



10-1-1993

Stephen K. Sanderson. *Macrosociology: An Introduction to Human Societies*. 2nd Ed.

Matthew Melko
Wright State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr>

Recommended Citation

Melko, Matthew (1993) "Stephen K. Sanderson. *Macrosociology: An Introduction to Human Societies*. 2nd Ed.," *Comparative Civilizations Review*: Vol. 29 : No. 29 , Article 9.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr/vol29/iss29/9>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the All Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Comparative Civilizations Review by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

hierarchically superior to various *peripheral* and *semi-peripheral* regions—constitute only one possible pattern, and not the one depicted in her study. She further considers the analytic sense in which such systems can be said to have “broken down,” and she argues instead for viewing such breakdowns as a form of *restructuring*. It is one of the many pleasant surprises of this meticulously and graphically empirical work that some of its finest pages should be devoted to elegantly concise and pointed conceptualization. In hailing it as a “first-class contribution that will become a major reference point in future scholarships” the **American Journal of Sociology** but gave it its due.

George Von der Muhl

A MATERIALIST, WORLD-SYSTEMS TEXT

Stephen K. Sanderson. *Macrosociology: An Introduction to Human Societies*. 2nd Ed., New York: Harper Collins, 1991.

When the first edition came along a few years ago, I took this to be a clone of Gerhard Lenski’s book. In fact both books have the same words in the titles, except that for Sanderson *Macrosociology* replaces *Human Societies* as the lead concept. Well, I had tried Lenski for introductory sociology, but there wasn’t time to use it in a quarter system, and in *Social Change*, where it was okay, but other combinations were more interesting.

So I probably would have given away Sanderson’s second edition except by the time it arrived I had realized he was a member of the ISCSC, and I was looking for reading material for an amorphous course I hadn’t taught in years: social organization.

It was then I realized that Sanderson was not a clone of Lenski. His perspective was very different, more concerned with social organization than social change, and decidedly materialist and world systems oriented in interpretation. The length was right for an upper level sociology course, the writing was interesting, especially because Sanderson doesn’t hesitate to take a stand, and I felt that as instructor I could blunt the impact of what I perceived to be excesses of materialism and world systems perspective.

The coverage is excellent if you want to get beyond an American contemporary perspective. He includes culture, evolution, preindustrial and industrial modes, stratification, economic systems, political evolution, the state, race and ethnicity, gender inequality, family and kinship, educational systems, religious systems and

science. Most of this is world embracing and reasonably free of ethnocentrism, outside of the Western ethnocentrism built into World Systems theory.

I had my students write after reading each chapter, almost every class meeting, and they worked from a perspective that was comfortable for them, choosing from a menu Sanderson provided in the first chapter: materialist vs. idealist (closer to Sorokin's ideational), functionalist vs. conflict (no room for interactionism), evolutionary vs. cyclical (with cyclical only implied), and an eclectic alternative that allowed for but discouraged mixing. My students could choose whatever they wished, and modify along the way if that seemed appropriate.

Also, Sanderson juxtaposes his broad generalizations with boxes that treat a specific topic, so that a chapter on economic underdevelopment and its theories is concluded with a box on successful development in East Asia. I allowed my students, who were answering a question I asked them about the general chapter, to write a box of their own from their own experience. So if I asked them whether the developed world was responsible for continued underdevelopment, I also asked them how their families would do if they were suddenly transported to Nicaragua or Pakistan. Their response to the broad question depended on their understanding and preference for modernization or dependency theory, while their answer to the family question depended on their assessment of their own families.

If Sanderson was explaining the capitalist system, I asked the students whether the industrial revolution was inevitable (every one of them answered yes!) and for a box, what was their place in the capitalist system. When Sanderson explained the evolution of the modern family, I asked them where romantic love had come from and for a box, why cohabitation had become so popular. (No one mentioned AIDS. When I suggested it might be a factor, they were puzzled.)

I took every shot at Sanderson I could, pointing out, for instance, that he dealt with culture before presenting the principles of his own materialist, world systems, evolutionary strategy, because culture would otherwise be an obstacle for the theory to overcome. Or defending the liberal theory of the state against his preferred Marxian. Or noting several times his complete blindness to the power and meaning of aesthetics.

All the same, his cumulative consistency took its toll, and while the class began only one third materialist, another third had switched strategies by the time the course had ended. It was terrifying, a microcosm of what is happening in the ISCSC. Lucky it wasn't a semester course.

The class wrote every period, and I read their collected material every couple of weeks. Then they had to respond to my comments by resubmitting everything written, with introduction and conclusion, so they had produced a paper on social organization in world history. It was then that we realized they had would up writing

length at the beginning of the quarter. It was also then that I realized I would have to read 30 such monsters, which was even more outrageous. But I had to admit that Sanderson's book, despite its flawed outlook, had coaxed some very courageous work out of many of the students.

Many of them had a world perspective, and lots of specific data to back their arguments. If they went out more materialist and systems oriented than I would have liked, at least many of them had insight into the limitations of such an approach.

Why did the book work so well? It is written at the right level, understandable to juniors and seniors who have survived general education, are involved in a major. It is hard to imagine how it can be used as an introductory text. Sanderson explains what needs to be explained, and then gets on with his argument. He presents two or more sides to many questions, but doesn't hesitate to assess the arguments. Often he summarizes in a chart that includes strengths and weaknesses, so if the student had any doubts, the summary would make it clear where Sanderson stands. The students didn't always go with Sanderson's choice, though it had its cumulative effect as one argument supported another. It was interesting to show them that there was a connection between their views on the origins of agriculture in Chapter 4 and the origins of the state in Chapter 12. It was easily possible to argue one week that the state came out of agriculture and another week that agriculture needed the state. When they saw this, they had to make a choice in their revision. While I often could argue with Sanderson about his deficiencies and omissions, particularly his Philistinism, he was rarely inconsistent.

If he does a third edition, Sanderson might consider broadening his title. The book might be used in upper level political science, economics and history courses as well as sociology. It is a systems book that can be read with pleasure and annoyance by either students or adult lay persons. If the summaries and suggestions for further reading were deleted, if it were slightly reduced in size and there were single rather than double columns, no one would guess that this is a text book. It is probably, however, that doing some writing as you go along greatly increases the power and interest of the book. But then, isn't that true of most books?

Matthew Melko

REBELLION AND ASSIMILATION IN AN INTERCIVILIZATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Grant D. Jones. *Maya Resistance to Spanish Rule: Time and History on a Colonial Frontier*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989. ISBN-
Published by BYU ScholarsArchive, 1993