

and how recruits are attracted to the Republican Movement. These personal histories include the climactic 1969/70 period and the intensive recruitment activities that followed. One interesting outcome from an analysis of the interviews is that they point directly to state sponsored violence as the prime motivating factor for many of the respondents attraction to the IRA and its philosophy of force. There is also an informative discussion on the basis for the Provisional IRA's legitimation as a military and political force in the service of Ireland. This is centered on the fact that the 1921 Dail Eireann (Parliament of Ireland), which was never dissolved, "... remained the de jure government (p24)". Tom Maguire, as the sole surviving and legally elected representative of that Dail, transferred its legitimacy to the Provisional IRA.

In chapter 6 the effects of Republicanism from the four prime recruitment paths, vis-a-vis pre and post-1969 six-county and twenty-six-county Republicans, are examined. Chapter 7 discusses the findings of this case study in light of political mobilization theoretical perspectives. A detailed account of data collection and procedures is explained in the appendix.

White convincingly illustrates that the politically charged terrorism of the Northern Irish six-county region is not simply the irrational activity of disenchanting social actors in a legitimate-rational society. On the contrary, this research points resolutely to rationally calculated decision-making that must necessarily consider a great deal of self-denial. In his summation, White puts forth some general implications of underestimating the zeal and commitment of men and women who are determined to challenge the status quo when they perceive the erosion of their civil rights and national identity.

Regrettably, White's research is limited to a singular viewpoint from a group devoted to a common purpose. Other viewpoints, such as those held by Nationalist sympathizers for peace through consensus, and anti-Nationalist or pro-British advocates, would have added immeasurably to this study if for no other reason than a comparative study of the construction of social realities in small group political mobilization. Finally, the book's title does not relate very well to its content. Even though the main focus is on past and present IRA members, the aim of the book is to identify those factors which motivated its members to join. It is not, as the title suggests, a historical examination of the organization per se.

Nevertheless, this book is an important contribution to the literature on group conflict. Accordingly, it would prove interesting and profitable to anyone concerned with sub-state or small group violence.

University of Kansas.

June Leahy

Classical Sociological Theory: A Positivist's Perspective, by Jonathan H. Turner. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers, 1993. 205 pp.

The sub-title of this book, ironic in itself, should serve as a warning to those scholars seeking an insightful contribution to any discourse on classical sociological theory and its relevance to contemporary issues. Turner's specific goal with this book, linked to his usual agenda of *elevating* sociology to the status of a natural science--biology and physics--is to "...codify the wisdom of the masters so that we can move on and make books on classical theory unnecessary" (ix). While relying on Comtean presuppositions concerning the *natural laws* of the social universe, Turner "...tries to extract the essential theoretical ideas from [a] thinker's work and to articulate the implicit laws and, in places, models proposed by a thinker"(5). This is supposedly achieved through the reduction of ideas and theorists, which are historical individuals, existing and creating within a context, to their status as universally valid laws; these laws are represented in the book as a handful of theoretical models whose true value lies, ostensibly, in their ability to be snatched out of thin air and plugged into a data set to reveal social "Truth." To make matters worse, Turner reduces, dualistically, the "discourse" occurring in other "'sophisticated' theory circles" to the status of relativism which is doomed to failure because of its attention to substantive questions of human values and *perspectival* inquiry; readers are left with the impression that there are only positivists of Turner's brand and all other theorists conflated into a post-modernists category.

Many readers will take offense at Turner's actual treatment of theorists and theories in this book. For example chapter twelve is entitled "Spencer, Marx, Weber, Simmel, and Pareto on Power and Conflict." The author heroically reduces these theorists' ideas on power and conflict to thirteen pages and twelve principles. In admitting that Marx and Weber would not have approved of this treatment, Turner argues that "...to the extent that sociology is considered a science...we should try to extract the theoretical principles from scholars' work, state them formally, and use them in our theoretical and research efforts to build a cumulative science"(136). Further, it is stated that "[w]hen principles are extracted and abstracted, the surface incompatibility of various scholars' work is dramatically reduced"(136).

