

SCTIW Review

Journal of the Society for Contemporary Thought and the Islamicate World

ISSN: 2374-9288

September 8, 2015

Sociological Misconceptions in the Study of Oriental Societies

Lutfi Sunar, *Marx and Weber on Oriental Societies: In the Shadow of Western Modernity*, Classical and Contemporary Social Theory Series, Ashgate, 2014, xiii + 208 pp., \$109.95 US (hbk), ISBN 9781472417169.

The monograph under review, *Marx and Weber on Oriental Societies: In the Shadow of Western Modernity*, presents a new and quite original interpretation of two of the most renowned thinkers and how they utilized studies on Oriental societies to support their sociological theories. As the author, Lutfi Sunar, claims, the Orient played a central role in the formation of Marx's and Weber's sociological work, since both dealt with the Orient in light of their interpretations of what led to the origins of Western modernity and capitalism. Sunar *argues* that Marx and Weber took the Orient as standing in opposition to the Occident, the unspecified Other, in order to support and emphasize the latter's unique development. More than that, he finds the Orient to be a common ground for a fruitful comparison and contrast of their theories. To achieve this, the author reconstructs Marx's and Weber's respective views of the Orient by analyzing the sources they used. In my review of this book, firstly, I aim to reconstruct Sunar's main argument and, secondly, I will offer some critical evaluations of its main methodological assumptions and further contextualize some of its findings.

To begin, the first chapter, entitled "Introduction: The Marx-Weber Relationship in Sociological Literature" (1-9), proposes the main thesis: that both Marx and Weber aimed to analyze the structure and function of modern society in conjunction with the development of modern capitalism and, more importantly, that the study of Oriental societies was a central element of their sociological theories that makes them comparable. In his review of the most prominent scholarly approaches to Marx and Weber, which interpreted them mainly on methodological grounds and in contrast to one another, Sunar contends that this antagonistic reading of Marx and Weber reflects the history of scholarship that emerged out of Cold War ideology and rhetoric; i.e., the scholarship on Marx and Weber was largely shaped by historical-political conditions, and this in turn directly applies to the forms of Orientalism found in Marx's and Weber's scholarship. Despite the strict divergence in Marx's and Weber's analyses of modern society, the author claims that they converge in their perspectives on Oriental societies in dealing with the historical formation of capitalism and the emergence of modernity in the so-called Western hemisphere. They do so because the aim of their sociology is to define the historical exceptionalism of Western societies, and, in

order to achieve this aim, both thinkers examined and constructed Oriental societies in strict opposition to Occidental societies. By taking the Orient as the common denominator between Marx and Weber, the author aims to overcome the oppositional reading of these classical sociological theorists.

The argument outlined in the introduction is developed in the following parts of the book. The first part, entitled “Karl Marx and Imagining the Orient” (13-65), consists of five chapters, in which the author reconstructs the formation of Marx’s view and vision of Oriental societies, including his use of studies and sources in the formation of his model of the Asiatic Mode of Production. The second part, entitled “Oriental Societies in the Theory of Max Weber” (69-160), entails six chapters. Therein Sunar discusses the formation of Weber’s sociology of Oriental Societies, analyzes his use of sources, identifies the basic elements of his study of Oriental societies, and describes how Weber defined the formation of modernity by using the Orient. The third part, entitled “Converging Poles of Sociology” (163-180), serves as a conclusion and briefly compares Marx’s and Weber’s analyses of Oriental societies, which culminates in an epilogue—a proposal for a re-examination of the role of Marx and Weber in the history of sociology. In order to do justice to the structure of this argument, a more detailed analysis is necessary.

The first part of the book starts with the second chapter titled “The Development of Marx’s Vision of the Orient: The Cultural and Social Background” (13-22). It presents a brief biographical sketch of Marx’s life and work with a focus on the political and intellectual environment of the young Marx. After outlining the main influences in Marx’s sociological work, the author argues that Marx developed his approach to Oriental societies in three different stages. In the first stage, which is confined to the critique of the philosophy of Hegel, there is no direct analysis of Oriental societies. However, when Marx intensified his efforts to understand and define modern society in the time after the 1848 revolutions in France and Germany, the author suggests, he produced numerous articles on colonial issues dealing with production and administration in Oriental societies. These articles, in turn, laid the foundation for his posthumously published work, *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*, which contains the first systematic analysis of Oriental societies. In conjunction, Sunar identifies those passages in which Marx references Oriental societies in his *Contributions to the Critique of Political Economy* as well as in the first and third volumes of *Das Kapital*. Based on this analysis, the author concludes this chapter by arguing that Marx criticized capitalism and, in doing so, placed Oriental societies at the opposite pole of the modes of production by defining them as a primitive communism. Besides providing some historical information on the development of Marx’s theory, this chapter comprehensively and systematically presents the passages in Marx’s works where he actually deals with what the author calls “Eastern” or “Asian” societies. This being said, it becomes quite clear that the Orient did not play a central role in the formation of Marx’s thinking.

