, trans-local social relations, global business cycles, technically mediated cultures, and communicationally displaced cities (Adams 1995; Giddens 1990). The processes of systemic differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration have been largely neglected in the discourse on the growing participation of cities in the global, regional, and national economies. For that reason, the reorganization of individual and collective action on the existing and evolving spatial scales is yet to receive its due theoretical attention. The theorization of the global reorganization of action (Amin and Graham 1997: 418-19) is yet to conceptualize urban creativity, innovation, and economy in terms of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of systems of accumulation. With the international differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of economies, cultures, and societies on the rise, cities provide increasingly more adequate analytical entry-points into the dynamics of the interrelationships among urban clusters of

innovation, specialization, and creativity. These clusters raise the importance of place-embedded factors emphasizing personal experience, reciprocity, and trust (Amin and Graham 1997: 419).

Likewise, the relations among dense urban nodes fall into a pattern of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration with regard to each other within the same city and trans-locally. That is the case since the enclaves of creativity, innovation, and learning connect across disembedded areas to “inner-city industrial districts, cultural complexes or central business districts” (Amin and Graham 1997: 419). The pattern of interrelationships among these urban nodes resembles a network connecting the multiplicity of differentiated units (Wilson 1995). These structurally and functionally differentiated units amplify the urban dynamics of global adaptability precisely via the crosscurrents of influences tying the vast variety of needs, functions, and compatibilities together. The relations of differentiation, interpenetration and institutionalization among the social systems become increasingly more important for understanding urban dynamics than any single social domain in isolation. Therefore, the heterogeneity of rationalities, spatialities, identities, and temporalities becomes the critically important catalyst of economic vitality, cultural novelty, urban governance, and institutional innovation (Amin and Graham 1997: 419). The systemic differentiation, interpenetration and institutionalization as processes unfolding in space and time receive independent theoretical support from the analyses of heterogeneous urban integration of multiple processes undergoing real-time differentiation (Harvey 1996: 259-64). Within the dynamic relational structures (Amin and Graham 1997: 419), these processes of urban integration, differentiation and institutionalization generate interdependent geographies of time and space (Carlstein, Parkes, and Thrift 1978; Thrift 2000b: 234).

Actor-network theories (Callon 1986b; 1991; Latour 1993) may extend the micro perspective on individual and collective action (Colomy and Rhoades 1994) to embedding of the configurations of technical artifacts (Bingham 1996; Hinchliffe 1996) into the structures of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation. Rather than stressing the expanded possibilities of new technological environments (Negroponte 1995), these structures of action draw attention to the relational, contingent, performative, and structural effects of the agents’ participation in differentiation, institutionalization

and interpenetration of systems of accumulation. This is a process of social ordering (Amin and Graham 1997: 420; Bingham 1996: 647; Thrift 2000b). Social ordering takes place in the context of struggles, environments, and opportunities where diverse individual and collective concerns are at stake (Thrift 1996). The differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of systems of accumulation create urban environments for the entrepreneurial strategies of “heterogeneous social groups, filières of firms, governance agencies” (Amin and Graham 1997: 420). The ideal-typical structure arising out of these systemic processes demands analyzing cities as sites where complex connections put into relational perspective the processes, networks, actors, things, and spaces entering into the configurations of simultaneous integration, institutionalization and differentiation (Thrift 1996: 1485).

Within the urban structure of ideal-typical relations between systems of accumulation, individual and collective action assumes forms that reflect the processes constitutive of social groups, actor-networks, and time-spaces. These groups, networks and spaces are the entities reflexively participating in the reproduction of social structures on global, regional, urban, and individual scales (Amin and Graham 1997: 420; Dear 1995; Graham and Marvin 1996). These agents, networks, and spaces produce both the highly concentrated environments of the electronic securities traders (Thrift 2000a) and the disconnected areas outside of the communications networks (Graham and Aurigi 1997). Under the influence of the momentum of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration among processes of accumulation (Judge, Stoker, and Wolman 1995), the institutional structures of cities change from hierarchical architectures to interrelated networks (Stoker 1995). These networks contribute to institutional differentiation, creating specifically urban forms of interpenetration of public, private, non-governmental, and hybrid forms of governance (Amin and Graham 1997: 420). These network-based forms of governance exhibit a greater degree of adaptability, complexity, and connectivity than do corresponding hierarchical architectures (Amin and Hausner 1997; Healey 1995a; Mayer 1995). The research on interrelationships among the systems of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation (Münch 1991b: 371) goes beyond partial perspectives and generalizations from case studies. The perspective based on theorization of ideal-types of these accumulation processes may strive to reconstruct

urban complexity analytically via the systemic exploration of its diversity, contingency, interdependence, and structure. These dimensions inform analysis of urban dynamics, urban policy and planning, urban competitiveness, cultural institutions, and collective projects (Amin and Graham 1997: 420-21).

Urban Structure of Modernity, Accumulation and Action

Across systems of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation, the contingency and complexity of action stems from hierarchies and conflicts created by the particular structure of ideal typical relations among these processes of accumulation (Münch 1991b: 370). The contingency and complexity of action is reduced by the channeling impact of interpenetration, institutionalization and differentiation that respectively provide foundations for the social integration, collective identity, and shared belonging (Amin and Graham 1997: 421). From the perspective of interpenetration, institutionalization and differentiation of systems of accumulation (Münch 1991b: 371), global capitalism focuses urban policy on the stimulation of consumption (Ritzer 2005; Zukin 1995) via the promotion of spectacular architecture, cultural events, and commercial theme-parks (Gottdiener 1997). Such policy-making does not necessarily contribute to the reproduction of modern social order that if its ideal typical relations of differentiation, interpenetration and institutionalization are neglected may consequently lead to processes of social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation growing institutionally apart, becoming unilaterally dominated, or unleashing inflationary cycles. The accumulation of solidarity is accomplished by means of the mobilization of cultural values and ideas, of economic legitimacy, and of political cooperation. The mobilization of solidarity cannot be based on spatial exclusion (Amin and Graham 1997: 421), social ghettoization (Wilson 1995: 158), and narrow coalitions (Judge, Stoker, and Wolman 1995). Urban space has historically been integrated into practices of “socio-spatial segregation, social control and surveillance” (Amin and Graham 1997: 421). However, in the ideal-typical structure of modernity, the rational discourse on the universality of the human and citizen rights affects the normative regulation of economic exchange and the legal regulation of social relations (Münch 1991b: 367). Consequently, the differentiation of urban space

into areas serving as vehicles for social, racial, or gender discrimination (Boyer 1995: 82, 105; 1996; Gottdiener 1997: 134) may have to be countered with further differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of economic, cultural, social, and political relations in order to redress the corresponding deficiencies of citizenship institutions.

Critique of rational discourse (Beauregard 1996) alone cannot account for the processes of differentiation, rationalization, and interpenetration (Münch 1991b: 367). These processes tie economic, cultural, social, and political rights into the structure of their institutionalization (Lovering 1995: 119). Dependent on its historical, contextual, and spatial configuration, the institutionalization of these rights can either succeed or fail to lead to urban renewal and creativity. The utilitarian interpretation of the interpenetration of systems of accumulation conceptually privileges marketplaces of connectivity, power, money, and culture accumulation. As the respective wellsprings of solidarity, polity, economy and creativity (Amin and Graham 1997: 422; Zukin 1995: 42), these processes of social, political, economic and cultural accumulation are supposed to evolve not within the ideal-typical structure of interrelationships among the respective systems of accumulation (Münch 1991b: 370), but as a spontaneous result of the free exchange across public spaces (Zukin 1995: 260). The ideal-typical structure of action envelops social institutions while not being restricted to them (Amin and Graham 1997: 422; Münch 1991b: 369). Consequently, the interaction between individuals and systems of accumulation cannot guide urban analysis, policy, and planning in isolation from the dynamics between processes of accumulation and their ideal-typical conditions. This dynamic independently occurs between cultural institutions and the social structure, on the one hand, and between the individual and collective action and the city as an agglomeration of the institutional environments for action, on the other hand.

From a more applied perspective on the theory of action (Colomy and Rhoades 1994), urban innovation and creativity may have to be conceptualized as institutional entrepreneurial projects that go beyond evolutionary, economic, or organizational innovation. The institutional innovation of global capitalism is shaped within networks based on reflexive rule-making, milieux of trust and reciprocity, and epistemic community-building (Amin and Graham 1997: 422). In contrast, urban innovation and creativity should further the differentiation, institutionalization, and interpenetration of

the systems of accumulation of cities. Rather than social homogeneity, cultural intermingling, and pleasurable consumption (Amin and Graham 1997: 422). However, the contradictions of modernity bring the pluralization of association, the universalization of moral norms, and the rule of law (Münch 1991b: 367) to bear upon the rights, cities, and economy. The reciprocal effect of the contradictions and dynamics of modernity on its structure is the rising “tolerance for difference, diffuse citizenship and hybrid shared spaces” (Amin and Graham 1997: 422). The interplay between the structure of modernity and its contradictions and its dynamics binds capitalism, discourse, citizenry, and authority into the dynamics of the differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of capital mobility, discursive inflation, disciplinary state, and governance crises. Consequently, cities as environments for action do not have to lay an exclusive stress on any of the processes of economic, cultural, social or political accumulation. Via temporary and flexible employment, family and community networks, informal and industrial services, third-sector employment, environmental recuperation projects, community and social assistance services, and community banks, the economic and solidarity accumulation are turning urban centers into hubs of productivity growth, nonmonetary exchange, skills development, and organizational innovation (Amin and Graham 1997: 423; Thrift 2000b). Cities should, therefore, also be addressed by interrelated social, governmental, economic, technological, and cultural policy-making (Münch 1991b: 370).

Within the structure of modernity, cultural accumulation, as an analytical ideal type, relates to other processes of accumulation through the investment of expertise into cultural goods and services, mobilization of power, and reputation building (Münch 1991b: 371). In an attempt at a tentative concretization of Münch’s theorization of the ideal-typical structure of modernity on the scale of cities, I surmise that these diverse media of cultural accumulation contribute to the renewal, integration, and evolution of cities in the possible direction of inclusive, hybrid, and *créole* (Hall 1995) development of society, economy, politics, and culture. However, among its factors the structure of interrelations between the processes of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation includes legitimization of economic activity, collective action, and political agency (Münch 1991b: 371). These ideal-typical forms of action constrain the potential

for differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration that urban, national, and regional systems of accumulation can have (Amin and Graham 1997: 423). This is the case because the multiple countervailing influences of these systems of accumulation mutually bind the ideal typical structure of modernity into particular historical configurations that exhibit varying degrees of propensity for tolerance, innovation, and growth. Consequently, the modern citizenry has its liberal, cultural, social, and political rights institutionalized (Wilson 1991) under the universalizing impact of the rational discourse, under the legalizing effect on urban communities of the rational exercise of power, and under the pluralizing influence on social association of modern capitalism (Münch 1991b: 367). Moreover, as both the cause and effect of the growing differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of accumulation processes, the process of modernization brings modern capitalism to bear, in an interrelated fashion, both on discourse via the situative adaptation of cultural ideas and rational calculation and on legal authority via the accountability of action and profit taxation (Münch 1991b: 368). However, the relations among these ideal-typical processes of rationalization, differentiation, institutionalization, and interpenetration within the structure of modernity find their particular realization in each city, nation, and region. Therefore, these structures of interrelations among the accumulation processes, analytically definitive of the respective systems of accumulation, do not necessarily prevent the extremes of utilitarian exploitation; income inequality; racial, ethnic, or gender discrimination; and life-chances differences from being encountered (Amin and Graham 1997: 423).

Rather than relating to a site of celebration of unmanaged diversity (Robins, Carter, Donald, and Squires 1993), a particular structure of modern social order characteristic of a city may have to be embedded into policies promoting social justice, community empowerment, and non-hierarchical urban planning. For their formulation, implementation, and effectiveness, these policies have to rely on the historical structures of ideal-typical systems of accumulation as they seek to mediate between legally regulated authority of the state and rational discourse of civic democracy (Münch 1991b: 368). Via the formalized channels of communication on civic governance (Amin and Graham 1997: 423-24), state regulation and democratic discourse jointly participate in the self-determination and vocal representation of communities. The state concentrates

power by making economic, policy, social, and political decisions. Consequently, within the ideal-typical structure of analytical relations of interchange, the system of political accumulation exchanges political goods, services, and returns with the system of economic accumulation. Likewise, the system of political accumulation obtains cooperation and reputation building from the system of the social accumulation of solidarity. In return for welfare payments and community goods and services, the system of social accumulation engages in economic cooperation and mobilization (Münch 1991b: 371). In this manner, the interrelationships among these systems of accumulation dynamically create system-mediated links among social justice, community-building, and empowerment (Amin and Graham 1997: 424). While increasingly involving non-governmental organizations, the interdependence of systems of political, economic, and association accumulation puts political limits on the policy effects that the fiscal crises or the neo-liberal state may have (Mingione 1996).

In city, as a site of the institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration of systems of accumulation, the dynamics of the differentiation of social policy, formal associations, public discourse, and social coalition building (Münch 1991b: 370) alters the social structure. Consequently, the structure of modern social order at the urban level arises out of the spatial and temporal distribution of labor, the geography of economic exchange, and the social boundaries of market involvement. The institutional mobilization binding the systems of accumulation into their particular structure of interpenetration, differentiation and institutionalization at the urban level encompasses the relationships among public, private, and voluntary organizations and the respective regulatory frameworks (Amin 1996; Amin and Graham 1997: 424; European Commission 1995). The interpenetration, differentiation and institutionalization characteristic of the ideal-typical structure of modernity builds upon the agreements, conflicts and interrelations among the actors collectively and individually participating in the systems of accumulation. Interpenetration may involve a change in the structure of the relations among the systems of social, political, and economic accumulation (Münch 1991b: 370). Consequently, under certain ideal-typical conditions, the economic goals become interdependent with social justice. Urban associations may interpenetrate with, differentiate from, and institutionalize market economy and welfare state. Decision-

making and authority legitimization may equally engage political, economic, and social actors. Urban governance may embed state and economic institutions into public discourse, and the discursively negotiated authority may replace the politics of institutional hierarchy (Amin and Graham 1997: 424; Judge, Stoker, and Wolman 1995; Lauria 1997).

The historical development of the analytical ideal-typical structure of modern social order is reflected in interactive governance (Amin and Graham 1997: 424), dialogic democracy (Beck 1997a; 1997b; Giddens 1994), communicative action (Arendt 1958a; 1958b; 1972; Habermas 1978b; 1981), and interactive reasoning (Healey 1997; Lake 1994; Patomaki 2000). These processes connect the systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation into the relational structure of individual and collective action. This relational structure brings businesses, organizations, government agencies, and individuals into the decentered network where multiple rationalities, institutions, and actors mesh (Amin and Hausner 1997). The effect on urban policy-making of the institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration consists in the growing discursive complexity of the relations between political institutions and interest groups (Münch 1991b: 370). Via networking, partnerships, and negotiations, these institutions and groups contribute to consensus building, conflict resolution, and innovative solutions on the urban level (Amin and Graham 1997: 425). While preserving the latent structures of transparency, empowerment, deliberation, and communication (Leadbeater and Mulgan 1994), these institutional and collective actors contribute to the civic participation in the urban governance by steering the urban, social, public, arbitrage, and media policy (Graham and Marvin 1996; Hill 1994).

The processes of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration taking place between the systems of political, economic, cultural, and social accumulation fosters the distribution of authority and reflexivity across governmental, business, and civic organizations. Consequently, these organizations develop the network-based relations of equal representation, limited power, and diffuse authority. The network-based relations facilitate inclusive public discourse, decision-making, associational networks, and empowerment practices (Amin and Graham 1997: 425; Cohen and Rogers 1992; Hirst 1994). The ideal-typical dynamics of the relations among the systems of economic,

social, and political accumulation produces the self-reinforcing causal links among economic reputation building, political benefits, and social mobilization (Münch 1991b: 371). These self-reinforcing relations produce polarizing effects on the processes of accumulation of money, reputation, and power. At the same time, the latter processes of accumulation may exert reinforcing influence on the structure of urban relations among local interests, associative networks, and urban politics (Amin and Graham 1997: 425). The position of the system of cultural accumulation in the ideal-typical structure of urban social order responds to the dynamic and contradictory imperatives of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration (Münch 1991b: 371). Ideal-typically, cultural accumulation takes places via expanding investment with expertise of civic autonomy, contestatory politics, urban authority and civic consensus (Healey and Vigar 1996). The analytical ideal-type of cultural accumulation has links of interchange to the systems of social, political and economic accumulation of respective forms of capital. Thus, as an attempt at historical concretization of the analytical ideal type of the structure of modernity, I tentatively assume that the social and economic forms of capital (Putnam, Leonardi, and Nanetti 1993) enter into relations of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration. Under the influence of cultural, social, political, and economic mobilization of communication, these forms of capital ideal-typically form the structure of modernity in response to the claims to urban solidarity (Mann 1986) and the pursuits of universal justice (Amin and Graham 1997: 426).

In the process of institutionalization, interpenetration and differentiation, modernization countervails contradictorily and dynamically the tendency to maintain the differentiation between rational authority, modern capitalism, and expert discourse. The process of modernization enhances the relations of mutual interdependence between the goal-oriented ethical choices and the rational appropriation of nature, society, and culture (Münch 1991b: 367-68). The institutionalization of the systemic interdependence occurs concomitantly to the social, economic, political, and cultural struggles for and against the collective projects of equality, welfare, inclusion, sustainability, and urbanity (Amin and Graham 1997: 426; Escobar 1992: 426-27; Walker 1994). The global generalization of the structure of modernity has raised the level of complexity that the institutional relations between systems of accumulation have around the world on the urban level. The

complexity of the urban systems of accumulation, in themselves and in the structure of their interrelations, is beyond the grasp of the prevalent models of urban decentralization, pluralism, and governance (Amin and Graham 1997: 426). The urban development towards the condition of differentiation, rationalization, institutionalization and interpenetration demands detailed mapping of the dynamics of mobilization, relations, and action among diverse institutions, plural movements, representative groups, and formal organizations. Since the ideal-typical structure of modernity is embedded into the structure of individual and collective action (Münch 1991b: 369), its contextualization in particular cities may have to employ a detailed analysis of the ideal typical relations that constitute systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation, as has been proposed by Münch, for example. Münch's theorization of modernity, systems and action may make it possible to account for how struggles among competing interest groups shape the systems of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation on the urban scale. The urban concretization of these systems is the process whereby the claims for social justice, empowerment, and solidarity are made (Amin and Graham 1997: 426).

Individual and collective action undertaken for the sake of solidarity, social justice, and social needs cannot abstain from the dynamics and contradictions of rationalization, differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration. This is the case for the reasons that, in the process of action, individuals and groups enter into binding interrelationships with governmental institutions, intermediate organizations, and public discourses (Amin and Graham 1997: 426). The conflicts occurring in the simultaneous and interdependent processes of political, economic, cultural, and social accumulation (Münch 1991b: 371) can hardly be adequately addressed by theoretically, methodologically, and spatially isolated approaches. The political challenges of urban growth, the economic loss of city assets, the urban breakdown of civic culture, and the communal powerlessness before social deregulation (Amin and Graham 1997: 427) cross the boundaries between systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation. Therefore, the differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of the structures of investment of capital, expertise, reputation, and power ties the social, fiscal, economic, technological, and cultural policy-making into the waxing or waning fortunes of cities. In the interconnected networks of modern cities, economic, social, political and cultural

goods and services flow across structures of accumulation. In urban space, the mobilization, interchange, and legitimization of these media of accumulation are just consequences of individual and collective actions (Münch 1991b: 370-71).

Chapter Nine: Strategies of Cultural Accumulation in Cities

This chapter shows how, in their reaction to global capitalism, urban strategies aiming to harness cultural clusters for urban revitalization have to take transformations in environments, institutions, and relations between economy and culture into account:

- Cultural accumulation via cultural clustering departs from a hierarchical arts organization towards horizontal networks of actors engaging in economic, social, cultural, and political interchange.
- Cultural clustering strategies justify, legitimize, and position urban development projects vis-à-vis diverse groups and individuals operating to reformulate the relations between culture and cities.
- Arising from the strategies of urban development, cultural clusters are variously shaped by the dynamics and contradictions of the interrelations among individual organizations, available strategies, and cultural objectives.
- Strategies of urban development require both analytical ideal types and their historical concretization.

Urban Strategies of Cultural Clustering

Not unrelated to global capitalism, the strategies of cultural clustering are employed for the sake of urban branding, positioning, and revitalization (Mommaas 2004: 507). These cultural clustering strategies stand at the intersection of the processes of cultural, economic, social, and political accumulation. Within the ideal-typical structure of modernity (Münch 1991b: 371) these accumulation processes demand detailed delineation should the goal of urban development be achieved. This is the case especially given the historical variation of cultural clusters bespeaking the urban differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of economy and culture. Cultural clusters may

necessitate an ideal-typical analysis of the cultural, economic, social, and political dynamics and contradictions of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration in cultural policy projects. Since the last decade of the twentieth century, cultural clusters have increasingly become integrated into the policy-making strategies of urban development (Mommaas 2004: 507-08). These urban development strategies have put cultural production, presentation, and consumption into their particular spatial contexts. These spatial contexts range from separate buildings to architectural complexes networked across the urban space or concentrated into quarters taking over from or replacing industrial areas appropriated for cultural, recreational, and commercial uses. Subsequently geared to urban revitalization, creative economy, and cultural planning, these concentrated or dispersed cultural complexes can arise from planning beforehand, informally redefining or leaving vacant the future cultural cluster areas.

Within urban policy-making, the cultural clustering strategies represent a departure from hierarchical arts organization. The hierarchical arts organization performs redistributive functions vis-à-vis the socially structured constituencies of cultural policy-making. By contrast, cultural clustering strategies support arts organizations based on the horizontal networks of actors engaging in interchange. These horizontal networks are inclusively related to their economic, social, and political environments that take increasing part in the artistic field via investors, planners, and developers (Mommaas 2004: 508). Thus, the interaction of these actors and environments is leading to the institutional differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of the processes of accumulation of money, discourse, reputation, and power (Münch 1991b: 371). Moreover, in urban regeneration strategies, cultural clusters characterize the saturation stage of urban development. The cultural saturation of urban development comes in the wake of flagship projects pressed into competition with other major cities already having dense festival programming, museum complexes, and theatre compounds (Mommaas 2004: 508). The saturated environment of urban competition drives the intensification process of cultural consumption, production, and circulation. In response to these urban changes, urban policy-making has to broaden its theoretical scope (Mommaas 2004: 508-09). One of the ways to do this is to bring the theorization of the differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration processes among systems of economic, cultural,

social and political accumulation to bear on urban policy-making. The broadening of urban policy-making addresses the need for precise accounting for the developments, conflicts, and interests involved in cultural projects strategies. Cultural development projects participate in the relations of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration leading to neither one-sided loss by the system of cultural accumulation of its autonomy (Zukin 1989; 1991) nor to unchecked appropriation by the systems of economic, political or social accumulation of the urban space (Loosely 1999).

The differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration between the processes of accumulation of political power and cultural expertise is especially salient in the European Union (Mommaas 2004: 509). Cultural entrepreneurship is ideal-typically embedded into the interchange between cultural policy decisions and the mobilization of power, on the one hand, and the legitimization of political agency and the political mobilization of culture, on the other hand (Münch 1991b: 371). Influenced by the global integration of political and cultural structures, the interchange between cultural policy-making and the mobilization of power simultaneously shifts the decision-making capabilities both from local to global structures of accumulation (Loosely 1999) and from any single system of accumulation to the relations of their institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration. The change in the relations among the systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation stemming from the growing differentiation, rationalization, institutionalization and interpenetration of the structure of modern social order (Münch 1984: 35, 63) has triggered a corresponding alteration in cultural policies. These cultural policies feature cultural clusters as foci of the negotiation of institutional autonomy, innovation, and accumulation (Mommaas 2004: 509). These institutional processes receive their specific expression in the action strategies, causal structures, and institutional environments of the variant ideal-typical structures of modernity.

The idea-typical analysis of the cultural clustering strategies may contribute to the conceptual construction of the comparative urban varieties of the structure of modern social order. Resulting from different urban development strategies, the urban varieties of the structure of modernity structurally follow from the particular configurations of relations among systems of social, political, economic and cultural accumulation. These

accumulation processes dynamically and contradictorily affect the policy-making, social transformations, urban hierarchies, and collective action in the fields of arts and culture, urban governance, and economic policies (Mommaas 2004: 509-10). The cultural clustering policies allow classification into the following clustering strategies. They are museum quarter, post-industrial complex, urban regeneration, old city, and theatre quarter clustering strategies. The differentiation, rationalization, institutionalization and interpenetration among the urban varieties of the structure of modernity orient these strategies as the ideal-typical formulations of cultural clustering policies. The strategies of cultural accumulation promoting the cultural clustering of the museum quarter type draw on urban development policies seeking to offset rising unemployment, declining tax base, and capital flight. The promotion of museum quarters seeks to achieve these economic objectives by the corresponding collective action oriented at inner-city renewal, image overhaul, and consumer services (Hajer 1993; Mommaas 2004: 510; Mommaas and Van Der Poel 1989; van Aalst and Boogaarts 2002). Rotterdam and Baltimore are typical examples of the application of the strategies of cultural accumulation of the museum quarter type.

Designed by leading architects, the museum quarters usually contain classical and modern art museums, arts institutes, multi-purpose exhibition halls, nature museums, and open-air spaces for theatre and event programming. These urban spaces serve to position the city as a culturally pioneering location (Mommaas 2004: 510). Planning of museum quarters extends to the surrounding urban areas. With cultural consumption in mind, these areas are transformed into boulevards filled with art galleries and cafes, historical atmosphere, informal networks, bars and restaurants, and education centers (Mommaas 2004: 510-11). These surrounding urban areas, networks, and institutions contribute to the success of the cultural cluster to the extent that gallery density, municipal support, and community participation increase (van Aalst and Boogaarts 2002). In contrast, the cultural clusters using post-industrial complexes for urban development appropriate sites of heavy industry, energy generation, and transportation infrastructure made obsolete by changes in the structure of economic accumulation and transferred into city ownership. Due to the lack of redevelopment resources, lingering environmental pollution, and unsuitability for residential and commercial purposes, these formerly industrial

complexes are easily adaptable for diverse short-term projects (Mommaas 2004: 511). Amsterdam and London provide examples for the strategies of cultural accumulation of a post-industrial complex type.

In post-industrial cultural complexes, the combination of fashionable dining and drinking establishments, art-house film theatres, performing arts spaces, art and design companies, dance and festival environments, and official and media events halls creates a dynamic mixture of cultural activities. Moreover, the urban concentration of cultural activities also attracts tourists, residents, and investors. These agents encounter in the reflexively managed historical authenticity, open variety, and bohemian atmosphere the type of cultural cluster that serves as a perfect backdrop for highly profitable dance parties, corporate meetings, and catwalk and filming events (Mommaas 2004: 511). Consequently, the necessity of investment into infrastructure, landscape, and architectural development of a post-industrial cultural cluster creates conditions for public-private partnerships (Mommaas 2004: 511). In the process of their implementation, as strategies of cultural accumulation, these public-private partnerships set art and cultural organizations, policy-making agendas, and economic development on the course of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration. Prevalent in towns formerly spawned by the industrial revolution, the cultural clustering strategy of urban regeneration draws on deliberate cultural planning near already popular bar and restaurant areas. Adjacent to the former factory quarters of industrial capitalism erased by post-industrial urban development, the architectural remnants of modernization process that urban regeneration strategies seek to reintegrate into downtown regeneration projects cater to service, residential, and office needs (Mommaas 2004: 512).

With the help of local cultural managers, arts foundations, purpose-built venues, and cultural organizations, urban regeneration centering on cultural accumulation incorporates cultural clusters into its strategies. Via multi-lateral negotiations, these individual and collective agents of cultural accumulation arrive at an agreement to focus cultural policy-making, economic development, and social policy on cultural quarters. On this basis, the regenerated urban areas allow for on-going cultural development. Such on-going cultural accumulation aims at anchoring performing arts, cultural enterprises, specialized libraries, socially entrepreneurial projects, educational institutions, and arts

and media productions in a cluster of newly designed, post-industrial, and legacy public buildings (Mommaas 2004: 512). The arts and culture can play a fuller role in urban regeneration (Mommaas 2004: 512) the more the processes of social, political, economic and cultural accumulation are interrelated with the policy-making and urban networks via the local structure of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration connecting individual and collective actors. In cities performing the administrative and service functions, the increasing popularity of cultural clustering as a strategy of urban development has led to the museum quarters creation of the old city type. These museum quarters take advantage of old city centers featuring religious structures, historical facades, and transportation hubs. The governmental funds frequently target old city centers for concentrated cultural development. By contrast, the cultural clusters growing around theatre quarters are likely to be situated in the vicinity of existing cultural facilities across the city space (Mommaas 2004: 513).

