from the power structures of the knowledge industry (e.g. diary writing) than from self-consciousness. While Wood and Zurcher argue quite rightly that individual reality, the validity and integrity of its authentic experience, is the keystone of modernity, what happens when the postmodern self becomes aware of contradictory standards of reality that undermine its own authenticity?

Interestingly, while not dealing with this deconstructionist or post-structuralist approach, the authors do suggest in the final chapter that the rational realities of institutional and product demands may be conflated with the realization of impulse/process interests. This chapter presents a four-fold table along the process/institution and impulse/process axes and outline variants in the development of the postmodern self. Accordingly, “therapeutic selves” can adjust and use impulses for productive relations and “organizational process” selves may use institutions as opportunities for pleasure. What this means to the authors is that we live in a time of cultural and social contradiction. Our institutional world, increasingly bureaucratized and rationalized, is essential for its industrial and post-industrial economy of services, products and managed information. Yet, our cultural world takes in conflicting knowledges which determine that the formal rationality of this social and economic world is destructive, repressive, and necessary, while also providing opportunities for postmodern self-exploration, impulse and process. While the diaries of the postmodern period generally reflect this social and cultural interaction, we can be guided and encouraged by the considerable merits of this book to new studies in order to unravel the confused meanings of postmodern artifacts.
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This is a long, well-written, and important book. Wuthnow who is professor of sociology at Princeton University describes the circumstances and factors that encouraged or inhibited the institutionalization of the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and socialism in various European national jurisdictions. In each case he analyzes contexts of action in periods of intense debate when the cultural products that eventually were thematized as definitive historical categories (the Reformation, etc.) came into full “production” as challenges to the past and guides for the future. For the Reformation he deals with the years 1519 through 1559. The Enlightenment material covers the period from 1715 to 1789, and socialism is considered from 1864 through 1914. Wuthnow, then, is not interested in long-term historical sequences and consequences—religious conflict in the 17th century, the Romantic counter-movements of the 19th century, the creation of the Soviet Union, etc.—but rather in where, how, and why the movements under consideration succeeded in the first place.

There are at least three ways to read this book. It can be read as an innovative extended methodological essay that conceptualizes and illustrates a way to think about the sociology of culture and study socio-cultural change. One can also read it as a set of three substantive essays dealing with the historical sociology of the Reformation,

the Enlightenment, and socialism. Finally, it can be read as a document of our times, a subtle articulation of culture as a problem in sociological analysis informed by deconstructive events in the period framed by the Berkeley Free Speech movement (1964) and the end of the Reagan Era (1988).

Wuthnow develops a "conceptual scaffold" to analyze the relationship between ideology and social structure and to account for cultural change. His "conceptual scaffold" is neither a theory in the strict sense nor a set of abstract methodological rules. Rather, it is a set of guidelines directing the analyst to specific organizational contexts where ideological production occurs and cultural change originates. Wuthnow's guidelines situate those contexts in networks of communication and linkage to audiences, patrons, and authorities who supply concrete resources and consume the objects of cultural production. Organizational contexts, themselves, are placed within the larger milieu of environmental conditions that create and fix the supply of economic, political, and cultural resources. Cultural change occurs when new modes of discourse create novel cultural products in concrete organizational contexts where actors are able to mobilize and use specific resources drawn from the surrounding environment to institutionalize or guarantee the reproduction of their cultural products.

Wuthnow's "conceptual scaffold" puts considerable distance between his approach to cultural analysis and some other types of cultural studies. Thus, he defines culture as visible, empirical "products"—texts or, more generally, public, observable symbols—and not as internalized beliefs, values, and attitudes. Furthermore, he eschews models positing a correspondence between culture and social structure that in either Marxian or Durkheimian specifications postulate a simple reflection of structure in culture. He rightly observes that those models, typically, do not specify how culture and structure are connected. Also, they do not do justice to specific situations that under close examination reveal complexities that undermine the notion of simple correspondence. As far as cultural change is concerned, Wuthnow's "conceptual scaffold" avoids the unicausal, unidirectional assumptions of perspectives or theories that associate cultural change with urbanization, development, technology, industrialization, etc. and, typically, do not specify how culture is linked precisely to those broad aspects of modernization and modernity.

Wuthnow's methodology is explicitly comparative. His units of analysis are states. For the periods under examination he employs his "conceptual scaffold" to organize a vast array of historical material in order to explain why significant innovations flowered in some states but not in others, e.g. the Reformation in England but not in France; the Enlightenment in France but only pale versions in Sweden or Austria; socialism in Germany but not in Spain. Ultimately, Wuthnow accounts for success or failure in terms of a match (or its absence) between the contents of discursive fields constructed in organizational milieux (communities of discourse) and channels of communication and resource allocation between those milieux and sources of support in the surrounding environment.

From a substantive perspective the most striking feature of Wuthnow's account is the major role he attributes to the state in the cases of the Enlightenment and socialism. He convincingly argues that where the state configured resources in a way that was advantageous to those engaged in Enlightenment discourse, the Enlightenment took root. By the same token, where the state did not in effect mobilize resources on behalf of those engaged in Enlightenment discourse, there was no Enlightenment. Wuthnow removes the Enlightenment from the clutches of idealist explanations.