The third chapter, “Discussions on the Asiatic Mode of Production” (23-33), gives an overview of the literature on Marx’s approach to Oriental societies. The author starts by presenting the early Soviet discussions, which are followed by an account of the discovery and publication of the *Grundrisse* and the rise and decline of the discussion of the Asiatic Mode of Production. Here, the author includes, despite its questionable relevance, a brief section on the Turkish debate on Marx and, subsequently, summarizes the main points of debate arguing that the place and function of Oriental societies in Marx’s theory is not addressed in these debates.

The author identifies in the fourth chapter, “Marx’s Sources for Oriental Societies” (35-42), Hegel’s dialectic as the methodological source for the development of Marx’s theory of

history, and he reiterates a point already made, namely, that Marx used Oriental societies as a mirror to Occidental societies, the former providing a context for the latter. The author then continues to specify the Enlightenment as the general framework for Marx's analysis of modern societies and argues that in the nineteenth century Western civilization is defined by the concept of progress. Subsequently, Sunar takes some early Orientalist studies as the source of Marx's foundational ideas and claims that Marx took information produced by these Orientalists for granted, as they served as the empirical basis for his theory that also helped him to formulate his philosophical methods and basic ideas. Without specifying which methods and ideas exactly Marx used, the author states that one can only find limited sources on the Orient in Marx's fundamental works, which might have more to do with the status of Oriental studies than with Marx's reception of it. In this context, the author, for example, contends that Marx "restricted himself through a selective use of his meager array of sources and generalized the information he found there to an extreme" (42). Without showing how Marx actually used his sources, the author merely identifies the sources that were cited and (other than in the second chapter) draws the general conclusion that Marx "uses the general thesis of political economists on the Orient without any criticism" (42). This rather indicated that Marx's view of the Orient was shaped through his theory than the other way around, as the author claimed earlier on. In any case, the dialectic between these two does not really become clear at this juncture.

The fifth chapter is entitled "Marx's Study of Oriental Societies" (43-60). It starts with the assumption that Marx's analysis of Oriental societies was shaped by his formulation of historical stages into modes of production leading to different forms of social and political organization. Thus, the author continues, Marx divided history into a number of epochs and periods based on the modes of production and forms of social and political organization, which is a commonly accepted view in the literature on Marx that he previously surveyed. While dealing with the ancient modes of production, Sunar observes that Marx classifies the Asiatic society and its mode of production as a separate form. Without providing sufficient evidence, he continues to argue that Marx used the term "Asiatic" for labeling the Oriental mode of production. Subsequently, the author addresses in a generic way some general notions, like the despotic state, irrigation and land ownership, as well as Oriental division of labor, village communities, the city, and how they apply to Marx and his work. He then addresses Marx's view on the change and stagnation in Oriental societies and argues that the relation of infrastructure and superstructure, with the former determining the latter, is reversed in Oriental societies, claiming that Marx contradicts his own theory when it comes to the Orient. Therefore, the system of production in the Orient enters a state of stagnation and remains in a stage of despotism. Sunar then concludes the chapter by addressing colonialism and the problems of the transition to capitalism, arguing that Marx's general theory of history can be used as a means to explain colonialism as the expansion and spread of capitalism, a view that cannot be easily justified in Marx's political theory. Without providing further evidence, the author concludes with such bold statements that, "According to Marx, capitalism will rescue the Orient from the eternal stagnation via colonialism, thus joining the Orient into the main current of history" (57), and "What he has to say on Oriental societies can be seen as a legitimation of colonialism" (58).