The old city as the core of cultural clustering focuses the spatial organization of the corresponding urban promotion strategies aimed at raising the quality of the public, residential, recreational, and cultural areas of the city. The extensions and renovations of art, historical, and science museums serve as the means to achievement of these urban promotion goals. Within the old city cluster, these cultural institutions are linked into a network with other museums dedicated to specialist topics, with wider environmental restoration initiatives, with visual and performing arts revitalization, and with architectural development of studio, tourist, and professional spaces (Mommaas 2004: 513). The cultural clusters converging on theatre quarters are not a usual part of the urban development projects oriented towards tourism, investment, and services. Consequently, the theatre quarters have to compete for affordable premises with residential, commercial, and public interest groups in order to establish their urban presence. Therefore, the cultural clustering taking place in multi-purpose complexes makes up part of the mixed-use city neighbourhoods where theatre quarters are situated. In these quarters, the theatre companies highlight the historical, architectural and cultural references of the cluster to reinforce their representation, funding, and publicity strategies (Mommaas 2004: 513). When the strategies of cultural clustering of the theatre quarter type succeed, more theatre companies are attracted into the area. In the theatre quarter, theatre companies serve

different stages of the theatre production, training, and promotion cycle while establishing collaborative relations among theatre companies, arts academies and centers, cultural organizations, and governmental institutions. Falling into the structure of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration, these companies, centers and organizations enable the emergence of complementarities between the quarter and the economic development reliant on creativity, knowledge, and learning that the cluster attracts (Mommaas 2004: 513).

Urban development policies around the world are rapidly adopting strategies of cultural clustering. Consequently, cultural policy-making converges on the growing emphasis on the place-based differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of processes of cultural, social, political, and economic accumulation. A wide variation of institutional structures complements these accumulation processes. These institutional structures articulate the social relations resulting from the particularities of urban environments for collective and individual action and from the path-dependency of modernization (Mommaas 2004: 513-14). The strategies of cultural accumulation that have recourse to cultural clustering can exhibit an ideal-typical structure of relations featuring differentiation, institutionalization, and interpenetration among cultural policy, market, expertise, and association (Münch 1991b: 370). Composing via institutionalized interchange the system of cultural accumulation, these media of political, economic, cultural, and social accumulation enter into variable relations with the systems of social, political, and economic accumulation. Via the structure of their interrelations, these systems of accumulation produce urban effects on cultural accumulation ranging from cultural monopoly to vibrant cultural multiplicity (Mommaas 2004: 514). Under the conditions of contingency and complexity of action (Münch 1984: 119), cultural clusters undergo the process of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration. Either separately or conjointly, a given cultural cluster may occupy a leading position in its field. In the process of differentiation, leading cultural positions are distributed among the institutional functions of design and planning, production and exchange, presentation and association, and decision making and allocation (Mommaas 2004: 514). Particular realizations of the effects that the ideal-typical structure of urban social order has on cultural accumulation, cultural clusters can exhibit variation in the historical

configuration of interrelationships among the processes of accumulation in which museums, cultural producers, corporate bodies, and governmental agencies participate.

The institutional framework of cultural clusters involves various actors in the discursive management of the relations among social, political, economic, and cultural organizations (Münch 1984: 119). These organizations are differently positioned with respect to their cluster network centrality, frequency of inter-institutional meetings, amount of managerial responsibility, fund-raising, cooperation and investment participation, and the distribution of maintenance and promotion costs (Mommaas 2004: 514-15). Large institutions are less dependent on clustering strategies than small organizations are (van Bon 1999). The degree of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration exhibited by the relationship configurations among the systems of social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation that the clusters belong to can differ. Therefore, contributions to cultural clustering projects from public financial support, private funding and investment, entrance fees and lease contracts, and non-governmental and state endowments depends on the configuration of relations among these systems of accumulation. In each particular situation, the structure of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration may either limit or increase the chances that cultural quarters become self-sustaining via strengthening of cultural actors, institutional integration, and expertise exchange. Out of these processes of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration among the clustered organizations emerges their local structure of inter-institutional relations. Thus, the city can gain in urban identity, recognition, and dynamism (Mommaas 2004: 515) deriving from the its structure of urban social order.

Münch's theorization of modernity, systems and action, approached from the perspective on cultural clustering policies as instances of cultural accumulation, may aid in assessing the success or failure of the strategies for positioning a cultural quarter as a place offering open identity, organizational opportunities, urban relevance, and spatial anchoring (Mommaas 2004: 515). The development of cultural clusters is path-dependent on whether they arise because of centralized planning strategy or have emerged from multiple related projects. The differentiation between the developmental paths of cultural clusters varies from the more governmentally administered consumer-oriented clusters to

the more infrastructure-derived production-oriented clusters (Mommaas 2004: 515-16). Nevertheless, the accessible spaces, cultural atmosphere, and creative community of each cultural cluster tend to be mutually reinforcing rather than planned (Lootsma 2000; Pol, Winden, Woets, and Berg 2005; Scott 1999).

Cultural Accumulation via Cultural Clustering

As the situated sites of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration among the processes of cultural, social, political, and economic accumulation (Münch 1991b: 371), cultural clusters reflect the shifting positioning of cultural institutions in the urban structure of social order. Consequently, more conventional city centers attract the urban development strategies of the museum quarter type, while city margins define theatre quarters as the places where bohemian and avant-garde agents form the clusters of alternative culture (Mommaas 2004: 516). At the same time, responding to global capitalism, cities increasingly break with clear-cut spatial hierarchies in favour of cultural, spatial, and institutional innovation (Holt and Sternthal 1997; O'Connor and Wynne 1996). Cultural development employing place-based strategies of cultural accumulation is affected by the complexity of relations that permit neither its reduction to structuralist and deterministic explanations nor its induction from ethnographic and classificatory descriptions (Münch 1984: 32). The ideal-typical conceptualization of cultural clusters may go beyond the general analytical model of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration of the respective accumulation processes. Within urban environments of dense interaction, the conceptualization of cultural clusters demands an ideal-typical analysis of the actual clustering of related activities, structured exchanges, represented identities, and situated functions (Mommaas 2004: 516-17).

A deployment of Münch's theorization of modernity, systems and action to cultural accumulation may make it possible to conceptualize the individual and collective interests behind the strategies of cultural clusters development. These strategies of cultural development unfold according to models of individual and collective action unlike those that govern organizational, structural, and urban dynamics alone (Mommaas 2004: 517). Diverse entrepreneurial groups deploy these cultural clustering strategies as

the discursive frames that justify, legitimize, and position urban development projects in the institutional environments of cultural policy implementation. These entrepreneurial groups operate to reformulate the terms of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration between culture and cities (Mommaas 2004: 517). The discursive frame more commonly used by the entrepreneurial strategies promoting cultural clusters refers to the improved positioning of the city in the structure of economic flows. The development of museum quarters and post-industrial complexes is expected to improve the positioning of these cities, as a consequence of municipal, regional, and national spending (Mommaas 2004: 517). However, spurred by advances in transportation, communication, and cultural infrastructures, consumer, tourist and social mobility is on the increase. Consequently, cities have to compete for a decreasing share of constantly diversifying leisure activities ungoverned by hierarchies of taste, class, and culture (Mommaas 2004: 517-18). These aesthetic, social, and cultural hierarchies no longer have a discernibly structured relation to the shrinking time budgets of city-dwellers (Broek 1996; Broek, Huysmans, and Haan 2005). Individual time budgets are spreading thin across the globalized experience, entertainment, and alternative opportunities. Faced with the availability of these leisure opportunities, the more prosperous societies increasingly prize authenticity, creativity, and individuality over more conventional cultural consumption (Richards 2001).

Likewise, decoupling of economic structures from spatial structures (Knulst 1993) makes cities less dependent on producer services and more on consumer services for their revenue flows (Mommaas 2004: 518). These revenue flows are increasingly attracted by the cultural infrastructures of cities (Featherstone 1991; Martin 1998). Serving the social structure of global capitalism, cultural infrastructures face heterogeneity, instability, and undifferentiated taste patterns (van Eijck and Knulst 2005; Wynne and O'Connor 1998) as their operating environments. As a means to counteract the on-going volatility of the locational geography of industries of global capitalism, cities increasingly adopt the strategies of cultural accumulation for their international, regional and national positioning. Constantly optimizing the production, service, and agglomeration factors of their individual and collective action (Amin and Graham 1997; Castells 1996; Lash and Urry 1994), the industries of global capitalism devalue the existing asset bases of the

material resources, buildings, and infrastructures of cities. At the same time, inter-urban competition for positioning as preferred locations for economic, cultural, social and political accumulation puts pressure on cities to support the immaterial inputs of ambience, quality, and image-value that increase in their importance (Mommaas 2004: 518). In the process of urban development, the circuits of social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation incorporate these immaterial inputs into their relations of interchange. Given the instability of their environments of operation, cultural clustering strategies seek to promote the brand image of their hosting cities as places that residents, visitors, and investors might prefer over the increasing number of others. As marketed destinations (Mommaas 2004: 518) cities leverage their infrastructures of cultural consumption to achieve the cultural saturation of the urban experience. The saturated urban environments offer opportunities for cultural consumption distinguished by the qualities of spectacularity, specialness, and signification. These qualities of the urban experience are closely related to social, political, cultural, and economic accumulation (Hannigan 1998; Lury 2000; Metz, Schrijver, and Snoek 2002) taking place via the image-making (Debord 1994), staging (MacCannell 1999), and aesthetization (Willey 1998) strategies.

The pressures to make the arts and culture more community-oriented, financially independent, and multi-culturally innovative transform cultural policy-making into an action strategy aimed at restoring the relevance of cultural organizations to the experience economy of media, entertainment and tourism (Jong and Schuilenburg 2006; Mommaas 2004: 518-19; Pine and Gilmore 1999). As the classical arts and cultural heritage increasingly lose their social relevance (Eijck and Mommaas 2004; Mommaas 2004: 519; O'Connor and Wynne 1996; Rossel 2005) cultural accumulation becomes decoupled from the social structure. Consequently, not only does the emphasis of global capitalism on post-modernist affinities with popular culture and immediate experience becomes predominant (Rossel 2005; Schulze 1992) but also the modernist and classical culture becomes just another sector on the market of cultural preferences (Münch 1991b: 245-48). Despite arts and cultural education programs oriented at the modernist heritage, the success of new cultural forms, popular music, new media, digital culture, artistic fashion, and architectural design has shifted the balance of public policy. Public policy

increasingly favours an entrepreneurial approach towards cultural production and consumption. This is the case because the criteria for cultural policy-making no longer can be imposed from outside of the cultural market without running the risk of biased evaluation, selection, participation, and circulation decisions (Mommaas 2004: 519).

Cultural policy reoriented to support cultural accumulation stimulates the circulation of exposure, funds, and space among formats, activities and institutions. These spheres, agents, and environments cross generational, cultural, and community boundaries at the expense of making these cultural organizations more dependent on their market performance (Mommaas 2004: 519-20). Another consequence of increased cultural accumulation is the expansion of the range of cultural topics covered by educational curricula. Additionally, the process of cultural accumulation set in train by these changes legitimizes the relations of interchange between culture and economy. A structure of urban relations among the processes of social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation arises from the urban structure of modernity as an historical ideal-type (Münch 1991b: 249-56). The reformulation of cultural policy away from the classical and modern arts and culture towards approaching the cultural market as an environment for cultural accumulation is bound to elicit opposition from the more established arts organizations (Mommaas 2004: 520). Established arts organizations have long enjoyed governmental support of their institutional autonomy. However, the necessity of the system of political accumulation to legitimate its collective decisions by mobilization of cultural discourse and power (Münch 1991b: 371) may make the adjustment of governmental cultural policy to global capitalism in the field of arts and culture into an indispensable measure. The cultural policy called forth by global capitalism needs to strengthen the independent political, economic, cultural, and social agency on the urban scale (Giddens 1991; Rigney and Fokkema 1993) vis-à-vis the corresponding processes of globalization (Loosely 1999).

Cultural policy-making encouraging the proliferation of cultural entrepreneurialism, arts-driven development, and institutional interdependence widens the financial, public, and social sources of cultural accumulation. This support may be focused on cultural clusters that urban revitalization strategies may promote in order to react more effectively to the environment of the “global cultural industries, the

commodification of culture, changing taste paradigms and the rise of new media formats” (Mommaas 2004: 520). Cultural clusters have come to the fore of cultural policy-making due to the strategic role that creative economy is playing in the restructuring of cities affected by global capitalism. Cities whose fortunes decline under global capitalism pursue revitalization via the integration of cultural production and consumption into the global circuits of cultural accumulation (Mommaas 2004: 520-21). In the global circuits of accumulation, the economies of added cultural value, communication and information, and creativity, experience, and concepts (Waters 2001) converge upon the creative city. The creative city is the place that permanently adjusts to multiple dynamic environments characterized by global cycles of innovation, regeneration, and change (Landry 2000; Verwijnen and Lehtovuori 1999). The institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration of social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation brings about the correspondingly growing interrelationship of policy-making with each system of accumulation (O'Connor 1999). Consequently, urban development strategies aimed at bolstering the creative economy, urban renewal, and institutional innovation may have to create, stimulate and nourish cultural clusters. In this respect, cultural clusters become part of the critical infrastructure serving the on-going differentiation, interpenetration, and institutionalization of cultural accumulation. These structural, institutional, and discursive processes take place via the accumulation of creative, infrastructural, and social capital. The complementarities of these accumulation processes are capable of compensating for risk and uncertainty (Banks, Lovatt, O'Connor, and Raffo 2000), creating stable spatial identity (van Bon 1999), and spreading creative innovation benefits (Mommaas 2004: 521).

Economic policy-making participates in differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration by offering place-related advantages to the enterprises (Simmie 2002) that act innovatively vis-à-vis the systems of economic, social, and cultural accumulation. In the environment of volatile, ephemeral and reflexive post-industrial production, the corresponding economic, cultural, social, and political strategies depend on the constant inputs of creative individuals, open networks, and social feedback (Banks, Lovatt, O'Connor, and Raffo 2000; Bilton 1999). In these environments, the independent location, lifestyle, and professional choices of these organizations, agents, and networks

are decisive (Mommaas 2004: 521). Though the emergence of such famous creative districts as Montmartre, Rive Gauche, and SoHo has been spontaneous, the conditions favourable to their development can be preserved from disappearance under the deleterious impact of social, political, and economic effects triggered by creative success (Franck 2001; Zukin 1989). Consequently, these favourable conditions may be preserved or created via steering the process of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration towards reinforcing those paths and models that are oriented at their interrelated development. The paths and models of interrelated development ought to bridge the bohemian marginality and cultural start-ups, plan openness, and decentralization into the urban design, and link institutions of cultural production with richly diversified reception environments (Mommaas 2004: 521-22; Verwijnen and Lehtovuori 1999).

Cultural clustering strategies may mutually reinforce the institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration of social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation processes. These accumulation processes create the environments of risk, openness, and dynamism. These environments are favourable to creative individual and collective action oriented at the symbolic, ephemeral, and service economy (Amin and Graham 1997; Bilton 1999; Mommaas 2004: 522; Münch 1991b; O'Connor 1999; Scott 2000a; van Bon 1999; Verwijnen and Lehtovuori 1999). In some cities, the transformation by global capitalism of the relations among the processes of social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation has made entire economic sectors obsolete. The transition to global capitalism forces cities formerly hosting thriving industrial, shipbuilding, transportation, military, religious, public, and medical infrastructures to embark on the path of post-industrial development. The industrial infrastructures that remain in existence have both thwarted attempts at their modernization and heightened the inter-urban competition in cities where the reorientation towards the post-industrial economy has succeeded. Consequently, the urban legacy of industrial development puts the increasing share of urban heritage in cultural consumption into the center of strategies of cultural accumulation via the celebration of diversity, history and local identity (Mommaas 2004: 522). The emphasis of global capitalism on cultural accumulation has turned post-industrial urban spaces into

environments of coexistence. In post-industrial cities, counter-cultural groups and gentrified development projects, cultural incubators and commodification of space, and spectacular event areas and real estate speculation exist side-by-side (Mommaas 2004: 522).

During transition to global capitalism, cultural accumulation may successfully integrate post-industrial urban infrastructures into cultural cluster areas. Formerly industrial areas are converted into office, residential, and exhibition spaces. Cultural accumulation favours development of projects oriented at the retention of cultural producers in urban clusters. Cultural policy depends for its success on post-industrial production a critical necessity of which as a strategy of cultural accumulation is to maintain the competitive positioning of the city within the open, creative, and mobile networks within which cultural producers move (Mommaas 2004: 522-23). Moreover, the adoption of cultural clustering strategies depends not only on the architectural heritage available for integration into the cultural infrastructure, but also on the emergent development, maintenance, and proliferation of local support networks (Mommaas 2004: 523). These support networks link the post-industrial cities to the circuits of social, political, economic and cultural accumulation. The processes of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration may have their homologous counterparts in the preconditions for the developmental trajectories towards global capitalism. These developmental trajectories are reflected in the cultural policies of cities that have established cultural clusters in a bid to position themselves as centers of innovative cultural production (Mommaas 2004: 523). However, individual and collective strategies of cultural accumulation that lead to decision-making in the post-industrial process of cultural accumulation escape the general descriptions and static explanations of the transition to global capitalism. The research of these accumulation strategies may demand recourse to Münch's theorization of modernity, systems and action for gaining an analytical access to the interplay between individual and collective agents and their historical environments, between dynamics and contradictions of accumulation and their urban institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration, and between global structures of interchange and local accumulation processes.

The crisis in economic accumulation of managerial capitalism gave impetus to novel forms of legitimization of, and power mobilization for, social, political, economic, and cultural decisions (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005a; Münch 1991b: 371). The processes of accumulation of global capitalism have led to renegotiation of the structure of interrelations among institutions, groups, and discourses bearing immediate effects of the reorganization triggered by the transition to global capitalism. Taking place in the arts and culture, collective action, economic exchange, urban space, and governmental policy, the reorganization characteristic of global capitalism promotes liberalized cultural expression, investment, training, marketing, distribution, and relevance on the urban scale (Bianchini 1989: 37-38; Mommaas 2004: 523-24). Consequently, cultural clustering strategies as the urban linchpins of the processes of accumulation that global capitalism enables reproduce the structure of interrelations emerging from deregulated social, political, economic, and cultural markets. These markets are increasingly less dependent on policy-making input for their operation. Via money, expertise, reputation and power as the media of interchange between the systems of accumulation, these social, political, economic and cultural markets are engaged in local network building, inter-institutional cooperation, and contingent and complex integration (Mommaas 2004: 524; Münch 1991b: 371). Nevertheless, contributing to cultural diversity, urban democracy, and alternative platforms (Mommaas 2004: 524), cultural clusters give spatial expression to the processes of social, political, economic and cultural institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration. Within the urban framework of cultural clusters, these processes serve as a means of cultural accumulation.

Cultural Accumulation as Urban Development

Cultural clusters may represent the urban effects of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of the systems of accumulation in the process of their interchange via communication media of power, expertise, reputation and money. Economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation processes undergo their interpenetration, institutionalization and differentiation via their relations of interchange (Münch 1982; 1991b). Consequently, the system of economic accumulation enlists the economic

cooperation from the other systems of accumulation in exchange for social, cultural, and political goods and services. The system of political accumulation enlists the political cooperation and legitimization of political action in exchange for cultural, economic, and social policy-making. The system of cultural accumulation achieves cultural democracy implementation and cultural production and consumption decisions in exchange for legitimization of collective social, economic, and political action. The system of social accumulation benefits from economical, infrastructural, and social policy decisions in exchange for political, cultural, and economic benefits and services (Mommaas 2004: 524-25; Münch 1991b: 371). In each cultural cluster, the interpenetration, institutionalization and differentiation of social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation realizes the particular urban configuration of these processes. The configurations these processes enter into resist generalization beyond the strategies of cultural accumulation of the groups that manage, finance, justify, and embed the creative quarters into the institutional circuits of cities. These accumulation circuits accommodate both the centralized consumption-oriented approach to cultural policy-making and the decentralized emergence of cultural production projects (Mommaas 2004: 525). The urban particularization of the structure of modern social order (Münch 1991b: 368-69) depends on local circumstances. Local circumstances facilitate or hamper different combinations of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration and their developmental trajectories. These processes of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration jointly contribute to the configuration of the cultural clusters. Consequently, the cluster configurations are contingent outcomes of the strategies of cultural accumulation developed by policy-makers. The cluster configurations carry the influences of systems of accumulation reflexively changing in response to the on-going interaction between urban environments and individual and collective actors. Additionally, the cluster configurations serve as environments for institutional self-observation by the organizations involved in urban development of the creative economy, cultural infrastructure, and cultural democracy (Mommaas 2004: 525).

The place that the arts and culture occupy in urban development associated with global capitalism (Zukin 1989; 1991; 1992) draws on the dynamics of the deindustrialization of cities. Under the impact of global capitalism, cities turn their

formerly industrial production districts into quarters of cultural consumption. Post-industrial urban renewal proceeds via the reintegration of socially, politically, economically, and culturally marginal spaces into the urban structure of global modernity (Appadurai 1996). The urban structures of globalized accumulation are where the interaction between the environment of post-industrial economic development and individual and collective actors sets the course of mediation among the multiple processes of urban accumulation (Mommaas 2004: 525-26). Projects promoting culture-driven urban regeneration frequently meet with the criticism of the instrumentalization of culture for economic development purposes (Mommaas 2004: 526). Such aesthetic critique of the capitalist relations between the culture and economy may conflate the dynamics of modernity with an economically reductive interpretation of its contradictions. Moreover, the aesthetic critique also may also reinforce the deregulating effects of the crisis of industrial capitalism. This may be the case because the critique of capitalism insists on the necessity of maintaining the autonomy of cultural institutions. However, the structure of modern social order that emerges out of the increasing interdependence of the social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation on regional, national, and urban scales goes beyond the binary distinctions between, for example, the autonomy and authority, the economy and culture, and the public and private.

The concerns that the cultural clustering strategies of urban development raise are significant. As the urban environments that cultural producers and consumers confront, cultural clusters participate in the contradictions and dynamics of modernity. Rising real estate values hinder cultural development, rising cultural cluster popularity socially homogenizes the surrounding urban areas, and the rising influx of diversity-seeking tourists increases the pressure for cultural conformity of institutional programming (Mommaas 2004: 526). As part of the differentiated, institutionalized and interdependent processes of social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation, the cultural clusters exhibit variation arising from the particular strategies of urban development. These strategies critically depend on the urban environments shaping the dynamics and contradictions of the structure of modernity in its interdependence with the relations among individual organizations, available strategies, and cultural objectives (Münch 1991b: 369). These organizations, strategies, and objectives institutionally mediate

between the culture and economy, places and flows, and agency and structure (Mommaas 2004: 526-27). In each city according to its place in the structure of global modernity, institutional, differential and interdependent mediation develops along non-linear trajectories of capital, expertise, reputation, and power accumulation (Featherstone 2007; O'Connor and Wynne 1996: 75; Schulze 1992).

The transformation of modernity towards greater differentiation, rationalization, institutionalization and interpenetration of its constituent processes of accumulation takes place via the continuous circuits of institutional integration, goal specification, adaptive openness, and structural generalization (Münch 1991b: 368). As the sites of the interrelated accumulation processes of expertise, reputation, power, and money, cultural clusters cannot impose an exclusive logic of operation on the groups and individuals pursuing accumulation strategies of their own without risking to undermine their legitimization, mobilization, and transaction power in the urban structure of global social order (Mommaas 2004: 527-28; Münch 1991b: 371). The variability of the structure of modern social order allows for different models of the relations into which cultural infrastructure, interest groups, and policy-making can be theoretically embedded (Mommaas 2004: 528). As strategies of cultural accumulation, cultural clustering policies can flexibly react to their local conditions, innovatively apply developmental models, and situatively form interest-based inter-organizational alliances (Bilton 1999; Mintzberg and McHugh 1985; Mommaas 2004: 528). Thus, cultural policies affect the configuration of the inter-institutional relations in which they reflexively participate.

A lacking differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of cultural clusters with the urban structure of accumulation may affect negatively the effectiveness of strategies of cultural accumulation vis-à-vis global capitalism. Global cultural accumulation takes place via signing of exclusive contracts with local cultural producers by global creative industry corporations. Global advertisement corporations draw the national cultural infrastructure companies into global cultural accumulation through the relations of ownership. Global cultural accumulation takes root as international financial services companies build their head offices in cultural quarters. Global cultural accumulation readily integrates the inter-institutional cooperation frameworks that fail to achieve formal recognition by the governmental organizations (Bilton 1999; Mommaas

2004: 529). However, without the concerted social, political, economic, and cultural policy-making oriented at creating favourable environment for innovative entrepreneurial projects, the accumulation processes seeking to adapt to global capitalism cannot produce the cultural, reflexive, and strategic conditions necessary for solving its crises on its own (Mommaas 2004: 529). The urban particularization of cultural clustering strategies represents the models of urban development that follow in the wake of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration of global social order. Consequently, global capitalism transforms the hierarchical social structures governing the processes of accumulation into network-based, process-oriented, and post-industrial environments (Mommaas 2004: 529-30). The transformation finds its urban reflection in cultural clusters. Embedded into the urban structures of inter-institutional relations, cultural clustering strategies may need to complement locally reflexive policy-making with interdependent policies of economic, social, political, and cultural accumulation to be effective.

Since the late twentieth century, urban development policies increasingly are implementing cultural clustering strategies. Spatial configurations of cultural institutions fall into the inter-related patterns of differentiation, rationalization, and interpenetration. Cultural policy-making may have to take into account these inter-related patterns in order to adequately inform the individual and collective action taking place in the environments of global capitalism composed of diverse, inclusive, and innovative inter-institutional networks (Mommaas 2004: 530). The urban structure of the social relations among the accumulation processes affects the form that cultural clusters take via their activities portfolios, governance structures, financial arrangements, infrastructural embedding, and developmental trajectories. These strategies of cultural accumulation determine the balance between cultural production and consumption, between art and entertainment orientation, and between hierarchical centralization and open networks (Mommaas 2004: 530). The development of cultural clusters can serve creative economy, urban positioning, cultural revitalization, architectural preservation, and cultural democracy. Importantly, urban development deploying cultural clustering strategies is widely implemented as a result of the emergent processes of the institutionalization,

differentiation and interpenetration of culture-oriented strategies of individual and collective action (Mommaas 2004: 530; Münch 1991b).

While cultural clustering strategies might result from the institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration of the processes of social, political, economic, and cultural policy-making, the eventual successfulness of cultural accumulation depends on individual and collective actors. Urban environments of these actors critically affect the trajectories of urban development, policy-making, and global positioning (Mommaas 2004: 530). The transition to global capitalism as a configuration of relations of accumulation neither resolves the contradictions of modernity nor brings its dynamics to a halt (Münch 1991b). However, the transition to global capitalism alters the contradictions and dynamics of modernity in the direction of their greater complexity, instability, and reflexivity (Mommaas 2004: 530-31). Hence, the transition to global capitalism forces the policy-making processes on the urban, regional, and national levels to take increasingly into account the on-going differentiation, institutionalization, rationalization, and interpenetration as their environments of action. Given that the modern processes of social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation can each come to play a disproportionate role in collective decision-making (Münch 1991b), the critique of modernity has to rely on the detailed analysis of the structure of their interrelations in order to formulate fine-tuned strategies of urban governance, reflexive involvement, and cultural accumulation.

Chapter Ten: Cultural Accumulation of Global Modernity

In this chapter, art museums receive attention as the points of reference for the philosophical, institutional, and sociological exploration of contemporary art, global museums, and the structure of modernity.

- Perniola philosophically explores the dynamics and the contradictions of modernity as a structure of relations between culture, economy, society and politics.
- Notably aligned with the transformations afoot in global cities, art museums and biennials manifest urban structures of global social order. Thus, international art exhibitions are complex and contingent instances of social, cultural, political, and economic accumulation.
- Art exhibitions materialize cultural accumulation into institutional, differentiated and interrelated forms as they participate in strategies deriving from movement through networks, continuous data exchange, and formation of impermanent alliances.
- Münch's theorization of modernity, accumulation and action provides analytical frames of reference for empirical urban research.