However superficially correct this may be, should we be concerned with the *reduction* of incompatibilities in theory or should we be concerned with an acknowledgement of them? Should we follow Turner in boiling down theory--excising history and cutting away individual intersections with it? Apparently Turner feels that neat and tidy theoretical packages can be blended together--merging in the middle of the road. At least with this approach sociologists would no longer have to deal with messy empirical realities that do not fit their models--simply reduce a bit further!

Similarly, sociologists interested in Mead or Weber will not be satisfied with Turner's reduction of them into: "Mead as a social physicist" or Weber's ideas on integration and conflict boiled down to nine pages--including models illustrating "Weber's Theory of Delegitimation and Conflict"(112) and "Weber's Propositions on Geopolitics and Conflict"(115) in which the author admits that

"In this model, I have taken considerable liberty to rephrase the variables in Weber's argument--"(115).

Turner's treatment of Weber is particularly unsettling. The issues and questions that Weber had concerning objectivity and value-freedom, central concerns, are summed up in a crude fashion and reduced to a sentence. A search of the bibliography reveals that Turner has not seen *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*--a source which flies in the face of his gross description of Weber's thought on "objectivity", value-freedom in research and, more importantly in this case, the use of abstract laws in empirical analysis. Moreover, Turner's reduction of Weber is undertaken because

...I believe that one of the reasons that sociologists still read and reread Weber with an almost religious fervor is because we sense that he articulated some basic laws of human organization. With some notable exceptions...few want to admit or acknowledge this possibility, but Weber's laws are nonetheless there to be observed. Indeed, Weberian laws simply pop out and hit you between the eyes, if you are looking for them(109).

Basically, the entire book unfolds in similar fashion as Turner articulates the "basic laws" of the classical theorists. The only thing interesting about this is the various degrees of resistance each offers to being systematized--little considering Turner never breaks the surface tension of the foreground.

Turner's view of theory in the social sciences is drastically mislead and a sad vision of a potential future; sad especially in regard to the popularity, perhaps increasing, of this type of "theorizing" and use of theory in much of contemporary sociology. Turner and his ilk are numerous victims of the Charisma of Reason--the religion of the Enlightenment. He has bought into the dream that a few general laws can be collected and built over time to explain social reality.

The inherent danger of theory building of the type presented in this book, was best illustrated, historically, by the use and confusion of ideal types and "Marxist" theories as stand-in's for reality. As soon as we transcend their use for leading the way to fruitful ideas and questions, and treat them as reality, the result is a problematic and foggy religion--the use of theory as a "cook-book." Unlike Weber, Turner allows for no pluralistic interpretations and no chance for perspectives--hence the irony within the sub-title of this book. Perhaps we should have respect for what Weber, and Nietzsche before him, respected: that which lies beyond our own horizons and coming to terms with the limits of our own knowledge.

University of Kansas

Mark P. Worrell

## *Sociological Imagination*

Formerly THE WISCONSIN SOCIOLOGIST

Quarterly Journal of the  
Wisconsin Sociological Association

*Sociological Imagination* (ISSN) 1077-5048), the oldest continuously published state sociology journal in the United States, publishes articles and note-length manuscripts on issues pertaining to all areas of sociological research, teaching, and practice. We also encourage submission of review essays on theoretical, methodological, and substantive topics, as well as review of books and films that are of interest to sociologists.

Recently published articles include:

- Lee Bowker on wife battering
- Remi Clignet and Sunita Kishor on higher education
- Jean Hector Faley on Scottish oral history
- Richard Quinney on visual sociology
- Richard Salem on crime and punishment
- Lynnell Simonson on the victim's rights movements
- Kenneth and Robert Wolensky on the ILGWU
- T.R. Young on political correctness

Manuscripts should be sent to the Editors, Ronald Berger and Bruce Wiegand, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, WI 53190. Inquiries concerning subscription matters should be sent to the Treasurer, David Brown, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, Eau Claire, WI 54702.