Introduction

Reaching for the Global

Michael Burawoy

How can ethnography be global? How can ethnography be anything but micro and ahistorical? How can the study of everyday life grasp lofty processes that transcend national boundaries? After all, participant observation, as sociologists have crafted it, aims for the subjective interpretation of social situations or the foundations of human interaction. It was designed to elucidate social processes in bounded communities or negotiated orders in institutions. It was incontrovertibly intended for the small scale. It was certainly not meant for the global! Classical anthropology, likewise, made a fetish out of the confinement of fieldwork, the enclosure of the village, the isolation of the tribe. Studies of ritual and routine, custom and law, or lineage patterns were irredeemably local. By convention global ethnography can only be an oxymoron. This book, therefore, departs from convention.

A THEORETICAL IMPOSSIBILITY?

If the prospects for global ethnography are bleak from a methodological standpoint, they are no less dismal from a theoretical standpoint. Take Fredric Jameson's theory of the global postmodern.[1] It begins with early capitalism, where the global is directly accessible from the local, from the spinning jenny, the county manor, or even the stock exchange. Ethnography fits well here. This double transparency of the near and the far did not last long. As capitalism spread across the world the truth of the local moved outside itself, embedded in obscure and distant circuits of capital. It was impossible to appreciate the fate of Manchester textiles without knowing about America's slave South or the progress of colonization in India. With the help of science, however, it was still possible to discern the terrain of this new imperial order, the operation of cartels, the rise of finance cap-

ital, forcible incorporation of peripheries. With the help of theory, ethnography could, at least in principle, link up the local to the global. But today, under late capitalism, science is helpless to comprehend a fragmented, dispersed, volatile, lived experience, let alone connect it to what Jameson considers to be an impenetrable totality. The local dissolves into ephemeral imagery while the global becomes invisible. With no place to root itself, to develop a coherent point of view, there can be no ethnography, let alone global ethnography. The best we can do is to dwell on fleeting experiences, telltale anecdotes, or aesthetic works that offer glimpses into a fractured, fragmented, all-encompassing "globality."

If Jameson's enigmatic postmodern pronounces ethnography's death sentence, theories of the information society condemn it to life imprisonment. In Manuel Castells's three-volume treatise, information technology promotes a network society of global reach in which the space of flows— flows of information, technology, and finance—replaces the space of places, the rootedness of industrial work, the fixity of urban and rural life.[2] The information society divides powerless places from placeless power—the decaying shipyard from commodity markets, the welfare client from universal discourses of legitimate need. The instantaneous transmission of electronic media introduces timeless time and the dissolution of history. The world is polarized between those within the flows of critical resources and those excluded, between the network society and the marginalized populations. If ethnography has any place, it is irrevocably local, buried in black holes or locked in real virtuality. In either case there is no exit, no way of climbing out to the other world.

In David Harvey's theory of global capitalism, ethnography is allowed out of prison but only to wander around homeless and irrelevant.[3] In his account the postmodern condition is propelled by the dynamics and contradictions of capital accumulation. In the Fordist period, crises were solved by exporting them to other territories or postponing them into the future, what he calls "time-space displacement." Capitalists could extend markets to the noncapitalist world abroad or create new demands through warfare or the welfare state at home. They could increase profits by drawing on cheap labor or by infrastructural innovation. Having exhausted themselves, these solutions are now replaced by "flexible accumulation," accelerating the processes of production, exchange, and consumption. Capitalism seeks to overcome its crises by producing more things more rapidly and by turning consumers into digestive automatons. All realms of life become volatile and ephemeral, subject to "time-space compression." If ethnography manages to withstand the hurricanes that sweep through everyday life, it can do no better than record the devastation.

Working from the top down, John Meyer and his associates have argued that the modern world society causes the diffusion of common institutional

models and patterns of legitimacy among nation states.[4] These are, of course, Western models—democracy, markets, educational systems, legal orders, and so on. Meyer and his colleagues have little to say about the power that lies behind this diffusion nor, what is more important for us, about the link between models or norms on the one side and concrete practices on the other. Instead of theorizing the link between models and practices, they talk of their "decoupling," making it difficult to understand concrete variation within the same formal structures. On the ground, liberal democracy, for example, is very different in South Africa, Russia, Sweden, and the United States. The neo-institutionalists do not deny this diversity, but they leave ethnographers, who work from the ground upward, without theoretical tools to delve into the connections between micro-practices and macro-structures. Once more ethnographers have no theoretical hoist out of the local.

Anthony Giddens creates a chink in the global armor by recognizing the new opportunities opened up by what he calls time-space "distanciation."[5] In Giddens's premodern world, time and space were inseparable, congealed in locale, that is in "place." Then time separates itself out. It becomes the abstract time of the calendar and the clock. Next, space separates itself from place. The compass, the map, and the planetary system point to a world beyond place, a world with its own logic. In this time-space distanciation, locales still exist but they are connected to each other through symbolic tokens (money), experts (doctors, lawyers, accountants), as well as by new technologies (language, radio, television, and the Internet). Through them everyday life is disembedded, lifted out of the local and attached directly to the global. For Giddens, however, these connections across space and time afford new possibilities as well as new anxieties.

But if the global is enabling as well as constraining, whom does it enable? In Robert Reich's new world economy, the beneficiaries are the labor aristocracy of "symbolic analysts" who spiral through the weblike structure of the elevated corporation, through workplaces connected across national boundaries, removed from local contexts.[6] These sky workers—"symbolic analysts" or Rosabeth Moss Kanter's "world class"—are detached from those stranded on the ground, production workers and the growing sector of in-person services.[7] Saskia Sassen drops a ladder down from the sky, tethering the "global city" of corporate executive, accountant, and banker to the armies of service workers, often immigrants, who scamper around like Lilliputians at the feet of Gulliver.[8] Ethnography can now be grounded but in a place from which the global is still largely invisible.

Is the prognosis for global ethnography, and indeed for the world, as hopeless as it looks? In this book we argue that it is not. Surprising though it may seem, even the bleakest of these theories extends a special invitation to the ethnographer. However they differ in substance, all these accounts

share a common theme: globalization as the recomposition of time and space—displacement, compression, distanciation, and even dissolution. Here lies the connection to the ethnographer, whose occupation is, after all, to study others in "their space and time." In entering the lives of those they study, ethnographers attune themselves to the horizons and rhythms of their subjects' existence. The ethnographer has, therefore, a privileged insight into the lived experience of globalization. On that basis alone, if ethnography can establish a terra firma and deploy new cognitive maps, it can shed light on the fateful processes of our age—processes that leave no one, least of all ethnographers, untouched.

Indeed, global ethnographers cannot be outside the global processes they study. They do not descend tabula rasa into villages, workplaces, churches, streets, agencies, or movements. They are also embedded in the time-space rhythms, not only of intimate relations, academic routines, TV sitcoms, café life, household, and so forth, but also of distinctively global processes. This was especially true of us as we developed our collective project. Precisely because we were scattered all over the globe, embedded in sites in countries as far apart as Russia, Hungary, Brazil, Ireland, India, and the United States, we became the living embodiment of the processes we were studying. For three intense years, no matter where we were, there were only rare moments when any one of us was out of touch with the rest. Strung out over the earth, continually moving between places, we were virtually always connected by a global net, the Internet. We surveilled one another even as we surveilled others. The very structure of our labor process brought global and local together, hauled us out of sites and into a global connection.[9]

To be a global ethnographer is one thing; to do global ethnography is another. We had to rethink the meaning of fieldwork, releasing it from solitary confinement, from being bound to a single place and time. We had to endow fieldwork with the flexibility to adjust to the space-time coordinates of the subject population. We had to self-consciously combine dwelling with traveling.[10] We had to pursue Indian nurses working in the United States back to Kerala, follow the careers of Irish software engineers as they spiraled through transnational corporate webs, and hitch ourselves to the feminist discourses circulating between Brazil and the United States.

Even when our fields did not themselves stretch across the globe, and it was only the participants' imaginations that connected them to the global, our ethnography was no less multi-sited.[11] We sought to understand the incessant movement of our subjects, the mosaic of their proliferating imaginations, by ourselves continually switching places, moving among sites within the field. It was not possible to confine ourselves to a single breast cancer movement: we had to study them in relation to one another—their internal diversity, their interweaving, the dialogues through which they achieve their own trajectories. Union organizing campaigns that contest the

global city cannot be understood in isolation but only in their multiple connectedness. The clash of global imaginations around toxic dumping in rural Hungary cannot be understood except through its connection to the source of waste—the Budapest Chemical Works. Within any field, whether it had global reach or was bounded by community or nation, our fieldwork had to assemble a picture of the whole by recognizing diverse perspectives from the parts, from singular but connected sites.

Even as we consciously elevated movement, we did not lose sight of dwelling. We were determined that our studies not dissolve into a welter of postmodern fracturing and fragmentation, that they did not become a pastiche of vignettes, and we did not become tourists tripping from resort to resort. We were determined to ground our ethnographies in local histories. It was never easy to recover pasts and we used any means available—oral histories, archives, official documents, newspapers, community memories. In this way our ethnographies also became ethnohistories. We used this grounding in the past to spiral outward and explore changes in globalization. The clamor of Hungarian welfare clients to be treated like "mothers" was traced to the penetration of new global discourses that demanded means-testing to replace universal policies of socialist welfare. The changing experiences of work in the San Francisco shipyards were traced to demilitarization and the restructuring of global shipbuilding and repair. In pushing their carts with energy and determination, homeless recyclers tried to reenact a world of blue collar jobs, of Pax Americana, a world that they had lost.

In short, welding ethnohistory to ethnography, combining dwelling with movement, all our studies accomplished three things: first, they delved into external forces; second, they explored connections between sites; and third, they uncovered and distilled imaginations from daily life. Forces, connections, and imaginations became the three essential components, the three axes of our studies. However, determining which of these three would become the focus in each case of specifically global analysis varied according to the particular experience of globalization—whether people experienced globalization as an external force to be resisted or accommodated, whether people participated in the creation and reproduction of connections that stretched across the world, or whether people mobilized and/or contested imaginations that were of global dimensions.

In order to explicate the methodology we practice, I have adopted two interconnected approaches. In the first approach I stake out the terrain of global ethnography by reference to what it is not. Much of what follows, in the first approach, discusses the limitations of sedentary and perspectival anthropology on the one side and of urban and institutional sociology on the other. The second approach to unpacking global ethnography is genealogical, tracing how we got to where we are. Here arrival, if not accidental, is also not inevitable. There were many twists in the road; we entered

many blind alleys as we battled to uncover the global. Such paths, entered but not ultimately taken, will not appear here. Instead, my narrative dwells on my own critical engagement with two major traditions of ethnography—the sociology of the Chicago School and the anthropology of the Manchester School—leading to the extended case method and from there to global ethnography.

From today's vantage point it is easy to forget that earlier in this century, in the 1920s and 1930s, the science of sociology was almost coterminous with ethnography. In the period of Chicago School preeminence, social surveys were associated with muckraking reform and the crusading women around Jane Addams and Hull House, while participant observation was science—objective, hard, and male. Thus, I begin with Chicago's foundational classic, Thomas and Znaniecki's *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America,* which was published just after World War I. From the standpoint of global ethnography this was indeed a very promising beginning, but Thomas and Znaniecki's successors in the Chicago School narrowed the field's scope to local ethnography of the metropolis, and from there it disappeared into the interiors of organizations and institutions. Connection with history and the outside world was lost. As the object of ethnography became more limited, so its method became progressively more marginal within sociology.