International Art Exhibitions as Cultural Accumulation

To gain a theoretical perspective on more than two hundred international art biennials taking place around the world (Vogel 2005), I take recourse to Mario Perniola's notion of the "political economy of *grandeur*" (Perniola 2004a: xx) as a philosophical treatment of cultural accumulation. For a description of the place of art biennials within the larger process of transition to global capitalism, the discussion by Perniola of the banalization of the problematic of art offers a perspective on cultural accumulation as a consequence of

differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of modern social order on a global scale. Since the value of artworks is either determined on the art market or established within networks of communication, Mario Perniola distinguishes a possibility of the “political economy of *grandeur*” (2004a: xx) as a philosophical resolution of the modern contradiction between the *aura* of artworks and their technological disenchantment. Benjamin (1968) draws attention to the contradiction in his essay *The Work of Art in the Age of Technical Reproduction*.

The place that international art biennials occupy within Perniola’s political economy of *grandeur* is best grasped as that of “the general re-negotiation of all the greatness inherent in the process of globalization” (2004a: 67) as he draws on sociological and philosophical works of Boltanski and Chiapello (1999), Baudrillard (1981; 1997) and Lyotard (1979; 1983; 1988). Applicable to international artists as capable of “recycling themselves, and inserting themselves in the new hierarchy of greatness” (Perniola 2004a: 67) through participation in art biennials, the notion of the political economy of *grandeur* also accounts for the exceptional vibrancy of the international art scene. Perniola discerns the central role that global art institutions, such as the Museum of Modern Art, New York, the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, or the Venice Biennale of Contemporary Art, play in the international field of art. For Perniola, the central role of these art institutions follows from the “contemporary paradigm” in art “in which public artistic institutions (namely big museums and international exhibitions) play a primary role in both fields, that of the valorization of works of art and of media events” (Perniola 2004a: 47). Perniola recognizes that “the artistic value resides in the combination of connections (discourses, actions, grids, situations and sense effects) established around or starting from an object, which is only an occasion, a pretext, or a point of transition” (2004a: 47). However, the rise to prominence of international art exhibitions is rooted in the continuing process of the unfolding of the contradictions and dynamics that modernity holds within its ideal-typical structure, the philosophical history and the implications of which for the present moment Perniola charts.

By putting into question the adequacy of the institutional paradigm of art to capturing the “new hierarchy of greatness,” Perniola (2004a) arrives at defining in philosophical terms the aesthetic and philosophical underpinnings of the artistic practice

and of the status of the work of art. Thus, the present trends in contemporary art that, on one hand, stress the “celebration of appearance” and, on the other, “the experience of reality” (Perniola 2004a: 3) find their place in the historical trajectory leading towards “the play of contemporary art” (Perniola 2004a: 63) that international exhibitions and art institutions manifest. These two trends reciprocally reinforce the increasing purchase that international art exhibitions, and artists, have on contemporary art. One trend, finding its support in the “evolution of the means of mass communication” (Perniola 2004a: 3), promotes the global dominance of “the idea of social spectacle, [and] the poetics of the ephemeral” (Perniola 2004a: 3) that are spelled out in theoretical terms of the “‘weak thought’, ‘post-modern’, ‘trans-avant-garde’” (Perniola 2004a: 3). The other trend pays attention to “the themes of death and sex” and “a direct exposure of events” (Perniola 2004a: 4) within the process of highlighting the virtual as the “irresistible [...] object extremely other and disquieting” (Perniola 2004a: 4).

These trends put international art institutions into the foreground of social, economic, political, and cultural accumulation as the theoretical coordinates that founded contemporary art increasingly come into question. While the conceptual horizons opened by Kant and Hegel have encompassed the artistic expression of the twentieth century, their eclipse turns contemporary artists into philosopher-artists who chart the cultural “topography of reality” (Perniola 2004a: 69). Despite the explorations of the existing philosophical premises and various innovations, the “specificity of the aesthetic experience” (Perniola 2004a: 5) has not been re-established. This leads to the thinning out of the theoretical mediation between the artwork, as the object of artistic valorization, and the public. The mediating work of the critic or curator has pushed art institutions and their documenting and archival role into the limelight of critical attention since “[w]ithout theory, there is no institution” (Perniola 2004a: 5). Within this situation of the collapse of institutional separation between art and the public, “[a]rt loses its distance with respect to reality and acquires a physical and material character that it never had before” (Perniola 2004a: 22). In other words, Perniola particularizes, in terms of philosophy and history, cultural accumulation as an analytical ideal type in which the relations of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration take aesthetic form.

When the premises that subtended modern art are no longer tenable, the postmodernism as a term of theoretical and critical reference gains a new currency presaged in Jean-François Lyotard's work *The Postmodern Condition* (1984). According to Perniola, Lyotard contends that "the postmodern must be understood not so much as the mere repetition of the modern but as its 'anamnesis' (Lyotard 1993: 80), its disenchanted and unbiased exam, its critical and demystified critique" (Perniola 2004a: 27). Among the sites that are particularly suited for such operation are cultural institutions and art exhibitions. Embodying the "contemporary paradigm" (Heinich 1998b) of contemporary culture, art exhibitions exist at the intersection of the "incongruous mixture of economic, aesthetic and communicative aspects" (Perniola 2004a: 50) characterizing it. In this contemporary condition, the political economy of *grandeur* as cultural accumulation equally encompasses museums, curators, artists, and artworks. Artists participate in cultural accumulation as brand-names, since each of the latter "guarantees the value of artistic merchandise" (Perniola 2004a: 46). Additionally, in the system of cultural accumulation artists are the persons who, not unlike philosophers, "pursue impersonal goals (the opening of horizons of experience characterized by a claim to universality) by personal means (the protection and development of one's own singularity)" (Perniola 2004a: 50).

Structurally, art exhibitions repeat in their relation to the ideal-typical structure of modernity the relation that postmodern art, as exemplified in Andy Warhol's work, maintained with modern capitalism as being "both supercapitalist and anticapitalist" (Perniola 2004a: 29). However, contemporary art challenges postmodernism both for obscuring the "difference and alterity of both sexual and artistic experience" (Perniola 2004a: 31) and for its "complicity with the politics of an imperialistic culture" (Perniola 2004a: 31). The context of cultural accumulation saturated with art exhibitions and art museums effects a transition beyond the problematic of the postmodern since "[w]hile [it] placed stress on simulation and synthesis, the physiological turn focuses on the 'being thing' in all its nonconceptuality and incomprehensibility" (Perniola 2004a: 32). This contemporary displacement of the postmodern toward the "resexualization and a revaluation of art" (Perniola 2004a: 31) brings contemporary art into philosophical proximity with cinema that immanently aims at "documenting a unique event in the

moment in which it occurs and becoming, insofar as film fact goes, a unique event” (Perniola 2004a: 40).

As contemporary art increasingly loses grounds for consideration of its “autonomous conceptual meaning” (Perniola 2004a: 37), as does cinema, “the opinion that today’s art can do without theory” (Perniola 2004a: 44) becomes common. Such a break with the aesthetic principles that have founded the experience of art from the eighteenth century onwards turns the “[s]ingularity and its more transgressive manifestations” (Perniola 2004a: 46) into the prevalent criterion of artistic value. This puts the theory of art into an impasse in which it can neither “go back toward the *aura*” (Perniola 2004a: 45) nor “abolish itself and let the public establish empirically and immediately what is and what is not art” (Perniola 2004a: 45). Benjamin’s (1968) essay on the work of art draws attention to the contradictions and dynamics of modernity that affect cultural accumulation in its social, political, economic and cultural foundations. Furthermore, Benjamin (1968) contributes to thinking of the aesthetic experience beyond the reification and fetishism is his definition of the “*sex appeal* of the inorganic” (Perniola 2004a: 46) that finds its theoretical counterpart in Boltanski and Thévenot’s discussion of *grandeur* (1991) or worth (Boltanski and Thevenot 2006). Boltanski and Thévenot respond to the injunction “to place in evidence the plurality of systems of action and axiological systems” (Heinich 1998a: 24). Moreover, they take seriously the motivations provided by actors (Heinich 1998a: 21). Boltanski and Thévenot provide justification for the philosophical and sociological research into the not self-evident arrangements in which the “value of people, objects and actions are strictly connected among themselves” (Perniola 2004a: 51). For them “the practice of art and philosophy are not private matters: ‘In a world in which human beings are appreciated for their *oneness* and in which the most general is the most *original*, the greats are both unique and universal’ (Boltanski and Thévenot 1991: 201-2)” (Perniola 2004a: 53). Thus, Perniola explores the philosophical contradictions and dynamics of modernity.

Advocating the transition “from the analysis of essences to that of representations” (Perniola 2004a: 53), Perniola stresses that “it is not important to know whether originality exists or is an illusion, but to know through which operation it is constructed, maintained and dissolved” (Perniola 2004a: 53). Thus he describes the

philosophical situation of the contemporary art as “a ‘transit from the same to the same’ (Perniola 1998) through which a radical difference is fulfilled” (Perniola 2004a: 59). In this position he concurs with Joseph Kosuth that the “‘value’ of particular artists after Duchamp can be weighed according to ‘what they *added* to the conception of art’ (Kosuth 1991: 18)” (Perniola 2004a: 60). Such overshadowing of the public as the artist “annexes to himself the function of the critic and turns to a public of artists” (Perniola 2004a: 60) turns the public, precisely, into the *remainder* to the working of the field of cultural production that provides “the key to the success of artistic operations” (Perniola 2004a: 64). As artistic value is “based more on the market of information and communication than on the cultural one” (Perniola 2004a: 64) the strategies of provocation and scandal aimed at the public turn it into an individual strategy of cultural accumulation. Art exhibitions articulate precisely this contradictory and dynamic relationship that cultural accumulation maintains with art through the “figures of artist, public and specialist” (Perniola 2004a: 45) whose participation in the processes of interchange of reputation, money and expertise furthers the differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of art in the structure of modernity.

Philosophical Transition to Global Modernity

The global modern moment (Appadurai 1996) can be philosophically characterized by the reversibility, availability, and enigma (Perniola 1995) that Mario Perniola (2001; 2004a; 2004b) captures in the notions of the “simulacrum,” “transit,” and “ritual without myth.” Rather than associated with the negative consequences that Debord’s (1994) spectacle has for the possibility of bringing the actual conditions of existence to consciousness, thus opening the possibility for a social revolution, Perniola’s simulacrum reveals the thing-like nature of the society, discourse, and subjectivity that follow the trajectory of unfolding from one consummate configuration into another. Rather than precluding the access to the real conditions of existence, the simulacrum partakes of the exponentially increasing complexity of modernity to the effect of filling the ontological space of the world. This full world of things creates the simulacra as the radical effect of its transition from the same to the same as a philosophical reflection of the contradictions

and dynamics of modernity. The remainder that the modern unfolding of the world leaves is the shadow from which the simulacrum as the copy without the original comes to cultural, social, political, and economic light. Perniola's notion of the transit from the same to the same to the effect of producing a radical social, cultural, political, and economic difference takes modernity to mean not the destination but the process of transition. Consequently, art museums find prominence in the international field of art where architecture, exhibitions, and biennials all converge on the transformation of urban spaces.

In the global modern moment (Appadurai 1996), as a function of its participation in a system of trans-local relations of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation, urban development deploys art museums in order to position cities on the globalized map of flows and destinations. The strategies of cultural accumulation, such as those of cultural clustering, connect urban development to the urban structure of modernity. Urban clusters of cultural accumulation arise out of the second geography of walking strategies (de Certeau 1984), Situationist *détournement* (Debord 1994), and rhizome-like (Deleuze and Guattari 1987) agglomerations of chance encounters, co-dependent occurrences and transitions from virtual to actual. Thus, cultural clusters turn into the ephemeral spaces where the second geography precariously manifests itself. The paradigmatic example of such cultural accumulation via urban clusters of flows of varying density and scale is international art exhibitions. Each art exhibition represents the generic institutional features that became common in as diverse places as Gwangju, Sao Paulo, and Moscow. In these cities, contemporary artists appear in individual and group shows in biennial exhibitions, museum shows, and special projects. The public-private partnerships bringing together states, non-governmental organizations, media, local companies, foundations, and multinational corporations increasingly enable these international art exhibitions. Thus, art museums, biennials and exhibitions as instances of cultural accumulation depend on their differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration vis-à-vis the local, regional, and global systems of economic, social and political accumulation that position these cultural events within the multiple hierarchies of cultural clusters.

The degree to which the power in the global modern age (Beck 2005) becomes conditional on the legitimacy spectacles of participation, eroding the differences among the elections, festivals, biennials, or Olympiads, points to the emerging relations of general interchange-ability. In the system of these relations, the death of the political (Perniola 2001) could be said to lead to the rise of the style that marks contemporary art. The situation, where the contingency and complexity of political action continues to rise steeply, inaugurates the obliteration of the formerly important distinctions between the friend and foe in favour of the temporary alliances among individuals and groups. In their movement through networks, continuous data exchange, and formation of impermanent alliances, these individual and collective agents become nomadic subjects of interpersonal, inter-institutional and international relations. In the differentiated, institutionalized and interdependent environments that these relations engender, old identities, borders, and assumptions wither away. Correspondingly, the prominence of global art museums and international art biennials has greatly increased since the late 1980s (Vanderlinden and Filipovic 2005). In respect to the non-Eurocentric representative canons, the communication dynamics of the globally spreading modernization (Münch 1991b) has lent to international art exhibitions a set of roles and positions that are different from those associated with the shows more closely related to the European modernisms. For Martinez (1996) the international field of art is crisscrossed with the forms of agency that provide both constraints and opportunities to independent art curators that represent a new kind of institutional agency in the field of art. From the late eighties onwards, individual curators took increasing part in artistic decision-making. Thus, art curators shifted the institutional emphasis from collective towards individual decisions. The shift took place on the background of the ongoing crisis in the theoretical foundations of art history (Preziosi 1989; 2003). In the current global moment of modernity (Appadurai 1996), the structure of trans-local flows across art institutions increasingly determines the field of contemporary art where the art museums, biennials, foundations, and galleries take center stage.

In the field of art, the struggles over the definition of its state of affairs as well as over the stakes in its future condition break out. As the decisive agents in the field of contemporary art, curators increasingly act as power brokers. Performing the nodal

functions in the global structure of the densely interconnected political, economic, cultural, and social networks, art curators link the international flows that mould into their particular shapes the local, regional, and trans-regional artistic fields. As art biennials and signature museums rise to prominence, the relation of these art institutions to the current moment of modernity goes beyond the rhetoric surrounding their proliferation. These art institutions give material expression to the relations between power, reputation, money, and expertise. Correspondingly, since its foundation in 1895 at the zenith of the power and influence of the European empires, *la Biennale di Venezia*, the biennial international art exhibition in Venice, attests to the larger social, economic, cultural, and political situation. The period from the last decade of the nineteenth century to the beginning of World War I, known as *la belle époque*, is the time of unparalleled flowering of the arts and sciences in France. The ending decades of the long nineteenth century (Hobsbawm 1977; 1987; 1988), brought to an abrupt close by the Great War, are also considered to be the time of unprecedented peace and prosperity in Europe. Moreover, *la belle époque* laid the groundwork for the flowering of European modernisms. Formative for the artistic, literary, and architectural development of the twentieth century, the *fin-de-siècle* of the nineteenth century is when the future modernists of *la belle époque* and the interwar period are getting their education, meeting each other in the metropolitan *cafés*, and starting their creative careers (Wilson 2000).

The intensification of the economic, social, political, and cultural life witnessed at the turn of the twentieth century apparently correlates with the birth of the Venice biennial as an institution representative of the process of modernization (Münch 1991b) from the perspective of cultural accumulation. Consequently, the contemporary growth in the number of international art biennials and global museums articulates the global condition reminiscent of the cultural ferment that marked *fin de siècle* Europe. International art exhibitions and museums as public spectacles resemble in their popularity the long history of the universal expositions (Bennett 1995) beginning with the Universal Exhibition in 1851 in London. Predating the polarization between the mass appeal of the fun fairs and the restrained environments of the art exhibitions, the international exhibitions share with contemporary art museums the concern for bringing the widest audiences, spectatorial pleasures, and commercial interests together. The

varieties of modernity spreading to the remotest corners of the globe via international cultural, social, political and economic institutions (Stallabrass 2004) complexly map their structuring features upon the institutions, differences, rationalities and interdependencies producing these events. The universal exhibitions of Europe and North America form the common institutional heritage of both biennials and museums. These art institutions retain their situated specificity vis-à-vis the globalization of art exhibitions and museums as the institutions trans-locally articulated by the individual and collective agency of art curators, sponsoring corporations, visiting scholars, brand-name artists, and international organizations. The more visible among the international art biennials, such as those held in Venice, Kassel, Sao Paulo, and New York, serve as the prototypes of emerging international art events in other cities. However, the transformations that global capitalism facilitates on the local, regional, and global scales endow the differently positioned art institutions with cultural, social, political and economic capital the amounts of which depend on their position within the emerging global structure of political, economic, cultural, and social relations. Consequently, international art institutions could be indicative of the effects that the larger changes in cultural, social, political and economic accumulation taking place since the late 1980s have on the structure of modernity on the regional, national, and urban scales. International art exhibitions as highly complex and contingent events may supply the social, political, economic, and cultural parameters for mapping the change in the process of change itself. The art exhibitions and museums may serve as historical entry points into the urban dynamics and contradictions of the structure of modernity as an analytical structure of ideal-typical relations.

International Art Institutions vis-à-vis Social, Political, Economic, and Cultural Accumulation

International art exhibitions manifest the shift to global social order in the system of cultural accumulation. Within the institutional framework of recurring international cultural events, international art exhibitions connect global centers with multiple peripheries. In the structure of these trans-local relations, art museums make publicly

accessible the artworks, documentation, and shows that originate in nodal points of cultural, social, economic and political networks. Accruing through these global, regional and local networks, cultural accumulation takes place at art biennials, museums, and festivals. Becoming increasingly prevalent, international art biennials may correspond in the geography of their spread to the institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration of an international regime of governmentality (Rectanus 2002; Stallabrass 2004). Art biennials stage the exhibited works in relation to the international discourse on contemporary art. International art exhibitions serve as testing grounds for alternative relations between art, public, and urban space via forms of cultural accumulation that relate the local to the international scales. Via their position in urban structures of modernity, international art exhibitions may reproduce the constellations of social, political, economic and cultural accumulation that are constitutive of the former as they institutionally, differentially and interdependently participate in cultural accumulation on the regional, national, and urban scales. Debates over international art exhibitions bring to the surface the tensions between the centers and peripheries where the cultural accumulation enters into the relations of social, political, economic, and cultural differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration with the spheres of society, politics, economy, and culture.

Art museums have increasingly converged in their discursive, institutional, and representational practices with corporations (Rectanus 2002). As museum practices change, the exhibition spaces of art museums are becoming increasingly interrelated with the economic, cultural, social and political processes affecting the urban space via its compatibilities, tipping points, and organizing logics (Sassen 2006). Not unlike the concept of transit (Perniola 2001), the transition from the same to the same of the process of exhibition of artworks gives rise to radical cultural difference. Consequently, each particular art exhibition can make the process of the cultural accumulation that they are part of historically available for an analytical reconstruction of “what it tells us about society as a whole rather than about the population of similar cases” (Burawoy 1991: 281). As a realization of cultural accumulation in the field of art, contemporary art increasingly acquires its meaning in the topology of places in which the artworks circulate (Groys 2005). Consequently, as part of an ideal-typical analysis of urban

structures of social order as they take shape via local structures of relations between systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation, contemporary art exhibitions may be approached as historical ideal types.

Intimately related to the processes of accumulation of power, money, reputation, and expertise (Münch 1991b), art museums as institutions dedicated to cultural accumulation make possible the subject-positions that map onto the social, political, economic and cultural structures underlying it. As modern institutions that undergo processes of differentiation, rationalization and interpenetration (Münch 1991b), art museums cast into material forms the structures of cognition and recognition that their spaces of representation validate. As the partial representations of an imaginary universal museum, international art exhibitions map out the varying regions of cultural accumulation characteristic of global social order in terms of the alternative collective memories, multiple projects for building the sense of common identity, and explorations of cultural possibilities. Thus, art exhibitions may become the sites for Debord's *détournement* (1988) as the virtual subversion of hegemonic organizing logics imposed on words, things, and people.

The representational space of the art exhibitions philosophically coincides with the remainder of the political (Perniola 2004a). The international proliferation of art museums has its other side in the condition of being on the move that is increasingly shared by the modern individuals (Münch 1991b). Correspondingly, contemporary artists accumulate their reputation to a growing extent in direct relation to the frequency of their participation in international artistic events at the globally visible art biennials' and art museums' exhibitions (Groys 2005). The art museums become transformed into event-oriented institutions within the post-industrial urban structures of cultural accumulation where the "nonprofit institutions (e.g., museums, operas, theatres, symphonies) occupy different positions within the cultural marketplace, or in what Schulze [(1992)] terms the market for experiences (*Erlebnismarkt*)" (Rectanus 2002: 23).

The situation-specific interrelations of cultural, social, political and economic accumulation underpinning the international art exhibitions define the amount of resonance that they generate. Via embedding of these international art events into the globally interconnected institutional framework of cultural accumulation taking place on

the regional, national, and urban scales, cities play a growing role in producing site-specific added value in the accumulation process. The frequent preference for internationally recognized curators to perform key functions in art biennials, the regular juxtaposition of international artists with local ones, and the cooperation between the community, governmental, and commercial interests open the possibility to consider the international art exhibition as an emerging institutional form of cultural accumulation. Lodged in the structure of interchange between social, political, economic and cultural accumulation, international art exhibitions are the products of the contingent and complex actions of individual and collective actors. Consequently, the growing differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of the governmentality spheres of the nation-states, regions, and cities (Hardt and Negri 2000; Sassen 2006) provides the condition of possibility for the emergence of novel relations among the processes of cultural, social, political, and economic accumulation.

Art museums are institutionally aligned with the transformations afoot in global cities (Sassen 2006). In these cities, previously hegemonic collective identities lose their discursive legitimization as their economic, social, political, and cultural bases erode under the influence of rationalization of the respective systems of accumulation (Rectanus 2002: 3). As they dot the cultural map of the world, international art exhibitions redefine the urban identity of the places where they occur (Stallabrass 2004: 14). As the spaces where economic, social, political, and cultural values are validated, art exhibitions act as the correspondingly singular events embedded into the accumulation strategies (Rectanus 2002: 7). Spurred by the transition from the social order structured around hierarchies of managerial capitalism to the one built on the networks of global capitalism, the international art exhibitions take advantage of the increasingly wide spread of the networked mode of institutional operation. Thus, art museums adopt similarly networked organization via increasing the number of temporary exhibitions while placing additional emphasis on international collaboration.

In what Perniola (1995) terms the culturally, socially, politically, and economically enigmatic moment in the history of modernity, a reversal occurs in the late twentieth century between the roles that things and people play. Hence, institutions, discourses, and persons differentially appropriate the contemporary art through

embedding artistic events, objects, and representations into their self-referential practices (Rectanus 2002: 24). As the accidental arrangements get locked into formations of lasting influence (Urry 2003), art museums as a form of such accidental institutional arrangements become re-embedded into the differentiated and interdependent relations that follow different organizing logics than those that have imposed durability on their initial institutional form. As a tipping point of the switch between alternative organizing logics in the field of contemporary art, the late twentieth century has made it possible for art museums as simulacra, as the institutional reproductions losing in the process of their development the continuity with their original historical prototypes, to emerge. Turning their exhibition, discursive, and accumulation practices into rituals without myth (Perniola 2001), art museums increasingly exert their attraction through the cultural, social, political, and economic cachet, the sex appeal of the inorganic (Perniola 2001: 48-49), that artworks possess (Meyer 1979). Cultural consumption as a social practice becomes dominated by the multiple intensities that its experience affords (Jameson 1991). Consequently, rather than the *aura*-bearing objects, the artworks are the artefacts of the process of cultural accumulation in its pure form.

Art Museums in the Urban Structure of Modernity

Frequently cited as one of the more prominent global cities, New York has progressively lost in centrality to the processes of industrial production since the 1970s (Sassen 2006). Correspondingly, the share of the advanced services in the U.S. international trade grew in the last quarter of the twentieth century (Harvey 1989: 147). As it assumed the coordinating role in the processes of corporate management, international finance, and economic mediation, New York has retained its central position to the global structure of economic accumulation. Through the technologically enabled possibilities of communication, circulation and financialization, New York tapped previously unavailable reservoirs of labour, talent, and consumption. At the heart of the global capitalism forming a single financial network of the speculative exchange connected into disparate financial markets since the late 1980s, New York has become one of the nodes in its emergent topology of economic accumulation.

The art museums of New York characterize the current global moment of modernity (Appadurai 1996) since the processes of the economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation growing in their trans-local interdependence reaffirm the centrality of these art museums to the international networks where artistic value is validated (Groys 2005). In these networks, the global art museums translate their cultural, political, economic, and social capital into investment opportunities both at home and abroad. After the art markets' decline following the economic downturn in the 1980s (Stallabrass 2004), the growing share of the private funding of the arts in the U.S., followed by similar trends in other countries of the OECD, has promoted network-oriented institutional logics in the field of art. Following the logic of exchange of the cultural capital of art museums for the economic value of the urban spaces they occupy, art museums participate in the process of turning cities into points of attraction for speculative financial capital. Such policy of urban visibility draws on the cultural capital of art museums to attain a dominant positioning among the nodes of the global economy through amplification of circulation of flows. In celebrating their attendance figures as the registers of their civic relevance, metropolitan art museums reinforce the nodal centrality of these cities. In these world cities, the systemic dynamics of the globally interconnected cultural, social, political, and economic institutions sets the terms of exchange between cultural and economic capital. Metropolitan art museums draw upon these relations of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration between the economy and culture for the endowments, expansion drives, and sponsorships that post-industrial urban governance makes increasingly necessary for their operation (Harvey 1989: 62-63).

From the perspective of Münch's theorization of the differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration of the processes of cultural, social, political, and economic accumulation, I approach art museums as examples of the contradictions and dynamics of modernity. In New York, as one of the nodal cities of global capitalist accumulation (Abu-Lughod 1999), modernity extends its dynamics and contradictions to the global scale. In the U.S., as the art museums professionalized their operation, their curatorial personnel has gained autonomy from the boards of trustees (Alexander 1996). However, the increase in the block-buster exhibitions, the faster circulation of art shows,

the growing revenue share of merchandizing, and the expanding dining and gala-reception facilities are indicators that the institutional autonomy of art museums has been achieved at the price of greater interdependence among their processes of cultural, social, political and economic accumulation (Stallabrass 2004). As global capitalism couples economic accumulation with the world scale on which it organizes its interrelationships with social, cultural, and political accumulation, the former turns the urban structure of the relations of accumulation that obtains in the global cities into a historical ideal-type of global capitalism. The institutions, environments, and actors that participate in the operation of the urban structure of the relations of accumulation define the nodal cities of the emergent and existing regional, national, and urban economies, polities, societies, and cultures. The representational spaces of art exhibition provide opportunities for the competing urban structures of individual and collective capabilities, socialities, and mobilities to seek recognition in the spaces of cultural, social, political, and economic validation. These individual and collective actors shape the urban space, mobilize the institutional resources, and claim their share of social, political, economic, and cultural capital. In the increasingly global space of trans-local flows, cities become the points of articulation of the changes that bring into operation the processes that capture, order, and orient these flows (Sassen 2006). As the media of cultural, social, political, and economic accumulation (Lash and Lury 2007), artworks become the means that art institutions deploy to accumulate expertise, reputation, power, and money (Münch 1991b; Vanderlinden and Filipovic 2005). Consequently, these processes of accumulation transform art museums into the sites of contingent intersections of the flows, agents, and structures entering into the relations of differentiation, institutionalization and interpenetration on the urban level. As agents implementing the strategies that connect exhibition spaces to multiple networks, art curators turn art museums and biennials into the reflexive institutions that selectively enable cultural, economic, political, and social accumulation.