In "Marx's Oriental Mirror" (61-65), the concluding chapter of the first section, Sunar reiterates that Marx did not attempt to study Oriental societies independently, but rather analyzed these societies in the context of his reconstruction of modern societies. By way of negation, he summarizes his main objective and rather counterintuitively argues, "The fact that Oriental societies are not dealt with directly...demonstrates their great importance in

Marx's work" (63). Then the author argues that the sources used by Marx did not provide sufficient information for a study of Oriental societies, which can easily be inferred, to support the view that Oriental societies were conceived in opposition to modern societies. In contrast to what the author argued for in the fourth chapter, he now claims that Marx was actually aware of the weakness of his sources and "used them within a critical perspective" (63). Sunar then restates that the main weakness in Marx's study of Oriental societies is that he used his sources selectively and did not study Oriental societies independently.

The second section of this book deals with the reconstruction of Weber's study of Oriental societies starting with the seventh chapter, "The Formation of Weber's Sociology of the Orient and its Reception" (69-84). Here the author analyzes the political and intellectual climate in Germany during Weber's youth and discusses the formation of his thought and its epistemology. In line with common views in sociological scholarship, he stresses that Weber rejected causal explanations in the social and cultural sciences and emphasized the subjective or intended meaning of social actions. He also provides an exegesis of Weber's notion of the ideal type, which was introduced as a means to study the characteristic features of recurring social phenomena. Without having discussed Weber's own approach to Oriental societies yet, the author concludes this chapter by reviewing the later debates that evaluate Weber's studies of Oriental societies.

In "Weber's Sources on Oriental Societies" (85-98), the author meticulously lists and elaborates upon in considerable detail the sources that Weber used in his studies on China, India, and Islam. He observes that, "There is a great bibliographic variety in his works" (85). Here, he aims not only to identify the sources, but also to determine which sources Weber was mainly relying on in his account of these societies. Even though Sunar acknowledges Weber's work for stressing an interpretative sociology by introducing the notion of ideal types, at the same time he praises Weber for having actually "transformed the knowledge in his sources into a sociological explanation and established general explanatory models" (95)—a claim that might need to be justified more clearly in light of Weber's interpretative approach to sociology.

The ninth chapter, "Same Old Differences: Differentiating between the Orient and Occident" (99-110), reiterates some of the main concerns and issues that the author already addressed in the work of Marx. In the most general terms, he again starts by contending that "Weber uses the Orient as the opposite of the West, that is, to mean non-Western" (99). Taking Western forms of rationalism as the main criterion, as the author stresses, Weber overemphasizes the unique nature of the Occident in contrast to the Orient. Sunar then continues by reconstructing the way Weber utilized rationalism to explain the formation of capitalism and how this in turn facilitated the view that capitalism is based on the opposition to traditionalism. As the author rightly states, Weber's analysis of Oriental societies is driven by his attempt to prove the originality of the West. The author also identifies climatic differences and the restrictions of water supply and irrigation as one of the determinant factors that Weber supposedly used to differentiate between Occidental and Oriental societies. On the other side, as the author argues, Weber attributed the decisive difference between the Orient and Occident in the historical differentiation that emerged with the Hebrew and Greek societies; namely, the ways in which they overcame the Oriental religions' ties to magic. The author goes on to identify how, in Weber's work, the emergence of city-state civilization and the formation of democracy can be seen as one of the major advances of the Greeks. Additionally, Israel is characterized as having gained fundamentally different features in contrast to surrounding civilizations. This chapter ends without bringing together these different threads in the proposed line of argument.

The tenth chapter, “Divergences: Religion, Politics, and Economics” (111-133), deals with some central features of Weber’s sociological theory, namely how Weber based his study of economics and politics on the ethical values and worldviews derived from world religions. In accordance with the standard interpretation, the author argues that it was Weber’s aim to demonstrate the impact worldviews and religions have on decisions regarding the organization of social relations and economic decisions. In order to do this, he reconstructs the differentiation of religious thought and mentality in Weber’s work, claiming that Weber assumes that there is a direct correlation between religious beliefs and the structures of society. Sunar therefore maintains, “Not only does religion influence the social order, but the social order influences religion” (111). In light of this, Sunar also finds that Weber opposes the “passive Orient” to the “active Occidental” and continues to elaborate on Weber’s different notions of God, the individual, and the differences he sees in the West and East. The author further explicates the different ways in which religions and the world are related to one another in Weber’s work. Subsequently, he discusses, in more detail, Weber’s notion of the spirit of capitalism and the forms of economic rationalization, as well as the differentiation of political systems and their forms of legitimizing political authority that Weber attached to different forms of worldviews.