The trajectory of ethnography within anthropology, however, was the reverse. In the early decades of this century, professional anthropologists sought to separate themselves from amateurs—missionaries, travelers, colonial administrators—by emphasizing the rigorous scientific practice of careful observation in situ. The mythical figure of the lone, secluded anthropologist surrounded by "curious natives" became paradigmatic. Malinowski, encamped in his tent on the Trobriand Islands, signified the new discipline. Not far from the anthropologist's tent a storm was brewing, however. The anthropologist's confinement was soon to be unsettled by the distant and sometimes not-too-distant drums of anticolonialism. Here I take up the history of the Manchester School of social anthropology as the vanguard of this anthropological awakening to a wider imperial order. Its perspective on ethnography, refracted through the class and race struggles of Southern Africa, was still limited by the imperial order upon which it depended. Standing, as we do, within a postcolonial world, it is easy to diagnose the limitations of the Manchester method—the extended case method—but we nonetheless take it, or at least its revision, as our point of departure for our global ethnography. Finally, we show how our sociological sensibilities differ from what is now a flourishing global anthropology,[12] or from that tendency within it that marginalizes history and overlooks the continuing importance of the nation state.[13] In the conclusion we juxtapose our own grounded globalizations to their perspectival global "scapes."

THE POLISH PEASANT IN EUROPE AND AMERICA

The scientific move in *anthropology* during the second decade of the century turned fieldwork into a professional rite of passage, and with it came the closing of "tribal" societies, stripping them of their history, severing them from their colonial and capitalist determinations.[14] By contrast, the scientific turn in *empirical sociology,* at least in the United States, began with a global vision, pioneered by W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki's idiosyncratic, eclectic, and unwieldy classic, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America.* Originally published in five volumes between 1918 and 1920, it became the foundation tome of the early Chicago School.

It begins with a vision of the Polish peasant (prior to 1850), living within an array of rural primary groups of which the extended family was the most important. It ends with the institutions and mores of Polish American society in Chicago. Extraordinary for its time, *The Polish Peasant* describes communities in flux, with histories at both terminals of the immigration stream. Its depiction of social change is reminiscent of Emile Durkheim's account of transition from mechanical to organic solidarity, but here the transition is more obviously precarious and is spatial (traversing the Atlantic) as well as temporal.[15] Thomas and Znaniecki saw the decay of the old order as taking two roads—either *disorganization,* in which group values no longer regulate individual behavior, or *reorganization,* in which new institutions emerge to foster the reintegration of the individual. The path to a modern, "rational," self-regulating order is racked by the contending forces of disorganization and reorganization. In Poland the balance favors reorganization and nation-building, while in Chicago disorganization assumes the upper hand as adaptive institutions are slower to develop.

While global in scope, *The Polish Peasant* is at the same time ethnographic in method, inasmuch as it relies on "human documents" to describe the experiences of seasonal migrants at home and immigrants abroad. Its more than two thousand pages intersperse sociological analysis and historical commentary with lengthy extracts from letters exchanged between family members, and with newspaper articles, court records, and autobiography. Interestingly, Thomas regarded documentary evidence as more reliable than the interview, which he thought distorted as much as it revealed life experiences. As authors, Thomas and Znaniecki are erased from the text, so that even the division of labor between them is a matter of dispute. We do know, however, that the project was Thomas's brainchild. He spent much time wandering around Chicago's neighborhoods, learned Polish, and between 1908 and 1913 spent eight months every year in Europe, where he collected materials, visited important towns, immersed himself in local history, and mingled with peasants. He had initially a more ambitious plan,

eventually shelved, of comparing peasants from different parts of Europe. It was on his last trip to Warsaw that he met Florian Znaniecki, a social philosopher deeply acquainted with Polish peasant society. Forced into exile in 1914, Znaniecki landed on Thomas's doorstep and was thereupon invited to join the collaborative venture that was to become *The Polish Peasant*. It was Znaniecki who then collected the documentary materials on Chicago's Polish community.[16]

If this was ethnography, it was certainly very different from the form being pioneered by another Polish émigré, Bronislaw Malinowski, who was pitching his tent in New Guinea at the time that Thomas and Znaniecki were assembling *The Polish Peasant*. Where Thomas and Znaniecki sought to locate the subjective, lived experience of the Polish peasant in its widest historical and geographical context, Malinowski, reacting against evolutionary theory, was militantly opposed to history and consideration of the extralocal context. Thomas and Znaniecki's rich tapestry of traveling and dwelling is in sharp contrast to Malinowski's solitary confinement. Yet they do share one feature. Like Malinowski's isolation of the Trobriand community, Thomas and Znaniecki searched for an original, self-contained "peasant community." But the purpose of isolation was different: Malinowski wanted to diagnose the internal functioning and stability of the existing Trobriand community, whereas Thomas and Znaniecki sought a historical baseline from which to understand the changes wrought upon Poland since the middle of the nineteenth century. Their first volume, therefore, is devoted to the erosion of the peasant community brought about by the occupying powers, by the advance of industrialization and rural impoverishment, and by the changing class structure and social mobility.[17] Thomas and Znaniecki are very aware of how decay could lead in many directions—to disorganization, reaction, and even revolution. They describe all of these tendencies as well as the possibilities for a new type of cooperative society based on "rational" norms rather than unreflective custom.

Thomas and Znaniecki observe that the same forces that led to the weakening hold of the primary group and the rise of individualism could, under the right conditions, lead to the reorganization of rural society. The rise of what we would now call a national civil society depended upon new forms of intellectual leadership, education, secondary associations, and above all the press. Thomas and Znaniecki were especially interested in the formation of civil society under what was effectively colonial rule. Long before Benedict Anderson, they well understood the importance of print capitalism for constituting the nation as an imagined community.[18] Through newspapers as well as through letters exchanged across the Atlantic, the world of the peasant ascended to a global scale.

Such *global imaginations* extended to the actual creation of utopian communities in far-off lands, such as the proposed state of Paraná in Brazil, to

which thousands of Poles flooded in the 1890s. Thomas and Znaniecki describe the "super-territorial organization of Polish American society," or what today we call the "deterritorialization" of the nation state.[19] Religious, cultural, and political associations linked communities in the United States to Poland. Indeed, Polish America became the "fourth province of Poland." More generally, global imaginations fed upon the *global connections* of immigrants and those left behind. Letters exchanged between Polish emigrants and their families back home are dominated by the latter's economic needs. Women stranded with their children in Poland describe a life of destitution as they beg for remittances, while emigrants are concerned about the fate of their relatives, the burial of their parents, the employment of a brother, the marriage of a sister. It is difficult to know what proportion of emigrants wrote letters, but the evidence of continuing contact is impressive. Besides an exchange of money, there was a continual movement of people, with emigrants sponsoring friends and relatives, who would bring the latest news and gossip from the village. Today, as we shall see in Part 2, the telephone, the video, and the computer make living in two worlds easier, but there is little evidence that the dilemmas of duality are much different now than they were a century ago.

What *global forces* propelled emigration? Here Thomas and Znaniecki lack any compelling theoretical framework. They were concerned with individual responses to social circumstances, rather than with explaining the circumstances themselves. In their methodological introduction, following Thomas's earlier work, they propose four underlying "wishes" that govern human adaptation—desire for new experience, desire for recognition, desire for mastery, and desire for security. They move from the social situation inward to the individual and psychological rather than outward to the macro and economic. Nonetheless, despite their general hostility to materialist explanations, in the chapter "Emigration from Poland," Thomas and Znaniecki do argue that the difference between seasonal migration to Germany and the more dramatic emigration to America was related to levels of rural impoverishment. Seasonal migrants were often small farmers seeking supplementary income, while emigrants were more likely to come from a poorer, landless rural proletariat. They do not, however, have a corresponding analysis of the labor demand—the steel mills, the meat packers, the new manufacturers, and the garment industry—that made Chicago a magnet of immigrant labor in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth.

When they turn to the immigrants' experience in Chicago, they do describe the devastating effects of what they call "economic dependency," which are nothing other than the vagaries of wage labor under the unregulated capitalism of the early twentieth century. Thomas and Znaniecki focus not on wage labor, however, but on the shock to the immigrant accustomed

to the stability of rural life; on the weakness of new institutions of social control (church, parish, mutual benefit society, shops, and press); and on the corrosive effects of the individualizing welfare agencies. Just as anthropology was silent about imperialism, so Thomas and Znaniecki were silent about capitalism. It was the unexamined backdrop to immigrant (mal)adaptation; by overlooking it they missed the very class forces that would later usher in the New Deal. As I shall have cause to repeat and as others have said before me, without an analysis either of capitalism or of the state, it is impossible to understand first the transformation of America and then of the world in the twentieth century.[20]

The Polish Peasant was, therefore, *global ethnography without a theory of globalization.* Such theories were, of course, available in the writings of Lenin, Luxemburg, Hilferding, and other socialists, but nothing could have been further from the liberal pragmatism of the early Chicago sociology. Without theory, global ethnography was bound to wither on the local vine. The possibility of taking *The Polish Peasant* in the direction of more global ethnography was firmly buried by Herbert Blumer's celebrated indictment of its methodology that appeared in 1939. Invited by the Social Science Research Council to pronounce judgment on *The Polish Peasant*, he chided the authors for not living up to their scientific pretensions.[21] Theory and data were, according to Blumer, at best loosely coupled. Thomas and Znaniecki's distinction between values and attitudes, their typification of personality, their concepts of disorganization and reorganization, were obtained independently of the human documents they were supposed to analyze. For Blumer this was a cardinal sin, rather than the defining feature of good theoretical work. The social-psychological program announced at the beginning of *The Polish Peasant*, where among other things Thomas and Znaniecki propose a situational analysis based on subjective interpretations and emergent microprocesses, became the basis of Blumer's subsequent work, but for now he was using it to pass a negative judgment on their empirical enterprise. Rather than using their rich historical data to develop a new macro theory, Blumer chose to bolster the scientific basis of Thomas and Znaniecki's social psychology. The time was not ripe, the interest was not there, and the training was absent for locating these so well documented transnational processes within their global context.

Blumer's critique of *The Polish Peasant* enunciated a conception of science as inductive, as rooted in and emergent from the data. It would become the foundation of "grounded theory," which took ethnography into ever more restricted waters.[22] Blumer became an early switchman who led Chicago sociology down the road to symbolic interactionism, to the study of negotiated orders within bounded spaces. As we shall see, there were many factors predisposing Chicagoans to forsake the bigger historical picture for *institutional ethnography,* but Herbert Blumer was a major architect and

propagandist, and his critique of *The Polish Peasant* one of its founding documents.

But we are getting ahead of ourselves. Between Thomas and Znaniecki and the post–World War II Chicago institutional ethnographies of Howard Becker, Erving Goffman, Fred Davis, Anselm Strauss, Donald Roy, and other students of Everett Hughes is the classical period of the Chicago School under the leadership of Robert Park and, to a lesser extent, Ernest Burgess—the period of *local ethnography,* whose major studies appeared in the 1920s and 1930s.