As the mode of operation of the institutional, differential and interdependent support structures of art museums and biennials converges globally (Rectanus 2002; Stallabrass 2004), the boundaries between the public and private spheres blur. As the leading hubs of financial capitalism have achieved the unprecedented amounts of

international consolidation in the 1990s (Strange 1998), the global cities stand to gain the most from economic, cultural, social, and political globalization by drawing into the spheres of the respective international exchange still new countries, institutions, and relations. In the growing number of fields, the increasing ambit of influence of global cities draws both individual and collective actors towards their urban space as the stage for the inter-institutional mediation of the processes of accumulation. By dint of their distinct, institutionalized and integrated position in the trans-local structure of economic, cultural, social, and political relations, global cities are singularly equipped to turn the dynamics and contradictions of the respective processes of accumulation to their advantage. Consequently, by their participation in the processes of accumulation of reputation, money, expertise, and power, such art museums as the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, the Museum of Modern Art New York, or the Louvre Museum, experience the binding effects upon the agents associated with these museums of the institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration of the economy, culture, society and politics. Thus, these global art museums appear to have both their discursive authority and their institutional autonomy increase in direct proportion to their accumulated amounts of cultural, social, political, and economic capital.

The transformation of the urban space, that the economic, cultural, social and political institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration of the structure of modernity has wrought, has found its historical reflection in international exhibitions. As the processes of accumulation of money, expertise, solidarity, and reputation increase in their scope and scale, the spaces of representation of international art exhibitions appear to increasingly serve the purposes of embedding the artworks into the processes of accumulation of social, political, economic, and cultural capital (Lash and Lury 2007; Münch 1991b). Correspondingly, international art exhibitions in their events circuits, lists of participants, and engagements of urban space have the regional, national, and urban networking in-built into their mode of operation. In so far as these spectacular events become entangled with the relations of institutionalization, differentiation and interpenetration, the implications that the globalization of the art museums, exhibitions, and biennials have for the participating individual and collective agents stem from the complexity and contingency implications (Perniola 1986) of the process of modernization

(Münch 1991b). The network-oriented logic governing the processes of accumulation of global capitalism favours a growth in complexity and contingency of the strategies of action (Perniola 1986) that individual and collective actors have to adopt in order to adjust to the increasing differentiation, rationalization, institutionalization and interpenetration across the structure of modern social order. In contrast to the political divisions that separated the political field into contending camps, highly complex and contingent media, actions, and environments do not produce an obvious and stable structure of social, economic, political, and cultural relations. According to this, more enigmatic, logic of operation, each individual or collective agent is ready to form alliances, to enter into agreements, and to cooperate with others, forming thereby the networks of contingent, complex, unstable and ambiguous relations. At the intersection of the processes of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation (Münch 1991b), individual and collective action may demand reconsideration across the ideal-typical modes of accumulation it analytically and historically involves as it is found in a condition primarily mediated by networks, data, and requirements of the moment (Perniola 1986).

Under the conditions of booming art museums' construction and expansion, exhibition attendance figures, and auction sales turnovers, art museums globalize their operation. Hence, international art exhibitions serve as the "displays of cultural capital that reinscribe the networked metropolis within a place of displaying privilege" (Keith 2005: 126). Thus, international art exhibitions become the paradigmatic spaces for an ideal-typical analysis of social, political, economic, and cultural accumulation (Luke 2002: 212; Perniola 2004a). Art museums and biennials become the gateways for interoperability, networks, and circulation. International art exhibitions embed their objects, narratives, and media into the relationships of interchange that self-reflexively establish their boundaries. Therefore, at the global stage of the unfolding of the contradictions and dynamics of modernity, art is relativized "by the contemporary criss-crossings of world imagery, the globalization of expression, the syncretic and 'contaminated' nature of international visual arts" (Tythacott 2003: 10-11). The ideal-typical analysis of international art exhibitions comes into contact with the contemporary situation (Perniola 1995). As the interrelations among global cities change, they may

demand renewed attempts at their understanding via the theoretical reconstruction of the ideal-typically historical position that art museums occupy in their urban structures of cultural, social, political, and economic accumulation.

Conclusion

In as much as European sociology encompasses a diverse theoretical field, German sociology also refers to a great variety of theoretical approaches with Münch's sociology among them. This thesis introduces Münch's theorization of action, systems, and modernity with regard to fruitful applications it may potentially have in a variety of fields such as urban studies, economic analysis, and contemporary sociology. As this thesis seeks to demonstrate, the question of Münch's position in German and more broadly international sociology is far from closed. At a closer examination, only tentative results of which I present, Münch's works not only may shed light on received opinions on sociological classics but also can parallel such contemporary developments as the work by Boltanski and Chiapello's on capitalism. While increasing the variety of theoretical positions in the field of sociology, my introduction of Münch's contribution to social thought and to sociological theory appears to respond to both the necessity to reinterpret sociological classics in light of the present state of sociology and the demand for a consistent frame of theoretical reference in bodies of scholarship growing around a single specialization, such as urban or regional studies.

One of possible reasons why Münch's work is yet to meet with a wider acceptance is the dominance of American sociological theories internationally. As a discipline, sociology has strongest institutional bases in the United States where both a consensus and the disagreements over a canon of sociological thought may have more long lasting effects than similar discussions in Europe. Also, a particular relation to the classical texts of sociology that exists in the United States, as opposed to Europe, may have diminished the authority that classical sociological texts hold. In contrast, the reception of such sociological classics as Tönnies, Simmel, Weber and Elias in Germany is engaged in a deeper discussion of the questions of theoretical importance to the discipline with possibly less weight given to the contribution that post-classical sociology

has made to the resolution of the questions that classical authors have posed. In this regard, Münch comments that

[t]he turning point in integrating idealism and positivism in Western thought is provided by Immanuel Kant's critique of reason. The systematic influence of Kant's critiques for the [...] theory of action in the work of Durkheim, Weber and Parsons is noticeable throughout. In his last major work, *Action Theory and the Human Condition* which appeared in 1978, Parsons himself emphatically underscored the significance of Kant in this respect. Only a Kantian perspective, then, can help us achieve an interpretation of [...] action theory which does justice to the original work, is objectively tenable, and allows for its rational reconstruction and fruitful further development. [...] I must stress again that this procedure is one of *rational reconstruction* in the light of these theoretical problems, and not a historical presentation of individual contributions and stages of development. The criterion applied throughout is: How should a particular item of theory of stage of development be interpreted if it is to go as far as possible towards answering the fundamental metatheoretical and object-theoretical questions? (italics in the original, Münch 1987: 3)

The critical debates in which Münch participates may have to be approached separately from Münch's theorization that needs to be addressed in its praxiological and epistemological dimensions. It is the metatheoretical grounds on which it may become possible to substantiate a claim of whether Münch's theorization of modernity, systems and action makes a significant contribution to sociological theorization. While more active engagement of Münch's theoretical output with theories originating in other sociological traditions, such as French and British where Bruno Latour or John Urry may represent cogent counterparts, is clearly in order, this thesis represents only a first step in the direction of exploring the place of Münch in German sociology. In view of the detailed polemical presentation by Münch of his ideas vis-à-vis those by Luhmann, Habermas, and Schluchter, I made a multi-sited inquiry into the applicability of Münch's

theoretical framework to urban studies, economic sociology, theorization of modernity, and cultural accumulation.

In a discipline as diverse as sociology is a wide variety of theories compete for degrees of dominance. However, an introduction of a body of theory, such as Münch's, into the discourse of sociology can only contribute to making the claims of each theory involved more precise and relevant both within the discipline and in inter-disciplinary contexts. Moreover, the explicit intention of Münch, in his three-volume *Sociological Theory*, is to conceive of his contribution to sociological theory in a broadly comparative perspective that proposes that

[t]he underlying basis of the outlined development [of sociological theorizing] is a continuation of the debate on ever higher levels of completeness, on which ever finer biases and errors become the objects of criticism and corresponding revisions aiming at the improvement of the paradigms and theories. It is the discourse going on between the competing paradigms and theories that determines their continuous improvement. In this way the paradigms and theories come closer to each other, overlap, and cover a larger part of the reality of the social world, but nevertheless continue to disagree and compete. However, the points of disagreement and competition become ever finer over the course of time. (Münch 1994: 4)

The theorization of social institutions, action systems, and accumulation processes proposed by Münch (1982; 1991b) offers a perspective that clarifies the economic, social, cultural, and political transitions taking place since the late twentieth century. The contemporary development by Münch of the theories of Weber, Durkheim, and Parsons both relates classical sociology to the present-day dynamics of the structure of modernity, and lends itself to the micro conceptualization of the structure of modernity on the urban level, as this thesis hopes to demonstrate.

Münch's sociology, developed in his theoretical and applied works, has a potential to offer a different perspective on dominant sociological approaches to economy, culture, modernity, and cities. For urban policy-making to reflect the

complexity level exhibited both by world economy and world-cities, a theorization attempt commensurate with their strategic positions in the networks of flows has to translate the complexity of the phenomenal world into multi-scalar, context-sensitive, and process-oriented concepts. The theoretical effort of Münch has important implications for the mutual reinforcement of explanatory power of both theoretical research and practical problem-solving that can supply theoretical constructions with content and empirical intuitions with frames of conceptual reference.

As urban centers concentrate organizational, service, and communication infrastructures, amplifying both the influence of networks and the importance of global flows, the urban strategies and theorization emphasis has to shift towards the performative, contingent and material aspects of cities. The theoretical effort of Münch can contribute to the reinforcement of the explanatory power of both theoretical research and practical problem solving by laying the foundations of a theory of modernity, accumulation and action.

An analytical account of the coalition formation, exchange processes, and competition and conflict is compatible with multi-sited methodologies as they bridge the research practice and the elaboration of theoretical frameworks. With the help of multi-sited research, interdisciplinary connections defined by areas of inquiry can guide the process of clarification of links among multiple processes. An ideal-typical perspective on the interrelations between culture and economy may offer theoretical avenues for both analytical and historical accounts of their contradictory and dynamic effects within the structure of interrelations among the processes of accumulation. To understand the dynamics and contradictions of modernity, it is necessary not to reduce the latter to institutions, but to define it as a constellation of contingent, variable and self-reflexive forces that allow for its variation and change.

As the importance of economic accumulation grows it is imperative to explore how the analytically graspable structure of economic relations changes over time via the conceptual articulation of its multiple contexts. To develop historical ideal types of economic and cultural accumulation, the theory of action has to be brought to bear upon the relations within which individual and collective agents face particular national traditions, political situations, economic practices, and cultural expressions.

In temporally, spatially, and socially specific ways, urban spaces actively contribute to the formation of structures, cultures and communities. An ideal-typical analysis of cities has to be guided by the dynamics and contradictions occurring between particular institutions and social structure, between individual and collective strategies, and between environments and actors. The transformations afoot in cities, global and local alike, materialize spatial relations into institutional forms of accumulation strategies such as international exhibitions, cultural clusters, and art museums.

The dynamic and contradictory interrelationships between the systems of accumulation demand, for their understanding, not their reduction to institutions but their definition as constellations of forces allowing for variation and change. The ideal-typical structure of modernity is as contingent, variable, and complex as individual and collective actors themselves are. The integration of social practices, representations of space, and social spaces into a comprehensive conceptual framework has to proceed by paying attention to the discursive, material, and social conditions of action vis-à-vis systems of economic, cultural, social and political accumulation that, under given historical conditions, exhibit varying degrees of differentiation, institutionalization, rationalization and interpenetration.

To return to the museum vignettes in Chapter 1, I hope that this thesis has laid the basis for theorizing how, in the urban structure of modern social order, art museums translate money, expertise, reputation and power into economic opportunities, circulation of flows, and network centrality. As a strategy of cultural accumulation, cultural clusters exhibit variation arising from the interrelations among individual organizations, available strategies, and cultural objectives. We may hypothesize further that, variously connected to social, cultural, political and economic accumulation, international art exhibitions provide differentiated, institutionalized and interdependent nodes of interchange of money, power, reputation and expertise. These, however, remain topics for further research.

This thesis argues that culture-driven projects of urban revitalization may be understood in terms of analytical and historical ideal-types. While the relations among global capitalism, urban communities, world cities, and cultural institutions, such as art museums, need historical particularization in case of each city, an ideal-typical analytical

framework of sociological reference may guide the process of establishing particular links between economy, society, politics and culture on the urban level. To the extent that I sought to show the possible applications of the notions of analytical and historical ideal type, while making distinctions among these; to introduce other Münch's concepts such as systems of accumulation, media of interchange, and systemic interrelations; and to show possible areas of their subsequent application according to the program of Münch's sociology; I consider myself to have tentatively shown that there is both demand for a renewed interest in theorization of ideal types and its available conceptualizations, such as Münch's, that deserve further exploration. This I consider to be my original contribution in this thesis.

While Münch makes use of the terms of systems, interchange and interrelations, in my understanding, he does so from a strictly analytical perspective that has a high level of abstraction. This is what allows Münch to make analytical distinctions among levels of analysis according to their degree of abstractness. Consequently, any concretized use of Münch's analytical terms, such as interpenetration, differentiation, rationalization and institutionalization, runs the risk of reifying these terms unless their very high level of abstraction is born in mind. Moreover, from Münch's perspective, historical processes fall into the domain of the construction of historical ideal types. Interpenetration, differentiation, rationalization and institutionalization, as analytical terms of reference denote kinds of interrelationship among systems of accumulation not actual relations themselves. These terms pertain to the process of construction of analytical ideal types having very high level of abstraction. Understanding reification as conflation of the scales of analysis, as between, for example, analytical and historical frames of reference, I have highlighted the distinction between analytical and historical ideal types throughout my thesis to prevent their reifying use. For me, ideal types stand half-way between highly abstract analytical categories and historical reality. I admit that my use of the terminology of ideal types may be theoretically insufficient. However, the use I make of the terminology of ideal types fits my methodological purposes. Münch's writing being remarkably jargon free where it concerns actual events, processes and actors, it is necessary to refrain as far as possible from misuse of Münch's theoretical terms whenever their application is attempted.

With regard to the distinction between modernity and capitalism that follows from Münch's theorization of modernity, accumulation and action, the domains of social, political, cultural and economic action have to be constructed as distinct ideal-types. The rational choice theory cannot apply to all of them equally. Even in the area of economic policy-making the decisions that are implemented do not necessarily have to be governed by an economic utilitarian calculation. Economic accumulation as activity concerned with management of scarce resources according to preexisting preferences does not set these preferences alone. The preferences, priorities and decisions are set in the spheres of society, culture, and politics before they fall under the sway of the economic forces of supply and demand. The economic theory of supply and demand applies to economic accumulation to a more adequate extent than does Marx's labour theory of value. From the point of view of economic accumulation, both capitalism and communism are just its varieties with one being more efficient than the other. Consequently, the example of France's transition to global capitalism I have brought up earlier in my thesis brings home the distinction between modernity as a social order and capitalism as analytical term.

Without the distinction between its historical and analytical uses, the term of capitalism is prone to be used in a reifying manner. Moreover, Boltanski and Chiapello's attempt to construct ideal types of capitalism – that they summarize as the spirits of bourgeois, managerial and global capitalism – suffers from the same analytical deficiencies that, Münch highlights, plague Weber's original formulation of the notion of ideal type. Münch's criticism of Weber's theorization of ideal types as being open to charges of conflation between historical ideal types of capitalism and its analytical ideal types equally applies to Boltanski and Chiapello's work. Boltanski and Chiapello appear to connect their notions of tests and justification regimes to a certain notion of modern social order that they counterpoise to capitalism without providing sufficient grounds for either analytical or historical distinctions that they make. In contrast, Münch theorizes the relations between capitalism and modernity in a more complex fashion conceptually mediated by the notions of analytical and historical ideal types. To follow Münch's analytical strategy, for my methodological purposes of tracing the notion of cultural accumulation from scales macro to micro, the distinction between Boltanski and

Chiapello's and Münch's theorization of modernity, accumulation and action may be sufficiently summarized with my recourse to the notions of ideal types, especially because there are non-negligible parallels between their works.

With regard to global capitalism, I surmise that, from Münch's perspective, to speak of a global social order one needs to have ideal-typical preconditions for it. In his *On Empire*, Hobsbawm (2008) unequivocally states that there are no empires, as historical precursors of globalization, in historical record that fail to successfully accumulate power, money, reputation, and expertise. Furthermore, Jean-François Bayart's (2007 [2004]) book on globalization and subjectivity, demonstrates on a wealth of examples, ranging from Europe to Africa, the latter having a variety of comparably weak states, that, vis-à-vis the process of globalization, the tendency for states is to become institutionally stronger rather than weaker. Since the process of globalization does not appear to lead to the establishment of a global social order in the sense that Münch has for modernity as an ideal type, whether analytical or historical, Münch's analytical focus on nation-states may remain relevant for the analysis of the processes out of which a global social order might emerge. Furthermore, since Münch's theoretical framework is applicable both on the micro and the macro scales; his analytical categories may also sharpen the understanding of the processes taking place on a global scale. Moreover, I assume it is possible to conceive of a global social order as both an analytical and an historical ideal-type, whether in singular or plural. However, I am not sure whether a single global social order or a plurality of global modernities would supersede states to the extent of making them irrelevant as units of analysis or as points of either historical or analytical relevance or both.

A global social order would have to be institutionalized, differentiated, rationalized, and consistent that, in my opinion, an overly large number of individual and collective actors would have to adhere to in order to have a binding force in an historical or analytical sense. In other words, the systems of economic, cultural, social, and political accumulation analyzed on a global scale may not necessarily show the features of modern social order, at least according to Münch's terms of theoretical reference. Even though there are notable examples of translocal governmentality, via *lex mercatoria* in the international trade (Sassen 2006) or legislative harmonization in the European Union

(Münch 1993), the economic, cultural, social and political convergence associated with globalization is yet to receive institutional, interdependent, contextual and discursive backing that would be shared on scales from micro to macro. The dynamics and contradictions of the processes of globalization may still find their more cogent explication with reference to the nation states and their interrelations rather than to global capitalism.

Bibliography

- Abu-Lughod, Janet L. 1999. *New York, Chicago, Los Angeles: America's Global Cities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1993. "Editorial Comment: On Screening Politics in a World of Nations." *Public Culture* 5.
- Acheson, James M. 1994. "Welcome to Nobel Country: A Review of Institutional Economics." Pp. 3-42 in *Anthropology and institutional economics: Society for Economic Anthropology Meeting, Monographs in economic anthropology*, edited by J. M. Acheson. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.
- . 1998. "Lobster trap limits: A solution to a communal action problem." *Human Organization* 57:43.
- Acheson, James M., Jack Knight, James M. Acheson, and Jack Knight. 2000. "Distribution Fights, Coordination Games, and Lobster Management." *Comparative Studies in Society & History* 42:209.
- Adams, Paul Channing. 1995. "A reconsideration of personal boundaries in space-time." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 85:267.
- Adorno, Theodor W. 1966. *Negative Dialektik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1973. *Negative Dialektik: Jargon der Eigentlichkeit*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Agnew, John A. 1989. "The Devaluation of Place in Social Science." Pp. 9-29 in *The Power of place : bringing together geographical and sociological imaginations*, edited by J. A. Agnew and J. S. Duncan. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Albert, Michel. 1993. *Capitalism vs. capitalism : how America's obsession with individual achievement and short-term profit has led it to the brink of collapse*. New York: Four Walls Eight Windows.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C. 1982. *Theoretical logic in sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1984. "The Parsons Revival in German Sociology." *Sociological Theory* 2:394-412.
- . 1987a. "Action and Its Environments." Pp. 289-318 in *The Micro-Macro Link*, edited by J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Münch, and N. J. Smelser. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1987b. "The Centrality of the Classics." Pp. 1-57 in *Social theory today*, edited by A. Giddens and J. H. Turner. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- . 1990a. "Core Solidarity, Ethnic Out-Groups, and Social Differentiation." Pp. 267-93 in *Differentiation theory and social change : comparative and historical perspectives*, edited by J. C. Alexander and P. B. Colomy. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 1990b. "The Mass News Media in Systemic, Historical, and, Comparative Perspective." Pp. 323-66 in *Differentiation theory and social change : comparative and historical perspectives*, edited by J. C. Alexander and P. B. Colomy. New York: Columbia University Press.

- . 1992. "Durkheim's problem, and differentiation theory today." Pp. 179-204 in *Social change and modernity*, edited by H. Haferkamp and N. J. Smelser. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1998a. "Constructing an Empirical Concept from Normative Controversies and Historical Transformations." Pp. 1-19 in *Real Civil Societies: Dilemmas of Institutionalizations*, edited by J. C. Alexander. London and Thousand Oaks: SAGE Studies in International Sociology.
- . 1998b. *Neofunctionalism and after*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C. and Paul B. Colomy. 1985a. "Institutionalization and Collective Behavior: Points of Contact Between Eisenstadt's Functionalism and Symbolic Interactionism." Pp. 337-45 in *Comparative social dynamics : essays in honor of S.N. Eisenstadt*, edited by S. N. Eisenstadt, E. Cohen, M. Lissak, and U. Almagor. Boulder: Westview Press.
- . 1985b. "Toward Neo-Functionalism." *Sociological Theory* 3:11-23.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C. and Paul Burbank Colomy. 1990. *Differentiation theory and social change : comparative and historical perspectives*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Alexander, Jennifer. 1998c. "Women traders in Javanese marketplaces: ethnicity, gender, and the entrepreneurial spirit." Pp. 203-23 in *Market cultures : society and morality in the new Asian capitalisms*, edited by R. W. Hefner. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- Alexander, Victoria D. 1996. *Museums and Money: The Impact of Funding on Exhibitions, Scholarship, and Management*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Althusser, Louis and Etienne Balibar. 1968. *Lire "le Capital"*. Paris: F. Maspero.
- . 1970. *Reading "Capital"*. London: New Left Books.
- Amin, Ash. 1994. "Post-Fordism: A Reader." in *Studies in Urban and Social Change*. Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- . 1996. "Beyond Associative Democracy." *New Political Economy* 1:309-33.
- Amin, Ash and Stephen Graham. 1997. "The Ordinary City." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 22:411-29.
- Amin, Ash and Jerzy Hausner. 1997. "Interactive Governance and Social Complexity." Pp. 1-31 in *Beyond market and hierarchy: Interactive governance and social complexity*, edited by A. Amin and J. Hausner. Cheltenham, U.K., Lyme, N.H., and Williston, Vt.: Elgar and American International Distribution Corporation.
- Amin, Ash and Nigel Thrift. 1992. "Neo-Marshallian Nodes in Global Networks." *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research* 16:571.
- . 2002. *Cities: Reimagining the Urban*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Anderson, James D. 1988. *The education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Anderson, Perry. 1974. *Lineages of the absolutist state*. London: N.L.B.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. *The Social life of things : commodities in cultural perspective*. Cambridge Cambridgeshire ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1990. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Theory, Culture, and Society* 7:295-310.

- . 1996. *Modernity at large : cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appelbaum, Kalman. 2000. "Crossing Borders: Globalization as Myth and Charter in American Transnational Consumer Marketing." *American Ethnologist* 27:257-82.
- Appelbaum, Kalman, Russell W. Belk, John Clammer, Roy Dilley, James H. McDonald, Daniel Miller, and Benjamin Orlove. 1998. "The Sweetness of Salvation: Consumer Marketing and the Liberal-Bourgeois Theory of Needs [and Comments and Reply]." *Current Anthropology* 39:323-49.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1958a. *Elemente totaler Herrschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt.
- . 1958b. *The origins of totalitarianism*. New York: Meridian Books.
- . 1972. *Crises of the Republic; lying in politics, civil disobedience on violence, thoughts on politics, and revolution*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Arnade, Peter, Martha Howell, and Walter Simons. 2002. "Fertile Spaces: The Productivity of Urban Space in Northern Europe." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32:515-48.
- Arnade, Peter J. 1996. *Realms of ritual : Burgundian ceremony and civic life in late medieval Ghent*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Arnason, Johann P. 2001. "Capitalism in Context: Sources, Trajectories and Alternatives." *Thesis Eleven* 66:99-125.
- Arrighi, Giovanni, Beverly J. Silver, and Iftikhar Ahmad. 1999. *Chaos and governance in the modern world system*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Attreed, Lorraine. 2002. "Urban Identity in Medieval English Towns." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32:571-92.
- Babb, Florence E. 1998. "From Cooperatives to Microenterprises: The Neoliberal Turn in Postrevolutionary Nicaragua." Pp. 109-22 in *The third wave of modernization in Latin America : cultural perspectives on neoliberalism, Jaguar books on Latin America*, edited by L. Phillips. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources.
- Baechler, Jean. 1995a. *Le capitalisme: Les origines*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1995b. *Le capitalisme: L'économie capitaliste*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Baechler, Jean and Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein. 1997. "L'avenir du capitalisme. Débat : Le capitalisme ? Quel capitalisme ? Comment peut-on être anticapitaliste ?" *Revue du MAUSS semestrielle* 9:13-35.
- Balshem, Martha Levittan. 1993. *Cancer in the community : class and medical authority*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Banks, Mark, Andy Lovatt, Justin O'Connor, and Carlo Raffo. 2000. "Risk and trust in the cultural industries." *Geoforum* 31:453-64.
- Baran, Paul A. and Paul M. Sweezy. 1966. *Monopoly capital; an essay on the American economic and social order*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Barnes, Trevor J. 2001. "Rethorizing Economic Geography: From the Quantitative Revolution to the "Cultural Turn"." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 91:546-65.
- Baron, Hans. 1955. *The crisis of the early Italian Renaissance; civic humanism and republican liberty in an age of classicism and tyranny*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

- . 1966. *The crisis of the early Italian Renaissance*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Baudrillard, Jean. 1981. *Simulacres et simulation*. Paris: Éditions Galilée.
- . 1994. *Simulacra and simulation*. Translated by S. F. Glaser. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 1997. *Le complot de l'art*. Paris: Sens & Tonka.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1995. *Life in fragments : essays in postmodern morality*. Oxford ; Cambridge Mass.: Blackwell.
- Bayart, Jean-François. 2007 [2004]. *Global subjects : a political critique of globalization*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Beauregard, Robert A. 1996. "Voices of Decline." Pp. 363-91 in *Readings in urban theory*, edited by S. S. Fainstein and S. Campbell. Cambridge, Mass. ; Oxford: Blackwell.
- Beaverstock, Jonathan V. and Marcus A. Doel. 2001. "Unfolding the spatial architecture of the East Asian financial crisis: the organizational response of global investment banks." *Geoforum* 32:15-32.
- Beaverstock, Jonathan V., R. G. Smith, and P. J. Taylor. 1999. "A Roster of World Cities." *Cities* 16:445-58.
- Beck, Ulrich. 1986. *Risikogesellschaft : auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1988. *Gegengifte : die organisierte Unverantwortlichkeit*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1997a. *The reinvention of politics : rethinking modernity in the global social order*. Cambridge, UK; Cambridge, MA: Polity Press; Blackwell Publishers.
- . 1997b. *Weltrisikogesellschaft, Weltöffentlichkeit und globale Subpolitik*. Wien: Picus.
- . 2005. *Power in the global age : a new global political economy*. Translated by K. Cross. Cambridge, UK and Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Becker, Marvin B. 1981. *Medieval Italy : constraints and creativity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bell, Daniel. 2000. *East meets West : human rights and democracy in East Asia*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Bendix, Reinhard. 1978. *Kings or people : power and the mandate to rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1996. *Nation-building & citizenship : studies of our changing social order*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Bendix, Reinhard and Guenther Roth. 1971. *Scholarship and partisanship; essays on Max Weber*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1968. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." in *Illuminations*, edited by H. Arendt. New York: Schocken Books.
- Bennett, Tony. 1995. *The birth of the museum: history, theory, politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Berger, Bennett M. 1981. *The Survival of a counterculture : ideological work and everyday life among rural communards*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bershady, Harold J. 1973. *Ideology and social knowledge*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- . 1977. "Commentary on Talcott Parsons' Review of H. J. Bershad's *Ideology and Social Knowledge*." Pp. 134-41 in *Social systems and the evolution of action theory*, edited by T. Parsons. New York: Free Press.
- Bestor, Theodore C. 1998a. "Making things clique: cartels, coalitions, and institutional structure in the Tsukiji wholesale seafood market." Pp. 154-80 in *Networks, markets, and the Pacific rim : studies in strategy, Japan business and economics series*, edited by W. M. Fruin. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1998b. "Visible hands: auctions and institutional integration in the Tsukiji wholesale fish market, Tokyo." Pp. 229-54 in *Japanese business: Critical perspectives on business and management*, edited by S. Beechler and K. Stucker. London ; New York: Routledge.
- . 1999. "Wholesale Sushi: Culture and Commodity in Tokyo's Tsukiji Market." Pp. 201-42 in *Theorizing the city : the new urban anthropology reader*, edited by S. M. Low. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- . 2004. *Tsukiji : the fish market at the center of the world*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bianchini, Franco. 1988. "City centres, city cultures : the role of the arts in the revitalisation of towns and cities." Centre for Local Economic Strategies, Manchester.
- . 1989. "Cultural policy and urban social movements: the response of the 'New Left' in Rome (1976-85) and London (1981-86)." Pp. 18-46 in *Leisure and urban processes : critical studies of leisure policy in Western European cities*, edited by P. Bramham. London: Routledge.
- Bianchini, Franco and Hermann Schwengel. 1991. "Re-imagining the City." Pp. 212-34 in *Enterprise and heritage : crosscurrents of national culture*, edited by J. Corner and S. Harvey. London: Routledge.
- Biersack, Aletta and Lynn Avery Hunt. 1989. *The New cultural history : essays*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bilton, Chris. 1999. "Risky Business: The Independent Production Sector in Britain's Creative Industries." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 6:17-39.
- Bingham, Nick. 1996. "Object-ions: from technological determinism towards geographies of relations." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16:635 – 57.
- Blau, Peter M. 1987. "Contrasting Theoretical Perspectives." Pp. 71-85 in *The Micro-Macro Link*, edited by J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Münch, and N. J. Smelser. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bledstein, Burton J. 1976. *The culture of professionalism : the middle class and the development of higher education in America*. New York: Norton.
- Blim, Michael. 1990. *Made in Italy : small-scale industrialization and its consequences*. New York: Praeger.
- . 1996. "Cultures and the Problems of Capitalisms." *Critique of Anthropology* 16:79-93.
- . 1997. "Can NOT-Capitalism Lie at the End of History, or Is Capitalism's History Drawing to an End?" *Critique of Anthropology* 17:351-63.
- . 2000. "Capitalisms in Late Modernity." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29:25-38.

