Anderson's class analysis focuses on the Creoles' dual relation to the direct producers and the mercantile/bureaucratic apparatus, yielding three types: an Indian zone where mass uprisings frightened them and where peninsular merchants and officials were deeply entrenched; a mestizo zone (Chile & Colombia) where only fractions of the agrarian bourgeoisie dared revolt; and a "vanguard zone" (Venezuela and La Plata) featuring low indigenous pressure, high external commercial orientation, slaves available for controlled mobilization, and seminomadic cowboys with distinctive military skills. And, as usual, one receives from Anderson a vocabulary lesson gratis.

Suter is the senior member of a Zurich research team under Bornschier's general direction. They have already published several reports from their data in both German and English, but their work is not yet widely disseminated and known. In the current chapter they accomplish three things. First, they demonstrate strong correlations between debt defaults (and reschedulings) and the cyclical movements of the world-economy over the last two hundred years, locating heavy borrowing toward the end of *A*-phases and defaults in the early years of the subsequent *B*-phases when anticipated export revenues fail to materialize. Second, they show that two particular types of national political regimes tend to default, whereas two quite different types typically carry out the reschedulings. Detailed analyses of Turkey, Peru, and Argentina illustrate the argument. Third, they analyze the contemporary rise of creditor cooperation, through the Paris Club and World Bank-initiated consortia, noting that government creditors have organized themselves with greater facility than private creditors. Here the main consequence seems to be increased power of the core over the periphery.

Neither an annual nor a one-shot affair, *World Society Studies* might be called an "occasional." How often it appears remains to be determined. If the foundation maintains its high level of selectivity in research sponsorship, we can all hope that the occasions will be frequent.

Cultural Theory.
By Michael Thompson, Richard Ellis, and Aaron Wildavsky. Westview, 1990. 296 pp. Cloth, $49.95; paper, $16.95.

Reviewer: FRANK DOBBIN, *Princeton University*

This volume is a welcome addition to the growing body of work at the nexus of cultural analysis and political science. Its main aim is to elaborate on the theoretical contributions of the work pioneered by Mary Douglas, to whom the book is dedicated, and to extend and systematize "cultural theory" (which the authors use in the singular to refer to their own theory). The book makes two important contributions to social science debates on culture. First, at the level of metatheory the authors articulate, in a cogent and systematic way, the central tenets of the social constructivist approach to culture that now informs work in sociology, anthropology, and political science. Second, at the level of theory they offer a detailed and exhaustive typology of cultures which, right or wrong, represents an effort to develop cross-societal categories of culture as a corrective

to the "not in my tribe" approach commonly found in case studies — an approach implying that cultures are entirely idiosyncratic.

The book is divided into three parts, the first of which outlines the authors' "cultural-functional" theory in detail. Here they forcefully argue their meta-theoretical position. The distinction frequently made between culture as ideals ("cultural bias") and culture as social structure ("social relations") is wrong-headed, as others have maintained, because ideals and social structures are interdependent and combine to form "ways of life." The functional element of the theory comes into play when they tackle the problem of cultural continuity over time; ways of life are sustainable ("viable") only to the extent that they encompass cultural biases that serve the latent function of reinforcing patterned social relations.

At the core of their argument is a typology of five different "ways of life," which they derive from the dimensions of Mary Douglas's grid-group schema. Grid refers to the extent to which life is constrained by social structure; group to the extent of incorporation into clearly bounded social units. A two-by-two table employing these dimensions produces hierarchy, individualism, egalitarianism, and fatalism, with a residual category of autonomy for hermits who, in essence, exist outside of society. This typology expands upon common tradition-modernity dichotomies (e.g. gemeinschaft-gesellschaft), and the authors argue that it is both exhaustive and analytically precise because it is derived from "dimensions" rather than from empirical examples. Critics may insist that these are the wrong dimensions or that two dimensions are too many or too few. These ways of life exist at the subgroup level, and each society is composed of all four in differing proportions, thus the authors avoid a common pitfall of cultural characterizations by making room for intrasocietal diversity in worldviews. The text refers to these ways of life repeatedly, and because few concrete examples appear before the third section, the book sometimes acquires an astrological tone ("Individualists attribute personal failure to bad luck . . . egalitarians prefer the simple life").

The second section analyzes the works of a number of classical and modern social theorists to demonstrate that functional analysis is widely used in the social sciences. The discussion of Parsons, by way of product differentiation, is most useful because it makes clear that the authors' cultural-functional explanation merely suggests that ways of life are self-sustaining but not that they are necessarily adaptive. Comparisons with Jon Elster and with Emile Durkheim are also illuminating. However, the authors spend more time and space than is warranted shoehorning ill-fitting authors into their functional category.

The book's theoretical mission is best served when the authors apply their framework to empirical examples, as they do in the final section by reanalyzing classical studies such as Almond and Verba's *The Civic Culture.* Here they make a strong case for the salience of subcultures and show the flexibility of their own schema. As a programmatic statement, the book is compelling and offers a clear and illuminating typology, although the rigidity and comprehensiveness of the typology may discourage its use by all but complete converts, because it leaves little room for theoretical innovation; indeed, the authors invite readers to confirm their theory rather than to expand upon it. However, the most

significant drawback of this approach, I believe, is that it retreats from analyzing society-wide tenets of reality, which has been one important strength of social constructivist works. The authors instead analyze the tenets shared within the very interest groups they criticize behaviorists for paying too much attention to (Italian Communists are egalitarians; American antiabortionists are hierarchists). While they aim to explain intranational cultural diversity, in effect they have returned to the interest group level of analysis and thus tend to neglect the collective constructions of reality that we usually call culture.

Political Networks: The Structural Perspective.
By David Knoke. Cambridge University Press, 1990. 290 pp. $42.50.

Reviewer: DAVID SCIULLI, *Texas A & M University*

David Knoke has written possibly the clearest substantive discussion in the literature of the contributions network analysts have made to political sociology in the past two decades and of where they are likely to turn their considerable energies next. This is a clearly written, rich, sophisticated book. When it is released in paperback, I will assign it as required reading in my graduate courses in contemporary social theory and in political sociology. It is so clearly written that I might do the same in upper-level undergraduate courses.

After opening with a general discussion of how network analysts approach the study of politics and society, Knoke surveys their substantive contributions by moving from microsociological to macrosociological units of analysis: individual voting patterns (chapter 2), social movements and collective behavior (chapter 3, with Nancy Wisely), organizations and corporations (chapter 4, with Naomi Kaufman), community power structures (chapter 5), national power structures (chapter 6), and international relations (chapter 7, with Jodi Burmeister-May). He concludes (chapter 8) by speculating about coming changes in the workplace, the political system, and the international order, but, compared to his tight discussions in the preceding chapters, this rambling ending could just have well been dropped from the manuscript.

I found it helpful to read the appendix ("some fundamentals of network analysis") at the very point where it is first mentioned since it nicely complements Knoke's opening discussion of network or structural analysis. His discussion of basic concepts — relational form, relational content, structural equivalence, cohesion, path distance, actor prominence, and network boundaries — is straightforward and masterful. The central thesis that cuts across the book's substantive chapters greatly assists the reader in visualizing the place of network analysis in the literature, and it steadily accumulates support as Knoke moves through the substantive issues. Network analysis supplements (rather than displaces) both normative and rational modes of explanation. It adds the meticulous study of concrete entities and ongoing relationships to what would otherwise be overgrand normativist or rationalist generalizations on how and why groups cohere and how collective power is wielded. In this way network analysis invites theorists of all stripes to adjust their generalizations, and, in particular, to pay more attention to empirical literatures and less attention to the classics.