THE INTROVERSION OF THE CHICAGO SCHOOL

After the University of Chicago dismissed William I. Thomas in 1918, Robert Park became the leading figure of the department and, with Ernest Burgess at his side, pioneered what came to be known as the Chicago School of urban sociology.[23] Where Thomas and Znaniecki had explored the national integration of the peasant community, both as a process within Poland and between rural Poland and urban America, Park and his followers confined their attention to the uncertain transition taking place on their doorsteps. Once again Durkheim, although largely unacknowledged, hovered in the background—not just his theory of anomie or disorganization but also his theory of social change.[24] According to Durkheim, urbanization brought increases in moral density, impelling competition and then differentiation on the basis of adaptation to the environment.[25] In adopting these ideas as their own, the Chicago School founded the field of human ecology—the study of the division of the city into natural areas, each performing distinctive functions for the whole.[26]

Archetypal in this regard was Burgess's famous depiction of the city as consisting of concentric zones—the central business district, surrounded by an area of transition invaded by business and light manufacture, leading into a zone inhabited by the working class.[27] Further out are the residential areas of higher classes, and at the city limits is the commuter zone of suburbia. Park and Burgess sent their students out to study these areas in detail—who lived there, where they came from, what they did, and the emerging forms of association and disorganization. The best came back with what became the classic local ethnographies of the hobo[28] and the slum of "Little Hell," at the back door of Chicago's greatest concentration of wealth along "The Gold Coast."[29] Louis Wirth studied the Jewish ghetto, tracing its two millennia of history from Eastern Europe, Spain, and Germany to America.[30] Most of Wirth's monograph details the settlement patterns in Chicago of two successive waves of immigration. Even more than in Thomas and Znaniecki, Wirth's gestures to a global ethnography were eclipsed by a concern with problems of adaptation and mobility within the city.

There were also studies of specific urban institutions. The most famous of these is Paul Cressey's study of the taxi-dance hall, where single men paid to dance with young women, hired by proprietors of the hall.[31] Cressey and his collaborators observed the "sex game" on the dance floor and interviewed both taxi dancers and patrons, showing how this novel institution was an adaptation to the anomic life of the metropolis, teeming with immigrants and displaced persons. In all these studies, beneath the chaos of urban life, its incessant movement and vibrancy, the Chicago ethnographers revealed an ordered segmentation. As Park was fond of repeating, Chicago was the ideal laboratory for the study of social processes, the discovery of universal laws of human interaction. In the end these laws were few and far between, often adding up to no more than loose generalities, such as Park's optimistic cycle of group interaction, from competition to conflict, to accommodation and finally assimilation.

Even as the early Chicago School confined itself to local ethnography, it studiously avoided the study of work and industry. Later, after the Second World War, such subjects would become a central focus of institutional ethnography. In the 1920s and 1930s the study of industrial relations was dominated by the Harvard-based team led by Elton Mayo. In their exhaustive investigations of Chicago's Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company, Mayo and his team, like the Chicagoans, tried to blot out what was happening on their doorsteps—the mounting class struggle of the depression. In the case of the Chicago School, the silence seems all the more deafening in view of Park's prodigious comparative experience: beginning as a journalist, he proceeded to postgraduate studies at Harvard and in Germany and then for seven years worked closely with Booker T. Washington at Tuskegee before coming to Chicago in 1913 at the age of 49. The Chicago School, even as it practiced a sociology of "the common man," was always hostile to anything that smacked of revolution or socialism. In focusing on urban settlement from the perspective of social control, they were oblivious to the very forces that were transforming the city.

The methodological lesson, however, is what concerns me here. The search for transhistorical laws obscured real history, namely, the seismic shifts in the political and social landscape of the 1920s and 1930s.[32] As Lizabeth Cohen has documented, under the shock of the depression, ethnic associations and paternalistic employers could no longer protect their communities.[33] Chicago's working classes, therefore, switched their allegiance from neighborhood, mutual benefit society, and church to trade union, political party, and state. The popular impetus behind class associations bridged ethnic and even racial divides, reconfiguring the very meaning of particularistic identities. Park's conceptual templates of invasion and succession, cycles of group interaction, the functions of "natural" areas, and so on, drained local ethnography of its local context and so missed dramatic

transformations wrought by the rise of mass culture, political machines, trade unions, and a rudimentary welfare state.

The Chicago School had remarkably little to say about class relations, but there was one notable, usually overlooked, exception, which speaks volumes for the Parkian tradition. Ernest Hiller's *The Strike* is a conceptually rich and empirically concrete study of class consciousness, class mobilization, class struggle, and class compromise. It examines strikes from the "social situation" of workers, giving credence to their imagination and rationality as well as to the structural impediments to their success. It is ethnographic inasmuch as Hiller bases his analysis on all manner of human documents from all over Europe and the United States—socialist speeches, tactical pamphlets, newspapers, autobiographies, government documents, and conciliation reports. His range of reading was extraordinary for a sociologist of his time.

Yet, paradoxically, Hiller pays little attention to Chicago's own remarkable history of labor wars. As if to underline the irrelevance of place and time, he begins his book with a "typical" strike at a South Wales colliery! Strikes in diverse sectors—coal, steel, garment, railroads, docks, agriculture—are all lumped together irrespective of historical or national context with the single purpose of discovering (or illustrating?) *the* "natural history" of *the* strike—mobilizing for concerted action, maintaining morale, controlling strikebreakers, involving the public, and finally demobilizing and reorganizing. Natural history becomes history out of context.[34] As we shall see, the substitution of natural process for historical specificity is a consistent thread running through Chicago ethnography, from Park to Janowitz.

After World War Two the Chicago department found itself in disarray, as its various factions struggled for the Parkian mantle. The Chicago sociologists were only too aware that sociology was taking very different turns elsewhere and that they were losing their prewar preeminence. They faced competition from the East Coast, from Harvard where Talcott Parsons was pioneering the deductive theorizing of structural functionalism, and from Columbia where the Merton-Lazarsfeld team pursued quantitative research and middle-range theory. In searching for their own niche, Chicago sociologists—Everett Hughes, Louis Wirth, and Herbert Blumer—battled with one another to define a subjective and situational approach to behavior and an empirically grounded notion of theory.[35] Blumer became the propagandist against Parsonian grand theory and abstracted empiricism, while Hughes and Anselm Strauss quietly trained cohorts of graduate students in fieldwork. Wirth died in 1952, and in the same year Blumer left to create the Berkeley department, leaving Hughes, now chair, to contend with an increasingly divided department. Before he left for Brandeis in 1961, however, he had nurtured an exceptional group of graduate students, the Second Chicago School, which included such luminaries as Erving Goffman,

Herbert Gans, Joseph Gusfield, Howard Becker, Fred Davis, Eliot Freidson, and Donald Roy.[36]

The classic ethnographies of this immediate postwar period shifted from the study of locality to the study of institutions, specifically to the enclosed spaces of prisons, asylums, hospitals, and factories. Their analyses focused on the creative impulse in human behavior that was already central to Thomas and Znaniecki.[37] The Chicagoans exposed the subterranean world of institutions (prisons, asylums, hospitals, concentration camps), how inmates of such institutions created an informal world of their own, and how they contended with formal organizational structures and managerial attempts to control behavior. Ironically, the Chicago studies revealed that institutions created the problems they were supposed to solve: inmates learned to behave like the insane, workers learned to restrict output. These institutional ethnographies presented a world as it appeared from below, from the standpoint of the worker, the inmate, the patient. There was little attempt, however, to study the external pressures that led managers to impose specific forms of control, how these may change over time, or how inmates might draw on outside resources to challenge institutional powers. They studied a closed and delimited world, a world taken out of history and out of its American context.

Closing ethnography off from its context had the advantage that its claims could be generalized across diverse settings. Decontextualization made Chicago theory preeminently portable and in that sense global. Thus, Goffman's remarkable insights—now commonplace—into how asylums produce rather than correct mental illness inspired and justified deinstitutionalization the world over.[38] In a parallel argument, Howard Becker pioneered new approaches to "deviance," or what Thomas and Znaniecki had called "disorganization." Taking the standpoint of the underdog, Becker argued that there was nothing intrinsically deviant about the marihuana smoker or the dance musician.[39] He showed that by labeling as outsiders those it regarded as disreputable, society exacerbated their "deviance." This was, of course, an old Durkheimian point, but it also demonstrated an oft-quoted maxim of Thomas's, that if a social situation is defined as real then it is real in its consequences. For Becker, as for institutional ethnography in general, it was sufficient to take the side of the underdogs and to show that they were being labeled deviants and punished accordingly. But he did not explore the broader context of labeling—who labels whom and why or how "deviants" contest their labeling.

In a famous clash of perspectives, Alvin Gouldner launched a holy war on what he perceived as Becker's moral complacency, his romantic fascination with the "exotic other," and subjected "labeling" theory to withering attack.[40] Becker might be critical of the immediate caretaker agencies for the way they treated delinquents, drug addicts, or alcoholics, but at the

same time he was feeding the oppressive machinery of the welfare state. In documenting the lives of marginalized groups, he was providing material for their regulation. No wonder the welfare state was happy to fund such research. Becker, Gouldner averred, was therefore on his own side too, pursuing his own interests as a career sociologist, and unwilling to adopt a radical critique of the world that sponsored him. Rather than present deviants as social problems to be solved, Gouldner called for their representation as challenging the regime that regulated them. He focused on sociologists' implication in the world they analyze, on the symbiotic relation of participant and observer, deviant and sociologist, institution and ethnographer, locating them both in their wider historical and political context.[41] In so doing, Gouldner underlined the importance of power and reflexivity, so effectively obscured by the Chicago School's focus on social control. His critique of institutional ethnography laid the groundwork for more radical visions of ethnography that would be critical of the welfare state. Today his critique sounds anachronistic, since the welfare state has retreated and the global has encroached onto the national terrain. Writing in the 1960s, he did not imagine that the sociologist-ethnographer, studying urban occupations and institutions, was implicated in a world beyond the nation state. He could not imagine a global ethnography. For that we need to turn to the anthropologists.

THE EXTROVERSION OF THE MANCHESTER SCHOOL

As the postwar Chicago School turned in on itself, retreating from local ethnography to the even more confined institutional ethnography, so the workplace, the prison, the hospital ward, the classroom, became like the anthropologist's sequestered village. At the same time anthropology itself was awakening to the challenges of decolonization. Not surprisingly, therefore, it was from the periphery that new visions emerged, washing back against metropolitan shores. In Southern Africa, the rapid expansion of industry based on cheap African labor had brought whites and blacks together under the banner of communism. Here colonial anthropologists could not ignore the wider contexts of their fieldwork. Race and class conflagrations burst the mythology of the museum "native."

If *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* was the founding classic for the Chicago School, then Godfrey Wilson's *The Economics of Detribalization in Northern Rhodesia,* also published in two parts in 1941 and 1942, is the forerunner of the Manchester School of Social Anthropology.[42] Both studies set out from small-scale peasant or tribal societies in a state of natural equilibrium that is disturbed from the outside. While Thomas and Znaniecki take off in the direction of *global connections and imaginations*—the transatlantic flow of people, letters, money, and ideas—Wilson explores *global forces* that

were wreaking havoc with tribal society. Wilson begins with the disequilib-
rium of the depression-era world economy in which capital accumulation
outpaces consumption, propelling the search for raw materials and new
markets. The global crisis has its local manifestation in Broken Hill, where
international capital had begun to excavate zinc in 1906. Broken Hill, like
the much larger center of Northern Rhodesian—today Zambian—industry
known as the Copperbelt, became a racially charged and class-divided com-
munity of Indian traders, skilled whites, and cheap African labor. The tribal
economy sank into distress as its young men were drawn off to the mines,
where they were paid less than was needed for family subsistence, housed in
single quarters, and expected to return "home" once they were no longer fit
for work. Where Thomas and Znaniecki focus on the contrary forces of
social disorganization and transnational civic associations in the Polish
American community of Chicago, Wilson hones in on the raw class relations
of Broken Hill, on the African adoption of Western consumption in clothes,
drink, and food, on the breakdown of the family ties, and on the prolifera-
tion of divorce and prostitution. Rapid incorporation into a world economy
multiplies tensions that reverberate into the furthest corners of this British
colony. This was a far cry from the conventional village anthropology.