These differences are further elaborated upon in the eleventh chapter. In “Disengagements: Basic Elements of Weber’s Study of Oriental Societies” (135-153), the author examines various related aspects, in which Weber tries to exemplify the different developments of Oriental and Occidental societies and how they are viewed in opposition to one another; namely, the role of the city as a location for capitalism and the different role it plays in Oriental societies. Here he also addresses the different notions of law and legal systems in the Orient and Occident and discusses, despite its questionable relevance for the overarching argument, the different forms of music in the West, with a particular focus on the rational foundations of modern music to support that Weber viewed the Orient and Occident in strict opposition to one another.

The chapter that concludes the second section is titled “Weber’s Occidental Geist: Defining the West by Using the Orient” (155-160). Reiterating the main argument, the author hypothesizes that Weber made comparisons between Oriental and Occidental civilizations, but “never felt the need to question the empirical or theoretical validity of this literature” (157). The author continues to contend that Weber needed to identify basic features as ideal types in order to compare such complex entities as the Orient and Occident. On this basis, he states that Weber is eclectic, anachronistic, and juxtaposes unrelated evidence that casts a considerable shadow on Weber’s claim for objectivity. Contrary to Weber, the author states that, “Because the basic goal is to formulate an Orient whose character opposes that of the West, Weber does not observe, in any case, the context of the data he selects” (159).

The third part concludes the argument of this book. In “Converging Poles of Sociology,” the author reiterates the main points made in the introduction. In the thirteenth chapter, “A Comparison of Marx [sic] and Weber’s Analyses of Oriental Societies” (163-175), he starts by describing Weber’s relationship to Marx and tries to identify what these different sociological theories have in common by showing how both have their theoretical basis in the notion of Western exceptionalism. By comparing the Orient with modernity as each thinker presented them, Sunar maintains that in Marx’s work “the Oriental societies were dealt with and approached as a combined single structure, ignoring different historical and social conditions” (165), whereas in Weber’s work one becomes more aware of the differences within Oriental societies due to the advancements in Oriental studies.

Nevertheless, in order to support his general argument, the author insists that Weber still “confuses these differences and does not refrain from creating an Orient that is formed of a society opposed to the West as a whole in order to establish a base for his analysis” (165). Thereafter, the author addresses what he calls “overlapping sources and common fallacies in the developing orientalism,” even though he acknowledges the advances in the study of Oriental societies. He points out that “Weber developed analyses based on concrete data in keeping with Marx’s general templates. While Marx makes more general and abstract comments regarding the subjects at hand, Weber takes advantage of more detailed empirical research and is able to carry out more penetrating factual analyses” (167). He continues to argue that both thinkers conceived of geographical and climatic conditions as well as the need for irrigation in agriculture as reasons for the emergence of despotism in Oriental societies. In conclusion, the author maintains that Marx and Weber are subject to the same methodological mistake: that they studied the Orient not for its own sake, but used the available sources only to construct their theories of the historical exceptionalism of Western societies, and in so doing dealt with a fictional Orient. As the author reiterates, “When it comes to Oriental societies, there is similarity between Marx and Weber in that both thinkers neglect their own methodologies” (174). “Thus,” he continues, “when Oriental societies are examined, both Marx and Weber abandon their own methods and become united in the idea that the determining factor is the political structure” (175). The only methodological question that remains regarding this endeavor is: What does the study of the West reveal about the study of the East?

* * *

One of the advantages of this work is that it draws new attention to the importance of the analysis and reconstruction of concept formation in the sociology of what is often called “Oriental Societies.” Its main strength is that it calls for a re-evaluation of the role of Marx and Weber in the history of sociology. That being said, I have identified several major weaknesses in Sunar’s argument: the uneven treatment of Marx and Weber, the lack of clarification of the categories used, the insufficient analysis of the use of sources on Oriental Societies in the work of Marx and Weber, and the lack of elaboration on the role of religion in the concept formation of Marx and Weber.