- Blumer, Herbert. 1953. "Collective Behavior." Pp. 165-222 in *Principles of sociology, College outline series*, edited by A. M. Lee. New York: Barnes & Noble.
- . 1969. *Symbolic interactionism; perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Boddy, Martin. 1999. "Geographical Economics and Urban Competitiveness: A Critique." *Urban Studies* 36:811 - 42.
- Boden, Deirdre and Harvey Luskin Molotch. 1994. "The compulsion of proximity." Pp. 257-86 in *Now/Here : space, time and modernity*, edited by R. Friedland and D. Boden. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Boeri, Stefano, Rem Koolhaas, Sanford Kwinter, Hans-Ulrich Obrist, and Nadia Tazi. 2000. *Mutations : Rem Koolhaas, Harvard Project on the City : Stefano Boeri, Multiplicity : Sanford Kwinter : Nadia Tazi, Hans Ulrich Obrist*. Barcelona, Spain, and Bordeaux, France: Actar and Arc en rêve centre d'architecture.
- Boltanski, Luc and Eve Chiapello. 1999. *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 2005a. *The new spirit of capitalism*. New York, NY: Verso.
- . 2005b. "The New Spirit of Capitalism." *International Journal of Politics, Culture & Society* 18:161-88.
- Boltanski, Luc and Laurent Thevenot. 1991. *De la justification : les économies de la grandeur*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1999. "The Sociology of Critical Capacity." *European Journal of Social Theory* 2:359.
- . 2006. *On justification : economies of worth*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Boltanski, Luc and Laurent Thévenot. 1991. *De la justification. Les économies de la grandeur*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Boone, Marc. 2002. "Urban Space and Political Conflict in Late Medieval Flanders." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32:621-40.
- Boone, Marc and Peter Stabel. 2000. *Shaping urban identity in late Medieval Europe = L'apparition d'une identité urbaine dans l'Europe du bas moyen âge*. Leuven: Garant.
- Boudon, Raymond. 1977. *Effets pervers et ordre social*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1979. *La distinction : critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- . 1984. *Homo academicus*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- . 1985. "The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups." *Theory and Society* 14:723-44.
- Bourricaud, François. 1976. "Penury and Deficit, or the Problem of Political Underutilization." Pp. 557-78 in *Explorations in general theory in social science : essays in honor of Talcott Parsons*, edited by T. Parsons and J. J. Loubser. New York: Free Press.
- Boyarin, Jonathan. 1994. "Space, Time, and the Politics of Memory." Pp. 1-24 in *Remapping memory : the politics of timespace*, edited by J. Boyarin. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Boyer, Christine M. 1994. *The city of collective memory : its historical imagery and architectural entertainments*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- . 1995. "The Great Frame-Up: Fantastic Appearances in Contemporary Spatial Politics." Pp. 81-109 in *Spatial practices : critical explorations in socialspatial theory*, edited by H. Liggett and D. C. Perry. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- . 1996. *CyberCities : visual perception in the age of electronic communication*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Branch, Taylor. 1988. *Parting the waters : America in the King years, 1954-63*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Braudel, Fernand. 1977. *Afterthoughts on material civilization and capitalism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . 1979a. *Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme, XVe-XVIII siècle: 1: Les structures du quotidien*. Paris: A. Colin.
- . 1979b. *Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme, XVe-XVIII siècle: 2: Les jeux de l'échange*. Paris: A. Colin.
- . 1979c. *Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme, XVe-XVIII siècle: 3: Le temps du monde*. Paris: A. Colin.
- . 1982. *Civilization and capitalism, 15th-18th century*. New York: Harper & Row.
- . 1992. *Civilization and capitalism, 15th-18th century*, Edited by S. Reynolds. Translated by S. Reynolds. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Brenner, Neil. 1994. "Foucault's New Functionalism." *Theory and Society* 23:679-709.
- . 1998. "Global cities, glocal states: global city formation and state territorial restructuring in contemporary Europe." *Review of International Political Economy* 5:1-37.
- . 1999. "Beyond State-Centrism? Space, Territoriality, and Geographical Scale in Globalization Studies." *Theory and Society* 28:39-78.
- Britnell, R. H. 1996. *The commercialisation of English society, 1000-1500*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Broek, Andries van den. 1996. *Politics and generations : cohort replacement and generation formation in political culture in the Netherlands*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Broek, Andries van den, Frank Huysmans, and Jos de Haan. 2005. *Culture-lovers and culture-leavers : trends in interest in the arts & cultural heritage in the Netherlands*. The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office : Ministry of Education, Culture and Science.
- Bromley, Simon. 1999. "The Space of Flows and Timeless Time: Manuel Castells's "The Information Age"." *Radical Philosophy* 97:6-17.
- Brooks, Peter. 1984. *Reading for the plot : design and intention in narrative*. New York: A.A. Knopf.
- Brucker, Gene A. 1969. *Renaissance Florence*. New York: Wiley.
- Buck-Morss, Susan. 1995. "Envisioning Capital: Political Economy on Display." *Critical Inquiry* 21:434-67.
- Buechler, Hans, Judith-Maria Buechler, Simone Buechler, and Stephanie Buechler. 1998. "Financing small-scale enterprises in Bolivia." Pp. 83-108 in *The third wave of modernization in Latin America : cultural perspectives on neoliberalism, Jaguar books on Latin America*, edited by L. Phillips. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources.

- Burawoy, Michael. 1991. *Ethnography unbound : power and resistance in the modern metropolis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burckhardt, Jacob. 1990. *The civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, Edited by P. Burke and P. Murray. Translated by S. G. C. Middlemore. London, England ; New York, N.Y., USA: Penguin Books.
- . [1860] 1985. *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien : ein Versuch*, Edited by K. Hoffmann. Stuttgart: A. Kröner.
- . [1861] 2007. *Judgements on history and historians*, Edited by H. Trevor-Roper. Translated by H. Trevor-Roper. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Calhoun, Craig Jackson. 1983. "The Radicalism of Tradition: Community Strength or Venerable Disguise and Borrowed Language?" *The American Journal of Sociology* 88:886-914.
- Callies, Horst. 1975. "Der Stadtbegriff bei Max Weber." Pp. 56-60 in *Vor- und Frühformen der europäischen Stadt im Mittelalter : Bericht über e. Symposium in Reinhausen b. Göttingen in d. Zeit vom 18.-24. April 1972*, vol. 1, *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Nr. 83-84*, edited by H. Jankuhn, W. Schlesinger, and H. Steuer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Callon, Michel. 1986b. "Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Briec Bay." Pp. 196-223 in *Power, action, and belief : a new sociology of knowledge?, Sociological review monograph*, edited by J. Law. London ; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- . 1991. "Techno-economic networks and irreversibility." Pp. 132-65 in *A Sociology of monsters : essays on power, technology and domination, Sociological review monograph*, edited by J. Law. London: Routledge.
- Camille, Michael. 2000. "Signs of the City: Place, Power, and Public Fantasy in Medieval Paris." Pp. 1-37 in *Medieval practices of space, Medieval cultures*, edited by B. Hanawalt and M. Kobiak. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Carlstein, Tommy, Don Parkes, and Nigel J. Thrift. 1978. *Timing space and spacing time: 1: Making sense of time*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Carrier, James G. and Josiah Mcc. Heyman. 1997. "Consumption and Political Economy." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 3:355-73.
- Castells, Manuel. 1989. *The informational city : information technology, economic restructuring, and the urban-regional process*. Oxford, UK ; Cambridge, Mass., USA: B. Blackwell.
- . 1996. *The rise of the network society*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.
- . 2000. *The rise of the network society*. Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.
- Castoriadis, Cornelius. 1988. *Cornelius Castoriadis: political and social writings*, vol. 3, Edited by D. A. Curtis. Translated by D. A. Curtis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 1999. "La rationalité du capitalisme." Pp. 65-66 in *Figures du pensable, La couleur des idées*, edited by C. Castoriadis. Paris: Seuil.
- . 1999a. *Figures du pensable*. Paris: Seuil.

- . 1999b. "La rationalité du capitalisme." Pp. 65-66 in *Figures du pensable, La couleur des idées*, edited by C. Castoriadis. Paris: Seuil.
- Champagne, Duane. 1990. "Culture, Differentiation, and Environment: Social Change in Tlingit Society." Pp. 52-87 in *Differentiation theory and social change : comparative and historical perspectives*, edited by J. C. Alexander and P. B. Colomy. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 1992a. *Social order and political change : constitutional governments among the Cherokee, the Choctaw, the Chickasaw, and the Creek*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- . 1992b. "Transsocietal Cultural Exchange within the World Economic and Political System." Pp. 120-53 in *The Dynamics of social systems, Sage studies in international sociology*, edited by P. B. Colomy. London ; Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Chevalier, Bernard. 1982. *Les bonnes villes de France du XIVe au XVIe siècle*. Paris: Aubier Montaigne.
- Chiapello, Eve. 1998. *Artistes versus managers : le management culturel face a la critique artiste*. Paris: Editions Métailie and Seuil.
- Chiot, Daniel. 2001. "A Clash of Civilizations or of Paradigms?: Theorizing Progress and Social Change." *International Sociology* 16:341.
- Church, Andrew and Peter Reid. 1996. "Urban Power, International Networks and Competition: The Example of Cross-border Cooperation." *Urban Studies* 33:1297-318.
- Cisneros, Henry and American Assembly. 1993. *Interwoven destinies : cities and the nation*. New York: Norton.
- Clifford, James. 1986. "Introduction: Partial truths." Pp. 1-26 in *Writing culture : the poetics and politics of ethnography : a School of American Research advanced seminar*, edited by J. Clifford and G. E. Marcus. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1994. "Diasporas." *Cultural Anthropology* 9:302-38.
- Clifford, James and George E. Marcus. 1986. *Writing culture : the poetics and politics of ethnography : a School of American Research advanced seminar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coates, David. 2000. *Models of capitalism : growth and stagnation in the modern era*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press; Blackwell.
- Cohen, Joshua and Joel Rogers. 1992. "Secondary associations and democratic governance. (Cover story)." *Politics & Society* 20:393.
- Coleman, James S. 1971. "Collective Decisions." Pp. 272-86 in *Institutions and social exchange; the sociologies of Talcott Parsons & George C. Homans*, edited by H. Turk and R. L. Simpson. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- . 1973. *Power and the structure of society*. New York: Norton.
- . 1974. "Inequality, Sociology, and Moral Philosophy." *The American Journal of Sociology* 80:739-64.
- Coleman, James Samuel. 1990. *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Collins, Jim. 1995. *Architectures of excess : cultural life in the information age*. New York: Routledge.

- Collins, Randall. 1975. *Conflict sociology : toward an explanatory science*. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1981. "On the Microfoundations of Macrosociology." *The American Journal of Sociology* 86:984-1014.
- . 1986. "Weber's Last Theory of Capitalism." Pp. 19-44 in *Weberian sociological theory*, edited by R. Collins. Cambridge Cambridgeshire ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Colomy, Paul B. 1985. "Uneven Structural Differentiation: Toward a Comparative Approach." Pp. 131-56 in *Neofunctionalism, Key issues in sociological theory*, edited by J. C. Alexander. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- . 1990a. "Strategic Groups and Political Differentiation in the Antebellum United States." Pp. 222-64 in *Differentiation theory and social change : comparative and historical perspectives*, edited by J. C. Alexander and P. B. Colomy. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 1990b. "Uneven Differentiation and Incomplete Institutionalization: Political Change and Continuity in the early American nation." Pp. 119-62 in *Differentiation theory and social change : comparative and historical perspectives*, edited by J. C. Alexander and P. B. Colomy. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Colomy, Paul B. and Gary Rhoades. 1994. "Toward a Micro Corrective of Structural Differentiation Theory." *Sociological Perspectives* 37:547-83.
- Comte, Auguste. 1830. *Cours de philosophie positive*. Paris: Bachelier.
- . 1853. *The positive philosophy of Auguste Comte*, Edited by H. Martineau. Translated by H. Martineau. London: J. Chapman.
- Cook, Scott and Leigh Binford. 1990. *Obliging need : rural petty industry in Mexican capitalism*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Coombe, Rosemary J. 1995. "The Cultural Life of Things." *American University Journal of International Law and Policy* 10:791-835.
- Cooper, Eugene and Yinbo Jiang. 1998. *The artisans and entrepreneurs of Dongyang county : economic reform and flexible production in China*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe.
- Coser, Lewis A. 1956. *The functions of social conflict*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- . 1967. *Continuities in the study of social conflict*. New York: Free Press.
- Cox, Kevin and Andrew Mair. 1989. "Levels of Abstraction in Locality Studies." *Antipode* 21:121-32.
- Cremin, Lawrence A. 1961. *The transformation of the school; progressivism in American education, 1876-1957*. New York: Knopf.
- . 1988. *American education, the metropolitan experience, 1876-1980*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Crimp, Douglas and Louise Lawler. 1993. *On the museum's ruins*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Crouzet-Pavan, Elisabeth. 1992. *Sopra le acque salse : espaces, pouvoir et société à Venise à la fin du Moyen Age*. Roma: Ecole française de Rome.
- Crouzet-Pavan, Elisabeth. 2000. "Cultures et contre-cultures : à propos des logiques spatiales de l'espace public Vénitien." Pp. 89-200 in *Shaping urban identity in late Medieval Europe = L'apparition d'une identité urbaine dans l'Europe du bas moyen âge*, *Studies in urban social, economic and political history of the*

- medieval and modern Low Countries*, edited by M. Boone and P. Stabel. Leuven: Garant.
- Crozier, Michel. 1964. *Le phénomène bureaucratique; essai sur les tendances bureaucratiques des systèmes d'organisation modernes et sur leurs relations en France avec le système social et culturel*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf. 1955. "Struktur und Funktion: Talcott Parsons und die Entwicklung der soziologischen Theorie." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 7:491-519.
- . 1958a. "Out of Utopia: Toward a Reorientation of Sociological Analysis." *The American Journal of Sociology* 64:115-27.
- . 1958b. "Toward a Theory of Social Conflict." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 2:170-83.
- Danto, Arthur Coleman. 1997. *After the end of art : contemporary art and the pale of history*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Davis, Mike. 1990. *City of quartz : excavating the future in Los Angeles*. London ; New York: Verso.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. 1975. *Society and culture in early modern France : eight essays*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Davis, Robert C. 1994. *The war of the fists : popular culture and public violence in late Renaissance Venice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1998. "The Geography of Gender in the Renaissance." Pp. 19-38 in *Gender and society in Renaissance Italy, Women and men in history*, edited by J. C. Brown and R. C. Davis. London ; New York: Longman.
- de Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by S. Rendall. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- de Tocqueville, Alexis. 1856. *L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*. Paris: Michel Lévy frères.
- . 1967. *L'Ancien régime et la Révolution*, Edited by J. P. Mayer. Paris: Gallimard.
- Dear, Michael. 1995. "Prolegomena to a post-modern urbanism." Pp. 27-44 in *Managing cities : the new urban context*, edited by P. Healey. Chichester ; New York: J. Wiley.
- Dear, Michael J. 2000. *The postmodern urban condition*. Oxford, OX., England ; Malden, Mass: Blackwell.
- Deas, Iain and Benito Giordano. 2001. "Conceptualizing and measuring urban competitiveness in major English cities: an exploratory approach." *Environment & Planning A* 33:1411-29.
- Debord, Guy. 1988. *Commentaires sur la Société du spectacle*. Paris: Éditions Gérard Lebovici.
- . 1994. *The society of the spectacle*. Translated by D. Nicholson-Smith. New York: Zone Books.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1972. *L'Anti-Œdipe: Capitalisme et schizophrénie*. Paris: Minuit.
- . 1980. *Mille plateaux : capitalisme et schizophrénie*. Paris: Éditions de minuit.
- . 1983. *Anti-Oedipus : capitalism and schizophrenia*. Translated by R. Hurley, M. Seem, and H. R. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- . 1987. *A thousand plateaus : capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 1988. *A thousand plateaus : capitalism and schizophrenia*. London: Athlone Press.
- DeLillo, Don. 1985. *White noise*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Dematteis, Giuseppe. 1988. "The Weak Metropolis." Pp. 121–33 in *World cities and the future of the metropolises*, edited by L. Mazza and G. Teyssot. Milano: Electa.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1967. *L'Écriture et la différence*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- . 1972. *La dissémination*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- . 1981. *Dissemination*. Chicago: University Press.
- . 1988. *Limited Inc.* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Descartes, René. [1618-1637] 1963. *Œuvres Philosophiques*, Edited by F. Alquié. Paris: Garnier frères.
- Deutschmann, Christoph. 1999. *Die Verheissung des absoluten Reichtums : zur religiösen Natur des Kapitalismus*. Frankfurt am Main ; New York: Campus.
- . 2002. "Die gesellschaftliche Macht des Geldes." Pp. 367 in *Leviathan. Sonderheft ; 21*, edited by D. Baecker. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Diallo, Djibril. 2003. "United Nations Development Programme Annual Report: A World of Development Experience." United Nations Development Programme, New York.
- Dicken, Peter. 1992. *Global shift : the internationalization of economic activity*. London: Paul Chapman Pub.
- Diggins, John P. 1978. *The bard of savagery : Thorstein Veblen and modern social theory*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Doel, Marcus. 1995. "Bodies without organs: schizoanalysis and deconstruction." Pp. 226-40 in *Mapping the subject : geographies of cultural transformation*, edited by S. Pile and N. J. Thrift. London and New York: Routledge.
- Doel, Marcus A. 1999. *Poststructuralist geographies : the diabolical art of spatial science*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Doel, Marcus and Phil Hubbard. 2002. "Taking World Cities Literally: Marketing the City in a Global Space of Flows." *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action* 6:351-68.
- Dolan, Frances E. 2002. "Gender and the "Lost" Spaces of Catholicism." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32:641-65.
- Dow, Thomas E., Jr. 1968. "The Role of Charisma in Modern African Development." *Social Forces* 46:328-38.
- Dreeben, Robert. 1971. "American Schooling: Patterns and Processes of Stability and Change." Pp. 82-119 in *Stability and social change*, edited by B. Barber, A. Inkeles, and T. Parsons. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L., Paul Rabinow, and Michel Foucault. 1983. *Michel Foucault, beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Drèze, Jean and Amartya Kumar Sen. 1995. *India, economic development and social opportunity*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Duffy, Hazel. 1995. *Competitive cities : succeeding in the global economy*. London ; New York: E & FN Spon.
- Dumont, Louis. 1967. *Homo hierarchicus, essai sur le système des castes*. Paris: Gallimard.

- . 1976. *Homo aequalis*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1983. *Essais sur l'individualisme : une perspective anthropologique sur l'idéologie moderne*. Paris: Editions de Seuil.
- Duncan, Carol. 1995. *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. New York and London, England: Routledge.
- DuPlessis, Robert S. 1997. *Transitions to capitalism in early modern Europe*. Cambridge, United Kingdom ; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1897. *Le suicide; étude de sociologie*. Paris: F. Alcan.
- . 1973a. *Moral education; a study in the theory and application of the sociology of education*, Edited by E. K. Wilson. Translated by E. K. Wilson and H. Schnurer. New York: Free Press.
- . 1973b. *On morality and society; selected writings*, Edited by R. N. Bellah. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . [1897] 1952. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*, Edited by G. Simpson. Translated by J. A. Spaulding and G. Simpson. London: Routledge & K. Paul.
- Durkheim, Émile. [1893] 1964. *The division of labor in society*. Translated by G. Simpson. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- . [1893] 1998. *De la division du travail social*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Eijck, Koen and Hans Mommaas. 2004. "Leisure, Lifestyle, and the New Middle Class." *Leisure Sciences* 26:373 - 92.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. 1963. *The political systems of empires*. London New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- . 1964. "Social Change, Differentiation and Evolution." *American Sociological Review* 29:375-86.
- . 1965. *Essays on comparative institutions*. New York: J. Wiley.
- . 1971. *Social differentiation & stratification*. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.
- . 1973. *Tradition, change, and modernity*. New York: Wiley.
- . 1978. *Revolution and the transformation of societies : a comparative study of civilizations*. New York: Free Press.
- . 1980. "Cultural Orientations, Institutional Entrepreneurs, and Social Change: Comparative Analysis of Traditional Civilizations." *The American Journal of Sociology* 85:840-69.
- . 1982. "The axial Age: the Emergence of transcendental visions and the Rise of Clerics." *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 23:294-314.
- . 1985. "Civilizational Formations and Political Dynamics." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 8:231-51.
- . 1990. "Modes of structural differentiation, elite structure, and cultural visions." Pp. 19-51 in *Differentiation theory and social change : comparative and historical perspectives*, edited by J. C. Alexander and P. B. Colomy. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Eisenstadt, Shmuel N. 1996. *Japanese civilization : a comparative view*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- . 2000a. "Multiple modernities." *Daedalus* 129:1.
- . 2000b. *Die Vielfalt der Moderne*. Weilerswist: Velbrück Wissenschaft.
- Elias, Norbert. 1939. *Über den Prozess der Zivilisation : soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen*. Basel: Haus zum Falken.

- . 1978. *The civilizing process*. Translated by E. Jephcott. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Ellin, Nan. 1996. *Postmodern urbanism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Ellis, Desmond P. 1971. "The Hobbesian Problem of Order: A Critical Appraisal of the Normative Solution." *American Sociological Review* 36:692-703.
- Emlen, Julia, Kurt A. Raaflaub, and Anthony Molho. 1991. *City-states in classical antiquity and medieval Italy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Thomas J. Watson, Jr. Institute for International Studies, and Association of Ancient Historians.
- Engels, Friedrich. [1845] 1996. "The Great Towns." Pp. 46-55 in *The city reader*, edited by R. T. LeGates and F. Stout. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Ennen, Edith. 1972. *Die europäische Stadt des Mittelalters*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1979. *Die europäische Stadt des Mittelalters*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Escobar, Arturo. 1992. "Reflections on Development: Grassroots Approaches and Alternative Politics in the Third World." *Futures* 24:411-36.
- Escobar, Arturo, David Hess, Isabel Licha, Will Sibley, Marilyn Strathern, and Judith Sutz. 1994. "Welcome to Cyberia: Notes on the Anthropology of Cyberculture [and Comments and Reply]." *Current Anthropology* 35:211-31.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. 1990. *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Estabrook, Carl B. 2002. "Ritual, Space, and Authority in Seventeenth-Century English Cathedral Cities." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32:593-620.
- European Commission. 1995. *Local development and employment initiatives : an investigation in the European Union*. Luxembourg; Lanham, MD: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities; UNIPUB distributor.
- Evans, Peter B., Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol. 1985. "On the Road toward a More Adequate Understanding of the State." Pp. 347-66 in *Bringing the state back in*, edited by P. B. Evans, D. Rueschemeyer, and T. Skocpol. Cambridge Cambridgeshire ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fagen, Richard R. 1965. "Charismatic Authority and the Leadership of Fidel Castro." *The Western Political Quarterly* 18:275-84.
- Fainstein, Susan S. 1994. *The city builders : property, politics, and planning in London and New York*. Oxford, UK ; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Fang, Frank S. 2007. *China fever : fascination, fear, and the world's next superpower*. Berkeley, CA: Stone Bridge Press.
- Faris, Ellsworth. 1953. "Book Review: *The Social System* by Talcott Parsons." *American Sociological Review* 18:103-06.
- Featherstone, Mike. 1991. *Consumer culture and postmodernism*. London ; Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- . 2007. *Consumer culture and postmodernism*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Feld, Steven. 1994. "From schizophonia to schismogenesis: on the discourses and commodification practices of 'world music' and 'world beat'." Pp. 257-89 in *Music grooves : essays and dialogues*, edited by C. Keil and S. Feld. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Firebaugh, Glenn. 2003. *The new geography of global income inequality*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

- Fischer, Michael M. J. 1991. "Uses of Life Histories." *Anthropology & Humanism Quarterly* 16:24-27.
- Fischer, Michael M. J. and Mehdi Abedi. 1990. *Debating Muslims : cultural dialogues in postmodernity and tradition*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Fitzpatrick, Tony. 1997. "A tale of tall cities." Pp. 9 in *The Guardian*. London.
- Foster, Hal. 1983. *The Anti-aesthetic : essays on postmodern culture*. Port Townsend, Wash.: Bay Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1966. *Les mots et les choses : une archéologie des sciences humaines*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1969. *L'archéologie du savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1971. *L'ordre du discours; leçon inaugurale au Collège de France prononcée le 2 décembre 1970*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1975. *Surveiller et punir : naissance de la prison*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1980. *Power/knowledge : selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*, Edited by C. Gordon. Translated by C. Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Franck, Dan. 2001. *The bohemians : the birth of modern art : Paris 1900-1930*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Frank, Andre Gunder. 1970. *Sociology of development and underdevelopment of sociology*. Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria: Afrografika Publishers.
- . 1978. *World accumulation, 1492-1789*. London: Macmillan.
- . 1998. *ReOrient : global economy in the Asian Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Freeman, Carla. 1998. "Femininity and Flexible Labor: Fashioning class through gender on the global assembly line." *Critique of Anthropology* 18:245-62.
- Freeman, Jo. 1973. "The Origins of the Women's Liberation Movement." *The American Journal of Sociology* 78:792-811.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1972. "Das Ich und das Es." Pp. 237-427 in *Gesammelte Werke : chronologisch Geordnet*, vol. 13, edited by A. Freud. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.
- Friedland, Roger and Deirdre Boden. 1994. *NowHere : space, time and modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Friedman, John. 1995. "Where We Stand: A Decade of World City Research." Pp. 21-47 in *World cities in a world-system*, edited by P. L. Knox and P. J. Taylor. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Friedmann, Jonathan. 1986. "The world city hypothesis." *Development and Change* 17:69-83.
- Fubini, Riccardo. 1992. "Renaissance Historian: The Career of Hans Baron." *The Journal of Modern History* 64:541-74.
- Gaines, Jane. 1991. *Contested culture : the image, the voice, and the law*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Gallagher, Shaun. 1992. *Hermeneutics and education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Gates, Hill. 1996. *China's motor : a thousand years of petty capitalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Geddes, Patrick. 1915. *Cities in evolution; an introduction to the town planning movement and to the study of civics*. London: Williams & Norgate.
- Gibson, Chris and Lily Kong. 2005. "Cultural economy: a critical review." *Progress in Human Geography* 29:541-61.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. 1996. *The end of capitalism (as we knew it) : a feminist critique of political economy*. Cambridge, Mass. ; Oxford U.K.: Blackwell Publishers.
- . 2000. "Poststructural Interventions." Pp. 127-38 in *A companion to economic geography, Blackwell companions to geography*, edited by E. S. Sheppard and T. J. Barnes. Oxford ; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The constitution of society : outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge Cambridgeshire: Polity Press.
- . 1990. *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- . 1991. *Modernity and self-identity : self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- . 1994. *Beyond left and right : the future of radical politics*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The black Atlantic : modernity and double consciousness*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Ginsburg, Faye. 1993. "Aboriginal Media and the Australian Imaginary." *Public Culture* 5:557-78.
- . 1994. "Embedded Aesthetics: Creating a Discursive Space for Indigenous Media." *Cultural Anthropology* 9:365-82.
- . 1995. "Mediating Culture: Indigenous Media, Ethnographic Film, and the Production of Identity." Pp. 256-91 in *Fields of Vision: Essays in Film Studies, Visual Anthropology, and Photography*, edited by L. Devereaux and R. Hillman. Berkeley: U of California P.
- Ginsburg, Faye D. and Rayna Rapp. 1995. *Conceiving the new world order : the global politics of reproduction*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gledhill, John. 1998. "The Mexican Contribution to Restructuring US Capitalism: NAFTA as an instrument of flexible accumulation." *Critique of Anthropology* 18:279-96.
- Gold, John Robert and Stephen V. Ward. 1994. *Place promotion : the use of publicity and marketing to sell towns and regions*. Chichester England ; New York: Wiley.
- Goldthorpe, John H. 1968. *The Affluent worker: political attitudes and behaviour*. London: Cambridge U.P.
- Goldthorpe, John H., Catriona Llewellyn, and Clive Payne. 1980. *Social mobility and class structure in modern Britain*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press.
- Goldthwaite, Richard A. 1980. *The building of Renaissance Florence : an economic and social history*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . 1993. *Wealth and the demand for art in Italy, 1300-1600*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gottdiener, Mark. 1985. *The social production of urban space*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1997. *The theming of America : dreams, visions, and commercial spaces*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