At the time Wilson was writing his *Economics of Detribalization in Northern
Rhodesia,* Max Gluckman was penning his paradigmatic *Analysis of a Social
Situation in Modern Zululand.* If Wilson's panorama broke from anthropo-
logical confinement into a global context, Gluckman's contribution was
more methodological. His monograph begins with an account of a bridge-
opening ceremony in 1938 in Zululand, describing the relations among dif-
ferent personae of South African society—African chief, Zulu king, the
Chief Native Commissioner, the local magistrate, missionaries, Zulu police,
and the lone anthropologist. Gluckman saw in the "ceremony" interdepen-
dence but also conflict, equilibria but also instability—tensions endemic to
the everyday worlds of Zulu society, enmeshed in the rapidly industrializing
multiracial South Africa. There never was any isolated tribe here! The Zulus
were a proud nation that had fought valiantly and often successfully against
their Afrikaner and British conquerors. World capitalism and colonial his-
tory were the warp and weft of Zulu society.

Gluckman's archetypal "extended case method" laid the foundation of the
Manchester School of social anthropology. He himself moved to Northern
Rhodesia in 1939 to succeed Godfrey Wilson as director of the Rhodes-
Livingstone Institute, which had been established to study the impact of
"European civilization" on "native African society." Although no revolution-
ary by any stretch of the imagination, Gluckman's communist sympathies
made him the object of suspicion in the eyes of the trustees of the Institute,
and so his appointment was delayed.[43] Once in office, however, he laid out

plans that would shape his own endeavors and those of his collaborators for
the next thirty years. Throughout the period, he retained strong ties to
Northern Rhodesia even after leaving there in 1947 to take up first a two-year
lectureship at Oxford and then to become professor of social anthropology
at Manchester University. At Manchester he gathered around him a remark-
able group of students and associates, many of whom did their fieldwork in
Central Africa, elaborating, revising, and disseminating the Manchester
gospel. They included such illustrious figures as Victor Turner, Clyde
Mitchell, William Watson, A. L. Epstein, Bruce Kapferer, Moshe Shokeid,
Elizabeth Colson, Ronald Frankenberg, Jaap van Velsen, and Freddie Bailey.

The Manchester anthropologists made four innovations. First, their
accounts of village life highlighted *social process.* Unlike his Oxbridge teach-
ers, Radcliffe-Brown and Evans-Pritchard, who saw fieldwork as unearthing
symmetrical and static structures then to be typologized, Max Gluckman
and his students focused on social process, the endemic conflicts and
schisms of African societies. They showed how the ambiguity of kinship
norms or succession rules led to continuous feuding, rebellion, and even
civil wars that in turn paradoxically tended to reinforce rather than under-
mine political orders. Conflict was ubiquitous but it was also functional.[44]

Changes in theory dictated changes in *fieldwork technique.* This was the sec-
ond innovation. The study of social process demanded careful attention to
practices as well as to norms, to actual behaviors as well as to the rules they
instantiated. Africans were not moral dupes who simply executed norms;
like everyone else, they contended over the interpretation of norms, manip-
ulating them in the pursuit of interests. The Mancunians, therefore, fol-
lowed cases—kinship factions, succession struggles, property disputes—
over extended periods of time, and from one setting to the next.[45] It was in
social situations—"events," "dramas," and "crises"—that discrepant norms
became visible, but equally in such public displays of contention that unity
was paradoxically preserved.[46]

Discrepant practices and deviations from norms marked internal con-
tradictions of African society, but they could also be traced back to *external
forces.* This attention to the wider context was the third distinctive feature of
the Manchester School. Thus, kinship strategies and factional struggles
have greater fluidity when villagers can appeal to colonial officials (such as
the magistrate) as well as to traditional ones (such as the chief). In the eco-
nomic realm, agriculture is affected by the migration of men to the various
mining centers of Southern and Central Africa. The Manchester anthro-
pologists were not interested in recovering any pristine and fictional past of
the self-contained tribe but instead studied the impact of the tribe's inte-
gration into the wider society, whether colonial administration supported or
subverted the power of the village headman,[47] whether labor migration rein-

forced or undermined local economies.[48] There was no presumption that urbanization or industrialization would detribalize rural areas. It could just as easily lead to "retribalization."

This brings us to the fourth innovation of the Manchester School. Those external forces were not simply left unexamined, the province of sociologists, economists, or historians. Instead the Manchester anthropologists traveled to town with their notebooks and settled among the urban population of the Copperbelt. There they began to study the forces that were having such a dramatic impact on the rural areas. Ulf Hannerz writes, "Apart from the work of the early Chicago school, perhaps no other single localized complex of urban ethnography can match the studies which for a number of years came out of Central Africa."[49] The theoretical frameworks of the two schools, however, could not be more different. Where Park drew analogies from plant ecology, Gluckman was influenced by Marxism. Where the Chicago School focused on ethnic adaptation and the functionality of natural areas, the Manchester School began from the *class relations of colonial capitalism.*

The Manchester anthropologists did not study urbanism from the standpoint of the breakdown of social ties, the breakdown of tribal mores. Their point of comparison was not tribal life in the village but the industrial revolution in England.[50] Here again they differed from Thomas and Znaniecki, whose point of reference was the primary group of the pristine Polish village. How appropriate for the Manchester School to hark back to the English working classes in the study of Africa! The Manchester mantra was *A townsman is first a townsman and only secondarily a tribesman.* The tribal dance, argued Clyde Mitchell, as performed in the mine compounds, was tribal in form but urban in content.[51] The song, the clothes, the values were unmistakably part of an urban civilization, although Mitchell would be heavily criticized for claiming that Africans were drawing on Western lifestyles to evaluate one another. In A. L. Epstein's classic urban ethnography, the mines stamped their needs on the compound where the workers lived, its confinement, segmentations, and enclosures absorbing the ceaseless rhythm of the mine shift.[52] When the miners rose up against mine management in 1952, they cast aside their "tribal elders"—a system of management-sponsored representation—and vitalized their own fledgling trade union. Before Edward Thompson had wrought his revolution in the study of working classes,[53] Epstein was studying the self-formation of an African working class. To be sure there were limitations to this class analysis, which did not anticipate the disappearance of colonialism, but for its time it represented a radical break with anthropology.

Yet Manchester Marxism was only one side of the Manchester School, and not always the most prominent. It attained its most vivid expression

when deployed against other anthropologists, as in the case of Gluckman's remorseless attacks on Malinowski for studying social change in South Africa as culture contact and for ignoring South Africa's peculiar history of colonial conquest and racial capitalism.[54] There was, however, another side of the Manchester School that was much closer to the Chicago School in its search for transhistorical generalities. The Mancunians wanted to demonstrate that African society was no less dynamic, no more "primitive," than Western industrial society. They had only disdain for those who would constitute the African society as fundamentally "different," "other," or "inferior." The internal contradictions, the gap between norm and practice, endemic strife, the peace in the feud, the functions of rebellion, were no less true of the British army, the university department, the shop floor, than of the Lozi and the Zulu. Indeed, when they returned to Manchester, Gluckman's students were expected to show the relevance of their African findings to the British context.

Victor Turner, for example, was interested in ritual, so he studied the Roman Catholic Church. In later work he showed how the interdependence of structure and antistructure (communitas), or the necessary phases of social dramas, were of universal applicability.[55] Concepts originating in his first study of the Ndembu[56] are applied to counterculture in the United States; to Muslim, Christian, and Hindu pilgrimages; and to the Hidalgo Revolt against Spanish rule. The drive for universality was akin to the Chicago School's pursuit of general laws. Turner's four phases of social drama (breach, crisis, redress, and reintegration) are strikingly parallel to Park's cycle of group interaction (competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation). Turner explicitly draws on Znaniecki for his idea of community as the source of human creativity.[57] In stretching their theoretical templates so widely they became very thin, in combating colonial ideologies of racial superiority with human universality, the Mancunians paradoxically overlooked the real consequences of colonial domination and also the way Africans might be organizing themselves to challenge that domination.

The liberal face of the Manchester School received no less relentless criticism than what Gluckman had meted out to Malinowski. It was the young South African social anthropologist Bernard Magubane who delivered lone, courageous criticisms of Manchester's universalism, accusing the white Mancunians of smuggling into their work assumptions of Western superiority, of denying Africans their cultural specificity, and of understating colonial domination and thus the potentiality of anticolonialism.[58] Too often, Magubane claimed, the Manchester School took the colonial order as given and eternal. Magubane was turning Manchester against Manchester, appropriating and extending Manchester Marxism and launching it against Manchester's other face, its liberal face. Many of Magubane's criticisms are

now commonplace but at the time he delivered them, in the last years of colonialism, he was alone in piercing the radical self-image of Manchester anthropology.

At the same time that Alvin Gouldner was angrily denouncing the Chicago School for concealing the ethnographers' interest in the social problems they studied, revealing how both the problems and those who studied them were bound up with the welfare state, Ben Magubane in a similar vein and a similar tone was excoriating white anthropologists for failing to recognize their own role in upholding the colonial order. Gluckman could not understand these accusations. Had he not suffered at the hands of settlers and colonial administrators for his communist sympathies? Had they not held up his directorship? Was he not for the native? From the African's point of view, his protestations were beside the point. Magubane was correct to diagnose a liberal complacency in the Manchester School, the same complacency that Gouldner found so disturbing in the Chicago School—the complacency of academic "objectivity" that concealed the ethnographers' implication in the world they study. But the worlds in which the Chicago sociologists and the Manchester anthropologists were implicated were different. Gouldner referred sociologists to their entanglement with the regulatory agencies of the welfare state, while Magubane accused anthropologists of supporting imperial domination. As we shall see, this distinction proves important in the way sociologists and anthropologists conceive of the world order.

Taking his own fieldwork on the Copperbelt as point of departure, James Ferguson has recently added a respectful arrow to Magubane's quiver.[59] He digs up the theoretical premises of Manchester complacency, namely, their faith in progress and convergence. Even as it disdained traditional anthropology for casting the African as Other, Manchester anthropology subscribed to other modernization mythologies—the presumption that Africans would become urban dwellers like urban dwellers elsewhere, that the African industrial revolution would follow in the footsteps of its Western forerunners. They saw that Africans could switch back and forth between the roles of "tribesman" and "townsman," that there was no simple evolution of the *individual* from the former to the latter, yet they could not see the same indeterminacy in the historical process. They could not see that history too could switch directions, that it did not possess any more teleology than the circulation between town and country.

Ferguson's postmortem on the Manchester School comes twenty-five years after Northern Rhodesia became independent. In the 1950s Manchester anthropologists did not anticipate the end of colonialism, let alone the disillusionment of postcolonialism. They did not anticipate the precipitous decline of the Zambian economy, the ramifications of a falling copper price. They could not imagine massive unemployment, the devastating

consequences of structural adjustment, the return to the village, or the trauma of AIDS. Looking back now, we can see that they needed to have extended the extended case method to the level of the world economy. They needed to have taken their Marxism more seriously. They needed to have returned to their forerunner, to Godfrey Wilson's pioneering work on global ethnography.

After Max Gluckman died in 1975, the Manchester School continued in name only. Its most able practitioners scattered and took up their own callings. The Manchester mantle had passed, at least in part, to a distant cousin, another social anthropologist, Pierre Bourdieu.[60] The parallels are remarkable if unrecognized—the focus on social process, the divergence of norms and practices, the manipulation of rules, the functionalism, and the concept of field. Even Bourdieu's concept of habitus can be found in Victor Turner's work. There are two telling differences, however. First, Bourdieu's analysis of reproduction focuses on domination rather than on the functions of conflict, the peace in the feud, and the ritual of rebellion. Second, his focus on reflexivity demands that we recognize that we are of the world we study, that we are accountable to the "natives," who now talk back. No longer can we pretend to any clear demarcation between us and them. The political and economic orders that upheld such divisions have fallen. In this respect Bourdieu is as resolutely "postcolonial" as the Manchester School was "colonial." What this might mean and might not mean for the development of the extended case method is the question that concerns me next.