Sunar does not evenly reconstruct how Marx and Weber viewed Oriental societies. As the outline of the argument indicates, he is more concerned with identifying and reconstructing the sources they used rather than establishing the link between how Marx and Weber used their sources and how the use of these sources actually affected the formation of their different theories of society in general and the societies in the Orient in particular. Besides, by merely focusing on the study of Oriental Societies in Marx and Weber, the author misconstrued the formation of Orientalism as a much broader and persisting cultural and social phenomenon. More general questions about the relevance of the study of Oriental societies are not sufficiently addressed to locate and identify the role Marx and Weber played in this respect. The author, for example, missed the chance to make, in more theoretical and methodological terms, a contribution to the formation of Orientalism in sociology as an academic discipline.

More importantly, the author does not further develop or reconstruct the concept of the Orient, or, even, establish an analytical or operant definition of it. Thus, it remains unclear what exactly the author means when he refers to the Orient or to Oriental societies; this also applies to the grid of classification he used to determine and select the sources in analyzing

Marx and Weber. Although the author reconstructs the role of a stereotype in the formation of social theories, he does not demonstrate how he establishes the historical continuity of the concept he used. Without a precise definition of one of the most central concepts for his analysis and the establishment of a broader methodological framework of analysis, Sunar fails to distinguish between the historical contexts, within which Marx and Weber introduce their sociological concepts for studying Oriental societies, and the scholarly sources they used to support their studies of these societies.

Other than making clear the similarities between Marx and Weber in light of their study of Oriental societies, the author does not develop a more systematic argument about theory formation or the impact of Oriental studies on the formation of social theory. In contrast, as stated before, he primarily focuses on the use of sources instead of reconstructing the Orientalism within social theory. The empirical foundation of his evidence simply does not justify the claim that the study of Oriental societies is a central part of Marx's theory of capitalism.

There are further questions about the structure and organization of the main argument. The book and its individual sections begin with discussions of the reception of the work of Marx and Weber. Before starting with the reconstruction of the evidence, the author directs the reader to the outcome before the argument unfolds. In light of this, it could be surmised that the selection of sources was determined more by the history of its reception than by its true historical development. Consequently, Marx and Weber are read and reconstructed from a contemporary perspective rather than reconfigured in the context of their time. It is from this basis that the author is able to reiterate the same point at the beginning of each chapter and section without demonstrating a concise development in the argument.

Another weakness of this study lies in its structure of the two main parts. The reconstruction of Marx and Weber is made on uneven grounds. As the author points out, Marx and Weber studied Oriental societies in different degrees of depth and intensity. As he also indicates, Oriental studies significantly developed from the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth centuries. Although one may wonder whether the difference in Orientalist scholarship and the changing social and political conditions may have affected how Marx and Weber approached their sources, the author, in the end, seems to take an ahistorical approach in comparing the different sociological theories. In order to drive his point home, the author tries to make the reader believe that, in dealing with Oriental societies, Marx and Weber are essentially the same. This only seems plausible by decontextualizing these theories and emphasizing that both share the same essence. The other consequence is that the author discards most scholarship on Marx and Weber based on the assumption that it follows a particular agenda. Rather than considering the methodological differences in the sociological theories of Marx and Weber, the author starts at the fringes of their sociological approaches and argues that these theories are virtually the same in regard to the Orient. Aside from the fact that Marx and Weber have different views and approaches to understanding and studying the origins of Western modernity and the formation of capitalism, the author does not seem to take into consideration that Marx and Weber might have had different views of the Orient. The fact that they used the same term does not mean that both had the same concept of it. Besides, the author does not reconstruct what exactly Marx and Weber meant by "the Orient" and what alternative terms they used in their works, for example "Asia" or "the Middle East."

Furthermore, the organization of the different sections is inconsistent and does not follow a coherent structure. Aside from the obvious differences in the length of the chapters on Marx (52 pages) and Weber (91 pages), the author did not make the same effort to

reconstruct the sources that Marx used (7 pages) as he did when reconstructing the sources that Weber used (13 pages). Besides, Marx's account of the Orient is rather insignificant in contrast to Weber's account. Whereas Weber made a considerable effort to reconstruct the organization of Middle Eastern and East Asian societies to find broader grounds on which to build his theory, Marx primarily used research on the Asian mode of production to explain the exception to his theory. In particular, the selection and use of sources in Marx's reconstruction is not thoroughly explicated. For example, the author does not explain what difference it made that Marx formed his notion of the Orient on the basis of philosophical works published in the early nineteenth century, whereas Weber used empirical sources that were based on scholarship produced using a different paradigm of research. Furthermore, Sunar does not sufficiently take the different intellectual contexts of Marx and Weber into consideration. For instance, what role did positivism and historicism play in the work of Weber? What differences did the background of German philosophy make on the theory formation of Marx and Weber? What does this tell about the differences in the theories and methods Marx and Weber used? More importantly: What is the connection between the sources used by Marx and Weber, and how does this difference effect the ways in which they constructed their theories of modernity and capitalism? These and other questions central to this research project remain unanswered.