- Gouldner, Alvin Ward. 1970a. *The coming crisis of Western sociology*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 1970b. *The coming crisis of Western sociology*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 1980. *The two Marxisms : contradictions and anomalies in the development of theory*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Graham, Stephen. 1997. "Telecommunications and the future of cities: debunking the myths." *Cities* 14:21-29.
- Graham, Stephen and Alessandro Aurigi. 1997. "Virtual cities, social polarization, and the crisis in urban public space." *Journal of Urban Technology* 4:19 - 52.
- Graham, Stephen and Simon Marvin. 1996. *Telecommunications and the city : electronic spaces, urban places*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Granovetter, Mark. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *The American Journal of Sociology* 91:481-510.
- Grasmuck, Sherri and Patricia R. Pessar. 1991. *Between two islands : Dominican international migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Green, Thomas Hill and John R. Rodman. 1964. *The political theory of T. H. Green; selected writings*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Griffiths, Ron. 1995. "Cultural strategies and new modes of urban intervention." *Cities* 12:253-65.
- Groys, Boris. 2005. "Multiple Authorship." Pp. 93-100 in *The Manifesta decade : debates on contemporary art exhibitions and biennials in post-wall Europe*, edited by B. Vanderlinden and E. Filipovic. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Guattari, Félix. 2000. *The three ecologies*. London ; New Brunswick, NJ: Athlone Press.
- Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson. 1992. "Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference." *Cultural Anthropology* 7:6-23.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1965. *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit : Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*. Neuwied: H. Luchterhand.
- . 1967. *Theorie und Praxis; sozialphilosophische Studien*. Neuwied am Rhein: Luchterhand.
- . 1971. *Theorie und Praxis : sozialphilosophische studien*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- . 1973. *Legitimationsprobleme im Spätkapitalismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1976. *Zur Rekonstruktion des historischen Materialismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1978a. *Politik, Kunst, Religion : Essays über zeitgenössische Philosophen*. Stuttgart: Reclam.
- . 1978b. *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit : Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*. Darmstadt: Luchterhand.
- . 1981. *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1982. *Zur Logik der Sozialwissenschaften*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1988. *Der philosophische Diskurs der Moderne : zwölf Vorlesungen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Hajer, Maarten A. 1993. "Rotterdam: re-designing the public domain." Pp. 48-72 in *Cultural policy and urban regeneration : the West European experience*, edited by M. Parkinson and F. Bianchini. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Hall, Peter A. and David W. Soskice. 2001. *Varieties of capitalism : the institutional foundations of comparative advantage*. Oxford England ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, Stuart. 1995. "New cultures for old." Pp. 175-213 in *A place in the world? : places, cultures and globalization, The shape of the world : explorations in human geography ; v.4*, edited by D. B. Massey and P. M. Jess. Oxford: Oxford University Press in association with the Open University.
- Hall, Tim and Phil Hubbard. 1996. "The entrepreneurial city: new urban politics, new urban geographies?" *Progress in Human Geography*:153-74.
- Hamilton, Gary G. 1994. "Civilizations and the Organization of Economies." in *The handbook of economic sociology*, edited by N. J. Smelser and R. Swedberg. Princeton; New York: Princeton University Press; Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hammersley, Martyn and Paul Atkinson. 1983. *Ethnography : principles in practice*. London ; New York: Tavistock.
- Hanawalt, Barbara and Michal Kobiak. 2000. *Medieval practices of space*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hannigan, John. 1998. *Fantasy city : pleasure and profit in the postmodern metropolis*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Haraway, Donna Jeanne. 1991a. "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century." Pp. 149-282 in *Simians, cyborgs, and women : the reinvention of nature*, edited by D. J. Haraway. New York: Routledge.
- . 1991b. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." Pp. 183-202. in *Simians, cyborgs, and women : the reinvention of nature*, edited by D. J. Haraway. New York: Routledge.
- Harding, Vanessa. 2002. "Space, Property, and Propriety in Urban England." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32:549-69.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Harrison, Faye. 1997. "The gendered politics and violence of structural adjustment." Pp. 451-68 in *Situated lives : gender and culture in everyday life*, edited by L. Lamphere, H. Ragoné, and P. Zavella. New York: Routledge.
- Harvey, David. 1987. "Flexible Accumulation through Urbanization Reflections on" Post-Modernism" in the American City." *Antipode* 19:260-86.
- . 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford England and Cambridge, Mass., USA: Blackwell.
- . 1996. *Justice, nature, and the geography of difference*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.
- . 2006. "The New Imperialism." *The Professional Geographer* 58:114-17.
- Haskell, Thomas L. 1977. *The emergence of professional social science : the American Social Science Association and the nineteenth-century crisis of authority*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- . 1984. "Professionalism versus Capitalism: R.H. Tawney, Emile Durkheim and C.S. Peirce on the Disinterestedness of Professional Communities." Pp. 180-225 in *The Authority of experts : studies in history and theory, Interdisciplinary studies in history*, edited by T. L. Haskell. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Healey, Patsy. 1995a. "Discourses of integration: making frameworks for democratic urban planning." Pp. 251-72 in *Managing cities : the new urban context*, edited by P. Healey. Chichester ; New York: J. Wiley.
- . 1995b. *Managing cities : the new urban context*. Chichester ; New York: J. Wiley.
- . 1997. *Collaborative planning : shaping places in fragmented societies*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Healey, Patsy and Geoff Vigar. 1996. "Consensus-building and institutional re-design for regional development." in *The Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning and Association of European Schools of Planning Congress*. Toronto: Ryerson Polytechnic University.
- Hefner, Robert W. 1998a. "Introduction: society and morality in the new Asian capitalisms." Pp. 1-40 in *Market cultures : society and morality in the new Asian capitalisms*, edited by R. W. Hefner. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- . 1998b. "Markets and Justice for Muslim Indonesians." Pp. 224-56 in *Market cultures : society and morality in the new Asian capitalisms*, edited by R. W. Hefner. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- . 1998c. *Market cultures : society and morality in the new Asian capitalisms*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- . 1998d. "Multiple Modernities: Christianity, Islam, and Hinduism in a Globalizing Age." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27:83.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. 1957. *Sämtliche Werke. Jubiläumsausgabe. Auf Grund des von Ludwig Boumann [et. al] besorgten Originaldruckes im Faksimileverfahren*, Edited by H. Glockner. Stuttgart: F. Frommann.
- . 1972. *Hegel's philosophy of mind*, Edited by W. Wallace. Translated by W. Wallace. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press.
- Heinich, Nathalie. 1998a. *Ce que l'art fait à la sociologie*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- . 1998b. *Le triple jeu de l'art contemporain : sociologie des arts plastiques*. Paris: Minuit.
- Heller, Patrick. 1999. *The labor of development : workers and the transformation of capitalism in Kerala, India*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Hennis, Wilhelm. 1987. *Max Webers Fragestellung : Studien zur Biographie des Werks*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Henshall, Nicholas. 1992. *Myth of absolutism : change and continuity in early modern European monarchy*. London ; New York: Longman.
- Hertz, Ellen. 1998. *The trading crowd : an ethnography of the Shanghai stock market*. Cambridge England ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, Dilys M. 1994. *Citizens and cities : urban policy in the 1990s*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Hinchliffe, Steve. 1996. "Technology, power, and space--the means and ends of geographies of technology." *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space* 14:659.
- Hindess, Barry. 1986. "Actors and Social Relations." Pp. 113-26 in *Sociological theory in transition*, edited by M. L. Wardell and S. P. Turner. Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Hintze, Otto. 1987. "Der Moderne Kapitalismus als historisches Individuum. Ein kritischer Bericht über Sombarts Werk." in *Sombarts "Moderner Kapitalismus"* :

- Materialen zur Kritik und Rezeption*, edited by B. v. Brocke. Muenchen: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Hirschman, Albert O. 1977. *The passions and the interests : political arguments for capitalism before its triumph*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Hirst, Paul Q. 1994. *Associative democracy : new forms of economic and social governance*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1651. *Leviathan, or, The matter, forme, & power of a common-wealth ecclesiasticall and civill*. London: Printed for Andrew Crooke, at the Green Dragon in St. Pauls Church-yard.
- . 1966. *Leviathan*, Edited by I. Fetscher. Neuwied und Berlin: Luchterhand.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. 1954a. "The Crisis of the 17th Century--II." *Past and Present*:44-65.
- . 1954b. "The General Crisis of the European Economy in the 17th Century." *Past and Present*:33-53.
- . 1977. *The age of revolution : Europe 1789-1848*. London: Abacus.
- . 1987. *The age of empire, 1875-1914*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- . 1988. *The age of capital, 1848-1875*. London: Cardinal.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 2008. *On empire : America, war, and global supremacy*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1983. *The managed heart : commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hodgson, Geoffrey M. 1994. "The return of institutional economics." Pp. 58-76 in *The handbook of economic sociology*, edited by N. J. Smelser and R. Swedberg. Princeton; New York: Princeton University Press; Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hole, Judith and Ellen Levine. 1971. *Rebirth of feminism*. New York: Quadrangle Books.
- Holliday, Ian. 2000. "Productivist Welfare Capitalism: Social Policy in East Asia." *Political Studies* 48:706.
- Holt, Douglas B. and Brian Sternthal. 1997. "Poststructuralist lifestyle analysis: Conceptualizing the social patterning of consumption in..." *Journal of Consumer Research* 23:326.
- Homans, George Caspar. 1961. *Social behavior: its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- . 1974. *Social behavior; its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- hooks, bell. 1990. *Yearning : race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean. 1992. *Museums and the shaping of knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2000. *Museums and the interpretation of visual culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Horkheimer, Max. 1967. *Zur Kritik der instrumentellen Vernunft. Aus den Vorträgen und Aufzeichnungen seit Kriegsende*. Frankfurt a. M.: S. Fischer.
- Horkheimer, Max and Theodor W. Adorno. 1947. *Dialektik der Aufklärung : philosophische Fragmente*. Amsterdam: Querido.
- Hort, Sven Olsson and Stein Kuhnle. 2000. "The coming of East and South-East Asian welfare states." *Journal of European Social Policy* 10:162.
- House, Floyd N. 1939. "Book Review: *The Structure of Social Action: A Study in Social Theory with Special Reference to a Group of Recent European Writers* by Talcott Parsons." *The American Journal of Sociology* 45:129-30.

- . 1950. "Book Review: *The Structure of Social Action: A Study in Social Theory with Special Reference to a Group of Recent European Writers* by Talcott Parsons." *The American Journal of Sociology* 55:504-05.
- Howell, Martha C. 1986. *Women, production, and patriarchy in late medieval cities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hubbard, Phil. 2002. *Thinking geographically : space, theory, and contemporary human geography*. London ; New York: Continuum.
- Hughes, Diane O. 1977. "Kinsmen and Neighborhoods in Medieval Genoa." Pp. 95-111 in *The Medieval city*, edited by H. A. Miskimin, D. Herlihy, A. L. Udovitch, and R. S. Lopez. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hume, David. 1739. *A treatise of human nature : being an attempt to introduce the experimental method of reasoning into moral subjects*. London: Printed for John Noon.
- . 1740. "An abstract of a book lately published; entitled, A treatise of human nature, &c. Wherein the chief argument of that book is farther illustrated and explained." London: printed for C. Borbet sic, at Addison's Head, over-against St. Dunstan's church, in Fleet-street.
- . 1978. *A treatise of human nature*, Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge and P. H. Nidditch. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press.
- . [1748] 1902. "An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding." Pp. 5-165 in *Enquiries concerning the human understanding and concerning the principles of morals*, edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge. Oxford: The Clarendon press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1971. "The Change to Change: Modernization, Development, and Politics." *Comparative Politics* 3:283-322.
- . 1996. *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hutchcroft, Paul D. 1998. *Booty capitalism : the politics of banking in the Philippines*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1995. "Changing values, economic development and political change." *International Social Science Journal* 47:379-403.
- Inglehart, Ronald and Wayne E. Baker. 2000. "Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values." *American Sociological Review* 65:19-51.
- Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The death and life of great American cities*. New York: Random House.
- . 1984. *Cities and the wealth of nations : principles of economic life*. New York: Random House.
- Jameson, Fredric. 1991. *Postmodernism, or, The cultural logic of late capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Jencks, Charles. 1987. *Post-modernism : the new classicism in art and architecture*. New York: Rizzoli.
- . 1996. "The city that never sleeps." *New Statesman* 125:26.
- Jepperson, Ronald L. 2002. "Political Modernities: Disentangling Two Underlying Dimensions of Institutional Differentiation." *Sociological Theory* 20:61.
- Jessop, Bob. 1995. "Accumulation Strategies, State Forms and Hegemonic Projects." *Environment and Planning A* 27:80-111.

- . 1997. "A neo-Gramscian approach to the regulation of urban regimes: accumulation strategies, hegemonic projects, and governance." *Reconstructing Urban Regime Theory: Regulating Urban Politics in a Global Economy* 5:1-74.
- . 1998. "The narrative of enterprise and the enterprise of narrative: place marketing and the entrepreneurial city." Pp. 77-102 in *The entrepreneurial city : geographies of politics, regime, and representation*, edited by T. Hall and P. Hubbard. Chichester and New York: Wiley.
- Jones, Catherine. 1993. "The Pacific Challenge: Confucian Welfare States." Pp. 198-217 in *New perspectives on the welfare state in Europe*, edited by C. Jones. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jong, Alex de and Marc Schuilenburg. 2006. *Mediapolis : popular culture and the city*. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers.
- Jordan, Steven and David Yeomans. 1995. "Critical Ethnography: Problems in Contemporary Theory and Practice." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 16:389-408.
- Judge, David, Gerry Stoker, and Harold Wolman. 1995. *Theories of urban politics*. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Kaiser, Andre. 1997. "Types of Democracy: From Classical to New Institutionalism." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 9:419-44.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1781. *Critik der reinen Vernunft*. Riga Latvia: J. F. Hartknoch.
- . 1956. *Critique of practical reason*, Edited by L. W. Beck. Translated by L. W. Beck. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merril.
- . 1966. *Werke in sechs Bänden*, Edited by W. Weischedel. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges.
- . [1788] 2003. *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, Edited by H. Klemme and H. D. Brandt. Hamburg: Felix Meiner.
- . [1790] 2001. *Kritik der Urteilkraft*, Edited by H. Klemme and P. Giordanetti. Hamburg: F. Meiner.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1972. *Commitment and community; communes and utopias in sociological perspective*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Kass, Alvin. 1965. *Politics in New York State, 1800-1830*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Keith, Michael. 2005. *After the Cosmopolitan?: Multicultural Cities and the Future of Racism*. Abingdon, Oxon and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Keith, Michael and Steve Pile. 1993. *Place and the politics of identity*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Kertzer, David I. 1988. *Ritual, politics, and power*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Killian, Lewis M. 1984. "Organization, Rationality and Spontaneity in the Civil Rights Movement." *American Sociological Review* 49:770-83.
- Kipling, Gordon. 1998. *Enter the king : theatre, liturgy, and ritual in the medieval civic triumph*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press.
- Klapisch-Zuber, Christiane. 1985. "Kins, Friends, and Neighbors": The Urban Territory of a Merchant Family in 1400." Pp. 68-93 in *Women, family, and ritual in Renaissance Italy*, edited by C. Klapisch-Zuber. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Knight, Richard V. 1995. "Knowledge-based Development: Policy and Planning Implications for Cities." *Urban Studies* 32:225-60.

- Knight, Richard V. and Gary Gappert. 1989. *Cities in a global society*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Knowles, J. Gary. 1991. "Parents' rationales for operating home schools." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 20:203.
- Knox, Paul L. and Peter J. Taylor. 1995. *World cities in a world-system*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Knulst, Wim. 1993. "The Gentrification of a Rearguard: An Attempt to Explain Changes in the Extent and Composition of the Arts Public in the Age of Television." Pp. 193-215 in *Cultural Participation: Trends since the Middle Ages, Utrechtse Publikaties voor Algemene Literatuurwetenschap/Utrecht Publications in General and Compara (UPAL): 31*, edited by A. Rigney and D. Fokkema. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kobialka, Michal. 2000. "Staging Place/Space in the Eleventh-Century Monastic Practices." Pp. 128-49 in *Medieval practices of space, Medieval cultures*, edited by B. Hanawalt and M. Kobialka. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kosuth, Joseph. 1991. *Art after philosophy and after : collected writings, 1966-1990*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kresl, Peter Karl. 1995. "The determinants of urban competitiveness: a survey." Pp. 45-68 in *North American cities and the global economy : challenges and opportunities*, vol. 44, *Urban affairs annual reviews series*, edited by P. K. Kresl and G. Gappert. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Krugman, Paul R. 1995. *Development, geography, and economic theory*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- . 1999. *The return of depression economics*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Kumar, Krishan. 1999. "Modernization and Industrialization." Pp. 72-104 in *Modernity : critical concepts, Routledge critical concepts*, edited by M. Waters. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Lake, Robert W. 1994. "Negotiating local autonomy." *Political Geography* 13:423-42.
- Landry, Charles. 2000. *The creative city : a toolkit for urban innovators*. London: Earthscan Publications.
- Landry, Charles and Comedia. 2000. *The creative city : a toolkit for urban innovators*. London: Earthscan Publications.
- Lash, Scott and Celia Lury. 2007. *Global Culture Industries: The Mediation of Things*. Cambridge, UK, and Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Lash, Scott and John Urry. 1987. *The end of organized capitalism*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press.
- . 1994. *Economies of signs and space*. London and Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in action : how to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- . 1988. *The pasteurization of France*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- . 1993. *We have never been modern*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- . 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Laughlin, Kim. 1995. "Rehabilitating science, imagining Bhopal." Pp. 277-302 in *Technoscientific imaginaries : conversations, profiles, and memoirs, Late editions*, edited by G. E. Marcus. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Lauria, Mickey. 1997. *Reconstructing urban regime theory : regulating urban politics in a global economy*. Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.
- Law, John. 2000. "Transitivities." *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space* 18:133-48.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul Felix and Morris Rosenberg. 1955. *The language of social research; a reader in the methodology of social research*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Leach, Belinda. 1998. "Industrial Homework, Economic Restructuring and the Meaning of Work." *Labour / Le Travail* 41:97-115.
- Leach, William. 1999. *Country of exiles : the destruction of place in American life*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Leadbeater, Charles and Geoff Mulgan. 1994. "Lean democracy and the leadership vacuum." *Demos Quarterly* 3:45-82.
- Lechner, Frank. 1985. "Modernity and its Discontents." Pp. 157-76 in *Neofunctionalism, Key issues in sociological theory*, edited by J. C. Alexander. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- . 1990. "Fundamentalism as Path Away from Differentiation." Pp. 88-118 in *Differentiation theory and social change : comparative and historical perspectives*, edited by J. C. Alexander and P. B. Colomy. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1959. *La somme et le reste*. Paris: La Nef de Paris éditions.
- . 1966. *Sociologie de Marx*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- . 1974. *La production de l'espace*. Paris: Éditions Anthropos.
- . 1986. *La production de l'espace*. Paris: Éditions Anthropos.
- . 1991. *The Production of Space*. Translated by D. Nicholson-Smith. Cambridge, Mass., USA: Blackwell.
- LeGates, Richard T. and Frederic Stout. 1996. *The city reader*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Leitner, Helga and Eric S. Sheppard. 1999. "Transcending interurban competition: conceptual issues and policy alternatives in the EU." Pp. 227-39 in *The urban growth machine : critical perspectives two decades later, SUNY series in urban public policy*, edited by A. E. G. Jonas and D. Wilson. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Lenin, Vladimir Il'ich. [1902] 1969. *What is to be done? Burning questions of our movement*, Edited by V. J. Jerome. Translated by J. Fineberg and G. Hanna. New York: International Publishers.
- Lever-Tracy, Constance, David Fu-Keung Ip, and Noel Tracy. 1996. *The Chinese diaspora and mainland China : an emerging economic synergy*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Macmillan Press; St. Martins Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1949. *Les structures élémentaires de la parenté*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- . 1962. *La pensée sauvage*. Paris: Plon.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin and Earl Raab. 1978. *The politics of unreason : right-wing extremism in America, 1790-1977*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lock, Margaret M. 2002. *Twice dead : organ transplants and the reinvention of death*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Lockwood, David. 1958. *The blackcoated worker; a study in class consciousness*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Loftman, Patrick and Brendan Nevin. 1996. "Going for Growth: Prestige Projects in Three British Cities." *Urban Studies* 33:991-1020.
- Logan, John R. and Harvey Lusk Molotch. 1987. *Urban fortunes : the political economy of place*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Loosely, David. 1999. "Cultural policy in the twenty-first century: Issues, debates and discourse." *French Cultural Studies* 10:5.
- Lootsma, Bart. 2000. *Superdutch : new architecture in the Netherlands*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Lovering, John. 1995. "Creating discourses rather than jobs: the crisis in the cities and the transition fantasies of intellectuals and policy makers." Pp. 109-26 in *Managing cities : the new urban context*, edited by P. Healey. Chichester ; New York: J. Wiley.
- Luhmann, N. 1994a. "The Modernity of Science." *New German Critique* 61:9-23.
- . 1994b. "'What is the case?' and 'what lies behind it?'" The two sociologies and the theory of society." *Sociological Theory* 12:126-39.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 1977a. "Interpenetration: Zum Verhältnis personaler und sozialer Systeme." *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 6:62-76.
- . 1977b. "Vorwort. Arbeitsteilung und Moral: Durkheims Theorie." Pp. 17-35 in *Über soziale Arbeitsteilung – Studie über die Organisation höherer Gesellschaften*, edited by E. Durkheim. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1978a. "Interpenetration bei Parsons." *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 7:299-302.
- . 1978b. "Soziologie der Moral." Pp. 8-116 in *Theorietechnik und Moral, Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Wissenschaft ; 206*, edited by N. Luhmann and S. Pfürtnner. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1982. *The differentiation of society*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 1984. *Soziale Systeme : Grundriss einer allgemeinen Theorie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1986. *Ökologische Kommunikation : kann die moderne Gesellschaft sich auf ökologische Gefährdungen einstellen?* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- . 1988. *Die Wirtschaft der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1990. *The Paradox of System Differentiation and the Evolution of Society*, Edited by J. C. Alexander and P. B. Colomy. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 1992a. *Beobachtungen der Moderne*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- . 1997. *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1998. *Observations on modernity*. Translated by W. Whobrey. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- . 2002. *Theories of distinction : redescribing the descriptions of modernity*, Edited by W. Rasch. Translated by J. O'Neil and others. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Luke, Timothy W. 2002. *Museum Politics: power plays at the exhibition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lury, Celia. 2000. "The United Colors of Diversity: Essential and Inessential Culture." Pp. 146-88 in *Global nature, global culture, Gender, theory and culture*, edited by S. Franklin, C. Lury, and J. Stacey. London: Sage.

- Lyotard, Jean François. 1979. *La condition postmoderne : rapport sur le savoir*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- . 1983. *Le différend*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- . 1984. *The postmodern condition : a report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 1988. *Le postmodernisme expliqué aux enfants*. Paris: Gallilée.
- . 1993. *The postmodern explained : correspondence, 1982-1985*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- MacCannell, Dean. 1999. *The tourist : a new theory of the leisure class*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Maire Vigueur, Jean-Claude. 1989. *D'une ville à l'autre : structures matérielles et organisation de l'espace dans les villes européennes, XIIIe-XVIe siècle : actes du colloque*. Roma, Italie: Ecole française de Rome and Università di Roma.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1922. *Argonauts of the western Pacific*. London: G. Routledge & sons, Ltd.
- Malmberg, Anders and Peter Maskell. 1997. "Proximity, Institutions, and Learning—Towards an Explanation of. Industry Specialization and Regional Agglomeration." *European Planning Studies* 5:25-41.
- Mann, Michael. 1986. *The sources of social power*. Cambridge Cambridgeshire ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Marcus, George E. 1993. *Perilous states : conversations on culture, politics, and nation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1995. "Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:95-117.
- . 1996. *Connected : engagements with media*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marcus, George E. and Michael M. J. Fischer. 1986. *Anthropology as cultural critique : an experimental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marcus, George E. and Peter Dobkin Hall. 1992. *Lives in trust : the fortunes of dynastic families in late twentieth-century America*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Markusen, Ann. 1999. "Fuzzy Concepts, Scanty Evidence, Policy Distance: The Case for Rigour and Policy Relevance in Critical Regional Studies." *Regional Studies* 33:869-84.
- Martin, Bill. 1998. "Knowledge, identity and the middle class: from collective to individualised class formation?" *Sociological Review* 46:653-86.
- Martin, Emily. 1994. *Flexible bodies : tracking immunity in American culture from the days of polio to the age of AIDS*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Martin, Ron and Bob Rowthorn. 1986. "The Geography of de-industrialisation." in *Critical human geography*. London: Macmillan.
- Marx, Karl. 1967. *Capital: a critique of political economy*, Edited by F. Engels. Translated by S. Moore, E. B. Aveling, and E. Untermann. New York: International Publishers.
- . [1843] 1956. "Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie. Kritik des Hegelschen Staatsrechts. Einleitung." Pp. 201-333, 78-91 in *Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels. Werke*, vol. 1, edited by K. Marx, F. Engels, and I. f. M.-L. b. Z. d. SED. Berlin: Dietz.

- . [1867] 1962. "Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. Erster Band." in *Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels. Werke*, vol. 23, edited by K. Marx, F. Engels, and I. f. M.-L. b. Z. d. SED. Berlin: Dietz.
- . [1885] 1963. "Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. Zweiter Band." in *Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels. Werke*, vol. 24, edited by K. Marx, F. Engels, and I. f. M.-L. b. Z. d. SED. Berlin: Dietz.
- . [1894] 1964. "Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. Dritter Band." in *Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels. Werke*, vol. 25, edited by K. Marx, F. Engels, and I. f. M.-L. b. Z. d. SED. Berlin: Dietz.
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. 1848. *Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei*. London: Gedruckt in der Office der "Bildungs-Gesellschaft für Arbeiter" von J.E. Burghard.
- . 1978. *The Marx-Engels reader*, Edited by R. C. Tucker. New York: Norton.
- Mascia-Lees, Frances E., Patricia Sharpe, and Colleen Ballerino Cohen. 1989. "The Postmodernist Turn in Anthropology: Cautions from a Feminist Perspective." *Signs* 15:7-33.
- Massey, Doreen. 2007. *World city*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Massey, Doreen B. 1999. "On space and the city." Pp. 157-75 in *City worlds, Understanding cities*, edited by D. B. Massey, J. Allen, and S. Pile. London and New York: Routledge in association with the Open University.
- Massey, Doreen B. and P. M. Jess. 1995. *A place in the world? : places, cultures and globalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press in association with the Open University.
- Mayer, Margit. 1995. "Urban Governance in the Post-Fordist City." Pp. 231-49 in *Managing cities : the new urban context*, edited by P. Healey. Chichester ; New York: J. Wiley.
- Mayhew, Leon. 1990. "The Differentiation of the Solidary Public." Pp. 294-322 in *Differentiation theory and social change : comparative and historical perspectives*, edited by J. C. Alexander and P. B. Colomy. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political process and the development of Black insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1983. "Tactical Innovation and the Pace of Insurgency." *American Sociological Review* 48:735-54.
- . 1988. *Freedom Summer*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, David H. and Andrew W. Cox. 1979. *The politics of urban change*. London: Croom Helm.
- McLaughlin, Eugene. 1993. "Hong Kong: A Residual Welfare Regime." Pp. 105-40 in *Comparing welfare states : Britain in international context*, edited by A. Cochrane and J. Clarke. London ; Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- McLuhan, Marshall. 1967. *Understanding media: the extensions of man*. London: Sphere Books.
- Merton, Robert King. 1949. *Social theory and social structure; toward the codification of theory and research*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- . 1967. *On theoretical sociology; five essays, old and new*. New York: Free Press.
- . 1968. *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.