IN BERKELEY WITH THE EXTENDED CASE METHOD

I arrived at the University of Chicago in September 1972 as a grandchild and disciple of the Manchester School. I had been in Zambia since 1968, a refugee from England. Since Zambian independence in 1964, social anthropology was no longer organized from Manchester but had decamped to the Institute of Social Research, the renamed Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, at the new University of Zambia. It was there in 1970 that I began my postgraduate studies in sociology and anthropology—in those days and in that place no one bothered to distinguish between the two—at the feet of two vigorous minds. They were Jack Simons, the South African communist cum social anthropologist, and Jaap van Velsen, a formidable second-generation figure of the Manchester School. Surviving these two redoubtable figures served me well when I had to cope with the cut and thrust of the Chicago sociology department.

When I arrived at Chicago's Hall of Social Sciences, I had already dabbled in the extended case method. For four years I had studied the "Zambianization" of the copper mines—how Zambian "successors" were denied the resources and authority of their expatriate predecessors and

how these in turn were promoted into newly created positions to "oversee" Zambianization.[61] It turned into a study of the reproduction of the color bar, the principle that no black should have a white subordinate. Given that the first goal of the postcolonial Zambian government was to eliminate racial injustice, how was it, I asked, that the color bar persisted? I extended out from the racial dynamics of the workplace to the economic and political interests of Zambian workers, multinational capital, the new governing elites, and expatriate management. I showed how the configuration of *class* forces, inherited from colonialism, held the racial order in place. I continued my study of the Zambian "new class" of successors when I became an M.A. student at the then recently founded University of Zambia. There I spent two years participating and observing students on campus. Once again I adopted the Manchester method, examining a dramatic conflagration between university and government to trace the political lines of fault within the postcolonial order.[62] In each case study I deliberately, if mistakenly, resisted the neocolonial temptation to blame everything on forces beyond Zambia, on the continuing grip of Western imperial interests. In my view this was an ideology too easily deployed by the new Zambian elites to hide their own exploitation and domination of subaltern classes.

I left Zambia for Chicago expecting to find thriving discussions about development and a lively school of urban ethnography. I was in for a shock. Chicago's Committee on New Nations, a center of research on newly independent countries of Africa and Asia, was already defunct. I found Chicago sociology decidedly parochial and, even sadder, its ethnographic tradition moribund. What little there was seemed as closed off from the world as ever. William Kornblum's *Blue Collar Community* was about to be published. It paralleled Epstein's study of the Copperbelt in that it considered the relation between work and community on the South Side of Chicago, but it ignored history and context. Kornblum did not reach beyond the workplace to the imminent collapse of the steel industry nor beyond the neighborhood to the eclipse of machine politics. Kornblum worked inward to the primary group as the foundation of secondary associations rather than outward to economy and state. Similarly, Gerald Suttles's *The Social Order of the Slum*—the other minor classic of the period—cordoned off his community with geographical barriers, the tracks of the elevated railway, freeway construction, and the like. While the destiny of the Addams Area, one of the oldest slums of Chicago, was determined beyond its perimeters, Suttles focused on moral isolation and ordered segmentation within its artificial boundaries. Suttles and Kornblum brought Chicago ethnography to its final denouement, combining *institutional ethnography's* focus on the negotiated order with *local ethnography's* concern with urban community. Innovative though they were, these monographs were out of step with the times, ignoring the

legacies of the Civil Rights Movement, the Antiwar Movement, and the Great Society Program.

For my own research, I was interested in becoming a Chicago factory worker. Using a kinship entrée, I managed to land myself a job as a machine operator in the South Chicago plant of a large multinational. By a stroke of fate, it was the same plant that the famous Chicago ethnographer Donald Roy had studied thirty years before.[63] My first instincts were to undertake a critique of institutional ethnography—Roy's failure to see beyond the walls of the factory, his failure to recognize the historical specificity of Geer Company and its place within American capitalism.[64] When I contemplated Roy's enormous dissertation, a rich compilation of description and analysis, my respect for him as worker and ethnographer grew. I realized that it would be more interesting to use his study as a historical base line with which to compare my own. I would thereby supplement ethnography with ethnohistory. In this endeavor I was influenced not only by burgeoning studies of the transformation of work, but by the strange sameness of Roy's and my experiences. Although work at the drills had not changed much, there had been changes in the regulation of work. Over the thirty years, managerial control had become more reliant on consent than coercion. There had been a shift from a more despotic to a more hegemonic regime of production.[65] In trying to explain this, I extended my attention out from the shop floor, first to the absorption of Geer Company into a large multinational and, second, to the broader changes in industrial relations of the postwar period.

This launched me on a twenty-year research program into the politics of production. I asked whether the hegemonic regime I observed in Chicago was peculiar to America, as distinct from other advanced capitalist countries, and from there how production regimes might differ in early capitalism, Third World countries, and state socialism, and with what consequences for class formation. For the most part I used available ethnographies and social histories to explore these variations.[66] My interest in working conditions under socialism was piqued by another fateful coincidence, the discovery of Miklós Haraszti's lurid description of his own trials and tribulations as a machine operator in Hungary in the early 1970s.[67] My desire to suffer in a socialist factory intensified when the Polish working class rose up against its rulers in 1981. With the help of Ivan Szelenyi, János Lukács, and many others, between 1983 and 1989 I made my way into various factories in Hungary—champagne, textile, another machine shop, and finally long stints as a furnace man in the Lenin Steel Mill.[68] As I searched on the shop floor for the seeds of democratic socialism, the edifice of state socialism was disintegrating from above. Since I was not interested in the transition to capitalism, I jumped ship for the Soviet Union as soon as I could. But disaster—

call it revolution if you will—followed me everywhere. Since 1991 I have been observing and participating in the reprimitivization, what I call the involution, of the Russian economy. Following fellow workers from the early nineties, I have turned my attention to women's survival strategies and the household economy. I have finally evacuated industry because industry is disappearing.

I trace my own biography here not only to indicate my relation to the Manchester and Chicago Schools, not only to offer examples of the extended case method, but also to underline the fact that while I was a traveling ethnographer, while I never shrank from drawing the broadest conclusions from the smallest details, while I moved from continent to continent, nonetheless my horizons were always limited by the nation state. When I explained the differences between my experiences in two machine shops, one in Chicago and the other in Hungary, I drew on the relation between state and economy or on the economic logics of shortage and surplus economies. When I contrasted the success of Chinese economic reforms and the abysmal failure of Russian market reforms, I focused on national factors, the embeddedness of the state. My sociological vision always stopped at national boundaries. I never became a global ethnographer. Globetrotter, yes—global ethnographer, no.

How to extend the extended case method to the globe? That is the task Teresa Gowan and Seán Ó Riain set for us in the preface. But first it is necessary to offer a little adumbration of my understanding of the extended case method itself. It was only when I arrived in Berkeley in 1976 and had to teach participant observation that I began to reflect on my own research and contemplate what a historically grounded, theoretically driven, macro ethnography might mean. Compared to Chicago, Berkeley sociology was much more hospitable to the sort of ethnography I did. On the one hand, there was a long history of comparative and historical inquiry, stretching back to Frederick Teggart through Reinhard Bendix, Philip Selznick, Seymour Martin Lipset, Neil Smelser, Franz Schurmann, and Robert Bellah—a tradition that continues to thrive to this day. On the other hand, there was a deep commitment to ethnography begun by Herbert Blumer's mini-transplant of the Chicago School to Berkeley, bringing on board David Matza, Erving Goffman, Bob Blauner, Arlie Hochschild, and Troy Duster. Today the ethnographic tradition is stronger than ever with Barrie Thorne, Loïc Wacquant, Martin Sanchez Jankowski, Raka Ray, and Laura Enriquez. My aim was to marry these two traditions: the comparative historical and the ethnographic. Outside the department there was the inspirational work of anthropologists such as Aihwa Ong, Nancy Scheper-Hughes, and Paul Rabinow, and of the geographers, Dick Walker, Michael Watts, Allan Pred, and Gillian Hart. For them the extended case method was the very air they breathed.[69] Geography and anthropology could don the latest ethnographic

fashions unencumbered but also undisciplined by the heavy weight of the sociological canon. At Berkeley, then, I got all the encouragement I needed to situate ethnography within its historical and geographical context!

When it came to teaching participant observation, I quickly learned that the best way was to cast students out into the sea and let them swim for themselves. You learn ethnography through practice, and perhaps a little bit of apprenticeship. There are guidelines but few rules. More or less anything goes. It was in those seminars, meeting twice a week, that we collectively engaged each other's projects. That is where we learned the lore of participant observation and the strategies of "extending out." At the end of one especially collaborative seminar during the fall of 1988, I proposed turning the studies into a book. The students, mainly in their second and third years, seemed up for the challenge. With varying degrees of enthusiasm they conducted further research and endlessly revised their papers. The process proved much more arduous and lengthy than any of us expected, but eventually our labor bore fruit and *Ethnography Unbound* appeared. Here were studies of social movements around AIDS activism and the peace movement, of workplaces in welfare agencies and a bread cooperative, of immigrants from Cambodia and Central America, of schooling in the classroom and in an after-school tutorial college, of ethnographers working in an AIDS-prevention project, and, finally, one brave individual studied us. The ethnographies aimed to confound conventional stereotypes of participant observation as atheoretical, ahistorical, and micro. Each study sought to reconstruct, revise, or simply elaborate preexisting theories to accommodate its empirical findings to wider contexts of determination. The studies showed how labor markets shaped work organization, how the state defined spaces for collective mobilization, how welfare agencies limited the effectiveness of reform, how the local network economy could foster cooperative enterprises, and so on.

The authors of *Ethnography Unbound* had immersed themselves in the local metropolis to come up with a composite picture. In this they were similar to their Chicago predecessors, but the portrait they painted had a very different tone, style, and perspective. Instead of "social control"—the leitmotif of the Chicago School—they focused on the dynamics of domination and resistance; instead of a group's capacity for "self-regulation," they studied the "hegemony" of one group over another. To use Habermas's language, the Berkeleyites emphasized the way the external "system" colonized the subject lifeworld and how that lifeworld, in turn, negotiated the terms of domination, created alternatives, or took to collective protest. The Chicagoans, on the other hand, had focused on lifeworld autonomy as if there were no world beyond—the natural urban communities of Hoboland and Gold Coast, patients in the hospital or workers on the shop floor. The sociological habitus of the Berkeleyites, with a little nudging from myself,

led them beyond their sites to their constraining structures, whereas the Chicagoans celebrated self-regulation and bracketed the outside world.

The practitioners of the Chicago School occupied a non-Marxist and pre-feminist space in which the accumulation of knowledge was viewed as emancipatory. The post-Marxist and feminist Berkeley students of the late eighties, on the other hand, regarded knowledge with suspicion. Foucault had seeped into their imagination so that from their point of view knowledge was all too easily implicated in domination. But that didn't stop their practicing sociology. Rather, it made them averse not only to grand narratives and grand theory but also to the Chicagoan proclivity toward empiricism, in which abstraction followed closely on the heels of observations. Berkeley students took the middle road, searching for theories that might make their observations interesting, theories that would make their findings unexpected or anomalous, and then elaborating those theories. Apart from a general interest in domination and resistance, in how people participated in recreating or contesting the conditions of their oppression, there was little theoretical unity to *Ethnography Unbound*. What bound us together was method, in particular the extended case method.