Still further questions to be asked include whether the author succeeded in demonstrating that Orientalism is the key aspect in the theory formation of Marx *and* Weber and whether the study of Oriental Societies is the decisive point of reference leading to the results Marx and Weber discovered regarding their studies of the formation of capitalism and the emergence of modernity? What is the role of human intentionality and the infrastructure? What are the views of the laws of history? How do interpretation and explanation matter and differ in the works of Marx and Weber? What is the role of Durkheim in the formation of Weber's thought? What role did colonialism and, in particular, the military campaign of Napoleon in Egypt (as the depiction of Napoleon facing the Sphinx on the book cover seems to suggest) play in the formation of Orientalism? Another shortcoming of this monograph is that it does not address the role of religion in the formation of Oriental Societies. Islam does not play a significant role either.

Overall, the author tends to assume that there is some simple form of determinism in the way Marx and Weber used or were affected by their sources in the study of Oriental societies. Without providing sufficient evidence or a further evaluation of the sources on Oriental societies that were available in the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries,¹ the claim that Marx and Weber are selective remains unconvincing. Without evaluating the sources in the context of their time, the author merely points out and continually reiterates that the sources Marx and Weber used are insufficient for studying Oriental societies, which as we know was not their aim. If Sunar makes these kinds of statements, he should provide some more argument and evidence that his view of the Orient is correct and does not itself rely on insufficient sources.

In the end, the critique that Sunar articulates can be applied to his own work; as shown, it is selective, anachronistic, and contradicts its own methodological premises. The work is

¹ See for example: Edward W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, 2 vols. (London: C. Knight, 1836); Henry J. Van Lennep, *Travels in Little-Known Parts of Asia Minor*, 2 vols. (London: J. Murray, 1870); Charles M. Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1888); Martin Hartmann, *Der islamische Orient: Berichte und Forschungen*, 3 vols. (Berlin: W. Peiser, 1905); and Edvard Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco* (London: Macmillan, 1914).

anachronistic because it employs the same simplistic and essentialist notions of the Orient and Occident it aims to criticize. In this regard, the author reiterates the same methodological fallacy that he accuses Marx and Weber of making. The author further fails to convince his audience that the Orient played a central role in the formation of social theories of modernity and the origin of capitalism.

The main problem is that the author does not provide an alternative view other than stating that the Orient in the work of Marx and Weber should be reconsidered. He argues that Marx and Weber are wrong in their view that the East is in opposition to the West. However, he does not go beyond articulating this claim. Besides, the author reifies the Orient and Occident as if they were, for Marx and Weber, entities or totalities on their own. He seems to overlook the fact that both used different sources and wrote at different times on different issues related to what the author calls “Oriental societies.” In doing so, he reiterates the points he is criticizing Marx and Weber while his main claims remain unproven.

In light of the points of critique raised above, this work is a crucial reminder of the main challenges scholars in sociology and the social sciences face when studying the formation of sociological approaches to a particular field of study. Aside from the work and effort put into this scholarly account and the merit it may have, it is doubtful that this book contributes to the historical and sociological scholarship on Marx and Weber. Given the prominence of Edward Said, Bryan S. Turner and others who proposed a sharp critique of “Orientalism,” it is questionable, if the present book actually made a contribution to this kind of scholarship which deserves to be taken seriously. Because of the theoretical and methodological obstacles posed by this book, a more rigid and refined reconsideration of the role of the “Orient” in the work of Marx and Weber will sooner or later certainly become necessary.

Jens Kreinath
Associate Professor of Anthropology
Wichita State University

© 2015: Jens Kreinath

Authors retain the rights to their review articles, which are published by SCTIW Review with their permission. Any use of these materials other than educational must provide proper citation to the author and SCTIW Review.

Citation Information

Kreinath, Jens, *Sociological Misconceptions in the Study of Oriental Societies*, *SCTIW Review*, September 8, 2015. <http://sctiw.org/sctiwreviewarchives/archives/703>.

ISSN: 2374-9288