- Metz, Tracy., Janine. Schrijver, and Otto. Snoek. 2002. *Fun! : leisure and landscape*. Rotterdam; New York, NY: NAI ; Available in North, South and Central America through D.A.P., Distributed Art Publishers.
- Meyer, John W., John Boli, George M. Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 1997. "World Society and the Nation-State." *The American Journal of Sociology* 103:144-81.
- Meyer, John W., David Tyack, Joane Nagel, and Audri Gordon. 1979. "Public Education as Nation-Building in America: Enrollments and Bureaucratization in the American States, 1870-1930." *The American Journal of Sociology* 85:591-613.
- Meyer, Karl Ernest. 1979. *The art museum : power, money, ethics : a Twentieth Century Fund report*. New York: Morrow.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1982. *Capitalist democracy in Britain*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Milis, Ludo J. R. 2002. "Monks, Canons, and the City: A Barren Relationship?" *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32:667-88.
- Miller, Daniel. 1994. *Modernity, an ethnographic approach : dualism and mass consumption in Trinidad*. Oxford ; Providence, RI: Berg.
- . 1997. *Capitalism : an ethnographic approach*. Oxford, UK ; Washington, D.C.: Berg.
- . 1998. "Conclusion: A Theory of Virtualism." Pp. 187-215 in *Virtualism : a new political economy*, edited by J. G. Carrier and D. Miller. Oxford ; New York: Berg.
- Miller, Perry. 1956. *Errand into the wilderness*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1940. "Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motive." *American Sociological Review* 5:904-13.
- . 1959. *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mingione, Enzo. 1996. *Urban poverty and the underclass : a reader*. Oxford ; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Mintz, Sidney Wilfred. 1985. *Sweetness and power : the place of sugar in modern history*. New York, N.Y.: Viking.
- Mintzberg, Henry and Alexandra McHugh. 1985. "Strategy Formation in an Adhocracy." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 30:160-97.
- Mitchelson, Ronald L. and James O. Wheeler. 1994. "The flow of information in a global economy: The role of the American urban system in 1990." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 84:87.
- Molho, Anthony and John A. Tedeschi. 1970. *Renaissance. Studies in honor of Hans Baron*. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni.
- Mommaas, Hans. 2004. "Cultural Clusters and the Post-industrial City: Towards the Remapping of Urban Cultural Policy." *Urban Stud* 41:507-32.
- Mommaas, Hans and Hugo Van Der Poel. 1989. "Changes in Economy, Politics and Lifestyles: An Essay on the Restructuring of Urban Leisure." Pp. 254-77 in *Leisure and urban processes : critical studies of leisure policy in Western European cities*, edited by P. Bramham. London: Routledge.
- Mommsen, Wolfgang J. 1959. *Max Weber und die deutsche Politik: 1890-1920*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1974. *Max Weber und die deutsche Politik: 1890-1920*. Tübingen: Mohr.

- Montgomery, John. 1995. "Urban Vitality and the Culture of Cities." *Planning Practice and Research* 10:101-10.
- Moore, Barrington. 1966. *Social origins of dictatorship and democracy; lord and peasant in the making of the modern world*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Morris, Aldon. 1981. "Black Southern Student Sit-in Movement: An Analysis of Internal Organization." *American Sociological Review* 46:744-67.
- Münch, Richard. 1976a. *Legitimität und politische Macht*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- . 1976b. *Theorie sozialer Systeme : eine Einführung in Grundbegriffe, Grundannahmen und logische Struktur*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- . 1978a. "'Kapitalismus' und 'okzidentaler Rationalismus': Zwei Perspektiven zur Analyse der Strukturprobleme moderner Gesellschaften." Pp. 72-106 in *Theorienvergleich in den Sozialwissenschaften, Soziologische Texte*, edited by K. O. Hondrich and J. Matthes. Darmstadt ; Neuwied: Luchterhand.
- . 1978b. "Max Webers "Anatomie des okzidentalen Rationalismus": Eine systemtheoretische Lektüre." *Soziale Welt* 29:217-46.
- . 1980. "Talcott Parsons und die Theorie sozialen Handelns II: Die Kontinuität der Entwicklung." *Soziale Welt* 31:3-47.
- . 1981. "Talcott Parsons and the Theory of Action. I. The Structure of the Kantian Core." *The American Journal of Sociology* 86:709-39.
- . 1982. *Theorie des Handelns : zur Rekonstruktion der Beiträge von Talcott Parsons, Emile Durkheim und Max Weber*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1984. *Die Struktur der Moderne : Grundmuster und differentielle Gestaltung des institutionellen Aufbaus der modernen Gesellschaften*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1985. "Commentary: Differentiation, Consensus, and Conflict: Some Comments on Smelser, Colomy, Lechner, and Barber." Pp. 225-37 in *Neofunctionalism, Key issues in sociological theory*, edited by J. C. Alexander. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- . 1986. *Die Kultur der Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1986a. "The American Creed in Sociological Theory Exchange, Negotiated Order, Accommodated Individualism, and Contingency." *Sociological Theory* 4:41-60.
- . 1986b. *Die Kultur der Moderne. Band I: Ihre Grundlagen und ihre Entwicklung in England und Amerika*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1986b-c. *Die Kultur der Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1986c. *Die Kultur der Moderne. Band II: Ihre Entwicklungen in Frankreich und Deutschland*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1987. *Theory of action : towards a new synthesis going beyond Parsons*. London ; New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- . 1988. *Understanding modernity : toward a new perspective going beyond Durkheim and Weber*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- . 1989. "Structures, Cultures and Knowledge: A Historical Comparative Exploration." Pp. 37-66 in *Social structure and culture*, edited by H. Haferkamp. Berlin ; New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 1991a. "American and European Social Theory: Cultural Identities and Social Forms of Theory Production." *Sociological Perspectives* 34:313-35.

- . 1991b. *Dialektik der Kommunikationsgesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1993. *Das Projekt Europa : zwischen Nationalstaat, regionaler Autonomie und Weltgesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1994. *Sociological theory*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- . 1995. *Dynamik der Kommunikationsgesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1998. *Globale Dynamik, lokale Lebenswelten : der schwierige Weg in die Weltgesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 2004. *Soziologische Theorie. Band 1: Grundlegung durch die Klassiker*. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus Verlag.
- . 2004b. *Soziologische Theorie. Band 2: Handlungstheorie*. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus Verlag.
- Münch, Richard and Neil J. Smelser. 1987. "Relating the Micro and Macro." Pp. 356-87 in *The Micro-Macro Link*, edited by J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Münch, and N. J. Smelser. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Muir, Edward. 1981. *Civic ritual in Renaissance Venice*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- . 1995. "The Italian Renaissance in America." *The American Historical Review* 100:1095-118.
- Muir, Edward and Ronald Weissman. 1989. "Social and Symbolic Places in Renaissance Venice and Florence." Pp. 81-103 in *The Power of place : bringing together geographical and sociological imaginations*, edited by J. A. Agnew and J. S. Duncan. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Mumford, Lewis. [1937] 1996. "What is a City?" Pp. 92-96 in *The city reader*, edited by R. T. LeGates and F. Stout. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Munck, Ronaldo. 2005. *Globalization and social exclusion : a transformationalist perspective*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Mundy, John Hine and Peter N. Riesenbergs. 1958. *The medieval town*. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.
- Murdoch, Jonathan. 1997. "Inhuman/nonhuman/human: Actor-network theory and the prospects for a nondualistic and symmetrical perspective on nature and society." *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space* 15:731-56.
- Myers, Fred R. 1992. "Representing Culture: The Production of Discourse(s) for Aboriginal Acrylic Paintings." Pp. 319-55 in *Rereading cultural anthropology*, edited by G. E. Marcus. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Naisbitt, John and Patricia Aburdene. 1990. *Megatrends 2000 : ten new directions for the 1990's*. New York: Morrow.
- Nash, June C. 1989. *From tank town to high tech : the clash of community and industrial cycles*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Negroponte, Nicholas. 1995. *Being digital*. New York: Knopf.
- Nelson, Benjamin. 1969. *The idea of usury, from tribal brotherhood to universal otherhood*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Newman, Peter and Andy Thornley. 1997. "Fragmentation and centralisation in the governance of London: Influencing the urban policy and Planning Agenda." *Urban Studies* 34:967-88.
- Nicholas, David. 1971. *Town and countryside: social, economic and political tensions in fourteenth-century Flanders*. Brugge: "De Tempel,".

- Nippel, Wilfried. 1991. "Max Weber's 'The City' Revisited." Pp. 19-30 in *City-states in classical antiquity and medieval Italy*, edited by J. Emlen, K. A. Raaflaub, and A. Molho. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Thomas J. Watson, Jr. Institute for International Studies, and Association of Ancient Historians.
- Nisbet, Robert A. 1966. *The sociological tradition*. New York: Basic Books.
- Oatley, Nick. 1998. *Cities, economic competition, and urban policy*. London: Paul Chapman Pub.
- O'Connor, Justin. 1999. "Popular culture, reflexivity and urban change." Pp. 76-102 in *Creative cities : cultural industries, urban development and the information society, Publication series of the University of Art and Design*, edited by J. Verwijnen and P. Lehtovuori. Helsinki: University of Art and Design Helsinki UIAH.
- O'Connor, Justin and Derek Wynne. 1996. "Left Loafing: City Cultures and Postmodern Lifestyles." Pp. 49-91 in *From the margins to the centre : cultural production and consumption in the post-industrial city, Popular cultural studies ; 10*, edited by J. O'Connor and D. Wynne. Aldershot: Arena.
- O'Donnell, Guillermo. 1993. "On the state, democratization and some conceptual problems: A Latin American view with glances at..." *World Development* 21:1355.
- Olds, K. 1995. "Globalization and the production of new urban spaces: Pacific Rim megaprojects in the late 20th century." *Environment & Planning A* 27:1713-43.
- Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The logic of collective action; public goods and the theory of groups*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Ong, Aihwa. 1987. *Spirits of resistance and capitalist discipline : factory women in Malaysia*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- . 1991. "The Gender and Labor Politics of Postmodernity." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20:279-309.
- . 1992. "Limits to Cultural Accumulation: Chinese Capitalists on the American Pacific Rim." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 645:125-43.
- . 1993. "On the Edge of Empires: Flexible Citizenship among Chinese in Diaspora." *Positions* 1:745-76.
- . 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Duke University Press.
- Orru, Marco. 1997. "The Institutional Analysis of Capitalist Economies." Pp. 297-310 in *The economic organization of East Asian capitalism*, edited by M. Orru, N. W. Biggart, and G. G. Hamilton. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Ostling, Susan. 2007. "The Global Museum and the Orbit of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum New York." *International Journal of the Humanities* 5:87-94.
- Park, Robert E. 1926. "The Urban Community as a Spatial Pattern and a Moral Order." Pp. 3-18 in *The urban community : selected papers from the Proceedings of the American sociological society, 1925, The University of Chicago studies in urban sociology*, edited by E. W. Burgess. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1969. "The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Behavior in the Urban Environment." Pp. 91-130 in *Classic essays on the culture of cities*, edited by R. Sennett. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

- Parkinson, Michael. 1994. "European cities towards 2000: the new age of entrepreneurialism?" in *European Institute for Urban Affairs*. Liverpool: The John Moores University.
- Parry, Roland Lloyd. 2007. "Brand Louvre." *Museums Journal* 107:34-35.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1928. "'Capitalism' In Recent German Literature: Sombart and Weber." *The Journal of Political Economy* 36:641-61.
- . 1929. "'Capitalism' in Recent German Literature: Sombart and Weber (Concluded)." *The Journal of Political Economy* 37:31-51.
- . 1931. "Wants and Activities in Marshall." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 46:101-40.
- . 1932. "Economics and Sociology: Marshall in Relation to the Thought of His Time." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 46:316-47.
- . 1936. "Pareto's Central Analytical Scheme." *Journal of Social Philosophy* 1:244-62.
- . 1937. *The structure of social action; a study in social theory with special reference to a group of recent European writers*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, inc.
- . 1951. *The Social System*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- . 1953. "The superego and the theory of social systems." Pp. 13-29 in *Working papers in the theory of action*, edited by T. Parsons, R. F. Bales, and E. Shils. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- . 1955a. "Family structure and the socialization of the child." Pp. 35-131 in *Family, socialization and interaction process*, edited by T. Parsons and R. F. Bales. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- . 1955b. "The Organization of Personality as a System of Action." Pp. 133-86 in *Family, socialization and interaction process*, edited by T. Parsons and R. F. Bales. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- . 1963a. "Introduction." Pp. xxix-lxvii in *The sociology of religion*, edited by M. Weber. Boston: Beacon Press.
- . 1963b. "On the Concept of Influence." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 27:37-62.
- . 1963c. "On the Concept of Political Power." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 107:232-62.
- . 1964a. "Evolutionary Universals in Society." *American Sociological Review* 29:339-57.
- . 1964b. "The Incest Taboo in Relation to Social Structure and the Socialization of the Child." Pp. 57-77 in *Social structure and personality*, edited by T. Parsons. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- . 1964c. "Social structure and the development of personality; Freud's contribution to the integration of psychology and sociology." Pp. 78-111 in *Social structure and personality*, edited by T. Parsons. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- . 1966. *Societies; evolutionary and comparative perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- . 1967a. "Durkheim's Contribution to the Theory of Integration of Social Systems." Pp. 3-34 in *Sociological theory and modern society*, edited by T. Parsons. New York: Free Press.
- . 1967b. *Sociological theory and modern society*. New York: Free Press.
- . 1968. "On the Concept of Value-Commitments." *Sociological Inquiry* 38:135-59.

- . 1969a. "On the Concept of Influence." Pp. 405-38 in *Politics and Social Structure*, edited by T. Parsons. New York: Free Press.
- . 1969b. "On the Concept of Political Power." Pp. 352-404 in *Politics and social structure*, edited by T. Parsons. New York: Free Press.
- . 1969c. "On the Concept of Value-Commitments." Pp. 439-72 in *Politics and social structure*, edited by T. Parsons. New York: Free Press.
- . 1969d. *Politics and social structure*. New York: Free Press.
- . 1970. "On Building Social System Theory: A Personal History." *Daedalus* 99:826-81.
- . 1971. *The system of modern societies*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- . 1977. *Social systems and the evolution of action theory*. New York: Free Press.
- . 1977a. "Review of 'Harold J. Bershad: Ideology and Social Knowledge'." Pp. 122-34 in *Social systems and the evolution of action theory*, edited by T. Parsons. New York: Free Press.
- . 1977c. "Some Problems of General Theory in Sociology." Pp. 229-69 in *Social systems and the evolution of action theory*, edited by T. Parsons. New York: Free Press.
- . 1978a. *Action theory and the human condition*. New York: Free Press.
- . 1978b. "A Paradigm of the Human Condition." Pp. 352-433 in *Action theory and the human condition*, edited by T. Parsons. New York: Free Press.
- . [1933] 1968. "Pareto." Pp. 411-16 in *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*, edited by D. L. Sills and R. K. Merton. New York: Macmillan.
- . [1937] 1968. *The Structure of Social Action*. New York: Free Press.
- Parsons, Talcott and Robert Freed Bales. 1955. "Conclusion: Levels of Cultural Generality and the Process of Differentiation." Pp. 353-94 in *Family, socialization and interaction process*, edited by T. Parsons and R. F. Bales. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Parsons, Talcott, Robert Freed Bales, and Edward Shils. 1953. *Working Papers in the Theory of Action*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Parsons, Talcott and Jan J. Loubser. 1976. "Explorations in general theory in social science: essays in honor of Talcott Parsons." Pp. 909, xv, edited by J. J. Loubser. New York: Free Press.
- Parsons, Talcott and Gerald M. Platt. 1973. *The American university*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Parsons, Talcott and Edward Shils. 1951. *Toward a General Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Parsons, Talcott and Neil J. Smelser. 1956. *Economy and society; a study in the integration of economic and social theory*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Pascal, Anthony. 1987. "The Vanishing City." *Urban Studies* 24:597-603.
- Patomaki, Heikki. 2000. "Republican public sphere and the governance of globalizing political economy." Pp. 160-95 in *Value pluralism, normative theory, and international relations*, edited by M. Lensu and J.-S. Fritz. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Macmillan Press; St. Martin's Press.
- Perin, Constance. 1992. "The Communicative Circle: Museums as Communities." Pp. 182-220 in *Museums and communities: the politics of public culture*, edited by I.

- Karp, C. M. Kreamer, and S. Lavine. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press and Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Perkin, Harold James. 1981. *Professionalism, property and English society since 1880*. Reading: University of Reading.
- Perniola, Mario. 1986. "Post-Political Styles." *Differentia: Review of Italian Thought* 1:37-46.
- . 1995. *Enigmas : the Egyptian moment in society and art*. Translated by C. Woodall. London ; New York: Verso.
- . 1998. *Transiti*. Roma: Castelveccchi.
- . 2001. *Ritual thinking : sexuality, death, world*. Translated by M. Verdicchio. Amherst, N.Y.: Humanity Books.
- . 2004a. *Art and its shadow*. Translated by M. Verdicchio. New York and London: Continuum.
- . 2004b. *The sex appeal of the inorganic*. Translated by M. Verdicchio. New York : London: Continuum.
- Pes, Javier. 2007. "Art Museums in the Age of Expansion." *World Literature Today* 81:38-42.
- Pestello, Fred P. 1991. "Discounting." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 20:26.
- Petric, Vlada. 1987. *Constructivism in film : The man with the movie camera : a cinematic analysis*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Phelps, N. A. 2000. "The locally embedded multinational and institutional capture." *Area* 32:169-78.
- Phillips, Anne. 1999. *Which equalities matter?* Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press; Blackwell Publishers.
- Phillips, Derek L. 1993. *Looking backward : a critical appraisal of communitarian thought*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Pietz, William. 1993. "Fetishism and Materialism: The Limits of Theory in Marx." Pp. 119-51 in *Fetishism as cultural discourse*, edited by E. S. Apter and W. Pietz. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Pile, Steve. 1996. *The body and the city : psychoanalysis, space, and subjectivity*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Pine, B. Joseph and James H. Gilmore. 1999. *The experience economy : work is theatre & every business a stage*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pirenne, Henri. 1914. "The Stages in the Social History of Capitalism." *The American Historical Review* 19:494-515.
- . 1939. *Les villes et les institutions urbaines*. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan.
- . 1951. *Histoire économique de l'Occident médiéval*. Bruges: Desclée, De Brouwer.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1977. *Poor people's movements : why they succeed, how they fail*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Plagens, Peter. 2007. "Contemporary Art, Uncovered." *Art in America* 95:45-51.
- Plattner, Stuart. 1998. "Economic Behavior in Markets." Pp. 9-23 in *Economic anthropology*, edited by S. Gudeman: Elgar Reference Collection. International Library of Critical Writings in Economics, vol. 99.
- Cheltenham, U.K. and Northampton, Mass.:

- Elgar; distributed by American International Distribution Corporation, Williston, Vt.
- Pleij, Herman. 2002. "Restyling "Wisdom," Remodeling the Nobility, and Caricaturing the Peasant: Urban Literature in the Late Medieval Low Countries." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32:689-704.
- Pol, Peter M. J., Willem Van Winden, Paulus Woets, and Leo van den Berg. 2005. "European Cities in the Knowledge Economy: The Cases of Amsterdam, Dortmund, Eindhoven, Helsinki, Manchester, Munich, Munster, Rotterdam and Zaragoza." in *EURICUR: Institute for Comparative Urban Research*. Hants, England and Burlington, VT, USA: Ashgate Publishing.
- Polanyi, Karl. 1944. *The great transformation*. New York, Toronto: Farrar & Rinehart, inc.
- Pope, Whitney. 1973. "Classic on Classic: Parsons' Interpretation of Durkheim." *American Sociological Review* 38:399-415.
- Pope, Whitney, Jere Cohen, and Lawrence E. Hazelrigg. 1975. "On the Divergence of Weber and Durkheim: A Critique of Parsons' Convergence Thesis." *American Sociological Review* 40:417-27.
- Porter, Michael E. 1998. *The competitive advantage of nations : with a new introduction*. New York: Free Press.
- Postan, M. M. 1966. "The Cambridge Economic History of Europe." Cambridge, England: The Cambridge University Press.
- Prevenier, Walter. 1986. "Henri Pirenne et les villes des anciens Pays-Bas aux bas moyen âge (XIVe–XVe siècles)." Pp. 27-50 in *La Fortune historiographique des thèses d'Henri Pirenne : actes du colloque organisé à l'occasion du cinquantième de la mort de l'historien belge, Archives et bibliothèques de Belgique, numéro spécial = Archief- en bibliotheekwezen in België, extranummer*, edited by G. Despy, A. E. Verhulst, and R. van Uytven. Brussel: Archives et bibliothèques de Belgique and Institut des hautes études de Belgique.
- Preziosi, Donald. 1989. *Rethinking art history: meditations on a coy science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 2003. *Brain of the earth's body: art, museums, and the phantasms of modernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2006. *In the Aftermath of Art: Ethics, Aesthetics, Politics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Prior, Nick. 2002. *Museums and modernity: art galleries and the making of modern culture*. Oxford: New York Berg.
- Putnam, Robert D., Robert Leonardi, and Raffaella Nanetti. 1993. *Making democracy work : civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Qian, Yingyi. 2003. "How Reform Worked in China." Pp. 297-333 in *In search of prosperity: Analytic narratives on economic growth*, edited by D. Rodrik. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Ramirez, Mari Carmen. 1996. "Brokering Identities: Art Curators and the Politics of Cultural Representation." Pp. 21-38 in *Thinking about exhibitions*, edited by R. Greenberg, B. W. Ferguson, and S. Nairne. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Rau, Zbigniew. 1991. *The Reemergence of Civil Society in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*. Boulder: Westview Press.

- Readings, Bill. 1991. *Introducing Lyotard : art and politics*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Rectanus, Mark W. 2002. *Culture Incorporated: Museums, Artists, and Corporate Sponsorships*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rex, John. 1962. *Key Problems of sociological theory*. London: Routledge & K. Paul.
- . 1981. *Social conflict : a conceptual and theoretical analysis*. London ; New York: Longman.
- Reynolds, Susan. 1984. *Kingdoms and communities in Western Europe, 900-1300*: Oxford, Clarendon.
- Rhoades, Gary. 1990. "Political Competition and Differentiation in Higher Education." Pp. 187-221 in *Differentiation theory and social change : comparative and historical perspectives*, edited by J. C. Alexander and P. B. Colomy. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Richards, Greg. 2001. "The experience industry and the creation of attractions." Pp. 55-69 in *Cultural attractions and European tourism*, edited by G. Richards. New York: CABI Publishers.
- Riding, Alan. 2007a. "The Industry of Art Goes Global." Pp. H2 in *New York Times*, vol. 156.
- . 2007b. "The Louvre Emerges Smiling From Abu Dhabi Deal." *New York Times* 156:E2.
- Rieff, David 1993. "Multiculturalism's Silent Partner: It's the Newly Globalized Economy, Stupid." *Harper's Magazine*, pp. 62-72.
- Rigney, Ann. and Douwe Wessel Fokkema. 1993. *Cultural participation : trends since the Middle Ages*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
- Ritzer, George. 1983. "The McDonalidization of Society." *Journal of American Culture* 6:100-07.
- . 1985. "The Rise of Micro-Sociological Theory." *Sociological Theory* 3:88-98.
- . 1990a. "The Current Status of Sociological Theory: The New Syntheses." Pp. 1-30 in *Frontiers of social theory : the new syntheses*, edited by G. Ritzer. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 1990b. "Micro-macro linkage in sociological theory: applying a metatheoretical tool." Pp. 347-70 in *Frontiers of social theory : the new syntheses*, edited by G. Ritzer. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 2005. *Enchanting a disenchanted world : revolutionizing the means of consumption*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press.
- Robertson, Roland. and Bryan S. Turner. 1991. *Talcott Parsons : theorist of modernity*. London; Newbury Park: Sage Publication.
- Robins, Kevin. 1996. *Into the image : culture and politics in the field of vision*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Robins, Kevin, Erica Carter, James Donald, and Judith Squires. 1993. *Prisoners of the City: Whatever Could a Postmodern City be?*
- Rodrick, Dani. 2000. "How Far Will International Economic Integration Go?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14:177-86.
- Röhl, Klaus F. 1997. "Procedural Justice: Introduction and Overview." Pp. 1-36 in *Procedural justice, Oñati international series in law and society*, edited by K. F. Röhl and S. Machura. Aldershot, UK; Brookfield, USA: Ashgate; Dartmouth.

- Romano, Dennis. 1989. "Gender and the Urban Geography of Renaissance Venice." *Journal of Social History* 23:339-53.
- Rörig, Fritz. 1955. *Die europäische Stadt und die Kultur des Bürgertums im Mittelalter*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Rose, G. 1999. "Performing space." Pp. 247-59 in *Human geography today*, edited by D. B. Massey, J. Allen, and P. Sarre. Cambridge, UK; Malden, Mass.: Polity Press; Blackwell Publishers.
- Rose, Vicki McNickle. 1977. "Rape as a Social Problem: A Byproduct of the Feminist Movement." *Social Problems* 25:75-89.
- Roseberry, William. 1996. "The Rise of Yuppie Coffees and the Reimagination of Class in the United States." *American Anthropologist* 98:762-75.
- Rosecrance, Richard N. 1999. *The rise of the virtual state : wealth and power in the coming century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rossel, Jorg. 2005. *Plurale Sozialstrukturanalyse : eine handlungstheoretische Rekonstruktion der Grundbegriffe der Sozialstrukturanalyse*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Rotenberg, Robert Louis and Gary W. McDonogh. 1993. *The Cultural meaning of urban space*. Westport, Conn.: Bergin & Garvey.
- Rothschild-Whitt, Joyce. 1979. "The Collectivist Organization: An Alternative to Rational-Bureaucratic Models." *American Sociological Review* 44:509-27.
- Rothstein, Frances A. 1996. "Flexible Accumulation, Youth Labor and Schooling in a Rural Community in Mexico." *Critique of Anthropology* 16:361-79.
- . 1999. "Declining Odds: Kinship, Women's Employment, and Political Economy in Rural Mexico." *American Anthropologist* 101:579-93.
- Rouse, Roger. 1996. "Mexican Migration and the Social Space of Postmodernism." Pp. 247-63 in *Between Two Words: Mexican Immigrants in the United States, Jaguar Books on Latin America: 15*, edited by D. G. Gutierrez. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources.
- Rubin, Miri. 1992. "Religious Culture in Town and Country: Re°ections on a Great Divide." Pp. 3-22 in *Church and city, 1000-1500 : essays in honour of Christopher Brooke*, edited by D. Abulafia, M. J. Franklin, and M. Rubin. Cambridge England ; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Rutheiser, Charles. 1996. *Imagineering Atlanta : the politics of place in the city of dreams*. London: Verso.
- Ryser, Judith. 1994. "The future of European capitals : knowledge based development : Berlin-London-Paris : Anglo-Franco-German seminar : Report." in *The future of European capitals*, vol. London: Goethe-Institut London.
- Sabine, George Holland. 1961. *A history of political theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Sachs, Jeffrey. 1998. "Making it work." *Economist* 348:23-25.
- . 2000. "Notes on a New Sociology of Economic Development." Pp. 29-43 in *Culture matters : how values shape human progress*, edited by S. P. Huntington and L. E. Harrison. New York: Basic Books.
- Sahlins, Marshall. 1994. "Cosmologies of capitalism: The trans-pacific sector of "The World System"." Pp. 412-55 in *Culture/power/history : a reader in contemporary*

- social theory, Princeton studies in culture/power/history*, edited by N. B. Dirks, G. Eley, and S. B. Ortner. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy. 1980. *Saint-Simon at Versailles*, Edited by L. Norton. Translated by L. Norton. London: H. Hamilton.
- Saint-Simon, Henri. 1865. *Œuvres de Saint-Simon & d'Enfantin, précédées de deux notices historiques et publiées par les membres du conseil institué par Enfantin pour l'exécution de ses dernières volontés ..* Edited by J. Arlès-Dufour, B. Bazard, A. Enfantin, and et al. Paris: E. Dentu.
- Sarat, Austin and Thomas R. Kearns. 1993. *Law in everyday life*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1963. *Search for a method*. New York: Knopf.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1991. *The global city : New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.,
- . 1994. *Cities in a world economy*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press.
- . 2001. *The global city : New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- . 2006. *Territory, authority, rights : from medieval to global assemblages*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Savigliano, Marta. 1995. *Tango and the political economy of passion*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Sayer, Andrew. 1994. "Cultural studies and 'the economy, stupid'." Pp. 635-37 in *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space*, vol. 12.
- Schluchter, Wolfgang. 1971. *Wertfreiheit und Verantwortungsethik; zum Verhältnis von Wissenschaft und Politik bei Max Weber*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1972. *Aspekte bürokratischer Herrschaft*. München: List Verlag.
- . 1976. "Die Paradoxie der Rationalisierung. Zum Verhältnis von Ethik und Welt bei Max Weber." *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 5:256-84.
- . 1978. "Max Webers Gesellschaftsgeschichte. Versuch einer Explikation." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 30:438-67.
- . 1979. *Die Entwicklung des okzidentalen Rationalismus : e. Analyse von Max Webers Gesellschaftsgeschichte*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1988. *Religion und Lebensführung*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Schmidt, Vivien Ann. 2002. *The futures of European capitalism*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, Volker H. 2001. "Oversocialised Epistemology: A Critical Appraisal of Constructivism." *Sociology* 35:135-57.
- . 2006. "Multiple Modernities or Varieties of Modernity?" *Current Sociology* 54:77-97.
- Schmidt, Volker H. and Chee Han Lim. 2004. "Organ transplantation in Singapore: history, problems, and policies." *Social Science & Medicine* 59:2173-82.
- Schneider, Jane. 1994. "In and Out of Polyester: Desire, Disdain and Global Fibre Competitions." *Anthropology Today* 10:2-10.
- Schneider, Robert A. 2000. "The Postmodern City from an Early Modern Perspective." *The American Historical Review* 105:1668-75.