We are not the only ones to use the extended case method. Many ethnographers approach their work with sensitivity to process, systematically incorporating historical and geographical context with a view to reconstructing existing theory. Thus, community ethnographies have not always stopped at the tracks, so to speak, but have incorporated the wider contexts of racism and labor markets[70] as well as urban political regimes.[71] Workplace ethnographies, traditionally confined to "plant sociology," have also taken external factors into account, such as race and ethnicity, citizenship, markets, and local politics.[72] Participant observation studies of social movements have located those movements in their political and economic context.[73] Ethnographies of the school have always sought to explain how education is shaped by and at the same time influences wider patterns of social inequality.[74] Family ethnographies have found it impossible to ignore influences beyond the household.[75] It is worth noting that many of these ethnographies are feminist in character, which is not an accident since, following Dorothy Smith, they have been concerned to dislodge essentialist explanations for gender domination by identifying external forces that have confined women in subordinate positions.[76]

My purpose here is to pull together a concept of what all these studies do in common, an elaboration of the dimensions of the extended case method with a sensitivity to questions of power and reflexivity.[77] The first dimension is the one common to all participant observation, *the extension of the observer into the world of the participant*. Rather than bringing the "subject" into the laboratory or into the world of the interviewer, the observer leaves the security of the university for the uncertain life of the participant. This is some-

thing shared by all three approaches—Chicago, Manchester, and Berkeley. There is a huge literature on covert and overt participant observation, different levels of immersion, insider and outsider status, and the role of informants, but what makes this relationship most problematic is the relation of *domination*, which distorts the mutuality of exchange.

The second dimension refers to *extensions of observations over time and space*. Ethnographers don't stick their toe in the water only to pull it out a second later. They spend extended periods of time following their subjects around, living their lives, learning their ways and wants. Believing that situations are important in determining both actions and beliefs, the ethnographer's problem becomes one of understanding the succession of situations as a social process. The early Chicagoans paid lip service to process, while the later ones took it more seriously, but it was the Mancunians who pioneered new forms of data gathering that were event- or case-centered. Such a reduction of situational observations to social process involves underscoring the contribution of some agents at the expense of others. It necessarily involves the second face of power—*silencing*.

The third dimension refers to *extending out from micro processes to macro forces*, from the space-time rhythms of the site to the geographical and historical context of the field. This was, as I have said above, a distinctive innovation of the Manchester School, and notably absent in the Chicago Schools. One way to think of the macro-micro link, but not the way we think of it, is to view the micro as an expression of the macro, discovering reification within the factory, commodification within the family, bureaucratization within a school. Some putative principle that governs society is found in its every part. For us the macro-micro link refers not to such an "expressive" totality, but to a "structured" one in which the part is shaped by its relation to the whole, the whole being represented by "external forces." That determination is often made accessible by explaining the divergence of two similar "cases." For example, in my work I explained the difference in work organization between my plant and Donald Roy's by reference to the different corporate context and the changing industrial relations context. I explained the difference between my experiences in Chicago and Haraszti's in Budapest by reference to the different political and economic orders of advanced capitalism and state socialism. The danger here is from the third face of power—*objectification*. That is to say, constituting the extralocal as forces gives them a false sense of durability. After all, forces are only the historically contingent outcome of processes that are hidden from the ethnographer. Objectification can be a powerful source of mystification, since we often believe we are in the grip of forces beyond our control which turn out to be quite fluid and susceptible to influence. Whatever the risks of objectification, the discovery of extralocal determination is an essential moment of the extended case method. Such discovery is impossible, how-

ever, without prior theory that would identify those external factors likely to be important.

The fourth dimension, therefore, is the *extension of theory*. Rather than being "induced" from the data, discovered "de novo" from the ground, existing theory is extended to accommodate observed lacunae or anomalies. We try to constitute the field as a challenge to some theory we want to improve. What makes the field "interesting" is its violation of some expectation, and an expectation is nothing other than some theory waiting to be explicated. We have seen how resistant the Chicago School was to adopting prior theoretical frameworks (even their own!) in order to refine, elaborate, revise, or reconstruct them. The Mancunians were also suspicious of starting with theory, although implicitly they almost always did. As social scientists we are conventionally taught to rid ourselves of our biases, suspend our judgments so that we can see the field for what it is. We cannot see the field, however, without a lens, and we can only improve the lens by experimenting with it in the world. There is an element of power here too, the fourth face of power—*normalization*. We are in danger of straitjacketing the world we study, disciplining it so that it conforms to the framework through which we observe it. We must expose our theories to continual critique from those they presume to understand, we must search for anomalies that challenge our theories, if we are to avoid the sorts of power effects that Edward Said, for example, discerns in "Orientalism."[78] Indeed, much of this book aims to expose the limitations of fatalistic and naturalistic interpretations of "globalization."

These in a nutshell are the four moments of the extended case method: extending from observer to participant, extending observations over time and place, extending from process to external forces, and extending theory. The fact that each dimension is limited by a corresponding face of power is not an indictment of the method but of the world. The shortcomings of our method only underline the ubiquity of domination, silencing, objectification, and normalization. The extended case method seeks to highlight those limitations not by ignoring them but by centering them— by entering into a dialogue with those we study, by encouraging different voices to challenge our emergent accounts of process, by recognizing there can be no one-way determination between processes and forces, and by developing theory through a process of dialogue with other theorists as well as with the world we encounter as ethnographers. We are engaged in a reflexive science in which the limitations of method become the critique of society.

FORCES, CONNECTIONS, AND IMAGINATIONS

We can engage and problematize each of the four dimensions of the extended case method but any given study will inevitably focus on one or

two at the expense of the others. *Ethnography Unbound* focused on the fourth, the elaboration and reconstruction of theory. The authors used their studies to improve existing theories in one of five substantive areas—social movements, work, immigration, schooling, and the practice of sociology. However, they made no attempt to understand the specificity of the Bay Area as a modern metropolis—as postindustrial economy, center of innovative politics, or multicultural agglomeration. The Bay Area was simply the container for our ethnographies. The extralocal was never problematized or defined as something we shared. It was specific to each case study—regional economy, labor markets, state, education system, and so on.

In this book, from the beginning, we were concerned to define a common context that we all shared, whether our sites were in the Bay Area, Pittsburgh, Middle America, Ireland, Hungary, India, or Brazil. That common context was the "globe." It was not simply a container for our researches, nor a variegated, taken-for-granted background. It became instead an object of theorization in its own right. Where *Ethnography Unbound* deliberately opened up context, here we reenclose our studies not within a village or a nation but within the globe. We do this to contribute, individually and collectively, to an understanding of globalization. This is where we depart from those contemporary anthropologists who open up their studies to the world without the world's becoming an object of investigation.

In effect we are problematizing the third dimension of the extended case method, the extension from micro to macro, from local to extralocal, from processes to forces. It is not simply that we take external "forces" to a global level but we problematize the very concept of forces. The danger here, as I have already suggested, is *objectification*—that global forces will appear inevitable and natural. We have adopted three strategies to counter objectification. The first is to consider global forces as constituted at a distance. The focus of the ethnography then is on the way global domination is resisted, avoided, and negotiated. The second strategy is to see global forces as themselves the product of contingent social processes. Here forces become the topic of investigation; they are examined as the product of flows of people, things, and ideas, that is, the global connections between sites. The third strategy, the most radical, sees global forces and global connections as constituted imaginatively, inspiring social movements to seize control over their immediate but also their more distant worlds, challenging the mythology of an inexorable, runaway world.

We begin with *global forces*. We draw on all sorts of secondary constructions to create a picture of the "global" economy, polity, and culture as composed of forces constituted beyond our sites. The global force makes itself felt through mediators that transmit it as their interest or as the subjective internalization of values or beliefs. The locality in turn can fight back, adapt, or simply be destroyed. Lynne Haney works through the entire chain

starting from men in suits, messengers of welfare efficiency and discipline, sent out by international agencies. They appeal to Hungarian sociologists and welfare administrators, who latch onto the rewards for adopting neoliberal discourses, and in turn direct welfare agencies to put those principles into practice. The ethnographic chain ends with protesting welfare clients, outraged by the materialization of their needs. They appeal to welfare regimes of the past to defend their interests in the present.

Like Hungary's "welfare mothers" held in disrepute, San Francisco's homeless recyclers mobilize their nostalgia for an era when they were included in American society. Teresa Gowan portrays them as reenacting that past, doggedly clinging to their work and their independence as recyclers, even as they are rejected as no better than the refuse they collect. They live near San Francisco's decaying shipyards, reminding workers there that tomorrow it could be them.

Twenty-five-year veteran boilermaker Joe Blum knows only too well how the yards have changed. He has experienced the long process of degradation not so much of the work itself but of the craftworker and the way he is treated. As sociologist, Joe Blum looks beyond changes in the immediate production regime to the transformation of the global shipbuilding and ship repair industry and to demilitarization. He and his fellow craftworkers show great ingenuity in finding new ways to labor in the shadows of globalization, in an effort to avoid the final degradation of homelessness. In each of our three cases, global forces descend on participants from without. These forces are not presented as abstract and inert, but as concrete and dynamic, evoking fluid patterns of resistance and accommodation.

The second approach takes us into the belly of the whale to see how global forces are constituted by global connections. While all of us are engaged in multi-sited ethnography, while none of us is riveted to a single place and time, it is only in the study of *global connections* that multi-sitedness becomes the object of theorization. Studying connections between sites, however, proved to be much more problematic than we had anticipated, mainly because from any one site connections fan out in multiple directions, so that the relations between any two sites are usually thin. Sheba George, for example, studies Christian nurses who migrate from the state of Kerala in India to Central City, U.S.A. They come from all over Kerala and not just a single community, so her ethnography tends to be more extensive and thinner in Kerala as compared with her more focused fieldwork in the parish of St. George's in Central City. She focuses her attention on the nurses' upward mobility as they migrate, and discovers that this is by no means an unalloyed American success story. Even in the United States, the nurses are pulled back into Indian patterns of gender and class stigma. She describes the finely balanced compromise between the downwardly mobile husband and the breadwinning wife and how this leads "nurse-husbands" to

reclaim status in the religious congregation. The immigrant community is no victim of global forces but actively reenacts its global connections to Kerala through the flow of marriage partners, babysitting kin, children, priests, videos, and monetary remittances, and through short visits for funerals, marriages, and births.

Seán Ó Riain has to concentrate on the Irish end of his study—software engineers who have the world in their heads, spiraling across the Atlantic through corporate webs. The global workplace, however, is firmly embedded in local as well as global networks, customs, and prejudices. Space and time, rather than being disembedded, are intensified by the global workplace, as the workteam is subordinated to the almighty deadline, emanating from American headquarters. As they plot their careers, they participate in and reproduce global connections. Like Sheba George and Seán Ó Riain, Millie Thayer burns the candle from both ends, but like them she too has to concentrate on one end, in her case Recife. She offers us the most optimistic picture of global connections—Brazilian feminists appropriating academic theories to engender popular social movements. The downside here is that the discourses and lessons learned in Brazil don't flow back to engender poor people's movements in the United States.

Unemployed shipyard workers, homeless recyclers, and means-tested welfare clients experience *global forces* as degradation and individualization, powers that dominate them and to which they must submit. Resistance there may be, but it is effective only in carving out small arenas of autonomy at the margins, enough autonomy to stymie rather than ignite rebellion. When we enter these anonymous forces and explore the processes of which they are composed—chains, flows, networks, in short *global connections*—we discover a more open and less determinate picture. From this second perspective the new world order offers new opportunities, new horizons, the expansion of geographical boundaries, an escape from the oppressive enclaves that had confined migrant nurses in Kerala, software engineers from Dublin, and feminists from Recife.

The third perspective demystifies globalization as something given, natural, and eternal—an ideology behind which corporations, governments, parties, unions, and so forth all justify their self-interested action as driven by global pressures. We study how different images of globalization are produced and disseminated, and how they can galvanize social movements.[79] Zsuzsa Gille shows how struggles over the distribution of resources and dangers in a small county in postsocialist southern Hungary suck global actors—multinational capital and the Greens—into a whirlpool of local politics disconnected from the central state. An ideological war is waged around the benefits of incineration and the hazards of waste. Steve Lopez documents the way unions in Pittsburgh refuse the logic of globalization and reverse attempts to privatize nursing homes by appealing to home-

grown counter-ideologies. The global imaginary deployed by Pittsburgh's new elites comes up against an equally powerful local imaginary. Maren Klawiter's study of breast cancer activism goes one step further. She shows how the medical-industrial complex, through changing medical practices, lays the foundations for local social movements, whose imaginations are then projected onto a global plane. Zsuzsa Gille explores the warring ideologies of globalization; Steve Lopez analyzes a local battle against the neoliberal ideology of globalization; and Maren Klawiter shows how ideologies springing from novel social movements can rise to the global level where they clash with other global imaginations.

Here then are the three strategies of global ethnography, strategies that correspond to real experiences of globalization. Transnational connections are the most directly global experience. Of course, as such, these are not new. Elites have always been connected across national boundaries, and international labor migration is certainly as old as capitalism. New means of transportation and communication, however, have made transnational links more universal, extending them in particular to such professional classes as software engineers, feminist organizers, and nurses. Still, not everyone is connected across the globe. Many experience globalization as a remote force that seems beyond human control. Especially, those expelled from a previous era of globalization who cannot find a niche in the new order—welfare mothers, redundant shipyard workers, and the homeless—can be overpowered by the effects of globalization. They experience globalization as loss. These "rejects" from the old order can resist or negotiate, but they do not have the wherewithal to contest globalization. That is the prerogative of those who have managed to accumulate resources with which to launch their challenges. Service workers can exploit their indispensability to the new global city. Hungarian villagers have turned their disused land with its toxic dumps into bargaining weapons against transnational capital. Women have appropriated control over their breasts, the most colonized part of the their body, putting the cancer industry, at least temporarily, on the defensive. These groups have challenged globalization by welding their resources to global or consciously counterglobal imaginations. Global imaginations reconfigure what is possible, turning globalization from an inexorable force into a resource that opens up new vistas.

BEYOND THE NATION

Recent reconstructions of the history of sociology and anthropology have drawn attention to their "preclassical" concerns with cultural diffusion and social difference on a global scale. At the beginning of this century anthropology narrowed its global focus to accommodate a professionalization that was marked by devoted and extended fieldwork, by dwelling rather than

traveling, by enclosing community in both space and time. When anticolonial struggles burst around their tents, when ethnography's imperial pillars collapsed, anthropologists rediscovered the global context of their studies. Such openings were pioneered in the 1950s by, among others, the Mancunians whose broader visions reflected the peculiar conditions of southern Africa—advanced industrialism, white settler colonialism, and burgeoning struggles of racialized classes.

Anthropology is now returning to its forebears of the nineteenth century, when European novelists, missionaries, colonial administrators, and sundry travelers painted the lives of "distant, exotic peoples." To be sure, today there is every attempt to hear multiple voices and perspectives, to deny difference's claim to superiority, and to recognize the location of the anthropologists relative to their subjects. For all the difference, however, the old and the new global explorations have something profound in common—the bypassing of the nation state. If the early anthropologists reflected a period before the rise of the modern nation state,[80] their contemporaries today have sprung straight from village to the world as though the nation had already deceased. Arjun Appadurai articulates this tendency when he writes of the way electronic media and transnational migration have liberated modernity from the nation state.[81] Modernity, as he says, is now at large, settling and unsettling localities everywhere, creating diasporic public spheres, dissolving the past in the present, prompting a nostalgia without memory, stimulating and releasing imagination in everyday life. The cultural landscapes—ethnoscapes, technoscapes, financescapes, mediascapes, ideoscapes—are the fabricated lens of a fragmented, imaginary world in which the nation state is pulled apart, enfeebled and dissolved.

Appadurai has influenced our own study of global connections and imaginations, but being sociologists we have a different legacy to contend with. As Robert Connell has insisted, sociology also set out in the last century with unabashedly imperial ambitions, concerned with mapping out hierarchies of difference—gender, racial and ethnic—on a global scale.[82] But its first major ethnography, *The Polish Peasant*, was remarkable in leaving behind those early discourses on "progress" and superiority. Thomas and Znaniecki took the standpoint of the colonized in prosecuting Polish nationalist renewal against the occupying powers. As we have seen, the Chicago School shrank this global ethnography into local ethnography, and from there it disappeared into the interiors of organizations. With the diminution of scale, with the turn to micro-sociology, ethnography became increasingly marginal—where before it had been central—to sociology, whose object had become civil society and its connection to the state.

Classical sociology, what is now retrospectively called the canon, was born between 1890 and 1920 as part of a nation-building enterprise. Its hidden premise was not only the justification of imperialism, global difference, and

domination of "primitive other," but the flip side of this—the metropole's
domination, but with the consent of, its subordinate classes. Sociology par-
ticipated in Gramsci's project of "national hegemony"—the expansion of the
state's ideological apparatuses, and its penetration into the newly constituted
civil society. Classical sociology was born together with the railroads, the
police, universal schooling, the welfare state, the popular newspaper, the
trade union, and the mass political party. Its message was solidarity, legiti-
macy, and bureaucracy. To this day its major subdisciplines—family, organi-
zations, political sociology, crime and deviance, health and medicine,
stratification, and so on—focus on the stabilizing and destabilizing tenden-
cies of civil society. World system analysis is not a challenge to sociology but
the apotheosis of sociology as we know it, because it presumes national hege-
mony to be unproblematic, a world order constituted of relations among
nation states. Indeed, rather than challenge sociology, world system analysis,
at least in its early incarnation, is itself challenged by globalization, by
processes that are supranational, transnational, and postnational.[83]

Anthropologists can simply evacuate their villages and communities and
move straight into the global arena, blissfully unperturbed by the tenacity of
the nation state. Their discipline has never taken the modern nation state
seriously and they are not about to do so now. Sociologists, on the other
hand, are still haunted by the nation state as their discipline's raison d'etre.
That is why when we talk of global forces we mean *supranational* forces,
forces that operate above the nation state. The logic of the world market,
and of its constituent institutions such as the United Nations, European
Union, and International Monetary Fund, takes the existence of nation
states as its premise. What is novel is the fact that states are now pulled not
only from below but also from above. But the effects reverberate downward.
As civil society loses its influence over the state, it turns outward, developing
what we have called *transnational* connections—flows of people, informa-
tion, and ideas, and the stretching of organizations, identities, and families.
The dense ties that once connected civil society to the state are being
detached and redirected across national boundaries to form a thickening
global public sphere. Yet these connections and flows are not autonomous,
are not arbitrary patterns crossing in the sky, but are shaped by the strong
magnetic field of nation states. Taxation, welfare, labor markets, regional
centers of economic agglomeration, natural resources, education, political
regimes, and ideologies—all mark out national grids for the transnational.
Just as global connections are transnational, global imaginations are *post-
national* in that they react against the nation, reinvigorate the local, demand
regional autonomy, or clamor for universal identities. As our studies show,
abstract ideas such as environmental justice, human rights, and feminist dis-
courses have their effects only when they are embodied in movements on
national soils. Even if it is true, *pace* Appadurai, that global imaginations

have emancipated themselves from the nation state and that the cultural is
rapidly disconnecting from the nation state, that should not blind us to the
latter's continuing influence in the realm of forces and connections.

If we are more cautious about the disappearance of the nation state than
anthropologists, we are not saying nothing has changed. Indeed, it is the
project of this book to specify what is new about the global, what distin-
guishes the global postmodern from the more familiar global imperialism
out of which it is emerging. As sociologists we take Stuart Hall very seriously
when he asks what it might mean to constitute hegemony not at a national
level, which is the old sociological project, but at a global level: that is the
new sociological project.[84] We return to these issues in the conclusion, after
ethnography has put flesh on the bones of our schemata.

NOTES

1. Fredric Jameson, "Cognitive Mapping." See also his *Postmodernism or, The Cul-
tural Logic of Late Capitalism*, and *The Cultural Turn*.

2. Manuel Castells, *The Information Age*, vol. 1, *The Rise of the Network Society*; vol.
2, *The Power of Identity*; and vol. 3, *End of the Millennium*.

3. David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity*.

4. John Meyer, John Boli, George Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez, "World
Society and the Nation-State"; and John Meyer and Brian Rowan, "Institutionalized
Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony."

5. Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, and *Modernity and Self-Identity*.

6. Robert B. Reich, *The Work of Nations*.

7. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, *World Class*.

8. Saskia Sassen, *The Global City*.

9. Indeed, Seán Ó Riain's account of the global labor process in this volume
(chapter 6) provides a good model for our own work relations. In the beginning we
went through an intense introverted phase, focused on establishing the parameters
of our collective endeavor, followed by an extroverted phase in which centrifugal
forces drove us apart. After the first year it was difficult to recapture our early soli-
darity. From then on we were held together by occasional meetings, informal sup-
port groups, and a continuous stream of deadlines that took us through successive
rewrites and revisions, new field work, and reorientation of the overall mission. At
times I felt much like Ramesh in Seán's description, trying to hold course from a dis-
tance and imagining the circulation of subversive e-mail exchanges beyond my
vision. For their part, my collaborators saw me as their Bela Karoly, the tyrannical
Olympic coach remembered for his incessant urgings, endless demands, and emo-
tional blackmail of his young female gymnasts.

10. James Clifford explains the early anthropologists' devotion to extended field-
work in a single place, their concern with dwelling rather than traveling, as an

attempt to demarcate themselves from missionaries, travelers, and colonial adminis-trators, who also indulged in descriptions of the tribes and peoples they came in touch with. Systematic observation, sustained over time in one place, was to make them scientists as distinct from dilettantes. See Clifford, "Traveling Cultures," and "Spatial Practices." Paul Rabinow's *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco* was one of the first ethnographies to break with professional codes by back-staging "dwelling" and front-staging "traveling," traveling to, through, and out of the field. Finished with the pre-liminary rituals of graduate school in Chicago, Rabinow takes off for the "field," arriv-ing in Sefrou, one of Morocco's regional cities. His motion narrative takes the reader from the city's colonial outposts to its Ville Nouvelle (where he finds his first Arabic teacher) and from there to the Medina where he meets his capricious contact to the village. He negotiates entry with the village elders and, once in, he is passed from one informant to another. Finally, he meets a Moroccan soul brother who leads him to deeper self-realization. The reflections end with Rabinow returning to Chicago a changed person, even more alienated from graduate school than when he set out. The book is saturated with the language of movement. In displacing the ethnogra-pher as dweller and centering movement, he violates all conventional norms.

11. George Marcus elaborates the idea of "multi-sited" ethnography in his *Ethnography through Thick and Thin*, especially chapters 1 and 3.

12. For recent reviews of the literature, see Michael Kearney, "The Local and the Global," and George Marcus, *Ethnography through Thick and Thin,* chapter 3.