- Schreiner, Klaus. 1986. "Die mittelalterliche Stadt in Webers Analyse und die Deutung des okzidentalen Rationalismus." Pp. 119-50 in *Max Weber, der Historiker, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft: Bd. 73*, edited by J. Kocka. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupert.
- Schubert, Karsten. 2000. *The Curator's Egg: The Evolution of the Museum Concept from the French Revolution to the Present Day*. London: One-Off Press Distributed by Christie's Books.
- Schütte, Hans Gerd. 1977. "Handlungen, Rollen und Systeme. Überlegungen zur Soziologie Max Webers und Talcott Parsons." Pp. 17-57 in *Handlungstheorie interdisziplinär*, vol. 4, edited by H. Lenk. Munich: Fink.
- Schulze, Gerhard. 1992. *Die Erlebnisgesellschaft : Kulturosoziologie der Gegenwart*. Frankfurt Main ; New York: Campus.
- . 1994. "Gehen ohne Grund. Eine Skizze zur Kulturgeschichte des Denkens." Pp. 79-130 in *Philosophische Ansichten der Kultur der Moderne, Philosophie der Gegenwart*, edited by A. Kuhlmann and M. Augé. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- . 2000. *Kulissen des Glücks : Streifzüge durch die Eventkultur*. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus.
- . 2003. *Die beste aller Welten : wohin bewegt sich die Gesellschaft im 21. Jahrhundert?* München: C. Hanser.
- . 2006. *Die Sünde : das schöne Leben und seine Feinde*. München: Hanser.
- Sclar, Elliott D. 1992. "Back to the city." *Technology Review* 95:29.
- Scott, Allen J. 1999. "The cultural economy: Geography and the creative field." *Media, Culture & Society* 21:807.
- Scott, Allen John. 1988. *Metropolis : from the division of labor to urban form*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2000a. *The cultural economy of cities : essays on the geography of image-producing industries*. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- . 2000b. *The cultural economy of cities : essays on the geography of image-producing industries*. London and Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- Scott, Allen John and Edward W. Soja. 1996. *The city : Los Angeles and urban theory at the end of the twentieth century*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Senghaas, Dieter. 1998. *Zivilisierung wider Willen : der Konflikt der Kulturen mit sich selbst*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Sennett, Richard. 1970. *The uses of disorder: personal identity & city life*. New York: Knopf.
- . 1990. *The conscience of the eye : the design and social life of cities*. New York: Knopf : Distributed by Random House.
- . 1994. *Flesh and stone : the body and the city in Western civilization*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Shibutani, Tamotsu. 1970. "On the Personification of Adversaries." Pp. 223-33 in *Human nature and collective behavior; papers in honor of Herbert Blumer*, edited by H. Blumer and T. Shibutani. Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- . 1978. *The derelicts of Company K : a sociological study of demoralization*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Shields, Rob. 1992. "The individual, consumption cultures and the fate of community." Pp. 99-113 in *Lifestyle shopping : the subject of consumption*, *International library of sociology*, edited by R. Shields. London ; New York: Routledge.
- . 1996. "A guide to urban representations and what to do about it: alternative traditions in urban theory." Pp. 227-52 in *Re-presenting the city : ethnicity, capital, and culture in the 21st-century metropolis*, edited by A. D. King. New York: New York University Press.
- . 2003. *The virtual*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Short, J. R. 1999. "Urban imagineers: boosterism and the representation of cities." Pp. 37-54 in *The urban growth machine : critical perspectives two decades later*, *SUNY series in urban public policy*, edited by A. E. G. Jonas and D. Wilson. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Short, J. R. and Y. H. Kim. 1998. "Urban crises/urban representations: selling the city in difficult times." Pp. 55-78 in *The entrepreneurial city : geographies of politics, regime, and representation*, edited by T. Hall and P. Hubbard. Chichester ; New York: Wiley.
- Short, J. R., Y. Kim, M. Kuus, and H. Wells. 1996. "The Dirty Little Secret of World Cities Research: Data Problems in Comparative Analysis." *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research* 20:697-717.
- Short, JR. 1996. *The Urban Order: An Introduction to Cities, Culture, and Power*: Blackwell Publishing.
- Silverman, Debora. 1986. *Selling culture : Bloomingdale's, Diana Vreeland, and the new aristocracy of taste in Reagan's America*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Simmel, Georg. 1890. *Über soziale Differenzierung. Sociologische und psychologische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.
- . 1900. *Philosophie des geldes*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humbolt.
- . 1908. *Soziologie. Untersuchungen ueber die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humbolt.
- . 2004. *The philosophy of money*, Edited by D. Frisby. Translated by T. Bottomore, D. Frisby, and K. Mengelberg. London ; New York: Routledge.
- . [1914] 1926. *Der Konflikt der modernen Kultur: ein Vortrag*. Muenchen: Duncker & Humblot.
- Simmie, James. 2002. "Knowledge Spillovers and Reasons for the Concentration of Innovative SMEs." *Urban Studies* 39:885-902.
- Sklair, Leslie. 1997. "Social movements for global capitalism: the transnational capitalist class in action." *Review of International Political Economy* 4:514-38.
- Sklair, Leslie. 2001. *The transnational capitalist class*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and social revolutions : a comparative analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1985. "Bringing the state back in: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research." Pp. 3-37 in *Bringing the state back in*, edited by P. B. Evans, D. Rueschemeyer, and T. Skocpol. Cambridge Cambridgeshire ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smart, Alan. 1993. "The Political Economy of Rent-Seeking in a Chinese Factory Town." *Anthropology of Work Review* 14:15-19.
- . 1999. "Getting things done across the Hong Kong border: economic culture in theory and practice." Pp. 158-86 in *Qiaoxiang ties : interdisciplinary approaches to*

- 'cultural capitalism' in South China, *Studies from the International Institute for Asian Studies, Leiden & Amsterdam*, edited by L. Douw, C. Huang, and M. R. Godley. London and Leiden, Netherlands: Kegan Paul International in association with International Institute for Asian Studies.
- Smelser, Neil J. 1959. *Social change in the industrial revolution; an application of theory to the British cotton industry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1974. "Growth, structural change, and conflict in California public higher education, 1950–1970." Pp. 9-141 in *Public higher education in California*, edited by N. J. Smelser and G. A. Almond. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1985. "Evaluating the Model of Structural Differentiation in Relation to Educational Change in the Nineteenth Century." Pp. 113-29 in *Neofunctionalism, Key issues in sociological theory*, edited by J. C. Alexander. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- . 1990. "The Contest Between Family and Schooling in Nineteenth-Century Britain." Pp. 165-86 in *Differentiation theory and social change : comparative and historical perspectives*, edited by J. C. Alexander and P. B. Colomy. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 1991. *Social paralysis and social change : British working-class education in the nineteenth century*. Berkeley; New York: University of California Press; Russell Sage Foundation.
- Smith, David A. and Michael Timberlake. 1995. "Conceptualising and Mapping the Structure of the World System's City System." *Urban Studies* 32:287-302.
- Société Jean Bodin, pour l'histoire comparative des institutions. 1958. "La Ville." *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin* VI-VII.
- Soja, Edward W. 1989. *Postmodern geographies : the reassertion of space in critical social theory*. London ; New York: Verso.
- Sombart, Werner. 1913. *Der bourgeois; zur geistesgeschichte des modernen wirtschaftsmenschen*. Muenchen: Duncker & Humblot.
- . 1928. *Der moderne Kapitalismus; historisch-systematische Darstellung des gesamteuropäischen Wirtschaftslebens von seinen Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. München: Duncker & Humblot.
- Sorkin, Michael. 1992. *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- . 1992a. "See you in Disneyland." Pp. 205-32 in *Variations on a theme park : the new American city and the end of public space*, edited by M. Sorkin. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Spencer, Herbert. 1897. *The principles of sociology*. New York: D. Appleton and company.
- . 1975. *The principles of sociology*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Spencer, Herbert and F. Howard Collins. 1914. *The principles of sociology*. New York and London: D. Appleton and company.
- Spohn, Willfried. 2003. "Multiple Modernity, Nationalism and Religion: A Global Perspective." *Current Sociology* 51:265-86.
- Stabel, Peter. 1997. *Dwarfs among giants : the Flemish urban network in the late Middle Ages*. Leuven: Garant.

- . 1999. "Women at the Market: Gender and Retail in the Towns of Late Medieval Flanders." Pp. 259-76 in *Secretum scriptorum : liber alumnorum Walter Prevenier*, edited by W. P. Blockmans, M. Boone, and T. de Hemptinne. Leuven: Garant.
- Stallabrass, Julian. 2004. *Art incorporated : the story of contemporary art*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stewart, Kathleen. 1995. "Bitter faiths." Pp. 381-98 in *Technoscientific imaginaries : conversations, profiles, and memoirs, Late editions*, edited by G. E. Marcus. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. 1994. *Whither socialism?* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Stoker, Gerry. 1995. "Regime theory and urban politics." Pp. 170-94 in *Theories of urban politics*, edited by D. Judge, G. Stoker, and H. Wolman. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Stone, Clarence N. 1989. *Regime politics : governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*. Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas.
- Storper, Michael. 1995. "The World of the City: Local Relations in a Global Economy." in *European Network for Research on Services Annual Meeting*. Aix-en-Provence, France: European Network for Research on Services.
- . 1997. *The regional world : territorial development in a global economy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Storper, Michael and Richard Walker. 1989. *The capitalist imperative : territory, technology, and industrial growth*. Oxford, UK ; New York, NY, USA: B. Blackwell.
- Strange, Susan. 1998. *Mad money : when markets outgrow governments*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Strathern, Marilyn. 1991. *Partial connections*. Savage, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Strauss, Anselm L. 1978. *Negotiations : varieties, contexts, processes, and social order*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Streeck, Wolfgang and Kozo Yamamura. 2001. *The origins of nonliberal capitalism : Germany and Japan in comparison*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Surace, Samuel. 1992. "Incomplete Differentiation: New Forms." Pp. 93-119 in *The Dynamics of social systems, Sage studies in international sociology*, edited by P. B. Colomy. London and Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Susser, Ida. 1997. "The Flexible Woman: Regendering labor in the informational society." *Critique of Anthropology* 17:389-402.
- Swedberg, Richard. 1998. *Max Weber and the idea of economic sociology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1999. *Max Weber's sociology of capitalisms*. Stockholm: Univ., Department of Sociology.
- Swyngedouw, E. 1997. "Neither global nor local: 'glocalization' and the politics of scale." Pp. 137-66 in *Spaces of globalization : reasserting the power of the local, Perspectives on economic change*, edited by K. R. Cox. New York: Guilford Press.
- Szporluk, Roman. 2000. *Russia, Ukraine, and the Breakup of the Soviet Union*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press and Stanford University.

- Tabari, Keyvan. 2003. "The Rule of Law and the Politics of Reform in Post-Revolutionary Iran." *International Sociology* 18:96.
- Taussig, Michael T. 1992. *The nervous system*. New York: Routledge.
- . 1993. *Mimesis and alterity : a particular history of the senses*. New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, Ian R. 1990. *The Social effects of free market policies : an international text*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Taylor, Peter J. 1997. "Hierarchical tendencies amongst world cities: a global research proposal." *Cities* 14:323-32.
- . 2000. "World Cities and Territorial States Under Conditions of Contemporary Globalization." *Political Geography* 19:5-32.
- . 2004. *World city network : a global urban analysis*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Teitelman, Robert. 1989. *Gene dreams : Wall Street, academia, and the rise of biotechnology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tenbruck, Friedrich H. 1975. "Das Werk Max Webers: Methodologie und Sozialwissenschaften." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 27:663-702.
- Terhorst, Pieter and Jacques Van De Ven. 1995. "The national urban growth coalition in The Netherlands." *Political Geography* 14:343-61.
- Thrift, Nigel. 1994. "On the social and cultural determinants of international financial centres: the case of the City of London." Pp. 327-55 in *Money, power, and space*, edited by S. Corbridge, N. Thrift, and R. Martin. Oxford, England ; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- . 1996. "New Urban Eras and Old Technological Fears: Reconfiguring the Goodwill of Electronic Things." *Urban Stud* 33:1463-93.
- . 1997. "Cities without modernity, cities with magic." *Scottish Geographical Magazine* 113:138-49.
- . 1998. "Virtual Capitalism: The Globalisation of Reflexive Business Knowledge." Pp. 161-86 in *Virtualism : a new political economy*, edited by J. G. Carrier and D. Miller. Oxford ; New York: Berg.
- . 2000. "Performing Cultures in the New Economy." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90:674-92.
- . 2000a. "A hyperactive world." Pp. 29-42 in *Geographies of global change : remapping the world in the late twentieth century*, edited by R. J. Johnston, P. J. Taylor, and M. Watts. Oxford ; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- . 2000b. "Not a straight line but a curve: or cities are not mirrors of modernity." Pp. 233-63 in *City visions*, edited by D. Bell and A. Haddour. New York: Pearson Education.
- Thrift, Nigel and Kris Olds. 1996. *Refiguring the economic in economic geography*: Arnold Publishers.
- Tierney, Kathleen J. 1982. "The Battered Women Movement and the Creation of the Wife Beating Problem." *Social Problems* 29:207-20.
- Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From mobilization to revolution*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Tiryakian, Edward A. 1992. "Dialectics of modernity: reenchantment and dedifferentiation as counter processes." Pp. 78-94 in *Social change and*

- modernity*, edited by H. Haferkamp and N. J. Smelser. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Toffler, Alvin. 1980. *The third wave*. New York: Morrow.
- Tönnies, Ferdinand. 1887. *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft; Abhandlung des Communismus und des Socialismus als empirischer Culturformen*. Leipzig: Fues.
- . 1957. *Community and society*, Edited by C. P. Loomis. Translated by C. P. Loomis. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Touraine, Alain. 1973. *Production de la société*. Paris: Seuil.
- . 1978. *La voix et le regard*. Paris: Seuil.
- Trexler, Richard C. 1980. *Public life in Renaissance Florence*. New York: Academic Press.
- Turkle, Sherry. 1984. *The second self : computers and the human spirit*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Turner, Ralph H. and Paul B. Colomy. 1988. "Role differentiation: Orienting principles." Pp. 1-27 in *Advances in group processes*, edited by E. J. Lawler and B. Markovsky. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.
- Turner, Ralph H. and Lewis M. Killian. 1987. *Collective behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Twitchell, James B. 2004. *Branded nation : the marketing of megachurch, college, inc., and museumworld*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Tyack, David. 1966. "The Kingdom of God and the Common School: Protestant Ministers and the Educational Awakening in the West." *Harvard Educational Review* 36:447-69.
- Tyack, David B. 1974. *The one best system : a history of American urban education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Tyack, David B. and Elisabeth Hansot. 1982. *Managers of virtue : public school leadership in America, 1820-1980*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tyack, David and Elisabeth Hansot. 1980. "From Social Movement to Professional Management: An Inquiry into the Changing Character of Leadership in Public Education." *American Journal of Education* 88:291-319.
- Tyler, Stephen A. 1986. "Post-modern ethnography: From document of the occult to occult. document." Pp. 99-122 in *Writing culture : the poetics and politics of ethnography : a School of American Research advanced seminar*, edited by J. Clifford and G. E. Marcus. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tythacott, Louise. 2003. *Surrealism and the Exotic*. London and New York: Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Uchitelle, Louis. 1991. "Market Magic; But Just Who Is That Fairy Godmother?" Pp. <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9D0CE0DB1F3CF93AA1575AC0A967958260> in *The New York Times*. New York.
- Urry, John. 2000. *Sociology beyond societies : mobilities for the twenty-first century*, Edited by Anonymous. London ; New York: Routledge.
- . 2003. *Global complexity*, Edited by Anonymous. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity; Distributed by Blackwell.
- Valler, D., A. Wood, and P. North. 2000. "Local governance and local business interests: a critical review." *Progress in Human Geography* 24:409-28.

- van Aalst, Irina and Inez Boogaarts. 2002. "From Museum to Mass Entertainment: The Evolution of the Role of Museums in Cities." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 9:195-209.
- van Bon, Saskia. 1999. "The cultural industries: fostering the local in the network economy. A case study of the Northern Quarter in Manchester." Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands.
- van den Berghe, Pierre L. 1963. "Dialectic and Functionalism: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis." *American Sociological Review* 28:695-705.
- van Eijck, Koen and Wim Knulst. 2005. "No More Need for Snobbism: Highbrow Cultural Participation in a Taste Democracy." *Eur Sociol Rev* 21:513-28.
- van Uytven, Raymond. 1986. "Les origines des villes dans les anciens Pays-Bas (jusque vers 1300)." Pp. 14-26 in *La Fortune historiographique des thèses d'Henri Pirenne : actes du colloque organisé à l'occasion du cinquantième de la mort de l'historien belge, Archives et bibliothèques de Belgique, numéro spécial = Archief- en bibliotheekwezen in België, extranummer*, edited by G. Despy, A. E. Verhulst, and R. van Uytven. Brussel: Archives et bibliothèques de Belgique and Institut des hautes études de Belgique.
- Vanberg, Viktor. 1975. *Die zwei Soziologien : Individualismus und Kollektivismus in der Sozialtheorie*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr.
- . 1978. "Kollektive Güter und kollektives Handeln." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 30:652-79.
- Vanderlinden, Barbara and Elena Filipovic. 2005. *The Manifesta decade : debates on contemporary art exhibitions and biennials in post-wall Europe*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1919. *The vested interests and the state of the industrial arts: "The modern point of view and the new order"*. New York: B.W. Huebsch.
- . 1927. *The theory of the leisure class; an economic study of institutions*. New York: Vanguard press.
- Verdery, Katherine. 1996. *What was socialism, and what comes next?* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Verhulst, Adriaan E. 1987. "L'historiographie concernant l'origine des villes dans les anciens Pays-Bas depuis la mort de Henri Pirenne (1935)." Pp. 107-16 in *Henri Pirenne : de la cité de Liège à la ville de Gand : actes du colloque organisé à l'Université de Liège le 13 décembre 1985, Cahiers de Clio*, edited by J.-L. Kupper, F. Bierlaire, and U. d. Liège. Liège: Université de Liège, Section d'histoire.
- . 1999. *The rise of cities in north-west Europe*. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York, NY; Paris Cedex: Cambridge University Press; Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- Verwijnen, Jan and Panu Lehtovuori. 1999. "Creative cities : cultural industries, urban development and the information society." Pp. 271 in *Publication series of the University of Art and Design*. Helsinki: University of Art and Design Helsinki UIAH.
- Virilio, Paul. 1987. "The overexposed city." *Zone* 1:14-31.
- . 1997. "The Overexposed City." Pp. 381-90 in *Rethinking architecture : a reader in cultural theory*, edited by N. Leach. New York: Routledge.

- Vitale, Marina and Domenico Scafoglio. 1995. *La piazza nella storia : eventi, liturgie, rappresentazioni*. Napoli: Edizioni scientifiche italiane and Università degli studi di Salerno.
- Vogel, Carol. 2005. "This Whitney Biennial Will Take In the World." Pp. <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/30/arts/design/30whit.html?adxnnl=1&adxnnlx=1133772031-tbdzfaG9IeRsv+z7iBNlg> in *The New York Times*. New York.
- von Gierke, Otto Friedrich. 1868. *Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- . 1954. *Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht*. Graz: Akademische Druck-u. Verlagsanstalt.
- Wade, Robert and Frank Veneroso. 1998. "The Asian crisis: The high debt model versus the Wall Street-Treasury-IMF complex." *New Left Review*:3.
- Wagner, Peter. 1994. *A sociology of modernity : liberty and discipline*. London etc.: Routledge.
- Walker, R.B.J. 1994. "Social movements/world politics." *Millennium* 23:669-700.
- Wallace, Michael. 1968. "Changing Concepts of Party in the United States: New York, 1815-1828." *The American Historical Review* 74:453-91.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice. 1974. *Capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1976. *The modern world-system : capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1979. *The capitalist world-economy : essays*. Cambridge etc.; Paris: Cambridge University Press; Ed. de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- . 1980. *Mercantilism and the consolidation of the European world-economy, 1600-1750*. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1984. *The politics of the world-economy : the states, the movements, and the civilizations : essays*. Cambridge Cambridgeshire ; New York; Paris: Cambridge University Press; Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.
- . 1989. *The second era of great expansion of the capitalist world-economy, 1730-1840s*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- . 1991a. *Geopolitics and geoculture : essays on the changing world-system*. Cambridge England ; New York; Paris: Cambridge University Press; Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- . 1991b. *Report on an intellectual project : the Fernand Braudel Center, 1976-1991*. Binghamton, N.Y.: State University of New York and Fernand Braudel Center for the Study of Economies, Historical Systems, and Civilizations.
- . 1995. *Historical capitalism ; with, Capitalist civilization*, Edited by I. M. Wallerstein. London: Verso.
- . 2004. *The modern world-system in the longue durée*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Warner, R. Stephen. 1978. "Toward a Redefinition of Action Theory: Paying the Cognitive Element Its Due." *The American Journal of Sociology* 83:1317-49.
- Waters, Malcolm. 2001. *Globalization*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Weber, Max. [1905] 1934. *Die protestantische ethik, und der geist des kapitalismus*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . [1905] 1979. *Die protestantische Ethik : eine Aufsatzsammlung*, Edited by J. Winckelmann. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn.

- . [1920] 1972. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, vol. 1. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . [1921] 1972. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, vol. 2. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . [1922] 1963. *The sociology of religion*, Edited by T. Parsons. Translated by E. Fischhoff. Boston: Beacon Press.
- . [1922] 1968. *Economy and society: an outline of interpretive sociology*, Edited by G. Roth and C. Wittich. Translated by E. Fischhoff and others. New York: Bedminster Press.
- . [1922] 1973. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, vol. 3. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . [1922] 1976. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft : Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Weidenfeld, Katia. 1996. *La police de la petite voirie à Paris à la fin du Moyen Age*. Paris: L.G.D.J.
- Weiming, Tu. 2000. "Implications of the Rise of 'Confucian' East Asia." *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 129:195-218.
- Weiss, Anita M. 2003. "Interpreting Islam and Women's Rights." *International Sociology* 18:581-601.
- Weissman, Ronald F. E. 1981. *Ritual brotherhood in Renaissance Florence*. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1989. "The Importance of Being Ambiguous: Social Relations, Individualism, and Identity in Renaissance Society." Pp. 269-80 in *Urban life in the Renaissance*, edited by S. Zimmerman and R. F. E. Weissman. Newark; London: University of Delaware Press, University of Maryland, College Park, Center for Renaissance and Baroque Studies, and Associated University Presses.
- Westwood, Sallie and John Williams. 1997. *Imagining cities : scripts, signs, memory*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- White, Hayden V. 1973. *Metahistory: the historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Whitehead, Alfred North. [1925] 1967. *Science and the modern world*. New York: Free Press.
- Wiesner, Merry E. 1993. *Women and gender in early modern Europe*. Cambridge England ; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilensky, Harold L. 1974. *The welfare state and equality : structural and ideological roots of public expenditures*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wilk, Richard R. 1996. *Economies and cultures : foundations of economic anthropology*. Boulder, Colo.: WestviewPress.
- Willey, David. 1998. "Two tales of one city: alternative accounts for leisure and tourism in urban renewal in Plymouth, England, U.K.—a practical example." *World Leisure and Recreation Journal* 40:1-22.
- Williamson, Oliver E. 1985. *The economic institutions of capitalism : firms, markets, relational contracting*. New York; London: Free Press; Collier Macmillan.
- Willis, Paul E. 1980. "Notes on Method." Pp. 88-95 in *Culture, media, language : working papers in cultural studies, 1972-79*, edited by S. Hall. London; Birmingham, West Midlands: Hutchinson; Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham.
- Willke, Helmut. 1983. *Entzauberung des Staates : Überlegungen zu einer sozietaalen Steuerungstheorie*. Königstein/Ts.: Athenäum.

- . 1989. *Systemtheorie entwickelter Gesellschaften : Dynamik und Riskanz moderner gesellschaftlicher Selbstorganisation*. Weinheim: Juventa.
- Wilson, Elizabeth. 1991. *Sphinx in the city : urban life, the control of disorder, and women*. London: Virago.
- . 1995. "The rhetoric of urban space." *New Left Review*:146.
- . 2000. *Bohemians : the glamorous outcasts*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Wittrock, Bjorn. 2000. "Modernity: One, none, or many? European origins and modernity as a global condition." *Daedalus* 129:31.
- Worpole, Ken. 1992. *Towns for people : transforming urban life*. Buckingham ; Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Wu, Chin-Tao. 2002. *Privatising culture : corporate art intervention since the 1980s*. London and New York: Verso.
- Wynne, Derek and Justin O'Connor. 1998. "Consumption and the postmodern city." *Urban Studies* 35:841.
- Yamamura, Kozo and Wolfgang Streeck. 2003. "The end of diversity? : prospects for German and Japanese capitalism." in *Cornell studies in political economy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Yang, Mayfair Mei-hui. 2000. "Putting Global Capitalism in Its Place: Economic Hybridity, Bataille, and Ritual Expenditure." *Current Anthropology* 41:477-509.
- Zolberg, Vera L. 1986. "Tensions of Mission in American Art Museums." Pp. 184-98 in *Nonprofit Enterprise in the Arts: Studies in Mission and Constraint*, edited by P. J. DiMaggio. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zonabend, Françoise. 1993. *The nuclear peninsula*. Cambridge England ; New York, NY, USA; Paris: Cambridge University Press; Editions de la maison des sciences de l'homme.
- Zukin, Sharon. 1989. *Loft living : culture and capital in urban change*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- . 1991. *Landscapes of power : from Detroit to Disney World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1992. "Postmodern urban landscapes: mapping culture and power." Pp. 221-24 in *Modernity and identity*, edited by S. Lash and J. Friedman. Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA: Blackwell.
- . 1995. *The cultures of cities*. Cambridge, Mass. ; Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zylberberg, Jacques and Jean Baudrillard. 1986. *Masses et postmodernité*. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.