13. There are many important anthropological figures who have resisted the temptation to marginalize history. Eric Wolf, *Europe and the People without History,* was a central figure in pioneering the location of ethnography in its global and histori-cal context. Other anthropologists have become sensitive social historians. See, for example, John and Jean Comaroff, *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination,* and Jean and John Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution.*

14. See Joan Vincent, *Anthropology and Politics,* for a fascinating historical recon-struction of the field of anthropology, which shows how this closing of the tribe came about, and Eric Wolf, *op.cit.,* for an anthropological reconstruction of history through a world system lens.

15. Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society.*

16. This narrative is drawn from Morris Janowitz's "Introduction" to his collec-tion *W. I. Thomas on Social Organization and Social Personality* and from Martin Bulmer, *The Chicago School of Sociology.*

17. I am here referring to the 1927 two-volume edition of *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* and not to the original five-volume edition. The contents are identical, just slightly rearranged. Thomas and Znaniecki mainly focus on parts of Poland occupied by Russia and to a lesser extent on those regions occupied by Ger-many, hardly mentioning Austro-Hungarian Poland.

18. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities.*

19. See, for example, Basch, Schiller, and Blanc, *Nations Unbound,* or Rachel Sherman, "From State Extroversion to State Extension in Mexico: Modes of Emi-grant Incorporation, 1900–1997."

20. See, for example, Eli Zaretsky's "Editor's Introduction" in his abridged edi-tion of Thomas and Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America.*

21. Blumer, *An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's* The Polish Peasant in Europe and America.

22. The locus classicus here is Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory.*

23. Thomas was arrested in a Chicago hotel room with a young woman on charges of disorderly conduct, false registration, and violation of the Mann Act. The event attracted a lot of negative publicity, especially as the woman's husband had just sailed for France to fight in the war. Thomas himself had always been a controversial figure, not least for his adamant support of women's rights. The staid University of Chicago wanted nothing more to do with him, despite protestation from some of his colleagues.

24. In their textbook, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology,* Park and Burgess do draw on Durkheim in their introductory chapter, using his notion of "collective rep-resentation" to establish the grounds for their key concept of social control. The only significant reference to Marx in the more than a thousand pages is to his "pon-derous tomes" to which orthodox socialism appeals. Simmel, by contrast, is a domi-nant influence throughout.

25. Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society,* Book 2.

26. The locus classicus of the early Chicago School, known as the green bible, was the textbook by Robert Park and Ernest Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Soci-ology.* Park became famous more as an essayist than as the author of original mono-graphs. See, for example, the collections in Park and Burgess, *The City,* and Ralph Turner, editor, *Robert E. Park on Social Control and Collective Behavior.* The best biogra-phy of Robert Park is Fred Matthews, *Quest for an American Sociology.*

27. Ernest Burgess, "The Growth of the City."

28. Nels Anderson, *The Hobo.* While this ethnography is by no means global in scope, it does locate migratory labor and homelessness in the context of capitalism. Anderson had been a hobo himself and his account, like Teresa Gowan's study (chapter 3 below), is unusual in giving centrality to work. But there is a difference. Whereas Gowan's independent recyclers try to reenact a world they have lost, the hoboes described by Anderson are more forward-looking, less oppressed by stigma-tization, more community-oriented, and more politically engaged (often with the IWW). Indeed, in a new introduction, written in 1961, thirty-eight years after the book's publication, reflecting on the hoboes' disappearance, Anderson referred to them as "heroic figures of the frontier" (xxi)—a far cry from contemporary pathol-ogization of the homeless, to be sure, but notably lacking in critique of the material and discursive world that had produced the degradation he had so effectively described. From the point of view of Park and the Chicago School, *The Hobo* offered a case study of a self-regulating community.

29. Harvey Zorbaugh, *The Gold Coast and the Slum.*

30. Louis Wirth, *The Ghetto.*

31. Paul Cressey, *The Taxi-Dance Hall.*

32. This is how Park and Burgess distinguish sociology from history: "As soon as historians seek to take events out of their historical setting, that is to say out of their time and space relations, in order to compare them and classify them; as soon as the historians begin to emphasize the typical and representative rather than the unique

character of events, history ceases to be history and becomes sociology" (*Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 8).

33. Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal.*

34. Hiller's book anticipates much social-movement literature of today—the pursuit of universality comes at the expense of history. The studies in the third part of this volume by Gille, Lopez, and Klawiter adopt a different, contextualized approach to social movements.

35. This narrative is taken from Abbott and Gaziano's "Transition and Tradition," a detailed account of factional fighting and feuding within the department, which reports that the department was in effective receivership from 1950 to 1957.

36. See Gary Fine, *A Second Chicago School?*

37. In his various writings Hans Joas has made the Chicago School's focus on the creative dimension of social action its defining trait, tracing this back to John Dewey and G. H. Mead. See Joas, *G. H. Mead, Pragmatism and Social Theory*, and *The Creativity of Action* (chapter 3).

38. Erving Goffman, *Asylums.*

39. Howard Becker, *Outsiders.*

40. Alvin Gouldner, "Sociologist as Partisan."

41. Alvin Gouldner, *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology.*

42. The Manchester School was composed of white social anthropologists who came to study with or under the redoubtable Max Gluckman, chair of Manchester University's Department of Anthropology from 1949 to 1975. Gluckman had been director of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute in Northern Rhodesia, which was to become Zambia in 1964. Even after Gluckman moved to Manchester, much of the fieldwork of his students continued to be conducted in Southern or Central Africa, although his international reputation attracted scholars to Manchester from all over the world.

43. See Richard Brown, "Passages in the Life of a White Anthropologist."

44. See Max Gluckman, *Rituals of Rebellion in South-East Africa, Custom and Conflict in Africa*, and *Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa.*

45. See, for example, Jaap van Velsen, *The Politics of Kinship*, which in many ways anticipated Pierre Bourdieu's analysis of kinship-based society in Algeria and his book *Outline of a Theory of Practice.*

46. See, for example, Victor Turner, *Schism and Continuity in an African Society.* Max Gluckman distinguishes the use of cases as "apt illustration" from their being the object of study in themselves, when they become the embodiment of social process. See Gluckman, "Ethnographic Data in British Social Anthropology."

47. Max Gluckman, *Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa*, chapter 5.

48. William Watson, *Tribal Cohesion in a Money Economy*, and Jaap van Velsen, "Labor Migration as a Positive Factor in the Continuity of Tonga Tribal Society."

49. Ulf Hannerz, *Exploring the City*, 119.

50. Max Gluckman, "Anthropological Problems Arising from the African Industrial Revolution."

51. Clyde Mitchell, *The Kalela Dance.*

52. A. L. Epstein, *The Politics of an Urban African Community.*

53. Edward P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class.*

54. Gluckman, *Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa*, chapters 8 and 9.

55. Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process*, and *Dramas, Fields, and Methods.*

56. *Schism and Continuity.*

57. *Dramas, Fields, and Methods*, 32–33.

58. Bernard Magubane, "Crisis in African Sociology," and "A Critical Look at Indices Used in the Study of Social Change in Colonial Africa."

59. James Ferguson, *Expectations of Modernity.*

60. The parallels are most clear in Bourdieu's *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (see pp. 22–30 for references to Gluckman and van Velsen) and its updated version, *The Logic of Practice.*

61. Burawoy, *The Colour of Class on the Copper Mines: From African Advancement to Zambianization.*

62. Burawoy, "Consciousness and Contradiction: A Study of Student Protest in Zambia."

63. Donald Roy, "Restriction of Output in a Piecework Machine Shop," "Quota Restriction and Goldbricking in a Machine Shop," "Work Satisfaction and Social Reward in Quota Achievement," "Efficiency and the Fix: Informal Intergroup Relations in a Piecework Machine Shop."

64. I was influenced in this regard by Tom Lupton's parallel Manchester study *On the Shop Floor.* Lupton, also an experienced worker, developed a view similar to Roy's, that the amount of effort delivered by workers was quite rational and that if this did not come up to managerial expectations it was because management had got the incentive system wrong or because the necessary material conditions were absent or because the work was poorly organized. Lupton, however, compared two different firms where he worked—a transformer factory and a garment factory—with a view to explaining differences in productive behavior on the part of workers. The differences between the shops allowed him to "extend out" his study to include such explanatory factors as labor markets, product markets, competition between firms, and labor costs as a proportion of total costs. It was this extension beyond the workplace that was never even contemplated by the Chicago School.

65. Burawoy, *Manufacturing Consent.*

66. Burawoy, *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes under Capitalism and Socialism.*

67. Miklos Haraszti, *A Worker in a Worker's State.*

68. Michael Burawoy and János Lukács, *The Radiant Past.*

69. One should not forget that Berkeley's anthropology department had its own close and distinguished connection to the Manchester School, one of Manchester's rare women, Elizabeth Colson.

70. See, for example, Elliot Liebow, *Tally's Corner*, and Philippe Bourgois, *In Search of Respect.*

71. See, for example, William Foot Whyte, *Street Corner Society;* Ida Susser, *Norman Street;* and Lynne Haney, "Homeboys, Babies, Men in Suits: The State and the Reproduction of Male Domination."

72. See, for example, Louise Lamphere et al., *Sunbelt Working Mothers;* Robert Thomas, *Citizenship, Gender and Work;* Vicki Smith, *Managing in the Corporate Interest;* Linda Blum, *Between Feminism and Labor;* and Ching Kwan Lee, *Gender and the South China Miracle.*

73. See, for example, Rick Fantasia, *Cultures of Solidarity;* Paul Johnston, *Success While Others Fail;* and Raka Ray, *Fields of Protest.*

74. See, for example, Paul Willis, *Learning to Labor;* Jay MacLeod, *Ain't No Making It;* and Brian Powers, *Making Marginality.*

75. See, for example, Judith Stacey, *Brave New Families;* Marjorie Devault, *Feeding the Family;* and Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, *Gendered Transitions.*

76. Dorothy Smith's "sociology for women" begins by debunking abstract, decontextualized, and universalistic sociology as the ideology of ruling men and turns to the concrete lived experience of women as point of departure. The microstructures of everyday life, which women direct, become the foundation and invisible premise for macro-structures controlled by men. When one includes the injunction to participatory research, this looks like the extended case method except that it claims to have no theoretical premises. Looking at Smith's empirical studies, on the other hand, I find them saturated with Marxism. See Smith, *The Everyday World as Problematic.*

77. Compare Jaap van Velsen's "The Extended Case Method and Situational Analysis," published in 1967 as one of the most advanced formulations of the Manchester method, with a more recent version, published by his student thirty years later, Burawoy's "The Extended Case Method."

78. Said, *Orientalism.*

79. We follow the lead of Allan Pred and Michael Watts, who study the cultural forms of protest, or what they call "symbolic discontent," that accompany capital accumulation in geographically and historically specific situations—from Islamic millenarianism sparked by Nigeria's integration into a world oil economy, to the renegotiation of gender identities among Gambian peasants instigated by the spread of contract farming, to linguistic resistance of California construction trades, to antiunion strategies of Korean capital. They show how movements are not only generated on the terrain of competing ideologies but such movements in turn often compose further alternative, compelling visions of their own (Pred and Watts, *Reworking Modernity*).

80. I am borrowing Eric Hobsbawm's periodization in *Nations and Nationalism since 1780.*

81. Appadurai, *Modernity at Large.*

82. Connell, "Why Is Classical Theory Classical?"

83. More sophisticated world systems analysis seeks to understand the way location in the world economy sets limits on the possibilities of national hegemony. For an exemplary study in this genre, see Kathleen Schwartzman's *The Social Origins of Democratic Collapse.*

84. Hall, "The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity," "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities," and "When Was the 'Post-Colonial'? Thinking at the Limit."

PART ONE

Global Forces